

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING  
SEPTEMBER 26, 2006**

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

Chair Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:00 PM.

**I. JONATHAN FEINS – Continued Preliminary Plans for Stonehouse Road Access to the Harborview Subdivision in Sutton**

G. Dana Bisbee (Pierce Atwood, LLP) appeared on behalf of Jonathan Feins to address an administrative issue with the NLPB.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. Bisbee if he had received a letter from New London Town Counsel Adele Fulton in which she verified that the NLPB did have jurisdiction in the matter and was authorized to require the applicant to pay reasonable fees for an independent engineer to review the project. Mr. Bisbee replied affirmatively. He advised that his client was not convinced that he was required to pay such fees. Mr. Bisbee opined that because Louis Caron (L. C. Engineering Company, LLC) was working for the Sutton PB, the increase in cost for services provided to the NLPB would be modest. He stated that he still disagreed with the NLPB on both counts. He said that his client would agree to pay the fees, however, because the modest increase in fees was not worth making a squawk over.

Chair Ebel advised that there was precedence for the requirement in the King Ridge subdivision which is located in Sutton with access over the former King Ridge Ski Area road in New London. She advised that the PB could either pass a motion or simply present an invoice for payment of the fees.

PB member Clough said that she was concerned, not only with Louis Caron's work with regard to Stonehouse Road, but also with any studies needed in regard to the intersection of Stonehouse Road and King Hill Road. Mr. Bisbee responded that Mr. Caron's engineering review would include the intersection.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Hollinger) **THAT THE DEVELOPER OF THE HARBORVIEW SUBDIVISION IN SUTTON BE REQUIRED TO PAY REASONABLE FEES FOR AN INDEPENDENT ENGINEERING REVIEW OF STONEHOUSE ROAD AND THE INTERSECTION OF STONEHOUSE ROAD AND KING HILL ROAD IN NEWLONDON. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chair Ebel advised Mr. Bisbee that the usual procedure was for the developer to set up an escrow account. Ken McWilliams advised that Louis Caron would be asked to provide an estimate of fees, the estimate would be conveyed to the developer, and the developer would then be required to set up an escrow account.

Mr. Bisbee stated that there were two unresolved issues: the slope of the road at the intersection and the sight distance. He opined that they were somewhat competing issues. He advised that David Eckman (Eckman Engineering) had spent quite some time on the issue and they have come close to an agreement. He stated that they had also been working with the NH Department of Transportation (DOT). He said that DOT had asked the developer to look at the possibility of shimming the approach. He advised that Mr. Feins initially had not been willing to do that inasmuch as his experts have told him that the sight distances are adequate and have advised installing a speed plate warning of 30 mph at the intersection. Mr. Bisbee said that Mr. Feins was now agreeable to have an engineering study of shimming the approach. He said that safety concerns might warrant a re-design of the intersection. He said that Mr. Feins had suggested that, if the re-design idea moves forward, perhaps a three-way stop should be considered if both the NLPB and the Sutton PB are not satisfied that the intersection is safe.

Mr. Bisbee said that his client would like to have a formal proposal presented by October 9, so that the NLPB could review the site plan at its October 24 meeting. He said that the subcommittee would have to meet before October 9 and questioned if that would be possible. Chair Ebel advised that the subcommittee should review the proposal before the PB meeting. Ken McWilliams clarified that the review would have to take place before October 9 as submissions for the October 24 meeting must be in two weeks before the meeting date. Chair Ebel advised that the PB would not be comfortable making a decision on the proposal before NH DOT had completed its review and issued a report that the PB could review.

PB member Clough asked if there were any records or minutes of the meetings that have already taken place with NH DOT. Mr. Bisbee replied that there were none. He advised that he had met that day with William Oldenburg, P.E. at the NH Bureau of Highway Design, and that he had had one other conversation with him. Mr. McWilliams pointed out that NH DOT had attended the subcommittee meetings.

