



BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING

NEW LOCATION: EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING CENTER

77 RAMSDELL LANE

Barrington, NH 03825

**Tuesday January 7, 2020
6:30 p.m.**

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
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 December 17, 2019 meeting minutes.

Without objection the minutes of December 17, 2019 were approved as written.

S. Diamond arrived at 6:34 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM December 17, 2019

2. [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.

R. Boyer will sit in for S. Diamond.

Bruce Scamman from Emanuel Engineering represented applicant Eliot Wilkins from RRB5, LLC (Turbocam) on Redemption Road. Bruce explained that this site plan involves 3 lots and stated that the lots are 77, 1.2, and 1.4. Bruce explained that they have redesigned per environmental services and Dubois & King recommendations. Bruce explained that in the packet was the responses to Dubois & King. Bruce gave the Board an update on where they are at. Bruce explained that they had porous pavement on most of the site. Bruce explained that the NH environmental services stated that they cannot have porous pavement so have created bioswale that has wetlands underneath it. Bruce explained that the water would travel underneath the parking lot and showed the area. The underground would infiltrate the water back into the ground. Bruce explained that the buildings would still be in the same location and the Town didn't like one of the swales, so they moved it out of the right of way. There are four waivers in reference to drainage pipes.

WAIVERS:

- 1. 4.7.7 (1) Minimum allowable pipe diameter in any storm drain system shall be 15 inches.**

Bruce explained that in several places 15' is too large per the design of Dr. Rob Rosen ; PE 12" diameter pipes and smaller are required for the optimum functionality of the systems. Per Dubois & King if this couldn't be met then a waiver was needed.

- 2. 4.7.7 (2) The minimum design velocity in pipes shall be 2 feet per second and the maximum velocity shall be 10 feet per second.**

Bruce explained that regulations state that water flow must be 2' to 10' per second but doesn't say whether per storm or peak must hit that. All storms have a diminishing flow, so at the end of a storm the flows would always slow to speed slower than 2 feet-per-second.

- 3. 4.7.7 (3) The minimum depth of cover for storm drain lines shall be 36 inches from the top of pipe to finished grade.**

Bruce explained that they have underdrains but there was no vehicle loads on them so there was no need for 36' of cover. Bruce explained that they use 18' to 24'.

- 4. 4.7.7 (4) Bedding and backfill shall be ¾ inch crushed stone. Bedding shall be a minimum 6-inch depth in earth and 12-inch depth in ledge.**

Bruce explained that there are some places where they would have it and some where they would not want it. The underdrains along the building have approximately 2 inches of bedding. Bruce explained that in some areas water will travel through the crushed stone and could cause erosion.

J. Huckins asked if the four waivers were sent to Dubois & King and address why they are needed.

Bruce explained that they would be in the packet going to Dubois & King. Bruce asked where these [requirements] came from.

J. Huckins explained that it came from driveway cuts.

Bruce asked if it was addressing driveway culverts.

J. Huckins explained that was what it meant originally, that was how this got established, and then it was required everywhere.

S. Diamond joined the Board.

S. Diamond explained that if it gets cold with the water freezing in the gravel under pipes, it might be about freezing/lifting rocks into a pipe.

Bruce stated that he understood but that in some situations this wouldn't work.

J. Brann asked about on Sheets C3, C4, and C6 they show in the middle of the building a 10' wide strip of traditional pavement to door entrance but having eliminated all the porous pavement was this appropriate.

Bruce explained that was true; it was showing a 10' paved walkway. Bruce explained to the Board that they put bubbles around all the changes which was a NHDES requirement on the plans so that it would be easier to see where all the changes were; these would be removed on the final plans.

S. Diamond asked about the term water settling with respect to clogging things [pipe].

Bruce stated that was correct and explained that it must reach the required flow range at some point. Bruce explained that could meet at a quality storm event or a 10-year storm event. Bruce explained that most are at a 10-year storm event.

J. Brann asked if they would meet the 10-year storm event.

Bruce explained that he would need to go back and look but stated he assumed it would. Bruce explained that most pipes are flowing in that range anyway. Anything below 1 foot per second allowed settling.

J. Brann stated that if there was only ¼ of inch of rain you could see clogging.

Bruce agreed.

