



TOWN OF  
NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING ON THE  
PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS

MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, March 24, 2015  
7:00 PM

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** William Helm (Chair); Michele Holton (Secretary); Peter Bianchi (Board of Selectmen's Representative); Jeremy Bonin; Emma Crane; William Dietrich; Marianne McEnrue Alternate), Elizabeth Meller (Alternate); and Tim Paradis (Alternate)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Paul Gorman (Vice Chair)

**STAFF:** Lucy St. John (Planning and Zoning Administrator), Chris Work (Recording Secretary)

Chair Helm called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. He explained that tonight's meeting was the second public hearing to be held on two proposed zoning amendments regarding the definition of family and changes to the sign provisions. The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments from the public on these amendments in order to include them on the 2015 Town Meeting Warrant for consideration. Mr. Helm asked Elizabeth Meller to sit in for Paul Gorman, who is absent tonight.

**Zoning Amendment Proposed # 1- Definition of Family**

**Amendment #1 - New Definition of "Family."** This amendment proposes to replace the current definition of "family" in order to broaden the current definition of "legally related" to include accepted forms of committed relationships and nuclear households, and to delete consideration of domestic servants as an additional occupant.

Chair Helm noted that in the initial hearing concerning this amendment, the board proposed to define family as "3 persons or less," which it later revised to "5 persons or less."

**Definition to be deleted: #49. Family:** *One or more persons occupying a single Dwelling Unit, provided that unless all members are legally related, no such Family shall contain over five persons, but further provided that domestic servants employed on the premises may be housed on the premises without being counted as a Family or families.*

**Proposed definition: #49. Family:** *One or more persons occupying a single Dwelling Unit, provided that unless all persons are related by blood, marriage, civil union, adoption or guardianship, no such family shall contain more than five (5) persons. In*

*determining the maximum number of persons allowed, children (under the age of 18) of any of the residents shall not be counted. For the purpose of this Ordinance, the term "family" and the term "household" shall be synonymous and interchangeable.*

Chair Helm then asked the audience for comments on both amendments, starting with the definition of family.

### **Public Hearing Opened**

Michael Todd suggested the proposed definition include additional language limiting the relationship by blood or marriage. For example, he recommended adding the words "All persons related by blood are restricted to three degrees of kinship." He noted that no limit has been placed on how many distant cousins could live in the house, which would not be counted in the five. Limiting kinship is a commonly recognized process from intestacy statutes of inheritance. If one applies that logic, it means in the same household, the principal could reside with a child, grandchild and a great-grandchild. All those persons would not count as the five. Going the other direction, however, the same rule applies. Uncles, nephews, nieces and aunts could be included, but no one outside that boundary would be considered "family." First cousins would be out. Attorney Todd asked the board how broadly it wishes to define "family."

Michele Holton commented that she has members of her family outside that branch of whom she is fonder than some of the closer ones, and does not agree with what Michael Todd is suggesting.

Michael Todd reiterated that for purposes of applying the ordinance, he feels the amendment should contain a limiting factor. He said the ordinance could be expanded to include five degrees of kinship. Simply saying "all members must be legally related" does not set limits.

There were no further comments from the audience on this particular amendment.

### **Zoning Amendment Proposed # 2- Sign Provisions**

**Amendment #2 Revised Sign Regulations:** The Planning Board proposes to delete the entire section of the current provisions of Article II, General Provisions, #10 – Sign Regulations – and the sign table titled "Quick Reference to Sign Size and number by Zone District" located in the back of the Zoning Ordinance, and replace it with the new language and a new Sign Table. (The complete text is available on the Town's website, and copies can be obtained at the Town Office.)

Chair Helm noted that copies of the entire 13-page document were on hand at tonight's meeting and offered to provide a hard copy to anyone who wished to read it. Chair Helm asked Lucy St. John to inform the public in attendance of several minor -none substantive - changes to the text which have been incorporated since the last public hearing. Ms. St. John displayed the proposed changes in the rationale statement and explained why they were made, incorporating the table into the text and just calling it a Sign Table, not a quick reference table. The Board members all agreed that these were editorial, not substantive changes.

Chair Helm asked for any public hearing comments.

