TOWN OF ALTON **APPROVED**
ZONING AMENDMENT COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF 2016

October 11, 2016

Members Present:
Paul Monzione, Chair
Tim Morgan
Tom Hoopes
Scott Williams

Others Present:
Nic Strong, Town Planner
John Dever, III, Code Official
Dave Hussey

CALL TO ORDER

Paul Monzione called the meeting to order at 6:05p.m. He noted that Dave Hussey was present to discuss his solar farm proposal and asked that public input be added at the start of the meeting.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Scott Williams moved to provide a public input opportunity before the rest of the agenda items and change the agenda accordingly.
Tom Hoopers seconded the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

PUBLIC INPUT

Dave Hussey noted that he had submitted a proposed regulation which was to be taken as the first draft for the ZAC to work with. He also noted that he had provided a brochure to give the committee an idea of what the panels were like and so on for these solar energy systems. Dave Hussey said that he had checked into the reflection from the panels that Tom Hoopes had mentioned at the last meeting and noted that the panels were now designed to absorb 100% of the sunlight so there was no reflection problem. Dave Hussey noted that some parts of the regulation had been left blank for the committee or the Planning Board to work on, including percentage of lot coverage and things like that.

Nic Strong noted that she had only had a few minutes to look at the proposal that day but pointed out that wherever this proposal had been pulled from had zoning districts different to Alton and those would need to be revised to match the Town's own zones. Also, the ordinance was based on using a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process with the Planning Board to administer the solar energy system requirements and the Town of Alton currently did not have any other areas that used a CUP. She noted that if that was the way this ordinance was proposed the Planning Board would have to establish the forms and methods to deal with it.

Scott Williams noted one thing that he had seen in the proposal was that the maximum height listed was 10 feet off the ground and he did not think that was high enough to meet the pitch requirements

for the panels in this area, unless the panels were movable to track the sun by flattening out in the summer and steepening in the winter. Dave Hussey stated that most of the solar farms used panels that moved to follow the sun. Scott Williams stated that he just didn't know if the panels were up on their edge they could be higher than 10 feet. Dave Hussey stated that might be right and perhaps that should not be limited at 10 feet. Scott Williams suggested keeping the height under the maximum building height allowed in town of 35 feet, although the panels would not be considered a structure.

Dave Hussey stated that in most places the land on which the solar farms were located was considered dual purpose land because it could still be used for agricultural purposes, allowing grazing near or under the panels, for example. He noted that all the structures were not permanent. He stated that most of them were hauled in on trucks with precast slabs. Scott Williams stated that the slabs shown on the brochure that Dave had submitted were modular, were not dug to frost level so they could float and if the panels were set high enough that animals could still graze underneath them. Dave Hussey also noted that he had left the CUP language in the proposal because he thought that the Planning Board would end up handling the process.

Paul Monzione asked if the 10-foot height in the regulation was measured to the base? John Dever, III, stated that there were presently residential installations that were taller than that; ground mounted systems might be 15 feet to the top of the structure with the panels. Scott Williams stated the top was what should be used for this measurement. Paul Monzione stated that the CUP could be converted to Special Exception for Alton because that had been done before in town. He noted that the purpose of the CUP was to satisfy certain criteria for each application which could be done through the existing Special Exception process. Discussion regarding viewsheds and so on could be dealt with through the Special Exception, along with discussion on diminution of property values and so on. He noted that would probably not be a problem because most of these systems would be put in areas out of sight. Dave Hussey stated that they would likely be so low they wouldn't be seen over his fence for the panels he was proposing for his property. He stated that the proposal included language for buffers and screening.

Tim Morgan asked if there was already an ordinance in place for those people putting in the personal systems. Scott Williams stated there was no ordinance as they were allowed by right. Tim Morgan asked if a permit was required for a personal ground mounted system. John Dever, III, stated it would require a building permit and an electrical permit. Tim Morgan stated he wanted to make sure the proposal did not conflict with what someone could do on their individual lot. Dave Hussey stated it did not make sense to put in anything under one megawatt for a solar farm which would take at least five acres of land. Tom Hoopes asked how land would be identified that was close enough to the 3-phase system. It was noted that the only way these systems would work would be to tie to the 3-phase system. Scott Williams stated that the ground mounted systems had an advantage with clearing snow over roof mounted systems. He noted that the best production day was in winter when the air was cold and free of moisture even though the hours of sunlight were shorter. Dave Hussey stated that the systems would be maintained and the snow and pollen removed, and adjustments made on a regular basis.

October 11, 2016

Nic Strong stated that currently solar panels for a single family residential use were not covered by the Zoning Ordinance at all, they were permitted by right and required building and electrical permits from the Building Department. The Zoning Ordinance currently included a definition for "Energy Facility: A facility, which produces energy to include the following only: solar power, methane or hydropower as a small scale (under 100KW).". Nic Strong noted that was allowed in the Residential Rural by Special Exception and in the Rural District by right. Scott Williams stated that the average home would probably be between 8 and 10 kW for a system. Nic Strong asked if the proposal was to leave the existing Energy Facility at the small scale in the ordinance and add this proposal from Dave Hussey as a separate entity and then if that was the case, where would the ZAC propose to allow that use.

Tom Hoopes thought this would have to be defined by where it was accessible to the 3-phase power. Scott Williams agreed that the power had to be able to get to the grid. Dave Hussey agreed and also noted that the power company and the PUC would have to agree which would all happen well before the proposed system came to the Town for any approvals. Tom Hoopes stated that requiring a Special Exception would mean that those criteria would be met before the application came to the Planning Board for site plan review. Paul Monzione stated that a Special Exception could be granted conditionally on the applicant obtaining state and federal and local permits. Scott Williams stated that the other thing to consider was the contract with the utility company; he noted that there were things to consider with net metering. John Dever, III, thought that the best option with regard to location was to have the solar companies propose the locations in town that had access to the 3-phase power grid. Dave Hussey stated that how much the substations could handle also had to be factored in.

Paul Monzione stated that for purposes of trying to determine appropriate zones where these Solar Energy Systems would be allowed it should be done consistent with commercial and industrial type uses. The ZAC should not be concerned with which zone it was in unless the use interfered with the lake, for example, or other features. He suggested that the basis for which zones this use should be allowed in should be the same as other commercial activity. It would then be up to the person who wanted to build that use to figure out whether it worked with the power company or not. Paul Monzione went on to say that in the future the technology may change to develop new ways to get the power to the substations. Dave Hussey stated that there had even been discussion in some cases of building substations right on the land with the Solar Energy System. Paul Monzione said it was up to ZAC to figure out what works for the Town and leave it up to the applicant and the power company to figure out if it works for them. Dave Hussey stated that it cost up to $17,000 just to have the power company review the application so this use was not going to be for everyone.

