

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
JULY 24, 2007**

DRAFT

MEMBERS PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Celeste Cook, Tom Cottrill (arrived at 7:35 PM), Dale Conly, Jeff Hollinger, Michael Doheny, Ken McWilliams (Planner), Larry Ballin (Selectmen's Representative), Michele Holton (Alternate), Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate)

Chair Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM. Chair Ebel advised that Alternate PB Members could participate in discussion, but could not vote on issues because all regular members of the PB were present.

I. JOHN McKENNA – Concept Minor Subdivision (Tax Map 73, Lot 11)

John McKenna (New London Agency) advised that he was representing Dorothy and Richard Scott with regard to a request to subdivide 182 Everett Park, Tax Map 73, Lot 11. He displayed a 1977 survey done for a previous subdivision of the property. He said that the subdivision would create two lots: one of approximately two (2) acres with frontage on Parkside and containing a small barn and a second lot containing approximately 23,000 square feet with frontage on Everett Park and containing the house.

Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams if there were any issues that needed to be addressed. Mr. McWilliams replied that both of the proposed lots would meet the minimum lot size and frontage requirements. He advised that there would need to be a 15-foot setback from the existing house. He said that both lots would be served by municipal sewer and water. He advised that no issues had been raised and, therefore, the applicant could go directly to a Final Site Plan Review (SPR).

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present who wished to speak. There were none.

II. ANTHONY E. VENTI – Concept Site Plan Review: Dog Boarding Kennel & Dog Day Care (Tax Map 104, Lot 18)

Chair Ebel informed the PB that Anthony Venti was no longer proceeding with his proposal for a dog boarding kennel and dog day care.

III. R. G. ASELTINE – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 118, Lot 21)

Chair Ebel asked Alternate Michele Holton to join the PB until PB member Tom Cottrill arrived.

PB member Dale Conly presented an application submitted by R. G. Aseltine to cut a tall pine located within the 50-foot buffer at 387 Forest Acres Road. Mr. Conly advised that the tree had been struck by lightning and, as a result, posed a danger to both the house and the beach. He said that there was sufficient growth in the area so that no replanting should be required.

Chair Ebel noted that there was no map of the site showing existing trees and vegetation within the buffer and the tree to be removed and asked if one was available. Ken McWilliams responded that all available information had been provided to the PB.

It was **MOVED** (Ballin) and **SECONDED** (Hollinger) **THAT THE REQUEST TO REMOVE ONE LIGHTNING-DAMAGED PINE LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 387 FOREST ACRES ROAD, TAX MAP 118, LOT 21, BE APPROVED WITH NO REQUIREMENT FOR REPLANTING. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

PB member Cottrill joined the PB, and Alternate Holton stepped down.

IV. JAMES CLEVELAND REVOCABLE TRUST & MARILYN KIDDER MARITAL TRUST – Final Minor Subdivision (Tax Map 101, Lot 9)

DRAFT

Ken McWilliams presented for PB signatures and forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds a mylar of the James Cleveland Revocable Trust & Marilyn Kidder Marital Trust Minor Subdivision that was approved by the PB at its July 10, 2007 meeting. The mylar was circulated for PB signatures.

- V. The MINUTES of the JULY 10, 2007 MEETING of the PLANNING BOARD were APPROVED, as amended.

VI. HARRY SNOW - Final Major Subdivision

(Tax Map 106, Lot 13)

Harry Snow (Owner/Developer) and Peter Blakeman (Blakeman Engineering, Inc.) appeared before the PB for a Final Site Plan Review (SPR) of the proposed subdivision of 41.4 acres that abut Bog Road and Messer Pond into seven (7) lots to be known as Rocky Ridge at New London.

Mr. Blakeman distributed copies of a subdivision and topographical plan bearing Conservation Notes as well as General Notes. He said that there had been a number of preliminary SPR and PB subcommittee meetings in regard to the proposed subdivision of 41.4 acres into seven (7) lots, four of which would have frontage on Messer Pond. He advised that access would be by way of a 1200-foot road leading in from Bog Road and ending in a cul-de-sac. He advised that Schauer Environmental Consultants, LLC had conducted a High Intensity Soils Survey (HISS). Mr. Blakeman advised that the proposed lots would each contain 4.5-4.9 acres. He said that, even after subtracting steep slopes and wetlands, all lots would meet, or exceed, the four (4) acre minimum lot size requirement.

Mr. Blakeman reviewed the Conservation Notes on the plan presented. He said that the buffer requirements described therein were contained in the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions. He advised that there would be a 200-foot "no-disturb" setback from the normal high water line of Messer Pond coupled with a 300-foot "no-build" setback lying between the 200-foot "no-disturb" zone and 300 feet of the normal high water line of Messer Pond. He advised that the buffers were incorporated in the Conservation Notes on the plan. Mr. Blakeman advised that the wetland buffer for Lot 1 had been reviewed and approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). He pointed out that Lots 1 and 2 were subject to building envelopes, as noted in the Conservation Notes. He advised that the Conservation Notes also addressed the definitions of "building envelopes" and "development".

Mr. Blakeman stated that Lot 1 would contain a fire pond containing a minimum of 30,000 gallons of available water. He said that there would be a fire lane along Bog Road and a dry hydrant. He said that the fire pond would also serve as a detention area for drainage water. He explained that pipes from the cul-de-sac would direct drainage to a grass swale thence to a level spreader thence to the wetlands. Mr. Blakeman advised that test pits had been dug on each proposed lot and the results were shown on the plan. He said that proposed driveways were also shown on the plan. He advised that plan included a sheet showing the 15% slopes. He said that the proposed drives were located between the slopes and the wetlands. Mr. Blakeman said that each lot and building envelope would require submission of a soil erosion control plan and that the developer planned to employ Low Impact Development (LID) techniques, mostly landscaping.

Mr. Blakeman advised that the plans had been submitted to the State of NH Wetlands Bureau for approval for the driveways on Lots 3 and 4 to cross jurisdictional wetlands and approval was pending. He advised that the New London ZBA had already granted a Special Exception in that regard.

Abutter John Brimmell (Tax Map 94, Lot 4.009), 70 Surrey Lane, asked which lot on the plan was Lot 5. Mr. Blakeman replied that Lot 5 was the lot next to the Brimmell property. He said that the maximum slope on the driveway would be just under 5%.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. Blakeman to discuss the fire pond. Mr. Blakeman stated that New London Fire Chief Jay Lyon wanted enough cover (six feet) over the pipe to protect it from freezing. He advised that the fire pond would be owned by Lot 1, not by the Town of New London, and that ownership was so noted on the plan. He said that the Homeowners' Association Covenants would provide for maintenance of the fire pond in perpetuity by the Homeowners' Association.

DRAFT

Chair Ebel inquired about drainage plans. Mr. Blakeman replied that drainage would be collected in ditches leading to culverts and thence to the ponds. He demonstrated three points where seasonal streams flowed into Messer Pond. He said that they had tried to limit peak flow to no post-development increase, so there will be no increased impact on abutters. He said that at "Point A" there would be no post-development change. He advised that Sheets B-1 and B-2 of the plans demonstrated pre- and post-development drainage. Mr. Blakeman advised that there would be a slight increase at "Point B" that included drainage from 10 acres off-site and was also shown on sheets B-1 and B-2. Mr. Blakeman advised that "Point C", near the Kaufman house, took drainage from the area above the development and along Bog Road. He said this point would actually show a decrease in drainage due to the detention pond. He explained that all drainage would go through level spreaders and that detention would provide treatment. He advised that they would also employ LID techniques.

Chair Ebel asked about the issue regarding docks. Mr. Blakeman replied that docks would not be allowed if they were to be fixed to the shore. He said that free-floating docks would be allowed; however, they could not be pulled from the water and stored on shore.

