



BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING

As Chair of the Barrington Planning Board, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this Board is authorized to meet electronically. Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are: We are utilizing the Microsoft Team for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through the Microsoft Team, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in the meeting through dialing the following phone #603-664-0240 and Conference ID: 710446828#

664-0182 or email: birvine@barrington.nh.gov

Tuesday, November 3, 2020
7:00 p.m.

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

Roll Call Vote

James Jennison-Yay
Steve Diamond-Yay
Donna Massucci-Yay
Ron Allard-Yay
Jeff Brann-Yay

Members Present

James Jennison, Chair
Jeff Brann, Vice Chair
Steve Diamond
Donna Massucci
Ron Allard

Member Absent

Andy Knapp ex- officio

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

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Barrington Planning Board Meeting Minutes/bi
November 3, 2020/pg. 1 of 23

1. Approval of October 20, 2020 meeting minutes.

Without objection the minutes were as approved as written.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay
J. Jennison-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
J. Brann-Yay

REQUEST FOR TO CONTINUE CONSIDERATION

2. [236-4-GR-20-SR \(Owner: Sunset Rock LLC\)](#) Request by applicant for Site Review to increase their operation in Barrington from 83.3 acres to a total of 88.8 acres (Map 236, Lot 4) located backland off Tolend Road in the General Residential Zoning District. * BY: Michael Wright, RESPEC; 67 Water Street, STE 109, Laconia, NH 03246.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Michael Wright from RESPEC represented Sunset Rock LLC asked the Board to continue the case until November 17, 2020 due to needing to add more information.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by S. Diamond to continue consideration for this application to November 17, 2020. Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay
J. Brann-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay
R. Allard-Yay

ACTION ITEM CONTINUED FROM October 6, 2020

3. [238-36-V-20-SR \(Owner: Waldron B. Haley Revoc Trust\)](#) Request by applicant for Site Review to amend application for a multi-family Development **ADDED** 3.4 Conditional Use Permit located off Franklin Pierce Highway (Map 238, Lot 36) in the Village District. BY: Scott D. Cole, Beal Associates, PLLC; 70 Portsmouth Avenue; Stratham, NH 03885.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Scott Cole from Beal Associates represented applicant J & L Terra Holdings and would like the Board to if they could continue the application until November 17, 2020.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to continue the application until November 17, 2020. Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

S. Diamond-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
J. Jennison-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay
J. Brann-Yay

ACTION ITEMS

4. [223-24&26-RC-20-AmendSub \(Owner: Route 125 Development, LLC\)](#) Request by applicant to amend the previous conditional approval from 55 residential lot and 5 commercial lots to 58 residential lots and 4 commercial lots adjacent to Route 125 (Calef Highway) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Scott D. Cole, Beals Associates, PLLC; 70 Portsmouth Avenue, 3rd Floor, Unit 2; Stratham, NH 03885.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Scott Cole from Beal Associates represented Joe Falzone, owner of Route 125 Development. Scott showed the Board what was previously subdivision conditional approved by the Planning Board. Scott explained that they have been working with their highway engineers and going back and forth with NHDOT. Scott explained that the north access toward Rochester off Route 125 (Calef Highway) has been removed. They added a cul-de-sac, which was September Drive, and a through road going back towards the south access that would be 160' long. They have added a through road that was roughly 900' from the intersection down to the main intersection to the southern entrance. Scott explained that this seemed to be the best result with NHDOT for Joe Falzone and their needs. Scott explained that C-5, a commercial lot of 12.7 acres on the north end of the property, was not viable use for a commercial property. The lot was surrounded by wetlands and wetland buffers and did not have direct access to Route 125 (Calef Highway). This would cause an issue as commercial vehicles would need to go through the residential subdivision; not good for safety concerns. Scott explained that they went before the Zoning Board of Adjustment because there was a 500' Commercial Overlay in the front of property for residential use to allow residential use within that zone for access reasons. The Zoning Board of Adjustment allowed them to put in three conventional residential size lots within the lot that was the C-5 commercial lot. Scott explained that they were also able to add 3.5 acres into the open space. Scott explained that none of the ponds needed movement so the drainage doesn't change, and this would be reviewed by NHDES, so they are asking if the Board felt it need three party review from the Town Engineer. They also need to reapply with NHDES for AoT permit.

