

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
May 24, 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 Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM.

I. AUSTIN EATON (CONSTANCE GRANGER PROPERTY) – Continued Preliminary Major Subdivision and Cluster Development Plan (Tax Map 61, Lot 14)

Chair Ebel announced that the applicant had requested that the hearing on the preliminary major subdivision and cluster development plan be continued to June 28, 2005.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE HEARING ON THE PRELIMINARY MAJOR SUBDIVISION AND CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE GRANGER PROPERTY BE CONTINUED TO JUNE 28, 2005, AS REQUESTED BY AUSTIN EATON, DEVELOPER. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

II. GUENTER K. HUBERT – Concept Site Plan Review: Use of Parking during Tent Sales (Tax Map 59, Lot 3)

Guenter Hubert appeared for a determination of the need for a site plan review in order for Hubert's to use three of its parking spaces for tent sales. Mr. Hubert provided a packet of information, including parking and handicapped accessible parking, on the site and the building. He advised that his review of the Zoning Regulations in concert with parking requirements for retail space (27 spaces) and medical office space (3 spaces) combined had yielded a result of 30 required spaces. He stated that the original plan approved by the PB showed 36 spaces, including two handicapped accessible spaces. He also referred to a visual measurement plan that revealed 40 marked spaces, including 3 handicapped spaces. He opined that three of the existing spaces could be "de-commissioned" for use during tent sales without bringing total available parking below regulatory requirements.

Chair Ebel asked how many times a year did Hubert's have tent sales. Mr. Hubert replied that three-day tent sales were held four times a year. Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams if it would be necessary for Mr. Hubert to de-commission the spaces. She asked if it would not be possible for him to simply use the three spaces for 12 days a year. Mr. McWilliams agreed that the simple solution would be to permit the use for 12 days a year.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT NO SITE PLAN REVIEW BE REQUIRED FOR HUBERT'S TO USE THREE OF ITS PARKING SPACES AT 219 COUNTY ROAD FOR THREE-DAY TENT SALES FOUR TIMES EACH YEAR. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

PB member Cottrill asked to have the minutes reflect that the number of available parking spaces would still exceed the regulatory requirements, even if three spaces were in use for a tent sale.

III. SUBLIME CIVIL & JESSEMAN ASSOCIATES – Preliminary Site Plan Review: Office Expansion (Tax Map 60, Lot 3)

Sue Clough recused herself from the Planning Board.

Stephen Jesseman (Jesseman Associates) advised that Robert Daley (Intelligent Banking Solutions), the prospective buyer, was out of town and, therefore, unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Jesseman advised that, in the plan presented, the parking space in the front yard would be removed, as would the driving access to the abutting motel parking lot. He advised that he had negotiated a leasing agreement with the motel owners for five parking spaces for 99 years. Chair Ebel requested, and received, a copy of the leasing agreement. It was noted that the lease provides for the five spaces to be available only during the hours from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. Mr. Jesseman stated that seldom would all of the spaces be in use at the same time. Ken McWilliams clarified that the spaces would be available for use by the motel after 5:00 PM. He emphasized that the spaces would be shared spaces. He also advised that, should the use of the motel property change, the five

MAY 24, 2005

spaces covered by the lease would not be available for whatever the changed use might be. PB member Andrews asked if the spaces would be striped. Mr. Jesseman replied affirmatively. PB member Cook asked if it would be possible for Sublime Civil/Jesseman Associates clients or personnel who park in the spaces in the motel lot to walk through to the Jesseman building. Mr. Jesseman replied that, although he would cede the right to drive through the right-of-way, the right to walk through would still exist.

Mr. Jesseman briefly recapped the Executive Summary submitted to the PB. He advised that the proposed use of the building would be professional office space. He noted that the existing two-car garage would become a seminar room for Intelligent Banking Solutions. He advised that an existing shop building would be removed in order to accommodate required parking and the intervening area would be converted to green space, i.e., pervious area. He added that an existing second floor apartment would be converted to office space for Jesseman Associates. He further advised that there would be a total of eight to ten employees for both entities and the hours of operation would be 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM from Monday through Friday. He estimated that business traffic, including deliveries, would be approximately six per week. He stated that there would be neither change in nor impact on municipal services.

