



TOWN OF
NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, May 5, 2015
7:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: William Helm (Chair); Paul Gorman (Vice Chair); Peter Bianchi (Board of Selectmen's Representative); Jeremy Bonin; William Dietrich; Marianne McEnrue (Alternate); Elizabeth Meller (Alternate); Tim Paradis (Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michele Holton (Secretary); Emma Crane

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

Chair Helm called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and asked Liz Meller and Tim Paradis to sit in for Michele Holton and Emma Crane, who are absent tonight.

Public Hearing(s)

Minutes of April 21

MOTION WAS MADE (Liz Meller) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman) to accept the April 21, 2015 minutes as written. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED, with Bill Dietrich abstaining because of his absence from the April 21 meeting.

Public Comment

Chair Helm asked the audience if anyone wished to comment on any items or issues not listed on the agenda. Sue Andrews stated that she had concerns about the revised sign ordinance and found it very difficult to understand. She came to the meeting tonight on Bill Helm's recommendation, but is not quite sure how to proceed. Chair Helm replied that he thought most of the people at tonight's meeting had seen his letter in the *Intertown Record*, which was written in response to Ms. Andrews' full-page *Kearsarge Shopper* ad last week which he felt contained misinformation about the amended ordinance. He said he thought some of her comments were misleading and indicated he wished she had attended some of the Planning Board meetings over the last four months when these changes were being discussed. Chair Helm said he's happy to have a dialogue tonight. He remarked that the Planning Board puts forth to voters its best effort after hearing much input over a number of months. He noted that he did not have a problem with someone who disagrees with the board, but feels that person should at least have the correct set of facts.

Ms. Andrews said she felt pretty strongly the statement on the ballot that says the Planning Board was making these changes in order to simplify the ordinance was itself misleading,

because there have been many revisions made. In reading the reworked version, Ms. Andrews has found conflicting information and she is honestly confused about what is allowed. She cited several areas of inconsistency regarding “signs requiring Planning Board Approval” in the text, and what is listed on the chart. Chair Helm agreed this was a legitimate observation and is something the board will correct in the next go-around. However, he feels these are minor details which do not affect the intent of what the board is trying to do. The board has been clear that this new version is a complete revision of the old ordinance. Chair Helm noted that the board asked real estate representatives to attend meetings where this topic was being discussed, since there were issues with real estate signs, and changes were made with their input.

Brief discussion ensued about too many “for sale” signs being allowed on properties, and how big they can be. Ms. Andrews asked for clarification on what kind of sign can be displayed by a business in the commercial zone. Chair Helm answered several of her questions regarding commercial signage. Ms. Andrews commented the maximum square footage allowed in the commercial zone in the new version of the ordinance is not clear. Mr. Helm responded that all sites have a maximum of 36 sq. feet for signs. Ms. Andrews remarked that the Planning Board usually has straightforward rules, but the new ones are confusing.

Chair Helm noted that the reason these changes were made was because the rules actually were not straightforward. Previous ordinances were simply not clear and were being misinterpreted by the general public. Numerous calls were being made to the Selectman’s Office and Planning Board, and the board began this process with the conviction that the ordinance needed to be clearer. The revised ordinance is the result of discussions that have evolved over time. He noted that the board may come back a year from now and make further changes. The ordinance is not etched in granite forever.

Selectman Bianchi stated that he thought there was a reasonable foundation for the board to make the changes they did at the present time. He feels the town needs to try and see if the revised ordinance works or not. If it doesn’t, the board may have to make further changes. Sue Andrews responded that she was surprised that the board chose to throw out the old ordinance and start over. Paul Gorman countered that the board did not throw the whole thing out. It tried to make changes in what already existed, but discovered this this was not going to work. The board also wanted to give businesses more flexibility in square footage.

For example, said Peter Bianchi, the intent regarding real estate signs was to make the kinds of signs that are already being used legal. Mr. Bianchi emphasized that every single move the board has made was unanimous. The new version of the sign ordinance is a work in progress. He attested to the fact that one of the most highly debated issues in town is signs. This was one of the toughest matters the town has had to address. Again, he reiterated, the intent was not to make the ordinance more confusing. Selectman Bianchi noted that Ms. Andrews’ comments might have had more of an effect if the board had heard from her during the revision process. Ms. Andrews said that Mascoma Savings has a lite sign and asked why this is permitted. Peter Bianchi noted that some businesses have tubular neon signs inside.