S. Diamond explained that he appreciated that NHDOT desire the points of access to Route 125 (Calef Highway) and this should not be the Town priority, which should be with connectivity and relieving pressure on connection off Route 125 (Calef Highway). S. Diamond explained that the corridor study for Route 125 (Calef Highway) was for well-spaced signalized intersections this needs to head towards. S. Diamond expressed that someday someone was going to pay for [Old Greenhill] road intersection to be a useable.

Scott explained that they have been working with NHDOT and highway engineers that are more knowledgeable than they are. Scott explained that this does meet the regulations and the Old Greenhill entrance going back very far with the Planning Board this was beaten to death. Scott explained that they left a RoW to the Old Greenhill Road, and this would be aligned with the new through road. Scott explained that this was a short distance to the intersection, and this was widened for the commercial use. This was for a left and right turn out and explained that this was very wide.

S. Diamond asked if there was no drivable route to the Class 6 portion [Old Greenhill Road] would not have an access.

Scott stated that was correct and there wasn't even on the first go around.

S. Diamond asked if it (RoW) is not drivable would there be a gate there and said that according to the drawing it looks like there was one.

Scott stated no and explained that was a paper RoW per the previous approval; there was an agreement to put boulders at the end of it so no one would come down or go out.

S. Diamond questioned a paper RoW and asked if that means the road would likely not be built.

Scott explained that there was no road proposed and explained that this was a walking trail that was too agreed with the Planning Board; only a trail not roadway through.

J. Brann asked about the increase of development traffic on the one entrance/exit at C-1 where the Town Hall would be and if there was a double lane exiting.

Scott explained that there would be a right and left lane, and a 50' radius because of commercial lots coming out instead of a 20' radius. This was a wide entrance for a wide vehicle.

J. Brann asked about easements being added for Lots 12 and 13 for drainage system, and an easement or easements for the drive to get to the cul-de-sac to get to the three new lots R1, R2 and R3.

Scott stated yes, the would-be new easements and to the new lots; these are displayed on two sets of plans. Scott explained that most of the drainage has not changed and they did apply driveway easements for the new conventional lots.

J. Brann asked if they were going to supply draft easement language for drainage and access as requested by the Town Planner.

R. Allard asked if the easements were part of R1 and R2 and are the on R1 land.

Scott stated that they were driveway access to R3, and they would have a driveway access across those two lots.

S. Diamond stated what was different about this plan from what was before was that if a tree were to fall or an accident were to occur in one spot, he expressed that there would be no way for a vehicle to get in or out. S. Diamond stated that previously there would have been another option and was concerned that there were a lot people in the development.

Scott explained that there are and explained that there was a very short entrance way of 400' which was shorter than the allowable length of access to a cul-de-sac. Scott explained that every other portion of the property would have two directions to get to that point.

Joe Falzone explained that it complies with the thousand foot minimum and explained that he had to review to meet the standard with the Fire Department. Joe explained that the Fire Department has indicated to the Planning Board that this was adequate for public safety.

J. Brann asked about the letter from Department of Environmental Services approving the permit it discusses conference of the conservation restrictions. J. Brann explained that they should be placed on both existing and all future property owners. J. Brann asked if there was paperwork that documents the restrictions.

Joe Falzone explained that they have been submitted and approved by the State, and they would submit them.

J. Jennison asked about S. Diamond's point from Route 125 (Calef Highway) to the new circular cul-de-sac dead-end longer than 1000'.

Joe Falzone stated yes and the only distance that was less than 1000' was the driveway which they applied for a Zoning Board of Adjustment permit that was not mentioned.

Scott explained that the distance from Route 125 (Calef Highway) to the first intersection was 400'.

J. Jennison expressed that the big loop was a cul-de-sac with one lane in and was kind of a lot of road and in some regards he agreed with S. Diamond. J. Jennison asked how wide was the road through the loop now.

Scott explained that it was 22' and explained that was anywhere along this project other than the first two means of getting to that section. Scott explained that this would no different than a short 400' cul-de-sac even though the road beyond that was longer.

J. Jennison expressed that it doesn't go anywhere so it wasn't like it was a short cul-de-sac because it doesn't go anywhere but to itself.

