

Note: Unapproved minutes are subject to revision.
All minutes are available at the Town Clerk's Office (488 Townhouse Road,
675.5207).

TOWN OF CORNISH, NH
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CASE 06-01
JULY 5, 2006 – Unapproved Minutes

Members Present

voting: Karim Chichakly, Jason Bourne, Jim Brown, Caroline Storrs, and Bill Balch

non-voting: Bruce Tracy

Representing Verizon Wireless: Linda Connell of McLane, Graf, Raulerson & Middleton, Mercy LuHanga, Radio Frequency (RF) Engineer, and Todd White, Construction Manager, and Chuck Webberly, Site Acquisition Specialist.

Also in attendance: Mara Sabinson, Merilynn Bourne, Caroline Reed, Jan Timmons, Keith Jones, Daniel Kebalka, Bill Gallagher, Leo Maslan, John Gregg (*Valley News*), and Heidi Jaarsma (recording secretary).

The meeting was held at the Cornish Elementary School and was called to order by Karim Chichakly at 7:40 p.m.

Case 06-01: Verizon Wireless (applicant) has requested a Special Exception concerning Article IV Section 4.1 to the zoning ordinance regarding the applicant's request to construct a wireless communications facility including a 190' lattice type tower. Applicant also requests two variances concerning Articles V and VI-A, Section D.2 & C4a.1. Applicant is requesting a variance to the height regulations and a variance to the requirements of setback. Applicant proposes the construction of the tower at 880 Townhouse Road, Tax Map 2, Lot 20E.

Closed Discussion:

Caroline Storrs introduced into the record a motion for rehearing submitted by the applicant. The Board discussed concerns regarding communication between Verizon representatives and Mark Hutchins, the Town's contracted expert. Ms. Connell also discussed her concern that Jim Brown's letter regarding the communication between Mr. Hutchins and Verizon referred to a non-public meeting. Mr. Chichakly said that there had been no meeting and that any reference to one had been inadvertent. Mark Hutchins, continued Mr. Chichakly, was the Town's expert and it was reasonable for anyone on the Board to speak with him. Ms. Connell repeated her assertion that 140' was too low for Verizon. Although collocations at that height had been discussed, Ms. Connell pointed out that any prospective collocater would be able to test at the site. Before the construction of the tower, coverage levels can only be predicted by modeling.

Jason Bourne asked why a tower in Vermont could not serve the coverage gap on Route 12-A. Mercy LuHanga said that no Vermont tower was planned. Ms. Connell said that one must look to the town where the coverage is proposed. Jason Bourne replied that Verizon needed Cornish to hit the areas of VT I-91 that cannot be hit

from the Mt. Ascutney tower. He added that it was somewhat hypocritical not to build a tower in Vermont to serve New Hampshire. Mr. Connell said that she was somewhat concerned with the 122' height coverage in Vermont. Due to terrain factors the entire coverage area would be less reliable. Mr. Bourne said that the modeling would take that into account.

Mark Hutchins said that he agreed with Ms. Connell: he would be nervous about the reliability of a 122' tower (125' total tower height). Verizon's goal, he said, was not just to close the gap but to achieve some reliability in overlap. He added that NH Route 12-A does have a lot of traffic and suggested that there could be a higher standard for that road. He also felt that a higher tower would better serve Townhouse Road. With a lessening of the tower height now, more and higher facilities would be needed in the future. The most problematic area for this tower was the intersection of NH Route 12-A and Platt Road. At 150' the coverage in that area, Mr. Hutchins said, was not bad. At 165' there was good coverage all the way up NH Route 12-A. At 125', or anything below 150', Frenell interference would diminish coverage. From a radio frequency engineering standpoint, Mr. Hutchins was more comfortable at a 150' tower height.

Jim Brown asked Mercy LuHanga for a clarification of the 150' height: was it the center line or the total tower height with antennas? Ms. LuHanga said that her modeling took 150' as the center line. The total tower height would be approximately 153'.