PB member Andrews asked Mr. Jesseman to point out the location of the shop on the plan. PB member Hollinger asked if there was any regulatory limit on the number of employees that could be housed in a building of this size. He suggested that an abrupt increase could result in parking problems. Ken McWilliams advised that parking requirements are based on the square footage of the building. He advised that, although the zoning regulations have no provision limiting the number of employees in a building, the Fire Department would evaluate the proposal to assure compliance with all state and local fire codes which do contain limits on occupancy. Chair Ebel asked about any fire requirements regarding occupancy. Peter Stanley, Fire Chief, advised that the requirement is one person per 100 square feet. Ms Andrews asked where the boundary of the commercial district is located. Mr. Jesseman demonstrated the location on the plan. Mr. McWilliams explained that the boundary runs through the building; however, the Zoning Board of Adjustment in 1988 granted the building the right to be entirely commercial in use. He emphasized that the ZBA action applies only to the building, not to the entire property.

Mr. Jesseman noted that the Fire Department had asked for egress plans and exit signs. He then advised the PB that he would seek waivers of requirements for a boundary survey (one was done in 1988, and there have been no changes), identification of buildings within 200 feet (he stated that the motel would be added; otherwise, there have been no changes), 2-foot contours (the site is flat), changes in existing grade (no changes are proposed), drainage structures (no changes proposed), and 25-year storm drainage calculations (he mentioned the impervious area).

Chair Ebel asked if the parking spaces on the Jesseman property would be striped. Mr. Jesseman replied in the negative and indicated that the parking area would be gravel. He added that the Town Administrator, Jessie Levine, had asked the same question in the meeting of municipal department heads. He stated his belief that Mr. Daley was not ready to do any paving right now. PB member Cottrill asked about existing parking. Chair Ebel asked if paving would alter existing parking in any way. Mr. McWilliams advised that there are three parallel spaces on the south side of the building. He opined that striping would advise drivers how to park and might eliminate angle parking in that area. He also suggested installing barriers, such as railroad ties, between the parking landscaping areas. Mr. Jesseman opined that Mr. Daley could advise his employees to park in the parallel spaces. Chair Ebel asked about the effectiveness of lime striping. Mr. McWilliams replied that it would last only until the first big rain washed it off, in other words, it would not last long-term.

PB member Cottrill asked how many spaces would be required for the proposed use. Ken McWilliams replied that 13 spaces would be required. Chair Ebel asked if the spaces on the motel property would be clearly designated for use by occupants of the Jesseman building. Mr. Jesseman said that he would make that request. PB members Andrews and Cottrill sought, and received, an explanation of the overlapping parking and its impact on future uses of the motel property. PB member Cook asked if handicapped accessibility would be required. Ms Andrews asked what would happen if the proposed conference room were to be divided into cubicles. Mr. McWilliams advised that parking is based upon square footage, in this case 3760 sq. ft., and that figure would not change. Ms Andrews requested, and received, an explanation of how the parking requirement was calculated.

MAY 24, 2005

Chair Ebel asked if any abutters were present. Abutter Richard Bott questioned the parking along the side of the property. He opined that it seemed to be angle parking, not parallel. He approved the elimination of one space in front of the building. He suggested that two spaces on the side were outside the commercial district and, therefore, should be eliminated. He also opined that the number of weekly deliveries exceeds the six per week mentioned by Mr. Jesseman. He maintained that the site was not conducive to commercial activity, since it is located in a residential neighborhood. He advised that the original ZBA ruling was made to permit Mr. Jesseman to have his office on the first floor; now, Mr. Jesseman wants to make the entire building commercial. Mr. Bott stated that existing parking regulations have not been enforced, even though he has contact the Town on several occasions regarding non-compliance issues.

PB member Hollinger observed that, with the lease of five spaces from the motel, it would be possible to eliminate the two spaces on the side and still have 14 available parking spaces. He suggested that eliminating those spaces might be a way to appease the neighbors. PB member Andrew asked how the owners would signal "no parking" in that area. Mr. McWilliams and Mr. Bott both opined that a physical barrier would be needed. Mr. Hollinger and Chair Ebel suggested that the owners could grass the area and plant shrubs or trees to make it appear more residential in nature. The original intent of the board was not to make Little Sunapee Road commercial. Abutter Bott reiterated that a physical barrier would be needed. Mr. Jesseman suggested planting shrubs parallel to the driveway to shield it from the Bott property. Mr. Bott replied that his property looks right up Jesseman's driveway. He recommended the installation of curbing. Chair Ebel opined that Mr. Daley would need to install some alternative physical barrier temporarily, as he seems to have no immediate plans to pave. Mr. Hollinger opined that the goal is to make the site look as residential as possible. Chair Ebel stated that the goal is not to invade the setback and not to allow angle parking. Ms Andrews suggested that railroad ties could be used to form a barrier.

