

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING  
JANUARY 24, 2006**

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

ABSENT: Tom Cottrill

Chair Karen Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM.

**I. C. GRANGER – Preliminary Minor Subdivision (2 lots) (Tax Map 61, Lot 14)**

Abutter and PB member Jeff Hollinger recused himself from the PB.

Douglas Sweet (Bristol, Sweet & Associates, Inc.) and Jim Granger were present.

Mr. Sweet presented plans for the proposed subdivision for PB review. He noted that the property contained 46 acres and had 680 feet of frontage on Pleasant Street. He advised that the proposal would create one lot containing 6.75 acres and an existing house and a second lot containing the balance of 40 acres with 150 feet of frontage on Pleasant Street. Mr. Sweet said that topographical mapping and wetlands delineation had been completed. He opined that the PB was well acquainted with the property, having visited the site on several occasions.

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

Ken McWilliams advised that, at the meeting of municipal department heads, concern had been expressed regarding the proposed driveway easement on the corner and a request had been made for an enlargement of that area of the plan to be submitted for Final Site Plan Review.

Abutter Rebecca Irving commented that the abutters had not seen the plans; therefore, they didn't know if there were any questions. Chair Ebel asked Mr. Sweet to hold up the plans so the audience could see what was being proposed. Abutters present were invited to come forward to review the plans before the PB. Ms Irving requested an explanation of the plan notes and abbreviations. She said that she has had a driveway over the property for 46 years. Mr. Sweet explained that Note 5 on Plan C states that there is "no recorded easement" relating to her driveway. He said that the note refers to the fact that there is no driveway easement on file at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds. PB member Clough asked if Ms Irving would be able to continue to use the driveway. Mr. Sweet replied that she had for many years, so he assumed that she could continue to do so. Ms Irving asked if her driveway would become the driveway for the proposed Lot 2. Mr. Sweet replied that the driveway to Lot 2 could start there or perhaps a bit lower on the plan.

John Wilson asked about the intended use of the larger lot. Mr. Sweet responded that Mrs. Granger thought that it would be wise to subdivide the Granger home from the rest of the property because there had been interest expressed in purchasing the land that Austin Eaton sought to develop. Mr. Sweet said that by subdividing the property, the Grangers would now be able to sell the property to interested parties for development or preservation. He suggested that those who had previously claimed that "had she let them know that she wanted to sell" could now step up to the plate.

Mr. Sweet advised that HISS mapping to show compliance with regulations had yet to be completed and monuments had to be set. He stated that wetlands requirements could be met, but advised that details in that regard would be presented at the Final Site Plan Review.

Abutter Priscilla Ohler asked if egress from the property would still be on the curve of Pleasant Street. Mr. Sweet replied that it would.

Chair Ebel re-stated the intent of the proposed minor subdivision and asked Mr. Sweet if he wanted to continue the Preliminary SPR or to go to Final SPR. Mr. Sweet opted to go to Final SPR at a date to be determined.

Mr. Hollinger returned to the PB.

**II. DRS. PHIPPS, BAKER, & GUTGSELL– Preliminary Site Plan Review: Dental Office  
(Tax Map 84, Lot 55)**

Ross Stevens (Stevens Engineering) and Gregory Gutsell, DDS were present.

Mr. Stevens referred to his letter of January 9, 2006, a copy of which was distributed to PB members, and the highlighted map that accompanied it. He said that they were back to discuss the issues of Lovering Lane and parking. He advised that abutter Graham McSwiney and the municipal department heads seemed to be supportive of the proposed changes. Mr. Stevens said that he wanted the PB's opinion on whether widening Lovering Lane to 18 feet would be acceptable. He advised that the Lane was currently 16-feet wide at Main Street and became 14-feet wide opposite the rear door of the McSwiney building. He advised that the widening would take place on the McSwiney side and that a curb would be installed.

Chair Ebel asked if anyone had talked with Mr. McSwiney. Dr. Gutsell confirmed that he had and said that he believed Mr. McSwiney's interests were the same as the dentists. Mr. Stevens added that he had talked with Mr. McSwiney and that Mr. McSwiney had said that he was neutral regarding the proposed changes.

