



# TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

## PLANNING BOARD APPROVED MEETING MINUTES June 14, 2011

**PRESENT:** Tom Cottrill (Chair), Jeff Hollinger (Vice-Chair), Tina Helm (Selectmen's Representative), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), Peter Stanley (Zoning Board Administrator), Paul Gorman, and Michael Doheny (alternate)

**NOT PRESENT:** Michele Holton, Dierdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate), John Tilley

Chair Cottrill called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. He asked Michael Doheny to sit in for John Tilley who was absent.

### COA (Map 084, Lot 075-000) 37 Pleasant Street - Concept Site Plan Review to place a storage container on the lot:

Mr. Stanley said that Ms. Friese had asked to put a storage compartment on their property. He referred to Article II, Section 11, d of the Zoning Ordinance, which explains a variance would be necessary to permit the on-going use of a metal storage container on site, but not in support of a permitted building project.

This storage compartment would be used to store large items for the yard sale they will have in the fall. Ms. Friese said the yard sale would be help to support their operations. Mr. Stanley said they would need a zoning variance to do this. Once obtained, they would need to come back to the Planning Board for a site plan review.

Ms. Helm asked about the likelihood of obtaining a variance from the ZBA, would the COA be allowed to do have a storage container. Mr. Stanley said probably not. The ZBA needs to consider whether there was something unique about this situation that would grant approval.

**IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (Michael Doheny) to refer the applicant to the ZBA for a Zoning Variance. The applicant was advised that if the variance is approved, they will need to return to the Planning Board for a Site Plan Review. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### Springledge Farm (Map 073, Lot 053-000) 37 Main Street – Concept Site Plan Review to install a 22'x96' "cold-frame" greenhouse:

Mr. Stanley said the purpose of the hearing is to decide if a site plan review should be required. Mr Stanley showed an aerial photo of the property in question. One such "hoop house" was installed in 2006 and the Planning Board had waived the need for a site plan review. It is considered a farm structure and does not necessitate additional parking. The soils in that area are not compacted and absorb way more water than what they would find in a conventional site. Mr. Stanley said there is no evidence of soil erosion anywhere on the property. Stormwater management was his biggest concern. The purpose of this "hoop house" is to extend the growing season and to allow for the growing of local fruits, vegetables and plants that may be harmed by harsh weather. Mr. Stanley recommended waiving the need for a site plan review, as they did the last one, but also make the approval contingent upon Mr. Berger following best practices regarding storm water and runoff from the site.

Mr. Berger said that the “hoop house” is for season extension. It goes up quickly and can come down quickly. It would be covering existing field and they will be growing edible crops. He noted that there would be 6’-8’ between all the houses to allow room for their tractor. There have been no issues with runoff that they have seen.

Mr. Doheny asked if the house would be covered seasonally or year round. Mr. Berger said it would be year round. They would grow spinach and kale; things that are winter hardy. The house will not have electricity or heat. They usually take the top off a month out of the year to let the natural rain fall and wash away any deposits that may have built up.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman) to waive the Site Plan Review for Springledge Farm to erect a “hoop house” as proposed provided the Applicant follow NHDAMF Best Management Practices in the installation of the cold frame and in the management of stormwater runoff on the site. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Flying Goose Brew Pub (Map 122, Lot 001-000) 40 Andover Road - Concept SPR to install an ADA compliant bathroom at the front of the building:

Mr. Stanley said the purpose of the hearing is to determine if a site plan review should be required for the addition of a new ADA compliant bathroom for the pub. The current bathroom would just barely be compliant. The pub is a non-conforming structure already as it is closer to the boundary line along Andover Road (Rte 11) than is permitted (50’). They received a zoning variance to install a bump-out in the entrance. The new part would not be closer than the original part, as the building line and the property lines diverge. They have submitted this request to waive the Site Plan Review because this is an ADA bathroom, does not alter parking requirements, and necessitates no additional seating or staff.

Chair Cottrill asked if the main entrance was wheelchair accessible. Ms. Mills said it was.

**IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (Jeff Hollinger) to approve the Applicant’s request to waive the requirement of a site plan review for the installation of an ADA compliant bathroom. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Schweizer Trust (Map 032, Lot 001-000) 813 Little Sunapee Road - After-the-fact tree-cutting request

Mr. Stanley showed a slide of a tree on the property that had broken and was in danger of taking out other trees on the property. The property far exceeded the points necessary for the area.

**IT WAS MOVED (Tina Helm) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve the after-the-fact tree-cutting request for Schweizer Trust. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Williamson Realty Trust (Map 50, Lot 003-000) 644 Lakeshore Drive, emergency tree cutting request

Mr. Stanley showed a slide and explained that the root system was lifting from an unhealthy pine. The tree is leaning towards the house and they will need to bring a crane in to get it out. They have over 100 points in this section where the tree is currently.

**IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman) to approve the tree-cutting request for Williamson Realty Trust. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Review of the Telecommunications Chapter and Application

Mr. Stanley said he liked the approach to the height issue. It made sense and gave the Planning Board flexibility without having to send everything to the ZBA. The canopy average height is determined by the average height of the five tallest trees, not measuring from the base of the tower to the top of the trees.

There was some concern that the word canopy was confusing. The average tree “height” of the five tallest trees was Chair Cottrill’s suggestion.

Ms. Crane said that recently, she and her husband went to a meeting in Sutton about this type of thing and there was a lot of confusion about tree height, tower height and the slope of the land. Mr. Stanley said the Planning Board can take into consideration far more than just the tree canopy and tower height. They can apply some reasonable science as to whether a tower needs to be a certain height or not.

Page 3 – Chair Cottrill wondered if the minimum height was really “required” for minimal service or if it would be “desired” as in wanting a higher tower for more surrounding coverage. Mr. Stanley said the tower company has to prove there is a void in coverage based upon the towers in proximity. Based on this proof, they then show how the tower will fill the void in coverage. Mr. Crane said that it is required if they want to be able to provide a service. Chair Cottrill wondered if the same void could be filled by two smaller towers or one large tower. Mr. Stanley said not necessarily... New London is in the middle of several towers that don’t help coverage. Chair Cottrill wondered if when tower companies come seeking to fill the coverage void they would ask for either one 200’ tower or two 50’ towers. Mr. Stanley said they would generally have just one site and not two. Mr. Crane said Sutton had the same issue of whether to have six towers instead of one large one. The tower construction group put one in as tall as they could to fill a void on I-89. They had to go through all the analysis and prove the results to the Town showing where and why they wanted to put the tower. Mr. Stanley said the idea of the taller towers giving more service is just not true. The trend is not to go higher, but to have more towers that are smaller. Mr. Crane said they can still refuse and if they can’t find an alternative way, they can come back to the Planning Board. Chair Cottrill suggested putting the word “only” into the sentence “shall be only...”

Page 4 – Chair Cottrill said that “RSA” should be included in the 3<sup>rd</sup> line down in section F, #4. Mr. Stanley said there should be a small “b” and not a small “g.”

Chair Cottrill said the line straight below “676” where it refers to the applicant maintaining a positive balance; he opined that it should read “adequate” balance. Mr. Hollinger agreed. It does need to be adequate and not positive. They would ask to take out both references to “positive” and replace them with “adequate.”

F, #9 – Chair Cottrill questioned if two miles within the border thereof was far enough. Mr. Stanley said that it was sufficient. Any tower beyond two miles would not be used by someone within the border.

Page 6 – Mr. Stanley liked the visualization strategies suggested in the document.

Page 10 – Mr. Stanley said that the Planning Board ends up with a fair amount of license in this document, but would need to supply backup for their decision.

Page 11- Chair Cottrill thought the word “preexisting” needed to be hyphenated to read “pre-existing.”

Mr. Stanley indicated that Ms. Ruppel would change the numbering where appropriate.

#### Application

Mr. Stanley said he had no comments on the application and explained that they can tweak it as will, but they needed the checklist completed incase a request came in this summer.

Chair Cottrill asked who, in the future, would do the preliminary review of a tower application, the Planning Board or Mr. Stanley. Mr. Stanley said he would do it himself along with Ms. Ruppel. They

will immediately pull the RPC in as he has no time to add this to his work-load and the RPC is more used to doing these sorts of things. This would be done at the expense of the applicant. Mr. Stanley said he would be checking in on the project as an administrator. There would also be a third party review and technical review. The RPC has already developed a list of people to use for these reviews.

Mr. Stanley said when they accept the application as complete, the clock starts. The PB is allowed 150 days for a new tower application and 90 days for a co-location. They call it a "shot-clock" and Mr. Stanley said that the first part (30 days) is a government mandate and nearly impossible to meet, but they have to do it.

Mr. Stanley said since the lease agreement for the tower proposed at the transfer station is with the Town, the tower company will work with them in a reasonable manner. He was told by Ms. Ruppel that in the long term towers will get shorter and shorter, and closer and closer together.

Review of minutes of May 25, 2011

**IT WAS MOVED (Paul Gorman) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to accept the minutes of May 25, 2011, as circulated. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, June 28 at 7pm. They would be working on the Master Plan.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (Tina Helm) to adjourn the meeting of June 14, 2011. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:05pm

Respectfully submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary  
Town of New London