

**MINUTES  
CHARLESTOWN PLANNING BOARD  
OCTOBER 7, 2014**

Members Present: Robert Frizzell (Chair), Sharon Francis (Vice-Chair), Steve Neill (Ex-Officio Member), Richard Lincourt, Rose Smith-Hull

Alternates Present: There were no alternate members present.

Staff Present: David Edkins – Planning & Zoning Administrator  
Regina Borden – Recording Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER & SEATING OF ALTERNATES:** Mr. Frizzell called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. He noted that regular members, Pat Royce and Roger Thibodeau, and alternate member, Mr. John Bruno, were not present. Mr. Lincourt is expected but will be late. Mr. Frizzell advised that meetings are tape recorded and asked anyone wishing to speak to identify themselves for the record.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2014:**

The Minutes were passed over due to lack of a quorum. Mr. Neill could not vote as he was not present at this meeting.

**SMALL FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST (LARRY & DONNA SMALL, TRUSTEES), Cont'd.- Two (2) Lot Subdivision – 96 James Street – Map 112, Lot 13 – Zone A-1 (Rural Residential):** Mr. Frizzell summarized that at the last meeting the PB members voted for completeness but asked that the plan be revised to show the driveway to the garage. Mr. Edkins advised that the Driveway Permit was approved by Highway Superintendent Keith Weed. There were no abutters present at this meeting.

**Mrs. Francis moved to grant final approval to the Small Family Revocable Trust for a two lot subdivision at 96 James Street. Mr. Neill seconded the motion. With four members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**WHELEN ENGINEERING CO., INC. – 660 Sq. Foot Addition to Existing Manufacturing Facility – 99 CEDA Road – Map 106, Lot 3 – Zone F-1 (Industrial/Business):** Mr. Edkins advised that the addition is highlighted on the plan on display on the easel. Mr. John Olson explained that they need to add another stand-by generator to better prepare for power outages and it needs to be put in a shed. It will match the roof, structure and siding of the existing building. No abutters were present at this meeting. Mr. Frizzell noted that this will be an Amendment to the previously approved plan.

**Mrs. Francis moved to accept the application from Whelen Engineering Co., Inc. for a 660 square foot addition to the existing manufacturing facility as complete. Mrs. Smith-Hull seconded the motion. With four members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**Mr. Neill moved to grant final approval for Whelen Engineering Co., Inc. for a 660 square foot addition to the existing manufacturing facility, as submitted. Mrs. Francis seconded the motion. With four members in favor, the motion was approved.**

Mr. Olson advised that they want to change the entrance to Industrial Drive and their property. He displayed an engineer's rendition and aerial view. The flag pole will be taken down and put next to the road. The area will be landscaped. At the same time they will put up a new sign like the one that is there except it will be half the size. He hopes to get some granite posts to hold up the sign. The PB members had no objections; Mr. Neill noted that it is very attractive. Mr. Edkins advised that they will need to get a new Sign Permit as it is required anytime a sign is changed.

**Mrs. Francis moved approval of the changed sign subject to filling out the one page Sign Permit application. This includes the landscaping around the new sign. Mrs. Smith-Hull seconded the motion. With four members in favor, the motion was approved.**

*Mr. Lincourt arrived at this time.*

**TAMARA GOLDEN – Individual & Small Group Health Coaching as a Home Occupation – 276 Main Street – Map 118, Lot 1 – Zone A (Town Center Residential/Professional):** Mrs. Golden is a health coach and does health nutrition education. She does this for a company but would like to do some work on her own. She has a small office in the house that was formerly a doctor's office. There will be no exterior changes except for the sign. Mrs. Carol Clark, an abutter, was present but had no objections to this; it is a great idea. Mrs. Smith-Hull questioned a parking area. Mrs. Golden explained that it is just grass now.

**Mrs. Francis moved approval for completeness for Tamara Golden for a home occupation at 276 Main Street. Mrs. Smith-Hull seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**Mr. Lincourt moved to grant final approval for Tamara Golden for a home occupation at 276 Main Street. Mr. Neill seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**TAMARA GOLDEN – Sign Permit – 276 Main Street - Map 118, Lot 1 – Zone A (Town Center Residential/Professional):** Mr. Edkins displayed the color sketch of the proposed sign. It will be located just inside the sidewalk. The sign is within the regulations. Mrs. Golden advised that the sign might be lighted in the winter months but it will only be on when she is open in the evening. It will be 60-feet back from the road. The sign will be one sided facing toward the street.

