

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
July 26, 2005**

PRESENT: Tom Cottrill (Vice-Chairman), Sue Ellen Andrews, Dale Conly, Celeste Cook, Jeff Hollinger, Sue Clough (Selectmen's Representative), and Kenneth McWilliams (Planner).

ABSENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman)

Vice-Chairman Cottrill called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM.

**I. MARK REED – Continuation of Public Hearing to Appeal Denial of a Driveway Permit
(Tax Map 42, Lots 16 & 17)**

Ken McWilliams briefly described the situation. Town Road Agent Richard Lee has the authority to issue driveway permits in all cases where an application meets all of the standards. In the Reed case, the sight distance standard could not be met; therefore, he denied the request. Mr. McWilliams referred the PB to the sketch presented and reminded PB members that Mr. Reed had just recently merged the two lots. He explained that Mr. Reed would now like to put in an additional driveway; however, the proposed driveway would not have adequate sight distance to meet the standard.

Mark Reed advised that the road served only one other resident. He stated that, in the meeting of municipal department heads, it was recommended that driveway traffic be one-way, entering via the existing drive and exiting via the proposed drive. It was also recommended that the proposed drive be extended 30 to 40 feet to the right in order to increase the sight distance.

PB member Clough asked if Chief of Police Seastrand was in agreement with the recommendation. Mr. McWilliams advised that both Chief Seastrand and Mr. Lee agreed with the recommendation. He added that the idea of entrance and exit signage had been discussed briefly, but it was deemed unnecessary for this situation.

Vice-Chair Cottrill asked if the problem was the sight distance to the left. Mr. McWilliams replied affirmatively. He noted that the recommendation might result in the applicant having to exit into on-coming traffic; however, traffic along the road is minimal. PB member Cook asked if Mr. Reed's property was the one with the long drive at the end of the road. Mr. Reed confirmed that it was.

PB member Clough asked if there were any abutters present. There were none. Mr. Reed advised that he had spoken with all of the abutters regarding the proposed drive. Mr. Cottrill asked if the sketch distributed at the PB meeting was a good representation of the recommendations made by the department heads. Mr. Reed replied that it was.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Andrews) **THAT A WAIVER OF THE DRIVEWAY SIGHT DISTANCE REGULATION AT 75 GOOSE HOLE ROAD BE GRANTED, CONTINGENT UPON THE APPLICANT WORKING OUT THE DETAILS OF LOCATION AND DESIGN WITH NEW LONDON TOWN ROAD AGENT RICHARD LEE. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

II. JOHN REGO PEROTTA – Concept Site Plan Review: Need for Site Plan (Tax Map 84, Lot 55)

Ken McWilliams advised that Mr. Perotta would like to establish a 60-seat function facility in the former Crossroads building in space previously occupied by a real estate agency. Reporting on the meeting of municipal department heads, he stated that the Fire Department identified the need for two exits, remote from each other and not through the kitchen; an exit from the second floor; panic bars; a fire escape at the back, and reviewed the need for sprinklers. Richard Lee, Town Road Agent, advised that the proposed sidewalk in front of the building could affect parking in front. Mr. McWilliams advised that the proposed change in use from office to function facility would change required parking somewhat, but opined that available parking was more than adequate. He advised,

however, that he had not yet verified the impact of the parking changes. He recommended that an approval be conditional upon meeting all state and local fire code requirements.

Vice-Chair Cottrill asked if the parking spaces available served multiple buildings. Mr. McWilliams confirmed that they did. PB member Andrews opined that a function facility would require much more parking than a real estate office. Mr. McWilliams concurred; however, he reiterated the opinion that there was excess parking available. John Perotta advised that the operation would be primarily catering or function specific, not a standard restaurant. Mr. Cottrill asked how often functions would be scheduled. Mr. Perotta replied three to four times a week. PB member Andrews asked what determined the number of seats. Mr. Perotta advised that the maximum seating would be 100 based upon 1600 square feet of space. Fire Chief Peter Stanley stated that fire codes stipulate 15 square feet per person. Mr. McWilliams advised that it would be necessary to calculate the parking available and spaces now required for other users who share the parking. PB member Clough asked if there would be any issues because the parking would be located on an adjoining property. Mr. McWilliams replied that there would be no problem, as the properties had received joint site plan approval. Ms Clough asked if one property could monopolize parking. Mr. McWilliams replied affirmatively.

