

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
OCTOBER 10, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Sue Ellen Andrews, Celeste Cook, Dale Conly, Jeff Hollinger, Sue Clough (Selectmen's Representative), Ken McWilliams (Planner). Tom Cottrill joined the PB at 7:40 PM

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

I. LAURIE DURKIN – Final Site Plan Review: Home Business (Tax Map 121, Lot 5)

Laurie Durkin met with the PB in regard to her plan to operate a home business, Noteworthy Papers, at 485 Old Main Street. She advised that customers would come to her home to view vendor samples and select products. She said that she would then place the orders and deliver the items. Ms Durkin advised that, generally, customers would arrive one at a time; however, around the Christmas holidays there might be small groups. She advised that she had plans to add on to her house in the spring and to extend the driveway at that time. Ms Durkin said that she anticipates receiving only one delivery per day.

PB member Clough asked about parking. Ms Durkin replied that there was space for four to five cars, and she opined that the available parking would be adequate. She described the area where parking would be located, both now and after the planned driveway extension.

Chair Ebel asked about the size of the area in Ms Durkin's home that would be used for the business. Ms Durkin replied that approximately 200 square feet would be used. She said that the business is currently being operated out of the entryway; however, after the proposed house expansion, the business would be moved to the area now occupied by the master bedroom. Chair Ebel asked what the total square footage of the house was. Ms Durkin replied that the house contained approximately 4500 square feet. She stated that the space currently used as the master bedroom had its own entrance and bathroom facilities. Ms Durkin advised that she was the sole owner of Noteworthy Papers and the only employee.

Chair Ebel ascertained that Ms Durkin was familiar with the New London Zoning Regulations governing home businesses. Ken McWilliams reported that no issues were raised at the afternoon meeting of municipal department heads. He advised that the Fire Department and Highway Department had both viewed the site.

Chair Ebel advised that she had received an e-mail in support of the home business from abutter Frank Hammond (443 Old Main Street).

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE FINAL SITE PLAN FOR A HOME BUSINESS AT 485 OLD MAIN STREET (TAX MAP 121, LOT 5) BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY LAURIE DURKIN. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

II. ADRIANNE G. LAURIDSEN –Final Annexation (Tax Map 94, Lot 3 & Tax Map 95, Lot 44)

Adrienne Lauridsen was accompanied by Pierre Bedard (Pierre Bedard & Associates).

Mr. Bedard displayed plans showing Tax Map 95, Lot 44 with 2.15 acres and Tax Map 95, Lot 45 containing 4.89 acres. He advised that the garage and blacksmith's shop were on the same parcel with the house, and the plan was to put them on a separate lot. Mr. Bedard reviewed the proposed changes in the frontage amounts and acreage.

PB member Hollinger asked if all setback requirements would be met under the proposed plan. Mr. Bedard responded affirmatively. Ken McWilliams reported that no issues had been raised at the afternoon meeting with municipal department heads.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present at the meeting. A member of the audience identified himself as an abutter, and advised that he had no issues with the proposed annexation.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Clough) **THAT THE FINAL ANNEXATION PLAN FOR TAX MAP 94, LOT 3 AND TAX MAP 95, LOT 44 BE APPROVED AS PROPOSED BY ADRIANNE G. LAURIDSEN. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

III. JANET KIDDER – Concept Site Plan Review: Remove Underground Gas Tanks & Discuss Parking (Tax Map 84, Lot 73)

Janet and David Kidder appeared before the PB to discuss removal of the underground gasoline storage tanks and parking at the Kidder building located at 11 Pleasant Street, Tax Map 84, Lot 73.

Janet Kidder referred to the diagram displayed regarding the location of the underground tanks to be removed and the proposed addition of one to three parking spaces. She advised that a demolition permit was required in order for K. G. Enterprises, Inc. to remove the tanks. She stated that the site currently had six parking spaces and one that was frequently used immediately to the right of the island. She opined that the parking spaces existed prior to adoption of zoning regulations.

