



TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

375 MAIN STREET • NEW LONDON, NH 03257 • WWW.NL-NH.COM

PLANNING BOARD APPROVED MEETING MINUTES October 22, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Cottrill (Chair), Jeff Hollinger (Vice-Chair), Paul Gorman (Secretary), Peter Bianchi (Board of Selectmen's Representative), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), John Tilley, Michael Doheny (Alternate), Bill Helm (Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michele Holton, Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate)

STAFF: Lucy St. John (Planning and Zoning Administrator), Kristy Heath (Recording Secretary)

Chair Cottrill called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Bill Helm, alternate, was asked to sit in for Michele Holton, who was absent.

Marshall's Garage – Continued Discussion from September 24, 2013 Meeting (Tax Map 077-037)

Chair Cottrill asked if there was any new information to share. Ms. St. John noted that she provided the Board a copy of the file history, and explained that the plan referenced in the site plan application discussion of 1998 is plan MCRD 10710, a copy was provided to the Board. She explained that the Board was familiar with the history of this discussion, and that the Board can decide what further action, if any, is required, noting this is a continued discussion from the September 24th meeting. Ms. St. John said that the McChesney's were in attendance and are represented by Attorney John Arnold of Hinckley Allen. She noted that no one was present to represent the Marshalls. The Chair asked if the Marshalls were aware of the meeting. Ms. St. John said although she did not send them an agenda she believed the Marshall's were aware that the meeting. Attorney Arnold asked that all the issues identified in their letters be considered at this meeting, and in determining if Site Plan Review is required.

Ms. St. John referred to the file history provided to the Board. The Chair referred to the letters dated September 6th and Sept 13, 2013 from Hinckley Allen. Attorney Arnold asked that each of the points referenced in the letters be considered. Chair Cottrill said he would go through the allegations one at a time and the Planning Board would determine if any of the claims would prompt a site plan review (SPR).

- Buffer trees were cut - Mr. Hollinger said the trees were not part of the 1998 plan so that, in itself, would not require a SPR.
- Persistent Change/Expansion of Use - Chair Cottrill noted that any additional days of operation or increased traffic would require a SPR. He referred to the site history, the Site Plan application of 1998 and the Executive Summary. The Executive Summary (a) The operation of the business will be the same as it has always been, which is generally six days a week, Monday through Saturday, from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and occasional operation on Sunday and after 6:00 p.m. on an as-needed basis. The Board discussed the terms "generally", "occasional" and "on an as-needed basis" noting that these terms could imply a broader scope and that when they review other site plans in the future they will require more specific terms. Mr. Hollinger opined that there is expansion and change and that any expansion and any change in buildings would require a SPR.
- Changes to the annex building – It was noted that the long white building in the back was being used for mechanical operation instead of storage, noting it was initially for storage. Chair Cottrill said the SPR in 1998 stated that the space had already changed from storage into mechanical operation so this might not be an issue.

- Main Garage Building changes to the floor plan and Annex building changes. Chair Cottrill noted that interior floor plan layout would typically prompt a SPR.
- Construction of Additional Parking – The McChesney/Arnold Letter of Sept 6th states in the spring of 2011, Mr. Marshall constructed 4-5 new parking spaces, and that as recently as August 20, 2013, 36 vehicles were parked at the garage. Chair Cottrill asked Ms. St. John if she had any observations about parking on the property, specifically parking in the rear. She explained that it is not paved and thus there are no defined spaces and was asked to estimate how many vehicles might be there, she thought they maybe 20-30 vehicles, noting she didn't count them during her visit. Peter Bianchi said it was hard to determine if they were in violation of any parking requirements if they don't have backup information from the 1998 site plan telling them how many spaces they had at that point in time.
- Number of employees/customers – The Executive Summary submitted in 1998 indicated the number of employees to be 10 and the customers per day were estimated at 20-25. Chair Cottrill noted that in the first or second PB meeting regarding this issue, Mr. Marshall stated that the numbers represented and stated in the Executive Summary of 1998 are an accurate reflection of current business practice.
- Addition of a temporary structure – (The green tent-like structure on the property). Ms. St. John noted that there are provisions in the current Zoning Ordinance to address temporary structures. She explained that she wasn't able to locate a building permit for this "temporary structure" or that it was permitted by any former site plan review. She had found an aerial image of the property on "Google Earth" that showed the structure was there in 2005.
- Car rentals and sales – It is alleged that cars are being rented from the garage. It was asked if this use was permitted in the 1998 SPR or if it is now a new change in use. Mr. Tilley thought it would be a change in use and if continued, would require a SPR. If rentals were discontinued it would negate the need for a SPR

