



BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING

NEW LOCATION: EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING CENTER

77 RAMSDELL LANE

Barrington, NH 03825

(Approved August 1, 2017)

Tuesday July 11, 2017

6:30 p.m.

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

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present

Fred Nichols, Chair

James Jennison, Vice Chair

Casey O'Brien-ex-officio-Absent

Jeff Brann

Richard Spinale

Steve Diamond

Alternate Member: Dan Ayer-ex-officio

Town Planner: Marcia Gasses

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of the June 20, 2017 Meeting Minutes.

Without objection the Board approved the June 20, 2017 meeting minutes.

MASTER PLAN UPDATES

Formatted

2. The Planning Board will be holding a Public hearing for the adoption of the Vision Chapter of the Master Plan. **Copies available in the Land Use office or on line under Land Use Notices.**
http://www.barrington.nh.gov/Pages/BarringtonNH_Land/index

F. Nichols explained that this was a Public Hearing and possible Adoption of the Vision and Community Chapter of the Master Plan. F. Nichols explained that there had been a number of meetings over the last few years on this chapter and the Town has had input from a large group of citizens and residents.

M. Gasses explained that the town hired Strafford Regional Planning Commission to help with the drafting of the document with “The Envision” in 2014 that started the process.

F. Nichols explained that the Board has talked about the Vision several times. He explained that the Board was ready to take the envision statement to the next step.

S. Diamond explained that he went to the first 2014 Barrington Community Profile “Envision” session workshop where he felt that it seemed very reasonable to lower the tax base by having a public sewer so that we would have more commercial development which, after reviewing, would cost a lot of money and would not be cost efficient. He stated that this would not work out because most of the Route 125 corridor was in the Stratified Drift Aquifer Overlay except for a small portion. He would like to see the Town Center location be on Route 9 and Route 126 and also would like to see public water and sewer removed from page 12 under “Move forward with the development of the town center”.

J. Brann explained that his thought was the vision action was to determine what the need was. He explained that he thought it would be premature to remove public water and sewer.

F. Nichols explained that this meant that it might be determined that these are not needed.

J. Jennison questioned if S. Diamond’s concern was not the public water and sewer, but commercial development on the Route 125 corridor.

S. Diamond explained that it was the cost of public water and sewer and the cost of rapid development.

J. Jennison explained that it sounded like S. Diamond wanted to slow down development.

F. Nichols read from the benchmark for success “Balance reasonable economic growth while protecting rural, quiet character of Town. Ensure that people passing through the major corridors of Barrington notice that signage, buildings, and landscape portray a theme that distinguishes in Barrington from other towns.” He explained that he felt the Board has not done anything that conflicts with the concerns.

S. Diamond explained that he went to workshop in Newmarket on stormwater control to address problems caused by climate control change.

John Huckins of Huckins Lane explained that he went to the vision chapter events and explained that it said public water, not municipal water, because the discussion was that an individual investor would come in and invest and incorporate 2 or 3 users together into one system.

S. Diamond questioned what the difference was.

John Huckins explained if this was a municipal system the Town run system.

M. Gasses explained that communities like Durham and Newmarket are subjected to a MS4 permit, which has to do with stormwater and sewer discharge because of Great Bay as they do have municipal systems. M. Gasses explained that Town of Barrington was initially included in the MS4 but because there was only a tiny area on Tolend Road that was included into the defining of the area, the Town was waived from this.

F. Nichols opened public comment.

Pam Failing of 17 Edgewater Drive asked about the Vision plan for capital improvements to the village center.

Amy Antonucci from 219 France Road asked about the 3 option types of systems; municipal, public and private and questioned if public was still private.

M. Gasses explained that public was not owned by the Town.

Pam Failing from 17 Edgewater Drive explained that she thought that the Town should not go to public water and sewer because this would be an expense to the Town. Pam thought that the vision statement was well written.

J. Jennison explained that public water and sewer was not free the user would pay by the usage. He explained that municipal water and sewer could be the safer way to go.

M. Gasses explained that the Town Center has been in the Zoning Ordinance since 2007. M. Gasses explained that the Town Center was located at the intersection of Route 9 and 125 north to Oak Hill Road and south on Route 125 to the movie theater; these are the parts zoned as Town Center. M. Gasses explained from the vision statement developed in 2014 that she felt the residents were not looking at municipal water and sewer.

R. Spinale explained that this was a public hearing to adopt the Vision and Community Character Chapter of the Master Plan and the Board was getting off topic on this. He explained that this was the Vision statement and doesn't mean that this was going to happen.

J. Jennison explained that the Planning Board took the information that came from the community. The Zoning Amendments that are drafted are voted on by the people, and considered in drafting the chapter.

