

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING  
OCTOBER 11, 2005**

PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Sue Ellen Andrews, Dale Conly, Celeste Cook, Tom Cottrill, Jeff Hollinger, Sue Clough (Selectmen's Representative), and Kenneth McWilliams (Planner)

Chair Karen Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:32 PM.

**I. R. PUTNAM, et al. – Continued Preliminary Subdivision (Tax Map 136, Lot 9)**

Chair Ebel allowed time for PB members to read a letter presented to the PB for consideration.

Douglas Sweet (Bristol, Sweet & Associates, Inc.) presented color-coded plans identifying wetland and stream buffer areas. He advised that the applicant would like to create three lots on property consisting of 13+ acres located on Soo-Nipi Road. He advised that there were designated wetlands near and running through the property. He further advised that a wetlands scientist had delineated the wetlands on the property. He said that the issue was the determination of where to apply the 100-foot buffer. Mr. Sweet opined that the 100-foot buffer should not apply to the wetland "fingers" or "bumps" identified on the map. He advised that the proposal had been reviewed with the Conservation Commission and that the Commission supported extending the 100-foot buffer from the heavy blue line on the plan or 100 feet back from the wetlands associated with the buffered stream, but not including the wetland "fingers."

Mr. Sweet also clarified that the previous plans had merely shown possible house locations, not specific building envelopes, on the proposed lots. He opined that the plan presented complied with the Wetland Buffer regulation set forth in Article XIII. G. of the New London Zoning Ordinance that states that the general location of Wetlands are delineated by the National Wetlands Inventory Map dated March 13, 2001 and delineated on a specific site by a qualified professional acceptable to the New Hampshire Wetland Board.

Chair Ebel asked what Mr. Sweet believed was the difference between the regulation and the plan presented. Mr. Sweet replied that the soil type was used to determine the wetlands in the proposed subdivision. PB member Clough asked if the soil in the "finger" was different from the soil within the buffer. Mr. Sweet responded affirmatively. Ms Clough asked about the vegetation in the "finger" and the "bumps". Chair Ebel stated that the "fingers" met the definition of wetlands pursuant to both New London's regulations and the state law upon which the town's definition is based. Mr. Sweet agreed and stated that the wetland extensions in question were clearly jurisdictional wetlands, but that he did not believe that the buffering regulation meant to include the extensions. PB member Hollinger opined that the difference in scales used to draw the proposed subdivision plan and a smaller diagram presented made comparison difficult. Mr. Sweet stated that the boundaries had been delineated by a wetland professional. He advised that he did not have the National Wetlands Inventory Map, but that the wetlands on the town map were based on the national map which was, in turn, based on the assessment by soil scientists.

PB member Clough asked if there had been core samples taken in both the brook area and the bumps or was the applicant going by the State mapping. Mr. Sweet replied that many core samples had been taken. PB member Andrews asked if the National Wetlands Inventory Map was drawn on the basis of known soil types or if there had actually been site visits. Mr. Sweet responded that the map had been drawn using available data. Ms Andrews observed that the requirement for wetlands to be delineated by a soils expert had revealed another wetland not on the map based on soil types. Mr. Sweet responded that the 2001 overlay map triggers the requirement for a professional to delineate wetlands on a specific site, but that there is no requirement for additional buffering. PB member Hollinger asked if the significant-wetland line on the plan was based on soil type and vegetation. He also asked if the change was gradual or sharply defined. Mr. Sweet responded that the change would differ on different properties. Ms Clough asked if Mr. Sweet was recommending a 25-foot buffer, rather than the 100-foot buffer required by the regulations. Mr. Sweet, while maintaining that his interpretation of the regulation was correct, advised that his client "wanted" additional protection, even though no buffer would be *required*. Ms Andrews stated that she had walked the property and found sphagnum moss in the area under discussion.

PB member Hollinger suggested that the applicant could go back and look at the bounds of the lots. Mr. Sweet demonstrated how two lines on the plans had moved. Mr. Hollinger asked if that change had altered the building envelopes. Mr. Sweet reiterated that no specific building envelopes had been identified.

