

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

In attendance were JoAnn Duffy—Chairman, Cathy Whooten, Emily Sandblade, and Alan Yeaton. Also in attendance were Jonathan O'Rourke—Planning & Zoning Administrator, and Darrell Halen—GTV audio/video technician.

JoAnn Duffy called the meeting to order at 7 pm. The Board said the Pledge of Allegiance. She asked the Board to introduce themselves.

MINUTES—meeting of April 5, 2016

Emily Sandblade made a motion to approve the minutes to the ZBA meeting of April 5, 2016. Cathy Whooten seconded the motion. VOTE: 3-0-1. Alan Yeaton abstained. Motion carries.

JoAnn Duffy explained this is normally a board of five members. Tonight we have only four members present. You have the choice of going ahead tonight or waiting for a full five-member board. The reason is you have to have three positive votes. The fewer members present the less chance of having three positive votes.

Joey and Kimberly Bolduc said they would proceed this evening.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Joey & Kimberly Bolduc, Applicant/Owners, are seeking Variances to build a 10' X 42' addition to the front of the existing family home that will be 10 ft. from the front property line, whereas the Goffstown Zoning Ordinance requires a 25 ft. front setback from the front property line. Another variance is required as the addition will be built 9 ft. from the side property line whereas a 15 ft. setback is required. This concerns Section 4.3 Table of Dimensional Regulations, of the Goffstown Zoning Ordinance. The property is located on 114 Sharon Street, (Map 19 Lot 50), in the Residential-2 Zone. (Continued from the April 5, 2016 Meeting.)

JoAnn Duffy said we received additional information in our packets. She asked the applicant to review what they've provide.

Joey Bolduc reviewed the documentation they provided. The first document is an over view of the neighborhood. They took a walk within the neighborhood to compare with theirs. This document shows it is common within their area. The green colored boxes reflect properties that are 0-10 feet from the road. The red boxes are 11-15 feet, and the blues boxes are 16-10 feet from the road.

Kimberly Bolduc said if you drive around you can see this is pretty common. The homes are close to the street. What they are asking to do would fit in with the existing homes. They used a digital measuring tape and measured from the road because they don't know where the setback and property lines are on every one of these homes.

Joey Bolduc explained they measured from the home to the street, or to the closest part of the sidewalk, if there was one. Sometimes they measured from the front of the steps because there had been a concern last meeting that their steps would be street facing. But they will be facing the driveway, not the street. Jon O'Rourke took pictures of several homes that are close to the street. They are shown in the packet he (Jon O'Rourke) sent out.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Kimberly Bolduc said it shows that what we are proposing to do will fit into the character of the existing neighborhood. She addressed page 2 of the packet they submitted. There was confusion in the diagrams they had initially provided as to what it would look like. Page 2 is the basic layout. We are outgrowing the home and need to have a third bedroom. Their dining room isn't really a dining room. With the extension they would have a real dining room and a covered porch we could walk onto.

Joey Bolduc said page 3 shows a 3D visual of what the porch would look like and where the entry door will be. The stairs go out to the driveway, and do not go out facing the road.

Kimberly Bolduc said they put up stakes and strings to show where the addition would be and what the front lawn would consist of after the addition. The addition doesn't even surpass the tree in the front yard. When we look at the other homes, what we want to do seems to make sense. Page 5, with Joey and the baby, and it shows how much space they actually is. It is more than they envisioned and more than other homes in the neighborhood. At the last meeting something that came up was about safety. It is something they have thought about. They've addressed that the front door will not be facing the road, and we will be walking onto the porch from the driveway. Sharon Street is really set back. You can see the river from their yard. There is very little vehicular traffic. It's not busy at all. There are more people walking their dogs, running, walking with strollers, etc. The only time we notice a little more traffic is when there is a baseball game down the road. The addition isn't going to affect pedestrian traffic, parking, or other homes. It won't have a negative impact on the neighborhood. We didn't buy this house with the intention of their children playing in the front yard. They go to parks, etc.

