



**BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**NEW LOCATION: EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING CENTER**

**77 RAMSDELL LANE**

**Barrington, NH 03825**

**Tuesday February 5, 2019**

**6:30 p.m.**

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

**Approved February 19, 2019**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Members Present**

James Jennison, Chair  
Jeff Brann, Vice Chair  
Steve Diamond  
Donna Massucci  
Andy Knapp ex- officio

**Absent**

Fred Nichols

Town Planner: Marcia Gasses  
Staff: Barbara Irvine

**MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

1. Approval of the January 22, 2019 meeting minutes.

*Without objection the minutes of January 22, 2019 were approved as amended at lines 65 and 107.*

**ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 2, 2018**

2. [263-13.1,13.2,18&19-RC-18-9.6/SR \(Owners: Town of Barrington, John Scruton, Town Administrator and Liberty International Trucks of Barrington, LLC\)](#) Request by Applicant

Arleigh Green, Hard Rock Development, LLC, for development of an excavation project for the sale of sand/gravel. Construction to include the construction of proposed roads shown to road base and proposed drainage features on Route 125 (Calef Highway) and Pierce Road (Map 269, Lots 13.1, 13.2, 18, & 19) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Barry W. Gier, PE, Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc.: 85 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH 03885. **Application has been accepted as complete.**

J. Jennison gave a description of application.

Barry Gier from Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc represented Hardrock Development, LLC. He explained that since the last public hearing they have met with NHDES to establish the scope for the hydrogeological study requested by the Planning Board. He explained that the applicant did retain an engineer for the hydrogeological study and met with NHDES to finalize the scope. He explained that this would be an on-going process because NHDES was a per-project deal. He explained that NHDES wanted the measurements and monitoring to continue through the summer. He explained that they want to see what the low flow conditions and ground water levels would be. He explained they wanted to see what the conditions would do to the ground water and the surrounding areas. He expressed to the Board that since they must do the monitoring through the summer they are not ready and would like to ask for this application be tabled until they have the hydrogeological study completed. He explained that the applicant would pay for notifying all abutters and post in the paper prior to the meeting as though this was a new hearing. He explained that they also met with Strafford Regional Planning Commission and the recommendations were the same as the Board previously. He explained that the hydrogeological study being the major recommendation and have the blasting contractor come talk to the Board.

J. Brann stated that there was quite list of questions from SRPC and asked when they were going to be working on preparing answers.

Barry Gier explained that most of the questions were asked by this Board at a different hearing. He explained that they would respond to SRPC and the Board with any questions that they had.

S. Diamond stated that he had given several questions to SRPC that he did not get in before for the deadline. He asked if he should send to M. Gasses.

Barry Gier expressed that they should be forwarded to M. Gasses.

J. Jennison stated that he felt tabling was appropriate at this time, as this would give ample time because there was a lot to be done.

M. Gasses expressed that she wanted everyone to understand that abutters would be re-noticed so they would not need to come to every meeting because this was going to be several months.

J. Brann expressed that they had given continuations and they still have not been ready even when they wanted to come back for January. He explained that he was glad they wanted to table this until they were ready. He explained that there would be extensive revisions to the original plan that he assumed were not ready.

Barry Gier explained that they had not been done because the hydrogeological study was driving the project. He explained that if the study came back in a negative manner they were not going to pay him until all the revisions have been made. He explained until they complete testing, assess the hydrogeological study, and meet with NHDES to see where they stand, they will not be ready to proceed. He explained that monitoring would continue throughout the project. He explained that there would be a report on the monitoring at that time. He explained reports would be supplied during the construction and impacts may cause a shutdown or a revision to the project.

S. Diamond questioned if the time frame could go into the summer, He asked if they knew when that cutoff would be, and a true report be done.

Barry Gier explained that the study would go into the summer because it depends on the weather. He explained that if June and July were dry, they may be able to complete in August or September. He explained that it depends on the weather; they planned on a shorter time, but a wet June and July could stretch out the time frame.

S. Diamond explained that this could go on for more than 10 years and asked when another report would be generated.

Barry Gier explained that at the end of the low period that would be the time NHDES would accept the results of the analyses and make sure the analyses are correct. There would be ongoing monitoring throughout the project.

M. Gasses explained that the hydrogeological study was a big part of the project but other issues including traffic made this a big project.

