

**LONDONDERRY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
268B MAMMOTH ROAD  
LONDONDERRY, NH 03053**

**MINUTES FROM 12/20/17 MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Members introduced themselves. The following members were present: Neil Dunn, Chair; Jacqueline Benard, Vice Chair; Suzanne Brunelle, member; and Brendan O'Brien, alternate member. Also, in attendance were Richard Canuel, Senior Building Inspector; Laura Gandia, Associate Planner; and Beth Morrison, Recording Secretary. Chairman Dunn reviewed the hearing procedures. Chairman Dunn announced that there was only a four member board and that any applicant can request a continuance to the January meeting with the hopes of securing a full five member board. Chairman Dunn appointed B. O'Brien as a voting member. Chairman Dunn stated that the applicant in cases 12/20/2017-7, 12/20/2017-8, 12/20/2017-9 and 12/20/2017-10 requested a continuance to the January 17, 2018 meeting.

**J. Benard made a motion to accept the applicant's request to continue cases 12/20/2017-7, 12/20/2017-8, 12/20/2017-9 and 12/20/2017-10 until the January 17, 2018 meeting.**

**B. O'Brien seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 4-0-0. The applicant's request for a continuance was granted.**

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - N/A

II. REPORT BY TOWN COUNCIL – N/A

III. PUBLIC HEARING OF CASES

**A. CASE NO. 12/20/2017-1: Request for two variances to LZO 3.11.6.D.5.b to allow (1) three wall signs where only two are permitted, and (2) to allow 125.35 SF of signage where 100 SF of signage are allowed, 12 Innovation Way, Map 28 Lot 17 2A, Zoned GB, Electronics for Imaging (EFI) (Owner and Applicant)**

B. O'Brien read the case into the record noting there was a previous case with the City of Manchester for a variance that was granted. Craig Moore, Barlo Signs International, 158 Greeley St., Hudson, NH 03051 addressed the Board representing EFI. Ray Bazarka, facility manager for EFI also

addressed the Board. C. Moore stated that the rear of the building currently does not have a sign and will help direct traffic, and reassure truck drivers that they are in the right location as EFI receives a lot of business from out-of-state. He stated that this is the only building on this property and people may be deceived that Innovation Way is a road that goes to another business, and the sign will help identify EFI. He noted that they are requesting the sign to be illuminated as there is a second shift at this location.

He then reviewed the five criteria for the granting of the variance as follows:

- (1) The granting of the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: because the existing building is large and not visible from Pettengill Road. He stated the addition of a third sign will help trucking companies identify the rear of the building and will not be contrary to the public interest.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed: because vehicles entering from Pettengill Road will be directed to the rear of the building and aided in their direction to the correct location on the property.
- (3) Substantial justice is done: because the Pettengill elevation will be hidden from trucking companies entering the property from Pettengill Drive. He stated that the proposed third sign is specifically for trucks and visitors travelling from Pettengill Road to help identify their location.
- (4) Values of surrounding properties are not diminished: because proper way signage that is minimal and provides proper direction, is not detrimental to the surrounding property values.
- (5) There is no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because: limiting large scale properties to two wall signs is a broad restriction and does not take into consideration the magnitude of the property in question, nor the identification needs of each specific elevation. He stated the use is a reasonable one as because the planned shrubs and trees on the Pettengill Road frontage will prevent the public from entering the property easily and adding a third sign will help identify the rear of the building.

Chairman Dunn asked the Board if they had any questions. S. Brunelle asked where the two other signs are located. C. Moore identified the other two signs as items B and C in the Board's handout. She asked about the blue color for the sign. C. Moore stated that was the company's corporate color. J. Benard asked if there would ever be any other businesses on Innovation Way. C. Moore stated that he did not know the answer and deferred to Ray Bazerka who stated he did not know of any. B. O'Brien asked what the applicant meant in his answer for elevation. C. Moore stated it is obscured and not visible due to a lower elevation. N. Dunn stated that he had gone by this property today and thought it was quite visible and asked if the applicant was planning to anything. R. Bazerka stated they were not. N. Dunn asked if there would be any aversion to having the illumination in the sign go off at 11 p.m. R. Bazerka stated that would be fine.

