



TOWN OF
NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

375 MAIN STREET • NEW LONDON, NH 03257 • WWW.NL-NH.COM

NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, November 17, 2015

PRESENT: Bill Helm (Chair), Paul Gorman (Vice Chair), Michele Holton, Bill Dietrich, and Jeremy Bonin, Tim Paradis, Janet Kidder (Selectmen's Representative), and Marianne McEnrue (Alt.)

ABSENT: Elizabeth Meller (Alt.)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Steve Root of 151 Job Seamans Acres, Sue Andrews of 114 Turkey Hill Run Road, Jon Walluck of Waitsfield Vermont, Laurie DiClerico of 614 Little Sunapee Road, Todd Emmons of 318 Brookside Drive, Pierre Bedard of 810 Bunker Road, Jeff and Missy Owen of 112 Ridge Road, Jason Avery of 60 Carter Road, Rob and Maureen Prohl of 144 Wilmot Center Road, Peter Stanley of Burpee Hill Road, and Jay Lyon, Fire Chief.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Helm called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes

- ✓ Motion to approve the Planning Board Minutes of November 3, 2015. IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman) to approve the minutes. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.
- ✓ Motion to approve the CIP Subcommittee Minutes of July 31, 2015 and August 14, 2015. IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (William Dietrich) to approve the minutes. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Public Hearing

Chair Helm informed the audience this public hearing is not required by law, but the Board decided to hold a public hearing to solicit public input into the process.

Public Hearing opened. There were no comments from the public on this item. Public hearing closed.

Site Plan Review Regulations Amendments Public Hearing

Chair Helm informed the audience this hearing is required by state law and opened the public hearing. Comments below pertain to the proposed amendment to Article I, D. (4).

Sue Andrews commented:

- ✓ She read a letter she prepared and submitted it to the Board at the meeting for the public record. Copy of letter is attached for the record.
- ✓ Is concerned as the hospital and college have the biggest buildings in town, the most employees, and not including them in the Site Plan Review process could be detrimental to the Town.
- ✓ Asked if an existing college building were going to be turned into a dormitory or vice versa wouldn't the Planning Board want to review these plans?
- ✓ The proposed amendment is unfair and gives preferential treatment to some and not to others.
- ✓ Believes this would be a big mistake for the Town, and lessen the Planning Board's role in the community.
- ✓ Suggested the Planning Board should reconsider the amendment change, as this is a mistake.
- ✓ Asked the name of Town Counsel (Attorney Barton Mayer) and suggested that any action should be put off until Town Counsel has responded.

Steve Root commented:

- ✓ Asked why doesn't the proposed amendment reference the Institutional District and the Hospital Institutional District specifically, not just specific users in the districts, such as New London Hospital and Colby-Sawyer College.
- ✓ Asked what is the rationale for exempting only certain users.
- ✓ Supports Sue Andrews comment.
- ✓ This is preferential treatment for larger institutions.
- ✓ Asked how the Board would know the difference between small changes and large changes.

Laurie DiClerico commented:

- ✓ Agrees with Sue Andrews and Steve Root comments.
- ✓ Concerned about safety issues, and how this would be addressed, for example what if an existing building is converted to a dormitory.
- ✓ Concerned about traffic flow and use, for example if the Clough Center is converted to a more intense use, traffic in the area and on the site could be affected.

Todd Emmons, Colby- Sawyer College commented:

- ✓ Not opposed to the proposed amendments.
- ✓ Site Plan Process has been costly (fees, abutter notification) and time consuming to the College.
- ✓ Need to streamline the process
- ✓ College looking for more flexibility, if the ordinance states certain uses are permitted in the Institutional zone, why should the College have to appear before the Planning Board each time to have such uses reviewed.
- ✓ Cited example of moving Nursing Department Offices from the Caretaker Cottage, and moving a small wall for office uses, and had to go through Site Plan Review.

Peter Stanley commented:

- ✓ Referred to RSA 674.43 Power to Review Site Plans.
- ✓ Referenced an existing threshold of 1000 feet and added that the Planning Board does not have the power to exempt individuals and said a warrant was needed by Town Meeting for authorization.
- ✓ Urged Planning Board not to take the path of allowing some individuals (College and Hospital) an exemption from the process.
- ✓ Suggested that the Planning Board review the RSAs and understand their role and responsibility.
- ✓ Stated that the Fast Track option is permitted by RSA 674:43 if approved by Town Meeting, and that the former Fast Track option worked and department heads were involved in the process. However, it was not approved by Town Meeting.
- ✓ This is a dangerous path for the Town to take.
- ✓ This would be a good case for someone to sue the Town.

