



**BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**NEW LOCATION: EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING CENTER**

**77 RAMSDELL LANE**

**Barrington, NH 03825**

**Tuesday December 3, 2019**

**6:30 p.m.**

**(Approved December 17, 2019)**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**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

**Alternate Member**

Rondi Boyer-filling in for Ron Allard

**Members Absent**

Ron Allard  
Robert Pimpis

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

**MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

1. Approval of the November 19, 2019 meeting minutes.

*Without objection the minutes of November 19, 2019 were approved as written.*

**ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 15, 2019**

[Barrington Planning Board Meeting Minutes/bi](#)  
[December 3, 2019/ pg. 1 of 15](#)

2. [249-32&250-133-NR-19-SR \(Owner: Peter Cook\)](#) Request by applicant for a proposed Site Review for a gravel access, parking area with a proposed barn and greenhouse-detention basin for Wildlife Encounters at 270 Beauty Hill Road on a 77.32-/+ acre site in the Neighborhood Residential Zoning District. By: Tobin Farwell, P.E., Farwell Engineering Services, LLC; 265 Wadleigh Falls Road; Lee, NH 03861.

Derek Small applicant for Wildlife Encounters asked the Board if he could have his application continued until February 18, 2020.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by A. Knapp to continue the application until February 18, 2020. The motion carried unanimously.*

#### **ACTION ITEM CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 5, 2019**

3. [233-77, 234-1.2&1.4-V-19-SR \(Owner: Town of Barrington\)](#) Request by applicant RRB5, 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.  
**(Application has been accepted as complete/9.6 Permit and 3.4 permit have been approved.)**

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

A. Knapp recused himself.

Bruce Scamman from Emanuel Engineering represented applicant RRB5, LLC (Turbocam) location of the project would be on Redemption Road. Bruce explained to the Board that they were asked the last time they were before they were asked to work with the Board, Dubois & King on drainage and AoT on getting approval from the State of New Hampshire. Bruce explained they were also asked to speak to the Fire Department he explained that they have reached out to the Fire Department but as of today have not heard back. Bruce explained that they just received the comments from Dubois & King on Monday morning. They have not had a chance to make the changes from Dubois & King. They received the comments from AoT about a week ago and were not able to get in touch with AoT until last Wednesday. Bruce explained to the Board that the State has asked them to remove porous pavement and put in traditional pavement. The State of New Hampshire has classified them as a surface water protection area and explained that porous pavement can not be used.

J. Brann asked if porous pavement was already used in other parts of Turbocam facilities.

Bruce explained that this was a new regulations and porous pavement does not do nitration and they are working with the State and Dubois & King to use a biotreatment system.

J. Brann expressed that this was also going to change Dubois & King recommendations about using less of the porous pavement for some of the heavy vehicles traffic areas.

John Huckins asked if they were doing away with the porous pavement completely.

Bruce explained that was what the State wanted them to do.

John Huckins expressed that would change the whole drainage analysis.

Bruce explained that he believed that NHDES changed on November 1<sup>st</sup> and thought that they were in before that. Bruce explained that they are working with the State to give them as much as they can. Bruce explained to the Board the process of what would need to be done. Bruce explained that they are still trying to go with a net zero increase in the impact in the wetland buffer because the Board already approved the 9.6 permit.

S. Diamond expressed that they felt strongly that the building was going to be this size.

Bruce explained the area out was front was lower and the could redesign and said that he felt there wouldn't be much pavement change. Bruce explained that the square foot and pavement wouldn't change much according the original analysis.

R. Boyer asked about the proposed well would it change.

Bruce explained that it could change, and they would be outside the well radius and the well could be relocated.

J. Brann expressed that all but 2 of Dubois & King's comments had to do with the drainage so no sense in addressing these. J. Brann asked about the grading on #3 of Dubois & King comments slopes were at 4% was needed to be 2%.

Bruce explained that it was at 2% so he needs to check this out.

