

1 Sandown Planning Board  
2 Minutes  
3 April 7, 2015  
4

5 **Date:** April 7, 2015

6 **Place:** Sandown Town Hall

7 **Members Present:** Matt Russell -Vice Chairman, Ed Mencis – Secretary, Steven Meisner,  
8 Doug Martin

9 **Members Absent:** Ernie Brown - Chairman, Mark Traeger, Lisa Butler – Alternate,  
10 Terry Treanor – Ex Officio, Town Engineer - Steve Keach

11  
12 **Opening:** Mr. Russell opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m.  
13

14 **Review of 3/17/15 Minutes**

15 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept the 3/17/15 minutes as written. Mr. Meisner  
16 seconded the motion. Members voted in favor. Mr. Martin abstained. The motion passed.  
17

18 **Correspondence**

- 19 • At the last meeting, the board appointed Lisa Butler as an alternate for two more  
20 years. The board signed the appointment sheet.

- 21 • Invoice from RPC for \$5,937 for the annual dues.

22 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to approve the invoice for \$5,937 for annual  
23 dues to the Rockingham Planning Commission. Mr. Martin seconded the motion. All  
24 members voted in favor. The motion passed.

- 25 • Email from Donna Green regarding the impact fees asking the board to partner with  
26 Danville and re-evaluate the impact fees.  
27

28 Mr. Russell made the recommendation to discuss the impact fees at the next meeting which  
29 the board agreed was a good idea. Mr. Mencis noted the study was expensive when they did  
30 it last. Ms. LaBranche noted they could potentially apply for a TBG from RPC to hire a  
31 consultant to do the work. She noted that RPC would not be able to help them do that study.  
32 Mr. Russell suggested they invite Ms. Green and Mr. Ward, the two school board  
33 representatives, to the next meeting.  
34

35 The board suggested Ms. Cairns do some research on what it would cost to do the analysis  
36 and possibly contact the consultant that did it last time. Also to explore if any of the data  
37 collected when they updated the master plan would be useful in the analysis. They suggested  
38 Ms. Cairns also contact Steve Keach to see if there are any other consultants that he would  
39 recommend.  
40

41 The board discussed how to accurately determine what there is coming down the line in  
42 terms of development. Would the investment be worth what they would gain in increased  
43 fees. Mr. Russell suggested they try and determine how many undeveloped lots there are in  
44 town. Ms. LaBranche thought they assessor might be able to help with that.  
45

46 **Julie LaBranche – RPC to discuss the zoning regulations for in-home occupation and**  
47 **the business zone**

48 *Brian St. Amand, 2 Rowell Lane was present with some input.*  
49

50 Mr. Russell noted he went back and reviewed the regulations for other towns that Ms.  
51 LaBranche circulated and felt the proposed changes for Sandown were the best.  
52

53 Mr. Russell felt they should add a more defined definition as to what an in home business is.  
54 He liked E. Kingston's the best. Ms. LaBranche agreed it could be added to section C.  
55

56 Ms. LaBranche reviewed the application process. The applicant would submit an application  
57 to the building inspector for the invisible business. The visible business would go to the  
58 planning board. The board agreed they liked that. Mr. Meisner suggested adding that there  
59 will be application fees associated with both the visible and invisible applications.  
60

61 Mr. Russell suggested adding language to explain that telecommuters do not need to go for  
62 an in-home occupation permit. Ms. LaBranche agreed that was a good idea and suggested  
63 adding in language stating "an in-home occupation does not include personal telecommuting  
64 from home when employed by another place of business."  
65

66 Ms. LaBranche will contact the building inspector about the application form.  
67

68 Ms. LaBranche reviewed the visible business criteria  
69

70 Mr. Russell questioned agriculture and if there needed to be anything special in place. Mr.  
71 Meisner noted they needed to comply with the state regulations for safety and health, but they  
72 are currently allowed to do that in the residential zone.  
73

74 Members discussed having no visible display of products from the outside of the dwelling.  
75 Mr. Meisner felt there shouldn't be any display. Mr. Martin felt that they wouldn't be able to  
76 sell their product if it's not on display and thought it should just be limited.  
77

78 Mr. St. Amand noted that once you let something in, it's really difficult to have it taken out.  
79 You need to make it so it doesn't get out of control. He feels the invisible business is what  
80 got his situation in place. Mr. St. Amand had concerns about having the businesses policed  
81 by the neighbors.  
82

83 Mr. Russell agreed there should be no display of visible products in a residential  
84 neighborhood.  
85

86 Mr. Martin noted he was fine leaving no display of products. If someone has a problem with  
87 it, they can come in and plead their case when they apply. All members agreed to leave it as  
88 is, having no visible display of products.  
89

90 Members discussed signs and agreed the size of the sign should remain the same as what is  
91 allowed now. Mr. Meisner suggested they reference the existing sign ordinance.  
92

93 Mr. Martin suggested changing #3 and adding the "property owner" must reside at the  
94 property where the in-home occupation is permitted. The board agreed.

