



**Meeting Minutes**  
**BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**Early Childhood Learning Center**  
**77 Ramsdell Lane, Barrington, NH**  
**Tuesday March 26, 2013**  
**6:30 p.m.**

J. Huckins called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Members Present**

John Huckins, Chair  
Alan Kelley, Vice-Chair  
George Calef  
Anthony Gaudiello  
Dawn Hatch, Ex-officio

**Members Absent**

Jackie Kessler – Absent, excused  
Steven Oles - Absent

**Alternate Member Present**

Stephen Jeffery

**Town Planner**

Marcia J. Gasses

**Seating of Alternate**

Stephen Jeffery to vote for Steve Oles

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

*A motion was made by G. Calef and seconded by D. Hatch to move discussion of the request for a recommendation for appointment to the planning board by Jason Pohopek. Motion carried unanimously.*

J. Huckins expressed that Jason would be an asset. His knowledge of the laws and regulations would be beneficial to the board.

A. Kelley was not supportive because he felt there would be perceived favoritism among some members of the community due to Jason's work as a surveyor.

D. Hatch felt that it was good to have qualified volunteers and believed that it would be okay.

G. Calef felt it would be an asset to have one surveyor on the board and that Jason was a logical person to take S. Oles place.

T. Gaudiello asked Jason about a prior issue over David Vincent.

Jason Pohopek expressed what the issues were concerning the Fisheye development. In his opinion, David had recused himself at meetings when necessary.

G. Calef expressed it is hard to get applicants that want to do it. Jason had professional knowledge that would benefit the board.

S. Jeffery spoke about the perception of a conflict of interest.

*A motion was made by A. Gaudiello seconded by G. Calef to recommend Jason Pohopek for appointment to the planning board.*

Roll Call Vote

Gaudiello – Aye

Calef - Aye

Hatch - Aye

Jeffery – abstain

A. Kelly – Aye

Huckins – Aye

The motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor and one abstention.

Huckins discussed how he was upset that people abstain when they do not agree, expressing they should vote no.

## MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of March 5, 2013 Public Hearing Meeting Minutes.

The board reviewed the March 5, 2013 minutes making spelling and grammatical corrections.

*A motion was made by G. Calef and seconded by A. Kelley to approve the March 5, 2013 minutes with correction. The motion carried unanimously*

## ACTION ITEMS

2. Vote for a request for a three month extension for the conditional approval Case # **SR11/399 (Glass Lane Biznis Store)** Matthew Jensen; 94 Blake Road; Epping, NH 03042.

*A motion was made by A. Kelley and seconded T. Gaudiello to grant a 6-month extension. The new date is September 11, 2013. The motion carried unanimously*

## REVIEW OF PLANS

3. **269-11-RC-13-SR (Robert & Deborah Martin)** Request by applicant to construct a garage to be used as a typical residential garage within the existing commercial zone located on a 11.98 acre site located at 314 Old Concord Turnpike (269, Lot 11) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. By: Berry Surveying & Engineering, Chris Berry; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

After discussion on parking, the board wanted the applicant to show how they would address the four required parking spaces.

The board felt that a letter from DOT stating that the current driveway cut is suitable.

The board would like an explanation of why the application seeks a waiver from item #5 of the checklist.

The board questioned the drainage, and whether any additional water would leave the site. The drainage analysis would need to be explained.

## REPORT FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT

### COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

### REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

4. Discussion of Site Review and Subdivision Regulations.

A. Gaudiello reviewed the amendments, which had been provided to board members.

A. Gaudiello explained that most of the comments in parenthesis were for his use.

G. Calef questioned 2.4.5(2)

J. Huckins explained the department heads make recommendations to the board.

The language for 2.4.5(2) would be stricken. With A. Gaudiello working on new language to include review by the Technical Review Committee.

2.5.1(3)

2.5.5 The board agreed to strike the symbol

3.2.2 The block should read Approval Block and 3.2.2 should be labeled Approval Block

3.5.6 The body text to say, show existing and proposed gas lines on the plan.

M. Gasses will ask Dubois & King if engineers still use the Manning's Formula

4.8.3 Access Management needs to be addressed

M. Gasses needs to ask the minimum sight distance, 300 or 365

4.8.6 Intersection Sight Distance M. Gasses needs to ask Dubois & King, also page 66

4.9.1 (3) should be no paragraph (4)

A. Gaudiello will work on 4.9.6

The board will look at sign regulations and review process at the next work session.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD**

J. Huckins provided information from the UNH Cooperative Extension on a service to help with Master Planning.

D. Hatch thanked J. Huckins for his many years of outstanding service.

D. Huckins discussed process on April 2<sup>nd</sup> for discussion on the approval process of the excavation application on Green Hill.