M. Gasses explained that she looked at this design and felt that it was more favorable than the last one. M. Gasses explained that there were multiple directions that you could go. M. Gasses explained that at the end you initially end up at Route 125 (Calef Highway) and stated that it was a wider road that can handle it. M. Gasses explained that this has numerous shorter ways to get there. M. Gasses explained that she did go over the cul-de-sac with Mark Moreau, the Road Agent, and stated that he was okay with this. They talked about how large it was, consulted with Scott, and he was comfortable with that and was able to get his equipment around just like it was mentioned and being able to put the snow inside the center of the cul-de-sac.

J. Jennison expressed that they [Road Agent] weighed in, but his concern was does it meet the Town Regulations. It was really a giant loop and does egress meet regulations because it's so long.

M. Gasses explained that it's not necessarily that long because you can go out to the right and there are multiple ways to turn out that makes it compliant with the regulations.

J. Jennison expressed that he felt if you drove around in circles and you were not going anywhere and felt there was safer egress on previous the plan with two exits and he could understand from the Route 125 (Calef Highway) perspective that it's not.

J. Brann asked J. Jennison which part he was questioning he didn't understand if it was the cul-de-sac itself.

J. Jennison explained that it was the length of the road from entrance to the end. J. Jennison explained that just because you can go up, go left, and come around, he just wanted clarification that this meets the regulations for a cul-de-sac.

R. Allard explained that it's not the only one-way out and explained to J. Jennison that within the orange part on the plan part to the right, there were two ways to get there.

S. Diamond asked what the reason for behind that rule; that's what matters for safety reasons and asked if we understood that.

M. Gasses explained that her understanding was to provide safe access and explained that it varies from community to community. M. Gasses explained that our rule was 1000' and that was what the used for our decisions. The Fire Chief maybe willing to go a little farther depending on the design and had no issue with this one.

S. Diamond asked if they could get a reasoning from the Fire Chief on why the rule exists so that the Board can understand how to apply this best.

M. Gasses explained that she didn't believe this was the place. M. Gasses explained that if you wanted to ask the Fire Chief at another time and explained that the Board was here to apply the regulations and focus on the changes that were made to the conditionally approved project and not to rehear the whole project.

R. Allard expressed that to S. Diamond's point couldn't the Board look at the orange part on the plan and the landscape on both sides; the biggest concern would be if a tree fell across the road. R. Allard explained that one lot was the Town Hall and the other a commercial lot and asked if there were a lot of trees along that road.

Scott explained that there was also open drainage and that there would be quite a distance on each side before you have existing mature vegetation that would remain in that area. Scott explained that as you come in opposite of the first intersection this would all be clear because there's a cistern there. This area would have no vegetation at all so from there on you would be back to two ways of egress.

J. Huckins expressed that the only time that he could remember a dead end/loop was where the beginning of the loop was over 1000' and this was quite a few years ago. J. Huckins explained that the reason the Planning Board allowed this was to go an extra 20' because there were all wetlands there so they couldn't make the turn out to make it work.

J. Jennison asked if there was a previous question about building the buildings in the commercial buffer on the back side and felt this was brought up.

Scott explained that the orange part on the plan and explained that at the rear of the residential lots [to the north], and on the left side that was now bordering Lots R1/R2/R3, they would be providing the 100' buffer along all of the back rear property lines between the residential use.

S. Diamond asked being a conservation subdivision there's a buffer around the residential part with the road being there and does it allow it to serve the purpose it's supposed to be there for?

J. Jennison asked if you could use the buffer for the road.

J. Huckins explained that in his opinion you could because the way the buffer was setup was to separate the residential use from the commercial use. J. Huckins explained that way you would have over 100' with the road in that other space left so you have more than 100' from the residential lots to the commercial lots which was the whole idea for the 100'.

S. Diamond expressed that this was not much of a visual buffer.

J. Huckins explained that it's not supposed to be a visual buffer, it's just supposed to be a buffer.

S. Diamond expressed that it's like it's beginning to lose the purpose of a conservation subdivision.

J. Brann explained that with the amount of land to the north and to the east, even up to the northwest, the area hasn't changed. J. Brann asked if the actual footprint hasn't changed how was it less of a conservation subdivision.

J. Jennison asked if whether the buffer was appropriate to put a road in the buffer.

J. Huckins explained that the 100' buffer for the conservation subdivision.

M. Gasses explained that more residential to the development and explained that they were more protection to the residential portion.

