

## WASHINGTON PLANNING BOARD

### Minutes

May 13, 2011

Planning Board meeting to discuss changing the Site Plan Review Regulations to allow "cottage industries" to have a sign.

PB Members present: Jim Crandall, Tom Marshall, Nan Schwartz, Lionel Chute and Steve Terani

At 6:30 PM, the meeting was called to order by Jim Crandall. Lionel asked if we were just taking care of a small problem when maybe we should look at the larger issues concerning signs and business. He feels that the way cottage industries are defined may be out of date and in need of review. Tom explained that we are working on trying to bring people into compliance with the LUO in terms of signs, and in doing that we have discovered legitimate instances where cottage industries have a sign and should be able to have one. If we want to work on the sign ordinance, as was intended at the time it was added to the LUO, it is a bigger job and needs to go to Town Meeting for a vote. We have a chance to change one thing in the Site Plan Review Regulations, which will be helpful right now and can be done with a hearing and a vote of the board. All agreed. We reviewed what is considered a cottage industry and what is not classified in that way. We talked about what types of business fall into this category.

Tom feels he would like to go with allowing one sign for cottage industries.

Steve asked if the 35-foot distance from the centerline of the road required by the State applies to our Town roads and it would not (however, a subsequent read of the LUO shows that the 35-foot distance does apply). Tom felt that we should point to the LUO for the rules for signs.

Tom questioned the use or permitting of temporary signs such as real estate, event signs or political signs. They aren't mentioned in the LUO. Nan felt we could include those when we revisit the LUO sign rules, if we felt it was needed. Tom said that temporary signs could be a

nuisance or danger if they aren't properly anchored. We discussed the temporary signs used for things like the Farmer's Market and other events and agreed that at this point we won't seek permits because of their temporary nature. We all agreed to defer the discussion of what constitutes a temporary sign and whether it needs a permit, along with other confusing or silent aspects of the existing sign ordinance, to a later date.

We discussed a phone call Nan received from Jo Ellen Wright about signs for the Library and whether permits were needed. Nan will contact Jo Ellen and let her know what was discussed.

Tom felt we should require that signs allowed for cottage industries, have to be on the premises and not off site.

Tom mentioned that people have been inquiring about their existing signs and whether they need a permit. At least one sign permit has come in already, for an existing sign.

After more discussion we decided to change the Site Plan Review Regulations, Section III, 5.d, to read "A cottage industry may have one sign on their property, which conforms to the LUO Section #309 - Signage, a sign permit is required." Lionel made a motion to make the change to the Site Plan Review Regulations, Section III, 5.d, as read, Jim seconded the motion, all voted in favor. Nan will ask Michelle to notice for a hearing to take place at our next Planning Board meeting, on June 7<sup>th</sup>. Meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Nan Schwartz  
Planning Board Secretary