

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

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

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

I. ERIN ANDERSON – Concept Site Plan Review: Need for Site Plan (Tax Map 84, Lot 89)

Erin and Edward Anderson were present. Mr. Anderson advised that his wife currently has a barbershop in Newport, but would like to move it to New London. He said that Ms Anderson had found a spot at 353 Main Street under the New London Inn to which she could re-locate. He said that the space had most recently been used for retail sales by Village Sports; however, at an earlier time it had housed a barbershop.

Mr. Anderson advised that Ms Anderson only wanted to cut hair for men, not provide hair styling. He said that NH state regulations would require installation of a sink; however, there were no plans to wash or dye hair. Mr. Anderson advised that there would be no employees. He said the hours of operation would be 9:00 AM to 2:00 PM in Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday and 12:00 PM to 7:00 PM on Wednesday. He added that the hours could be subject to change upon customer needs; however, the business would not be open prior to 8:00 AM nor after 8:00 PM.

Chair Ebel asked if customers would be scheduled one at a time. Ms Anderson responded that there would be no appointments; rather, the business would serve walk-in customers.

Ken McWilliams referred to Article III of the Site Plan Review Regulations that outlines the types of development requiring site plan review. He said that the barbershop would be a change in use from retail sales. However, since there would be no change in traffic flow, parking, drainage, water, sewer, or other utilities, he opined that there would be no need for Site Plan Review.

Chair Ebel opined that the proposed barbershop would be a less intensive use than the prior retail sales use. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley stated that the only requirement would be for the applicant to obtain a sign permit and she had already applied for that.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT NO SITE PLAN REVIEW BE REQUIRED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A BARBERSHOP ON THE LOWER LEVEL AT 353 MAIN STREET IN SPACE PREVIOUSLY USED FOR RETAIL SALES. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

II. HARRY SNOW –Preliminary Major Subdivision (Tax Map 106, Lot 13)

Harry Snow was accompanied by Peter Blakeman (Blakeman Engineering, Inc.). Mr. Blakeman stated that Mr. Snow proposed to subdivide a 41.4-acre property on Bog Road into seven lots. He said that the smallest lot would contain 4.34 acres. He displayed a plan of the proposed subdivision.

Mr. Blakeman advised that the jurisdictional wetlands had been mapped by a certified soils scientist. He said that the plan presented showed reductions for steep slopes and for 85% reduction for wetlands, as required by recent revisions to the Land Subdivision Control Regulations. Mr. Blakeman stated that the area 300 feet off Messer Pond was in the R-2 Residential District and the remainder of the property lay in the ARR Agricultural and Rural Residential District. He advised that all lots recognized the four-acre minimum lot size required in the ARR District and all would have 200 feet of road frontage. He advised that the access road would end in a cul-de-sac. Mr. Blakeman advised that Mr. Snow had agreed in the purchase agreement upon a 200-foot buffer from Messer Pond and the covenant agreement would state that the 200-foot buffer was a "no disturbance" area. He said that Mr. Snow had also agreed to a 300-foot "no build" buffer, meaning that no structure would be

closer to Messer Pond than 300 feet, but land disturbance could occur in the 100-foot strip back from the shore land no-disturbance buffer. Mr. Blakeman stated that the southeast corner of the property was mapped wetland and, pursuant to the New London Zoning Ordinance, would have a 100-foot buffer all around it. He said that each lot would require State approval and the proposed road would also require specific State approval.

Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams to report on any issues raised at the meeting with municipal department heads. Mr. McWilliams advised that the wetland in the southeast corner was protected under Article XIII, Section G, of the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District of the New London Zoning Ordinance that sets forth the minimum width of Wetland buffers. He advised that the regulation requires a 100-foot horizontal buffer from the boundary of all significant Wetlands identified for protection on the New London Streams and Wetlands Protection Map dated March 13, 2001. He advised that the wetland would have to be delineated by a certified soils scientist. Mr. McWilliams advised that the property was similar to the Putnam property that the PB had reviewed in November 2005. He pointed out that Lot 7 had long fingers of wetland extending up into it and, therefore, would be subject to buffer requirements.

