



**Meeting Minutes**  
**Work Session**  
**North Hampton Planning Board**  
**Tuesday, October 20, 2015 at 6:30pm**  
**Town Hall, 231 Atlantic Avenue**

o

7

8

9

10 These minutes were prepared as a reasonable summary of the essential content of this meeting, not as a  
11 transcription.

12

13 **Members present:** Shep Kroner, Chair; Tim Harned, Vice Chair; Dan Derby, Phil Wilson,  
14 Nancy Monaghan, and Jim Maggiore, Select Board Representative.

15

16 **Members absent:** Josh Jeffrey

17

18 **Alternates present:** None

19

20 **Others present:** Jennifer Rowden, RPC Circuit Rider, and Wendy Chase, Recording Secretary

21

22 **I. Old Business**

23

1. None

24

25 **II. New Business**

26

27 **1. Committee Updates**

28

a) Long Range Planning (LRP) – Mr. Derby said that the Committee is working on the 2016  
29 town-wide survey and found a format that they like. He said that they will hold a  
30 meeting to go over the questions and present them for review by the Board at the  
31 November Work Session.

32

b) Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) – Ms. Monaghan said that the CIP Committee is meeting  
33 Friday, October 23<sup>rd</sup> with the intent to finish this year's CIP, and if not, they will meet  
34 the following Friday to finish.

35

c) Rules and Regulations/Procedures – No report

36

d) Application Review Committee (ARC) – No report

37

e) Economic Development Committee – No report. Ms. Chase will find out if the  
38 Committee has disbanded.

38

39 f) Select Board – Jim Maggiore – Mr. Maggiore said that NHMA is facing issues regarding  
40 Air bnb accommodations being offered in New Hampshire towns and cities. He  
41 wondered if the Planning Board had any thoughts or concerns on the subject. Mr.  
42 Maggiore said that there is no way to regulate Air bnb and there is concern about safety  
43 and whether or not proper building and fire codes are being met. Ms. Rowden said that  
44 there are some things the Planning Board can do as far as regulations and suggested

- 45 they keep an eye on it. Mr. Maggiore reported that the Select Board voted 2 in favor  
46 and 1 opposed to allow the Library to build on the “homestead” property.  
47 g) RPC Circuit Rider – Jenn Rowden – Ms. Rowden went over the SB2 March Meeting  
48 Calendar – the Board has two work sessions before the first public hearing on proposed  
49 zoning amendments and three regular meeting dates including November 3<sup>rd</sup>.  
50 h) Approved signs – Building Inspector Report- No signs have been issued by the Building  
51 Inspector this month.

52  
53 **2. Proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments/additions and/or Regulation**  
54 **amendments/additions Discussion.**

- 55 a. Section 506.4.L – “OPEN” window sign. – Ms. Monaghan explained that the Sign  
56 Committee proposes a new section to the Sign Ordinance to allow “OPEN” window signs  
57 with certain restrictions. The size allowed is no larger than 10” x 20” with LED single dot  
58 exposed lights with no more than two colors (red and blue only); the sign must be turned  
59 off when the business is not open. They also propose to amend Section 506.5.G –  
60 Internally lighted signs to include the sentence, “except as described in Section 506.4.L.  
61 Ms. Monaghan said that the Sign Ad hoc Committee has met with the Business  
62 Association faithfully and listened to their thoughts and ideas. There is a small group in  
63 the business community that wants internally lighted signs. She said they plan to meet  
64 and discuss another sign issue and may propose another amendment to the Board. Mr.  
65 Derby said that the Long Range Planning Committee has 3 or 4 questions regarding  
66 signage for the survey; one question is whether or not to take the ban off of neon signs;  
67 neon signs are specifically prohibited in the sign ordinance. Mr. Wilson commented that  
68 “neon” signs are passe’. He suggested framing the question by asking if people want  
69 internally lighted signs. He also suggested splitting the question into two parts – would  
70 residents like to see larger signs and would residents like to see more signs. It’s a good  
71 idea to separate the questions because some residents may want larger signs, but not  
72 more signage. Mr. Maggiore said that the color of a sign has a dramatic impact on the  
73 ability to read it. He said when applicants come in to apply for a sign they already have  
74 the sign designed without researching how to design it so that it is easily read and  
75 identified. Ms. Monaghan voiced concern on how the questions are framed and said that  
76 the questions on the survey should be neutral and offer options. She said that “signs” are  
77 a contentious issue with the business community.

