

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Tracy Emerick, Chair
Fran McMahon, Vice Chair
Ann Carnaby
Keith Lessard
Brendan McNamara
James Waddell, Selectman Member
Jason Bachand, Town Planner
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager/Planning

ABSENT: Alex Loiseau

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Emerick commenced the meeting by leading the Pledge of Allegiance and introducing the Planning Board members. The Steering Committee introduced themselves. Pat Bushway, HBAC; Erica DeVries, ZBA; Brian Warburton, Budget Committee; Barbara Kravitz (Resident Representative) is on the telephone. She dialed in from home.

Mr. McNamara was Acting Clerk for the meeting.

Mr. Emerick asked the Board if they minded hearing the Change of Use first and the Board agreed with that.

- **Change of Use –200 Drakeside Road: Retail to Beauty Salon**

Attorney Kevin Baum, Hoefle, Phoenix Law Firm, appeared. Jessica Kenerson was present and in the audience. This location is in the General Zone. It had been a first-floor retail; second floor residential. There is an outbuilding/shop in the rear. The former retail shop will be changed to a salon with partial retail. It will be primarily a salon, but will have a boutique for sales of products. The Kenersons are making cosmetic improvements.

BOARD

Mr. Lessard said he thinks it's a good use. Is there assigned parking for the apartment buildings was asked. Ms. Kenerson said there is a separate driveway. There is enough room for three or four spots. There are four assigned spots. There is a construction business being rented out in the rear. There is ample parking on the right side of the property per Ms. Kenerson. That parking is assigned to them. Mr. Lessard said parking is a huge issue in the Planning Office. There will be a middle portion being removed and paved. At the location closest to the road, there were six spots designated when it was a window shop. There will be no heavy equipment being operated at the location right now. No storing of equipment per Ms. Kenerson.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Lessard asked for a cleaner parking plan. He wants to see where the residents in the apartment units are parking. It does not show where landscape will be modified. Ms. Kenerson said they will flatten everything out. She said the five spots are highlighted. They will need a Driveway Permit to repave per Mr. Lessard. Attorney Baum noted this is a Change of Use.

Mr. Lessard asked about the Change of Use – and the service use. He asked about customers. Mr. Bachand said there should be a condition for a scaled drawing depicting parking to be placed on file. Mr. Bachand suggests the salon's parking be on the side instead of the front to prevent frequently backing out onto Drakeside Road. Attorney Baum will have a scaled parking drawing showing both of the businesses and the tenants as well.

Mr. McNamara discussed the photo with the parking to right of the garage. What are the dimensions was asked. Attorney Baum said there is no marked parking right now. The intent is to mark it. The spaces have to be 9' x 18'. Mr. McNamara asked about two businesses. The salon and the construction business using the rear. Attorney Baum said that was a shop. It did not have construction parking per Mr. McNamara. Mr. McNamara mentioned in the future the parking should be reconfigured so no backing out can occur onto Drakeside Road. If parking is on the right side of the building, does that shrink the aisleway was asked, i.e. if the spots are 9' x 18'. Attorney Baum said with the salon there will be a reduction of people coming and going.

Mr. Lessard said it (prior business) was a sleepy business in the past. The outbuilding was part of the same business. Mr. McNamara said under same family/same business. There are currently 7 employees per Ms. Kenerson. It's just Ms. Kenerson for the beauty salon. There were separate businesses going on besides the family business per Ms. Kenerson.

Mr. Bachand discussed the other business; the construction business. There will be no stockpiling of material – it would trip a site plan. Mr. Bachand is fine with the Change of Use as long as a scaled parking drawing for the site is provided to the Planning Office which demonstrates a safe and efficient parking layout.

Ms. Kenerson does real estate also. She wants to be there 3 or 4 days a week. Sign permits are almost in place. The name is Drakeside Salon.

MOVED by Mr. Lessard to approve the Change of Use (with Mr. Bachand's comments above).

SECOND by Mr. McNamara.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

Mr. Emerick noted that the applicant for 144 Ashworth Ave; 6, 8 & 10 Riverview Terrace & 6 Johnson Avenue requested to be continued to November 3, 2021.

