



Town of Barrington
Public Meeting – Work Session
Draft Proposal Review & Subcommittee Meeting #2
August 8, 2023, 2:00PM - 4:00 PM
TOWN HALL LAND USE CONFERENCE ROOM @ TOWN HALL
4 SIGNATURE DRIVE
BARRINGTON, NH 03825

Meeting Minutes

The Barrington Subcommittee will hold a work session on Tuesday, August 8, 2023, concerning the following agenda items for discussion:

Primary purpose of the meeting: Draft Proposal Review & Subcommittee Meeting for amendment to supplement section 9.6 to the Town’s Zoning Ordinance. Review Case study(ies)

1. Introduction of Staff and Steering Committee.

Committee Attendees: Ken Grossman, Conservation Commission; Paul Panish, Conservation Commission; John Driscoll, Planning Board; Ron Allard, Planning Board

Staff Attendees: Vanessa Price, Jamey Jameson

2. Case Study work session utilizing Ecosystem Functions and Services Data Form.

The subcommittee reviewed the case study of a recent case file that was filed and utilized the Ecosystem Functions and Data Form. Discussion on the data sheet and case:

- The case file didn’t find wetland on the internet platforms WPPT and Granitview.
- If you haven’t used the platform before, it is not user friendly. Discussion that a user guide will have to be further developed. The user guide should be used to assist the applicant, possible that Conservation Commission may help as an active advisory role and as a resource for the applicant when filing a development that needs a 9.6. Mr. Panish discussed that in the exercise of the case study, and didn’t find the wetlands, but rather found the information in the Hydrologic Soils layer. He further said that at their next meeting, discuss with the consultant the mythology for the case file and why does it fall short. Discussion if this is appropriate for all applications? Not all boundaries were viewed and may need to be viewed as part of the user guide.
- Ken Grossman discussed that the restoration of wetlands is important, and how do we get there?
- Ron Allard expressed that his expectation from this effort, was to develop a tool for the Conservation Commission to help identify wetlands, and not infringe on property rights.

- Mr. Grossman answered that wasn't necessarily what his thought was for this zoning amendment. He discussed that that the Conservation Commission, as an advisory committee, wanted in zoning their role for determining wetland buffers.
- John Driscoll discussed that the Planning Board would most likely not support the 100 foot buffer due to property rights.
- Mr. Grossman discussed that the 100ft buffer should be looked at taking it out of the evaluation. Perhaps to look at a minimum buffer that cannot be infringed upon.
- Mr. Driscoll reiterated this process on the data sheet references have a poor user interface.
- Mr. Grossman discussed that a bigger development project would have more deep science into identifying the buffer of the wetlands.
- Mr. Allard discussed that the data sheet needs to be simplified. The rankings have a scale of 1-5, based on that to find the value of wetlands.
- Mr. Grossman said maybe it would be the number of feet.
- Mr. Allard stated that there is a need to value all the factors. It's a larger ask for a more stringent value of a wetland.
- Mr. Driscoll stated it was about the quality of wetlands.
- Mr. Allard his concerns of the valuation of the wetlands, and it cannot be so strict to the applicant as it is a burden to the applicant and their property rights.
- Mr. Grossman discussed it was more than property rights. Barrington values the conservation of land.
- Jayme Jennison stated that the demographics are changing, the politics of the town may have changed. Barrington reflects rural community but is worried over property rights infringements. There need to be tools, or a way to show, how the applicant would be affected.
- Mr. Allard discussed on the form, the issue with the point system, and how to get to the point system on the cart, with yes or no answers. There is a disconnect on the numbering issues.

Discussion moved to the review of the changes to the rapid assessment method.

3. Review of changes to the rapid assessment method.

- Discussion on the changes to the rapid assessment method. (Those changes are attached to the meeting minutes.)
- Mr. Grossman and Mr. Panish were in agreement that this would be discussed at their Conservation Commission meeting on August 10, 2023.
- Mr. Grossman discussed that it may be possible that the Conservation Commission would be able to do the assessment and recommend the results to the Planning Board. However, that will have to be discussed at their August 10, 2023, meeting.

- Overall, the subcommittee group decided that maybe additional planning board cases need to be reviewed as case studies to evaluate the methodology of the evaluation system. However, they wanted to still move forward with 2024 Zoning Amendment to the voters for them to decide.
- V. Price stated that the completed user guide and draft language for the Zoning Amendments would have to be a complete document, because if it did pass by the voters, it would be considered active the day it has the vote to pass.
- Mr. Panish was concerned that the user guide would have to be further looked at and may not be ready for the voters in 2024.
- At the next meeting, August 15, 2023, the consultant will be present to discuss the updates, methodology and the next steps.

4. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 PM. The next meeting date is scheduled Tuesday, August 15, 2023, 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM.