

-- FILE COPY --

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
May 6, 2009**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Russo called this Planning Board meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. on Wednesday, May 6, 2009, in the Community Development meeting room in the Hudson Town Hall basement.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Russo asked Selectman Maddox to lead the assembly in pledging allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

III. ROLL CALL

Chairman Russo asked Mr. Barnes to serve as Acting Secretary until Ms. Stewart arrived and to call the roll. Those persons present, along with various applicants, representatives, and interested citizens, were as follows:

Members

Present: James Barnes, George Hall, Tierney Chadwick, Suellen Quinlan, Vincent Russo, Richard Maddox (Select men's Representative), and Terry Stewart (arrived at 8:45 p.m.).

Members

Absent: None. (All present.)

Alternates

Present: Brion Carroll, Tim Malley, Stuart Schneiderman, and Ken Massey (Selectmen's Representative Alternate).

Alternates

Absent: None. (All present.)

Staff

Present: Town Planner John Cashell.

Recorder: J. Bradford Seabury.

IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Russo seated Mr. Carroll in place of Ms. Stewart, who had not yet arrived.

V. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

Chairman Russo addressed the minutes for the meeting of November 12, 2008, asking if there were any changes or corrections

Chairman Russo referenced Page 2, expressing a belief that the statement "off-site parking was a requirement of the Zoning Ordinance," as attributed to Mr. Maynard, should be to "on-site" parking. Mr. Maynard, sitting in the audience, said that he would have said that off-site parking was not allowed. Chairman Maddox requested that the text be changed, one way or the other.

No further changes or corrections being brought forward, Mr. Carroll moved to accept the minutes as amended; Ms. Quinlan seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members present voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried (7-0).

Chairman Russo said he would take up **Old Business** Item A out of order, noting that the applicant had requested deferral until some time in June.

XII. OLD BUSINESS

**A. Tip Top Tree Service (Existing Cond.)
SP# 05-08**

**Map 161/Lot 48-1
6 Clement Road**

Purpose of plan: Site Plan Review, relative to wholesale distribution of bark mulch products. Hearing. Deferred Date Specific from the 04-08-09 Planning Board Meeting.

Selectman Maddox moved to defer the Tip Top Tree hearing for 6 Clement Road to the June 24th meeting, as requested by the applicant. Ms. Quinlan seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

No preliminary reference was made to items of correspondence received in tonight's handouts.

VII. PERFORMANCE SURETIES

No **Performance Sureties** items were addressed this evening.

VIII. ZBA INPUT ONLY

No **ZBA Input Only** items were addressed this evening.

IX. DESIGN REVIEW PHASE

No **Design Review Phase** items were addressed this evening.

X. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW ONLY

No **Conceptual Review Only** items were addressed this evening.

XI. JOINT DISCUSSION/REVIEW

A. Review and Discussion on LED Signs in the Business (B) Zoning District

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell noted that representatives of the Hudson Chamber of Commerce and also of Barlo signs were present, as well as Board of Selectmen chairman Roger Coutu; he then reviewed the documentation pertaining to this item, as provided as attachments to his staff report and/or in the members' information packets, including a letter from the Hudson Chamber of Commerce .

Selectman Massey clarified that Mr. Roger Coutu was present as a member of the public, not as a member of the Board of Selectmen or as a member of the Hudson Chamber of Commerce .

Ms. Brenda Collins, 5 Locust Street, from the Hudson Chamber of Commerce, said the Chamber had discussed the sign ordinance, and had put together the letter sent to the Board as a talking point . With LEDs coming in, she said, the Chamber had thought the Board needed something to look at for the purposes of discussion.

Chairman Russo opened the meeting for public input and comment, in favor or opposition.

Mr. Arthur Bartlett, of Barlo Signs, 156 Greeley Street, referred to a document that had been provided to the Board by his firm about LED signs , saying it was fairly complex. He said there were two ways to approach this, with the first being to discuss

how to control the signs, while the second would be for him to tell the Board why the signs were important.