PB member Clough asked if they had considered landscaping to protect the residential abutters. Mr. Stevens replied that they planned no further encroachment and planned to do some screening. He opined that using Lovering Lane for access would permit large trees on the property to remain untouched. Dr. Gutsell opined that there were very nice, large trees on the property that he would like to remain.

PB member Clough asked if there was any minimum width for town roads. Ken McWilliams replied that different classes of roads had different minimums. He advised that *Service Roads* had a minimum width of 14 feet and allowed up to 40 trips per day and *Local Roads* had a standard width of 18 feet of travel way and allowed for 240 trips per day. PB member Andrews asked about the difficulty exiting from Lovering Lane onto Main Street. Mr. McWilliams replied that the issue had been discussed at the meeting of department heads and a recommendation had been made to limit parking along that side of Main Street in order to increase the line of sight.

Ms Clough asked if there was any sideline setback requirement that McSwiney must meet. She asked Mr. Stevens if his intent could be met and still allow Mr. McSwiney to meet setback requirements. Ken McWilliams advised that the McSwiney property was a corner lot that would be subject to 30-foot setbacks. He noted that the lot was already non-conforming and advised that the PB could not make a non-conforming lot more non-conforming. Ms Clough asked if a Variance would have to be obtained from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) to make it more non-conforming. Mr. McWilliams replied affirmatively.

Mr. Stevens stated that he had not yet been able to find all of the monuments for Lovering Lane and that he was not sure where the right-of-way was actually located.

John Ohler asked if there were any diagrams that could be shared with the audience. Mr. Stevens distributed copies of the proposed changes.

Ms Clough asked if Lovering Lane was a dedicated dead-end road, since, unlike other roads along that side of Main Street, it did not go all the way through to Barrett Road. Mr. McWilliams replied that he did not know the history of Lovering Lane, but that it almost looked like an old driveway. Someone said that it had started out as a driveway for the property now occupied by Ellen's Interiors and that driveway had been extended to give access to the houses, now occupied by Clough and Dexter, built beyond Ellen's Interiors. PB member Cook asked if the property below the end of the road was private. Mr. McWilliams replied affirmatively and noted that there appeared to be some type of structure through which any connection would have to pass.

Dr. Gutsell stated that the building contained 5600 square feet and 25 parking spaces, based on square footage, would be required. He said that he had designed a parking plan based on hour and day of the week activity instead of square footage. He presented his plan and provided handouts to the PB. He described parking lot usage based upon the hour of the day and day of the week. He opined that the proposed usage would not be dissimilar from that at his existing location. He said that the currently parking situation worked regardless of

what the regulatory requirements were. He said that existing parking provided 26 spaces and that included 2 spaces for apartment tenants. He walked the PB through a projected Tuesday or Thursday demand for parking. He said that Wednesday would be the most demanding. Chair Ebel asked if Dr. Baker would continue to be on site only on Wednesdays. Dr. Gutsell said that Dr. Baker had said that he was flexible. Dr. Gutsell admitted that he could not say that no one ever parked on Main Street or in the town parking lot. Chair Ebel told Dr. Gutsell that she appreciated the effort that he had put into devising his plan. She added that, even though the PB could only require compliance with existing parking regulations, it was good to know that the dentists' needs would not greatly exceed what was technically required.

PB member Clough asked if, when Dr. Gutsell spoke of parking for tenants, was he referring to tenants at his present location or tenants at the proposed location. Dr. Gutsell replied that he had been referring to tenants at the current location. Ms Clough asked how many tenants would be at the proposed location. Dr. Gutsell replied that there would be none. He stated that he had been trying to respond to earlier statements regarding the number of parking spaces needed. He said that currently two spaces are used by tenants and others are sometimes used by visitors to the Kearsarge Regional School. Chair Ebel advised that it would be important to assure that employees parked off the street. Dr. Gutsell responded that his employees now do that and that he was sure that Dr. Baker and his employees would as well. The PB members concurred that it was important that the Main Street parking spaces not be occupied all day by employees. Dr. Gutsell agreed and assured the PB that he would require his employees to park in the designated parking lot.

