

1 MINUTES  
2 ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC MEETING  
3 **NEW LOCATION—EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING**  
4 **CENTER**  
5 **77 RAMSDELL LANE**

6 Barrington, NH  
7 April 20, 2016  
8 7:00PM  
9

10 Members Present

11 Karyn Forbes, Chair  
12 George Bailey  
13 Meri Schmalz  
14 Raymond Desmaris  
15 Dawn Hatch  
16

17 Alternate Member Present

18 George Schmalz  
19

20 **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**  
21

- 22 1. Approval of March 16, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes.  
23

24 *A motion was made by R. Desmaris and seconded by G. Bailey to approve the minutes. The motion carried*  
25 *unanimously.*  
26

27 **CONTINUED CASES FROM March 16th ACTION ITEMS**  
28

- 29 2. [206-12-GR-16-ZBA Variance \(owners: Kenneth & Julie Santer\)](#) Request by applicant for a variance from  
30 Article 4, Section 4.1.1 Minimum Standards Table 2 for the side setback where 30' is required to allow the  
31 construction of a single family home that the setback is proposed to be 7.8 feet, to the overhang on Isaacs Turn  
32 Road on a .91 acre site (Map 206, Lot 12) in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. BY: Chris Berry, Berry  
33 Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.  
34

35 Christopher Berry, Berry Surveying and Engineering represented the applicant. The prior plan showed the lot toward  
36 the east. The house had been centered at the recommendation of the Board and the house footprint had also been  
37 narrowed by almost 10 feet. The setback request was for just the sideline. A joint driveway between the two lots was  
38 proposed. All of the information has been combined on one plan. The setbacks requested were approximately 24' and  
39 25'. The criteria provided last month had not changed.  
40

41 R. Desmaris asked if the yellow shading was a deck.  
42

43 Christopher Berry stated yes.  
44

45 K. Forbes expressed the request was reasonable. The applicant had centered the proposed home and reduced the size,  
46 the lot was a lot of record and there would not be a reduction in property values.  
47

48 R. Desmaris agreed the request was reasonable.

49  
50 *A motion was made by R. Desmaris and seconded by D. Hatch to approve the application. The motion carried*  
51 *unanimously*  
52

### 53 **NEW ACTION ITEMS**

54  
55 **3. 118-54-GR-16-ZBASpecExcept (owner: Suzanne Schneider)** Request by applicant for a Special Exception under  
56 Article 5.2.3 of the Zoning Ordinance for Accessibility Additions/Structures to extend a ramp and a variance from  
57 Article 4, Section 4.1.1 Minimum Stables Table 2 for the side setback where 30' is required to allow the 8' x 11'  
58 deck to be 20.3' from the side setback at 75 Bulley Road on a .16 acre site (Map 118, Lot 54)

59  
60 David Vincent explained the prior approval of October 21, 2015. The original ramp had shown it ended prior to the end  
61 of the building. The special exception was for the actual ramp that had to be extended to meet the ADA requirements.

62  
63 K. Forbes asked if there was a reason the ramp had to be higher.

64  
65 Bob Leeland explained the trusses had to be raised higher.

66  
67 David Vincent explained there was currently a slider with a 4'X5' deck which was the minimum for code. The request  
68 was to enlarge the deck to 11.7' X 8' including stairs so that the daughter was able to sit on the deck and the wheel chair  
69 could be turned around.

70  
71 G. Bailey asked if the slider opened to full ADA compliant.

72  
73 David Vincent expressed the chair fit through the door but he did not know if it was ADA compliant.

74  
75 George Bailey questioned whether the width of the stairs would cause a safety issue with the window.

76  
77 M. Gasses expressed the construction would need to meet the building code.

78  
79 K. Forbes expressed the deck would need a variance while the ramp would need a Special Exception.

80  
81 K. Forbes read the requirements for a Special Exception for Accessibility:

- 82 • The structure or addition is reasonably necessary to provide access purposes as provided herein;
- 83 • The structure or addition reasonably cannot be built without violating the setback(s) or cannot be built without
- 84 violating the setback(s) except with unreasonable expense to the owner;
- 85 • The setback violation is as small as reasonably possible under the circumstances;
- 86 • The value of abutting properties will not be affected adversely;
- 87 • And the structure or addition is consistent with the health, safety and welfare of the public and the
- 88 occupants/users of the premises.

89  
90 David Vincent expressed the applicant met all requirements.

91  
92 K. Forbes asked if there was anyone to speak in support.

93  
94 Dan Ayer expressed the width of the stairs could be worked with.

95  
96 K. Forbes asked if there was anyone to speak against.

97  
98 No one spoke.

99  
100 R. Desmaris expressed the ramp was reasonable.

101

102 *A motion was made by D. Hatch and seconded by G. Bailey to approve the application. The motion carried*  
103 *unanimously*

104  
105 D. Hatch expressed the request for the Variance was reasonable.  
106

107 K. Forbes expressed it was reasonable.  
108

109 *A motion was made by G. Bailey and seconded by D. Hatch to approve the Variance. The motion carried unanimously*  
110

111 **ADJOURNMENT**  
112

113 *A motion was made by R. Desmaris and seconded by G. Bailey to adjourn at 7:20 p.m. The motion carried*  
114 *unanimously*

115  
116 Respectfully submitted,  
117

118  
119  
120 Marcia J. Gasses  
121 Town Planner & Land Use Administrator

DRAFT