

# Approved: June 25, 2014

Planning Board Site Walk  
Wednesday, May 28, 2014  
6:20 pm  
25 Piscataqua Street, New Castle NH

---

**Site Walk at 25 Piscataqua Street, Map 18, Lot 41, permit for relocation of a driveway. Applicants: Christine Strong and David Murphy**

**Members Present:** Patty Cohen, Darcy Horgan, Ned Robinson, Eric Katz, Dave McArdle

**Also Present:** John Chagnon and Marc Batchelder (Ambit engineering), Christine Strong, David Murphy, Brandon Strong, Phil and Rita Fusco, Justin Richardson

John Chagnon demonstrated to those present the location of the current driveway to the left of the property (as you are looking at the house from the street) and the proposed relocation of the driveway to the right of the property. He noted that the proposal also includes an addition to the back of the house and a garage and turnaround at the end of the proposed driveway. Mr. Chagnon said the proposed driveway will be just to the left of the utility pole located at the street edge and that a portion of the ledge outcropping located on that side of the property will be removed. He said the removal of the ledge may also aid with water issues associated with the foundation of the home on that side of the property.

Chair Horgan asked Mr. Chagnon to demonstrate where the property line is on the right side of the property and what portion of the ledge outcropping would be removed.

Mr. Chagnon demonstrated this to those present.

Eric Katz asked how the ledge will be removed and Mr. Murphy said the ledge could be removed by chipping or blasting. Mr. Chagnon said this would be discussed further at the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Katz asked what the width of the driveway is proposed to be.

Marc Batchelder said the driveway is proposed to be twelve feet wide.

Chair Horgan asked how many feet of backup space are planned in front of the garage to allow those using the driveway to back out of the driveway and exit front end first.

Mr. Batchelder said the back up distance is planned to be approximately twenty feet.

Justin Richardson pointed out that there is a grade change and a curve located just above the proposed location of the driveway. He noted that this will cause an issue with a safe

sight distance. Mr. Richardson also noted that the remaining ledge outcropping will add to the visibility issue.

Mr. Katz noted that the property next door has a driveway located in close proximity to the proposed driveway and asked how that driveway has a safer sight distance.

Mr. Richardson noted that the driveway at the property next door has been in existence for quite some time and is therefore grandfathered. He noted that the current RSA states that construction of a new driveway has to be in the safest location. Mr. Richardson said the current driveway at 25 Piscataqua Street is at a point where there is less of a grade change and in a straight section of the street.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the area where the current driveway is located would be utilized to mitigate stormwater by adding a rain garden at a location to collect roof runoff.

Chair Horgan asked if there would be a grade difference between the street and the driveway once it is excavated.

Mr. Chagnon responded that the street is at 21.8 feet and the driveway is planned to be at 21.7 feet.

The site walk adjourned and the members returned to Town Hall to begin the Planning Board Meeting.

Planning Board Meeting  
May 28, 2014  
7:00 PM  
Town Hall

**Public Hearing for applicants Christine Strong and David Murphy, 25 Piscataqua Street, Map 18, Lot 41, permit for relocation of a driveway.**

**Members Present:** Darcy Horgan, Patty Cohen, Ned Robinson, Eric Katz, Dave McArdle

**Members Not Present:** Kate Murray and David Houston

**Others Present:** Marc Batchelder, Larry Gormley, John Chagnon, Cynthia Thomas, Susan and Roger Epstein, Pamela Cullen, Linda Zacher, Rita Fusco, Christine Strong, David Murphy, Phil Fusco, Brandon Strong, Sarah Flause, Justin Richardson, Holly Biddle, Jeff Reilly, Allen Grundy, James Sullivan

Chair Horgan called the May 28, 2014 meeting of the New Castle Planning Board to order at 7:02 PM and welcomed and thanked those present for attending.

Chair Horgan noted that the voting members for the evening for all matters other than the driveway relocation permit would be herself, Patty Cohen, Ned Robinson, Eric Katz and David McArdle.

Chair Horgan noted that the voting members for the driveway relocation permit would be herself, Patty Cohen and Ned Robinson. She explained that members Eric Katz and Dave McArdle are abutters to 25 Piscataqua Street so are recused as members for discussion and voting on the permit.

**1. Public Hearing for applicants Christine Strong and David Murphy, 25 Piscataqua Street, Map 18, Lot 41, permit for relocation of a driveway.**

Chair Horgan began the discussion of the driveway relocation for 25 Piscataqua Street at 7:06 pm.