J. Brann asked after reworking everything, was anything else outstanding with respect to the application.

Bruce explained that the septic has not been submitted to the State because they had to rework the leach field. They are still working on the Natural Heritage Bureau and the Conservation Commission about the turtles. Bruce explained that they cannot resubmit the AoT permit until the Natural Heritage Bureau gives the final say.

J. Brann asked if they have received a time frame.

Bruce explained that they do not have a time frame.

J. Jennison asked if they are still waiting for Dubois & King and Fish and Game.

J. Huckins stated that as new owners they need to supply a new project application only.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

John Wallace from the Conservation Commission asked that the new information be given to the Board.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by B. Pimpis to continue the application until January 21, 2020. Vote 4/2

A. Knapp returned to the Board.

3. 219-45-GR-19-Parking Area (Owners: Jason Nash & Alisha Gallagher) Request by applicant for a proposal to construct a 5-car parking area at 58 Seavey Bridge Road (Map 219, Lot 45) in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. BY: John Wallace, Barrington Conservation Commission; POB 660; Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

John Wallace from the Conservation Commission explained to the Board that they would like to put a parking lot on the property aka: Barr Property where the Barrington Trails begin on Seavey Bridge Road. John Wallace explained that this was part of the land that was subject to a conservation easement with a revision for a 5-car parking area.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that he included in the packet what the other conservation parking lots in Town had submitted which was a little different than the regulations. J. Huckins explained that he wanted the Board to follow what they did on the other Conservation parking areas in Town.

J. Brann stated that the difference from the last ones were a driveway permit was needed, the culvert needs to be 15-inch diameter with 12 inches minimum cover, and ditch lines accordingly on inlet and outlet. J. Brann asked why less depth.

John Wallace explained that he was not an engineer and didn't put the packet together but did explain that there was ledge at the beginning.

J. Jennison asked John Wallace if he addressed the driveway permit.

J. Huckins explained that they would need to get a driveway permit before they built the driveway. J. Huckins explained to the Board that it looks like they wanted to remove top soil and level off the site by adding more gravel; that was how they came up with the 6" to blend.

John Wallace explained that there was ledge going in.

J. Brann explained there was a parking loading requirement for noncommercial use and read from the Site Review Regulation that under parking area surfaces for non-paved surfaces they need to be graded and surfaced with crushed stone, gravel, or other suitable material to provide a surface that is stable and will help to reduce dust and erosion and prevent off-site drainage.

J. Huckins explained that this was less use for total cars than a residential driveway.

J. Jennison asked if that part of the road was dirt.

J. Brann asked about paving the apron.

J. Huckins explained no requirement if the road was dirt. J. Huckins explained that the 15" culvert and fill was partly in the right of way.

J. Jennison asked if abutters were notified.

B. Irvine stated they were notified.

S. Diamond asked about the water bar on the plan; which way was it on the trail.

John Wallace explained that it goes right down the river.

J. Huckins explained that this protects the erosion control.

S. Diamond asked what it was made of.

John Wallace explained that it was made of wood.

J. Huckins explained that a lot of times you would see humps of dirt and keep it up.

S. Diamond asked if it was like a single set of stairs.

John Wallace explained that was correct.

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

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that they would need to waive the application fee but the abutters and notice in the paper need to be paid.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by B. Pimpis to waive the \$150.00 application fee. The motion carried unanimously.

A. Knapp expressed that he was looking at the subdivision regulations driveway stating that a residential driveway was 10' and non-residential was 20'; this was 12'.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that he believed what A. Knapp was saying this would need a waiver.

A. Knapp expressed that by having a waiver this puts the Board in a situation where they don't meet design standards.

J. Brann asked if there was any reason why they couldn't meet the standards.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that the reason could be that this was conservation land and they are trying to keep a minimum impact as possible with the parking.

J. Jennison expressed where this was not paved, he felt it was acceptable.

S. Diamond asked if the regulations were applicable in this situation.

J. Brann explained that subdivision regulations are the only reference for driveways.

A. Knapp stated that they would need to request a waiver from subdivision regulations section 12.3.2 (1) minimum width of 20' for non-residential use.

A motion was made by J. Jennison and seconded by S. Diamond to waive section 12.3.2 (1) minimum width from subdivision regulations. The motion carried unanimously.



Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0195

jhuckins@barrington.nh.gov

NOTICE OF DECISION

Office use only	Date certified:	As built received:	Surety returned
		n/a	n/a
"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.			
Proposal Identification: 219-45-GR-19-Parking Area Request by applicant for a proposal to construct a parking area on Seavey Bridge Road (Map 219, Lot 45) in the General Residential (GR)			

Owner: Jason Nash & Alisha Gallagher 58 Seavey Bridge Road Barrington NH 03825	Dated: xxxx/xx,2020
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its xxxx xx, 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 xxxx xx, 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) Driveway Permit is needed
 - b) Culvert needs to be 15-inch diameter with 12 inches minimum cover, and ditch lines graded accordingly, on inlet and outlet.
 - c) Waiver for the application fee of \$150.00
 - d) Waiver from 12.3.2 (1) minimum width of 20'
- #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. 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
- 2) The applicant shall notify the Town when improvements are complete in order to receive 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 A. Knapp to approve the five parking spaces on Seavey Bridge Road. Vote 7/0

Roll Call:

Pimpis-Yay
Brann-Yay
Diamond-Yay
Knapp-Yay
Allard-Yay

Jennison-Yay
Massucci-Yay

ACTION ITEMS

4. [234-1.5-V-20-SR-3.4 & 9.6](#)[Renew \(Applicant: Turbocam, Owner Town of Barrington\)](#) Request by applicant to present a Site Review for the purpose of constructing a building footprint with 26,640 s.f. of industrial space and 6,240 s.f. of office space, 3.4 Conditional Use Permit for a light manufacturing use within the Village District and a 9.6 Special Permit for a 478 s.f. of grading within the 50' wetland buffer on a 3 acre lot located on Redemption Road (Map 234, Lot 1.5) in the Village (V) Zoning District.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

A. Knapp recused himself.

Eliot Wilkins from Turbocam International asked the Board that they accept their reapplication for Lot 1.5. Eliot explained to the Board that the Select Board gave them permission to go ahead with the site work on this lot.

J. Brann asked how the about the previous Notice of Decision; under the conditions precedent if the applicant has met these conditions. J. Brann asked if there was a new notice of decision to be issued.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that where nothing had changed, that he included the notice of decision from 2014 that showed the conditions that have not been met. J. Huckins explained to the Board that his understanding was that nothing has changed in Site Review or Zoning Ordinance and that the Board was going by the notice in the 2014 application.

J. Brann asked about what has changed from 2014 to now.

J. Huckins explained that nothing has changed.

J. Brann asked why the cistern location wasn't in the condition's precedent for approval from the Fire Chief.

J. Huckins explained that it should have been on there, explained that he believed that Chief Walker was happy with the cistern behind the other building as it was a close enough location and because of the amount of water, but explained that he didn't have anything in writing from Chief Walker stating this.

Eliot explained that there was a cistern with 32,000 gallons of water.

J. Huckins explained that Chief Walker was happy with this for the distance but believed that this was not in writing.

J. Brann asked if the questions from Dubois & King were ever answered on the drainage report.

J. Huckins explained that the questions were answered.

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

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Richard Senechal from 19 Kelly Lane stated that he didn't know if he was an abutter. Richard explained that they are an abutter to the building that has been built. Richard explained that his house was at the top of the ledge and eight months out of the year they cannot have their windows open or sit on his deck because of the noise and the building was lit up. Richard asked the Board where the applicant was planning on building this time.

J. Huckins explained that they were going to build on the left side almost across the street where the original building was.

Richard asked if there wasn't going to be anything around the top.

J. Huckins explained that there wasn't going to be anything around the top.

Richard asked if this building was going to require any blasting that would cause any problems for his property.

J. Huckins stated that this lot was going to be used for the blasting for the properties closer to Route 9.

J. Brann stated there was going to be blasting per the plan.

J. Huckins explained not on this application. J. Huckins explained that they were going to use the fill for the lots closer to Route 9.

J. Brann asked if there wasn't going to be blasting, why was there a pre-blast condition survey? If no blasting, why this survey.

Eliot explained that at this time there would be no blasting on Lot 1.5. Eliot explained that the initial work there would be no blasting but when they build the building there would be. Eliot explained that as the site work continues and building begins, there would be some blasting.

J. Brann stated so there would be some blasting just not at this time. J. Brann stated that if there was blasting, that would require pages of requirements to fill out/meet including notify abutters.

J. Huckins explained that was required by State Law based on the distance.

Richard Senechal explained that he was affected by this already with lighting, noise, and dumpster climbing at 6 am. Richard explained that the back doors are always opened to the plant and explained that they have no privacy.

