Groton Sign Committee Meeting Minutes – 14 June 2005

Present: Members - Joe Bassett, Alberta Erickson, John MacLeod Non-members - Janine Doucette, Bob Lacombe, Andy Field, Jack Mettee,

Meeting started at 7:37pm

Meeting minutes of 12 May 2005 were accepted.

Andy Field discussed proposed freestanding signs for the new shopping plaza near the four corners and how to approach potential freestanding sign(s) at that site.

The committee addressed the questions listed in the table below to establish a rationale for proposing changes to the sign by-law that would address developments such as the Boston Road Market Place currently under construction on Route 119.

No.	Question / Decision / Discussion / Next step
1	Should wall signs be determined as a percentage of facade area? What is an appropriate percentage? Why?
	Decision: The committee unanimously agreed a percentage of a façade could be used for a business wall sign.
	Next step: Determine the appropriate percentage.
2	Section 196-5 of the by-law states that multi-occupancy business buildings can have only 1 wall sign for each business and that all signs must be the same size. - Why should this not apply to all occupants of the Boston Road Market Place? - Is one wall sign enough for each business?
	Decision: The committee split on allowing one wall sign for each business. Peter Myette and John Macleod were for a business to have a single wall sign. Alberta Erickson and Joe Bassett agreed that a second sign should be allowed.
3	Why does section 196-5 B not work in addressing the signage needs for the Boston Road Market Place?
	Decision: The committee unanimously agreed that a new item should be added to section 196-5 B to address development similar to the Boston Road Market Place.
	Next step: Determine an appropriate term and definition.

4	Should the Boston Road Market Place be allowed 2 freestanding signs exceeding the current height limit?
	Decision: The committee unanimously agreed that no change should be made to the current freestanding sign height limit of ten feet and that the two freestanding signs could be allowed per section 196-5 E:
	E. Two-road exposure. Businesses that have property and public buildings fronting on two (2) public roads may have a freestanding sign on both roads provided that the total area of both signs is not more than one hundred fifty percent (150%) of the allowed area for that site.
	Next step: Define a more appropriate area that maintains the ten foot height limit.
5	How should 'department' signs be addressed? (They are shown in the Shaw's elevation drawing-some examples: PRODUCE, BAKERY, DELICATESSEN, SEAFOOD)
	Decision: The committee unanimously agreed that these types of signs would be handled by an appropriate percentage as discussed in question 1.
	Next step: Define department signs. Do photo study of appropriate percentage and present to sign committee.
6	How should companies with several corporate entities be addressed?
	Decision: The committee unanimously agreed this would be addressed by the proposed percentage rule.
7	What distinctions should be made between a tenant's sign and an owner's sign?
	Decision: The committee unanimously agreed there should be no difference between a tenant's sign and an owner's sign.
8	What kind of signage is appropriate for businesses with 70,000 square feet or 100,000 or 200,000 square feet buildings?
	Decision: The committee unanimously agreed this is best addressed by drafting a addition to section 196-5 B as discussed in question 3.
9	What new definitions should be added to section § 196-2. General guidelines; definitions: - Façade - Wall sign - Freestanding sign
10	Miscellaneous action items:
	Schedule an extra meeting for 28 June 2005 Draft proposed addition to section 196-5

Permit Applications Reviewed:

- None.

Meeting adjourned at 9:43pm