**Katherine Fischer:**

- ✓ Referred to page 2, general provision, #2- Master Sign Plan. She thinks this is more of a definition and should be included in the provisions related to Definitions.
- ✓ She has read several other sign regulations and commented this particular one did not flow as well.
- ✓ She asked why the board felt the need to make changes and questioned what deficiencies were present in the old regulations.

Chair Helm responded that the old sign regulations were difficult to explain to people and the board finally decided to make these changes.

**Michael Todd:**

- ✓ Referred to page 1, #1 Definition of sign. He asked why it did not include the words “logo” or “licensed trademark.” The Board agreed this was a reasonable comment, and agreed to incorporate this change, noting that it was not a substantive change.
- ✓ Referred to page 2, General Provision, # 4 RSA Provisions and suggested citing the specific RSAs that apply, relative to political signs, sign mounted on trees, and etc.
- ✓ Since New London holds trees in high regard (designated Tree City USA), there should be a prohibition on putting signs on trees. It was noted that tree farms are allowed to post signs on trees and state laws allows signs on trees from the period Nov 1-May 1.
- ✓ Suggestion to clarify how measurement of 15 feet occurs on page 13, item 6.
- ✓ On the matter of definitions, the Supreme Court says we go to the meaning of the word or common meaning of the word, and as he looked at some of the terms, he did not find they were particularly different from those in the dictionary. If the definition is not substantially different, it probably doesn’t need to be in the ordinance, and it would simplify things for people.
- ✓ Said he appreciated how hard the board has worked on these amendments.

**Katherine Fischer:**

- ✓ Referred to page 2, Definition of sign, and suggested that the first sentence read as follows: “Sign: Any combination of letters, numerals, lines, symbols, shapes or design, in any medium, on any surface, intended to convey the identity of, or information about, any person, place, thing, product of service.” The words, “including the display area” would be deleted.
- ✓ She also noted that the following sentence in the text is a fragmented sentence.
- ✓ The ordinance would be better organized if it were rearranged from the perspective of the person who came in and wanted to put a sign up, what they would want to know first, the types of signs that don’t need a permit, signs that do need a permit, and definitions later. It would make it more readable.

**Public Hearing Closed for both proposed Zoning Amendments.**

**Minutes: March 3, 2015, March 5, 2015 Subcommittee, and March 6, 2015**

Bill Helm referred to the draft March 6<sup>th</sup> minutes, pages 1-2 under, Update by Staff and Subcommittee, which begin with, “Ms., St. John reported that Tom Cottrill telephoned her this afternoon... and the update continues on page 2. Tom Cottrill had talked to Bill Helm, since that meeting, and Tom Cottrill conveyed to Bill Helm that he felt his comments had been misrepresented by Ms. St. John. A motion was made to amend the draft March 6<sup>th</sup> minutes, and delete all but the last paragraph in this section, and to leave the paragraph that read, “Paul Gorman noted at the subcommittee meeting....” ..... and end with “... to convey information to the general public.”

**MOTION** (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Peter Bianchi) to accept the revisions in the minutes of March 6, 2015, as stated, and accept the March 3 and March 5 minutes as written. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda**

There were no comments on items not on the agenda.

**Zoning Amendments-- Discussion and action following the public hearing comments**

Chair Helm opened discussion on the aforementioned proposed zoning amendments. He noted again that this was the second public hearing being held regarding these amendments.

**Proposed Amendment #1, Definition of Family:** Marianne McEnrue said she was confused about the relationship between nieces and nephews and cousins and brothers. She was not sure she understood the restrictions on relatives “going sideways.”

Attorney Todd Michael, who spoke at the public hearing, explained that “intestate” refers to a person who died without a will. He showed a NH Intestacy Chart which explains the order of inheritance for such a person’s relatives. Third degree of kinship would include in the line of descendants: the principal, child, grandchild, brother, and brother’s child – niece or nephew. Ascendancy would cover principal’s parent, grandparent, or uncle of the parent or aunt of the parent, and finally, the principal’s great grandparent.

The Board briefly discussed Attorney Michael Todd’s comments and Chair Helm said he believed that adding it to the definition would not make it any easier to interpret what constitutes a “family.” He said the reason the board changed “legally related” was to be able to include civil unions. He feels that adding any “degrees of kinship” would cause the board more interpretation issues than they already have. Michele Holton agreed that it would cause hard feelings in many families. She felt the whole premise was absurd and too restrictive.

