



Meeting Minutes
BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Early Childhood Learning Center
77 Ramsdell Lane, Barrington, NH
Tuesday April 2, 2013
6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Member Present

John Huckins, Chair
Alan Kelley, Vice-Chair
Anthony Gaudiello
George Calef
Jackie Kessler showed up at 6:45

Members Absent

Steven Oles
Dawn Hatch, Ex-officio

Alternate Members

Stephen Jeffery
Michael Clark Ex-officio

Town Planner

Marcia Gasses

J. Huckins brought the meeting to order at 6:39pm

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

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of March 26, 2013 Meeting Minutes.

A motion was made by G. Calef and seconded by A. Kelley to postpone acceptance until after review. The motion carried unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

2. **SR12/410 (Gas Station and Convenience Store)** Request by applicant to construct a 5,000 convenience store and gas station on a 1.84 acre site located at 491 Calef Highway (Map 238, Lot 4) in the Town Center (TC) and Stratified Drift Overlay (SDA) Zoning Districts. Applicant: The Three Socios, LLC; 321 D Lafayette Road, Hampton, NH 03842

A motion was made A. Kelley and seconded by T. Gaudiello to continue this application to May 7th, 2012. This motion carried with all members except for G. Calef who abstained.

3. **250-79-RC-12-SR Associated Buyers (Steppingstone Farm Partnership)** Request by applicant for a minor site review to add one 7250 s.f. freezer on a 4.35 acre site located at 54 Commerce Way (Map 250, Lot 79) in the Regional Commercial (RC) Zoning District. By: Chris Berry; Berry Surveying & Engineering.

A motion was made by A. Kelley and seconded by T. Gaudiello to continue this application to May 7th, 2012. This motion carried unanimously.

J. Kessler arrived at 6:45 pm.

4. **210-57-GR-12-SR Daniel Hussey (Trinity Conservation)-Gravel Excavation Operation** Request by applicant to propose a Gravel Excavation Operation with access through Map 210, Lot 44 on a 100 acre site located on Green Hill Road (Map 210, Lot 57) in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. By: Jeff Kevan; TF Moran, Inc.

FX Bruton started off by introducing himself and the applicants. He started off by explaining the things that they had worked on since last meeting. There was some interest in having no perception of vibration associated with the blasting at the property line. With this in mind they reduced the blasting plan previously submitted to a level of .15. Blasting is a fairly incidental portion of this project and now this plan brings it down to less than the blasting for a foundation house. This should more than adequately fit the town's criteria. In addition to this, the applicant also submitted plans with respect to noise issues. It should show that even at the source the sound levels would only be at 53-65 decibels. They have tried to meet all the performance criteria and he feels that the applicant has done this with these submissions.

The condition of Greenhill road was another issue that was brought forth by the board. The applicant originally submitted some engineering detail that the town engineer had reviewed. They had an original estimate to do some of the work of \$900,000 which was suggested. The applicant met with the town manager, the planning department, road agent Peter Cook the towns and applicant engineer. They went out and looked at the road to see what really needed to be done with respect to the project and what the town would be doing in the case of a no build situation. When the above group went out they looked at this road they determined that there would be approximately \$730,000 worth of improvements to the road. A portion of this work was what the town was anticipating on doing in the next 5 years. The town engineer reported that this was something the town was looking at doing in the next 5 years at a cost of \$350,000. The applicant went back and looked at this data and made a proposal for \$130,000 contribution towards this work. The premise of this was looking at the access from one point to the project. The applicant's road engineer report identified this in two ways one being the west section running from the project to route 202 and one being the east section which is running from the project to route 125. They made an original recommendation that they would put some controls that would restrict outgoing traffic with full loads to the west side. They understand that the police chief would rather see the traffic going to a signalized intersection. They also understand that the state is proposing some work at the intersection of route 125 and that the town would want to see some coordination with the state.

With this in mind the applicant ran the numbers again and came to the conclusion that it would propose using the easterly means of egress to and from the site and would contribute the full amount that the town's engineer had said would be needed for these improvements. This amount was \$366,000 which was half of what the road engineer said would be needed for the entire road. This considered with what the town was going to spend over 5 years equals the exact amount that the town's engineer estimated would be the total improvements to the road. The applicant proposed as a condition of approval that the applicant would be responsible for completing the entire improvements as outlined by the towns engineer from the point of the project to the east side to route 125 while coordinating with the state. What this does is allows the town to make improvements at its own pace to the west side. If the town does not do this then the applicant would continue to be restricted until that work was done to the use of one side. To control this they would come up with some sort of signage plan. Also, because of the potential for customers coming in and breaking agreements the applicant thought that a \$50 fine for wrong usage of the road would be put on the driver and that money would go to the town for road improvements.

They were able to look at the recommendations made by the town staff. FX noted that some recommendations were issues that had come up recently and the things that are not in the recommendations that we have all talked about in terms of hours of operation, testing protocol and things of that nature are already on the plan and thus would be conditions of approval. With that being said, in terms of addressing the recommendations there is a blank for what this board wants to do for the improvements to Greenhill road so this is something that needs to be discussed. There was a typo that he found in the blasting being .15 and it should be .015. The only other issue is something that needs to be addressed is a site distance to the west side of 5 feet that didn't meet the criteria. The applicant would agree to reduce the road way on the west side which would take about 50 feet of work. This would resolve the site distance issue and would be consistent with what the town would be doing anyway. Other than that we have looked at the recommendations and they are consistent with what we have been talking about. They incorporate the isinglass advisory boards concerns of being involved in the monitoring of what is going on and the applicant does not object to that. We have worked hard to meet the performance standards, the requirements that we needed to meet, and the interests expressed by the board and the abutters. We are asking for the conditional approval with the recommendations.

A. Kelley asked if there was anything written up about what the applicant would do about the site distance to the west.

Jeff Kevan said that they would have to lower the road about 4-5 inches, it is a 50 foot stretch and they will work with the town road agent and make this repair so that we have the adequate site distance.

A. Kelley stated that there should be something written up to do this.

Jeff Kevan responded by saying that they could do that or add it to the conditional approval.

J. Huckins opened up public comment and reminded the public that the board cannot make a decision based on the lowering of house values. It is not something they could consider and is not a discussion that will be had tonight.

Giulio Franceschini handed out a paper to the planning board and asked for any questions regarding what he had passed out.

J. Huckins explained that the zoning was different at the time that this was done.

Giulio Franceschini said that this may be true but it is still the same sand and the same rocks that are there and it has nothing to do with the ordinance. If you read on, it will show you that these are key witnesses that the Hussey family hired to go to court and it is interesting.

G. Calef said to Mr. Franceschini that he should have given this to the board prior to the meeting so they could review it. He cannot comment on it tonight because he has not had a chance to read it.

Jae Whitelaw explained the document he had provided for the board. She said that the documents had to do with a variance denied back in 1988-89 and according to the court order there could not be this type of activity because of the zoning ordinance at that time. The zoning ordinance has since changed so the court order is not valid anymore.

Bill Potter asked if there was a scale that would be used in weighing the trucks. There should be one to keep the roads intact and to monitor whether the trucks would be overloaded.

M. Gasses expressed that the engineer provided a moveable scale that would be on site.

Bill Potter was concerned about Hansonville road because it is in both Barrington and Rochester and there has not been any talk of keeping these trucks off that road because that road is not in good condition at all. He then sited the January 8th minutes, it reads that attorney Whitelaw responded to a question by saying that parts of RSA 155 are only in effect and applied within the town if the town does not regulate excavations in the zoning ordinance which would define that. Those provisions in 155 E are not applicable in Barrington because it allows for excavation. In tonight's agenda you refer to RSA 674.44. I found an article on the town's website article number 674.27 article 4. It says excavation of earth should be made in accordance with RSA 155 E which attorney Whitelaw said no.