Mrs. Bott stated that she had researched the Minutes from 1988 and asked if the limitations contained in the 1988 approval would still apply. She expressed her concern that the stipulations might be forgotten or overlooked. Chair Ebel advised that any limitations would still apply. She and PB member Andrews both opined that it would be good to re-emphasize any limitations. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that all of the parking spaces on the plan presented by Mr. Jesseman lie within the commercial district. He reviewed the site plan with Chair Ebel, and PB member Cottrill.

PB member Andrews asked if the PB should act on the waiver requests. Chair Ebel replied affirmatively and asked Mr. Jesseman to review his request for waivers. Mr. Jesseman requested waivers of the following Site Plan Review requirements:

Article IX.A.1. Boundary lines of the area included in the site. Mr. Jesseman asked to use a 1988 survey, since there have been no changes.

Article IX.A.6. Shape, size, and location of existing and proposed structures within 200 feet. Mr. Jesseman stated that the Lamplighter Motel would be shown on the plan; however, there have been no other changes since the last review. PB member Andrews inquired about Powers Point. PB members asked about the significance of the two different shades of yellow on the zoning map. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley explained that the two shades represent two different zones, R-1 and R-2. Abutter Bott opined that buildings within 200 feet should be shown. PB members reviewed the zoning map. Chair Ebel noted that a waiver would eliminate the Bott, Powers Point, and Sweatt properties. PB member Hollinger opined that, if abutters were concerned, then the waiver should not be granted. Ken McWilliams asked if showing contiguous properties would satisfy those concerns. Chair Ebel opined that it would be adequate.

Article IX.A.8. Existing and proposed grades, drainage systems, structures, and topographic contours at intervals not exceeding two feet. Mr. Jesseman stated that there is no rise across the property. Ms Andrews asked how much of a slope there is between the property and the Garden Spa. Mr. Jesseman replied "18 inches". PB member Clough opined that, since there is prior history of drainage problems, the PB should consider requiring the topographic contours. Mr. Jesseman described the action of the prior owner and the resolution of the problem. He advised that there were no grade changes proposed.

Article IX.A.15. Drainage design. Mr. Jesseman advised that no drainage structures existed and none were proposed. With respect to the calculations related to a 25-year design frequency, he advised that the previously mentioned impervious area would be added to the plan. He opined that any change in the calculation would be negligible. PB member Hollinger asked, if there were to be additional paving in the next few years, would drainage increase. Mr. Jesseman replied that the area on the plan that appeared to be paved was actually bark mulch. He

MAY 24, 2005

also opined that removal of the shed would augment existing drainage. Abutter Bott asked where the drainage would go. Mr. Jesseman replied that the existing packed gravel driveway was as impervious as paving would be and, therefore, the drainage pattern would not change. He briefly described existing drainage. Upon request of Chair Ebel, he agreed to provide a drainage pattern for PB review.

Article IX.A.18. Location of waste disposal facility. Mr. Jesseman advised that a note would be placed on the plan indicating that trash disposal would be inside; however, an outside location for a dumpster would be identified, as would the requirement for screening. Ken McWilliams advised that the note should say that the plan is to have waste disposal inside, but if it is outside, it must be placed as noted on the plan.

Mr. Jesseman requested that the final SPR be scheduled for June 28, 2005.

Sue Clough returned to the PB.

IV. TKR (PETER CHRISTIAN'S) – Concept Site Plan Review: Restaurant Expansion (Tax Map 73, Lot 77)

Russ Sarles presented a plan for a 16' x 25' addition to provide 30 additional seats and the addition of a deck for seasonal seats. He stated that he had met with municipal department heads in the afternoon. He advised that Peter Christian's is currently approved for 96 patrons inside and 16 seasonal patrons on a deck. The proposal includes plans to move a 16' x 30' building to the space now occupied by the deck and to relocate the driveway. Mr. Sarles advised that currently the parking area is used by abutters and by people picking up and dropping off students at KRMS. He stated that the picking up and dropping off of students for evening events at KRMS has been problematic for customer parking at Peter Christian's. He advised that the current location of the dumpster chews up two parking spaces. Removal of the shed would permit relocation of the dumpster. The proposed relocation of the driveway and removal of the small building would provide a straight shot to the rear of the Peter Christian's, thereby permitting deliveries to be made at the rear of the building. Mr. Sarles advised that the dumpster would be fenced and its relocation would free up 16 feet of additional parking space.