Mr. McWilliams advised that the plan as presented did not reflect slopes between 15% and 25%, as required. He said that the applicant needed to re-check the steep slope calculation. Mr. McWilliams said that the proposed access to Lot 4 was of concern and a common access with Lot 3 had been suggested to avoid impacting the wetlands. He said that the Fire Department wanted a water source on site and had discussed placing a cistern at the end of the cul-de-sac. Mr. McWilliams said that Richard Lee, New London Town Road Agent, wanted to review drainage and erosion and sediment control plans when available. Mr. Blakeman pointed out an alternate access for Lot 4.

Chair Ebel recapped the Putnam property review. She advised that Putnam had argued that only the wetland depicted on the New London Streams and Wetlands Protection Map needed to be buffered, while the PB had required a buffer for what was actually on the site. Putnam went for an administrative appeal of the PB decision. The Zoning Board of Adjustment upheld the PB decision.

Mr. Blakeman stated that the regulation was only intended to buffer significant wetlands. He agreed that those wetlands must be delineated in the field and can differ from the wetlands cited on the Map. Chair Ebel referred to the broad definition of wetland as set forth in the New London Zoning Ordinance and the Putnam decision. She stated that per the Putnam decision and Town Counsel's opinion relating to the Putnam matter, that definition was controlling. Mr. Blakeman opined that use of the term "significant" in the regulation modified the definition and reflected the true intention of the PB at the time it was adopted. He opined that the matter needed to be discussed, because distant properties with fingers could be subject to buffers without the owners' knowledge. He questioned how the upland buffer regulation could be enforced, and opined that it couldn't be enforced for subdivisions only. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley advised that the issue had arisen and the matter had been referred to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for a Special Exception for existing lots of record.

Mr. Blakeman asked how the wetlands were reviewed in determining eligibility for a building permit. Zoning Administrator Stanley replied that he would use all overlays and site information. PB member Conly advised that the Conservation Commission had some concerns because Messer Pond is only 15-feet deep and, therefore, very fragile. The Commission had noted the large amount of wetlands in the proposed subdivision and needed to know the location of the road. The Commission identified other areas of concern including the location of septic, the use of fertilizers, cutting restrictions, and it encouraged the use of building envelopes. Mr. Conly said that there had been similar concerns when property on the other side of Messer Pond was developed.

Edythe Anderson (71 Pillars Lane) said that she was curious about the seasonal variation in wetlands, and she opined that the variation made it difficult to determine drainage. PB member Andrews responded the matter was covered by the regulations for jurisdictional wetlands. She advised that vegetation, as well as other indicators, would inform visitors to a site as to the location of jurisdictional wetlands. Mr. Blakeman advised that wetlands were identified by hydrology, vegetation, and poorly drained soils. He said that Mr. Snow had had high intensity soils mapped for the proposed subdivision.

Chair Ebel asked if there were anyone present from the Messer Pond Protective Association (MPPA). Bob Crane (315 Forest Acres Road) said that he represented the MPPA. He said that the MPPA wanted to be kept informed, that the MPPA noted the same factors as those identified by the municipal department heads, and that the MPPA understood that purchase covenants would also protect the pond. Mr. Blakeman advised that the deed signed by Harry Snow contained protection. Mr. Snow pointed out that he had increased setbacks beyond the town regulatory requirements. Mr. Crane asked how the protections would be enforced. Mr. Blakeman replied that if a violation was pointed out to the town, the town would take appropriate action. Chair Ebel stated that this was something that needed to be discussed because a simple deed covenant alone is not enough to authorize the Town to enforce covenants. She said with no homeowners' association, another method would have to be used. She said that usually the PB required that covenants be put on the subdivision plan and in the individual deeds. Ken McWilliams said that there were covenants regarding conservation generally put on the plan. Abutter Moreno asked about the road and drainage. Abutter Fred Kaufman (216 Bog Road) volunteered Bob Crane to be a member of any PB subcommittee appointed to review the proposed subdivision. Chair Ebel asked Mr. Crane if he would be willing to serve on a subcommittee, and he agreed that he would.