Chair Helm commented:

- ✓ The that previous Fast Track Option (formerly Appendix I of Site Plan Regulations) was deemed to be illegal per review by Town Counsel, and the Site Plan Regulations were amended to include specific threshold limits (referring to the Site Plan Regulations amended March 2015).
- ✓ Discussed the time, and cost to businesses and institutions to make minor change.
- ✓ Explained that the proposed amendment only would pertain to existing buildings; new buildings would still need Site Plan Review.
- ✓ Addressed the need to make this a “user friendly” ordinance and not force people to come before the Planning Board for uses that are already permitted.
- ✓ The proposed amendment would still require review from the Fire Chief.
- ✓ Public Hearing closed 6:55 pm.

Building Permit and Surveys Memo

Steve Root inquired about the status of the discussion regarding surveys and building permits. Staff noted that she prepared a memo to the Town Administrator and Board of Selectmen. Staff noted that she couldn't recall the specific dates at this moment. (Note- Memo to the Board of Selectmen/Town Administrator from the Planning & Zoning Administrator dated Sept 8, 2015. Memo was discussed at the Sept 14, 2015 Board of Selectmen meeting. The Oct 5th Board of Selectmen minutes state the input would be sought from the Planning Board). Chair Helm apologized and noted that this topic can be discussed at the Dec 1st meeting.

Site Plan Review Regulations Public Hearing Reopened: Reopened to solicit comments on the other proposed amendments to the Site Plan Regulations. Comments below pertain to the other proposed amendments to the Off-Street Parking provisions in Section A & F. Chair Helm opened the public hearing on Site Plan Review concerning the Off-Street Parking provisions in Section A & F. Chair Helm asked if there was any objection to removing Paragraph F, Appendix A.

Steve Root commented:

- ✓ Thought this was taking out the ability of a small business to make an arrangement with someone else to make parking accommodations when there was no other option for parking on the property.
- ✓ Noted that KCOA had made a deal in years past with the Lake Sunapee Bank. This provision would take away this flexibility, and parking is a frequent issue for small businesses.
- ✓ Noted that if enforcement of the parking is an issue, shame on the Planning Board.
- ✓ Perception is that the Planning Board is lax, why strike this current provision, as parking is needed.
- ✓ Thought this would allow some unusual parking arrangements and would need some standards. He cited example of the arrangement for the 74 Main (and parking across the street).

Peter Stanley commented:

- ✓ Explained that what precipitated the 2004 New London Parking and Traffic Study prepared by the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission was underutilized parking, as businesses have different hours of use, and could share parking. This would lessen the need or opportunity to have more pavement in town, and thus reduce stormwater runoff.
- ✓ There are lots of other “parking arrangements” about Town including the Pizza Chef arrangement with Colby-Sawyer College.
- ✓ Terrible soils in town, stormwater management is an issue.
- ✓ Why make any changes to the regulations, they are working now, doesn’t see any reason to junk this provision now.
- ✓ Cautioned about taking anything out that might be referenced later and might be a standard.
- ✓ Agreed that private parking arrangements should be recorded.

Sue Andrews commented:

- ✓ Ask about the category for schools.

Chair Helm commented:

- ✓ Said that by taking out the provisions it would allow someone to come before the board and make legal arrangements.
- ✓ Cited the example of Millstone Restaurant asking to use parking off-site and not sure how previous parking arrangements can be enforced.
- ✓ Reviewed some of the case history of the KCOA property, as this is an example of parking-sharing, and is not aware if the lease arrangement was ever recorded, and the lack of a real mechanism in the ordinance for these provisions to be enforced.
- ✓ Suggested adding a sentence that any casual-neighborly parking arrangements be recorded for future reference.
- ✓ Noted that Jeremy Bonin has reviewed the parking requirement compared to the NFPA and other codes to make them more consistent with the actual types of businesses and

land uses in New London. Table, will incorporate minor edits (as general office was left out, was in current language).

- ✓ Public Hearing closed at 7:10 pm.

Tree Cutting Applications

Nancy Dahm Tree Cutting. Property located at 110 Murray Pond Road. Tax Map 045-005-000.