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that the area over the underground tanks and now occupied by an island could not automatically become parking without PB Site Plan Review (SPR). He said that the proposed removal of the tanks and the island would constitute a change in the layout of the approved site plan and, therefore, would require SPR as provided in Article III. C. of the Site Plan Review Regulations. Chair Ebel polled the PB members, and advised that the PB would have no problem with the removal of the underground tanks. PB member Clough asked if the PB could make a motion regarding a demolition permit without SPR on the proposed increase in parking.

David Kidder advised that no parking spaces were proposed for the area to the left of the island or in the area currently occupied by the island. He opined that the town wanted to install a curb at the property boundary. He said that he would put some type of plantings in the area between the curb and the building. Chair Ebel asked him to verify that he was not requesting an increase in parking on the site. Mr. Kidder replied that he was not seeking an increase in parking.

Ken McWilliams advised that the portion of the site where the traffic flow would be changed and the area that would be used for landscaping met the criteria demanding SPR, as set forth in Article III. C. of the Site Plan Review Regulations. Chair Ebel asked if the municipal department heads had raised any issues. Mr. McWilliams replied that New London Town Road Agent Richard Lee had, in the past, expressed concern regarding safety issues caused by people at the gas pumps pulling out into traffic and, thereby, creating a third line of traffic at the intersection of Pleasant and Main Streets. He opined that the proposed landscaping would address both safety at the intersection and the aesthetics of the site.

Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that there was a procedural requirement for SPR in order for a building permit to be issued. He stated that PB approval or waiver of the requirement for SPR would be necessary before a permit could be issued. He cited Article III. C. of the SPR Regulations as the reason for requiring SPR. Chair Ebel asked if the site had ever had a SPR. Ms Kidder replied in the negative. She said that they could remove the tanks and the island to allow seven parking spaces and landscaping or they could pull the tanks and leave the island in place. Ken McWilliams advised that the PB could require a modified SPR to address the change in traffic pattern. He said that the PB needed to know where the curb line would be set and suggested that it might even be set beyond the

property line in the town right-of-way. He advised that the PB needed details of the proposed site changes.

New London resident Richard Bott asked if the removal of the tanks and island would not be an improvement to the site. He said that the State of New Hampshire had a right-of-way for Main Street.

Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that, at the meeting with municipal department heads, Jessie Levine, Town Administrator, and Richard Lee, Town Road Agent, had been vehemently opposed to having cars parked all the way to the intersection. PB member Clough pointed out that the PB did not have a plan drawn to scale. Chair Ebel asked if the Police Department had made any comments. Mr. McWilliams cited the state statute prohibiting additional parking backing into traffic within a certain distance from the intersection. He stated that the current proposal did not include spaces all the way to the intersection as originally presented to the department heads, but only to the edge of the island away from the intersection. He said that this proposal would not violate the statute mentioned by Police Chief David Seastrand.

PB member Hollinger asked how parking in the area now occupied by the island could be prevented. Mr. Kidder replied that curbing and landscaping would be used. PB member Andrews opined that the PB should review the proposed change in the traffic pattern and approve the changes, not waive SPR. Chair Ebel stated that this would make sense given the amount of traffic in the area and the fact that no SPR existed for the site. Janet Kidder stated that such a plan should include the usage of her property to access the Wilson building. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that PB approval could be contingent upon limiting where parking must stop, e.g., at the end of the island. Chair Ebel asked where that point would be. She advised that the PB needed a scaled, detailed drawing of the corner, the proposed curb line, and the proposed landscaping. She opined that waiver of SPR might be influenced by abutter interests, and she asked if any abutters were present. There were none. PB member Clough advised that the town would want a more detailed agreement on file.