Chairman Dunn asked for public input and there was none. Chairman Dunn closed public input and the Board began its deliberations as follows:

- (1) The variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it would not harm the public or threaten public safety.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed as it helps public safety.
- (3) Substantial justice would be done because there is no harm to the general public and it will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.
- (4) Values of the property would not be diminished as there is no other property located near this parcel.
- (5) There is not a fair and substantial relationship between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because of the uniqueness of the elevation in relation to the building. The proposed use is a reasonable one to help identify the property for customers or deliveries.

**S. Brunelle made a motion to grant the variance in CASE NO. 12/20/2017-1 to allow three wall signs where two are permitted at 12 Innovation Way, Map 28 Lot 17 2A, Zoned GB, Electronics for Imaging (EFI) (Owner and Applicant) as presented.**

**B. O'Brien seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 4-0-0. The applicant's request for a variance was granted.**

**S. Brunelle made a motion to grant the variance request in CASE NO. 12/20/2017-1 to allow 125 SF of signage where 100 SF of signage are allowed at 12 Innovation Way, Map 28 Lot 17 2A, Zoned GB, Electronics for Imaging (EFI) (Owner and Applicant) as presented.**

**B. O'Brien seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 4-0-0. The applicant's request for a variance was granted.**

**B. CASE NO. 12/20/20107-2: Request for a variance from LZO 3.11.5.c to allow a sign 30 feet in height where only 10 feet are allowed, 16 Nashua Road, Map 010 Lot 138, Zoned C-II, Cracker Barrel Old Country Store (Owners & Applicant)**

B. O'Brien read the case into the record noting there are no previous zoning cases. Richard Frankel, Manager with Elrod Engineering, Nashville, TN addressed the Board representing the applicant. He stated that the sign has been in existence for that store since it opened noting that the sign contained 65 SF of signage and was 30 feet in height. He stated that the sign was removed by NHDOT due to the roadway widening being performed on Nashua Road. He stated that since the sign was removed, it should technically come into compliance being 10 feet in height. He stated a variance was requested to restore the 30 feet tall sign that existed since the opening of the store in 2000.

He then reviewed the five criteria for the granting of the variance as follows:

- (1) The granting of the variance would not contrary to the public interest: because allowing the Cracker Barrel sign to be reinstalled at the original 30 feet overall height serves the public interest by keeping the location visible to the motor public. He noted that at 10 feet overall height, the sign has very limited visibility due to the curvature of the road and the general terrain.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed: because the ordinance seeks to control the size of signs in order to maintain consistency and order; and this request would serve to maintain status quo, as it does not increase the height of the sign, but seeks to maintain what has been an accepted appearance for the past 17 years.
- (3) Substantial justice is done: allowing the reinstallation of the 30 feet overall height sign would provide adequate visibility for business and requiring the reduction of the overall height to 10 feet would result in diminishing visibility and create a subsequent loss of business.
- (4) Values of surrounding properties are not diminished: because the property sits in relative isolation and has displayed the overall height sign for 17 years. Reinstalling the sign at its original height would not impact the surrounding properties.
- (5) There is no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because: the intent of the ordinance is to keep signs within a reasonable size range of one another while still allowing the public to identify different businesses. In this case, the effort is to restore what existed prior to construction, thereby, maintaining the relationship this sign has in fact had to others in the area. The proposed use is a reasonable one because there is no substantial change proposed for what existed prior to the state road work; and since the previous sign existed for 17 years with no objections, we believe this to be a reasonable one.

Chairman Dunn asked for questions from the Board. N. Dunn asked if it would be the exact same sign. R. Frankel stated that Cracker Barrel has made a very subtle change to the logo, but to the average individual, it would look identical. S. Brunelle asked if the applicant could expand on his written answer to the fifth point of law. R. Frankel stated that you cannot see the store from the highway and without

the sign the motoring public cannot see the store and noted that with the sign being gone due to construction there has been a substantial decrease in sales.

Chairman Dunn asked for public input.

Sue Joudrey, 23 Peabody Row, asked if the sign would stay at 30 feet. R. Frankel stated that it would.

Chairman Dunn closed public input and the Board began its deliberations as follows:

- (1) The variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it would increase public safety of the motoring/traveling public.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed because it increases public safety.
- (3) Substantial justice would be done because the public benefits from the sign to identify the property.
- (4) Values of the property would not be diminished as all other properties in the area are commercial in nature and would not be affected by the sign.
- (5) No fair and substantial relationship does exist between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because the property is hidden in the back of the lot and invisible to the public. The proposed use is a reasonable one due to the uniqueness of the property.

**J. Benard made a motion to grant the request for a variance in CASE NO. 12/20/20107-2 from LZO 3.11.5.c to allow a sign 30 feet in height where only 10 feet are allowed, 16 Nashua Road, Map 010 Lot 138, Zoned C-II, Cracker Barrel Old Country Store (Owners & Applicant)**

**B. O'Brien seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 4-0-0. The applicant's request for a variance was granted.**

**C. CASE NO. 12/20/2017-3: An appeal of an administrative decision regarding the interpretation of "multi-tenant" in LZO 3.11.6.D.3.c, 298-302 Rockingham Road, Map 17 Lot 24, Zoned C-II, Remi Fortin Realty Company, LLC (Owner & Applicant)**

B. O'Brien read the case into the record noting a prior case where a variance request was granted. S. Brunelle recused herself from this case. Chairman Dunn explained to the applicant that they would need all three members' votes in order for the variance to be granted. He explained that the applicant could request a continuation until January 17, 2018, in the hopes of securing a full five member board. Jane



Keefe and Mark Fortin, managing partners of Remi Fortin Realty, addressed the Board. J. Keefe informed the Board that she is requesting the Board make a determination that 298-302 Rockingham Road is in fact a multi-tenant commercial development for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted area of a free standing sign. She noted that multi is defined by more than one. She stated that by R. Canuel's own admission, the regulation has no specific definition. She stated that there are three tenants in this parcel at the moment, the brewery, the dog daycare and a trailer storage by Fortin companies, and therefore is in fact multi-tenanted. She stated in her opinion, she did not think the Board could justifiably deny the 100 SF sign as requested as it does fall under the LZO broad definition of multi-tenant. She stated they had received a letter from R. Canuel dated November 27, 2017, stating that there is no specific definition in the LZO.

Chairman Dunn asked for questions from the Board. N. Dunn asked R. Canuel for his interpretation of the ordinance. R. Canuel stated that there is no specific definition in the ordinance and leaves it up to an interpretation on his part based on how ordinance has been applied in the past. He stated that multi-tenant has been used for a multitude of tenants on a lot, such as someone in the Crossroads Mall, where there would be a need for additional signage to adequately advertise all the tenants. He noted that for this particular case, the site plan was approved for only two tenants, and he stated that he referred to Webster's dictionary where multi was defined by two or more. B. O'Brien asked how many tenants are in the building. M. Fortin stated there are three: storage, dog daycare, and a brewery right now. He stated that these buildings could have multiple tenants and only has 50% occupancy now. J. Benard asked how the applicant notified the public about tenants in the building prior. J. Keefe explained that there used to be a sign, which was in the state right-of-way, and when they went for the site plan review, it was determined that sign had to be removed. N. Dunn asked R. Canuel if the applicant was approved for more tenants. R. Canuel stated the most recent site plan was approved for two tenants. N. Dunn asked what generated a new site plan. R. Canuel explained that it was a change of use that triggered the site plan. N. Dunn asked if the applicant wanted more tenants would they have to go for a new site plan. R. Canuel stated that they would. N. Dunn asked if the applicant wanted more tenants. J. Keefe stated they did not right now, but they would like more tenants in the future. R. Canuel stated that additional tenants would require an amendment to the site plan. N. Dunn noted that it might make more sense to amend the site plan making this issue null and void. J. Keefe stated that the process was complex and costly and would not be a wise business decision at this time.

Chairman Dunn asked for public input and there was none.

The Board closed public input and began its deliberations. N. Dunn stated that the applicant believes because multi is not well defined and they have more space, they should therefore be considered a multi-tenant. J. Benard stated that when she looked up the definition, she found singular to be one, several

was two and multi was more than two. B. O'Brien stated that he looked up multi and found it to be more than one. J. Benard stated that the Board's interpretation is that multi can be defined as two.

