1 2 3 4		Town of Sandown Zoning Board of Adjustment Minutes 3/27/14	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<u>Meeting Date:</u> <u>Type of Meeting:</u> <u>Method of Notification</u> : <u>Meeting Location</u> : <u>Members present:</u>	March 27, 2014 Public Hearing Public Posting - Sandown Town Hall, Sandown Post Office, Sandown Website, Eagle Tribune Sandown Town Hall Chairman - Steve Meisner, Christopher True, Curt Sweet, Hans Nicolaisen – Selectmen's Liaison	
13 14	Absent:	Dave Ardolino, Donna Green	
15	Opening: Mr. Meisner op	ened the meeting at 7:07 p.m.	
16 17 18 19 20 21	Robert Nickerson is requ Town of Sandown Zonin	The property is located at 351 Main Street, Sandown, NH. lesting a variance from Article III, Part C, Section 3A of the g Ordinance to permit the removal of the existing changeable an internally lighted LED sign.	
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Mr. Meisner notified the applicant that he didn't have a full board and he had the right to postpone to next month if he wanted to wait for a full board. Mr. Nickerson noted that he would move forward with the meeting. Mr. Meisner noted he could ask for a postponement or withdraw at any time until the hearing is closed. Mr. Meisner noted he would probably be able to have a four or five member board at the next meeting. Mr. Nickerson opted to move forward with the hearing.		
29 30 31 32 33 34	Mr. Nickerson noted he currently has an antique changeable sign and he was hoping to change it with a smaller sign that is internally lit by LEDs. He noted the sign is currently over lit with flood lights and it seems to make sense to put in an LED sign which wouldn't put up nearly as much light. He would be able to reduce the wattage he currently has so he wouldn't be wasting voltage and the sign would be more readable than what it is now.		
34 35 36 37	Mr. Nickerson noted it is currently a three sign marquee with a changeable portion in the middle. Mr. Nickerson showed the board a sample of what he was looking to put in.		
38 39 40 41	Mr. Sweet clarified he was looking to change the message center part of the sign. Mr. Nickerson confirmed that was correct, nothing on the sign would change besides that center message center. Mr. Sweet questioned what portion would be lit. Mr. Nickerson noted just the letters would be lit.		
42 43 44 45 46	Mr. Meisner asked if there would be any flashing lights. Mr. Nickerson noted he wouldn't have any flashing, but he might have the type scroll. Mr. Meisner felt that having flashing lights in Sandown would be too much.		

47 Mr. Meisner noted that no residences would have direct site line to the sign. The only 48 residence that might be able to see the sign would be the home on the corner of Glastombury, 49 but they probably don't have direct site line. 50 51 Mr. Sweet asked for dimensions for the sign. 52 53 Mr. True questioned why he needed to change the sign. Mr. Nickerson noted that his current 54 sign is pretty antiquated, no one notices it, it blends with the landscape and isn't that 55 productive as far as merchandising. He is in the business district and needs to merchandise to 56 exist. Also, the electric bill is high because of the halogen lights over-lighting the sign. 57 58 Mr. Nicolaisen asked if anyone has seen the sign at the town hall in Auburn. At first he didn't 59 like it, but now feels it is much more effective and not obnoxious. 60 61 Mr. Nickerson noted the approximate dimension are 6'x39" and would be two-sided. 62 63 Mr. Nickerson noted the current sign is so mundane and doesn't serve the intended purpose. 64 He noted it is a different world now then when the regulations were written. 65 66 Mr. True didn't feel there would be any hardship if they didn't grant the variance. He has a 67 sign that he is able to use. 68 69 Mr. Nickerson noted the whole purpose of the board is to weigh the pros and cons of an 70 application and decide if the current statute needs to be embellished. The current statute 71 hasn't kept with the times. 72 73 Mr. True didn't feel he has the authority to change ordinances. Mr. Meisner noted they aren't 74 changing ordinances, they are allowing opportunity. It is the board's responsibility to look at 75 the criteria and all the information the applicant presents us to make a determination. Board 76 members have to decide that for themselves. 77 78 Mr. Nickerson noted in a sense, the sign creates a hardship because it is expensive to run and 79 it isn't very effective. He would like to keep with the times and doesn't doubt that the town 80 will likely have one in the near future. He felt the proposed sign would be less intrusive than 81 what is currently there. He noted the current regulations haven't kept pace with the times. Mr. 82 Meisner noted the current ordinance restricting internally lit signs has been in place for many 83 years because no one has requested it be changed. 84 85 Mr. Sweet noted they needed to consider that it is the business district and he is trying to 86 make a viable business. His business uses the LED signs and it serves them very well. 87 He feels Mr. Nickerson's location is very neat and clean and he has no residential abutters. 88 He noted if the business was in a different location than it might be different. 89 90 Mr. Nickerson noted he understands why the board wouldn't want any neon on the marquee. 91 He is trying to put up something fairly innocuous. 92 93 Mr. Meisner noted that he is in the business district and doesn't have any residential 94 neighbors. If it were a quarter mile up the road, he would feel different about it. He would 95 likely add a contingency if it were to pass that it wouldn't be allowed to flash. If something

96 were to change with Sue Padden's building and it became a residence, he doubted anyone 97 would want to see flashing lights coming in their window. 98 99 Mr. Sweet noted that they could add conditions to the approval if they want to have more say 100 in how it appears. 101 102 Mr. Sweet asked if it would be color. Mr. Nickerson noted it would likely be color. You can 103 program it to use different colors. 104 105 Mr. True asked if he would have scrolling messages. Mr. Nickerson noted he probably would 106 so that he could have multiple messages at one time. 107 108 Mr. Sweet asked if it would be one- or two-sided. Mr. Nickerson noted it would be two-109 sided. 110 111 Mr. Meisner asked Mr. Nickerson to read through his questions and answers: 112 113 1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The stated purpose 114 of Article III indicates that it is to insure the public health, safety and not endanger 115 the public. The installation of this sign would cause none of these issues to occur and 116 further could be made available in times of emergency to police and fire. 117 118 2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The sign would promote the general 119 health by focusing the light within the sign enabling a wattage reduction in the 120 current lights. Night time sky light emission would be reduced—energy conservation 121 would occur. The area would not be over lighted as it currently is. The public would 122 benefit by its availability to police and fire in times of emergency. 123 124 3. Substantial justice is done because: Of the gains stated in #1 and #2, would allow 125 better use of commercial property there by employing local people. 126 127 4. The values of surrounding properties will not be diminished because: There is now 128 an existing sign that is illuminated in a different way and lighted at a greater volume. 129 The replacement sign would not be any more unsightly and most certainly would 130 cause less peripheral light. 131 132 5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an 133 unnecessary hardship because: USE (A) or (B). 134 135 The "Special Conditions" of this property that distinguish it from other 136 properties in the area are as follows: The property and its building is elevated and 137 set back making visibility of the business and visibility for display purposes very 138 difficult. 139 140 (A) Owing to the special conditions of the property, set forth above, that 141 distinguish it from other properties in the area: 142 143 No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general (i) 144 public purposes of the ordinance and the specific application of

145		that provision to the property because: The public health or safety	
146		would not be diminished by replacing the existing sign with an	
147		internally lighted one.	
148	(ii)	The proposed use is a reasonable one because: The change is not	
149		substantial. Changing from an externally lighted sign to a more	
150		energy efficient internally lighted one. No radical change that would	
151		affect abutters.	
152			
153	If the criteria	in subparagraph (A) are NOT established, an unnecessary	
154	hardship will	be deemed to exist, if and only if:	
155			
156	(B) Owing to t	the special conditions, set forth above, the property cannot be	
157	reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is		
158	therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it because: Elevation and set		
159	back from the	road causes decreased visibility.	
160		·	
161			
162	Mr. True asked if the 6	5'x39" was the dimensions of only the message area or the entire sign.	
163	Mr. Nickerson confirmed it was the dimensions of the entire sign, but he was only replacing		
164	the white portion of the sign.		
165	1	č	
166	Mr. Meisner opened the hearing to the public.		
167	I		
168	Linda Meehan, 56 North Road, Sandown		
169	Mrs. Meehan noted the purpose of the zoning board is they do bend the laws when there is a		
170	need. She recently came to town hall for an Eagle Scout award ceremony and noticed the		
171	town had replaced the old broken shades with beautiful blinds. She was thinking the town		
172	was making progress and she feels our town needs to continue to make progress. The digital		
173		iks the signs are great because they are far easier to use.	
174			
175	She noted there is a ge	ntleman running a business in town. He is in the business district and	
176	feels our town should support the few business we have. She hoped the board would vote in		
177	favor of the application.		
178		-	
179	Ed Mencis, 56 North R	Poad. Sandown	
180		elt similar to Mrs. Meehan; times are changing and we are in the digital	
181	age. We need to promote and help business in town and help them succeed. He feels it would		
182	be a step forward in the right direction. As someone in town who has been doing business for		
183		poprt of the project and hopes the board supports the application.	
184	many years ne is misaj	sport of the project that hopes the could supports the uppreation.	
185	Mr Nickerson noted it	is a small town and it's tough to do business in a small town. He tries	
186		siness as possible. The economy has made it much harder to make a	
187	living. He employs four mechanics. The new sign would be much more effective and easier		
188	to use and feels it would help his business.		
189		r	
190	Mr. Meisner noted the	sign ordinance was adopted on March 8, 1988. Mr. Nickerson noted	
191		a business district then. Mr. Meisner noted the ordinance is under	
192	- ·	isn't specific to the business district.	
193	o providend und		

194 Mr. Nickerson noted there are special purposes in the business district. He doesn't have 195 people across the street to offend. 196 197 Mr. True asked if it would be on all night. Mr. Nickerson noted it needed to be off at 9:30 198 according to the current ordinance. He noted Mr. Sherwood used to help him set his timers to 199 make sure the lighting was turned off at 9:30. 200 201 Mr. Meisner closed the hearing. He asked the public and the applicant not to add any 202 additional comments. 203 204 Mr. True noted he would like to add no neon as a condition of approval. Mr. Meisner noted 205 he wouldn't be able to add neon to what he's proposing, and he isn't anyway. He can't go 206 beyond what he has specified to the board. 207 208 Mr. Sweet asked what the ordinance allowed for in terms of square footage. Is the board 209 allowing more square footage than what is allowed in the business district? 210 211 Mr. Meisner confirmed that Mr. Nickerson had a sign permit for the sign that is there. Mr. 212 Nickerson confirmed he did and that Mr. Sherwood measured the sign to make sure it was in 213 compliance. 214 215 Mr. Sweet noted that the regulations state no more that 35 sq. ft. per lot in the business 216 district. Mr. Meisner noted in his opinion there is an existing sign with a permit. He hasn't 217 measured it, but puts his faith in code enforcement that it is of legal size. 218 219 Mr. Meisner did the calculations and came up with 39 square feet. He reiterated that he puts 220 his faith in code enforcement to do their job. If it's over, it's not our responsibility. 221 222 Mr. Sweet noted he doesn't mind if it's over, he just wants the dimensions stated correctly. 223 224 Mr. Nicolaisen noted he already has a permit for the sign, which was measured by the 225 building inspector. He is there tonight to only change the lighted portion of the sign. 226 Mr. Meisner noted it is their job to pick apart the regulations. 227 228 Mr. Meisner noted he is not concerned about the size of the sign. 229 230 The Board agreed that no flashing on the sign was important to add. No one had any other 231 conditions to add to the approval. 232 233 Mr. Nicolaisen noted that no abutters were present to add concerns. 234 235 MOTION: Mr. True made a motion to approve the variance from Article III, Part C, Section 236 3A of the Sandown Zoning Ordinance for Case # 01–M10 L32-3—for the property located at 237 351 Main Street, Sandown, NH to permit the removal of the existing changeable sign, to be 238 replaced with an internally lighted LED sign. The following condition will apply: No flashing 239 lights are allowed on the sign/display. 240 241 Mr. Sweet seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously in favor (3-0). The motion

242 passed.

243

The variance was granted. Mr. Meisner noted for the applicant that there is a 30-day appeal timeframe if someone has new information not covered at that hearing, they could apply for a rehearing. Mr. Nickerson noted he is familiar with the process.

247

Mr. True asked if he had to wait to change the sign until the 30 days was over. Mr. Meisner noted he could change it tomorrow, but if someone did file an appeal, he would be issued a cease and desist and if the appeal went through, he would have to change it back to original condition. It's at their risk if they want to move forward before the 30 days process.

252253 Minutes

254 Members decided to hold off on the minutes until the next meeting.

255256 Other Business

Members discussed the conference at the Grand View Hotel. Mr. Meisner noted they do
usually have classes closer. Mr. True noted he would like to attend some kind of class.

Ms. Cairns sent an email to the board noting a legislative change that made variances good
for two years. Mr. Meisner noted that their regulations are more stringent and the more
stringent regulation is the one the board would go by.

MOTION: Mr. Sweet made a motion to adjourn. Mr. True seconded the motion. All
 members voted in favor. The motion passed. Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

266267 Respectfully Submitted,

rarea Mains

268 269

Andrea Cairns