



TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

PLANNING BOARD APPROVED MEETING MINUTES September 25, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Cottrill (Chair), Jeff Hollinger (Vice-Chair), Tina Helm (Board of Selectmen's Representative), Emma Crane (Conservation Commission Representative), Michele Holton, John Tilley, Michael Doheny (Alternate), Deirdre Sheerr-Gross (Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Paul Gorman (Secretary)

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

Chair Cottrill called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Paul Gorman was not present and so Deirdre Sheerr-Gross, alternate, was asked to sit in for him.

Minor Subdivision Plan – 170 Morgan Hill Road -Tax Map 047-001-000

Ms. St. John said that Pierre Bedard was there to speak on behalf of the owners of the property that consists of 109 acres. The request is to subdivide the property into one 15-acre lot, which includes the house and a structure, and another 95-acre lot. She noted that this property is identified in the Master Plan as of interest to the town for conservation. She explained that the Planning Board should review the waiver request, prior to making a determination for completeness. Ms. St. John conveyed that the waiver requested seemed reasonable, and that if granted, the application could be deemed complete for this minor subdivision application. Ms. St. John referred to the staff report provided to the Planning Board and the suggested actions to be addressed including waiver requests, deeming application complete or incomplete, determination of regional impacts and finally a public hearing.

Mr. Bedard explained he is requesting several waivers, as conveyed in the letter dated September 10, 2012 included in the packet of information:

1. Complete Boundary Survey – they have adequate boundary information on the adjoining parcel and have surveyed the 14.8-acre parcel that will be taken from the larger piece.
2. Wetlands and Steep Slopes Mapping – a High Intensity Soil Survey (HISS) was done on both proposed lots and the standards were 3.48 acres and 2.7 acres under soil mapping.
3. Buildings Within 200' – Most of the buildings have been identified but there may be some within Slope 'n Shore which abut the property.
4. Topographical Mapping – Mapping the parcel did not seem appropriate. They show 2' topographical mapping where they did the HISS mapping.
5. Boundary Line Monuments – All corner monuments are drilled holes in the base stones of a stone wall. They feel that adding stones to the existing stonewall would be unnecessary and not as effective.

He explained that the proposed new 14+ acre parcel will include the 4 acres previously taken out of current use, they have identified the area around the dwelling, which is approximately 4 acres and this is why they made the parcel with the house more the 14+ acres.

The chairman then entertained comments from the public as a public hearing notice was posted for this minor subdivision plan. Al Eggert, a resident who lives in the Slope 'n Shore development asked who the trustees were of the land, as his map showed several names (C. Bucklin and J. Bucklin). Mr. Bedard said that it is a Trust with four daughters serving as the Trustees. They have had the property on the market for a while and have seen no activity. A realtor suggested that dividing the house from the rest of the property would make it more attractive for purchase. The lots could be sold separately. Mr. Eggert noted that there are eight properties in Slope 'n Shore (seven of which have houses on them) that abut the property in question. He asked how

many streams or water bodies flowed from the property. Mr. Bedard said it is part of the Lake Sunapee Watershed.

Ms. Holton asked if the Trustees mentioned their plans for the larger parcel. Mr. Bedard said they had not. He explained that they retained him for this minor subdivision plan and hasn't conveyed any specific plans for the larger parcel.

It was asked if the 14 acre lot was able to be subdivided later or if wetlands would prohibit this. Mr. Bedard said there were some wetlands and he wasn't sure it would be able to be subdivided. He said that more HISS mapping would be necessary before the 14 acre parcel could be further subdivided noting the zoning requirements are for lots with a minimum of two acres. For the 95 acres, Mr. Bedard said it could be subdivided if the property meets appropriate zoning regulations regarding wetlands, steep slopes, etc. He explained that if they wanted to further subdivide the parcels that a public notice to abutters would be required. Ms. Holton said that this is a minor subdivision but could go into major subdivision status. She recalled a situation where a large parcel was subdivided and the owners of the main parcel didn't tell the abutters about their plans to subdivide. A minor subdivision became major subdivision and much fighting and ill feelings ensued. She hoped that this wouldn't happen again and felt that neighbors should keep each other informed of their plans.

