



# TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

## **New London Planning Board MEETING MINUTES Thursday, January 11, 2024 Whipple Memorial Town Hall, 6:30 PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tim Paradis (Chair, voting), Paul Vance (voting), Jeremy Bonin (voting), Emily Campbell (voting), Marianne McEnrue (voting), Janet Kidder (Selectmen's Representative)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Katie Vedova, Joe Kubit, Paul Gorman, David Royle

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Town Planner, Adam Ricker, John Ellis, Susan Cox, John Wilson, Bebe Casey, Amy Kaplan, Nancy Rollins, Michael Quinn, Steve Root, Peter Nichols, Karen Epstein, Rich Epstein, Winfried Feneberg, Phil Sherman, Colin Beasley, Peter Stanley, Bob Lyon, Rob Prohl, Maureen Prohl, Mike Fallon, Ralph Tingley, Tom Conway, Jay Lyon, Jerry Coogan, Bob Ruggles, Tom Elliot

1. **Call to Order** – Chair Paradis called the meeting to order at 6:30pm. Emily Campbell and Janet Kidder will be voting members tonight.
2. **Review of minutes: December 12, 2023 - Deferred**
3. **Public Comment - None**
4. **Tree Cutting – Domenic and Molly Ferrante**, Located at 53 Lighthouse View Road, Map/lot 126-005-0-0-0, +/-1.20 acres, Zoned Residential (R-2) Shoreland Overlay District. The applicant is applying to remove three trees.

Josh Bartlett, an arborist with Chippers attended the meeting. Adam Ricker stated he went out to the property and did a site visit with Josh. This is an older house and is close to the water. There are three trees that they would like to remove but one is leaning close to the house and needs to come down. Removing will leave that cell deficient by three points. The landscape architect has proposed a replanting plan that includes trees and bushes from the DES Native Species list. The replanting will replenish the cell with 7 points.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Emily Campbell) to approve the tree cutting application on the Ferrante property. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

5. **Tree Cutting – Wendy Miller**, Located at 253 Forest Acres Road, Map/lot 118-015-0-0-0, +/- 1.10 acres, Zoned Residential (R-2) Shoreland Overlay District. The applicant is applying to remove three trees.

Tom Conway attended the meeting. Adam Ricker stated he did a site visit with Mr. Conway at this property. They will remove a dead ash tree, a white pine with root rot and wood pecker damage and another pine tree that has root rot. In the specific cell that has only one tree there is a stone paver patio so they are trying to find room along the shoreline. They may need to add more plantings in neighboring cells instead.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Emily Campbell) to approve the tree cutting application. The replacement of 10 points would be to replant 5 points in the cell where the tree is being removed and the remaining 5 points will be split between 2 adjacent cells. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 6. Tree Cutting – George P Quakenbos Trust**, Located at 157 Poor Road, Map/lot 91-012-0-0-0, +/-2.70 acres, Zoned Residential (R-2) Shoreland Overlay District. The applicant is applying to remove 29 trees.

Adam Ricker did a site visit with Pam Perkins. There are a variety of trees throughout the property that the applicant would like to remove and the vast majority of the cells have more than 25 points upon completion of the cutting. There is one area of concern near the water where the removal of the tree drops the cell count below 25 points. It's been proposed to replace with 10 points of native species from the DES list. This would be 5 points of tree and 5 points of shrubs.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Marianne McEnrue) to approve the tree cutting application for the Quakenbos property. The replacement of 10 points would be to replant 5 points of trees and 5 points of shrubs from the DES native species list. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

## **7. 2024 Proposed Zoning Amendments PUBLIC HEARING**

Town Planner Adam Ricker explained that tonight is the first hearing of what could potentially be two hearings for zoning amendments. This is the last opportunity for the Planning Board to make a change to what is proposed. If there is a substantive change made tonight, the board can continue that item to January 23, 2024 for the second public hearing at which time they can make a decision on that particular item as to whether it would move forward to town meeting.

### **a. Article XVIII Cluster Subdivision**

The above amendment seeks to eliminate requirement that developments have a minimum of 5 acres, and to reduce the buffer to 50' in an effort to allow for small scale infill development.

A cluster development has different land requirements for what each individual house is built on but overall, there is no additional density allowed for the development. There is common area that is reserved for each one of the houses. The current zoning ordinance doesn't allow for cluster subdivisions on a tract of land any less than five acres. The intent is to potentially allow for small infill developments to occur. There is also a proposal to reduce a perimeter setback from 100 feet to 50 feet. This is because 100-foot perimeter setback on a small lot would use a significant amount of land.

Peter Stanley stated that as of 2012, New London had the 4<sup>th</sup> highest population density in the region behind Hanover, Lebanon and Claremont. We can accommodate that density without it being obvious because of the fact we have the 100-foot buffer requirement for Cluster Developments. A 50-foot buffer becomes more see through unless more vegetation is added. It would be better to keep it 100 feet with an exception in certain zone districts where there isn't enough room or where more visibility is expected. We should be trying, based on the master plan, to protect the visual qualities of New London so effort should be made to hide the large-scale development in town. He doesn't agree with reducing the buffer and hopes the Planning Board rethinks this.

Bob Lyon stated he agrees wholeheartedly with Mr. Stanley. He stated if the current size is five acres, what is the actual proposal to reduce it to? Is it just eliminated? Adam Ricker responded that zoning still stands, it would eliminate the minimum development lot size for the cluster section of the ordinance. It doesn't change the lot size for individual lots. Density is different in every zone and is based on the individual zone. Mr. Lyon stated there is a lot of concern in town about water supply. Why would anyone want to vote for a zoning change with impending water issues? Adam Ricker stated this doesn't change the allowable density but the advantage to the developer is that they can develop on a smaller footprint which is more affordable. The advantage to the general public is the preservation of common area land that is left untouched. Mr. Lyon asked why are we wanting to make this change and put more houses up? He understands the national housing crisis but he isn't sure the town of New London has to solve that.

Tim Paradis responded that the philosophy is that there is a housing shortage nationally but also locally and if you talked with the college, the hospital and other businesses in town, there is a massive crisis when it comes to affordability and attracting workers to the town. They do have to be smart about water use but some of the development has been happening outside of the water precinct. There are challenges but development doesn't have to be halted as a result. Mr. Lyon responded that based on that, the Planning Board is saying that they are doing this because of workforce housing. He asked then why are they putting up Twin Pines which is 60 units of affordable housing. Why should he vote for this when that project is coming in? Mr. Paradis stated the Twin Pines project will help the situation but not fix it. We need all levels of housing.

Jeremy Bonin stated this board represents the town and referred to the 2019 Master Plan survey which resulted in 93% of survey respondents identifying "attracting a balanced mix of residents of all age groups" as important or very important to the future of New London. 77% responded that "expanding rental opportunities for members of the workforce" is important and 63% favored exploring provisions of detached accessory units as important. Mr. Lyon responded that the survey responses have to be taken into context of what is going on in the town.

Jeremy Bonin asked Mr. Stanley for clarification on whether he was proposing a different buffer between zones or different between street side and perimeter side. Mr. Stanley responded he was referring to all the way around the perimeter. 100 feet is working well and has worked well for many years.

Adam Ricker summarized it to say "no structure in the conservation zone, agricultural rural residential or residential R-2 shall be located closer than 100 feet to the perimeter of the tract" and "no structure within the urban residential R-1 shall be located within 50 feet of the perimeter of the tract." Mr. Ricker also read the language for the buffer strip section using the same content.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Paul Vance) to continue this item to the second public hearing on January 23, 2024 with the discussed changes. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**b. Article XIX Planned Unit Development**

The above amendment seeks to eliminate requirement that developments have a minimum of 5 acres, and match the buffer to the requirements of the underlying zone

district. Additionally, the proposal eliminates the requirement to connect to the public sewer and water systems. The proposal seeks to allow for small scale infill development.

Adam Ricker stated the intent is to allow for some small infill development. There is a component of this which involves case law that allows conversion of rental units to PUD whether they meet the local PUD regulations or not if nothing is changing other than the ownership structure. An example of this is when Bar Harbor approached them to subdivide the carriage house and the bank branch into a PUD.

The proposed new modification would be to eliminate the 75-foot setback and instead add “to the underlying setback of that zoning district”.

Due to water capacity issues with the New London/Springfield water precinct, another proposed change would be to the water and sewer Service section and that would now read:

**Sewer Service:** All Planned Unit Developments shall be served by the New London Sewer Commission for sewage disposal when the development is within 100 feet of the sewer system.

Jerry Coogan stated he is in favor of retaining the requirement for sewer and thinks you should always hook up to a sewer system if a development is in a reasonable proximity and should require even a larger distance, maybe 200 or 300 feet.

Mike Fallon asked for clarification with regard to sewer hookup requirement in a PUD. Steve Root stated currently the ordinance states if you are in a PUD, you must hook up to the sewer system. In large parts of the district, it's not possible to connect to the sewer so currently PUD's that are possible have to be reasonably close to where the sewer line is. State law states if you are close to the sewer line, hook up to it so we are now saying if you aren't close to the sewer you don't have to hook up.

Mr. Root wants to know what the build out impact will be because he believes it will have impact and asked if there is an idea of the number of units? The current requirement has a restrictive effect on PUD's. Bob Lyon also asked what the expected build out would be. Typically, when a proposal is done, there is an idea of what the impact will be. Adam Ricker responded they don't have a number but shared the PUD Overlay and discussed the limited number of properties available for future development. Mike Fallon stated he prefers that the current New London ordinance stay in place because it will be a deterrent. He spent much of his career in this business and knows how much it slows down or accelerates development. If it is done in a measured way, you can control development and the town should be careful and incremental in what is permitted.

Jeremy Bonin stated whether this is changed or not, all development still needs to go before the water precinct.

Adam Ricker reviewed the agreed upon changes which included eliminating the 5-acre minimum as well as the 75-foot perimeter buffer in section 7a.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Emily Campbell) to continue this item to the second public hearing on January 23, 2024 with the discussed changes. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

**c. Article V Residential Districts, Section C. Yard Requirements, 2.**

The above amendment seeks to modify the side yard setback for the Residential (R-2) and Urban Residential (R-1) without water and sewer, to 20' on both sides of a property

The current side yard setbacks in the R-2 district are a minimum of 20 feet on one side of the building with the requirement that the aggregate of the two sides adds to 50 feet. It's unclear what the reasoning was when this was put into place initially. The proposed amendment is to simply reduce it to a minimum 20-foot side yard setback on both sides.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Marianne McEnrue) to move this amendment to the warrant at town meeting. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

**d. Article XV Floodplain Overlay District & Article III Definitions**

The above amendment seeks to revise the Floodplain Overlay District to comply with modifications required by the State of New Hampshire and to maintain compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program.

Town Planner Adam Ricker shared in order for New London residents whose properties fall within the flood plain to qualify for flood insurance through the National Flood insurance program we are required to stay compliant with their regulations. Every few years, the state does a review of the flood plain regulations and tells us what we need to change to stay in compliance. FEMA has completed their review of the flood plain maps in the Contoocook watershed and have proposed this. We don't have the option to not move forward with this if we want people to continue to get flood insurance who are in the flood plain.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Marianne McEnrue) to move this amendment to the warrant at town meeting. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**e. Article II General Provisions, Section 18 Accessory Dwelling Unit**

The above amendment seeks to modify the Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance. The changes include, but are not limited to, allowing 3 bedrooms, 1,250 square feet of interior living space, detached accessory dwellings units, and properties not in the Shoreland Overlay District to have one attached and one detached accessory dwelling unit.

Adam Ricker shared that the rationale for increasing the number of bedrooms and square footage is that lifestyle and working arrangements for people has evolved over the years and bedrooms are commonly being used as home offices and the proposal provides flexibility.

An ADU is not allowed to be used as a short-term rental and as part of that, a short-term rental (STR) definition has been proposed to be added to the definition section. That definition would read: An accessory use of a residential dwelling-unit, rented for a fee for a period of less than 90 days. No more than two parking spaces per ADU shall be

required. The standard is one space per bedroom but the reasons this is being proposed is so if there were three bedrooms you wouldn't be required to provide three parking spaces.

The last section states that the placement of the detached ADU shall not adversely affect traffic on roads or safety of pedestrians and will not otherwise create a safety hazard. It shall also not be considered an additional dwelling unit for the purposes of determining minimum lot size or density.