Chair Ebel asked if there would be any handicapped-accessible parking spaces. Dr. Gutsell replied that, if possible, there would be two in front of the building. Mr. Stevens discussed the scheme to do so, indicating that the spaces would be set in and parallel to the Main Street. Dr. Gutsell said that the sidewalk would go around the spaces. At the meeting of department heads, it was mentioned that it could be included in the plan. Mr. Stevens also said that at the meeting it had been mentioned that the handicapped spaces could double as an emergency access to the building. Mr. Stevens opined that the creative parking calculation would allow for expansion in business utilization as well as schedule expansion. Dr. Gutsell advised that about one-third of the building would be taken up by support services, a meeting room, and doctors' offices.

Abutter Rosemary Bernard (149 Barrett Road) asked if the size of the parking lot would increase or remain the same. She also asked if it would be paved. Dr. Gutsell replied that it would be paved. Ms Bernard said that she was concerned about drainage run-off and snow storage. Dr. Gutsell advised that there would be a cistern to collect drainage. He said that he was not sure about snow storage, but he had to get a bucket loader to remove the snow. He said that he could do that again, if necessary. Ms Bernard stated that the current owner plowed the parking lot and sometimes the snow and gravel ended up on her property. Mr. Stevens advised that he was trying to address storm water drainage and gravel washing onto abutting properties. Ms Bernard said that she would like additional landscaping to deter drainage. Dr. Gutsell said that he wanted to protect the trees. He said that he would work out the snow storage so that her property would not be adversely affected.

PB member Hollinger asked if there would be any increase in the number of parking spaces on the McSwiney property. Dr. Gutsell replied that he would not be increasing the number; however, Mr. McSwiney might want to expand parking. He opined that the needs of the two properties were parallel and that Mr. McSwiney would sign off on the plan. Ken McWilliams advised him that the PB would require a signed written agreement regarding access to the dentists' property over the McSwiney property.

Chair Ebel advised that buffering and screening between the business property and the abutting residential properties would be critical. PB member Clough stated that Lovering Lane had been basically a private driveway. Dr. Gutsell suggested that there would be 20 car trips per day. Chair Ebel suggested that the crosswalks on Main Street could experience increased usage because of children coming from the school and that the crosswalks would have to be well-maintained. Mr. Stevens added that the idea of a future sidewalk was also an issue. Ms Clough said that the town was trying to convince property owners to extend the sidewalk from the library to Lovering Lane.

Mr. Stevens advised that he would negotiate a signed agreement with Mr. McSwiney regarding access over his property. Ms Clough advised that he was also important to find the bounds of Lovering Lane. Ken McWilliams stated that other issues to be addressed included determination of the impact of the proposed road changes on setbacks, where the right-of-way actually lies, and what procedures must be followed for widening a

town road. He advised that dentists should come back to the PB when the surveys and agreements are complete.

Mr. Stevens asked what the PB's feeling was in regard to the plans. He wanted to know if the consensus of the PB was supportive of the ideas put forth. Chair Ebel took a sense of the PB and replied that the PB was supportive.

**III. ROBERT EWING – Discussion of Changes to Drainage and Covenant Restricting Lot Sales  
(Tax Map 96, Lots 15 & 10)**

Neither Robert Ewing nor his representatives appeared to present this item to the PB.

**IV. CATE FAMILY TRUST – Concept Minor Subdivision (2 lots) & Annexation  
(Tax Map 103, Lots 1 & 2)**

Plans for the proposed minor subdivision and annexation were presented for PB review. Erin Darrow (Erin's Land Use Consulting) introduced herself as the engineer for the project and other members of her crew. Delavan Cate, an owner of the property, was also present.

Ms Darrow advised that there were currently two lots: one of 101 acres owned by the Cate Family New Hampshire Realty Trust and another of 2.7 acres owned by Delavan and Janice Cate. She said that the intent was to increase the size of the smaller lot to 4.7 acres.