Joey Bolduc said it will make the house look more proportioned. On the last page of the packet they provided shows the other addition they built. The roof line is lopsided. Coming out another ten feet will make it more proportioned. With not using the front yard for play we will be put in some nice plants and make it aesthetically pleasing.

Kimberly Bolduc said there were other options the Board discussed. When we bought the house in 2011 it was a single bedroom home. We added on the second bedroom. We've made many improvements to the house. We couldn't do what we've done to this home in a bigger home. We love the neighborhood and want to stay here a long time. We want to raise our children in the town we grew up in. Someone asked about going further back. We went as far back as we could with the original addition.

Joey Bolduc referenced the picture that shows the shed and addition. There is a ledge that has a 60-70 foot drop.

Kimberly Bolduc said it was also mentioned about building a seconded floor. That's not an option. They existing structure couldn't hold a second floor. You have a letter from the Barriere's, who live across from us, which supports our request. We have letters from 111A Sharon Street, Jean Picard and John Plourde, and from Ray Lacasse, of 111 Sharon Street. She read the letters, which also reflect support of the application.

Alan Yeaton asked how many of the homes, colored red on the map, were built prior to the Zoning Ordinance. There are two. His father-in-law owns them. It's on Rochambeau Street and he doesn't think it's a fair comparison.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Cathy Whooten asked where the septic system is.

Joey Bolduc said they have municipal sewer and water.

Cathy Whooten said she noticed on the plans that they have a porch and a garage. What is between the porch and garage?

Joey Bolduc said it is a small walkway to get in and out of the house. There is also a bulkhead that protrudes out that is not shown.

Cathy Whooten asked how long the driveway is.

Joey Bolduc said he would guess it is about 35 feet from the road to the garage.

Cathy Whooten asked if there could be consideration of closing in the area between the porch and garage, and turning the garage into a bedroom.

JoAnn Duffy said we are not supposed to redesign someone's plans.

Cathy Whooten said she is looking at it from the standpoint that they could create the needed, additional living space by incorporating the garage and the area between it and the porch. You could possibly build another garage further forward on the driveway.

Joey Bolduc said the problem with that is that the porch is the entryway into their living room.

Kimberly Bolduc said we now have room for possibly four vehicles in our driveway. We'd be eliminating a lot of our driveway in doing that. It would cost them a lot more to turn that into a bedroom and also build another garage. They would be decreasing their property value by taking away the garage. We have sat down and thought of every possibility. She doesn't know how that would work. The bulkhead going into the basement is there. It is the only egress to the basement. The reason we didn't make the addition in the back bigger is because of where that bulkhead is. She wouldn't want to decrease their property values by putting the garage to that use, and she's not sure, with the codes, that it would work.

Alan Yeaton said he's walked their property a couple of times. He heard mention of multiple automobiles. What's going on over there?

Cathy Whooten asked if he was referring to the mention of parking space for four vehicles.

Joey Bolduc said his brother-in-law and sister-in-law lives on Lewis Street. Her parents visit often. They have people at their house.

Kimberly Bolduc said she meant that if they eliminate a portion of their driveway it would decrease the value of their home. They only have two cars, but it is more valuable to have spots for more cars.

JoAnn Duffy opened the hearing to the public. There was no comment from the public.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

JoAnn Duffy said she looked up, in the zoning handbook that the State puts out, about the spirit of the ordinance because Gail Labrecque had concerns. It talks of the new statutory language. It says, *"Based upon the language of the opinion (of Harborside Associates) we can now state the following regarding applications of the elements to actual applications for relief. Public interest and spirit of the ordinance, as held in Farrar v Keene of 2009, the two elements are related. For a variance to be contrary to the public interest and inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance, its grant must violate its basic zoning objectives. There are two methods to answer this question. 1) is to examine whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the neighborhood, or 2) is to examine whether the granting of the variance would threaten the public health, safety, or welfare."* Her own opinion is that it wouldn't do either.

Cathy Whooten asked if this was deliberations.

