



MEETING MINUTES
BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING
(NEW LOCATION) 572 Calef Highway (next to Elementary School)
Barrington, NH
Tuesday November 19, 2013
6:30 p.m.

NOTE: THESE ARE SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES ONLY. A COMPLETE COPY OF THE MEETING AUDIO IS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE LAND USE DEPARTMENT

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Anthony Gaudiello-Chair
George Calef
Alan Kelley, Vice-Chair
Jason Pohopek
Dennis Malloy, Ex-officio

Member Absent

Jackie Kessler

Alternate Members Present

Daniel Ayer
Joshua Bouchard
Stephen Jeffery

Town Planner: Marcia Gasses

A motion was made by A. Kelley and seconded by G. Calef to take item three first as a courtesy to the applicant. The motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of the November 12, 2013 Public Hearing Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved as corrected.

REVIEW OF PLANS

2. [220-22-GR-13-CUP-SR \(Tyler Casey Custom Woodwork \)\(Raymond Turmelle\)](#) Request by applicant to present a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit for a home woodworking business in accessory barn on a .80 acre site located at 38 Greenhill Road (Map 220, Lot 22) in the General Residential Zoning District. Applicant: William T. Casey; 12 Hood Circle; Boxford, MA 01921

M. Gasses explained that the application was for a Home Business. The applicant does custom woodworking. All question under the Conditional Use Permit had been answered by the applicant. An existing insulated garage on the property was to be used for the business. Ms. Gasses had requested the applicant submit a waiver for Section II of the Site Review checklist. The business was a Home Business using an existing structure with only one employee and Ms. Gasses did not believe the review warranted a surveyed site plan. The parking requirement under a cottage industry was one per employee.

The Board would review everything they needed to under Section 7.4 of the Zoning Ordinance.

REPORT FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT

3. Review for final approval for Trinity Conservation.

M. Gasses, Planner explained that the board had asked that the applicant return to the board when the precedent conditions had been met. Ms. Gasses explained that the Notice of Decision was in their packet and all precedent conditions; accept for the Driveway Agreement had been satisfied. The Driveway Agreement was in the process. The actual application for a driveway permit had to be signed by the Town where the work was to occur in the Town right-of-way. The Selectmen had agreed to sign the application when an indemnification agreement had been signed by the Applicant. The Applicant had supplied the signed indemnification.

Discussion ensued regarding the Board having the documents prior to the meeting to review them.

G. Calef expressed that he had picked up his packet prior to the meeting and reviewed the documents.

M. Gasses offered to go through the documents with the board, as the review would not take much time. She had verified all the precedent conditions listed had been met prior to the meeting. Just the driveway agreement with NHDOT remained. The Chair could sign the site plan after the NHDOT Driveway Agreement was received.

A motion was made by D. Ayer and seconded by G. Calef to sign the Site Plan & Developers Agreement when the driveway agreement was received. The motion carried 6-1

Roll Call Vote

D. Malloy aye
G. Calef aye
J. Pohopek aye
A. Kelley nay
J. Bouchard aye
D. Ayer aye
A. Gaudiello aye

A. Gaudiello brought forth discussion of an extension.

A. Gaudiello explained that the Applicant was not sure how long the NHDOT would take in reviewing the application, and where it had been almost six (6) months since the conditional approval the granting of an extension would prevent the Applicant from having to return to the board for an extension before the approval expires.

A motion was made by D. Ayer and seconded by G. Calef to grant an extension for 60 days to meet precedent conditions. The motion carried unanimously

Roll Call Vote

S. Jeffery aye
D. Ayer aye
A. Kelley aye
A. Gaudiello aye
J. Pohopek aye
G. Calef aye
D. Malloy aye

Jason Hill asked if multiple extensions would be granted if needed.

A. Gaudiello explained that with proper cause the Applicant could return to the Board.

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED
REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

4. Discussion on amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

S. Jeffery observed that there was an incorrect reference in the Zoning Ordinance, 9.31 references town study cited in 9.6, which is incorrect. It should read 9.3

A. Gaudiello read the Warrant Article 7 from 2001

A. Gaudiello discussed the desire to have an amendment that would go forward from the original warrant, which was presented to the voters, which reflects the interpretation we have today.

G. Calef explained the effect of imposing a buffer on a landowner. He explained that the landowner loses the use of a considerable portion of their property when buffers are applied.

J. Pohopek explained his understanding. Current lots created were having buffers applied. In consideration of moving forward we have to consider past precedent.

A. Gaudiello presented a proposed change to the ZO to bring the ordinance in line with the current interpretation.

A. Kelley wished to have the proposed change by A. Gaudiello submitted to the Town Attorney, for review of its constitutionality, based on equal application of buffers.

A motion was made by A. Kelley and seconded by S. Jeffery to have the proposed Zoning Amendment submitted by A. Gaudiello submitted to the Town Attorney to find out if it was constitutional based upon equal application of buffers.

Discussion ensued regarding the prior question submitted by the Planner to the Town Attorney and the Attorney's finding that buffer requirements could be applied based upon the creation date of the lot.

Roll Call Vote

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| <u>D. Malloy</u> | nay |
| <u>G. Calef</u> | nay |
| <u>J. Pohopek</u> | nay |
| <u>A. Gaudiello</u> | nay |
| <u>A. Kelley</u> | aye |
| <u>J. Bouchard</u> | nay |
| <u>S. Jeffery</u> | aye |

The vote failed two (2) to five (5)

Discussion on the definition of machine shop

The Board discussed eliminating “Machine Shop” from the table of uses, and incorporating machining of blanks into the definition of “Light Manufacturing”

A. Gaudiello suggested taking into consideration how a company handled its waste. A company such as Turbocam recycles much of the waste produced in the manufacturing process.

M. Gasses suggested the following definition of Light Manufacturing, “the manufacture of finished products or parts, including processing, fabrication, machining of metal blanks or other materials, assembly, treatment, and packaging of such products, and incidental storage, sales and distribution of such products, provided all manufacturing activities are contained entirely within a building and where no process involved will produce noise, vibration, air pollution, fire hazard, or noxious emission which will disturb, or substantially endanger neighboring properties.

A. Gaudiello suggested the striking of “machine shop” and adding the machining of items which they would want to include under “light manufacturing.”

A motion was made by J. Pohopek and seconded by J. Bouchard to strike Machine Shop from the Table of Uses. The motion carried

SETTING OF DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT

The Board would meet next on December 3, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. at the Elementary School Annex.

A motion was made by G. Calef and seconded by J. Bouchard to adjourn at 9:05 p.m. The motion carried

Respectfully Submitted,

Marcia J. Gasses
Town Planner & Land Use Administrator