PB member Cottrill said that there were two issues: removal of the underground tanks and island and preventing parking in the area. He suggested that jersey barriers could be used to prevent parking in the area. Chair Ebel asked if the Kidders planned to plant grass over the area. Ms Kidder replied affirmatively. Mr. Cottrill asked if the Kidders were requesting two additional parking spaces. Ms Kidder replied that a total of seven parking spaces would be fine. Mr. Cottrill stated that the PB needed a scale drawing showing the seven spaces and the distance of the curb from the building. The area would not have to be paved right away. PB member Cottrill asked if there was any required distance from the intersection for head-in parking. Ken McWilliams replied that head-in parking was not recommended at all and that approval of even one additional head-in parking space would be going against the tide. He advised that there must be five feet between parking and the street.

Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that the issue was with the structure above the ground, i.e., the island, and the open space that would result from its removal. Chair Ebel asked about the width of the parking spaces and what size car the spaces were designed to accommodate. The Kidders replied that the spaces were 9-10 feet wide. Ken McWilliams opined that making the parking spaces narrower would make backing out more difficult. Chair Ebel and other PB members discussed the necessity for a SPR of the site. The sense of the PB was that SPR could be waived, but only if the department heads reviewed and approved a detailed parking and landscaping plan for the site. Chair Ebel stated that, considering the amount of traffic in and out of the intersection, it would be very important to have such a plan on file.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR THE KIDDER BUILDING LOCATED AT 11 PLEASANT STREET, TAX MAP 84, LOT 73, BE APPROVED, CONTINGENT UPON RECEIPT WITHIN TWO WEEKS OF A DETAILED, SCALED DRAWING OF PARKING THAT WILL EXTEND NO FURTHER THAN THE NORTH EDGE OF THE EXISTING ISLAND AWAY FROM THE INTERSECTION OF PLEASANT AND MAIN STREETS AND THE**

CURB LINE AND LANDSCAPING TO REPLACE THE OPEN AREA CREATED BY REMOVAL OF THE ISLAND THAT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT HEADS OF THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms Kidder said that she had a problem with the requirement for plan approval by department heads. She said that they might require something, like a fountain, that would be inappropriate. PB member Hollinger responded that approval by department heads was the trade-off for not having to go through a full SPR and that some form of review was necessary. Ms Kidder advised that she would need a copy of the draft PB Minutes in order to obtain a building permit. Chair Ebel explained that the PB had a week to publish draft Minutes. It was agreed to send a copy of the draft Minutes to the Kidders via e-mail.

**IV. ROBERT EWING – Review of the Proposed Security for Major Subdivision Improvements
(Tax Map 96, Lots 15 & 15-4)**

Stephen Kushmerek, designer/surveyor (CLD Consulting Engineers), presented a written cost estimate for improvements to Balsam Acres Road, Sewer, and Water Extension related to the Robert Ewing subdivision.

Ken McWilliams advised that Richard Lee, New London Town Road Agent, had reviewed the estimate and approved security of \$77,639. Mr. McWilliams said that the \$77,639 represented 110% of the engineer's estimate, as was customary. Chair Ebel asked if there were copies of the estimate available for PB review. Mr. Kushmerek provided extra copies. Chair Ebel requested, and received, confirmation that the Richard Lee, Town Road Agent, would be sending a memo regarding his approval of the estimate.

Mr. Kushmerek advised that the plans presented that evening showed the monuments that had been set. He provided mylars for future signing by the PB. Ken McWilliams advised that the mylars would be held until a Letter of Credit in the amount of \$77,639 has been received, at which time the mylars would be signed by the PB and forwarded to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds to be recorded.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE PROPOSED SECURITY OF \$77,639 FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO BALSAM ACRES ROAD, SEWER, AND WATER EXTENSION IN REGARD TO ROBERT EWING'S MAJOR SUBDIVISION OF TAX MAP 96, LOTS 15 & 15-4 BE APPROVED AS SET FORTH IN THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 LETTER FROM CLD CONSULTING ENGINEERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**V. ROBERT DALEY (35 LITTLE SUNAPEE ROAD, LLC) – Preliminary Site Plan Review:
Parking (Tax Map 60, Lot 3)**

Robert Daley advised that the proposal to modify the on-site parking at 35 Little Sunapee Road was being made for purposes of employee safety and convenience.

