

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
JANUARY 29, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Dale Conly, Celeste Cook, Tom Cottrill, Michael Doheny, Larry Ballin (Selectmen's Representative), Alternate Michele Holton, and Kenneth McWilliams (Planner).

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jeff Hollinger and Alternate Deirdre Sheerr-Gross

Chair Karen Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM. Chair Ebel asked Alternate Michele Holton to sit in for Jeff Hollinger.

I. SECOND PUBLIC HEARING ON ZONING AMENDMENT NO. 11 PROPOSED BY THE PLANNING BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE VOTERS IN MARCH 2008

Chair Ebel opened the Public Hearing by outlining the procedures to be followed in discussing the proposed amendments. She advised that only one of the amendments proposed by the Planning Board had been carried forward to a second public hearing. She further advised members of the audience that copies of the revised proposed amendment had been made available on the town website and in the selectmen's office. Chair Ebel explained that the document showed the changes to the zoning amendment by a combination of **highlighting** the proposed new language and ~~striking out~~ the existing language to be deleted.

Chair Ebel said that, if there were no objections, she would dispense with the reading aloud of the proposed amendment. Hearing no objection, she proceeded with the hearing.

AMENDMENT NO. 11- ARTICLE XVI SHORE LAND OVERLAY DISTRICT. The amendment would amend the Town's Shore Land Overlay District in Article XVI primarily to correspond with the stricter provisions of the new amendments to the State's Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act. Major changes include incorporating the new state provisions on waterfront buffer and impervious surfaces.

Chair Ebel advised that the revision related to Article XVI. Section G. Waterfront Buffer, paragraph 2.c. regarding the requirement that a minimum combined tree and sapling score of at least 50 points must be retained as written by the state. She explained that the amendment, as initially proposed, would have given one (1) credit point, toward the minimum of 50 points, for mature shrubs. She said that provision would have made the New London Zoning Ordinance less restrictive than the state statute, and town regulations could not be less restrictive than state regulations. She explained that that had necessitated the second hearing on this provision being held that night.

Chair Ebel said that subsequent to the first public hearing, Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley had contacted her in regard to another problem with the proposed amendment. She asked Zoning Administrator Stanley to explain the issue he raised. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that the issue related to the calculation of the maximum of 20% impervious surface permitted in the Shore Land Overlay District. He said that the Shore Land Overlay District established by the New London Zoning Ordinance extended to a line 300 feet inland from the Reference Line; whereas under the newly adopted state statute, the Shoreland Overlay District extended 250 feet inland from the Reference Line. He said that the state would allow 20% impervious surface in the 250-ft. area, but New London would apply the 20% maximum to a 300-ft. area. He used a simplified calculation to illustrate that the amount of impervious surface allowed could then exceed the state's 20% maximum because the builder could choose to use the entire amount of impervious surface permitted by the New London proposal within 250 feet. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that because neither set of regulations allowed any increase in the amount of storm water run-off, and because the proposed amendment would require an Erosion Control plan, the issue he had raised was not an overwhelming issue; however, he said that it deemed it appropriate to bring the matter the PB's attention. He noted that currently the New London Zoning Ordinance permitted 20% impervious surface within 300 feet from the Reference Line and the state allowance of 20% within 250 of the Reference Line would become effective on April 1, 2008.

Chair Ebel recommended that the PB place the amendment on the ballot as proposed, rather than pull it, because it was not feasible to leave the old regulation as is. It was in conflict with the new state statute and would be too confusing for those trying to comply with the law. She further explained that the issue would be nullified when the newly adopted state law goes into effect because it would supersede the tiny glitch in New London's law.

She said there was no time to take the matter to a third hearing which would be necessitated by an additional substantive change in the amendment. PB member Conly said that the PB had already agreed to study the matter during the next year, so there might be additional changes anyway as the state and the town see how new provisions work out in the field. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that there would be “lots of good data” available within six months. He said that out of five parcels currently under review, only one seemed to contain more than 20% impervious surface in the buffer area.

