

**Planning Board**  
Town of Greenfield  
Approved Meeting Minutes  
Recorded by Janice Pack  
January 8, 2018

**Members Attending:** Paul Renaud, Ken Paulsen, Andre Wood, Kat Carpenter, Robert Marshall

**Meeting Opened:** The meeting was called to order by PRenaud at 6:12 PM.

**Minutes:** The Minutes from the meeting of December 21, 2017 were read by PRenaud. Changes were made: Lines 63-65 were rearranged to read: RMarshall suggested we ask Mike Borden to draft a business permit form for the Board to review. PRenaud felt that was a good idea and will ask him to draft one before February. The new owners of Allrose Farm have approached PRenaud regarding a copy of the Business Permit. Line 80: change "hold them accountable" to "and urge their support". KPaulsen motioned to accept the minutes as amended. AWood seconded and all were in favor except KCarpenter who abstained. Motion passed.

**Mail**

An application with plans from Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC on behalf of the Blanchettes, along with Check #4862 in the amount of \$10

A letter from the Town of Bedford, NH advising of a meeting on 1/8/18 to hear an application for final site plan approval to construct a telecommunications facility

The December 2017 flyer from the Southwest Region Planning Commission

**Old Business**

The Board reviewed the Planning Board Report to be published in the Town Report, and agreed on a few changes.

**6:30 PM PUBLIC HEARING: Zoning Ordinance Amendment Proposals**

The Public Hearing was opened at 6:38 PM. Neal Brown was in attendance.

PRenaud went through the Rules of Procedure, and it was acknowledged that the proper procedure for Noticing had been followed. PRenaud noted that the order of the Amendments had changed slightly.

1. This amendment would amend the sign ordinance to be clearer as to how many and what size signs are allowed.

NBrown asked for clarification about the illumination allowed. He is specifically concerned about the sign on the Meeting House lawn. He had wanted to get an electronic sign to replace it. The Board said that was outside the purview of the Public Hearing, and suggested that he bring it up before the Select Board.

2. Amendment 2 (if Amendment 1 passes) increases the sign size allowed for professional uses and home-based occupations, and proposes to allow illumination consistent with what is allowed in the Business District.

Pelagia Vincent joined the meeting at 6:55 PM and wanted to know how the changes to the Sign Ordinance would affect the look of the Lakeside Village District. PVincent asked for clarification: Do the regulations currently allow for signage? PRenaud explained the ordinance the way it stands now; there is no lighting allowed in any district except the Business District. PVincent is concerned about the look of the Lakeside Village District changing when potentially everyone could have an illuminated sign. She asked if the Board had considered parking for home-based businesses. AWood said that we are looking to regulate based on impact. Depending on the type of business proposed, the regulations currently state what the parking rules

are. PRenaud said that we are not discussing parking tonight, but he did read the current ordinance to her. PVincent then asked a few questions about enforcement, septic system capacities and detailed a specific concern she had. PVincent asked if the Board had considered the impact from a tax base; she wanted to know if a homeowner with a home-based business had a different tax rate. RMarshall explained how Avitar does the assessing and that it was not a Planning Board issue. It is PVincent's belief that having a home-based business could decrease the value of the surrounding properties. PRenaud read from the Site Plan Review some of the general guidelines that the Planning Board goes by in deciding whether or not to allow a business. Both NBrown and PVincent wondered why the change to allow home-based businesses in the Lakeside Village District needed to be made. The Board explained it was to make it fair, to enable the Board to fix an oversight that currently doesn't allow home-based businesses in the Lakeside Village District. They were just trying to be consistent.

PVincent is very concerned that passage of these amendments will change her "little piece of paradise" and says she will inform her neighbors and fight this.

PRenaud said that the sign ordinance has been in place for several years and there has not been a proliferation of signs. AWood said that doesn't mean there won't be one. He asked if PVincent was concerned mainly about home-based businesses, or signs. She is opposed to allowing signs in the Lakeside Village District.

Moving on to the next proposed ordinance amendments:

3. This amendment adds a reference to explicitly allow home-based businesses in the Lakeside Village District.
4. This ordinance deals with junkyards, and the amendment clarifies the definition.
5. This amendment is merely housekeeping: the word "customary" will be deleted in 5 locations. It was simply an oversight that it was not done last time. AWood said that the word "customary" is arguable and vague, which is why it was deleted by Town Meeting vote in 2017.