PB member Conly pointed out that the regulations say “general delineation of wetlands” and require that a professional soils expert delineate wetlands on a specific property. He opined that the regulation does not mean that any wetlands identified (discovered) should not comply with setback requirements. He opined that the purpose of the regulation is to provide a wide view and the site visit by a soils expert provides site specific information. Chair Ebel stated that the capitalized term “Wetlands” in the buffering regulation refers to the Zoning Regulation definition and *that* definition does not refer to the National Wetlands Inventory Map. She opined that the inventory map was a starting point and that the regulation recognized that by providing that the actual wetlands to be buffered be required to have an actual on-site assessment by a qualified soils scientist. The definition of a Wetland is “an area that is inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal conditions does support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.” Chair Ebel also advised that any reduction in the buffer requirement would require a Special Exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. PB member Andrews stated that the regulations were very clear: the big map identified the area and the wetlands expert delineated the site specific wetlands. She opined that the buffer regulations would apply to the wetland “finger” and the “bump”. Mr. Sweet continued to maintain that the term “Wetlands”, as used in the regulations, obviously referred to the National Wetlands Inventory Map and that what is on that map should determine wetlands to be buffered, not the site visit by a soils expert.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present in the audience. There were none. PB member Cook asked if there would be any possibility of limiting the subdivision to two lots, instead of three. Mr. Sweet replied that the property was comprised of 13 acres and, originally, four lots had been planned. Ms Andrews advised that there was a lot of wetlands on the third lot, and described it as a forested wetland. Mr. Sweet agreed.

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that the U.S.G.S. had been the source of the streams information used in developing the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District regulations. He also advised that the mapping does include some errors, e.g., sometimes they are shown to be on the wrong side of the road. He also pointed out that sticking with the on-site delineation, even if it were to differ from the general map, would be setting a precedent. Mr. Sweet opined that the regulations state that the wetlands to be protected are those delineated on the National Wetlands Inventory Maps of Wetlands. He opined that all of the regulations are based on the 2001 map. He acknowledged that the site visit by a soils expert might identify additional wetlands, but they would not be covered by the regulation because they were not on the National Wetlands Inventory Maps. Ms Andrews asked if he would determine the boundary line on the basis of soils. Mr. Sweet replied that the soils expert would flag any wetlands. He conceded that everything would be within jurisdictional wetlands. He also stated that the contributory streams went way back on the property. Ms Andrews advised that the regulations define how far back one must go. Chair Ebel and PB member Andrews both opined that the general map is a tool to identify an area to be looked at more closely by a soils expert.

PB member Clough inquired about the “boundary” referred to in the regulations and asked what would happen if the soils expert found a major discrepancy. Ken McWilliams advised that the area would have to be greater than 10,000 square feet. Chair Ebel asked if a wetland could be buffered. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied “only if mapped”. He advised that the map specifically eliminated some small streams. Ms Clough asked if a vernal stream would stand alone. Mr. Stanley replied that one could not build there.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Hollinger) to **REQUIRE A 100-FOOT BUFFER AROUND THE FINGER AND THE BUMPS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION PLAN FOR TAX MAP 136, LOT 9.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED.** [In favor 5; Opposed 1 (Conly); Abstaining 1 (Cottrill)]

PB member Cottrill opined that the wetland definition in the regulations seemed very clear and requested a summary of the discussion. Chair Ebel replied that the PB wanted to buffer wetlands and streams. She advised that the tools available are the National Wetlands Inventory Maps that identify general wetland areas and a site visit by a wetlands expert who would delineate the site specific wetlands and set the boundaries. She also advised that the reference to “wetland” is the definition on page 33 of the New London Zoning Regulations.

Chair Ebel advised that Mr. Sweet could appeal the PB’s interpretation of the regulation to the Zoning Board of Adjustment or submit a request to the ZBA for a Special Exception for reduced buffers. Mr. Cottrill read the New London Zoning Ordinance definition for jurisdictional wetlands based upon soil type and vegetation. Mr.