Bruce Stetson, 89 Little Cove Road, (Tax Map 106, Lot 19) said that free-floating docks are seasonal. He asked if the docks would be isolated from land. Mr. Blakeman responded in the affirmative. 82 Little Cove Road resident Bingham (Tax Map 105, Lot 2) asked if one would be able to obtain a waiver for a path to the water or to put docks in the water. Abutter Fred Kaufman, 216 Bog Road, (Tax Map 106, Lot 12) opined that one could apply for a special exception if he/she went to the Kellners for permission. Ken McWilliams advised that the 200-foot "no disturb" and 300-foot "no-build" buffers were governed by the Kellners' deed to Mr. Snow and by PB Subdivision Regulations and New London Zoning Ordinances.

Mr. Stetson questioned how a dock could not be attached to land. Chair Ebel opined that what people were referring to as a dock would have been called a swimming raft in earlier times. Mr. Stetson questioned whether it was correct to call something not connected to land a dock. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that a dock connected to land would be considered to be a "structure" and no structures are permitted in the buffer area. Abutter Kaufman asked if there was any requirement regarding how far out a dock/raft must be. Chair Ebel responded in the negative. Mr. Stetson opined that someone could put a dock/raft two feet out from shore.

Chair Ebel advised that there were copies of a very rough draft of the PB subcommittee's July 19, 2007 Minutes available on the table. She said that the subcommittee had discussed drainage issues, the fire pond, Conservation Notes (some of which were not yet reflected on the plan), proposed By-Laws, and Homeowners' Association documents. She advised that the By-Laws would be extensively re-worked. Chair Ebel said that discussion of the proposed Covenants regarding amendment and enforcement dealt mostly with the deed restrictions and the ability of the Town of New London to enforce the covenants would be built into the Covenants. She advised that the subcommittee had discussed dock issues and impervious area, for which no significant increase was projected. Ken McWilliams clarified that the Town of New London would be granted authority to enforce certain *parts* of the Covenants, *not all* of them. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that access by the Town of New London would be addressed.

Peter Blakeman said that two iron rods indicated the buffer area. He advised that Pierre Bedard (Pierre J. Bedard & Associates, P.C.) would mark with rods the buffers on individual lots.

Chair Ebel noted that lots without frontage on Messer Pond would be required to retain a minimum of 30% of their area covered by natural trees, sapling, shrubs, and groundcovers at all times. She pointed out that Lots 1 and 2 contained building envelopes; however, Lots 3 and 4 did not because so much of the property was either buffered or wetland, making the 30% limitation and building envelopes unnecessary.

Abutter Brimmell asked where a house would be located on Lot 5. Harry Snow replied that a house could be located anywhere on the lot. Mr. Blakeman advised that the developer would not be clearing the wetland area

DRAFT

that extends approximately 65 feet from the Brimmell house. Mr. Brimmell asked what percentage of Lot 5 that was. Mr. Blakeman estimated approximately 30%.

Alternate PB member Sheerr-Gross asked if there would be any view easements. Mr. Blakeman responded in the negative.

Mr. Stetson asked if the 300-foot “no build” area would be included in the deeds. He said that he had not found the answer to that question in the PB subcommittee minutes. Mr. Snow said that it would be included in the deeds.

Ms Bingham asked how anyone would get a floating platform (raft/dock) into the water. PB member Ballin replied that he/she would have to use the public access. Prospective buyers need to be fully aware of the restrictions regarding docks and access to Messer Pond. Chair Ebel asked if there were many rafts in Messer Pond. Mr. Stetson said that there were. Chair Ebel asked where they were stored when not in the water. Mr. Stetson replied that they were pulled up to shore and tied. Chair Ebel recommended clarifying the issue of dock storage in the covenants explaining that such storage was not permitted. Abutter Kaufman added that it didn't mean just out of sight.