78  
79 **Mr. Wilson moved and Mr. Kroner seconded the motion to take the proposed sign ordinance**  
80 **amendments as presented to a First Public Hearing on November 17, 2015.**

81 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

82  
83 Ms. Chase informed the Board that there was a lot of business on the November 3<sup>rd</sup> Agenda. It was  
84 suggested that the sign ordinance amendments slated for the November 3<sup>rd</sup> agenda be moved to the  
85 November 17<sup>th</sup> Works Session.

86  
87 **Mr. Derby moved and Mr. Wilson seconded the motion to hold a First Public Hearing for the Sign**  
88 **Ordinance Amendments approved by the Planning Board on September 15, 2015 to**  
89 **November 17, 2015.**

90 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

91

92 The Board was reminded that the Public Hearing on the proposed amendment to Article I – Purpose is  
93 continued to the November 3, 2015 meeting. The Board met with Town Counsel prior to this meeting to  
94 seek advice on a proposed amendment to the original amendment presented by the Little Boar’s Head  
95 Village Commissioners.

96

97 b. Riding Stables and Greenhouses – Mr. Harned explained that the proposed amendment  
98 is to take “greenhouse” and “riding stable” out of the Special Exception in R-1 and R-2  
99 and to add under Special Exception, “commercial greenhouse” and “commercial riding  
100 stable”. Mr. Harned said he attended an Agriculture Commission meeting and learned  
101 that as a result of the Runnymede Farm Court decision, many people in town now have  
102 “riding stables” without ever receiving a Special Exception and there is concern that it  
103 could become an issue when they go to sell their property. He also came up with four  
104 definitions to add to the Zoning Ordinance for Board discussion:

105

106 ***Equestrian (substitute Equestrian for Riding?) Stable:*** *Building(s), structure(s) and/or ground(s) whose*  
107 *principle or primary purpose is for but not limited to the housing, shelter, feeding, care or exercise of*  
108 *equine animals.*

109 ***Commercial Equestrian (substitute Equestrian for Riding?) Stable:*** *Any Equestrian Stable where the*  
110 *onsite animals are for purposes other than personal and/or onsite agriculture use or where more than*  
111 *four(?) (4) animals are boarded for fee or other considerations.*

112 Ms. Rowden referred to Section 405.3 – Commercial animal husbandry and said that horse breeding  
113 stables with 20 or fewer animals is not considered a commercial use.

114

115 Mr. Wilson suggested adding language that ties it back to Section 405.3 that if 20 or more animals then  
116 it is considered a commercial operation.

117

118 Ms. Rowden said that could be done or they could consider defining what a private stable is. She said  
119 that the reason this issue came up was the potential impact large accessory buildings has on abutting  
120 properties.

121

122 Mr. Kroner added that the Board also wanted to define “riding stables” because of the Runnymede Farm  
123 court case, where it was not defined.

124

125 Mr. Wilson suggested adding two categories under the proposed definition of Equestrian Stable –  
126 Private or Personal and Public and Commercial and defining each. Private/Personal – the onsite animals  
127 are primarily for personal and/or onsite agricultural use and where no more than four animals are being  
128 boarded for a fee or other consideration, and the definition for Public and Commercial can be pretty  
129 much the same but different amount of animals.

130

131 Mr. Harned proposed the following regarding Greenhouses:

132

133 ***Greenhouse:*** *A structure, room or area where the primary function allows the growing conditions*  
134 *(temperature, humidity, lighting and/or etc) to be regulated for the cultivation or growing of plants or*  
135 *plant products.*

136 ***Commercial Greenhouse:*** Any greenhouse where more than 30%(?) of plants and/or plant products are  
137 not used and/or sold on site or at local farm stands or farm markets.

138 The Board discussed how to enforce the “30%” criteria. Ms. Rowden said that it is consistent with state  
139 law regarding Farm Stands. 30% of sales have to come from onsite production.

140  
141 The Board discussed the percentage, and what it comes down to, is that 70% of what is produced would  
142 be sold offsite and that is not the intent of the Board.

143  
144 Ms. Rowden pointed out that “greenhouses” falls under the State’s definition of agriculture/farming and  
145 agriculture is allowed in all three zoning districts. (#10 in the definition “production of greenhouse  
146 crops”).

147  
148 It was the general consensus of the Board to remove “greenhouse” from Special Exceptions and require  
149 a Conditional Use Permit for greenhouses of a certain size.