MOVED by Mr. McMahon.

SECOND by Mr. Lessard.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

II. ATTENDING TO BE HEARD

Master Plan Steering Comm.

1. **Public Comment (relating to Master Plan)**
2. **Resilience Planning & Design – Consultant for the Phase II Comprehensive Update**
 - a. **Report out on Forum #1 and update on online and print surveys**
 - b. **Updates on Outreach Underway (website, flyer, sign-ups, local schools, etc.)**
 - c. **Planning for Focus Groups**
 - d. **November Meeting (Results from Forum #1, Update on Focus Groups, etc.)**
 - e. **Looking ahead - March 2022 - Vision and Future Land Use Forum**

Regina Barnes appeared. She has a public comment. She filled out the survey. She discussed the Natural Hazards and Coastal Impacts, Population and Housing.

Natural Hazards – Ms. Barnes discussed building on the wetlands. Developments were discussed. Sewer lines were discussed. Drainage infrastructure was discussed. She is on the CIP Committee for Hampton. She wants to work with the Master Plan Committee. We need more sources other than from the residents.

Ms. Barnes discussed the 80 taxable valuation. The Town needs to take better care. We need dedicated space for seniors.

Ms. Barnes discussed appeal by the Planning and Zoning Boards. Housing stability was discussed. Imposing housing demands was discussed.

Mr. Emerick noted it was not funded; he sits on the Finance Committee in Concord.

Jay Diener, Steering Committee Resident Representative, appeared and was seated with the Steering Committee members.

Liz Kelly from Resilience Planning and Design appeared. She said we will discuss the upcoming Focus Groups this evening.

Forum #1 (Hampton Academy on September 29th) was discussed. It was a good turnout. About 100 people arrived. There were two separate times. They are combing through feedback now. That will come to us (Steering Committee) at the November meeting. The survey data will be organized as well. There were 30 online responses submitted. Town Hall is a drop off spot. Bonnie Serowik (represents many seniors) took some information. We need to do more outreach. The survey announcement came out today to everyone as well.

Liz said an email can go to the Town blast and Recreation blast. Steve Whitman (Resilience) contacted the SAU and they agreed to send the survey out to faculty and families.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

Responses should trickle in now that we are hitting many people in the community.

There is an October 31st deadline to answer. Ms. Kelly said we could extend deadline by one more week.

Mr. Lessard asked about WMUR - flash your phone on it; it will pick up – A QR code, hit a picture of this—is this something we can do was asked. We can check that out. Channel 22 – getting the message out on the channel will be helpful.

Ms. Kelly discussed an update on the project website data. Just under 4,000 hits on the website have occurred which is very good; 1,022 unique users; 350 document downloads. 162 email list sign ups. All very good.

Focus Groups - Potential focus group topics were discussed. We came up with focus group topics. Ms. Kelly likes the focus groups. It's a chance to organize small conversations around topics. Experts on that topic or people are familiar or knowledgeable on a topic. The goal is to collect information. The timeframe for focus groups is for 1-1 ½ hours. There can be 6-8 or 10-12 people in each focus group.

Ms. Carnaby asked about the first focus group. Are there other format formulas was asked. The HBAC is noted as a Focus Group. What is that about was asked. Ms. Kelly said we are invited to attend in January. They included them within their scope in terms of project management. The Beach is so important.

Ms. DeVries discussed young families and professionals. Maybe just limit it to young families. Not socio-economic. Housing – Ms. DeVries said housing is an issue and it is so big and broad. It is beyond young families. She discussed affordable housing units. Strike “and professionals”. Combine young families and students. Housing should have its own category. “Professionals” meant more like “working single people”.

Ms. Bushway asked about the HBAC. It will be more inclusive than just the Commissioners. How do you limit the size of the group was asked. Ms. Kelly thinks this will be a bigger conversation. They are attending the meeting. Maybe having a separate focus group for Hampton Beach. The HBAC is more of a planning function. Ms. Olivier noted that the HBAC wanted to meet with Resilience and Planning on the Master Plan. Resilience is meeting with the Board of Selectmen on Monday for a project update; the HBAC is also a meeting to update and include. Maybe HBAC should not be listed as a Focus Group. Ms. Kelly concurred.