Property owner not present. Lucy St. John presented the application materials submitted, including a hand sketched diagram showing that a portion of a birch tree (1/2 of it) on property needs to be removed. Staff noted that she has not visited the site, and that the site is also located in the Streams Conservation Overlay District, referring to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and that the Planning Board shall request the Conservation Commission to review the plan and make recommendations. Ms. St. John noted that the Conservation Commission has been provided the information, and they are meeting tomorrow morning, November 18, 2015.

- ✓ **Chair Helm requested a motion to approve to remove part of one tree subject to review by the Conservation Commission. IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (William Dietrich) to approve the motion. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Raoul & Karen, LLC (formerly Carr) Tree Cutting. Property located at 29 Boulder Point Road. Tax Map 115-002-000.

Pierre Bedard represented the owner, owner not in attendance.

- ✓ Explained that there was a fire in July 2014, the house was destroyed and damage done to the vegetation.
- ✓ Many trees and shrubs have died consequently but other low red maple shrubs have sprouted.
- ✓ Noted that the trees are dead, and are not included in the scoring. They do not have any plans to replant. Stated that the dead and fire damaged trees are creating hazards for the new construction.
- ✓ Pellettieri Associates, Inc. is in the process of preparing a landscape plan for the property. Stated the new home would be in exact footprint of old and there is actually a reduction in square footage, but not sure if the building permit has been submitted yet.
- ✓ Stated a State Shoreland permit has been submitted and approved and DES did not express any concerns.
- ✓ Noted that after the fire, the soil (exposed mineral surface) was stabilized, as they planted grass.

Board comments:

- ✓ What is the plan to replace the points (for trees/vegetation) which were lost due to the fire?

- ✓ Discussed that if the trees/vegetation were destroyed by fire, and thus dead, do they count in the scoring, and shouldn't they be replaced. Reviewed page 67 of Shoreland provisions (2) Dead, diseased, or unsafe trees or saplings (as determined by the Planning Board) shall not be included in scoring and reviewed (3) and (4) regarding removal and points in each segment.
- ✓ Discussed that if the saplings are growing back as Mr. Bedard has noted, how is the vegetation along the shoreline allowed to grow back, as the provisions of (2, b) states that pruning of shrubs and ground cover down to a height of 3 feet is permitted, and (2, c, 6)- allows trimming... of branches for the purpose of providing views shall be limited to the bottom half of the trees and saplings. The Board discussed that these provisions contradict the purpose of maintaining a natural vegetative buffer.
- ✓ If the saplings were the only remaining trees after removal of all the dead trees, and this was confirmed by the Mr. Bedard, there is concern that nothing would be left on the shoreline.
- ✓ Discussed is the intent to allow a "landscape plan" or to leave the site to grow back in a "natural landscape".
- ✓ Ms. St. John stated that although she has spoken with the architect of this project many times, she has not received a building permit application.
- ✓ Janet Kidder stated there was some current legal activity concerning the property as the former owners (Carr) had not asked for an abatement of taxes after the fire and consequently no taxes were abated. The owners are now suing the town for abatement of property taxes.
- ✓ Concern that if no replanting is done to replace what was lost by the fire and if the owners cut the shrubs down to three (3) feet as allowed, essentially there won't be any trees or significant vegetation to protect the shoreline.
- ✓ Board agreed it would be helpful to review the landscape plan that Pellettieri Associates is creating for the owners.
- ✓ Lucy St. John thought a site visit would be appropriate at this point. Chair Helm suggested a continuation of application due to a need for more information.
- ✓ Board members noted that the trees should be replaced, as essentially this may be a loophole in the regulations.

Motion to continue the application for 29 Boulder Point Road to the Planning Board meeting of December 1, 2015 and scheduled a site visit on November 30, 2015 at 11am. IT WAS MOVED (William Dietrich) AND SECONDED (Michelle Holton) to approve the motion. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Robert Ruggles Tree Cutting. Property located at 823 Bunker Road. Tax Map 077-004-000.

Property owner not present, nor the agent Talbot Builders. Noted that the diagram and plan was submitted by Talbot Builders, agent for the applicant. Applicant wishes to remove 3 dead trees; cell D to go from 41 points to 36 points and cell B will go from 70 points to 60 points.

- ✓ **Motion to approve the tree cutting application for 823 Bunker Road. IT WAS MOVED (Paul Gorman) AND SECONDED (Michelle Holton) to approve the motion. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Conceptual Site Plan Discussions-Chair Helm explained that conceptual discussion on not binding discussions.