J. Huckins explained that they have to follow 155 E. If the town didn't have regulations as a part of 155 E than it would have to meet a different criteria. She was saying that the town didn't have to meet a different criteria because they had an ordinance.

Bill Potter said that they still have to meet the regular stuff like diminishing value and deterioration and this doesn't apply to that.

Jae Whitelaw explained that they have to meet the statutory requirements, some of which don't apply because the town has the regulation of excavations in its zoning ordinance. So not everything in 155 E applies but a lot of it does.

Bill Potter said he was talking to other local operations and they both told him that 155 E has to apply to any town review of excavations unless the town zoning requirements are stricter.

M. Gasses said there is a portion of 155 E that refers to the criteria of a special exception. The special exception is required from the zoning board when the use is not permitted within the zoning ordinance. The section under 155E is that portion of the ordinance that does not apply in this instance.

Bill Potter was concerned about the reclamation process that will supposedly be taking place by the applicant. He said that the clear cutting of the trees still has not been reclaimed by the applicant and doubts they will reclaim the land afterwards. He handed the board many pictures that he took of the logging devastation.

J. Huckins said that the applicant is going to bond the reclamation process as a part of approval.

Russ Bracket said that he hoped the board had received all of the staff recommendations. He then asked if the lowering of the road to address the line of sight will be under their cost and will be up to standard that the road needs to be.

J. Huckins explained that the board hasn't gotten this in writing yet but it will be a part of the conditions of approval and will be at their cost.

Russ Bracket said that there were a lot of things in these plans and notes that Marcia put together. A few things that he did not see addressed were that Mr. Hussey said there would only be 1 loader and 1 excavator at any one time. There is nothing in the plans that addressed this. He was wondering if that was still true and if this will be another condition of approval.

Jeff Kevan explained that what they have put on the plans will be the 30 truckloads per day, which will control how much equipment will be on site. They have also called for 1 mobile grinding unit and a sound screen to go with it.

Russ Bracket said that this talks strictly to the crushing plan and does not mention any other equipment. The part about the 'not more than three loads per hour' says "assume" and it should say "will not".

Jeff Kevan said that they have committed to this number and it will not change.

Russ Bracket expressed that he thought the April annual well check should be more frequent which was discussed already. He then asked where the water would come from in supporting this operation.

Jeff Kevan stated that water will be brought in from off site with a water truck.

Russ Bracket said that there was one thing that came up tonight that astonished him. It was when they said that they would prefer to go out to the east side to route 125. In the lawyer's letter to the town it was very specific that they wanted to go to the west side to route 202. He wanted to know why it was a total change going from one direction to the other.

J. Huckins explained that the police chief was present and it was his recommendation for the trucks to go this way instead. He then asked the police chief to explain this rationality.

Police Chief Dick Conway explained that traffic lights are going to be installed at the intersection of Greenhill and 125. This would allow the trucks to go down Greenhill and go north or south with the traffic lights. If they go out towards 202 they come up at the rise, with a loaded truck it would take a lot of time to accelerate across.

Russ Bracket said that there was a lot of meeting notes from the IRLAC meeting and there were concerns that should be in these notes. He urged the board to make the decision after looking at Marcia's notes.

Chris Baughman requested that additional buffers be added to what they have already stated so that they there would be actual woodland within the buffer. He suggested an extra 50 feet so that they have a complete 75 feet of woods. He then asked about where the fence would be on the property line.

Jeff Kevans said that they would be glad to place it wherever they think is best but he thought that the best place to put it was in the clearing and put the trees they said they would plant on the abutters side outside the fence. This would be easy and would not require the fence to wind through trees.

Chris Baughman said that the shrinking vegetation is the main concern for him and that they should put it on the other side so someone looking at his house would not see it. There isn't much buffer left even if this is done and he would like to see this extended.

