

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
April 11, 2006**

PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Dale Conly, Celeste Cook, Tom Cottrill, Clough, Sue (Selectmen's Representative), Ken McWilliams (Planner). Sue Ellen Andrews joined the PB in session at 8:25 PM.

ABSENT: Jeff Hollinger

Chair Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM.

I. NEW LONDON HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, INC. – Final Site Plan Review: Office to Medical Office Use for a Portion of the Former Stahlman Engineering Building (Tax Map 84, Lot 79)

Todd French (Facilities) and Lori Underwood appeared on behalf of the New London Hospital Association, Inc.

Mr. French advised that the hospital had completed its assignment to make arrangements to lease additional parking space. He reported that Robert Stahlman, owner of the property at 74 Pleasant Street, had arranged to lease five (5) parking spaces from Echo Communications. He advised that a copy of the parking lease was on file with the PB. Mr. French further advised that the leased spaces would be used by New London Hospital employees. He said that in the meeting with municipal department heads, the New London Fire Department had ordered a door stop and the installation of additional smoke detectors and the Police Department had advised the hospital of alarm requirements. Mr. French stated that the New London Hospital Association, Inc. was requesting that the PB waive several requirements contained in the Site Plan Review (SPR) Regulations.

Ken McWilliams advised that the plans displayed were those of the originally approved site plan for tax map 84, lot 79. He said that the sewer department had advised that the sewer service line was a pump line and that care must be taken not to interfere with its operation during renovations. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley pointed out that the five-year parking agreement, executed by property owner Robert Stahlman and Echo Communications, for five spaces extended beyond the hospital's three-year lease of the Stahlman property. He also pointed out that the parking agreement could be renewed for an additional five years. Mr. McWilliams recommended that the hospital return to the PB with a lease of the same duration as the property rental agreement; however, it was decided after some discussion to accept the lease term as it was in the lease.

Chair Ebel asked if the parking lease had been reviewed by counsel for the hospital. Mr. French replied that it had not. Laurie Underwood advised that the parking lease was between Robert Stahlman and Accumail. Chair Ebel replied that the letter of agreement indicated that New London Hospital was Mr. Stahlman's representative with regard to the leasing of five parking spaces from Accumail. She advised that the PB usually required a 20-year parking agreement and that parking agreements were usually more formal; however, in this case, since the rental term was likely far shorter than that, she reiterated that the 3-5-year term was acceptable.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters who would like to speak. Ross Stevens, although not an abutter, asked about the proposed use by New London Hospital. Mr. French responded that the first floor would provide 2100 square feet for patient services and the remaining 1,000 square feet would be used for general office functions. He said that all of the 4,000 square feet on the second floor would be general office space for the hospital billing department.

Ken McWilliams advised that the hospital was seeking to have a number of requirements contained in the SPR Regulations waived. He said that the hospital was using the originally approved site plan for the Stahlman site and was not proposing any changes to the site itself. The waivers requested were outlined in Ms Underwood's March 27, 2006 letter to the PB.

PB member Clough noted that Fire Chief Peter Stanley's letter referred to limiting the number of non-ambulatory persons and asked what impact that would have on potential patients seeking services offered on the

first floor. Ms Underwood responded that most non-ambulatory patients were in-patients at New London Hospital. She said that most of the patients seeking services as outpatients would be ambulatory.

Chair Ebel asked if leasing of the five additional parking spaces would permit more than one handicapped-accessible parking space. Ms Underwood replied that the new spaces would result in a recommendation to increase the number of handicapped-accessible spaces. She advised that all spaces in front of the building would be marked for patient parking and that there was one space near the door that could be designated for handicapped parking.

Chair Ebel asked what the hours of operation would be. Ms Underwood replied that the offices would be open from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM and the patient care areas would be in operation from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF ARTICLE IX, A. 1 AND ARTICLE IX, A. 3 THROUGH A. 18 OF THE SITE PLAN REVIEW REQUIREMENTS BE APPROVED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE FINAL SITE PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF A PORTION OF THE FORMER STAHLMAN ENGINEERING BUILDING LOCATED AT 78 PLEASANT STREET AS MEDICAL OFFICE SPACE BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED, CONTINGENT UPON COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OUTLINED IN THE NEW LONDON FIRE DEPARTMENT'S LETTER OF APRIL 7, 2006, AS WELL AS ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE NEW LONDON POLICE DEPARTMENT, AND THAT NEW LONDON HOSPITAL RETURN TO THE PLANNING BOARD IN THREE YEARS TO REVIEW THE PARKING LEASE. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

PB member Cook asked if the door to the patient services portion of the building would be handicapped accessible. Mr. French replied that an automatic-open option would be installed.

II. PUBLIC SERVICE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE –Public Hearing to Consider Trimming and Removal of Trees along two Designated Scenic Roads (Camp Sunapee Road & Davis Hill Road) pursuant to RSA 231:158 and a Request to Trim Trees in the Shore Land Overlay District

David Crane, Regional Arborist for Public Service of New Hampshire, advised the PB that the proposed trimming and removal were part of the normal routine maintenance that PSNH conducts every five years. He advised that the specifications were the same as those used in the past and that they were outlined in his letter dated February 10, 2006. He reviewed the specifications for the benefit of the audience. He said that, as of that afternoon, all affected customers had been contacted and all trees had been marked. Mr. Crane advised that only two large decaying spruce trees were located in the Shore Land Overlay District and that he had discussed their removal with the Conservation Commission and with the Town Road Agent, Richard Lee.

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley spoke in support of the request by PSNH. PB member Conly, representative from the Conservation Commission, said that he had driven along the road and checked all the marked trees and supported the request.

Mr. Crane advised that two healthy trees that had been marked along Camp Sunapee Road were very close to PSNH lines and presented a potential fire risk from brushing along the wires and arcing and could cause blinking lights. He also said that some landowners were planning to put lines underground and PSNH was waiting to see what would happen. Mr. Crane advised that a new home required setting a new pole and that required removal of a tree.

Tom McCormick (104 Camp Sunapee Road) said that he had spoken with Mr. Crane that day and reviewed all marked trees and he supported the proposed cutting and trimming. Mr. McCormick suggested that the road

could be well served if the lines were buried. He said that he did not know the cost of burying lines or who would pay to have them buried. He estimated that there were 1000 feet of line to be buried. Mr. McCormick said that he was concerned about cold weather in winter and the potential exposure to very cold temperatures. He opined that his neighbors agreed. He reiterated that he was not sure how to make the burying of lines occur.

Mr. Crane replied that PSNH did bury lines at the homeowner's expense. He opined that it would not make sense to proceed with removing trees if the power lines were to be buried. Mr. McCormick responded that burying the lines was only an idea and might be too expensive. He said that he wanted PSNH to remove the marked trees. Chair Ebel advised that the decision to bury lines would be in the hands of the property owners.

Mr. Koron (182 Camp Sunapee Road) stated that he wanted PSNH to make sure that all trees that were cut were removed. Mr. Crane responded that the wood belongs to the landowner, unless the property owner stipulates that it is not wanted. He said that PSNH cuts it into four-foot lengths and leaves it on the property.

Bill Andrews (41 Camp Sunapee Road) said that loss of power was becoming a real problem to those who live along Camp Sunapee Road. He suggested that all new houses that are built should be required to bury lines. He said that it was ironic that a scenic road needed so much trimming and might end up with only light poles instead of trees. Mr. Koron replied that there were other lines in addition to power lines, e.g. cable, telephone, etc. Mr. Crane noted that anyone wanting to bury all the lines would have to negotiate separately with each of the other utilities before anything could move ahead.

Chair Ebel asked how deep power lines were buried. Mr. Crane replied that the trench would be two- to three-foot deep with gravel below the lines to assist drainage. PB member Clough advised that the lines would also be placed in conduit.

Ms Clough asked about the work to be done on Davis Hill Road. Mr. Crane advised that all of the marked trees were defective, many with missing tops. He opined that they were ice damaged; he said that there was quite a bit of residual damage from the 1998 ice storm. Ms Clough asked if all landowners had been notified. Mr. Crane responded affirmatively and added that the last landowner had been contacted just that evening.

Mr. Koron asked when the cutting and trimming would begin. Mr. Crane replied that work would not begin until after the road postings have been removed. He said that work would begin after mud season, probably in May.

Chair Ebel asked for a review of the two healthy trees on Camp Sunapee Road. It was the consensus of the PB that the proposed removal would be in the best interests of the property owners.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REQUEST BY PUBLIC SERVICE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE TO TRIM AND REMOVE TREES ALONG TWO DESIGNATED SCENIC ROADS (CAMP SUNAPEE ROAD AND DAVIS HILL ROAD) PURSUANT TO RSA 231:158 AND A REQUEST TO TRIM TREES IN THE SHORE LAND OVERLAY DISTRICT IN ELKINS BE APPROVED. AS OUTLINED IN ITS FEBRUARY 10, 2006 LETTER. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Crane requested a copy of the most recent zoning regulations. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied that the maps would be pretty expensive. Mr. Crane said that he only wanted a copy of the New London Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Stanley provided him with a copy.

**III. DRS. PHIPPS, BAKER, & GUTGSELL AND G. McSWINEY – Preliminary Site Plan Review
(Tax Map 84, Lots 55 & 56)**

PB member Clough recused herself from the PB.

Dr. Phipps, Dr. Baker, Dr. Gutgsell, and Graham McSwiney were all present. Ross Stevens (Stevens Engineering) advised that he was representing all parties that were now presenting a joint application signed by both landowners. He provided a copy to Ken McWilliams for PB files.

Mr. Stevens recapped Lovering Lane discussions and stated that his clients were no longer pursuing a Zoning Board of Adjustment Variance.

Mr. Stevens displayed plans for each lot. He stated that the dentists' parking access would be via Lovering Lane and across the McSwiney property. He said that the plan included one off-street handicapped-accessible parking space. Mr. Stevens stated that the width of the drive across the McSwiney property would be increased to 26 feet. The plan displayed provided 13 parking spaces for McSwiney and 25 spaces for the dentists. Mr. Stevens said that the width of Lovering Lane would be increased from 14 feet to 18 feet of paved roadway. Mr. Stevens said that, although the McSwiney property would be curbed to facilitate drainage, there would be no major changes to properties on the other side of Lovering Lane.

Mr. McSwiney advised that his intent would be to increase parking sufficiently to accommodate using his entire building as office space. Ross Stevens said that, in that case, he would need to calculate the necessary number of parking spaces and re-work the plans, as the 13 spaces were not based upon that information.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. Stevens what was new on the plans displayed. Mr. Stevens demonstrated the proposed edge of the McSwiney property. He stated that currently drainage in the form of sheet flow went toward an abutting property. He advised that the proposed drainage would collect all drainage from the new parking area into chamber detention and a catch basin and thence, to a municipal drainage system. He said there would be a similar plan on the McSwiney property, so there would be no increase in drainage running off the site. Mr. Stevens advised that on Lovering Lane the intent would be to detain, but not interfere with a couple of catch basins to minimize the impact of widening the road and enlarging the two parking lots.

In regard to landscaping, Mr. Stevens opined that the lots were pretty well landscaped now. He said the dentists would like to preserve the large older trees. He said that the property lines were heavily wooded; however, it would be possible to increase screening between the parking lots and the residential properties, if desired. He said that there were heavy shrubs along the Clough property line except between the Clough garage and the McSwiney parking area. He advised that he would work with the Cloughs in that regard.

Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams to explain the reason why a ZBA Variance would not be necessary. Mr. McWilliams asked Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley to recap his conversation with town counsel. Mr. Stanley explained that the right-of-way and the road placement of Lovering Lane did not agree. Town counsel had advised that someone could petition the Board of Selectmen to re-lay the road and obtain an easement from McSwiney; therefore a ZBA Variance would not be necessary. Mr. Stanley said that town counsel had recommended that someone petition the town to re-lay the road, on the condition that the abutting property owner agrees. Chair Ebel asked if that would be 'eminent domain'. Mr. Stanley opined that it would be.

Chair Ebel questioned the statement that drainage from Lovering Lane would not be increased very much by widening the road. Mr. Stevens replied that the existing catch basin was ineffective. The plan suggests replacement of that catch basin and installing a new catch basin where the McSwiney access begins. PB member Cottrill asked if all the drainage from the two proposed parking lots would be directed through that drainage system. Mr. Stevens replied affirmatively, all water would be collected under the lots and directed through the existing storm-water system. Mr. McWilliams asked if the chamber system would require lowering the water table in that area. Mr. Stevens said that it would. Chair Ebel asked if Town Road Agent Richard Lee approved of this proposal. Mr. McWilliams replied that when Mr. Lee learned that it would be a closed drainage system, he was less concerned than when he thought it would be an open system. Chair Ebel said she wasn't clear whether that meant he approved and would like Mr. McWilliams to follow up with him again. Mr. Stevens advised that storm drainage detention lessens the rate of drainage and ameliorates the impact.

Chair Ebel asked about setbacks. Mr. Stevens replied that the setbacks were currently less than those required by the regulations and would be even less than now on the Lovering Lane side and at the rear. He said that there would be the same pre-existing sub-standard setbacks at the front and on the other side. Chair Ebel asked what the setback requirements were. Ken McWilliams replied that setbacks for a corner lot in the Commercial District were 30 feet from any abutting right-of-way and 10 feet from the rear and side.

Mr. McWilliams reported that at the meeting of municipal department heads it had been noted that the parking setbacks around the proposed parking areas do not meet the 10-foot setback requirements; however, the zoning regulations do provide for flexibility when a commercial site is being redeveloped. It was also noted that snow storage would present problems and probably all snow would need to be trucked off the site. Dr. Gutgsell agreed to truck the snow away from the site as necessary. Richard Lee, Town Road Agent, discussed the need for coordination with proposed sidewalk plans with regard to curb cuts, handicapped-accessible parking, and turning radius. The Fire Department advised coordination of floor plans with the Fire Department. Discussion of lighting in the area of the parking lots revealed that only one light is currently planned. The Sewer Department advised that excavation could encounter old sewer lines that are still in use to drain cellars and care should be taken not to plug them up.

Chair Ebel inquired about the triangular symbols on the plan. Ross Stevens explained that those signified non-parking areas and/or pedestrian access areas. Chair Ebel asked if there were setback issues all around the property. Mr. Stevens responded that the zoning regulations *suggest* 10-foot side and rear setbacks. He said that they had tried to keep within the existing setbacks, but still get 25 parking spaces. He added that the proposed McSwiney parking lot included a 10-foot setback. Chair Ebel recalled that abutters had expressed concern about snow storage and drainage and gravel ending up on their property because of plowing. Mr. Stevens opined that the plan addressed those issues.

Chair Ebel asked if they had had any discussion with the neighbors. Dr. Gutgsell replied that they had tried to address the concerns in previous PB meetings and said that the plan would reduce the gravel at that point and would direct drainage toward the catch basin. Mr. Stevens advised that he had not discussed screening with abutters William and Marta Clough or abutter Edward A. Dexter, Jr. He said that abutter Dexter was concerned about drainage as he had already had to make changes on his property due to alterations to Lovering Lane. Mr. Stevens said that he had told Mr. Dexter that no additional changes were being proposed for Lovering Lane. Dr. Gutgsell asked if the property line was really the dividing line between the Commercial District and the Residential District. Abutter Bill Clough responded that the line really passed through his dining room. Chair Ebel opined that regardless of where the dividing line for zoning boundaries was, the site was surrounded by long-term residential properties.

Chair Ebel asked if the plan provided only one handicapped parking space in front of the building. Mr. Stevens replied that it would be a generous one space. Chair Ebel opined that a handicapped parking space in front of the building would reduce the amount of general parking available along Main Street in a very busy area. PB member Cook advised that there have been discussions regarding no parking being allowed along Main Street. Mr. Stevens said that it would be possible to create a handicapped accessible parking space behind the building. Dr. Gutgsell said they planned to have them in the back and the dentists were now planning to have an elevator to enable them to fully utilize all levels of the building.

Dr. Gutgsell asked if there were any long-range plans to make the intersection of Main Street and Pleasant Street a right-turn-only intersection. Chair Ebel and PB member Clough both responded in the negative. Mr. Stevens stated that Main Street on-street parking spaces are only delineated in front of the library; although there is non-designated parking in front of the McSwiney building. Chair Ebel opined that many people, especially older people, used Main Street parking to access the library. She wondered how Road Agent Lee would feel about putting handicapped accessible parking along Main Street. Fire Chief Peter Stanley stated that there needs to be some space available in front for ambulance access.

PB member Andrews noted that handicapped accessible parking spaces needed to be wider than conventional parking spaces; therefore, if there's an elevator, why not put them in the rear. She asked about striping the space if there were to be a curb. Mr. Stevens replied that the space would be located in a 12-foot recess off the roadway. He said that parking spaces off Main Street were striped and designated. Ms Andrews opined that the dentists might end up with a curb there. Mr. Stevens advised that he intended to plan for handicapped accessible parking in conjunction with proposed plans for sidewalks. Chair Ebel stated that it would still remove two spaces now used for general parking. PB member Andrews opined that the space in front of the building was not used that much for general parking now. Ms Andrews again asked if they really wanted

handicapped accessible parking in front of the building. Dr. Gutgsell responded affirmatively. He opined that it was very smart to do so. He stated that any handicapped person could use it, whether a client of the dentists' or not. He said that if the space were not to be used for handicapped accessible parking, then it would be more green space. PB members Cook and Andrews supported the idea of more green space along Main Street instead of the handicapped space proposed.