**J. Benard made a motion in CASE NO. 12/21/2017-3 to grant the applicant's request for an appeal of an administrative decision with the finding that that the determination relating to the definition of multi-tenant as outlined in the November 27, 2017 from Richard Canuel, Senior Building Inspector, was in error, 298-302 Rockingham Road, Map 17 Lot 24, Zoned C-II, Fortin Remi Realty Company, LLC (Owner and Applicant)**

**B. O'Brien seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 3-0-0.**

**D. CASE NO. 12/20/2017-3A: Request for three variances (1) from LZO 3.11.5.C.1 to allow a sign taller than the allowable 10 feet in height, (2) from 3.11.6.f.4.a.i to allow placement of a sign 0 feet from the property line where 15 feet from the property line are required; and (3) from 3.11.6.D.3.a to allow a sign larger than the allowable 65 SF, 298-302 Rockingham Road, Map 17 Lot 24, Zoned C-II, Remi Fortin Realty Company, LLC (Owner & Applicant)**

B. O'Brien read the case into the record noting there are no previous zoning cases. J. Keefe stated that the applicant withdrew the third variance in **CASE NO. 12/20/2017-3A**, given the Board's decision in the previous case.

She then reviewed the five criteria for the granting of the first variance for an increase in sign height as follows:

- (1) The granting of the variance is not contrary to the public interest: because it will not alter the health, safety and welfare of the area. She stated there are no adverse effects to the neighbors and it is easier to identify the new startup businesses at this location. She noted that the property sits below the road and there is a significant slope to the front of the property in addition to a significant amount of wetlands. She also commented on the distance from the centerline of the roadway to where the property line is also noting the unusual width of the roadway and right-of-way.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance is observed: because public safety is enhanced by the height and size of the sign. There are no adverse effects to the public.
- (3) Substantial justice is done: because the loss to the applicant by not receiving the variance far outweighs any gain by the public. Safety to the public is the only gain here and the public is at a loss when they are not able to easily find businesses.

- (4) Values of surrounding properties are not diminished: because a sign will actually increase the values as there is no sign there now to properly identify these businesses.
- (5) There is no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because the sign height limitation is not meant to be applied to a property that sits below the right of way. She stated that this property is unique, as it sits 10 feet below the right of way at grade level. She referenced her points made under criteria number 1. The proposed use is a reasonable one because a sign is reasonable to identify and locate these businesses.

J. Keefe further explained that the Rockingham Road right of way is 150 feet wide and in addition the 15 foot setback would place this sign 90 feet from the center of the road. She noted this would cause significant safety issues to the public because of present tree cover, speed limit and sign distance from the road. She stated that the applicant is requesting to use the existing concrete bound location to erect the new sign. She stated that the present concrete would become in the inner western edge of the monument style fieldstone base required by the LZO parallel to the driveway and would ensure no part of the sign is on the state property.

She then reviewed the five criteria for the granting of the second variance regarding the setback as follows:

- (1) The granting of the variance is not contrary to the public interest: because it will be easier to be seen by the public and keep the applicant away from the wetlands.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance is observed: because the purpose of the ordinance is to promote businesses and therefore makes the sign easier to be seen by the travelling public. She noted it enhances the safety of the public and helps visibility to the public.
- (3) Substantial justice is done: because the sign placement would help to minimize the hardship of the visibility and the slope. She stated that Londonderry wants to be a business friendly and this is certainly business friendly.
- (4) Values of surrounding properties are not diminished: because it will only enhance the value of the surrounding land owners.
- (5) There is no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because with the uniqueness of the property slope sitting below the grade of the road by 10 feet, and the hardship of the present width of the road, the sign placement, height and size are all very reasonable request. She noted this will keep the applicant away from wetlands as much as possible as well. She further commented on the significant tree cover that exist on the state owned property which effects visibility. The proposed use is a reasonable one because a sign is reasonable to identify and locate these businesses.