Ms Darrow said that there was a well right on the existing property line. She said that the proposed minor subdivision and boundary lot line adjustment would address that issue. Ms Darrow advised that the wetlands had been delineated by a certified wetland scientist and that the Cates were seeking a waiver of the requirement for a two-foot contour topographic survey of the entire lot 103-2. She said that there were topographic surveys for the two-acre lot and for the two-acre house site on the larger lot. She stated that the Cates were also seeking a waiver of the requirement for a high-intensity soil survey of the entire 101-acre lot. She described the larger lot as being "very wooded". She opined that requiring two-foot contour topographic and high-intensity soils surveys of the entire area would present an undue hardship to the landowners. Ms Darrow said that there was an older septic system on the site; however, test pits for septic design were taken in November 2005 by NH Licensed Septic Designer Carlisse Clough and approved by New London Health Officer Donald Bent. She advised that the percolation test results demonstrated that land characteristics desirable for development existed on the site.

PB member Andrews asked in what zone the property was located. Ken McWilliams replied that the property was located in the Agricultural & Rural Residential District. Ms Andrews asked if the minimum lot size in that zone was four acres. Mr. McWilliams replied affirmatively. Ms Andrews opined that because the size of the smaller lot would be so close to the minimum, it would be important to know the location of wetlands. Ms Darrow reiterated that wetlands had been mapped for the entire property. She also reiterated that topographic mapping of two-foot contours and high-intensity soils mapping of the entire area would present an undue hardship for the owner.

Chair Ebel asked if the larger lot was selected for development, would the house location be the same as the one on which the yellow house that burned had been. Mr. McWilliams stated that the issue was how much soils testing should be done to demonstrate to the PB that the site would allow development. Chair Ebel said that the owner might build somewhere else on the lot and the PB would like to know about the property characteristics. She asked if the proposed new regulations had been taken into consideration when developing the plans. Ms Darrow responded affirmatively and stated that basically the owner would be replacing the house that burned.

Mr. McWilliams advised that the New London Highway Department would want a driveway designation on the larger lot that would meet NH Department of Transportation requirements for sight distances. PB member Clough said that the owner must still meet all Site Plan Review requirements. Mr. McWilliams stated that the plan must demonstrate that the owner has a qualifying lot, typically two acres. Ms Andrews said that she was confused by the reference to two acres when the minimum lot size is four acres in that district. Mr. McWilliams reiterated that the owner must demonstrate that he has a qualifying lot.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROL REGULATIONS SECTION V. B. 4. TOPOGRAPHIC MAPPING AND SECTION V. B. 5. HIGH INTENSITY SOILS MAPPING FOR THE ENTIRE LARGER LOT BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**V. HARRY SNOW – Final Certificate of Performance: Snowcrest (Tax Map 55, Lots 11, 12, & 14)**

Harry Snow (developer) and Peter Blakeman (Blakeman Engineering, Inc.) were present.

Mr. Blakeman presented a request for a Final Certificate of Performance for the Snowcrest development. He advised that reports from the Fire Department and Highway Department had been provided to the PB. He said that the consensus was that houses in Snowcrest were being built rather quickly. He reported that Town Road Agent Richard Lee agreed with the decision to delay the final one-inch wearing course of pavement for another year or two, when the majority of houses will have been completed and heavy construction traffic abates.

Mr. Blakeman referred to a memo from Mr. Lee regarding raising the amount for the pavement to \$15,000 and retaining \$5,000 for shoulder work for a total of \$20,000 in security. He advised that roads had to be named and signs installed as well as a stop sign installed. Mr. Snow stated that the road signs had been erected.

