



---

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Town of Barrington Planning Board**  
**Public Hearing**  
**(Approved on March 5, 2024)**  
**February 6, 2024, at 6:30p.m.**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

J. Driscoll called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** John Driscoll, Ron Allard, Bob Tessier, Joyce Cappiello, Donna Massucci

**Members Absent:** Buddy Hackett, Andy Knapp

**Staff Present:** Town Planner: Vanessa Price, Planning & Land Use Administrative Assistant:  
Barbara Irvine

**3. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Review and approval minutes of the January 9, 2024, meeting minutes.

*A motion was made by J. Cappiello and seconded by B. Tessier to approve the minutes oof January 9, 2024, as written. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Review and approval minutes of the January 10, 2024, meeting minutes.

*A motion was made by B. Tessier and seconded by J. Driscoll to approve the minutes oof January 10, 2024, as written. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

C. Review and approval minutes of the January 25, 2024, meeting minutes.

*A motion was made by J. Cappiello and seconded by B. Tessier to approve the minutes of January 25, 2024, as written. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

#### **4. STAFF UPDATES-TOWN PLANNER**

A. Planning Board Members Needed:

V. Price explained they are looking for Planning Board and Zoning Board members to help shape Barrington's future and getting involved they are accepting applications.

**Would you like to lend a hand in shaping Barrington's future?** The Land Use Department is currently looking for Planning Board alternates and Zoning Board of Adjustment and alternate members. Check out [www.barrington.nh.gov](http://www.barrington.nh.gov) for more information on these and other volunteer opportunities in Town!

V. Price explained they are looking for Planning Board and Zoning Board members to help shape Barrington's future and getting involved they are accepting applications.

B. Subdivision Regulations review at February 20, 2024, Work Session Meeting.

V. Price let the Board know that they would be working on the Subdivision Regulations at the February 20, 2024, work session. V. Price explained that there would be minimal updates.

#### **5. ACTION ITEMS**

##### **A. Adoption of Driveway Regulations**

*A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by B. Tessier adopt the Driveway Regulations as written. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

#### **CONTINUED CASES: From January 9, 2024**

- 1) **240-8-NR-23-Sub (23) (Owner: Young Road, LLC (Previously-Norma Bearden)** Request by applicant for a major site plan to subdivide into 23 Lots using the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance with waivers on a 65.55-acre lot (Map 240, Lot 8) in the Neighborhood Residential Zoning District on Young Road. BY: Christopher Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825. **(Application was accepted as complete on April 4, 2023. Waiver granted October 17, 2023.)**

**Applicant has asked for a continuance to the March 5, 2024, Planning Board meeting.**

J. Driscoll gave a brief description of the application.

*A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by B. Tessier to approve the request to continue the application for Young Road, LLC to March 5, 2024. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

#### **A. CONTINUED CASES: From January 16, 2024**

**(January 16, 2024, meeting was cancelled to inclement weather.)**

- 1) **253-14-GR/SDAO-23-SR (Owner: Hambone, LLC)** Request by applicant for a Major Site Plan Review for Seven Multi-family units with waivers and **ADDED 3.4 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT** on 49 Winkley Pond Road (Map 253, Lot 14) a 13.47-acre lot, in the Stratified Drift Aquifer Overlay and the General Residential Zoning District. BY: Christopher Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

**(Application was accepted as complete and waivers were granted on September 5, 2023.)**

J. Driscoll gave a brief description of the application.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering represented Hambone, LLC. Chris explained that the Planning Board approved their Conditional Use Permit for the proposed use on the parcel and that there were a couple of minor plan edits that the Planning Board requested. Chris

Explained that they added additional parking, additional lamps found a better way to use one of the lamps that they were proposing flipped to the other side of the road. Chris explained that would provide a little more use along the road and in front of the units. Chris stated that they believed that they have accomplished everything that was asked to do.

R. Allard asked about the HOA agreement that needed to be made.

Chris explained the applicant has prepared that and they would be submitted to the Land Use office for Town attorney review.

J. Driscoll opened public comment.

J. Driscoll closed public comment.

V. Price read the Notice of Decision:

Date of Application: August 15, 2023  
Date Decision Issued: February 6, 2024  
Case File #: 253-14-GR&SDAO-23-SR

## NOTICE OF DECISION - DRAFT

[Office use only]	Date certified:	As built/s received:	Surety returned
"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.			
<b>Re: Request by applicant for a Major Site Plan Review for Six Multi-family units with waivers and 3.4 Conditional Use Permit on 49 Winkley Pond Road (Map 253, Lot 14) a 13.47-acre lot, in the Stratified Drift Aquifer Overlay and the General Residential Zoning District.</b>			
<b>Owner:</b> Hambone, LLC 242 Central Avenue Dover, NH 03820  <b>Applicant:</b> Christopher 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 February 6, 2024, meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

The application has met all the Town's Ordinances and Regulations of the Town of Barrington.

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 12 calendar months to the day, February 6, 2025, the Board's 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) At the September 5, 2023, Planning Board Meeting, the Board approved the following waivers:
    - i. Article 12, Table #1: Minimum Road Centerline Radius (Section 4.8.1).
    - ii. Article 12, Table #2: Max Grade within 100' of an Intersection (Article 4.8.1).
    - iii. Article 4.8.6 (2) Sight Distance location of the vertex of the sight triangle.
  - b) At the January 9, 2024, Planning Board Meeting, the Board approved a waiver for minimum pipe cover for pipe from CB #3 & CB #4.

- c) At the January 9, 2024, Planning Board Meeting, the Board approved a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Multifamily Housing in the General Residential District.
  2. Add the following to the Plan:
    - a) Owner Signature.
    - b) Wetland Scientist Signature.
    - c) Professional Surveyor Signature.
    - d) NHDES Permit Number.
  3. Provide a detailed engineer's estimate of construction cost.
  4. Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town.
  5. Ownership and Maintenance of the stormwater system and driveway maintenance of the proposed Homeowner's Association to be approved by Town Attorney. The applicant is responsible for attorney fees.
  6. The H.O.A will be recorded at the S.C.R.D. by the Land Use Department. The applicant is responsible for recording fees. A copy will be on file at the Town's Land Use Department.
  7. Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit three (3) full size paper copies of the subdivision plans, one (1) 11' x 17' copy and .pdf/a format file format with supporting documents, with a letter explaining how the applicant addressed the conditions of approval to the Town's Land Use Department.
- The Planning Board Chair shall sign and date all plans meeting the conditions of approval. The Board shall endorse three (3) full size paper copies of the subdivision plans for their records and one (1) 11' x 17' copy and .pdf/a format file format for the case file folder.