PB member Andrews asked how many parking spaces Peter Christian's needed now. Mr. Sarles replied that the existing 47 spaces exceed the regulatory requirement for the current capacity. Mr. Sarles advised that he would also request permission to re-pave the parking lot. PB member Conly asked if the two parking spaces in front would be eliminated. Mr. Sarles replied affirmatively. Ms Andrews asked how Peter Christian's would gain parking spaces, noting that the spaces currently used by the dumpster were included as part of the initial count of available parking spaces. She also asked if parking for the apartment tenants had been considered. Ken McWilliams replied that the five apartments required seven spaces. He also advised that, if the proposal is for 25 new seats, 55 spaces would be required; if the proposal is for 30 new seats, 57 spaces would be required, including those for the apartments. Ms Andrews reiterated that the spaces currently occupied by the dumpster could not be counted as new spaces. PB member Cottrill asked about parking for seats on the deck. Mr. McWilliams replied that those were already accounted for. Mr. Sarles stated that he did not want to erect a fence to exclude use by abutters; however, if the parking area were to be fenced and limited to PC's parking only, sufficient spaces exist. Ms Andrews emphasized the need to comply with the regulations. Mr. McWilliams stated that some of the 10-foot wide spaces could be reduced and one aisle could be eliminated. He opined that additional spaces could be made available. Ms Andrews asked if PC's would be getting rid of the building. Mr. Sarles replied that it would be moved to the space where the deck is currently located. PB member Conly requested, and received, confirmation that 57 parking spaces would be required for the additional of 30 seats. PB member Sue Clough asked if the setback requirements would be met. Mr. McWilliams replied affirmatively. Ms Clough asked if the green space between PC's and the school would be retained. Mr. Sarles replied affirmatively. Ms Clough asked about any need for additional snow removal measures. PB member Cottrill inquired about the edge of the pavement.

Reporting on the meeting of municipal department heads, Ken McWilliams stated that the Fire Department would require that the new building be plumbed for sprinklers, with an outside connection for fire apparatus and that there be a long-term plan to install sprinklers throughout the entire building. The Sewer Commission cited the need to review the location of the sewer service connection to PC's, in order to determine whether or not there would be any conflict with the proposed changes.

Mr. Sarles asked to return to the PB on July 12, 2005.

MAY 24, 2005

V. **ARISTOTLE SOULIOTIS – Concept Site Plan Review: Change Use to Convenience Store with Gas**
(Tax Map 84, Lot 2)

The applicant was not present. Ken McWilliams advised that Mr. Souliotis had met with the municipal department heads in the afternoon and suggested that he might not have understood that he also had to appear before the PB as well. Mr. McWilliams offered to contact Mr. Souliotis to clarify the procedures.

VI. **NICK KARAGIANIS (WILDBERRY BAGEL CO.) – Concept Site Plan Review: Add Outdoor Seating in Summer**
Tax Map 73, Lot 81)

Nick Karagianis, owner of Wildberry Bagel Co., proposed placing patio furniture on the front lawn at Wildberry Bagel during the summer. He stated that he was not seeking approval for additional seating and that no service would be provided to those electing to use the furniture.

PB member Cottrill asked if the chairs would be moved outside during the day and inside at night. Mr. Karagianis replied that the tables would remain on the lawn overnight; however, the umbrellas and chairs would be removed. He advised that 90% of his business was take-out. He also stated that he had offered tables and seating on the lawn one previous summer and found that it worked well. He commented that when he purchased the business from the Wrights in 1996, the lawn tables and chairs existed.

Ken McWilliams reported that there had been considerable discussion at the meeting of municipal department heads. Currently, Wildberry Bagel has 14 seats inside and parking consists of two spaces in front and seven behind the building. He said that the nine parking spaces would allow for a total of 18 seats; therefore, four seats could be added without any adjustment in parking. He stated that adding more than four seats outside would require a comparable reduction in the number of seats available inside.

PB member Hollinger asked if there would be any limit on the number of seats outside. Mr. McWilliams replied that the size of the lawn would be a limiting factor. Mr. Karagianis reiterated that 90% of his business was take-out. Mr. McWilliams observed that, currently, customers park, go in to pick up food, and then leave, all within a brief period of time. He opined that the proposed lawn seating could encourage customers to linger longer, thereby occupying available parking longer.