Ms. Andrews said she understood that this is a complicated issue. However, she does feel the new language is not as clear as she personally thinks it should be. There are too many gray areas, which Sue surmises will open the town up to problems about what is allowed and what is not. She also thinks there is a general sentiment around town that the Selectmen and/or Planning Board are not really interested in enforcing the current sign ordinance. Peter Bianchi noted that sign enforcement does occur, but it's not something the public knows about all the time because the Selectmen try to address the problems they've heard about and respond accordingly. He added that one of the reasons for revising the present sign ordinance was to minimize ambiguities.

There were no further comments from the audience. Chair Helm thanked Ms. Andrews for offering constructive criticism.

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. Continued from the April 7 & 21 meetings. Lucy St. John indicated she had received an e-mail from Mr. Bateman asking to postpone this meeting so that he and his brother could have an opportunity to discuss how to proceed. There was some speculation as to whether the property had been sold. Ms. St. John will verify that the Batemans still own the property. Ms. St. John read portions of the e-mail sent to her by Mr. Bateman.

MOTION WAS MADE (Liz Meller) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman) to continue the Bateman tree-cutting hearing to the September 1, 2015 Planning Board Meeting. MOTION WAS 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. Continued from the April 7th meeting. Ms. St. John said she had received an email, and had anticipated Mr. Ryan being in attendance.

MOTION WAS MADE (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman) to continue this hearing until the June 9, 2015 Planning Board meeting. Ms. St. John was asked to contact Mr. Ryan to let him know the hearing was continued and his presence is requested. MOTION WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Home Business Site Plan Application and Public Hearing

- Colonial Armory Home Business Application. Located at 191 Old Main Street. Tax Map #107-007-000 (Old #107-014-000). Approximately 4.6 acres. Property owned by Tacee and Steven Walker (formerly owned by Carolyn Pelzel and Bruce McClintock). Zoned R2-Residential. Owner proposes to use a section of the existing detached garage as an office and for the storage of merchandise for an Internet-based sporting goods and sales company.

Chair Helm asked board members if they thought this was a project of regional impact and the answer was no. There was no interest in doing a site visit. Ms. St. John referred to the staff report and noted that one abutter, Connie Mcelwee (TM 107-016-000) had stopped in to review the file. No written comments were received, however Ms. Mcelwee did have concerns.

Steven Walker was present to discuss the application. He noted he had been before the board in November for the same business at the property he was renting at 879 Main Street. He noted they recently purchased the property at 191 Old Main Street and that he has not met all of his neighbors. Mr. Walker is aware that several abutters have sent the town messages saying they were not aware that this business was opening and are not particularly pleased about it. He said there would be no signage and no parking.

Public Hearing opened.

Michael Todd mentioned that he met his new neighbor – Mr. Walker – at the hardware store this afternoon. He conveyed his concerns:

- ✓ He is perplexed about the zoning ordinance, noting that this is a retail business.
- ✓ He is very concerned about the amount of traffic on Old Main Street. He has appeared before the Selectmen numerous times regarding traffic issues on that street, but nothing is ever done. Residents have asked that “no trucking” signs be moved - they’ve asked for “saddle horse” signs and “pavement ends” signs. He noted the town did put up “S” signs. However, the overriding issue is traffic.
- ✓ There is no crown left in the road because of the heavy traffic.
- ✓ Explained that he used to be in the delivery business, so if Mr. Walker is shipping goods such as military rifles – that is a component based thing.
- ✓ That because of all the people who use that road-propane trucks, tree services, firewood delivery, plumbers and other service technicians, the traffic is getting out of hand as evidenced by the condition of the road.
- ✓ Reiterated that this is a residential zone and the amount of traffic has to be dialed down. Commented it would be good if Mr. Walker could keep the visits to 10 or less per week.

Mr. Walker responded the most he has in a week is three or four. Mr. Walker said he has had maybe three deliveries in the last four weeks. He physically takes his goods to the depot. There’s probably a maximum of four deliveries in any month. Mr. Walker also commented that he has four kids, and he is aware of the amount of traffic on Old Main Street. He also commented that his wife shops on-line and this generates more traffic than his home business would. Mr. Walker said he doesn’t do pickups, but what is the difference between him making three trips a day and someone else going from their home to the store three times a day?

Public Hearing closed.

Chair Helm thanked Mr. Todd for his comments. He noted he had raised a useful point about an inconsistency in the part of the zoning ordinance regarding the terms “home occupation” and “home business” There is a question about whether a home business located on a state-maintained road should have the same requirements as one located on residential roads.