Fire Chief Stanley reiterated the need to provide reasonable access for emergency personnel. Chief Stanley advised that currently the NH Department of Transportation does not allow any parking on that side of Main Street, so providing a recessed handicapped accessible parking space in front of the building, subject to NH DOT approval, would provide adequate space for emergency access where none now exists. PB member Andrews opined that emergency vehicles would access the property with or without any parking space and that if someone were parked in the space, the ambulance would be in the road anyway.

Resident Sue Clough said that no one could park on the street during a snowstorm and suggested that handicapped parking might be allowed as an exception. She reminded everyone that a similar space had been constructed near the entrance to the town hall on Seamans Road. She suggested that members of the PB might want to view that space. Dr. Gutgsell advised that the handicapped accessible parking slants downward.

Chair Ebel asked if the dentists and Mr. McSwiney would be returning to the PB for continuation of the Preliminary SPR or if they intended to go directly to Final SPR. Mr. Stevens responded that he would prefer to have a Final SPR in May. He said that the only real issues were drainage, parking, and access. Mr. McWilliams advised that the applicants did have the option of continuing the preliminary SPR. Mr. Stevens opined that the handicapped accessible parking should not be the focal point of the review.

Ms Andrews opined that if the department heads and the fire chief viewed the handicapped accessible parking space as desirable, the PB should probably go with their recommendations, even though green space would be sacrificed. Mr. Stevens pointed out that the plan under review exceeded the minimum green space requirement. Ms Andrews noted that the width of the road from the edge of the sidewalk was 12 feet and asked what the width was from the edge of the pavement. Mr. Stevens replied that the right-of-way was 17 feet wide. Chair Ebel asked Dr. Gutgsell if he had said he was hoping for two handicapped accessible parking spaces. Chair Ebel noted that there appeared to be only one such space on the plan displayed, and she asked if the plan would be to construct only one. Dr. Gutgsell replied that he'd like two, but only one was shown.

PB member Conly stated that the primary issues to be resolved were drainage, parking, and the roadway (Loving Lane). PB member Cook asked if there were any issues regarding drainage onto the abutting library property. Mr. Stevens replied that curbing seems to prevent any drainage onto that lot. Chair Ebel asked the dentists if they had discussed the impact of their scheduling on the parking plan, i.e. not all scheduling their heaviest appointments on the same day. Dr. Gutgsell replied that they had discussed the matter. He said that 25 spaces would be adequate and that there would be only two practitioners having appointments on any one day. Dr. Baker said that he could be flexible about the days he was in New London.

PB member Cottrill asked if the PB had to vote to waive the 10-foot setback requirement. Ken McWilliams replied in the negative and referred to Article XI. C. 5. Flexibility in Area and Location of the Site Plan Review Regulations in regard to the redevelopment of sites originally developed under different and often lesser standards. Ross Stevens advised that he would be requesting waivers of the requirements pertaining to the shape, size, and location of existing and proposed structures within 200 feet of the property and topographic contours at two-foot intervals.

PB member Cottrill asked if the PB had flexibility with regard to parking requirements. Mr. McWilliams responded affirmatively. Mr. Stevens advised that the plans tried to meet the parking and green space requirements in redeveloping the commercial lot. Mr. Cottrill said that the PB could reduce the parking requirement and increase the green space requirement. He said that he would like to add green space along the Fraize and Clough properties. Mr. Stevens said that he had always been curious about the 26-foot aisle requirement in the parking regulations. He opined that the usual requirement is 44 feet, and often a town uses 42 feet on hillsides. Mr. Cottrill asked about snow storage or would it be the intent to remove all the snow from

the site. Mr. Stevens replied that all snow would be removed. He also pointed out the plan to install curbing along the sidelines. Mr. Stevens opined that the screening was heavy in most areas, although slimmest near the Fraize property and along the Clough-McSwiney property line.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters who wished to speak. Abutter Bill Clough (23 Lovering Lane) said that he had heard a lot of talk about working together with the abutters; however, the only conversation he has had with the applicants occurred when he saw Mr. Stevens outside and went out to ask him what he was doing. Mr. Clough also said that he had heard nothing during the review regarding traffic entering Main Street from Lovering Lane. He said that he was concerned about the sight line being impeded by the small building on Ellen Winkler's property, especially when combined with snow banks and on-street parking along Main Street.

