



**MEETING MINUTES**  
**BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**Early Childhood Learning Center**  
**77 Ramsdell Lane, Barrington, NH**  
**Tuesday April 16, 2013**  
**6:30 p.m.**

**ROLL CALL**

**Members Present**

John Huckins, Chair  
Alan Kelley, Vice-Chair  
Anthony Gaudiello  
Dawn Hatch, Ex-officio  
George Calef  
Jackie Kessler

**Alternate Members Present**

Stephen Jeffery

**Members Absent**

Steven Oles

**Town Planner**

Marcia Gasses

J. Huckins called to order the meeting at 6:33pm.

**NOTE: THESE ARE SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES ONLY. A COMPLETE COPY OF THE MEETING AUDIO IS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE LAND USE DEPARTMENT**

**MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

1. Approval of April 9, 2013 Meeting Minutes.

G. Calef made changes to line 68

G. Calef made a motion and A. Kelley seconded to accept the meeting minutes. This motion carried unanimously.

## **REPORT FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

### **2. Discussion on Barrington Village Enrichment Center landscaping change.**

M. Gasses explained that this was on Commerce Way at a daycare center. She said that over the winter they found that the landscaping was not in the best location due to plowing issues. They asked if they could take the current landscaping and use it somewhere else on the site.

G. Calef explained that it was a curb bump out that they wanted to move and they asked if they could take it out and make it straight.

G. Calef made a motion and D. Hatch seconded to accept the landscaping revision. This motion carried unanimously.

### **3. Discussion with Wayne Noyes owner of Generator Connection on Sign for new tenant.**

Wayne Noyes explained that he would like to put up another sign farther down the lot. It would be another sign with the same shape as the one he has now. He explained that it is a green sign with yellow lettering and it meets the setbacks from the state. Originally he only wanted to put up one sign but the zoning says there can be a sign for each establishment. The sign will be 6 feet by 5 feet.

J. Huckins asked if it was in highway commercial.

Wayne Noyes explained that it was.

M. Gasses asked if there were 3 tenants in there, would they allow 3 separate signs.

The board discussed this issue based upon the district he is in. They were hoping to answer the question on what the definition of establishment was and whether 2 separate businesses would allow for 2 separate road signs.

G. Calef explained the other options of having a roof sign and a wall signs.

Wayne Noyes explained that he wouldn't want to have this because he didn't want to compromise the buildings neatness and aesthetics.

T. Gaudiello suggested that the board recommends he submit a waiver based on his reasoning and asked if there was anything else we could advise the applicant to do.

J. Huckins agreed with T. Gaudiello and said that he could work to redesign his existing sign.

G. Calef suggested he redesign his signs because there was too much lettering on the sign.

M. Gasses suggested another thing they could do is waive the size of the sign requirement so it could be bigger.

Wayne Noyes said he would discuss with the tenant what they would do if they can't do separate signs. He then said what he was going to do is make the sign a little bit taller and move their open signs to open flag on the columns. He does not want to do roof signs, in order to keep the building looking neat and clean. He would redesign the sign to fit both the tenants' signs within the requirement.

J. Huckins said that he needs to put in an application to the board to go bigger with his sign. If he wants to change what the sign says and keep the same size, you do not need to come back before the board. D. Hatch wanted to make sure that he knew even if he requests a waiver it's not definite.

Wayne Noyes said that he wants to be good neighbors so what he will do for now is change the way to existing sign looks and maybe apply for the waiver and add another sign in the future. He said that if the tenant wants to pursue their own sign I will let them know, but for now we will share the same sign.

#### **4. Discussion on UNH Cooperative Extension Community and Economic Development Assistance.**

M. Gasses said that J. Huckins had given her information regarding a community economic and development assistance program available through UNH. She said that she had contacted Molly Donovan to speak with the board on May 21<sup>st</sup>. They assist in UNH Cooperative Extension to developing a community vision for a town master plan and they also create a community profile to help set up community outreach plans as they re-do their master plan. The cost is minimal of \$500-\$2500 and she had put this into the budget in the master plan. The alternative would have cost in the range of \$20,000.

J. Huckins it might be worth giving a copy of this to the selectman because they can consider asking for an economic development committee.

G. Calef said that we need to find, zone and locate areas for economic development because we are the only committee that can do zoning. He suggested that they need to plan to put in places of economic development for the future that are not going to impact residential neighborhoods.

J. Huckins and D. Hatch discussed the last master plan update.

J. Huckins said that they are all on board with having these people come in.

#### **5. Discussion with Josh Bouchard about his interest in becoming an alternate member of the planning board and his Maple Sugar Business.**

Josh Bouchard said that as they have expanded their operations they would want to expand the building he would like to expand with an addition or replace the building altogether. He would prefer to replace the building altogether and was just asking what his options are.