Jeff Owen, New London Cleaners. Property located at 93 Newport Road. Tax Map 072-038-000.

Jeff Owen, owner, explained he is not selling the property, but may be selling/leasing a portion of the business space to another potential business. He might sell the portion of the current business that now includes the laundromat portion and the new owner will incorporate the dry cleaning portion, but this work will not be performed on premise. He would then rent out the current space that houses the dry-cleaning business but does not know what the use will be. Mr. Owen handed out a rough sketch on how he might want to reconfigure the space, and discussed the current parking spaces.

The Board discussed the need for Site Plan Review, as the space is greater than 1,000 square feet, and for any interior and exterior modifications. Also discussed that currently they have adequate parking space and will only need 17 spaces so parking is not an issue. Chair Helm said the Fire Chief has to approve and has to be a permitted use allowed in the commercial zone.

Brian Dumais. Discussion on “little free library”. Proposed location at the Sparrow School at 10 Lovering Lane. TM 084-059-000.

Staff received an email asking this be postponed until a later date. Discussion postponed.

Site Plan Applications and Public Hearings

- ✓ **Mountain View Shopping Center/Crosspoint Associates. Located at 277 Newport Road. Tax Map 059-008-000.** Zoned Commercial. For the addition of two (2) additional parking lot islands to create visual symmetry in conjunction with the already existing two (2) islands.

Board determined this is not a project of regional impact. Comments received from the Fire Department and Public Works are OK with the work that was done.

Jon Walluck, Property Manager stated that company had relied on contractor to get site-plan review. A diagram was submitted showing the location of the islands, which were already installed in front of Unleashed/Verizon. He noted that no parking spaces were involved. Waiver requested to the other Site Plan requirements. These islands replicate two existing islands in design and landscaping.

Public hearing opened. No comments received. Public hearing closed.

Motion to approve islands at Mountain View Shopping Center. IT WAS MOVED (Paul Gorman) AND SECONDED (Jeremy Bonin) to approve the motion. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

- ✓ **Robert Stahlman. Property located at 74 Pleasant Street. Tax Map 084-079-000.** A portion of the property is zoned Commercial and a portion is zoned Residential (R-1). The applicant proposes to extend the driveway located on the side of the office building with an easement over the Canary Systems property (Tax Map 084-080-000), and to create a paved parking area to the rear of the building (22 spaces), with access gained via the easement. A Subdivision and Annexation plan was approved at the October 6th meeting, which increased the lot area. The Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) received a variance application to consider a commercial parking lot in the residential district. The ZBA public hearing was held on September 29th and continued to November 10th. The variance was denied at the ZBA November 10th meeting. Wetlands delineated by John Sisson, Beaver Tracks, LLC; Boundary and Existing Conditions by Clayton Platt, Licensed Land Surveyor and driveways, grading and drainage design by Robert Stahlman, P.E.

Board determined this is not a project of regional impact. Comments received from the Fire Department today. Chief Lyon has no issues. Staff noted that Chief Lyon has conveyed that the clearing of the site has opened the site up and he now has better access. Comments received from Richard Lee, Public Works Director dated November 17th. Concerned about two way ingress/egress, snow storage, drainage and runoff.

Michelle Holton recused herself from discussion and vote as she had done at previous meeting.

Mr. Stahlman presented this application:

- ✓ He stated that the variance request was denied at the Nov 10th ZBA meeting.
- ✓ He is a licensed engineer in 17 states and he is comfortable with his ability to get his application approved.
- ✓ He purchased the rear portion (from the abutter) because he needs more parking for his building, and he has been unsuccessful in securing other off-site parking lease arrangements.
- ✓ He intends to submit a petitioned zoning amendment for the March Town Meeting. Said he is confident he will get the approval in March Town Meeting as he knows people in town who will help him.
- ✓ His purpose tonight is to get approval to extend the driveway to the rear, and is not seeking approval for the parking area in the rear (as the variance was denied).
- ✓ He submitted a proposed easement documents from Canary Enterprises LLC, Alex Neuwirt.
- ✓ Presented a modified plan showing the driveway from current commercial lot going through residential lot, reflecting proposed driveway on his approved easement. He has eliminated one parking space (directly next to proposed driveway entrance) for access to this proposed driveway, which will be 12 feet wide. Said he would just put up a stop sign

on the site, so people driving on the driveway to the back, would know to go slow, and there is enough visibility.