Paul Monzione asked what the term was that was currently defined in the Zoning Ordinance. Nic Strong noted it was Energy Facility. Paul Monzione stated that Solar Energy System for this proposal would need its own definition. Tim Morgan stated it was important to make sure that this regulation did not become applicable to someone just putting in their own residential system. Scott Williams stated that the existing definition with the 100kW number differentiated between the systems. John Dever, III, stated that solar panels for residential do not qualify as an Energy Facility.

He stated that in his opinion an Energy Facility was designed to provide more power than used. Tim Morgan stated that an individual residence could do that. He wanted to make sure that the definitions were written so that the individual homeowner could install solar panels for their home and have some output of power in addition, without being subject to the process. Scott Williams stated that could happen now. He noted that under 100kW the applicant just needed a building permit. Paul Monzione asked if the 100kW was sufficient in the definition? Scott Williams thought it was appropriate because he didn't know any residence that would use 100kW. Dave Hussey thought it made sense to have levels of systems for residential use, industrial use and commercial use where the power produced would be sold to the power company.

Paul Monzione stated that if the definition currently in place worked for the residential use of solar panels, then the Solar Energy Systems would be separately in place and be added to the definitions. He noted that two sections of the Zoning Ordinance would require changes, the definitions and the substantive section. He asked ZAC if this should be added to the list of items to bring to the Planning Board in November for proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance. Tim Morgan stated the Table of Uses needed to be updated to allow the use in different districts. Paul Monzione stated all the changes for this proposal could be done in one warrant article. Some discussion took place regarding this being a petitioned warrant article and timeframes therefor or an article proposed by the Planning Board. Paul Monzione noted that the guts of the regulation were presented in Dave Hussey's draft but it needed tweaking. The ZAC determined to hold their next meeting on October 25th. The ZAC determined that the Solar Energy Systems amendment would be part of the ZAC proposals for amendments to go to the Planning Board.

Paul Monzione stated that ZAC would keep working on the proposal and at the next meeting would have a revised version to be presented to the Planning Board. Dave Hussey stated that he thought getting 25 signatures for a petition on this would be hard but having the Planning Board support it would make the process easier.

Tim Morgan stated that the ZAC needed to consider in which areas of town this use would be allowed by Special Exception and whether there were areas where it would not be permitted. Tom Hoopes stated that the restrictions for screening and the 3-phase lines would restrict the locations where the use could take place. Paul Monzione stated that the fact that the property had to be near the 3-phase lines would not drive the ZAC's decision. He suggested looking at the Table of Uses and seeing what similar kinds of uses were permitted in which districts. Dave Hussey stated that in some states Solar Energy Systems were allowed under agriculture/farming; harvesting sunlight. John Dever, III, thought ZAC should consider where there would be lots big enough to accommodate the use with the required screening and buffers. Scott Williams thought that screening and buffering would solve a lot of the problems. John Dever, III, stated that would exclude the use from certain areas. Tom Hoopes thought that the use would only really work in the Rural and Rural Residential districts.

Paul Monzione thought this use should be allowed in commercial zones, noting, for example, that if owner of the new car wash in town wanted to power the car wash with solar power from a system on

the land in back, if he were not in the districts mentioned he wouldn't be allowed to do it and he should be. Scott Williams agreed. Paul Monzione said that in the regulation provided if there had to be certain lot sizes and screening, that would limit where these systems could go. He thought the ZAC should look at where in Town commercial activities took place that were similar and then it would be up to the individual landowners to meet the rest of the criteria. Paul Monzione pointed out that just because the use was permitted in a zone did not mean it was permitted on every lot in that zone. Tim Morgan thought that the use could be allowed by Special Exception in all the zones. Paul Monzione thought perhaps not Lakeshore Residential. Scott Williams thought the nature of the Lakeshore Residential zone would probably prohibit the use. John Dever, III, pointed out that there were large lots of land zoned Lakeshore Residential on Route 28A, so he thought each zone should be considered. Tim Morgan again suggested allowing it by Special Exception in all zones and then the ZBA would decide if the criteria had been met.

Paul Monzione suggested that ZAC consider the zones to permit it in between now and the next meeting. His inclination would be to look at the Table of Uses and if certain zones permit a certain level of commercial activity then he thought Solar Energy Systems could be allowed there by Special Exception. He noted that the proposed language would be revised and the ZAC would consider the zoning district question for the next meeting.

CONTINUED BUSINESS

1. Review of amendments to Section 340 Sign Regulations at the 9/27/16 meeting

Paul Monzione stated that at the last meeting ZAC had spent a lot of time going over the amendment to the sign regulations in light of the US Supreme Court's decision that prohibits regulation of signs based upon content with the understanding that the regulation should be content neutral. Scott Williams stated that the copy of the ballot included in the ZAC packets regarding animated or flashing signs had been done in response to a sign he had installed. Tim Morgan stated that the ballot had been provided because he had had a question about the wording of this section in the Zoning Ordinance and this is where it came from although it did not explain what it meant. Nic Strong stated that the language came from a petitioned warrant article and that meant that there were no minutes of any discussion or any explanation about the language and the way it was written. She noted that this was in 2008.

Paul Monzione stated that the changes from the last meeting had been incorporated into the document before the ZAC tonight. Nic Strong noted that the first yellow highlight on page 32 was to address a question Tim Morgan had about the use of the word "site". She noted that she had rephrased this sentence after having reviewed the Master Plan section that the language had initially been pulled from. Nic Strong noted that the second highlighted paragraph on page 32 was because she had added language to say that the ordinance was intended "to ensure that the constitutionally guaranteed right of free speech is protected". The committee members thought this was a good idea. In Section B. 1. Nic Strong stated that she had noticed the use of the word "commercial sign" and suggested changing it to "business sign" which was used elsewhere in the sign regulations and would

avoid confusion with commercial vs. non-commercial speech or copy. The committee members agreed.