Bob Brown (Messer Pond Protective Association) opined that even with a 300-foot “no-build” and a 200-foot “no-disturb” buffer, someone could still build a raft and place it one foot from land. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley stated that the Town of New London has no authority over what the State of New Hampshire permits on the water. Chair Ebel advised that everyone must comply with the Town of New London Zoning Ordinance and the covenants with respect to the 200-foot “no-disturb” buffer. She noted that the town ordinance permits pathways through the buffer; however, the deed restrictions imposed by the Kellners do not allow pathways to be constructed. Abutter Kaufman noted that the covenants indicated that landowners would have access to the water. He asked what the Kellners' restrictions on the “no-disturb” buffer were. Mr. Snow replied that it would allow for there to be a walking path, but it would not permit construction of a trail.

Gerald Rogoff, 583 Forest Acres Road (Tax Map 119, Lot 21), asked about the requirement that the Conservation Land remain in “as natural a condition as possible” in the deed restrictions. He said that he did not agree with Harry Snow's interpretation. He opined that it would be very necessary to make the meaning of terms clear and cited “dock” versus “raft” as an example. Mr. Blakeman read from the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions, item 3. Permitted Activities, pertaining to the Conservation Land. Chair Ebel responded that Mr. Rogoff was asking the PB to interpret the intent of restrictions contained in an agreement, a deed, between two private parties and that, in any event, the town had no authority to restrict what was placed in the water. The pond is under the State's jurisdiction. Mr. Snow stated that there was no intent to restrict access to Messer Pond. PB member Cottrill opined that the expectation should be that a trail will gradually be built up as the result of repeated travel.

Mr. Stetson said that he was concerned about the lack of enforcement by the State. He opined that the State did nothing and the matter was “out of control”. PB member Ballin responded that the Town of New London had no authority over what happens on/in the water.

Abutter Walter Angoff, 64 Surrey Lane (Tax Map 94, Lot 4.1), said that he and fellow abutters, Brimmell and McColgan to name two, had written to the PB requesting that the development be required to maintain a tree and forest growth barrier with a minimum depth of 100 feet between it and all abutting land. He said that after they had purchased their properties, Bob Bell had subdivided abutting land. He said that at that time they had asked that a visual buffer be created and the requirement had been put in the Bell deeds. Mr. Angoff said that they were now asking for that visual barrier to be continued by Mr. Snow; however, it did not appear to have been done. Chair Ebel responded that continuing the barrier had been discussed and that Mr. Snow strongly opposed such a buffer. She said the PB had attempted to respond to the request by requiring that a minimum of 30% of the areas on Lots 5-7 must be covered by natural trees, saplings, shrubs, and groundcovers at all times. The PB hoped that provided adequate protection.

DRAFT

Mr. Snow stated that the proposed subdivision was not a cluster development. He opined that the proposed lots were adequate in size and adequately buffered to provide protection. Mr. Blakeman advised that there would be no "clear cutting" as happened in the Bell subdivision. He said that there was no regulation that required a developer to institute such a buffer. Chair Ebel asked if there were not wetlands in the area to which Mr. Angoff referred. Mr. Snow replied affirmatively. He said that Bob Bell had clear-cut his land right to the edge of the Snow property. Mr. Angoff requested, and received, orientation on the plan displayed. Mr. Snow opined that protection was adequate. PB member Cottrill opined that it would not be fair to require Mr. Snow to lose more land to an additional buffer to address a problem created by Bell. Discussion ensued among PB members regarding the probable house placement realistically. Alternate PB member Sheerr-Gross opined that owners would be working with sunshine and views in determining house placement.

Mr. Angoff said that they were looking for additional protection. He opined that the Nelsons (52 Oakmont Road) had also cut a lot. Chair Ebel asked Mr. Angoff where they would have wanted a buffer. Mr. Brimmell pointed out the area near Lot 4. PB member Ballin asked how much vegetation he had on his lot. Mr. Brimmell replied that he had 10 feet or so. PB member Conly asked what the distance would be from the stone wall to Mr. Brimmell's house. Mr. Blakeman replied that it was approximately 120 feet. He estimated that any building would be approximately 65 feet from the house given the wetlands on the property.