PB member Cook asked what would be on the second floor. Mr. Perotta advised that there would be an office, and, perhaps, music lessons. He also stated that a previous tenant, Gourmet Garden, had a very large grease trap. Ms Andrews again asked what would determine the maximum seats permitted. Mr. McWilliams replied that Mr. Perotta would have to present a written plan regarding the number of seats/occupancy requested. Ms Clough asked if seats in the function facility would be in addition to those in the front café. Mr. Perotta replied affirmatively.

Vice-Chair Cottrill opined that the PB was missing some of the information needed in order make a decision. Ken McWilliams advised that the PB could table the matter until the information has been provided or the PB could approve the request, contingent upon adequate parking availability. Mr. Cottrill asked what would happen if the calculation were to show inadequate parking. Ms Andrews expressed her concern about the inability for those sharing the parking to comment on the proposal if there were to be no site plan review. Mr. McWilliams advised that notices of site plan review would be sent to the owners of the properties, not to the occupants. He stated that the New London parking study showed that the parking area (58 spaces) was typically only one-third full. Mr. Perotta said that if a large group was scheduled, he could request that people be "shuttled in".

PB members Hollinger and Conly stated that they would be comfortable with Mr. McWilliams' determination that adequate parking existed. Ms Clough stated that she was uncomfortable that those who share the parking have not had an opportunity to discuss their plans. Mr. McWilliams asked if a letter from the property owner would help. Ms Clough replied affirmatively. In response to a question posed by Mr. McWilliams, Mr. Perotta replied that he had spoken with the property's owner. Vice-Chair Cottrill reminded the PB that a similar situation existed at 207 Main Street and opined that the PB needed an acknowledgment from the property owner that he was aware of Mr. Perotta's plans and parking requirements.

It was **MOVED** (Clough) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT NO SITE PLAN REVIEW BE REQUIRED FOR A CHANGE IN USE FROM OFFICE TO FUNCTION SPACE AT 420 MAIN STREET, AS PRESENTED BY JOHN PEROTTA, CONTINGENT UPON THE DETERMINATION OF THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SEATS, THAT EXISTING PARKING IS ADEQUATE OR IN EXCESS OF REQUIREMENTS, RECEIPT OF A LETTER FROM THE OWNERS OF THE VILLAGE GREEN ACKNOWLEDGING THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS, AND COMPLIANCE WITH ALL STATE AND LOCAL FIRE CODES. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

III. JOAN WAMSLEY/TAILORJOAN – Concept Site Plan Review: Need for Site Plan – Medical Office to Retail Service (Tax Map 59, Lot 3)

Ken McWilliams stated that Joan Wamsley would like to take over 625 square feet in the building located at 219 County Road. The proposed use would be a change in use from medical office to retail service (seamstress).

PB member Clough asked if, when Hubert's moved into the building, parking spaces were allowed for the space under consideration. She also reminded PB members that Hubert's had been given permission to set aside four parking spaces to accommodate tent sales. Mr. McWilliams advised that the four-space-set aside was temporary and would occur only four times a year. Vice Chair Cottrill asked if the parking requirement would decrease as a result of the change in use. Mr. McWilliams replied that it would decrease from 4.5 spaces/1,000 square feet to 4.0 spaces/1,000 square feet.

It was **MOVED** (Clough) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT NO SITE PLAN REVIEW BE REQUIRED FOR A CHANGE IN USE FROM MEDICAL OFFICE TO RETAIL SERVICE OF 625 SQUARE FEET AT 219 COUNTY ROAD. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

IV. ARISTOTLE SOULIOTIS – Preliminary Site Plan Review: Convenience Store/Gas Station (Tax Map 84, Lot 2)

Ken McWilliams distributed plans of the existing and proposed site usage. He stated that Mr. Souliotis would like to convert the existing service station to a convenience store with gas pumps.