Nic Strong next noted on page 33, Section B. 8. that she had included language regarding non-commercial speech in the proposal but during the past couple of weeks while reading about the subject she had found other wording that she wanted ZAC to review and decide on which language they liked better. Tom Hoopes thought that there needed to be a simple statement about why all the changes were required to the regulations, i.e. supreme court rulings. Tim Morgan said that could be put in the explanation for the warrant article. Paul Monzione stated that the first and original paragraph was the simplest. Tim Morgan stated he liked it for that reason. "Signs containing noncommercial speech are permitted anywhere that advertising or business signs are permitted, subject to the same regulations applicable to such signs." Nic Strong stated that the other two proposed sections were interesting because they say that if someone wanted to change a commercial sign to noncommercial they did not have to get permits to do so where the language read by Paul Monzione might make them think they did. Paul Monzione thought the last sentence from the second suggested Section B. 8., "The purpose of this provision is to prevent any inadvertent favoring of commercial speech over noncommercial speech, or favoring of any particular noncommercial message over any other noncommercial message. This provision prevails over any more specific provision to the contrary." could be added to the first section. Some discussion took place regarding when the changing of a sign required permitting (change of use or change of business) and when it did not (existing owner changing logo or color scheme). The committee agreed to add the language read by Paul Monzione so that Section B. 8. would read: "Signs containing noncommercial speech are permitted anywhere that advertising or business signs are permitted, subject to the same regulations applicable to such signs. The purpose of this provision is to prevent any inadvertent favoring of commercial speech over noncommercial speech, or favoring of any particular noncommercial message over any other noncommercial message. This provision prevails over any more specific provision to the contrary."

Nic Strong stated that the table in Section C. had been updated to include the last column "Temporary signs - size permitted**". She noted that had not been finalized since the last meeting so she had carried over the sizes allowed for permanent signs in the Residential Commercial and Recreation Service districts into the temporary signs column. Tom Hoopes stated that one of the handouts that had been previously distributed regarding signage included a page that illustrated different sized signs in relation to a person. For the other districts Nic Strong noted that the size of permanent signs allowed were quite small and at the previous meeting the committee had indicated that temporary signs could be larger because they were temporary so she had left those numbers blank for the committee to discuss. Tom Hoopes reminded the committee that signs for different events, for instance, a yard sale or a political event, had to be allowed to be the same size. Nic Strong stated that the sizes could be different within different districts. Tom Hoopes pointed out again that the sketch of sign sizes could give the committee a good idea of what sizes looked like in relation to a human. He noted that some of the political signs were huge and the concept of limiting the number of signs by the frontage length on the lot was a good idea.

Paul Monzione suggested, to keep the ordinance simple, looking at the largest political sign on display right now and to say that temporary signs could be that big, regardless of what they were for. It was noted that the biggest sign was probably 4' x 8', the size of a sheet of plywood, 32 square feet. Paul Monzione stated that he thought signs that size were a bit over the top but the practical problem was the trend for political candidates to have bigger and bigger yard signs. He stated that if the zoning ordinance restricted the size of signs to less than 32 s.f. then when a political candidate had a sign that big a property owner would not be able to use a sign that size; but the enforcement of that restriction would be problematic. Paul Monzione noted that by the same token, due to the US Supreme Court's prohibition on regulating signs by content, if the Town allowed a 4' x 8' candidate sign then a 4' x8' craft fair sign had to be allowed also. Scott Williams stated that realistically speaking the craft fair type signs were self-regulating because people generally put them up on a Friday and took them down when the sale was over and no one was in town to monitor those type of events anyway. If the same thing happened week after week it would become more of a business and come to the attention of code enforcement.

Paul Monzione stated that temporary signs could go up for any number of reasons: political campaigns, commercial special event sales, weekend sales. Tom Hoopes stated that the size could not vary within the same zone. Paul Monzione stated that could not be done by content. Scott Williams thought that the whole idea would end up driving John Dever, III, as the Code Official crazy. He noted that some of the things would not be abided by because someone putting up a sign for a yard sale, no matter the district, would put up the sign and not care what the rules said. John Dever, III, said that the restrictions on size provided a method for the Town to act if a property owner created an obnoxious or unreasonable circumstance by virtue of putting up signs; it would provide an avenue to back up the Code Official if there ended up being legal action over it. He thought that limiting the sizes within the different districts was reasonable.

Tom Hoopes thought that 2' x 3' was a large enough size for temporary signs. John Dever, III, stated there would always be someone trying to take advantage of an ordinance to get more than should be allowed. Paul Monzione stated that with regard to the current size of signs for permanent business signs, the committee had decided at the last meeting to leave the existing ordinance as it was until next year. He noted that the simplest way of going about this would be to say that whatever was permitted in the zone for a permanent sign would also be the size for temporary signs in that district. He noted that the problem with that was that currently many of the temporary signs were bigger than that and that would be where the Code Official would be driven crazy in trying to enforce the size. Paul Monzione asked if the committee thought temporary signs should be allowed to be as much as 32 s.f. John Dever, III, clarified that would be in the zones where that size was allowed. Paul Monzione stated that if his property was in a district where the 32 s.f. size was not allowed and he wanted that size political sign in his front yard, why should he be prohibited from that? He stated that he understood the right to regulate the sizes. Tom Hoopes stated that the purpose was to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public by avoiding traffic hazards and reducing visual distractions. He noted that in his opinion the signs in the downtown area were a visual distraction. Paul Monzione thought that for a temporary sign, regardless of the zone, people should be permitted

to have a yard sign that was consistent with what is seen for candidate signs during elections these days. He thought that those signs had reached a limit and they would not continue to get bigger and bigger. He also noted, again, that personally he did not like the size and thought they were way too big, but acknowledged that people were adamant about their views and it was only for a certain time in a year every four years for a presidential election.

Tim Morgan noted a couple of zones like Lakeshore Residential and Residential Rural and Residential where the 24 s.f. permanent signs were not allowed. In those instances, permanent signs were restricted to as little as 4 s.f. and in those instances it might be all right to allow them something larger than permanent but not 24 s.f. Paul Monzione asked what Tim Morgan would suggest the largest size be for those zones he had mentioned. He noted that the graphic circulated by Tom Hoopes offered some suggestions. Tom Hoopes thought that 2' x 3' was big enough for a yard sale or family wedding sign. He did not think the Lakeshore Residential should allow large signs. Scott Williams agreed. Currently the Lakeshore Residential district allowed 4 s.f. for a permanent business sign. Paul Monzione asked if the committee wanted to maintain that size for temporary signs in that district or go a little larger. Tim Morgan stated he would allow something a little larger, along the lines of the smaller political signs. Scott Williams thought 2' x 2'. Tom Hoopes noted that standard size of foam core that could be purchased in stores for homemade signs was 20" x 30" and there was also 11" x 17" paper or card out of which people may make a sign. Tim Morgan thought that the committee could suggest 2' x 3' which would be 6 s.f. Paul Monzione asked about the other zones Tim Morgan had mentioned. Tim Morgan stated the Residential district allowed 3 s.f. for a permanent sign so 6 s.f. would be appropriate there. In the Residential Rural and Rural districts 12 s.f. was permitted for a permanent sign. He thought that was a good size sign. John Dever, III, noted that he was familiar with a sign in the Rural zone that was 32 s.f.