There was no further discussion.

**MOTION** (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to ask the Town Clerk to present Amendment #1, as written, on the Warrant for the Town Meeting in May. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Proposed Amendment #2 – Sign Provisions.** Chair Helm asked board members their reaction to the suggestion that “definitions” be moved to the end of the ordinance. It simply sounds like a minor rearrangement to him. Jeremy Bonin commented that moving the definition to the end was not necessarily helpful. As a point of reference, Lucy S. John referred to page 20 of the Zoning Ordinance. Peter Bianchi thought that it would be easier for a person to have the definitions up front, so they would know right away whether they needed to go any further. Marianne McEnrue concurred, saying she would want to have that information before she plowed through the entire ordinance.

Michael Todd thought the order of the text should follow the order of the sign table. The order of rearrangement of various sections of the ordinance were briefly debated. It was suggested a motion be made to move these sections in various ways, but no motion was forthcoming. Chair Helm then recommended a motion to retain the current order of the revised sign provisions.

**MOTION** (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Michele Holton) to retain the current order of the sections of the proposed zoning amendment. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommended revisions concerning the “signs” amendment included:

- ✓ No good reason to change the definitions – all agreed
- ✓ Noted it may be redundant, but probably should insert the word “logo” in Item 1, page 2.
- ✓ Insert the word “visible” before “surface.” “Visible” will replace “display.”
- ✓ Sign definition, to remove the language “including the display area” as this is implied in the actual definition.
- ✓ Sign Table- reverse the order, to follow the text. Signs requiring a permit from the Planning Board, Signs requiring a permit from the Board of Selectmen and Sign Not requiring a Town Sign Permit.

**MOTION** (Bill Dietrich) AND SECONDED (Jeremy Bonin) to make the three changes noted above. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

It was asked whether the “master sign plan” should be moved under “Definitions.” All agreed it should.

**MOTION** (Peter Bianchi) AND SECONDED (Jeremy Bonin) to move “master sign plan under “Definitions.” THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

With regard to heights of signs being 15 feet off the ground, Chair Helm noted that it would be unlikely to find signs on sides of hills. The board did not make changes to the height provisions.

**MOTION** (Jeremy Bonin) AND **SECONDED** (Peter Bianchi) to ask the Town Clerk to present Amendment #2, with the proposed changes, on the Warrant for the Town Meeting in May. **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Peter Bianchi and Lucy St. John commented that the Board has received an email from Stefan Timbrell dated March 16, 2015 regarding real estate signs, where he asked if the total square footage refers to one side or both sides of a sign. The Board discussed that most signs are two sided, noting for example if the total square footage allowed is 10 square feet, that the sign could have 10 square feet on each side.

**MOTION** (Michelle Holton) AND **SECONDED** (Liz Meller) for the board to acknowledge it is common practice for a real estate sign to have one or two sides, each of which can be up to 6 feet. Any free-standing sign can be two-sided, each side can have the required square footage amount. **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Michael Todd inquired about the RSA regarding real estate signs. Ms. St. John will provide the RSA references regarding signs to him.

**Tree Cutting Applications (Shoreland Overlay District)**

- Bateman property located at 81 Lighthouse View Road, Tax Map 126-009-000. Application received March 16, 2015. Proposal to remove two (2) trees – David Carey was present to represent the Batemans regarding the application to cut two trees on their property. Chair Helm remarked that in 2011, there was a previous approval for tree cutting on that property. The total points for each 50’ segment are different from what is presented in the current application. The tree cutting provisions state that segment should start from the northerly or easterly boundary of the property. Mr. Carey responded that he went from right to left. The Board reviewed the 2011 application details and the current application details and noted some discrepancy. Chair Helm asked the board if a site walk should be scheduled. Ms. St. John also pointed out that knowing where the 50’ reference line is important and should be delineated in the field.

**MOTION** (Peter Bianchi) AND **SECONDED** (Liz Meller) to conduct a site walk. The Board scheduled the site walk for Tuesday, March 31<sup>st</sup> and the tree cutting application would be included on the April 7<sup>th</sup> agenda for further discussion. **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- Ryan property located at 143 Lighthouse View Road. Tax Map 115-001-000. Application received March 18, 2015. Proposal to remove two (2) hemlock trees. No one was present to present the application.