Mr. McWilliams provided a brief summary of the proposal. At the meeting of municipal department heads, the Police Department had been concerned about the proposed time of deliveries and possible traffic congestion if deliveries were made in front of the building. The proposal now includes the conversion of two parking spaces behind the building to accommodate delivery trucks. The proposed sharing with Pizza Chef of snow storage/removal, drainage, and a dumpster would all require some sort of written agreement. He advised that Mr. Souliotis was proposing the addition of one gas pump. Peter Stanley, Zoning Administrator, advised that only one free-standing sign would be permitted on the site. The department heads discussed the canopy design and lighting with Mr. Souliotis. Mr. McWilliams advised that it might be necessary for Mr. Souliotis to obtain a Variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA), if the required 30-foot setback cannot be met for the canopy. The department heads discussed signage to direct one-way entrance and exit traffic flow. Mr. McWilliams also suggested pulling parking back from the slope at the rear, and there was discussion about putting in a retaining wall. He also noted that the tenant might also need a grease trap. Richard Lee, New London Road Agent, advised that sidewalk curbing would be at the expense of the property owners, but the town would provide the sidewalk. The Fire Department advised that it would need to receive a floor plan for review. Mr. McWilliams also advised the PB that Mr. Souliotis was proposing to lease space to Dunkin' Donuts.

PB member Hollinger asked how the traffic would combine with traffic from Pizza Chef. Aristotle Souliotis replied that one exit/entrance would be eliminated. He opined that the sidewalk would help to delineate the travel way. All traffic from both sites will use the same entrance and exit. Vice-Chair Cottrill asked if an access agreement would be needed. Ken McWilliams replied affirmatively, adding that several agreements would be needed. PB member Andrews observed that some of the Pizza Chef parking had been re-arranged. She asked if delivery trucks for Pizza Chef and Arctic Dreams would continue to park in front of that building.

Mr. Hollinger commented that most Dunkin' Donuts offer drive-thru service. Mr. Souliotis responded that this would be a satellite store only and would not offer such service. PB member Cook asked how often donuts would be delivered. Mr. Souliotis replied two times per week. John Souliotis corrected the mis-statement saying that donuts would be delivered twice each day. Ms Cook asked if Dunkin' Donuts would have its own signage. Ken McWilliams replied that the site is allowed one free-standing sign of 25 square feet, plus one 15- square-foot sign on the building. He advised that, if a business is not on the 25-square-foot sign, it could have two 15-square-foot signs on the building.

Ms Cook asked if there would be parking in front of the business. Mr. Souliotis replied that the only parking in front would be for those pumping gas or on the street; otherwise, all parking would be in back. PB member Clough asked if there would be a rear entrance to the convenience store. Mr. Souliotis replied that there would be a door either on the side or in back. Mr. Cottrill asked how many parking spaces would be required. Mr. McWilliams replied that eight would be required, based upon the square footage and advised that there are 16 existing spaces. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley stated that the municipal department heads recommended no on-street parking in front of the business.

PB member Clough requested, and received, a demonstration of the slope location and the possible retaining wall. Ken McWilliams suggested that pulling the parking back away from the edge of the slope and eliminating two parking spaces to accommodate deliveries would permit the parking aisle to be moved back and curb stops installed. PB member Andrews asked if a guard rail would be needed. General response was "probably". Ms Andrews suggested that the location of the doors into the building could encourage parking in the back and cited examples where this had been done successfully. Mr. Cottrill asked if Mr. Souliotis had plans for the entrances. Mr. Souliotis replied front, back, side, but would be meeting with contractor that week. Mr. Cottrill asked what plans Mr. Souliotis had to mitigate parking confusion. Ms Clough suggested using signs.

PB member Andrews inquired about green space. Mr. Souliotis mentioned the small amount shared with Pizza Chef. Ms Clough commented that the site pre-dates regulation. PB member Hollinger opined that the applicant would be required to comply with current regulations. Mr. Cottrill asked Mr. Souliotis to demonstrate proposed green space. Ken McWilliams advised that green space should constitute 25% of the total lot area. Mr. Souliotis also noted the area between the building and abutter C.B. Coburn. Vice Chair Cottrill recommended that Mr. Souliotis calculate the available space to determine if the site complies. Ms Clough asked what the basis of the 25% was. Mr. McWilliams replied "aesthetics". He added that the regulations require an additional 20% for on-site snow storage, before requiring snow to be trucked off-site. Ms Andrews asked about the undefined space shown on the plan to the south side of the building and suggested that Mr. Souliotis might plant shrubs there. PB member Cook asked about the possibility of moving the green space at the front of the site in the area in front of two overhead garage doors of the former business. PB member Hollinger suggested planting flower beds/grass/bushes in that area. He pointed out the area to Mr. Souliotis.

