



**Raymond Planning Board  
MINUTES\*  
Wednesday, May 18, 2011**

**Present: Vice-Chair Robert O'Neill, Greg Foster, William Priest, and Bruce Sanford (8:08)**

**Absent: Chairman Patrick Clark**

**Staff: Hugh Coxe, Planner; Chris Hanson, Code Enforcement Officer, and Danielle Loring, Recording Secretary.**

**Other: Ken Clark, Raymond Service Center (Applicant); and Mike Meyers, Meyer Realty Investments (Applicant).**

**1. Call to order:** Interim Chairman Robert O'Neill called the meeting to order at 7:16pm and the Board did not have a quorum. Mr. O'Neill explained that they were going to proceed without a quorum and when Mr. Sanford arrived the Board would brief him on the materials and he could vote or abstain based on his comfort level.

**\*\*3. Applications:**

- a) Mike Meyer requested a sign approval, on behalf of Meyer Realty Investments, for property at 1263 Roosevelt Trail (Map 053, Lot 004A) in the C Zone**

Planner Hugh Coxe explained that this was an application for a new free standing sign. The bottom of the sign was not high enough and proposed sign would also have a planter, which was not permitted. He explained that the reason for the height requirement was to improve line-of-sight for incoming and outgoing traffic. The applicant liked the idea of the planter for aesthetic purposes and Mr. Coxe explained that it was the discretion of the Board to allow for it. The ordinance required that the sign be created by a design professional, but he explained that the Board could waive that requirement, which the applicant was going to request orally. Mr. Coxe continued to explain that the design met the height and square footage requirement and the sign was wholly on the property.

Mr Coxe also explained that the plans also showed another sign, but that was only for conceptual purposes to show that it could be possible. He explained that the Board was not approving any design aspects for additional signs. Mr. Foster wanted to know if the height requirement was able to be waived and Mr. Priest wanted to know if there was an elevation hump at that location. Mr. Coxe responded that he did not visit the site so he was not sure about the specifics of the area.

Mike Meyer handed out photos that showed the line of sight. He said that he was okay with the height but he would like to keep it as low to the ground for aesthetics. He did not feel that the sign hindered

\*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

\*\*Items taken out of order

the line of sight.

Mr. O'Neill wanted to know if there was a setback requirement and Mr. Coxe said that there was no height requirement on the property but it was required to be 6' off the ground if it was off the property and he felt that Mr. Foster was justified in leaning towards a waiver. Mr. Meyer said that he would also like to have a waiver for the design professional because he did not to commit to a design until he knew that he had approval. He also asked that the Board to approve the possibility for more sign frontage for the building to avoid coming before the Board in the future as he rented out the different parts of the property. Mr. Coxe said that he could not approve conceptual requests without their being an exact plan. Mr. Meyer explained that he was asking for phased approval that allowed for the square footage of the building.

Mr. Priest wanted to know if they could restrict the square footage on the first two signs to leave room for the last two. Mr. Coxe replied that he felt that was feasible. Mr. Priest said that they could approve the maximum amount of square footage and leave it up to Mr. Meyer to allocate it and Mr. Coxe commented that he did not think that they could waive him from coming before the Board in the future.

Mr. Coxe presented his list of conditions and waivers:

1. Construction should be in compliance with what was submitted.
2. Sign should be at least be 6' above- *waived because of location*
3. No planter-*waived*
4. Should display street number
5. Not giving approval for any future signage on any future buildings
6. Approve waiver for sign submitted from design professional.

No one had any further discussion and decided to move on to the next application until Mr. Foster arrived.

**b) Ken Clark requested a sign approval for his business, Raymond Service Center, located at 2 County Road (Map 053, Lot 004) in the C Zone**

Mr. Coxe explained that the application was for a new free standing sign. The proposed sign was almost lower than 6' from the ground and he was not sure where the sign was going. He did not think that it was going where the temporary signage was but closer to Route 302. He explained that the existing signage had not generated any complaints. The total square footage is met and Mr. Clark could go to 288 ft<sup>2</sup> but was only proposing 284 ft<sup>2</sup>. The plans were not submitted by a design professional.

Mr. O'Neill wanted to know why the design professional was required and Mr. Coxe thought that it had to do with quality standards, especially within the commercial district.

Mr. Clark felt that the 6' recommendation was a good one because of line of sight for drivers and makes the sign more visible to people driving by. Mr. Clark handed out a new design for his sign. He said that because he did not know where his property lines were, he could only use existing evidence that there was a previous sign to determine his future sign location. He was going to try to stay along that line of

\*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

\*\*Items taken out of order

sight with existing signs to make sure that people know to go down County Road.