Scott Williams noted that by increasing the size for the Lakeshore Residential district to 6 s.f., Tim Morgan had been allowing a 50% increase over the size of a permanent sign. He asked if that could carry over to the Residential Rural and Rural districts, allowing the size of a temporary sign in those two districts to be 18 s.f. He noted that was a 3' x 6' which still was not very large. Tim Morgan agreed that was not very big. Paul Monzione thought that the rest of the zones should be allowed to have the large size temporary signs at 32 s.f. He noted that people would be putting them on their lawns. Scott Williams stated, no matter what, it would happen anyway and the Code Official would not have to be running around after political signs because that would be a waste of his efforts. Paul Monzione stated that the Code Official would just have to worry about the Lakeshore Residential and the Residential districts and those restrictions were wisely chosen for these two districts for a reason. Tom Hoopes asked if sandwich boards would be temporary signs. Scott Williams stated that they were almost always going to be temporary signs by their nature. Paul Monzione stated that it made sense to allow a very large sign was because it was temporary and occasional and would not be a blight or constitute a constant nuisance. Tom Hoopes thought 24 s.f. was adequate for that purpose. John Dever, III, stated that in terms of political signs they were preprinted to certain sizes. Scott Williams stated that the committee needed to be careful to draft an ordinance that met the requirements of the recent court decision but did not create a monster for the Code Official. Paul Monzione stated that was why he would be okay with a larger number in most of the districts. He

noted that if someone wanted to put up a large sign for a candidate on their private property in an election as part of their rights of free speech it would be hard to argue with that. Scott Williams stated he agreed with 32 s.f. for a temporary sign in the zones that currently allowed 24 s.f. permanent signs. Tom Hoopes stated he would just as soon stick with 24 s.f. Scott Williams stated that the problem was that using the 32 s.f. signs would not stop. Paul Monzione stated that many residents won't even know what the regulation is and it was going to become a hard job for the Code Official to deal with if he had to drive to someone's house and say that the candidate sign is too big, it had to be removed.

Paul Monzione went on to say that if the regulation was amended to allow temporary signs of 32 s.f. in all districts other than Lakeshore Residential and Residential, in which districts the size would be restricted to 6 s.f., the Code Official would only have those two districts to be concerned about violations; and that was feasible to police and enforce. He noted that the fewer differences zone to zone, the easier it would be for people to comply and for the Code Official to enforce. The restrictions would be only in the zones that were absolutely necessary and Lakeshore Residential and Residential were important. Tom Hoopes thought that there will be complaints that the signs are too big. Scott Williams did not think the net result of this zoning ordinance amendment was going to be any different; he thought people were probably doing it now and would continue to do it after the change. Paul Monzione stated he suggested that size because whose size signs were already out there. Tom Hoopes did not want to encourage any more of them. John Dever, III, stated that it seemed logical and reasonable to limit the two zones. Scott Williams was concerned that this not create an overwhelming situation for the Code Official to handle.

Paul Monzione asked if the committee agreed that in the Residential and Lakeshore Residential districts the total square footage of temporary signs would be not to exceed 6 s.f. and in all other districts the total square footage of temporary signs would be not to exceed 32 s.f. The committee's consensus was as Paul Monzione had stated.

Nic Strong next asked if, in the Residential Commercial and Recreation Service districts, there would be an allowance for temporary signs on the buildings as well as freestanding as with the permanent signs allowed in those districts. Scott Williams noted that a lot of temporary signs were already on buildings. Paul Monzione thought that this might be addressed in the temporary sign definition. John Dever, III, noted that the currently proposed definition would allow a temporary sign on a building. Paul Monzione suggested that the definition of temporary sign could be amended to include the wording "either standing alone or temporarily affixed to a structure", after the materials. Tim Morgan thought this could be addressed in the table of sign sizes, noting that there was a column to describe properties which had two or more businesses on one lot, and a 32 s.f. temporary sign would be allowed under the committee's previous discussion. He stated the question was whether or not each individual business could have a temporary sign on their business and, if so, what size could it be. He noted that currently for permanent signs two or more businesses were allowed a 24 s.f. sign and each business was allowed a 10 s.f. sign on the building.

Scott Williams stated that it was tough to be in business and the Town should allow as much signage as could be tolerated, so he did not want to see it limited too much. He thought that most temporary signs become permanent signs. Nic Strong stated that the frontage requirement for a multiple-building business site might limit temporary signs so much that the individual businesses would need to be allowed temporary signs on the buildings to get people to the special temporary event. Paul Monzione noted that the permanent signage requirements for multiple businesses was 24 s.f. and 10 s.f. per business on the building. He noted that the permanent sign requirement allowed a little less than half of what was permitted for a freestanding sign for a building sign. He suggested taking the total temporary sign size of 32 s.f. and dividing it by two to allow 16 s.f. on the building. Paul Monzione asked what happened if there were three businesses. Nic Strong stated that the ordinance addressed two or more businesses. She noted that she and John Dever, III, had spoken about this when signs had come up with site plans to determine what the current language of the ordinance meant. Paul Monzione stated that the whole sign regulation needed to be rewritten from scratch in the future. But at this time the change would be proposed to allow 16 s.f. for temporary signage on a building per business for sites with two or more businesses.

Paul Monzione suggested that in the definition of temporary sign, the wording be added as suggested earlier, "Temporary sign: A sign, banner, pennant, poster or display constructed of paper, cloth, canvas, plastic sheet, cardboard, wallboard, plywood or other like materials, ***either standing alone or temporarily affixed to a structure***, that appears to be intended to be displayed for a limited period of time, that is used for a specific circumstance, situation or event intended or expected to take place or be completed within a short or definite period of time.". He noted then that the definition allowed a temporary sign to be put on a building or it could be free standing. Paul Monzione noted that temporary signs were frequently attached to buildings. The committee agreed with the proposed change to the definition.