Sweet opined that there are different types of jurisdictional wetlands. Mr. Cottrill stated that he did not understand why the building envelopes could not be moved down on the property. PB member Clough opined that it might be necessary to refine the regulation. Chair Ebel replied that the New London regulatory definition was based on the State of NH definition. She stated that there has to be a starting point for review and the national maps provide that. Chair Ebel expressed her appreciation of the Conservation Commission input; however, statutory interpretation prevails. She stated that this decision is not like deciding whether it is all right to cut a tree. That regulation anticipates some subjectivity in the decision. PB member Conly advised that the Conservation Commission had balanced buffering the finger versus reasonableness. He added that the Commission was sensitive to precedent, but thought there were differences.

Ken McWilliams outlined the options available to the applicant: (1) appeal the PB's interpretation of the regulation /definition to the ZBA, or (2) seek a Special Exception from the ZBA for reduced buffers, or (3) revise the plan and lot lines.

The hearing on the Preliminary Subdivision of Tax Map 136, Lot 9 was CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 8, 2005 AT 7:30 PM.

**II. SYDNEY L. CROOK – Final Lot Merger & Minor Subdivision**  
**(Tax Map 68, Lots 10-18 & Tax Map 69, Lot 7)**

Pierre Bedard distributed the final "Plan of Merger" and advised that the objective was to merge the lots identified on the plan and Clark Lane into one contiguous lot of record. Sydney Crook advised that the original subdivision had been approved in 1979. He also advised that no shoreline would be included in the merger.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present. Tory Gage indicated that she would like to speak to the proposal regarding public access to the "Lookout". Chair Ebel advised that the issue of access was not involved in the proposed plan of merger.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cook) to **APPROVE THE MERGER OF TAX MAP 68, LOTS 10-18 AND TAX MAP 69, LOT 7 AS PRESENTED BY SYDNEY L. CROOK.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A Mylar was presented for PB signatures and forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

Pierre Bedard distributed plans for a proposed subdivision of the newly merged lot into two lots: Lot 1 having 4.47 acres and encompassing the "Lookout" and Lot 2 having 39.8 acres. Mr. Bedard advised that access to Lot 1 would be over Lot 2 via a 50-foot easement over the existing Clark Drive and Lookout Drive. He stated that the 4.47-acre lot would be deeded to the Town of New London at sometime in the future. He added that the lot would have a conservation easement.

PB member Cottrill asked if the access had to be 50-feet wide. Mr. Bedard replied that Mr. Crook wanted to protect the existing stone walls. He also advised the PB that Mr. Crook had applied for and been granted a Variance by the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The Variance was necessary because Lot 1 would have no frontage on a public road.

PB member Clough asked how the remainder of the property would be accessed. Mr. Bedard replied that access would be off Davis Hill Road or two access points off NH Route 103A. He advised that the previously mentioned easement could accommodate a driveway, but would not be sufficient for a town roadway.

Tory Gage, speaking for her grandmother who is an abutter, stated that there is a shared boundary and stonewall very close to the "Lookout". Ms Gage said that before the PB grants public access she would like the issues of parking and availability of the "Lookout" for town events addressed. She also asked if there would be a curfew, noting that the spot has been used for parties in the past. She stated that the stone wall is deteriorating and she would like the town to repair it. She also would like signage reminding visitors that the area is surrounded by private property that should be respected. PB member Andrews asked if Ms Gage would like signage at the

bottom of the road. Ms Gage stated that she and Mr. Crook had discussed the stone wall and the responsibility for maintaining the wall.

PB member Clough asked who would be responsible. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley replied that the Town would be responsible if the lot becomes town property. He suggested that some higher level of oversight should be put in place. Chair Ebel asked about availability for town events. PB member Andrews stated that permission should be required. Zoning Administrator Stanley suggested that the easement could include appropriate language. Ms Clough advised that the Board of Selectmen have a policy that prohibits alcohol on town property. Mr. Crook advised that access would be limited to foot traffic for the most part.

PB member Andrews advised that she had climbed up to the "Lookout" and opined that the stone wall delineated the property line. Ms Gage opined that signage would be needed and asked for tasteful signage near the wall. Ms Clough asked Mr. Crook for his input regarding activities to be permitted. Mr. Crook replied that parking would be at the Park & Ride off NH Route 103A or along Davis Hill Road. He advised that anyone not able to walk would need to obtain permission and a key to the gate in order to access the "Lookout" by car. Mr. Cottrill asked if there could be weddings. Mr. Crook replied affirmatively. Ms Clough added that guests and participants would have to walk up to the site.