The board discussed the law with home occupations or business and the definitions of detached single family dwellings in zoning.

J. Huckins said that he was trying to find a way for him so he did not have to come before the board and go through the whole planning board process.

Josh Bouchard explained that if he replaced the building then he wouldn't want to do it until next year.

J. Huckins said he fell under the home business of 7.4 and there was a list of 11 criteria so what he would have to do is come before the planning board for a conditional use permit. After this the planning board need to set up is a minor site. So what he needs to do is fill out a full application to ask for a conditional use.

T. Gaudiello said the best advice he would give is the options being the most conservative and most likely to work.

J. Huckins said if his new plan would encroach on the setbacks then he would have to go to of the ZBA, if he expands into the legal area of where you could be then you would not be required to go to the ZBA.

M. Gasses said that unless he has a good reason as to why he cannot conform to the ordinance the ZBA probably would not let you do this.

#### **Comments on having Josh Bouchard on the planning board**

J. Huckins said to Josh Bouchard that because he was a fire fighter and the fire department met on Tuesday nights he wanted to make sure he was not spreading himself too thin.

Josh Bouchard said he was on an engineering board now because he is a civil engineer and he would give this up to pursue something else. He also said that he talked to Rick about splitting his time with the fire department.

G. Calef said he was a fire fighter for 43 years and never felt confident without being there on Tuesdays.

J. Huckins said that if his interest was serving the town you can also check out the ZBA and the Conservation Committee.

Josh Bouchard said that he would be interested in this and would think about other options for serving the town. He also mentioned how during maple season he is not available for two months.

J. Huckins suggested other options for helping the board by putting together a sub-committee for setting up regulations and other various things. He just wanted to make sure that he would not run away if he did not get approved by the selectman.

A. Kelley made a motion and T. Gaudiello seconded to recommend him to the selectman as an alternate. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Huckins explained where he needs to go from here.

## **REVIEW OF PLANS**

5. **223-6-RC-13-SIGN (The Storage Spot)** Request by applicant for a sign permit to replace signage located on a 4.01 acre site located at 248 Calef Highway (Map 223, Lot 6) in the Residential Commercial Zoning District. By: Sundance Sign Company; 39 Oak Street; Dover, NH 03820

M. Gasses explained that this was in regional commercial zoning. The sign is going in the same spot and meets the requirements at 31.9 square feet. She also thought that it would be internally lit but she will call him to specify.

The board discussed their rule of light and dark colors and what the rule specifies.

J. Huckins said the sign is going to meet the size but he needs to specify the colors and if it is internally lit he needs to request a waiver.

M. Gasses said that they cannot regulate the color of sign.

T. Gaudiello said that the applicant should need to address color, internally lit and the glare that it would cause.

## **COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED**

M. Gasses said that there was a memo that is a request for a recommendation for a building permit for an addition to an existing home, because it is on a private road it is not part of a subdivision. Because of this it requires a recommendation from the planning board to the selectman

J. Huckins explained why the selectman needs it and why they need a building permit.

M. Gasses showed a picture of the new house with the addition.

J. Kessler explained she would have no problem giving a recommendation to the selectman that they see no problem with this.

A. Kelley motioned and seconded by T. Gaudiello to tell the selectman that they see no issue. The motion carried unanimously.

## **REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

## 6. Discussion of Site Review and Subdivision Regulations.

A. Kelley said that on the timing of material in section 4 they have talked about making that consistent with the 15 days of subdivision. They are also looking at handling of meetings in looking at the office of energy and planning recommendations. They have not come up with anything written to put before the board yet.

T. Gaudiello said that the rules and procedures conflict with the subdivision regulations with respect to the 15 days of materials of shipment.

M. Gasses asked the board to look at the international building regulations.

T. Gaudiello asked if they could weave it into our regulations. One suggestion in there was moving signs from site review to zoning. If we did that then Tom would have signs for himself. If it went into zoning would signs ever come before us?

M. Gasses said no other than part of the site plan. If it did not follow the zoning it would go before the ZBA.

T. Gaudiello said that the international building regulations suggested putting signs in the zoning board. If it were in zoning, would people with signs have to come before the board?

The board discussed the positives, negatives, and feasibility of putting signs in zoning or leaving it to code enforcement. They discussed potential process changes.

T. Gaudiello said the three things they needed to do were to address cost, size, and location. The thoughts he had about addressing these issues were to put this into zoning and let someone else deal with, or to develop a way right now that we can invent processes to do this more efficiently or when it comes time to change the ordinance, write a minor site review process into it.

J. Huckins said there is a process called an administrative where a threshold can be set to what is going to be administrative and what is not.

M. Gasses said that she was for T. Gaudiello ideas on taking baby steps and streamline to process that is shorted and less expensive to see how it works.

The board agreed that this should not go into zoning and should stay on the planning board.

