



TOWN OF
NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

375 MAIN STREET • NEW LONDON, NH 03257

**Zoning Board of Adjustment
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 6, 2026
Whipple Town Hall**

Members Present: Michael Todd (Chair), Peter Theroux, Frank Anzalone, Lauren Snow Chadwick, Ann Bedard, Julia Lemense, Steve Root

Staff Present: Adam Ricker (Planning/Zoning Administrator), Vickie Stafford (Land Use and Assessing Coordinator), Ashley Seybold (Town Administrator)

Others Present: Marcie and Ross Campbell, Mark Picton, Jessica Hunt, Connor Jennings, Sue Andrews (Resident)

1. **Call to Order:** Michael Todd called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

2. **Governance and Procedures:**

Michael opened with a roll call and clarification of board members and alternate status to ensure a voting quorum. Ann Bedard recused herself from the first application, alternates Lauren Snow Chadwick and Peter Theroux acted as full voting members for that case.

3. **Public Hearing Notices:**

Public Hearing(s): Application for a Variance

Case # ZBA 25-08
Applicant: Martha & Ross Campbell
Address: 584 Lakeshore Dr.
Parcel ID: 050-008-000
Zone(s): R2- Residential with Shoreland Overlay

Summary: The applicant is applying for a variance to of Article XVI, Section C,F, R2-Residential District with Shoreland Overlay. The applicant proposes the renovations to allow construction of a new

street-side dormer to match the existing lake-side dormer and to reconfigure the side hip roof to a gable so it does not shed snow on the deck pathway.

This case is a continuation from December 2, 2025, due to a weather-related event. The property is located at 584 Lakeshore Dr, which is situated entirely between the road and the lake. The house lies fully within the 50-foot setback, and exterior alterations require a variance. The applicants confirm they are proposing a roadside dormer and a change from a hip roof to a gable roof, both within the setback area.

Michael explained the variance criteria and the board's role. In response to questions from the board, the applicants state that the project will not change the character of the neighborhood or block views of the lake. They emphasize that the house will remain a traditional cottage consistent with Pleasant Lake properties and that pedestrians' experience along the road will not change.

The board members question the applicants about change to roof height and massing. The applicants confirm that the ridge height will not change and that the dormer height increase is minimal and visually similar to the existing lakeside dormer. The board continued a discussion with the applicants about hardship and zoning uniqueness. The applicants confirm that the existing stairway serving upstairs bedrooms is narrow, steep, and non-code-compliant. Given the age of the house and the inability to expand elsewhere due to setback limitations, the board agrees that denying the variance would prevent reasonable and safe use of the property, satisfying the hardship criteria.

Substantial Justice and Applicant benefits were discussed and the applicants cite improved safety from a compliant stairway as the primary benefit, along with increased natural light, better airflow, and improved livability.

The board shifts the discussion to whether the project would cause any harm to the general public, and the applicant responds that there would be none, stressing that the footprint and size of the house are not increasing and that the work is necessary to properly maintain the structure.

The board then invites Sue Andrews up to the podium. Sue Andrews, an abutter living two houses away, speaks in favor of the project, stating that it will improve both the appearance and usability of the house and will not adversely affect the neighborhood.

With no further public comment, the board votes unanimously to enter deliberation. Board members concur that the uniqueness of the lot, the reasonableness of the proposal, and the care taken by the applicants satisfy the variance criteria. The board finds that substantial justice is done, no public harm results, and hardship is clearly demonstrated. With no conditions deemed necessary, the board votes unanimously, 5-0, to approve the variance as requested.

Following the approval, the board addresses an administrative issue: a board member had recused herself from the previous case, requiring a reconfiguration of voting members and alternates for the next hearing. An alternate steps down from voting status, and the chair clarifies that alternates may continue to participate in the discussion but not vote.

Public Hearing(s): Application for a Special Exception:

Case # ZBA 25-09
Applicant Mark Picton
Address 38 Mill Pond Rd.
Parcel ID 042-015-000
Zone (s) Agricultural Rural Residential (ARR), Streams Conservation Overlay District

Summary: The applicant is requesting a Special Exception pursuant to Article XXII, G.3, Streams Conservation Overlay District, to allow a reduction in the required Stream Buffer/Natural Woodland Buffer. The request is associated with the construction of a single-family residential structure with a 1' x 40' encroachment of the structure and additional walkway and front steps into the Natural Woodland Buffer.

Before the applicant proceeds, staff clarifies that although the zoning ordinance includes a "waterfront buffer," the constraint affecting this property is actually the stream buffer overlay, not a lake or waterfront buffer. With that distinction noted for the record, the applicant is invited to present the proposal.

Mr. Picton requested the special exception to replace a one-story house (26x39ft) with a slightly larger two-story home (28x40ft), with minimal encroachment into the stream buffer due to lot constraints and steep slopes. The new house would maintain neighborhood character and similar residential use, with a 10% increase in floor area. Sewage disposal was discussed; either an upgraded septic system or connection to the town sewer will be required. The site is not in a flood zone, and the new structure will not adversely affect traffic or property values.

Concern was discussed regarding home occupations. The applicant confirms there is no intent to operate a business from the property. While the design includes garage space and a personal workshop, these uses are strictly residential and non-commercial.