Mr. Daley advised that the approved parking was awkward because a shed had been erected since the site plan for Sublime Civil & Jesseman Associates was approved by the PB on June 28, 2005. He said that currently the approved site plan provides for 10 parking spaces on the site and five more at the abutting motel. Mr. Daley advised that he would like to use an on-site gravel area, containing only three dead trees that need to be removed, for parking. He said that the gravel area resulted from demolition of a garage. He added that some of it was located on a right-of-way that had been given up during the last Site Plan Review (SPR).

Chair Ebel asked if the file contained "as-built" plans. Mr. Daley advised that there were three parking spaces toward the motel and seven spaces along the back of the property. PB member Cottrill asked how many parking spaces were required. Mr. Daley replied that he did not know. He stated that

practical parking differed from official parking. PB member Andrews asked Mr. Daley if he now found the parking to be inadequate. He was now proposing two parking spaces in front of the building. PB member Hollinger advised that those were previously proposed and turned down by the PB because of the concerns of neighbors in the residential zone. Stephen Jesseman (Jesseman Associates, P.C.) explained the past review to Mr. Daley.

Chair Ebel asked if Mr. Daley was now proposing 15 on-site parking spaces. Ken McWilliams advised that Article XI. K. Consideration for Adjacent Land of the Site Plan Review Regulations states that "No parking area in commercial zones shall be built or maintained within ten (10) feet of any boundary line of a residential zone, nor within ten (10) feet of a street line whenever the street contains the boundary line of a residential zone located directly across the street from any part of the site." Mr. McWilliams stated that the 10-foot setback in the rear started at the back of the parking space and that the landscape setback requirement applied to both sides of the property line.

PB member Hollinger asked if Mr. Daley was trying to put more parking spaces on the lot. Chair Ebel reminded everyone that the PB had spent a considerable amount of time and effort during the June 2005 SPR in order to come up with a parking solution/compromise that would be work for the commercial property and its residential neighbors. Abutter Richard Bott (42 Little Sunapee Road) said that there were only two (2) parking spaces where three (3) spaces were shown on the plan. PB member Cook asked why the existing parking was not working for the employees. Mr. Daley replied that the parking was congested and backing up was difficult.

Chair Ebel asked the PB to first discuss the two (2) spaces proposed in front of the building. She said that the PB really discourages parking in front of commercial buildings. Mr. McWilliams pointed out that the proposed parking would not meet the 10-foot setback requirement contained in Article XI. K. of the Site Plan Review Regulations. Mr. Daley disagreed. PB member Cook opined that Article XI. L. Harmonious Development would apply, as well. PB member Andrews said that the PB had reviewed a proposal for parking spaces in front of the building and had rejected it. Mr. Daley asked what zoning regulation prohibited parking in front. Ms Andrews asked if the five (5) parking spaces leased from the motel were used. Mr. Daley responded affirmatively. PB member Hollinger said that Mr. Daley knew what the requirements were at the time he purchased the property and that it was somewhat annoying to have him back within little more than a year looking for a change. Mr. Hollinger said that the PB had made its approval with consideration for neighbors and it had also discussed zoning issues. PB member Conly added that the PB had spent considerable time working out a compromise for the business and for neighbors. Mr. Daley opined that it was appropriate to come back for a revised SPR if a property owner decided that the parking plan originally approved was not working well.