150  
151 Mr. Harned proposed the following for accessory structures:

152  
153 **Accessory Structure.** Any building or structure, detached from but located on the same lot, which is  
154 incidental and subordinate to the principal building.

155 ***Require Conditional Use Permits for any non-residential structures greater than ?? square feet***

156 (1) **Conditional Use Permit Required.** A Conditional Use Permit is required for any Non-Residential  
157 structures greater than 4000(?) square feet foot print.

158  
159 The Board decided that structures that are greater than 2,400 will require a Conditional Use Permit from  
160 the Planning Board. This will give neighbors a chance to have a say and will allow the Board to review  
161 the plan and potential negative impacts it the structure may have on neighboring properties. The Board  
162 also decided to define “greenhouse” as a building so that it would require a Conditional Use permit if  
163 over 2,400 square feet.

164  
165 Mr. Harned referred to Section 405.2.2 and suggested pulling in those requirements into the Conditional  
166 Use Permit.

167  
168 Mr. Harned proposed the following regarding non-residential structures:

169  
170 ***Require Conditional Use Permits for any non-residential structures greater than ?? square feet***

171 (2) **Conditional Use Permit Required.** A Conditional Use Permit is required for any Non-Residential  
172 structures greater than 4000(?) square feet.

173 **Thoughts: Square feet trigger a function of lot size, X for under 4 acres & Y for over 4 acres,**  
174 **or a percentage of the buildable lot area, larger setbacks?**

175 (3) **Conditional Use Permit Review.** The following process shall be used by the Planning Board in  
176 considering applications for Conditional Use Permits under this Section (508):

177  
178 (a) An application shall be submitted to the Planning Board. The application shall contain details of  
179 the type and extent of the structure proposed for the property, including the proposed use of

- 180 the structure. A hand-drawn approximate-to-scale rendering of proposed operations shall be  
181 acceptable for the application.
- 182 (b) The Planning Board shall conduct a public hearing for which proper notice has been given to  
183 abutters and the public. Notice standards shall be the same as those that apply to Site Plan  
184 Review Applications.
- 185 (c) The Planning Board shall have authority to impose reasonable conditions of approval that the  
186 Board deems appropriate under the specific circumstances presented in the application process  
187 and shall provide a written notice of decision to the applicant within five (5) business days of the  
188 date of the decision.
- 189 (d) In order to reduce the financial burden on applicants, application fees for this conditional use  
190 shall be limited to the fee for certified, return-receipt-requested notifications to abutters in the  
191 Site Plan Review process. (Or do we assume if they can afford a large building they can afford  
192 the fees?)  
193

194 Mr. Harned referred to Section 508.5.C.1 in the Agriculture ordinance and asked if the Board should  
195 come up with criteria for a Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Wilson suggested Mr. Harned look at the draft  
196 he did on the building size and may find that he can use the same criteria.  
197

198 Mr. Harned asked the Board if they should start having the Conditional Use Permits recorded at the  
199 Registry of Deeds. The ZBA has their decision letters recorded. Ms. Chase said that the ZBA added a fee  
200 of \$35.00 to their application to cover the recording fees. (The Select Board sets fees).  
201

202 The Board agreed the need for a definition of Accessory Structure. Ms. Rowden was asked to come up  
203 with 4 or 5 definitions including the Town of Rye's definition.  
204

205 **III. Other Business**  
206 **1. Minutes**

- 207 a. September 15, 2015 – Mr. Wilson moved Mr. Maggiore seconded the motion to approve the  
208 September 15, 2015 meeting minutes as written.  
209 The vote passed in favor of the motion (5 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention). Mr. Harned  
210 abstained because he was not in attendance at the September 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- 211 b. October 6, 2015 –Mr. Wilson made emendations to lines 79 and 113. Mr. Wilson moved and Mr.  
212 Kroner seconded the motion to approve the October 6, 2016 meeting minutes as emended.  
213 The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).  
214

215 2. Correspondence – The Board was in receipt of a letter from Richard Skowronski regarding compliance  
216 of the condition of approval for his conservation subdivision plan that requires a conservation easement  
217 on the property. The Board did not have a chance to digest it because it was brought to their attention  
218 at this meeting. Ms. Chase will add the correspondence from Mr. Skowronski to the November 17, 2015  
219 Work Session meeting.  
220

221 The meeting adjourned at 9:10pm without objection.  
222

223 Respectfully submitted,

224  
225 Wendy V. Chase

226 Recording Secretary

Approved November 17, 2015