**MOTION** (Peter Bianchi) AND **SECONDED** (Jeremy Bonin) to conduct a site visit on Tuesday, March 31 at 6:00 pm along with the other site visit discussed this evening, and the tree cutting application will be included on the April 7<sup>th</sup> agenda for further discussion. **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **Conceptual Discussion**

**Pike Brook Road Revocable Trust, Jacqueline M. Hudkins, Trustee. Ferrante (Domenic and Molly) – Pike Brook Road Realignment, Lot Merger and Subdivision.** Tax Map 135, Lots 8, 9 and 10. Zoned R2 Shoreland Overlay District. Pike Brook Road is a private road.

Greg Grigsby of Pelletieri Associates was present, along with Peter Blakeman of Blakeman Engineering, to represent the Pike Brook Road Revocable Trust in this matter. Mr. Grigsby noted that the owners acquired three properties on Pike Brook Road. They have lived in the Lake Sunapee area for over 10 years and are planning to move down the lake and take advantage of the large beach area these properties offer. The owners are proposing to take the existing roadway that goes through the three properties and relocate a section of the existing road, which is on their property, moving it further away from the lake. Five of the nonconforming structures will eventually be removed and the septic system replaced. There is also a Tiki hut on the property and the disposition of that building is still to be determined. These properties will comprise a lot of beach area. The owners are proposing the road relocation for several reasons including: safety concerns during construction, allows for more flexibility when designing the location of structure to be put on the lot, and this is a benefit as the road will be further away from the lake. The neighbors beyond these properties will have unfettered access during construction and beyond. The timing of the projects will depend on the regulatory process. Two of the lots will be merged creating a larger conforming lot. The existing road is about 10 feet wide; the new one will be a wider and will provide better access to emergency vehicles.

Mr. Grigsby stated the owners sent a letter to several of the abutters to informally make them aware of the project, as this is only a conceptual discussion and does not require notification to abutters. The owner wanted to make sure the abutters were part of the discussions upfront. The owners have spoken to three of them so far, and will be looking to receive input from the neighbors as the work progresses. Overhead utilities will be relocated. PSNH has indicated they find the road alignment and proposed changes to be positive, as the existing overhead utilities are now offset from the road and are considered stranded poles. Relocating them will allow PSNH easier access to the poles. He explained there have been some discussion if the utilities will be underground or above ground, there may be some consensus on the placement of the utilities, and lots of permitting issues to comply with.

Peter Blakeman talked about the specifics of the new road, and the design elements are still in the conceptual stage. He stated that the current road (Pike Brook Road) is really just a common driveway with access to all the properties. The site is blessed with sandy and gravelly soil. It is a private road, so there would be no town maintenance. He suggested it really could be considered a service road, per the Subdivision Regulations, Standards for Street Design, page 77. The plan is to create a low volume road, as it currently is, and improve the road width which may include a turnoff area to allow emergency vehicles better access. He commented that he had already reviewed his plans for the road with Richard Lee, Jay Lyon and Ms. St. John. He noted the vertical alignment is fairly flat, so there should be no issues. Realignment the road will move the road further away from the abutters. He remarked that this property is not really a subdivision. The owners are considering merging two lots together, so they would end up with

two lots, not three. Finally, Mr. Blakeman observed this is a private road with no right of way and it is not shown on any town subdivision or town road plans. Final plans concerning the road may require further study.

Chair Helm referred to Ms. St. John's staff report on the conceptual discussion and asked the Board if they had any comments or questions.

Marianne McEnrue asked if the road would be the primary access for all of the buildings on these two lots – will they put in driveways from this road to each structure? Mr. Blakeman replied that they had not gotten that far yet. They have to decide where the houses will go first. Chair Helm asked if the board was just going to discuss the roads at this time, and not the lot merger. Mr. Blakeman replied the lot merger is just a paper issue which will not happen until near the end of the process. Chair Helm noted that Lot 8 is in conformity, but Lots 9 and 10 are too small; however, it looks as if the plans are to merge Lots 8 and 9, and Lot 10 will remain nonconforming. Michele Holton commented that she was familiar with this area and it makes sense to do it this way for safety reasons.