PB member Doheny said that section D. General Provisions 3. seemed to conflict with section E. Specific Provisions for Residential Development with regard to waterfront access. He asked which section was correct. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied that both were correct. He said that section E created the methodology to address the provisions contained in section D. Ken McWilliams explained section E more fully.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Holton) **TO PLACE THE REVISED PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 11 ON THE BALLOT FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE VOTERS IN MARCH 2008.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

II. BILL DEGNAN – 14 CARROTS – Concept Site Plan Review: Need for Site Plan Review?

(Tax Map 59, Lot 8)

Mr. and Mrs. Degnan were both present. Mr. Degnan advised that they would like to have three tables providing six seats inside 14 Carrots. He said there would be no changes inside. He said that the three tables would make up a total of six seats. He showed where the counter would be cut off and where the bathroom would be relocated. He explained that the space was needed to provide handicapped accessibility. He said that they would use an old existing sewer line for the relocated bathroom.

Chair Ebel asked if any issues had been raised at the meeting with municipal department heads. Ken McWilliams responded that several of the departments wanted to have a floor plan. In regard to parking, Mr. McWilliams said that there had been six (6) seats outside for quite some time; however, they had never been approved by means of a Site Plan Review (SPR). He said that the department heads had discussed with the Degnans the concept of moving those six outside seats to the inside during the winter. Mrs. Degnan said that they really didn't want to change anything. She said that patrons currently stand at the counter and eat their “take-out” food. She opined that since the majority of customers took their purchases out to their cars to eat, there would be no impact on parking or traffic.

Chair Ebel noted that the parking requirement would increase to three (3) spaces. Mrs. Degnan asked for an explanation of the increase. Mr. McWilliams advised that currently the parking requirement for 14 Carrots was based upon the standards for a retail business. He said that the parking requirement for retail business was one space per 1000 sq. ft. of floor space, with a minimum of five (5) parking spaces. He explained that adding a “take-out” food operation would make them subject to the Restaurant with Take-out parking requirement that there be one parking space for every two seats. Mr. Degnan said that 14 Carrots was eligible for 10 parking spaces. Mr. McWilliams responded that adding three tables with six seats inside, in addition to the existing three tables with six seats outside, would increase the number of parking spaces required to 12 spaces. Chair Ebel pointed out that a SPR of parking would not be only for 14 Carrots, but would be for the entire shopping center. Mr. McWilliams opined that keeping the total seating to six (6), which would require three (3) parking spaces, would seem to be the most reasonable approach.

PB member Holton opined that being able to sit down while they eat would aid the digestion of patrons. PB member Conly recommended that in bad weather the six seats could be located inside and in good weather they could be moved outside. Mr. and Mrs. Degnan agreed. PB member Ballin asked if the proposal would be subject to any oversight by the NH Department of Health. Mr. Degnan replied that he had already consulted with state officials.

It was **MOVED** (Holton) and **SECONDED** (Doheny) **THAT NO SITE PLAN REVIEW BE REQUIRED FOR THE ADDITION OF THREE TABLES HAVING A TOTAL OF SIX SEATS INSIDE 14 CARROTS (TAX MAP 59, LOT 8), CONTINGENT UPON THE TOTAL NUMBER OF SEATS ON THE SITE NOT EXCEEDING SIX (6).** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

III. 177 & 159 POOR ROAD REALTY TRUST – Final Annexation

(Tax Map 91, Lot 5 & Tax Map 90, Lot 1)

Michele Holton recused herself from the PB.

Clayton Platt (Pennyroyal Hill, Land Surveying & Forestry, LLC) presented a request by property owners, Katherine Kellogg and Mr. Peeler, to annex a portion of a larger lot they own to a smaller lot they own. He advised that both parcels were lots of record and both contained pre-existing, non-conforming structures. Mr. Platt told the PB that Ms Kellogg and Mr. Peeler had purchased the two lots and now wanted to make changes that would be benefitted by having 365 feet of lake frontage in the larger lot and 152 feet of lake frontage in the smaller lot. He said the plan was to annex a portion of the larger lot to the smaller lot, thereby increasing the smaller, non-conforming lot's lake frontage from 141 feet to 152 feet. Mr. Platt advised that the resulting lots would conform to the state requirement for 150 feet of shorefront per dwelling unit.

Ken McWilliams advised that no issues had been raised at the meeting with municipal department heads.

Michael Todd advised that he represented the Administrative Trust for John Coughlin (Tax Map 90, Lot2). He stated the first notice that the trust had received relative to the proposed annexation was the notice for Final Annexation. Ken McWilliams responded that the notice of Final Annexation was the only notice that had been issued. Mr. Todd asked for a copy of the plan under review. Mr. Platt gave him a copy.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Doheny) **THAT THE FINAL ANNEXATION PLAN FOR TAX MAP 91, LOT 5 & TAX MAP 90, LOT 1 BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED.**
The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Michele Holton returned to the PB

IV. COLBY-SAWYER COLLEGE – Concept Site Plan Review: Add Bedrooms in the Basement of Three Residence Halls & Add a New 30 –Space Parking Lot
(Tax Map 85, Lot 33)

Tom Galligan, President of Colby-Sawyer College, was accompanied by Douglas Atkins, Colby-Sawyer's Vice-President for Administration, and Stephen Jesseman and Richard Fink from Jesseman Associates, P.C.

President Galligan advised the PB that the college had enrolled its largest class ever last September when 378 new students matriculated and the goal for September 2008 was to enroll another 355 new students. He said that after many years in which the percentage of students living in residence halls remained at 87-88%, more students were choosing to live on campus. He said that in fall 2007, 91% of the students chose to live on campus. President Galligan advised that the plan was to convert space in the basements of three residence halls to provide for 40 additional beds. He said that there would be 15 new beds in Colby Hall, 10 in McKean Hall, and 15 in Shepard. He advised that the college had traditionally calculated required parking on the basis of 0.7 parking spaces for each bed. He said that the plan before the PB was to add 30 parking spaces

Richard Fink demonstrated the locations of Colby, McKean, and Shepard Residence Halls. He said that the college would have to provide emergency egress from the basements of the halls; therefore, it was proposing external staircases. He said that foundation drains would have to be installed in areas where there were none, and it would be necessary to add attenuation (fire alarm) features. Mr. Fink advised that the design had been reviewed with municipal department heads, and the review had focused on life safety, water and sewer tie-ins, and health issues. He said that the plan was for the same type of use; however, the number of beds would increase.

Mr. Fink advised that the college was proposing to construct 30 additional parking spaces adjacent to Lot M by creating a new Lot O toward the east and Colby Farm. He said the original design was for 30 90-degree spaces; however, the college was now looking at 60-degree-angled parking instead. He said the plan was to have 26 internal spaces with four additional spaces. Mr. Fink said that the municipal department heads had asked the college to investigate the possibility of adding even more spaces. He pointed out on the plan an area where additional spaces could be located. He advised that the college currently had a total of 753 parking spaces on campus. He said that he had reviewed the history of parking and had collected data regarding usage. He said that in 1993 there were 170 faculty and staff and 659 students of whom 38% registered cars. He said that in

2000 there were 234 faculty and staff and 852 students of whom 60% registered cars, and in 2007 there were 247 faculty and staff and 1052 students of whom 66% registered cars. He pointed out the very large increase in the number of students registering vehicles. He reviewed the parking demand and availability percentages and advised that the estimate of 0.7 spaces per bed was chosen as the mid-point.

PB member Ballin asked what the existing deficit in the number of parking spaces was. He noted that the available 753 parking spaces were not adequate to accommodate parking by both employees and students. PB member Cottrill asked if the issue was that there more parking permits than there were spaces. President Galligan corrected the fall 2007 enrollment number that should have been 952, not 1052. He said that they did not have the number of deficient spaces, but they would be able to come up with it. PB member Doheny asked if the Commuter Lot C was restricted to only commuters. President Galligan responded that it was, although others sometimes parked there. Chair Ebel inquired about the location of Lot C. PB member Cottrill pointed it out on the plan.

PB member Cook asked who owned all the cars that parked along Main Street. PB member Cottrill opined that they were faculty and staff cars. Ms Cook asked if there were a faculty parking lot. She was advised of the locations for faculty parking. PB member Ballin asked about parking for Hogan. PB member Cottrill opined that if there were 80 commuters, there needed to be 80 parking spaces. Douglas Atkins responded that not all commuters and staff were on campus on the same time. Mr. Fink said that the same could be said of faculty and staff. PB member Cottrill asked what the current parking load was. Was every space filled all of the time? He said that he often saw empty spaces in Lot K. Stephen Jesseman said that some students parked on the grass creating illegal spaces. PB member Cottrill asked if the proposed new spaces would be used, even though they would be closer that Lot K.