J. Huckins explained that this was not to protect a residential subdivision; that's here it was to protect the other areas around the conservation subdivision. J. Huckins explained the buffer to the adjacent lots, for instance Deer Ridge that exceeds the 100'.

R. Allard asked about the road that goes to Green Hill and if they said that was pedestrian in the white part on the plan to Green Hill.

Scott explained that's going to be a deeded RoW and as per condition of approval, part of the design was to put in a trail at a maximum of 10% grade so people can walk and enjoy the trail. This way they can have access to the Class 6, this would not be drivable, and there would be boulders put on the end at the intersection with the Class 6 portion.

R. Allard asked if this was going to be gravel.

Scott explained that this would be graded gravel.

R. Allard asked if instead of boulders could they put a gate with a key for the Fire Department. In case of an extreme emergency they could get in there with emergency vehicles.

Scott explained that the boulders was part of the conditional approval and can ask Joe about the gate.

Joe explained that the reason was because you couldn't get in the last section of a couple hundred feet; you can never support a fire truck, but it could support a trail, not as wide as a road would be.

R. Allard asked about emergency vehicles such as an ambulance.

Joe explained that an ambulance couldn't get down that trail.

J. Huckins explained that Old Green Hill Road was so bad that you couldn't get an emergency vehicle down there. J. Huckins explained that if this had an option to be made into a road in the future if Old Green Hill Road was ever upgraded so until that time it would be a thru road. J. Huckins explained that even though it was going to be a walking trail now, it has the future potential for being a roadway if Old Green Hill Road ever gets upgraded.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that they need to focus on the changes and not try to visit the whole project.

R. Allard agreed but before there was two ins and outs now there was only one.

S. Diamond asked about the orange lot that was near Route 125 (Calef Highway) that was commercial and someday that would be developed.

Scott stated that was correct.

S. Diamond expressed that buffering around residential area was important.

Joe explained that C3 and C4 do not get their access off this subdivision road; they don't have anything to do with this for traffic reasons. Joe explained that when they get a use [for the lots] they must apply to NHDOT based on whatever the volume of that use would be. Joe explained that they can construct and access a shared driveway to those two lots. Joe explained that he was trying to find the least traffic generating use and then go for another driveway curb cut to serve those two lots.

J. Brann asked if the access would be off Route 125 (Calef Highway).

Joe explained that this would be a driveway, not a road, and this eliminated a lot of traffic in the traffic count. Joe explained that he would never do drive-throughs because they would have too much traffic. Joe explained that he would have offices or something that doesn't generate a lot of traffic.

J. Brann asked if we look at C3 and C4 there was 100' buffer from the back of the lots between R1 and 47/48; the buffers would not be disturbed because access would be off Route 125 (Calef Highway).

Joe stated that was correct.

J. Jennison stated that he assumed that they were going through the buffer to access those two lots on the back side of the subdivision.

J. Brann asked about the NHDES approval was that the conservation area would be surveyed by a licensed surveyor and marked by monument stakes prior to construction. Also, if the survey determines the parcel was less than size permitted, they shall submit the completed survey to NHDES for review. J. Brann asked if this information was on the plan somewhere.

Scott stated he would need to check and explained that this was part of the permit, which was part of the record.

J. Brann explained that the contractor would be following the plan and seemed like an appropriate note to go on the plan.

Scott stated that he could add to the plan.

J. Brann asked M. Gasses if it should be on plan and explained that this was item #21 on the NHDES permit.

M. Gasses asked if this was generated after the conditional approval from before.

J. Brann explained that the Board received stamped October 13. This was the letter from NHDES.

Joe expressed that they had no problem adding to the plan.

S. Diamond asked if they were restricting consideration for any use of the commercial lots that would generate significant traffic and asked if they could be a little more specific about that.

Joe explained that they don't want storage units but that was a very low impact of traffic. If you had a bank with a drive through teller and a drive thru, NHDOT looks at the numbers totally different as a higher generator. Joe explained that he would look for a low volume use like office space or a real estate office, and explained that until you get the tenant you don't know.

J. Brann asked if what's driving development that could be done on C3 and C4 is whatever you could get to allow for a shared driveway permit from the State.

Joe stated that was correct.