J. Huckins said that at this point in time we don't want to change anything in zoning all we want to do is work on site review to see if we can do a minor or not.

The board agreed that language should be created to make review of signs quicker and cheaper. They agreed that standards were not being changed. It was just a change in the process.

T. Gaudiello said that we now need to revert back to the business of signs. He said first thing to be done was to address the internally lit signs. We should revert back to the exact language of volume 3<sup>rd</sup> amended 2011 about the internally lit signs. We should accept internally lit signs with dark background light letters.

The board was okay accepting internally lit signs with dark background and light letters.

T. Gaudiello said the question arises of what is applicable sign review? If the sign is a part of a regular site review then it would seem that the sign is part of that review. What is the appropriate review process for a stand-alone sign? The questions that arose to him were if the sign is an off premise business sign, if the sign is an off premise directional sign it would require site review. Is this true?

J. Huckins said in 5.2.2 there are 11 things that if they have, they do not need a permit.

T. Gaudiello asked again about off premise business signs, off premise directional signs and a third any sign that seeks a waiver needs to come before the planning board.

The planning board agreed.

The board discussed the sizes of signs being too small and too restrictive and different ways they could work this out for limiting sizes. They discussed how there used to be one master sign with the name of the plaza and then reader board signs underneath that, all not exceeding a certain size.

The board went to their chart that worked to show the different sizes of signs allowed in different zones.

The board agreed that in the RC zone it would stay at 48 square feet with a maximum height of 15 feet. They added internally lit for the lighting type and the setback to be 15 feet.

The board discussed that Highway Commercial Overlay should have signs bigger than 12 square feet.

T. Gaudiello stated that what should be added is a comment in the additional remarks section that will read please refer to the home occupation and home business requirements in the ZO for signs.

The board continued to specify sizes for signs for home occupation and home business's.

J. Huckins said if someone was approved as a home business he would be allowed to have a little sign out by the road to let people know they are at the right place. If that person was set up as a business and went through site review then they could do the bigger sign. The 4 square foot sign is for home business and home occupation which is around homes that won't impact the other houses.

The board then discussed the sizes of sign for HCO and Village District.

J. Huckins thought that these should have similar standards because they are similar.

The planning board agreed with this.

The board agreed that the maximum square footage of the signs for these should be 32. They then brought up the maximum height and set it to 15 feet. They added internally lit to lighting arrangement and the setbacks should stay at 10 feet.

They then discussed the size of signs for Town Center.

They agreed to make the signs 32 square feet with a height of 15 feet. Keep the lighting the same and keep the setback at 10 feet.

T. Gaudiello stated that all the setbacks have remained the same and now the only thing that is left is the residential. He said that for home business and home occupation signs to see the ZO in 7.3 and 7.4 for home occupation and home business.

The board decided for general residential and neighborhood residential to leave the maximum area the same but put a note for home business and home occupation. They set the maximum height to 10 feet. They decided to not have internally lit signs in these zones. They added backlighting and side lighting. They agreed on 6 square feet for the maximum size of signs and a 5 foot setback.

T. Gaudiello stated that in 5.2.2 paragraph 5 reads 2 square feet in area or smaller. It should take out “or smaller” because it is redundant. There is a reference error in 5.2.2 paragraph 12 where it refers you to subsection 573 and it should be 574. There is a small edit in 5.2.82 there is an extra space in there. In 5.2.83 there should be an index before the words any nonconforming sign. In 5.3 paragraphs 6 sub section G, both integral signs and marquis signs have the same subparagraph index G so one should be G and one should be H.

T. Gaudiello stated that this finished signage.

D. Hatch asked if they were going to put a definition of building versus establishment.

The board discussed this citing other examples from the town for their reference.

D. Hatch suggested replace the word establishment with building.

J. Huckins suggested using the word lot instead of establishment.

T. Gaudiello stated that there were 3 ways to go on this thing, replacing establishment with building, replace it with lot, and M. Gasses was going to come up with what the judge said the definition was in the case she cited.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD**

### **SETTING OF DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT**

Next meeting will be May 7<sup>th</sup> at 6:30pm.

J. Kessler motioned and D. Hatch seconded to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

Other information. a) Files on the applications and items, above, including the full text of any proposed ordinances, regulations, or other initiatives are available for inspection in the Planning & Land Use Office, from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday; b) If you

are looking at this agenda on the Town's website, you can click on any underlined projects and other items to access additional information; c) This agenda, these applications, and other items are subject to errors, omissions, and change prior to final action; d) Some agendas are marked as "Preliminary Agenda". These are subject to change. The final agenda will be prepared on the Thursday evening prior to the meeting and will be posted on the Town's website; e) Contact the Planning & Land Use Department if you have questions or comments about these or any related matters or if you have a disability requiring special provision.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the Land Use Office at 603.664.5798. Requests should be made 5 days in advance.