### **General and Subsequent Conditions**

1. Where no active and substantial work has commenced upon a site, plans that are approved and signed by the Board shall expire two years from the date the plan is signed. 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. Expired plans must be submitted to the Board for review to ensure compliance with these and all other town ordinances and regulations via the normal application process.
2. Where no active and substantial work (as defined in Article 13, Definitions) has commenced upon a site, plans that are approved and signed by the Board shall expire two (2) years from the date the plan is signed (NH RSA 674:39(2)). 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 all other town ordinances and regulations.
3. Prior to construction, and before any work in the Winkley Pond Right of Way is performed, the applicant shall apply to the Selectboard for permission to work in the right of way and a bond will be required to ensure that the right of way is returned to its original condition. The developer shall provide security, in an amount to be determined by the town's engineer.
4. Prior to the start of the work, a pre-construction meeting will be held to review procedures, identify responsibilities, and discuss Town requirements. This shall occur after the Planning Board chair, or their designee, sign the plans approved by the Notice of Decision. It is the owner(s) responsibility to contact the Land Use Department to start the process of setting up a pre-construction meeting to include the Town Planner, Town Road Agent, Owner, Owner's Engineer and Town Engineer.

5. All vehicles related to construction are not to be parked on Winkley Pond Road but on the owner's property.
6. 30,000-gallon cistern installed and operational prior to framing permit.
7. Street view signage shall be 911 compliant and approved by the Town of Barrington.
8. The responsible party will conduct the inspections, complete the required maintenance, and will maintain the Inspection & Maintenance Check Lists and Logs, and will provide copies with the Annual Report to the Town of Barrington, Land Use Department by December 15th of each year and made available to NHDES upon request. Upon an ownership change, the Annual Report will include the Transfer of Ownership.
9. At the conclusion of construction, before the submittal of as-builts, the applicant's engineer, the Town Engineer, the Town Road Agent, and Town Planner will conduct a site walk to assess the road damages done by the construction for repair. Damages done during construction will be responsible for being corrected and cost borne by the applicant and their engineer.
10. The applicant's engineer shall certify in writing that the improvements have been constructed as approved prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
11. Current Use subject property or a portion of it is presently in Current Use. The applicant must provide the Town of Barrington Assessing Department Current Use map and/or other items needed to assure requirements of RSA-79A and the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administrations Rules are satisfied.

I wish you the best of luck with your project. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Price, Town Planner

cc: File

*A motion was made by J. Cappiello and seconded by R. Allard to approve the major Site Plan for six multi-family units as read by the Town Planner. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

- 2) [243,244&230-MultiLots-23-Design \(Owner: Carla Williams\)](#) Request by applicant for a Design Review for Two Major Conservation Subdivision with 174+/- dwelling with 480 acres +/- of open space on Canaan Back Road for 600+/- acres in total, in the General Residential Zoning District. BY: Mitchell Rasor, Rasor Landscape Architecture; 87 Main Street; Yarmouth, ME 04096.

J. Driscoll gave a brief description of the application.

J. Driscoll opened public comment.

V. Price explained that the public comment was continued from the previous meeting.

**Doug Bogen, Chair of the Conservation Commission** explained that he previously submitted written comments that you all have seen. Doug explained that the property was a huge opportunity in terms of conservation protection. Doug explained that the Conservation Commission was very concerned that it does get protected in the future. Doug explained that this property has been previously mentioned on their list of areas in the Town deserving of protecting.

Doug mentioned the following:

Conservation values, particularly on the Co-occurrence map, just the number of different values that we want to see protected. It's also the largest remaining open space of unfragmented land in the whole town that doesn't currently have any Conservation protection.

So, for that reason alone, we feel it's very, very important and it's certainly top of our list for things needing attention. So, they strongly support not a conservation subdivision on this land if it's done right. They've seen conservation subdivision developments that, you know, we've had issues with, and they get this one right given that it's such a high priority for us, we prefer that the town or SE Land Trust get ownership of the land.

Given that there have been concerns in the past with a homeowner association and given this such a large piece of land and so many important values there.

So, we really want to maintain the unfragmented quality of this land and our main concern as others have stated, is the proposed size of the proposed development and we think that the yield plan is, problematic in terms of the numbers, estimated there are a lot of areas that really haven't been adequately delineated. The wetlands, the wetland buffers the ledges and so forth that we really need to have better information before we can determine how many lots can really be put on that land. So that's a huge concern and certainly the density of the development areas that the clusters that are proposed is of concern as well, and particularly in terms of ground water, water resources we need to have a better sense of what impact it could have on these very important wetlands, particularly the prime wetlands and the area.

Doug summarized they really wanting to see in addition to better detail on the wetlands and the wetland buffers was that there be a full environmental impact assessment done on the project and we like also to see hydrogeological study again because of the very critical water resources involved. They would also like to see a wildlife management study because this area is also considered a very important uh transit area for wildlife throughout the region.

They hope that we can come up with a plan that is acceptable to everybody and that we can preserve these very important environmental values that we all love in our town.

**Colin Williams, 94 old Settlers Road abutter** supplied the Board with documents that are labeled **Document #1** in Coot Farm file.

What I've done there is take the overlay that the developer has provided and done another overlay of the existing soils that are there and included descriptions of the soils and what I did not have a chance to print out is page 78 through 82. Which of the Stratford County Soil Survey of 1973 which says that all the illustrated soils have severe limitations for foundation, septic systems, and roadways, and to call the yield plan. Realistic to come up with several 175 houses. If you look at all the Paxton D soils, the finishing description of it says that effluent. If you build a septic system here, effluent will escape, and they are all immediately adjacent to the prime wetlands.

Colin explained that if you want 60 housing units with their septic tanks leaking into the wetlands. Colin pointed out that there are six prime wetlands crossings, including over 1000 feet of road that is built in the wetlands buffer of a prime wetland. Colin showed the Board in the bottleneck the buffers overlap and additional crossings.



Colin explained that in 1990-91 they tried to in a bridge so that they had better access but would have has too much impact. Colin explained that they have five other crossings, and one was denied the cluster of seven this royal water table was listed as 6 to 12.

**Marie Pelletier from 15 Old Settlers Rd,** and I am not an abutter, but was speaking on behalf of Henry Peterman of Canaan Road.

Marie explained that he wishes he could be here for this meeting, but his military service requires him to be out of the state.

Marie read the following on his behalf:

Having two children, a 9-month-old, and a 3-year-old, makes some concern for the burden its development could have on our schools. He is concerned not just for staffing, but with our school's staffing, but with what? Our schools will be able to handle using the NASDAQ demographic study overview.

What is the impact of the current Barrington residential construction and when will we feel it in our schools?

Henry has come up with the below findings in 2020. **Document #2 in the Coot Farm file**

The demographic study was done in relation to the school growth. He just wanted to point out a few of the things the Planning Board, a few of the things to the Planning Board and this community in 2000 to 2020, Barrington has grown by 1851 residents.

The current major developments being built, plus coup farm could bring in over 800 residents, 235 referenced in this project in this projection, plus 174 on Coot, with 2.4 average per home. This entire projection by the demographic study is considering 160 homes, which is recommending in an impact on the schools as follows:

**Grades K-4 would add 1.5 to 4 classes needed**

**Grade 5 to 8 0.51 class is needed**

**Grade 9 to 12 a 100,000 to 200,000 additional**

These 160 homes account for three categories of approved projects under construction.

75 home units approved in the Pipeline, 80 home units and approve not under construction.  
80 units.

And an additional 174 homes. So, this initial assessment of the town has already developed. These numbers are just estimates based off what the information was provided in the **demographic study**.