Doug Bogen from 21 Lois Lane stated that he liked the general vision and that he saw a master plan on the website 10 years ago but has not seen any changes. Doug stated that he liked the idea of having a town center but would like to see some changes in the next 10 years. Doug stated that he would like to see solar use on municipal buildings and energy savings.

F. Nichols explained that this was in the Capital Improvement plan.

R. Spinale explained that the information came from the public so somewhere along the line it must have been brought up that they were interested in a treatment plant. R. Spinale explained that the Board cannot just strike the information out.

J. Brann stated that he thought that there was never an intent to build a municipal sewer system.

R. Spinale stated that he agreed that he thought so too.

M. Gasses explained that was not what they were saying.

J. Brann stated that because of the cost and scale, the Town didn't appear big enough.

M. Gasses explained that the Town does have property close to the Rochester line that would be suitable for some kind of low impact light industrial type business and if the business was willing to connect and Rochester was willing to them it would be helpful. M. Gasses explained that the businesses tell us where they want to be, the businesses want to be on state roads where they can be seen. M. Gasses explained that she believed that this line came from an environmentally friendly stand point not to damage the environment.

J. Brann explained that with limited use that could work.

M. Gasses explained that it is expensive to operate treatment plants.

Pam Failing stated that she was at both planning sessions and she didn't believe that this was talked about.

John Huckins stated that he agreed with R. Spinale because this Vision was brought by all the residents at multiple meetings. John Huckins explained that this was the Vision of the public and explained that this was supposed to be the Vision of the public that comes forward in the Master Plan. John Huckins explained that this was what the public agreed on.

F. Nichols explained that this was a public hearing for input from the public.

J. Jennison stated that this was the public hearing that was a final step in the long process.

Susan Frankel from 128 France Road asked about the statement from page 5 "These measures will help to guide and track the success of the community's actions over the coming years". Susan asked if the benchmarks would be tracked and recorded so the public would know the progress.

M. Gasses explained that she thought that the benchmarks in the past were not formerly tracked. M. Gasses explained that she and John Huckins went over the prior Master Plan that was done in 2004 and a lot of things had been completed. M. Gasses expressed that the Board had decided to do one chapter at a time going forward.

Susan Frankel asked if there was no plan on tracking the benchmarks.

M. Gasses explained that the benchmarks was the job of the Planning Board.

John Huckins explained that tracking the Master Plan was for public input into what the community wanted to see. John explained that the Board tries to do what the community wants by developing zoning that the public votes on. John explained that the last time the Master Plan was done there were only two zoning districts; now the Town had six. John explained that once you change zoning you also need to change subdivision and site review regulations to achieve what the public wants.

J. Brann suggested that the Board should have an annual workshop/review to go through the benchmarks to see what has been accomplished. J. Brann explained that when the Board developed input for the Selectmen on projects that should be funded that this would be part of their view.

J. Jennison explained that zoning could have changes each year.

F. Nichols explained that the benchmarks could be reviewed every 6 months. F. Nichols stated that everyone in the public are invited to be put on the agenda and have 5 minutes to speak about one item of interest to bring before the Board involving the vision statement.

M. Gasses explained that there are going to be several chapters of the Master Plan that the Board would be looking for public input on.

S. Diamond asked if there was something that the public wanted to do we would ask the Selectmen for the funds.

F. Nichols explained that most likely it would be an outside developer that would come before the Board.

M. Gasses explained that Strafford Regional Planning Commission worked with the Town on transportation, private bike lanes, and safety for pedestrians on State roads with support of the Town's people. M. Gasses explained that there were grants available for these types of projects. M. Gasses explained that the Selectmen would need to support projects that are wanted.

John Wallace from 183 France Road asked about page 11 under natural resources & recreation requesting the wording to be changed to have a positive statement added.

F. Nichols explained that John Wallace was at all the workshops and wanted to know if the group supported what was written.

John Wallace explained that he wanted to continue to see the protection of our natural resources by the placement of land in Conservation.

M. Gasses explained that she felt that John Wallace was acting on statements by the selectmen and that was not what the Board was trying to do.

R. Spinale explained that the Board was getting away from what the hearing was about and trying to change what was written. R. Spinale read from the benchmark for success the following "This series of benchmarks have been developed by the Planning Board and the Town's Planning Department, in John Wallace explained that he felt it was.

R. Spinale asked if there was anything negative stated that would indicate the Board did not want to continue what was there.

John Wallace felt that he would like to see a positive statement.

J. Brann explained that this already said that we want to provide education and put land into conservation. He asked if John was asking for municipal funds for these.

John Wallace explained that was how this has been done for the 20 years why it shouldn't continue.

R. Spinale expressed that the statement was what was happening and would continue. He stated that this has been filtered through many people and this was where it was at.

