

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
MAY 27, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Dale Conly, Tom Cottrill, Michael Doheny, Jeff Hollinger, Ken McWilliams (Planner), Larry Ballin (Selectmen's Representative), Michele Holton (Alternate), Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate).

MEMBER ABSENT: Celeste Cook

Chairman Karen Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM. She asked Alternate PB Member Deirdre Sheerr-Gross to sit in as replacement for Celeste Cook.

I. BRUCE & SHIRLEY AVERY – Final Site Plan Review: Home Business (Tax Map 49, Lot 3)

Bruce and Shirley Avery were both present. Mr. Avery explained that the Pleasant Lake Protective Association (PLPA) has had a site for selling PLPA logo materials at its annual meetings for a number of years. He said that there had been requests for merchandise to be available for purchase at other times during the year. Mr. Avery said that the proposal was to have a virtual store selling PLPA logo clothing that could be ordered via e-mail or telephone. He said that orders would be picked up at the Avery home at 780 Pleasant Street by appointment only. Mr. Avery advised that merchandise would be advertised on the PLPA website, in PLPA newsletters, and through e-mails to PLPA members.

Mr. Avery emphasized that the 780 Pleasant Street site would be used solely for merchandise pick-up, not for display and sale of merchandise. He said there would be no signage, and there would be no employees. He advised that the unfinished basement contained 1644 sq. ft. and the area used for storage of PLPA merchandise would not be bigger than 25 sq. ft. He said that there were four parking spaces available on the site; however, he did not foresee a need for parking for longer than it would take someone to pick up an order.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present who would like to speak. No one responded. Chair Ebel called the PB's attention to a letter from abutters Joan and Don Lamson stating that they had no objection to the proposal.

Ken McWilliams opined that the proposed use was innocuous. He advised that it was the occasional pick up of merchandise that made the proposal use a home business rather than a home occupation. Chair Ebel noted that Fire Chief Jay Lyon was present and asked if he had any comments. Fire Chief Lyon said that there would have to be signs for egress and interconnected smoke detectors.

It was **MOVED** (Ballin) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE APPLICATION FOR A HOME BUSINESS AT 780 PLEASANT STREET (TAX MAP 49, LOT 3) FOR STORAGE AND PICK UP OF MERCHANDISE BEARING THE PLEASANT LAKE PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION LOGO BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY BRUCE AND SHIRLEY AVERY. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

II. WILLIAM & BARBARA GREEN – Final Annexation (Tax Map 120, Lots 3 & 2-004)

Barbara Green presented the final mylar showing the proposed change in property line for the PB to sign. She said that they had received approval from NH Department of Environmental Services (DES) for the subdivision. She presented the approval for PB review. Ken McWilliams and PB members said they were puzzled by the DES form that appeared to be approval of the lot for a septic system. Ms Green said that there were no plans to build or install septic systems on the property. She explained that a lot line would be extended to add one-third of an acre to a triangular piece of property.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present. There were none.

It was **MOVED** (Sheerr-Gross) and **SECONDED** (Ballin) **THAT THE PROPOSED FINAL ANNEXATION PLAN FOR THE WILLIAM D. GREEN, JR. REVOCABLE TRUST & WILLIAM D. GREEN, JR. & BARBARA D. GREEN (TAX MAP 120, LOTS 3 & 2-004) BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The mylar was circulated for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

III. MARILYN KIDDER MARITAL TRUST – Concept Subdivision (Tax Map 101, Lot 9)

PB Member Sheerr-Gross recused herself. Chair Ebel asked Alternate PB Member Holton to sit in for PB Member Cook.

Marilyn Kidder was accompanied by Pierre Bedard (Pierre J. Bedard & Associates, P.C.). Mr. Bedard read aloud his letter to the PB dated May 12, 2008 requesting that the proposed subdivision be reviewed as a minor subdivision.