Barry Gier explained that study was thousands of dollars and the design work was tens of thousands of dollars. He explained one step at a time.

J. Brann asked M. Gasses if she checked with the attorney and was there an issue tabling this application.

M. Gasses explained the attorney stated no issue.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by S. Diamond to table the application for Hardrock Development, LLC. Vote 4/1 abstained*

*Roll Call:*

*Diamond-Yay*

*Brann-Yay*

*Knapp-Abstained*

*Jennison-Yay*

*Massucci-Yay*

### **ACTION ITEM CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 8, 2019**

3. **220-34-RC-19-2Sub (Owner: Vaughn K. Cook)** Request by applicant for a 2-lot subdivision lot 34 will be 3.82 acres and new lot 34.1 will be 3.18 acres at 39 Brittany Lane (Map 220, Lot 34) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Randy R. Orvis, Geometres Blue Hills, LLC; PO Box 277; Farmington, NH 03835.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Randy Orvis from Geometres Blue Hills, LLC represented Vaughn Cook. He was proposing to subdivide a lot off the 7-acre lot for his daughter to build a house. He explained that his house was the last house on the road. He explained that the new house would have the first residential driveway on Brittany Lane.

S. Diamond asked what the shoulder width was on this road and what the pavement width was.

Randy Orvis explained that this was a gravel road and the width was 20' to 22'.

J. Jennison asked if this was a private road.

Randy Orvis explained that this was a private road.

J. Brann asked if they were taking one piece of property and dividing it into 2 parcels.

M. Gasses showed where the house was, and new lot would be the first house on Brittany Lane and taking access off the 50' portion of the Brittany Lane ROW.

A. Knapp asked if there was a proposed placement for the residence.

Randy Orvis explained that there was. He explained that they wanted to keep home close to the road to keep the construction cost down.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that they may notice that Randy Orvis put a setback for the septic on the plan and one for the buffer.

J. Brann stated septic setback, not building setback.

M. Gasses explained that there was a lot a line for the 500feet setback from the centerline of Route 125 because this was in the Regional Commercial Zoning District.

S. Diamond asked about the small road shown on the plan.

Randy Orvis explained that this was an was an old logging road.

*A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by J. Brann to accept the application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.*

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

### **Requested Waivers:**

#### **8.8 Monumentation.... Request waiver from granite bounds**

Reason given: instead the applicant proposes #4 rebar 40" long with #10 cap

A. Knapp asked what the resistance to monuments.

M. Gasses explained that in some new subdivisions they like the look of the granite. She explained that the rebar has more stay power.

Randy Orvis stated that unless you drill a hole in the granite you will not be able to find it.

A.Knapp expressed that he preferred granite.

J. Brann asked where the monuments were going to go.

Randy Orvis showed on the plan where they were going to go.

M. Gasses explained that the granite was only at the road.

J. Jennison expressed the Board usually agrees to grant this waiver.

J. Brann asked if there was any reason why he couldn't put in granite.

Randy Orvis stated no except he couldn't this time of year.

M. Gasses explained that the rest of the subdivision did not have granite.

J. Brann questioned if the other lots didn't have granite.

Randy Orvis said they didn't have granite.

J. Brann expressed that if the rest did not have granite, why would we make them have granite.

*A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by D.Massucci to grant the waiver for 8.8. Monumentation as specific circumstances relative to the subdivision, or conditions of the land in such subdivision, indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations.*

Roll call:  
Massucci-Yay  
Jennison-Yay  
Knapp-Yay  
Brann-Yay  
Diamond-Yay

#### **12.2.1 Road Design Standards Table I, Pavement**

Reason given: Per 12.4(1) Paving may be waived by the Planning Board for private roads with low traffic volumes and moderate grades.

M. Gasses read the following:

*Staff supports the waiver for these reasons, with the condition a note be added to the plan, "Before an unpaved private road may be accepted as a Town road, it shall be paved and brought up to town standards in effect at that time. (12.4(1) of the Barrington Subdivision Regulations.*

S. Diamond asked if this road had very little topography change.

Randy Orvis explained that was correct. He explained that there was a 1% slope.