S. Diamond asked what was the visible landscaping that they agreed to do.

Richard Senechal explained that they originally put in a buffer with some small line of spruce trees or something. He explained that he believed that they didn't survive the first winter and they were gone. Richard explained that at this time there was no buffer and invited the Board to come to his property and see that everything was lit up.

J. Huckins explained that they can't go back to a building that was already built for this application as it is for a building that across the street.

Richard Senechal expressed that he felt the applicant was taken care of but not him as a home owner and tax payer.

R. Allard explained that if the barrier died, he could file a complaint to the Code Enforcement Officer and that could be investigated.

S. Diamond stated that they couldn't unapproved something that was approved but could go back and enforce conditions that have not been met.

J. Huckins explained that if there were conditions that haven't been met then they could go investigate that.

J. Brann explained that there are regulations that if the buffers are not maintained then they could look into that.

J. Huckins explained that two months before approval the Fire Chief had no problems.

J. Brann expressed that they need to be a memo in the file.

J. Jennison suggested an updated agreement to be put in the file from the Fire Chief.

J. Huckins explained that the 9.6 permit and 3.4 conditional use permit were already approved. J. Huckins suggested that the Board reapprove the waiver.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Jennison asked Eliot to address the use of the building.

Eliot explained that this building was going to be used for manufacturing.

J. Brann asked what kind of manufacturing and are any hazard chemicals involved.

R. Allard explained that hazard chemicals would be all State stuff. R. Allard asked if the parking was going to change based on the use.

J. Brann stated that they need to have a new waiver for the parking with more information to support it.

Eliot explained to the Board that all he knew was that this was going to be used for light manufacturing.

J. Huckins explained they need to provide the proposed use and parking and the justification to allow less parking to grant the waiver. J. Huckins suggested that he come in and talk to staff for what was needed.

J. Brann stated they [Board] need to know what the grounds are for granting the waiver.

Eliot explained that the amount of people that were required to work there was much smaller and the additional parking that was already across the street.

J. Brann stated that there needs to be a justification on why to grant the waiver.

J. Huckins read the waiver from MJS Engineer to the Board.

R. Allard expressed that light manufacturing doesn't mean fewer parking spaces.

J. Huckins asked Eliot if he understood what the Board was looking for this waiver.

Eliot stated he did.

J. Brann asked about the Town Counsel going through all easement language. J. Brann expressed that this should be done by now.

J. Huckins explained that there are no easements on this site because the Town still owns this Lot.

S. Diamond read from MJS Engineering and asked for clarification of the following:

We request the Applicant clarify the reason for the amended soil located under the stone subbase of the Stormtrap. It is our understanding that the soil is being amended to reduce the infiltration rate capacity. However, we are concerned that a “field mix of the amended soil will not be consistent and could lead to early failure of the infiltration system.

J. Huckins asked what number.

J. Brann explained that it was #10 but the response references #7.

J. Huckins read the following answer from MJS Engineering to Dubois & King #7:

In accordance with Env-Wq 1500 (AOT Regulations), pretreatment is provided in the form of deep sump catch basins, and treatment is provided by the underground infiltration basin (StormTrap system). To meet treatment requirements, the soil below the system must be amended to have a maximum infiltration rate of 10 inches per hour. A factor of safety of 2 is used in the design. Therefore, the design infiltration rate is 5 inches per hour.

J. Brann explained that the answer to Dubois & Kings was they met State regulations.

J. Huckins stated that this met AoT regulations and the AoT permit was still valid.

S. Diamond asked what early failure of the infiltration system would be.

J. Huckins explained that this has to do with the parking lot not the building.

Bruce Scamman explained to the Board that NHDES make sites that infiltrate too fast to slow down material infiltration. What Dubois & King was concerned about was that it would clog the bed and not have the infiltration rate? Bruce explained that the State wants it to slow down so that the bacteria can grow in the soils so it would treat anything that was in the waters.

J. Brann stated that Dubois & Kings concerns were not with the applicant but with the State's requirements.

J. Huckins explained that they were basing their comments on the Town regulations because the regulations.

J. Brann asked about Sheet C-4 driveway profile; looking at the existing grade and underground storage, is this where the fill would be going.

Eliot explained that they supplied information the last time on where the fill needed to go.

J. Brann asked about the maximum slope of 10%.

J. Huckins explained 10% driveways and 7% roads.

J. Brann explained that his only concern was about a fire truck or ambulance going down the 2% grade and then up the 10% grade; would a truck get hung up on the transition in slope.