Nic Strong next noted that Section D. was proposed to include the details about temporary signs other than the size which was taken care of in the table. She noted that she had added a mini purpose statement to stress the reason for the details in the section. She then said that the committee needed to discuss the frontage requirements and the number of days that temporary signs could be up. Scott Williams asked about the frontage measurement and whether the committee strongly felt it was needed. Tom Hoopes stated it was inserted to prevent having too many signs in a small area. He noted at that point it could be considered a distraction. Scott Williams thought trying to regulate that would be an absolute waste of effort. John Dever, III, asked what if someone wanted to put up a sign for each candidate. Paul Monzione asked if the committee wanted to include restrictions on the number of signs by frontage. He stated that there were provisions included in the proposed language regulating signs that create a public safety hazard and that they could be removed. Section D. 5. stated "All temporary signs shall be securely constructed and properly secured, and shall be placed in such a location as to not endanger vehicular or pedestrian traffic by obscuring a clear view or by creating confusion with official street signs or signals." Paul Monzione asked the committee if they thought that Section D. 5. eliminated the need for Section D. 2. which was proposing to limit the number of temporary signs allowed by frontage. He noted that someone going overboard with the number of signs to the extent that it was affecting traffic safety could be told by the Code Official

that they were blocking the view of the traffic or intersections so the signs would have to be taken down or moved back or reduced in number or spread out somehow. He asked if that provided enough to the Code Official to work with. Nic Strong suggested adding language that clearly specified that the size allowed for temporary signage was a lot total not per sign. She noted that the way the ordinance currently was written someone could have four 32 s.f. signs on one lot. She asked the committee if they wanted to regulate that aspect or not.

Tim Morgan excused himself from the meeting. Paul Monzione reminded him of the next meeting on October 25, 2016, at 6 p.m. Scott Williams noted he would not be at that meeting or the Planning Board meeting on the 18th.

Paul Monzione stated he did not know about regulating the number of signs with the discretion granted by Section D. 5. with regard to endangering vehicular or pedestrian traffic. He noted that if the sheer number of signs, say 15 signs, created a hazard but they could take those same 15 signs and move them back and not create the hazard, then why stop them from having 15 signs. He noted by contrast that one 32 s.f. sign could obstruct the view at an intersection. Paul Monzione stated that D. 5. was not limited to number or size of signs, it was discretionary and if any sign interfered with traffic safety it could be dealt with on that basis. Scott Williams thought that was the best way to deal with the issue. Paul Monzione stated it was a legitimate concern and was not addressing numbers of signs or size of signs, only that a hazard was created. Scott Williams was very concerned about not creating something that was difficult for the Code Official to work with.

Paul Monzione asked the committee if deleting D. 2. restricting the number of signs based on the frontage of a lot was appropriate. The committee agreed.

Paul Monzione noted that D. 3. stated "Temporary signs shall not be located within any right-of-way and shall only be located on property that is owned by the person whose sign it is and shall not be placed on any utility pole, street light, similar object or on public property.". Scott Williams stated that most temporary signs were put in the right-of-way. He noted that some state roads had 100' plus rights-of-way. John Dever, III, stated that was to do with reasonableness because installing temporary signs at the edge of pavement versus next to the sidewalk was different. He noted that Route 11 between Rand Hill and Jesus Valley Roads, the right-of-way was 250' wide and extended down to Farmington Road. Scott Williams thought the right-of-way restriction should be removed. He noted that the Code Official could use the traffic hazard/view obstruction language to remove temporary signs that were creating distractions or difficult driving conditions if they were in the right-of-way. Paul Monzione stated that the configuration of lots in town was such that many people's front lawns were in the right-of-way. He asked what was being prevented by having someone not put a sign in the right-of-way. He stated that the idea was to prevent that person from creating a hazard to snowplowing or emergency vehicle access or sight line obstruction. He noted that Section D. 5. covered those issues and including the right-of-way language in Section D. 3. could create problems for certain lots. John Dever, III, suggested deleting the words "shall not be located within any right-of-way and" from Section D. 3. and leave the rest of the language to read: "Temporary signs shall only be located on property that is owned by the person whose sign it is and

shall not be placed on any utility pole, street light, similar object or on public property.". Paul Monzione agreed because this would prohibit temporary signs from public property or on street lights, telephone poles and so on; and those were very valid restrictions. The committee agreed with Section D. 3. as amended.

Paul Monzione next noted Section D. 4. "Temporary signs may be placed XX days prior to, and shall be removed within XX days after the conclusion of, the event which is the basis of the sign.". John Dever, III, suggested seven days. Paul Monzione stated that this created problems because the committee needed to add the number of days for temporary signs but the event needed to be defined because political campaigns needed to be included. He noted that if the language was to allow temporary signs seven days prior to and seven days after an event like a bake sale or craft fair, for example, it made sense. The campaign for an election went on for months. Tom Hoopes stated that election was self-defining. Paul Monzione stated that if the election was the event then the only time the political signs would be allowed to go up would be seven days before and after November 8th. He noted that the ordinance could not distinguish the time allowed for temporary political signs any differently than for other temporary signs. He went on to say that this had to be covered under a definition of event.

Nic Strong stated that she had read an ordinance trying to deal with the same issue that had included language along the lines of "signs that coincide with the timing of a political campaign" to try to get around calling out political signs. Paul Monzione thought that the better way of handling it was to define the event. Nic Strong stated that the problem then was that the number of days for temporary signs to be allowed still had to be included. She noted that the definition of event would have to include "such as, but not limited to, craft sales, art fairs, etc.". Paul Monzione said that Section D. 4. would say "Temporary signs may be placed seven days prior to, and shall be removed within seven days after the conclusion of, the event which is the basis of the sign." He asked what would be done in that case about a political campaign. John Dever, III, stated that no limit should be placed on how many days before but the limit would remain on days after. Paul Monzione stated that could not happen because then political signs were being treated differently. He stated that prior to the event was just as important as the after and all signs had to be treated the same. Nic Strong stated that if the prior to was removed then things like craft fairs, as noted by Scott William, would put up their signs on the Friday and have a specified time to remove them. The political signs would go up whenever and get taken down in the same time period. Paul Monzione pointed out that if he knew he was going to have turkeys on sale for Thanksgiving, if he decided to put up a temporary sign in September or August or at the 4th of July, removing the prior limit for putting up temporary signs was not helpful in terms of sign clutter and visuals.