Chair Cottrill asked for a sense of direction from the Board: Whether or not the Marshalls should come in for a SPR based on the issues raised in the Sept 6th letter. Mr. Hollinger said a SPR would be needed if there was no building permit or site plan for the temporary structure, if there had been change made within the buildings, and if there were cars being rented and sold, as this would signify an additional use. Mr. Doheny thought a letter should be sent to the Marshalls indicating that if they wish to continue renting and selling cars and using the temporary structure, a SPR would be required. If not, Mr. Doheny agreed with Mr. Tilley that it would negate the need for a SPR.

Motion: IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) Marshall's Garage to present a site plan to the Planning Board within sixty (60) days to update site usage and layout since the last site plan review of 1998 and to apply for any after-the-fact changes to use and layout of the entire site based upon 1) the apparent addition to the property of a temporary structure, 2) possible changes to the interior floor layout and usage of the main building and the annex building, 3) increase in use of the lot by renting and selling automobiles, 4) possible increases in parking areas and 5) changes to drainage; and to ask the Planning and Zoning Administrator to send a letter to the Marshall's requesting clarification, in writing and within thirty (30) days, regarding the renting and selling of automobiles and to further ask that Marshall's Garage discontinue such activity until site plan review can be accomplished. **THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Chair asked Ms. St. John to prepare the letter to the Marshall's and to include the Notice of Decision. She reminded the Board that there were non-conforming issues having to do with these expansions that were not discussed but will likely surface during site plan review. No further discussion occurred.

Final Site Plan Review - TJM Enterprises, DBA Flying Goose Pub & Grille – Function Room & Site Improvements. Tax Map 122-001-000. Located at 40 Andover Road, at the corner of NH Routes 11 and 114. Zoned ARR. Owned by Thomas and Vicky Mills Trust.

Ms. St. John indicated the applicant submitted a revised plan later this afternoon, which she provided to the Board via email and that she didn't have time to review it prior to the meeting. She also noted that she wasn't able to prepare a staff report, as she was out last week. She referred to the site history information that was provided to the Board, outlining records from the 1960s to current. She added that four abutters had visited her office to review the plans and she also received a letter from an abutter requesting that it be read into the record. She noted that the Flying Goose Pub & Grille is in the ARR district, and the building is an existing non-conforming structure and non-conforming use.

Brianna Mills, representing Flying Goose Pub & Grille distributed a handout to the Planning Board titled "Brewery Storage and Function Room Addition." This handout provided information on setbacks, septic, safety/fire, parking/water run-off and expansion of non-conforming use vs. normal business growth. Ms. Mills reviewed the details outlined on this handout. She explained additional details including that they are proposing a separate leach field for brewery wastewater, which has been reviewed with the Town's health officer. She explained that they weren't aware of the septic odor issues that have been brought to their attention, but intend to resolve this issue to be good neighbors, by installing charcoal filters.

Ross Stevens, from Steven's engineering, representing the Flying Goose provided further details on the site, referring to the site map details projected on the screen. He noted that the architecture is to code with ADA access. He has reviewed the plans with Chief Lyon and will install a sprinkler system to the mechanical areas of the addition. They will also have a buffer for winter plowing. The brewery level of the addition will move indoors some existing cold and grain storage which is currently being stored outdoors. Mr. Stevens said the second floor architecture will be made to be aesthetically pleasing. He said the restaurant has experienced growth since 1996 and the proposed improvements are for the continued growth of the business.

Chair Cottrill asked for comments from the audience and from abutters.