Chair Ebel asked what about 10 on-site parking spaces with three (3) across the back, none in front, keeping the dumpster in the location originally approved, and waiver of the 10-foot setback requirement in the rear. PB member Andrews asked if space #6 on the plan presented would push spaces toward the road. She asked what the surface was in that area. Mr. Jesseman and Mr. Daley replied that the surface was cement or gravel. PB member Clough asked if there were any minimum number of parking spaces required. Ken McWilliams replied that all parking requirements were based upon the square footage of the building.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. Daley where he would want the parking spaces to be located, if the PB approved an additional three (3) spaces on the site. Mr. Daley responded that if a waiver was to be considered, why limit the increase to only three (3) spaces. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley recommended that, if a waiver were to be considered, a sub-committee be appointed to visit the site. He opined that it was very "tight back there", very compact and the PB needed to see the site. PB members Cook and Hollinger advised that they had looked at the site that day; however, neither had driven onto the property. Ken McWilliams advised that if the PB were to consider a waiver of the rear 10-foot setback requirement for the Daley property, the abutting motel would also have to apply for SPR and a waiver

of the rear 10-foot setback requirement for that property. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that the PB needed to think carefully about granting such a waiver, and Mr. McWilliams agreed.

Abutter Bott stated that the dumpster was not located in the place originally approved by the PB nor was it screened. Chair Ebel asked if this were true. Mr. Daley said that the waste company explained that it would be more convenient to put the dumpster where it was now, so parked cars didn't have to be moved in order to access it. He said that it was very inconvenient for employees to have to move their cars to access the dumpster where it was originally approved to be located. Chair Ebel asked how often the dumpster was emptied. Mr. Daley replied that it came once a month. Several PB members expressed surprise that the dumpster placement created such a problem given the infrequency of the pickups. PB member Andrews stated that originally no dumpster was going to be permitted at all; however, when the PB decided to permit one, its placement and the screening were carefully thought out. Abutter Bott asked how current violations on the site would be addressed. Chair Ebel advised that the PB needed to see the site in order to form its own opinion. It was agreed that PB members would coordinate site visits with Mr. Daley.

David Barry, owner of the Lamplighter Motel, advised the PB that he would be willing to go through the SPR process to obtain a waiver of the 10-foot setback requirement.

PB member Cottrill opined that the PB needed to have a copy of the existing site plan for the next meeting at which the matter was to be discussed. Stephen Jesseman agreed to provide a copy for each member of the PB. PB member Clough asked if the copies could be smaller in size than the plan displayed at the PB meeting. Mr. Jesseman replied affirmatively. Chair Ebel advised that she would like to have copies of both the existing site plan and the proposed site plan available to the PB members during their site visits. Mr. Cottrill requested a more accurate drawing of the proposed parking. He opined that the plan before the PB was somewhat confusing.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Clough) **THAT THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW: PARKING AT 35 LITTLE SUNAPEE ROAD (TAX MAP 60, LOT 3) BE CONTINUED TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2006 AT 7:30 PM. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised the PB that Mr. Daley had been sent a Notice of Violation relative to the location of the dumpster months ago, and it had not been moved back as it should have been. He advised that, if the dumpster were not located where indicated on the approved site plan, the owner of the property would be subject to a citation of violation and a hefty fine. Mr. Daley said that he had contacted Mr. McWilliams immediately after getting the Notice of Violation to advise him that he was planning to come before the PB for a revised SPR and that Mr. McWilliams had told him that the dumpster could remain where it was until that time. Zoning Administrator Stanley responded that the dumpster needed to be on the approved site. If it were on the approved site, it could remain there while the PB reviewed the proposed changes. Mr. Stanley advised that a Notice of Violation had been sent to Mr. Daley some months ago. Mr. Daley advised that he would call to have the dumpster moved and that he didn't realize dumpster placement was a major issue. He reiterated that it had been moved to allow easier access.

PB member Clough recommended that Mr. Daley try to come up with a proposal without the two (2) parking spaces in front of the building.

