

**TOWN OF NEW HAMPTON  
PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
NEW HAMPTON TOWN OFFICE  
NEW HAMPTON, NH 03256**

Public Hearing on Zoning Amendments  
January 2, 2017

**MEMBERS  
PRESENT**

Regular members Mr. Kettenring, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Mertz, and Mr. Broadhurst were present.

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Permitting Assistant Mr. Pollock, Mrs. Lucas and Mr. Katz

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Kettenring called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**MINUTES**

There were none.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

There were none.

**PUBLIC HEARING**  
*Zoning Amendments*

Mr. Kettenring said that because no public was in attendance to ask questions, the board could get started discussing the Zoning Board Amendments.

The amendments were discussed in the order of the packet in which the changes are highlighted.

**ACCESSORY  
DWELLING UNITS  
(ADUs)**

After a brief discussion and request for public input, Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Broadhurst, that the proposed amendments be prepared and placed on the town warrant for the deliberative session to be voted on in March. The vote was unanimous.

**ARTICLE V  
SECTION R (ADUs)**

The board discussed adding a clarification that the changes were made due to a result of a legislative action that will be in effect as of June 17, 2017.

After a brief discussion and request for public input, Mr. MacDonald made a motion, seconded by Mr. Broadhurst, that the proposed amendments be prepared and placed on the town warrant for deliberative session to be voted on in March. The vote was unanimous.

**AGRITOURISM  
SPECIAL  
EXCEPTION**

After a brief discussion and request for public input, Mr. Broadhurst made a motion, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, that the proposed amendment be prepared and placed on the town warrant for deliberative session to be voted on in March. The vote was unanimous.

**ARTICLE V**  
**GENERAL**  
**PROVISIONS**  
**SECTION D:**  
**SEWAGE DISPOSAL**  
**WITHIN 10 FEET OF**  
**A PUBLIC RIGHT OF**  
**WAY**

After a brief discussion and request for public input, Mr. MacDonald made a motion, seconded by Mr. Broadhurst, that the proposed amendment be prepared and placed on the town warrant for deliberative session to be voted on in March. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. MacDonald asked if another clarification for this amendment be added as well. Mrs. Lucas said that she would discuss it with the attorney.

**SIGNS**

The board asked that the word “Abandoned” be changed to “Discontinued” throughout the amendment.

The board recommended that discontinued signs be removed in 60 days. The board decided that damaged sign be given 60 days to repair, while a discontinued sign would have a year and 60 days.

Mr. Katz asked about the wording. He reads that the amendment says that you have 10 months and not 14. He feels that the amount of time is very generous and should not be extended.

Mr. Kettenring asked if this needed to have a clarification.

Mr. MacDonald suggested that if a year be given by saying that one year has passed following the deadline created by the notification of disrepair or leave it as is and calculate the deadline.

Mr. Broadhurst asked if by rewording it, if it would be more of an issue for the Selectmen to enforce or interpret it.

Mr. Pollock asked if the advertised use of the property be discontinued.

Mr. Kettenring said that the word advertise is removed completely.

Mr. Kettenring asked why the board had to wait a year to ask the property owner to remove the discontinued sign.

Mr. Broadhurst asked that because the board changed Article V section E, does the board need to have the abandoned flag article at all.

Mr. Kettenring said that the board needs a definition of it.

Mrs. Lucas asked if the board could change the Article Title V: ii to read Damaged, Abandoned or Discontinued Signs and have to remove the signs within 60 days as both articles were trying to address the same issue.

Mr. Kettenring said that the definition could read, “that if the use of the property is discontinued for one year or 60 days has passed since the notice from the Selectmen”.

Mr. Mertz said that the board could change first bullet on abandoned signs on page 79 to read that the use of the property has been discontinued for 60 days.

Mr. MacDonald asked if discontinued signs were defined.

Mr. Pollock asked if the board should change Article V to read Damaged, Abandoned or Discontinued Signs. The board agreed to change the wordage.

The board discussed the various meanings of Abandoned and Discontinued. If a property is unused and a sign is on the property, then that sign could be abandoned. If an Election Sign is still being posted on a used piece of property, then that could be considered Discontinued as the Election is over.