PB member Cottrill asked what would happen to the stone wall shown on the plan where the proposed additional parking would be constructed. Mr. Jesseman replied that the stone wall might disappear. Mr. Atkins said that the college was trying to bring the Colby Farm building into the campus and removing the barrier of the stone wall would aide in that endeavor. He added that at the present time there was no lighted access from the campus to the building and that would also be addressed by lighting in the parking area. PB members Ballin and Cook asked about the rectangular area shown in the middle of the proposed additional parking. Mr. Fink replied that it was the Ivey chiller.

PB member Cottrill asked what plans the college had for the lot where Seamans Alumni House stood. President Galligan replied that the space would be left open for now. PB member Conly recommended that the college consider using pervious surfaces, like the hospital recently did, in its parking lots. President Galligan responded that the college was looking at all of the options. Mr. Fink said that even if the pervious surface idea did not work, there were many other Low Impact Development (LID) options available that they were considering, several of which were not even in the recent update to the New London Site Plan Review (SPR) regulations. PB member Cook wanted to know how many light poles there would be in the new parking area.

Chair Ebel said that at the meeting with municipal department heads, there had been a discussion about increasing the number of new parking spaces to 40. She advised that parking had always been an issue. PB Cottrill questioned whether the parking spaces would be used. He opined that the proposed increase would not alleviate parking on Main Street. He said that it did not appear as if Lot K was presently used to capacity. President Galligan responded that many students needed their cars for their internships; thus, leaving spaces open during the day. He said that the parking lots were "permitted" up to capacity; although some spaces were open during the day. PB member Cottrill asked why increase the amount of impervious surface and lose a stone wall to create a parking lot that would not be fully utilized. PB members Doheny, Cottrill, and Ebel asked the college to consider retaining, but moving the stone wall, rather than removing it entirely. Mr. Jesseman responded that the option could be considered in designing parking. Chair Ebel noted that the college probably wanted to avoid having Colby Farm marooned beyond a sea of asphalt and little touches like the stone wall could help. PB member Cottrill asked about the possibility of adding parking along the access road to the tennis courts instead of eliminating the stone wall. Mr. Fink replied that they tried to avoid remote parking spaces. Chair Ebel asked that the data Mr. Fink collected regarding parking be made available to the PB by letter or memo. Mr. Fink agreed to provide it. Mr. Fink said that he did not know exactly how many faculty and staff permits there were. He opined that many would have more than one permit, because more than one car would be registered to give the staff person flexibility regarding which car s/he decided to drive to work. He said that

adding 30 new beds, and using a standard of 0.7 parking spaces per bed, indicated that 28 additional parking spaces would be required. He said that calculation formed the basis for the college's proposal to add 30 new parking spaces. PB member Cottrill pointed out that the college also had a parking area across Seamans Road from Sawyer Center.

Mr. Jesseman said that the college was also thinking about future plans as it considered the parking issue. President Galligan advised that the college would not be averse to increasing the number of new parking spaces by 10, thus making a total of 40 new spaces. PB member Conly complimented the college on the parking made available for the Hogan Sports Center. He told President Galligan that the sports center was a great resource for the community, as was the college library.

Brian Prescott opined that for functions held at Hogan, parking near Hogan seemed to be more logical than parking in a remote space. President Galligan said that the fact that some students go away on weekends relieves some of the parking demand. Mr. Jesseman advised that there was a steep bank near Lot M and that some cars had gone over the bank because the drivers thought that the road continued. He said that the college would be installing guard rails to prevent that from happening in the future.

PB member Cottrill said that the PB had talked with the college at other times about the parking on Main Street obstructing the line of sight for cars exiting from Squires Lane onto Main Street. Mr. Atkins responded that the Board of Selectmen would need to talk with the NH Department of Transportation about sight lines and moving the "No Parking" signs further from the corner.