Mr. Coxe explained the reason why location was an issue was because new signs are not allowed off the property and he just wanted to make sure that it was not within the right of way. Mr. Hanson suggested adding a condition to have Public Works Director, Nathan White, measure 50' from the center of the road to ensure that the sign was not within the right of way.

Mr. O'Neill asked if there was going to be lighting and Mr. Clark replied that he had not planned on it but, at the very least, he would just have lighting on the County Road-side. Mr. O'Neill agreed with that because he did not feel that it was necessary because of the street lighting in the area.

Mr. O'Neill explained that he also wanted to see what the sign was going to look like. Mr. Coxe explained that because it was not a full site review, it was not required for him to submit design but the purpose of a review was to have the sign fit in harmoniously with other businesses. Mr. Clark explained that he wanted his business to stand out from the others. Mr. O'Neill felt that the purpose of the ordinance was to maintain the "beautification" of the area but he was not seeing any consistency in the applications that they were currently reviewing. Mr. Coxe said that the standards were just to be guidelines for designing the sign and Mr. O'Neill agreed that he felt that it was a lot to ask that everyone get their signs prepared by a design professional.

Mr. Hanson wanted to point out that, one of the biggest complaints by business owners was the cost of signage in the current economy. Mr. Clark wanted to know if there was anything that he could do in order to meet the design guidelines. Mr. Priest commented that he felt that Mr. Clark's concept was what you would expect to find on a garage and that there were changes that he could make to make it more "country." Mr. Clark said that he agreed with making such changes but was concerned with changing it to include those features would cause him to exceed his allowed square footage. Mr. O'Neill said that those changes would not negatively impact Mr. Clark if he did them as the Board was suggesting them and reminded him that he would need to change the sign to also include his address.

Mr. Coxe presented the conditions and waivers as:

1. Need to display street number
2. Indicate the location of sign
3. The bottom of the sign be 6' off the ground
4. Waive design professional requirement but found that it was not necessary because it was designed by Moonshine signs and even though Mr. Clark was going to change it, as long as it met all standards, staff could approve it.

Bruce Sanford came at 8:08pm and the Board explained the procedure that had been decided upon in the beginning and said that he could vote or abstain then Mr. Coxe summarized the conditions that were decided upon for the Meyer application.

Mr. Sanford was concerned that if the State increased their right of way that the signs would have to be moved. Mr. Coxe felt that the sign was still good because it was completely on his property and the sign could be raised at that time.

\*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

\*\*Items taken out of order

Mr. Sanford was concerned with lighting, shielding and the angle of the floodlights because they could potentially blind drivers at night. He wanted to add a condition that the CEO have to approve it and Mr. Coxe felt that it was feasible.

MOTION: William Priest motioned to approve the waiver article 9 section 10 that the sign does not have to be 6' above street; seconded by Greg Foster.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (4/0)

MOTION: William Priest motioned that the sign does not have to be created by a design professional; seconded by Greg Foster.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (4/0)

MOTION: Robert O'Neill motioned for approval the signage for Meyer Realty Investments with the conditions of approval as stated by Huge Coxe; seconded by William Priest

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (4/0)

The Board continues with the Raymond Service Center application and Mr. Coxe summarized Mr. Clark's application. Mr. Sanford wanted to know if Mr. Clark was going to remove the existing signs and Mr. Coxe explained that he was not required to because it would not exceed his maximum street frontage and there was no limitations on the number of free standing signs. Mr. Sanford then wanted to know if there was going to be any lighting and Mr. Clark explained that he would not have any lighting on the main sign but that he could have soft lighting on his smaller sign for his tenant. Mr. Sanford suggested having the CEO approve the lighting as well and the Board agreed with that condition. Mr. O'Neill also wanted to add that the applicant was allowed to redesign the sign in accordance with design guidelines and the Board agreed.

MOTION: William Priest approve the sign permit application for Raymond Service Center as long as it was 50' from center line; seconded by Bruce Sanford.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (4/0)

## **2. Approval of Minutes:**

### **a) March 9, 2011**

\*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

\*\*Items taken out of order

MOTION: William Priest motioned to approve the minutes from the March 9, 2011 meeting; seconded by Greg Foster.

DISCUSSION: None

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (4/0)

**b) March 16, 2011**

MOTION: William Priest motioned to approve the minutes from the March 16, 2011 meeting; seconded by Greg Foster.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: APPROVED (3/0/1 ab [RO])

**4. Communications:**None

**5. Other business:** None.

**6. Adjournment:**

MOTION: William Priest motioned to adjourn; seconded by Greg Foster.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (4/0)

Interim Chairman Robert O'Neill adjourned the meeting at 8:32pm.

\*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

\*\*Items taken out of order