Gary Surprenant, 67 Sutton Road (123-001-001), an abutter said his property runs from Route 114 to Overlook Terrace, which runs the full length of the back of the site. He expressed concerns about the following issues:

- Drainage from the brewery operations: the size of the culvert and if the brewery were going to expand how would drainage be addressed, his property has gotten wetter.
- Dumpsters need lids: Garbage is often seen on the grounds and carried elsewhere with wind.
- Increased traffic due to a larger parking lot and said about 25 cars/day turn around in his driveway.
- Landscaping regulations and how they are enforced. Chair Cottrill said landscaping would be included in a site plan per site plan regulations in commercial zones. Mr. Surprenant wondered if landscaping would be improved if they decided not to move forward. Mr. Mills said they would definitely move forward with landscaping and would clean up the dumpster area as well.
- Lighting layout and lighting code requirements. Mr. Surprenant likes the dark skies in their area and is concerned that they could change. Right now, headlights shine into his home from the parking lot of the restaurant. He also asked about the lighting the path leading to the lower parking area. It was asked if people would be walking down a path to get to their car in the lower parking lot even at 1:00am. This was answered in the affirmative. Mr. Stevens said there would also be an added light on the path and it will be on a timer; not on all night long. He noted the plans indicated that the lights will be shielded, downward facing lights and they have submitted a plan for all the lights on the

building. Mr. Stevens said the code requirements are not very explicit and that they would design the lighting to take into account the neighbors and their wishes.

- Noise and commotion. Parking lot is noisy at closing. He assumed that additional business traffic would surely affect the police staffing levels. He wondered if the Police Department had been consulted.
- Non-conforming use and zoning clarification. Chair Cottrill said the lot is a grand-fathered non-conforming lot with a non-conforming structure operated commercially and that zoning and site plan regulations apply as to what the owners can/cannot do. He said in this case, the application would likely be referred to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for decision. Abutters are notified of any zoning hearings and there is a public input portion of the meeting. Chair Cottrill said if it isn't an allowed use by the zoning ordinance, the ZBA will have to decide to grant or deny the request.
- Property values. They invested in putting in a new kitchen that looked out at a birch tree and they couldn't see the restaurant. Now they see a tree and solar panels. One of their favorite things about the view from their window was their winding driveway; now a parking lot will go alongside it making it much less appealing. Mr. Surprenant opined this will affect his property value. He wondered if there is any information on how this expansion affects property values. Chair Cottrill noted that this would be considered by the ZBA.
- Runoff, drainage and groundwater impacts- wants to see the calculations
- Smell that is coming from the septic system currently. Mr. Stevens said it is effluent and when the wind blows it creates a vacuum and he thought it was coming from the current leach field. It could also be from someone else's leach field in the area. Mr. Tilley said this could happen when the grinding pumps come on to move the volume.
- Silo building- shiny, distracting, when was this permitted, and what is it used for? Mr. Mills said it was a wood pellet silo that holds fuel for a wood pellet burner. They got permission to put this in a year ago. Mr. Mills understood that silos and solar panels weren't pretty to everyone but he wasn't sure how to make those things softer or more attractive.
- Site visit by the Planning Board is suggested.
- Snow is pushed on his property and affects drainage
- Solar panels- unattractive, affects his property value, not given notice, lack of sufficient landscaping to block them
- Wedding receptions would they be permitted? Ms. Mills said they are not pursuing the wedding business.

Maureen Strachan (109-009-000), an abutter who lives across from the pub wondered if there had been anything addressed with regard to the landscaping and lighting that is planned. She hoped they would address the noise level which is quite high right now when people leave the restaurant. She thought this noise would only increase with an addition to the restaurant.

Jim DeAngelis of Rowell Hill Road (123-029-001), an abutter, expressed concerns about the following issues:

- Additional functions would create more noise, maybe not from patronage, but from increased recycling and solid waste disposal. Already, they can hear glass smashing from their homes as it is dumped to be recycled. There are also random pick-up times of the restaurant's solid waste and there is not much care taken with the use of the back-up alarm before the sun rises, with idling at high gear when unnecessary, etc.
- Are brewery tours, tasting and other expansions planned? Mr. Mills said if they could expand the brewery operating space they might want to put in a bottling line to enhance what they do. They have people asking to buy bottles of their beer all the time. The brewery is not structured for tours or tastings, however. They do get requests for occasional tours by home-brew groups that make arrangements to come meet with the brew master to learn how the operation works. There is not a lot of incentive to do this kind of thing every day, however.