PB member Conly said that he knew the MPPA tested the water in the pond, and he encouraged the MPPA to test at the point where water enters the pond. Chair Ebel asked how often testing was done. Mr. Crane replied that this year the water had been tested three times, once each month, at inlets on the Forest Acres side of the pond. Mr. Blakeman asked if the testing was part of the voluntary lake assessment program. Mr. Crane responded affirmatively. He said the MPPA was also concerned about road salt. He said the conductivity of the pond was high. Chair Ebel asked how deep the pond was at its deepest point. The response was 25 feet. Ms Anderson opined that relying on testing only once a month was risky.

Ken McWilliams advised that he had received an e-mail from abutters John and Judith Brimmell (Tax Map 94, Lot 4.009) in which they requested a buffer zone, free of home sites, on the western border of Mr. Snow's land between their property, and that of their neighbors, and that of Mr. Snow. The Brimmells also stated their opposition to extending Surrey Lane, now a dead end road, to Mr. Snow's subdivision.

Chair Ebel advised that the PB had also received a letter from abutters Eleanor and Walter Angoff (64 Surrey Lane) in which they stated that they wanted Surrey Lane to remain rural with no outlet, protection of the 100-foot green belt established along the length of Fieldstone Lane in the Bell subdivision, and protection of the water quality of Messer Pond. The Angoffs also asked about blasting and asked for notification well in advance of the event, should blasting be necessary. Mr. Blakeman replied that he did not know at this time whether blasting would be required. Chair Ebel said that the Angoffs also expressed concern for the safety of children in the Surrey Lane community if through traffic were to be introduced.

Chair Ebel sought the sense of the PB and all agreed that a sub-committee should be appointed to review the proposed subdivision. Chair Ebel appointed PB members Clough, Conly, and herself. She also invited Bob Crane, Mr. Blakeman, and Mr. Snow to be part of the subcommittee.

Mr. Snow stated that he wanted the feeling of the PB regarding the direction that he was taking. He opined that the requirement that there be a minimum of 300 feet between Messer Pond and any development would achieve the necessary protection. He said the lots would be large enough to permit larger houses. He said the size of the lots would be much larger than anything else in New London where most are one acre. He opined that building envelopes were not necessary.

Chair Ebel replied that the proposal includes pond buffers, but it doesn't buffer upper areas; therefore, the subcommittee would need to study steepness. PB member Clough said that looking at building envelopes might add additional protection. Chair Ebel stated that the PB had established a general policy in past approved subdivisions along water bodies to require building envelopes and cutting and fertilizer restrictions, among other things. Mr. Blakeman stated that the approval of a subdivision near Soo-Nipi included neither building envelopes nor any additional buffers. Ms Clough replied that the PB would only be looking at building envelopes and that the PB needed more time to look into issues. Chair Ebel advised that a building envelope shows a general location for a house. She reminded those present that the subcommittee meetings would be

public meetings and would have recorded Minutes. Mr. Blakeman commented that they were public meetings, but not public hearings.

A discussion of a meeting time for the subcommittee ensued. It was agreed that arrangements would be made via e-mail.

PB Clough opined that the municipal department heads had identified a lot of good issues and some of those could/should be addressed before the subcommittee met so that the information would be available.

It was **MOVED** (Cooke) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE PRELIMINARY MAJOR SUBDIVISION OF TAX MAP 106, LOT 13, AS PROPOSED BY HARRY SNOW, BE CONTINUED TO TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2006 AT 7:30 PM. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**III. ROBERT DALEY (33 LITTLE SUNAPEE ROAD, LLC) – Continued Preliminary Site Plan Review:
Parking (Tax Map 60, Lot 3)**

Robert Daley displayed plans for the proposed parking changes. In regard to the issue of where the zone district line was located, he advised that he had consulted an August 17, 1988 map and those boundaries were noted on the plan before the PB.

Abutter Richard Bott asked what the 250-foot line was based upon. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley and PB member Cottrill both responded that it was based upon the center line of Newport Road. Mr. Daley also showed the plan that was previously approved by the PB. He noted that all PB members had visited the site, and he asked if the visits clarified the issues and the proposal.