J. Brann asked about Dubois & King stated that they would also need another additional ADA parking spot.

Bruce explained that they may be losing a couple of spots from the drainage after 75 parking spots you need an additional spot.

J. Brann asked about comment #6 of Dubois & King the storm drain trench didn't meet the requirements.

Bruce explained that they would work on this because all the drainage would be changing.

J. Brann asked if they would be looking to continue the application.

Bruce expressed that was what he was looking for unless the Board wanted them to answer the comments the Board had. Bruce asked if the applicant do any clearing of the trees.

John Huckins explained that by the regulations that no digging or excavation worked could be done but cutting of trees was not restricted.

Bruce asked if where Lot 1.5 was an approved lot could some of the excavation work be started. The AoT permit was still good until the end of 2020.

J. Jennison stated that they would need to see if the approval was still good they would need to get back to them.

J. Jennison open public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

*A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by J. Brann to approve to have the application continued to December 17, 2019. The motion carried unanimously.*

A. Knapp returned to the table.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

4. [238-11-V-19-SR \(Owners: 535 Franklin Pierce , LLC\)](#) Request by applicant to open an home occupation and home business for Antiques and Glass Company in a garage attached by a solid roof to the main house on a 1.8-acre lot at 535 Calef Highway in the Village Zoning District.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that the applicant needs a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and they are asking the if they can use their amended septic design for the plan. J. Huckins explained to the Board in the past that they have allowed applicants to use the septic plan.

Sharyl Murphy explained to the Board that they purchased 535 Franklin Pierce Highway and they would like to run a business out of the home in the garage. Sharyl explained that they had the business for over 27 years the business as two entities. Sharyl explained that there would be one entrance in a one single shop.

R. Boyer asked what the two businesses were.

Sharyl explained that the two businesses are a antique/vintage shop and glass shop and they repair screens not much happens with the glass part. Sharyl explained that in most carry repairs would be at someone's home. Sharyl explained that they run the business now in Wells, Maine.

J. Brann asked if this was going to be ran in the garage.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that as the Zoning Administrator he determined that this was one business run under two entities. J. Huckins explained that this would be the same as a hardware store that does window and screen repair under a different name.

J. Brann questioned that a home business a resident must live there.

J. Huckins explained that there was a resident there.

J. Brann asked about the septic plan showing that the residence was going to be turned into two apartments.

J. Huckins explained that if the Board looks at the septic plan it was designed so that they could have an accessory dwelling unit. J. Huckins explained that they could still have this as a single-family home with a home business. J. Huckins that the accessory dwelling would be less that 1000 s.f. so it would not be a duplex.

J. Brann asked that the owner live in the primary part of the home.

Sharyl explained that one of the owners would live in the home.

J. Jennison explained that there was for a further ADU they want to use a septic plan that has been approved for there plan.

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

### **3.4 Conditional Use Permit**

#### **All documents/requested information needed prior to opening a public hearing for the Conditional Use Permit received? Yes**

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

*The building or structure is attached to the garage by a roof (as opposed to walls), and home-based businesses are allowed in the zone. We are located in the village district, however, a CUP is required to allow our business, (run as two entities), to exist.*

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.

*The garage has been in existence since approximately 1967 and meets all zoning requirements. No changes to the structures design or location are proposed, and therefore the ordinance will be complied with.*

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

*The building will remain the same on the outside. The public health and safety will not be endangered. The code enforcement officer will assure all internal improvements meet code.*

4. The building, structure or use will not materially endanger the public health or safety.

*No changes to abutting property values will be realized as a result of this proposal. There will be no noticeable changes to the property or structure.*

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 located.

*The garage will continue to look the same as it has for years in color, structure design, and location. The only changes to the outside of the garage will be appropriate entry doors to the shop, and window upgrades.*

6. The building, structure or use will not have a substantial adverse impact on highway or pedestrian safety.

*We have applied for and received approval from NHDOT, for this proposed use. There will be minimal impact on traffic and pedestrian safety.*

7. The building, structure or use will not have substantial adverse impact on the natural and environmental resources of the Town.