Paul Monzione's stated that seven days prior and seven days after an event was a good idea because it was a reasonable time in advance and after the event and the only problem occurring was to define a political campaign as an event. He stated that an event should be defined as "something that occurs for several days, such as…" and also say, included in an event is a political campaign. John Dever, III, stated that seemed like a better way to address it. Nic Strong asked if anything could be added to the definition of temporary sign to take care of this rather than create a definition of event

which could lead to confusion if it conflicted with other definitions of commonplace terms should the matter go to court. She noted that currently a temporary sign was a sign that "appears to be intended to be displayed for a limited period of time, that is used for a specific circumstance, situation or event intended or expected to take place or be completed within a short or definite period of time.". She asked if a short list, for example, political campaign, bake sale, could be added. Paul Monzione thought that the definition could even say "an example of an event".

Scott Williams asked if any towns had addressed this issue yet that the Town of Alton could look at to use the language. Nic Strong stated that towns statewide and nationwide were struggling to come to terms with what should be done to their sign ordinances to bring them into compliance with the US Supreme Court's decision. Tom Hoopes stated that the Municipal Association had offered some suggestions of possible changes to make to ordinances, including allowing additional signs on properties for sale or rent.

Paul Monzione suggested adding language to the temporary sign definition: "Temporary sign: A sign, banner, pennant, poster or display constructed of paper, cloth, canvas, plastic sheet, cardboard, wallboard, plywood or other like materials, either standing alone or temporarily affixed to a structure or building, that appears to be intended to be displayed for a limited period of time, that is used for a specific circumstance, situation or event intended or expected to take place or be completed within a short or definite period of time. ***Examples of events include such things as, but not limited to, craft fairs, old home week, political campaigns and yard sales.*** If the sign display area is permanent but the message displayed is subject to periodic manual changes, that sign shall not be regarded as a temporary sign." Paul Monzione noted that adding political campaigns as events to the definition of what an event is then seven days prior to the campaign the sign could go up to seven days after the campaign. The days prior to a campaign might be difficult to ascertain. Clearly a campaign would be over on election day so the days after would be easier to manage. Tom Hoopes thought that two days was ample time to remove temporary signs after an event. John Dever, III, stated that seven days was what was currently allowed. The committee agreed with seven days prior and after.

Paul Monzione stated that the committee had already discussed Section D. 5. Section D. 6. was that "Temporary signs shall not be illuminated.". Nic Strong stated that she had added that but asked the committee if they agreed. The committee agreed. Paul Monzione stated that temporary signs should not be specifically illuminated but if someone put a temporary sign under an existing street light it wouldn't apply. Scott Williams stated that there were LED signs on back of trailers that could be moved around that could be used as temporary signs, but not under this provision. Paul Monzione stated that the existing ordinance included language that prohibited trucks and vans from being parked as signs.

Nic Strong stated that the other new section before the committee was the Off-Premises Signs section which had come up at the last meeting. She noted that the definition was "A sign which pertains to a business, industry or activity which is not located on the premises upon which the sign is located." Tom Hoopes asked if this was intended to be for directional signs off a highway to a remote location. Nic Strong stated it was any sign pertaining to the business. Paul Monzione stated

that this section was to do with permanent signs. Scott Williams noted that the section was dealing with directional signs and advertising signs.

Paul Monzione read Section E. 1. "Off premises signs are allowed only with a permit from the Building Inspector" and noted that was appropriate. He noted that the only signs that don't require a permit were temporary signs. Tom Hoopes asked if this would cover enter and exit signs and so on. Scott Williams stated those did not fall under this regulation.

Paul Monzione read Section E. 2. "Off premises signs shall count towards the overall signage allowed for each lot.". Section E. 3. "Off premises signs shall not be located within any right-of-way and permission for the sign shall be granted in writing by the owner of the property upon which the off-premises sign is to be placed." Section E. 4. "Off premises signs shall not exceed XX square feet in size and shall otherwise comply with the general provisions of Section B. above." Paul Monzione thought that the off-premises signs should be the same square footage as the permanent signs allowed in the zone. He asked why an off-premises sign should be treated any differently than a permanent sign. He thought it would make sense to say in Section E. 4. "Off premises signs shall not exceed the square footage of signs permitted in the zone in which it is located.". Discussion took place regarding this provision allowing large signs for businesses that were not on the property the sign was on. Paul Monzione offered a scenario where a business was located down a long driveway beside another property to get there and the person who owned the lot close to the road was willing to put the 24 s.f. business sign on their lot for better publicity. Scott Williams thought the business should be allowed to do to that to advertise the business.

Paul Monzione asked who would the square footage of the sign be calculated for? The lot with the business or the lot on which the sign was placed? Nic Strong stated that Section E. 2. needed to be more specific to say which lot was meant by the language. Discussion took place regarding which lot was meant here because if the square footage of the sign went with the lot on which the business was located but the sign was on a different lot, that lot would also be allowed to have a sign. Paul Monzione thought that the sign square footage should go with the lot on which the sign was located. Tom Hoopes asked what would happen if the owner of the lot closer to the road wanted to have his own sign. Paul Monzione stated that they would not work out any deals with the business owner in back. Tom Hoopes and John Dever, III, thought that the square footage should go with the business that was applying for the sign. Tom Hoopes thought that the off-premises signs should be smaller than the permitted use signs. Paul Monzione wondered what would happen if there were three businesses on the other lots and all three wanted to make a deal with the owner of the lot by the street, could he have three 24 s.f. signs on his lot because the size counted towards their lot, not his. Tom Hoopes thought the size should be divided by the number of businesses so the signs would get smaller. Scott Williams thought this scenario would turn into the sign having to be a monument sign or pylon sign and each business would get so much square footage on the sign.

Paul Monzione stated that the fewer things the ZAC had to decide upon to put in the ordinance, the easier it was for everyone to understand and for the Code Official to enforce. He noted that if the property was allowed 24 s.f. of signage would that be in addition to the off-premises signs. Nic

Strong asked what would happen if the lot on which the off-premises sign would be placed was in a different district than the lot on which the business was located. Paul Monzione thought the whole section had to be governed by the lot on which the sign was to be located; if the lot was restricted to 24 s.f. of signage, then that was all that was available. He noted that if the lot with the business was in the Lakeshore Residential district which was allowed 4 s.f. for a permanent business sign, but the sign could go on a lot that was allowed 24 s.f., then the size had to be governed by the lot on which the sign was placed. He stated that Section E. 2. should be changed to read "Off-premises signs shall count towards the overall signage allowed for each lot ***upon which the sign is located***.". The committee agreed. Paul Monzione stated that the property owner on which the sign was located was potentially giving up the right to have a sign themselves; and the owner of the lot with the business thereon could potentially have a sign on that lot too. He also noted that there was the relief offered by the variance process if the owner of the lot with the sign on it wanted to have a sign too.

