

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
SEPTEMBER 25, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Celeste Cook, Tom Cottrill, Dale Conly, Jeff Hollinger, Ken McWilliams (Planner), Larry Ballin (Selectmen's Representative), Michele Holton (Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michael Doheny, Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate)

Chair Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM. Chair Ebel asked Alternate PB Member Holton to join the PB as a replacement for PB Member Doheny.

I. DOROTHY & RICHARD SCOTT – Final Minor Subdivision (Tax Map 73, Lot 11)

Dorothy and Richard Scott were accompanied by John McKenna (Realtor) and David Eckman (Eckman Engineering, LLC).

Mr. Eckman distributed small copies of the subdivision plans to PB members. He said that the Scotts were trying to sell their property and were proposing to subdivide a 1.38 acre parcel at 182 Everett Park to create two lots: Lot 1 would contain 0.6 acres and an existing house; Lot 2 would contain 0.78 acres and an existing workshop. He advised that both lots would be served by municipal water and sewer. Mr. Eckman advised that the plan also defined the location of a pre-existing 10-foot-wide sewer easement over Lot 1 for the benefit of a lot located behind the Scott property. He pointed out that the sewer easement was described in Note 8 on the plan.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present who wished to speak. There were none. Chair Ebel asked if any issues were raised at the meeting of municipal department heads. Mr. McWilliams replied that no issues had been raised.

John McKenna advised the PB that a sale of the property, both lots, to one person was pending, but the Scotts needed to demonstrate that the property could be subdivided.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE FINAL MINOR SUBDIVISION OF TAX MAP 73, LOT 11 INTO TWO LOTS, ONE CONTAINING 0.6 ACRES AND ONE CONTAINING 0.78 ACRES, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY DOROTHY AND RICHARD SCOTT. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A mylar of the plan was presented for PB signatures and, thereafter, to be forwarded to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

II. GREG GUTGSELL & DARREN PHIPPS/GUTGSELL & PHIPPS, DDS, PA – Preliminary Site Plan Review: Dentist Offices (Tax Map 59, Lot 1)

Michele Holton recused herself from the PB due to her involvement with the Lake Sunapee Region Visiting Nurse Association (LSRVNA), an abutter.

Greg Gutgsell, DDS introduced Darren Phipps, DDS and Chris Lizotte (Sheerr McCrystal Palson Architecture). He said that he and Dr. Phipps were proposing to use the property at 125 Newport Road, formerly the site of Hayward Refrigeration, for their dental practices. Dr. Gutgsell said that the PB had recently reviewed a proposed plan for the site presented by Dan Wolf. He advised that Gutgsell & Phipps, DDS, P.A. planned to adapt the existing building for its purposes.

Chris Lizotte displayed a plan of the property and proceeded to pointed out the differences between the plan proposed by Gutsell and Phipps and the plan presented by Dan Wolf at an earlier PB meeting. He advised that Phase I would provide 4,136 square feet of dental office space at the front of the existing building and Phase II would include a 4,000-square-foot addition off the back of the existing building. Mr. Lizotte said that the proposed use would be less intense than the use previously proposed and would require less parking, thereby allowing for more green space for detention of drainage and on-site treatment. Chair Ebel advised that the PB wanted to push parking lot construction toward drainage infiltration, not detention, and encouraged the use of low impact drainage (LID) techniques. Mr. Lizotte said that parking would follow the grade. Mr. Lizotte advised that, in Phase II, clients would enter via a porch that would be constructed as part of the 4,000-square-foot addition. He said that the curb cuts would remain unchanged. He advised that the parking spaces on the Griffiths side of the property would be used for staff parking and the public would park on the side abutting the LSRVNA.