Selectman Maddox asked Mr. Bartlett if the price numbers on the LED sign at the Sunoco fueling station on Lowell Road were larger and/or brighter than average, or average. Mr. Bartlett said his understanding was that the numbers were way oversized to what they needed to be, because the owner was not limited to text and it was a fairly good-sized board. Selectman Maddox noted that the signs at the Irving fueling station on Route 102 were smaller and less bright, but seemed adequate.

Mr. Bartlett said he had been trying to think how to approach this, saying he could go through each of the items—brightness, etc.—and that they needed to be discussed. He said he had lived in Hudson for a long time and was not out to abuse the privilege of a message center. He said there was new technology pertaining to message centers, saying they could be controlled if the Board would allow business owners to have them. He said the controls would have to be discussed and put into the ordinance, as it would be better to be on the forefront of the controls, rather than after the fact. If the Board were open to using the new technology, he said, he could tell the Board that it could be controlled, and those controls would have to be discussed and worked into the ordinance.

Selectman Maddox said he did not know what was being talked about when the discussion got into NITS, lumens, etc. Mr. Bartlett said he could discuss controls, saying he thought a lot of them were too bright and they hurt his eyes; he then asked if in the Board's eyes there was a place for these signs—noting that a lot of schools had them, and saying he thought they were allowed to the schools because of a loophole. He reiterated that he could discuss control, if the Board would allow it, saying he could guarantee the effectiveness of the controls.

Mr. Carroll said there were two ways to address this, with one being for the ordinance to say what was not allowed, and the other being to say what was allowed.

Chairman Russo said he would hold off on that, as Mr. Bartlett's first question had been whether the Board felt these things had value to the community.

Ms. Quinlan asked how much increase of business was attributable to signs. Mr. Bartlett said it was more than 10%, saying every salesman in his firm who sold a sign subsequently brought in a letter saying how much it had increased business. He said an ordinance saying that no sign could be bigger than 10 ft² would hurt the business community. He said changeable copy signs were kind of outdated, as it was difficult to update them, and the issue was whether to accept the new technology.

Ms. Quinlan asked if every business would have one. Mr. Bartlett replied in the negative, saying some shopping centers could be cleaned up. Ms. Quinlan referenced the sign at the Pheasant Lane Mall. Mr. Bartlett said the Board could only control size and repetition rate. He then reiterated his question as to whether the Board was open to the issue, saying he could control them but there was no where to go if the Board did not have any interest. He said businesses would not be able to compete and the town would lose them, but he could help the businesses survive.

Ms. Quinlan said the Board just wanted the signs to look appropriate, with quality, and would accept any good advice of that nature.

Town Planner Cashell referenced the blue sheet pertaining to Nashua's sign ordinance, either proposed or adopted, saying it seemed a reasonable approach. He noted that the first item said the changing sign could not exceed 50% of the area or 52 ft² overall. He noted that the Hudson ordinance had dimensions, and he suggested that 50% of the sign could be used electronically.

Mr. Carroll said the Board had asked the sign industry people to come in to discuss how to make business more visible without turning the town into a small Las Vegas, but he was concerned about slippery slopes and things running amuck. If a framework that could not be broken could be established, he said, he thought the Board would be open to that dialog.

Selectman Maddox said the Town of Hudson wanted to work toward a reasonable sign ordinance that would help the business community, and the question was how to make that happen. He said Mr. Bartlett was asking the Board to express favor without knowing the details, saying he thought the Board needed to determine what problems might exist if the Board adopted new ordinance provisions.

Mr. Hall said he had a few other criteria, saying the Board had to be sure it was a benefit to the community and not a point of aggravation or something that would give a honky-tonk look to the town. He said he did not see the difference between signs with stick-on letters and electronic changing signs, but he was concerned with the fact that he got aggravated every time he drove past the Sunoco station, because that was not the kind of sign he had in mind—the letters were too big and too bright. He said he would be looking for things that benefited both the business community and the community as a whole. Comparing the Sunoco and Irving signs, he said he was not sure how to qualify the two signs, saying it was largely a matter of taste, and many businessmen would say the bigger and brighter the sign, the more benefit they would achieve.