J. Huckins stated that these lots would need to come back before the Board for Site Review approval.

A motion was by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to accept the amended application as complete. Vote 4/1

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

S. Diamond-Nay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Brann stated that they have not changed any of the locations or sizing of the detention ponds, and the engineering has been through review apart from the cul-de-sac so expressed that he felt this didn't need to go for D&K review.

S. Diamond stated roads are in a different place than they were and explained that he doesn't know every bit on how to apply the rules on the engineering factors that could be involved, and it was a small section.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that they still need to get NHDES approval for these changes and that would give this a third party look at this.

J. Brann stated that NHDES was going to give this another look and felt that S. Diamond was correct, there was a small change in the roads, but does that significantly change the drainage systems, paths or detention ponds.

R. Allard, D. Massucci and S. Diamond are comfortable with NHDES and not sending out for third party review.

S. Diamond suggested that the path to the north be built not paved but built up to the level that a vehicle could get through.

M. Gasses explained that she would caution only because that would be a road to just about nowhere other than if you were driving in off-road vehicles. M. Gasses explained that she felt this was not a fiscally smart thing to do at this point. M. Gasses explained to S. Diamond that she sees his concerns, but the chances are small of people not being able to get out of this road given the width of it and emergency response time from not only Barrington but the City of Rochester. M. Gasses expressed that she felt there would not be much of a delay and would be a very rare instance.

S. Diamond explained to M. Gasses that it wouldn't be fiscally sensible for who? Eventually would be constructing a through road that goes the rest the way through. Someone was going to need to pay to improve that section of the road.

M. Gasses explained that she has been out their multiple times and looked at the road and explained that there was one other very nice gentleman that owns the land along that. If this was going to ever be upgraded this would cost a pretty penny and at this point it would be more of a benefit to one individual and with the cost, she didn't see happening for maybe 50 years. M. Gasses explained that the easement was there.

J. Jennison explained that he felt that S. Diamond was saying that if this road was built in 5 or 10 years and the road was built, we don't have connectivity and no way to ensure connectivity no was ever going to connect that road. If Old Greenhill Road was built to a passable standard any time in the future there's no mechanism for that section to be finished from this development to that [Old Greenhill] road.

M. Gasses and J. Huckins disagreed and explained that was the whole point of putting that paper street or trails so the road is there for the possibility of a connection later.

J. Brann asked if between Lots 42 and 41 wasn't there previously access to those lots off what was now September Drive leading up to Green Hill Road.

M. Gasses explained that there was a modification made given where the cul-de-sac was so now it's just the RoW that goes up to Old Green Hill Road. M. Gasses explained that now this goes straight through; there's not driveways off it.

J. Brann stated as he recalled the Board discussed that the road under the previous plan would be developed to Town standards up to the back of the lots and would not be developed from back of the lots out to Green Hill Road.

Joe stated that was correct.

J. Brann explained that if they were ever going to develop the road, they didn't want to have to go in and disturb the area in between those two lots. J. Brann expressed that it made more sense to put the base in now for that road while they were doing the development and stop at the back of the lot lines there. Then if they ever wanted to develop that road, they could bring the back end of it up to standards without affecting the lots.

Joe stated that was correct and that's what they going to do.

J. Brann explained that September Drive from the four-way intersection along Lots 41 and 42 the roadbed would be put in there up to the lot line.

Scott explained that the initial design was as J. Brann said but it was to where the driveway locations where NS was where the structures were. Scott explained that it was not to the rear of the properties and the grading was instructed to be no more than 10% so that anyone would have the ability to walk it because by nature; it's like 15%. Scott explained that has been changed so that the driveways now come off the front of the lots because that RoW was in a different location. The driveways are not needed to come off that because they're at a better grade on the proposed road. Scott explained that the intent now was to just have the trail constructed at a grade no more than 10% for as long as needed until it caught up with the existing terrain.

Joe explained that the didn't have a problem building the road to the 100 or 150 feet if that's what the Board wants.

J. Brann explained that seems to be a middle ground to address everybody's concerns about providing for connectivity

in the future and doing what makes sense from construction standpoint.

Scott stated they can do that but wanted to make it clear that wasn't what's on the plan now and doesn't want anybody to think that was the intention, but they can modify the plans and show that. Scott explained that the road would be built to the 150' or whatever the Town maintains.

J. Brann asked J. Jennison and S. Diamond if that took care of their concerns.

S. Diamond expressed that it does. He thinks asked if they were saying that to the residential lot lines before you start entering the green space that road would be built to the full width and paved.