*There will be no impact to the resources of the Town by this proposal.*

8. Adequate public utilities, common 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.

*No public expenditures are needed.*

9. Where deemed necessary when considering an application for Conditional Use approval, the Planning Board may require that adequate visual buffers be established.

*The garage is almost invisible from the road, given its placement behind the house and its position to the road. There are also many trees on the property that act as a visual buffer.*

The Board has a discussion on the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit.

J. Jennison open public comment.

Christine Barrows from 545 Franklin Pierce Highway asked about the exterior lighting and signage she wanted to know how much.

Sharyl stated she didn't know what size was allowed.

John Huckins explained that they would need to come in and get a sign permit from code enforcement and the size was regulated by the regulations in Town. J. Huckins explained that the size of the sign they wanted was way smaller than what was allow in that district.

Sharyl explained that they would like to light for at night so the public could see the business.

J. Brann explained that in section 20 of the Zoning Ordinance explains what lighting was allowed.

Christine Barrows asked Sharyl if she would be living there.

Sharyl explained that their business partner would be living there.

Christine Barrows asked if Sharyl would be there when the business was open.

Sharyl stated that she would be there running the antique shop.

Christine Barrows asked if that would be everyday 9-5.

Sharyl explained that she would be 10-5 and felt that it would not be 7 days a week.

Christine Barrows asked if there would be items sold outside on the lawn.

Sharyl explained that they are not allowed to have anything outside.

Christine Barrows asked if there would be construction and refurnishing of furniture what would the noise impact be on the properties that abut.

A. Knapp asked about leading paint and strippers.

Sharyl explained that this would be done in the cellar and most of the work would be done there. Sharyl explained that all the paints they use are nontoxic and water base a not harmful for the environment.

A. Knapp asked about oils, bases and stains.

Sharyl explained that anything they use does not affect the environment they use.

A. Knapp asked about the use and the storage of the rags after use. A. Knapp explained that this was a common fact of home fires.

Sharyl explained that they use gel stains.

J. Huckins explained that most stains are water base and that it was almost impossible to buy oil base.

Sharyl explained that they do not use oils base.

S. Diamond explained that the Zoning Ordinance does have a noise ordinance.

Christine Barrows asked about the location of their garage disposal and the location and would that be seen from her property.

Sharyl explained that they are going from 10,000 s.f. to 2,000 s.f. so that would have a temporary pod and they do need a dumpster but that would be enclosed enough so the trucking company can get to it.

J. Brann asked where the location of the dumpster would be.

Sharyl stated she was thinking straight in or around the corner, but it would depend of the trucking company for location.

A. Knapp asked where they were downsizing are, they going to use part of the house.

Sharyl stated no. Sharyl explained that they also own a business in North Hampton where some would be moved to.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

*A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by R. Boyer to approve the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit. The motion carried unanimously.*

#### **7.4 Home Business**

7.4(1) – All home businesses must receive a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan approval from the Planning Board.

*We have requested a conditional use permit from the planning board to allow the business operations to take place within the detached garage on the premises. Please see separate attached documents.*

7.4(2) - Before granting a conditional use permit the Planning Board must determine that the proposed structure(s), location, and size of the parcel, are of a suitable scale, appearance, and character that are compatible with the surrounding development and neighborhood where the use is proposed.

*The business will take place within an existing garage and no changes to the lot will be noticeable from the boundaries of the parcel or the road.*

7.4(3) - A home business may only be conducted as an accessory use to a detached single-family dwelling located on the same property.

*The business will be an accessory use to the existing single-family detached home. The septic design shows the home being converted to 2 apartments. If it is done it will be an accessory dwelling which is considered a single-family detached home.*



7.4(4) - Not more than one (1) home business may be established on a property.

*There will only be one home business show as 2 entities on the property.*

7.4(5) - No more than two (2) non-residents of the property may be employed within a home business.

*There will be no more than 2 non-residents employed within the home business.*

7.4(6) - The use may be conducted in a separate accessory building but said building shall contain no more than 2,500 square feet of total floor space.

*The existing garage has approximately 720 square feet of floor space.*

7.4(7) - The home business shall be totally conducted within the designated accessory structure but may occupy an area outside said structure if this area is adequately screened with fencing or a vegetative buffer. In no case shall the activities of the home business, both inside and outside the accessory structure, occupy more than 4,500 square feet.

*There are no plans to have any business conducted outside of the garage at this time.*

7.4(8) - There shall be no display of goods or wares visible from the street.

*There will be no display of goods or wares on the property.*

7.4(9) - Not more than two (2) commercial vehicles related to said home business shall be stored on the premises.

*There will be no more than 2 commercial vehicles related to the said home business.*

7.4(10) - The building or premises containing said home business shall not be rendered objectionable or detrimental to the residential character of the neighborhood because of exterior appearance, traffic, emission of odor, smoke, dust, noise, onsite storage of hazardous materials as determined by the Barrington Fire Department.

*It will remain the same in exterior appearance and there will be no detriment to the character of the neighborhood.*

7.4(11) - A certificate of occupancy for the proposed use shall be issued by the Building Inspector once verification with all the preceding standards is confirmed.

*The Barrington Building Department will perform regular inspections of the renovations and the business will not open until a certificate of occupancy is issued.*

The Board had a discussion on the 7.4 Home Business.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by A. Knapp to waive the Article 3 Site Plan Specifications to accept the submitted septic plan as the plan for the Site Review 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. Vote 6-0 Waiver granted.*

Roll Call

R. Boyer-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

J. Brann-Yay



D. Massucci-Yay

*A motion was made by R. Rondi 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.

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> 238-11-V-19-SR (Owners 535 Franklin Pierce Highway LLC) Request by applicant for a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit to allow a home-based business in a non-attached garage at 535 Franklin Pierce Highway (Map 238, Lot 11) on a 1.8 acre lot in the Village District (V) Zoning District			

Owner: 535 Franklin Pierce Highway, LLC 5 Exeter Road North Hampton, NH 03862	Dated: XX X,2019
--	------------------

### Dear applicant:

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

A Conditional Use Permit was Granted for a Home Business to allow for an antique/vintage and glass shop.

[Barrington Planning Board Meeting Minutes/bi](#)  
[December 3, 2019/ pg. 9 of 15](#)

The Planning Board voted to allow for an updated septic plan to satisfy the requirements of a site plan.

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 XXX X, 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) The Home Business must comply with Article 7.4 of the Town of Barrington Zoning Ordinance
  - b) The Planning Board voted to allow for an updated septic plan to satisfy the requirements of a site plan
  - c) Driveway must remain 18 feet wide year-round
  - d) Hours of operation 9-7pm.
- 2) Revise the following plan notes
- #3) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town

## 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,

John Huckins  
Zoning Administrator  
cc: File

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by A. Knapp approved the application for home business for antiques/vintage and glass replace as read by in the notice of the decision. Vote 5/1*

5. Request by applicant to adjust boundary lines between lots 54.7.1 and 54.7.2 for a site review for 43 commercial storage-office units with a 9.6 Special Permit in the wetland buffer also with a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit on a total of 8.691-acre lot on Calef Highway (Map 220, Lots 54.7.1 & 54.7.2) in the Residential Commercial and the General Residential Zoning Districts. BY: Robert Stowell, Trittech Engineering Corporation; 755 Central Avenue; Dover, NH 03820.

J. Jennison read a brief description of the application.

J. Huckins gave the Board a brief description on what involved in this application. J. Huckins suggested that they do the Lot Line Adjustment was previously approved this one he explained that the back part of the lot went into the General Residential zone because this was a narrow lot upfront that became deeper lots so now, they need a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit was needed because of the back of the lot was General Residential they need for the use. J. Huckins explained then 9.6 Special Permit that the Planning Board did not approve the 9.6 permit, but they did approve for the driveway to go through the buffer. J. Huckins explained that the Board should do the Boundary Line Adjustment, 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and the 9.6 Special Permit then you could expect the application as reasonability complete so they can send to Dubois & King so the review could get done.

Bob Stowell from Trittech Engineering Corporation represented Al Estes from Mill Falls Realty LLC who did the Mill Falls subdivision in 2004 this was the land left over from this subdivision. Bob explained the location of the proposed area of where the storage/office space would be located. Bob showed on page SP-1 what the project would look like. Bob explained that each building would be 2,500 s.f. that would be split into 2 units of 1,250 each that would have storage, office and bathroom. Bob explained that these would be for high end storage for RV's and boats for the winter. Bob explained that this was storage but not self-storage. Bob explained that these times could become condominium and be sold. Bob explained that they are here to do a Lot Line Adjustment he explained out the 2-lots (BLA1) would be divided and gave the description. Bob explained that the NHDES lot needs to have state subdivision approval and explained that sheets that go with the lot line. Bob explained the (SPP1 Plan) 9.6 application that they do have impact to the wetland buffer. Bob explained to the Board that sheet EX1 was for the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit he explained that 500' back it has two zoning districts the Highway Commercial and the General Residential zones. Bob explained that they are looking for the commercial use and explained under general residential this was a permitted use with a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit.

Bob explained that the following items are still missing:

- a) AoT permit with the State.
- b) Drainage
- c) Lighting
- d) Landscape Plan

J. Huckins explained that the Board should do the Boundary Line Adjustment first because conditional use has to do with the site approvals.

A. Knapp questioned that after the lot line that one lot would be a lot smaller.

J. Huckins explained that it still concedes the minimum requirements.

A. Knapp stated that even if it was going to be 5 units.

J. Huckins that when they get to the site review with the previses area and the breakdown. J. Huckins explained that as part of the lot line we have the minimum requirement in zoning if it go to the sheet it shows the lot sizes.

Bob explained that the smaller lot was about 1 ½ acre in size. Bob explained that the NHDES lot for subdivision lot they would look at it as 5 residential lots.

A. Knapp stated because of bathrooms the load was going to be based on a square footage.

Bob explained that they figured 20% office finished for sewage and for parking calculation.

J. Brann stated he did not see a septic design for the sewage.

Bob explained that the (Sheets ISDS 54-7-1 front lot & 54-7-2 back lot) front lot was below septic standards which this one would be oversized they allow 300 gallons per day.

J. Brann asked about the location of the leach field.

Bob showed location on plan of leach field.

J. Brann questioned the abandoned boundary line and asked if there was still going to be 2 lots.

*A motion was made by R. Boyer and seconded by D. Massucci to accept the Lot Line application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.*

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Huckins questioned on plan BLA the reference for shoreland zone for 75' setback was no requirement in Barrington.

Bob explained that he wasn't sure if this applied to Barrington and stated that he would get rid of it.

*A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by R. Boyer to approve the Lot Line Adjustment.*

Vote 6/0

Roll Call

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

R. Boyer-Yay

J. Huckins explained that before the zoning changed both lots were in the regional commercial and the applicant would not have to do the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit.

S. Diamond asked what the uses of these units would be used.

Bob explained that these units are not for people to run businesses out of. Bob explained that they want these used for storage high end. Bob explained that the covenant would explain what they want these units used for. Bob explained that there would be no employee parking.

J. Huckins explained that they are requesting for storage and explained that the other one down the road when approve they gave a list of different businesses and uses that they wanted in the units.

A. Knapp asked that they want to review the covenant.

J. Huckins explained that they have a portion of the covenant, but they are still in the draft stage.

Bob stated they are still working on the covenant.

S. Diamond asked if they could you the entire unit as office space.

Bob explained that that they are working with the protective covenant for what would be in the units. Bob explained that this was for the upper end market.

S. Diamond expressed that he wanted to know what these units were going to be used for.

J. Jennison explained that he understood what type of clients at the high end that they wanted in these units. J. Jennison was also concerned about the other uses as well that own storage units and put homeless people in them.

Bob explained that this was not the type of clients these units are for.

J. Huckins asked if this could be added to the covenant.

*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.*

### **3.4 Conditional Use Permit**

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

*The applicant proposes the Barring Storage-Office project that is a Permitted Use for the portion of the lot that is within 500 feet of Route 125. Barrington Zoning Ordinance 2.1.2(7) allows for this use for the balance of the property by Conditional Use Permit.*

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.

*The proposed use is a permitted use in the Regional Commercial Zone. The Conditional Use Permit allows this for the balance of the property.*

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

*Access to the site is provided from Route 125, and the project requires Site Plan Approval.*

4. The building, structure or use will not materially endanger the public health or safety.

*The property fronts on Route 125 and is surrounded by other commercially developed properties.*

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 located.

*The property fronts on Route 125 and is surrounded by other commercially developed properties.*

6. The building, structure or use will not have a substantial adverse impact on highway or pedestrian safety.

*Access to the site is provided from Route 125, and the project requires Site Plan Approval.*

7. The building, structure or use will not have substantial adverse impact on the natural and environmental resources of the Town.

*The development, regardless of use, will follow the Town of Barrington Zoning and Site Review Regulations.*

8. Adequate public utilities, common 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.

*All infrastructure will be privately constructed, owned, and maintained.*

9. Where deemed necessary when considering an application for Conditional Use approval, the Planning Board may require that adequate visual buffers be established.

*Significant natural buffers exist to the other General Residential uses in the surrounding area.*

The Board had a brief discussion on the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

*A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by S. Diamond to grant the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit for the backlot to allow commercial business in the General Residential. The motion carried unanimously.*

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

J. Jennison asked what the disturbed amount was.

J. Huckins explained that it was 14,500 s.f. and that included everything on both lots.

J. Jennison asked if this included the driveway.

J. Huckins stated that it did include the driveway.

S. Diamond understand that this was a very small impact but asked the Board about the memo from the Conservation Commission about the impact and for a site walk. S. Diamond expressed that he felt they wanted this case continued.

J. Huckins expressed that he felt that the Conservation Commission did not understand what was going on when they looked at the plan. J. Huckins stated that 80% was already disturbed.

A. Knapp stated that the parking area and detention pond would be disturbed.

J. Brann questioned if Dubois & King were going to review this.

J. Huckins asked if they wanted to continue this case until they see the drainage analysis.

J. Brann expressed that he would like this to go to Dubois & King first. J. Brann explained that even the Conservation Commission didn't know what they were looking at. J. Brann expressed that he was uncomfortable approving the 9.6 Special Permit without the drainage analysis.

J. Huckins asked the applicant to show the existing and new impacts on the buffer plan showing the total square footage of each. J. Huckins explained that this information would be forwarded to the Conservation Commission and then if they still want a site walk, we would do that.

*A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by A. Knapp to continue the 9.6 Special Permit application until February 4, 2020. The motion carried unanimously.*

*A motion was made by D. Massucci and seconded by J. Brann accept the site plan application as sustainability complete. The motion carried unanimously.*

*A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by R. Boyer to continue the application until February 4, 2020. The motion carried unanimously.*

The Board had a brief discussion on the site plan application.

## **REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

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

6. Does the Board have any input on the CDBG (Lee Oaks).

J. Huckins explained that this mobile home park has failing septic and they need the Town to help them with a grant.

A. Knapp explained that this was the Select Board helping the community.

*A motion was made by R. Boyer and seconded by D. Massucci to send a memo to Select Board that the Planning Board supports the grant. The motion carried unanimously.*

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

The next meeting will be on December 17, 2019 at 6:30p.m. at the ECLC 77 Ramsdell Lane.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully,

Barbara Irvine