Jason Bourne said that he did not see, from the coverage maps, a significant decrease in coverage as the tower height went down. He asked Mr. Hutchins to explain. Mr. Hutchins said that the changes are modest, but the hill west of the proposed tower is a major obstruction and coverage of Townhouse Road will decrease as the height goes down. Mr. Hutchins discussed shadowing and grazing which diminish coverage. Only at 140' was the tower clear of shadowing. In the case of an accident, 12-A could suffer from loading with a shorter tower height. Ms. Storrs asked Mr. Hutchins what the Freeman Hill tower would do for NH Route 12-A. Mr. Hutchins said that that tower was not very high. He said he would rather have Verizon Wireless comment on the sector orientation of the Freeman Hill tower.

Mr. Chichakly asked Mr. Hutchins to speak more about the overlap on NH Route 12-A. Mr. Hutchins said that he was comfortable at the 150' level. The space where a signal drops off needs to overlap with a signal of increasing strength from a different source. The handoff between signals can be soft or abrupt, but a good signal will be needed in approaching the South Plainfield tower. Mr. Chichakly asked Mr. Hutchins if he was confident of overlap at 150', but not any lower. Mr. Hutchins responded in the affirmative. Ms. Storrs asked Mr. Hutchins how he felt about 140'. He said that he was more concerned about grazing and interference, especially in areas two miles or more out from the tower.

Jason Bourne said that he did not see a significant difference in the projected coverage maps between a 187' and a 122' tower. Mr. Chichakly said that he did see a difference in coverage and pointed to several areas. Mr. Bourne questioned whether those areas were significant. Mercy LuHanga said that the gaps can grow larger as the signal shrinks due to loading. Terrain difficulties at the proposed site

made it impossible to do a drive test. Ms. LuHanga said that she could not go below 150' using modeling only.

Karim Chichakly asked Todd White about the towers in the photo simulation. He said that the width at the top of the monopole did not seem as wide as the top of the lattice. Mr. White said that was due to the simulation and that the lattice tower was a more accurate representation of the antenna width. The Board examined the set of photo simulations at 150'.

Caroline Storrs suggested the Board think about stealth, tree-construction specifically, as an option. Mark Hutchins said that he was not aware of a 150' tree-construction. The tallest he knew of was 120' in Grantham. He added that the total tower height would be 7'-10' higher than the proposed height to accommodate the 'foliage' at the top of the tree. Collocations would also need to be farther apart. Ms. Storrs said that she did not want to consider a tree-construction if the total height would have to be increased. Bill Balch said that he had seen several on the way down from St. Johnsbury and that the tree-constructions stick out.

Karim Chichakly asked the Board what he felt would be an acceptable height. Ms. Storrs said that she had been leaning toward 140', but after Mr. Hutchins' testimony, she would find a 150' center line acceptable. Mr. Chichakly and Jim Brown agreed. Jason Bourne discussed the coverage maps that showed the VT I-91 gap being hit by a tower as low as 100' and said that he did not believe the Verizon had to be provided with coverage of everything they want. Mr. Chichakly said that the argument fell apart with overlap and shrinkage. In the scheme of the entire town, especially Townhouse Road, Mr. Chichakly felt lowering tower height would be a mistake. Bill Balch said that allowing for some collocation could reduce the total number of towers built in the town in the long run.

Karim Chichakly asked Board members if, in their opinion, the benefit could be sought by some other reasonably feasible method. Jim Brown said that six other sites had been examined and did not pan out. Building higher up on the hill behind the proposed site was not feasible. He did not see any other way. Caroline Storrs said she still thought a Vermont tower could serve the 12-A gap better. Karim Chichakly said that the same interference that came into play with towers north of the site on the NH side might effect the VT side. The Board and Ms. Connell discussed the applicability of the Pelham case.

Mr. Chichakly asked what Verizon's obligations were as holders of a license. Ms. LuHanga said that Verizon had to provide service to keep its license and that the license area covered New Hampshire and Vermont. Mark Hutchins added that while one of the three sectors of the panel array is pointed at Vermont, two are clearly pointed at New Hampshire. Jason Bourne asked if coverage going down VT Route 5 and VT I-91 was from sector one or two. Mark Hutchins looked at the map and said that part of the second sector was directed to that area. Mercy LuHanga agreed saying that the second sector covered Cornish and Windsor. Mr. Bourne asked how the decision to aim the sectors was made. Ms. LuHanga said that the sectors were run through an optimization model. Mr. Bourne asked if the best coverage for Cornish was the basis for the model. Ms. LuHanga said that all coverage objectives were considered. Was VT Route 5 part of the coverage objective, Mr. Bourne asked. Ms. LuHanga said that it was. Mr. Bourne said that it was very frustrating

to see that the majority of coverage was to Windsor and VT I-91. It was only fair, he felt, for Windsor to come back with coverage for Cornish. Mr. Chichakly pointed out the issue of interference. Mr. Bourne questioned interference when other locations have four towers in very close proximity to one another. Mr. Chichakly said that interference is very terrain-dependent. Caroline Storrs and Bill Balch both said that they agreed with Mr. Brown that there was no other reasonably feasible alternative.