J. Huckins explained that they are going to put the fence in front of the vegetated buffer before the slope goes. They are not going to cut out any more buffer.

Jeff Smith said that the state had looked at the bridge and there was a certain percentage of load that was going to be traveling over this bridge. Now the bridge is getting all of the trucks both ways. He asked if this has been addressed by the state.

M. Gasses said that she spoke with Steven Wyoks a bridge engineer and asked him if all the trucks going towards the bridge would make a difference. He said that they anticipated most of the loads would be going towards 125 anyway and that this would not make a difference. The bridge itself is structurally sound and it would not have a negative effect from the use of all the truckloads.

Jeff Smith said in his opinion the trucks going downhill towards a one lane bridge and up the other side is unsafe. It is a dangerous spot so he doesn't see it safer going one direction.

Dale Lavertu said in regards to the blasting being only the size of the blast for a foundation, it is all well and good if it is only one day. The blasting is all day everyday will become an annoyance.

Jeff Kevans explained that there would be blasting for 1 day every two months and there would be a grinding operation for approximately 1 to 7 days some time in that period.

Dale Lavertu asked about the noise level of the grinding operation in relationship to what they are talking about for blasting.

Jeff Kevans stated that they called for a sound screen that will be put in place so that they are below the requirement for the property line.

Dale Lavertu said that this response did not answer his question and he did not care about the sound screen. He said that if the screen works than the blasting doesn't matter either.

FX Bruton explained the sound level with the screen is anticipated to be between 53-65 db at the source. This could be as much as 800 feet from the property line. At the property line it would be below the 75 db which is required by the performance standards.

Dale Lavertu said that they should still consider the annoyance to the abutters of a constant operation. With blasting once every 30 days and grinding all day long with the noise level being roughly the same there is a huge annoyance.

FX Bruton said that they have proposed blasting once every two months which is 6 times a year.

Dale Lavertu said that he was talking about the grinding operation.

FX Bruton explained that Jeff Kevans described a limited amount of grinding and he has described the amount of db's that would be produced at the source. We have scaled this operation down to a level where perception is not even humanly possible at the property line, in fact they are at half of what human perception would be at the property line for vibration. They have dampened the noise far below what the requirements are even at the property line.

Dale Lavertu said that he has heard a lot of talk about planning to do things but feared that this would not actually hold true.

FX Bruton said that this is a requirement and if these are exceeded the operation would cease until there is remediation which is also on the plan. All of those things that Jeff indicated in terms of blasting that are not in the recommendations are in the plans.

Dale Lavertu asked about the potential fine for going the wrong way. He said that this is a proposal from the applicant for a fine of \$50. What is going to be put in place to ensure that if they go the wrong way there will be enough of a fine to deter them from doing this. He thought that \$50 for a fine is not enough.

J. Huckins said that they had just received this information tonight and they had talked with the attorney about a developer's agreement to make sure that this stuff is enforceable. The \$50 is what they will fine their drivers and is irrelevant to what the town would fine them for the same action.

Jae Whitelaw explained that the fine would be assessed by the applicant on the truck driver. This is a mechanism that the applicant is proposing as a way to get the truck driver to comply with the condition that is imposed on the applicant. The town can address separately whether or not there should be different penalties for the applicant, but one penalty for not complying with a condition is to shut down the operation.

Dale Lavertu said there was discussion about the improvements for the road to 202 and asked if the trucks can go down route 202 after the improvements have been made.

Jae Whitelaw said that this was one question that she had for FX. There was the proposal of going east and not going west but then there was discussion about once the improvements being done the trucks being able to go west. The issue the chief has with going west has nothing to do with the conditions of the road. This is something that needs to be figured out by the board and the applicant.

M. Gasses stated that in addition to the proposal of the repairs to Greenhill road the town's plan did not include the extent of repairs that were required to handle truck traffic. This is not for the board to decide because it is a selectman issue. It would depend on the financial circumstances of the town at the time.

