



**PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE ON WETLAND BUFFERS MEETING
LOCATION: TOWNHALL LANDUSE OFFICE
333 CALEF HIGHWAY
BARRINGTON, NH 03825**

**Tuesday April 24, 2018
4:00 p.m.**

MINUTES

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

DRAFT MINUTES

Members Present

Jeff Brann
Fred Nichols
Ken Grossman
John Huckins

Members Absent

Donna Massucci
Doug Bogen

Staff

Marcia Gasses

Public: John Wallace

1) Introductions

Planning Board Representatives: Jeff Brann, Donna Massucci

Conservation Commission members: Ken Grossman, Doug Boden
Citizens: Fred Nichols, John Huckins

2) Elect Chair

Without objection Fred Nichols was elected Chair.

3) Discuss Process

F. Nichols expressed that there was a difference between buffers and some required more protection than others, a wetland scientist would define the wetland and functionality.

J. Brann expressed that all wetlands have value there are none that have zero value.

K. Grossman explained you could begin with a default number and allow the Planning Board to deduct based upon the functionality of the buffer. Points were assigned for the wetland and its buffer.

J. Huckins suggested that a wetland scientist be hired to develop definitions.

J. Brann described the New Hampshire method that was designed for looking at a community's wetlands as a whole. It was not intended for evaluation at the individual project level.

J. Huckins expressed the New Hampshire method was not for applying to a specific application.

J. Brann explained that as a Town they determine what is most important, whether flood protection, wildlife protection or aesthetics.

John Wallace expressed that he thought a wetland scientist would be able to determine functionality.

F. Nichols expressed we could stay with the existing setbacks with the opportunity to ask for a review to access the functionality and receive possible reduction.

K. Grossman suggested Matt Tarr from Cooperative Extension could assist the group with the review of benefits from the perspective of wildlife benefit.

J. Huckins asked if we would have the wetland scientist develop the point system.

J. Brann expressed there was a common agreement that there could be a point system that would allow them to decrease the size of a buffer.

F. Nichols would like the wetland scientist to look at the table Ken Grossman had provided. *See attached document*

J. Huckins expressed they would need more information about each quality before they could make an informed decision.

J. Brann expressed that even with a ranking method you have to use some judgement.

F. Nichols expressed they invite a wetlands scientist to the next meeting and then we could put in the work order on what we would like him to do.

F. Nichols expressed they may want to go to 150' for prime and 75' for regular. Then with the point system it may bring the buffer down.

K. Grossman expressed he liked his thought; it should be more dependent on what the wetland scientist tells them.

J. Brann expressed the voters had clearly voted that proposal down when the petitioned amendment failed.

4) Set next meeting date

May 8th 3:00 p.m. The Town Office

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia J. Gasses
Town Planner & Land Use Administrator

attachment

SUGGESTED QUANTITATIVE RULES FOR 9.6(1)(F)

Points are to be assigned for the wetland and its buffer using the following scale:

Scenic and aesthetic value	1 point
Flood water storage, flood water conveyance	2 points
Groundwater recharge and discharge	2 points
Erosion control, wave attenuation	3 points
Wildlife habitat, food chain support, wetland plant habitat	3 points
Aquatic habitat, fisheries	3 points
Water quality protection	4 points

The extent to which the Planning Board may reduce the wetland buffer is to be determined by the following table:

Points	Allowable Buffer Reduction
0-5	Up to 30 feet
6-10	Up to 20 feet
11-15	Up to 10 feet
≥16	Buffer may not be reduced