Mr. Lessard asked how Hampton Beach is defined. He thinks Boar's Head south, but north of the bridge. The end of High Street there are some businesses. There is the main beach. Ms. Kelly said for focus groups, this group needs to be defined.

HBAC has been funded by the State per Mr. Emerick.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Warburton is confused why we call out HBAC as a focus group. It is a State agency. It does not need to be listed as a Focus Group. He does not like the word “Professionals”.

Ms. Carnaby said Mr. Whitman should have a conversation with HBAC Chairman Nancy Stiles. Ms. Bushway said the January meeting will be the means to have a discussion. Mr. Lessard asked what their focus is on the Master Plan. Mr. Lessard said our focus may be totally different than what that small group wants it to be.

Ms. Carnaby said it is for transportation elements, the Route 1A project from High Street to the bridge. New efforts will focus on coastal resilience of protecting shorelines.

Mr. Bachand said to call the focus group Coastal Route 1A. Everyone said that sounds fine.

Mr. Diener asked about the demographic profile – how will the profile be tracked was asked. Ms. Kelly said tonight we are vetting topics. We are looking at staff and us for guidance on individuals we know in the community. If we know individuals who may want to be in the group; we can reach out to them. Ms. DeVries asked about the lack of participation. Ms. Kelly can manage the logistics.

Mr. Bachand said we broke into “Zoom” rooms on the prior Focus Groups (Phase I).

Ms. Kravitz appreciates the HBAC. It is an entity. She asked for the Committee to think about the HBVD as well.

Ms. Kravitz noted the Senior Citizens should be added to the focus groups. Will focus groups meet just one time was asked. Does the topic get repeated in a timeframe was asked.

Mr. Emerick discussed regional and function and some are demographic. Some young families could go to two topics.

Ms. Kelly said this is not a public event.

Mr. McNamara discussed condensing the groups. Follow up focus meetings can be used for popular focus groups.

Mr. Emerick discussed the areas of Town, versus issues like transportation.

Ms. DeVries said we discuss strong opinions about open space and conservation. Issue-based approach rather than geography-based. Mr. Diener said some topics will rise and others won't.

Ms. Carnaby discussed Town government and the Community Center. Ms. Kelly discussed gaps in information that need further exploring.

Ms. DeVries asked if we can take this feedback back and come to the group.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

We don't need to re-hash focus groups that we have already heard. Mr. Lessard likes the usual suspects. How do we interest young families was asked.

Ms. DeVries discussed Zoom. She noted break out rooms work well.

It was noted to use the email server for a list for inviting the parents.

Can we do Zoom for school aged kids was asked. There is a student focus group identified. That is high school students. Maybe we could go into the classrooms. Have a group meeting. The middle school has a program for kids. The Shark News. **Mr. Bachand could be interviewed. Interviews are on Thursdays and the broadcast is on Friday.** This is for Middle School. We'll go topical/not geographical. A new list will be brought for the November meeting.

Hampton PTA according to Mr. Warburton is a good group to reach out to as well.

Ms. Kelly said for the November meeting, they will bring the report from the first Community Forum and from the survey. They will talk about the focus groups and bring a new list.

Looking ahead – Mr. Whitman and the team are talking about Community Forum #2. They are thinking the next few months for the first focus groups being completed. March is a good time to have the second forum. Vision and Future Land Use would be the focus. Ms. DeVries would like Resilience to give the 10 best vision ideas of other communities to the Steering Committee. Ms. Kelly has different ways to send out the Vision. She will bring a couple of different versions.

Ms. Kravitz said to add to the timeline for the adoption of the Master Plan. It's not on the project timeline chart—it is not on the outreach and engagement part. Ms. Kelly will make it reflective. She asked how Coastal and Vision portions will be integrated.