FX Bruton said that if the town had anticipated spending \$350,000 over a period of time and were relieved of the burden of shimming and overlaying to the east side then they could take the recommendations that Dubois and King said should be done to the west side. This project is not the only use of this road, and the road agent wants these improvements to happen. The town should consider improving the road. If the town decides to not follow these recommendations then the applicant will continue to only use one side of the road. We are not asking the town to do these improvements, but it would seem prudent for the selectman to do this. He then stated that if the town did these improvements they would like to have discussion with the town about gaining access to the west.

Jae Whitelaw saw this as the clarification she needed to address the road conditions of going east or west.

J. Huckins stated that they could come back and have that discussion come time for pit review later on.

Dale Lavertu said that the community doesn't want to improve the road so the applicant could send 60 tractor trailer trucks a day down it. He also stated that they should have to file for new permits once the improvement had been made.

Elizabeth Doarn Healy said that she went to the selectman's meeting and at the meeting there was a recommendation from the selectman and the board to improve both sides of the road up to standards because there will not be a way to monitor which way the trucks would be going. The selectman also said that the road improvements to Greenhill road would not be moved up on the time line for the benefit of the applicant. She expressed her concerns for the bridge on to Route 125 not being able to handle the trucks.

Cindy Andrews asked how to address the concerns of the trucks wanting to get to 202 in Rochester. She explained how the truck drivers would have interest in getting to 202 and as a resident of Rochester she wanted to know how to address this issue by either going to Rochester city council or with the Barrington Planning board.

Jim Andrews said that when they are looking at noise it will be amplified when coming out of the pit. It is going to be louder on the outer perimeters then it is within the sand pit.

John Syr said that the amount of trucks found being used on Hansonville and Greenhill road will be surprising. He stated how he worked at a place where they used a cone crusher and a jaw crusher and it is nothing that you want to live next to. He said that you can't keep up with controlling the dust and the noise is very deceptively loud. Finally he suggested that the board go to an operating gravel pit to get a better understanding. The other operations are following the same guidelines but they are a disaster.

J. Huckins closed public comment and asked if the board had any further questions.

J. Kessler asked if there was a traffic study done.

J. Kevans said that there was a traffic assessment done on the road to see what kind of traffic the project would generate.

J. Kessler wanted to clarify that there was not a traffic study done to look at the potential dangers of the trucks going out on 125 or 202.

J. Kessler asked who did the study and what kind of study was done?

Jeff Kevans explained that they did a traffic assessment on what 30 trucks a day would add to the traffic and they looked at the sight distance for each side and will be providing for adequate sight distance.

J. Kessler just had concern that the line of sight issue was studied and addressed because the trucks pulling out on the highway pose a danger to people not being able to see them.

Jae Whitelaw stated that the planning board did not request a study for existing traffic.

Jeff Kevans said that starting in the spring the DOT will be putting in traffic lights at the route 125 intersection. The issue with the 202 intersection is in the acceleration speed of trucks going through the intersection.

S. Jeffery expressed concerns about the monitoring wells. He couldn't find anything where they addressed the time frame for monitoring wells.

Jeff Kevans explained that the wells were put in to monitor the depth of the water table, and it lined up pretty well with the data that they already had. Normally it is monitored 2-3 times per year in March and April because the level is usually the highest then. They will do this to make sure that we keep a 4 foot separation between the pit and the water table. When the pit gets to around 10-12 feet deep they will put in a test pit and read the soils to ensure that they don't encroach on this 4 foot barrier. He also stated that one of the conditions of approval was to hire a geotechnical engineer to answer any water table questions that come up.

S. Jeffery asked if there was a written proposal for this.

Jeff Kevans said that we had agreed to do this and was in Marcia's recommendations

M. Gasses thought a note on page 3/12 needed some clarification. It currently says that it will be monitored in just April and this needs more.

Jeff Kevans said that they would change it to saying they will monitor it three times a year in April, August and October or something like that.