Chairman Dunn asked for questions from the Board. N. Dunn asked if the wetlands run along the front edge of the property. J. Keefe answered yes. N. Dunn asked if they wanted a setback. M. Fortin stated they wanted no setback.

Chairman Dunn asked for public input.

Bob Merrill, 569 Mammoth Road addressed the Board. He asked if the sign would be on state property. M. Fortin stated it would not be on state property, just the applicant's property.

Chairman Dunn brought it back to the Board for questions. J. Benard asked why the proposed sign drawing depicts four tenants when they only have a site plan for two tenants now. J. Keefe stated that the applicant wants to give the current tenants each a square and a square to put Remi Fortin Realty with space available and a phone number in it. M. Fortin stated that these buildings are only at 50% occupancy. B. O'Brien asked why the applicant picked four places on the sign. J. Keefe stated that is how the old sign was. N. Dunn asked if the applicant were to change the copy if they got more tenants, would they have to go the Planning Board. R. Canuel stated that is correct because the current site plan is only approved for two tenants. J. Benard asked what the current regulations are for signage. R. Canuel stated that per Londonderry ordinance, there is no regulation of sign copy. J. Benard asked why the sign could not be pulled back from the setback as the applicant has eight acres. M. Fortin stated it would not be visible to the public because of the large right of way, slope of the land and significant tree cover. J. Benard stated she realized those issues, but stated there are eight acres of which the applicant could clear a line of sight for the sign. J. Keefe stated that there is a significant amount of state owned land in the front of her property and she would need to state approval to do anything with that land. N. Dunn stated that he thought the Board was having a problem with the fact that the sign has four spots and the applicant only has two tenants, and he is not comfortable with what is presented. M. Fortin stated this sign was just preliminary or a draft. J. Keefe stated that they would be willing to alter the sign for just the two tenants as this was just a draft copy. R. Canuel reminded the Board that the variance requests are for the height of the sign and location of the sign, and that there is no regulation of sign copy. J. Benard asked what the height of the sign request is. J. Keefe stated that they would like 25 feet as stated on the application.

The Board closed public input and began its deliberations as follows:

- (1) The variance would not be contrary to the public interest: because it increases public safety and does not alter the essential characteristic of the neighborhood.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed: because it increases public safety.
- (3) Substantial justice would be done: because it increases public safety.

(4) Values of the property would not be diminished: because it would not impact the surrounding property values.

(5) There is no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property: because there are trees and shrubs in front of the property that the applicant cannot control along with the wide state right of way as well as unique topography of the land in the front. The proposed use is a reasonable one as business wants signage for identification.

**B. O'Brien made a motion to grant the variance request in CASE NO. 12/20/2017-3A from LZO 3.11.5.C.1 to allow a sign taller than the allowable 10 feet in height with the condition that the sign not exceed 25 feet in height, 298-302 Rockingham Road, Map 17 Lot 24, Zoned C-II, Remi Fortin Realty Company, LLC (Owner & Applicant)**

**J. Benard seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 3-0-0. The applicant's request for a variance was granted.**

**B. O'Brien made a motion to grant the variance request in CASE NO. 12/20/2017-3A from LZO 3.11.6.f.4.a.i to allow placement of a sign 0 feet from the property line where 15 feet from the property line are required at 298-302 Rockingham Road, Map 17 Lot 24, Zoned C-II, Remi Fortin Realty Company, LLC (Owner & Applicant)**

**J. Benard seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 3-0-0. The applicant's request for a variance was granted.**

**E. CASE NO. 12/20/2017-4: Request for a variance from LZO 2.3.1.4. to allow dog kennels on a 1.7 acre lot where two acres are required, 187 Pillsbury Road, Map 6 lot 101, Zoned AR-1, Beryl Blakemore, Executrix of the Estate of John Pullis (Owner) & Elyse Greco (Applicant)**

S. Brunelle went back on the Board at this time. B. O'Brien read the case into record noting no previous cases. B. O'Brien read a letter, Exhibit 1, into the record against the variance. Ari Pollock, from Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell, addressed the Board representing the applicant in this case and the following case. He stated that the applicant would like to continue this case and the next case to the January meeting as the Board only has four members.