Mr. Katz asked what the difference between Abandoned and Discontinued?

Mr. MacDonald answered that that was what the board was discussing.

Mr. Mertz said that to him Abandoned means that the property is no longer active or the owner is no longer present.

Mrs. Lucas said that using the farm stand sign that is active in the business/commercial district, but the owner stops growing the produce for the stand and changes the sign to read BUY LOCAL. It's a statement. Even if the owner is not there and actively doing that, she does not believe it could be defined as an abandoned sign as it's a seasonal business.

Mr. Mertz said that with the old furniture warehouse building, the business moved out, but is still under ownership. It is no longer a furniture warehouse, and is no longer active, so the sign should be removed.

Mrs. Lucas said that the Selectmen could say that because there has not been any activity there that they will issue a letter. The owners could just go up and paint over the sign, and not remove it. The business has a permitted right to be there.

Mr. Mertz said that they may have a permit, but as it is inactive and it is advertising something that is no longer active, then the sign should be removed.

Mrs. Lucas said that she doesn't believe that was the intent of the law.

Mr. Katz asked if the sign in decent condition and is maintained, then would it be considered discontinued or abandoned.

Mrs. Lucas said that as long as it was related to the use of the property.

Mr. Kettenring said that the only issue would be if it was a business that moved from New Hampton to Meredith, then it would become an off premise sign that would make it discontinued.

Mr. Kettering suggested that the words Abandoned and Discontinued not be used in the same definition.

The board agreed that the word Abandoned be changed to Discontinued throughout the Article.

Mr. Mertz asked if the board had to wait one year to address a sign that was in disrepair.

Mr. Kettenring asked if the board could change it to 60 days after the notice was given to repair it.

Mr. Pollock said that on page 79, the second bullet reads that the owner has 60 days has passed to repair the sign.

The board made a total of three changes to this article on Page 79.

- Abandoned signs to Discontinued signs
- The words abandoned if to discontinued if
- 1 year to 60 days from issue of the notice

After some discussion and request for public input, Mr. Broadhurst made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mertz that the proposed amendments be prepared and placed on the agenda for Public Hearing at the regular meeting of January 17, 2017.

## **FLAGS**

The board discussed the wordage of the warrant on the new flag ordinance.

Mr. MacDonald asked if a poster could be put up at the polling place to explain the new ordinance.

Mrs. Lucas said that the board would have to be very careful about how it was worded as an outsider might see that the board was trying to sway the vote.

Mr. Pollock suggested that the word total area be changed to combined area.

The board agreed that it would be clearer to use the word combined area instead of total area.

Mr. Katz suggested that the board use combined area of the flag material.

The board discussed adding the word dimensions, but thought it might be too complicated.

Mrs. Lucas said that in the business district that the flag area is 64 square feet. This square footage does not include both sides. One side is only considered, so in actuality you have two sides to paint.

Mr. Pollock asked if the board agreed that this could be discussed at the next hearing.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Vote was unanimous.

Mrs. Lucas added that Mr. Katz had asked about the use of a pennant on a pole, would it be considered a sign.

Mr. Kettenring asked if the board considered pennants as flags.

Mr. MacDonald read the definition of Signs on page 83. A Pennant is considered a sign according to the definition.

The board discussed that the commercial district be limited to two flags as well as having their signs.

Mr. Kettenring suggested that the word Pennant be taken out of the Sign definition.

Mrs. Lucas suggested to remove it completely as it is considered a flag.

The board is defining a flag as a piece of cloth, so a pennant would be considered a flag.

Mr. Mertz asked why the board was taking the word pennant as a sign.

Mr. Kettenring said that if something is made out of cloth, then to him it is a flag.

Mrs. Lucas said that when someone applies to have a sign or flag, it needs to fit into one of the categories. If the object is shaped as oblong or square it is not based on content, but on shape. The final decision comes down to the Selectmen.

The board agreed to leave the definition as is for the coming year and see if an issue arises with the word pennant in the sign definition.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

**ADJORNMENT**

Mr. MacDonald made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mertz to adjourn at 8:24 pm. Vote was unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Regina Adams

DRAFT