- Chemicals used in cleaning the brewery equipment. Mr. Mills wasn't sure of the details. Drainage and concern that the water from the site was what was causing increased water to travel under the Messer barn. He wanted assurance that the amount of this runoff wouldn't increase with the addition.
- Monitoring the system for the brewery waste water and how it would be done. Mr. Stevens said they would sample the water. It would be a higher grade septic system than any residential system available. The system is not part of the site plan review that night and presumably it will be funded in the context of this project. The State of New Hampshire will provide a leach field application for this.
- Patrons not acting respectful, he has children who may be in the yard.
- Septic odors. This has been a consistent bother for a long period of time. Any more patronage would only add to this waste issue. Would like more details about the septic plans.
- Trash left on their property when patrons who don't park in the parking lots throw their trash out and along the road. Mr. Stevens said it is hard to say where trash comes from. Mr. DeAngelis feels that Mr. Mills has done a good job with his restaurant and has worked hard. He wondered, however, who he should call if a patron who is at the restaurant (but not parked in the parking lot) is swearing or throwing trash in the area where his kids are out in the field working with their horses. Mr. Stevens suggested calling Mr. Mills directly. Chair Cottrill suggested calling the New London Police Department if there is such a disturbance. Mr. DeAngelis said he had done this before and it is in the police logs. There have been arrests made.
- Water usage. How much water is used on a daily basis? When operating and cleaning the brewing vessels they have to be cleaned in batches. More beer being brewed would increase this amount of cleaning and the amount of water being used.

Bob Hallisey, an abutter (110-011-000) from Overlook Terrace asked if there was a required distance from the leach field to a well. Mr. Stevens said yes, but this leach field will be further from his well than the existing leach fields. When he created the leach fields that are there now, they had to look at the distance from abutting wells. Mr. Hallisey suggested the Planning Board come into Overlook Terrace to look and see what has been done in that area already.

Ann French, an abutter (109-010-000) who lives across from the restaurant said her family has lived there for 34 years and they have been good neighbors with the restaurant, supporting them over the years. She identified the following concerns:

- Buffer- The trees give a buffer to the road and restaurant but now that the restaurant will be expanding, it will be right in their line of sight.
- Driveway and Traffic Safety- The traffic on Route 11 and the way they get into their driveway is of concern. It is even more dangerous after the re-working of the intersection because they have done away with some striping on the roads. Now there are two lanes of traffic coming up the hill. They have had several near-misses. If parking will be enlarged and there will be a larger entrance to the restaurant, more traffic, including large trucks, will be adding to this.
- Lighting- Additionally, they have a huge light that is on all night and shining in their windows making their entire upstairs bright. Concern that more of those kinds of lights would be installed. Mr. Mills said the light Ms. French was speaking of was a State highway light. Mr. Stevens showed where the light she was talking about was. He showed the plan with the enlarged entrance to the parking lot so large trucks can get in and out easier.
- Noise- There has been good communication between them. In the last year or so the noise and the commotion that goes on at closing time and into the early hours of the morning is something they've never experienced before. This is not noise just coming from the restaurant but also from the house being rented to Colby-Sawyer students at the Crockett Farm. She said it is especially loud Friday and Saturday nights. This changes the whole neighborhood and they've never had that much noise before. There are motorcycles revving, and people yelling and screaming.
- Property values- She was concerned with property values because of parking.

- Solar panels- She is happy that they have used solar power but is sorry that no one was contacted to see if they had any suggestions or comments about it. She wondered how that happened that they weren't contacted.

Lynn Hopkins, an abutter of 37 Overlook (110-012-000) said her family is concerned with the notion that anything that gets larger creates larger problems. Although they live full-time in Longmeadow, Massachusetts, New London is special to them. They want to move to New London because they love it and its culture. New London has the beauty, aesthetics, quaintness and charm that they value. The expansion will directly affect her property and she'd like to have her well water evaluated. She was worried about too many parking lots and lighting.