Ms Gage asked about the possible use of the easement as a driveway and wondered if there would still be a locked gate if it were used as a driveway. Mr. Crook replied that there could only be two house lots on Lot 2. Ms Clough advised that there would still be gated access to the "Lookout", but it might be further up the road.

Mr. Bedard reminded the PB that the "Lookout" had been an item of the highest priority in the two most recent Master Plans.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE MINOR SUBDIVISION OF THE NEWLY MERGED MAP 68, LOTS 10-18 AND MAP 69, LOT 7, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY SYDNEY L. CROOK, SUBJECT TO THE PLACEMENT OF A SIGN AT THE STONEWALL BETWEEN THE "LOOKOUT" ACCESS AND PROPERTY OWNED BY N. GILMAN AND B. WOODRUFF TRUSTS REMINDING VISITORS NOT TO GO ONTO PRIVATE PROPERTY.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**.

A Mylar was presented for PB signatures and forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

### **III. WILLIAM F. KIDDER ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST – Final Annexation/Boundary Agreement (Tax Map 73, Lot 82)**

Michael Todd appeared on behalf of the William F. Kidder Administrative Trust. He explained that the property contained the William F. Kidder "Icehouse" Trust and was comprised of three parcels: one acquired in the 1950s from Charles Shepard, a strip formerly housing oil tanks, and a third that was jointly purchased with James Cleveland to be owned 50/50. Mr. Todd advised that when the property was placed in a conservation easement, a 10-foot wide strip of land was inadvertently omitted. Mr. Todd stated that tax maps would be unchanged; however, in order to convey the property to the "Icehouse Foundation," the omission must be corrected.

PB member Cottrill asked if the result would be one lot. Mr. Todd replied that the result would be one contiguous lot to be owned by the Icehouse Foundation. Chair Ebel asked if any abutters were present. There were none.

It was **MOVED** (Clough) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE FINAL ANNEXATION OF TAX MAP 73, LOT 82, OWNED BY THE WILLIAM F. KIDDER ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**.

A Mylar was presented for PB signatures and forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**IV. JOHN HOWE/BICKNOR-WILMOT, INC. – Final Site Plan Review**

**(Tax Map 73, Lot 80)**

John Howe displayed plans for a new building approximately the same size as the 1973 LaValley barn that currently sits in the residential district. He advised that he had applied for and been granted a Variance by the Zoning Board of Adjustment to put parking on that spot. He told the PB that it had been decided to move forward with the building at a slower time of year because of the impact that building and tearing down would have on parking. He advised that he does not yet have a copy of the easement for the sewer line, but has reached agreement over the telephone with Barry Wright and K. C. Slocum-Wright. He stated that the Sewer Commission had asked that the line be insulated, and he has agreed to do that. He also mentioned briefly the water draining from the roof of Wildberry Bagel onto the driveway. He advised that there would be no additional signage on the street; perhaps on the building.

Mr. Howe referred PB members attention to a letter submitted that day in which he requested waiver of four Final Site Plan Review requirements: (1) 200-foot of property site plan – already set up and drawn out in town records; (2) topography within 200 feet – land is mostly flat around property; (3) a separate drainage design – drainage detail on site plan has been deemed adequate; (4) new boundary survey – no change from survey done in 1991, plus having the corner pertinent to the project surveyed and reset in 2004.

Mr. Howe advised that the drainage would be improved with the addition of an infiltration trench and the parking area would be paved. He stated that he had discussed plans with the highway department. PB member Clough asked for a description of the infiltration trench. Chair Ebel asked where the water would go. Mr. Howe again mentioned the Wildberry Bagel roof drainage. He said that the water runs off the existing blue stone, rather than being absorbed. He spoke of the infiltration trench again. He suggested that the water might have gone over to drains on the Kearsarge Regional School District property.

