

Raymond Planning Board MINUTES\* Wednesday, August 17, 2011

# Present: Chairman Patrick Clark, Vice-Chair Robert O'Neill, Greg Foster and Bruce Sanford.

Absent: William Priest

Staff: Town Planner Hugh Coxe and Recording Secretary Danielle Loring.

# Others Present: Kristi Brill, Burr Signs Agent

**1. Call to order:** Chairman Patrick Clark called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm and a quorum was declared.

# 2. Approval of Minutes:

# a) June 8, 2011

MOTION: Robert O'Neill motioned to accept the minutes from the June 8, 2011 meeting; seconded by Greg Foster.

DISCUSSION: None.

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

Mr. Clark stated that US Cellular has been on the agenda but had requested to be tabled. Mr. Coxe explained that they had contacted him and said that they wanted to move forward but it was found that they did not have a Stormwater Maintenance Plan ready in time for the August meeting. More importantly, he wanted to make sure that all the members had complete applications and said that he could provide them with a list of all the materials. Mr. Clark said that he would rather have new, complete materials submitted. Mr. Coxe said that he would make that request but since the deadline for the September meeting had already passed, the earliest they could be on the agenda was October.

### 3. Applications:

#### a) Map 050, Lot 049 Commercial Zone 1340 Roosevelt Trail Burr Signs

Mr. Coxe explained that this was a sign application to replace an existing sign for CN Brown. Burr Signs was proposing to replace existing signage with a pylon sign with new braces. It would totally illuminated, as was the existing sign. There were two issues, one was the distance from property line to pylon sign. The application materials did not include materials that show where the property line was with certainty, but rather than providing a survey of plot, they were going to move the sign 6' up.

Mr. Clark wanted to know if they were sure that the sign was on their property. Mr. Coxe said that staff had measured from the center of the road and 18' from curbing. All evidence would suggest that the sign was on the property and it has been in that location for 18 years. He suggested that, as a condition of approval, they must show evidence that it was on their property. Mr. Clark said that he was fine with that but because it existed before the widening of the right of way, there was a chance that it was in the right of way.

Mr. Coxe continued that another issue was that there were temporary signs and they had been told needed to be removed. These were not grandfathered because they did not exist as of June 2, 2009, when the sign ordinance was passed. He stated that there was no nuisance caused by sign. The applicant was allowed 189 sq ft but was only using 169 and they were raising the sign 6'.

Kristi Brill from Burr Signs said that she would try to answer any question that the Board may have. Mr. Clark wanted to know about the lighting for the sign. Mr. Coxe said that it was internally illuminated and that the canopy signs were going to be LED. Ms. Brill said that the other thing on the canopy sign that was going to be illuminated was the Company's trimark on the sidebar and she confirmed that the temporary signage was going to be removed by early the following week.

Mr. Clark that he was a little concerned with the position of the pylon sign. He felt that rather than requiring a professional survey, that it would be possible to conduct a class D survey. He felt that it would be much more affordable than a full boundary survey. Mr. Coxe wanted to know if the DOT would have records of the boundary lines and Mr. Clark confirmed and stated that they would also have reference of the monuments to find the right of way. His primary concern with the position was because if they were replacing the base, than the position of the sign was not grandfathered. The applicant was required to meet all the conditions of the ordinance, which made ensuring that the sign was on their property a must.

Ms. Brill wanted to know if CN Brown had to move the sign, would that mean that they would have to re-engineer the whole parking lot and Mr. O'Neill said that they would, if the sign had

to go into the parking lot. Mr. Sanford wanted to know if the Board had to approve the location or if it could be placed anywhere on the property. Mr. Coxe explained that it could go anywhere, including right up to the property line, as long as the whole sign was on the property. Ms. Brill wanted to know if they only replaced the sign materials, if they would have to move the base and Mr. Coxe replied that even the over hang on the sign would have to be within the property line.

Mr. Coxe proposed the following conditions conditions:

- 1. That the applicant must construct and maintain the sign in accordance with by testimony given;
- 2. The applicant would conduct a Class D survey in order to establish property lines;
- 3. No temporary signage would be allowed and any existing signs would be removed within the next week.

MOTION: Robert O'Neill motioned approve the sign change for CN Brown/Citgo with the three conditions as stated; seconded by Bruce Sanford.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (4/0)

# 4. Old Business:

a) Map 008, Lot 083 LRR1 Zone 76 Mill Street Theresa Gagnon

Mr. Coxe explained that all the conditions appear to have been met for the backlot driveway that had been approved by them at the last meeting, but he wanted their feedback about the Stormwater Maintenance Plan. Mr. Clark said that he was comfortable signing the Mylar based on what he had seen and that no motion was necessary to accept the it.

# 5. Other business:

Mr. Coxe reminded the Board that they should be reviewing any ordinance changes that they would like to make so that they could have public hearings in time for Town Meeting 2012. He knew that there were changes that needed to be made to Timber Harvesting. Mr. O'Neill said that he felt that sign changes should go before the Code Enforcement Officer. Mr. Coxe said that he agreed and added that he felt that they should only come before the Planning Board if it was part of a Site Plan Review.

# 6. Adjournment:

MOTION: Robert O'Neill motioned to adjourn; seconded by Greg Foster.

# VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (4/0)

Chairman Patrick Clark adjourned the meeting at 7:41 pm.