JoAnn Duffy said she brought it up in case there were questions on it, as we discussed in our recent meeting with the attorney. She thinks it would be hard to prove it doesn't meet the spirit of the ordinance unless you were putting in something like an office building. Also, Patty Gale had sent us some information that contained an old property card. It has a signature of a hearing officer from MMC. It is the opinion that the back yard has a steep slope, and they don't have full use of the land because of the shape of the slope. The house is a mobile home and not a ranch. It's already been proven that they can't go out back, or up because of the kind of structure it is. She wanted that on the record.

Cathy Whooten said under our Zoning Ordinances, Section 14.9.2 Continuation of Non-Conforming Structures, says, *"Where a lawful structure exists at the effective date of adoption or amendment that could not be built under the terms of this Ordinance by reason of restrictions on lot area, lot coverage, height, required yards, its location on the lot, or other requirements concerning the structure, such structure may be continued so long as it remains otherwise lawful, subject to the following provisions."* Section 14.9.2.1 reads, *"The structure shall not be enlarged or altered in a way that increases its non-conformity, but any structure or portion thereof may be altered to decrease its non-conformity."*

JoAnn Duffy said the structure itself was not non-conforming. Wouldn't they have needed a variance to put the structure on the back of it?

Jon O'Rourke said that is the way he understands it.

Alan Yeaton said no. They met all the setbacks when they built that addition.

Joey Bolduc said they got a variance for the side setback for that addition. They went in it by three feet.

JoAnn Duffy asked if they got a variance to the section of the ordinance that says they aren't to go larger.

Joey Bolduc said it didn't come up.

Alan Yeaton asked why we weren't made aware of the fact that this house has had a variance before.

Kimberly Bolduc said it was mentioned at the last meeting.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Cathy Whooten read Section 14.7.2 Date Lot Was Created. *“The date of creation of a lot shall be considered established by its most recent legal and conforming change in configuration by parcel area reduction, consolidation, land division, or other official action if such was required.”*

JoAnn Duffy said we are just looking at the structure. They aren't doing anything with the lot. They are just expanding the structure.

Jon O'Rourke said he has a notice of decision dated April 3, 2012. The Board voted 5-0-0 that the application had no regional impact and to approve the variance.

JoAnn Duffy said we were provided something with the fact that they had received the variance before.

Cathy Whooten said each variance has its own identity as to why it would be granted. She wouldn't compare apples to oranges.

JoAnn Duffy said they are asking for two variances—the side yard and the front yard. The side yard matches and will not go further than it currently is. It's not becoming more non-conforming on the side. It is only on the front.

Cathy Whooten said she's not concerned with the side. She is with the front.

Emily Sandblade asked if the front is currently conforming.

JoAnn Duffy said it conformed when the home was originally built, but does not conform to today's standards.

Joey Bolduc said we will still have almost 16 feet of actual front yard space. That's a pretty good amount and a lot of these houses are a lot closer than that.

Alan Yeaton said you are 16 feet from the pavement.

Joey Bolduc said he understands that.

Kimberly Bolduc said it is about 10.5-11 feet to the setback.

JoAnn Duffy said the visual of the picture shows what to expect.

Cathy Whooten said it doesn't show the road.

Kimberly Bolduc said on page 5 the picture shows a good visual of where the yard would end. One of the things to think about is on page 4. It shows their current front door. It shows how the stairs come out. They come out 4.5 feet. We are really only asking to go from the edge of the stairs out 5.5 feet. On page 4 of Jon O'Rourke's packet shows it a little better. Asking for 10 feet sounds like a lot, but we already have steps that are protruding out 4.5 feet from the front door.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Joey Bolduc said the bottom of that page has a good picture to show what is left.

Emily Bolduc said there is still a good amount of space in the front yard. Many of these homes are grandfathered in. But it goes to show the nature of Pinardville. Many houses are that close.

JoAnn Duffy said she went on the GIS on the Town's website to see what the overall neighborhood looked like. She started to look at the houses on Sharron Street to see how many bedrooms they have. Besides (the Bolduc house), all but one had three bedrooms. There were even a few with four bedrooms.

Joey Bolduc said it would increase the value of the house if they could build another bedroom. It will be well-built.

JoAnn Duffy said the one that shows it best is the one with the green tape on page 4 of Jon O'Rourke's pictures. The green tape shows what the addition would look like. The bushes take up a lot of space but they will be gone.

Alan Yeaton asked if they moved the shed.

Kimberly Bolduc said it was moved over a little bit.

Alan Yeaton asked how far away from the property line it is. You moved it toward the side property line.

Kimberly Bolduc said she's not sure how far it is. They would have to look at it.

Alan Yeaton said the setback for a shed is 10 feet.

Joey Bolduc said it's probably not 10 feet from the property line.

Alan Yeaton said it's not. They moved it closer to the property line, making it an infraction to the Zoning Ordinance.

JoAnn Duffy said that's a separate issue and can be taken care of.

Kimberly Bolduc said they are here trying to do the right thing. They wouldn't do anything they knew was wrong.

JoAnn Duffy closed the public hearing and the Board entered deliberations.

Alan Yeaton said he's concerned. He'd like to suggest there are alternatives to building to the front of the house, such that they wouldn't have a zoning infraction.

Alan Yeaton made a motion to deny the application because there are other alternatives to building to the front of the house. Cathy Whootten seconded the motion.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

JoAnn Duffy asked what the other options might be.

Alan Yeaton said they could build to the rear of the house.

JoAnn Duffy asked if that was even though the property card and assessing information said it's not buildable back there.

Alan Yeaton said he's been back there.

JoAnn Duffy asked if he meant the addition would be off the original part of the house or off of the addition.

Alan Yeaton said he's not saying where.

JoAnn Duffy said you have to give a reason for the decision. To say that it can be built elsewhere isn't reason for denial.

Cathy Whooten said her reasons was a valid reason. There is room in the basement. There is the possibility of using the existing garage, and if they want a garage there is enough room on the driveway to add another one.

JoAnn Duffy said the reasons being given are to redesign their plan. We have to go through the variance criteria. The reasons being given have nothing to do with the five criteria. The application says granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because we will be adding to the overall look of our home, which will allow for a better overall country look. The answers are the same for both variance requests. Let's first do the side setback.

Alan Yeaton said this is not met because the public interest is protected to keep the overall appearance of the community, and this alters it beyond what is acceptable.

Cathy Whooten said she agrees it is not met.

Emily Sandblade said she doesn't agree.

JoAnn Duffy said she also doesn't agree. The application states the spirit of the ordinance is observed because they would like to build the structure over the property setback.

Alan Yeaton said he thinks that criteria is not met because they want to build extensively in the front yard of their property.

Cathy Whooten re-read section 14.9.2.1 about altering a non-conforming structure in a way that increases its non-conformity.

JoAnn Duffy asked if she is saying that no non-conforming structure can be enlarged.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Cathy Whooten said she is saying in this particular situation the ordinance states the structure shall not be enlarged or altered in a way that increases its non-conformity. She's not going to go further to make it an overall assumption.

Emily Sandblade said she doesn't agree with Alan Yeaton and Cathy Whooten.

JoAnn Duffy said she doesn't either. The application says that granting the variance would do substantial justice because being able to add the third bedroom would allow them to stay in the home and town we currently reside in. We have a baby boy due in March and our house is too small. Remember that spirit of the ordinance and public interest are related. You'd have to actually find that it would essentially alter the character of the neighborhood or would be a threat to the health, safety and welfare of the public. She asked if they agreed with the substantial justice criteria.

Cathy Whooten said she thinks there is the possibility of having another bedroom in that home without going into the setbacks.

Alan Yeaton said he has no comment. He agrees with Cathy Whooten.

Emily Sandblade said she doesn't agree with Cathy Whooten.

JoAnn Duffy said she also doesn't agree. The values of surrounding properties will not be diminished because we will not be obstructing any neighbor's current view and will add to the overall look of the community. She agrees with that statement because they are not building upwards and are not blocking anyone's view or sight. It doesn't seem like it would be harmful. We also received three letters from abutters saying they have no issues with it.

Emily Sandblade said she agrees.

Cathy Whooten said she has no comment on that. She's not an appraiser.

JoAnn Duffy said you don't have to be.

Alan Yeaton said he thinks it's detrimental to the value because they will have built out on both sides of the house. Why would you want that to happen? It would block his view.

JoAnn Duffy addressed hardship. The application states that owing to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because the lots are all small in the area and many people are looking to do the same thing. The proposed use is a reasonable one because building this third building on our home would allow us to keep our house in Goffstown and not have to move because we are having baby. She thinks the hardship has to do with the land, and the fact that it is dipping down in the back. It has been stated in the Town records that it's not buildable land back there. Although Alan Yeaton disagrees.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Alan Yeaton said he didn't say it was buildable land at the back of the property. He said there is enough land at the top of it to build an addition to that house. He disagrees with the hardship.

Emily Sandblade said she agrees with the hardship.

Cathy Whooten said she agrees that they need a third bedroom, and that it is a hardship. But she doesn't believe this is the wherewithal to resolve the hardship issue.

JoAnn Duffy said the question is if she agrees there is a hardship. They have to have a hardship to get a variance.

Cathy Whooten said no.

JoAnn Duffy said every vote on that was a tie. We can take a vote but it will be a tie. We have to have three positive votes for approval. When there is a tie vote, it doesn't count. It's dead. It doesn't mean anything. It means we have no decision.

Emily Sandblade said the motion on the table is to deny the application.

VOTE to deny both variances: 2-2-0. JoAnn Duffy and Emily Sandblade against. Motion fails.

JoAnn Duffy said we have a dead motion.

Cathy Whooten said he has to reapply.

JoAnn Duffy said no. He hasn't gotten three positive votes but he hasn't gotten a decision from us. He has to have a vote of three for a decision.

Cathy Whooten said she would like Jon O'Rourke to clarify that.

JoAnn Duffy said she would like to get an opinion from the Town attorney. That would be clearer as to whether we can make statements that they can put it elsewhere. We're not looking at that. We are looking at what they are asking for. She thought the attorney explained that to us at the last workshop we had. She'd like the attorney's opinion. We'll have to table this.

Alan Yeaton said we table nothing. We voted on it.

JoAnn Duffy said we voted nothing. It was a tie vote and the motion died.

Alan Yeaton said the variance is denied.

JoAnn Duffy asked Jon O'Rourke to also check on that issue. With a tie vote there is no outcome. You have to have either a yes or a no. And when you vote on something to deny you have to have a reason. You can't just deny it because you feel like it. She told the applicants the town would be in touch.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Wayne Perreault, Applicant, is appealing an administrative decision of the Zoning Administrator, allowing the parking of vehicles within the Town-owned right of way, by requesting that the administrator remove the wording from the Violation notice dated September 24, 2015, as follows: "According to the definition below, the front yard area begins at the property line (not the edge of pavement of the roadway). So as long as you move your cars into the area considered the "Town-owned right of way" you may continue to park in front of your house." This concerns Section 7.3 and 7.3.5 of the Goffstown Zoning Ordinance. The property in question is located on 5 Spring Street, owned by Monica Gorman, (Map 38 Lot 105), in the Residential-1 Zone. (Continued from the December 1, 2015 Meeting.)

JoAnn Duffy said we received some information from Mr. Perreault tonight, which is actually dated for January.

Wayne Perreault said it is just the summary. He is looking to address this one decision at this property. He's not looking for it to go around town to be enforced. He's not sure he'll even ask it be enforced here because things are changing in the neighborhood. We just recently finished with the appeal from the NH Supreme Court. Since this has gone out, no one has come to oppose. They are not parking on the lawn, which is a right of way. The Board was to meet with Attorney Drescher for a legal opinion.

JoAnn Duffy said we did meet with Attorney Drescher a few weeks ago. The outcome was that he gave us advice as to how to handle this. She asked if anyone from the public wanted to comment on the appeal. She said the suggested motion is that *"The Board finds that that portion of the Order constitutes comments on parking regulations that are beyond the scope of the statutory enforcement or interpretation jurisdiction of the Code Enforcement Officer and, accordingly, are not appropriately contained in an Order by the CEO."* Basically the Board is agreeing with the appeal.

Wayne Perreault asked if it would be removed.

JoAnn Duffy said it won't be removed. This will be a follow-up. We can't remove it because Brian Rose is no longer here.

Cathy Whooten said it is also beyond our scope of jurisdiction.

Wayne Perreault said it basically goes back to, if a police officer comes over, I can show him something.

Cathy Whooten made a motion that the Board finds that the portion of the Order which reads as follows:

"According to the definition below, the front yard area begins at the property line (not the edge of pavement of the roadway). So as long as you move your cars into the area considered the "Town-owned right of way" you may continue to park in front of your house,"
challenged by the applicant, concerning Sections 7.3 and 7.3.5 of the Goffstown Zoning Ordinance, constitutes comments on parking regulations that are beyond the scope of the statutory enforcement or interpretation jurisdiction of the Code Enforcement Officer and, accordingly, are not appropriately contained in an Order by the CEO. Without commenting on the accuracy of the information contained in the questioned paragraph, the Board finds that paragraph should not have been included in the Order and, as such, it should be ignored. The Board does not find it necessary to direct that a

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

corrected Order be issued, as requested by the applicant, as this decision is sufficient. Emily Sandblade seconded the motion. VOTE: 4-0-0. All in favor. Motion carries.

JoAnn Duffy said Wayne Perreault would be provided a copy of tonight's decision.

Cathy Whooten asked if this would follow or be attached to the initial ruling like an amendment.

Jon O'Rourke said it would be in the file.

Wayne Perreault asked if the other party would be notified.

JoAnn Duffy questioned if there was another party since this was an appeal of an administrative decision.

Wayne Perreault said they were in violation of parking in the setback.

JoAnn Duffy said it doesn't hurt to notify them.

O'Reilly Auto Parts, LCC, Owner & Sandra Wilkinson, Applicant, are seeking a Variance to allow an internally illuminated signs within the required 250 ft. required buffer from any Residential District. This concerns Section 6.6.3 of the Goffstown Zoning Ordinance as this property abuts the Residential-2 District. The property is located on 711 Mast Road, (Map 15 Lot 154), in the Commercial Zone. (Continued from the April 5, 2016 Meeting.)

Jason Hargreaves presented on behalf of the applicant. They are applying to have an internally lit sign. They do use low impact, low voltage, LED lighting for their exterior signs on the property. It is essentially not causing road glare or visible glare for the residents. We feel it creates higher visibility for our clients and for the ease of travel for traffic, while not impeding on outward appearance of other businesses on the street. We would like an internally lit sign as opposed to hanging exterior lights on one big, bright picture image to attract attention to the building.

JoAnn Duffy asked if the Residential-2 zone is behind them.

Jason Hargreaves said it is. The property is actually a long rectangle that goes to the woods in the back. It is to the left and back, behind. It is actually behind the Chinese restaurant. The property is rather large in size and the building will be up close to the street. We will have a large back area on the property.

Cathy Whooten asked if there were other signs on the property.

Jason Hargreaves said the sign they are looking for is an interior lit sign and will be on the building. He thinks there may be a street sign but isn't sure they were incorporated into the plans presented.

Cathy Whooten said when she was reading the section on signs, it said only one sign is allowed on a piece of property. She doesn't know if a variance would be needed to have a second sign.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Jason Hargreaves said the property does have a pole sign, close to the street, with the names of the previous businesses. He didn't see the buildings themselves prior to the fire. He's not 100% certain of what was previous or what is allowed.

JoAnn Duffy asked if they would be using the existing pole.

Jason Hargreaves said they would probably modify it. We would change it to one color coded to shape and design. The pole would be in the same place.

Alan Yeaton said the sign is too close to the property line.

JoAnn Duffy said they may grandfather it.

Jason Hargreaves said it is on the 10 foot setback line.

Alan Yeaton said he thinks that's a different sign.

JoAnn Duffy said you are basically asking to have a variance for a sign on the building.

Jason Hargreaves said we feel a low impact LED light would better match the building and the street. We are looking to add to the value of that strip to the businesses.

JoAnn Duffy said size-wise it meets code, but the property is touching a residential zone. Would it be on all the time?

Jason Hargreaves said the exterior lights are on a timer and would go off at dusk. Most of our stores close at 9 pm, and we give them time to get out of the building. That is probably by 10 pm.

Cathy Whooten asked if he would mind it being a condition of an approval.

Jason Hargreaves said as far as he is aware, he doesn't see an issue. But he would want to speak with the owner of the company to confirm. They do have multiple buildings now that are on a timer and do shut off.

Cathy Whooten asked about the low impact LED lighting. Are they like the YMCA or the Cumberland Farms signs?

Jason Hargreaves said they are low impact and not that bright, headlight in the face kind of light. These will be kind of a dull face but will project the business name and have low impact visibility. Also, it provides that visual cue for the safety of drivers, traffic, and for identification purposes. Our company is 4500 stores strong. We have multiple properties throughout Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. We are expanding at a rapid rate. We already have approval for the building. We will be bringing jobs to the area, and we want to be a member of the community. We want to blend in well with the businesses on that strip and add to the beautification of Goffstown.

Cathy Whooten said her only concern is having two signs on the property. She doesn't have an issue with it but doesn't know if it is conforming.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

Jason Hargreaves referenced the property of Bill Sarette across the street. It has multiple signs.

JoAnn Duffy said that property has more than one business on it.

Cathy Whooten asked if he was using the pole sign.

Jason Hargreaves said no. There is no electricity to that portion of the strip right now, due to the fire damage.

JoAnn Duffy said she appreciates the fact that we don't want to have lights in a residential area, but in this case it won't be affecting it at all.

Jason Hargreaves said that sign would be removed and they would put in their own sign, according to the ordinance of the town and the setbacks.

JoAnn Duffy said you can have a pole sign and a wall sign. But you can't have two pole signs.

Alan Yeaton said the dollar store has a pole sign and a wall sign.

Jon O'Rourke referenced the Zoning Ordinance Section 6.6.2 allows a maximum of three building signs. It doesn't differentiate between building and pole signs.

JoAnn Duffy said there is no one here from the public to offer comment. She closed the public hearing.

Cathy Whooten made a motion to approve the application with the condition the sign be turned off by 11 pm. Alan Yeaton seconded the motion. VOTE: 4-0-0. All in favor. Motion carries.

Cathy Whooten asked if anyone went to the conference last week in Concord.

JoAnn Duffy said she thinks they changed the date.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

JoAnn Duffy nominated Alan Yeaton as Chairman. VOTE: 4-0-0. All in favor.

JoAnn Duffy nominated Gail Labrecque as Vice Chairman. VOTE: 4-0-0. All in favor.

CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from Wayne Perreault regarding 5 Spring Street, Map 38 Lot 105 application.

Letter from Laurian and Christine Barriere, 115 Sharon Street, abutters to the property is located on 114 Sharon Street, (Bolduc) Map 19 Lot 50, encouraging the Board to approve the Variance request for the addition.

Copy of the Hooksett Zoning Board of Adjustment Procedures.

Cathy Whooten made a motion to adjourn. Emily Sandblade seconded the motion. VOTE: 4-0-0. All in favor. Motion carries.

GOFFSTOWN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES TO MEETING OF MAY 3, 2016

The meeting adjourned at 8:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Labrecque
Recording Secretary

These minutes are subject to approval by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.