PB member Conly asked about snow removal. Mr. Howe displayed a plan on which snow storage areas had been highlighted. PB member Cottrill asked if snow was ever removed from the site. Mr. Howe replied that it would be if it became necessary. Chair Ebel asked if snow would be stored on top of the infiltration trench. Mr. Howe replied that the snow would act as insulation. Chair Ebel stated that it would prevent drainage from entering the trench. Mr. Howe agreed that it would have to be cleared. Ms Clough asked about grading. Mr. Howe replied that there would be no change in grade. He spoke again about drainage flow from the Wildberry Bagel. Mr. Cottrill asked if the pavement would be pitched or level. Mr. Howe replied that it would be slightly pitched. He demonstrated the areas and the slope of the drive on the plan. Chair Ebel advised that she would want to know about the grade in light of the request for a waiver of a separate drainage design. Ms Clough asked how he would keep the trenches cleared of debris. Mr. Howe replied that the trenches would be lined with large stones and filtration fabric. Chair Ebel advised that she had just attended a seminar at which the experts stated that fabric becomes clogged by silt and that they now recommend not using it. PB member Cottrill questioned the depth of the trench. He wondered if the three feet indicated would take it below the frost line.

Chair Ebel asked who the engineer for the project would be. Mr. Howe replied that his brother would be the engineer. PB member Andrews asked about his credentials. Mr. Howe replied that he was a licensed civil engineer. Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams for his opinion. He replied that the proposed building was small and the remainder of the site would be pretty impervious.

It was **MOVED** (Clough) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE REQUESTED WAIVERS OF THE 200 FEET OF PROPERTY SITE PLAN, TOPOGRAPHY WITHIN 200 FEET, SEPARATE DRAINAGE DESIGN, AND NEW BOUNDARY SURVEY REQUIREMENTS BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Ken McWilliams reported on issues discussed at the meeting of municipal department heads. The Fire Department requested that the mechanical room be removed from under the stairs or that some protection be added. The Fire Department also advised that the project must comply with all state and local fire codes. Razing the existing building located in the residential district requires a demolition permit, and the shingles must be tested for asbestos. The existing building must be removed before a building permit can be issued for the proposed new building. The required Certificate of Occupancy cannot be issued until the PB-approved plan has been completed, including any paving. The Highway Department raised issues relating to the sidewalk and

required bonding. In regard to the water line, the applicant must obtain a permit to work in a public right-of-way. The Sewer Commission advised that the existing sewer line extending from Wildberry Bagel must be replaced with a six-inch line with Styrofoam insulation. Sewer and water lines both require easements.

PB member Clough asked if there was any landscaping plan. Mr. Howe pointed out existing landscaping features on the submitted plan and suggested erecting staggered fencing and reconstructing an existing stone wall.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE FINAL SITE PLAN FOR REMOVAL OF A BUILDING LOCATED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING OF SIMILAR SIZE IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, AND THE INCREASE IN PARKING SPACES AT 207 MAIN STREET BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY BICKNOR-WILMOT, SUBJECT TO RECEIPT OF THE NECESSARY EASEMENTS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL STATE AND LOCAL FIRE CODES, AND RECEIPT OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**V. NEW LONDON HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION – Final Site Plan Review: Parking Lot Expansion  
(Tax Map 72, Lots 16 & 17)**

Fred Mock (McFarland-Johnson, Inc.) and Todd French (New London Hospital Facilities) presented an amended site plan for proposed parking lot expansion.

Fred Mock stated that the plan had been amended based upon PB comments. Drainage from the proposed staff parking lot behind the building had been moved away from the edge of the wetland, as requested by Richard Lee of the New London Highway Department, and directed into a stone ditch.

Chair Ebel asked how gasoline, oil, and other pollutants would be filtered out. Mr. Mock replied that the plan included no filtering provision. As requested by Mr. Lee, the drainage would no longer be via sheet flow toward the wetland; rather it would go into a ditch. PB member Clough asked if the employee parking lot would be paved. Mr. Mock replied “not initially”. PB member Andrews asked about Mr. Lee’s reason for directing drainage from one wetland to another. Ken McWilliams replied that directing drainage to a rock-lined swale would provide more time for water to infiltrate, rather than going into a wetland as sheet flow.