VI. GEORGE M. DELAFIELD – Referral of Minor Subdivision Application from the Sutton Planning Board with Sole Access from New London via Stonehouse Road

Mr. and Mrs. George M. Delafield appeared to discuss a proposed subdivision of property that they own in Sutton for which the sole access is via Stonehouse Road in New London.

Mr. Delafield displayed a plan of the proposed subdivision. He advised that eventually they wanted to build a small "carriage house" on a 2.6-acre lot with access off Stonehouse Road via one driveway

following along a stonewall that separates New London and Sutton. He stated that the object was to be able to leave the original house to their son and the newly-built house to their daughter.

Chair Ebel asked if there would be any restriction to prohibit their son or daughter from selling the property outside the family. Mr. Delafield replied that they hadn't gotten that far in their planning yet.

PB member Andrews advised that the NLPB would only be reviewing the access issue. She asked if the meeting had been "Noticed". Ken McWilliams replied that notices had been sent to the New London abutters to Stonehouse Road.

Mr. McWilliams advised the PB that it needed to be very sensitive to another pending application and the feasibility of improving Stonehouse Road and the intersection of Stonehouse Road with King Hill Road. He advised that this applicant should be asked to participate fully in funding the road and intersection improvements, if the subdivision were to occur before the fact.

Mr. Delafield asked if the NLPB considered Harborview to have two (2) access roads. Chair Ebel replied that at the point of application, the solely maintained access for Harborview was via Stonehouse Road in New London. She advised that the situation at the time of application was what governed the review authority pursuant to the applicable NH statute.

PB member Andrews opined that the cost of the intersection and road improvements would be the cost of construction, not to include legal costs. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley opined that engineering costs should also be included. He also opined that the applicant needed to know what those costs would be. Ken McWilliams advised that the applicant had the option to share in the expense of the improvements without knowing the estimate or to delay the application.

Chair Ebel sought consensus of the PB regarding responsibility for cost of improvements to Stonehouse Road and the intersection with King Hill Road in New London in the event that the subdivision were to be approved by the Sutton Planning Board. There was consensus that the applicant would be expected to share in his fair share of the costs of road and intersection improvements. For instance, if Harborview had 35 lots, the costs would be divided by 36 and Mr. Delafield would be expected to pay 1/36th. Zoning Administrator Stanley strongly opined that the engineering costs should be included in the cost of construction.

Mr. Delafield asked if the PB had the authority to approve the application that evening. Chair Ebel replied that the PB could approve the application and require that the applicants pay a share of the costs of improving the road and the intersection. Mr. Delafield asked if construction expense would not be part of the approval if Harborview were not in the picture. Chair Ebel replied that the road would not require improvement if Harborview were not in the picture. Mr. Delafield questioned whether they should be held responsible for something that may or may not happen in the future. Chair Ebel responded that she needed to discuss the matter with town counsel. She stated that she assumed that the responsibility to pay would stem from the time of subdivision approval, not application. PB member Conly pointed out that the Delafields would not be totally penalized as they would benefit from a safer intersection at the point that Stonehouse Road meets King Hill Road.

Chair Ebel suggested that the Delafields might want to postpone submitting an application to both the NLPB and the Sutton PB until this funding matter is clarified. Ken McWilliams advised that the Sutton PB had indicated that it would continue its hearing on the application until it received comments from the NLPB. Chair Ebel stated that, based on the RSAs, both New London and Sutton would have to sign off on the subdivision plan. Mr. McWilliams noticed that the plan presented for review contained only one signature block.

Mrs. Delafield asked how the decision would be known. Mr. Delafield stated that he needed to hear what counsel recommended and what costs would be included (construction only or construction plus engineering). Mr. McWilliams advised that discussion would ensue regarding eligibility for town support of road and intersection improvements. He said that if the project were found to be eligible for

town support, but the town had no funds for the project, then the PB could declare the application scattered and premature.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT CONSIDERATION OF THE REFERRAL OF A MINOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATION FROM THE SUTTON PLANNING BOARD WITH SOLE ACCESS FROM NEW LONDON VIA STONEHOUSE ROAD BE CONTINUED TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2006 AT 7:30 PM. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VII. MASTER PLAN – Review/Comment on the New London Data Packet

Ken McWilliams asked if there were any questions and/or comments on the materials contained in the data packet. He said that he envisioned using the data (1) for updating applicable chapters of the existing Master Plan and (2) for a PowerPoint presentation to be used at the proposed Vision Workshop.