Mr. Bartlett said there was no history of an LED sign causing any traffic problems, anywhere in the country. He said drivers could read LED signs faster, because they were crisp. He then suggested that he go through two or three things, to move things along. Referring to the Nashua ordinance, he said the important thing was getting the owner to sign an affidavit that the owner would be responsible for any legal aspect if there were any problem with the controls. He said the affidavit and the usability of 50% of sign area were two critical factors, saying the percentage could be changed, but 50% was the norm in the industry.

Chairman Russo reminded all present that this was to be a joint discussion, and others in the audience could come up to the lectern at any time.

Selectman Maddox noted that the Chamber's proposal was 30%, with no more than 20 ft², in size. Mr. Bartlett said he did not have the Chamber's memo, but 20 ft² was too small and the sign would be unreadable.

Selectman Maddox asked Mr. Bartlett to point out what signs in the brochure met the 50% concept. Mr. Bartlett said he had not had any meetings with the Chamber of

Commerce and had not know n they were putting this brochure out; he suggested that there were some people in the Chamber who did not have a good understanding of what was involved —adding that the proposed relationship was not a good relationship and would not work, giving nothing b ut problems, as it would make people use one line of copy. If the square footage were not reasonable, he said, the town would get people doing things that did not make sense with regard to the copy .

Selectman Maddox asked for an example fro m the brochure representing what was being proposed. Mr. Bartlett reiterated that this was not his brochure, saying these were all 200 ft² signs. Selectman Maddox referenced the Town of Newmarket sign illustrated on the first page, asking if that sign represented the 5 0/50 percentages that Mr. Bartlett was advocating. Mr. Bartlett said it was probably 40% or maybe 30% or 35%. He said that smaller percentage would work if there were a large sign, but Hudson had a rather restrictive size limitation and it would not work . He then stated that the Board should try to write an ordinance that no one could get around, saying he could help them do that.

Selectman Maddox said he was just trying to get some knowledge as to what was reasonable, saying the illustrated sign looke d reasonable to him. Mr. Bartlett said a lot of the signs illustrated in the brochure were big signs, adding that many people would not spend the money if the sign were too small; he predicted that someone who bought a small sign would try to change it, or to get more text in. He stated, as an example, that no one would spend \$30,000 to buy a 15 -ft² sign. He said he was after a one -hour message changing rate, saying this was unheard of in his industry but he was happy with that and it was probably the mo st important part of the proposal. He said the industry normally said six seconds, adding that there was one other town that had an hour, but most communities in this state, including Nashua and Manchester, said six or five seconds, but he was recommendin g one hour as the rate -of-change, because all he was trying to do was get the message out, so that the business community co uld communicate with the public, and a one -hour change rate should be able to get all the communication that one needed to the gener al community over time.

Mr. Carroll suggested that Mr. Bartlett scan through the Chamber's memo, saying it made sense to him and seemed to have specificity, and he would like to have Mr. Bartlett's comment as to what made sense and what did not. He said h e felt signs should be turned off after normal business hours, but that the Chamber's proposal seemed to make sense and have specificity.

Town Planner Cashell noted that the maximum size of signs in the Business and Industrial zoning districts was 100 ft², so 50% would allow up to 50 ft², but 225-ft² signs were allowed in the large industrial park and business park areas, which would allow 112 ft² for electronic changing messages . He referenced the two ordinances that Mr. Bartlett had introduced last Janua ry, limiting the electronic changing messages to time and temperature, and he asked if that were still what Mr. Bartlett would be looking for. Mr. Bartlett said clock time and temperature were a different thing, as it would be a 1 -minute change and had to be addressed differently , in a different part of the ordinance . Mr. Cashell said the most important thing was to have the applicant s pick on the precise limitation of what they wanted —adding that the Nashua ordinance's concept of an affidavit was exactly what was wanted. He said the Board needed some clear

illustrations of what Mr. Bartlett would like the Town to adopt, adding that tonight's discussion was just a follow-up to the January discussion.