**Grades K through four will need 3 to 7 classrooms added**

**Grades 5 to 8 will need one to two classrooms added**

**Grade 9 to 12 cost an additional 200,000 to 400,000 in the town**

Now let's take one more look at the numbers.

**Cost per pupil:**

**Elementary is a 16,000**

**Middle 9 to 12 is 17,500**

**Dover 14,000**

**Oyster River 18,300**

**Coe Brown 18,000**

**Cost of additional cost of adding 100 students**

**Elementary 1.6 million**

**Middle 1.755 million**

**9 to 12.**

**Dover 1.41 million**

**Oyster River 1.8 million**



### **Coe Brown 1.9 million**

One of the goals of the proposed development is affordable housing.

This equates to lower property tax for the homes, which means less funding to cover the cost of the additional students given a school tax rate of 13.62, a home would need to be valued at over 1.17 million or 1.17 million to pay for one elementary student in over 1.35 million to pay for one Oyster River Student.

Now for the children before the age of five. There is a serious daycare shortage in this state, the largest daycare in Barrington does not even have enough staff.

Any new children due to the staffing shortage?

Every accredited daycare within 20 miles of Barrington has over a year waiting list in that that is based on even if they can accept any children, this is a very large struggle on the community and is not brought up enough.

### **Christopher Betterman from 216 Canaan Back Road:**

Christopher explained that he was a retired medical doctor with specialty board certification in emergency medicine.

In 1999, I retired from the practice of emergency medicine in Barrington if he learned anything during my 27 years in the emergency department, it was that minute's matter when human welfare is online. Regarding the proposal to subdivide the coot farm and the 174 residents, is there, I don't want could have placed the residence of the proposed coot farm any further from the building where the Barrington ambulances are garaged or further from here. Emergency departments of Wentworth, Douglass, or Portsmouth Hospital. Make no mistake about it, the remote location of the proposed 174 residences, we'll put the welfare and lives of those living there at risk. Some of those living there will be gravely harmed by the remote location and some will die. Mutual aid agreements between Barrington and Strafford, as well as between Barrington and Northwood, may change, ambulance transit times marginally and spread the town cost of ambulance service to the residents of the proposed could farmers subdivision among three towns.

One additional small comment I'd like to make is regarding the coot farm subdivision in the spring of 2023, my wife and I broke two suspension springs in our Volkswagen on Canaan Back Road.

Christopher explained what the subdivision would do to the road and could not handle the load of cars as it was right now with the wetlands there. Christopher explained that this would be a major construction effort to bring the road up to the level that would have to be for the number of Cars that would be traveling with that subdivision.

**Dan Ayer, a taxpayer from 334 Old Concord Turnpike** explained that he was wondering about the Nippo Roads Association with the extensive work on the lake. Dan explained that they are not a direct abutter, but they would have been notified.

J. Driscoll asked Dan if he was talking about their impact on Route 9.

Dan Ayer explained that he was talking about the water flow into the lake, they spend grants cleaning up on Nippo Lake.

**Lynda Brushett from 106 Harlan Drive** explained that the wetlands that are there go that way and would have an adverse impact if anything happens to those wetlands. Lynda explained that the reason her and Jay Corcoran are there was that they own the other half of Nippo Hill that was 550 feet high. It's a rock.

Lynda explained that it comes down these wetlands come, and they go between Nippo and Brown Hill into Nippo Brook.

Lynda explained that when she talked about a geological and that she submitted written testimony around the scattered and moved to our development, and I just want to bring that to the forefront because this is what some of the my colleagues back here mention, and because whether there's 180 units, which is impossible and down to 100 and 174 by virtue of what kinds of units they are, how many of them and where they're located, clearly it's going to outpace the capacity of Barrington's public infrastructure, emergency services, waste, transportation, recreation, schools, et cetera, to support the health and safety of our Community as well anyone new that moves in. Lynda explained that there's only like 15 or 20 houses along that island.

Lynda asked that this be put on record that they wisely stayed in our subdivision regulations that the first purpose is to prevent scattered and premature development that the article reads that to provide against such scattered or premature subdivision of land as would involve danger or injury to the health, safety, or prosperity by region, of the lack of water supply, drainage, transportation, schools, is somebody's talked about public services, etcetera, or necessitate the excessive expenditure of public funds for the supply of such services. Lynda also explained the regulations state for regional impacts and to be able to understand it and our regulations also stay that the planning board at its discretion will not approve scattered or premature development that would impose danger injury to the public health.

Nor will the board approve such development, which will necessitate excessive expenditure.

Public funds for the supply of such services? It asked to find in our regulations a scattered and premature development is one that poses a danger to the public through insufficiency of services.

This is what the good doctor just talked about is what the lady talked about around the schools.

Lynda explained that she just doesn't understand exactly where this comes into play whether it's posted an application or it's a free and I don't know, I don't know how that all works.

Lynda explained that one of my recommendations is I'm hopeful that you guys will figure it out to figure it out and to know what kind of information to request from the developer such that you would be able to make that decision because of course mine. This is just an opinion, as people have talked about that road. If any of you guys have ever been over there after that rainstorm, we had a few months ago or during mud season and if somebody says, you know, you hardly can get through there and it's a scenic road. It's bounded.

Lynda explained that as the authority as a Planning Board they can change that, but she believed that there are public safety issues along with all the environmental impact. One thought our regulations provide that the app that the application of these regulations to prevent scattered or premature development shall include consideration of the highest and best use of a particular tract of land, the compatibility of a particular use with the remainder of the Community and the protection of the financial interests of the purchaser, subdivision providers and local government, as Mr. Razors said, and so did the conservation. This is a high priority, unfragmented when you are unfragmented it means nobody's developed in there and that's why there's all those different kinds of species and trees and you've never developed in there. So that's what the importance is and that's why I think that before proceeding to a subdivision application, the potential to conserve this whole property should be deeply explored and we have the regulatory rationale and direction to have that happen.

**Charles Burnham from 188 Canaan Back Road (Strafford)** was the first house in Strafford where Canaan Back Road ends. Charles explained that he has lived there for 32 years. I'm not speaking for Strafford, but I have talked to the Planning Board, and I've talked to the selectman in both are quite concerned about the impact as a regional effect here on Northwood, Strafford, even Nottingham. Charles explained that the

the Board probably knows that Back Canaan and Strafford is also a scenic growth for the RSA, so the Planning Board is concerned of the huge effect on Back Canaan Road.

Secondly, the Selectman that concerned on the ability for Strafford to provide both ambulance and fire your own Chief Walker has made the statement that Strafford people can get there faster than Barrington by quite a bit. So, this is a cost impact on Strafford that we're not really prepared for.

The only other thing I would comment on is having looked at many times at the intersection on Canaan Back Road to 202 and 9 there was major work that needs to be done to bring that up to grade so that this increase in traffic can get on and off 202 and 9 some years ago and I tried to look this up. Charles explained that it's been over 10 years since you first left 202 the culvert there washed out. There was a ditch across the road there was six feet or more deep, and this took some time to fill in and get the road back and running.