Chair Ebel said that she was concerned that the data was for 2000 and that, by the time the Master Plan has been updated, the data will be outdated. She wondered if there would be any way to get more recent data. Mr. McWilliams replied that it would be possible to obtain an updated population estimate. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley stated that the population in 2000 was 4116 and that it is estimated to be 4500 now. Chair Ebel asked if those numbers included Colby-Sawyer College students. She was advised that the college students were included and that they account for approximately 1000 of the population numbers. PB member Clough stated that it would be possible to get a concept of sustained growth. PB member Cottrill said that the PB should probably try to synchronize Master Plan updates with the census. Mr. Stanley opined that housing costs and school enrollment were usually pretty up to date annually.

Chair Ebel opined that determining what topics to include in the Vision Workshop would be difficult. Mr. McWilliams advised that he would make some recommendations to the PB. Chair Ebel said that she was concerned about costs attendant to growth in the elderly population as compared with costs that result from growth in families with school-age children. Mr. McWilliams advised that towns were changing their perceptions regarding affordable housing for working families. He said that many towns want to have mixed communities as they view them as being more vibrant.

Chair Ebel mentioned an expert in Exeter, New Hampshire. Mr. McWilliams said that unless towns have plans to attract families, the school-age population would decrease and the school population would go down. He said that the PB needed to get accurate information and debunk myths. He mentioned that Russ Tebo's projection regarding the school-age population refuted existing myths re building affordable housing attracting high numbers of families with children. Chair Ebel opined that it would be nice to know what the reality is. PB member Andrews advised that a "Saving Special Places" presentation was scheduled for October 30. She said that it would include the cost of community services and the open space costs versus developed space costs. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that there would be a contingent strongly pitching affordable housing. PB member Andrews opined that the PB should also look at the off-campus student housing issue. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that he had been in many of the places used by students, and he opined that the manner in which students treat the premises was a real problem.

VIII. DRIVEWAY REGULATIONS – Review Draft

Chair Ebel asked if the term "driveway" had been defined anywhere in the regulations. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley replied in the negative, but advised that it could be added to the definitions in Article III of the New London Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Ebel questioned the wording on page 7 in Item J. Drainage that states "drainage shall not interfere". She asked if "interfere" might be too broad a term, and she said that perhaps the regulation needed something more specific. She asked if town counsel had reviewed the proposed regulation and

said that the PB needed feedback. She cited a similar need with regard to the wording on page 8 in Item S. Erosion. Chair Ebel stated that the PB could not approve something that would cause damage.

PB member Clough asked if on page 9 in Section VI 1. “disapproved” should be “denied”. All agreed that the term should be “denied”. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that Section VI 4 Enforcement must conform to the RSA language that provides for some “other designee” to have authority. He said that the PB needed to revise all regulations to conform to the RSAs. Chair Ebel recommended that Mr. McWilliams should get the appropriate wording from town counsel. Mr. Stanley emphasized that regulations needed to provide the ability for the Board of Selectmen to delegate authority to some other official.

PB member Cottrill asked about the “20 feet” reference on page 7 in Item L. Steep Slopes. Zoning Administrator Stanley explained that it refers to the change in elevation over a distance of 20 feet.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

A. MINUTES of the SEPTEMBER 12, 2006 MEETING were APPROVED, as circulated.

B. MINUTES of the SEPTEMBER 26, 2006 MEETING were APPROVED, as circulated.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **10:15 PM**.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____