Ms. Jenn Robichaud, identifying herself as an employee of Barlo Signs, said she worked with sign codes every day, finding the holes and finding the problems. She said they had worked very hard to help Nashua write its ordinance, and she truly believed that an iron-clad ordinance could be written. She said definitions had to be written, describing what it was, and also the prohibitions —saying when the sign could be on, when it should be off, and what was allowed, including what was prohibited (scrolling, animation, etc.). She expressed a belief that the Sunoco station sign's characters were too big, saying it was not an attractive sign, in her professional opinion, whereas the Irving sign was. She said they could come back another evening, now that they knew there were people willing to listen, and write a code and show some signs and some percentages. She said her understanding of the Hudson ordinance was that signs did not get 100 ft², but instead would get 1 ft² of sign per foot of linear frontage, up to 100 — meaning that a business person who had 50 feet of frontage was not getting 100 ft² but was getting 50 ft², and was angry, because persons with larger lots got bigger signs. She said Nashua allowed up to 150 ft² and had not cut the signs in half, but had allowed 50 ft², and 52 ft² on the larger pylons. She said the 30% limit would be too small for people with smaller lots, and she expressed objection to the idea of getting signage based on frontage.

Ms. Maryellen Davis, 14 Nathaniel Drive, said she had some commentary for the Board. She said tonight's discussion was all about EMCs (Electronic Message Centers), and this town did not even allow informational message centers, just time/temperature types. She said code enforcement became a Town issue, which could be very expensive for the Town. She asked the Board to consider where the town was today, before jumping right into this, and suggesting that it should move one step at a time, to see how things worked out.

Ms. Chadwick said the one concern she had was the fact that the sign proponents were recommending these signs be permitted in the G zone, much of which was residential—noting that a lot of the other towns had very well defined areas, but Hudson had mixed areas.

Selectman Massey asked Mr. Bartlett if there were a point of diminishing returns whereby the size of the sign dictated what percentage could be used for the message. Mr. Bartlett replied in the affirmative. Selectman Massey suggested that the sign could not exceed a certain amount. Mr. Bartlett said that would take care of itself, as a business owner would not buy a sign that was too small. He said 50% was an excellent rule, as anything more than that would mean that the sign would be overpowering the business name, etc. Selectman Massey said there would be a practical minimum size to make having a sign worthwhile; Mr. Bartlett expressed agreement.

Selectman Massey noted that a recorded site plan was a public record of what was permitted, and the code enforcement officer of a municipality had every right to enforce anything beyond that. He asked why Nashua had wanted to include this rule. Mr.

Bartlett said he thought there had been signs in the past that had not been on the site plan.

Ms. Robichaud said the history of that document was 100% attributable to the mortgage-business sign on Amherst Street. She said it was important that the property-owner, not the tenant, sign the affidavit.

Selectman Massey said that in all of these things which became code enforcement over time, the question was if what was being done on the site was consistent with what the site plan said. He then noted that the documentation was differentiating between the number of lumens to be allowed at night as opposed to the number during the day, and he asked if there were a practical way for the Code Enforcement Officer to know. Ms. Robichaud said that the document Selectman Massey had referenced was probably 50 years old. Selectman Massey said his question was what was the practical way not have a Draconian ordinance. Mr. Bartlett said this was difficult to answer, but the definition of brightness had been extremely worked out, saying he had done this all over the country, using a simple foot-candle definition.

Mr. Carroll asked if there were not meters that could read out the lumens. Ms. Robichaud said that was what the Board would find in the document she would prepare. Mr. Bartlett said it would just require a phone call, telling the owner that the control had to be "blankety-blank" and the sign had to be dimmed down. Selectman Massey stated that the Police Department had sound-decibel meters that they could take to a site when there was excessive noise, saying the police had been trained to use them, with the meters being calibrated on some regular basis.

Mr. Bill McInnery, 943 Fox Hollow Drive, said he was very pro-business, adding that he had used to be in the billboard business, but he thought one dimension was being missed, as there was no inventory of signs, and no one could say how many there were. He said the Town Assessor had told him that signs were part of the profit, but Hudson did not have that, and Hudson was not assessing signs. He said the State Department of Revenue had told him that signs could be assessed but that it was a policy to be determined by each community. He noted that homeowners were assessed for pools and decks, and he suggested that business people should be assessed for signs.

Mr. Rick Hammer, from Hammer & Signs Signs, Pelham NH, said the Chamber of Commerce had consulted with him and he had given as much information as he could. He said Mr. Malley had taken the initiative to research different towns, to come up with something conservative, so some of these were small, and he would love to see them made bigger, but he thought the Chamber had been very conservative, hoping that the Board would have something to go by, representing many hours of research.

Mr. Hammer then reviewed the "*Draft To Initiate Discussion*" document prepared by the Hudson Chamber of Commerce, noting that the Chamber's proposal was to allow EMCs in the Business, Industrial, and G zoning districts, provided that they conformed with the restrictions listed in the following paragraphs. He said that Item #1 provided definitions for terms relevant to electronic signs, while Item #2 restricted the size message area of a sign to 30% of the total area of the sign or to 20 ft², whichever was

smaller—adding that this percentage was based on the Pelham ordinance which he had helped develop.

He noted that Item #3 would restrict the EMC message to two lines of text or numbers, with no additional graphics or images being allowed --noting that this restriction was based on certain used -car lots, which had flashing signs, and the idea was to have a mechanism that would be used very responsibly, making things easier on business people who could not change signs with snow on the ground.

He noted that Item #4 restricted the frequency of changing the sign illumination elements to not less than 15 minutes, or 900 seconds, saying this was based on the Merrimack practice, and adding that this seemed to be the trend in other communities, also.

He said that Item #5 provided that the entire message area would change at once, with the characters first fading to complete darkness, remaining at that state for five seconds, and then illuminating at the same rate, saying this was done out of courtesy to previous discussions, to ensure that no sign would be a flashing sign.

He said Item #6 pertained to minimum distance of an EMC sign from residential structures, saying the 200-ft distance was related to the existing code relative to other structures.

He noted that Item #7 pertained to location, prohibiting EMC signs from TR, R-1, and R-2 districts.

He noted that Item #8 limited the amount of brightness ; saying there could be an automatic sensor to bring the color up brighter during the day, but dimming it to a more comfortable level at night.

He said Item #9 specified the maximum nighttime brightness as 600 NITS; he noted that the limit was expressed in NITS, saying this was how the manufacturers rated the brightness.

He noted that Item #10 specified the maximum daytime brightness, adding that he did not understand this figure (2,000 NITS), saying he thought it had to be amended. Mr. Malley said it was a starting point for discussion.

Mr. Hammer said the Board could see from Item #11 how the Chamber was looking out for the community and looking for effective control. He said Nashua would tell the Board that the signs could not be controlled. He then argued that the tenant should be responsible, not the land -owner, as the tenant might be the one who was causing the problem, and the land -owner would have no control over it.

Mr. Hammer said this was a start and could be amended by people who understood electronic signs. He said the 30 -ft² limitation was very restrictive, saying signs needed at least fifteen characters across —adding that Pelham allowed scrolling but with restricted size. He said he was not trying to get the biggest sign, but he did feel for his customers, who were struggling with the economy. He said this proposed ordinance would be a good start, keeping down the clutter of banners, balloons, letting on the sides of trucks, etc. He said all they were really talking about was controlling the

brightness, which was the only thing that was a problem. He then told of an incident in which two signs had been put up, one red and one amber, reporting that there had been public outcry in opposition to the red sign, but everyone liked the amber one. He then concluded by stating that LED EMCs would save electricity.

Mr. Schneiderman asked if the NITS measurement could be changed to foot-candles; he then suggested setting up something to measure illumination at the closest point on the street to where the sign was. Mr. Hammer said there was a trend in many of the towns to prohibit all kinds of internally lighted electric signs, which he professed not to understand, saying he saw no difference between an internally lighted sign and signs with 1000-Watt floodlights shining on them. He then referenced a Billerica provision that specified the maximum brightness of a sign as 75 lumens, saying he had asked if the Building Inspector went out and checked it out —asserting that the only way to measure lumens was in a totally dark room at a known distance. He said it could not be measured with a light meter, as percentages would have to allowed for moonlight, streetlights, and other ambient light in the area. He stated that maximum brightness could be expressed in the code and the sign owner could be told to lower it, adding that the Town could fine them or take them to court if they did not. He expressed a belief that the Town would get cooperation from business owners, if their name were on the line.

Mr. Bartlett said measurement of lighting was difficult; he then passed around a sheet of paper that he said told how to do it and how to measure it, adding that the measurement took place in whatever ambient light was around, which was a good way to measure it. Chairman Russo asked Town Planner Casella to make copies of the sheet so that all Board members could have one.

Mr. Schneiderman asked if the size of signs addressed double spaced signs. Mr. Bartlett said most of them would be double spaced. Mr. Hammer said the proposed code only measured on one side of the sign, restricted to one face. Mr. Bartlett said he only knew of one town that restricted signs to one side.

Mr. Schneiderman asked about the reference to fading of the message, asking how long it would take. Mr. Hammer said it was a controlled mechanism and could be controlled to whatever was wanted. Mr. Schneiderman noted that the signs were proposed to be restricted to certain districts; he asked if it could be in the Business district only on state highways. Mr. Hammer said he could not comment on that, as he had just been consulted by the Chamber: he suggested that this question should go to either Mr. Malley or to Ms. Collins. Ms. Collins said she thought any business should be allowed to have signage, and she questioned what such a restriction should mean, saying she could not recall the zoning. Mr. Schneiderman suggested it would be Routes 102, 111, and 3-A, and he suggested limiting the signs to businesses along the State highways, as well as the Industrial areas along those highways.

Ms. Robichaud said Mr. Schneiderman's concern was valid, noting that Hudson was different in only having a couple Industrial zones. She then stated that the industrial parks could be off the state highways, and no one would see the signs except people driving into the park.

Mr. Schneiderman said he was concerned about the density of the signs, asking how close one sign could be to the next one —asking if they should be kept 5,000 feet apart, for example. Ms. Robichaud said that was a huge number, adding that usually 150 to 200 feet were used for that sort of restriction. She said she would like to discuss this point, which she agreed was valid. She noted that Town Planner Cashell had her E-mail address and she would be willing to answer any questions that might come up.

Mr. Hall suggested that the Board should focus on what was being talked about —not what zones they would be in, what streets they would be on, or how close they would be to each other. He said those questions could be answered after everyone was comfortable with what the signs would be and how bright they would be. He suggested that the Chamber and Mr. Bartlett should get together, so that there would be a unified proposal with which everyone could be comfortable. Ms. Robichaud said they could do that, but she then added that she thought it was absolutely imperative that the property owner be the one who signed the affidavit. Mr. Hall said he would like to have them provide a fully written ordinance, for the Board to review.

Mr. Carroll said he wanted Ms. Robichaud involved with this, saying he agreed that it should be a cooperative effort, and he thought they could come up with a crack ordinance.

Mr. Roger Coutu, 10 Rita Avenue, noted that he owned a business at 95 River Road; he said the discussion had become a lot more convoluted than he had anticipated it would. He said two things said tonight had made sense, with one being Ms. Davis's suggestion that the Board should crawl before it walked. He said the Board should decide on exactly what it wanted and where it wanted. He said his business displayed four or five lines of cigarette pricing and it was a nightmare to do it in the snow, adding that the costs when bulbs burned out was prohibitive.

Ms. Stewart arrived at 8:42 p.m. and took her regular seat at that time.