J. Huckins explained that it requires a 5% transient, and this was written in the Fire Code that was over the length of a fire truck.

J. Brann asked if this was being met in this case.

J. Huckins explained that they are required to make sure the wheel base accommodates the grades.

J. Brann suggested that a profile for the fire truck be shown.

J. Huckins explained that the Fire Chief has requested this in the past.

Bruce Scamman explained to the Board that if they look at C-4 profile, look at the K values. He would need to look at design, but it appears that the K value indicates there isn't a problem.

R. Allard explained that both calculations were done.

R. Boyer stated that she felt that even if someone wasn't an abutter but are in the area they should be notified.

J. Huckins explained that the RSA explains what an abutter was.

A. Knapp (as applicant) explained to the Board that there was a buffer along the property in question and explained many of the trees were replaced after the building was built in 2014 and some have died off. A. Knapp explained that they have replanted a good portion of them about 2 years ago. A. Knapp explained that as part of their staff they have the former owner of Rivet Landscaping. A. Knapp also explained that they are working with UNH Cooperative to make sure that they are doing everything the best they can and natural. A. Knapp stated the trees are growing but the problem was that they are on a steep slope.

S. Diamond stated what we are learning was that maybe we should ask for evergreens.

A. Knapp explained that they are monitoring the growth and the area to keep it well maintained.

J. Brann asked if this [new] facility would be visible from his [Mr. Senechal] property.

A. Knapp explained that it's a good possibility given where he sits up on the knoll and he looks out over the whole development. A. Knapp explained that he spoke to him to see what they can do in the area.

J. Brann asked if that would include any impact that the new facility would have.

A. Knapp expressed that there should be no more impact. A. Knapp stated he would look into vegetating the buffer up there.

J. Jennison asked if a vegetated border was on the plans.

R. Allard stated that there shows that there was a landscaping plan but not in this packet.

J. Huckins explained that one probably a dedicated plan.

A. Knapp explained that there would not be much of a buffer from this lot.

J. Huckins stated the following was what the Board was looking for:

1. Waiver for parking.
2. Letter from Fire Chief about the cistern.
3. Profile for the entry of fire trucks.

J. Brann asked about the permanent vegetation on Sheet C6 and if this impacts the swales and erosion control. J. Brann asked about Note #5 that no seeding on slopes steeper than 2/1 but on Sheet C7 it states turf matting for turf on slopes 2/1 or greater for erosion control. J. Brann asked if you can't seed 2/1 slopes or greater, how do the notes square.

Bruce Scamman explained that you are going to need this enforcement fabric for 2/1 slopes. Bruce Scamman explained that you can seed a 2/1 slope if you have the fabric to hold it. Bruce explained that he would not design something that was steeper than 2/1. Bruce explained that in New Hampshire you need to follow Best Management Practice.

J. Brann asked if these plans need to go back to Dubois & King.

J. Huckins explained that at the last meeting the question was already addressed and there were no design changes so no.

J. Jennison stated they need to revise the waiver and the use of the building.

S. Diamond asked if they truly need all the lighting.

Eliot stated that was the original plan.

R. Allard suggested they cover the lighting in their additional information.-

J. Huckins explained that was in the regulations; they need it too.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by B. Pimpis for the application to be continued until January 21, 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

A. Knapp returned to the Board.

R. Allard recused himself.

5. Review of a request for a building permit at 17 Otter Way, a private road, for Jim & Lisa Ford ([Map 114, Lot 38](#))

Lisa Ford and her husband were representing their themselves for a building permit on a private road.

J. Brann asked if there was an existing house.

Jim Ford stated that it has been taken down.

J. Huckins explained that they have already received a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
J. Huckins explained that they did receive a demo permit to take down the house.

J. Jennison explained to the applicant that the Select Board looks for a recommendation from the Planning Board.

J. Brann asked if the applicant received the memo from road agent.

Jim Ford explained that he spoke to the Road Agent and he would be doing the road work.

J. Brann asked if there is a road association.

R. Allard (public) explained that there was, he was the president, and the Fords were in good standing.

S. Diamond asked if they were aware of the private road policy.

J. Huckins explained that the standard memo would to the Select Board from the Planning Board.

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

The next meeting will be on January 21, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. at the ECLC 77 Ramsdell Lane.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.