Chair Helm asked for further comment on Mr. Walker’s application and there was none. He asked Mr. Walker if he had to get an ATF license for this business, and the answer was yes.

MOTION WAS MADE (Bill Dietrich) AND SECONDED (Jeremy Bonin) to grant the waivers requested and the Home Business be approved contingent upon receiving Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms (ATF) license for this location and any other State and Federal permits required. MOTION WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Site Plan Applications and Public Hearings

- Stahlman Office Building. Located at 74 Pleasant Street. Tax Map #084-079-000 (Old #084-001-000). Zoned Commercial. New medical office practice and changes to the interior layout.

Bob Stahlman was present to discuss recent changes to the interior of his building. He summarized that this is an 8,000 sq. ft. office building built in 1987. It has been fully occupied most of the time since then. Mr. Stahlman moved his business in 2005 and leased the space to New London Hospital. Paula Wyeth, an accountant, eventually moved in, and the rest of the first floor was leased by Stiffel Nicholas for five years. Their lease was up in March and the company elected to move back to the Gallery, which has better visibility.

Mr. Stahlman explained that the tenants on the second floor are varied. He said he has never been required to appear before the Planning Board because of new tenants or interior changes to the building. Instead, he simply filled out paperwork with the Planning and Zoning Administrator. Dr. Lori Richer, Richer Wellness MD, has moved her practice into the building from Newbury. Very few changes were made to this 1,500 sq. ft. space, except for putting in a wall to separate an area of about 300 sq. ft. Another alteration was to tear out a 10-ft. wall closet to make the reception area bigger. Additionally, one bathroom was adapted to accommodate handicapped people and a shower was added. These updates were inspected and approved by Fire Chief Jay Lyon. Mr. Stahlman said Dr. Richer is a good tenant with one full-time employee. Two or three people might come into her office at a time, and this does not affect parking. He explained that Attorney Jackie Hudkins was initially interested in renting the other 1,500 sq., ft. space but declined because the parking was not adequate for her law practice. He is still advertising this space as available for lease. Mr. Stahlman maintains that there has been no change in the site plan from 1987 at all and he does not anticipate or plan to make any modifications to it. The business that eventually leases the space will have to deal with what is available for parking space.

Chair Helm replied that Town Counsel had ruled a couple of years ago that the fast track application process was not legal. He explained that the Site Plan Regulations were recently

amended to address change of use, based on square footage and any space greater than 1,000 sq. feet requires a plan.

Chair Helm opened the public hearing. No abutters were present and no comments were received. Ms. St. John noted that he is requesting waivers as this is an existing developed building site. Public hearing closed.

The Board agreed that there is no regional impact and a site visit was deemed unnecessary. Mr. Stahlman gave Ms. St. John a full size copy of the Site Plan for the file.

Chair Helm commented to Mr. Stahlman that if he gets another medical practice in the building, these tenants are supposed to have more parking than other businesses.

MOTION WAS MADE (Liz Meller) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman to grant the waivers requested and approve the Site Plan. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

- Canary Systems, Inc. Located at 5 Gould Road (corner of Gould and Pleasant Street, old Post Office). Tax Map 084-080-000 (Old #084-002-000). Owner Alex Neuwirt. Applicant's agent – George Neuwirt. Zoned Commercial. Proposed improvements include parking lot redesign, re-grade the loading dock area, removal of the 1st Pleasant Street entrance, landscaping and interior and exterior building improvements. A conceptual plan was discussed at the April 7th Planning Board meeting.

George Neuwirt was present to bring the board up to date on current plans for this site. When he originally presented the conceptual plan at the April 7 meeting, he showed existing conditions in and around the building. The intent was to add five parking spaces and spend some money cleaning up outside. In taking advice offered by the board at that meeting, the Neuwirts had Glenn Bonewald draw up a landscaping plan. Mr. Neuwirt displayed a diagram of the proposed new landscaping design. Mr. Neuwirt pointed out where one entrance will be eliminated, noting that they are trying to create a better traffic flow. The center divider will be removed and a new entry way constructed. A concrete patio and walkway from the entry way will be built. About 2,600 sq. ft. of pavement will be turned into a grassy area, resulting in more vegetation on the property.

In addition, the Neuwirts plan to add an additional bathroom in the back corner of the building – about 100 sq. ft. He explained they had some sewer issues, which have been discussed with Richard Lee, Public Works Director. They will be installing a new gravity fed sewer line.