Ken McWilliams pointed out that the building envelopes depicted on the plans were not precise locations. Chair Ebel asked Mr. Snow if he would be the developer of the subdivision. Mr. Snow responded affirmatively. Chair Ebel said "so you could be sensitive to the issue". Chair Ebel asked how narrow the wetland was. Mr. Blakeman replied that it was 25 feet. Chair Ebel asked if Mr. Snow wouldn't be cutting into the wetlands. Mr. Snow said that he would cut as necessary in order to provide a view of Mount Sunapee. PB member Cottrill pointed out that an abutter could build a visual barrier on his/her side of the property line. PB member Conly said that the PB was trying to make Mr. Snow aware of the concerns and asking him to be sensitive to them. Mr. Brimmell stated that he was very concerned about there being no clear-cutting. He said that he didn't think the 30% requirement was responsive enough to the concerns of the abutters. Chair Ebel stated that the 30% requirement had been negotiated and was not specifically required by the New London Zoning Ordinance. She noted that a 40% requirement had been rejected by Mr. Snow. PB member Ballin opined that Mr. Snow would be very respectful of abutters' concerns. Mr. Angoff said that they were also concerned about how owners after Mr. Snow would treat the property. Zoning Administrator Stanley asked Mr. Snow if all the lots, including Lot 4, were for sale. Mr. Snow responded affirmatively.

Chair Ebel advised that, in its deliberations, the PB subcommittee worked hard to protect Messer Pond and the property of abutters. She opined that a good result was achieved through this negotiation. Mr. Snow said that the result was not the way he wanted it, but he'd work with it. PB member Cottrill asked Bob Brown if he had seen the list of permitted uses in the "no-build" buffer. Mr. Brown replied that he was concerned with the subcommittee minutes. Chair Ebel advised that the subcommittee would be meeting again on August 2. She said that the abutters could work at other solutions. PB member Cook said that, having lived in a Snow-built house, she was confident that Mr. Snow would place houses on the lots taking the topography of the lots into consideration. Mr. Snow said that he would do so.

Mr. McWilliams asked if Pierre Bedard would be marking the 200-foot buffer as well as the 300-foot buffer on the ground. PB members stated that it would be good to have both buffers marked. Mr. Snow opined that it would be easy enough to pull the information off the plan and mark the 300-foot buffer, as well. Chair Ebel opined that it would be a good idea to include both. Mr. McWilliams reported that during the meeting with municipal department heads, Richard Lee, New London's Director of Public Works, had raised numerous issues, including the need to have an erosion control plan in place and inspected prior to any excavation taking place and the need to have State of NH Department of Environmental Services permits for two driveways to cross wetlands and approval for a subdivision with lots of less than five (5) acres.

It was **MOVED** (Ballin) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR THE HARRY SNOW PROPOSED SUBDIVISION OF 41.4 ACRES, LOCATED**

DRAFT

OFF BOG ROAD AND ABUTTING MESSER POND, BE CONTINUED TO TUESDAY, AUGUST 14, 2007 AT 7:30 PM. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII. NEW LONDON HOSPITAL.

Celeste Cook recused herself from the PB. Chair Ebel asked Alternate Member Sheerr-Gross to sit in her place.

Donna Gatnarek, Director of Marketing and Public Relations, advised the PB of two scheduled events at New London Hospital: an August 29, 2007 Employee Recognition Event from 5:30-8:30 PM and an August 30, 2007 Ground Breaking Event from 3:30-5:00 PM. She said that the hospital planned to erect tents for the events; however, the tents would take up some of the parking spaces in front of the hospital. She said that the hospital had arranged to use the Colby-Sawyer College parking lot located beyond Mercer Field and planned to operate shuttles from the parking lot to the hospital. Ms Gatnarek said that the hospital would request employees not to park on the hospital grounds at those times. She advised that approximately 500 invitations to the ground breaking had been mailed.

