



TOWN OF  
NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD  
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, March 3, 2015

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** William Helm (Chair); Paul Gorman (Vice Chair); Michele Holton (Secretary); Peter Bianchi (Board of Selectmen’s Representative); Emma Crane, William Dietrich, Tim Elizabeth Meller (Alternate), Marianne McEnrue (Alternate), Tim Paradis (Alternate)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jeremy Bonin

**STAFF:** Lucy St. John (Planning and Zoning Administrator), Chris Work (Recording Secretary)

**Call to Order:** Chair Helm called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. He asked Liz Meller, who serves as an alternate, to sit in for Jeremy Bonin, who is absent.

Mr. Helm explained that the meeting tonight would be divided into two parts: the board will proceed first with public hearings on the two proposed zoning amendments concerning the definition of “family” and “signs,” and the proposed amendment to the Site Plan Regulations. The second half of the meeting will be to review and discuss the items listed on the agenda.

**Minutes of February 10, 2015:** Approved as presented.

**Public Hearing on Proposed Zoning Amendments- Definition of Family**

**Rationale:** The Planning Board is proposing to revise the current definition of “family,” and replace it with a new one, per Article III, Definition: #49. The purpose is to broaden the current definition of “legally related” to include accepted forms of committed relationships and nuclear households; to better align the number of unrelated persons with current state safety regulations (from over five [5] persons to three [3] persons), and to delete consideration of domestic servants as an additional occupant.

**Definition to be Deleted:**

#49. Family: One or more persons occupying a single Dwelling Unit, provided that unless all members are legally related, no such Family shall contain over five persons, but further provided that domestic servants employed on the premises may be house on the premises without being counted as a Family or families.

**Proposed Definition:**

#49. Family: One or more persons occupying a single Dwelling Unit, provided that unless all persons are related by blood, marriage, civil union, adoption or guardianship, no such family shall contain more than (3) persons. In determining the maximum

number of persons allowed, children (under the age of 18) of any of the residents shall not be counted. For the purpose of this Ordinance, the term “family” and the term “household” shall be synonymous and interchangeable.

Chair Helm explained that the Planning Board solicited input from Attorney Barton Mayer on the proposed definition of family, and introduced into the record the letter from Town Counsel. The Planning Board members were provided a copy of this correspondence prior to the meeting. Chair Helm highlighted three (3) key points- legitimate purpose for the definition; issues related to non-conforming uses; and right for existing uses to continue, and zoning regulates the use of land, not people.

### **Public Hearing Opened**

**Attorney Bradford E. Cook from Sheehan Phinney Bass & Green, representing Colby Sawyer College (CSC).** He introduced others from the College in attendance including Tom Galligan, President; Todd Emmons, David Sauerwein, Doug Atkins and Karen Bonewald.

- ✓ He provided a letter to the Planning Board dated March 3, 2015. The letter was introduced into the record, but was not read into the record.
- ✓ He briefly reviewed the letter including referencing the New Hampshire Supreme Court case Town of Durham v. White Enterprises; discussed the history of the current definition and stated that he believes with the changes which have occurred over the years related to family, this case would not have passed if it were before the NH Supreme Court now.
- ✓ He explained that any existing units using the current definition of the amendment would continue to be able to do so. This amendment will not affect existing housing units, but would have an influence on future buildings, which is a concern for the future development of the College.
- ✓ The College’s position is that there are better ways to deal with this issue than to change the number of unrelated persons allowed to occupy a single unit.
- ✓ He remarked that for various reasons, he does not think the revised definition of “family” will accomplish what the Board hopes it will.
- ✓ With regard to non-college residences that may be out of compliance and house more than five unrelated residents, the better answer would be to enforce the present regulations. If the Town does not have an enforcement mechanism, then one should be put in place. Why reduce it to five, when the Town hasn’t and doesn’t enforce it now.
- ✓ The College has acquired several properties on Seamans Road.
- ✓ There are other rental units all over Town.
- ✓ As far as residential safety is concerned, 10 or 11 related people living in an overcrowded unit is no different than 6 or 7 unrelated people living in a single unit. If the Town has safety concerns, it should deal with them.
- ✓ The college’s housing meets all safety regulations.
- ✓ If the Town is concerned about noise and nuisances, these issues should be enforced as well.
- ✓ If the number of unrelated persons is changed to three (3) the College won’t buy any more houses.

- ✓ Need flexibility, to respond to the changing demands of students.
- ✓ He is concerned about the inability of Mr. Snow to be able to finish out his project and not having the flexibility to meet changing demand.

**Tom Galligan, President of Colby Sawyer College**

- ✓ Commented that higher education is facing the most challenging regulatory environment ever these days and any new economic or regulatory laws puts the college at risk.
- ✓ He reminded the board and audience members that anything which threatens the college threatens the community.
- ✓ He noted that the college employs over 350 people and contributes \$15 to \$20 million annually to our local economy.
- ✓ He maintained that if the proposed revised definition of “family” is approved, the college will not be able to expand its off campus and he urged the board not to approve it.
- ✓ The College gives out about \$36 million in financial aid to students annually, so income from housing is critical to their survival. He emphasized again that room and board income is crucial to the school.
- ✓ Enforcement is the real issue.
- ✓ The housing built by Harry Snow gives students an attractive, affordable option to campus residences housing options.
- ✓ If it turns out that the proposed new language is passed, the college will have to sell these units.

**Harry Snow, local developer and developer of Cottage Lane housing units, leased to CSC**

- ✓ He wanted to drive home the point that because of diminishing returns, he cannot and will not build three-person units. Has one more lot on Cottage Lane, he won't build the unit, as it is not economically feasible if the number is reduced from 5 to 3 unrelated persons.
- ✓ He said the new definition will have a serious effect on future housing in New London.
- ✓ He explained that the Town has a very small commercial zone and little land available to develop.
- ✓ He explained that the Town has gone from requiring a density of 5,000 sq. feet per unit for commercial land to 10,000 sq. feet, which limits the number of units that can be built. The density issue is really the issue.
- ✓ People are talking about affordable housing and Workforce Housing, and these types of units are part of the equation. Towns and cities like Concord, Lebanon and Hanover all have much higher density than New London.
- ✓ He explained that the current Master Plan discusses the importance of the College to the Town.
- ✓ He feels the revised language does nothing to create future housing and the ordinance should stay as it is.
- ✓ He noted that the current density requirements for property with water and sewer available is 1 family/10,000 square feet. He noted he can't make it work economically to build units with water and sewer with the current density requirement.

- ✓ He noted that his buildings are among the safest buildings in town. He reminded board members that the college does all the plowing and sanding for these units, which costs a lot of money. The safety systems in these buildings have to be inspected yearly.
- ✓ He suggested that the Town should concentrate on inspecting all buildings for safety and enforce existing regulations.
- ✓ When asked if it would be more efficient and cost-effective to build an apartment building, Mr. Snow said from a density standpoint, there is no difference.
- ✓ Junior and senior CSC students want to live off-campus. The College wants to provide what the students are looking for, more independent living. They want parking and independence. The current housing units allow each person to have his/her own room and kitchen facilities
- ✓ Nationally a huge percent of college housing is provided privately, not campus housing.
- ✓ Stated that he had only recently heard about this change and had he known earlier, he would have voiced his opinion.
- ✓ He feels the Planning board is forcing the situation and asked that this item be tabled until next year.

**Michele Holton, resident**

- ✓ Her concern is about people like herself, who own a big house, and the day may come when she is in it alone. Her house, which is close to the college, has 5 or 6 bedrooms, which she could rent out for income under the old ordinance, but not under the proposed revised language.
- ✓ Added that the board needs to consider the private investor.

**Doug Atkins, who is a member of the management team at the college**

- ✓ Said he had a comment, a perspective, and a question. He said in reviewing the Planning Board minutes over the past few months, he found it curious that the board was asking the Zoning Administrator to look at regulations in three other college towns.
- ✓ His perspective is that for years Colby Sawyer College has been considered essential to the town, but no one bothered to contact anyone at the college, their neighbors, or Harry Snow about the plan to revise the definition of “family.”
- ✓ Asked why the College was not specifically invited to participate in this discussion.
- ✓ He also had a question about whether the Selectmen plan to adopt a rental ordinance.