Karim Chichakly asked the Board to consider the spirit of the Ordinance, in particular the competing objectives of collocation and low tower height. Ms. Storrs said that reducing the height and using a monopole reach that goal. Jim Brown said that a 150' tower would fairly adjudicate the competing values. Jason Bourne said that he was looking at the minimum impact on the Town. He thought the tower could be lower, 130' based on projected coverage maps provided by Verizon. He said that he would sacrifice the coverage provided to Cornish to lower the height; collocation at 100', he added, was still possible for cell signals. Mr. Brown said that that approach ignored the gap on NH 12-A and went against the recommendation of the Town's expert. Mr. Bourne said that Mr. Hutchins had given testimony from an RF engineering standpoint. The job of the Board was to find a balance. Mr. Chichakly and Mr. Bourne again discussed the difference in projected coverage at decreasing tower heights. Mr. Bourne felt there was not a significant decrease in coverage, Mr. Chichakly felt there was.

Mr. Chichakly asked for a straw vote on the applicant's request for a variance. The straw vote was 4-1 in favor with Jason Bourne voting against. Mr. Chichakly asked for a straw vote on the applicant's request for a special exception assuming that acceptable conditions were put on the special exception. The straw vote was 4-1 in favor with Jason Bourne voting against.

Jim Brown presented a draft copy of conditions to the granting of a special exception, attached. Ms. Connell questioned the quarterly inspections (draft condition #21): she said it was extremely out of the ordinary. Mr. Brown pointed to the section of the Zoning Ordinance requiring quarterly inspections. Ms. Connell said that she might need to ask for reconsideration, but not at this point.

Jim Brown suggested that the conditions be reviewed by Town Counsel. Jason Bourne asked how a decision could be written before a vote. Mr. Chichakly said that Mr. Brown had compiled the conditions from meeting minutes.

Bill Balch made a motion to table the hearing until 7:30 p.m., August 7, 2006, at the Cornish Elementary School. Jim Brown seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was 5-0 in the affirmative.

Caroline Storrs made a motion to table the 6/22/06 motion for a rehearing. Jim Brown seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was in the affirmative. Linda Connell said that the motion for rehearing might be a moot point. She asked if the Board had any objection to the submission of an application for Site Plan Review in the interim. The Board did not.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Heidi M. Jaarsma

DRAFT
Application of Verizon Wireless
for Special Exception and Variances
Case No. 06-01

List of Conditions

1. Before commencing construction, Verizon must : (a) complete the Site Plan Review process before the Planning Board; and (b) complete reimbursement of all fees and expenses incurred by the Town's experts, as well as by the Board for its administrative and other costs in this matter.
2. Verizon must make substantial progress towards completing construction one year from the date of final Planning Board approval, or this grant of a special exception and variances will lapse.
3. With respect to the height variance, the tower may not exceed 150' in height, and the initial antenna array may not extend more than 3' above the top of the tower.
4. After the date hereof, any proposed increase in the height of the tower above 150' will require approval of this Board of a separate variance application.
5. The tower shall be monopole-style.
6. Verizon shall maintain on file with this Board an undertaking to supply available space on the tower to additional users for collocation at reasonable fees and costs according to the tower's design.
7. Collocation on the tower by additional provider(s) will require Site Plan Review before the Planning Board. Collocation will not require an appearance before this Board unless an increase in the height of the tower is involved (see no. 4).
8. The tower shall not be lighted, unless required by the Federal Aviation Authority ("FAA"). In the event lighting is required, Verizon shall appear before the Planning Board for prior design approval.
9. The tower must remain in compliance with all applicable standards and regulations of the FAA, the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), and all other agencies with the authority to regulate towers and antennas. Failure to comply with any new standards or regulations within six months shall constitute grounds for removal, at Verizon's expense, on the grounds of abandonment (see no. 22).
10. Regarding the FCC's regulations on the Maximum Permissible Exposure limits for RF fields, Verizon shall submit a certificate that its antenna array is in compliance, as built, within 90 days of its first commercial use of the tower.
11. Additionally, Verizon shall be responsible for submitting a similar certificate with regard to all additional users on the tower, within 90 days of commercial operation by each user.
12. The tower shall be maintained in compliance with all applicable building codes and the applicable building and safety standards of the industry. Failure to comply shall constitute grounds for removal, at Verizon's expense, on the grounds of abandonment (see no. 22).

