



Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Wednesday October 22, 2025

Meeting called to order at 6:00 PM on Wednesday, October 22.

Board Present: Alecia Loveless, Jerry Blanchard, Rob Gilgen, Linda Moore, April Hibberd and Sally Fitzgerald

Absent: Sean Gawlik

Public Present: Mary Moritz, Cheryl Jensen, Chris Jensen, Veronica Morris

Minutes: September 24 minutes – Tabled

Continued Business: None

Littleton Elks Lodge Sign Permit Application: (42 Main St., Map 403 Lot 17, Zoning District 2)

The Elks Lodge erected an internally lit 5 ft by 4 ft electronic sign in August 2024. The Zoning Board has approved a Variance since the sign does not conform to the Zoning Ordinance. The application is in front of the Planning Board to receive final approval of their sign permit application.

Discussion included installation without permit, enforcement timeline, ongoing violation status, variance conditions and code enforcement actions.

The Board requested clarification on the Variance conditions (turn-off times, dimming vs. off, roof/shield, message timing).

Sally Fitzgerald made a motion to send John Moodie a letter in regard to the violations. Due to lack of a second, Sally rescinded her motion.

Motion: Rob Gilgen made a motion to deny the sign permit application because it does not meet the Variance conditions as issued by the ZBA. Linda Moore seconded, all in favor.

Application denied due to non-compliance with Variance Conditions.

Motion: April Hibberd made a motion that the applicant must turn the sign off until the application has been approved by the Planning Board. Alecia seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Motion: Jerry Blanchard made a motion that the Board attempt to make verbal contact with the applicant to address the conditions of the ZBA and that the sign be turned off until the conditions are met. Linda Moore seconded. Alecia, Jerry, Rob, Linda and April in favor, Sally opposed. **Motion carried.**



Alecia Loveless opened the **Public Hearing** at 6:37 PM for the proposed Site Plan Review Regulations amendments to include noise regulations.

Veronica Morris and Cheryl Jensen of the Conservation Commission presented the proposed amendments to the Site Plan Review Regulations. They worked with the Noise Pollution Clearinghouse to create the amendments which would add measurable decibel levels and require sufficient buffer strips to protect the residents and small-town character of Bethlehem while allowing commercial and industrial development.

Proposed Site Plan Review Regulations Amendments

1. Article 6 – Section 6.02 (C. #25)
 - a. **Add** “to comply with the requirements of Section 10.08 D and other applicable regulations”
 - b. **Final Format** “Noise that can reasonably be expected to be heard beyond the property lines, including hours and duration of impact. Applicants may be required to provide a noise study report including decibels, noise level contours, and list of remedies to reduce impacts to neighboring property and public areas to comply with the requirements of Section 10.08 D and other applicable regulations.”
2. Article 10 – Section 10.05 (B.)
 - a. **Add** “Buffer strips shall be sufficient to limit noise to the levels permitted in Paragraph 10.08 D.”
 - b. **Final Format** “Sufficient buffer strips shall be provided to reduce noise and provide privacy between the proposed development and abutting residential areas or other incompatible uses. Buffer strips shall be sufficient to limit noise to the levels permitted in Paragraph 10.08 D. Buffer strips shall contain vegetation to screen the site during winter months.”
3. Article 10 – Section 10.08 Add new bullet point (D.)
 - a. **Add in final format** D. “Noise shall be controlled so that noise levels do not exceed either of the following criteria at and beyond the property boundary:
 1. 37 dBA Leq (15 min.) between 10 PM and 7 AM (nighttime).
 2. 47 dBC Leq (15 min.) between 10 PM and 7 AM (nighttime).

There were a few clarifying questions about the amendments.

1. Why were there two different sound levels for the same time period?
 - a. It was explained that dBA measures medium to high frequency sounds more accurately and dBC measures low frequency more accurately.
2. What is the enforceability on existing commercial or industrial uses?
 - a. It was explained that although this would not regulate existing commercial/industrial uses, if those entities were to file a site plan amendment, they would then have to conform with the proposed changes if adopted.



3. Are these proposed changes for daytime/nighttime hours?
 - a. It was explained that the proposed amendments are specifically for nighttime.
4. Are the changes going to regulate the neighbors making noise with generators, guns, fireworks, racecars, animals, etc.?
 - a. It was explained that agricultural uses are not regulated per State law. However, agritourism can be regulated, for example a loud wedding venue.
 - b. These changes will only affect commercial and industrial uses that go before the Board for site plan review and single-family housing does not go before the Planning Board, therefore not regulated under these changes.
5. Who would do the decibel readings?
 - a. A Code Enforcement, Health Officer, or Police Officer.

The proposed amendments were created so that entities would plan accordingly in the hope to prevent violations, give a level to refer to when the Town proposes enforcement actions and when reviewing a site plan, it gives a limit so that the Planning Board will have reference as to what sound contours should be.

Motion: Linda Moore made a motion to amend the Site Plan Regulations with the recommendations set forth by the Conservation Commission. Rob Gilgen seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Alecia Loveless closed the public hearing at 6:59 PM.

Alecia Loveless called for any other business.

Public Participation

Cheryl Jensen and Veronica Morris wanted to clarify that the Board received a copy of proposed Industrial and Commercial Noise Regulations to be added to the Zoning Ordinance, which are separate proposals from what the Board had just approved. However, the copy they received had changes and comments attached to it as there was a misunderstanding that these changes would not be going into the Site Plan Regulations but will be going into the Zoning Ordinance.

They are requesting that the document be reverted to its original form and sent to legal for review.

Motion: April made a motion to send the proposed noise ordinance to legal. Jerry Blanchard seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Board and Administrative Communications

Zoning Ordinance Recommendations:

Accessory Dwelling Units updates recommended to align with House Bill 577 (RSA 674:71–73) allowing one attached or detached ADU per single-family residence; severability ensures state law prevails if local amendment fails.



Motion: Jerry Blanchard made motion to adjourn at 7:18 PM. Rob Gilgen seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Emerson
Interim Planning & Zoning Clerk