Jeremy Bonin said he had a couple of questions regarding stormwater management. He noted there are wet areas on the property now and asked if a couple of culverts should be put in this area? Mr. Blakeman responded that there is already a culvert on the property and they plan to build new ones for stormwater management. Mr. Bonin asked how much the road would be enlarged. Mr. Blakeman said Chief Lyon wants to go up to 18 feet total width for access. The builder is trying to balance safe access and the aesthetic nature of that road.

Peter Bianchi brought up the bridge between the northern and southern section and asked if there would be changes in access from Soo Nipi Park Road or Owl's Nest Road? Blakeman said no work is planned on Owl's Nest Road. Selectman Bianchi wondered whether this will really end up a road or just a big driveway. Lucy St. John explained that Pike Brook Road is included on a list of roads in town, and is identified on that list as a private road. She noted that it is not a common driveway, as Peter Blakeman had commented previously.

Chair Helm inquired if the owners knew the status of the rights of passage or other details in easement language that historically that have allowed people to go across to the other properties. He assumes they all have deeded access and opined that the road will have to adhere to the standards required for current subdivisions. Mr. Helm said that moving forward, the board will want to conduct a site visit and asked Mr. Blakeman to inform the Board when might be a convenient time to schedule a site walk.

Mr. Blakeman said they would have to seek the approval of the abutters, since the owners are changing the path of the easement. All these people will have to acquiesce to this change.

Ms. St. John referred to the Subdivision Regulation, Standards for Street Design, and noted that she, Richard Lee and Jay Lyon previously met with Mr. Blakeman and Mr. Grigsby to discuss the project and reviewed the street standard identified in the Subdivisions Regulations. Ms. St. John commented that this really isn't a service road, and is more a local road, referring to the

table in the Subdivision Regulations. She referred to two recent emails from Jay Lyon and Richard Lee dated March 24<sup>th</sup> regarding some general concerns and comments about this project and Owls Nest.

Chair Helm commented that he has reviewed the emails from Jay Lyon and Richard Lee. An observation was made that other roads in the area may have to be upgraded to accommodate the growth. Mr. Grigsby noted that the area is not growing. There is turnover, but not additional buildings. Peter Bianchi responded that converting a seasonal home to a year-round home is increasing the size of that area. Chair Helm said it was the obligation of the board to consider what the future use of the road is and consider other changes that are occurring in the area which may affect traffic on the road and the configuration of the road. It was noted that an Intent to Cut and logging operation is occurring in the immediate area.

Several abutters and other interested parties were in attendance and asked questions.

- ✓ June Fichter, Executive Director, Lake Sunapee Protective Association, commented that if the road is made larger, there is a point at which the impervious surface becomes detrimental. She is concerned that run-off could be an issue. Mr. Grigsby replied that all of this is being counted in the calculations, and the road would meet all town and state requirements.
- ✓ Deb Putnam, an abutter, commented that there is not an increase in population in the area, but rather the houses are turning over to new occupants.
- ✓ Nathaniel Stevens, an abutter, had contacted staff prior to the meeting with some questions.
- ✓ Anthony Woetz, an abutter, stated that there used to be a fish hatchery at the end of Pike Brook Road. He also commented that it is a road and not a driveway.

## **Other Business**

Planning and Zoning Administrator's Updates/Information

- **Solar panels.** Ms. St. John reported that she had received an email from Gary Surprenant dated March 16, 2015 regarding guidelines for solar panels, solar farms and any sort of commercial solar enterprise. He is particularly concerned about the visual impact. She noted he is an abutter to the Flying Goose Pub solar panels. She stated that several building permits have been issued for roof mounted solar panels. She also noted that a building permit application was submitted for ground mounted solar array for the Scheuch residential property at 192 Andover Road (next to the Country Club). She explained that she did contact NHDOT, District 2 Engineer Alan Hansom to inquire if the State had any concerns about potential glare or other issues. She explained that there are not any current restrictions in the Zoning Ordinance which would prohibit the installation of roof or ground mounted solar systems for residential use, other than setbacks and height requirements. She suggested the Board consider addressing solar array systems in their discussions in the next year, and look at issues around whether someone should be allowed to erect a ground mounted system in the front yard, how much of a property could be used for solar array, accessory use issues, and other relevant concerns relative to the installation of solar.