Vice Chair Cottrill asked if the Fire Department had any concerns regarding the proposed additional gas pump. Fire Chief Peter Stanley replied in the negative. He advised that the department had not yet seen a floor plan.

Ken McWilliams advised that any required ZBA Variance must be obtained prior to Final Site Plan Review. Vice-Chair Cottrill advised that the PB would also need written agreements regarding the proposed shared dumpster, snow removal, and drainage.

Ms Clough inquired about the hours of operation. Mr. Souliotis replied that initially he was saying that the business would be open from 6:00 AM to 11:00 PM; however, it might be less. Ms Clough asked if the gas pump canopy lights would remain on all night. Mr. Souliotis responded that the police department had mentioned using the gas pumps for its vehicles. Zoning Administrator Stanley discussed employing a lighting design that would focus light downward. Ms Clough advised that there was a New London Lighting Committee that was very concerned about all-night lighting. Mr. Stanley suggested that the PB could require "friendly" lighting. Ms Clough opined that security and dark skies issues should both be considered.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Clough) **THAT THE ARISTOTLE SOULIOTIS PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW BE CONTINUED TO TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2005 AT 7:30 PM AT THE WHIPPLE MEMORIAL TOWN HALL. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

V. **KEARSARGE LAKE SUNAPEE COMMUNITY CENTER – Preliminary Site Plan Review: Community Center** (Tax Map 59, Lot 3)

Ken McWilliams briefly recapped the history of the proposed community center. He stated that, approximately a year ago, proponents of a community center presented a conceptual site plan for a complex to be built on property lying partially within the commercial district and partially within a residential district. He noted that the PB had determined that a privately owned, tax-exempt, recreational facility would fall within the category permitted in a residential neighborhood by special exception. The PB, therefore, referred the applicants to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for a ruling on the proposed community center's status. At that time, the PB had identified traffic flow and amount, pedestrian flow, drainage, conservation of wetlands, and visual impact as issues to be addressed in a preliminary site plan review. Mr. McWilliams advised that the ZBA had granted the Special Exception; thus, the community center had returned to the PB for preliminary site plan review. He advised that preliminary SPR would probably extend over three to four PB meetings.

Eric Palson (Sheerr McCrystal Palson Architecture, Inc.) and Fred Downey appeared on behalf of the proposed community center. Mr. Downey advised that the community center now qualified as a 501 (c) 3 corporation, and he said that the corporation was tax exempt. Mr. Downey further advised that the ZBA had granted a Special Exception to cross wetlands and to construct a privately owned community center on property lying in both the residential and commercial districts. He stated that the proponents were now working with an advisory board. He reminded the PB that voters of the Town of New London had, in March 2005, approved the gifting of a tract of land to the center to be used as a skating rink. He stated that a survey conducted in the late 1990s showed a need for a community center and additional playing fields. Mr. Downey stated that the plan was to construct a one-acre skating pond, 225' by 360' playing field, and a building housing a multi-purpose gymnasium, offices, and meeting rooms.

Eric Palson stated that the community center proponents were seeking a sense of the PB to get an idea of the allowable project before conducting fund-raising activities. He stated that Ross Stevens (Stevens Engineering) would be doing the civil engineering; however, he has not yet started. The current plans presented to the PB are an architectural rendition. Mr. Palson advised that the property consists of a 10-acre portion of a larger parcel; therefore, the existing parcel would require subdivision. He advised that the wetlands have been identified, and the proposed entrance placed at the optimal sight line.