PREPA Grant

- 1. Update on project related outreach (Flyer, website, etc.)**
- 2. Draft edits to existing land use regulations**
- 3. Next Step - Interactive Virtual Community Forum #1: Overview of Project, Climate Impacts, Audit Findings, and Recommended Regulation Changes – Nov/Dec 2021**

Mr. Bachand discussed the grant project. No action needs to be taken now. It was awarded to us from the Piscataqua Region Estuary Partnership (PREP). Resilience is working with us. The Articles may come forward in 2023. It's outreach and education right now.

An update on the outreach itself was discussed. A flyer is developed. It's printed. There will be copies on display.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

It is live (on the website) now. Go under the Planning icon on the website, under “Departments”. There is a page set up there. There are a few resources there now. The guidance document and video are there.

Draft edits to the land use regulations were discussed. Zak from Resilience worked on the first-round draft. The Wetlands Conservation District Ordinance and Floodplain Management Ordinance were discussed. An audit was done in August. No comments need to be provided as of yet. They should be provided to Mr. Bachand by December 1st.

Ms. Olivier and Mr. Bachand will work on updating the Site Plan Regulations and Subdivision Regulations. Early 2022 it will be presented to the Planning Board. A Forum will be held Spring of 2022. The first forum would be interactive – likely November or December of this year.

Ms. Kravitz asked for the WCD map (geographic map). It would help to visualize the effects. There is a very general map. We look at every application on a site-by-site basis.

Timeline for zoning ordinance amendments was asked about by Ms. DeVries. We have the information in the Planning Office.

III. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

20-060 144 Ashworth Ave; 6, 8 & 10 Riverview Terrace & 6 Johnson Ave

(continued from April 7, 2021, May 19, 2021, July 7, 2021, July 21, 2021, September 1, 2021, and October 6, 2021) BEING CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 3, 2021.

Map: 293 Lots: 65, 66, 73, 72 & 71

Applicant: Zoo Property Management, LLC & Albert Fleury

Owner of Record: Same

Site Plan: Merging of lots 66 and 73 to expand the existing restaurant (Wally's Pub). New four-season addition to include additional bathrooms, additional dining space & abundance of air flow for patrons.

Note: Waiver Request: Section V.E. Detailed Plans was denied by the Planning Board on April 7, 2021.

IV. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

V. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES of October 6, 2021

MOVED by Mr. McMahon to approve the October 6, 2021 Minutes.

SECOND by Ms. Carnaby.

VOTE: 4 – 0 – 2 (Waddell & McNamara)

MOTION PASSED.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

- **Proposed 2022 Zoning Articles**

Mr. Bachand discussed four potential Zoning Articles. These have been vetted with the Town Attorney and the Building Inspector, and also with Jay Diener (Conservation Commission) where appropriate. There may additional Articles coming.

The first one to discuss is on impervious surface and decks. There is a revised version that was discussed by Mr. Bachand, Mr. Diener and Attorney Gearreald. Paperwork is available in the Planning Office. Brianna O'Brien, Conservation Coordinator, was present. Currently, a deck is only considered porous if it is 6' high off the ground and the area underneath is permeable. Pervious and porous are synonymous. Mr. Diener discussed the pervious and impervious language. We use "pervious" more so than "porous". **It was noted we can check the definition in the green book.** Mr. Diener said we normally speak pervious and impervious. We use pervious more often than porous. Mr. Bachand said we can use pervious. There is a definition for "impervious" per Ms. O'Brien. Mr. Bachand looked at what other Towns are doing regarding decks. Can we be more flexible is the question. Pre-existing lots of record were discussed, Aquifer, etc. Every community is different in what they allow.

Defining standards for construction was discussed. Mr. Bachand read the language. Criteria was discussed.

If 6' off the ground; planks not greater than 8" in width with a minimum of quarter inch space between each plank. **Mr. Bachand can double check with the Building Inspector on any safety questions.** Underneath is to remain permeable.

Three feet off the ground was discussed by Mr. Bachand, 8" planks, 1/4" space between each plank; the area underneath remains permeable. 200 square feet in size.

Mr. Bachand asked about the threshold of 200 square feet. He asked about 50 percent impervious if over 200 square feet. Or should anything above 200 square feet be considered impervious.