Chair Horgan explained that the Planning Board is charged to review the permit application with regard to the point of access from the town's right of way to the property line and to look at safety, visibility, drainage and any other ordinances that pertain to the application in addition to questions regarding general planning within the Master Plan on the Island.

John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering introduced Christine Strong, one of the property owners.

Christine Strong said that she and David Murphy purchased the home at 25 Piscataqua Street this past October with the intent of restoring it from the duplex it currently is to a one family home for them to live in. She said they hired the architect, Ann Whitney, who is experienced working with historic homes. Ms. Strong said they intend to restore and rebuild the house to its original street frontscape as requested by the Historic District Commission. She said they have worked diligently with the HDC and their guidelines to maintain the existing cape. Ms. Strong said this property was attractive to them because the lot allowed them to build without requiring zoning relief or variances due to the lot size. She said they have met with the abutters consistently and have attempted to be transparent with their plans. Ms. Strong said they met with the neighbors next door, the Fusco's, in an attempt to address their concerns. She said their plan for the home rests on relocating the driveway and noted that they are required to keep the foundation in the existing location. Ms. Strong said they would like to take advantage of the southern exposure, create appropriate runoff and drainage and address water and foundation issues by relocating the driveway to the opposite side of the property. She said they spoke with the Town's road agent, Steve Tabbutt, about the proposed relocation of the driveway. He issued a letter of approval stating he had no significant issues but asked them to work carefully and within appropriate guidelines when removing ledge and grass. Ms. Strong said they met with the Historic District Commission and continue to work with them. Now they are here to address concerns of the residents in New Castle regarding the driveway. She said this has been a difficult process for them and noted that they are committed to building a beautiful home with gardens that complement the other homes on the street. Ms. Strong said they hope to address questions that the Planning Board members may have and to receive approval to relocate the driveway and keep the project moving forward.

John Chagnon noted that Ann Whitney prepared a model of the home and Ms. Strong displayed this to the Board. The model showed the effect of the current ledge and what the view would be with the proposed change in the ledge.

Patty Cohen asked if the model reflects the height of the ledge as well, and Ms. Strong replied that it does.

Chair Horgan asked if the post on the model represents the utility pole near the property, and Ms. Strong said it does.

Ms. Strong demonstrated where the turnaround and garage would be located on the back of the house.

Mr. Chagnon said they submitted a copy of the driveway permit application and a set of drawings which include the existing condition plan (c1) showing what is currently on the site, the proposed site plan (c2) which includes details of the proposed addition to the structure, the new driveway location, calculations relative to New Castle ordinances and grading that will be undertaken to deal with the storm water runoff from the addition and a detail sheet (c3) with notes about erosion control and rain garden construction. He said

the property does not need relief from any ordinance and the dimensions fall within the purview of the ordinance. Mr. Chagnon said there is a letter from the road agent which recommends proper procedures regarding removal of the ledge.

Mr. Chagnon said the relocation of the driveway is a good opportunity to provide for adequate storm water treatment for the addition. He noted that the low side of the property is where the driveway is currently located and by moving the driveway they can direct the roof runoff and construct a rain garden in the area to infiltrate the runoff. Mr. Chagnon said this process would provide treatment that would not occur if the driveway remains where it is. He said the change will not interrupt the flow of water down the street and noted that the driveway will pitch away from the abutter to the north and go out to the street. Mr. Chagnon said that one third of the driveway will pitch out directly to the street and follow the gutter line and that in the back of the property the water will come around and flow through the rain garden before getting to the street and the catch basin. He said he feels that the design provides adequate auto turning movement to provide the ability to turn around and face the street when leaving the driveway and entering the one way street. Mr. Chagnon said the proposed location provides an improved sight distance to the right. He said there is no change of use at the property and the relocation of the driveway will provide the extra benefit of allowing the applicants to take care of issues on the north side where ledge is up against the foundation and causes a water problem. Mr. Chagnon said the design will allow the applicant to properly repair the foundation on that side.

Ned Robinson asked if most or all of the water from the roof of the proposed addition will drain to the south.

Mr. Chagnon replied that approximately half of the roof runoff will drain to the south.

Mr. Robinson asked if the other half will drain to the driveway and Piscataqua Street.

Mr. Chagnon replied that half will flow to the low side and the other half will flow to the rain garden.

Chair Horgan asked if that is how the current roof runoff flows.

Mr. Chagnon replied that currently both the front and back flow out the back corner where the driveway is currently located.

Chair Horgan asked if there is a water issue in the basement.

David Murphy replied that the ledge on the one side of the property continues into the basement and that elevation is higher than the foundation which leads to the possibility of water issues.

Patty Cohen asked if the ledge is located in the house as the foundation at that point. She also asked if they are intending to remove the ledge if the driveway is approved.

Mr. Murphy said they have not decided on whether or not to remove the ledge located inside the house. He said they are hopeful that reducing the elevation to the level they are proposing would stop the flow of water and would make it so they would not need to remove the ledge in the basement.

Mr. Chagnon said they will review the foundation and water issue as the ledge is removed and see if it makes sense to remove it and put in a proper foundation. He said with the new design they will be able to direct the water away from the house so removing the ledge from the foundation may not be necessary.

Ms. Cohen asked if there are ways to mitigate the problem with the runoff going into the foundation without removing the ledge, perhaps by channeling the water.

Mr. Chagnon said the ability to deal with that issue is a side benefit and is not driving the design of the driveway.

Chair Horgan asked if there is currently a water issue in the basement.

Ms. Strong said the architect assumes that the foundation will need to be shored up and that aiding the water issue is an added benefit to the design of the driveway being on that side of the house. She noted that the property slopes upward, so the water will naturally run down to where the rain garden is planned.

Mr. Murphy said there is significant negative grade on the property and there is a sump pump installed in the basement. He noted that they are not living there currently so are not aware of the water issue first hand.

Chair Horgan opened up the Public Hearing for public comments at 7:31 pm.

Justin Richardson introduced himself saying he is an attorney speaking on behalf of the Fusco's – who are direct abutters. Mr. Richardson distributed copies of a letter submitted to the Board of Selectmen. He said the Fusco's are not opposed to expanding and improving the building, but the driveway is a difficult issue. Mr. Richardson said the proximity of the driveway to the Fusco's property line is a problem since it is so close. He said the proposal to relocate the driveway is intended to maximize the applicants' view and is not due to a need regarding flooding. Mr. Richardson said the Board needs to review driveway regulations and decide if this proposal complies. He cited several sources, ordinances and regulations with regard to driveways. Mr. Richardson said the existing driveway is on the lower side of the property and noted that the proposed location improves the sight distance looking to the right, but will not improve the sight distance to the left where bicyclists, joggers and pedestrians may approach. He noted that the height of the rock wall is 26 feet at the highest and that will be reduced to 21.5 feet which is greater than the safe sight measurements. Mr. Richardson said when a car is situated eight or ten feet into the driveway there is a blind spot which is a concern and suggests safety concerns. He said that subdivision regulations state a driveway cannot be

located within 50 feet of the intersection of two public roads (Piscataqua Street and Salamander Lane). Mr. Richardson said it falls on the Planning Board to decide if the proposed location is the safest location or if the existing driveway is the safest location. He said the remaining ledge creates an obstruction to the view to the left. Mr. Richardson said as a safety matter it is not optimal to have two driveways next to each other. He said it is a difficult decision and it may be helpful to review the regulations and statutes which say the location shall be selected to most adequately protect the safety of the public.

Larry Gormley said he is an attorney speaking on behalf of Mr. Murphy and Ms. Strong. He said that Mr. Richardson has made reference to regulations that do not apply. He said that driveway permits are issued based on the Road Agent recommendation. Mr. Gormley said his clients met with the road agent, then the Select Board, who informed them that the Planning Board has authorization on driveway permits. He noted that this permit does not involve a subdivision and is not a legal change of use. Mr. Gormley said that 25 Piscataqua Street was and will be a residence. He said the only consideration for this board is the curb cut and there is nothing in the permit that impacts zoning regulations. Mr. Gormley said that the Fusco driveway has the same issues that the proposed driveway would have and said the proposed plan is disturbing to them and others that do not want to see the ledge removed. He said the applicants have the right to rely on the regulatory framework and they have done that. Mr. Gormley said the application is straight forward and simple and suggested that the members look at the Zoning Regulations and see that they are not applicable.

Justin Richardson noted that in the Town of New Castle the exercise of driveway permitting authority is conferred upon the Planning Board. He noted that grandfathering applies not only to changes of use but also to using a property in a substantially different manner, which is what is being contended.