PB member Clough asked when the final review would occur before the Sutton PB. Mr. Bisbee responded that a group of abutters had hired a lawyer to assist them and that the lawyer had inquired as to why the plan was taking so long. He said that the designation of Stonehouse Road as a scenic road, the second access, and the intersection issues had all taken time to address. He said that the final site plan had not yet been submitted to the Sutton PB. He advised that he did not want to present a final site plan to both the Sutton PB and the NLPB on October 24, only to NLPB. Mr. Bisbee thanked the PB for its willingness to accommodate the applicant by changing its meeting time to 7:00 PM in the past and advised that the earlier starting time would not be necessary on October 24.

## **II. DEBRA L. & JEFFREY C. PERKINS –Concept Annexation**

**(Tax Map 62, Lot 14 & Tax Map 49, Lot 24)**

Jeff Hollinger recused himself from the PB.

Debra Perkins advised that the plan was to create a two-acre lot with 150 feet of frontage on Bunker Road by moving a lot line. The lot would be created from a 9.3 acre lot, Lot 62-14, owned by Debra Perkins. Ms Perkins said that the deed would stipulate an easement right of passage for the remaining land of Debra Perkins. She said that they had walked the site; however, percolation tests would be needed in order to determine where the house and attendant facilities should be located. She described a lot, Lot 26 that was created in 1991, but never taken out of the total acreage. Ms Perkins advised that the remainder of the property would have frontage on Lamson Lane at the bottom of Lot 24. She said that there was a woods road created in 1956 by her father and his siblings that would serve as the driveway for the proposed lot. Ms Perkins advised that all of the property was now in current use.

Chair Ebel asked about Lots 20 and 21. Ms Perkins replied that they, along with Lot 22, were original Lamson Lane lots on which there were cottages. She said that her house now occupied some of that property. She said that Lots 24 & 25 were created only because it was the easiest route for the bulldozer. PB member Andrews asked if there were any plans for Lots 24 and 25. Ken McWilliams advised that the lots would have to be merged because leaving a lot without frontage was not permitted. Ms Andrews asked why the plan was for a lot line adjustment, not a subdivision. Mr. McWilliams replied that no new lot was being created. He advised that Lot 24 would become part of the larger lot. He said that Lot 14 and Lot 24 would need to be annexed first.

Ms Perkins asked when the percolation tests should be done. Mr. McWilliams replied that they would want to be sure that there was adequate land to accommodate a house, septic system, well, and driveway on the lot that would have frontage on Bunker Road. PB member Andrews added that they would want to be sure there was enough land without wetlands.

PB member Andrews asked if there were any wetlands on the property. PB member Clough said that she had heard two brooks mentioned. Ms Perkins pointed out the location of Red Brook on the plan. Ms Andrews said that she was very concerned about wetlands compliance. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that a property owner would not get a building permit if there were wetlands; he cautioned the Perkins about the

steepness of the slope as part of the proposed lot would be very narrow. He said that he did not know what the slope was, but suggested that a narrow lot might not allow them to do what they planned. Ken McWilliams concluded that the PB would like to have the wetlands mapped. He advised that 15% of the lot could be wetlands. Ms Perkins asked who could advise them about wetlands mapping. Chair Ebel advised that a soils scientist should be consulted. Mr. McWilliams offered his assistance.

Jeff Hollinger returned to the PB.

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

Ken McWilliams advised that Charles Hirshberg (CLD Consulting Engineers) had been unable to review the estimate with Town Road Agent Richard Lee and had asked to have the matter continued to October 10.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED SECURITY FOR MAJOR SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED BY ROBERT EWING BE CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 10, 2006 AT 7:30 PM. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**IV. NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC HEARING – Advisory Final Site Plan Review: Highway Maintenance Facility, including a Patrol Shed and Salt Storage Shed  
(Tax Map 33, Lot 21)**

Alan Hanscom (District Engineer, NH DOT District 2, Enfield) displayed plans of the site layout and grading plan for a new NH DOT highway maintenance facility on Old Dump Road. He provided orientation by pointing out the respective locations of Little Lake Sunapee, the stump dump, and Old Dump Road. He advised that the existing building was not shown on the plan. He said DOT proposed to go to the back of the property in the area of an old gravel pit. Chair Ebel asked if the plan could be placed on an easel so that members of the audience could also see what was planned. PB member Cottrill asked if Mr. Hanscom had an area map. Mr. Hanscom responded in the negative.

Mr. Hanscom advised that the existing buildings, a 1970 two-bay structure attached to a 1945 building and a storage shed, are located on the front of the property. He said that the proposed new facility and new salt and sand storage building would both be 50'x120' structures. He advised that the existing floor of the pit would be raised to provide greater distance above the water table. He said the septic would be designed with a pump system. Mr. Hanscom then displayed the floor plan for the proposed facility. It would contain four-bay truck garage, a break room, an office, restroom(s), furnace room. There would be 18-foot-high second story that could be used for storage. He advised that there would be a drain with a grease trap leading to a 2000-gallon holding tank, which would periodically be pumped out and trucked off site.

PB member Hollinger asked if the other building would be for sand and salt storage with no office. Mr. Hanscom replied that it would be exclusively storage. PB member Cottrill asked if DOT would be taking down the old buildings. Mr. Hanscom replied that the old salt storage building would be taken down; however, the existing building would be retained for warm storage of construction vehicles, e.g., tractors that are now stored outside. Mr. Cottrill asked what the elevation change was from one area to the other. Mr. Hanscom replied that it was about ten feet. Mr. Cottrill asked about the location in relation to the New London dump. Mr. Hanscom pointed out the location of both on the plan displayed.

PB member Andrews asked if it would be open or have doors. Mr. Hanscom replied that the salt storage shed would be closed on the sides, open on the front. PB member Clough asked if there were any regulations that had to be met. Mr. Hanscom responded that would be constructed in accordance with best management practices. Ms Clough wondered if there would be any special efforts made to protect the lake. Mr. Hanscom replied that DOT would try to control the direction taken by ground water flow and sweep up any spilled salt. PB member Andrews asked where the water from the grease trap would go. Mr. Hanscom replied that it would go into a holding tank. Mr. McWilliams noted that the tank contents would be pumped out and taken off-site.

Chair Ebel asked Jack Sheehan, who was in the audience, to speak about the conductivity testing on Little Lake Sunapee. Mr. Sheehan stated that the study had been going on for 15 years. He said that conductivity had increased from 70 units to 100-105 units since 1996. He advised that three years ago the Little Lake Sunapee Protective Association began chloride studies and found there were 22-25 units. The Association met with Town Road Agent Richard Lee to request a decrease in the amount of sodium chloride used on Little Sunapee Road. He said that he had just received the results of this year's test and they were significantly lower than those of the past three years. He advised the August 25, 2006 test showed a decrease from 106 to 71 units and chloride reduction from 22-23 units to 13 units. He opined that the conductivity in all lakes was a grave concern and road salt was a contributor. He advised that the level in Bucklin Brook was very high; however, how much came from the old stump dump and how much came from NH DOT was unknown. Mr. Hanscom asked if the data that Mr. Sheehan presented was from one test or from more tests. Mr. Sheehan replied that there was one test on August 25. He said that the results were just in, and he planned to share them with NH DOT. Mr. Hanscom suggested that multiple tests taken throughout the year would be better. Mr. Sheehan said that they planned to take multiple tests.

Chair Ebel asked about the New London Highway Department salt shed and precautions taken by New London regarding salt. Town Administrator Jessie Levine replied that the design was similar to that proposed by NH DOT. She said that the proposed structure would replace a building that is falling down; therefore, it would be an improvement. Mr. Sheehan noted that it would be located further back on the property as well. He opined that any improvement would be good. PB member Clough asked if it would be larger than the existing storage shed. Mr. Hanscom replied that it would be somewhat larger. Ms Clough asked if the existing staging area would be paved. Mr. Hanscom replied that a 20-30-foot wide area around the building would be mostly paved. He described the pathway for drainage into a level spreader. He pointed out the routes water would flow from the two major surface drainage areas.

PB member Hollinger asked when construction would begin. Mr. Hanscom replied that construction would not start much before spring. He said that there had been a delay in getting the plans from the architect and the project was due to go out for bid in late September.

PB member Cottrill asked how many towns were served by the facility. Mr. Hanscom listed the areas covered, mentioning roads in Grantham, Springfield, Bradford, Andover, New London. He said the area served was the same area that had been served for the past 30 years. Mr. Cottrill asked if there would be any chance of expansion. Mr. Hanscom replied that there would be no expansion, unless something else diminished. Mr. Cottrill suggested that, if expansion were planned, maybe the facility could be moved closer to the highway and away from a residential neighborhood. Mr. Hanscom replied that two years ago, NH DOT had looked around for other locations. He said that the facility was not ideally sited, but NH DOT couldn't find any other location where the facility would be welcomed.

Chair Ebel advised that the PB had received a letter from Laurie and Joseph DiClerico, who were unable to attend the hearing. Chair Ebel read the letter in which the DiClericos asked that any new and pre-existing outdoor lighting be of the type necessary to reduce light pollution at night and that the two new structures be sited in such a way that they will act as noise screens for the neighborhood. Mr. Hanscom stated that the lighting used would direct light downward and the street light beside the current salt shed would be removed. He said that it was a 24-hour facility, so nighttime lighting was necessary. Chair Ebel stated that the town was working to minimize light pollution. Mr. Hanscom said that he would keep that in mind and use appropriate lighting. He stated that the current layout of the buildings was not what the DiClericos would have preferred, but it was the best for that site.

Ron Koron (182 Camp Sunapee Road) said that he was speaking for the Little Sunapee Protective Association. He said that the LSPA was pleased about the low-salt road designation. He asked if the object was to improve the existing buildings. Mr. Hanscom replied affirmatively. He advised that last winter there was ice in the attic and storage areas and that the building was 60 years old. He said that it was cramped and that it was not possible to get all of the equipment under cover. He said the latter created challenges for starting diesel equipment in cold weather. Mr. Koron asked if there would be any additional traffic. Mr. Hanscom replied that

there would be no change in duties or employees. Mr. Koron asked what about the old buildings. Mr. Hanscom replied that the old salt and sand shed was in very poor shape and would be demolished at a later date. Mr. Koron asked if there were any way to test the drainage. Mr. Hanscom advised that there were approximately 10 test wells from the old dump and the NH DOT site. He said that Bucklin Brook was also tested. He advised that the Big Lake Sunapee Protective Association visited frequently and that NH DOT was working with that association. Mr. Koron asked if there had been any talk about brine plant. Mr. Hanscom replied in the negative.

Abutter Chris Bottinger asked if the facility would impose on an area sometimes referred to as the "old Messer burial ground" for cows or if the area had been all excavated out. Mr. Hanscom opined that it would not be an issue.

Ken Jacques New London-Springfield Water System Precinct Commissioner, asked what finish the floor of the salt shed would be. Mr. Hanscom replied that it would be asphalt. PB member Clough asked why the building locations would not provide the sound buffer preferred by the DiClericos. Mr. Hanscom described how the work area and buildings would be sited. He pointed out an area contaminated by use as a dumping area in some prior time and wetlands areas. He said that there was not a lot of useful land on the site. Ms Clough asked if there had been any discussion about a tree buffer. Mr. Hanscom replied that it wouldn't be possible to plant items that didn't like constantly wet feet. Abutter Bottinger said that he had 200-300 trees. He suggested removing the equipment backing bells to cease disturbing the DiClericos.

Commissioner Cricenti asked about the portion of the property that abuts the New London-Springfield Water System Precinct. Mr. Hanscom replied that the area would have the diesel pump and the old salt storage shed would probably come down to let the road become a two-way road. James Cricenti, New London-Springfield Water System Precinct Commissioner, asked if some delineation were planned. Mr. Hanscom replied affirmatively.

PB member Cottrill asked how far the edge of the pavement extended and how could drainage be minimized. He asked how the stream was protected. Mr. Hanscom replied that there was not a lot activity today, but there would be more with the proposal. Mr. Cottrill said that he would like an effort to buffer the stream. Chair Ebel asked if the stream was a buffered stream. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that it was not a buffered stream identified on the New London Streams and Wetlands Protection Map; however, some of the wetlands in the area were buffered.

PB member Andrews asked if NH DOT shared results of its testing with the town. Mr. Hanscom replied in the negative and said that he would ask the town to share its results with NH DOT. Ms Andrews opined that there appeared to be opportunities to test and that New London, NH DOT, and the LSPA could do something cooperatively. Ken McWilliams opined that now would be a good time to get baseline data. Jack Sheehan said that it would be necessary to determine how deep the wells are and what is being measured, surface run-off or groundwater flow. He stated that, if it were storm water, it needed to be channeled it to some point for testing. Mr. Hanscom stated that the culvert under did not collect water from the work area. Chair Ebel said that perhaps a testing plan could be drawn up between the various players so that baseline data could be measured before construction begins. Mr. Koron, Ms Levine, and Mr. Hanscom agreed to work together on testing. Chair Ebel opined that the proposed facility will be better than the existing plant. PB member Cottrill asked if New London was sampling the ground water now. Town Administrator Jessie Levine replied that the town was testing the two wells located on town property.

Chair Ebel thanked Mr. Hanscom for his presentation and the NH DOT for informing the PB and the Town of New London of the proposed construction work.

**V. COLLEGE CAFÉ – Site Plan Review: Need for Site Plan Review**

**(Tax Map 85, Lot 44)**

John Perrotta said that he had received approval from the PB in July 2005 to do some catering and some function activities in the space formerly used by Babson Real Estate. He said that he now wants to put in a seven-day, 4:00 PM-Midnight tavern. He asked if the proposed use would be within the existing approval. He

advised that the parking lot was empty most evenings. He advised that there would be seating for 47 and said that originally the agreed upon seating was for 60.

PB member Cottrill opined that the issues would be parking and traffic. Chair Ebel said that originally the space contained a real estate agency; however, College Café has been allowed to use the space as a quasi-restaurant without a Site Plan Review. PB member Cook said that originally it was only to be one day/week. Mr. Cottrill said that now the proposal was for more days and asked what the impact would be on abutters. Town Administrator Jessie Levine opined that a neighbor who thought the approval was for a real estate office might be concerned about the change to a tavern.

Mr. Perrotta said that the tavern would not be a “watering hole”. He said that there might be an “open-mike” night on the weekend. He said that he had spoken with his landlord and the landlord had granted approval.

Chair Ebel read from the Minutes of the July 25, 2005 Meeting of the PB the motion granting PB approval for the College Café. PB member Andrews said that the use would be going from catering and functions to a full restaurant. She opined that the only issue would be parking. PB member Hollinger opined that the PB needed to afford the neighbors an opportunity to weigh in on the change. Ken McWilliams opined that the PB could be lenient in its requirements for a Site Plan Review, i.e., it could use a simplified plan.

Fire Chief Peter Stanley advised that the Fire Department would need a floor plan, drawn to scale for seating. He said the Department needed to know the location of tables and chairs in order to determine the maximum occupancy level. Mr. Perrotta shared a modified plan with Fire Chief Stanley, who said that he would ask Jay Lyon to review the plan to determine the occupant load and come up with a plan that agrees with the parking approved. Chief Stanley said that there needs to be a creditable record on file in the event of future owners. He said that the occupant loan approved by the Fire Department and the parking approval should agree.

Chair Ebel sought the consensus of the PB and all agreed that a simplified Site Plan Review (SPR) should be required. Mr. McWilliams advised Mr. Perrotta that the first opportunity would be on October 24, 2006. PB member Hollinger asked what the proposed opening date was. Mr. Perrotta replied that the date rested in the PB’s hands. It was agreed that Mr. Perrotta would consult with Mr. McWilliams regarding the SPR.

**VI. AUSTIN EATON – Final Certificate of Performance: Great Pines & Release of the \$3,000 Letter of Credit (Tax Map 58, Lot 27)**

Austin Eaton advised the PB that all conditions had been met. He said that there had been some washout due to the recent rain and one or two silt fences needed to be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator. He said that everything was completed. He noted that no Great Pines homeowners were present at the meeting, and he interpreted that to mean that they must be satisfied.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Hollinger) **THAT A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF PERFORMANCE BE ISSUED FOR THE GREAT PINES SUBDIVISION AND THAT THE \$3,000 LETTER OF CREDIT BE RELEASED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**VII. GEORGE MARTENS – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 106, Lot 18)**

Ken McWilliams presented a request from George Martens to remove one dead birch tree which potentially threatens his living room and replace it with blueberry bushes. PB member Dale Conly has visited the site and has recommended approval of the request with no additional planting required. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that the area was very heavily forested. Chair Ebel opined that the approval might as well include the replanting requirement, since the owner planned to plant blueberries.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT THE REQUEST TO REMOVE ONE DEAD BIRCH TREE LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 370 FIELDSTONE**

**LANE BE APPROVED WITH ADDITIONAL PLANTING AS PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**VIII. DISCUSSION OF PLANNING BOARD BUDGETS FOR 2006 & 2007**

Jessie Levine, Town Administrator, distributed a comparative summary of planning expenses for 2004, 2005, and 2006. She told the PB that the 2006 budget provided for \$31,500 for the circuit rider planner. She advised that the Board of Selectmen had approved covering the planning portions. She said that Finance Officer Carol Fraley had reviewed the records and broken out the costs as shown on the chart distributed. She said that the estimated costs for the Zoning Regulations and the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) were pretty close to the expenditures. Ms Levine said that the big change was in the planning hours: 309.5 hours in 2004, 382.5 hours in 2005, and 379.25 hours in 2006. She explained how the 2007 estimates were derived yielding a budget of \$37,800, lower than the \$46,200 proposed by the Town Planner. The Budget Committee was totally satisfied with the value received for the expense of the Town Planner.

PB member Cottrill asked if an estimate was made for the hours in 2006. PB member Hollinger opined that the estimate would have been 480. He said that when he applied the percentage of increase he came up with 520 hours. PB member Andrews opined that 420 hours was not enough. Ms Levine said that January and February expenses were significantly higher than the previous year. Chair Ebel pointed out that March was higher, as well. Discussion ensued regarding the reason the hours were higher. Chair Ebel asked how many hours/month were included in the budget proposed by Ms Levine. PB member Hollinger said that the budget included 35 hours/month. PB member Clough noted that there had been only one month with fewer than 35 hours. PB member Andrews said that she applied a percentage of growth and estimated 520 hours. Ken McWilliams advised that the average for the previous seven months was 56 hours/month. Ms Levine opined that probably the PB should budget high. Discussion ensued.

PB member Cottrill asked if the estimate included the revision of the regulations or did it include only planning. Ms Levine replied that it was the estimate for planning only. PB member Clough questioned the number of hours estimated for zoning. She suggested that the zoning hearings must have been combined with other issues. She opined that 420 hours was too low an estimate. PB member Hollinger opined that the 520 hour estimate did not allow for growth. Chair Ebel said that the PB wants to keep the PB expenses under control. PB member Clough agreed and said that the budget had to be defended at Town Meeting. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that additional and new regulations would require more lengthy PB review time. He noted that the Land Subdivision Control Regulations, the Site Plan Review Regulations, and the Driveway Regulations were all under revision.

Ken McWilliams said that he had suggested quarterly budget reviews with the Town Administrator and the Finance Officer. PB member Andrews stated that the 520 hour estimate only addressed the 2006 expenses. Ms Levine said she would leave the budget at \$46,800, as proposed, and see how it goes. Chair Ebel said the PB needed to monitor expenses closely.

**IX. MASTER PLAN: (A) Review/Comment on New London Data Packet. (B) Review/Comment on Draft Maps. (C) Discuss Community Workshop Schedule**

Ken McWilliams asked if the PB members had brought the Master Plan Data Packet to the meeting. He advised that it contained the data that he would use for the Vision Workshop and for updating the existing Master Plan.

PB member Clough advised that the Board of Selectmen was concerned about the loss of small businesses in town. She asked if the PB had ever assembled a demographic profile. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley stated that retail business had a difficult time in town because the population was not sufficient to support it. Chair Ebel stated that it had been the businesses in town that had opposed expansion of the commercial zone precisely for that reason when the last Master Plan was done. Ms Clough wondered if the town should have information to provide to prospective residents regarding retail business opportunities.

Ken McWilliams advised that the Vision Workshop was now scheduled for spring. He said that he would like volunteers for each chapter of the plan to assemble, collect, present data, and follow through to implementation. He said that it was very important for volunteers to be engaged after the Vision Workshop. PB member Clough advised that she would share the information with the advisory committee to the Board of Selectmen. She opined that with the workshop in the spring, the summer schedule of one meeting per month may not be possible. Chair Ebel advised that the one meeting/month was a PB option, but the PB could hold two meetings/month.

#### **X. DRIVEWAY REGULATIONS – Review of Draft Regulations**

Ken McWilliams advised that the draft regulations had undergone two reviews by the municipal departments and revisions had been made. He noted that at the last meeting, PB member Clough had raised the issue re driveways that did not meet the Section III standards having to appeal to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a Variance. He said that he would include an item to address that issue.

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley opined that in Section III. Q. the standard of “. . . minimum of 8” of gravel. . . minimum of 4” of crushed gravel” should be clarified. He also recommended that Section VI. 1. Enforcement be modified to include “consistent with state RSA” or to permit the Board of Selectmen to delegate the authority, so that all of the town’s regulations agree. PB members recommended that the “highway” references in Section I. A. Authority should be brought into agreement for the purpose of clarity.

PB member Clough asked about the derivation of the 500-foot standard included in Section III. A. of the regulations. Mr. McWilliams replied that the 500-foot standard might reflect the state requirement. PB member Hollinger asked how the standard would be applied in the case of a circular drive. Mr. McWilliams replied that a circular drive would be judged to have two entrances. He noted the need to specify two entrances. Ms Clough asked if the sight distance requirements were different for driveways and for roads. Mr. McWilliams replied in the affirmative. PB member Cottrill asked why 25-mph was included in the sight distances standard in Section III. C. He opined that everyone drove faster than 25 mph and that the higher speeds would require additional sight distances.

PB member Andrews said that the “highway” references in Section I. A. should agree. PB member Clough recommended that the entire paragraph should be simplified/broken down.

PB member Andrews asked what was the meaning of “to the end of the driveway” in Section III. E. Mr. McWilliams replied that the wording was intended to cover lots with no buildings. PB member Cook suggested including concrete drives in Section III. H., so that the reference would be to approaches paved with “asphalt, tar, or concrete”. PB members asked about the statement in Section III. J. Drainage that a driveway should “not interfere with the street’s drainage.” Mr. McWilliams referred PB members to the first sentence in Section III. S. Erosion Control. Chair Ebel suggested changing the wording to read “town street or highway”. She asked why the regulation could not be modified to include “or abutting property”, similar to the wording in the Erosion Control item. Chair Ebel recommended stating the requirement in such a manner as to indicate that the regulations were constructed to protect abutting properties. She suggested adding a sentence stating that “drainage from the driveway shall not interfere with drainage on abutting properties.”

PB member Clough recommended that the reference to “the board” in Section VI. 4. Waiver should be changed to “the Planning Board” for purposes of clarification. It was recommended that the statement about going to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, now located in Section VI.4. Waiver, should be re-located. Mr. McWilliams advised that he would include an item about requirements that originate in the zoning ordinance.

In discussing Section III. N. and Section III. O. PB members suggested that it might be a good idea to add “50 foot or as determined by the most current regulations” and “100 foot or as amended” respectively. Chair Ebel said that she didn’t like limiting the regulation to a specific number. She opined that it would be easier to amend a regulation without an exact number.

**XI. OTHER BUSINESS**

A. MINUTES of the AUGUST 22, 2006 MEETING were APPROVED as circulated.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **10:05 PM**.

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

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

CHAIRMAN \_\_\_\_\_