PB member Ballin asked if the increase in the number of students would impact on the water and sewer capacity. Mr. Jesseman responded that the college might have to increase the size of the sewer pipe to the first manhole on Main Street. He said that Director of Public Works Richard Lee really wanted the college to install foundation drains. Ken McWilliams added that Director Lee also wanted the installation of grease traps for the kitchenettes in each dorm. Mr. Fink advised that the residence halls would continue to house all of the same services, i.e. student rooms, laundry facilities, kitchenettes, etc. Mr. Jesseman told the PB that the basements once had been used as living space.

Chair Ebel asked Fire Chief Jay Lyon if he wanted to make any comments. He said that the college knew that it needed to have plans for egress from the basements, expand the existing sprinkler systems, compartmentalize kitchens and laundries, and expand window egress.

Mr. McWilliams advised that at the meeting with municipal department heads there had been discussion regarding parking layout options, e.g., angle parking rather than 90-degree parking would allow space for landscaping. Mr. Fink advised that there were already three light poles in that area and they wanted to provide protection for those poles. President Galligan reiterated that parking close by and the accompanying lighting would make the Colby Farm more accessible.

Mr. Jesseman emphasized that the 0.7 parking spaces per bed was a documented, established standard, and he wanted the record to reflect that. He said that he didn't want a 1:1 parking space requirement, e.g., 40 beds: 40 spaces. Chair Ebel and PB members Ballin and Cottrill responded that the PB did not want to adopt the 0.7-spaces/bed standard proposed because it would be too rigid. The PB needed to retain flexibility when reviewing the college's proposals. Mr. Ballin advised that there appeared to be parking deficiencies already and that was why the PB was urging the college to increase the number of new spaces to 40. President Galligan agreed to add 10 parking spaces to the 30 new spaces proposed originally.

V. REVIEW OF THE BALLOT FOR THE 2008 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE NEW LONDON ZONING ORDINANCE

Ken McWilliams advised that the rationale for each of the proposed amendments was the part to be reviewed. PB member Ballin said that the Kearsarge Regional School District had advised that it was not legally permitted to include rationale on its ballots. Mr. McWilliams responded that including rationale for zoning amendments was provided for in the R.S.A.s.

- A. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1: Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley recommended striking “structural” in line one. Chair Ebel recommended striking “to” and replacing “the improvements” with “those” in line two. It was noted that the word Alter should be enclosed in quotation marks, i.e. “Alter”.
- B. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2: Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley recommended replacing “for” with “of” in line one. PB member Ballin said that Resident Matthew Bemis was still concerned about the rights-of-way for utilities on his property and whether the proposed setbacks would apply to those. Ken McWilliams responded that he had met with Mr. Bemis that day. PB member Ballin sought confirmation that the setbacks would not apply to a utility right-of-way. Mr. McWilliams replied that they would not. PB member Holton asked if Mr. Bemis could not file a corrective deed removing “right-of-way” and replacing it with “easement”. Mr. McWilliams replied that filing a corrective deed would be possible.
- C. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 3: Resident Brian Prescott asked for an explanation of the purpose of the proposed amendment. Zoning Administrator Stanley responded that the amendment would clarify that the distance for the Side Yard setback is measured from the primary structure. He recommended that “the lot that establishes the minimum side yard setback” be replaced by “a lot from which the minimum Side Yard setback is measured”. PB members recommended that the second sentence be deleted.
- D. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4: Zoning Administrator Stanley recommended deleting “voluntary replacement and”. PB member Cottrill recommended deleting “potential”.
- E. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 5: Zoning Administrator Stanley recommended replacing “used in other districts” with “as used elsewhere”. PB member Cottrill said that the terms Street and Right-of-Way should be in quotation marks. He also recommended replacing “on corner Lot” with “regarding corner Lots” at the end of the sentence.
- F. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 6: Recommended the same revision as in the preceding amendment.
- G. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 7: Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley recommended that the rationale refer to “raising and keeping” animals. Chair Ebel recommended using only “keeping” animals. PB member Cottrill asked why the reference to Agriculture had been included. He questioned defining “Agriculture” by using the term “agriculture”. Chair Ebel said that the amendment re-defined “Agriculture”. Mr. McWilliams said that the amendment provided a revised definition of “Agriculture”. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that he received many inquiries regarding how many animals could be kept. He said the proposed amendment would provide some guidelines. PB members recommended revising the first sentence by replacing “add provisions pertaining to Agriculture and the raising” with “revising the definition of Agriculture, including specific provisions regarding the keeping”. PB members recommended deleting the second sentence in the rationale.
- H. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 8: No changes
- I. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 9: Change “in order for citizens to” to “so citizens will”
- J. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 10: PB member Cottrill asked how many institutions would be affected by the proposed amendment. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied that there were two, Colby-Sawyer College and New London Hospital. PB member Ballin asked about the Kearsarge Regional School District. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied that the town had no jurisdiction over the school district, which falls under the jurisdiction of the state. PB member Cottrill recommended deleting “institutional” and inserting “Colby-Sawyer College and New London Hospital”. Mr. Ballin asked if Site Plan Review would be required. Mr. Stanley responded affirmatively. He said that the institution would need a comprehensive plan.
- K. PB PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 11: PB member Cottrill asked if applicants would not need a permit from the state and wasn’t the amendment just complying with state law. PB recommended changing “correspond with” to “conform to” in the first sentence. At the end of the second sentence, change “buffer and impervious surfaces” to “buffers and restrictions on impervious surfaces on shore land lots”.