Larry Gormley said 25 Piscataqua is used as a residence. He said historically, New Castle has authorized the road agent to issue driveway permits.

Patty Cohen told Mr. Gormley that the Select Board has held authority over driveway permits for 25 years not knowing that the Planning Board actually held that authority. She said that historically the Select Board would request the input of the Road Agent when considering a permit.

Mr. Gormley said that subdivision rules do not apply at this location and said that the town of New Castle could give the road agent the authority.

Holly Biddle said she lives two houses south of the property on Piscataqua Street. She said the key issue is how dangerous it is to have the driveway next to the rock and not have visibility of children on the road, bicyclists and skateboarders, etc. coming south on the road. Ms. Biddle said there is also the issue of cars that do not know Piscataqua is a one way street that come down the road the wrong way. She said to her the key issue is safety.

Cynthia Thomas, Atkinson Street, asked if the driveway is not moved how the residents will have access.

Chair Horgan said there is an existing driveway.

Ms. Thomas asked why they wish to relocate the driveway.

Chair Horgan said the owners wish to add on to the property and to gain a water view on the side where the existing driveway is and to gain southern exposure. She said that the living space would be oriented to that side of the property where the current driveway is located.

Christine Strong said they wish to angle the house and garage to capture the sun in the living space.

Ms. Thomas asked what would happen if the board votes against the permit.

Mr. Chagnon contended that that question does not need to be answered tonight.

David Murphy said that working with the existing structure in the current location makes it difficult to construct an addition with adequate lighting.

Pam Cullen, Becker Lane, agreed that this is a difficult decision between property rights and abutters in the town. She asked the members to think of several items; (1) the safety issue of having four driveways in the same proximity, (2) there are options for the property owners, (3) what is the best decision for all involved.

Jeff Reilly said he lives behind 25 Piscataqua Street. He said he has seen a lot of change in New Castle and thinks that the weight should go to the property owner, then safety, then the significance of the change being requested. Mr. Reilly said that he thinks what is being proposed is fairly trivial and he does not understand the significance. He said the property owners' interest is important and deserves serious consideration.

Sarah Flause, Piscataqua Street, said she lives in this town because of its old homes and old landscapes. She said she has not moved her driveway and has not built a garage, because that is the way the homes were built and is the way they are supposed to be. Ms. Flause said the way the houses are is the history of New Hampshire and should not be taken lightly.

Rita Fusco, Piscataqua Street, said this process has been really difficult and began in October. She said she feels this is not a good plan and not the right thing to do. Ms. Fusco said the owners have worked well with the Historic District Commission, but she feels the relocation of the driveway will have a negative impact for her property and is not the correct thing to do.

Allen Grundy, 63 Piscataqua Street, said he used to live at 25 Piscataqua Street as a renter. He said his concern is from a natural aesthetic view regarding the rock formation, which

is unique. Mr. Grundy said he would hate to see it be cut through and scar up the landscape when there is an adequate driveway. He said he does not think it is necessary to relocate the driveway since there is currently a driveway.

Christine Strong said they are looking forward to being part of a neighborhood and appreciate the aesthetics of that neighborhood. She said they are not planning on removing all of the rock and plan to landscape around it. Ms. Strong said their intent is to have beautiful plantings and outcroppings to complement the area. She said there will be some rock removed. Ms. Strong said they purchased the home because it did not need variances. She said she appreciates what has been said, but the discussion is centering on a small part of her property, and she requests that they be allowed to do this so that they can capture the sun and the view and move the living space to the south side of the property. Ms. Strong said she does not think it is an unreasonable request. She said they are trying to build a beautiful home in a beautiful community on the property they purchased.

Eric Katz, 18 Becker Lane, said his motto is “live and let live”. He said he has no opinion; but the owners can remove the ledge at any point without needing approval from the Town. Mr. Katz said he never really noticed the ledge, and the owners have the right to remove it. He said the proposed additions meet the setbacks and the aesthetics and designs are the purview of the HDC. Mr. Katz said the point being discussed is a safety issue. He said the Fusco’s have two driveways, and one is adjacent to the proposed driveway. Mr. Katz said the street is a one way street and the same issue that the proposed driveway faces can be faced further up the road. He urged the Board to make a decision based on if it is a reasonable use of the property and not on emotion.