PVincent asked what happened next. PRenaud said at the end of this Public Hearing the Board would decide whether or not to move these zoning amendments forward to vote. NBrown asked if permission for signs were granted on a case by case basis. PRenaud said that was true. A determination is made based on impact. KCarpenter reminded all that any permanent commercial sign did need a permit from the Building Inspector.

**The Public Hearing was closed at 8:14 PM.**

The Board moved forward with discussion of proposed zoning ordinance amendment #1. PRenaud wondered if the language should be changed. The statement of purpose is good, and changing "advertising signs" to "permanent commercial signs" is good; he didn't see anything that needed to be changed in Amendment #1. AWood agreed that the statement of purpose is fine. RMarshall said that sign ordinance was reviewed because of a change in language that came down from the Court, but he has heard in the Public Hearing tonight that there is a real concern about the commercialization impact. AWood said a change in words here would create change throughout the Town, not just in one district. He felt perhaps we should reduce the size of allowable signs in the Lakeside Village District. RMarshall felt we should go back to the inconsistency we originally had. PRenaud said that sign approval is done on a case by case basis, and we should not change the whole amendment based on tonight's turn-out. KPausen felt that people live in Greenfield because of the quality of life, and signs, including lighted signs, do not appeal to him. He said he would be amenable to a 1' by 3' unlit sign, hoping that there wouldn't be too many of them, but in his opinion, a 9 square foot sign would be a great distraction. PRenaud asked if we should take out the illumination of signs for home-based businesses. Not reaching an agreement, the Board skipped ahead to #3.

RMarshall motioned to move Amendment #3 forward to ballot as written. KCarpenter seconded. All were in favor (5-0)

RMarshall motioned to move Amendment #4 forward to ballot as written. KCarpenter seconded. All were in favor (5-0)

RMarshall motioned to move Amendment #5 forward to ballot as written. PRenaud seconded. All were in favor (5-0)

Returning to Amendment #2, which is contingent on Amendment #1 passing, the Board began their discussion once more. There seemed to be a consensus that the Board members did not mind changing the size of the sign as much as they minded the illumination of a sign outside of the Business District and Industrial District. RMarshall said that the intent of the amendment was to prevent commercialization. KCarpenter suggested that we unstrike the language for F. and it would still give the Planning Board the authority for oversight; it would still be more restrictive. That would remove the contingency, too.

AWood moved that we reinstate 2F in Section IV:B of the Zoning Ordinance and keep the remaining part in D. KCarpenter seconded it. All were in favor (5-0)

KCarpenter moved to move Amendment 2 as amended to ballot. KPaulsen seconded it. All were in favor (5-0).

And lastly, back to Amendment #1. In 1B it says "Outside the business district the maximum size shall be 9 square feet" and after much discussion, RMarshall proposed "Sign size and lighting regulations for home-based businesses can be found in Section 4B." KCarpenter moved to accept Amendment #1 as amended. KPaulsen seconded it. All were in favor (5-0). RMarshall moved to move Amendment #1 as amended to ballot. PRenaud seconded it. All were in favor (5-0)

This brought the Board to the question of whether or not the changes were significant enough to warrant another Public Hearing. RMarshall thought they were. PRenaud said that he would get a legal opinion on this.

#### **Greenfield Spirit article: Zoning Ordinance Amendments**

PRenaud has an extension on the submittal; he will put it together with a short explanation. He will send it to the Board members for comment, but turn around will need to be very quick.

#### **Scheduling for Site Plan Review: Self Storage Facility – 295 Sawmill Road (Tax Map R1, Lot 29)**

PRenaud advised the Board that the application was filed with the Town, date stamped 1/2/18. State Statutes say there has to be at least 21 days from when an application is filed with the town and when you can take action on it. He also told the Board of his conversations with John Gryval, ZBA Chair, and their decision to have separate hearings. PRenaud proposed that we reschedule our next meeting for 1/22/18 to 1/29/18 to accommodate the applicants. The Board was in agreement.

#### **Planning Board Report to ZBA: Variance from setback requirements – 47 Lakeview Circle (Tax Map S1, Lot 9)**

The Board reviewed the application submitted by the Billodeaus to the ZBA. The house lot is already nonconforming. After review of the lot map and tax card, a letter was drafted which will be given to the ZBA supporting approval of the variance.

KCarpenter moved to adjourn this meeting, and AWood seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed.

**The meeting adjourned at 10:34 PM.**