Ms. Carnaby's deck is over a slope. It slopes down to 5'. This assumes every deck is above level ground per Ms. Carnaby. It would be measured from the point of greatest distance from the ground.

Mr. Lessard asked why we are doing this. Mr. Bachand said if someone has a deck that is not 6' off the ground; it's sealed surface—everywhere. It is considered entirely impervious surface. If it's 6' off the ground it is impervious. A shorter deck should not necessarily be considered sealed surface. Mr. Bachand said it gives reasonable use to some residents' property. Difference between 3' and 6' is "B". The 50 percent rule. Mr. Emerick thinks 50 percent should be considered impervious over 200 square feet.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

These are for decks built outside of the WCD per Mr. Diener. That puts them out of our jurisdiction per Mr. Diener.

If you're in the WCD, you have to comply with "A" per Mr. Bachand. It was noted no one polices this.

Mr. Diener thinks 200' is a big deck. That is quite a bit of coverage. Cut it back to 100 square feet per Mr. Diener. Mr. Diener said to meet halfway.

Any deck greater than 160' feet in size was discussed. Mr. McMahon said lumber comes in 8' lengths. You could use 8' x 16'. Then 50 percent of its total surface area above 160' is considered impervious. One half of the coverage. We need an algorithm.

Can this be scheduled for public hearing was asked.

Mr. Diener said they have a Conservation Commission meeting next week; The Commission has not had the opportunity to look at this yet. The Commission should look at this as a whole. It can go for public hearing after Conservation holds its meeting. If there are substantive changes, it can come back to this group. Otherwise, the 17th of November. **An algorithm should be added to this per Mr. Lessard. People need to be able to follow this as an example.**

Next, Mr. Bachand discussed clarification to the WCD section of the Zoning Ordinance. Prohibited Uses. This came up with regard to an application. 2.3.4 WCD Ordinance, Use Restrictions and Prohibitive Uses. Item "C". Repaired or replaced. Is it considered further expansion in the buffer. If so, it should be prohibited. The Board hears these as Wetlands Permit applications. It was discussed and this information (on the Amendment) is located in the Planning Office.

Mr. Bachand said it shouldn't be simple for people to encroach further into the WCD. Applicants would have to go for a Wetlands Permit, but also get relief from the ZBA first. Mr. Diener said it is a prohibited use; one should not be able to be issued a Wetlands Permit, but it does happen. We have to stop it from happening, if it is a prohibited use. That is the goal of what we are trying to accomplish here. We need to understand what a prohibited use is. The language is not clear per Mr. Bachand.

Mr. McNamara said the Conservation Commission letters are what the Planning Board relies on. Mr. Emerick said we have grandfathered structures which makes this tough.

Mr. Diener said one can repair a structure, you just can't encroach. This is not taking anything away that is not there. The Planning Board should not grant what is not permitted. Our letter should state 'not recommending' for sure. Mr. Bachand said this makes the language tighter.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Carnaby discussed the original foundation versus existing footprint. Attorney Gearreald liked the word “footprint”. If you don’t say original foundation, nothing will stop someone from building out and then going out and asking for a variance on the existing footprint. Original foundation is cleaner per Ms. Carnaby. Someone can build out and then go out and ask for permission based on the existing footprint. It’s cleaner to have the original foundation. Mr. Bachand said to say “original footprint”. Existing footprint is a bird’s eye view per Mr. Lessard. Ms. O’Brien said original foundation, does that go to the very first foundation at the location. Original refers to the very first one ever approved location. Existing is most recent that was approved. Maybe existing is better. Ms. O’Brien said we need to think this about this more. Mr. Bachand offered “legally existing footprint”.

Ms. Carnaby discussed not building further into the buffer. Mr. Diener said there are unfortunately ways people find their way around it. We need to find a definition that is encompassing and understanding as it can be.

Ms. Carnaby asked if the glossary definitions can all be put in one place. She feels there are too many glossaries throughout the Ordinance.

There is a definition of “footprint” in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Bachand read it aloud.

A change to Section 2.3.5 was discussed. Uses not permitted, but also not prohibited. Only undertaken by a Wetlands Permit. It is clarifying the language. This deals with permitted versus prohibited. Mr. Diener likes the concept. He thinks the wording is awkward. You’re talking about both permitted and prohibited.

Mr. Emerick said not prohibited means permitted. It is a speedbump in the sentence.

Ms. O’Brien said anything forgotten to be listed has to be taken up with a Wetlands Permit. Or any alteration to a permitted use not explicitly written. Anything that we just listed that is not allowed will be allowed with a Wetlands Permit. It needs clarifying. Mr. Lessard said it may need to come back. It was noted to have the Commission take a look at the third change before we schedule a public hearing. If more substantive changes are needed, we’ll discuss at the next meeting. Otherwise, it would be heard in November.

A special provisions item was discussed by Mr. Bachand. The Commission could take a look at this one also. If it has substantive changes, it can come back. Mr. Diener discussed the special provision. He is not opposed to it at all. We should find a way to do this for all of the Ordinances, not just the WCD. It does not just apply to the Aquifer. Mr. Bachand said that’s where 1.4 suffices, then do we need this here was asked. If reinforcement is appropriate, it should be universally appropriate. Mr. Bachand said it’s all listed here. Mr. Diener said we should do this globally. Mr. Bachand said it is called out in other sections. It’s a catch all in all sections per Mr. Bachand. It’s a statement of obvious facts.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Bachand said we can wait for the Conservation Commission's comments on those two.

Next, Mr. Bachand discussed multi-family condominiums. Our Ordinance does not have "condominium" in the definitions. Multi-family is defined as three or more units. Mr. Bachand discussed the new language. Separate units on separate lots will be included as one condominium. Mr. Bachand does not want the multi-family ordinance to be bypassed. It corrects the flaw; multi-family condominium is 3 or more units; irrespective of number of lots involved, it will be multi-family. You can still have a duplex and condo on the property. If one Association with three units or more and one project, it is multi-family regardless if they are on separate lots. For example, Mr. Bachand said if someone has 10 individual lots with a total of 15 dwelling units; or one large lot with 15 dwelling units, attached or duplexes, but all on one lot. Either way, that should be a multi-family development. If someone divides it into 10 lots, and has a mix of single-family and duplexes, it is still a multi-family condominium. Mr. Lessard asked about a homeowner association. Ms. Carnaby discussed the definition of condominium. It's a form of ownership. Not real estate. Mr. Bachand said it's still real property. Mr. Emerick said we should talk to Attorney Gearreald about homeowner associations. Mr. Emerick said there is an umbrella over a condo association or homeowners association. Mr. Lessard said boat slips can be condominiums. That could happen at Hampton Beach.

Mr. Lessard is agreeable to cleaning this up. Mr. Bachand asked if we need a separate amendment to this. Not right now but an HOA can be super strong per Mr. Lessard. Mr. Bachand said it's not perfect, but it's a good start. We have time to edit this, if needed.

Mr. Bachand said we could schedule it for public hearing. The Board said to go for it. Once these are approved for ballot, they are law. Unless voted down next March.

Next, Mr. Bachand discussed the Sign Ordinance (Article V). Section 5.4.1.e—why would we strike the sentence was asked. Mr. Bachand said Attorney Gearreald can answer this. It is based on case law of the U.S. Supreme Court. Mr. Lessard wants it to stay in. Mr. Waddell wants it in too and let it go to Court. Ms. Carnaby asked about why something could not be done to an offensive sign in Town. Mr. Bachand does not personally agree with striking it either, but the Sign Ordinance must be content neutral. There are legal cases that discussed signs. Vulgar language was discussed in terms of recent case law. Ms. Carnaby said we were told we could not do anything about it. Mr. Bachand said it was not enforceable. Mr. Bachand said Attorney Gearreald can talk directly to the Board, if it wishes. The Board wants it to stay in. Ms. Carnaby asked how we enforce it. Mr. Bachand said Attorney Gearreald can follow up with the Board. Mr. Lessard said if we have no teeth; maybe just remove it. Mr. McNamara doesn't understand the damages; how does this work was asked.