**Karen Bonewald, CSC Controller- Financial Services Staff**

- ✓ The college is currently in the midst of an intense marketing campaign. Each college markets to a small pool of students.
- ✓ Students do not want to be in dorm rooms.
- ✓ As a point of interest, she noted that Proctor just put up a new dorm for 16 kids, and it cost them \$3 million.
- ✓ She urged the Board to consider the financial ramifications of this decision to the college.

**John Norris, a local contractor, lives on Stoneybrook Road. He has worked at CSC for 10 years.**

- ✓ Commented there is no doubt that this relationship has contributed to his family's well-being.
- ✓ He observed that the economic impact of Colby Sawyer College and New London Hospital combined is \$150 million. If Colby Sawyer accounts for just half of that, he still wants to participate.
- ✓ Part of his retirement plan is to possibly buy some land and build a duplex for student housing. He emphasized there was no way he could go forward with that plan if only three unrelated people are allowed in one household.
- ✓ Mr. Norris remarked the number seemed very arbitrary.
- ✓ Mentioned the Stream Ministries rentals- people had AK 47s, and nothing was enforced.
- ✓ Student rowdiness is grossly overstated.

**Tom Cottrill, former Planning Board Chair**

- ✓ Said this issue is not solely about the College; it also has to do with compliance.
- ✓ He has a large house, and may consider renting rooms to off-set the taxes. There are other large homes in Town who may consider doing the same.
- ✓ The Master Plan talks about affordable housing and workforce housing and if only three unrelated people are allowed in a household, he commented that nobody is going to make any money.
- ✓ Need more rental properties in Town
- ✓ He agrees that this proposed amendment will not work for a number of people and recommends the amount of unrelated persons permitted in a household should be kept at five.
- ✓ Doesn't want the Town to change the current density requirements.

**Chair Helm**

- ✓ Responded that some other college towns do have rental ordinances.
- ✓ With regard to the matter of inviting comments from the college and community about the revised amendment, he noted that all of the Planning Board's meetings are posted and public. He was under the impression that some members of Colby-Sawyer's staff had already been notified about this ongoing discussion.

**Selectman Bianchi**

- ✓ The Town has not discussed a rental housing ordinance at this time.
- ✓ The Town recognizes the CSC is an integral part of the New London community.
- ✓ Commented that no one on the board has a problem understanding the issue of housing students at the college, and he wondered whether building new dormitories had been considered.
- ✓ Asked whether Colby-Sawyer had figured out the financial impact to the college if this amendment is passed? He said there must be concern on their part about the future impact, since the revision would have no effect on present units.

- ✓ What are the economic impacts to the College to build a house or dorm and why hasn't or doesn't the College want to build dormitories?

**Attorney Brad Cook** responded at this point he could not answer that question. He knows the College has to address it, but is not able to quantify the financial impact just yet.

### **Public Hearing Closed for the Definition of Family.**

#### **Public Hearing on Proposed Zoning Amendments- Sign Provisions**

##### Zoning Amendment – Definition of “Signs” – Amendment #2

The Planning Board proposes to delete the entire section of the current provisions of Article II, General Provisions, #10 Sign Regulation and the Quick Reference Table regarding Signs located in the back of the Zoning Ordinance. They recommend replacing it with new language and a new Sign Table. The purpose is to clarify and make the ordinance more user-friendly, outline what signs will or will not require a sign permit, and outline which types of signs require review and approval by the Planning Board or Board of Selectmen.

#### **Public Hearing Opened –Sign Provisions**

##### **Tom Cottrill, former Planning Board Chair**

- ✓ Stated that he did not think the Planning Board really needed to completely start over in order to make the “sign” language clearer. When he was the Chair the Planning Board the Board annually reviewed provisions and made adjustment as they seemed appropriate.
- ✓ Finds the revisions to be more confusing than the language in the existing section.
- ✓ The newly formatted table has errors and is generally not helpful at all.
- ✓ He asked whether this language had been brought in from another town.
- ✓ He finds the re-ordering and current placement of the different sections bewildering.
- ✓ He dislikes the entire format.
- ✓ People in town do not want more or bigger signs.
- ✓ There is a lack of enforcement of current sign regulations.
- ✓ The rationale statement is misleading, and people should know that the size, number and other provisions are changing.
- ✓ Asked why the Town has failed to deal with the internally lit Liquor Store sign as it is an eyesore and not permitted.
- ✓ He enumerated a number of other suggestions and concerns including comments on abandoned signs, internally lit signs, changes to the dimensions requirements of the various signs, flag and flagpoles, institutional uses should be separate from commercial uses, the way the term travel way is used is confusing, how many directory signs are allowed, how many contractor/professional signs are allowed, how many sandwich board signs could be placed at the Chamber of Commerce, celebratory/decorative signs,

political signs, agricultural signs, why not distinguish between temporary and permanent signs, yard sales signs are a nuisance and clutter the landscape, why isn't anything being done to limit the number of yard sales, interior window signs, the sign table is unclear and hard to understand, how many flags and types of flags would be allowed, businesses would be able to have a lot more signs.

- ✓ Suggested that the Planning Board not present this amendment and take the time to review it more closely and do it next year.

Chair Helm asked for any other additional comments. There were none.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

#### **Public Hearing on Proposed Site Plan Amendments**

The Planning Board proposes to amend the Site Plan Regulations, Article I, D. Types of Development Requiring Site Plan Review. Item D. (4) Pertains to the Fast Track application process. The purpose is to delete the reference to the Fast Track option and clarify a threshold limit.

#### **Site Plan provisions currently read as follows:**

4. A change in Use or layout of non-residential property or Building(s) including changes to the exterior site layout and/or changes to the interior floor plan layout. However, the Zoning Administrator, after consulting with appropriate Department Heads, may determine that a change in Use or layout of non-residential property of Building(s) does or does not require Site Plan Review based on the Fast Track Application for Site Plan Review & Certificate of Occupancy Change of Occupancy or Minor Change of Use Only (refer to Appendix I).

#### **Proposed amendment language as follows:**

4. A change in Use or layout of non-residential property or Building(s) including changes to the exterior site layout and/or changes to the interior floor plan layout, except Site Plan Review will not be required if:

a) a change of Use and/or changes to the interior floor plan layout occur in a single-leasable space of less than 1,000 square feet; and

b) the owner of the property obtains written approval of the Fire Chief as to the adherence of the space to all state and local fire and safety regulations; and

c) no additional off-street parking would be required in accordance with the standards set forth in the Site Plan Review Regulations.

**Public Hearing Opened – Site Plan Amendment**

**Tom Cottrill, former Planning Board Chair**

- ✓ Explained that the current Site Plan Regulations (SPR) address the issue of Change of Use and Change in Occupancy.
- ✓ He referenced the parking requirements of the SPR.
- ✓ He observed that one of the biggest changes in rental property is not a change of occupancy, but a change of use. It is change of use that can get people into trouble.
- ✓ He cautioned the Board about how to address parking requirements, stating that parking spaces available to a particular business are restricted and that if a new use or change of use is proposed, the new tenants would have to find other parking spaces. He noted that the Board should be especially mindful of buildings that have a lot of other tenants. He cited a couple example including the Gallery, and noted if there is a change in use this could affect all the other tenants. He also cited the Kidder Building and dental practice on Main Street as these tenants rent space from a nearby bank.

**Dan Wolf, submitted an email dated Monday, March 2, 2015**

- ✓ Chair Helm noted the Board had received an e-mail message from Dan Wolf and summarized the content of the email.

**Public Hearing Closed.** There were no further comments on this amendment.

**Public Comment - total time may be limited to 15 minutes per the Chair**

- ✓ Chair Helm asked the audience if there were comments on any other matter not currently on the agenda, and there were none.

**Home Business Application-for NH Kittens – Kristin Hubbard. Property located at 102 Bunker Road. Tax Map 061-011-000. Zoned R -2.**

Chair Helm asked if the Board considered this a project of Regional Impact and if a Site Visit was of interest. The Board agreed neither was relevant. Staff was asked to provide a brief history. Ms. St. John referenced the conceptual discussion and staff report for the September 23, 2014 meeting, the November 18, 2014 minutes and the recent Special Exception granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment on February 12, 2015. Waivers were discussed and the Board approved them noting the kitten rescue operation is just two rooms of the house.

Ms. Hubbard briefly explained that she plans to rescue abandoned and/or orphaned kittens, get them socialized, and then adopted. She reviewed the details of her application executive summary.

**Public Hearing Opened**



- ✓ Chair Helm noted that an email had been received Monday, March 2, 2015 from abutters Jeff and Roberta Hollinger in support of the application. The Hollingers were the former owners of the property.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

**MOTION WAS MADE (Michele Holton) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve Ms. Hubbard's application for a home business as presented. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **Tracy Prescott – conceptual discussion on possible subdivision. Property located at 242 Elkins Road. Tax Map 077-041-000. Frontage on Elkins and Andover Road. Zoned ARR.**

Tracy Prescott was present to discuss the possibility of subdividing her property, which has frontage on Elkins and Andover Road. Her house is located next to a veterinary hospital that was previously operated by her husband, who is now deceased. She wants to divide the property to split the home and business so that each becomes a separate entity. She at some point would like to sell the portion with the house on it. Tracy emphasized that the veterinary business was sold and is separate from the house. She is just trying to decide how best to approach it.

Staff referred to the staff report and other information including the Town's GIS maps, the easement to the Richard's property, the letter from Peter Stanley of March 2012 and the recent Intent to Cut. Staff noted this is a conceptual discussion only, no abutters were notified.

Questions and comments included:

- ✓ If the frontage requirement applies to both road Elkins Road and Andover Road.
- ✓ Driveway permit process and if she had to put a driveway off of Route 11, Andover Road. She commented that she has been in touch with the State of NH and they do not want to allow her access off of Route 11. Harry Snow commented that shared driveways are permitted in New London; perhaps the driveway issue could be handled with another easement off Elkins Road. He noted that it would be difficult to get a cut on Route 11. Tom Cottrill also referred to the driveway requirements. Tracy asked if whether she had to get a driveway put in off Route 11 (Andover Road).

Chair Helm advised Mrs. Prescott to develop a plan showing how she would like to subdivide the property and consider coming back with a conceptual plan, and or work directly with a surveyor to develop a site plan and subdivision plan for further review by the Planning Board.

### **Discussion of Zoning Amendments Public Hearing Comments- Family Definition**

#### **"Family" definition discussion**

Chair Helm requested comments from the Board.

**Chair Helm**

- ✓ The Life Safety Code regulations kick in when the number of occupants “is greater than 4.”
- ✓ What the Planning Board is proposing to do does not impact the college’s existing rental properties.
- ✓ The question here seems to be what effect the amendment would have on future development of that sort – not just on the college, but on the town?

**Bill Dietrich**

- ✓ Asked where the idea of moving the number of unrelated persons permitted in a household from 3 to 5 came from.
- ✓ Noise and disruption were a concern in Hanover, his previous place of residence. He was not aware of any noise and nuisance issues here in New London.
- ✓ He is inclined to keep the number at 5.
- ✓ Suggested maybe having a Special Exception option.

**Liz Meller**

- ✓ Asked if there could be a two-tier system, one for the College and other rental housing units and one for lodging houses.

**Paul Gorman**

- ✓ Said he recognizes that the Town does not enforce the regulations, but there is not currently enough manpower to go from rental unit to rental unit and inspect each of them individually. The town needs to put an enforcement regulation in place.

**Michele Holton**

- ✓ Relative to informing people about the Life Safety Code she suggested that it might be a matter of just educating the community about these regulations. She thought Yankee Cable might present a program, or WMUR in Manchester. There could be a publicity campaign about this issue.
- ✓ She thought for some people it would be a question of whether private investment in rental property made any sense, especially if the owner was allowed only three tenants. She does not feel that anyone in town would knowingly abuse the rules.
- ✓ This is an issue about investing in rental property.

**Peter Bianchi**

- ✓ Asked if the Planning Board really wants the Board of Selectmen to have an agent who will go around evicting people and enforcing regulations.
- ✓ He reminded board members that the town does not give occupancy permits to residents.
- ✓ If the Planning Board passes the amendment, is it hampering development, or prosperity, or is this just a minor inconvenience?

**Emma Crane**

- ✓ Occupancy number should stay at 5 for the time being.

**Marianne McEnrue**

- ✓ She feels it is easy to say the proposed amendment will have a harmful economic effect, but has anyone really crunched the numbers?
- ✓ She suggests it might be useful to contact the University of New Hampshire to see if they would conduct a study. She thinks there could be any number of interesting combinations of solutions that the Town is not aware of.
- ✓ She asked what is the break-even point and wants more data.

**Tim Paradis**

- ✓ Noted he owns property in Manchester and is aware of Housing and Life Safety Code issues.
- ✓ He opined that increased density in the Town of New London might add to the vitality of the community. Seems density is a good thing.
- ✓ He feels the amendment requires further study.

**Other comments from the audience.**

**Harry Snow**

- ✓ Campus housing is only occupied about 180 days per year. The students are off in the summertime, and during vacations and breaks. He feels these would be good neighbors to have.

**Tom Cottrill**

- ✓ It looked as if the Board did not have enough information about how the proposed amendment will affect the town.
- ✓ He recommends the Board leave the number of unrelated occupants at 5, or just forget about amending this section until it has a better handle on what it's trying to accomplish.
- ✓ Advised the Board to consider implementing a life safety and rental policy, and have the Selectmen talk about enforcement in the next year. Chair Helm responded that these are Board of Selectmen issues.

**David Sauerwein, CSC VP of Student Development and Deans of Students**

- ✓ Suggested that all private rental housing and campus housing that complies with Life Safety Codes should be allowed to have 5 unrelated residents. If a landlord/owner is not compliant, then that person should be limited to renting to only 3 unrelated residents.

**Fire Chief Jay Lyon**

- ✓ The Fire Department is looking for low-income housing for firefighters to be able to live in New London, so this revision would affect what they had envisioned for the future.

- ✓ He wondered whether it would be possible to say the maximum number of unrelated occupants can be 3, but make a special exception to allow two more people if safety code requirements for the building have been met.
- ✓ Believes that part of the issue is that there are property owners in town who are not aware of the Life Safety Codes.
- ✓ He noted the college has worked hard to bring campus housing up to code compliance.
- ✓ Most enforcement situations take place in off-campus housing.
- ✓ He had no issue with keeping the number of unrelated individuals at 5, as long as code requirements are met.
- ✓ With regard to a single family dwelling, there is what's known as the "king of the castle" rule where an owner can do what he wants in his own house with related persons. For example a family may have ten (10) kids, this is different than a household with several unrelated persons.
- ✓ In a household with unrelated people, the standard is to do nothing that would cause others harm. The purpose is to protect the general public.
- ✓ Noted 37% of fires start in the kitchen and extend to the dwelling, and this is why codes are written.

**Attorney Brad Cook**

- ✓ Commented that if a person has a household with a mom and a dad and five kids, they can do whatever they want. It makes no sense.
- ✓ He asked aren't there places currently in violation. The Town doesn't enforce the current number of 5, so why go to three (3).
- ✓ The Town consider a policy that those that don't comply with the Life Safety Code can only be allowed to have (3) unrelated persons not five (5)
- ✓ If the town presently has a rule that when a household has more than three unrelated persons in it and the owner has not implemented life safety code regulations, then that person is in violation.

Chair Helm said he would like to propose a motion to extend this discussion and have a second public hearing on March 24<sup>th</sup>. The Board agreed to change the number of persons from the proposed number three (3) back to five (5) and to retain the other language in the proposed amendment, only to change the number.

**Amended Rationale Statement:**

The Planning Board is proposing to revise the current definition of "family," and replace it with a new definition, per Article III, Definition: #49. The purpose is to broaden the current definition of "legally related" to include accepted forms of committed relationships and nuclear households and to delete consideration of domestic servants as an additional occupant. No such family shall contain over five (5) persons.