Joe stated whatever distance they agreed to as J. Brann mentioned in the first plan and didn't know if that was 200' or 180' or 300' but that's what they would do to build the road.

J. Huckins explained that in the first plan it was just gravel it wasn't paved was it.

Scott stated it was gravel.

J. Brann stated that he and M. Gasses got this paved at least up to the driveways.

J. Jennison explained that now there are not driveways and felt that gravel was fine.

J. Brann expressed from an erosion standpoint felt it might make sense to do it [i.e. pave it].

R. Allard explained from his perspective if it's paved it's going to be a great place for kids to play and explained that Lots 41 and 42 may not like it.

J. Jennison expressed that he felt it was more likely for parking so that people walk in the green space.

M. Gasses asked if the Board could come to a consensus for the notice of decision, paved or not paved, and felt that the Board wanted this paved to the end of the property line.

Joe stated that whatever was in the first approval that they were supposed to do, they would do.

J. Jennison explained that this has changed because it was going through to the driveways and there were two driveways coming off the spur road; that's where it ends and now there's no driveways coming off that portion.

J. Brann stated that the best way to do this would be for the road to be from the intersection to the rear lot lines of Lots 42 and 41. J. Brann explained that the question would be to be asphalt it or not, but asphalt would help with erosion control and for people accessing the conservation area.

Scott explained to the Board that he has the previous plan and stated that J. Brann was correct, it was paved to a distance of 200', and this was in a hammerhead design with the two driveways that are not required now.

J. Jennison asked how deep are those lots.

Scott explained that they are 300' long.

J. Jennison asked if they should go to the back of the lot line.

Joe stated that he agrees with that.

J. Jennison read Conditions Precedent:



Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0195

mgasses@barrington.nh.gov

DRAFT AMENDED NOTICE OF DECISION

[Office use only]	Date certified:	As built 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.

Proposal Identification: 223-26 & 24-RC-19-Sub (Owners: Route 125 Development, LLC)
Request by applicant to amend the previous conditional approval from 55 residential lot and 5 commercial lots to 58 residential lots and 4 commercial lots adjacent to Route 125 (Calef Highway) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Scott D. Cole, Beals Associates, PLLC; 70 Portsmouth Avenue, 3rd Floor, Unit 2; Stratham, NH 03885.

Owner:
Applicant (Contact):
Joseph Falzone
Harbor Street Limited Partnership
7B Emery Lane
Stratham, NH 03885

Professional:
Christian O. Smith, PE & Scott D. Cole
Beals Associates, PPLC
70 Portsmouth Ave.
Stratham, NH 03885

Dated: November 3, 2020

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its November 3, 2020 meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

All of the precedent conditions below must be met by the applicant, at the expense of the applicant, prior to the plans being certified by the Planning Board. Certification of the plans is required prior to commencement of any site work or

recording of any plans. Once these precedent conditions are met and the plans are certified the approval is considered final.

Please Note* If all of the precedent conditions are not met within 6 calendar months to the day, by May 3, 2021, the Boards approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board.
Reference 8.2.3 of the Town of Barrington Subdivision Regulations

Conditions Precedent

- 1)
 - a) Add the owners signature to the final plan
 - b) Add the wetland scientist stamp & signature to the final plan
 - c) Add State Subdivision Approval Number to the Plan
 - d) Add the NHDES Wetland Approval Number to the plan
 - e) Add the NHDOT Access permit number to the plan
 - f) Add the NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit number to the plan
- 2) Revise the following plan notes
 - a) On page 29 of 37 Note 2. Specify 4" loam & seed, not bark mulch
 - ~~b) Remove Note 1 on page 17 (Town of Brentwood)~~
 - b) All plans should reflect current ownership
 - c) Sheet correct sheet numbering
- 3) Add the following plan revisions
 - a) Add Select Board approved street names to the final plan including for R1, R2, R3 if deemed necessary by the Fire Chief
 - b) Add the Tax Map and Lot Numbers assigned by the Assessing Department for the new lots to the final plan
 - c) Confer with NHDES regarding 1' Freeboard & Aquatic bench and revise is necessary
 - d) Show 2' paved shoulder
 - e) September Drive between the intersection and back lot lines of Lots 42 and 41 shall be constructed to Town standards
- 4) Add the following plan notes:
 - a) Add note indicating the purpose of the plan and existing and proposed use
 - b) Pedestrian access between lots 15 and 16 is to be constructed as part of phase III
 - c) Driveway entrances including culverts and aprons are to be constructed as part of road construction
 - d) All documents for the road between Lots ~~43 & 44~~ 41 & 42 shall clearly indicate the road is intended for future public use and at the time of road acceptance for the development this section will become Class VI. The deeds are to indicate the Homeowners Association is responsible for maintenance until such time as the road continues through.
 - e) Add note "all turnarounds will meet the requirements of the Barrington Fire Department
 - f) Add note Individual Commercial lots may be required to provide additional fire protection over and above what is shown on the plan.
 - g) Add note, "All utilities shall be installed underground" 14.1.1
 - h) Add note, cistern to be added to appropriate sheets
 - i) ~~Correct Road name on sheet 18 and 37~~
- 5)
 - a) Applicant will provide draft deed language to be approved by Town's attorney for Lot **R1** to include easement language for cemetery access.