A board member raises a technical concern regarding roof overhangs, noting that eaves are considered part of the structure under zoning rules and may extend beyond the stated footprint. The applicant acknowledges that the plans focus on the foundation footprint and that roof overhangs of approximately 12 to 14 inches are intended. This would slightly increase the overall width of the structure, resulting in a small additional encroachment- approximately 2.4 inches – into the buffer beyond what was described.

The board emphasized stormwater management due to roof overhangs and proximity to the stream, adding the following two conditions:

- 1) Submission of plans showing overhangs (max 1'4")
- 2) Stormwater mitigation per best management practices.

The board votes unanimously, 5-0, to approve the Special Exception with the two conditions.

Public Hearing (s) Public Service Company of NH d/b/a Eversource Energy (Cases 25-10 – 25-12)

Case # ZBA 25-10

Summary for ZBA 25-10 – Special Exception for Wetlands Conservation Overlay District.

The applicant is requesting a Special Exception pursuant to Article XIII, Sections B and G of the Town of New London Zoning Ordinance for the replacement of existing utility pole structures within the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District. The proposal includes the replacement of fourteen (14) existing wooden utility poles with weathered steel poles within the existing M127 transmission line right-of-way.

The request includes approximately 8,823 square feet (0.20 acres) of temporary wetland impacts associated with construction matting, work pads, and access roads. No utility structures are proposed within wetland buffers. One existing wooden utility pole located within wetland buffers will be replaced with a new pole in approximately the same location. Temporary wetland impacts are proposed for construction access, with one limited area of permanent wetland impact due to site constraints.

Case # ZBA 25-11

Summary for ZBA 25-11 – Special Exception for Steep Slope Overlay District:

The applicant is requesting a Special Exception pursuant to Article XIV, Section Boof the Town of New London Zoning Ordinance for the replacement of existing utility pole structures within the Steep Slope Overlay District. The proposal includes the replacement of fourteen (14) existing wooden utility poles with weathered steel poles within the existing M127 transmission line right-of-way.

The request includes approximately 69,908 square feet (1.60 acres) of grading impacts on slopes between 15-25 percent associated with gravel access road and work pad construction.. Existing wooden utility poles will be removed and replaced with new poles occupying approximately 40 square feet per structure, representing a one-to-one, in-kind replacement. Replacement structures will be located within approximately 5 to 15 feet of the existing poles, which will be subsequently removed.

Case # ZBA 25-12

Summary for ZBA 25-12 – Variance for Steep Slope Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a variance pursuant to Article XIV, Section B of the Town of New London Zoning Ordinance for the replacement of existing utility pole structures within the Steep Slope Overlay District on slopes greater than 25 percent. The proposal includes the replacement of fourteen (14) existing wooden utility poles with weathered steel poles within the existing M127 transmission line right-of-way.

The request includes approximately 85,244 square feet (1.96 acres) of grading impacts on slopes greater than 25percent associated with gravel access road and work pad construction. Existing wooden utility poles will be removed and replaced with new poles occupying approximately 40 square feet per structure, representing a one-to-one, in-kind replacement. Replacement structures will be located within approximately 5-15 feet of the existing poles, which will be subsequently removed.

The chair explained that three related matters were before the board, all associated with the same utility line but affecting different locations and regulatory overlays. Due to differing site conditions encountered during repairs, Eversource was seeking two special exceptions and one variance. To streamline the hearing, the chair suggested a single comprehensive presentation covering the overall project, followed by concurrent consideration of the two special exceptions and then the variance, with separate motions taken for each. This approach was agreed upon.

Ms. Hunt explained this will have minimal permanent impacts (replacement in existing right-of-way, use of matting in wetlands, permanent gravel only where matting is infeasible) and confirmed mitigation payments for wetland impacts.

The board's discussion addressed project timing, traffic impacts, public benefits (safety), the temporary nature of most impacts, and the replacement of poles as necessary maintenance.

The board questioned about road access, and whether any town roads – specifically Morgan Hill Road or its extension would be affected by the project. The applicant explained that they do not intend to access the site from Morgan Hill Rd at all. Instead, all access will occur via Pingree, Lakeshore, and Whitney Brook. The use of flaggers was mentioned where necessary, and the board members emphasized that local roads would not be adversely affected.

Board members discussed the implications of denying the variance, questioning whether the applicant would simply return in a future year with the same request. The applicant responded that replacement of these poles is necessary to maintain a safe and reliable system, and that refusing to allow replacement would create an abnormal and unsafe situation compared to other towns. This response directly supported the project's health, safety, and welfare justification.

The Board found the applications met relevant criteria for both special exceptions and the variance, noting the project wouldn't alter neighborhood character, diminish property values, or create undue hardship for the utility if denied.

All three requests were unanimously approved.

4. Other Business:

With no further zoning matters on the agenda, the board noted that approval of meeting minutes was not scheduled and would be deferred to the next regular meeting. Mr. Ricker reported that there were no new applications currently in the pipeline, but advised attendees to stay alert for future updates.

5. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Root, and seconded by Chair Todd, to adjourn the meeting. The motion was passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Vickie Stafford
Land Use & Assessing Coordinator