Chair Ebel advised that the referenced letter from the Fire Department was not in the file. Fire Chief Peter Stanley advised that there had been no changes since the previous letter was submitted. He said that a new letter would be forthcoming. PB member Clough asked if the Highway Department would put up the stop sign. Ken McWilliams replied that the developer was responsible for erecting the sign. He explained that the Highway Department would be responsible for signage only after the town accepted the road.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF PERFORMANCE AND A REDUCTION IN SECURITY FROM \$40,000 TO \$20,000 FOR FINAL PAVING BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO RECEIPT OF A LETTER FROM THE FIRE DEPARTMENT AND PLACEMENT OF A REQUIRED STOP SIGN.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**VI. BILL GREEN/BARTON CONDOMINIUMS – No Site Plan Review Required (Tax Map 73, Lot 56)**

Bill Green appeared on behalf of the Barton Condominium, LLC to request PB confirmation that no subdivision approval was required for the conversion of five apartments located at 89 Main Street to condominium units. He advised that the statement would go on file at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds so that anyone doing a title search would find that subdivision was not required.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE BARTON CONDOMINIUM, LLC CONVERSION FROM APARTMENTS TO CONDOMINIUM UNITS AT 89 MAIN STREET DID NOT REQUIRE SUBDIVISION APPROVAL.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chair Ebel signed a confirming statement to be forwarded to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the applicant.

**VII. HANNAFORD – Concept Site Plan Review: Proposed Site Changes (Tax Map 59, Lot 8)**

Jim Lord (Hannaford Bros. Co. Engineering Department Project Manager) displayed copies of (1) the 2003 approved site plan, (2) the 2005 “as-built” plan at the time the property was sold by Cricenti, and (3) the currently proposed plan.

Mr. Lord advised that subsequent to the sale the site had been brought back into compliance with the approved plan, but the results differ from the “as-built” plan. He noted the differences in layout, i.e., the island shapes

differ, the locations of the islands differ, and the locations of the handicapped accessible parking spaces differ from the "as-built" plan.

Chair Ebel questioned the statement that the site had been returned to compliance with the approved site plan. Mr. Lord replied that the location of the cart corrals had been returned to those approved in the final site plan. He stated that the regulations required 450 parking spaces based on square footage of the building; however, the approved site plan provided 463 spaces. He stated that 431 spaces were striped, the total did not include the 24 spaces near the house, and 14 spaces by Colonial Pharmacy were never constructed.

Mr. Lord said that Hannaford was requesting approval to install an island as indicated on the proposed plan to create 4 additional parking spaces, to add 2 handicapped accessible spaces plus 2 spaces that were never constructed, and to leave one existing space that was not on the plan. He stated that Hannaford wanted to install five cart corrals. Mr. Lord said that the net effect would be an additional 8 parking spaces over the number in the approved site plan and the required number of parking spaces would be met without adding any un-striped spaces. He advised that at the meeting with municipal department heads, many recommendations were made in regard to the islands, handicapped accessible parking, island curbing, crosswalks, and stop bars.

Chair Ebel asked why two spaces would be eliminated near the access to the Post Office. Mr. Lord and Zoning Administrator Stanley both replied that the spaces were located in a bad area where people would be backing in, where there would not be enough room for the stop bar, and at a very awkward intersection. Mr. Lord stated that Chief of Police Seastrand and Town Road Agent Lee agreed with the elimination. Ken McWilliams opined that curbing and vegetation would encourage/provide better traffic flow. Mr. Lord discussed the placement of the cart corrals. He acknowledged that there should be an enlarged view of the front of the store showing the placement of the corrals. Chair Ebel questioned the statement that there would be no loss in parking spaces even with additional cart corrals. Mr. Lord reiterated that none would be lost and that there would be a gain of eight spaces over the number in the required when the proposed site plan was approved.

PB member Clough asked if Hannaford would never get back to the 463 spaces originally approved. Mr. Lord replied that it would be possible to put some behind the house. He suggested that the house might be eliminated by the new owner of the shopping center. Chair Ebel asked if Hannaford employees parked over near the house. Mr. Lord replied "not usually". Chair Ebel said that the area was not even plowed and asked why not. Mr. Lord replied that this was Hannaford's first year and there was still much to be learned. Chair Ebel advised that the area needs to be plowed and employees should be encouraged to use those parking spaces as they had before in order to reduce crowding in the parking lot. She said that it was only a short walk to an existing door at the rear of the building. Mr. Lord advised that employees enter through the front door because of other issues. He said that Hannaford did have methods to control where employees park. He said that he would see that the area got plowed and would encourage Hannaford employees to use the spaces by the former Ritchie property after it got plowed. Chair Ebel asked who now owned the shopping center. Mr. Lord replied that it had recently been purchased by a very large company, Kimco Real Estate.