Chair Helm referred to Ms. St. John's staff report. Ms. St. John referred to the comments from Jay Lyon, Fire Chief and Richard Lee, Public Works Director. The Board determined the application was complete, and that this project does not have regional impact or require a site visit.

Chair Helm opened the public hearing. There were no questions from the audience. Chair Helm closed the public hearing.

Chair Helm asked the board to comment.

- ✓ Liz Meller said she was happy to see the handicapped parking lot space added. Chair Helm noted that the space was not where Jeremy Bonin had suggested it be placed. Jeremy Bonin said there needs to be an aisle adjacent to the handicapped space where no one can park, which allows wheelchairs to be discharged from vans.
- ✓ Jeremy Bonin commented that he thinks it will be confusing if traffic tries to come in off Pleasant Street because of the angled parking. Bill Dietrich suggested that an “Exit Only” sign be put on the Pleasant Street side, and an “Entrance Only” on Gould Road. Mr. Neuwirt said that his brother had not found parking to be a problem in the past and would like to leave it as is. After some discussion, Mr. Neuwirt agreed his brother would prefer to put up the signs rather than change the direction of the parking.
- ✓ Question about whether the traffic pattern at Country Press (across Pleasant Street) should be checked by police to see if there is a safety issue.
- ✓ Lighting is satisfactory.
- ✓ A dumpster will be removed. Another storage container will stay on the corner of the grass. Some debate about whether storage containers are temporary structures. It was noted the storage container that sits on the property now has been there for a long time.

MOTION WAS MADE (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman) to approve the Site Plan application with the following conditions:

1. Per the comments of Richard Lee, Public Works Director regarding the drainage and catch basin;
2. Per the comments of Jay Lyon, Fire Chief, that a self-closure be added to the break room door;
3. That an “exit sign” be placed by the driveway area on the Pleasant Street side, and an “enter” sign be placement by the driveway area on the Gould Road side;
4. Handicapped parking shall be in compliance with ADA requirements;
5. The center parking area aisle width meet the 22 ft. dimensions required.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Conceptual Discussions

- High Pines Conceptual Subdivision Plan for property owned by Samuel, William and Amelia Stevens. Located at 217 Owls Nest Road with frontage on Lake Sunapee. Tax Map 135-001-000. Zoned R-2, Residential. Proposal to subdivide the property for one additional lot and upgrade a section of Owls Nest Road. A tree cutting application for this property was discussed at the July 23, 2013 meeting and a conceptual plan was discussed at the May 20, 2014 meeting. Conceptual plan prepared by Clayton Platt, surveyor.

Clayton Platt was present to represent the Stevens family. He displayed a plan that shows a road running from 103A. There is a private deeded right-of-way dating back to the 1920's. Mr. Platt gave a brief history of the properties. He noted that until 2001, Owls Nest Road was just a private road for the houses located there. The property was subdivided into three lots in 2001. Mr. Platt said there are two kinds of roads – those that exist without Planning Board approval and those that do not. Some work has been done over the last 10 years and the subdivision was approved. Mr. Platt indicated the road would end at the Stephens' property. His primary question is whether there is enough frontage on Owl's Nest Road. He asked what conditions would be required for subdivision?

Chair Helm commented that the minutes from a year ago suggest there was a discussion about the number of driveways also, which Mr. Platt acknowledged. However, Chair Helm said it was not clear from the plan being displayed where the driveways were going. Mr. Platt said there would be driveways in several places and pointed them out on the diagram. Mr. Platt noted that an existing house might have to be removed in the future, but right now he is just interested in the road. Mr. Platt also mentioned that a survey and wetlands study still needs to be done.

Chair Helm explained that Fire Chief Jay Lyon has had some communications with Lucy St. John, recommending the road should be 18 feet in width because it serves more than five houses.

Barbara Kreisler was in the audience and stated that she has property which abuts this parcel to the north. She said that plowing stops at the Mulhern property, and the road is not passable. If one tries to drive on the road, it is ruddy and wet. Ms. Kreisler noted that technically every one of the abutters has a right of way from Pine Brook Road all the way to 103A. It is a deeded right of way, but is not regularly used, and not in the winter.

Chair Helm asked Mr. Platt if there was a plan to extend the road, because he did not see how Mr. Stephens could be forced to expand his road to 18 feet. Chair Helm feels that's a discussion that will come later.