Chair Ebel asked if there had been any changes in the plan presented. PB member Cottrill said that the previous drawing was incorrect. Mr. Daley said that the three proposed parking spaces had been slid forward. He briefly consulted with Stephen Jesseman (Jesseman Associates, P.C.) to find out if there had been any changes since the previous day. PB members noted that the proposed two parking spaces in front of the building still appeared on the plan displayed.

Mr. Jesseman responded that Mr. Daley was willing to consider eliminating the two spaces, but asked how much more the applicant had to give up. He opined that the two spaces in front would be more convenient and safer for visitors and would be reserved for visitors. Ken McWilliams asked if the two parking spaces in front were proposed or not. Mr. Daley replied that he was trying to have convenient and safer parking. The PB wanted the two spaces in front eliminated. Mr. Daley said that he didn't want to eliminate them until there an agreement on rear parking was decided. He said that he was hedging his bets; he didn't want anything off the table.

PB member Andrews said that the Little Sunapee Road side of the property faced residential properties; however, the rear of the Daley property really was very close to a very commercial property. She said that she would like to protect the residential neighborhood by minimizing any impact on Little Sunapee Road.

PB member Cook said that the location of the dumpster made it difficult to see where the parking was. In reviewing the Minutes when the existing plan was approved, she noted that many items from the previous PB review had not been done, e.g., paving. She opined that it would make sense to confine parking to the rear of the property.

Chair Ebel asked Ken McWilliams to review the setback requirements and the waivers. Mr. McWilliams replied that the Site Plan Review (SPR) Regulations require 10-foot setbacks (landscaping) on either side of the property line. The proposed changes would require a waiver of the entire 10-foot setback for Daley and an 8-foot setback waiver for the Lamplighter Motel. He said that he had never seen a proposal for parking that extended beyond/across a property line. Mr. Daley asked if any two properties had created adjoining parking areas. PB members replied that the setback requirements were designed to prevent back to back parking lots.

Chair Ebel asked if the goal was to increase the number of parking spaces on the site. Mr. Daley replied that Mr. Jesseman had suggested moving three spaces to achieve convenience and safety. He said he had asked if we're moving three spaces, why not do six. Chair Ebel asked where the three spaces would be placed if they were shifted. Mr. Daley replied that the cars in parking spaces 6, 5, and 4 would face cars parked at the motel. More convenient would be shifting to 1, 2, and 3. PB member Clough asked if the dumpster had been returned to the approved site on the property. She asked if the dumpster would remain there. Mr. Daley answered that, if the three spaces were moved, access to the dumpster would be improved and that it would remain where it is now per the previously approved site plan.

Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley asked about snow plowing and snow storage. He suggested that the PB would have to waive snow storage requirements. He opined that there would be no place for snow storage on the site. Chair Ebel asked what had been done about snow plowing and storage in the past. Mr. Jesseman replied that he had been able to store snow on the site and on the few occasions when it was necessary, a loader had been used to relocate the snow. Chair Ebel asked if snow storage would not eliminate parking spaces and wondered if plowing might not put snow on the motel property, perhaps blocking access to the garage. Mr. Jesseman replied in the negative. David Barry, owner of the Lamplighter Motel, advised that he contracted for snow plowing and any excess snow was removed from the site. He said that he had always been able to access the garage.

PB member Cottrill asked what the square footage of the building was and what the number of required parking spaces was. He was advised that there were 10 parking spaces on the site and 5 additional off-site spaces. Mr. Cottrill asked if the proposal would increase the square footage.

Mr. Jesseman suggested that, in regard to the regulatory buffer requirement, the existing buffer area could be considered a pre-existing, non-conforming buffer area. He opined that it looked better now that it did in the past. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that the SPR Regulations state that the PB may waive any of the SPR requirements upon written request of an applicant and "for good cause", "except that no relaxation may be granted which is in conflict with the New London Zoning Ordinance or other applicable regulations". He opined that the PB would be setting a dangerous precedent if all of the waivers requested by this applicant were granted. He asked how much should be packed onto a site before admitting that the site is too small for the business located on it.