**Mr. Neill moved to approve this Sign Permit for Tamara Golden as presented. Mrs. Smith-Hull seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**CAROD PROPERTIES – Sign Permits – 122-124 Main Street – Map 118, Lot 91 – Zone B (Business):** Mrs. Clark asked the carpenter to put up a sign saying “Entrance Only” but he went beyond that, to her surprise. Since she did not have approval she covered the top of the sign and left it saying “Entrance Only”. Mr. Edkins passed around color copies of the signs. The ZBA increased the total square footage of signage to 100 square feet on the property in recognition of the fact that there are three different businesses in two buildings on the same property. The ZBA felt this was reasonable due to the circumstances. They left it up to Mrs. Clark and Mrs. Flaig to decide how they wanted to divide the square footage up. It was based on the recognition that there would be a free-standing sign and signs on the building for Mrs. Flaig’s business. Mrs. Clark pointed out that when they met with the ZBA, Ms. Fisk wanted them to put a sign at the entrance to the Sumner House but because of the trees it would not show the sign or where Mrs. Flaig’s business is. Ms. Fisk wanted one free-standing sign and other signs to indicate where the businesses were so the only place they could put it was on the corner. This leaves Sumner House parking at a disadvantage because there is no indicator of where that is so they have been trying to come up with something to show where the restaurant entrance would be. Mrs. Francis pointed out that the signs have had a “rising sun” on them, she interpreted it as their logo, are they getting rid of it? Mrs. Clark said the top of the sign now curves up and gives the address. The “sunburst” was previously on there but it was never intended to be their logo. Mrs. Francis asked if the entrance sign size is big enough so drivers will see it. Mrs. Clark noted that what they have now conforms to the requirements. They would like a sign permit for a larger sign and they went back-and-forth between “Entrance Only” or “Restaurant Entrance Only” or “Restaurant Parking Entrance Only”. They would like to indicate that it is not Jiffy Mart parking. Mrs. Clark now has a large A-frame sign that states “Not an Exit”. Mr. Neill does not feel the A-frame is going to work in the winter time; it needs to be something free-standing. Mr. Frizzell suggested something at the end of the parking lot that says “Exit”; it would be considered a directional sign. Mrs. Clark asked about doing two signs; one parallel to Main Street facing into the parking lot stating “Not An Exit” and also put a directional arrow in the middle stating “Exit Only”. Mr. Frizzell pointed out that you can also drive in that way. They are looking to stop people from driving out onto Main Street. Mr. Neill noted that the “Not an Exit” sign needs to be on the Clark side of the sidewalk. Mrs. Clark would like to have something close to the driveway so people will not miss the restaurant entrance. She mentioned that they thought about resurfacing and painting the yellow arrow on it.

Mr. Edkins summarized that there is one permit for the whole package for the property for the free-standing sign, the two signs on the buildings and the directional type signs into the other parking lot. Mr. Lincourt questioned the illumination on the signs. Mrs. Clark said they are not sure what they are going to do yet. Mr. Edkins noted that they could have goose neck lights or ground mounted lights; their concern is that the ground mounted lights do not shine in the eyes of oncoming drivers. Mrs. Clark would like to get the permit approved so they could get the signs going and then come back for the lights. Mrs. Flaig has three separate doors. The “Main Street Nutrition with phone number” would be placed on the existing sign bracket; the salon entrance sign would be on the north entrance and protrude double sided. Responding to a question as to location of this sign from Mrs. Francis, Mr. Edkins stated that Mrs. Flaig can draw a diagram of where the sign will hang from the building. Mr. Frizzell summarized that Mrs. Clark does not need a permit for the directional signs. Mrs. Clark will have a sign that says “Do

Not Enter Here” and a sign that says “This Is an Exit” and in the future they might paint an arrow in the middle of the driveway.

**Mrs. Francis moved approval of the sign application for 122-124 Main Street for the free-standing sign for the Sumner House Restaurant, the protruding directional sign indicating the Salon entrance on the side of the building. The hanging sign with the design as presented for Main Street on the back side of the building is subject to the rendering of where it will be located on the building and an entrance sign on Main Street for the Sumner House that includes the logo.**

Mr. Edkins pointed out that they are only allowed one free standing sign per building but because there are two buildings they can have two free-standing signs. Mrs. Clark stated that the signs total well under 100 square feet. With two separate businesses and two entrances it is hard to show people where to go. They were trying to indicate where the three businesses are. Mr. Edkins stated that this package as presented is approvable and is within the intent of what the ZBA wanted. Several options for the signs were discussed.