Mr. Coutu suggested that the Board allow anyone who wanted an EMC to have stable line messages with one message line across the bottom that could scroll, saying this would let the Town see how it worked and anything more than that would be an eyesore.

Mr. Coutu said the second thing he had heard that made sense was Mr. Hall's suggestion that the Chamber and the sign-makers develop their own ordinance and bring it to the Board for review, so that the Board could get a clearer definition of what they were proposing, after which the Board could establish the code by which these signs would be allowed, where they could be placed, how close they could be, etc.

Selectman Maddox suggested that the Board needed to get back to the limited view, discussing time-temperature, brightness, etc. He said 97% of people would do the right thing. He suggested that Barlo Signs provide some examples of various sizes and readability percentages from their inventory.

Selectman Massey expressed thanks to the Chamber representatives, but cautioned that the first iteration would not be just time and temperature, saying what was really being talked about, in his mind, were static signs that were not quickly changeable and had fade-out/fade-in characteristics that would not bother the viewer's eyes.

Chairman Russo expressed agreement with what Selectman Massey had said. He then expressed concern about the statement that foot-candles had to be approached at night, saying the sign at the Sunoco station on Lowell Road bothered him, and saying it was so bright during the day that it hurt his eyes going by it, and he did not see how this proposed text could help measure that and would not help with signs in the day. He said he liked the idea of more static signs, changing once an hour, which would give the Town a chance to get a feel.

Ms. Maryellen Davis said she felt the Board needed to separate signs that could display a changing message from signs that gave time, temperature, or pricing —adding that just the latter type of signs might be a big culture shock to the residents of the town.

Chairman Russo asked if the Chamber representatives had any idea how much time they would need, based on the information that had been given. Town Planner Cashell said the next available meeting time would be June 4th. Ms. Collins suggested making it a little later, as she would be on vacation that week. The consensus of the Board was that July 22nd might be best.

Ms. Robichaud asked if Town Planner Cashell would be looking at materials prior to that. Mr. Russo answered in the affirmative. Mr. Cashell said he would be able to work with them, E-mail-wise or otherwise.

Mr. Carroll asked that they provide some examples within a ten -mile radius so that members of the Board could go look at them. Ms. Robichaud said that a Walgreens store in Hampstead had a very dangerous intersection on Route 111, granted by variance, and their very conservative sign was not changing once an hour; she then stated that the Peters sign in Nas hua was working fine.

Ms. Maryellen Davis asked if the Hampstead sign had been allowed by variance. Ms. Robichaud professed not to know but said she would get that information.

Chairman Russo asked that the Chamber people keep in mind that code enforcement on the brightness of the signs would be a big issue to the Board, which was looking for a sure -fire method to measure and determine. Ms. Robichaud said she did not see this moving forward if they did not do that, but it was tough. Mr. Bartlett said it would be harder because of the sunlight, but they would check into it. He pointed out that the Board should keep in mind that there were a lot of bright signs which had no lightness control.

Selectman Maddox suggested that the examples tell why the signs were being looked at, with respect to size, proportion, or brightness.

Mr. Carroll said the limitation could be that the meter had to be read at dusk, or not in full sunlight.

Selectman Massey said it would be interesting if there could be a password -protected setting for the luminosity —and the Town of Hudson had the password, rather than the sign owner, so that the brightness would not be a control issue.

-- FILE COPY --

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2009**

Page 13

Chairman Russo suggested calling a break at 9:03 p.m. Mr. Hall objected that it would be better to adjourn, noting that there was no further business to discuss.

XIII. NEW BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

No **New Business** items were addressed this evening.

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

No **Other Business** items were addressed this evening.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

All scheduled items having been addressed, Mr. Carroll moved to adjourn; Ms. Chadwick seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor.

Chairman Russo then declared the meeting to be adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Date: May 10, 2008

Vincent Russo, Chairman

J. Bradford Seabury, Recorder

Terry Stewart, Secretary

These minutes were accepted as submitted following review at the 06-10-09 Planning Board meeting.