PB member Cottrill asked if there was any desire to increase seating. Mr. Karagianis replied in the negative. Mr. Cottrill opined that it would be nice to eliminate the two parking spaces in front of the building. Other PB members did not concur. Chair Ebel asked how many seats were permitted. Mr. McWilliams replied that parking available would permit up to 18 total seats. Mr. Cottrill asked if the spaces were paved and marked. Mr. Karagianis replied affirmatively, but added that the marking had faded. PB member Andrews asked where the dumpster was located. Mr. Karagianis replied that it was in front of the garage. He said that it occupied space that could be turned into two additional parking spaces, but he has no intention to do so. PB member Cook asked where employees parked. Mr. Karagianis replied that they parked in the KRSD over-flow lot or on the street. Mr. Cottrill stated that he would like to see a plan. Mr. McWilliams replied that Mr. Karagianis was not proposing any changes; therefore, the site plan would not show any new information. Ms Andrews asked how the proposed change would be policed. Mr. McWilliams responded that complaints would be directed to Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley. Ms Andrews observed that Wildberry Bagel was busiest when schools were in session.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT NO SITE PLAN REVIEW BE REQUIRED FOR WILDBERRY BAGEL CO. TO ADD OUTDOOR SEATING IN THE SUMMER, SUBJECT TO THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE WILL BE NO INCREASE IN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF SEATS PERMITTED BY AVAILABLE PARKING. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

PB member Clough wondered why the 1994 site plan could not be found in the PB files and asked if the PB should contact the owners in order to obtain a copy. Zoning Administrator Stanley responded that it could be filed in the tax files in the Selectmen's Office. Mr. Cottrill said that he really would like to see the plan. Ms Clough advised

MAY 24, 2005

stopping at 14 seats until further information becomes available. Mr. Karagianis stated that he had a copy of the plan and that he would give a copy to Mr. Stanley to put in the PB files.

VII. W. MICHAEL TODD – Concept Site Plan Review

(Tax Map 84, Lot 64)

W. Michael Todd, manager of the property located at 210 Main Street, began by saying that his authority to represent the owner had been questioned. He explained that the proposed site plan would show the use of an outside previously existing door. He also noted that there were two parking plans: one recommended by the owner and a more aggressive one suggested by the tenant.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. Todd to explain the plan more fully. Mr. Todd stated that the building would continue to be a mixed-use property. He stated that the building had previously house a three-bedroom, 2 bath apartment upstairs, office and demo space for Foremost Builders and the College Sport Shop on the street level. He said that after the closing of the College Sport Shop, Foremost had taken over that space and Sage's Interiors had moved into the space previously occupied by Foremost. PB member Cottrill asked about the use of the lower level where the previously unused outside door is located. Mr. Todd replied that the lower level housed a garage for the apartment tenant and the remainder had previously been used by the College Sport Shop for office space and stock storage. He advised that the lower level also housed the furnace and became crawl space under a portion of the building. Foremost Builders proposes using the area previously used by the College Sport Shop as a field office. Mr. Todd displayed a site plan of the building as it was when occupied by the College Sport Shop.

Mr. Todd acknowledged the failure to obtain a building permit before adding a bath and a partition and a half. He attributed the oversight to lack of coordination between the out-of-town rental agent and himself. He stated that the building is owned by the Sally Fifield Trust and eventually will go to her two surviving children. He stated that he had been hired to manage the property. Mr. Todd advised that there had been many challenges and updates had been made. He maintained that there was no change in use. He stated the area of the building to be 2400 sq. ft. Ken McWilliams asked Mr. Todd if he had any breakdown in the use of the building. Mr. Todd repeated that there would be no change in use. Chair Ebel opined that the area occupied by Foremost was office space whereas it had been retail space when occupied by the College Sport Shop. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley stated that Mr. Todd's description for the PB differed from the description given at the afternoon meeting of municipal department heads. Mr. Todd replied that he had previously not given any thought to the nature of the materials that he had removed from the lower level of the College Sport Shop. A review of those items resulted in the modification of his description. Ken McWilliams observed that Mr. Todd had described the lower level as a field office. Mr. Todd replied that it would house two offices – one for the foreman for all jobs and one for the small handyman job oversight. He stated the intent to be to keep the "guys with dirty shoes" separated from the retail space on the street level.

PB member Clough asked if there were different requirements for retail space and office space and asked if specific measurements were needed. Mr. McWilliams replied that the apartment with three bedrooms required two parking spaces. He advised that retail space required 4.0 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. and office space required 3.3 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. He also advised that, at an October 14, 1997 conceptual site plan review regarding a proposed addition of a 20' x 26' structure on stilts, the owner was told that he would need nine parking spaces. He had 13 spaces. Ms Clough asked if there was any difference in the parking requirements for trucks and cars. Mr. McWilliams replied negatively.