Peter Bianchi commented that having a 14-foot road, then expanding it to 18 feet, then it stops, would create a bottleneck. Peter Bianchi commented that Fire Chief Jay Lyon discussed the concerns of Pike Brook Road and Owls Nest Road at a previous meeting and wants the road improved to meet fire safety requirements and to allow the fire equipment to safely pass on said road. A question was asked whether Chief Lyon was talking about the entire road. Selectmen Bianchi remarked that when they first subdivided Owls Nest Road, the road was changed substantially and a 20,000 gallon cistern was put in, as shown on the plan. At some point in time, that road was big enough to accommodate fire equipment.

Chair Helm recommended the Planning Board ask Fire Chief Jay Lyon to come to a meeting to discuss this further.

Ms. St. John suggested that considering two conceptual plans have been submitted for this area of town, along Owls Nest Road and Pike Brook Road, the Board may want to have a site walk.

Ms. St. John also commented that she was contacted by two residents on Owls Nest Road and Pike Brook Road as to why they did not receive an abutters notice. She explained that abutter notification is not required for a conceptual discussion. The two persons were Daniel Shimberger, who is on Pike Brook Road, and he is concerned as he conveyed he has a permanent right to use the road, and Nathaniel Stephens, who has some concerns and he also thought he had a deeded ROW.

Barbara Kreisler asked if abutters have to be notified for conceptual plans, and the answer was no.

Brief discussion about private roads. Comment was made that it was thought one could not subdivide on a private road. Is it clear that this is an approved Planning Board road? Chair Helm said when the subdivision was done, the Planning Board at that time approved whatever road that was approved to a certain point. Now the Stephens' want another subdivision and have to go through getting permission for subdivision and location of septic, as well as the condition of the road reaching to the new subdivision.

Barbara Kreisler asked if any private road in town could be brought to the Planning Board and the board could approve a subdivision on it.

Chair Helm stated that some clarification is needed as to the role of the Planning Board approving subdivision on a private road or if a road is going too realigned, whether or not the plan being presented is a subdivision or a lot merger. Lucy St. John noted that on the town's list of roads, both Owl's Nest Road and Pike Brook Road are listed as private. Laws regarding roads can get very complicated, but Chair Helm maintained that subdivision regulations apply to the road.

Conversation ensued about the how the road was used in the past. Barbara Kreisler pointed out that Pike Brook Road and Owl's Nest Road originally was one road - Soo Nipi Park Road South. The Fire Department made them change the name, and that's why there are now the two roads. At the first bridge, the road changes to Pike Brook Road. Ms. Kreisler emphasized that, historically, this had been one road. When the road was split, the residents were told that Pike's Brook Road would go to the bridge. Ms. Kreisler said her question was that historically this one road was connected, and she has a right of way, so is the board now going to consider relocating the road?

Chair Helm thought there were two issues here. He explained that this is a conceptual plan, and that nothing was binding tonight and all we are talking about now is the road. At some point, someone will come back here with a full-blown plan for the subdivision with septic, boundaries, wells, driveways and buffers, and then a full-blown discussion can take place.

Mr. Platt had questions about affordability and Chair Helm recommended he discuss this with the Fire Chief. Peter Bianchi said he had a real concern about the road, which would be a big expense to the people who want to subdivide.

Chair Helm asked Ms. St. John to schedule a site visit, and to inquire about if notification to the abutters along the private road is required. Ms. St. John noted the Site Walk will be posted. Paul Gorman will work with Ms. St. John to select a day and time before the June 9 meeting, and perhaps schedule the site walk sometime during the week after Town Meeting.

Lastly, Barbara Kreisler noted that the application refers to an on-site water well. To her knowledge, that is not true. Water is taken from the lake.

- Millstone Restaurant at 74 Main Street conceptual Site Plan discussion. Located at 74 Newport Road. Zoned Commercial. Tax Map 059-032-000.

Frank Anzalone, architect presented a conceptual sketch for discussion. They would like to add a small deck and outdoor seating for the summer months on the street side. The restaurant is considering adding 20 seats outside, and patrons would have to access the deck from the inside, which would take away eight seats in the restaurant – so a total of 12 additional spots. There are 32 parking spaces outside and a total of 116 seats in the restaurant. That would go up to 128 in the summer, which requires 39 parking spaces. Mr. Anzalone has made inquiries to the owner of the shopping center across the street from the restaurant as to his interest in leasing parking spaces to the Millstone, which he is happy to do.

Mr. Anzalone said he was just requesting general thoughts about the conceptual plan tonight. He would like to come to the June 9 Planning Board meeting with the site plan application.