F. Nichols explained that this was a public hearing so we need to let the public speak.

S. Diamond explained that the first [Community Profile] session had a large turn out and the second workshop did not have that many residents.

M. Gasses explained that the Conservation Commission could be heavily involved in the natural resources section of the Master Plan. M. Gasses explained that the Board will be working on the Economic Development Chapter next and then the Natural Resources Chapter.

Amy Antonucci explained that she attended both work session and thought that the whole thing was part of the process and her experience was that a lot of information was given that was kind of broad. Amy explained that they never saw the approved wording. Amy agreed that there were a lot of conversation about rural character and keeping a lot of open space. Amy explained that this was important to her and explained that this was in line about what the people were talking about.

F. Nichols closed public hearing.

J. Brann asked what the distinction was between the municipal piece verses what was written. He asked if the Board were to add, "and residents" after landowners, and wanted to know if that covers the public input. He explained that the residents are the ones that live here, provide education and are the ones that vote on things in the Town.

F. Nichols asked if the distinction between a resident and landowner was that someone was renting a piece of property verses a piece of land that might be donated or moved into Conservation land.

J. Brann explained that it could be businesses.

M. Gasses explained that this would be voters. She explained that John Wallace and the Conservation Commission do a great job at getting grants. She explained that from a municipal side there had been 2 sources a bond, that was approved a number of years ago, and the conservation fund. She explained that primarily the funds came from current use penalties and thought the Conservation Commission was receiving 75% now. She explained that if there was a subdivision done on a lot in current use as the lots were sold the penalties would be paid. She explained that the funds received are used to match grants received.

F. Nichols questioned whether in the vision statement we want more Conservation Land and felt that this would mean giving a larger portion to the Conservation Fund. He was concerned that a lot of roads in Town need work.

J. Jennison explained that he does not oppose the work that had been done by the Conservation Commission, but felt he did not want to choose wording leaving the door open for increasing funding for such projects. He felt that this fits in the community vision.

M. Gasses asked if the Board wanted this to say to continue to support the efforts of Barrington's Conservation Commission.

S. Diamond explained that his thought was that he felt that this would cause a lot of growth and that concerned him.

J. Jennison explained that he felt that the same people that wanted to keep things rural were the same people that wanted a CVS within walking distance. His opinion was that he thought in 2 years the public's opinion could change. He felt that this would be competing ideas and they shouldn't have a one sided idea in this document.

F. Nichols concerns were that this would be more traffic and repairs to the roads. He explained that he would like to see ways that would take the tax burden off residential tax payers.

Pam Failing explained that under natural resources & recreation that “of incentives” should be changed to “encourage.”

M. Gasses explained that landowners can put their land into conservation without involving the Town. She explained that you can put land into current use and take land out but you can’t take the land out of conservation.

R. Spinale asked if this was the 10 acre rule for conservation.

M. Gasses explained that the 10 acre rule was for current use.

R. Spinale explained that he was talking about current use. He felt that you needed a minimum of 10 acres to put in current use and felt that the tax payer gets a large tax break for land in current use. He explained that when the land was sold you pay the 10% penalty and 75% of that penalty goes to the Conservation Commission.

M. Gasses explained that some people don’t think before they put their land in current use. She explained that it was only a financial benefit to someone if the landowner keeps the land in current use for many years.

F. Nichols explained that the Board agreed on the following changes.

Page 10 last line under Growth and Development – change “regional” to “appropriate”

Page 11 bullet three next to “Continue to protect all of the town’s natural resources” – delete “of incentives” and insert “encourage” before landowners

F. Nichols explained that the Board was at a point that there are no more changes to the “The Vision” part of the Master Plan.

A motion was made by J. Jennison and seconded by R. Spinale to adopt the Vision Chapter with the changes revised. The motion carried a 4/1 vote.

Diamond-Nay

Nichols-Yay

Jennison-Yay

Brann-Yay

Spinale-Yay

ACTIONS ITEMS

- 3. 209-2-GR-17-SUB (Owners: John & Cheryl Huckins)** Request by applicant to subdivide a 1.03 acre lot in Rochester from a parcel containing 5.82 acres in Rochester, NH (Map 261, Lot 3.1) and 11.84 acres in Barrington, NH (Map 209, Lot 2) located at 70 Huckins Lane in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District.

F. Nichols gave a description of the application.

M. Gasses explained that the application involved two communities both Rochester and Barrington none of the changes were in Barrington. M. Gasses explained that a piece of land was going to be cut off in Rochester and under State law the Planning Board had to approve in recognition that the Board and see that this was not effecting the land in Barrington. M. Gasses explained that the Board had a memo from the Town Attorney explaining the reasoning.

John Huckins explained that Rochester needed Barrington to know what they were doing.