Mr. Palson stated that the pond would gather drainage from the entire parcel and could accommodate a regulation-size hockey rink. He indicated that it would be 14 feet deep at its maximum depth. Mr. Palson stated that three 62-foot bands would provide parking around the facility, and there would be some green space between/around the bands. He noted that the playing fields would be located nearest to Birch Acres. He advised that there would be 50 feet of undisturbed vegetation, plus a 25-foot setback between the playing field and Birch Acres. He stated that the "building proper would be as far from residential" as possible. He also noted the possibility of future expansion. Mr. Palson advised that the proposed building area is 19,780 square feet. He stated that the parking calculation has been done, and the center now seeks guidance from the PB regarding the number of parking spaces to be provided. He advised that the back of the building might be constructed of pre-engineered metal. Vice-Chair Cottrill inquired about the height of the proposed building. Mr. Palson replied that, originally, the plan was for 38 feet; however, having learned that the regulations contain a maximum height of 35 feet, the plans would be adjusted. He stated that the multi-purpose area would contain one regulation basketball court and two smaller courts. In addition, there would be offices and both large and small meeting rooms. The drawings displayed showed possible future additions.

The ZBA Notice of Decision contained examples of permitted uses that included sports games, after school activities, exhibitions, plays, child care, fund raising, rental of meeting rooms (free of charge for non-profits), dances, support of other non-profit organizations, storage closets for other groups, municipal meetings, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Meals-on-Wheels. Mr. Palson advised that parking had been discussed with municipal department heads. The calculation per square footage showed that 160 parking spaces would be needed. The plan presented shows 150-155 spaces. A sticking point is that the calculation using the number of people that could be in the room would require an additional 43 spaces. The multi-purpose room capacity would be 595 people. Mr. Palson stated that some of the spaces would often be empty. He suggested that an arrangement might be made for alternate parking, e.g., use of Kearsarge Regional School District parking spaces in the evenings. He also suggested that the community center could schedule events to prevent the use of any other part of the building when the multi-purpose room would be at capacity.

Mr. Palson advised that the center wanted to be sure that the proposed setback met with PB approval. In regard to off-site improvements, the center had thought to extend an existing sidewalk. That sidewalk is owned privately, however, not by the Town of New London. The traffic study suggested constructing a sidewalk on the opposite side of the road. The community center proponents opined that, although less desirable, this would be okay if there was a crosswalk. In regard to lighting, Mr. Palson stated that there were no plans to illuminate the playing field. PB member Clough asked if there were any plans to light the skating area. Mr. Palson replied that lighting the skating rink had not been considered until she asked about it.

Mr. Palson noted that a traffic study had been presented, and he asked if any other studies were required or recommended. Mr. Downey stated that the community center wanted the PB to identify issues to be addressed.

Ms Clough noted that there seemed to be abutters in the audience and said that she would like to hear from them. Abutter Matt Bickford (28 Aspen Lane) stated that he was not yet a full-time New London resident; however, he invited the PB to walk the property involved. He opined that segregating the wetlands would not be practical. He advised that the area proposed for the playing field is very wet. He stated that he has two access holes in his basement and there is water two inches below that has not receded at all. He also stated that his neighbors, the Gaylords, have been flooded with six inches of water in their basement. He advised that his basement has never flooded, but, if it should, he would pursue relief. He strongly recommended that the PB establish an escrow account to address any future problems. He also opined that a 50-foot buffer of deciduous trees with very little root system would easily fall over once excavating begins. He opined that a larger buffer would be needed. He observed that nature usually prevails in any contest with man-made constructions.

Abutter Frances Wilson (78 Birch Acres Road) stated that she had heard from Bittersweet occupants that there is stagnant water that has collected behind the building because an adjacent property owner filled in wetlands. She questioned the need for a community center. She stated that she had driven to the New London Outing Club (NLOC) during the afternoon and found only two cars. In addition, the tennis courts and playing fields were empty. She also stated that the NLOC is trying to encourage additional membership.

Mr. Downey responded that he serves on the NLOC field committee. He stated that a recent survey of the committee identified need for three additional fields, one of which was similar to that proposed for the community center. Bob Andrews advised that the need for gymnasiums and playing fields varies with the season. He said that, when varsity teams are playing, there is a need for additional playing fields/courts.