Chair Ebel advised that under New London's Land Subdivision Control Regulations, a minor subdivision can only have a total of three or fewer lots within a 5-year period. She noted that the proposal before the PB indicated that Ms Kidder wanted to subdivide the property into four lots within five years, thus changing the proposed subdivision from a minor subdivision to a major subdivision. She advised that a major subdivision had many more requirements than a minor subdivision.

Ken McWilliams, Town Planner, advised that the PB had two options: (1) it could require that the proposal be submitted as a major subdivision and then determine which items in the major subdivision final application requirements were applicable. He read over the list, and opined that the only applicable requirement above and beyond those required for a minor subdivision would be an Impact Assessment, or (2) it could waive the requirement that the minor subdivision be limited to three lots within a five-year period.

Fire Chief Jay Lyon advised that with anything three lots or over, the Fire Department required that there be an adequate source of water for fire protection available within 1500 feet. He said that the water supply in the area of the proposed subdivision was very limited, and the Fire Department would like adequate water available for fire suppression. He said that he would like a requirement for a cistern or fire pond if the third lot was subdivided, regardless of whether the subdivision was treated as minor or major.

New London Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley opined that when the property was originally subdivided, the two lots were not to be developed. Pierre Bedard disagreed. Zoning Administrator Stanley urged the PB to be cautious about "subdivision creep". Mr. Bedard responded that the intent of the previous subdivision had been to sell the first two lots to finance the project.

Fire Chief Lyon reiterated that there was certainly a lack of water in that area. He opined that a requirement that there be an adequate water supply for fire suppression should be part of any PB approval. Ken McWilliams advised that the minor subdivision application requirements allow for the PB to require other information to be provided as it deems necessary in order to evaluate the subdivision.

Chair Ebel asked if Will Kidder would be willing to represent to the PB in a legally-binding document that the fourth lot would not be built upon within five years. PB Member Conly said that the PB wanted some assurance/agreement that there would be no development of the fourth lot in the five-year period. Mr. McWilliams said that a note to that effect could be put on the plat.

PB Member Doheny said that he was concerned about a waiver of the requirement. Chair Ebel said that the PB would need to have a letter stating that the fourth lot would not be developed and there would have to be a provision requiring an adequate water supply for fire suppression. She asked Fire Chief Lyon for any additional comments. Fire Chief Lyon responded that the Fire Department requirement applied to subdivisions of three or more lots.

Marilyn Kidder said that the purpose of the proposed subdivision was to provide a building lot to each of her sons, Will and Putnam. She said that Putnam and his wife wanted to build a home on the property in the near future; however, Will had no plans to build within the five-year timeframe. She said that she didn't have to subdivide now; she could come back at some future time. Fire Chief Lyon opined that the applicant would be ducking the requirement. He said that if she were to wait, the State might adopt private residential sprinkler requirement in the meantime. He opined that the rationale had to be fair and equal for all people who subdivide. Ms Kidder responded that it was not practical. Chair Ebel said that the issue was really one that needed to be resolved between the Kidders and the Fire Department.

Chair Ebel said that the PB would be willing to waive the requirement that the plan be considered a major subdivision if the Kidders presented a letter stating that there would be no development on lot four before 2011.

PB Alternate Sheerr-Gross returned to the PB in place of PB Member Cook, and PB Alternate Holton stepped down.

IV. CATE FAMILY NH REALTY TRUST – Final Major Subdivision-4 Lots (Tax Map 103, Lot 2-1)

Erin Darrow, P.E. (Darrow Civil Engineering, P.L.L.C.), Delavan Cate, Mark & Vaughan Grubbs were present.

Erin Darrow advised that the proposal was to subdivide 42.9 acres into four lots to be accessed via two driveways. She said there would be wetlands crossings and NH Department of Environmental Services (DES) approval had been received for the crossings and for a fire pond. Ms Darrow said that the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) was reviewing a request for a Special Exception regarding the location a fire pond. She said that the fire pond would also benefit the lots 103-1 and 103-2-2 owned by other Cate family members. She advised that the goal of the proposed subdivision was to provide each of four siblings with a building lot and enough land to meet "current use" requirements.