S. Jeffery said he would like to see it checked once a month.

A. Kelley said he didn't see a problem with taking more frequent readings when it is open. What will be the time frame for when you have it open and can visually observe it?

Jeff Kevans said that there wasn't a timeline for this because it is based upon how fast they move material. It would be per area as they move through the excavation area.

Jae Whitelaw asked about the process and for clarification on how the excavation and viewing process was done.

Jeff Kevans said he didn't think that monitoring more frequently would prove to be more beneficial because the water table does not change that quickly. He then explained how they can read the soils for the water table by looking at how the water washes the iron out of the soil.

S. Jeffery said to his understanding this technique gives you a seasonal high water table where as a monitoring well would give you an exact high water table at that moment in time.

Jeff Kevans said that this was correct but the modeling is also beneficial to do, which is why they were proposing to do both.

M. Gasses asked that they come to a number so that they can put it in the recommendations.

S. Jeffery said that they should propose something and our engineer will look at it.

Jeff Kevans said they will look at it in March, April and October.

S. Jeffery asked if there was anything that might pose a threat to the water table.

Jeff Kevans responded by saying that there was not.

J. Kessler asked about the reason for the wells and the monitoring

Jeff Kevans explained that this was to make sure they keep 4 feet of soil so they can reclaim it and sell the land for development or another use after the project is complete.

J. Kessler asked for more clarification on the trucks going east and west and about the improvements to the road.

J. Huckins explained the developers agreement that would spell everything out about this and the lawyer would make sure that it would coincide with everything that the town wants.

T. Gaudiello said that the development plan sounds like it should contain many issues that don't appear as actual notes on the plat. He asked if they would be providing the board with a document that explains what they will propose to do.

Jae Whitelaw explained that FX was probably waiting for her to say that it is a good idea.

FX Bruton believed that most of the issues they had been talking about are on the plan. There is a certain point where there can be too many notes on the plan.

T. Gaudiello asked if he was saying that all issues that were addressed tonight were on the plan such as the issues of traveling east and west and the monitoring wells.

FX Bruton explained that the issue of the wells and the geotechnical engineer are on there as note 12, and note 13.

T. Gaudiello asked if these notes were on the plan or were there other things that will be in the developers arrangement.

FX Bruton said that the only other thing that was not in Marcia's notes was the frequency of monitoring the wells. There were other things such as how to address the issues of improving Greenhill road.

T. Gaudiello asked if the issue of traveling east or west was on there.

FX Bruton said that this was not on the plan but was in Marcia's notes for what the board needs to determine.

M. Clark wanted to make sure that the applicant wasn't opposed to these other issues and making the developers agreement. He also thought that pushing this fine down to the driver was not the effect that they were after.

FX Bruton explained that they would make a document for them with the issues of what they still need to iron out.

M. Gasses added that there are 4 more comments as notes of what to outright put on the plans one of them being the direction in which the trucks take.

J. Kessler asked for clarification on the road updates of note number 8.

J. Huckins asked what the applicant wanted to do at this time.

FX Bruton said that as they stated in the beginning they had asked to be granted the conditional approval of this plan. As a part of this approval they hoped to adopt the plan which they had with respect to access to the project. This is something that this board has the power to do. He then reiterated that all of the improvements that are needed for the east will be done under the cost of the applicant. The nuts and bolts of how this will be performed still need to be worked out, but if this approval is granted then they understand that the plan that they have presented to the board be approved thus improving the access way.

J. Huckins explained how bonds work in Barrington.

FX Bruton said that however they work out the bond is not a concern. They do not have a problem with this.

M. Gasses said that one recommendation she left off that board backs up is that all the road improvements must be completed prior to the project. The selectmen were very clear that there was going to be no project to be taken place on a substandard road.