Phil Fusco said his property has two driveways and they are very careful about pulling out due to the safety issues being discussed. He said putting in a driveway next to theirs will compound the risk. Mr. Fusco said there is a driveway on their property that is suitable. He said there are people that walk the street and enjoy the view of the rock formation. Mr. Fusco said that many people have commented to him about losing the view of the rock. He asked what is more important, the property owners view of the ocean or more people’s view of the rock. Mr. Fusco said the owners have done an outstanding job of maintaining the aesthetic of the neighborhood, but he has a problem with the safety of the proposed driveway.

John Chagnon said the argument that the proposed driveway is too close to Salamander Drive is not appropriate because the existing driveway is close to Becker Lane. Mr. Chagnon said he feels the proposed driveway is safe. He said during the site walk they took measurements and the ledge tapers off so there is a view over the ledge to the north. Mr. Chagnon said there is adequate view and noted that more of the ledge could be removed to improve the view if that is what the Board would like. He said the applicants wanted to preserve as much of the ledge as possible because they felt it was important to the neighbors. Mr. Chagnon said the issue of the ledge will be discussed by other boards.

Phil Fusco said that the view from the proposed driveway is obstructed by their lilac bushes and they would be happy to trim the bush, but the view is still restricted by the home. He said where the current driveway is located allows a view past his house and the lilac bush.

Justin Richardson said he agrees with Mr. Katz that it is not an aesthetic issue. He argued however, that the location should be that which provides the most protection to those traveling. Mr. Richardson said he thinks the project is possible if the structure is moved further back and the driveway stays where it is currently located.

Mr. Gormley again said that this location is not a subdivision and does not need to adhere to subdivision regulations. He noted that the Town's Road Agent's opinion is what should be considered, and he had no issues with the relocation of the driveway.

Ann McAndrew said she has lived in New Castle since 1939. She noted that the Fusco's house used to be a duplex which is why there are two driveways on the property. She noted it is a preexisting non-conforming item and to have another non-conforming item next to it makes it doubly dangerous.

Chair Horgan closed the public comments section of the Public Hearing at 8:27 pm.

Chair Horgan acknowledged that the Board's job tonight is to look at the point of access; where the driveway entrance meets the right of way; and look at it as far as safety, drainage and visibility.

Patty Cohen said from her perspective there are two issues that she is surprised have not been discussed, but are of concern to her. First is the blasting issue. Ms. Cohen said there are stringent State regulations with regard to blasting, and it is of concern to the Town if blasting poses any safety issues. She said the board has not learned if the ledge removal would be by blasting or jack hammering and what the issues associated would be. Ms. Cohen noted there is some history regarding blasting that was done when the sewer pipes were laid that caused issues. Ms. Cohen said she is also concerned that pulling around the utility pole (which will stay in place) will create a potential issue, especially during the winter when snow banks come into play.

Chair Horgan noted that the file for this application contains several letters (seven) that were opposed to the project and two in favor of the project. She said the blasting issue is noted in the letters as a concern.

Ned Robinson said the rock can be chipped or blasted. He said RSA does state that before any construction commences they need to consider the safety of the traveling public. Mr. Robinson said he has reservations about both locations of the driveway and agreed that the utility pole is a big concern. He said while there is planned to be a turnaround there is the possibility of someone backing down the driveway which would increase the safety issue. Mr. Robinson said the road narrows at that point.

Chair Horgan said that visibility is a big issue. She said to her it is clear that the visibility from the proposed driveway is less than what they currently have due to the curve in the road. Chair Horgan said there is not as much visibility from the proposed driveway and the utility pole is a safety issue because it is an obstruction. She said the curve and change in elevation causes concern also. Chair Horgan said she stood at the spot of a driver coming out of the driveway and did not have a good view. Visibility is blocked, and even though it is a one-way street, there are pedestrians, bicyclists and others coming in that direction, and they need to be considered. She said the Board needs to consider if this is a safe driveway. An engineering standard is 250' of visibility and is needed when entering a road of 35 to 50 mph. Given the slow speed of this road, one could cut that number in half, perhaps, or even a bit less than that. Chair Horgan noted that there are only approximately 25 feet of visibility to the left when leaving the driveway. She asked the board to consider if that is enough to be a safe driveway even given that it is a one-way street.

Ms. Cohen said the photos of the property show the relationship of the utility pole to the road and to the potential driveway and the issues that it raises.

Chair Horgan noted that there are only 20 to 21 feet from the garage entrance to the edge of the driveway. The rule of thumb is that at least 25 to 30 feet are needed to back out a car and turn it so it can exit a driveway nose first as opposed to backing out. Without the necessary distance, a driver would need to do a three-point turn in order to exit nose first. Chair Horgan said that increases the chances that some people will back out of this driveway which increases the danger of the driveway. She said there is also the issue of the blasting. Chair Horgan said the Town could require an independent engineering report regarding the blasting to determine if it would result in damage to the road, the utility line or the foundations of the houses.

Ms. Cohen noted that that would create additional expense and time to the applicant.

Mr. Robinson said in order to render a well-educated decision information should be presented to us regarding the blasting impact.

Chair Horgan said it has not been determined if the ledge would be chipped or blasted. She suggested that a study analyzing which would be the best way is needed.

Mr. Robinson said the Town should also take into consideration if the applicant would need to indemnify anyone that would suffer damage from the blasting.

Ms. Cohen said there are very strict State regulations on blasting; but they do not deal with the safety issues of the Town. She said she would say that the utility pole and the turning radius around the utility pole should also be studied.

Ms. Cohen said in winter the utility pole would pose an issue. She noted it is a tight area and there is not a lot of extra space between where the ledge is and the pole is located. Ms. Cohen said she finds it to be a concern and finds the proposed location to be less safe

than the driveway that exists. She noted that the road turns, and there is less of a line of sight at the proposed location of the driveway.

Chair Horgan said she concurs and given that the Board's charge is to look at the safety issue, she looks at it and concludes that it is not a safe place for the driveway. She noted that there exists a driveway with better visibility than the proposed.

Mr. Robinson said it has been pointed out that our main concern is the safety issue.

Ms. Cohen agreed that safety is the Planning Board's main concern.

Chair Horgan said in the winter the addition of piles of snow creates even more of an issue. She said she is sensitive to the fact that homeowners have a right to develop their property for their enjoyment, but it should not be at the expense of the safety of the general public.

Chair Horgan noted that the issue of removing a portion of the rock outcropping plays a part in this issue as well. She said it is a short, historic street and the natural rock formation goes as far back as these houses (they were built around that rock). Chair Horgan read from the town's Master Plan which has as one of its objectives to "Protect, preserve, and restore the island's natural resources and features which make up the unique character and physical attractiveness of the Island." She sees this ledge as a natural feature on one of the town's most historic streets that should be protected if at all possible. Removing a significant portion of this ledge was one of the biggest issues in the letters from abutters and neighbors. Concern for this ledge should not be discounted. Chair Horgan agreed that on its own, the issue of the rock outcropping might not be enough to supersede the rights of the homeowners, however, it should be taken into consideration.

Chair Horgan said the question of where the water and sewer lines are located has not been fully answered and it is not known if that would come into play.

Chair Horgan said that any blasting and its impact relative to the infrastructure is a question and would need to be addressed.

Chair Horgan said she is mindful of the applicant's rights, and based on the opinion of the Road Agent who said the proposed driveway was fine, the applicant went ahead on a new design with an architect.

Chair Horgan said what has not been done is to go back to the architect and ask if there is another design that would accomplish the southern exposure and some view and still use the current driveway. She reiterated that the Board is concerned about the safety of the proposed driveway and the blasting aspect.

*Patty Cohen MOVED that the Planning Board deny the driveway permit to relocate the driveway to the right side of the house at 25 Piscataqua Street; this was SECONDED by Ned Robinson and APPROVED unanimously.*

2. Review and approve minutes from April 23, 2014 and February 19, 2014

Minor corrections were made to the February 19, 2014 minutes.

Eric Katz MOVED to approve the February 19, 2014 minutes as amended; this was SECONDED by Patty Cohen and APPROVED unanimously.

Minor corrections were made to the April 23, 2014 minutes.

David McArdle MOVED to approve the April 23, 2014 minutes as amended; this was SECONDED by Ned Robinson and APPROVED unanimously.

3. Old business – there was none discussed at this meeting.
4. New business – there was none discussed at this meeting.
5. Correspondence – there was none discussed at this meeting.
6. Adjourn

*Patty Cohen MOVED to adjourn the May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2014 meeting of the New Castle Planning Board at 9:07 pm; this was SECONDED by Ned Robinson and APPROVED unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted by,

Sue Lucius, Secretary to the New Castle Planning Board