J. Brann asked if the access came out of Rochester.

John Huckins explained that he bought the land off someone that was moving his business to Rochester. John explained that he approached him because whoever bought his land there could have been a large subdivision and the houses would be too close to him to protect his own privacy.

J. Brann asked if his house was close to Rochester.

John Huckins explained that his house was close to Rochester. John explained on the plan what he was trying to do.

S. Diamond questioned why the checklist was not complete.

A motion was made by R. Spinale and seconded by J. Brann to accept the application as complete. The motion carried a 4/1 vote.

Spinale- Yay

Brann- Yay

Jemison- Yay

Nichols- Yay

Diamond- Nay

M. Gasses explained that a couple of changes needed to be made on the plan first; General needed to be changed to General Residential and she called Rochester and let them know they needed to have the rest of the dimensions added to the plan.

F. Nichols opened public hearing.

Stephen Jeffery from 128 France Road reminded the Board that they needed to comply with the juror standard if any personal or professional relationship with the applicant they need to recuse themselves.

F. Nichols closed the public hearing.

F. Nichols questioned the statement.

M. Gasses explained that recusal is totally up to the person.

F. Nichols explained that he put up a shed and needed to get an administrative form. He explained that he didn't feel that he had anything other than a professional relationship with John Huckins.

R. Spinale asked if he was acting as a member of a Board or just a resident of the town.

M. Gasses explained that F. Nichols did nothing different than any other member of the public would need to do.

John Huckins expressed that this would mean that anyone that ever got a permit would not be able to address this Board and explained because he works for the town that no one would be able to sit on the Board.

J. Brann explained that this was not a personal interaction, this was an interaction as a professional employee of the town.

John Huckins explained the difference would be if someone had a financial loss or gain by sitting on the Board explained that none of this applies.

J. Jennison explained that he was a builder and thought he had no conflict.

J. Brann read from the checklist boxes that were not check off to confirm completed.

M. Gasses read the DRAFT notice of decision.



Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0195

barrplan@metrocast.net

barrplan@gmail.com

DRAFT NOTICE OF DECISION

<i>[Office use only]</i>	<i>Date certified:</i>	<i>As received:</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>Surety returned</i> <i>n/a</i>
--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

"Applicant", herein, refers to the property owner, business owner, individual(s), or organization submitting this application and to his/her/its agents, successors, and assigns.

Proposal Identification: 209-2-GR-17-SUB Request by applicant to subdivide a 1.03 acre lot in Rochester from a parcel containing 5.82 acres in Rochester, NH (Map 261, Lot 3.1) and 11.84 acres in Barrington, NH (Map 209, Lot 2) located at 70 Huckins Lane in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District.

Owner: John D. and Cheryl A. Huckins 70 Huckins Lane	Dated: XXXXX,2017
--	-------------------

Barrington, NH 03825

Professional:
Randy Orvis
Geometres Blue Hills, LLC
PO Box 277
Farmington, NH 03835

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its XXXXX, 2017 meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

All of the precedent conditions below must be met by the applicant, at the expense of the applicant, prior to the plans being certified by the Planning Board. Certification of the plans is required prior to commencement of any site work or recording of any plans. Once these precedent conditions are met and the plans are certified the approval is considered final.

Please Note* If all of the precedent conditions are not met within 6 calendar months to the day, by XXXXXX, 2017, the Boards approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board. *Reference 8.2.3 of the Town of Barrington Subdivision Regulations*

Conditions Precedent

- 1) a) Add the owners signature to the final plan
- 2) Revise the following plan notes
 - a) Note 1 should read "General Residential District"
- 3) Add the following plan revisions to the plans
 - a) Add remaining lot dimensions to parcel to be subdivided in Rochester
 - b)
- 4)# Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town
- 5) Final Drawings (a) five sets of black line (b) plus one set of 11"X17" final approved plans (c) one electronic version by pdf or CD must be on file with the Town. Each individual sheet in every set of drawings must be stamped and signed by the land surveyor, engineer, or architect responsible for the plans. Note. If there are significant changes to be made to the plans, as specified above, one full size check print must be sent to the Land Use Office for review prior to producing these final drawings.

General and Subsequent Conditions

1)#

(Note: in both sections above, the numbered condition marked with a # and all conditions below the # are standard conditions on all or most applications of this type).

I wish you the best of luck with your project. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Marcia J. Gasses

Town Planner & Land Use Administrator

cc: File

A motion was made by R. Spinale and seconded by J. Brann to approve the application with the conditions as read by the planner. The motion carried unanimously.

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

4. Discussion on the Site Review Regulations.

No action

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

Next meeting would be August 1, 2017 6:30 p.m. Early Childhood Learning Center

Meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Irvine