- 13.No microwave dishes (except for "pizza box" style microwave relay antennas) shall be mounted on the tower without the prior approval of this Board in a separate special exception application.
 - 14.There shall be no signage, or other graphic representation, of any kind on the tower.
 - 15.The tower shall be finished in galvanized steel, and allowed to weather. It shall not be painted or otherwise finished without prior approval of this Board.
 - 16.All antennas and supporting equipment mounted on the tower must be of a neutral color that is compatible with the tower, so as to make all attachments as visually unobtrusive as possible.
 - 17.With regard to the setback variance, the minimum boundaries shall be approximately 111' from the eastern boundary and approximately 120' from the northern boundary, and 187.5' from all other boundaries. As a condition hereto, Verizon shall, prior to construction, submit a letter from a competent structural engineer regarding the collapse characteristics of the tower, stating that the tower, as built, is designed to collapse upon itself and not impinge on neighboring properties in the event of a failure.
 - 18.The tower shall be surrounded by security fencing in accordance with the initial plans filed with the Board.
 - 19.Given the remote nature of the site, no special landscaping is required for the immediate site. However, neither Verizon (for the land it leases), nor the land owner (for a distance of 100' from the boundary of the land leased to Verizon) shall remove any large trees that would cause a material change in the view of the tower in the local neighborhood. This restriction on cutting trees does not extend to brush cutting, or the removal of understory trees (with a caliper of less than 5") or dead trees.
 - 20.The permit for special exception shall expire if the use of the tower ceases for more than one year for any reason.
 - 21.Verizon shall supply a bond to the Town's Zoning Administrator in the amount of \$20,000 for the cost of removal, and shall also submit proof of insurance covering accident or damage. The amount of the bond may be increase after five years to account for inflation by _____.
 - 22.If the tower is abandoned, a declaration of abandonment may be issued by the Town following a public hearing, with notice to the owner/operator and to all abutters. Upon receipt of a notice of abandonment, the owner shall remove the structure within 90 days. If the tower is not removed within 90 days, the Town may execute the bond required by no. 20 and have the tower removed. If there are two or more users of the tower, this provision shall not become effective until all cease using the tower. The remaining users will assume responsibility for quarterly inspections.
-

**TOWN OF CORNISH, NH
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CASE 06-03
JUNE 20, 2006 – Unapproved Minutes**

Members Present

voting: Karim Chichakly, Chair, Bill Balch, Jason Bourne, Jim Brown, and Bruce Tracy.

Also in attendance: Bucky Demers, Jeff Lamoureux, Laura Packard, Bill Gallagher, Larry Dingee, Jim & Joan Littlefield, Dillon Gallagher, Dennis Demers, Ralph & Lorraine Cosseboom, and Judith Kaufman.

The meeting was held at the Cornish Elementary School and was called to order by Karim Chichakly at 7:47 p.m.

Case 06-01: Jeff Lamoureux has requested a Special Exception concerning Article IV Section 4.1 to the zoning ordinance regarding the applicant's request for an automobile repair garage.

Background

Bill Balch read the notice and reported that receipts had been received from all certified letters sent.

Bucky Demers asked Mr. Chichakly about the wording of the Ordinance regarding auto repair garages. Mr. Demers wanted to know if a special exception was necessary for an allowed use. Mr. Chichakly said that a Special Exception was necessary.

Mr. Chichakly asked Messrs. Demers and Lamoureux to make their presentation. Mr. Lamoureux said that he not brought anything; he did not know that he had to do so. Karim Chichakly said that the submission of a new application meant that the applicant was starting over again and was required to bring a lot plan and to tell the board what he was proposing to do. Bucky Demers said that he had been repairing cars for eighteen years in Cornish, when Jeff Lamoureux had acquired the building on Route 120, they had started an auto repair business there. Karim Chichakly said that the New Hampshire Superior Court had said that the building was not a garage and that Jim Brown and Jason Bourne had not been on the Board at the time. Dillon Gallagher said that the Town had a record of those proceedings. Bucky Demers said that he wanted to fall under the Ordinance that had been supported by 318 Cornish citizens.

Jeff Lamoureux reiterated that no one had told him he needed to bring a plan. The Board took the site plan, from the files, submitted for Straightaway auto at Site Plan Review in 2003 and approved in 2005. Jim Brown said that to meet the requirements of the Ordinance the area dedicated to commercial use would have to be expanded to one acre. Mr. Demers said that he is taxed on a 150 X 150 foot area. Mr. Brown, looking at the site plan, wondered if the setback from the road was met. Mr. Lamoureux said that it had not been an issue at previous hearings. Bruce Tracy said that the building had existed before zoning. Dillon Gallagher

agreed. Mr. Chichakly said that the new ordinance regarding auto repair garages stated expressly that all setbacks must be met.

Larry Dingee said that he was not sure how much the applicant was told he needed to prepare. Mr. Dingee said that it would be wise to tell the Mr. Lamoureux what information he would need to provide to the Board and postpone the hearing. Judith Kaufman questioned the July 3rd date of the hearing; many who had wanted to come could not because of the holiday. Mr. Chichakly pointed out that the third of July was not a Federal holiday.

Bill Gallagher said that it was clear there had been a lack of clear communication between the applicant and the Board. He questioned the need to start the process over again because two people on the Board were not involved. Mr. Chichakly responded that this was a new application regarding part of the Ordinance that did not exist before March of this year. The Board could not go sifting through information from the previous hearings. He added that the application submitted by the applicant is very clear regarding the required submission of a plan.

The Board discussed how fumes, noise, and glare could be measured. Guidelines are available. Lorraine Cosseboom said that she had no problem with glare since the light was redirected. She did mention of noise generated by a cannon. Her primary concern, she continued, was and always had been the water quality of the area which was in a wetlands and the business's impact on the character of the Town and the land.

Jim Brown said that he saw the main question as how to protect the water quality in the long term. Mr. Demers presented the DES approval of the septic system for the property and the garage's small waste generator number.

Joan Littlefield said that it was the duty of the governing board to enforce the Ordinance. She referenced an unrelated situation where she stated the Ordinance had not been enforced, and water quality had suffered. Bill Balch noted that the Zoning Administrator is the Selectboard.

Bruce Tracy pointed out that two similar businesses, Dingee Machine and Cornish Automotive, were both in close proximity to running water. Larry Dingee said that as part of a Special Exception the applicant must be in compliance with all state and local regulations; the obligation is on the applicant to show compliance. He continued that there are regulations and required reporting regarding waste disposal. Any abutter not happy with the Selectboard's enforcement regarding the issue could go to DES. He added that the applicant had gone through the ZBA and Site Plan Review once before and the septic system had been in compliance with the regulations.

The Board asked Messrs. Lamoureux and Demers what hazardous substances were on the site. The said that they burned waste oil and that disposal of parts washing fluid was subcontracted. Antifreeze was the only other substance. Dillon Gallagher said that a lot of people use chemicals in their homes. Jim Brown said that it was a different issue for a business. Jeff Lamoureux pointed out that if anyone else ever took over the garage, the permits would have to be transferred.

Mr. Chichakly discussed the conditions that had been put on the variance that Mr. Lamoureux had been granted for Straightaway Auto and said that he was using them as a starting point. The number of cars and the parking of cars on the north side of the garage were brought up. Mr. Demers said that many of the cars were personal vehicles. Dillon Gallagher said that he thought the allowed number of cars was not realistic. Lorraine Cosseboom mentioned late night noise after the races. Mr. Demers said that they no longer start the race car to take it off the trailer.