PB member Hollinger asked if there were any plans to address the ice in front of the building. He opined that someone was going to slip and fall on the ice. He suggested installing a heated sidewalk in that area. Mr. Lord agreed that it was a problem; however, there would probably be no solution until next year. In the meantime, he said that they have an employee clearing off the area frequently to keep it safe and passable.

Chair Ebel asked how many spaces were technically required for Hannaford and the shopping center. Mr. McWilliams replied 450. Chair Ebel asked how many were proposed. Mr. Lord replied that the intent was to bring the plan with improvements noted for the record. PB member Andrews asked if it would show parking spaces on the former Ritchie property. Mr. Lord said that it would, but the department heads did not want 14 parking spaces behind the Colonial Pharmacy building abutting County Road. Chair Ebel asked how the PB felt about the proposed placement of the two handicapped accessible spaces in front of Flash Photo, which she opined was one of the busiest place in the shopping center. A brief discussion ensued. PB member Clough and Zoning Administrator Stanley pointed out that Mr. Lord represented Hannaford, not the owner of the shopping center. Chair Ebel and Mr. McWilliams both opined that this was a site plan review for the entire property and Mr. Lord was representing the owner in this discussion. PB member Andrews asked if there was a ramp for the handicapped beside the two spaces. There was some disagreement as to whether or not ramps existed and, if they did exist, where they were located. Ms Andrews opined that, if there were no ramps, the

spaces could be relocated. She also wondered what the point of the spaces were if there wasn't a ramp that a wheelchair could use to access the stores. Zoning Administrator Stanley recommended that the PB allow Mr. Lord to return with a revised parking plan for 453 spaces plus those on the former Ritchie property. Mr. Lord said he would take the comments regarding the placement of the handicapped spaces into consideration.

After a brief discussion, it was agreed that the next step should be a "noticed" hearing on a revised final site plan that would provide abutters, as well as PB members, to review the proposed parking changes.

**VIII. TOWN OF NEW LONDON – Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record (Tax Map 89, Lots 12 & 13)**

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley presented on behalf of the Town of New London a request to merge two lots of record located on Laurel Lane. Mr. Stanley briefly described the location and history of the lots.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON TO MERGE TWO LOTS OF RECORD, TAX MAP 89, LOT 12 (LAUREL LANE) AND TAX MAP 80, LOT 13 (LAUREL LANE) BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record form was presented for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**IX. TOWN OF NEW LONDON – Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record (Tax Map 33, Lots 9 & 19)**

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley presented on behalf of the Town of New London a request to merge two lots of record located on Camp Sunapee Road and Little Sunapee Road, respectively. Mr. Stanley briefly described the location and history of the lots.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON TO MERGE TWO LOTS OF RECORD, TAX MAP 33, LOT 9 (4 CAMP SUNAPEE ROAD) AND TAX MAP 33, LOT 19 (LITTLE SUNAPEE ROAD) BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record form was presented for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**X. TOWN OF NEW LONDON – Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record (Tax Map 101, Lots 3, 4, 5, & 6)**

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley presented on behalf of the Town of New London a request to merge four lots of record located on Mountain Road. Mr. Stanley briefly described the location and history of the lots.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON TO MERGE FOUR LOTS OF RECORD, TAX MAP 101, LOTS 3, 4, 5, AND 6 LOCATED ON MOUNTAIN ROAD BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record form was presented for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**XI. TOWN OF NEW LONDON – Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record  
(Tax Map 88, Lot 7 & Tax Map 112, Lot 3)**

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley presented on behalf of the Town of New London a request to merge two lots of record located on Route 11 and Mountain Road, respectively. Mr. Stanley briefly described the location and history of the lots.