Chair Paradis stated there is room for discussion to change this to one or the other meaning allowing one detached or one attached ADU, not both.

Janet Kidder responded that it is her understanding that the state is looking at this and may require detached ADU's and while she's not opposed to that, she is opposed to allowing both attached and detached. We don't know what the unintended consequences would be and the density would be too much. Paul Vance stated there are a tremendous number of lots in town that already have separate buildings and for a relatively low expense could use as an opportunity to provide low to moderate cost housing. Having the ability to do detached ADU's makes sense and will open up potential on properties that have detached garages etc. Housing needs to be addressed and making this type of housing available would be helpful.

There was discussion and it was suggested to change section e. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) shall conform with the following:

- i. One attached ADU or one detached ADU per Single-Family Dwelling.

All other changes including size and parking will remain.

Bob Lyon agrees with moving to allowing either one or the other. He asked if there was a minimum size lot requirement? Adam Ricker responded no, and that is part of the state law that governs attached ADU's. Bob Lyon stated then we could start to see more dense areas in town if people decide to start doing this. Mr. Ricker responded that as it stands today, every single-family property is allowed to have an attached ADU so this would not change the net number. It would change the fact that right now, it is required to be attached to the main structure, and if this were to be adopted, going forward it could be a detached structure.

Bob Lyon questioned what the intent is related to workforce housing. Adam Ricker responded there are a variety of motives as to why people want to put in an ADU. Sometimes it is to have a companion on the property, or for a family member that wants to move back but can't afford to. Due to the difficulty to find childcare, families are also looking more and more at having live in nanny's and providing housing as part of that accommodation. It does provide a diversity in housing option for people that may not qualify under the traditional workforce housing income limitations. Bob Lyon stated he doesn't see the ADU proposal as addressing workforce housing at all.

Mr. Lyon asked what the definition of short-term rental is. Mr. Ricker responded there is a proposed definition:

An accessory use of a residential dwelling-unit, rented for a fee for a period of less than 90 days. The timeframe of less than 90 days was chosen in the hopes that it would not conflict with 90 housing contracts for traveling healthcare providers that work on a 90-day rotation.

Rob Prohl would like to see some enforcement with regards to STR. If it is currently based on neighbors reporting it or building permits, the town or Selectmen should look at this.

Bob Ruggles stated he previously sent an email that stated it should be either or and not both. Doing it incrementally makes more sense. He asked about enforcement mechanism going forward to make sure we don't end up with rental businesses. Mr. Ricker responded they had this experience when a new owner had an ADU and was not a permanent resident. As the ordinance is written, one of the units is required to be domicile of the property owner. It can be hard to track this but the property owner was required to remove the kitchen in the ADU.

Karen Epstein asked about setbacks and could someone put a small ADU close to their existing home. Adam Ricker stated yes, the distance between the ADU and the lot lines would be the same as what exist in that zone structures currently. Ms. Epstein asked if there is any distance required between the main house and the separate ADU? Mr. Ricker responded that there isn't anything proposed for internal setback requirements. She asked if this is something that should be considered. Jeremy Bonin stated this was discussed in 2016 and part of that conversation was that other structures including garages and sheds don't have a minimum between them so it didn't make sense to apply it to a detached ADU. Ms. Epstein thinks there is a difference between a shed and a unit where someone is living and parking a car. Mr. Bonin responded that both detached or attached ADU's have the same requirements for parking so it needs to be provided for regardless. The lot has to be able to support it and has to follow zoning districts regulations for setbacks.

Steve Root shared concerns he has about the process and Housing Commission and Planning Board meeting minutes not being posted in a timely manner. Mr. Root noted that there was a consultant working with the Housing Commission and asked if he produced a written report. The response was no but the consultant has a lot of good ideas and those were discussed during the working sessions. He asked if the Housing Commission voted to recommend these zoning changes related to ADU's? Mr. Ricker responded yes, the Housing Commission put forward their version and there were work sessions held with the Planning Board. Videos of these meetings are online for anyone that wants to view them. It was a collaborative effort. Housing Commission Chair Peter Nichols stated at least 6 meetings were held specifically to discuss these items and meetings were posted. He noted that attendance was quite low which is disturbing as they are as open and transparent as they can be and want as much comment and support as they can get, both good and bad.

Mr. Root doesn't feel transparency has been what it should be for these serious and important proposals. Was any economic analysis done of the benefit for affordable or workforce housing? You can't build or convert anything in New London at a cost

that translates into low-cost housing. It might add diversity of housing but it's not affordable.

Mr. Root would like to see some restrictions that take the detached ADU idea and match it with the rationale that makes sense, for example converting existing buildings that have been on the property for five years. Not every lot in town should get a detached ADU. Build out is the concern because it involves many things including water and traffic and we don't know what that number is. Mr. Bonin responded there have only been an average of two ADU's in the past seven years. The proposal is not an increase and is already in place, it's just being opened up to include detached ADU's. Mr. Root stated he stands by his statement that by allowing detached ADU's they are doubling the potential for having separate dwellings on each lot. This can be much more impactful than attached ADU's. Mr. Bonin stated we aren't growing at the rate that has been projected and the reason is because the opportunities for that growth aren't here. Mr. Root stated this proposal could result in a lot of growth but not affordable housing so the rationale for this is a just a gesture, not a solution to a problem. Mr. Bonin stated the board doesn't feel it is the solution to the problem but is a part of the solution.

Tom Elliot stated he disagrees with the suggestion that adding more ADU's won't have an overall impact on the availability of housing. Housing is fluid and allowing different types will make it more likely people will find the housing they need and that they can afford. Mr. Elliot has an ADU and asked if this proposal applies to ones that are existing or is this for new? Mr. Ricker shared he met with the town attorney and the answer he received was that it applies to ADU's who have gone through the proper channels of approval for the ADU conditional use permit. Mr. Elliot asked about STR and how it affects the main unit, not the ADU. Mr. Ricker stated it is not intended to impact that. If the property owner chose to live in the ADU, they can rent out their primary as a single-family home and this is unrestricted by the 90-day rule.

Mr. Elliot feels that 90 days is too long of a period to require. In his experience many people are not sure how long their contract will be. He suggested 30 days as 90 days seems inflexible for the audience you are trying to support. Mr. Elliot supports ADU's but feels allowing attached and detached is a bold move. There should be a standard that doesn't make it by right, to have an attached and detached on every lot.

Bob Lyon stated there are some areas in town that do have a lot of growth but you don't notice it due to setbacks. We have a beautiful town and he doesn't want to see multiple units on small lots. Some guidance should be given for internal setbacks and this should be addressed and specified.

Mr. Lyon stated if we want to have an informed public it's important to have minutes available. Regardless as to whether people aren't showing up for meetings, the information needs to be there.

Mr. Lyon stated what he is hearing tonight is that we are trying to increase the available housing. We've asked what the build out number is going to be and haven't gotten an answer. His takeaway is, we simply don't know what the impact is going to be. Jeremy

Bonin responded that isn't accurate. For the past seven years there have been two per year. That is the data we have to project it into the future. Mr. Lyon stated he isn't just talking about ADU's and the issue is water. He listened to a presentation from Ken Jacques from the water precinct who basically issued a warning that they can do 1.5 units per year. Jeremy Bonin stated he won't speak for the water precinct. Adam Ricker responded that the water precinct boundaries are not the same as the town lines so this is very different. Mr. Lyon asked again, how many ADU's do we expect to have going forward year per year. Mr. Ricker stated they aren't setting a maximum but in the seven years they have gone through this process, they have had 14 ADU's so it is reasonable to expect that this is an estimated average. There have been years that there have been zero and years there have been more. So, Mr. Lyon stated so he can tell people to expect on average, 1.5 units per year? Mr. Bonin responded it would be 2 ADU's per year, on average.

John Wilson commented in 2016, several meetings were held concerning detached accessory dwelling units being permitted on lake front properties. The result of these discussions was the matter was dropped.

Now the Planning Board is proposing detached ADU's in the shoreland overlay district that allow units with three bedrooms instead of two and an increase in square footage. There are a number of present lakefront homes that are 1,250 square feet or less. Present lakefront zoning requires a minimum of 200 feet of frontage and 2 acres for a single residence. This comports with the state's desire to limit lake loading however there are also many grandfathered lakefront lots that are much smaller than this required size. Maintaining water quality on a lake is a constant battle. Excess phosphorus can be the result of storm water runoff and septic system loading. Storm water runoff is increased by the amount of added impervious surface. This would be the case with a detached accessory unit. A three unit detached ADU would come close to doubling the septic system loading on a property. Detached ADUs on a lakefront property are dangerous to the health of a lake and should not be permitted. If you don't want to significantly alter the rural character of New London, don't mess with lake quality.

Jeremy Bonin clarified that attached ADU's are already allowed. Adding detached is an or, so it's the same allowable. Septic loading, especially around the lake is self-regulating. If someone is proposing a detached ADU that's adding a number of bedrooms that the lot can't support, it won't be allowed. Whether or not it is attached to the house or not doesn't matter, numerically it comes out the same when it comes to septic loading.

John Wilson stated if we are using past history, why are we making any changes? Jeremy Bonin responded because we still need more housing. Mr. Wilson stated when we use that as a fall back on our discussion, we are actually hoping to see that number increase. Tim Paradis stated we may see a few more but the idea is to add diversity of housing and find ways to modestly increase housing in town.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Emily Campbell) to move this item to the second public hearing on January 23, 2024 with the discussed changes. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

**8. Proposed Amendment by Petition PUBLIC HEARING**

### **1. Article III Definitions – Lodging House**

The proposed amendment seeks to modify the definition of Lodging House to include ShortTerm Rentals and add the requirement of a Conditional Use Permit and Fire Inspection.

Adam Ricker stated there are three ways to propose a zoning amendment in New Hampshire and those are through the Planning Board, the Select Board or a petitioned zoning amendment of 25 registered voters can propose it. The petitioned zoning amendment will end up on the ballot on voting day, no matter what. The board does not have the ability to amend it and the Planning Board's job is to decide if they support it or not. By law, it will state on the ballot whether it has their support or not.

The board has to establish their understanding of the proposal so it is clear what they are voting on. Mr. Ricker stated that this amendment proposes to amend the definition of lodging house within the Article III definition section of the New London Zoning Ordinance to include short term rentals in the definition of lodging house.

Additionally, the proposal includes requiring lodging houses (including short term rentals) to obtain a conditional use permit from the Planning Board. Lodging houses would be required to be inspected for compliance with state building code and RSA 153:10-a (Automatic Fire Warning Devices and Carbon Monoxide Detection Devices in Dwellings) on an annual basis.

Mr. Ricker stated that before zoning amendments come to the Public Hearing, they consult with Town counsel for review. The town attorney reviewed this and the proposed amendment is written in a manner than he advises is legally deficient because it does not include criteria for a conditional use permit. The Planning Board would not have a basis for which it could base its approval or disapproval of a lodging house.

Ralph Tingley stated he has been associated with the fire department since he moved to town 8 years ago and prior to that he spent 47 years in fire service in Connecticut. The goal here is to make sure people are safe and they aren't trying to stop STR's. The conditional use permit wouldn't be granted without the inspection first being conducted to show if there is a life safety issue. They want to be aware that these buildings are out there because this could change tactics employed or what they can expect when they arrive to a call.

Tom Elliot stated he opposes the proposed amendment but not the goal. He lives in Durham full time where there is a very well thought out life safety rental code that stringently protects landlords and tenants. There are other ways to achieve this goal that doesn't mix it in with land use control. He suggested encouraging the Selectmen to address this and to think through life safety issues.

New London Fire Chief Jay Lyon stated he hopes legislators will move something forth that makes sense in communities like ours. The concerns are not exclusively in New London, it's all communities throughout the state. Chief Lyon stated the department goes to calls at STR's that are concerning. Issues include no smoke detectors and no secondary means of egress.

Jeremy Bonin stated that he supports the intent of the petition and fire safety but will not endorse it because it is legally insufficient and non binding.

**IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Emily Campbell) to not support the petitioned article due to the fact that it is missing the criteria of a conditional use permit and how the board would proceed with that application.  
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**9. Future meeting Dates** – The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 23, 2024.

**10. Motion to Adjourn**

**IT WAS MOVED (Tim Paradis) AND SECONDED (Emily Campbell) to adjourn.  
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:56PM

Respectfully submitted,

Trina Dawson

Recording Secretary  
Town of New London