Abutter Gregory Potter (25 Aspen Lane) stated that the discussed access from Aspen Lane mentioned the need for a sewer line and the desire for a walking trail, and he opined that access would lead to parking along Aspen Lane. Mr. Palson replied that the community center would not need access from Aspen Lane. He said that, if the Aspen Lane residents do not want access, the center could make it so. Abutter Bickford recommended a solid border, so that there would be no access from Aspen Lane. Mr. Palson opined that the 50-foot buffer, in addition to the 25-foot setback, represented a significant concession by the community center. If houses were to be built on the property, he said, only a 25-foot setback would be required. Mr. Bickford reiterated his invitation to walk the area. He opined that houses would already have been built there, if the land was not so wet. He stated that, in his experience, playing fields were designed to be perfectly level with adequate drainage.

Abutter Ethelanne Vulgamore (175 Pleasant Street) stated that she lived across the street from the proposed "emergency exit". She invited the PB members to turn left off Pleasant Street to where she lives. She advised that the line of sight is very poor as vehicles come over the rise on Pleasant Street. She also stated that, at times, traffic is very heavy and very fast. She said that she would be concerned about safety and traffic. Abutter Wilson said that she would be concerned about the safety of a proposed sidewalk and the proposed location of the crosswalk.

Abutter Bickford stated that he would not like to see a skateboard park incorporated at a later date, even if it seemed to residents and local government to be the logical place for one. Abutter Potter said that he was concerned about setback issues. He opined that it would be necessary to block activities from the residential areas with a fence or something to protect both abutters and users of the playing field. PB member Clough stated that the PB has the authority to provide oversight and to increase requirements if it deems necessary.

Mr. Downey responded to the concerns expressed by the abutters. He stated that he had identified four: (1) Drainage – the community center would be very responsive to drainage concerns. (2) Access from Aspen Lane – access could be eliminated. (3) Crosswalk – the location of the crosswalk could be modified. (4) Traffic Issues – the community center would be looking for guidance on how to satisfy the concerns expressed. PB member Clough observed that the traffic study indicated that the heaviest traffic occurred just before and just after the school day.

Abutter Edgar Condict (65 Gould Road) stated that the ZBA had recommended that the community center hold a meeting with the abutters. Mr. Downey responded that the center had held a meeting at the time the ZBA met. Mr. Condict and Ms Wilson both stated that there had been no meeting with abutters since the ZBA hearing. Other abutters present concurred. Mr. Palson opined that the recommended schedule was to present a conceptual site plan and then a preliminary site plan. Ms Vulgamore requested two weeks notice of any meeting with abutters. PB member Cook opined that it would be important to meet with all abutters together at one time. Mr. Downey agreed to have a meeting with abutters.

Abutter Wilson advised that she had been told by someone affiliated with a forestry agency that property owners are required to leave three of every five trees when land is cleared. She stated that she is really concerned that the proposed buffer be trees, not shrubs or bushes.

PB member Cook asked if the facility would be open to surrounding communities. Mr. Downey responded affirmatively. He advised that the traffic study reflected traffic from the surrounding area. He stated that the community center would increase traffic at the intersection of Main and Pleasant Streets by four cars/hour. Abutter Vulgamore opined that topography was also very important in evaluating traffic flow.

Vice-Chair Cottrill asked if the community center has access to the additional 27 acres. Ken McWilliams asked if the remainder would have any frontage. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that property must have 150 feet of continuous frontage in the residential district.

PB member Conly asked if there were any parking standards for this type of facility. Mr. McWilliams replied that there are none in the Site Plan Review Regulations. He advised that the projected parking needs in the materials provided to the PB were based upon a calculation. He opined that the problem would be to determine what to do about additional parking demand for large events. He suggested that some parking might be available at night by leasing from other properties. Mr. Downey advised that the community center has just obtained access to an additional acre that provides parking flexibility. He suggested that cars could also park temporarily along the roadway and on the grass. Ms Clough said that she does not recommend parking on the grass long term. Mr. Palson stated that the community center could create a driveway on the fourth side of the property, since the drive already goes along three sides.

PB member Clough asked to have the wetlands pointed out. PB member Andrews clarified that the wetlands on the plan are those identified by a soils expert; however, it doesn't mean that other areas are not wet.

Abutter Bickford asked if the abutters could receive copies of the materials provided to the PB. Mr. Downey agreed to provide copies to abutters.