**Mr. Lincourt seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**THE SUMNER HOUSE – Restaurant Sign:** Several options on the wording were discussed - “Entrance Only” or “Restaurant Entrance Only”. Mrs. Clark will talk to Mr. Edkins about this.

**Mr. Lincourt moved to table this application. Mrs. Francis seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**PUTNAM FARMS, INC. – Voluntary Merger – Old Cheshire Turnpike – Map 252, Lots 6 & 7 – Zone E (Mixed Use):** Mr. Edkins reported that Putnam Farms purchased three small properties that abut their existing properties and they want to merge the smaller parcels with their larger parcels. Lot #7 is one-third of an acre with a garage building on it that will be merged with Lot #6 that is ninety-six acres.

**Mr. Neill moved to approve this Voluntary Merger for Putnam Farms, Inc. Mrs. Smith-Hull seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**PUTNAM FARMS, INC. – Voluntary Merger – Old Cheshire Turnpike – Map 252, Lots 12 & 13 – Zone E (Mixed Use):** Lot #13 is 0.95 acres and is being merged with Lot #12 that is sixty-six acres. Neither parcel has any buildings on it.

**Mr. Neill moved to approve this Voluntary Merger for Putnam Farms, Inc. Mrs. Smith-Hull seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**PUTNAM FARMS, INC. – Voluntary Merger – Old Cheshire Turnpike – Map 252, Lots 18 & 29 – Zone E (Mixed Use):** Lot #18 is 3.3 acres and is being merged with Lot #29 that is

47 acres. Neither parcel has any buildings on it. Mr. Edkins pointed out that the combined lot would have road frontage as before the merger Lot #29 did not have any. They are making this lot more compliant than it was previously.

**Mr. Neill moved to approve this Voluntary Merger for Putnam Farms, Inc. Mrs. Smith-Hull seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**PLANNING & POLICY ISSUES:**

**Historic District Ordinance:** Mrs. Higgins, Chair of the Charlestown Heritage & Historic District Commission, was present to do a follow-up on the draft of the proposed Charlestown Historic District Ordinance that was distributed and discussed at the last PB meeting. Tomorrow they will have the first round table discussion in the Community Room. At their meeting a week or so ago they mostly had homeowners in the Historic District attending; they want to continue to be a part of the process. She wanted input from the PB tonight. They are not concerned about what is in dark ink as that would go into the regulations or guidelines. All they need to have ready for the Warrant is the lighter printed language.

Mr. Lincourt recommended, under Definitions, that “color” be deleted. Mrs. Higgins and Mr. Edkins have been having discussions about the Definitions portion. “Color” is in there because it was in their sample ordinance. Mrs. Higgins agreed that “color” will be deleted. She is concerned about adding to the Definitions so it would not conflict with what the PB has in their regulations. Mr. Edkins thinks it is appropriate to have Definitions in this Ordinance. They have a separate section called “Definitions” that is supposed to go in the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations and Site Plan Review Regulations. Each set of regulations should have their own set of “Definitions” in it.

Mr. Lincourt referenced Section E, Activities Requiring Review. He suggested they might clarify that those activities are only within the Historic Districts. No. 3 - he felt they might want to strike “sidewalks”. Under Section G, they might want to consider a false gable roof. Mr. Lincourt thinks fences and stone walls are appropriate. Mrs. Higgins said the only stone wall was by the Dutch Treat.

Mr. Edkins pointed out that if this Ordinance is passed the next task would be to put together regulations, they would have to hold a Public Hearing before adopting those regulations but the Historic Commission would be the ones to vote to adopt; the voters would not have any final say in the adoption of the regulations. Mrs. Higgins noted that their idea is to try to come up with something now that the majority of the Town is in favor of. The whole Town votes but it is only the people in the Historic District that are affected. Mr. Edkins pointed out that there are a few things that he needs to research further: Whether this would be considered the zoning from a State statutes standpoint because if it were two things would happen: 1) The people who are affected by it could put together a protest petition which would mean that it would have to be adopted by a two-thirds vote rather than a simple 50% majority. The other thing is that there is a new State statute that just went into effect this year that requires if they are going to make zoning amendments or changes that affect fewer than 100 properties the owners of those properties have

to be notified individually by regular mail. He is not sure if this affects Historic Districts or not yet; he will check on this. Mrs. Higgins believes that this is not considered zoning per se.

