



MEETING MINUTES

Town of Barrington Planning Board

Public Hearing

January 3, 2023, at 6:30p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Andy Knapp, Ron Allard, John Driscoll, Andy Melnikas, Bob Tessier, Joyce Cappiello

Remote Present: Donna Massucci

Members Absent: Buddy Hackett

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

3. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Review and approve minutes of the December 6, 2022, meeting minutes.

A motion was made by J. Driscoll and seconded by J. Cappiello to approve the minutes of December 6, 2022 with the corrections. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (Remote)

B. Review and approve minutes of the December 13, 2022, meeting minutes.

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by J. Cappiello to approve the minutes of December 13, 2022 with the corrections. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay
A. Knapp-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay (Remote)

4. STAFF UPDATES -TOWN PLANNER

A. Working in coordination with Conservation Commission for function-based wetlands buffer system.

V. Price explained to the Board that staff, some Conservation Commission members and Planning Board member J. Driscoll met on December 22, 2022, to discuss the function-based wetlands buffer system. V. Price explained that they are working with the consultant there was a discussion on the point system to try to make the buffer larger. This may prove to be more hindrance on the zoning enforcement officer. V. Price explained that there are certain criteria to meet based on a point system.

J. Driscoll explained that the consultant present at the meeting, explained that some of these are two to four thousand dollars to do the wetland evaluations.

R. Allard expressed that the original discussion was making it more objective not expanding the zone and now talking about expanding the zone.

J. Driscoll explained that it depends on the various functions of the wetland and the buffer as they might have certain functions that are greater than other functions, then the point system is used. J. Driscoll explained that a lot of them would fall into the 50' buffer, that we already have, but if a special circumstance where it had wildlife impact could be up to 75' to 100'. J. Driscoll explained to the Board that it would require a soil scientist to evaluate every application.

J. Cappiello asked if Plaistow has a soil scientist on every application.

J. Driscoll expressed no for Kingston.

R. Allard expressed that he didn't know of many examples where the 50' hasn't been appropriate. R. Allard explained that he didn't know of any complaints where that was too little of an amount of a buffer.

J. Driscoll explained that the problem becomes that somebody has to pay somebody to evaluate. The landowner would be responsible for it an an estimated cost of two to four thousand dollar cost.

R. Allard expressed that he was hearing 175' too.

J. Driscoll explained that it would be 75' to 100'.

R. Allard asked who would make the termination when that would apply.

J. Driscoll explained that would be the soil scientist.

B. Tessier explained that he was more open to if you had a wetland and you wanted to hire a soil scientist you could opt for that.

J. Driscoll explained to the Board that they didn't come to any conclusions, and they would all think about it meeting ended. J. Driscoll explained that this would be very cost prohibitive to somebody. R. Allard explained that he has not heard of any complaints that 50' wasn't enough.

J. Driscoll explained that the Soil Scientist, Mark Jacobs, explained that it was a little more that 50' maybe 75'. J. Driscoll explained that would depend on what the setback of the function would be in relation to the wetland itself.

R. Allard explained that the State was 50' and we are 75'.

J. Cappiello expressed that she thought from a previously discussion that it would help the Board when they were thinking about giving exemptions to people to how valuable the wetland was.

J. Driscoll explained then you would need to have a soil scientist tell you the value of it.

R. Allard explained that going down to 50' but didn't agree with going to 75' or 100'. Trying to solve a problem that they don't have.

V. Price explained that the Conservation Commission was talking about the functionally of a wetland and was concerned that 50' may not enough in some instances.

R. Allard expressed that there's not one single example and asked to show an example.

J. Driscoll explained that besides Kingston he was not sure if anybody else did this in the State. J. Driscoll explained that the Conservation Commission had their point of view.

A. Knapp explained that if somebody came in requesting a wetland buffer exemption from or they're looking for a waiver from the 9.6 Permit that becomes their avenue to create their justification for a hardship. A. Knapp explained that the hardship was that the rules are overly stringent for the value of the wetland buffer.

J. Driscoll explained if they had a buffer of the configuration of the land that already was 100' at the top of this system they wouldn't have too about it. J. Driscoll explained that once you get into lessening the buffer, that it would depend on how the regulations are written that would require them to get professional help or send to CMA Engineers. J. Driscoll explained to the Board that it was just a preliminary decision.

5. FIRST PUBLIC HEARING FOR PROPOSED 2023 ZONING AMENDMENTS

Pursuant to NH RSA 674:16; 675:3 and 675:7 notice is hereby given of a public hearing to be held by the Town of Barrington Planning Board for the purpose of discussing proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Article 2 Zoning

Are you in favor of Amendment #1 to the Barrington Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board to amend the Zoning Map by changing Tax Map 251, Lots 64 & 65 from General Residential (GR) to Regional Commercial (RC)?

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Joel Runnals from 61 Weeks Lane asked why this would be proposed it's the purpose of it and the what's the benefit sounds like spot zoning.

J. Driscoll explained that they are 2 lots that on Route 125 that are zoned for commercial, and the owner thought that they were in the commercial zone.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

This amendment is recommended for approval by the Planning Board: Vote 7/0

The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (Remote)

Article 3 Zoning

Are you in favor of Amendment #2 to the Barrington Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board to amend Section 7.3 regarding home occupations to clarify that home occupations must be conducted entirely within the structure of the single-family dwelling, to limit the 30% square footage maximum to 500 square feet, and to limit the number of non-resident employees to one?

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Christopher Berry from Berry Surveying and Engineering asked about the section that talks about single family dwelling. It's not uncommon in this Town or surrounding Towns for people to have out structures that they run small businesses out of, and this prohibits that. Chris asked if this was intentional or if additional language might be needed to clarify the intent not the use of the property a piece to allow for somebody to do that in the future. Chris explained that if the Board recognizes the fact that if somebody wants to do that in an outbuilding, they would seek a variance providing the fifth criteria for special conditions of the land to meet the hardship. Chris explained that whether or not the Board wants to place landowners of the Town of Barrington in that position.

J. Driscoll explained that Chris may want to look at amendment #3 because he was talking about a business not an occupation and they are two different things.

Chris asked what the fundamental condition difference between a home occupation was where somebody runs a business a home occupation.

J. Driscoll explained that a home occupation might be either an accountant or professional that has one or two people show up occasionally with not much impact on the neighborhood. J. Driscoll explained that the next amendment would be for a home business that allows accessory building on the property.

Chris explained that in the first example where you have a professional office it couldn't be conducted outside of the home.

J. Driscoll explained then that would go with the next category.

Chris asked if whether or not that would have actual fundamental additional impact on a neighborhood, he also asked whether or not a home occupation needs to come to the Planning Board or whether enforce by Zoning. Chris asked if home business needs to come before the Planning Board for Site Plan review was the difference whether the business was conducted inside the primary structure or inside a secondary structure.

J. Driscoll explained that the home occupation goes to the Zoning Administrator.

V. Price explained that for a home business they would need a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and go to the Planning Board.

Chris asked if someone was to run a business out of their garage instead of in the home they would need to come before the Planning Board for a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit. Chris explained that he questions whether or not the single-family dwelling was appropriate for the home occupation as well.

A. Knapp explained at that point they would be coming in as a home business not a home occupation.

A. Knapp explained that the home occupation would be within the home and the home business would be outside the house so they would need to come before the Planning Board.

R. Allard explained that if you are a home occupation you want to protection from the person next door for doing things they shouldn't be doing in a residential area. R. Allard explained that they would be giving approval that they can do in a residential area.

J. Cappiello asked that if under definitions should they be more information of what you need to do.

A. Knapp explained that it is already defined.

Joel Runnals from 61 Weeks Lane explained that he supported neighborhoods, and the home occupation was exactly what he said the Board tried years ago and the Board had it like it should be not knowing that a business was there.

A. Knapp closed open comment.

This amendment is recommended for approval by the Planning Board: Vote 7/0

The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (Remote)

Article 4 Zoning

Are you in favor of Amendment #3 to the Barrington Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board to amend Section 7.4(7) regarding home businesses to clarify that the entire home business, including storage, is limited to an accessory or primary dwelling structure or an outside area which is

adequately screened, and to reduce the amount of area the home business may occupy from 4,500 square feet to 2,000 square feet or 10% of the lot, whichever is less?

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Joel Runnals from 61 Weeks Lane stated he agreed with this because he lives in a Neighborhood, and he wants it to look like a residential neighborhood. Joel explained that he doesn't want it to look like he lives on Route 125.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

This amendment is recommended for approval by the Planning Board- Vote 7/0

The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

Article 5 Zoning

Are you in favor of Amendment #4 to the Barrington Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board to amend the Zoning Map by changing Tax Map 234, Lots 57, 57.1, 57.2, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 77, and 79 from the Town Center (TC) to Village (V)?

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Joel Runnals from 61 Weeks Lane explained that he was on the Board when they did the rezoning, consultants had identified the locations before the Board did anything. Joel explained that the different areas in Town available for resources were in this area and was specifically singled out that it should be areas that were identified for clustered development. Joel explained that this was preserved with conservation land and open space design, and development would feed down into the Town Center. It didn't become that. Joel explained that a lot of his clients in this location came back before the Planning Board and expressed that they couldn't do anything here and the regulations are requiring them to put boulevards in to have single residential houses. Joel explained that this was out of proportion for the Town of Barrington and expressed that he also supported this amendment as well.

Ray Bisson from 338 Hall Road asked what the purpose of this was and why was 1.1 being left out.

A. Knapp explained that the original intent was that most of these were already developed and abuts Oak Hill Road the back section. A. Knapp explained that this aligns much more with the current neighborhood feel of a Village District than it doesn't it does a Town Center District. A. Knapp explained that there was no further way to develop these as a productive Town Center.

J. Driscoll explained that six of the parcels along Oak Hill contained single-family homes small lots.

Ray Bisson from 338 Hall Road asked what the purpose was of 1.1. being held out. Ray asked if the owners approached them, and they agreed or was this something that the Planning Board just pushing forward.

J. Driscoll explained that this was voted on and voted down in 2018.

R. Allard explained that John Huckins talked to most of the landowners.

J. Driscoll asked about Map 239, Lot 77 if this passed can the owner put just family homes in without the commercial.

V. Price explained that he has already received approval for this project.

A. Knapp explained that he could always come back to the Board and withdraw.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

This amendment is recommended for approval by the Planning Board: Vote 7/0

The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

Article 6 Zoning

Are you in favor of Amendment #5 to the Barrington Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board to amend Article 18 Definitions for Attached Building: A building having any portion of one (1) or more walls in common with adjoining buildings. connected by a common roof?

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Ray Bisson from 338 Hall Road asked just for clarification for the definition common roof that the roof line must be continuous across.

J. Driscoll explained that it must be a roof connection.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

This amendment is recommended for approval by the Planning Board: Vote 7/0

The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

Article 7 Zoning

Are you in favor of Amendment #6 to the Barrington Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board to amend Section 20.8.4 regarding temporary signs to increase the allowance for additional temporary signs from 30 to 60 days prior to an election in all zoning districts, provided they comply with the requirements of the ordinance?

B. Tessier stated 30 days was fine.

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Joel Runnals from 61 Weeks Lane expressed that he felt 30 days was fine.

J. Cappiello expressed that 30 days would be hard to control especially presidential elections and candidates are putting the signs out.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

This amendment is recommended for approval by the Planning Board: Vote 6/1

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Nay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

Article 8 Zoning

Are you in favor of Amendment #7 to the Barrington Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board to increase the required lot size in the General Residential (GR), Neighborhood Residential (NR), and Village (V) (residential) Districts from 80,000 square feet to 120,000 square feet and to increase the required amount of frontage in the GR, NR, and VD residential districts from 200 feet to 250 feet?

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Joel Runnals from 61 Weeks Lane asked the Board why they are trying to do this the lot size has been 80,000 square feet for a long time and seems to be working. Joel explained that he couldn't think of a reason to do this other than growth control.

A. Knapp explained that a lot of people have come in complaining or voicing their opinion that Barrington was losing its rural character and as the Town continues to grow that was part of the issue.

A. Knapp explained if they look at how they address the growth aspect of it in the sense that you won't see as many lots put into the General Residential areas when you look at Conservation Subdivisions. He further commented that would stop some of the growth, and to make it feel more like a quaint area that Barrington has been for years as land gets swallowed up and down the Seacoast and anybody who's lived south of the border sees what the sprawl looks like.

Joel Runnals from 61 Weeks Lane explained that was certainly growth control, but it doesn't affect him at all. Joel addressed A. Knapp, that people that move here with the same zoning that's been here don't like

the 200' footage they moved here and that's what it looks now. It makes it different than what it looks like now by doing that.

J. Driscoll explained that another aspect was when the developer comes in with the yield plan and takes the measurements and puts in a conservation subdivision would reduce sprawl.

A. Knapp expressed that the whole intent of zoning which the Board talked about in these prior articles was to build out a downtown center. A. Knapp explained that then the general influx of residential commercial was in the downtown center. A. Knapp explained it was in the Town Center and in the Village District where you have the ability to put density. General Residential should be the area where it is to maintain rural character. This is to help establish and maintain rural character that everybody moves to Barrington for at some point.

Joel expressed that he agrees about the yield plan and why not change the yield plan instead. Joel suggested maybe having a percentage less than that. Joel expressed that it has been this way for a long time and felt that 80,000 s.f. was plenty big it's a nice-looking lot.

J. Driscoll explained that you can put a nice-looking house on two acres and have the extra acres preserved more with trees may not want all three acres.

Christopher Berry from Berry Surveying and Engineering addressed the Board and explained they have a lot of family land in Barrington.

Chris explained there are three topics:

1. Understand the purpose, the comments, specifically the three professionals present, have been speaking the most here are hired by residents of Barrington to do the best they can for them.
2. To create as much value for them as possible some has to do with family inheritance and other economic factors not necessarily related to developers outside the Town of Barrington.

He hoped that the Board recognize that essentially reducing each individual landowner's value by nearly 50% by doing this by taking this one action. Each lot size would be increased by 50% and taking frontage requiring 25% multiplier from that as well. This would be a huge impact on people's land and value.

Chris explained larger developments, larger subdivisions and outside developers you keep pointing south for references to other ordinances and other Towns, municipalities some of the Towns do have larger lot sizes. Chris explained that residential homes have skyrocket because of these changes that they tried to institute to slow growth and throughout his career battling slow growth and affordable housing. Chris stated that they conflict with one another. Chris explained that if the Board was looking to develop Barrington better, there are better ways to do than this type of change. Chris explained that calculation-based conservation subdivisions instead of yield plan and conservation subdivisions was one minor example.

3. Chris wanted to know if this creates a conflict with the backlot subdivision or neck portion of the subdivision. Chris explained that this specifically talks about lots that have frontage between 200' and 250'. Chris expressed that the Board make want to make sure that this ordinance change doesn't then conflict with that ordinance forward.

A. Knapp asked Chris about taking value or adding value standpoint, the Board had a conversation there was that initial thought that it takes value away but the reality of it now looks at the size of the lot. A. Knapp explained that would make the lot more valuable in Barrington and creating value-add growth for people with the land that they already own. A. Knapp expressed as Chris pointed out that further south land value was significantly greater than Barrington.

Barbara Irvine from 1022 Franklin Pierce Highway expressed this was Barrington and felt that was all we needed to worry about.

A. Knapp stated you're right.

Barbara expressed to A. Knapp that she has worked in the Town Land Use for almost 20 years and that no one has come in and said I want bigger lots. Barbara explained that people do come in saying that they have 4 or 5 acres and say they need to subdivide, or they can't afford to stay here. Barbara expressed forget about the little people.

A. Knapp stated that was a tax problem.

Barbara stated no and that the people in Town are not being taking care of the people in Town. Barbara expressed to the Board that they need to start doing this instead of doing it for your own benefit.

A. Knapp explained that it benefits the people.

Barbara expressed that it doesn't benefit the people that has 4 acres and can't subdivide because the Planning Board changed the rule to three acres.

B. Tessier explained that he had a brief conversation with Code Enforcement John Huckins and one of the things the Board didn't do was look at the complete zoning package. B. Tessier expressed that this was going to have an impact on a lot more zoning ordinance that the Board hasn't considered and felt that before the Board does something like this needs to take a broader look at zoning along with what would be affected.

J. Cappiello expressed that was her thoughts when she got into the meeting was that it'll be helpful with some data from the master survey update next year. She stated that next year may be able to get more input from the residents she has heard mixed comments from people who live in Town.

J. Driscoll suggested holding off for another year.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

This amendment is NOT recommended for approval by the Planning Board Vote 1/6

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Nay

J. Driscoll-Nay

B. Tessier-Nay

A. Melnikas-Nay

R. Allard-Nay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Nay (online)

6. DISCUSSION WITH BOARD FOR A PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

A. Tyler and Katie Rand discussion with the Board for a Preliminary conceptual site plan on Ham Road.

A. Knapp gave a brief description of the preliminary conceptual site plan.

V. Price explained that Tyler and Katie Rand are back before the Board because the Board voted that the application was not complete. V. Price discussed the applicant had a discussion with staff and wanted to come back to the Board for a preliminary discussion, so they could be better prepared for the Board.

Tyler Rand from 132 Ham Road explained to the Board that he owns two lots. Tyler explained that one lot was his residence, and the other lot has only a barn on it. He was before the Board to talk about the property with barn. Tyler explained to the Board that the barn has a shared drive to their house and the needed a change of use to have a conference center out of the barn. Tyler explained that the barn was 200 years old and they have used it number of times for different functions. Tyler explained that he was looking at doing this for extra income and go about doing this the right way. Tyler explained that he was before the Board to be prepared with the right application and documents to submit to the Board with he right information.

Tyler explained to the Board that he has the following information to present to the Board when he applies:

1. 3.4 conditional Use Permit

2. Checklist (much of the checklist seem to not apply because the barn was existing)

3. Waivers

A. Melnikas discussed that almost everything was covered for every potentially event you could have. He explained that several of these events present a fire safety situation. A. Melnikas gave the example like birthdays parties, or anything with open flames in an older structure, even if renovated. A. Melnikas expressed that decorations are flammable inside this structure. A. Melnikas explained that from his perspective the occupancy isn't the big issue the open flame would be his concern.

Tyler explained that their primary events would be a wedding venue. That would be the biggest event and would like to open it up to have other events like the boy scouts. Tyler explained that as far as the fire safety he has been a fire fighter since he was 18. Tyler explained that he was a Barrington Fire Fighter and that he was working with Fire Chief Walker and that he does understand the fire safety. Tyler stated that he has had preliminary discussions with Chief Walker on the building and continue to work with him.

A. Melnikas explained to Tyler ask the Fire Chief was fire safety measures you should have.

Tyler explained that he would be working with the Fire Chief and explained that the Chief to him that he has been burned in the past where he wants Planning Board approval for a conference center because of different reasons.

J. Driscoll asked about a waiver because of the parking lot.

Tyler explained that he does not want a gravel parking lot he wants to keep the existing grass.

J. Driscoll expressed that this has been done in other situations.

Tyler explained to the Board that his driveway has two accesses and was shared with the barn. Tyler explained that he currently has a rock garden that would be removed allowing for a more perpendicular access and then his clients would have the driveway and come over to the parking lot.

R. Allard expressed that his concern was parking in a grass area having a wedding and people with heels and muddy dresses. R. Allard felt this was an undesirable situation and should be looking for a loading area close by that was paved.

J. Cappiello asked with the paved parking was there a space there to allow for drop-off.

Tyler explained that their current driveway existing now, and the entire side of his barn (it's currently paved). Tyler explained that when he has had elderly people there, they could drive up to the barn this was his handicap access for the barn. Tyler explained that about seven cars could easily fit there.

R. Allard explained that he was looking for an extended landing area for people along there and he didn't want cars backing up in the road. R. Allard suggested a waiver.

A. Knapp asked if they were adding some pedestrian doors to the barn.

Tyler explained the barn currently has three doors and the location of each. Tyler explained that he has two doors on the side that are going away in the process of redoing that side with another door. It is a personal door along with another door that would go to the workshop, it is not for emergency egress. Tyler explained that he would be working with the Fire Chief and if he thinks that there should be additional doors, he could do that.

A. Knapp asked if the existing manmade door an in swing or outswing?

Tyler stated that the door swings out.

A. Knapp explained that if there was 150 people in the barn and if a cool day the big doors are going to be dropped and needs to have two means of egress.

Tyler explained that the doors on the side are currently a swingout door, and he would be working on the fire codes that are part of the occupancy permit.

A. Knapp explained to Tyler that when people come in, they have a design plan that they show with the intention with everything laid out. A. Knapp explained that they usually bring in a full set of plans. A. Knapp expressed that he felt like this was going to be rented out pretty routine.

Tyler explained that they were looking at four wedding a year to help pay there taxes and that they were not looking to have a every weekend. Tyler explained that this was the existing barn and could modify as needed and come up with plans.

A. Knapp expressed that he doesn't want to be part of the approval that ends up with a massive fire event.

Tyler explained that was why he was before the Board to meet those challenges and get satisfactory answer on those.

V. Price asked the Board what she was hearing was that they want the applicant to get engineered plans.

R. Allard asked if this was conceptual.

V. Price explained that she was trying to get clarification because looking at previous cases that the Board has done. Staff is trying to help the applicant out the best we can. V. Price expressed to the Board that

they didn't have the Peach Farm have a survey plan. V. Price asked if the Board was looking for something more formal than just a plan.

Tyler explained that there would be no commercial kitchen or a bar venue and explained that he was before the Board for events.

J. Driscoll asked if most of the events were small?

Tyler explained that most of the events would be small and some live performances.

A. Melnikas asked what was meant by live performances.

Tyler explained a band.

A. Melnikas expressed that his question about having a band was no fireworks. He would like something more concrete on what the Fire Chief was looking for.

Tyler explained that he would do a walk through with the Fire Chief and the was not worried about sprinklers.

J. Driscoll explained that the Peach Farm had portable lighting.

A. Knapp explained that with the chairs and tables included what the uses are for each classification this would be what the occupancy load would be.

Tyler expressed that this was not part of the Peach Farm they only had one sheet.

J. Driscoll expressed looking at the Peach Farm comments.

R. Allard explained that the lighting plan needs to show parking show on the building.

D. Massucci asked if there would be water in the building?

Tyler explained that there would be water into the addition. The barn is not insulated.

D. Massucci asked Tyler to clarify the addition.

Tyler explained that the barn was 55' x 38' existing structure was 225 years old. Tyler explained that they have an application before the Zoning Board of Adjustment for mixed use on the north side of building that was 53' x 30' with 2 bathrooms and a workshop with a single bedroom apartment.

D. Massucci asked about trash removal and if the person bringing in all supplies in there self and taking away. She also asked if no cooking on the premises.

Tyler explained that there was a dumpster there that will stay and no cooking.

A. Melnikas asked where this was going for mixed use does that affect the need for sprinklers.

Tyler expressed that he didn't think so but that would be for the Fire Chief to answer.

V. Price explained that if for some reason he doesn't get the mixed use he can still ask approval for the conference center.

Tyler asked because he was going to the Zoning Board for mixed use and the Planning Board permission to have a conference center was there one that has to come before the other.

A. Knapp explained that he thought that they would need the Zoning Board approval before you come back to the Planning Board so that you have your complete package.

Preliminary has been closed.

7. ACTION ITEMS-CONTINUED FROM December 6, 2022

- A. [110-19&20-GR-22-LL/9.6 \(Owners: Christine & Brett Astin\)](#) Request by applicant proposing a Lot Line Adjustment between (Map 110, Lots 19 & 20) Lots 19 & 20 on a 2.32 - acre lot and a 9.6 Special Permit at 43 Liberty Lane in the General Residential Zoning District. BY: Raymond A. Bisson, LLS; Stonewall Surveying; PO Box 458; Barrington, NH 03825.

A. Knapp gave a brief description of the application.

Ray Bisson from Stonewall Surveying explained that he was represented Christine and Brett Astin from 43 Liberty Lane. Ray explained that the Lot Line was already approved and they are back before the Board for the 9.6 Permit. Ray explained that the Board was concerned with the 15' reduction request from the buffer. Ray explained that J. Driscoll asked about a better location. He went to explain that the location encroaches into the side slope of the State Septic Design. It forces all the drainage from the driveway to be directed to the wetland. Ray explained that it increases the amount of impervious surface to 1,300 s.f. and still impacts the level of the buffer by 180 s.f. Ray explained that per code 9.5 (3) still would be away from the driveway. Ray explained that he did go and meet with his client for several other options and issues with the location. They came up with exhibit number one as shown on the plan. Ray explained that relocating the retaining wall along the leach field would be a huge expense for his client. Ray explained that the location that they are showing now was close to the retaining wall as they can get but still allows for a swale between the retainer wall and the garage. That would allow the water to be drained in both directions. Ray explained that this location doesn't impact the side slope of the leach field and reduces the amount of impervious surface and the amount of runoff. Ray explained that the impact to the buffer was 240 s.f. but total coverage was only 830 s.f., compared to the previous 1300 s.f.. Ray explained to the Board that this area was already disturbed the was crushed stone pad along with the gravel and grass around it. Ray explained that this location moves the garage wall to 43.9' from the wetlands and minimize the impact of the coverage runoff. Ray expressed that their opinion this is the best place for the proposed garage.

J. Driscoll stated that he would have to agree with this reducing the buffer impact.

R. Allard asked about the area that you're showing this run beside the garage; Why was that there?

Ray asked if it was the swale.

R. Allard explained that there was room for the man door in the center of the building and asked why they don't put the man door off to the side.

B. Tessier explained that 24' is standard. Garage doors are 9' not 8'. For 18' you have 4' for the door so you would be pushing the cars right to the side of the garage. B. Tessier explained that you wouldn't even be able to open the door. B. Tessier explained that anytime you are building a 24' wide garage that main door was on the side a lot of time that would have an out-swing door.

Ray read the criteria for a 9.6 Permit:

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

The proposed detached garage is an allowable use in the General Residential district.

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

My clients wish for the garage to be out of sight from the road. Because of the septic and well locations, they cannot place the garage near the existing house. They also do not want the garage placed randomly in the backyard requiring an extensive driveway. The proposed location reduces the impervious surfaces by keeping it close to the existing driveway and is being placed on an already disturbed location.

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

In order to keep access to the rear of the property and maintenance of the garage and retaining wall, the garage is being placed approximately eight feet from the retaining wall. This still maintains a setback of 35 feet from the wetlands, which is in-line with the State of New Hampshire setbacks and Barrington's sec. 9.5.1(1).

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

Per plan note #9, required erosion control measures will be used during construction to contain soil run off.

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

All activities will be constructed within the existing tree line and fenced in area. No additional trees are being planned to be cut. The disturbed soil around the garage will be replanted with grass.

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

This is a minimal project with the disturbed area being lawn and crushed stone. There is nothing planned to have an impact on the wetland or the existing vegetation

A. Knapp opened public comment.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Driscoll to approve the 9.6 Permit for 43 Liberty Lane Map 110, Lot 20. Vote 6/1

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Nay
A. Knapp-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay (online)

V. Price read the Conditions Precedent:

Date of Application: November 8, 2022

Date Decision Issued: January 3, 2023

Case File #: 110-19&20-GR-22-LL/9.6

NOTICE OF DECISION

<i>[Office use only]</i>	<i>Date certified:</i>	<i>As built(s) 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: 110-19&20-GR-22-LL/9.6: Request by applicant proposing a Lot Line Adjustment between (Map 110, Lots 19 & 20) Lots 19 & 20 on a 2.32 -acre lot and a 9.6 Special Permit at 43 Liberty Lane in the General Residential Zoning District.			
Owners: Christine & Brett Astin 43 Liberty Lane Barrington, NH 03825		Applicant: Stonewall Surveying PO Box 458 Barrington, NH 03825	

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its December 6, 2022, meeting **APPROVED** your application for the Lot Line adjustment.

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its January 3, 2023, 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 the precedent conditions are not met within 12 calendar months to the day, the January 3, 2024, Board's approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board.

Conditions Precedent

Add the following to the Final Plan:

- a) Owner Signature(s).
 - b) Wetland Scientist Signature.
 - c) Professional Surveyor Signature.
 - d) Legend to 9.6 site plan and survey.
 - e) Please add note: The 9.6 Special permit is approved for construction in wetland buffer for an impact size of 240 SF.
- 1) At final submittal, all comments to applicant for Site Plan Review, Subdivision regulations shall be addressed.
 - 2) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town.
 - 3) Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit two (2) full size paper copies of the site plans, one (1) 11' x 17' copy and .pdf/a format file format with supporting documents as required in Article 3 of the Barrington Site Plan Review Regulations, 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 site 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, 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) 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.

(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

Town Planner
cc: File

8. ACTION ITEMS – NEW APPLICATIONS

- A. [260-7&7-1-GR-22-LL/3Lots \(Owners: Linda Kohrs, Susan Johnson & Jesse Schraufnagel\)](#) Request by applicants proposing a Lot Line Adjustment between Map 260, Lot 7 for 91.94 acres to adjust Map 260, for a boundary line adjustment of 0.83 acres from Lot 7 to Lot 7-1 and subdivision of Lot 7 for Lot 7-1 to be 4.90 acres, Lot 7-2 to 3.62 acres and Lot 7-3 to 2.36 acres along with waivers on Merry Hill Road in the General Residential Zoning District. BY: Joel Runnals, LLS, Norway Plains Associates, Inc; PO Box 249; Rochester, NH 03866.

A. Knapp gave a brief description of the application.

Joel Runnals from Norway Plains Associates, Inc. represented Linda Kohrs, Susan Johnson, and Jesse Schraufnagel all located on Merry Hill Road. Joel discussed the application for the Lot Line Adjustment between 368 and 370 Merry Hill Road, also known as, Tax Map 260, Lots 7 and 7-1. Joel showed the Board plan SCRD 69-96 plan in 2003. Lot 7 is comprised of 80-acres of Conservation Easement Area and the area that was not included in the conservation easement was created part of this parcel.

Joel explained to the Board that he gave them a plan recorded at the SCRD 85-19 from 2006 where Lot 7-1 was created. Joel explained that Lot 7-1 is trying to get an area of land from Lot 7 so that the existing driveway would be entirely on their property. Joel explained that they are not proposing new development by this Lot Line Adjustment. Joel explained that Lot 7-1 was created by the approved subdivision in 2006 this was 4.017 acres with this Lot Line adjustment it's going it would be 4.90 acres. Joel explained that because they are increasing the lot area of Lot 7-1, we will not need NHDES approval.

Joel discussed that Lot 7 was currently comprised of 80 acres adjacent to the conservation easement and not included in the easement and that was shown on the SCRD 69-96 plan. Joel explained that Lot 7 has an existing dwelling with an address of 368 Merry Hill Road with a well, septic system and driveway. Joel explained that the new area of Lot 7 would be 5.13 acres and that's just of the areas not included easement area combined with the 80 acres in conservation with the total of 85.13 acres. Joel explained that the proposed Lot Lines are configured so that Lot 7 can also continue using the existing woods road to access the conservation easement area and size of Lot 7 that would not need NHDES approval because this lot would be over 5 acres. Joel explained that they have done two test pits near the existing leach field because the existing house, but no new development has been planned for this lot. Joel explained that proposed Lot 7-2 would be 3.62 acres with contiguous uplands of 150 s.f. The property line would be along the conservation easement. Joel explained that Lot 7.2 would be a backlot with 50' frontage on Merry Hill Road. Joel showed the neck area of 16 s.f. on the plan. Joel explained that the remaining area was well over 80,000 in size. Joel explained that because Lot 7.2 was less than five acres it would require NHDES subdivision approval they would get after approval from this project. Joel explained that as of part of NHDES requirements, we are showing test pits 5 and 6 and a 4,000-sf potential effluent disposal area and a possible well with a 75-foot protective radius. Joel explained that there was also a topographic plan that shows that information.

Joel explained that on Lot 7-3 we show test pits 1 and 2, a 4,000-sf potential effluent disposal area and a possible well with a 75-foot protective radius that will be used for NHDES approval. Joel explained only one wetland area exceeds the 3,000-sf area but all the wetlands will have a 50-foot buffer for NHDES for septic systems. Joel explained the next proposed Lot 7-3 is being created as a conventional subdivision with 224 feet of front on Merry Hill Road this lot would be 2.36 acres with contiguous uplands of 98,000

sf. The proposed lines would be along the conservation easement. Joel explained that Lot 7-3 and would also need NHDES approval because this was under 5 acres.

R. Allard asked if Lot 7-3 driveway was going to be from Merry Hill Road.

Joel stated yes.

A. Knapp asked Joel about Lot 7.2 if the lot size was 150,000 continuous upland, a asked to clarify if he didn't count the neck.

Joel explained that the neck was only 16,000 s.f.

A. Knapp asked if that wasn't calculated?

Joel explained that exceeds the Town requirements.

A. Knapp asked if the wetlands were 2,600'.

J. Driscoll asked about access to the conservation area.

Joel explained that he could not answer that he didn't know a lot about the particulars of the easement.

J. Driscoll explained that this was also in current use.

Joel explained that none of that was going to change.

A motion was made by B. Tessier and seconded by R. Allard to accept the application as complete for Map 260-7 & 7-1. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

Requested Waivers:

Applicant requested waivers to the Subdivision Regulations:

i) The requirement of existing site conditions of surveying property lines of the entire parcel in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(5) of the Subdivision Regulations.

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by J. Driscoll not granting the waiver Article 5, Section 5.3.1(5) 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. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay
B. Tessier-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
A. Knapp-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay (online)

ii) The requirement of existing site conditions showing existing grades in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(6) of the Subdivision Regulations.

A motion was made by B. Tessier and seconded by A. Melnikas not granting the waiver Article 5, Section 5.3.1(6) 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. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay
J. Driscoll-Yay
B. Tessier-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
A. Knapp-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay (online)

iii) The requirement of existing site conditions estimated location and use of all existing structures in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(8) of the Subdivision Regulations.

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by R. Allard not granting the waiver Article 5, Section 5.3.1(8) 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. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay
J. Driscoll-Yay
B. Tessier-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
A. Knapp-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay (online)

IV) The requirement of existing site conditions of natural features in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(9) of the Subdivision Regulations.

A motion was made by J. Cappiello and seconded by B. Tessier not granting the waiver Article 5, Section 5.3.1(9) 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. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay
J. Driscoll-Yay
B. Tessier-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay
A. Knapp-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay (online)

V) The requirement of existing site conditions of man-made features in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(10) of the Subdivision Regulations.

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by J. Cappiello not granting the waiver Article 5, Section 5.3.1(10) 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. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay
J. Driscoll-Yay
B. Tessier-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
A. Knapp-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay (online)

VI) The requirement of monuments in Article 5, Section 5.3.2(16) of the Subdivision Regulations.

A motion was made by J. Driscoll and seconded by A. Knapp not granting the waiver Article 5, Section 5.3.2(16) 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. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay
J. Driscoll-Yay
B. Tessier-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
A. Knapp-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay (online)

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Jeff and Michelle Durell from 33 Evans Road are an abutter to the property. They stated they walk the Newhall Trails along with other neighbors. Michelle expressed that they are concerned about Lot 7-2 was to close to the forest trails and can continue to have access to that trail.

Joel explained that the trail was on Lot 7 not Lot 7-2 and there would still be access to the trail.

Matt Gahm from 11 Evans Road stated he uses the trails regularly. He addressed the board with the question of they knew the location of the trailhead, which was the access point to the conservation land as southland behind there. Matt asked if there could be clarification where that accessed on the trial of abutting against the pond. Matt explained that the tree removal has taken over the access in recent months.

Joel explained that they would not be in the conservation easement at all.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by J. Driscoll to the Lot Line and subdivision for Map 260, Lots 7, 7-1, 7-2 and 7-3. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Nay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

V. Price read Conditions Precedent:

Date of Application: December 13, 2022

Date Decision Issued: January 3, 2023

Case File #: 260-7&7.1-GR-LL/3Lots

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>			
Re: 260-7&7.1-GR-LL/3Lots: Request by applicants proposing a Lot Line Adjustment between Map 260, Lot 7 for 91.94 acres to adjust Map 260, for a boundary line adjustment of 0.83 acres from Lot 7 to Lot 7-1 and subdivision of Lot 7 for Lot 7-1 to be 4.90 acres, Lot 7-2 to 3.62 acres and Lot 7-3 to 2.36 acres along with waivers on Merry Hill Road in the General Residential Zoning District.			
Owners: Susan Johnson 1519 Tamarac Drive Golden, CO 80401		Jesse Schraufnagel 370 Merry Hill Road Barrington, NH 03825	Linda Kohrs 368 Merry Hill Road Barrington, NH 03825
Applicant: Joel Runnals Norway Plains Associates, Inc. PO Box 249 Rochester, NH 03866			

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its January 3, 2023, 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, January 3, 2024, 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 January 3, 2023, Planning Board Meeting, Board approved waivers for:
 - i) The requirement of existing site conditions of surveying property lines of the entire parcel in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(5) of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - ii) The requirement of existing site conditions showing existing grades in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(6) of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - iii) The requirement of existing site conditions estimated location and use of all existing structures in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(8) of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - iv) The requirement of existing site conditions of natural features in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(9) of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - v) The requirement of existing site conditions of man-made features in Article 5, Section 5.3.1(10) of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - vi) The requirement of monuments in Article 5, Section 5.3.2(16) of the Subdivision Regulations.

#2) Add the following to the Plan:

- a) All Owners' Signature.
- b) Wetland Scientist Signature.
- c) Professional Surveyor Signature.
- d) Existing street ROW dimensioned and pavement width dimensioned on plans.

#3) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town.

#4) At final submittal, all outstanding comments to applicant from Town Planner for Site Plan Review and Subdivision regulations shall be addressed.

#5) Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit two (2) full size paper copies of the site plans, one (1) 11' x 17' copy and .pdf/a format file format with supporting documents as required in Article 3 of the Barrington Site Plan Review Regulations, 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 site 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) 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.

(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
Town Planner
cc: File

- B. [234-25-1-V-22-3Lots \(Owners: TSB Construction, LLC\)](#) Request by applicant is proposing 3 new lots with two lots in the back and one standard lot off Franklin Pierce Highway (aka Route 9) with a private driveway to access two single family lots (Map 234, Lot 25-1) in the Village Zoning District. BY: Christopher Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

A. Knapp gave a brief description of the application.

Christopher Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering represented TSB Construction, LLC. Chris explained that they have been to the Zoning Board of Adjustment and received a variance to allow the 3 lot subdivision that they are proposing. Chris described the project location off Franklin Pierce Highway (aka Route 9) and the back side of the site has a large hill that goes to Meetinghouse Road. Chris showed the Board the existing condition of the site largely comes to the top of the slope and drains down towards Franklin Pierce Highway. Chris explained that the abutters that he was talking to, live in the large farmhouse and they have access over the old road. Chris explained that the 10 acres was part of the subdivision that was done on Meetinghouse Road and this lot falls into the Village District Zoning. Chris described that instead of townhouses the applicant decided to do 3 lots one lot having 150' frontage on Franklin Pierce Highway along with two backlots behind the large farmhouse this was to protect the people on Franklin Pierce Highway. Chris explained that they would be a single-family home to the center of the lot along with potential for a duplex to be constructed and condos all the larger lot on the remaining lands that's not definite. Chris explained the potential of the total density to be four units. Chris explained that he talked to the abutters about some of the impacts of the project on stormwater and how that would impact their site with their well and septic system. Chris explained that they gave him permission to discuss their concerns with the Board, and to not damaging a large tree on the property. Chris explained on the driveway where there are three or more that would need a road name. Chris explained that the plan set includes a road profile cross sections of the proposed driveway on how the driveway drainage would work and the final grading would look and appear with the two stormwater

structures. Chris explained the infiltration system proposed at the entrance to the project where stormwater is collected from the impervious surfaces, the developed surfaces are captured then treated and infiltrated back into the ground and discharged to the normal flow path. Chris explained the flow of the stormwater on the plan. Chris explained that the driveway profile does not exceed the maximum allowance of 10% on the site and noted that was one of Chief Walker's concerns and to make sure that he understands that. Chris discussed that they need to file for an NHDOT permit for the driveway off Franklin Pierce Highway (aka Route 9) and to meet their guidelines. Chris explained that he understands that this would need to go to CMA Engineers for their review. Chris explained that this project would require a notice of intent with the EPA and would require a State Subdivision permit NHDES.

R. Allard asked about the drainage plan addressing Chris. He asked where it takes a turn and goes parallel to Franklin Pierce Highway, and the other driveway comes down, there is a concern that a lot of water on there with a steep slope on both sides. R. Allard explained that he sees that flow going across the road and causing problems.

Chris explained that intersection was designed to be super elevated in one direction with soil designed on both sides of the driveway and explained the stormwater from that section.

R. Allard asked what happens on the downside.

Chris explained that it's going to be super elevated in the up position so its super elevated to the right as you're driving along the alignment.

A. Knapp expressed concern about the winter maintenance and plowing going to end up with a bank in there. A. Knapp stated that's going to sheet up and end up getting the ice side limit that becomes impact for the people that live there.

Chris explained that was the reason that swale design was so robust, as it allows for the soil design wide enough and deep enough to accept those snow loads.

R. Allard asked about the driveway that comes down it's not in the middle of the 50' ROW.

Chris explained that they went to Zoning Board of Adjustment for a Special Exception.

J. Driscoll asked if there was going to be a deeded easement to them to address the future problems since there would be three new property owners.

Chris explained that they could as the plan was quite heavenly noted would be recorded at the Strafford County Registry of Deeds. Chris explained that they received a variance for the frontage lot.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by A. Melnikas to accept the application for TSB Construction as complete. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Nay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

A. Knapp opened public comment.

Paula Kent from 757 Franklin Pierce Highway explained that she talked with Chris and the biggest concerns are the rain garden and turnaround right behind their house. Paula explained that the driveway was the entire length of the backyard and are concerned about lights on their house. Paula asked where the location of the septic would be she didn't see that on the plan.

Chris showed the location of the septic.

Paula showed the location of her well and the 200-year tree she would like to see more privacy.

Dan Ayers from 41 Oak Hill Road was concerned about the rain gardens it's still going to run down the hill.

Chris explained that it was going to be downslope from Mr. Ayers and it would not affect him.

A. Knapp closed public comment.

A motion from J. Driscoll and seconded by B. Tessier to send to CMA Engineers for review for TSB Construction. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Nay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

9. OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

(none)

10. ADJOURN

Meeting Adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

A motion was made by J. Driscoll and seconded by B. Tessier to adjourn the meeting at 9:53 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call:

J. Cappiello-Yay

J. Driscoll-Yay

B. Tessier-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Nay

A. Knapp-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay (online)

A. Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. The next Planning Board meeting is a Public Hearing

February 7, 2023, at 6:30p.m.

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