95

96 The Board discussed #11 regarding noise and agreed to add “within typical limits of  
97 residential activities.”

98

99 Members agreed to add “Hours of operation: 8:00 a.m. -5:00 p.m. with no hours on Sunday.  
100

101

102 Members discussed parking and whether to limit the number of cars on a case-by-case basis,  
103 or limit it from the start.

104

105 Ms. Cairns noted that a house at the end of a cul-de-sac could have plenty of room for 10 cars  
106 to be completely out of sight, but the traffic going in and out of the neighborhood would be  
107 very impactful. You have to limit how many cars they can have in the first place. If they want  
108 to have a business that is larger, then it probably isn’t appropriate for an “in-home”  
109 occupation and would be better suited in the business zone. The change in regulations is not  
110 meant to replace the business zone.

111

112 Ms. LaBranche noted you either need to limit the number of people that can come to the  
113 business per day (including employees) or you limit the number of parking spaces. She  
114 suggested eliminating outside employees and allowing only two cars for customers. The  
115 board felt they needed to allow employees.

116

117 Mr. St. Amand noted that just stating “off-street parking” is difficult because according to the  
118 Police Chief, as long as the tires are off the hot-top, the police can’t do anything about it.  
119 They can park up and down the street, as long as they are on grass.

120

121 Mr. Martin noted they would need to provide a plan showing appropriate parking. Mr. St.  
122 Amand noted that the business in his neighborhood has adequate off-street parking but the  
123 customers don’t use it and because they are technically off the road, the police can’t do  
124 anything about it.

125

126 Ms. LaBranche suggested they should limit the number of people they are allowed to have.

127

128 Members discussed number of employees and stayed with two and felt three spots for  
129 customers would be appropriate.

130

131 Mr. St. Amand didn’t feel the business should be open on Saturdays. He also he has concerns  
132 about enforcement being up to neighbors. He feels it divides neighborhoods and puts one  
133 neighbor against the other.

134

135 Ms. LaBranche suggested adding language stating “documented violations of the use of an  
136 in-home occupation documented by the building inspector could result in revocation of the  
137 permit.” Members agreed that should be added.

138

### **Business Zone**

139

140 Ms. LaBranche had parcel maps and land use maps which show which parcels are  
141 commercial and residential. She suggested RPC could do a parcel analysis. As she drove in,  
142 she noticed a lot of the lots along 121A are small. When you look at large buffers and  
143 minimum lot sizes, there aren’t many parcels that would qualify.

143

144 By doing a parcel analysis, they would look at buffers, minimum lot sizes, prohibited uses,  
145 traffic considerations, existing business district, parking standards and intersections. She  
146 would like to bring in existing businesses and talk to them. Ask what are the benefits and  
147 challenges of having a business in Sandown.

148

149 Ms. LaBranche added that it's a big change. People who live along 121A might not be open  
150 to the change. It's harder to manage when there are mixed uses next to each other. You will  
151 need to put limitations on it.

152

153 Mr. Russell questioned what they would gain by expanding the business district.

154

155 Mr. Martin noted that residents could assemble properties as they become available. The  
156 businesses wouldn't have tax impact on the schools, but would bring in tax revenue. There is  
157 a huge need to bring office space in town. For the first time in the last several years,  
158 industrial space in the region has dried up. We will see the development of those small  
159 industrial places and small office spaces.

160

161 Ms. LaBranche gave the board a worksheet and asked them to fill it out for the May 5<sup>th</sup>  
162 meeting. At that meeting, she will update the board on the MS4 Subcommittee. If you want  
163 to have a public event with businesses, it would need to be planned for June and they could  
164 talk about it at the next meeting.

165

166 **Other Business**

167 Ms. Cairns noted she was contacted by Cynthia Robinson the Planning Administrator for  
168 Chester. Chester is interested in having a joint public hearing for the application that will be  
169 submitted by Sara Surette for the school going on property located in both Sandown and  
170 Chester. The board agreed a joint meeting would be appropriate.

171

172 Ms. Cairns noted they didn't have an update from the chief on Hillside Estates.

173

174 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Martin seconded the motion. All  
175 members voted unanimously in favor. The motion passed. MEETING ADJOURNED at  
176 9:40 p.m.

177

178 Respectfully Submitted,

179



180

Andrea Cairns