It was **MOVED** (Cook) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON TO MERGE TWO LOTS OF RECORD, TAX MAP 88, LOT 7 (ROUTE 11) AND TAX MAP 112, LOT 3 (MOUNTAIN ROAD) BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record form was presented for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**XII. TOWN OF NEW LONDON – Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record (Tax Map 93, Lots 13 & 14)**

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley presented on behalf of the Town of New London a request to merge two lots of record located on County Road. Mr. Stanley briefly described the location and history of the lots. He advised that the two lots comprised a total of 35 acres.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON TO MERGE TWO LOTS OF RECORD, TAX MAP 93, LOT 13 (COUNTY ROAD) AND TAX MAP 93, LOT 14 (COUNTY ROAD) BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record form was presented for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**XIII. TOWN OF NEW LONDON – Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record (Tax Map 119, Lot 2 & Tax Map 120, Lot 5)**

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley presented on behalf of the Town of New London a request to merge two lots of record located on Bog Road. Mr. Stanley briefly described the location and history of the lots.

It was **MOVED** (Clough) and **SECONDED** (Hollinger) **THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON TO MERGE TWO LOTS OF RECORD, TAX MAP 119, LOT 2 (BOG ROAD) AND TAX MAP 120, LOT 5 (BOG ROAD) BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record form was presented for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**XIV. TOWN OF NEW LONDON – Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record (Tax Map 29, Lot 1, Tax Map 16, Lot 2, & Tax Map 16, Lot 1)**

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley presented on behalf of the Town of New London a request to merge three lots of record located on Goose Hole Road, Route I-89, and off I-89, respectively. Mr. Stanley briefly described the location and history of the lots. He advised that the tax maps were incorrect inasmuch as the lots are actually contiguous.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Conly) **THAT THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON TO MERGE THREE LOTS OF RECORD, TAX MAP 29, LOT 1 (GOOSE HOLE ROAD), TAX MAP 16, LOT 2 (ROUTE I-89), AND TAX MAP 16, LOT 1 (OFF I-89) BE APPROVED.** The **MOTION** was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Voluntary Merger of Lots of Record form was presented for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

**XV. OTHER BUSINESS**

- A. TOPIC OF REGIONAL INTEREST: HARBORVIEW** – Ken McWilliams advised that the Sutton Planning Board has referred the subdivision now known as Harborview to the New London Planning Board for review and comment as a project of potential regional impact. He recommended that the New London PB send notices to abutters who live in New London for the February 14, 2006 New London Planning Board meeting when the proposal will be reviewed. He also suggested that copies of the Sutton PB Minutes and any other related materials be sent out with the next PB Agenda or be hand delivered to PB members at the Public Hearing on Zoning Amendments 4 and 5 on Wednesday, February 1. All agreed.

Zoning Administrator Stanley explained that the reference in the materials to King Hill Road refers to King Hill Road in Sutton, not King Hill Road in New London. He said that people would travel over King Hill Road in Sutton to Newbury and thence to Stoneybrook Road. He also stated that there was no longer a plan to enter the development solely off King Hill Road in New London and Stonehouse Road.

PB member Andrews stated that there were many questions regarding the New London King Hill Road location with respect to the proposed development. Mr. Stanley tried to explain the relationship. He said that he would print a topographical map of the entire area. Chair Ebel advised that she had asked Mr. McWilliams to advise Eckman Engineering that the New London Planning Board wanted to know about the proposed traffic flow and needed additional detail in that regard. She said that the maps needed to clearly indicate how homeowners from the Harborview development would access New London's King Hill Road.

- B.** The MINUTES of the JANUARY 3, 2006 meeting were APPROVED, as circulated.
- C.** The MINUTES of the JANUARY 9, 2006 deliberative session were APPROVED, as circulated.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **9:40 PM**.

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

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

CHAIRMAN \_\_\_\_\_