Ross Stevens advised that the building mentioned was about 1.5 feet from the pavement. PB member Cottrill asked if the town could say that there could be no parking there. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that the NH DOT does not permit any on-street parking. Mr. Clough opined that dental patients, after one experience, would avoid parking in the designated lots because of the difficulty encountered in exiting Lovering Lane. Dr. Gutgsell disagreed and compared it to exiting the dentists' existing parking. PB members Andrews and Cottrill both disagreed. They advised that the situations were not the same; the existing dental parking exit is level whereas Lovering Lane exits on an incline. Chair Ebel said that the dentists had explored a variety of access plans, and everyone seemed to agree in the past that the one presented was the best option under the circumstances. Mr. Stevens stated that he had tried to improve the street access to mitigate the sight line problem.

Chair Ebel asked about deliveries. Dr. Gutgsell replied that deliveries usually are made by UPS. Chair Ebel asked if the deliveries came in panel trucks. Dr. Gutgsell replied affirmatively.

PB member Cottrill asked abutter Bill Clough if anything could be done along his lot line to ameliorate the problems. Mr. Clough replied that planting additional shrubs would help. He said that he would also be interested in knowing more about the proposed light at the rear of the dentists' building. Dr. Gutgsell replied that it would be a residential door light. Chair Ebel asked if the light would be on all night. Dr. Gutgsell replied that it could have a motion detector or could be turned off at night. He said that he would be willing to discuss the matter. PB member Cook asked him if he was sensitive to Mr. Clough's concerns. Dr. Gutgsell said that he was. Mr. Cottrill asked about trash disposal. He asked if the dumpster could be moved toward McSwiney's close to the building in one of the non-marking areas. Mr. Clough suggested that the party hired to empty the dumpster would probably drive into his driveway in order to back up to the dumpster. Mr. Cottrill asked if the dumpster would be screened. Dr. Gutgsell replied that it could be. Ken McWilliams advised that the regulations require that waste collection areas be fenced or screened. Dr. Gutgsell said that he would comply with the regulations.

May 23 was the date set for the Final SPR on the Drs. Gutgsell, Phipps, & Baker and Mr. McSwiney plan. Chair Ebel encouraged PB members to view the handicapped accessible parking space on Seamans Road near the entrance to Whipple Memorial Town Hall.

Sue Clough returned to the PB

IV. DISCUSSION OF PROCESS & SCHEDULE FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Ken McWilliams referred PB members to the handouts that presented two alternative plans for updating the Master Plan. He advised that the only difference between Alternative #1 and Alternative #2 could be found in Steps 12 and 13 regarding the number of review sessions. He said that Alternative #1 accomplished the Master Plan revision in three years; Alternative #2 accomplished the update in two years and five months, seven months less than Alternative #1.

Chair Ebel asked if the discussions would be eliminated and the PB removed from the review. Mr. McWilliams replied in the negative. He said that he would review the old plan and retain those aspects that were relevant. PB member Clough opined that the PB would have homework. Chair Ebel said that she was concerned about

finishing the process at Christmas. Mr. McWilliams said that the dates were “guesstimates”. He said that both alternatives would require one additional work session per month. Chair Ebel said that she was struggling over the pros and cons of each of the alternatives. Mr. McWilliams advised that the PB did not go through all of the discussions of each chapter during the last revision. PB member Cook opined that there was a need to discuss sometime. Mr. McWilliams offered to go through the existing Master Plan and “redline” all goals already accomplished.

Resident David Cook cautioned against the PB being too focused on the new plan and, in the interest of expediency, skipping the step of reporting back to the community regarding what was accomplished by the old plan. PB member Clough said in response that updating the community would be done in the Visioning Workshop. Mr. Cook asked how the PB could do Step 3 before doing Step 12. PB member Andrews said that each recommendation would be evaluated as the PB moves along through the Master Plan. Ms Clough opined that the PB would need to review the current Master Plan before the Visioning Workshop. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley opined that it was amazing how much has been accomplished. Chair Ebel opined that a report to the community would be a good way to kick off the Visioning Workshop. Mr. Cook suggested that there was no reason that the PB couldn't write a new Master Plan to include a requirement for regular reports and evaluation of progress. PB member Clough advised that the Master Plan was considered whenever changes to the regulations were proposed. Chair Ebel agreed and added that the number of regulatory changes was greatest right after the Master Plan revision. She commented that during the years immediately following the Master Plan's passage, there was much more discussion about complying with the recommendations than now when almost everything has been accomplished.