Sandra Rowse, an abutter (122-002-000) said she woke up one morning and the solar panel had been constructed right in her view. She went and asked why and found there was an ordinance that they don't have to talk to the abutters about such things. They weren't notified and had no say in it. She also expressed concern about the septic odor issues and explained that at Foxstand in Springfield, they have had the same problem which was due to a combination of things such as wind and heavy dew. Everyone has this smell coming from their systems but many don't realize it is there. In her situation, they used charcoal filters and this helped the situation immensely. The smell is an issue in an open area. Mr. Stevens said the use of charcoal filters is on the short-term plan to take care of the odor that had been identified recently.

Sue Jaggard, who lives on Main Street, wondered if the function room would be expanded into a regular dining room to accommodate larger parties for things such as wedding receptions. Ms. Mills said it would not as the kitchen capacity they have cannot accommodate any more patrons without greatly increasing wait time for food.

Barbara Hopkins- Ms. St. John said a letter (email) had been submitted today, October 22, 2013 from Barbara Hopkins. The complete letter was read into the record. Ms. Hopkins was not in attendance.

Details of the site plan were explained by Ross Stevens, Brianna and Tom Mills and questions addressed during the discussion and in response to the abutter concerns.

- Addition- cold and dry storage. Mr. Mills added that they want to accommodate cold and dry storage in the new addition. They currently have this storage outside so it is partly an appearance issue; they wish to have a much tidier appearance than it is now. They are sensitive to the fact that they have neighbors and are not trying to run the business in an inappropriate way. He did say he would make an effort to do planting at the edges of the solar panels but wanted to wait until they finished the process to see if they'd do a larger amount of work. If more buffers need to be worked in he didn't see that as a point of contention. He felt the feedback was very good for them. If there is not enough community support, they may decide to withdraw the application and not proceed with plans.
- Brewery waste water- There is a company currently working on a design for the wash-down water. Brewery waste is also taken off site by someone local who uses it as compost. Several underground tanks will take the brewery effluent and make very clean water using a tertiary system. Mr. Stevens said he has 35 years' experience in this and believes the plan they will use will be successful for many years to come. Mr. Stevens said the wash-down in the brewery is done twice per week using a total of 1,500 gallons of water. The company they are working with is designing a structure to handle 5,000 gallons of water per week. In comparison, residential systems are generally designed to handle 450 gallons per day.
- Drainage and stormwater- Mr. Stevens showed the detention basins and where runoff would go. There wouldn't be any more storm drains connected to basins that deliver water to a pipe off the property. Mr. Stevens said the retention pond would appear as a grassy area and because of the pond, there would be a noticeable decrease in runoff even with the increase in parking area.
- Function room- Would it change the hours of operation. Mr. Mills said it would not. It was asked how many functions/week they plan on hosting in the new room. Ms. Mills said she was not sure because

they have been turning people away when they have asked the restaurant to host such an event. She anticipated probably having just two events in the function room per month to start.

- Hours of operation - Mr. Mills said closing time in New Hampshire it is 1:00am. They stop serving food at 9:00pm and the bar stays open anywhere from 11:00pm to 1:00am depending on the higher traffic seasons and nights. Ms. Brianna Mills responded that the addition wouldn't be something they would be operating with the rest of the restaurant during regular hours. They are trying to accommodate a need for space for meetings, bridal showers, events, etc. but are not planning on having wedding receptions there as those are bigger events than they are comfortable with.
- Landscaping- Mr. Stevens said one issue they have been discussing is landscaping. There would be simple 2' x 8' areas extending off the building; one from the front and one from the east end of the addition. There will be planting beds and they will have low-shrub plantings similar to what is there at the entrance now. The remainder of the site is heavily landscaped at this point. Some trees and a garden will need to be relocated when the parking is expanded. There is no intent to landscape any land away from the building, itself.
- Outdoor functions- It was asked if outdoor functions would be allowed under this plan. Ms. Mills said they would not.
- Septic system- The restaurant is on town water and has an on-site septic system. He said the existing septic is 10 years old and provides a good degree of treatment and has excess capacity to handle the added function room.
- Wedding receptions- Mr. Mills didn't think the Town's zoning would require such language regarding limiting wedding receptions. If they approve the use as a restaurant space, they would be approved to host a reception should they wish down the line. If they were to sell the building later on, the new buyers could have a different idea of what to use the space for. Mr. Mills said the proposed room would accommodate 50 people. Mr. Doheny didn't think a space that would only hold 50 people would be a big draw for those looking for a place to host a wedding reception.