Ms Darrow advised that the applicants were requesting additional waivers of sections of the Land Subdivision Control Regulations. She said that they were requesting a waiver of the requirement in Section VI. K. 1. for bounds at all property corners and a waiver of Section VI. K. 2. Requirement for stone monuments. She proposed using iron pins for monuments instead of granite posts. Ms Darrow said that they were also seeking a waiver of Section V. B. 3. B. 8. Fiscal impact statement analyzing the impact of the subdivision on municipal, school, and county revenues and expenditures, including estimated potential tax revenue and estimated number of school children. Ms Darrow advised that two of the siblings were building house now and the other two had no plans to build, but wanted to keep the option open. She said that they were trying to keep the cost of the project down.

Ms Darrow read through the waivers requested in her May 9, 2008 letter to the PB. Those waiver requests and the reasons for the requests were:

LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS SECTION V – APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS. Sub-Section B. MAJOR SUBDIVISION – FINAL APPLICATION. Paragraph 7. Maps, Sub-paragraph a. Final Survey Plat. A waiver was sought to utilize iron pipes in lieu of granite monuments for the survey monuments.

LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS Section V – APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS. Sub-Section B. MAJOR SUBDIVISION – FINAL APPLICATION. Paragraph 7. Maps, Sub-paragraphs b. Topographic Map & c. Soils Map. A waiver was sought from the requirement of showing the topography and high-intensity soil survey for the entire property. Topographic site data and the soil survey information was shown on the design plans that illustrated that each proposed lot met or exceeded the minimum design requirements. The areas for which this information had been gathered and was shown were the locations of the future house sites. There was a large amount of land area, which would remain untouched, which would be difficult to survey and would be of undue expense to the owner for little public benefit.

LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS SECTION V – APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS. Sub-Section B. MAJOR SUBDIVISION – FINAL APPLICATION. Paragraph 8. Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan and Paragraph 9. Stormwater Management Plan. A waiver was sought from the requirement of providing a detailed engineer report showing a Stormwater Management Plan and Sedimentation and Erosion Control Plans, including V.B.9.b.10-13 because the Drainage Maps, and Fire and Utilities Plans, and the Sediment and Erosion Control plans detailed the stormwater design already.

LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS SECTION V – APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS. Sub-Section B. MAJOR SUBDIVISION – FINAL APPLICATION. Paragraph 10. Drainage construction plans and details. , Sub-paragraph a. The information shown on the proposed subdivision design maps illustrated the proposed conditions of the future culvert in enough detail to satisfy the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) and for future construction.

LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS SECTION V – APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS. Sub-Section B. MAJOR SUBDIVISION – FINAL APPLICATION. Paragraph 16. Agency or Permit Approvals, Sub-paragraph a. An Access Permit from the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). Driveway access and trench permits were being reviewed by NHDOT. It was anticipated that approvals would be in place in time for the Public Hearing of this application. If not, a conditional approval was requested pending final approval by the NHDOT.

Ms Darrow advised that each lot exceeded requirements of the New London Land Subdivision Control Regulations and the requirements for which waivers were being sought would place undue burden on the property owners. In regard to the erosion and sediment control plan requirements, she said that NHDES had approved the plans and the fire pond had been modified at the request of NHDES. Ms Darrow advised that the driveway permits were still being reviewed by NHDES; therefore, conditional approval was being requested.

Ken McWilliams advised that in the plan set distributed there were three sheets that presented data on sediment control and one sheet regarding erosion control that presented a great deal of data.

Chair Ebel stated that she would really like to have fiscal impact data and was inclined to deny that waiver request. PB Member Sheerr-Gross concurred.

PB Member Ballin opined that, in view of current technology, the PB might want to review its requirements for granite monuments rather than iron pins. Ms Darrow responded that iron pins could be moved more easily, but could not be set in granite easily. She said that if the monuments were metal, they could be located more easily because of the iron content. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley opined that metal content did permit one to locate boundary pins more easily.