Section 5.4.2 was discussed. All zones. The table was discussed. It references back to Table 1. Banners are allowed in certain zones. Mr. Bachand said temporary signs should be fine. Mr.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

Waddell said the sign was a banner. Ms. Carnaby asked about banners on properties and banners across streets.

Mr. Bachand discussed the flaw in Table 1. P's need to be changed to B's. The Table has been edited; permitted by Building Department. They should be B's. Not P's. Banners in residential zones will not be allowed.

Mr. Bachand discussed the Building Inspector's later comment regarding signs. Table 2. For example, a wall sign is 50 s.f., a freestanding sign is 50 s.f., and a roof sign is 32 s.f. 132 s.f. of total signage. If there are multiple signs for the same lot, it would be a percentage less of the total that is permitted. At 132 s.f – if you allow 50 percent of the total, that is 66 s.f. It prevents multiple massive signs. Make it more proportional throughout the site. The Building Inspector wanted this brought to the Board for discussion. Mr. Emerick gave examples of free-standing signs. He discussed a 7-business condominium unit. Each unit has their own sign on their unit. They are like 3' x 5'. He asked if this applies. The one at the street is maximum according to this. Mr. Bachand said it's a percentage of the total.

Mr. Lessard discussed the CVS signage. He asked what we are trying to achieve. Why is this a problem was asked. A business has to hang a shingle. Mr. Emerick thinks it is a really bad idea. The billboard on Route 1 is grandfathered.

Ms. Carnaby talked about trucks with parking/business signs on them. She discussed limits to keep charm in this Town.

Mr. Emerick thinks minimizing signage is not a good idea.

We will move forward with a November public hearing on signs, but excluding the Building Inspector's suggested change on total square footage.

Mr. Bachand noted that food trucks on private property has been discussed and is being looked at. The ideas of chickens and roosters on properties. That may come back.

Short-term rentals need to be addressed also.

Mr. Bachand discussed an email from Tocky. Information was provided to the Board. She has been communicating with him (Mr. Bachand) on the Aquifer Protection District. Amending the Aquifer Protection District was discussed. Paperwork was given to the Planning Board. North Hampton and Rye are dealing with this now. Tocky wants to expand the Aquifer Protection District. It is a significant boundary change. Mr. Bachand feels this is important. Mr. Bachand also feels we need to study this more. There is an RPC grant on this very subject. Mr. Bachand said we need to educate residents on these changes. It's super important, but we need more information before moving forward with this.

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 20, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Carnaby asked if the DES offers any wisdom on this. Mr. Bachand said the grant is through the DES. Ms. Carnaby thinks a year is too long. We would be starting it, but it can't go on the ballot until 2023.

- **Rockingham Planning Commission Proposal for Local Technical Assistance for Drinking Water Protection**

Mr. Bachand discussed the grant with the DES. We would get free technical assistance. They would help us update the Aquifer Protection regulations and locations. Mr. Bachand asked if he can submit a letter of support on behalf of the Board.

MOTION by Mr. McNamara to submit the letter of support.

SECOND by Mr. Waddell.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

On the Aquifer, we will do our own due diligence and come back next year on this per Mr. Bachand.

Mr. Bachand discussed vegetated open spaces and porous surface. Vegetated open space was discussed. The Conservation Commission is discussing this. Ms. O'Brien said the Commission brought this up. Stricter perimeters on what is considered porous and permeable was discussed. Taking up space on the lots was discussed. It may be premature to put anything forward right now. She reached out to other Towns. Most Towns are at the beginning stages on this. No one has moved forward to take steps to put limitations on at this time. It could fit in the Site Plan Regulations also.

Ms. Carnaby discussed the drinking water issue. She noted Ms. Bushway worked on the Drinking Water Committee for the State and she is still involved with them. She discussed this with the RPC.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Waddell to adjourn.

SECOND by Mr. McMahon.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Olivier, Office Manager/Administrative Assistant

****PLEASE NOTE****

ITEMS NOT CALLED OR IN PROGRESS BY 10:00 P.M.

MAY BE CONTINUED TO THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING