



BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING

NEW LOCATION: EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING CENTER

77 RAMSDELL LANE

Barrington, NH 03825

(Approved November 19, 2019)

Tuesday November 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.

Members Present

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

Alternate Member

Rondi Boyer

Town Planner: Marcia Gasses-Absent
Code Enforcement Officer: John Huckins
Staff: Barbara Irvine

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of the October 15, 2019 meeting minutes.

Without objection the minutes of October 15, 2019 were approved as written.

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM October 1, 2019

2. [220-47-RC-19-SR \(Mill Pond Investors of Barrington, LLC\)](#) Request by applicant for a Site Review proposal to add an additional 3,651 s.f. firing range to existing structure for commercial recreation at 55 Calef Highway on a 2.83-acre site (Map 220, Lot 47) in the Regional Commercial

Zoning District. BY: Ryan Greenhalgh, Groen Construction; 120 Washington Street, Suite 302; Rochester, NH 03839.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Devon St. Cyr co-owner of Ren Arms, LLC explained to the Board that they received a letter from Fire Chief and the Police Chief with no concerns; the Board also received a copy of the emails. Devon explained that they are back before the Board to answer questions. Devon explained that the Board wanted a surveyor and Norway Plains stepped up. Devon explained that the Board wanted a Hydrocad analysis that has been completed, and supplied the table that showed the addition would have no effect on the stormwater running off the property. Devon explained that there would be no change to the lighting in the front of the building. Devon explained that they showed the parking that would include the addition and explained that the Board was concerned about safety, so they brought in Rex Shield from Action Target.

S. Diamond asked about the well head on the plan.

Devon explained that was a test well for a State for test pits.

S. Diamond asked about the generator.

Devon explained that the generator was going to stay on the outside of the building where it was.

S. Diamond asked if it [facility] vents outside and if they were aware of Barrington's noise ordinance.

Devon explained the materials that are going to be used to keep the noise down and how they would be installed. Devon explained that they were aware of the noise ordinance as covered last month.

S. Diamond asked what the noise level and decimal distance would be.

Devon explained that he didn't have the number this was discussed last month, but it would be less than the traffic going on Route 125.

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by R. Allard to accept the application as complete. The Motion carried unanimously.

J. Brann questioned that there was no information on the plan that the limit caliber that would be fired on the range; was it going to be 50 calibers.

Devon explained that was not requested to be on the plan.

J. Brann expressed that this should be on the plan.

Devon explained that there were no requirements or in any of the Town ordinances.

J. Jennison expressed that this could be put under conditions precedent.

J. Brann stated that they said that was what it was designed for [50 caliber].

J. Jennison stated that he was the one that asked what they allowed. J. Jennison explained that it doesn't mean that it could be more if it could.

J. Brann expressed that currently the powerlines come from a pole on Route 125 and it was going to be

rerouted. J. Brann asked how that was going to be done.

Fenton Groen, the general contractor for the project, stated that has not been decided yet but it would be designed per the electrical code.

J. Brann expressed that there was a requirement for the powerlines to be run underground.

John Huckins stated that it was in subdivision regulations not site review.

A. Knapp explained that the utility decided on how they want to bring it in.

J. Brann explained that there was already a pole on the property, so could run underground from there.

A. Knapp explained that they are not going to be able to build a building under the powerlines, so they are going to have to reroute it and power company would let them know what their path would be.

J. Brann asked about the benchmarks that are required under Site Review 3.2.4 showing the location.

Timothy Runnals from Norway Plains explained that he that he has controls around the site around the site that all have xyz coordinates on them.

J. Brann asked if these were shown on the plan.

Timothy Runnals expressed that he believed that this was on the plan but usually they don't show controls on the plan.

J. Brann asked how they comply with the regulations if it's not shown on the plan.

Timothy Runnals stated that he could add to plan.

John Huckins explained to the Board that underground utilities are in Site Review under 4.4.3.

J. Brann asked about adding the index if more than one plan sheet, as required

Timothy Runnals stated no index but can add one.

J. Brann asked about [Site Review] requirement 3.2.1 (1) purpose of the plan in site review regulations, which was missing, and asked John Huckins about certificate of occupancy.

John Huckins explained that when the addition was built, they would give it a design review to make sure it was built to the standards.

J. Brann addressed 3.2.10 (19) in Site Review, a required note on the plan that certain conditions that need to be met prior to certificate of occupancy. J. Brann asked about contours not showing on the plan. J. Brann asked about Site Review 3.5.3 erosion control but stated that he doesn't know if there are any to prevent washout from the parking lot.

Fenton Groen explained that could be added to the conditions.

John Huckins explained that the topo was on Sheet 2 of the plan and explained that this was a very flat lot.

S. Diamond asked when using a 50-caliber weapon, would there be someone next to you and would the lanes be full.

Devon explained that the lane could be full.

S. Diamond asked if it could harm anyone.

Devon explained he experienced this, cannot harm anyone, and explained that the gas was away from the shooter.

S. Diamond expressed that he was concerned about someone getting harmed even if someone did not have military experience.

Devon explained that he has seen this go wrong and they are making sure that it doesn't. Devon asked Rex Shields from Action Target to explain.

Rex Shield from Action Target Train for Life explained that the lanes are called stalls that are 8' tall and 6' deep, and they are lined with the sound abatement panels. Rex explained that these stalls are more robust than was done at normal shooting ranges. Rex explained that everyone has hearing protection on and their goal was to make it more comfortable for the shooters so that they would keep coming back.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Robert Russell from 99 Tolend Road, owner of a similar business, explained that he has managed ranges. Robert explained to the Board that he has donated rifles to the Town police department. Robert explained that he has known Devon for almost 10 years as a business owner and a friend who would want a safe environment. Robert explained to the Board that he has a background in managing ranges also. Robert explained that he was looking forward to using this inside range.

Ryan Bilby from 227 Tolend Road explained that he has been a resident for a little over 4 years. Ryan explained that he supports the business giving a service to the sportsman professional in a safe facility. Ryan explained that this would be quite and safe. Ryan expressed that if you don't like guns this would be a safe legal way to use them and he totally supports this business.

David Totty from 242 Hall Road explained that he was a Cub Master for the Boy Scouts and wanted to share the support that they get from Renaissance Fire Arms for Cub Scouts and 4-H for the kids. David explained that they also support other youth groups in Barrington.

Rex explained to the Board that he works for Action Target and they are largest range builder in the United States. Rex explained they build them for the military and law enforcement. Rex explained some of the local ranges include Portsmouth Police Department, City of Manchester Police Department, Seabrook Power Nuclear Power Plant, and Sig Sauer Academy. He explained that this would be the safest.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Jennison read Conditions Precedent:



Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0330

jhuckins@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>			
Proposal Identification: 220-47-RC-19-SR (Mill Pond Investors of Barrington, LLC) Request by applicant for a Site Review proposal to add an additional 3,651 s.f. firing range to existing structure for commercial recreation at 55 Calef Highway on a 2.83-acre site (Map 220, Lot 47) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Ryan Greenhalgh, Groen Construction; 120 Washington Street, Suite 302; Rochester, NH 03839.			

<p>Owner: Mill Pond Investors of Barrington, LLC 55 Calef Hwy Barrington, NH 03825</p> <p>Applicant: Devon St. Cyr 55 Calef Hwy Barrington, NH 03825</p> <p>Developer: Ryan Greenhalgh Groen Construction Inc 120 Washington St. Suite 302 Rochester, NH 03839</p>	<p>Dated: November 6, 2019</p>
--	--------------------------------

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its November 5, 2019 meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

[Barrington Planning Board Meeting Minutes/bi](#)
November 5, 2019/ pg. 5 of 26

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 May 5, 2020, the Boards approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board.

Conditions Precedent

- 1) Add the following plan notes
 - a) Required sound control to comply with Article 7.1.2 of the Town of Barrington's Zoning Ordinance
 - b) Add index
 - c) 3.2.10 (19) RSA 676:13 all improvements specified on site shall be constructed complete, inspected prior to assurance of a certificate of occupancy.
 - d) add 3.5.3 erosion control
 - c) maximum 50 caliber
- 2) Revise the following plan notes
- 3) Add the owner's signature to the final plan.
- #4) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town
- 5) Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit three (3) complete paper print plan sets and supporting documents as required in Article 3 with a letter explaining how the Applicant addressed the conditions of approval. This shall include final and complete reports for all items submitted during review for the Town of Barrington's file. The Chairman shall endorse three copies of the approved plan(s) meeting the conditions of approval upon receipt of an executed bond for all improvements, excluding buildings. The Town shall retain a signed and approved reproducible 11"X17", and PDF format with supporting documents for Town records.

General and Subsequent Conditions

#1) Where no active and substantial work, required under this approval has commenced upon the site within two years from the date the plan is signed, this approval shall expire. An extension, not to exceed one year, may be granted, by majority vote of the Board so long as it is applied for at least thirty days prior to the expiration date. The Board may grant only one such extension for any proposed site plan. All other plans must be submitted to the Board for review to ensure compliance with these and other Town ordinances. Active and substantial work is defined in this section as being the expenditure of at least 25% of the infrastructure improvements required under this approval. Infrastructure shall mean in this instance, the construction of roads, storm drains, and improvements indicated on the site plan. RSA 674:39

(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,

John Huckins
Zoning Administrator

cc: File

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to approve the site review for an indoor shooting range based on the conditions read by the Chair. Vote 7/0

Roll Call:

Pimpis-Yay

Brann-Yay

Diamond-Yay

Knapp-Yay

Allard-Yay

Jennison-Yay

Massucci-Yay

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 15, 2019

3. **238-16-V-19-SR (Owner: Drew Pond, LLC)** Request by applicant for a Site Review proposal to construct two private roads each to serve 20 townhouse units off Route 9 with waivers (aka Franklin Pierce Highway) on an 18.02-acre site (Map 238, Lot 16) in the Village District. BY: Chris Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering represented Drew Pond, LLC. Chris explained to the Board that they have addressed the Dubois & King concerns. First he corrected the plan to say 15" pipe which was just mistyped and addressed how the cleaning velocities were met with the storm sewage. Chris explained how they meant the cleaning velocities. Chris explained that the corrections were made that the Board requested, and the legal documents were prepared by attorney James Schulte if it goes to final condominium sale. Chris explained that earlier the application they supplied how the units were going to be designed but Dubois & King stated they were not an architectural view, so he supplied a new lay out to the Board for review. Chris explained that they are working on the AoT permit and this does not require a wetlands permit. Chris explained that they are required to do a NH DOT permit. Chris explained that after talking to the Fire Chief, the fire cistern would be more than 1,000 feet drivable distance from the last unit. Chris explained that they agreed to place the cistern off the Route 9 highway with 30,000 gallons capacity so if the Fire Chief chooses, they use outside it for the condos and other outside needs along Route 9.

S. Diamond asked to explain where the cistern would be.

Chris showed the location on the plan.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

R. Allard read from Sheet 6 the following: "To maintain the storm water system in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Stormwater System Management, Inspection and Maintenance Manual." He

wants the legal documents to require maintenance of the storm water management if the system should need repairs or fail. R. Allard expressed that they would take steps above what was in the manual.

John Huckins asked if that would be in the manual that the attorney writes up.

Chris explained that would be in the documents of the operations manual that they write up, but he explained that nowhere in the document does it state that this would be withheld. Chris explained that as time goes on that the problem would come up. Chris explained that he would have the note amended.

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

DRAFT NOTICE OF DECISION

[Office use only]	Date certified:	As built received:	Surety returned
<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>			
Proposal Identification: 238-16-V-19-SR Proposal: The proposal is to construct two private roads off N.H. Route 9. One of the roads will be constructed on the eastern side of the lot, this road is proposed to be 450 feet long and will provide access to 20 townhouse units. The second road will be constructed in between lots 15 & 16-1, in the existing easement. This road is proposed to be 980 feet long and will provide access to an addition 20 units. Both roads will have a hammerhead turn around to allow emergency vehicles the ability access and leave the site safely and efficiently. Both roads will have additional parking for guests and dumpster pads for solid waste removal. As part of the site design, an intensive drainage design will also be implemented to capture treat and infiltrate the runoff generated from the proposed site. As part of this drainage design, 3 rain gardens and dry swale will be constructed and serve as primary treatment cells for the project. The site will also be serviced by o site septic's and a community well. A water doghouse will be built at the end of each building to connect the proposed fire line and domestic line to the building, the buildings will be sprinkled.			

Owner: Drew Pond, LLC	Dated: XXX, 2019
--------------------------	------------------

242 Central Avenue Dover, NH 03820 Applicant: Drew Pond, LLC 242 Central Avenue Dover, NH 03820 Professional: Kenneth A. Berry Berry Surveying & Engineering 335 Second Crown Point Road Barrington, NH 03825	
---	--

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its XXXXXXXXXXXX meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

Waivers Granted for:

1. **12.2.1 Table one of the Subdivision Regulations, minimum tangent of 100' between reverse curves.**
2. **12.2.1 Table 1 of the Subdivision Regulations, shoulder width of 6 feet in a cut and 3 feet in fill.**
3. **12.7 Table 2, maximum of 2% of a road grade within 100 feet of an intersection.**
4. **12.8.8(4) & 12.8.9, No ditches at grades above 8%, which require curbing, culverts and basins, or at grades above 6% when the developed length exceeds 250 feet.**
5. **4.7.7 (1) minimum pipe diameter of 15" in any drain system.**
6. **4.12.2 Lighting Requirements**
7. **3.1.3 Cross Sections**
8. **4.14.1 (1) Full Traffic Impact Analysis**

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 May 5, 2020, the Boards approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board.

Conditions Precedent

- Road names must be compliant with E911 and approved by the Town
- HOA documents approved by attorney

- Correct note #21 on page 8 to read Building addresses will be assigned through the Assessing Office
- Add note, "Required erosion control measures shall be installed prior to any disturbance of the site's surface area and shall be maintained through the completion of construction activities. If, during construction, it becomes apparent that additional erosion control measures are required to stop any erosion on the construction site due to actual site conditions, the owner shall be required to install the necessary erosion protection at no expense to the Town".
- Add wetlands stamp and signature to the final plan
- Add owners' signature to the final plan
- Add required permit numbers sheet 1
- Provide complete septic designs and construction approval numbers
- Provide well permit numbers and final water design

#2) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town

3) Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit three(3) complete paper print plan sets and supporting documents as required in Article 3 with a letter explaining how the Applicant addressed the conditions of approval. This shall include final and complete reports for all items submitted during review for the Town of Barrington's file. The chairman shall endorse three copies of the approved plan(s) meeting the conditions of approval upon receipt of an executed bond for all improvements, excluding buildings. The Town shall retain a signed and approved reproducible 11" X 17", and PDF format with supporting documents for Town records.

General and Subsequent Conditions

#1) Where no active and substantial work, required under this approval has commenced upon the site within two years from the date the plan is signed, this approval shall expire. An extension, not to exceed one year, may be granted, by majority vote of the Board so long as it is applied for at least thirty days prior to the expiration date. The Board may grant only one such extension for any proposed site plan. All other plans must be submitted to the Board for review to ensure compliance with these and other Town ordinances. Active and substantial work is defined in this section as being the expenditure of at least 25% of the infrastructure improvements required under this approval. Infrastructure shall mean in this instance, the construction of road, storm drains, and improvements indicated on the site plan. RSA 674:39

2) The engineer shall certify the improvements have been installed as designed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy/Use.

(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,

John Huckins

Zoning Administrator

cc: File

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to accept the site plan with the conditions read by the Chair. Vote 7/0

Roll Call:

Massucci-Yay

Jennison-Yay

Allard-Yay

Knapp-Yay

Diamond-Yay

Brann-Yay

Pimpis-Yay

ACTION ITEMS

4. **239-1-TC-19-SR (Owners: Peter R. & Sarah M. Ward)** Request by applicant Bellabiso Salon and Spa for a Site Review proposal to convert part of the existing structure into a salon and spa along with a 9.6 Special Permit in the wetland buffer at 643 Franklin Pierce Highway (Map 239, Lot 1) in the Town Center Zoning District. BY: Chris Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering represented owners, the Wards, and applicant Bellabiso Salon and Spa. Chris explained to the Board that they have revised the application after receiving comments from the Fire Chief. Chris explained to the Board that they would like to convert 2,000 commercial space that was a packaging company on site and they would like to turn it into a Salon and Spa. Chris explained to the Board that David Vincent from Land Surveying Services has worked with a wetland licensed surveyor for this project and his report has been submitted with this project. Chris explained to the Board the State permits that were required. They are a NHDOT permit which was received before he started this project, the septic design, and the sub surface plan. Chris explained that there was an existing gravel driveway, and an existing single-family home with a commercial use attached to the home. Chris explained that they would like to turn the commercial space into a five-chair salon and spa with two ADA parking spaces in the front with additional parking to the rear of the site. Chris explained to the Board that the Fire Chief wanted room to be able to turn the fire truck around and the dumpster location has been moved. Chris explained that they had submitted two rain garden designs and explained that they are not planning on paving at all; this would remain gravel. Chris explained that they would improve the existing storm water drainage on site by placing two rain gardens that are shown on the plan. Chris explained to the Board that site was already developed and would operate a small business and a single-family home. Chris explained that there was not a lighting plan and proper lighting with underground utilities with no lighting at the entrance. Chris explained that they would like to keep this as a rural area, keeping the gravel drive with no lines and leave it up to the applicant on what they want to do with signs. There would be overflow parking in the front of the site if needed that could also be used for a large amount of snow storage. Chris explained the water shed sheets. He explained the way the landscaping moves water from the site; he showed the water flow on the plan. Chris explained that the breakout areas remain outside the rain gardens.

R. Boyer asked if the water would not change where it was going into the pond east of the site.

Chris explained that was the goal to not increase flow but not to starve a wetland from required storm water.

B. Pimpis asked on the existing conditions versus proposed flow rates at some points.

Chris explained these were they are interim points, they are linked up, and in the final analysis the combined the rate at the boundary line was not increased.

R. Boyer asked where the square box on the left was.

Chris asked R. Boyer if she wanted to know how it would affect Things. Chris showed where the flow would go.

R. Boyer asked with all the infrastructure if that would benefit flow going to the east.

Chris stated it would for treatment and flow.

S. Diamond asked about the water coming of the property. For a 2-yr event flow would not change but for a 100-yr or worst event, the volume would be higher.

J. Jennison stated wouldn't that be decreased.

J. Brann expressed that it would decrease about a 1/3 and slightly higher difference of 10%.

John Huckins expressed that for 100-yr storm at the rate everything was running off.

R. Allard explained that if you increase the amount you are putting in the before and after analysis, both would increase.

Chris explained that there was a small underdrain.

Chris explained that they have an 9.6 application impact in the buffers.

R. Allard asked if the location he was showing was the new driveway.

Chris explained that was the area of the new driveway.

J. Brann explained that the driveway was also extended to the back.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by A. Knapp to accept the 9.6 application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Jennison explained to the Board the 9.6 permit. J. Jennison explained the reason for the permit was for egress on the back side of the building to gain access for fire.

S. Diamond asked if it could be pointed out the area that was impacted.

Chris explained that 9,200 s.f. was the impacted.

John Huckins explained to the Board that this driveway was put in before there was a wetland buffer on this lot. John explained that a lot of the driveway and impact was already in the buffer and there was no treatment going to the wetland. John explained that the disturbance that was happening in the buffer was protecting the wetlands.

J. Brann asked about using the previous surveyor existing plan.

Chris explained that he was the surveyor of record.

J. Brann stated on the plan it showed a paved area by the garage and on your plans that was not shown.

J. Jennison explained that on Sheet 3 of 9 there was a note on the plan stating “existing paved area to be reclaimed or remain at owner’s discretion”.

Chris explained that they design a treatment system so in the future the applicant may want to come back to add pavement.

J. Brann asked if for the entire driveway.

Chris stated that was correct.

J. Jennison expressed that this was fixing a problem.

A. Knapp agreed that this was an important of the current problem.

R. Allard expressed the driveway was safety related.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

SECTION 9.6 FOR SPECIAL PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION IN WETLAND BUFFER

criteria laid out in Chapter 9.6 for disturbance within a 50’ wetland buffer.

- A. The proposed use is in keeping with the intent and purposes set forth in the zoning ordinance.
 - a. **The proposed wetland buffer disturbance is generated from the expansion of the existing paved area to maintain a 24’ egress between the proposed gravel parking area and the existing paved area. In addition, swales and two rain gardens will be constructed at the toe of the slope along the backside of building. These swales will divert the runoff to the rain’s gardens.**
- B. After a review of all reasonable alternatives it is determined to be infeasible to place the proposed structure or use outside the buffer zone.
 - a. **The applicant is proposing to have the proposed spa and salon within the footprint of the existing building in order to limit disturbance. The proposed gravel parking area was placed near the existing building in order to keep all of the impervious area in one location. This will also make it more efficient to capture stormwater from both the existing impervious area as well as the proposed impervious area.**
- C. The proposed structure must be set back as far as possible from the delineated edge of the wetland or surface water.
 - a. **There will be no change to the footprint of the building.**
- D. Appropriate erosion and sediment control measures must be in place prior to and during construction.
 - a. **Erosion and sediment control measures are included within the plan set to show that all necessary erosion and sediment control measures will be taken to ensure that no sediment runs off into abutting wetlands and that the surrounding area is protected throughout the construction process.**
- E. Any disturbance to the surrounding buffer zone must be repaired and restored upon completion of construction.

- a. All grading and disturbance within the buffer will receive quality loam and seed, utilizing a variety of conservation seed mix. This will enable the vegetation to grow and the buffer areas to be restored.**
- F. All available mitigation measures to address changes in water quality volume and quantity be implemented, along with design and construction methods to minimize adverse impacts, if required by the Planning Board.
 - a. Two rain gardens will be constructed in order to capture the runoff from the proposed gravel parking area as well as the existing paved and gravel area in front of the proposed spa. These rain gardens will be constructed with a bio-media and stone layer, which will allow for treatment of the generated stormwater.**

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to approve the 9.6 permit application.

Vote 7/0

Roll call:

Massucci-Yay

Jennison-Yay

Allard-Yay

Knapp-Yay

Diamond-Yay

Brann-Yay

Pimpis-Yay

J. Brann expressed that ledgers are missing or needs to be updated, and a Planning Board block needs to be added. J. Brann explained that per Site Review 3.2.10 (19) need to add certificate of issuance of occupancy. J. Brann asked about stabilization construction entrance on Sheet 4 coming into the property.

Chris explained that the note was on the plan because it was required.

R. Boyer stated that on Sheet #4 Note #16 needs to be corrected (change “Dover”).

J. Brann asked about the berms on Sheet 5. Looking at the detail at the top of the page, there are 2 different berms, one 3 feet wide and the other 5 feet wide but the plan view states 2 feet wide berms.

Chris explained that they should say 2 feet.

James from Berry Surveying explained that there are two different berms on the plan and explained what they are doing.

J. Brann asked where the fourth berms were that are referenced.

James explained that they are at the top of the page.

J. Brann asked about Site Review 3.2.10 (16) required note; where was this on the plan.

John Huckins explained that it was on Sheet 4 Note # 25.

J. Brann asked about an inconsistency between the Drainage Analysis & Sediment and Erosion Control Plan. Sheet 7 Note 3 states not less than one pound of seed per 50 square yards of area, whereas the table below and the plan state 1.1 pounds of seed.

Chris explained that the document was correct.

A. Knapp explained that the way this was written wasn't incorrect as it says not less than one.

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by B. Pimpis to accept application the as complete. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Jennison Conditions Precedent:



Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0330

jhuckins@barrington.nh.gov

DRAFT NOTICE OF DECISION

<i>[Office use only]</i>	<i>Date certified:</i>	<i>As built received:</i>	<i>Surety returned</i>
<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>			
Proposal Identification: <u>239-1-TC-19-SR (Owners: Peter R. & Sarah M. Ward)</u> Request by applicant Bellabiso Salon and Spa for a Site Review proposal to convert part of the existing structure into a salon and spa along with a 9.6 Special Permit in the wetland buffer at 643 Franklin Pierce Highway (Map 239, Lot 1) in the Town Center Zoning District. BY: Chris Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.			

<p>Owners: Peter and Sarah Ward 643 Franklin Pierce Highway Barrington, NH 03825</p> <p>Applicant: Bellabiso Salon & Spa (Nana's Dreams LLC) PO Box 911 Dover, NH 03821</p> <p>Professional: Chris Berry, Principal, President Berry Surveying & Engineering 335 Second Crown Point Road Barrington, NH 03825</p>	<p>Dated: November 6, 2016</p>
---	--------------------------------

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its November 5, 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 XXXXX, 2019, the Boards approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board.

Conditions Precedent

- 1) Add the following plan notes
 - a) Add legend
 - b) Add Planning Board approval block
 - c) Add 3.2.10 (19) certificate of occupancy note
- 2) Revise the following plan notes
 - a) Revise notes on erosion control
 - b) Correct "Dover" on Sheet 4 Note #16
- 3) Town Counsel shall approve all easement language
- #4) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town

- 5) Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit three (3) complete paper print plan sets and supporting documents as required in Article 3 with a letter explaining how the Applicant addressed the conditions of approval. This shall include final and complete reports for all items submitted during review for the Town of Barrington's file. The Chairman shall endorse three copies of the approved plan(s) meeting the conditions of approval upon receipt of an executed bond for all improvements, excluding buildings. The Town shall retain a signed and approved reproducible 11"X17", and PDF format with supporting documents for Town records.

General and Subsequent Conditions

- #1) Where no active and substantial work, required under this approval has commenced upon the site within two years from the date the plan is signed, this approval shall expire. An extension, not to exceed one year, may be granted, by majority vote of the Board so long as it is applied for at least thirty days prior to the expiration date. The Board may grant only one such extension for any proposed site plan. All other plans must be submitted to the Board for review to ensure compliance with these and other Town ordinances. Active and substantial work is defined in this section as being the expenditure of at least 25% of the infrastructure improvements required under this approval. Infrastructure shall mean in this instance, the construction of roads, storm drains, and improvements indicated on the site plan. RSA 674:39

(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,

John Huckins
Zoning Administrator

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded A. Knapp to approve the site review for a salon and spa.
Vote 7/0*

Roll Call:

Pimpis-Yay

Brann-Yay

Knapp-Yay

Diamond-Yay

Allard-Yay

Jennison-Yay

Massucci-Yay

5. [233-77, 234-1.2&1.4-V-19-SR \(Owner: Town of Barrington\)](#) Request by applicant RR85, LLC (Turbocam) for a Site Review proposal to construct a light industrial building (27,640 s.f.) used for training and educational purposes with associated parking, utilities, and drainage with a 9.6 Special Permit in wetland buffer and a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit on Route 9/Redemption Road in the Village Zoning District. (Map 233-77 & 234-1.2 & 1.4). BY: Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering; 118 Portsmouth Avenue; Stratham, NH 03885.

A. Knapp recused himself.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Bruce Scamman from Emanuel Engineer represented owner Town of Barrington and applicant Turbocam International. Bruce gave a brief description of the location of the project that was proposed off Route 9 and Redemption Road. Bruce explained that he met with the Conservation Commission they had some serious concerns about the wetlands and being in the buffer with the pavement. Bruce explained that there were some rare turtles across the street, so they wanted to keep the buffer in as good of shape as possible. After reviewing the plans, they have decided to try and buy more lots from the Town that are now in the process. Bruce explained one lot was the American Legion lot and explained that Lots 1.2 & 1.4 are under contract with the Town. The long-term plan was to build an additional building on this lot and they could have a central driveway for both lots. Bruce explained that there are grade and ledge issues and they want the water from the proposed project to infiltrate back into the ground. Bruce explained that he brought revised plans that are slightly different from the previous set. Bruce explained the revised plan to the Board and explained where pavement would be with the location of the leach field. Bruce explained that the loading dock area and dumpster pad would be concrete. He also explained that there would be a lot of blasting. Bruce explained that the Conservation Commission seemed much more satisfied with this plan. Bruce explained that they also have a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit for the Village District and that this goes with the industrial park that they would also need 9.6 permit for some of the impacts. Bruce explained that they have removed the proposed 225' retaining wall that was in the buffer. They are going to try to do a 2 to 1 slope and just grade.

John Huckins explained that this would have less impact on the buffer.

Bruce supplied added information and notes that were added to the plan as explained below.

RE: Turbocam Site Plan Set - Route 9 / Redemption Road, Barrington, NH 03825

Town of Barrington Planning Board,

In response to the comments in your email sent on October 24, 2019 we have responded in bold print below to your comments:

- Add the following to the final plan:
 - The owner's signature needs to be added to the final plan. (The checklist states it's there but don't see it anywhere.)

An owner's signature block has been added to sheets C1.1 and C1.2.

- Planning Board approval block

A Planning Board approval block has been added to sheet C3.

- List of permits and approval numbers

A list of required permits have been added to the Cover Sheet.

- Note identifying which plans to recorded

A list of sheets to be recorded has been added to the Cover Sheet.

- Site Review Regulation 3.2.10(18) requires note addressing all materials and methods conform to Barrington Site Review Regulations and NH DOT for road construction. They marked it as will be added to final plan "if required." I assume this is because I think Redemption Road is a private road. (Note - I checked the list in Appendix 1 of the Subdivision Regulations and Redemption Road is not listed; appears list is out of date.) Although the NH DOT regulations may not apply, the Site Review Regulations reference the Subdivision Regulations that do have

standards applicable to private roads. Not sure what conditions were approved in the original approval for Redemption Road.

There are no new roads proposed on this plan, therefore we don't believe this note applies.

- Add Site Review Regulation 3.2.10(19) required note regarding certificate of occupancy (see Sheet C3).

The note regarding certificate of occupancy from Site Review Regulation 3.2.10(19) has been added to sheet C3 as note #18.

- Site Review Regulation 3.3(6) requires road pavement widths be shown on the plan and do not see them.

Road pavement widths have been added to sheets C1.1 & C1.2.

- The plans show a 225' retaining wall on the west side of the building between the building and the wetlands. There are not construction details for the wall included in the plans.

The slope on the southwestern side of the building has been revised from 4:1 to 2:1, therefore a retaining wall will no longer be required. Changes are reflected throughout the site plan set.

- Sheet D1 Erosion and Sedimentation Control Note 8 states temporary erosion measures to be installed per this plan, and in notes on other sheets refers to installation per contractor erosion control plan. Site Review Regulation 3.6(17) requires temporary measures be shown on the plan. I didn't find them on the plans and notes are inconsistent.

Silt Soxx are shown on sheet C4 as erosion control. Additionally, a SiltSack Type C is specified in the Drainage Structure Chart on sheet C4. A typical temporary grade stabilization structure referencing the detail on sheet D4 has been added to sheet C4.

- Related to previous comment, in Sheet D3 Note Section 3.03D it states "Washout area for all concrete trucks shall be ... on the contractor's erosion and sediment control plan." No such detail or plan found.

The note on Section 3.03D has been revised to say "Washout area for all concrete trucks shall be ... on the contractor's erosion and sediment control plan or on detail sheet." The total site disturbance detail on sheet D5 has been revised to show a 20'x20' concrete washout area.

- Site Review Regulation 3.5.10 landscape and screening be reflected in the plans. I didn't find this included in the plan set although it's not clear if they intend any landscaping above and beyond grading/seeding which are addressed.

There is no new landscaping proposed in this plan set. Existing vegetation between Route 9 and the proposed site is to remain. The total site disturbance detail on Sheet D5 has been revised to show the 246' vegetated buffer that will exist between Route 9 and the nearest point of the proposed parking lot. Furthermore, the elevation of the proposed improvements being much higher than the elevation of Route 9, will also help with screening.

- Site Review Regulation 3.5.11(1) requires a parking plan and none was found in the plan set. (There was a parking plan shown with the original plans before moving the building/combining lots/redrafting plans.)

Parking is shown on Sheets C3 and C6. The number of spaces in each section area circled on the plans with the parking areas delineated. Besides the handicap parking spaces, individual spaces are not depicted, but the paint striping details on sheet C6 show the required parking space dimensions for the spaces in the delineated parking areas. Dimensions for the handicap spaces can be found on Sheet D3.

- Site Review Regulation 3.7 requires building renderings and see none. (You may have them but not in plan set I reviewed.)

Building renderings were submitted on October 24, 2019 as a supplement to the Site Plan Set submitted on September 26, 2019.

- Site Review Regulation 3.8 requires illumination plan. First, Sheet D4 shows detail of wall mounted light that appears to be pole mounted so it's unclear if that is unit to be installed. Second, there is no actual illumination addressed on the plans per Site Review Regulation 3.8(2) thru 3.8(5) and whether they meet the regulations. There are what appear to be building mounted lights shown on Sheet C5 but the legend symbols do not address them.

The light fixture shown in the detail on Sheet D4 is just the light fixture, not the pole. This is simply a graphic. As specified in the detail, it is to be wall mounted. On Sheet C5, eight proposed wall mounted light fixture symbols are shown on the proposed building. There is a callout labeling the symbol as "typical" rather than being shown in the legend. Also, the callout references the Sheet D4 detail. If a separate lighting plan is required, it will be provided.

- I don't have drainage study in hand so couldn't determine if proposed drainage plan makes sense.

The drainage study was submitted to the town within the September 26, 2019 submission. Furthermore, the drainage was submitted to NHDES on September 13, 2019 as part of the Alteration of Terrain permit application.

- Site Review Regulation 3.2.4 states "Benchmark data shall be shown on each sheet of the plans." Additionally, it states there will be a benchmark per each five acres. Only found a benchmark on Sheet SD1 for Lot 77, not on all sheets. Additionally, as Lots 1.2 and 1.4 are 4.02 and 3.82 acres respectively, there should be more than one.

The benchmark shown on Sheet SD1 has been added to all of the sheets in the plan set. Three additional benchmarks have also been added to each sheet in the plan set.

- Minor comment – Sheet D1 Notes 2 and 5 list an exception for residential lots that seem inappropriate for this project. It appears to be boilerplate language copied onto these plans.

Notes 2 and 5 on sheet D1 have been revised to exclude any mention of residential lots.

- Minor comment – In Sheet D2 Part 3 Note E.3 "Ares" should be "Areas."

Note E.3 on Sheet D2 has been revised to say "Areas".

- Sheet D1 Note 6 requires a culvert or berm if surface water flows toward the construction entrance. Looking at the slopes/elevations and existing drainage plan, this appears to be the case. However, the detail on Sheet D3 shows the berm as optional and does not include the use of a culvert.

The berm shown on the detail on Sheet D3 is used for a different application. The berm shown in the detail helps remove dirt from vehicles' tires that are entering and exiting the site. As the detail specifies, the length of the construction entrance should be 75', but it can be 50' if the optional mountable berm is installed at the beginning of the entrance. The berm referenced in Note 6 on Sheet D1 is used for conveying stormwater. Since the construction entrance is at the high point of Redemption Road, a culvert or berm will not be required because stormwater will flow downstream from the entrance, within the roadside swales.

- The 9.6 permit application Item 3 states “With the exception of an underdrain ... all improvements are outside of the 50’ wetland buffer....” Sheets C3 thru C8 show construction of a 225' retaining wall within the buffer zone that is not addressed in the permit application.

The slope on the southwestern side of the building has been revised from 4:1 to 2:1, therefore a retaining wall will no longer be required. Changes are reflected throughout the site plan set.

- Driveway dimensions and slope are not shown on the plans. Therefore, couldn't check against Subdivision Regulations.

Pavement dimensions are shown on Sheet C6. Additional dimensions have been added to the plan near the driveway entrance. Maximum slopes have also been added to Sheet C4.

Sincerely,

Bruce Scamman, PE

Civil Engineer

Bruce explained that they he also has a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit to go over.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to accept the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Jennison stated they would go over the conditional use permit for complex. J. Jennison read the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit:

Describe in detail all proposed uses, structures, construction, or modifications requiring a Conditional Use Permit:

One light industrial building (27,640 SF footprint) and associated improvements is proposed to be used for training and educational purposes.

Describe in detail how the following conditions of the Town of Barrington Zoning Ordinance under Section 3.4 “Conditional Use Permits Issued by the Planning Board” have been satisfied by your proposal.

1. The building, structure or use is specifically authorized under the terms of this Ordinance.

Light Manufacturing Facilities are allowed in the Village Zoning District if a Conditional Permit is issued by the planning board.

2. If completed, the development in its proposed location will comply with all requirements of this Ordinance, and with specific conditions or standards established in this Section for the particular building, structure or use.

This project will comply with all requirements requested by the Town of Barrington, and State of New Hampshire.

3. The building, structure or use will not materially endanger the public health or safety.
The proposed building will not use materials that will endanger the public health or safety.

4. The building, structure or use will not substantially de-value abutting property.
The proposed building will not substantially de-value abutting properties. The town has created the industrial park for this purpose.

5. The building, structure or use will be compatible with the neighborhood and with adjoining or abutting uses in the area in which it is to be located.
The proposed building will be compatible with the neighborhood. The other uses on Redemption Road are also Light Manufacturing Facilities within the Village District.

6. The building, structure or use will not have a substantial adverse impact on highway or pedestrian safety.
An NHDOT permit will likely be required before the completion of this project. Redemption Road was designed for multiple industrial buildings.

7. The building, structure or use will not have a substantial adverse impact on the natural and environmental resources of the town.
All proposed structures and pavement edge have been designed to stay outside of the 50' wetland buffer. The AoT permit application estimates +/- 223,630 SF of total disturbance. Porous pavement is proposed to treat stormwater.

8. Adequate public utilities, community facilities, and roadway capacity are available to the property to ensure that the proposed use will not necessitate excessive public expenditures in providing public services.
Adequate public utilities, community facilities, and roadway capacity is available. The subdivision originally proposed multiple industrial buildings.

9. Where deemed necessary when considering an application for Conditional Use approval, the Planning Board may require that adequate visual buffers be established.
A green belt buffer is in place along Route 9. No structures are proposed less than 250 feet from Route 9.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

S. Diamond noted on the last page of the plan for the area to be logged and stumped an empty seal block.

Bruce explained that was for future and part of the AoT permit.

A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by R. Allard to approve the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to accept the 9.6 application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.

Bruce explained that the impact has been reduced to half.

John Huckins explained the location.

S. Diamond questioned the wetlands impact.

J. Brann explained that they would still be outside the buffer on C-3.

Bruce explained that it doesn't show the grade slope.