Mr. Daley responded that New London was not welcoming and friendly to business. He stated that his business brings people who spend money locally into the town. He said he was proposing to use an area between two commercial properties, an area that is now unsightly and that would be improved by the proposed usage. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that a PB waiver that would eliminate minimum standards when an area is located between buildings and across lot lines would not be a good precedent to set for the community. Mr. Jesseman said that Mr. Daley had demonstrated that the number of parking spaces on the original plan could be accommodated on the site. He opined that the opportunity to use the space between the two properties was unique.

PB member Hollinger asked if there wasn't some more creative solution, e.g., moving a lot line. He stated that a year ago, the PB had approved a site plan for the property, but a number of the conditions of that approval had not been met. He said that Mr. Daley was now asking the PB to approve additional considerations, when the previous conditions had not been met. Mr. Daley talked about not planting two trees that had been intended to block the site from the view of abutters.

PB member Clough said that she was concerned about less than 20% of the parking and driveway areas being available for snow storage and the elimination of buffers. She agreed that the rear space was not attractive, but she opined that additional parking would have an impact on Linwood and Eleanor Hurd's abutting residential lot on the Little Sunapee Road side of the Daley property.

PB member Andrews asked how the stated problem of employee "fender benders" would be lessened by the changes proposed. Mr. Daley demonstrated that three parking spaces would be moved forward and the space

behind parking spaces 10, 9, and 8 would allow more space. PB member Cook asked how many of the five spaces at the motel were used on a daily basis. Mr. Daley replied that 3-4 spaces were used every day. Ms Cook asked if there were any possibility of renting additional spaces at the motel. Mr. Daley replied that if he were to rent motel units, Mr. Barry would probably be happy to rent him additional parking spaces. He said that an easement had already been bartered away in exchange for parking spaces.

Abutter Bott stated that in 1988 the building was partially in the residential zone and partially in the commercial zone. The town agreed to make the entire building commercial, if no additional parking was proposed. Since 1988, the owners have returned to the PB twice to increase parking on the site. He spoke about additional traffic flowing out onto Little Sunapee Road. He said the dumpster had not been screened and that it had not even been placed in the approved location until just recently. He said that there had been no parallel parking all last year in the area shown on the plan; all parking all year had been head-in. He opined that the PB had reviewed all of the issues before and had approved a site plan for the property. Mr. Bott stated that there had been no State review of the increase in traffic, the open area calculation was not shown on the plan, snow storage was not addressed, and the owners had already been granted a PB/ZBA Special Exception to use the building for commercial purposes. He opined that the number of employees had increased and probably would continue to do so. Mr. Bott asked what the setbacks were in Commercial District.

Chair Ebel asked where the 10-foot setback reference appeared in the regulations. Mr. McWilliams said that the reference to a perimeter buffer zone appears in Article VII., Section B., Item 3 of the New London Zoning Ordinance. He read that section aloud. Chair Ebel read Article XIV. Waiver of Requirements of the SPR Regulations that states that the PB may grant no waiver that conflicts with the New London Zoning Ordinance or with other applicable regulations.

PB member Clough asked to have Article XI, Section C., Item 2. Perimeter Landscaping: read into the Minutes. It states that "A landscaped buffer shall be provided to assure that the development of the project conforms at its boundaries with the character of the adjoining land and its uses. These buffer areas shall be of sufficient width to provide privacy and noise protection, but in no case shall the width of such buffer be less than the setbacks otherwise required in that zoning district. (In the Commercial District, the landscaped buffer between the street right-of-way and the edge of the on-site parking lot shall be no less than five (5) feet wide)."