Ms Darrow said that the applicant was requesting a waiver of Section VI. STANDARDS FOR SUBDIVISION DESIGN. Sub-Section K. BOUNDS. Paragraph 1. Locations. She advised that there were permanent standing turn-bearing monuments shown on the plat at each property line corner rather than the several that would be required by the regulations. Chair Ebel reminded PB members that the approach described had been approved by the PB during Preliminary Site Plan Review (SPR).

PB Member Sheerr-Gross asked for clarification of Ms Darrow's statement regarding the size of the proposed lots. Ms Darrow explained.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Hollinger) **THAT THE REQUEST FOR WAIVERS OF NEW LONDON LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS SECTION V. SUB-SECTION B. BE APPROVED AS PROPOSED IN MS DARROW'S LETTER OF MAY 9, 2008 AND THAT THE REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL WAIVERS OF SECTION VI. SUB-SECTION K. PARAGRAPHS 1 AND 2 BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED, BUT THE ADDITIONAL REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF SECTION V.**

SUB-SECTION B, PARAGRAPH 3. SUB-PARAGRAPH B. 8. RE A FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT NOT BE GRANTED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resident Harry Blunt, owner of Dartmouth Coach Lines, asked if the Cates would be returning to the PB in two weeks time. Ms Darrow replied that the Cates were still in need of a Special Exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) regarding the location of the proposed fire pond near wetlands.

Chair Ebel advised that the Cate Application for Final Major Subdivision had not yet been deemed complete.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY CATE FAMILY NH REALTY TRUST FOR A FINAL MAJOR SUBDIVISION OF FOUR LOTS BE DEEMED COMPLETE. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

PB Member Ballin asked Ms Darrow what her correct address was. He said that the materials contained two different addresses for Darrow Civil Engineering. Ms Darrow replied that the business had recently relocated which accounted for some of the materials having different addresses.

Abutter Shelby Blunt (Tax Map 91, Lot 16) inquired about the chronology of the application review. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley responded that the Cates were seeking a Special Exception from the ZBA for the fire pond location. He advised that they already had been granted a permit by NHDES. Ms Blunt asked what the criteria were. Zoning Administrator Stanley responded. Ken McWilliams added that the Special Exception must be approved prior to the Final Site Plan Review by the PB.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. McWilliams about any issues raised at the meeting with municipal department heads. He reported that Zoning Administrator Stanley had noted that the plan showed building envelopes on lots 4 and 5 and said that any future development in the rear of the property would require additional review. It was noted that the 103-2 driveway should be shown on the plan instead of the prior driveway. Mr. McWilliams said that there had been several questions regarding the proposed Covenants. He asked Ms Darrow if she was prepared to go through the questions with the PB at that time. Ms Darrow replied that she might have to go back and forth with the attorney before further PB review. Chair Ebel advised that if the PB formed a subcommittee to review the plan, the PB would not be able to grant final approval that night. Delavan Cate said that he wanted the covenants to be right, even if it required more time. Chair Ebel and PB Member Doheny volunteered to be on a subcommittee to review the covenants. PB Member Doheny asked when the subcommittee should meet. Mr. McWilliams recommended that the meeting take place "the sooner, the better". Mark Grubbs advised that he could come up for a subcommittee meeting. Discussion ensued regarding a meeting time and the need to check on the availability of Sara Denz to take Minutes of the meeting. Chair Ebel solicited e-mail addresses from Delavan Cate and Mark Grubbs.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present who would like to speak. No one responded.

It was **MOVED** (Sheerr-Gross) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE HEARING ON THE CATE FAMILY NH REALTY TRUST FINAL MAJOR SUBDIVISION-FOUR LOTS BE CONTINUED TO 7:30 PM ON TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2008, IN THE SYDNEY CROOK CONFERENCE ROOM IN THE TOWN OFFICE BUILDING. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chair Ebel called the PB's attention to a letter from abutter Carrie Harrison (Tax Map 103, Lot3) who wrote in opposition to the proposed subdivision.