J. Brann expressed that he agreed with adding the note to the plan and felt that it would be unfair to have the applicant pave where the other lots were not required to pave.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by A. Knapp to grant waiver 12.2.1 road design standards Table 1, Pavement as not granting the waiver specific circumstances relative to the subdivision, or conditions of the land in such subdivision, indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations. The motion carried unanimously.*

**12.2.1 Table 1, Maximum dwelling units served if Dead-End 4 for a Minor Access/Private Road**

Reason given: There exists 5 dwellings and this proposal would be the 6<sup>th</sup>. The proposed new driveway will be on the 50' wide portion of the Brittany Lane R.O.W. and would be the first driveway from Route 125, all other existing driveways are further from Route 125.

M. Gasses explained that in the regulations this is a dead-end road and Table 1 states the maximum number of dwellings permitted on a minor access private road is 4, and for a major access it's 35. There is no such restriction in 12.3.1(4) of the regulations.

J. Brann questioned if this is for a private road.

S. Diamond asked about design standards for a major access road for more than 4 and to be wide and paved.

M. Gasses explained that this was less than 200 trips a day, which is considered minor access/private.

S. Diamond questions the future of these lots.

M. Gasses explained that the Board had control of future subdivisions, but that it was unlikely that would happen.

J. Brann stated that the Board already waived the pavement requirement and asked what the issue was with more than 4.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that this strictly is in Table 1 on page 57 in the subdivision regulations minor access/private. She explained that vehicle trips per day would be less than 200 trips per day, so this qualifies as minor access. She explained that the maximum [dwellings] was 4 on a dead-end and for a major access was 35. She explained that for minor access the ROW was 30 feet; this lot would have a 50' ROW for access.

J. Brann questioned maximum dwelling units served if dead-end conflicted with the standards for private roads.

S. Diamond asked the width to get in.

A. Knapp explained that it shows a 50' right of way.

M. Gasses explained that she had them show the access off the 50' right of way.

S. Diamond asked the width of the road to get in a vehicle through right now.

Randy Orvis felt it was approximately 24' but didn't have it in his field notes.

M. Gasses explained that the Fire Chief had no issue.

S. Diamond expressed that he wanted to make sure the shoulder was wide enough so if someone was parking on the road that you could get around it.

M. Gasses explained that the road was wide enough for someone to pass and repass.

J. Brann asked what the minimum width of the road.

Randy Orvis stated the minimum width was about 20'.

M. Gasses explained that they needed the waiver from the maximum of 4 home in Table 1 because there were already 5 houses on the road beyond this lot.

J. Jennison read from 12.4(5) the following on private roads:

Any subdivision road that has had construction standards waived by this Planning Board at any time may not be used as access for any additional residential units until such road has been reconstructed to comply with the then-applicable road construction standards of the Planning Board.

M. Gasses expressed that it was still maximum of four dwellings in Table 1.

S. Diamond asked about the 50' right of way for Brittany Lane; was that how much the association owns.

M. Gasses explained that it goes from 50' where the driveway would be to 40' for the remainder.

S. Diamond asked if this was a separate lot and asked if the homeowners association owns it.

M. Gasses explained that the rest of the right of way was owned by the lots on the other side of Brittany Lane. She explained that this lot would not need to use that portion of the right of way to enter.

S. Diamond asked who was responsible for this road; was there a homeowner's association.

Randy Orvis explained that there was a maintenance agreement.

M. Gasses explained that as part of the notice of decision they would need a written agreement.

Randy Orvis explained that Vaughn Cook was already a part of the maintenance agreement.

M. Gasses explained that they would need a written agreement to be recorded.

J. Jennison asked if the other houses had frontage on Chapman Drive.

Sally Cook stated yes.

J. Jennison asked if they just never took access from Chapman Drive.

M. Gasses explained that they were approved to take access this way. She explained that where this was the first house they would not even to go to the 40' ROW. They are required to have the driveway in the 50' ROW of the right of way.

S. Diamond asked if this was fine the way with legal instruments in place; if more things would accrue that the road really needed to be 50' wide whoever was responsible have legal right to make these changes.

M. Gasses explained that she wouldn't see this happening, the lots have now been created and there was no more subdivision potential and the other lots have frontage on Brittany Lane. They are not able to subdivide.

Randy Orvis explained that he had a legal opinion from their attorney to do what they are doing.

J. Brann asked if the owners agreed that the driveway would come off the 50' right of way.

Randy Orvis stated that the owners agreed.