Abutter Wilson observed that originally 75 parking spaces were proposed; now 150 are proposed. She opined that the 150 would be the size of the parking lot at Cricenti's Market. She also opined that more than one entrance and one exit would be required. Mr. Downey replied that very rarely would all parking spaces be full. He estimated that capacity would be reached only four to five times a year. Bob Andrews opined that it would be similar to the NLOC at the end of a game. He further opined that the volume would be less at the community center. Abutter Bickford asked how many communities would be served by the community center. Mr. Downey replied eight or nine, but there would really be no limit. Bob Andrews opined that not many people who are not coming now would come.

Abutter Bickford asked when the “day” would end at the community center. PB member Clough advised that the times of operation should be addressed in the discussion of lighting and traffic flow. PB member Andrews advised that the calculation of parking spaces did not take into consideration the simultaneous use of the playing fields and the indoor facilities. Mr. Palson agreed and said that he did not know how to calculate parking for the playing field. He suggested that a diversity factor was needed. Ken McWilliams raised the question of whether one should design for peak demand or everyday use. PB member Cook asked if the field could be divided for multiple activities simultaneously. Mr. Palson replied that no one wants unused parking lots. Ms Andrews opined that parking for the field would not be five or six cars. She suggested that 30 or more cars would be more accurate. Bob Andrews stated that a parking calculation based on use of every room in the building would yield too many spaces. He opined that a reasonable number should be determined. Mr. Downey commented that all of the parking spaces were designed as standard nine-foot spaces. He acknowledged the need to add 20 to 30 parking spaces for playing field parking to the 161 previously calculated. Ken McWilliams commented that the community center could use parallel parking along the access road.

Vice-Chair Cottrill moved the discussion to setbacks and buffers. He noted the acquisition of an additional acre of land at the far right corner of the property and asked if there were any plans to expand to the east. Mr. Downey replied that he had already spoken with David Kidder about additional land. Mr. Cottrill asked if the community center should plan the placement of the playing field based on its long-range plan. Bob Andrews said that it was really a matter of funding. He stated that the center could not afford to purchase additional land at this time. Mr. Downey replied that the center could study placement of the field, but opined that there is a limit on how far one can go. PB member Clough opined that there definitely would be a need for more than a natural vegetation buffer.

Bob Andrews asked if it would be appropriate for the PB to appoint a subcommittee to work with the community center. Vice-Chair Cottrill recommended that the community center meet with the abutters first. PB member Cook reiterated that it would be important to have all the abutters together at one time.

PB member Andrews asked who mapped the wetlands and when was the mapping done. Mr. Downey replied that Ross Stevens mapped them in August 2004. Ms Andrews advised that late August is a dry time of the year. She opined that one needed to walk the property and find out where the water really is. Mr. Downey asked if she referred to wetlands or water. Ms Andrews replied “water”. She asserted that one needed to know where any wet areas were located, whether mapped or not.

PB member Hollinger identified two areas of concern: (1) drainage and its impact on properties downhill toward Pleasant Lake, and (2) children walking along Pleasant Street. He opined that a sidewalk would be needed, noting that the posted speed limit is 25, but the average speed, according to the traffic study, is 42 miles per hour.

Bob Andrews advised that he was on the Sidewalk Committee that looked at extending the sidewalk up to Job Seamans Acres. Ken McWilliams advised that Town Road Agent Richard Lee had indicated that one reason not to extend the existing sidewalk would be the fact that the existing sidewalk is privately owned and is located on private land. Lee also advised that the water line goes along the east side of Pleasant Street, and the east side is abutted by a wetland. Mr. McWilliams stated that the sewer line is located on the west side of Pleasant Street, but would not eliminate the possibility of a sidewalk on that side.

Mr. Downey observed that drainage seemed to be the issue of greatest concern. Abutter Bickford strongly recommended an escrow requirement. He opined that nature tops engineering, no matter how good. He added that the waterway that would be disturbed is fragile and there would need to be constraints. Abutter Wilson stated that there supposedly has been a plan to re-do drainage in Birch Acres. She also opined that removing trees would exacerbate drainage problems. Mr. Downey replied that, if drainage problems were as great as abutters believed, the community center group might decide not to build the playing field. Eric Palson advised that the ZBA had sent the matter back to the PB to determine if the proposed use would be appropriate for this site. PB Vice-Chair Cottrill advised that the plan should show the direction of drainage flow.