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

April 2, 2013 at the ELC

Adjournment

*A motion was made by A. Kelley and seconded by A. Gaudiello to adjourn at 9:30 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia J. Gasses

Town Planner and Land Use Administrator

## **Attachment to Certification of Amendments – This is the document as presented. It does not include changes**

The approval and adoption of these amendments is recorded in the proceedings of the Planning Board of [Insert Date]. Text of the item amended is given as follows: text to be deleted is given in strikethrough font, text to be inserted is given in bolded font, and text provided for clarification or explanation is given in [bracketed italic font] and should not be read as a portion of the regulation.

[General Edit – remove entries which were to indicate a revision date. Instead we have on file with the Town clerk a history of revisions that cover those.]

1.3 [Bullet items are indexed as 1.3(1) through 1.3(11)]

1.5 [Bullet items are indexed as 1.5(1) & 1.5(2)]

2.3 [Bullet items are indexed as 2.5(1) through 2.5(4). Wording contained in Bullet 5 moved to the Section Body Text.]

2.4.2(1) Include a completed design review request form available at the Town Offices Land Use Office.; [The intro in 2.4.2 has a "...which shall:" introduction to the paragraphs making the includes necessary.]

2.4.2(2) Include a completed Site Plan Application Checklist marked design review checklist. Forms are available at the Town Offices Land Use Office;

2.4.5(2) The applicant shall contact department heads (i.e. e.g. the Highway Superintendent) directly to discuss any particular requirement or comments raised in the review process, and provide written verification to the Board that the comments are addressed to the satisfaction of that department head.

2.5.1(3) Include a completed application checklist for the type project to be considered. The appropriate forms are available from the Land Use Office Planning Board;. [The intro in 2.5.2 has the phrasing "... shall include" making the includes unnecessary. Also raises the ? of standard terminology Planning Board Office or Land Use Office.]

2.5.1(6) Include a list of the names and addresses of all abutters, as provided in in accord with RSA 676:4, I (b);

2.5.1(8) Include Applicable documents listed in Article 4.

2.5.1(9) Include a materials quantity list for all improvements excluding buildings, and a summary total for bond estimate for the project; and

2.5.1(10) Include The establishment of an escrow for anticipated review cost. The escrow amount is in sufficient amount determined by the Planning Board. The eEscrow account shall be periodically reviewed to ensure that sufficient funds are available to cover all review costs and additional escrow shall be provided as needed.

2.5.2 The date of delivery of a Formal Application to the Planning Board shall be stamped on the plan by the Land Use Office staff. and issue of a date stamp on the application

2.5.5 [The issue of standard presentation of RSAs – use §. Currently we do both. Related issue use NH or Chapter with RSA? Currently we do both)

2.6.4(2) "Schedule a Public Hearing (Insert words into the paragraph's lead words. Also call attention to Paragraph Bold index concept.)

2.6.4(5) Action - The Planning Board shall have 65 days, from the date of acceptance, to approve or disapprove the application, subject to extension or waivers as provided in RSA 676:4(c) 1 (1). The date of acceptance shall be the date that the Planning Board accepts the plan. (All this does is insert parenthesis around the 1 in the RSA citation.)

3.1.1 SCALE

Plan Type	Perspective	Scaling Ratio
Horizontal	Boundary Plans	Horizontal 1 inch = 100 feet Maximum
	All Other Plans	Horizontal 1 inch = 40 feet Maximum
Verticle	Verticle	1 inch = 4 feet Maximum
Cross Section	Cross Section	1 inch = 5 feet
(Horizontal & Vertical)		

[Revised column structure of scaling presentation: Insert Header Row, moved plan types to column 1, merged all other plans into single cell, and include Horizontal for the all other plans category.]

3.2.1 [Bullet items are indexed as 3.2.1(1) through 3.2.1(9)]

3.2.2 [For Discussion: Is there a reason for the dual IDs? Signature or Approval]

3.3 [Bullet items are indexed as 3.3(9) as is; 3.3(10)&(11)&(12) are as given below, and continuing items 3.3(13) through 3.3.(22) as is.]

3.3(10) North Arrow

3.3(11) Locus Map scaled at 1 inch = 2500 feet

3.3(12) To include the GR, NR, VD, and RC districts shown for the subject lot and abutting lots as applicable;

3.5.6 [No Body text – Strike the word reserved as unnecessary.]

3.5.11(1) Parking Plan - Showing all designated parking areas including Show all designated parking areas. Showing is to include surface materials, curbing, parking space and aisle dimensions, total number of spaces (including handicapped parking and shared parking areas), and off-street loading areas.