Chair Ebel opined that the situation was complex enough to warrant a site plan review. PB member Andrews stated that she would like to see what currently exists. Mr. McWilliams cited Article III. C. of the Site Plan Review Regulations that states "a change in use or layout of multi-family or non-residential property or building(s) which involves changes in traffic flow, parking, drainage, water, sewer, or other utilities" as cause for site plan review. Mr. Todd asked what would happen if the PB disagreed with what he wants. Mr. McWilliams replied that Mr. Todd could appeal to the Superior Court. Ms Andrews opined that the proposed change in parking would require a SPR. Mr. Todd advised that there were two parking proposals: one favored by the owner and one favored by the major tenant. Chair Ebel stated that parking on the site is problematic and the line of sight is limited when cars must back into traffic in order to exit the property. Mr. Todd reiterated that he did not see any change in use. Ms

MAY 24, 2005

Clough replied that he now proposes to use a door that was previously unused and to make accessible an area that was not previously used by customers.

Zoning Administrator Stanley commented on the parking intensity at this site in the afternoon and asked if construction would continue without a building permit. Mr. Todd replied that he had the application for a building permit and would be submitting it promptly. Mr. McWilliams advised Mr. Todd that a building permit could not be issued until the PB completed its site plan review. Zoning Administrator Stanley commented that the tenant had done many jobs in New London without benefit of building permits.

Chair Ebel advised that the PB needs a breakdown of the use of the square footage in order to determine the number of parking spaces required. Mr. Stanley recommended that trucks park in back of the building. PB members Andrews and Conly opined that any additional parking request would require a SPR. Chair Ebel asked if the matter would have to go to a Preliminary SPR or if another Conceptual SPR would be possible. Mr. McWilliams replied that, if Mr. Todd proposal showed no increase in parking, another conceptual would be possible; however, any additional parking would demand a Preliminary SPR. Mr. Stanley stated that the applicant must have a parking plan that complies with the regulations. He opined that, if adequate parking exists, no SPR would be needed. Mr. Todd assured the PB that neither he nor the owner wants the site to look like an industrial site. He added that the tenant needs to have an auxiliary site in a commercial district for parking trucks.

Ken McWilliams reported that, at the afternoon meeting with municipal department heads, Town Road Agent Richard Lee and the Police Department had both commented about the elimination of as many as possible of the spaces in front that require cars to back into traffic in order to exit. It was suggested that the head-in parking might be changed to parallel parking or parking could be put behind the building. Ms Clough asked how far back the commercial district extended. Mr. Todd replied 300 feet. He stated that the building might encroach on the abutting Bonanno property. Mr. McWilliams stated that the Sewer Commission indicated that the service line for the building came in from the back and that the line should not be under any proposed parking. Mr. Todd demonstrated where the line exited the building, but he said that he did not know where it went thereafter. He stated that, presently, storm water run-off from Main Street comes down in front of the garage door and he would like to see that redirected. Ms Clough asked if he had spoken with Mr. Lee about storm drains. Mr. Todd replied that there was no storm drain there. He added that the garage door had been replaced and the drainage behind the building had been changed.

Ms Clough asked if the need for a building permit was clear to the owners. Chair Ebel emphasized the need for the PB to know the breakdown of the square footage of the building.

VIII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The Planning Board elected the following persons to serve in the offices indicated for the ensuing year:

Chairperson:	Karen Ebel
Vice-Chairperson	Tom Cottrill
Secretary	Sue Ellen Andrews

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. PROPOSED SUMMER MEETING SCHEDULE: The PB tentatively scheduled meetings for July 12, July 26, and August 9. All dates are subject to confirmation at the June 14 meeting of the PB.
- B. The MINUTES of the APRIL 12, 2005 meeting were APPROVED as circulated.
- C. The MINUTES of the MAY 10, 2005 meeting were APPROVED as amended.

MAY 24, 2005

- D. Ken McWilliams asked for a motion amending the MINUTES of APRIL 26 to reflect that it was agreed that Jesseman/Daley would present a preliminary SPR on May 24, 2005.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **TO AMEND THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 24, 2005 PLANNING BOARD MEETING RELATING TO JESSEMAN/DALEY TO READ “IT WAS AGREED THAT A PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN WILL BE PRESENTED ON MAY 24, 2005”.** THE **MOTION** WAS **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**.

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

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____