J. Brann stated C-3 doesn't show the grading.

Bruce showed the grading on the plan.

John Huckins explained that all the impacts has to do with the grading, not anything with the parking.

J. Jennison asked if there was a number for what area they are disturbing.

John Huckins explained that he did ask for one for what area they were disturbing and now it has changed on what they are disturbing.

J. Jennison asked about the permit impact be much less that the amount listed.

J. Brann asked if that was a requirement to have that number. J. Brann explained that it does not have a requirement for the amount.

John Huckins stated they don't need the amount for this approved, but it should be on the plan.

9.6 Permit

Size of Impact: **223,630 SF area of disturbance**

Describe in detail all proposed uses, structures, construction, or modifications requiring a Special Use Permit.

Outside of the 50' wetland buffer, one light industrial building (27,340 SF footprint) is proposed to be used for training and educational purposes. Dredging, filling, and regrading is proposed within the wetland buffer as a result of the proposed building and associated improvements. Furthermore, an underdrain for the proposed porous pavement, and a proposed well is proposed within the wetland buffer.

Describe in detail how the following standards of the Town of Barrington Zoning Ordinance under Section 9.6 "Special Permit for Construction in a Wetlands Buffer" have been satisfied by your proposal.

1. The proposed use is in keeping with the intent and purposes set forth in the zoning ordinance as permitted in the base zoning district (See Table 1, Table of Uses, located in the zoning ordinance). If the base zoning district requires a conditional use permit or special exception for the proposed use, one must already have been obtained; or if the proposed use is not listed on the Table of Uses or is listed but not permitted, one must already have obtained a variance.

The facility will be an educational facility for light industry in the Barrington Village District's Industrial Park.

2. After a review of all reasonable alternatives, it is determined to be infeasible to place the proposed structure or use outside of the buffer zone.

An alternative layout was proposed to the planning board as a Preliminary Application on May 21, 2019, which had the proposed building and parking lot within the 50' wetland buffer. After receiving feedback from the Planning Board, the client decided to expand onto the adjacent lots in order to keep these structures outside of the 50' wetland buffer.

3. The proposed structure or use must be set back as far as possible from the delineated edge of the wetland or surface water.

With the exception of an underdrain for the proposed porous pavement, a proposed well, dredging, filling, and regrading, all proposed improvements are outside of the 50' wetland buffer, and are as far from the wetland edge as possible.

4. Appropriate erosion control measures must be in place prior to and during construction.

Silt Soxx are proposed around the perimeter of the wetlands per "Grading & Drainage Plan" on sheet C4 as erosion control. See Silt Soxx detail on sheet D3.

5. Any disturbance to the surrounding buffer zone must be repaired and restored upon completion of construction.

See sheet D1 for notes on repairing and restoring disturbed land.

6. All available mitigation measures to address changes in water quality and quantity be implemented, along with design and construction methods to minimize adverse impacts, if required by the Planning Board.

The majority of stormwater runoff will be treated by the proposed porous pavement, specifically the 18" thick bank run gravel filter course. The majority of the stormwater running onto the surface will be infiltrated into the groundwater. The rest (minimal) of the treated water will flow from the porous pavement section through the underdrains.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by D. Massucci to approve the 9.6 special permit application with the area of disturbance added to the plan. Vote 6/0

Roll Call:

B. Pimpis-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

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

J. Jennison read the following staff recommendations:

Police Chief, Robert Williams

- No questions or concerns and support the additional growth and development of Turbocam in a responsible manner.

Fire Chief:

- Fire protection?? Sprinklered?? Cistern??
- Is traffic going to be directional around the building? If not is there adequate turn around area for fire trucks?
- Letter to the Town acknowledging that fire trucks may damage the porous pavement, and the Town will hold no responsibility for any such damage that may occur.

Conservation Commission:

- Per Conservation Commission no comment.

Zoning Administrator:

- What is the total wetland Buffer impact.

John Huckins explained they should check with the Fire Chief.

Bruce asked if the Fire Chief requires sprinkler and cistern.

John Huckins explained that usually if it was sprinkler the Chief doesn't get too much into it.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to send the plans to Dubois & King for drainage review and continue the application until December 3, 2019. The motion carried unanimously.

A. Knapp returned to the Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD

6. Pursuant to RSA 41:14A, the Planning Board needs to make recommendations to the Select Board regarding the land acquisition of [Map 223, Lot 26, C-1](#)

The Board agreed to send the standard recommendation letter.

7. Pursuant to RSA 41:14A, the Planning Board needs to make recommendations to the Select Board regarding the land acquisition of [Map 223, Lot 29](#).

The Board agreed to send the standard recommendation letter.

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**UNFINISHED BUSINESS****OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD**

8. Update on Facilities and Utilities Chapter.

John Huckins gave an update that he spoke to Kyle at SPRC about the new Town Hall and Kyle was going to talk to Tara last week about the recreation information. John explained that he would be setting up a meeting with Melissa at the library.

9. J. Brann addressed a recent Facebook post by a Board member that alleged a recent partial waiver of the requirement for underground utilities was approved without any documentation to support it and the Board routinely waives such safety and reliability requirements. J. Brann showed the Board the three page letter the applicant submitted requesting the waiver that explained the rationale for the request, which was in the package of materials provided to the Board before the meeting. J. Brann also explained that a review of Planning Board minutes for 2017/2018/2019 found only two partial waivers of the same requirement and noted the member who authored the post voted in favor of one of the waivers. J. Brann stated that although votes didn't always support his position on issues, out of respect for the process and other members of the Board, he never used social media to disagree with the Board's decisions. Other members agreed that such posts are inappropriate.

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

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

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 10:11p.m.

Respectfully,

Barbara Irvine