PB member Andrews opined that if the existing plan was unsafe, that issue should be heard if the layout doesn't work; however, Mr. Daley has now proposed three (3) additional parking spaces. Chair Ebel agreed that the decision would turn on the safety issue. Mr. Daley said that the existing parking was not incredibly unsafe and the fender benders resulted from lack of attention on the part of the employees. Abutter Bott asked if the approved parking plan met the turning radii guidelines. He asked if the previously approved parking had been deemed safe. Mr. Jesseman replied that there was no area that combined parallel and head-in parking. He opined that visibility and lighting were less than desirable. Chair Ebel opined that employees should be familiar with the layout and should be able to deal with it. She opined that very few employers would go through such trouble to make things more convenient for their employees and she hoped that Mr. Daley's employees appreciated his efforts. She advised Mr. Daley that the PB must be convinced that the problem is safety. Fire Chief Peter Stanley demonstrated how close the proposed parking would be to the buildings and opined that the lack of space would impede access by fire apparatus in the event of a fire like the one experienced by the motel a year or so ago.

PB member Clough asked where the buffer would be. Mr. Jesseman said that the buffer never existed. Ms Clough said that when a site plan is changed, it must meet regulatory requirements for a buffer. PB member Conly advised that he was very unwilling to grant a waiver of the setback on two (2) properties. He stated that the town has adopted a set of standards, and he opined that those standards must be upheld.

Mr. Daley said that, given Mr. Conly's comment, he would like to go back with Mr. Jesseman to see what could be designed within the existing space. Chair Ebel advised that the PB did not want to (1) increase the number of parking spaces on the site, (2) have two parking spaces in front of the building, (3) waive setbacks to the extent requested, i.e., 100%.

PB member Cottrill said that it appeared that three spaces in the previously approved site plan already encroached on the setback. He noted the edge of the gravel and asked if there were any precedent to "grandfather" spaces 11, 12, and 13 on the proposed plan. Zoning Administrator Stanley responded that they had been parking right up to the edge of the property in violation of the regulations. He advised that a violation could not be "grandfathered". He opined that the 10-foot setback might have been waived or encroachment on the 10-foot buffer approved for three 9-foot spaces. He suggested that angled parking might be better than head-in parking. Zoning Administrator Stanley said the PB could waive the setback; however, a pre-existing violation did not constitute a "grandfathered waiver right". Chair Ebel advised that if the PB missed encroachment on the setback when the previous plan was approved, it's there, the plan was approved, and it's time to move on.

Mr. Cottrill asked how many employees were involved. Mr. Jesseman has three and Mr. Daley (IBS) has eight. The 2005 PB Minutes refer to a maximum of 14-15 employees. PB member Hollinger said that he didn't read any limit on the number of employees in the Minutes. Mr. Cottrill suggested that Mr. Daley change the angle of the three spaces and request the PB to waive the gravel setback. PB member Andrews opined that the applicant, not the PB, needed to design his parking.

Abutter Bott said that he objected to cars parked in violation of the regulations. PB member Andrews said that the PB tried to move the cars to the rear of the property and required the planting of two trees to buffer the Botts' view of parking up Mr. Daley drive. Mr. Bott asked if prior violations have been corrected. Mr. Daley asked if something was misrepresented did he have to comply. PB member Cook replied that he agreed to do certain things as a condition for approval; therefore, he must comply. PB member Clough reiterated that he must do what he agreed to do. Mr. Daley agreed to plant two trees.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cook) **THAT THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW: PARKING AT 33 LITTLE SUNAPEE ROAD (TAX MAP 60, LOT 3) BE CONTINUED TO TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2006 AT 7:30 PM. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

A. HARBORVIEW: Ken McWilliams said that Attorney G. Dana Bisbee had advised that he planned to file the final application for the road and intersection improvements in time for the November 14, 2006 meeting of the PB and that he would like to schedule meeting of the subcommittee. Mr. McWilliams advised the PB that the escrow account had not yet been funded.

It was **MOVED** (Clough) and **SECONDED** (Andrews) **THAT THE NLPB SUBCOMMITTEE FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO STONEHOUSE ROAD AND THE INTERSECTION OF STONEHOUSE ROAD AND KING HILL ROAD WILL NOT MEET UNTIL THE ESCROW ACCOUNT FOR PAYING COSTS INCURRED BY L. C. ENGINEERING, INC. HAS BEEN FUNDED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B. MINUTES of the OCTOBER 10, 2006 MEETING were APPROVED, as circulated.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **9:45 PM**.

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

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____