PB member Cook stated that she was concerned about the amount of traffic passing through a single entry and a single exit. Mr. Palson replied that traffic could “stack up” without impacting on traffic flow along Pleasant Street.

PB member Andrews asked if anything could be done about the intersection of Pleasant Street and Main Street. PB member Clough advised that the town had applied for grant monies to address the issue and that a solution would be forthcoming. She stated that the town is actively working on the intersection problems. Ken McWilliams advised that state regulations have changed and, as a result, the town's ability to charge developers for off-site improvements has been limited to improvements in roads, drainage, water, and sewer. An issue would be whether the intersection conditions were caused by the project or whether the conditions were pre-existing. He suggested that a sidewalk along Pleasant Street might be funded partially by the town and partially by the project.

Vice-Chair Cottrill asked about drainage to the lot across Pleasant Street. Mr. McWilliams replied that the PB should not approve any increase in drainage peak flow off from the site. Mr. Downey asked how peak flow would be measured. Mr. McWilliams outlined the procedure. Mr. Downey opined that it would be affected by the time of year. Mr. McWilliams agreed and cited a question raised earlier by PB member Andrews. Ms Andrews asked if any HISS mapping would be required. Mr. McWilliams replied in the negative, advising that HISS mapping is only required for housing developments. PB member Clough asked if any buffers would be required. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that the site was not a buffered wetland. Abutter Bickford asked if there would be any required water quality testing of the pond water. Mr. McWilliams replied that water quality testing would not normally be required; however, the PB could require additional studies. Mr. Bickford stated that he was concerned about health hazards. Bob Andrews advised that the pond would not be used for swimming; however, if people began to use it as such, the town health officer would test the water.

Vice-Chair Cottrill recommended that the project minimize light pollution. Bob Andrews stated that the proposed community center could put the lighting on timers. Mr. Palson advised that the center would not light the playing field. He indicated that, should the center's intentions ever change, a new application would be submitted to the PB. Mr. Cottrill advised Mr. Palson and Mr. Downey that there is a New London Lighting Committee chaired by Mark Vernon.

Mr. McWilliams advised that the next step would be for the community center to meet with the abutters. Following such a meeting, the center should return to the PB for additional preliminary site plan review. Abutter Bickford highly recommended having additional information available. Mr. Downey stated that information from Ross Stevens was needed. He noted that the traffic impact study completed by the project had already been submitted to the PB. The PB requested no additional studies.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. JACK GARRAHAN – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 50, Lot 2). PB member Conly presented a request from Jack Garrahan to cut four dead trees located within the 50-foot buffer at 668 Lake Shore Drive. Mr. Conly expressed disappointment regarding the absence of a replanting scheme. He advised that Mr. Garrahan would like to cut four dead trees. He further advised that the current walkway to the pond is on a steep slope. Mr. Garrahan would like to cease using that walkway and plant blueberry bushes there. He would also like to establish a new walkway to the left of the dead trees along a more gradual slope.

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley recommended that individuals submitting requests to cut trees within the 50-foot buffer be required to include proposed plantings on the plan. Mr. Stanley also noted that Mr. Garrahan had built a shed on the lot without a building permit. PB member Andrews asked how many bushes would be planted.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT THE APPLICANT BE REQUIRED TO RESUBMIT THE REQUEST FOR TREE CUTTING WITH A REPLANTING PLAN AND A WALKWAY PLAN. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- B. NEW LONDON INN – Seating on Front Porch (Tax Map 84, Lot 89): Ken McWilliams advised that the New London Inn had originally been on the agenda for the July 16 PB meeting; however, that meeting was cancelled. Because deferring review of the request until July 26 would have left the petitioner with little time to implement seating on the porch, PB Chair Karen Ebel approved the request with the understanding that the

porch seats would be taken from the inside seating to the outside seating, with no increase in the total number of seats provided.

Vice-Chair Cottrill opined that the New London Inn should submit a plan showing the number of seats and where they were taken from. Mr. McWilliams agreed to advise the New London Inn (Bridget LeRoy) of the need to submit a letter describing the number of seats and where they were taken from.

- C. The MINUTES of the JUNE 28, 2005 meeting were APPROVED as circulated.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **10:35 PM**.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____