Tom Hoopes stated again that off-premises signs should be required to be somewhat smaller than the permanent signs allowed on the other lots. He thought that off-premises signs would be out in the open alongside roads where they would be more distracting. Paul Monzione stated that the owner of the lot could put their own 24 s.f. sign there anyway so what was the difference whose sign it was?

The committee did not have any questions regarding Section E. 3. "Off premises signs shall not be located within any right-of-way and permission for the sign shall be granted in writing by the owner of the property upon which the off-premises sign is to be placed.". Paul Monzione suggested adding the size of the sign allowed in the district in which the sign was located to Section E. 4. "Off premises signs shall not exceed ***the size permitted for the lot upon which the sign is located*** and shall otherwise comply with the general provisions of Section B. above.". The committee agreed.

2. Continue reviewing Alton Zoning Ordinance, Working Draft 4.19.16, to be assisted by the packets dated 8/23/16.

Paul Monzione asked Nic Strong to walk the ZAC through the next item. Nic Strong stated that the committee should start by looking at the table entitled "Items that have not yet been discussed at a ZAC meeting and would require ballot vote".

- Mixed Use.
  Nic Strong stated that on her initial review of the Zoning Ordinance she had wondered if Mixed Use needed to be added as a definition because it was included in the Subdivision Regulations but not the Site Plan Review Regulations or the Zoning Ordinance. She noted that a search of the Zoning Ordinance indicated that the term is not used in that document so she no longer thought this definition was necessary. The committee agreed.
- Non-Conforming Lot.
  Nic Strong noted that there was a definition of Non-Conforming Structure and Non-Conforming Use but not of Non-Conforming Lot and one should be added. She noted that it would follow the format of the definitions for the other two types of non-conformity. The committee agreed.

Scott Williams asked if there was a date after which an abandoned use could not be reestablished. Nic Strong stated that the non-conforming section of the Zoning Ordinance said 18 months with no proven intent on the part of the owner to continue the use. She said if someone came to the Code Official with proof that they were going to reestablish the use but could not do so within the 18 months he could allow it to continue.

- Personal Wireless Service Facilities.
  Nic Strong noted that the definition would refer readers to Section 603 for definitions which was the Personal Wireless Service Facilities section. This was the same as proposed for the Inclusionary Zoning section. The committee agreed.
- Private Garage.
  Nic Strong noted that this use is not listed in the Table of Uses. She noted that this may be similar to the situation previously discussed with regard to the language at the beginning of the Table of Uses which stated that "This table does not prohibit those uses which are considered accessory and customarily associated with the primary use." The committee agreed it did not need to be added to the Table of Uses because it was considered an accessory use.
- Private Tent Site.
  Nic Strong stated that when she first reviewed the Zoning Ordinance she had gone through double checking that the listed definitions were included in the Table of Uses and this one was not. She noted that in Section 358 the details were specified as to where they would be permitted so there was no need to make any changes to the Zoning Ordinance. The committee agreed.
- Recreational Use - Not for Profit.
  Nic Strong noted that when she had reviewed the Zoning Ordinance with Town Counsel he had expressed that he did not understand the definition and wanted ZAC to discuss if it was needed. The committee determined that this could apply to summer camps, the recent Forest Society applications, and noted that the ZBA had used the definition to determine whether or not a use fell within the parameters. The committee determined that the definition should remain as is.
- Removal or Removed.
  Nic Strong noted that this definition "Cut, sawed, pruned, girdled, felled, pushed over, buried, burned, killed, or otherwise destructively altered." should mention "trees" and does not. She noted, however, that the term did not appear anywhere else in the Zoning Ordinance. Tom Hoopes thought that this was associated with Shoreland Protection at one point because it was not allowed to remove stumps from the embankments. The committee agreed that the definition should include the word trees.
- Repair Shop for Appliances.
  Nic Srong noted that this use was listed in the Table of Uses and allowed by right in the RC and RR and by Special Exception in Rural, but there was no definition. Paul Monzione thought the definition was essential because if the use was permitted the Town should be able to define what it is. He thought maybe the word "household" should be used in the definition. John Dever, III, asked about someone who wanted to repair medical appliances. The committee agree that a definition should be added.

- Restaurant, Fast Food.
  Nic Strong noted that Restaurant, Fast Food was defined but not listed in the Table of Uses. The Table of Uses included Restaurant and Restaurant and/or Drive-In Restaurant. Paul Monzione thought that it was included in the Table of Uses because the restriction on highway access required had come up at the ZBA. Nic Strong further noted that Restaurant, Drive-In was not defined. Paul Monzione clarified that Nic Strong was suggesting that if a definition of Restaurant, Fast Food existed it should be inserted in the Table of Uses along with the Restaurant and Drive-In Restaurant uses. Tom Hoopes asked if it included drive-throughs as opposed to drive-ins. John Dever, III, stated that the definition included self-service to the customer's automobiles. He noted that there was no definition of Restaurant, Drive-In, and noted that the Zoning Ordinance had been muddled in the past with definitions that were not in the Table of Uses and uses that had no definitions.
  The committee pointed out that there may be substantial differences between Restaurant, Drive-In Restaurant and Fast Food Restaurant. Paul Monzione stated that fast food was less important to him than the drive through aspect. He thought that drive through restaurants would affect traffic patterns and safety and stacking of vehicles, much more than fast food restaurants. Nic Strong stated that currently Restaurant was permitted by right in the RC, RS and RR districts with the frontage requirements on certain classes of road in the RR. It was also permitted by Special Exception in the Rural district. Paul Monzione stated that could be the type of place with no seats, only counter space and take out only. Nic Strong stated the definition included cafes, lunchrooms, cafeterias, tearooms, sandwich shops and the like, but not fast food restaurants. Fast food restaurant was separately defined. She asked where the committee wanted to allow that use. Nic Strong read the Fast Food Restaurant definition: "A building used principally to dispense prepared food and/or beverages to the public for consumption on or off the premises, the major attributes of which are assembly line preparation of food and speed of dispensing, self-service to the customer's automobiles and which generates a large volume and rapid turnover of entering and exiting motor vehicle traffic.".
  Paul Monzione stated that the Restaurant definition was good because it permitted a wide variety of types of eating establishment. He noted that if all he had in his restaurant was a counter and everything prepared was to go, that would fall under Fast Food. He thought that Restaurant should encompass everything except vehicle sales and vehicle sales should be in a category by itself, whether that be drive in or drive through. Paul Monzione thought that restaurants serving people that never got out of their car were in a completely different category from those that may not provide seating on the property but the customers had to get out of the cars and go inside the establishment to pick up their food. He stated that was why there was the restriction on the type of frontage required for that kind of restaurant. John Dever, III, pointed out that restriction applied to the regular restaurant too. Nic Strong stated that restriction only applied in the RR district to all the restaurants listed. John Dever, III, stated that it did not make sense to apply that to a regular restaurant.