- ✓ Said it is his right to install a driveway if that is his desire and he has already erected a fence and planted some trees to satisfy the neighbors.
- ✓ There is no need for a two-way driveway as cars come in the morning, park for the day and then will exit the proposed 12 foot driveway and he will permit cars to park on the driveway.
- ✓ Asked if he has permission to grade and level the proposed driveway area.
- ✓ Discussed why he couldn't widen the driveway, as there are trash receptacles which cannot be moved and a sewer tank which pumps out to the street and cannot be driven over. Explained that about seven (7) years ago he installed drains around the building to help with the drainage concerns.

Board comments:

- ✓ Why install a driveway (to a proposed parking lot) before getting approval for that parking lot and incur unnecessary expenses? What is the purpose of a driveway that leads to a residential property when he won't be able to use the residential lot for his business?
- ✓ Planning Board could only speak to the driveway as far as the commercial property goes on the easement and explained a commercial parking lot was not an approved use for a residential property.
- ✓ Planning Board does not have jurisdiction on a residential lot.
- ✓ The proposed driveway extension is only shown to be 12 foot wide, leading to a dead end, and it needs to accommodate two-way traffic since there is no other way out and that the driveway should be 22 feet wide. Asked for clarification on the distance from the building and suggested moving the driveway closer to the building to achieve the 22 foot width. Asked if there has been any other precedent set, in that the Planning Board permitted the approval of a one-way driveway. The proposal of the 12 foot width was questionable as the width would not be adequate for emergency vehicles.
- ✓ He can't eliminate the parking space required to access the driveway, as he is required to have 23 spaces and that the proposed gravel surface does not constitute a driveway.
- ✓ Stated that cars cannot park on the driveway as it will impede emergency traffic.
- ✓ Do not think that people in town will vote to enlarge the commercial zone.
- ✓ Suggested Mr. Stahlman wait until after Town Meeting before going through with this application because of all the other considerations such as snow removal, emergency vehicle access, potential cost for installing a driveway to a proposed parking area he can't use for a commercial lot, and he needs to address the width of the easement and other comments raised.
- ✓ Asked Mr. Stahlman if he wanted to continue at a later date or have his application voted on tonight.

Public Hearing Opened. Staff noted that comments were received from abutters for the ZBA meeting. No public comments received at the Planning Board meeting. Public Hearing Closed.

Mr. Stahlman asked if the application could be continued to after March 8, 2016 and acknowledged he was withdrawing his application.

Other Business

Signs - Update on NHMA webinar

- ✓ Paul Gorman, chair of the Sign Subcommittee, gave a brief update of the webinar.
- ✓ He noted that Janet Kidder, Bill Dietrich and Lucy St. John also participated in the webinar.
- ✓ He explained that the US Supreme Court case Reed v. Town of Gilbert has subjected local sign ordinance to exacting legal scrutiny. The court case focuses on the First Amendment (free speech), and requirement for “content neutral” signs.
- ✓ Bill Dietrich commented that most of signs in the country are probably not legal per this Supreme Court decision.
- ✓ Janet Kidder pointed out that the Selectmen cannot go onto private property and remove a sign although people in town think this to be the case once the permitted signage days have expired. Ms. Kidder emphasized that all governmental bodies are exempt from local regulations and that is why the liquor store is permitted to have an interior lighted sign that says “Liquor Store.”
- ✓ The Board discussed that revisions to the Sign Ordinance will be needed, and the enforcement of the current sign provisions may be difficult to enforce as a result of this case.

CIP- discussion of the public hearing comments

- ✓ Chair Helm noted that the public hearing was conducted this evening. No comments were received.
- ✓ The final version will be given to the Board of Selectmen (BOS) and Budget Committee. Bill Helm noted that he will attend BOS meeting on November 30, 2015 and Budget Committee meeting on December 2, 2015.
- ✓ Chair Helm asked for others to attend to impress upon the Selectmen and the Budget Committee the importance of acquiring the school site (1941 Building).
- ✓ Janet Kidder questioned if the Town was willing to acquire the building with all its attendant problems. Ms. Kidder suggested a warrant article should simply articulate that the Town would retain control of the site and decide later what will be done with it. Janet Kidder suggested that a design charrette might be an idea to solicit input on the site.
- ✓ Ms. St. John referred to the recent letter to Norm Bernaiche (Assessing Department) from CAI Technologies (letter dated Nov 2nd) regarding the tax map correction project and revised cost. She emphasized the need for this project, and projected cost increase, noting the importance of this project.
- ✓ Janet Kidder asked that a strong case be given for an enforcement officer, which is included in the proposed budget.