**Proposed Amended Definition:**

#49. Family: One or more persons occupying a single Dwelling Unit, provided that unless all persons are related by blood, marriage, civil union, adoption or guardianship, no such family shall contain more than five (5) persons. In determining the maximum number of persons allowed, children (under the age of 18) of any of the residents shall not be counted. For the purpose of this Ordinance, the term “family” and the term “household” shall be synonymous and interchangeable.

**MOTION WAS MADE (Michele Holton) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to hold a second public hearing on March 24<sup>th</sup> and change the proposed language to allow five persons (not three) and to retain the other proposed language. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **Discussion Public Hearing Comments- Sign Amendments**

Chair Helm asked board members if they heard anything during the public hearing on this proposed amendment that had any impact. Paul Gorman suggested that the Board get a small group of members together and consult with Tom Cottrill on how to rework the proposal.

Lucy St. John referred to the Planning Board meeting schedule and zoning amendment process timeline. She noted the Planning Board had previously cancelled their meeting of Tuesday, March 10<sup>th</sup> due to the school election. Thus in order to have time to revisit and consider the public hearing comments, revise the text and to post the changes, she suggested that this be done by Friday, March 6<sup>th</sup>. It was noted that some Board members would also be attending some training on Monday, March 9<sup>th</sup> and there are other meetings that week as well.

There was a brief discussion about whether the suggestions put forward by Mr. Cottrill could be considered “substantial.” Chair Helm noted that the statute allows the board to make editorial changes. Chair Helm maintained that making the change from 5 to 3 unrelated occupants in his mind is a substantial modification. He feels the other changes were just meant to be clarifying. Liz Meller commented that she did not think the changes were substantial. Marianne McEnrue observed that the number of changes suggested were substantial, but were they substantive? Bill Dietrich commented that he thought the adjustments suggested by Mr. Cottrill qualified as substantial.

The Board agreed that a subcommittee meeting chaired by Paul Gorman and including Liz Meller, Emma Crane and Bill Dietrich would be held on Thursday, March 5<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 am at the Town Offices to discuss the comments raised by Tom Cottrill at the public hearing regarding the proposed sign amendments. The meeting would be posted and all subcommittee meetings are open to the public.

The Planning Board then scheduled a Regular Planning Board meeting to be held at the Town Office at 5 PM on Friday, March 6 to review the changes suggested by the subcommittee and amend the “sign” language for posting.

### **Discussion Public Hearing Comments- Site Plan Regulations**

Chair Helm noted that there was not much public discussion about the proposed revisions to the site plan regulations, with the exception of the comments submitted by Dan Wolf. The Board agreed that the amendment language of 1,000 sq. feet might not be the right number, but the town should try it on for a while. If it needs to be changed in a year or so, that can be done fairly easily.

**MOTION WAS MADE (Michelle Holton) AND SECONDED (Paul Gorman) TO approve the proposed amendment language as noticed in the public hearing notice. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Tom Cottrill reiterated that a change in use of any size rental property has an impact. He feels there should be no changes to the site plan regulations.

### **Other Business**

There was no other business.

### **Planning and Zoning Administrator's Updates/information**

Chair Helm informed the board that Lucy St. John had appeared before the Budget Committee last night to speak in favor of her request for additional part-time staff, and increased funding for training. The Budget Committee did not approve her request for additional staff, but did increase financial support for training.

Ms. St. John referred to the agenda attachment list items. She noted that the NHDES newsletter has some discussion items which may be relevant when the board reviews the overlay zoning district. She mentioned the upcoming Preit- Flaherty training session, several Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment members will be attending. She also distributed a handout on the NH Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) May conference.

### **Future Meeting Dates**

Chair Helm reiterated that the subcommittee would be meeting on Thursday, March 5<sup>th</sup> and the Planning Board has scheduled another meeting for Friday, March 6<sup>th</sup>. The second public hearing on the proposed zoning amendments will be held on Tuesday, March 24.

### **Motion to Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn made by Emma Crane and seconded by Michelle Holton.

Meeting adjourned at 9:51 PM.

New London Planning Board  
Draft Minutes March 3, 2015 Regular Meeting and  
Public Hearings on Proposed Zoning Amendments and Site Plan Amendments  
Page 15 of 15

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Work  
Recording Secretary