**J. Benard made a motion to grant the request for a continuance in CASE NO. 12/20/2017-4 and CASE NO. 12/20/2017-5 to the January 17, 2018, meeting.**

**B. O'Brien seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 3-0-0. The applicant's request for a continuance was granted.**

**F. CASE NO. 12/20/2017-6: Request for a variance from LZO 3.11.8.B. to allow the alteration of a pre-existing non-conforming sign without bringing it into full compliance with the Londonderry Zoning Ordinance (the existing sign height is greater than what is allowed), 44 Nashua Road, Map 7, Lot 61, Zoned C-1, Leeman Corporation (Owner) and the Sign Gallery (Applicant)**

B. O'Brien recused himself at this time. S. Brunelle read the case into record noting no previous cases. Jeff Tuttle, from the Sign Gallery, 101 West River Road, Hooksett, NH addressed the Board. He stated that the existing sign has become unrepairable and the frame is rotted. He noted that the sign is difficult to see with it being in back of the Citizens Bank sign. He stated that a 10 foot sign would be very hard for anyone to see and noted that all the other signs in this area are at least 20 feet in height. He noted that the sign will be 75 feet wide and the same height as the existing sign.

He reviewed the five criteria for the granting of the variance as follows:

- (1) The granting of the variance is not contrary to the public interest: as the current structure is already established and we are only proposing a new design and appeal for the plaza.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance is observed: because there is an existing sign, we are asking to leave the main structure and update the sign with a new appealing look.
- (3) Substantial justice is done: since the number of tenants at this location with a shorter sign would result in poor visibility with a shorter sign. He also stated that all the other signs in the area are as tall as or taller than the one proposed.
- (4) Values of surrounding properties are not diminished: because the other properties will be unaffected since the current and proposed sign will have the same height as the current sign.
- (5) There is no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because if required to reduce the sign to the ordinance there will be poor visibility for the tenants of the building. The proposed use is a reasonable one because the proposed sign is matching the same height as well as unique nature of the facility with multiple tenants at this building allowing them to have adequate visibility is a reasonable request.

Chairman Dunn opened it up to questions from the Board. S. Brunelle asked what is unique about his property. J. Tuttle stated that there are tenants in the back of the building and on the right of the property, being split up, barely able to see this from the road. He stated that by the time a motorist

visualizes the property, they have already driven past it. J. Benard asked why the applicant would not adhere to the 10 foot regulation. J. Tuttle stated that it was because of competition with all the other signs in the area and a smaller sign would disappear in a very busy area.

Chairman Dunn asked for public input and there was none.

The Board closed public input and began its deliberations as follows:

- (1) The variance would not be contrary to the public interest: because it safely identifies businesses in a busy area with traffic and it does not alter the essential characteristic of the neighborhood.
- (2) The spirit of the ordinance would be observed: because it increases public safety.
- (3) Substantial justice would be done: because of the number of tenants on a 10 foot sign would decrease visibility.
- (4) Values of the property would not be diminished: because it would not impact the surrounding property values.
- (5) There is no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property: because the property is spit with tenants in the back and a road between lots would make a 10 foot sign seem insufficient. The proposed use is a reasonable use in a high traffic area.

**J. Benard made a motion to grant the variance request in CASE NO. 12/20/2017-6 from LZO 3.11.8.B. to allow the alteration of a pre-existing non-conforming sign without bringing it into full compliance with the Londonderry Zoning Ordinance (the existing sign height is greater than what is allowed), 44 Nashua Road, Map 7, Lot 61, Zoned C-1, Leeman Corporation (Owner) and the Sign Gallery (Applicant) with the restriction that the sign height shall not exceed 30 feet**

**S. Brunelle seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 3-0-0. The applicant's request for a variance was granted.**

**II. Communications and miscellaneous: None**

**III. Other business: None**

**J. Benard made a motion to adjourn at 09:45 p.m.**

**S. Brunelle seconded the motion.**

The motion was granted, 4-0-0. The meeting adjourned at 09:45 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Jim Tirabassi

CLERK

TYPED AND TRANSCRIBED BY Beth Morrison, Recording Secretary.

**APPROVED (X)** WITH A MOTION MADE BY J. TIRABASSI and SECONDED BY J. BENARD.