The committee decided that definitions were needed for Restaurant and Drive Through Restaurants.

- Right-of-way and street/road/highway.
  Nic Strong noted that right-of-way was not defined but it was in the Subdivision Regulations. Street, road and highway were used interchangeably in the Zoning Ordinance and Town Counsel suggested combining them into one definition. The committee decided to draft a definition of right-of-way and to combine street, road and highway under one definition. Tom Hoopes stated that corner lots and frontage should be reviewed. Scott Williams thought the frontage should be on the road from which the lot was accessed. Nic Strong noted that each district contained the requirement that the minimum lot frontage for corner lots be provided on each street or highway.
- School.
  Nic Strong noted that School was defined but not listed in the Table of Uses and Public or Private Educational Institutions were listed in the Table of Uses but not defined. It was noted that it was important to keep the definition of School as that term was used in other sections of the Zoning Ordinance, including the Sexually Oriented Business ordinance which used School in the section that specified how far away from various uses a Sexually Oriented Business should be located. It was noted that the definition of School was really defining the building, not the use, so this did not need to be added to the Table of Uses. However, the committee determined that a definition should be created for Public or Private Educational Institutions.
- Shed.
  Nic Strong stated that this use was defined but not included in the Table of Uses. However, this was once again covered by the language "This table does not prohibit those uses which are considered accessory and customarily associated with the primary use.". She went on to say that the use allowing sheds as the principal building on a lot was a separate thing and not defined in the definition section. The committee determined that no changes were needed to the Zoning Ordinance.
- Skilled Nursing CCRC Facilities.
  Nic Strong noted that the use was defined and Section 331 stated where the use should be permitted but this was not included in the Table of Uses. The committee determined that the use should be added to the Table of Uses.
- Storage Containers.
  Nic Strong noted that this definition existed but there was no listing for this use in the Table of Uses. Paul Monzione stated that if the use was not listed in the Table of Uses then it was not permitted. The committee determined that this definition was important so that everyone understood what the Town meant by the term but the use did not need to be added to the Table of Uses.
- Telecommunications Facilities & Tower and Tower Height.
  Nic Strong noted that these two definitions should be deleted because the new definition of Personal Wireless Service Facilities will be directing people to that section to find all the relevant definitions. The committee agreed.
- Upland.

Nic Strong noted that the statute referenced in this definition for Wetland was incorrect. The committee agreed that this should be amended.

- Waste.
  Nic Strong noted that the definition of Waste referred to the incorrect statute number which should be amended. The committee agreed.
  John Dever, III, stated that he had just found a definition of Restaurant, Drive-In because it was under D for Drive-In, versus R for Restaurant.
- Section 332, Sexually Oriented Business.
  Nic Strong noted that some different definitions had been added to the ordinance regarding different types of day care homes and nursery programs and she thought that those uses should be added to the section that required Sexually Oriented Businesses to be located a certain distance away from said businesses. The committee agreed.
- Section 333, Criteria for a Home Business.
  Nic Strong noted that Section 333 D. required that "One on-premise sign no more than 6 square feet shall be permitted to advertise the home business.". She noted that in the Residential Zone the requirement is that no sign shall exceed three square feet. Paul Monzione suggested adding "or as limited by the zone in which the home business is located, whichever is less/smaller/more restrictive.".
- Section 359, Stormwater Management.
  Nic Strong noted that this section referred to the old greenbook which used to be the standard for erosion control in subdivisions and developments referred to by the State. This had been updated by the State in 2008 into the three volume NH Stormwater Manual now used. She suggested changing this reference in the Zoning Ordinance. Some discussion took place regarding how to have this automatically update when the State decides to create a new document in its place. Nic Strong stated that the current language stated "as amended" which would take care of changes within the existing document. She noted that this happened infrequently, noting that the greenbook was dated 1992 and it was updated to the NH Stormwater Manual in 2008 and she had not heard of any plans to change that document. She thought that the Town should have to make a change to the Zoning Ordinance if the whole document were to be discarded and a new document introduced. The committee agreed.
- Section 520, Special Exceptions and Section 530, Variances.
  Nic Strong stated that the RSAs changed in 2013 to add a two-year time limit for Special Exceptions and Variances to be valid and she wondered if the committee wanted to add those to the Town's Zoning Ordinance. She noted that there was some provision for extension of the two-year timeline and that would be brought into the Zoning Ordinance as well. The committee agreed to add those timelines. The committee asked if there were limits on the extensions that could be granted and it was noted there were not.

Nic Strong noted that the next table included the larger substantive sections that the committee had already worked on. And all that was left was the Table of Uses which should be discussed at the next meeting.

TOWN OF ALTON **APPROVED**
ZONING AMENDMENT COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF 2016

October 11, 2016

OLD BUSINESS

1. Old Business-
   - None
2. New Business-
   - None
3. Approval of Minutes-

   September 27, 2016

Nic Strong apologized to the committee because of the lateness with which she had finished the minutes. The minutes were tabled for action until the next meeting.

SET DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

- October 25, 2016, at 6:00 p.m.
- November 1, 2016, at 6:00 p.m.
- November 15, 2016, with the Planning Board.
- December 20, 2016, public hearing on the amendments.

PUBLIC INPUT

Open to the public. None at this time. Closed Public session.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:00 p.m. Scott Williams moved to adjourn. Tom Hoopes seconded the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nic Strong, Town Planner

Minutes approved as written: October 25, 2016