IV. MASTER PLAN

Chair Ebel told PB members that the PB was being urged to add an Energy chapter to the Master Plan. She advised that the recommendation had come out of the Vision Workshops. Chair Ebel said that there were two issues to consider: (1) whether or not to include an Energy chapter and (2) whether a new chapter would be included in the PB's contract with Ken McWilliams.

PB member Ballin asked if the topic couldn't be included in another chapter, e.g., Utilities. Ken McWilliams responded that the new Energy Committee envisioned a comprehensive effort. He advised that a new chapter would not be included in the town's contract with the planner. It would need to be added to the "scope of services" and budget. He opined that it was a timely topic and had a lot of support from workshop attendees. He said there was interest in alternatives and initiatives. He said that he would have no problem adding a new chapter, but it opined that the work should be compensated.

PB member Ballin advised that the Energy Committee was very active. He suggested that it might be able to do most of the "leg work". Chair Ebel said that there was lots of enthusiasm for adding a chapter on energy, and she opined that it should be addressed. PB member Cook agreed. PB member Ballin suggested asking the Energy Committee to propose a draft. He advised that the Board of Selectmen did not want to increase the Master Plan budget to cover the cost of a new chapter. Mr. McWilliams said that he would not be willing to modify the approved contract to include a new chapter without compensation. He reminded the PB that the contract specifically outlines the chapters to be included, the scope of the work for each chapter, and the compensation to be paid for each chapter. He stated that the contract says if there is more work, there will be more compensation. He said that Town Administrator Jessie Levine had opined that an energy chapter could be included in the existing contract.

PB member Ballin said that he would talk with the Board of Selectmen and the Energy Committee. Chair Ebel said that the committee could do a lot of work. Mr. McWilliams cautioned the PB about depending upon volunteer committees to meet deadlines and that sometimes they created more work, rather than less. PB member Conly opined that Mr. McWilliams' compensation should increase if a new chapter were to be added to the Master Plan. Chair Ebel noted that Mr. McWilliams had already conducted an additional workshop without charging any additional fee. She said that Town Administrator Levine had advised that there was a lot of interest in having chapters on telecommunications and energy. Chair Ebel said this was clear at the most recent Master Plan workshop, but that a whole chapter on telecommunications was probably unnecessary. It was the sense of the PB that the telecommunications/technology information could be included in the Utilities chapter and would be included in the contract as executed.

Mr. McWilliams distributed copies of the 1996 Community Survey for PB review prior to discussion of suggestions regarding topics and questions at the February 12 Work Session.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. The MINUTES of the JANUARY 8, 2008 meeting were APPROVED, as amended.
- B. GUTGSELL & PHIPPS, DDS (Tax Map 59, Lot 1) PB member Ballin advised that Gutsell & Phipps, DDS had not contacted the Board of Selectmen regarding approval of a security deposit, as provided for by the PB at its January 8, 2008 meeting.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **9:45 PM**.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____