3.5.11(2) Circulation Plan – for the interior of the lot showing provisions Show provisions within the interior lot for both auto and pedestrian circulation. An access plan showing means of access to the site and proposed changes to any existing public streets including any traffic control devices, pedestrian and bicycle amenities, snow storage areas, directional signage, and other features necessary in conjunction with the site development plan.

3.6 Bullet items are indexed as 3.6(1) through 3.6(18)

3.8 Bullet items are indexed as 3.8(1) through 3.8(5)

3.9.8 See Article 8 9 (Reference error)

4.7.5 The rainfall event frequency to be used with this Manning’s formula shall be as follows a 1 in 50 year (2% chance) for (i) Commercial Areas, (ii) Industrial Areas, (iii) Flood Protection Works, (iv) Multi-Family Residential Projects

(1) Comercial Areas – 50 Years

(2) Industrial Areas – 50 Years

(3) Flood Protections Works – 50 Years

(4) Multi-Family Residential – 50 Years

(Small roman numerals are used in 4.7.5 but commas work as well.)

4.8.6 INTERSECTION SITE SIGHT DISTANCE (Subsection Heading)

4.8.6 TABLE 1 – INTERSECTION SITE SIGHT DISTANCE (Table Heading)

4.8.6 FIGURE 4 – EXAMPLE OF DESIGN INTERSECTION CLEAR SITE SIGHT DISTANCE FOR 45 MPH PASSENGER CAR DESIGN SPEED. (Figure Heading)

4.8.6 FIGURE 4 – CLEAR SITE SIGHT DISTANCE (Text within the figure.)

4.8.7 TABLE 2 – DESIGN STOPPING SITE SIGHT DISTANCE (Table Heading)

4.9.1(3 4) Reduce congestion in the streets and contribute to traffic safety. (To correct paragraph numbering)

4.9.4 Insert index 4.9.4(1) for 1st paragraph body text of 4.9.4. [Next paragraph body text entry is given as 4.9.4(2).]

4.9.6 ?? Should there be a date specific in 4.9.6(1) rather than “after the effective date of this Ordinance?? It would seem the date would be the adoption date of the Ordinance 6-23-05.

4.11.3(1) Site Plans in the Village (V) District (VD

4.12.2(9) Mounting Height (Text is unchanged in this paragraph except to correct the reference error as follows.) “...under Article 8 9.)

Article 5 – The question arises-what is “applicable sign review.” If the sign is a part of a regular site review then it would seem the sign would be considered as a part of that review. If a “stand alone” sign application the appropriate review process is what? Here are the questions that occur to me: If the sign is an Off Premise Business sign or if the sign if a Off Promisies Directional Sign it requires site review, if the sign application seeks a waiver, it require site review.

What is to be the required application form and fee?

The standards to be applied and the determination to be made would seem to be:

Proper Location

Proper Dimensions

Proper Lighting (Properly conditioned internally lit signs will be permissible.)

Proper disposition of any waiver requests. (A waiver request brings the application into the regular planning board processes for site review.)

It seems the process should be a “minor site process” in which the applications as given is reviewed for conformity with the applicable site review regulations by staff, commented upon by relevant department heads, and brought to the board with recommendations as to (1) completeness of the application, acceptance of the application, form of the approval to be considered, (or if fail to approve the reasons why.)l standards committee

5.2.2(1 {Unlighted signs not exceeding two (2) square feet in area or smaller bearing property numbers...”...”[or smaller is unnecessary wording.”}

5.2.2(12) Reference Error: ....Subsection 5.7.3 4

5.2.8(2) Rewording of a sign for an existing use, and ensuring uniformity in background necessitated by [remove space] 3) the rewording, shall not be deemed to constitute sign alteration.

5.2.8 (3) Insert the index 5.2.8(3) before the words: “Any nonconforming sign that ....”

5.3(6)(g) Both Integral Signs and Marquee have same subparagraph index (g) Reindex Marquee sign as (h) and continue sequence with subsequent items.

5.5.1(1) Signs shall be illuminated only by stationary, shielded light sources directed solely on the sign, without causing glare. Signs shall not be illuminated internally unless they utilize light-colored letters and symbols on a dark background, in order to avoid undue glare radiating from the sign

5.8.1 and 5.8.2 engage the question presented at the beginning – Site review process seems to be somewhat variable regarding signs. What process is being referred to here?



6.2 Reserved Definitions – Moved to Article 13 – Definitions and 6.2 is reserved.

6.3 Reserved [This avoids the need to renumber subsequent indexing.]

WHEN WE GET AROUND TO REDOING THE REGULATIONS IN FULL CONSIDER MOVING  
10,11 AND 12 TO A GENERAL PROVISIONS STATEMENT UNDER ARTICLE 1