IT WAS MOVED (John Tilley) AND SECONDED (Deirdre Sheerr-Gross) to approve the waiver for the boundary survey. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED (Deirdre Sheerr Gross) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve the waiver for the wetlands mapping. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (John Tilley) to approve the waiver for Buildings within 200'. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve the waiver for Topographical Mapping. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED (Deirdre Sheerr-Gross) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve the standards for Subdivision Design for Monuments. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

A resident asked about the flagging (red tape) and stakes along the road, and if these were proposed boundary markings. Mr. Bedard explained they are temporary flagging that surveyor use in the field, noting they are not permanent and would not survive the winter.

Mr. Don Voss asked if a developer took over the 95 acres, what protection they would have for someone building on either side of them. Mr. Bedard said that they would need to take that up with the Planning Board and abutters would be noticed about any actions with subdividing the land. Chair Cottrill said that depending upon the number of proposed lots and the timing from now, it could be considered a major subdivision. When asked about buffers along property lines, Cottrill replied that buffers and setbacks would have to conform to then-current regulations.

Mr. Tilley asked for clarification on whether the stone walls were present around the entire property. Mr. Bedard explained that the property has several stone walls, and it is typical to use an iron pipe instead of granite bounds, so not to disturb the stone wall.

IT WAS MOVED (John Tilley) AND SECONDED (Jeff Hollinger) to accept the minor subdivision application for 170 Morgan Hill as complete. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED (Deirdre Sheerr-Gross) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to consider the minor subdivision as not being a development of regional impact. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Eggert wanted to confirm that Mr. Bedard represented the trustees of the property. Mr. Bedard said that he did. Mr. Eggert said that they had a meeting at Slope ‘n Shore and wondered if the trustees had thought about conserving any of the land. Mr. Bedard was not aware if this had been considered.

Ms. Holton suggested that Mr. Bedard stress to the trustees that they keep communication open between themselves and the abutters with any plans they have for the property.

IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (Emma Crane) to approve the minor subdivision at 170 Morgan Hill. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms. St. John said that the fees payable to Merrimac County Registry of Deeds were still due. The mylar would be recorded at the Registry upon receipt of the appropriate recording fees.

Tree-Cutting Request – 135 Old Route 11, Eugene & Nancy Lindsey, Tax Map 56, Lot 21

Mr. Bedard presented the Lindsey’s tree-cutting request. Ms. St. John noted for the record that a tree cutting request was previously approved May 24, 2011 for this property. Mr. Bedard said they have a landscape designer who would like to eliminate the existing driveway, which is partially within the 50’ waterfront buffer, and create a new driveway higher up (west) on Old Route 11. They plan to replace the pavement with permeable materials and wish to cut two trees to complete their garage court. The points within that section of the waterfront buffer are over 108. After the cut they would have 104 points remaining in the 50’ strip. Ms. St. John said that the tree-cutting request and the shoreland permit were separate issues and should be dealt with separately. She noted that the State’s shoreland regulations were less stringent than the town’s. They would only be approving the tree-cutting request that evening.

IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (John Tilley) to approve the tree cutting request for the Lindsey’s at 135 Old Route 11, as explained. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Conceptual Review Discussion for Subdivision – Arrolyn Vernon Property on Pingree Road, Tax Map 23, Lots 5, 6 and 11.

Ms. St. John said that surveyor Clayton Platt would represent the owners. She explained that a conceptual review is for discussion, no waivers are granted and no decisions are made by the board or applicant. The purpose is to discuss issues relevant to the property, with no decisions being made by the Planning Board. The Vernon’s have been granted a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding a portion of the property. Ms. St. John offered that the applicants should present their request as two separate subdivisions. Ms. St. John explained that the Vernon family recently submitted a letter to the Town (letter dated September 12, 2012, received September 19, 2012) asking for research to be done on their parcel, as the parcel had been merged by the Town some years ago not by the land owners. She referenced the notice included in back of 2012 Town Report, regarding lots that were involuntarily merged by municipal action (RSA 674:39-aa. It was not determined if this applied. No research has been conducted on this issue.

Mr. Platt showed the Vernon family property on a map located on both sides of Pingree Road. The ultimate goal is to subdivide the property somewhat equally between the two sons, Mark Vernon and Jim Vernon on both sides of Pingree Road. The northeast side of the road consists of 72 acres, to be divided into two separate lots, one of 25 acres (for Mark) and the other of 47 acres (for Jim) as approved by the ZBA last Spring, contingent upon no further subdivision of either proposed lot and no building on steep slopes on either lot. Mark said that the minimum lot requirement was 25 acres so that is how they came up with the current configuration. It was noted Great Brook runs through the property and Little Brook runs to the South. There are many trail systems included on the property.

The southwest side of the road is 45 acres in size and partially surrounds Mark Vernon's house and lot that was subdivided from the main parcel in 1982. There is substantial wetland running behind the farmhouse and a wetland crossing permit will be required to access the site where Mr. Vernon's son plans to build. The applicants wish to have a 12-acre lot with the farmhouse for Jim, a 20-acre lot for Mark Vernon's son, and 13 acres to be annexed to Mark Vernon's existing house and lot of 6 acres

Mr. Platt identified where the trail-head was on the map. The property included areas of steep slopes and contains wetlands which will need to be factored into the equation if further subdivision is considered to be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Platt suggested that one option being considered is to merge lots on each side of the road together, thus Mark Vernon's proposed lot of 19 acres on the southwest side would be merged with the 25-acre lot on the northeast side of the road. The 20-acre lot planned for Mark Vernon's son's house on the southwest side of the road would remain as a 20-acre lot, with no merging of lots. The 12-acre house and lot on the southwest side of the road for Jim Vernon would be merged with the 47-acre lot on the northeast side of the road. Ms. St. John questioned the merging of parcels currently separated by the road.

Mr. Platt showed the detail page of the northeast side of the road that illustrated the 100' buffer and the 50' setback, including locating a building envelope. Mr. Doheny felt that if the ZBA approved it, he was also fine with it.

Ms. St. John said that one concern to keep in mind is that Pingree Road is gravel and when adding lots and thus more traffic, it could promote the need for more road maintenance.

On the southwest side of the road, Mr. Platt showed a building lot that would require crossing a wetland. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said she understood that if someone had an existing house lot and needs to cross a wetland to access it, it would likely be granted. She asked Mr. Platt what the ruling was on crossing wetlands to get to buildable land. Mr. Platt thought that this was possible with a permit. Mr. Platt said they would need wetlands approval first, and then Zoning approval for crossing a wetland.

Mr. Vernon asked about the soil mapping requirements on the southwest side of the property. Ms. St. John conveyed that demonstrating that a lot can accommodate a septic system is important when subdividing parcels, especially is a lot with an existing house is reduced in size. There was some discussion as to whether Jim's proposed 47 acre lot on the northeast side of the road could be annexed to his mother's property of 12 acres on the southwest side of the road later on and would that preclude him from having to do the HISS mapping. It was noted that this was true but they wouldn't be able to build further on the lot unless they came back to subdivide again.

Restoration of involuntary merged lots was referenced again, and how this may affect how the family subdivides the land in question. Discussion turned to the question of merging lots over an existing road, thus becoming bifurcated lots. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said if they put a contingency on this and were worried about the future of the mapping, he would have to come back and do the subdivision and mapping at that point in time. In reference to the lots for Jim Vernon, Chair Cottrill said that in order to have a second house (single family dwelling unit) on the lot, they would have to subdivide and meet all the requirements in order for it to be a conforming lot of record. Chair Cottrill felt it would be easier to keep them as separate lots now and one would be a buildable lot. Then they wouldn't need to subdivide later on. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said if the lots were merged thus becoming bifurcated, the words "proposed building site" should be removed since there would already be a house on each lot. Mr. Vernon said that Mr. Stanley had indicated that as long as they conformed to the stricter zone, this would be OK. Mr. Platt said that it would be a lot with a public easement right of way on it.

Ms. St. John didn't think allowing the parcel to be on both sides of the road was a good idea from a planning standpoint.

Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that she assumed this request was more than adequate to meet the zoning requirements other than the steep slopes and wetlands, which the zoning board approved.

Mr. Doheny said that they sent the applicants to the ZBA to get an answer about putting one lot into two on the northeast side of the road. Now there are two different questions: can they do what the ZBA said and allow the two lots to remain, and can they accept the request to bifurcate the other lots. He wanted to keep these as separate issues. Ms. Sheerr-Gross agreed that this was a simpler way to view these requests. Ms. St. John noted that the subdivision of this property, in her opinion should be considered by addressing the lots on the north of the road separate from the lots on the south of Pingree Road. Furthermore, there are wetland, steep slope, wetland crossing, and septic issues that will need to be addressed in whatever plan is formally submitted for the Planning Board consideration. The family will need to decide how these issues can be addressed relative to the Zoning Ordinance requirements and the desire to give the brother's (Mark and Jim) their share of land. She noted that if waivers are granted, this would part of the formal application submission, and considered at that time.

Ms. St. John said that conditions could be put on the plan to note HISS mapping was waived until the point they wish to build. If they don't plan to build on it the land, it would need to be stated on the map that the lot was "non-buildable."

Ms. Sheerr said that instead of doing HISS on the entire parcel but just on the buildable part, maybe that wouldn't be as expensive. She offered that it is to their benefit to do the HIS mapping to see if the land is even buildable.

There was some talk about the septic system at the farmhouse. Mr. Vernon said that it was installed around 1990-1991. They discussed that verification from the septic designer would be needed regarding the status of the existing septic system, and if there were the need for further soils mapping (HISS). Mr. Mark Vernon said he would speak with his brother about the mapping. Mr. Doheny felt this was being done by piecemeal and they need to look at it in its entirety and break it down piece by piece for them to approve.

As a conceptual discussion, there were no further comments.

Morgan Hill Bookstore – Conceptual Review Discussion: Consideration of a Loft Area for a Yoga Studio (TM/Lot 084-067-000)

Ms. St. John explained that Ms. Connie Appel of Morgan Hill Bookstore has an interested buyer for the property, who is considering using the second floor (approximately 700 square feet for a yoga studio), in conjunction with the retail book store on the ground floor. She referred to the permitted uses of Article VII, Commercial District of the Zoning Ordinance, noting nothing that mixed, use and retail service uses are listed, but there isn't anything for personal service uses such as a yoga studio. Several definitions in the ordinance were reviewed. It was noted that the building has been used over the years for other retail business uses. The discussion then focused on the parking requirements of the Site Plan regulations, specifically Appendix A. She further noted that the Town does not have a village or downtown district. For site plan review purposes, in the ordinance there was nothing that would describe such a studio.. The building used to house a cobbler, a shoe-store, and a Java Jack's. In 2004-2005 a piece of the property was annexed from the fire department. Ms. St. John asked if there were other yoga studios in town and what category was applied to the current spa business located on Main Street. Mr. Hollinger said that in the years past they approved a yoga studio in the CB Coburn building and categorized it as a retail business as people had to pay to participate.

Ms. St. John felt that retail was like a pharmacy, etc. She suggested the yoga business was more of a personal service business, and this may be something the Planning Board should discuss further. Chair Cottrill said that

for the purpose of a conceptual discussion, a change in use or size of business would require the Planning Board to review. He also noted that parking is an issue. More useable space means more parking spaces are required. Chair Cottrill said currently and before consideration of the loft, the bookstore is now short of parking spaces. Ms. Appel said that employees park behind the building where there are 3-4 parking spaces and some employees park in the school parking lot in the summer while most customers park on Main Street. She reference a parking study completed several years ago, and her experience over the past 18 years, it is clear to her that Main Street has plenty of parking available and even more so since the middle school moved.

In response to a suggestion that the bookstore and the yoga studio should be considered as separate businesses, Mr. Tilley didn't believe the businesses should be separated as they wouldn't see a bookstore/coffee shop as two businesses. Ms. Appel said that the prospective new owner has taught yoga in the past and may wish to open a studio but she wasn't sure that was a deal breaker. The upstairs has been used in the past by the quilting shop, the "Mini-Dip" and the "Cobbler's Bench."

Ms. Appel said that half of the space upstairs would be used for storage and office space. Only about 300 square feet would be used for the yoga studio. Chair Cottrill said that the size of the bookstore (1800 sq ft) currently requires 7.2 spaces but has only three or four. If the loft is fully utilized it will add 700 square feet, requiring an additional three spaces for a total of 10 spaces. Ms. Appel said they don't have a problem with parking even at the busiest times of the year. Chair Cottrill said that the real estate agency or any other neighboring property could become upset when bookstore customers use their parking lots. Additionally, they shouldn't rely on the school's parking spaces behind the building. He noted that some businesses agree to loan some of their extra spaces to other businesses needing spaces. Ms. Appel said that to keep Main Street businesses viable, they should consider the on-street parking as part of the equation. Ms. Sheer said that going from 3-5 spaces might make sense by using the street parking, but going from 3 to 10 is a stretch.

Mr. Tilley said this is an issue concerning everyone who visits businesses on Main Street and wants to be sure there is a place to park. Would parking become available at the old middle school? Ms. Helm said that there would soon be a meeting sponsored by the Board of Selectmen to get conversations started about ideas for the 1941 school building. Anyone who is interested in opportunities (such as parking availability) should attend. The date of the meeting is October 6th at 7:30am.

Chair Cottrill said that the bookstore is an already a non-conforming lot and adding a dozen vehicles for yoga classes could be burdensome. He wondered where all those cars would go. Mr. Hollinger said they will go from 1,800 sq feet (7 spaces needed) and adding the need for two more spaces. Mr. Cottrill expressed concern about the other existing businesses along Main Street, especially customer parking and how this yoga studio could potentially impact on-street parking. He felt they should take Main Street parking into consideration because if the business is limited by parking, the business could be worth less. Main Street parking is not being used at 100%.

Ms. St. John said she felt these were good points. She noted she spoke to the potential owner and suggested that they attend the Planning Board meeting and to make their potential purchase and sales agreement on receiving all applicable local, state and federal approval that may be required. The site plan process would afford the abutters the opportunity to express their concern about parking and other general site plan planning issue.. Chair Cottrill felt if it wasn't such big a stretch between what they have and what they need for parking, he would be more willing to entertain some creativity.

Ms. Appel thought the Planning Board was being too restrictive of the use of parking spaces on Main Street. Ms St. John said if the Planning Board wants to maintain vibrancy on Main Street, the Planning Board should offer provisions for creative parking. A public hearing would allow for abutter input. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that parking in the town as a whole needs to be addressed to encourage a vibrant Main Street.

Ms. Helm said recently the Board of Selectmen has talked with the college regarding parking. Seamans Road and Main Street are seeing more parking congestion. She subscribed to Ms. St. John's recommendation that the buyer should come to the Planning Board.. She thought it would be good to hear form the potential buyer and have it be a public meeting so the neighbors could weigh in.

Mr. Doheny said they could consider enforcing two-hour parking to free up the spaces, as there are many business owners who park on Main Street. Ms. Sheerr-Gross suggested discussing borrowing spaces from the school as the land is plentiful near there.

Ms. Helm agreed that they want a vibrant Main Street. Mr. Doheny suggested staggering hours for the yoga classes, and the retail portion of the yoga studio could be downstairs within the bookstore.

Chair Cottrill agreed that the prospective owner should attend to provide more details of their yoga plans. It is a non-conforming lot and parking is the challenge.

Mr. Tilley also agreed that at some point the Planning Board should discuss parking in general as it is one of the main issues they deal with in town. He wasn't sure what it meant or what needed to be changed, but it should be looked at. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that if they could come up with some "pocket parking" around town to allow for more available spaces, that would be good. Ms. St. John said this could mean coming up with zoning and site plan amendment language, allowing shared parking and creating a map showing parking opportunities in the vicinity of Main Street.

Ms. Appel noted that the parking study done in 2004 ignores the parking available on Main Street which didn't seem right. Ms. Sheerr-Gross said that she agreed and felt it was a critical issue. Ms. Appel said these regulations will make it difficult to sell a business. Chair Cottrill said that it may make it harder for her to sell *her* business to a person that wants to increase useable floor space, but selling the business to a person that wants to continue the business as is currently conducted would not require a discussion of parking. He said that other businesses in town have had to meet the same parking requirements and that some approvals were fairly creative in design and not every business has the same problem with parking.

As a conceptual discussion, there were no further comments.

Tree-Cutting Request – 706 Bunker Road, Hopwood, Tax Map 76, Lot 22.

Ms. Crane said that Terry Dancy from the Conservation Commission has looked at the two dead trees and approved that they should be taken down.

IT WAS MOVED (Jeff Hollinger) AND SECONDED (John Tilley) to approve the tree-cutting request for Hopwood. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Tree-Cutting Request – Bunker Road, Cundy, Tax Map 30, Lot 2.

Ms. Sheerr-Gross recued herself as the Cundy's were her neighbors.

Chair Cottrill said he tried to call them as the points didn't seem to add up on their diagram. He wasn't able to make contact. Ms. St. John asked stated she didn't have time to visit the site; the request was received September 17th. She asked if some minimum time frame could be established, 15 days or more, so that arrangements could be made for someone to visit the site. She wasn't aware of any minimum time submittal requirements. Mr. Cottrill asked if the applicant was present, as the plan submitted was not clear.

Chair Cottrill said that the applicant had called him earlier in the week and he told him that he was able to cut the trees if they were dead or in danger of falling on the house. Otherwise it would have to be reviewed by the Planning Board. Ms. Helm said he had planned to have the trees cut that very day but the tree cutters indicated that approval was needed from the town before they proceeded. He has re-scheduled the cutting for sometime

in the end of October. Mr. Hollinger said that if the applicant had come in to discuss the issue with Ms. St. John, the Planning Board would have been fine with her recommendation. Ms. Crane recalled that Mr. Stanley had made use of photographs in instances like this in the past.

IT WAS MOVED (John Tilley) AND SECONDED (Jeff Hollinger) to table discussion of the Cundy tree-cutting request for additional clarification. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Other Business

Notices of Decision

Ms. St. John said there is no requirement that the Planning Board Chair must sign the Notices of Decision. She can send them out unless they want Chair Cottrill's signature on them. The notices need to be sent out within 72 hours of the decision. Chair Cottrill said he was fine with her signing the decisions as long as he could look at them first.

Site Visits

Ms. St. John asked if the Planning Board wanted her to plan these. Chair Cottrill said that they don't usually all go out to look at the sites unless they have a subcommittee created for a special case. Ms. St. John reminded them that individual board members should not talk to abutters or property owners when reviewing sites.

Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Meetings

Ms. St. John explained the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) meetings have been scheduled.

Solar Panel Grant at Colby-Sawyer College

Ms. St. John shared that the college would like to have solar panels put on the roofs of Lawson, Lethbridge Lodge, and the Windy Hill School. They received a grant for this, and the funds need to be used by Dec. 31, 2012. The panels are flat, do not oscillate and will not add any vertical height to any building. Ms. St. John passed around photographs of what the panels would look like. She thought they would only need a building permit. The Planning Board agreed that applying for the building permits was appropriate and that site plan review was not needed for this. There were no concerns with the installation of solar panels at Colby-Sawyer College.

Ms. St. John said that the college would be coming in soon with some plans for their fields, parking and a wind turbine. The wind turbine project would be addressed under the provisions of a regional impact. The Planning Board expressed that the College needs to have open dialogue with the abutters in advance of bringing applications to the Planning Board.

Ms. Helm asked for suggestions for people they would recommend as representatives to the Regional Planning Commission. She would send a reminder to the Planning Board about sending names to her directly.

IT WAS MOVED (Emma Crane) AND SECONDED (Tina Helm) to adjourn. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 9:58pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary
Town of New London