Mr. Mills said in an effort to make things easier on everyone, he wanted to withdraw his application. He felt it was appropriate to rethink where they were at, work with their neighbors on mitigating some issues that already exist, and live within the footprint they have right now. The participants of the meeting thanked Mr. Mills for withdrawing his application.

Minutes of October 8, 2013

IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (John Tilley) to approve the minutes of October 8, 2013, as circulated. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Other business

Training Opportunities: Ms. St. John explained that she had contacted the Regional Planning Commission to inquire about training sessions. The RPC asked if the training sessions would be just for New London Board members or could other towns be invited. The Planning Board wants the sessions to be just for New London Board members. Ms. St. John also asked if they want the RPC to do all the training or if the Board wanted staff, including herself and Town Administrator to lead some training sessions. Chair Cottrill said he would like to do trainings with New London only in an effort to focus on New London zoning regulations. He explained that in years past training was focused for example on preparing to review complicated subdivision plans. He thought it was beneficial and added that the Town pays dues to the RPC which gives them a number of hours to use for things such as training. He suggested a RPC staff person, ones they are familiar with such as (Mike McCrory or Rachel Ruppel). Some training sessions will be scheduled to be held in early 2014. Chair Cottrill suggested members come forward with issues they would like to have clarified. Mr. Bianchi suggested having someone come down to meet with them for a quick overview of site plans, ordinances, etc. and they could then decide what topics they should spend more time on. Others agreed that this would be a good training approach.

2014 Planning Board Meeting Schedule: Ms. St. John noted it is time to develop the 2014 Planning Board meeting schedule. She will circulate the draft for input, including establishing dates for work sessions. The Board agreed they want to continue the 7:00 pm. start time.

Tax Map 049-015-000. Located at 101 Lamson Lane, Kent property- Ms. St. John said the tree cutting was approved at the Nov 13, 2012 meeting with conditions. The owner provided photographs showing the new plantings. It was suggested the staff develop an automated reminder of future deadlines so as to remember deadline date from Planning Board decisions.

CIP Discussion

It was determined that Emma Crane, Michele Holton and Jeff Hollinger would serve on the CIP committee with two members of the Budget Committee, John Wilson and Doug Homan.

Ms. St. John wondered if the Planning Board wanted to incorporate any changes into the CIP process and in documents and data produced as shown in samples she circulated to the Board from other towns. Chair Cottrill said the tables New London uses for their CIP are hard to read and that the CIP committee should consider those changes.

Shoreland Permits

Ms. St. John said if more than 20% of a property has an impervious surface, the applicant has to come before the Planning Board. She wondered if the Planning Board wanted applicants to come before them to present what they've presented to DES. Chair Cottrill said they have done this in the past. They've given input and made suggestions to applicants from time to time. Mr. Bianchi wondered if applicants should have a permit from DES before they come before the Town, the Board noted that this should happen. New London's shoreland regulations are stricter and they will be able to explain the nuances of New London's regulations to the applicant if they come forward to a meeting.

Incoming Information

Mr. Bianchi thought the Board should set a deadline of when information from the applicant can come to the Board, noting that a revised site plan was submitted this afternoon. He explained that there is not time to review the information prior to the meeting. Ms. St. John explained the application due dates are included on the meeting schedule. A discussion then focused on when an application should be submitted to the Board. Ms. St. John explained that the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations refer to a 15 day period, as well as the RSAs. If an applicant wants to be included on the agenda she includes them and the Board must decide if the application is complete. Chair Cottrill said in the past they had decided on 10 days. She explained that the Planning Board can continue the discussion of an application to another meeting date, they do not have to decide the same night as the meeting. Mr. Hollinger thought people would be upset if their case wasn't going to be heard at a meeting after thinking they are coming to the Board to be heard. It was generally agreed that Ms. St. John should draw the line on deadlines and if material is not delivered to Ms. St. John before 15 days before the meeting, that application shall be postponed until the next Planning Board meeting.

**IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (Jeff Hollinger) to adjourn the meeting.
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:19pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary
Town of New London