V. COLBY-SAWYER COLLEGE – Final Site Plan Review: Parking Lot O (Tax Map 85, Lot 33)

Douglas Atkins, Colby-Sawyer College's Vice President for Administration, was accompanied by Stephen Jesseman and Richard Fink (Jesseman Associates, P.E.). Mr. Atkins began by reviewing the changes that had

occurred over the past 15 years and the building of the college's athletic fields, new residence halls, Lethbridge lodge, and the Ivey Science Center. He advised that a drainage pond on the site had been constructed deliberately. He further advised that the proposed parking plan took advantage of existing infrastructure. He said that at the meeting with municipal department heads all had agreed that it was a learning process. Mr. Atkins advised that the college was willing to include some Low Impact Development (LID) features in the proposed parking plan, but he had a fiduciary responsibility to make sure that the plan proposed was fiscally responsible.

Richard Fink advised that the proposed parking lot would contain 40 parking spaces. He displayed Sheet D-2 of the proposed parking plan and demonstrated the way in which drainage would flow from the parking area to a perimeter stone diaphragm designed to treat sheet flow drainage, then to gravel, then to grass swales, and then to detention ponds. Chair Ebel told Mr. Fink that the copies of the plans provided to the PB had not included copies of Sheet D-2 and she questioned that omission. He said that the information was on another sheet we had along with a lot of other information. Mr. Fink said that there would be two infiltration basins and there would be grading around the perimeter. He advised that there would be trees and shrubs on the island between Parking Lots M and O.

Mr. Fink stated that the drainage plan incorporated 4.5 of the six LID best management practices prescribed by the town for pre-treatment and treatment, i.e., ponds, stone diaphragm, filtering, open channels, and test areas of pervious pavement and porous concrete. He said that the college would construct two 12 ft. by 25 ft. sections of the road leading to Colby Farm to test the efficacy of using pervious pavement or porous concrete pavement over glacial till conditions. He said that one of the sections would have pervious asphalt pavement and the other would have porous concrete pavement. Mr. Fink said that the Green Roof LID practice was not applicable.

PB Member Ballin asked if Colby-Sawyer was aware of the maintenance requirements for pervious asphalt and porous concrete pavement. Mr. Fink and Stephen Jesseman said that the college was aware of the maintenance required.

Reporting on the meeting with municipal department heads, Ken McWilliams said that on Sheet C-5 Chief of Police Dave Seastrand recommended erecting a "No Exit" sign on one-way aisle south to avoid confusion re the direction of traffic flow. Regarding Sheet C-6, Director of Public Works Richard Lee recommended having a separate print for drainage. Regarding the stone diaphragm detail on Sheet C-10, Director of Public Works Lee questioned having perforated pipe at the bottom of the infiltration. He recommended eliminating the perforated pipe. He recommended using earth dams along the trench every 35 feet and covering it with fabric to eliminate its getting clogged. Colby-Sawyer was amenable to that suggestion. Regarding the proposed holding pond that could hold up to seven tenths of a foot in depth, Director of Public Works Lee recommended that the under-drain pipe be capped and small holes made in the pipe to allow limited flow. Colby-Sawyer said that it was amenable to the suggestion as long as the cap could be removed if it did not work. The final item on Sheet C-10 was in regard to the permeable portion of the driveway. Director of Public Works Lee questioned whether a paving company would make that small amount of permeable pavement. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that the base was not designed to specifications for permeable pavement. He recommended replacing the bank-run gravel with two-inch-diameter stone, because the fines from the bank-run gravel would reduce the infiltration, and following the design criteria for constructing the base. Colby-Sawyer was amenable to the recommendation.

PB Member Conly stated that the Conservation Commission was looking to Colby-Sawyer College to be a leader in employing LID techniques and sees some willingness on the part of the college to cooperate. He said that initially such willingness had not been apparent. Vice-President for Administration Atkins responded that his fiduciary responsibility and the college's fiscal limitations made him unwilling to wholeheartedly approve the use of techniques that have not yet been proven. He invited the Conservation Commission to visit the site, and he volunteered to attend a Conservation Commission meeting to exchange ideas.

Chair Ebel said that the PB recognized that pervious pavement might not be the end-all and be-all, but the PB had perceived a lack of willingness to explore LID alternatives. She thanked the college for its recent willingness to try to incorporate LID techniques. Mr. Jesseman said that recently pervious pavement had shown

that it was not able to sustain the loading necessary for the proposed parking lot. He encouraged the college and the PB to work together and recommended getting a group together.

Chair Ebel advised that in the future, the PB would like to have post-development drainage plans included on a separate sheet in the PB packets.

Chair Ebel noted that the college had requested a waiver of the boundary survey requirement, i.e. Final Site Plan Review Checklist Item 2.f.1 Boundary survey and lot area. Ken McWilliams advised that the location was not near any property boundary lines.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE REQUEST BY COLBY-SAWYER COLLEGE FOR A WAIVER OF THE FINAL SPR REQUIREMENT FOR A BOUNDARY SURVEY AND LOT AREA, CHECKLIST ITEM 2.F.1, BE GRANTED.. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REVISED FINAL SITE PLAN BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS RICHARD LEE'S REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED STONE DIAPHRAGM AND PERVIOUS/PERMEABLE PAVEMENT. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. NEW LONDON FIRE DEPARTMENT RE SUBDIVISIONS: Fire Chief Jay Lyon noted that the PB had approved three subdivisions during the meeting. He said that the integrity of the Fire Department required consistency across the board in requiring adherence to regulatory requirements. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley said that property owners may not intend to further subdivide, but owners of property could change or the intent of owners could change. He opined that the PB needed to be alert to the potential for/possibility of subdivision "creep" when regulatory requirements for a major subdivision are waived to make a proposed subdivision a minor subdivision rather than a major subdivision. Discussion ensued. PB Member Sheerr-Gross said that her concern was that Fire Chief Lyon might not have been aware of the proposal to make a major subdivision a minor subdivision by waiving requirements. Chair Ebel wondered if the Zoning Administrator had a procedure in place to monitor such subdivisions.
- B. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: Chair Ebel appointed PB Members Cottrill and Hollinger as PB representatives on the Capital Improvement Program Subcommittee.
- C. The MINUTES of the MAY 13, 2008 MEETING of the PLANNING BOARD were APPROVED, as amended.
- D. SHORELAND PROTECTION AND WETLAND BUFFER SUBCOMMITTEES: Chair Ebel advised that the PB needed to discuss appointing subcommittees re the Shoreland Protection Regulations and Wetland Buffer Regulations in regard to wetland fingers. She outlined the issues that needed to be address. She reminded PB members that the "stop-gap" regulation that was adopted re wetland fingers stated that the buffer requirements applied up to the first man-made interruption of the wetland fingers. Chair Ebel volunteered to be on the subcommittee, and she appointed PB Member Conly as the second PB subcommittee member.

PB Member Sheerr-Gross reviewed her concern regarding the percentage of impervious surface that was allowed under the existing regulations. The PB had agreed to form a study group.

Chair Ebel opined that the each subcommittee needed representatives from the Conservation Commission and representatives from the public at large. PB Member Cottrill suggested a 2-2-2 committee, i.e. two PB members, two Conservation Commission members, two members of the public. Chair Ebel asked if PB members Cook and Sheerr-Gross would serve on the Shoreland Protection

Study Subcommittee. She said that she would have to contact the Conservation Commission regarding its two members and she would need to appoint two public members. PB Member Sheerr-Gross said that the new state law was changing constantly. She recommended appointing George Pelletierri or Peter Schiess, even though neither of them are residents, because of there knowledge of the state law. She also recommended including all members of the public and publicizing the existence of the subcommittee. Chair Ebel opined that the subcommittee should have representation from the protective associations.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **9:25 PM**.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____