So not only is this going to be expensive, but you're also going to have to hire consulting engineers to redesign it. On the southwest corner of that intersection is a cemetery right there on the northeast side. Charles explained you've got the Canaan Chapel, so I've talked to some people in the road construction business he thought it would be \$1,000,000. They're saying it's closer to \$2,000,000 to redesign that intersection and bring it up to grade because Canaan Back Road is going to have to be elevated somewhat back so that it is somewhat in line with the pavement on 202 and 9. That's a major cost impact and I hope that the thinking that the developer is going to share in that.

**Molly Boodey from 87 Canaan Back Road** explained that she has lived there since 1983 and her family has lived there for 10 generations. Molly explained to the Board that she wanted to express her feeling about the proposal. Molly explained that her concerns include environmental concerns as well as practical concerns such as traffic increase in altering the character of there road. Molly questioned adherence to Barrington Zoning Policy states that conservation subdivisions should maintain and protect Barrington's rural character by preserving scenic views and minimizing views of new development from existing streets. Molly explained that it also notes that there should be a minimization of development on steep slopes. It was clear to her that this plan would significantly alter the current landscape. It will not minimize views to existing streets.

In fact, if you look at the plan proposed lots fall near existing streets. Additionally, much of this land includes steep slopes and development would undoubtedly include these slopes. I live in a quiet, rather undeveloped section of Barrington and a major development like this is a drastic shift which does not align with Barrington's master plan or subdivision policy. I now want to address the wetlands of this area. The wetland here is designated as prime wetland. Only 6% of Barrington is designated as Prime Wetland and Barrington is one of the few New Hampshire towns with prime wetland. Prime Wetlands are a substantial significance. The community is even more so than nonprime wetland and is vital to sustaining populations of rare or threatened plant and animal species. This section of land that we are discussing is a substantial part of Barrington's primal lands in Barrington, a minimum buffer of 100 feet shall be required from the edge of the wetland and the Planning Board may require a larger buffer around a prime wetland. There are several areas on this plan that I believe either struggle to achieve. The 100-foot buffer or a strong contender for areas where the planning board should require a larger buffer. I would like to briefly mention the proposed open space in the design. This open space is required of a conservation subdivision, and this allows the area to bypass the typical low-density requirement for our zoning district.

Any area that is defined as undevelopable, such as wetlands, soils, or steep slopes, cannot constitute most of the proposed open space. I would argue that the land said to be open in this plan is either wetland or has steep slopes. Another important aspect of this land is its status as unfragmented land. Which others have mentioned due to its large acreage uninterrupted by development or public roads, unfragmented land is valuable as some species cannot live successfully on small chunks of land and need these large sections of uninterrupted land.

This is one of the largest unfragmented of land sections of Barrington and the development place directly next to this open space separates the land. The proposed wildlife corridor mentioned in the plan does not change the fact that this land will become fragmented and will no longer be suitable for certain species.

The Planning Board does have discretion when it comes to the amount of required open space and can ask that the plan include more, and I would urge them to do so to prevent fragmentation of the land and to protect the primal lands that exist here. As a final note, I have concerns about the traffic increase and population increase on the road. Our road currently has only a handful of homes on it. I don't know the exact number, but 174 dwellings would certainly be more than double the current population of our road. Our road is a dirt road with an extender Route 9.

This development would lead to issues with getting on to Route 9. In addition, these dwellings would need access to usable well water. It is difficult to know what this plan would be for.

Well, water Canaan Back Road was also a scenic road and there are protections afforded to scenic roads that should be considered. In summation, I see issues with the plan in terms of preserving the character of our road. Development here makes little sense and would undoubtedly harm the valuable and rare prime wetland that exists on the property. There is a clear issue with visibility from the road and buffering distances. The proposal would completely change the character of this area of Barrington, and I would be devastated to see it happen.

**Patrick Boodey 87 Canaan Back Road.** Patrick explained that it's the Elmwood Farm if he's not on the farm, volunteering at the Barrington Fire Department he works for the Dover School

District been doing that for over 30 years. Patrick explained that 20 of those years have been administered both at the high school and at the elementary level, where I have seen successful and not successful workforce housing and large developments in Dover. Even Dover has places that don't do well. They've even tried city within a city. They've tried some creative ways to see what works, so I can tell you what doesn't work and one of the things that hasn't been mentioned yet is the social infrastructure.

You heard a little bit about it from one person already. That said about the children before they go to public school, which is very true, but there's other things as well. Like there's sort of this unofficial rule in New England every 500 happened in habits.

You need Dunkin Donuts or Aroma Joes, but the reality is you need a lot more than that you need things for do after school for children. That's sort of local and nearby, and you also need convenience stores, gas stations and grocery stores that can handle that amount of more inhabitants. So, but let's say you magically had that you really wouldn't be able to have that in this section in the Canaan section, because it's not there are no places to put that social infrastructure if you're familiar with that part of town. There is already a stone house SELT where there are conservation easements like our farm is in. There's also a lot of swamp and wetlands that are not buildable for the social infrastructure, and I just want to throw a word of caution. You know, other communities around Barrington have tried and it hasn't worked.

I'm really concerned about the workforce housing because that's very specific. It's not just a bunch of houses put into an area, no matter how much you spread it out over what you can of the 600 acres. If you don't have that social infrastructure, no plans going to work is specifically that be concerning for workforce housing.

**Mike Camire from 237 Canaan Back Road.**

I'd like to speak to you further about the proposed Coot Farm development will have on the area and how affects the surrounding communities. Strafford Regional Planning Commission impact guidelines lists several areas considered for regional impacts. Some of these are traffic facilities, ecology and resources, public safety, and population growth. The traffic on increase in Canaan Back Rd will be dramatic on the Barrington end of the road. There are narrow points where it's difficult to pass two cars. One of those points is in front of my property

that is called Durgan Hill. If you have two cars coming, you know, one coming down and one going up, you're looking to where you can get over against the bank so that you can let the other car pass. The current road agent I believe is doing an exceptional job compared to the way it used to be 25 years ago. It's much better than it used. We have the full width of the road, but even with that you essentially must have one vehicle stopped to let the other one go through. Strafford ended the road is also going to be impact because it has some narrow areas and a 90-degree bend. There will be extra traffic on both routes 9 and 202 A. This will leave more to more traffic going both into Strafford and Northwood.

The towns of Strafford and the facilities the towns of Strafford, Northwood, Nottingham, could be called upon provide some of the emergency services Strafford Fire Department and of course, there are ambulance will be affected because they have the closest equipment to this proposed site as far resources, the water aquifer immediate area will be affected by withdrawal of thousands of gallons of water each day.

It's the aquifer and surrounding areas could be affected and if we recall from a few years ago, this was the concern with USA Springs, how they were going to affect the regional aquifer. Population growth with the increase of several 100 new people living in in Barrington, the population of students at the Barrington Schools will increase dramatically.

This will also affect Dover Durham and Northwood as we send our students to those schools.

So, with all of this in mind, we would like to request that a regional impact study be conducted for this proposal be allowed to move forward with that.

**Paul Klehm from 259 Canaan Back Road** explained that one of his concerns he would like to raise was the issue of 1,000 more car trips on Cannan Back Road daily basic. Paul explained that

If that happened it would seem unlikely that the road would be able to remain unpaved, which was something that most of the residents would not want.

But if it is to be paved, then the road would have to obviously be up to code and up to standards.

There are places in there in that road where it is very narrow, where there are stone walls very close encroaching upon the road, which leads to the potential for there to be the need for eminent domain for a taking and which may lead to a problem about whether or not you can take private property for a private purpose, which could lead to some difficulties down the road.

Obviously, then, where the Zielfelders and Pat Morse lives, where it gets very narrow and there's a hill that would obviously have to be flattened out and to have less of a blind spot for people coming in both ways, even on the back Canaan side, there's a very sharp right-handed turn. If you're adding a thousand car trips a day, there's a problem with that, especially since those of us who live on the road have all slipped as we go around that corner.

So, there are a lot of dangers that go in, but the biggest problem is the cost.

The cost is under Article 8 can apportion the cost and the cost here will be extremely large.

I am not an estimator. I do not know, but I would imagine it would be a very substantial cost.

And then who's going to allocate the cost of the applicant going to have to pay that cost or we as taxpayers going to have to absorb that cost for the sake of this developer to earn profit?

I hope you take that into consideration.

**Colin Williams** suggested asking for the endangered species and impact study he would testify that. Our systems are inhabited by blending startles, which are on the New Hampshire endangered list, as well as wood, turtles, and spotted turtles, which are both threat and help them across the road. When they come up to lay their eggs and there are numerous on both Canaan Road and Canaan Back Road, Old Settlers Road, where I have done that over the years, and I have photographic proof because I take pictures of them and send it to the



conservation Fish and Game department. And the other thing is, is there an email I can send you 2 pictures of the washouts?

V. Price told Colin to email to [planning@barrington.nh.gov](mailto:planning@barrington.nh.gov) or stop by the office.

J. Driscoll closed public comment.

Mr. Rasor thanked everyone for the comments and helps improve a plan as it moves along to have good, informed comments that help shape things for the better.

Want to also thank the road commissioner for meeting us on the site and giving us lots of good, solid and feedback regarding any proposal in the area, as well as the Fire Chief for meeting with us to review the plan, talk about all his concerns and how we could best address his concerns.

Also, we had meetings with Fish and game. We've met with SELT and want to thank them for their time and all their positive impact, or you know, and informed information that's helped us improve the plan and make our make the project move forward.

R. Allard asked about the number of units starting with the Yield plan and you heard a few comments on the yield plan. But I think also if I look at this, umm, the conventional yield plan, we have lot shape requirements that I think some of the like these lots violate we need a 3 to one ratio you can't go off that and some of those clearly have that problem.

Mr. Rasor asked R. Allard if he could have those marked up and forwarded to me.

R. Allard explained that the regulations are there, and they should make sure that the yield plan conforms are those is what I'm saying and normally when we look at your plan, we like to see make sure the building can be cited and then you also need to make sure you meet the driveway regulations with 10% slope.

All these lots right here with the buffer in the back, very steep slopes right there. R. Allard explained that he looked at those lots and I don't think they're developable because I don't think you can get the driveways in there. It made the 10% maximum slope with the 2% negative, and I see that kind of situation with a lot of these.

R. Allard explained that normally when we get a yield plan, there's a there's a lot, there's a house building envelope on it shows me to set back and that kind of stuff.

But in this case, we have such steep slopes, make sure you can driveway can make it because I look at these and I see a lot of loss. R. Allard explained that if they presented this plan as a conventional subdivision plan, I think there's no way we would approve it. R. Allard explained that he felt that this was presented it's not cost effective.

R. Allard explained that he mentioned before know you're five bridges and the bridge on Green Hill was over \$2,000,000. R. Allard explained that he didn't think they would present a conventional subdivision that had five bridges going over brooks. R. Allard explained that the plan that was presented you've heard other things with you know you need to have 60,000 s.f. of free of soils 35, 000 s.f. of upland and then you have wetlands delineation.

Mr. Rasor stated that at the last meeting he requested it would be helpful for them to be on the same page if the Board could provide them with a previous yield study that the Board thought was sufficient that way there meeting the expectations as they move forward.

D. Massucci explained that there are two things that she was concerned about, one was the impact on the environment, this was important. D. Massucci explained that you can bring all those houses in with the children and families in most Towns worry about children that are five years old to age 18. D. Massucci explained that there was a large population that are from six weeks to five years old that need housing they need a place to go. We don't have the teachers, so these are things that I'd like you to present in some way with a view of what your expectations of this town would be for that.

Mr. Rasor asked D. Massucci if she was saying that there was going to be a school impact fee.

D. Massucci stated that she was speaking for families that she deals with daily that don't have childcare or a place to go and in public community like the police department. D. Massucci explained that she wanted to know these big projects come in, what their intent is not to build and run and leave us with a mess. So, I think if we ask people, we ask contractors to come in, if you want to build, give us reason and support, don't just build a leave.

J. Cappiello explained that you asked about its prior subdivisions she explained that it's very common that we've required stormwater and drainage analysis, environmental traffic, hydrogeological wildlife, and this one would require regional.

Mr. Rasor asked as part of the subdivision plan.

B. Tessier expressed that he would reiterate what R. Allard said, which was looking at the initial plan it looks like a dream. B. Tessier explained that they need to take the time to get the wetland delineation, the slopes and all of that done to truly see what kind of numbers were talking about.

J. Driscoll explained that he had some comments:

Coot Farm this proposal is the largest ever presented in the town in one of the most sensitive areas in the town.

Probably will require a DRI development of regional impact affecting Strafford, Northwood in Nottingham.

The closest groceries, pharmacies, gas bank and pizza you must go to Northwood. If you want to go to Lee Circle, go to Nottingham.

Strafford's Bow Lake in Route 202 A which came in Canaan Back Road in Stratford leads to get to the Rochester area, which has major retail.

Also, New Hampshire DOT will have a lot to say about the intersection with Route 9/202 and is this has been mentioned major rebuild on that.

There have been similar situations where they would require a traffic light too.

You, of course, would do the traffic light.

If its traffic signal is warranted.

Your proposal is going to increase the traffic by 1000%.

It's about 17 houses now and you can we haven't done a traffic impact study yet.

It's 3500 linear feet, I would say 674:21 subsection Roman numeral 5, (J).

The Town may seek offsite improvements, called exactions, to improve the road.

Mr. Rasor asked for Route 9 or Canaan Back Road.

J. Driscoll continued:

J. Driscoll explained for Canaan Back Road.

Well, you have the 3500 square foot front frontage on that square foot linear frontage.



Also, even on Old Settlers Rd, it's about a 300% increase in traffic you're talking about from the dead-end side across Bruce Brooke. So that has a major impact on that road too.

You're proposing 14 units in through 5 units currently houses, so you it's a great increase in the impact on that road in the planning to build a bridge that there in the towns cost is about \$220,000. So, there might be some questions assisted with that too.

Mr. Rasor asked if he said building a new bridge there?

J. Driscoll explained in 2025 they're going to put a bridge in.

J. Cappiello explained replacing the bridge.

Well, there's no bridge now. (from the audience)

J. Driscoll explained that there's a culvert that has been washed out three times.

The nature of the area of the town's cooccurrence map shows that seven areas are greatly worthy of greater protection.

In this one is rated number one.

That's the map I gave you.

so, it has two prime wetlands, which has been mentioned in there are buffers involved?

But under 9.5 (2) of the zoning board could increase the buffer.

There's a criteria if you look that up in the zoning, if certain situations exist, which they may do in this situation, we could increase the buffer.

It's currently 100 feet be up to the board what they wanted to increase that too at your discretion. Yeah.

Yeah, there is discretion.

OK.

Also, curiously, if you look at the strategy stratified drift aquifer overlay map on the town map and the book it's page 97, if anybody can look that up online, uh is an isolated part of that drift off overlay in this area.

So that's another issue.

Things to look out the yield plan the has been discussed.

All yield plans must be feasible and realistic; you can't just take a topic map of great variant topography.

Put it on a flat piece of paper and then drop 180 houses on top of it.

Whatever you have them or is, it must be realistic, like Tom does require that the roads cannot exceed 7% grade.

You've got a lot of roads on your yield plan in as mentioned by R. Allard on, driveways cannot be exceeded 10%, particularly on the steep slopes.

Due to the types of soils in this area also that presents that kind of segways into the steep slopes, there are 15 to 25% slopes, 8 to 25% slopes and eight to 15% slopes on this yield plan.

The plan is to show that all the roads cannot exceed 7% and 10% for the driveways.

You must show the contiguous uplands that R. Allard had mentioned and should also show the five stream crossings that have been mentioned.

You under are in the Subdivision Regulations 5.3.2 (7).

You really must show how you would do the crossings.

Is it feasible and was engineering acceptable?

Mr. Rasor asked for the yield plan was the Board requesting an engineered plan or a concept plan?

J. Driscoll explained that the Board was expecting what they would receive from other developers.

Mr. Rasor asked if it needs to be a fully engineered plan ready to be permitted.

J. Driscoll explained that was correct and that would prove that it's feasible and realistic.

Mr. Rasor explained that the ordinance calls for a concept plan not an engineered plan he would like clarification.

R. Allard explained that the concept plan requires more study, it doesn't seem reasonable.

Mr. Rasor explained that the ordinance calls for a concept plan and the Board said that they need a fully engineered plan not a concept plan. Mr. Rasor asked if they could see this in writing directed towards.

J. Driscoll asked how they could prove the roads can't exceed 7% how could they prove that without engineering plans. J. Driscoll explained that they have a lot of work to do.

Mr. Rasor explained that they need clarification before moving forward.

R. Allard explained that the building envelopes should be included on the plan.

Mr. Rasor explained that they understand that the yield plan needs to be revised.

J. Driscoll explained the number of units determined on the yield plan does not excess to any area.

J. Driscoll explained that if the Board approves the yield plan does not mean that they approve any roads or access to a particular site. J. Driscoll explained that we only get a count of the number of units that can be used on the subdivision plan.

Mr. Rasor explained that they are not looking to build the yield plan.

J. Driscoll explained that if they go to the Subdivision Regulations Article 7, there are pages for traffic study, traffic impact and environmental assessments with other studies.

Mr. Rasor asked at what point in the process are those formally required?

V. Price explained that when they receive a formal application it's not necessarily due at that time but if you knew ahead of time the Board probably would ask for that this would be part of going through the application process.

J. Driscoll explained that they probably saw the comments from the police and fire about reaching that back portion over the area between the two prime wetlands.

Mr. Rasor explained that he had a meeting with them.

J. Driscoll explained that there are two 100' buffers there currently and when you get to the subdivision plan part of the determination would be if that area is accessible. J. Driscoll explained another concern was that there was only one point of egress into the 48 units of housing.

Mr. Rasor explained that was why they changed the current design to reflect the Fire Chiefs comment he did not like the original design and there would be two roads.

J. Cappiello asked him to point it out on the plan. J. Cappiello asked if they go further north where does that end up.

Mr. Rasor explained when he met with the Fire Chief, they didn't have this road here originally, but the Fire Chief said they needed that second row and straight full loop here starting point here originally had one road and the per his request we added in the second road. Mr. Rasor explained that when they first met with the Fire Chief, we only had one model back and requested this second.

J. Cappiello asked if they would have more housing up there but that's a single road.

Mr. Rasor explained that this was just a preliminary.

J. Cappiello explained that it still looks like 48 lots are one way.

Mr. Rasor explained that they changed the design to address the Fire Chiefs' access concerns and that's why they changed the design specifically to be just concerns.

J. Driscoll asked if there were two roads.

Mr. Rasor explained that they added the second road.

J. Cappiello said that it's still one for the 48 lots.

Mr. Rasor explained that was correct.

J. Cappiello explained that it looked like to her if there was a washout on that road that's one of their concerns so that's one of their concerns that they can't get emergency equipment in there.

J. Cappiello explained that would be an issue with the 48 lots.

Mr. Rasor explained that he wanted to clarify again that was an initial preliminary with the Fire Chief to review our concept and was not a final approval.

R. Allard explained that there's wetlands crossing.

Mr. Rasor explained that you are allowed at that end road line, and you're allowed to do that.

R. Allard explained that you're talking about 48 units in the back.

Mr. Rasor explained that they would only do what the ordinance allows and that they were told this meets the ordinance.

R. Allard explained that under scattered premature access and emergency vehicles, one of the one of the factors of scattered in premature statute.

Mr. Rasor explained that they talked about the required amount of fire water towers in the back and how many we must spread out back in there.

R. Allard explained it's emergency vehicles for health if you have a if you have a medical emergency, as the doctor indicates you must get back there, you know, time matters.

J. Driscoll explained that the culvert was washout out on Old Settlers Road and isolated five houses who knows what the future would bring to these wetlands. J. Driscoll explained that the yield plan would take a while to do. J. Driscoll explained that the 7 units would also have an impact on the wetlands and for the 14 units community water and septic probably a 30,000-gallon cistern. J. Driscoll explained that a cistern only supplies 1,000 drive able feet in any development along with buffer issues. J. Driscoll suggested looking at Article 7 for what was needed.

Mr. Rasor explained that SELT gave comment, and they removed the homes in that area to free up that corridor. Mr. Rasor asked about the concern of the about the access to the back.

J. Driscoll explained that the map shows one road going into the back area and the Fire Department and Police have a problem with that.

Mr. Rasor explained that they haven't seen anything in writing from them or comments.

J. Driscoll explained that was in the staff report that was emailed to you.

J. Driscoll opened public comment again.

Dan Ayer from 334 Old Concord Turnpike explained this was a design review nothing binding and in March there would be an election so refer to plan in process because it could change in the future.

V. Price explained to the Board that those in the audience when someone comes in for a design review and there's pending zoning amendments. Those folks that are coming in that had applied before the notice to the public hearing for the zoning amendments went out have one year from tonight to submit a formal application with the current regulations as they are today.

**Colin Williams from 94 Old Settlers Road.** Colin explained to the Board that on the map there are some flood control points because the wetlands and the flow of the water need to be taken into consideration.

J. Driscoll closed public comment.

*A motion was made by J. Driscoll and seconded by R. Allard to close the Design Review for the Coot Farm. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

## B. NEW APPLICATIONS

- 1) [265-1-1A-RC-24-SR \(Owner: Martin & Jacquelyn Burby\)](#) Request by applicant for a Minor Site Plan Review to add a use for packaging and delivery services with a waiver at 1203 Calef Highway (Map 265-1-1A) on a 2.59-acre lot in the Regional Commercial Zoning District.

J. Driscoll gave a brief description of the application.

Martin & Jacquelyn Burby owners explained to the Board that are applying for a change of use. Martin explained that what they would like to do was change of use at 1203B which use to be for small scale roasting and grinding of coffee. Martin explained that currently the coffee that they are making there would be the coffee that they mail order. Martin explained that they have partnered up with Bernie Kozar quarterback from Cleveland Browns his coffee was all mail order. Martin gave the background of their coffee that Doctor Glenn miller from UNH has a patent and he's able to extract a heart healthy antioxidant call resveratrol along infused with vitamin D3. Martin explained that they would have a maximum of 8 people with the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm five days a week.

R. Allard questioned the plan supplied has proposed building on it.

Jacquelyn explained that she looked at the plan with Vanessa and Everett Davis had no updated plans.

R. Allard explained that the 2 plans and structures don't match.

Jacquelyn explained that the smaller plan to the right.

R. Allard explained that the building shape doesn't match.

Jacquelyn explained the location on the building on the plan and showed the parking area.

V. Price showed R. Allard the recorded plan. V. Price explained that the plan shows the parking area. V. Price explained that they are asking for a waiver for the site plan.

The Board had a brief discussion about the plan with the applicant.

Martin explained that they are doing the overflow, but they are checking with another roasting company out of Ohio that does 3 to 5 million roasting a year. Martin explained that was more for the mail orders.

*A motion was made by J. Driscoll and seconded by B. Tessier to accept the application as complete. Vote 4/1*  
Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Nay

J. Driscoll-Yay

J. Driscoll opened public comment.

Dan Ayer from 334 Old Concord Turnpike wanted to thank the Board for small businesses so working with them hopefully would draw more people in Town.

## NOTICE OF DECISION

J.  
Driscoll  
closed  
public

comment.

### Requested Waiver:

**The requirement to have all site plans prepared and stamped by a professional engineer. Boundary monuments shall be certified by a licensed surveyor per Section 3.1.1 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.**

*A motion was made by J. Driscoll and seconded by D. Massucci to grant the waiver from Site Plan Regulations per Section 3.1.1 for 1203B Calef Highway 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.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Nay

J. Driscoll-Yay

V. Price read Notice of Decision:

Date of Application: January 16, 2024

Date Decision Issued: February 6, 2024

Case File #: 265-1-1A-RC-24-SR

<i>[Office use only]</i>	<i>Date certified:</i>	<i>As builts 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>			
RE: Request by applicant for a Minor Site Plan Review to add a use for packaging and delivery services with a waiver at 1203 Calef Highway (Map 265-1-1A) on a 2.59-acre lot in the Regional Commercial Zoning District.			
<b>Owner/Applicant:</b> Martin & Jacquelyn Burby 8 Roberts Rd. Dover, NH 03820			

### Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its February 6, 2024, meeting **APPROVED** your application referenced above. The approval for an added use to the property for packaging and delivery services at 1203 Calef Highway Unit 2.

Reviewed in accordance with the Town of Barrington, Site Plan Review Regulations For Nonresidential Uses and Multi-Family Dwelling Units, amended May 17, 2022, and the Barrington Zoning Ordinance, amended March 28, 2023. The application has met all the Town's Ordinances and Regulations of the Town of Barrington.

At the February 6, 2024, Planning Board Meeting, the Board approved waiver:

- i.) The requirement to have all site plans shall be prepared and stamped by a professional engineer. Boundary monuments shall be certified by a licensed surveyor per Section 3.1.1 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.

The hours of operation are Monday – Friday 7:00am – 7:00pm; and not to exceed eight employees.

Any changes to the site used for the operation of the business will require reapplication and review by the Planning Board.

I wish you the best of luck with your project. If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Price, Town Planner

cc: File

*A motion was made by J. Cappiello and seconded by D. Massucci to approve the Site Review for 1203 Calef Highway. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

**2) 108-1-GR/HCO-24-3Lots (Owner: Carolyn Bedford Revoc Trustee Hilary Parkhurst)**

Request by applicant for a Minor Subdivision for a 3-Lot subdivision at 497 Washington Street (Map 108, Lot 1) on a 35.6+/- acres in the General Residential/Highway Commercial (GR/HCO) Zoning District. BY: Chad Branon, PE, Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC.; 206 Elm Street, Milford, NH 03055.

J. Driscoll gave a brief description of the application.

Chris Winiarski attorney for Hilary Bedford Parkhurst and Dan Borowski from Fieldstone Land Consultants, LLC works with Chad Branon. Chris explained that the property was located at 497

Washington Street that was Ayers Lake Farm and the campground. Chris explained that they are looking to make a paper change which would be divided into three lots.

Chris explained that the 3 lots would be as follows:

Campground lot that would be 12.8 acres

Farmhouse lot that would be 2.5 acres



V. Price explained that a representative from Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC was the only one that had permission per the applicant's letter on file. V. Price explained that it's not on file that Chris can speak for the applicant.

Chris asked even if he was Hilary's attorney?

V. Price explained that would be up to the Board.

J. Driscoll explained that the attorney can speak during public comments.

Dan Borowski explained that he was representing Hilary Bedford Parkhurst for 497 Washington Street. Dan explained to the board that the site was currently 35.6 acres located General Residential/Highway Commercial Overlay with the minimum lot size was 80,000 s.f. with 60,000/ 35,000 the footage of 200 s.f. was required and setbacks are 40 from front and 30 sides

And rear 50' buffer from the wetlands. Dan explained that was for a 3-lot subdivision they are proposing separating the three existing areas on the lot.

Lot 1-13 acres for the campground

Lot 2- 2.5 acres for the Farmhouse

Lot 3-20 acres of the remaining acreage for the cabins on the east side.

Dan explained that all three lots meet the minimum lot size and all three lots have access from their frontage along Washington Street.

J. Cappiello asked about a resident on the lake that wanted to know if the septic systems were were all in accordance for the cabins.

Justin Purpora explained that they have received construction approval number for existing leach field.

J. Cappiello asked if it was one leach field for all the cabins.

B. Tessier said they have construction approval did you receive operation approval?

Justin Purpora explained that the mist of receiving it.

J. Driscoll said there was a comment that the cabins would be rented for a while.

Dan explained that was correct with no change in that.

R. Allard asked about the access from Route 202 was that a Zoning Board or was that Planning Board to get into the necessary.

V. Price explained that she was in contact with Chad (at Fieldstone) because it was the primary contact for this application. V. Price explained that she asked him for that lot where the house was there were 2 access points, one off 202 and the other one off the campground. V. Price explained that the applicant or you need to confirm which was their frontage because she wasn't given a clear answer. V. Price explained that they need to properly identify which was their frontage. V. Price explained that if their frontage was not going to be off 202, they have 2 access points that doesn't really matter it should be what their frontage was. V. Price explained that if their frontage was off 202, they do not need ZBA approval. V. Price explained that if their frontage was off the access that she showed on the plan.

Dan explained that all the access would be off 202.

R. Allard explained that they need to define the frontage.

V. Price explained that should be labeled on the final plan.

R. Allard asked what the class of that road was.

V. Price explained that she thought that was a driveway cut and they are making a new existing lot, so they need to adhere to the regulations for that of driveway regulations.

J. Driscoll read that the Road Agent had no concern the State might get involved with these other than one was dirt.

R. Allard explained that they have standards for road access and driveway access that if you're subdivided, they are going to be a certain width and then shoulder to upper shoulders with 16' width.

Dan explained that they are just making a driveway, they are not creating a road for the subdivision.

R. Allard explained that they need the minimum width with 2-foot shoulders.

Dan explained that if they need to upgrade to driveway standards and could that be a condition of approval. Dan explained that they would be keeping the same access point.

J. Driscoll explained that would be a condition of approval.

V. Price explained that the Board said residential driveway should have a minimum width of 10 feet and a maximum of 18 feet. V. Price explained that all unpaved residential driveways must include paved aprons for minimum distance of 16 feet from the edge of the road to pave way with grade not to exceed 10% or maintain a negative grade of less than 2% till it's beyond the ditch lines.

Dan measured 15'.

J. Driscoll explained that they are well within the boundaries.

*A motion was made by B. Tessier and seconded by J. Driscoll to accept the application as complete for 497 Washington Street as complete. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Cappiello-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

R. Allard-yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

J. Driscoll opened public comment.

Dan Ayer explained that the driveway was a NHDOT requirement and thought that there was one access point unless it was a corner lot.

V. Price explained that the determined that their access was going to be off 202 and its not going to be off the other side. No comments or concerns from the fire department.

Chris Winiarski is the attorney for Hilary Bedford Parkhurst, not a resident of Barrington. Chris explained that there was no NHDOT permit required for an existing driveway. Chris explained that the house was there before the road was there.

V. Price explained that they are creating a new lot.

J. Driscoll suggested contacting District 6.

Chris explained that there are no new roadways being proposed.

J. Driscoll closed public comment.

J. Driscoll read the Notice of Decision:

#### NOTICE OF DECISION

<i>[Office use only]</i>	<i>Date certified:</i>	<i>As builts 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>			
<b>Re: Request by applicant for a Minor Subdivision for a 3-Lot subdivision at 497 Washington Street (Map 108, Lot 1) on a 35.6+/- acres in the General Residential/Highway Commercial (GR/HCO) Zoning District.</b>			
<b>Owner:</b> BEDFORD CAROLYN REV TR 1990 C/O HILARY B PARKHURST 4 Pilot Rock Ln Riverside, CT 06878 <b>Applicant:</b> Chad Branon, PE Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC. 206 Elm Street, Milford, NH 03055			

#### Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its February 6, 2024, meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

The application has met all the Town's Ordinances and Regulations in accordance with the Town of Barrington, New Hampshire Subdivision Regulations, amended August 1, 2023, and the Barrington Zoning Ordinance, amended March 28, 2023.

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 12 calendar months to the day, February 6, 2025, the Board's 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 the total number of 46 campsites to the purpose of the plan.
- b) Note identifying which plans are to be recorded and which are on on file with the town:  
Update note 12: This plan shall be on file with the Town of Barrington Land Use Department and recorded at the S.C.R.D.

#2) Add the following to the Plan:

- a) Label the maintenance shed/pumphouse on proposed lot 108-1-2.
- b) Remove notation of dry for the contiguous lands and specify soil type for each proposed lot.
- c) Proposed lot 108-1: label the frontage access on the subdivision plan showing the driveway.
- d) Zoning Districts on all properties.
- e) Owners' Signature.
- f) Wetland Scientist Signature.
- g) Professional Surveyor Signature.
- h) NHDOT Driveway Permit Numbers

#3) NHDOT requires five (5) driveway permits for this subdivision with a driveway arrangement that satisfies the NHDOT Driveway Policy. NHDOT records show that none of these have been permitted.

#4) All driveways to meet the Barrington Subdivision Regulations Figure 4A and 12.3 Driveway Access & Design Standards.

#5) All lots to take access from their frontage. Per Town of Barrington Zoning Ordinance Article 4 Table 2 Table of Dimensional Standards and Section 4.1.2.

#6) No Access off of campground road for house lot 108-1.

#7) Identify Island Site on the plan with site number(s).

#8) Lot #29 needs to be labeled on proposed lot 108-1-2.

#9) Final subdivision plan submittal, must have a clean copy (No topography) for recorded at the S.C.R.D. and a set of clean copy and a of topography plans for the case file.

#10) The Board shall require residential subdivision and lot line adjustment plans to be recorded with the Strafford County Registry of Deeds, once said plan is approved or approved with conditions. As provided for in RSA 676:4, I (g), the cost of said filing is considered an administrative expense and shall be borne by the applicant. The filing fee must be paid prior to recording.

- a. Exact recording fee & return shipping to be determined by the Strafford County Registry of Deeds.  
(Payments will need to be payable to The Strafford County Registry of Deeds.) Town staff will

provide the cost when plans are submitted for the Planning Board Chair.

b. LCHIP (\$25 Payable to The Strafford County Registry of Deeds.)

c.

- #11) Certificate of Monumentation Installation submitted to the Town. Proper and complete survey monumentation shall be installed on the properties as a condition to final approval of the application. The applicant's surveyor shall certify in writing that the bounds and pins have been installed according to the submitted plan.
- #12) At final submittal, all outstanding comments to applicant from Town Planner Subdivision regulations shall be addressed.
- #13) Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit two (2) full size paper copies of the subdivision plans, one (1) 11' x 17' copy and .pdf/a format file format with supporting documents as required with a letter explaining how the Applicant addressed the conditions of approval to the Land Use Office.

The Planning Board Chair shall sign and date all plans meeting the conditions of approval. The Board shall endorse two (2) full size paper copies of the subdivision plans for their records and one (1) 11' x 17' copy and .pdf/a format file format for the case file folder.

### **General and Subsequent Conditions**

- #1) The 46 campsite spots and 10 cabin sites are to remain. No increase in number.
- #2) Street view signage shall be 911 compliant and approved by the Town of Barrington.
- #3) E911 addressing for the three lots will have to be established.

(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,

*Vanessa Price*

Vanessa Price, Town Planner

CC: File

*A motion was made by J. Cappiello and seconded by D. Massucci to approve the 3-lot subdivision at 497 Washington Street as read by J. Driscoll. The motion passed unanimously.*

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay  
J. Cappiello-Yay  
B. Tessier-Yay  
R. Allard-yay  
J. Driscoll-Yay

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

## **7. ADJOURN**

A. Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. The next meeting date is a Work Session on February 20, 2024, at 6:30 PM.

*A motion was made by B. Tessier and seconded by D. Massucci to adjourn the February 6, 2024 at 8:59 p.m.*

**\*\* Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote. \*\***