Ken McWilliams advised that one addition to the update would be an Implementation chapter regarding who, when, etc. does what; how priorities are set; measure of success.

Following discussion it was the consensus of the PB to proceed with Alternative #2 for updating the Master Plan.

Mr. McWilliams advised that the Visioning Workshop subcommittee had met and agreed upon a two and one-half day format. On the Friday evening, there would be an overview of both town and regulatory growth trends as well as what the Master Plan is. PB member Clough suggested that the PB could roll in the goals accomplished from the current Master Plan. The subcommittee suggested that perhaps there could be a potluck or sponsored meal, as well. On Saturday, there would be small groups with facilitators to discuss topical areas of the plan to elicit hopes and concerns of the community. The small groups would report to the larger group to get additional input as well to share information. Mr. McWilliams said that he would then draft a Vision chapter for the Master Plan revision. The Visioning Workshop participants would reconvene for half a day to give reaction to the draft and to develop a future growth exercise.

Chair Ebel stated that the PB had discussed having the Visioning Workshop in November. She observed that the subcommittee had recommended holding it earlier. Mr. McWilliams said that the subcommittee was trying to get the process done before the holidays. PB member Cottrill opined that the future growth exercise should be very early at the Visioning Workshop in order to really open the eyes of the attendees and get them excited and engaged right away.

Resident David Cook asked how many small groups there would be and what the minimum group size would be. Chair Ebel asked if participants would self-select small group assignments. Mr. McWilliams replied that individuals would be randomly assigned to small groups. Mr. Cook asked how many participated last time. Consensus of the PB was that there had been 100-200 at the first meeting and then the numbers had dropped off dramatically.

PB member Clough asked if the Visioning Workshop would be the end of involvement by the community. Mr. McWilliams replied that the PB hoped to keep them interested in attending PB work sessions outlined in Step 14 and participating in public hearings. Chair Ebel added that some people worked on specific chapters last time. Mr. McWilliams agreed and said that some also collected data. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that the Conservation Commission worked on that particular chapter of the Master Plan. Chair Ebel

said that some PB members might be more interested in specific chapters. Ms Clough suggested that the PB could delegate portions. Chair Ebel advised that some people have expressed a desire to work on certain issues. Ms Clough opined that one would need to keep a vision of the entire plan while working on specific issues.

Resident Cook asked if it wouldn't be appropriate for department heads and personnel to work on certain chapters. PB member Cook asked if the Visioning Workshop would be open to all property owners or only to permanent residents of New London. Mr. McWilliams replied that it would be open to all. PB member Cottrill said that a person could own a business in New London and not live here at all.

Discussion moved to the list of Proposed Maps. PB member Clough asked why two maps were to be eliminated. Mr. McWilliams replied that those maps were not particularly accurate, that existing plans show accuracy to three acres, and technology has advanced to permit septic alternatives. PB member Cottrill suggested leaving those maps in the list to call attention to the issue. He asked if all of the maps would be updated. Resident Cook asked about a "Google" presentation. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that the town already has maps to 100 scale that provide better mapping than available from Google.

PB member Andrews asked how often the mapping was done. Mr. Stanley replied that it had been done in 1989 and in 2003. He said that he hoped that it could be done more frequently and added that there was a need to have key elements noted on the maps, in addition to lot dimensions and building locations. Mr. McWilliams recommended that the maps be printed in color. He circulated sample maps prepared by Shelley Hadfield for the town of Plainfield. He advised that it would also be possible to combine several layers on one map. Chair Ebel asked if that would require Mr. McWilliams to hire another person. He replied that he would "sub out" the work.

Mr. McWilliams advised that he would return to the PB with a proposed scope of services.

PB members Cook and Andrews asked Zoning Administrator Stanley if he had checked on the status of parking at the rear of Foremost Builders. He replied that other issues had taken precedence.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. The MINUTES of the MARCH 28, 2006 meeting were APPROVED, as circulated.

The MEETING was ADJOURNED at 10:10 PM.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____