Mrs. Francis had some suggestions that she will bring to the meeting tomorrow. What they are looking for is a focus on appearance and aesthetics in that they relate to the Historic Districts. Future development would have to be compatible. She likes the idea of having the Commission issuing Certificates of Approval as they affect the structures of the Historic District and development in the historic boundaries of the District. For the property owners it would be difficult to get both Site Plan approval from the PB and get a Certificate from the Historic Commission. She suggested they consider removing anything from the Commission's purview that is already in the Site Plan so the applicants do not have to go to one or the other. They could have a statement within this Ordinance that would say that within the Ordinance they encourage the Historic Commission to advise the PB with regard to compatibility. Mrs. Higgins is not sure they can be a Historic Commission and not go through issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness in accordance with the RSAs. They will not be reviewing for the same things that the PB does. Mr. Edkins pointed out that the Site Plan Review piece would only affect commercial properties and multi-family residential property; the PB does not have Site Plan Review authority over single and two family residences. If somebody comes in to get a Building Permit to change a building that will trigger the Historic Commission's jurisdiction but if somebody wants to cut a tree, put in a new walkway or change the parking area there is no trigger so they need to think about what will trigger their jurisdiction over things other than actual building modifications. Mrs. Francis mentioned that there should be no over-lapping between the PB and Heritage Commission. Mrs. Higgins thinks a concern will be demolition but they cannot leave that out. Having a Historic District is having something that regulates some things that have not been regulated before. They will not be concerned about signs unless they do not conform to what was allowable; they might not feel it is appropriate for Main Street. They do not have a say on anything that is grandfathered.

Sue Coleman pointed out that the Historic Commission cannot change laws but they have a little bit of authority for them to look at these things. They are supposed to have an opinion and state it on the historic properties. Mrs. Francis presented an example of how the PB and Historic Commission could work together. Mr. Edkins noted that Site Plan Review authority does not have a lot to do with architecture but rather how the site itself works; they could ask for a rendering of what the building would look like. The Historic Commission has 45 days to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The PB has 65 days to render a decision but they rarely take that much time. Mr. Edkins shares Mrs. Francis concerns that the Historic District regulations would conflict with the Zoning Ordinance or the Site Plan Review regulations.

Ms. Chaffee pointed out that the guidelines and designs are completely a separate step from all of this. Mr. Edkins feels it is important to make people comfortable that if they adopt this Ordinance all of a sudden when they develop the guidelines they aren't going to come down with overly draconian guidelines because at that point it will be out of the voters' hands. Ms. Chaffee said Enforcement is on the last page. The RSA's and the Zoning Ordinance refer a lot of this back to the Building Inspector. Mr. Edkins is not that concerned about enforcement because the Building Inspector will not issue a permit until he has the Historic Commission's okay.

## **Charlestown Planning Board Minutes – October 7, 2014 – Page 7**

Mr. Frizzell summarized this discussion by stating that this will be continued at the Historic Commission's meeting tomorrow night. Mrs. Higgins wants to go through this section by section at that meeting. Mr. Edkins advised that someone should be taking notes at these meetings. Mrs. Higgins advised that Mrs. Coleman will be doing this. A notice of the public meetings was included in the PB packets; there will be meetings on Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup> and Thursday, October 23<sup>rd</sup> at 7:00 PM in the Community Room. Mrs. Higgins would like to be on the PB Agenda for November 4<sup>th</sup>. However it is Election Day therefore if they have a PB meeting it will be in the Town Hall.

### **ADMINISTRATION & CORRESPONDENCE:**

**New Hampshire Planning and Land Use Regulations Book:** Mr. Edkins enclosed a copy of the notice from the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission in the PB packets that the new State law books are going to be available. He usually keeps one copy in the office and has one available for anybody to borrow.

**Champlain Oil Company, Inc.:** Mr. Edkins distributed copies of the letter he received today from Champlain Oil regarding the issue of diesel trucks backing into the station off Main Street or backing out onto Main Street. They have solved this problem.

**Planning Board Procedures:** Mr. Edkins put out the revised Planning Board Procedures that include the revisions made at the last meeting. He asked the PB members to sign the last page of the original. Copies of this signature page will be available at the next meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT:**

**There being no other business, Mrs. Smith-Hull moved to adjourn this meeting. Mr. Neill seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 9:26 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Regina Borden, Recording Secretary

Minutes Filed: 10-16-14

(**Note:** These are unapproved Minutes. Corrections, if necessary, will be found in the Minutes of the October 21, 2014, Planning Board meeting.)