Jim Brown directed the Board to page 23 of the Ordinance. He said that the additional provisions in the Wetlands Overlay District could present a problem for the applicants: 'No use which utilizes, stores, processes or disposes of toxic substances which may pose a threat to surface or ground water.' (IV.D.1.c.i)

Mr. Demers noted that the garage was an intervener in the processes of appealing the Superior Court ruling that had overturned the variance. The Supreme Court decision was due in December. Laura Packard said that the applicant and Mr. Demers were just two average people trying to make a living. She was sorry that they had to go through this. Jim Brown said that he understood, but that the applicants had applied under new regulations. The recording secretary read the requests the Board had made to Mr. Lamoureux:

1. Measure setbacks;
2. Show lot size is in compliance;
3. Submit copies of the septic approval and small waster generator number;
4. Show that 35' setback is met (IV.7a.d);
5. Measure driveway entrance (max allowable, 50')
6. Let the Board know of any changes they want to request from the conditions of the Variance.

Bill Balch made a motion to table the meeting to 7:30 p.m., August 7th at the Cornish Elementary School. Jim Brown seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was 5-0 in the affirmative.

Respectfully submitted,
Heidi Jaarsma

**MINUTES
CORNISH PLANNING BOARD
JUNE 15, 2006 – Approved Minutes**

The Cornish Planning Board met on Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 7 p.m. in the Cornish Town Office. Members present were Cheston Newbold, Chair, Bill Lipfert, Troy Simino, and Peter Storrs; Jim Littlefield, Alternate; Merilynn Bourne, Selectwoman; and, Heidi Jaarsma, Secretary.

Joan Littlefield also attended the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Troy Simino made a motion to approve the minutes of May 20, 2006. Peter Storrs seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was in the affirmative.

Cheston Newbold made a motion to approve the minutes of June 1, 2006. Peter Storrs seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was in the affirmative.

Richard and Janet Avery – Continued Completeness Review and Public hearing re: Major Subdivision, Stage Road

Richard Avery, Chris Patton, and George Edson attended the hearing.

Mr. Patton presented the plan with the changes requested by the Board at the May 20th Completeness Review. Peter Storrs said that a single curb cut made more sense than a double driveway. Heidi Jaarsma asked how the right of way had been relocated. Mr. Patton said that the exact location had not been spelled out. Bill Lipfert said that equally good access can allow for the relocation of a right of way without a described path. Peter Storrs made a motion to accept the map as complete. Bill Lipfert seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was in the affirmative.

The Public Hearing was opened. Heidi Jaarsma said that the lot before the Board was the result of an earlier subdivision approved by the Planning Board. She did not see that further subdivision was feasible for the remaining lot should this five-acre subdivision be approved. She asked Mr. Avery if he would be willing to state on the plat and the deed that Lot 2 was not subject to further subdivision. Mr. Avery said that he would be willing to do so. Ms. Jaarsma made a motion to accept the subdivision as presented on the condition that the Board accept Mr. Avery's offer that Lot 2 not be subject to further subdivision, to be stated on the deed and the map. Merilynn Bourne seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was in the affirmative.

Christopher and Amanda Jewell – Completeness Review re: Major Subdivision, Clark Camp Road

Christopher and Amanda Jewell, Colleen O'Neill, George Edson, and Fred Sullivan attended the hearing.

Chris Patton presented the maps for Wayne McCutcheon. The Board asked that the following changes be made.

1. Show a 100' well radius per subdivisions regulations.
2. Scrub the locator on the south side of Clark Camp Road.
3. Show addresses of abutters on plan.
4. Show Wetlands and Driveway permit numbers on the map.
5. Show wetlands delineation.

Bill Lipfert said that since Mr. Jewell had stated that he wanted to limit the building area, the plan would need a reference point from the map in order to be able to describe it on a deed. Mr. Patton suggested a building envelope with dimensions from the road. Bill Lipfert also said that he was concerned with the grade at one point in the driveway which looked close to 25%. He suggested that state guidelines be used, keeping the drive at 15%. Heidi Jaarsma asked about the length of the driveway. From the map it was judged to be between eight and nine

hundred feet long. Ms. Jaarsma suggested making a waiver of the maximum driveway length (600') part of the Public Hearing. Fred Sullivan said that the driveway was in an ideal spot.

Paul Rondos – Preliminary Discussion re: Major Subdivision, Parsonage Road

Mr. Rondos discussed a five-acre lot he would like to subdivide from his Parsonage Road property. He was advised to be aware of setbacks and will apply for July.

Other Business

Cheston Newbold mentioned a monetary award given by the Joint River Commission to the Lyme Conservation Commission to go towards the generation of a Natural Resources Inventory.

Respectfully submitted,
Heidi Jaarsma