T. Gaudiello thought that the actual conditions of approval be in one document to be reviewed

J. Kessler agreed with this and stated that she would like to actually see the conditions of approval she can vote on.

T. Gaudiello said that he wasn't clear of the various elements that require monitoring the road. He then asked if they were proposing to put a watch out there, who will be recording the trucks and who will be responsible for policing the agreement.

Michael Clark said he thought there were still a lot of loose ends.

Jae Whitelaw sensed from the board, with the developer's agreement and enforcement issues aside, they would like to see a complete package of the total list of conditions for approval and all of the things that were said tonight that are going to be done. Our next collective job is to put all of these together as one document that contains everything.

J. Huckins said that there was also a thought about having third party review and making a bond to cover the cost of this.

FX Bruton said that Marcia had the recommendation for this and there was also language from the towns engineer about creating a budget for this.

M. Gasses explained that her suggestion was to set an amount for an escrow account to be drawn off. They could come up with a scope that will show exactly what the monitoring entails.

Jae Whitelaw suggested the board needs to make a decision on the applicant using the eastern access of the road and their proposal to make the improvements for the eastern access.

Michael Clark asked how the board could make that decision if they don't know how the trucks will be monitored.

Jae Whitelaw thought that they could make a conceptual position on this.

FX Bruton said he would like to make a final proposal with the town before voting on anything.

J. Huckins asked if the board needs to vote to have the applicant have direct work with the town lawyer.

Jae Whitelaw said that for review of documents it is appropriate to bill to the applicant. If it is conditions of approval that are being done than it is not appropriate.

FX Bruton agreed with the issue of review of documents.

J. Huckins explained why they should deal directly with attorney.

T. Gaudiello said that advantage of this is the gate keeping function. Right now if they were to deal directly with the attorney then in a sense they direct what they want to send to the attorney in quantity or form. It is a financial question of gate keeping.

FX Bruton explained that they also have a planning department that they will work with.

M. Gasses reminded them that anything the attorney and the applicant agree upon is not an agreement until it comes before the board.

T. Gaudiello motioned and A. Kelley seconded to continue this application to May 7th. The motion carried unanimously.

5. [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.

Chris Berry started off by introducing himself and the plan of constructing a garage to be used as a typical residential garage. It is 1,200 square feet. He wants to use it for storage. A few questions that came out of this was whether this would call for an increase in parking. They didn't think it would but they increased the parking by four spots. The other major question was the effects that it would cause on route 4. They determined that this would have no effects of route 4. They did an analysis on drainage and it did not increase the storm water run-off of this lot.

J. Huckins asked about the flow coming down the driveway.

Chris Berry explained that this would not have any effect because it would drain out before it reached route 4.

T. Gaudiello asked why this is a typical 'residential garage' and not what it actually is.

Chris Berry explained that on the plans it does not say residential on the plans anymore.

G. Calef motioned and T. Gaudiello seconded to accept this application as complete. This motion carried unanimously.

J. Huckins asked for clarification on waiver item #5.

Chris Berry revoked the request.

G. Calef motioned and J. Kessler motioned to accept the waiver for item #18. Motion carried unanimously.

J. Huckins explained the next waiver item #31

J. Kessler motioned and T. Gaudiello seconded to accept the waiver for #31. The motion carried unanimously.

T. Gaudiello motioned and G. Calef seconded to approve the waiver for item #25. The motion carried unanimously.

T. Gaudiello motioned and G. Calef seconded to approve the multi-use application. The motion carried unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT

M. Gasses explained that she was in contact with Wendy Huff and she thinks that the zoning ordinance will be worked on mid-month and gave an estimated time of work to be 4-6 hours.

T. Gaudiello agreed that this makes sense.

M. Gasses talked about a training program for any new member.

The board discussed the training program.

M. Clark presented J. Huckins with a plaque for all of his service that he had provided for the town by being the chairman of the planning board.

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

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

A motion made by T. Gaudiello and seconded by J. Kessler to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting Adjourned at 8:51 pm.

Submitted Respectfully by Gabriel J. Budds