Ken McWilliams reported that New London Fire Chief Jay Lyon had expressed concern about vehicles exiting via the incline on the driveway shared with the Griffiths' building. Mr. McWilliams advised that the proposed use would require 19 parking spaces for Phase I and the site provided 46 spaces. He said that that the proposed regulations would require 41 parking spaces altogether for both Phases I and II and there would still be enough on the site. PB Member Hollinger asked if all of the parking would be constructed now. Mr. Lizotte replied that Phase II parking would be constructed when Phase II was built. Chair Ebel asked where the staff would park. Dr. Gutsell responded that staff would park on the side abutting the Griffiths property and in the rear of the building. Chair Ebel asked if the dentists had seen the new parking requirements contained in the proposed Site Plan Review (SPR) Regulations. She recommended giving a copy of the proposed regulations to the applicants, in case they don't submit their final plan before the regulations are approved.

Ken McWilliams advised that Fire Chief Lyon recommended that the west access be used as an entrance only and that traffic be one-way exiting via the east access. Fire Chief Lyon also pointed out the need for the building to be "sprinklered", have a fire alarm, and be compliant with all state and local fire codes. Director of Public Works Richard Lee advised that the applicants would have to pay for wastewater service and install "one-way" signage for the left side. Mr. Lee also pointed out that the proposed location of the handicapped accessible parking was actually in the setback. Mr. Lizotte said that in order to be ADA compliant, the grade could not exceed 2%. He advised that the placement of the handicapped accessible parking was determined by the 2% requirement, which was met by the plan. He said that the sidewalk also met ADA requirements. PB member Cook asked if there was any way to locate an entrance near the ADA parking. Mr. Lizotte replied that the dentists wanted to use that area for offices, not an entryway. Ken McWilliams said that Police Chief David Seastrand had a problem with the curb cut on the west side of the property being used as an exit.

PB member Cottrill asked if there was any ability to switch the angled parking spaces on the west around. Mr. Lizotte replied that cars would then be backing uphill in winter if they were switched. Mr. Cottrill asked how far they were from the wall. Mr. Lizotte replied that they were 25 feet away. Dr. Gutsell stated that they hadn't considered not eliminating the west curb cut as an access. Mr. Cottrill suggested eliminating the first angled parking space on the west. Dr. Gutsell said that they had discussed locating the handicapped parking in front of the building. Chair Ebel advised that the PB was trying to eliminate parking in front of buildings.

Chair Ebel asked if they had any plans for paving. Mr. Lizotte responded affirmatively. PB member Hollinger asked what the green-space requirement was. Mr. Lizotte replied that the plan would meet the 25% requirement. Ken McWilliams advised that the requirement under the new regulations would be 35%. PB member Hollinger asked what the space in the rear would be before Phase II. Mr. Lizotte replied that it would be green space. Chair Ebel asked if there would be any shrubs. PB member Cottrill noted that there were two trees behind the building. Mr. Lizotte responded that the space would be used for swales and, maybe, a detention pond. Chair Ebel advised that the PB was trying to have drainage treated on-site and using LID techniques. PB member Ballin asked if any fill would be needed for construction of the parking area. Mr. Lizotte replied that they were trying to go with the grade. PB member Cottrill recommended removing the first parking space on the west and putting green space between the curb and parking space #2.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any drainage problems behind the property. Andi Steele, LSRVNA, advised that there was a private home located behind the New London Cleaners and that there had been some drainage issues there. She said there were no drainage issues now that she was aware of. She also advised that traffic from the LSRVNA exited via the curb cut on the east side of the Hayward property.

The applicants advised that they would like to return to the PB for a Final Site Plan Review on October 23, 2007. Chair Ebel advised that the PB would be looking for drainage calculations in its review of the plan. She said that the PB also recommended "one-way" signage and elimination of the first parking space on the west side of the property. She advised that the PB anticipated holding a Public Hearing on the proposed Site Plan Review Regulations at the October 23, 2007 meeting of the PB. She cautioned that the placement on the Agenda could determine what the requirements would be.

Michele Holton returned to the PB.

III. NEW LONDON HOSPITAL – Temporary Off-Site Parking (Tax Map 72, Lots 16 & 17)

Celeste Cook recused herself from the PB as a trustee of New London Hospital.

Lori Underwood, New London Hospital's Senior Director, Planning and Projects, said that the next three months, while work is being completed on the new parking lot, would be the most difficult for hospital parking. She advised that Colby-Sawyer College had allowed the hospital to use K Lot for parking during the summer; however, that option ceased to exist when the students returned to the college campus. She said that the hospital had also been using the parking area behind the New London Barn Playhouse, but had found that the playhouse was in a residential district, not the commercial district, and a neighbor had objected to that use of the parking area.

Ms Underwood advised that the Town of New London had offered the hospital 18 parking spaces at Bucklin Beach. She said that the hospital had also discussed using the area at the rear of the Hayward property located at 125 Newport Road for parking Monday through Friday, with a shuttle service for construction workers. She advised that the previous parking area at the hospital would be paved during Monday through Friday of the next week. PB member Ballin asked how many spaces would be available on the Hayward property. Ms Underwood estimated 20 spaces. She said that the hospital also had been offered 10 parking spaces at the Elkins beach. PB member Cottrill asked if there would be any parking available at the New London Outing Club. Ken McWilliams advised that the Outing Club was also located in a residential district, not a commercial district.

Chair Ebel said that the issue before the PB was whether a Site Plan Review (SPR) would be required for the hospital's temporary use of the Hayward property for parking.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Ballin) **THAT NO SITE PLAN REVIEW BE REQUIRED FOR NEW LONDON HOSPITAL'S TEMPORARY USE OF THE HAYWARD PROPERTY AT 125 NEWPORT ROAD FOR PARKING. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Ms Underwood advised that the hospital was thinking about setting up an island showing a core of the paving materials used for the parking lot.

Celeste Cook returned to the PB.

IV. ROGER KENNEY – Concept Site Plan Review: Home Business – Dental Office (Tax Map 73, Lot 73)

Roger Kenney advised the PB that he was a dentist and was investigating the possibility of purchasing property at 151 Main Street to establish a dental office as a home business. To that end, he said that he was seeking the PB's interpretation of three requirements set forth in the New London Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Kenney asked how the PB would interpret Article II, Section 15.b.2) a. that states that a home business may have no more than

two (2) non-resident employees. He asked if the limitation to two (2) referred to headcount or to full-time employees. Ken McWilliams replied that it would be possible to have two half-time employees as long as they were not on site at the same time.

Mr. Kenney asked what was meant by the phrase “base of operations” in that same paragraph. Chair Ebel replied that the regulation had been written with contractors in mind. She explained that contractors might have a large number of employees who worked away from the site, but who would be on-site at the beginning and/or end of each day. She didn’t think that it would be an issue for a dentist.

Mr. Kenney asked how the PB would interpret Article II. Section 15.b.2) c. regarding the number of permitted client/delivery trips per day. He asked if the average of 10 visits per day was an average over a week or a month or a year. Chair Ebel responded that because home businesses were located in residential neighborhoods, the PB wanted to minimize the impact of client/delivery traffic on the residential area; therefore, the regulation limited client/delivery trips to and from the home business to an average of 10 trips per day.

Ken McWilliams advised that the limitation on the number of trips per day was also tied into the number of parking spaces required. He pointed out that the regulation allowed only three (3) parking spaces in excess of parking for residential use. He said that the amount of parking permitted would limit the number of clients that could be on-site. He asked how many people would be on-site for the home business, in addition to the dentist and one staff member. Mr. Kenney responded that there would normally be one client being served and one client waiting. PB member Ballin asked how vehicles parked in the garage would count. Mr. McWilliams replied that the garage would satisfy residential parking. Chair Ebel asked what Mr. Kenney planned in regard to staff. Did he plan to have a hygienist and office staff? Mr. Kenney replied that, perhaps, there would be two hygienists on site. Mr. McWilliams observed that the discussion now related to parking for a home business that included two staff members and then clients. He pointed out that if there were two (2) non-resident staff parking on-site, the business would be limited to having only one (1) client on the site, because there would only be one space available. Mr. Kenney said that there was also a possibility for access to the property via Sawyer Lane. He said that there was a 132-square-foot carriage house that would be used for the business and the access was flush with the driveway. Chair Ebel stated that parking for the home business could not exceed three (3) parking spaces whatever the configuration might be. PB members Ballin and Hollinger opined that he would meet resistance to using Pressey Court to access a business as it is very residential with lots of kids. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley opined that, if the business was very successful, there would be a lot of traffic and neighbors would put pressure on for enforcement of the regulations.

Mr. McWilliams said that they needed to go back to the regulations governing home businesses in residential areas. If the requirements of a business exceeded what is permitted by the regulations, then the business needed to move to a commercial location. Chair Ebel asked if Mr. Kenney could go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for a Variance. Mr. McWilliams responded affirmatively. Mr. Kenney asked if the variance would only be for parking. Chair Ebel replied that it could be for whatever Mr. Kenney asked, e.g., he could also ask for a Variance on the number of trips per day permitted. PB member Cottrill opined that it sounded like the business was already at the maximum parking and trips per day allowances, so if the business were to grow it would have to move. Mr. Kenney said that his research had shown that New London could support another dental practice; however, the amount of commercial space was very limited. Chair Ebel recommended that he might want to look at the space that would be vacated when the other dentists moved. PB member Holton asked how many offertories Mr. Kenney planned. Mr. Kenney replied that he would like three (3); however, he was looking for two (2) in the space under discussion. He asked if there was any written definition of “finished floor area”. Mr. McWilliams contrasted finished floor area with an unfinished basement. PB member Ballin said that it was space habitable for living, not storage. Chair Ebel advised that the ordinance allows a limited home business in a residential area.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT ROGER KENNEY BE REFERRED TO THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR INTERPRETATION OF THE NEW LONDON ZONING ORDINANCE ARTICLE II. SECTION 15. b. 2) c. AND SECTION 15. b. 2) d., REGARDING THE NUMBER OF PERMITTED PARKING**

SPACES AND AVERAGE TRIPS PER DAY. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Ken McWilliams and Zoning Administrator Stanley reviewed with Mr. Kenney the process to be followed in regard to the referral. Mr. Kenney opined that the option didn't look good. He said that he wanted to think about that possibility. PB member Ballin said that the Master Plan discussions would consider the adequacy of the commercial space in New London.

VI. ZONING AMENDMENTS 2008 DISCUSSION

Ken McWilliams advised the PB that there were two additional amendments to be added to those outlined in his September 12, 2007 memo. The additions relate to (1) the wetland definition and the wetland buffer and (2) signage in the institutional zones.

PB member Cottrill asked what the priority was of the items on the list of possible amendments.

Shore Land Overlay District: All agreed that the most important item was revising Article XVI Shore Land Overlay District to be consistent with the newly adopted NH Shoreland Protection Act that becomes effective April 1, 2008.

Wetland Definition & Wetland Buffer: Chair Ebel opined that the PB needed to have feedback from the Conservation Commission before considering amendments to the wetland definition and the wetland buffer. PB member Conly advised that the Conservation Commission was working up a proposal. He said that the commission was leaning toward ending the wetland buffer at the first man-made interruption. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley urged that the definition be simple. Chair Ebel said that she was concerned that situations without any interruptions could go on forever and that this was the issue that should be rectified. She said that she was hoping the commission could suggest a solution to this issue, and asked if the commission was looking at the size of wetlands. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that getting into soil types would make it very complicated and would require professional assistance, for which the town had no funding at the present time. He said that the size approach was a totally different from what was being used now. Chair Ebel concluded that the Conservation Commission should make its recommendations and the PB would review them. PB members determined that this was the second most important issue to address.

Large Animals in Residential Zones: Regarding standards and regulations for keeping/raising large animals in residential zones, Zoning Administrator Stanley said that he was getting more requests for large animals in residential zones. He opined that the town needed to adopt standards. He said that the NH Department of Agriculture had standards that could serve as the model. PB consensus was that this was the third most important issue to address.

Funnel Development Provisions: Zoning Administrator Stanley said that the funnel development provisions in Article XVI of the Shore Lane Overlay District contain no provision regarding ownership of property by trusts or corporations. He said that there are two properties on which sales were pending where this could have an impact. Ken McWilliams advised that the pertinent part of the ordinance could be found in Article XVI. Section D. Paragraphs 3 and 4 on pages 54-55 of the New London Zoning Ordinance. He recommended consultation with Town Counsel Bart Mayer. PB member Cottrill asked about Article XVI. Section E.2.e. on page 55 in regard to non-addressed trust or corporations. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that there were legal non-conforming cabins on Pleasant Lake that were now being rented, but he wondered what would happen if a corporation were to buy them and sell timeshares or something.

Definition of "Substantial Improvement": Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that Town Counsel had advised that the "substantial improvement" definition contained in the ordinance was discriminatory because it was based upon the cost of improvements, rather than the value of the improvements.

References to Streets instead of Rights-of-Way in Articles V & VI: Zoning Administrator Stanley said that there were a dozen named roads that pass through the middle of properties. He asked what the setbacks were in those

instances. He advised that he would be discussing the matter with town counsel. He opined that there needed to be a clearly defined right-of-way. PB member Cottrill observed that the actual buildable space on a property could be much less than people perceived as being available.

Junk Yard Regulation Clarification: Zoning Administrator Stanley stated that the NH State Regulation refers to automobiles. He advised that upgrading the New London ordinance was not a high priority item. All agreed that this item should be removed from the list.

Signage in Institutional Zones: Zoning Administrator Stanley said that the existing regulations pertaining to signage were inadequate to address the special needs in the Hospital Institutional Zone and the Colby-Sawyer College Institutional Zone. He suggested that the ordinance should retain the size limitations, but the number of signs should be approved by Site Plan Review. He opined that it wasn't possible to write a regulation that would work for both the little guy and large institutions. Ken McWilliams advised that years ago New London Hospital had gone through the variance process, but it seemed ridiculously complicated. PB member Ballin suggested adding to the list the Kearsarge Regional School District property that will be vacant when the middle school moves to Sutton. Chair Ebel asked in what zone that property was located. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied that half of the drive from Main Street to the back of Peter Christian's was in the Commercial District and half was in a Residential District; all of the building and athletic fields were in a Residential District.

VI. DISCUSSION & ADOPTION OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM 2008-2013

Ken McWilliams asked if there were any comments on the report presented.

PB member Ballin said that he thought the \$100,000 mentioned in the first paragraph on page 8 had decreased to \$90,000. Ken McWilliams confirmed that it had and the correction was noted. Mr. Ballin said that in item 5 on page 8, the committee flat-lined the budget, rather than varying from car-to-van-to-car, etc.

Mr. McWilliams advised that both the new librarian and Bob Bowers, a trustee of Tracy Memorial Library, had met with the CIP Committee. The committee recommended that a professional be hired to evaluate the needs of the library and come to the CIP Committee with a finished proposal.

PB member Ballin spoke about the \$25,000 acquisition item on page 43 that was being looked at as funding for reclamation of the lagoon property. He said that some people thought the fund was to be used for building more athletic fields. Ken McWilliams advised that there had been discussion about building athletic fields on the lagoon property and going back to the voters to change the name of the fund. Chair Ebel opined that the work of the CIP needed to be transparent. If the fields were not needed any longer because of the new middle school and the two fields reclaimed by the New London Outing Club behind the old middle school, the report should reflect what the recreation money was to be used for. PB member Ballin said that Town Administrator Jessie Levine was adamant that the \$25,000 should continue to be set aside. PB members Hollinger and Ballin opined that the name on the fund needed to be clear about the use. Mr. Ballin inquired about the cost of lagoon mitigation. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that a test pit would be dug the next week. Mr. Ballin opined that the matter was in flux. Chair Ebel asked if there were enough concern in the Budget Committee to support a PB recommendation that the voters be consulted regarding the name of the fund reflecting the intended use of the monies. He said that it had not been resolved at the Budget Committee meeting. Mr. Ballin opined that the intent of the fund was to build more fields; however, we now have enough fields and no longer need the funds. Chair Ebel opined that the PB should not eliminate the funding without providing the Recreation Department with an opportunity to present additional detail. She said that she was not comfortable overriding the recommendation of the CIP committee without further discussion with the Recreation Department. Ken McWilliams suggested that the PB could refer the matter back to the CIP Committee to address with the Recreation Commission and the Recreation Director and to come back to the PB with a recommendation. Discussion ensued regarding a CIP meeting, and it was decided to refer the issue to that committee. Ken McWilliams said that he would advise Town Administrator Levine of the PB's decision.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. ROCKY RIDGE AT NEW LONDON (SNOW) SUBDIVISION: Ken McWilliams presented the mylar for the Rocky Ridge at New London Subdivision for signing by the PB and forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London. He advised that Director of Public Works Richard Lee had approved the level of security provided, approval had been granted by the NH Department of Environmental Services, approval had been granted for wetlands crossing, and all legal documents were ready to be submitted to the Registry of Deeds along with the mylar; thus, all conditions of approval had been met.

It was **MOVED** (Ballin) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE SECURITY SUBMITTED IN THE FORM OF A LETTER OF CREDIT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$239,000 FOR THE ROCKY RIDGE OF NEW LONDON SUBDIVISION BE APPROVED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

- B. NH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION LETTER announcing its plans to expand the existing Park & Ride facility located off Exit 12 of Interstate 89 to accommodate approximately 200 cars. PB member Ballin said that he hoped the Town of New London would be able to encourage the NH DOT to do a quality job.
- C. REVISED LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS: Ken McWilliams advised that he now had the Appendix materials from Richard Claytor (Horsley Witten Group) in hand and would schedule a Public Hearing on the revised Land Subdivision Control Regulations for October 23, 2007, along with a Public Hearing on the revised Site Plan Review Regulations. Regarding any pending Site Plan Reviews on the Agenda for October 23, Mr. McWilliams advised that for purposes of determining the applicability of the proposed regulations, the PB needed only to accept an application for Site Plan Review as complete; it wouldn't have to review it completely.
- D. MASTER PLAN WORKSHOPS: Ken McWilliams reminded the PB that Master Plan workshops were scheduled for Friday evening, October 12, and Saturday, October 13. He advised that 11 citizen facilitators were needed, but he'd like to have 12-13 available. He said that there would be a training session for facilitators on Wednesday, October 10. It was agreed that PB members should serve as facilitators only as a last resort. PB member Conly opined that the Chairman of the PB should not be a facilitator. PB member Cook asked if it would be possible to get the people who had facilitated the Elkins meetings. PB member Ballin said that Town Administrator Jessie Levine had a list of people who wanted to be involved with the Master Plan update and she would be sending out e-mails regarding the workshops.

He advised that the issue of providing on-site daycare to facilitate attendance at the workshops was raised at a recent meeting of the community council; however, Town Administrator Levine was concerned about the liability of having volunteers watching the children. PB member Conly said that he had spoken with the Kearsarge Community Presbyterian Church personnel and had learned that they had the rooms available, but the child care providers would have to be paid. PB member Cottrill opined that if the PB paid them, the church would have the liability. Chair Ebel said that she would check with Town Counsel about the liability issue.

Chair Ebel advised that Town Administrator Levine would be producing a Quick Link to be mailed to homes. PB member Holton suggested getting local newspapers to conduct interviews so that the papers would carry articles, in addition to announcements. She also suggested contacting the Kearsarge Valley Magazine re an interview on the local cable channel. PB member Ballin volunteered to be on the program, and PB member Holton said she would make the arrangements. Chair Ebel verified that PB member Hollinger would be responsible for refreshments at the workshops and PB member Ballin would be responsible for box lunches for the Saturday workshop participants.

- E. OCTOBER MEETING SCHEDULE: The PB decided not to meet on October 9, 2007 due to the lack of agenda items.

- F. The MINUTES of the SEPTEMBER 13, 2007 MEETING of the PLANNING BOARD were APPROVED, as amended.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **10:10 PM**.

Respectfully submitted,
Judith P. Condict, Recording Secretary
New London Planning Board

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____