Chair Ebel asked if there would be any other method to ameliorate and filter out phosphates, salts, sand, gasoline, etc. PB member Andrews inquired about the appropriate approach. Chair Ebel replied that, in other projects, e.g., Colby-Sawyer College, the PB had recommended devices to modify drainage. Mr. Mock replied that there was nothing available in this climate to reduce pollutants and that hydrocarbon removal was almost impossible. He said that treatments to improve storm water quality that the PB might be aware of were based on research in Maryland and southern parts of the U.S., not cold weather climates like NH. Chair Ebel disagreed and questioned the statement that nothing could be done. Mr. Mock replied that there was nothing available in which he would have confidence. He said that in the instances where grass swales are used to filter drainage, the grass eventually dies. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley stated that Colby-Sawyer College had installed infiltration traps that drains fed into to remove oils, etc. PB member Clough added that Town Road Agent Richard Lee had installed an infiltration trap at the Highway Department facility. Chair Ebel opined that it would at least be something more than running drainage directly into a stone ditch, which has been proven to be the least effective method for pollutant removal. Ms Andrews stated that the Colby-Sawyer trap was somewhat more sophisticated. She said that it was a mechanical trap of some sort. She opined that it would be an important thing to pursue given all the wetlands surrounding the hospital parking lots. Chair Ebel added that there is no buffer at all and opined that the PB should try to put in some way to clean the water going into the wetlands. Mr. Mock replied that he was not fan of infiltration trenches and traps only work if maintained. PB member Andrews asked why maintenance of the traps would be such a problem. Mr. Mock suggested that it would be possible to direct drainage away from a wetland and change it from channel flow to sheet flow by directing it through grass. Ms Clough said that drainage should be channeled away from wetlands.

PB member Cottrill asked if an increase in drainage would increase the size of the wetlands. Mr. Mock replied affirmatively. Mr. Cottrill opined that the PB must take care to avoid increasing wetlands. Chair Ebel stated that she wanted New London Hospital to be thinking about ways to address drainage issues relating to the parking lots. PB member Hollinger opined that it was important for New London Hospital to be a “good

neighbor". Todd French advised that the hospital now subjects parking lots to a salt liquid treatment that reduces the amount of salt used and that creates a sheet on the pavement that reduces adherence of snow and ice. Mr. Mock suggested that it would be possible to re-direct drainage to a level spreader and to install a trap.

Fred Mock moved to the issue of moving an existing hydrant. He advised that the hospital now proposes not to move the hydrant, but to place bollards around it and leave it in place. He stated that the hydrant was placed in a very shallow area over ledge and the water precinct had recommended not moving it. Mr. Mock addressed the issue relating to culverts on Parkside Road. He advised that Town Road Agent Richard Lee had walked the area and observed that water was bifurcated into three existing culverts. Mr. Mock advised that he now has a signed Mylar.

Mr. Mock said that a survey error relating to the location of the salt storage shed had been detected and that the wetlands had been mapped correctly by GIS. He advised that the existing shed would be removed and pointed out the recommended location for the proposed new salt shed. Ms Clough asked if there were any state guidelines for location of salt sheds. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied that a shed is supposed to keep salt dry and prevent infiltration of water. Chair Ebel asked if New London Hospital would clean up the area of the existing shed. Mr. French said "yes, it's an eyesore".

PB member Andrews asked about the hay bales and stones indicated on the plan. Mr. Mock replied that stone check dams would be used, not hay bales, and that they would be used to slow drainage to permit more filtration and straining of drainage. Ms Andrews observed that the hospital would be taking a treatment area (catch basin with sump) and building a parking lot over it. She said that it would slow erosion, but would discharge in a very limited area. She said that it would not increase drainage off the site, but it would increase drainage to another area on the site. Mr. Mock replied that the existing impervious area and the small increase in impervious area and size of the property would result in very little change in run-off. He opined that it would be a minor change in a large watershed. Several PB members stated that they were familiar with that argument, but all the minor flow increases add up to a major increase in flow over time, so it's best to try to keep water where it is being generated. Ms Andrews stated that there would be an increase in water on the lot, making more of it unusable. PB member Clough stated that the site would become more saturated. Mr. Mock agreed. Ms Andrews questioned the location of a catch basin in one area and not in the other. Mr. Mock replied that Town Road Agent Lee had recommended redirecting the flow going to the former and advised that the latter had no room for a level spreader.

PB member Hollinger asked if New London Hospital was looking for approval of one parking lot or two. Mr. French replied that the hospital wants to build one now and one later, but wants approval for both now. PB member Andrews inquired about the timetable for the proposed parking lot expansion. Mr. French advised that the hospital had put the project out for bids and the response estimates had been very high; therefore, the hospital would be re-evaluating what would be possible. He suggested that a reduction in the amount of site work could reduce costs. He advised that there is a very serious parking problem that must be addressed; however, the funds available are limited.

Fred Mock stated that at the meeting of municipal department heads, the Fire Department had advised that fire trucks could not negotiate a turn that he pointed out on the plan. Fire Chief Peter Stanley stated that it is very difficult for fire equipment to navigate the parking lot, especially two corners; however, the New London Site Plan Regulations do not contain any requirement that fire apparatus have full access to all parts of the parking lot. He emphasized that there was access to all areas of the building. Mr. Mock stated that the hospital had used a software program called Autoturn and that model showed that apparatus would have access. Mr. Stanley pointed out that the model used provided for 34-foot standard; however, the Fire Department needs a 47-foot standard. He added that he had conducted an on-site test and it showed that the ladder truck could not make the turns. He opined that if the truck could not negotiate the turns now, it wouldn't be able to do so later. Mr. Mock responded by saying that the proposed plan contained no adverse changes. Chair Ebel asked what buildings could not be accessed. Fire Chief Stanley replied that all buildings could be accessed; only incidents in outlying areas could not be accessed without making multiple point turns. Mr. Mock reiterated that the proposed plan would make nothing worse. PB member Hollinger opined that the plan should try to make things better. Mr. Mock stated that in designing the expansion, the hospital was interested first in safety and secondly in patient convenience. Chief Stanley asked if the PB approved the expansion, would all parking issues be fully resolved, e.g., elimination of access being blocked by illegally parked cars. PB member Cottrill asked who blocked access by parking in fire lanes. Mr. French replied that employees did. Chief Stanley opined that

typical usage was detrimental to access. Mr. French opined that, if both lots were built, the parking problems would be solved; building one would help. Mr. Cottrill asked if parking would be enforced. Mr. French replied that the hospital tries to enforce, but has no alternative parking spaces to offer. He opined that construction Lot B for employees only would help immensely. Mr. Cottrill opined that the hospital could mandate where employees park and could leave open the parking spaces closest to access. Mr. French advised that parking space must accommodate students, patients, employees, and visitors. PB member Conly opined that the hospital could have control over where employees park. Fire Chief Stanley stated that all would be concerned if there should be a car fire that could not be accessed by fire equipment. Mr. French replied that parking compliance would be easier to enforce, if adequate parking options existed.

Chair Ebel asked PB members for their thoughts in regard to the proposal. PB member Andrews replied that she had conflicting feelings regarding drainage issues. She opined that, if the applicant was not the hospital, the PB would want more evidence that the issues of increased volume and pollutants would be properly addressed. Mr. Mock demonstrated on the plan that drainage would flow from the proposed catch basin through a pipe to the headwall to rock and stone check dams and, thence, to the wetlands. Chair Ebel opined that, incrementally, the hospital would not be adding that much more drainage, but reiterated concerns regarding an increase in flow overall. Ms Andrews pointed out that any future subdivision of the property would be negatively impacted by the increased wetlands. PB member Cottrill asked how the water that flows from the shopping center parking lot comes over onto hospital property. Mr. Mock replied that it comes underground. PB member Clough and Mr. Stanley both opined that the situation was better than the previously existing situation. Mr. Mock advised that drainage had been revised when the medical office building was built. Chair Ebel asked for an explanation of the water treatment. Mr. Mock said that it comes primarily through pipes, with an occasional catch basin and is finally dumped into an elongated stone-lined trench with the check dams indicated. Chair Ebel commented that there was little or no filtration of the shopping center or hospital drainage, which is very troubling considering what is coming off of the parking lots. She mentioned that the UNH Stormwater Treatment Center research had recently shown that the commonly used stone-lined trenches filter out virtually nothing. Chair Ebel urged the hospital to keep this in mind for the future and to try, as Mr. Hollinger had suggested, to be as good a neighbor as possible with respect to pollutants coming off of its parking lots. Mr. French agreed to keep this in mind.

Mr. Cottrill asked if modifying or eliminating parking spaces would provide fire equipment with access. Chief Stanley replied that moving spaces to make a smaller jog and eliminating some spaces to increase the flare, could provide access. Mr. Cottrill inquired about the tree canopy and modifying landscaping. Mr. Mock replied that such modifications would improve the flare. Ms Andrews asked if the improvement would be sufficient to make access possible. Chief Stanley pointed out on the plans a way to widen the turn to a point that a fire engine could access. Mr. Cottrill cautioned that parking should not get too close to the wetlands. PB Hollinger recommended that PB approval could be contingent upon access by fire apparatus. Fire Chief Stanley offered to conduct a trial run in the school parking lot, if the hospital could come up with a plan with exact dimensions.

Chair Ebel asked if the timetable was to construct the additional parking this fall. Todd French replied that he was not sure. Chair Ebel said that it appeared as if there would be time for the hospital to return to the PB with a modified plan. PB member Clough stated that she would like to see the access issue resolved, and she also suggested that the hospital consider submitting a proposal for the most feasible of the two lots, rather than both lots. Mr. Mock replied that the hospital might want to build both lots. Mr. French asked if the island were to be moved and the radius increased, could PB contingent approval be granted. Ken McWilliams advised that a revised plan needs to come back to the PB. He stated that the PB could not give contingent approval to a plan not viewed by anyone.

The hearing on the Final Site Plan Review – Parking Lot Expansion submitted by New London Hospital was CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 25, 2005 AT 7:30 PM at the Whipple Memorial Town Hall.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

- A. MYRA FERGUSON – Tree Cutting Request** (Tax Map 50, Lot 7)  
PB member Conly presented a request submitted by Myra Ferguson to cut two dead trees, a hemlock and a white birch that touches the house, located within the 50-foot buffer at 584 Lakeshore Drive. Mr. Conly recommended approval.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **TO APPROVE THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY MYRA FERGUSON TO REMOVE TWO DEAD TREES, A WHITE BIRCH AND A HEMLOCK, LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 584 LAKESHORE DRIVE.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- B. TOM STARK – Tree Cutting Request** (Tax Map 50, Lot 8)  
PB member Conly presented a request submitted by Tom Stark to remove four trees located within the 50-foot buffer at 564 Lakeshore Drive. There are numerous small trees in the immediate area. Mr. Conly recommended approval.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Clough) **TO APPROVE THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY TOM STARK TO REMOVE FOUR TREES LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 564 LAKESHORE DRIVE.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**C. NOVEMBER MEETING SCHEDULE**

Ken McWilliams advised the PB that the second Tuesday in November is the Tuesday before Thanksgiving. He noted that there are five Tuesdays in November, which would allow the PB to move its meeting date to the following week, should it choose to do so. Chair Ebel said that the PB might want to move the meeting or, perhaps, cancel the meeting. She suggested waiting to see what issues arise.

- D. AUSTIN EATON (CONSTANCE GRANGER PROPERTY)** (Tax Map 61, Lot 14 )  
Ken McWilliams asked the PB what additional Notice it would like to give regarding the Continued Major Subdivision and Cluster Development Plan at Granger Ridge. Consensus of the PB was to place a Notice in the Kearsarge Shopper. Since abutters were “Noticed” when the continued hearing was rescheduled, the PB did not recommend additional individual notices to abutters. The PB discussed the poor acoustics at the Whipple Memorial Town Hall and agreed that a microphone to be used by all speakers would enable all parties to hear comments.

**E. UVLSRPC REGIONAL TOWN MEETING**

Chair Ebel discussed with PB members the UVLSRPC’s scheduling of a Regional Town Meeting at Colby-Sawyer College on a night when both the New London and Sutton Planning Boards are scheduled to meet. She pointed out that one of the presenters, Dan Sundquist, is on the Sutton PB and, therefore, will have a conflict. Following discussion, it was agreed that the NLPB should write a letter conveying its concern regarding the apparent lack of coordination.

- F. The MINUTES of the SEPTEMBER 27, 2005 meeting were APPROVED, as amended.**

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **10:45 PM.**

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

DATE APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_

CHAIRMAN \_\_\_\_\_