- **State Liquor Store sign located at Mountain View Shopping Center.** Tax Map 059-008-000.  
Waiver of Site Plan Review granted November 13, 2012. Chair Helm noted that at the last public hearing Tom Cottrill raised a question about the liquor store sign during the discussion of the proposed sign provisions. Mr. Cottrill conveyed that the Liquor Store sign does not conform to regulations and inquired as to what the Town was going to do. Ms. St. John was asked to review the file and provide an update at this meeting. Chair Helm explained that the Planning Board had waived the Site Plan Review regulations and granted approval in Nov 2012. Furthermore, the Town has solicited input from Town Counsel pending another complaint about that sign. Chair Helm explained that Town Counsel commented that a state agency is exempt from local zoning rules. There is nothing the board can do about the liquor store sign.
- **NHDOT Ten-Year Transportation Plan** –Ms. St. John referred to the information submitted and process for the Town to offer comments on the 10-Year Plan. She also referred to projects listed in the document relative to New London.
- **CIP Subcommittee.** Chair Helm provided an update on the composition of the Planning Board subcommittee which will be chaired by Bill Dietrich and includes Michelle Holton. Other members will be John Tilley, former Planning Board member; Bill Berger, and a member of the Budget Committee. The subcommittee will look at the CIP projects, including the transfer station. Chair Helm requested that Bill Dietrich and Michelle Holton submit a monthly report once the meeting schedule is decided. This group will be considered a subcommittee of the Planning Board, which requires posting of the meetings and the public is welcome to attend.

**MOTION** (Peter Bianchi) **AND SECONDED** (Emma Crane) to approve the appointment of this new subcommittee. **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- **NH Senate bill 146.** New Hampshire Senate Bill regarding Accessory Dwelling Units. Most recently discussed **Senate Bill 146** at the February 3 and February 10 meetings. Chair Helm explained that the Town of North Hampton included a letter in the Seacoast on-line publication regarding their opposition to the proposed SB 146. Chair Helm noted that the New London Planning Board had discussed the legislation with NH State Senator Jerry Little at the Feb 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. Chair Helm asked the Board if the New London Planning Board would like to send a similar letter in opposition of the bill, as did North Hampton. The Board agreed and the Chair will format a letter and sent it.
- **OEP Spring Conference:** Ms. St. John reminded Board members that if they plan to attend the Office of State Planning (OEP) Annual Spring Conference they should submit the registration form soon, as sessions do fill up.
- **Information Items on the Agenda Attachment List.** Ms. St. John explained that the “Information Items”, correspondence and state applications are included on the Agenda Attachment List to inform Board members and public of items related to planning issues.
- **Discussion on the March 6th draft minutes:** Ms. St. John stated that she wanted to go on record as saying that the draft March 6<sup>th</sup> minutes which were amended this evening did reflect her understanding of the issues that Tom Cottrill was trying to convey. She

noted that she would never purposely try to misrepresent information to the Board, as Tom Cottrill alleged. She explained that in the approximately 45 minutes telephone conversation she took notes, and she literally tried to share to the best of her ability what he communicated to her. Chair Helm responded that her notes were an honest reflection of what she thought Tom Cottrill said. Ms. St. John noted that much of the telephone conversation reflected many of the same concerns Mr. Cottrill expressed at the public hearing, in that he didn't think the revisions to the sign provisions were needed and he had various editorial changes. Ms. St. John said she felt it was important to be clear about this issue, and that in no way did she try to misrepresent what was conveyed during the phone conversation. She further commented that it would be best if people submitted written comments or attended a meeting to discuss their concerns, rather than convey them over the phone.

- **Change of Use of 2 Sites.** Ms. St. John informed board members that the former Graze Restaurant on Main Street is in the process of becoming a new restaurant called Tucker's and that a new business is proposed for the former Tailor Joan site next to Hubert's, with a retail component - estate auctions and Appraisal Company. Both applicants have been informed of the amended Site Plan Regulations process.
- **April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting-** Ms. St. John added that Spring Ledge Farm will be submitting a Site Plan application in the near future.

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

**Reminder -Future Meeting Dates** – April 7 Regular Meeting; April 21 Regular Meeting - Refer to 2015 amended Meeting Schedule (amended February 2015)

**Motion to Adjourn**

Motion to Adjourn was made by Bill Helm and seconded by Peter Bianchi.

Meeting adjourned at 9:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Work  
Recording Secretary