S. Diamond expressed that he agreed the condition of the road was fine; he was concerned about the width.

J. Brann stated that the Fire Chief and Road Agent did not have a problem.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by A. Knapp to grant waiver 12.2.1 for road design for maximum dwelling units served as not granting the waiver specific circumstances relative to the subdivision, or conditions of the land in such subdivision, indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations. Passed 4/1.*

M. Gasses read her comments:

- Both Lots Map 220-34 and Map 220-34.1 must join the homeowner's association or provide a maintenance agreement to be recorded at the registry of deeds.
- Add the State subdivision number to the plan.
- Correct the revision date to January 26, 2019.
- Any expansion on Map 220, Lot 34 may require a 9.6 permit.
- There appears to be an existing deck and pool attached to the existing home that is not shown on the plan. If these currently exist, they must be added to the plan. A building permit was issued for the items.

Peter Cook, Road Agent:

- Brittany Lane is a private road and I see no issue with this

John Huckins:

- Buffer to wetlands under 3,000 sq. ft.; no buffer required ZO-9.5(4)(6)

J. Jennison read Conditions Precedent:





## Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0195

[mgasses@barrington.nh.gov](mailto:mgasses@barrington.nh.gov)

### DRAFT NOTICE OF DECISION

<i>[Office use only]</i>	<i>Date certified:</i>	<i>As built received:</i> n/a	<i>Surety returned</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.</i>			
<b>Proposal Identification:</b> 220-34-RC-19-2Sub (Owner: Vaughn K. Cook) Request by applicant for a 2-lot subdivision, lot 34 will be 3.82 acres and the new lot 34.1 will be 3.18 acres at 39 Brittany Lane (Map 220, Lot 34) in the Regional Commercial District. By Randy Orvis, Geometres Blue Hills, LLC; PO Box 277; Farmington, NH 03835			

Owner: Vaughn K. Cook 39 Brittany Lane Barrington, NH 03825  Professional: Randy Orvis Geometres Blue Hills, LLC PO Box 277 Farmington, NH 03835	Dated: XXXXX/2019
---	-------------------

#### Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its XXXXX, 2019 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, 2019, 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
  - b) Add the wetland scientist stamp & signature to the final plan
  - c) Add State Subdivision Approval Number to the Plan
- 2) Revise the following plan notes
  - a) Correct the revision date to January 26, 2019
- 3) Add the following plan revisions to the plans
  - a) Add the location of any structures on Map 220 Lot 34 that are not currently shown
  - b)
- 4) Both lots 220-34 and 220-34.1 must join the homeowner's association or provide a road maintenance agreement
- 5) Add the following plan notes:
  - a) Any expansion on Map 220, Lot 34 may require a 9.6 Special Permit
  - b) Waiver granted from .8 Monumentation...granite bounds
  - c) Waiver granted from 12.2.1 Table 1 Road Design Standards pavement.
  - d) Waiver granted from 12.2.1 Road Design Standards
- 6)# Proper and complete survey monumentation shall be installed on the properties as a condition to final approval of the application. ~~Granite bounds shall be set at the intersection of existing or proposed lot sidelines with existing proposed streets.~~ Iron pins (pipe or rod) are to be placed at all property line corners and angles, and all points of curvature and points of tangency. Monuments for the lot being developed shall be placed not more than 300 feet apart in any straight line. The applicant's surveyor shall certify in writing that the bounds and pins have been installed according to the submitted plan. (*Reference 8.8 of the Town of Barrington Subdivision Regulations*)
- 7) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town
- 8) Final Drawings (a) five sets of black line (b) plus one set of 11"X17" final approved plans 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.
- 9) Provide a \$25 check made out to SCRD for the LCHIP fee.

## 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 A. Knapp and seconded by J. Brann to approve the 2-lot subdivision based on Conditions Precedent as read by the Town Planner. The motion carried unanimously.*

Roll Call:

Massucci-Yay

Jennison-Yay

Knapp-Yay

Brann-Yay

Diamond-Nay

### **ACTION ITEM**

4. **203-22-GR-19-(3) Sub (Owners: Christopher J. Bowlen & Amy E. Gelinis)** Request by applicant for a 3-lot subdivision lot 22.1 will be 1.84 acres, lot 22.2 will be 12.07 acres and the remaining 36 acres for Map 203, Lot 22 with waivers at 359 Pond Hill Road (Map 203, Lot 22) in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. BY: Joel Runnals, LLS, Norway Plains Associates, Inc.; PO Box 249; Rochester, NH 03866.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Joel Runnals from Norway Plains Associates, Inc. was representing Christopher Bowlen and Amy Gelinis. He explained all the areas on the plans. He explained that test pits and wetland delineation had been done by David Allain, Certified Wetland Scientist. He explained that he did get NHDES State subdivision approval but there would be a change with the lot numbering.

A. Knapp asked if Lot 20 was just meeting the minimum subdivision size.

Joel Runnals stated yes. He explained that all three lots exceed the minimum lot size of 80,000 s.f., which includes 60,000 s.f. free of hydric A soils and 35,000 s.f. of contiguous uplands.

J. Brann asked if the lots would come off Pond Hill Road.

Joel Runnals explained that they would come off Pond Hill Road.

J. Brann asked what type of road Pond Hill Road was.

Joel Runnals explained that it was a Class 5 road. He explained that it was a flat lot.

A.Knapp asked about the jog if it was for access because of a stone wall.

Joel Runnals explained that was correct. He explained that if they went the other way they would need a wetlands crossing.

A.Knapp asked if the rest of the lot was wet.

M. Gasses explained the location of the wetlands.

### **Requested Waivers:**

#### **5.3.1 (6) Existing grades**

Reason given: Our waiver request is to show topography in the area of interest (AOI) being developed and not on the remaining area or on abutting lots.

*A motion was made by J. Brann seconded by S. Diamond to grant the waiver for 5.3.1 (6) existing grades limit the topography in the area of interest as not granting the waiver would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and granting the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations.*

*The motion carried unanimously.*

#### **5.3.1 (8) The estimated location and use of all existing structures**

The estimated location and use of all existing structures.... on the site and within 100' of the site.

S. Diamond asked what each of the structures were.

Chris Bowlen explained the structures are the homestead, shed from early 50's, new garage, and a shed back to the 1800's. He also explained that the fields are maintained by a local farmer.

*A motion was made by A.Knapp and seconded by J. Brann to grant the waiver for 5.3.1 (8) estimated location and use of all existing structures as not granting the waiver would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and granting the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations.*

*The motion carried unanimously.*

#### **5.3.1 (9) Natural Features**

The waiver request is to show only the natural features that are in the area of interest being developed and not on the remaining 40 acres.

Joel Runnals explained that all the buildings would be in the front the land; out back was in current use.

*A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by J. Brann to grant the waiver for 5.3.1(9) natural features only showing natural features in the listed area as not granting the waiver would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and granting the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. The motion carried unanimously.*

#### **5.3.1(10) Man-made features**

The waiver request is to show only those structures that are in the area of interest being developed and not on the remaining 40 acres or on abutting lots.

*A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by J. Brann to grant the waiver for 5.3.1(10) Man-made features as not granting the waiver would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and granting the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. The motion carried unanimously.*

### **5.3.1 (11) The size and location of all existing public and private utilities**

We are showing poles along our frontage but not overhead wires. The plan already has enough lines without adding to the confusion with more lines.

*A motion made by D. Massucci and seconded by S. Diamond to grant the waiver for 5.3.1 (11) for the size and location of all existing public and private utilities as not granting the waiver would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and granting the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. The motion carried unanimously.*

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by A. Knapp to accept the application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.*

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

### **Waiver Request:**

### **8.8 Granite Bounds:**

*A motion was made by J. Jennison and seconded by J. Brann to grant the waiver for 8.8 granite bonds with steal pins instead of granite bounds as not granting the waiver would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and granting the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. The motion carried unanimously.*

M. Gasses read Planners notes:

- Add the owner's signature to the final plan.
- Number the plan sheets
- Add a note, "this is a two-sheet plan set, sheet one is to be recorded. Sheet two is available at the Barrington Land Use Office".

M. Gasses read Conditions Precedent:



## **Planning & Land Use Department**

**Town of Barrington**

**PO Box 660**

**333 Calef Highway**

**Barrington, NH 03825**

**603.664.0195**

## DRAFT NOTICE OF DECISION

<i>[Office use only]</i>	<i>Date certified:</i>	<i>As built/s received:</i> n/a	<i>Surety returned</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.</i>			
<b>Proposal Identification:</b> 203-22-GR-19-(3) Sub (Owners Christopher J. Bowlen & Amy E. Gelinas) Request by applicant for a 3-lot subdivision lot 22.1 will be 36 acres, lot 22.2 will be 12.07 acres and remaining lot 22 will be 1.84 acres; with waivers at 259 Pond Hill Road (Map 203, Lot 22) in the General residential (GR) Zoning District. By Joel Runnals, LLS, Norway Plains Associates, Inc.; PO Box 249; Rochester, NH 03866			

<b>Owners:</b> Christopher J. Bowlen and Amy E. Gelinas 359 Pond Hill Road Barrington, NH 03825  <b>Professional:</b> Joel D. Runnals, LLS Norway Plains Associates, Inc. PO Box 249 Rochester, NH 03866	<b>Dated:</b> XXXXX/2019
---	--------------------------

**Dear applicant:**

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its XXXXX, 2019 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, 2019, 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
  - b) Add the wetland scientist stamp & signature to the final plan
  - c) Add State Subdivision Approval Number for Lot 22 to the Plan
- 2) Add the following plan notes:
  - a) The following waivers were granted as part of this application: 5.3.1(6) Existing grades for the entire site, 5.3.1(8) The estimated location and use of all exiting structures...on the site and within 100' of the site, 5.3.1(9) Natural features on the entire site, 5.3.1(10) Man-made features on the entire site 5.3.1(11) The size and location of all existing public and private utilities, and 8.8 Granite Bounds.
- 3)# Proper and complete survey monumentation shall be installed on the properties as a condition to final approval of the application. Iron pins (pipe or rod) are to be placed at all property line corners and angles, and all points of curvature and points of tangency. Monuments for the lot being developed shall be placed not more than 300 feet apart in any straight line. The applicant's surveyor shall certify in writing that the bounds and pins have been installed according to the submitted plan. (*Reference 8.8 of the Town of Barrington Subdivision Regulations*)
- 5) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town

Please provide a check for \$25 made out to Strafford County Registry of Deeds to cover the LCHIP fee.

- 6) Final Drawings (a) five sets of black line (b) plus one set of 11"X17" final approved plans 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# Current Use subject property or a portion of it is presently in Current Use. The applicant must provide the Town of Barrington Assessing Department current use map and/or other items needed to assure requirements of RSA-79A and the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administrations Rules are satisfied.

(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 J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to approve the 3-lot subdivision based on Conditions Precedent as read by the Town Planner. The motion carried unanimously.*

### **COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED**

M. Gasses informed the Board she received a communication from Colin at SRPC and Chief Williams. She explained that we applied for a safety audit and explained that a month ago the application was accepted. She explained that Colin notified Chief Williams that it has gone to the next level and DOT would be notifying him. She explained that Katie O'Brien did a lot of research on accidents on Beauty Hill and Route 125 that was originally focused on the intersection. She explained that this was where DOT would send out their engineers, look at it, and then give recommendations. She explained that DOT plans on looking at Route 125 in general; this has been in the plans study last done over 12 years ago. She explained that Joe Falzone has two curb cuts that DOT would work with them on. She explained that the actual traffic safety audit was no cost to the town.

### **REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

M. Gasses informed the Board that Kyle from SRPC was working on more information for the facilities and utilities chapter of the Master Plan last meeting was in December. She has reached out to John Scruton and Conner for some more information if anything on a PDF. Colin has reached out to the Police Chief for space needs in the future.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

J. Brann explained to the Board that M. Gasses attached to the minutes the latest draft of the solar that incorporated all the input that the Board provided during the last discussion. He explained that this was getting close and asked that the Board take a look at it for the next meeting on February 19<sup>th</sup>.

S. Diamond asked about the adjustment on Regional Commercial and Conservation Subdivision. He was wondering if this had anything to do with the developer and the plan for the town hall.

M. Gasses explained that this came up before that, this has gone to the Zoning Board twice, and they have granted two variances. She explained that if it can be developed by General Residential guidelines so why was this in the table of uses that it's allows.

A. Knapp expressed that was brought up before and didn't get in time.

M. Gasses explained that the developer already received his variance.

S. Diamond stated that the reason for Regional Commercial was to focus on Commercial not residential.

J. Jennison explained that you could still develop residential behind it to meet the residential requirement.



M. Gasses explained that most commercial development would be in the first 500' and you could still have your residential development behind it.

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

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

The next meeting will be on February 19, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. at the ECLC 77 Ramsdell Lane.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.