Chair Ebel asked how many parking spaces would be taken up by the tents. Ms Gatnarek replied that 30 spaces would be used. Alternate PB member Sheerr-Gross asked how many parking spaces there were in all. Lori Underwood, New London Hospital Senior Director, Planning and Projects, advised that there were 300 spaces in all. She said that the hospital had actually been using the college parking lot during construction and that almost 40 people parked there every day.

Chair Ebel stated that the issue before the PB was whether a Site Plan Review (SPR) would be required for the proposed uses. Mr. McWilliams replied that he did not feel that SPR was necessary. Chair Ebel agreed, then asked how many parking spaces were available in the college parking lot. Ms Underwood estimated 275, but said she would have to consult Doug Lyon, Colby-Sawyer Treasurer, for the exact number... Chair Ebel asked if there were any other sites with available parking to accommodate some of the 500 invitees. Ms Underwood replied that the hospital was looking into other possibilities. Ms Sheerr-Gross asked who would be able to park at the hospital. Ms Gatnarek responded that the governor and handicapped guests would be allowed to park on the hospital grounds. Ms Sheerr-Gross asked if the town would put up "No Parking" signs. Mr. McWilliams said that the hospital had taken on that responsibility. PB member Ballin said that there would be no parking permitted along County Road.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Ballin) **THAT SITE PLAN REVIEW NOT BE REQUIRED FOR NEW LONDON HOSPITAL TO USE 30 OF ITS PARKING SPACES TO ERECT A TENT FOR AN EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION EVENT ON AUGUST 29, 2007 AND A GROUND BREAKING EVENT ON AUGUST 30, 2007. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Celeste Cook returned to the PB. Alternate Deirdre Sheerr-Gross stepped down.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. ROBERT FOOSE – Need for Site Plan Review

(Tax Map 72, Lot 40)

Robert Foose appeared for a determination of whether or not a Site Plan Review (SPR) would be required for a change in use of a building at 35 Newport Road, Tax Map 72, Lot 40.

Mr. Foose advised that in 1987 the building had been approved for Egan's Pizza that required 24 parking spaces. He recapped activity when he and Paul Linehan purchased the property. He advised that in 1991 the two lots were annexed. He reviewed prior PB reviews/actions covering several changes and said that at each juncture the adequacy of parking had been evaluated and the PB had determined that no SPR was

DRAFT

required. Mr. Foose advised that the currently proposed change in use from retail (art gallery) to medical (chiropractic practice) would use 16 of the 24 parking spaces available.

Chair Ebel said that the change from retail use of the building to medical use would require a little more parking. Ken McWilliams advised that the available 24 parking spaces were more than adequate to accommodate the change.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT SITE PLAN REVIEW NOT BE REQUIRED FOR A PROPOSED CHANGE IN USE FROM RETAIL TO MEDICAL OF A BUILDING LOCATED AT 35 NEWPORT ROAD (TAX MAP 72, LOT 40). THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B. LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS

Chair Ebel advised that she had been confused regarding which PB regulatory revisions had been distributed when and, therefore, had not brought her copy of the proposed revisions to the Land Subdivision Control Regulations to the meeting. Discussion ensued about distribution of the proposed revisions, and several other PB members were also confused.

Chair Ebel asked how many PB members were prepared to discuss proposed revisions to the Land Subdivision Control Regulations. It was agreed that the review would be deferred until the August 14, 2007 PB meeting.

Chair Ebel recapped the selection process that resulted in the request by the PB for Richard Claytor of the HORSLEY WITTEN GROUP to review the proposed Low Impact Development (LID) portions of the proposed regulations. She advised that the PB had received a memo from Mr. Claytor containing his comments on the draft regulations. She said that he had advised that a lot more detail should be included in various areas. Chair Ebel advised that she and Ken McWilliams thought that Mr. Claytor had done a good job in reviewing the draft, but they had hoped the results would include more precise regulatory language. When they went back to Mr. Claytor in that regard, he advised that the regulations needed greater technical specificity, but for Horsley Witten to provide that level of support would cost an additional \$2000.

Chair Ebel opined that there were two issues to be addressed by the PB: (1) did the PB want to include LID practices in the subdivision regulations, and (2) was there money in the budget to cover the additional expense to engage Horsley Witten Group to provide greater technical specificity. Mr. McWilliams said that he had drafted a memo to the PB regarding the first six month's budget status. He advised that during the January to July period, the PB had expended approximately \$16,600 of the \$46,000 planner budget for the year, thereby leaving just under \$30,000 for the next six months.

Mr. McWilliams advised that he did not have the expertise in LID practices to go forward alone with proposed LID regulations. He opined that LID practices were the "wave of the future". He advised that the State of NH DES was considering the adoption of LID regulations; in fact, The Horsley Witten Group had submitted a bid on that project. Mr. McWilliams said that LID was an entirely new way to deal with drainage (dissipating the water, getting as much as possible back into the ground on site) and how we protect water resources. He said that current methods for dealing with storm water drainage involved collection and detention. He advised that July 23, 2007 discussions with Richard Claytor related to the requirement for practices to address 50- and 100-year storms, as there were no very effective systems for doing so. Current practices do not feed into one another.

PB member Hollinger pointed out that for \$2000 the PB could get LID into the regulations and have it done correctly. PB member Ballin questioned whether the PB would have a final product at the end of the \$2000. Chair Ebel advised that originally the quote was \$3000, but when she expressed reservations with

DRAFT

the estimate, Mr. Claytor had reduced it to \$2000. She added that the results would be specific to New London and Mr. Claytor had assured her that it would be a good product. PB member Ballin said that he would want a contractual agreement that the PB would have a finished regulation at the end of the additional \$2000. Chair Ebel opined that LID might have to be “sold” to construction contractors and developers.

PB member Cook said that she was concerned about the impact on the budget for the town planner. Chair Ebel advised that there were two other issues that would need to be addressed in the regulations: (1) the new NH Shoreland Protection Law and (2) how far up the line to go with buffering for wetlands. PB member Ballin said that the PB also had to plan for refreshments and other costs connected to the Master Plan Vision Workshop. Mr. McWilliams advised that the Master Plan was budgeted for separately. Chair Ebel explained that, in deciding whether to recommend that the PB spend the money for the LID regulations, she and Mr. McWilliams had met with Zoning Administrator Stanley. Mr. Stanley said that he would try to draft regulations responsive to new changes in the state shoreland protection law and that would save money in the PB budget. Chair Ebel said that they had decided to request the Conservation Commission’s assistance in revisiting the wetland buffering ordinance. She hoped that, if the professional guidance was needed, the Commission would be able to use some of its budget, because the PB would be expending a total of \$3600 on developing LID regulations. Zoning Administrator Stanley said that he would speak to the Conservation Commission and felt confident that the Commission would be willing to help. PB member Conly concurred.

Chair Ebel reiterated that Mr. Claytor’s firm had bid on a NH DES proposal to draft a stormwater management manual that included LID procedures. She said Mr. Claytor felt some of this work could be useful for New London, so there was a crossover. Chair Ebel stated that she and Mr. McWilliams felt that New London could not wait for the DES manual to be finished because of inordinate delay. Other PB members agreed that the State of NH moved very slowly and that the PB should move ahead without waiting. Chair Ebel reiterated that the LID regulations drafted by Mr. Claytor would be specific to New London.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Ballin) **THAT THE PB HIRE RICHARD CLAYTOR OF THE HORSLEY WITTEN GROUP TO DEVELOP LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT (LID) REGULATIONS AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$2000, THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **10:32 PM.**

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____