Site Plan Review Amendments – discussion of the public hearing comments

- ✓ The Board conducted the public hearing earlier in this meeting. Numerous comments and concerns were raised.
- ✓ Concerning Table A there were no questions and it was accepted.
- ✓ Section F on parking: Chair Helm said it was helpful to have the existing KCOA agreement to look back on and perhaps leave the wording as is with addition of language that agreement must be recorded. Board decided to leave Section F in the text.
- ✓ Ms. St. John noted that parking provisions are typically included in the Site Plan Regulations, not the Zoning Ordinance to allow the Planning Board some flexibility when reviewing each site. Board discussed how to enforce parking regulations, as there are many instances of formal and informal parking arrangements. Not all are known, or recorded.
- ✓ Board discussed reasons to limit large parking areas as this is a stormwater management issue and the appearance of large parking areas is a visual issue.
- ✓ Staff noted that some communities have maximum parking requirements, not minimum requirements to address and minimize parking areas.
- ✓ Board discussed off-site parking arrangements, and concern about crossing a State or local road without proper crosswalk areas, and safety could be an issue. Recent example cited- 74 Main Street Restaurant and shared parking across the street at New London Dry Cleaners.

Motion by (William Dietrich) AND SECONDED (Michelle Holton) to approve a new Appendix A, Section A, Off-Street Parking Regulations and to leave the Section F. Off Site parking (F) in place. The discussion on exempting the Institutional districts (existing structures) from Site Plan Review was continued to the December 1st meeting, pending receipt of an opinion from Town Counsel. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Planning Board Meeting Calendar

Chair Helm suggested moving the public hearing on any proposed zoning amendment from Tuesday, January 12, 2016 to Thursday, January 14, 2016 (with snow date of January 15). Several board members are unable to attend the Jan 12th meeting. The second and fourth Tuesdays in February and March will be posted on the calendar for Planning Board meetings. Staff will revise and post the meeting calendar.

Agenda Attachment list – See list for details including correspondence, State applications, informational items and other items.

Intent to Cut

Ms. St. John referred to the Intent to Cut applications listed. Lucy St. John informed the Board that she includes these on the list as a FYI, and that forestry operations are regulated by State Forestry Laws. She referred to the previous discussion of this topic relative to the Canane

property, and the Town Overlay maps. She noted that Deb and Craig Langer recently appeared before the Board for a conceptual discussion. They will begin the logging operation soon. Board members had no comments on the Intent to Cuts.

Wetlands NHDES Standard Review Application for 293 Lamson Lane. Tax Map 062-008-000. Owned by Tim and Lucinda Carlson.

Ms. St. John provided a brief overview, noting this project involves the re-creation of a section of a perennial stream by daylighting an existing flow through a culvert. Approximately 100 linear feet of 24" culvert pipe will be removed, and a new drainage manhole and approximately 69 linear feet of 30" culvert pipe installed under a new driveway. From the outlet of the new 30" culvert, a new stream channel will be constructed to convey the stream to Pleasant Lake on the north side of the property. The new stream channel as designed will mimic the characteristics of the existing stream channel upstream of the property. Application received Nov 10, 2015. Staff will give an update on the specific language of the Zoning Ordinance which may apply at the December 1, 2015, meeting.

Jeremy Bonin recused himself as these are his clients.

Future Meeting Dates – December 1, 2015 and December 15, 2015

Motion to Adjourn

Motion to adjourn. IT WAS MOVED (William Dietrich), AND SECONDED (Tim Paradis) to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Vitiello,
Recording Secretary
Town of New London, NH

All Town of New London public meetings are accessible for persons with disabilities. The Town Office is handicapped accessible. Reasonable efforts will be made to accommodate persons with physical, emotional or sensory disabilities. Any person who feels that he or she may be unable to participate in a Town of New London public meeting should contact the Town at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. Please contact the Town Office at 526-4821, ext. 10. Information about the meeting is available in the Town Office and information is posted on the Town's website.

Questions regarding the Planning Board meeting, or items posted on the Town's website regarding the meeting can be directed to Lucy St. John, AICP Planning and Zoning Administrator at 526-4821, ext. 16 or email at zoning@nl-nh.com.

The Planning Board may enter into non-public session, if voted, to discuss items under RSA 91-A: 3.