Chair Helm asked for comments. Comment included: how much construction, signage, crosswalk, limits of State Right-of-Way, lighting, why the seating wouldn't be to the rear of the building as there is plenty of space and open green space, fire safety issues, hours of operation, parking (and leasing parking spaces) and if liquor would be served outside.

Frank Anzalone responded noting the construction would just be a small area on the right of the building, about 8 feet. It will not be covered. There might be tables with umbrellas. It would probably be a deck, with boulders situated so that cars could not run into it. He commented that the outdoor seating could not be situated in the back of the restaurant, as this is about curb appeal, the purpose is to get people into the restaurant. Management wants to open up the seating area so it gets more use.

Ms. St. John noted she briefly reviewed the files on this property noting that in many instances Site Plan Review was waived or the previous owners did not go to the Planning Board.

Mr. Anzalone was advised to identify the specific dates construction will start and end. Chair Helm recommended Mr. Anzalone put himself in the shoes of someone who does not want this to happen, in order to try and anticipate any issues.

Other Business

- Natural Resources Overlay District, ongoing discussion. Continued from the April 21, 2015 meeting. Chair Helm suggested the next area to be reviewed for the natural resources overlay district discussion should be “prohibited uses.” He thought some of the language needed to be tweaked and perhaps expanded, and looking at erosion and sedimentation provisions. He noted that there is much duplication in the ordinance. Chair Helm asked Ms. St. John to prepare a draft of what has been discussed to date, and the Board can determine how they wish to process.
- Tracy Library Garden. Ms. St. John referred to an email she had received from Donna Ferries, President of Community Garden at the Tracy Library, dated April 29 regarding the information board in the library garden, and if Planning Board approval was need. Chair Helm noted that the library is on town property, but is managed by the library trustees. Chair Helm recommended this be referred to the Board of Selectmen, similar to the recent discussion on the sewer pump station house which didn’t need Planning Board approval.
- Summer Meeting Schedule. Chair Helm asked the Planning Board to consider amending the meeting schedule as staff won’t be available on July 21st and to consider meeting on July 28th. The Board agreed to amend the meeting schedule.
- Planning and Zoning Administrator’s Updates/Information
 - Schimberger Tree Cutting. Tax Map 135-004 on Pike Brook Road, which had been previously referred to the Board of Selectmen will be on the May 11th BOS agenda.
 - Stump Grinding. Hogg Hill Design had sent staff an email about stump grinding in the waterfront buffer. She referred them to the provisions of Article XVI, Shoreland Overlay District. The Board agreed that stump grinding in the waterfront buffer is not a permitted use.
 - Office of Energy and Planning Spring Conference. Planning Board members that attended provided a brief overview and stated this was a worthwhile workshop. Liz Meller specifically commented on a session on how to review plans, workforce housing, cottage cluster housing and affordable housing. Bill Helm talked about the need to spend more time on real long-range community planning issues and less time on applications. He noted the Planning Board need to look at the needs of the Town center, addressing parking issues and role of various uses such as the Barn Playhouse in overall community planning and zoning issues. In addition, Chair Helm thinks the board will receive a proposal from the New London Hospital about building on their land in the near future.
 - CIP Subcommittee held the first meeting on April 29th. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 15, at 9 AM.
 - Agenda Attachment list. Ms. St. John asked board members if they were finding the attachment list helpful and the answer was yes.
- Historic Preservation Issues- Peter Bianchi explained that a demolition and building permit was submitted for a house in Elkins. Some area residents attended the Board of

Selectmen meeting to express concern about losing historic buildings in Town. Staff had provided the resident information on historic districts, historic commissions and other information. Selectman Bianchi noted that the town does not have an historical district in New London; however, Elkins has a great deal of historical significance. The Planning Board should look into historical districts and Mr. Bianchi asked that this topic be put on the meeting agenda sometime in the future. Chair Helm commented that this might be a good way to start the New Year after town meeting.

Emma Crane- Chair Helm disclosed that Emma Crane has asked not to be reappointed to the Planning Board next year. Chair Helm and board members thanked Emma Crane for her involvement on the Board and wished her well.

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

Reminder -Future Meeting Dates –June 9, June 23, July 7, July 28 and August 11. Refer also to 2015 amended Meeting Schedule (amended February 2015)

Reminder – May 12th Town Voting Day and May 13th – Town Meeting Day

Motion to Adjourn

Motion to Adjourn was made by Jeremy Bonin and seconded by Peter Bianchi.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Work
Recording Secretary