- 6)# Proper and complete survey monumentation shall be installed on the properties as a condition to final approval of the application. Granite bounds shall be set at the intersection of existing or proposed lot sidelines with existing proposed streets. Iron pins (pipe or rod) are to be placed at all property line corners and angles, and all points of curvature and points of tangency. Monuments for the lot being developed shall be placed not more than 300 feet apart in any straight line. The applicant's surveyor shall certify in writing that the bounds and pins have been installed according to the submitted plan. (*Reference 8.8 of the Town of Barrington Subdivision Regulations*)
- 7) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town
- 8) Provide a \$25 check made out to SCRCD for the LCHIP fee.
- 9) Final Drawings (a) five sets of black line (b) plus one set of 11"X17" final approved plans (c) one electronic version by pdf or CD must be on file with the Town. Each individual sheet in every set of drawings must be stamped and signed by the land surveyor, engineer, or architect responsible for the plans. Note. If there are significant changes to be made to the plans, as specified above, one full size check print must be sent to the Land Use Office for review prior to producing these final drawings.

General and Subsequent Conditions

- 1) The HOA documents and Conveyance of Open Space shall be recorded at SCRCD prior to the sale of any dwelling units in the development.
- 2)# In accordance with RSA 674:39 active and substantial development shall mean the expenditure of at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the infrastructure costs required for the first phase of the development, as indicated by a subdivision approved by the Planning Board, within (24) months of said approval, where approved plans have been properly recorded at the Registry of Deeds. Infrastructure shall mean in this instance, the construction of roads, storm drains, and underground utilities. Compliance with this definition shall also necessitate that a bond or other security to cover costs of said infrastructure requirements for the first phase has been posted with the Town prior to the beginning of construction. The first phase would come into Signature Drive and then go to the cul-de-sac. The second phase shall be to loop to Route 125 and the bond or other security to cover the cost of the infrastructure in the second phase shall be posted prior to the commencement of work in the second phase. The phase 3 and 4 was the large loop to the rear Prior to the commencement of work on in Phase 3 and 4 a bond or other security shall be posted to cover the cost of the infrastructure in the applicable phase.
- 3) The Cisterns required for fire safety shall be installed to Barrington Fire Department specifications. All required fire protection standards shall be operational prior to the issuance of any building permits. *Reference 11.5.(1) of the Town of Barrington Subdivision Regulations*
- 4) 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,

Marcia J. Gasses
Town Planner

cc: File

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard approved the amended subdivision as read by the Chair.
Vote 4/1*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay
S. Diamond-Nay
D. Massucci-Yay
R. Allard-Yay

5. [213-6-GR-20-Design \(Owner: Robert Diberto\)](#) Request by applicant for a Design Review for 2-Lot Subdivision with waivers on 32.6-acre site on Sloper Road (Map 213, Lot 6) in The General Residential Zoning District. BY: Chris Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering represented Robert Diberto for a Design Review on Sloper Road that was a 32.6-acre site. Chris explained that this lot has 75' of frontage on Sloper Road and stated that its barely between two Towns. Chris explained that they would require a courtesy review from the Strafford Planning Board for the few hundred feet or less. Chris gave a brief history of the lot from the early 90's and explained that this was the remaining piece. Chris explained that Mr. Diberto built a pretty substantial driveway that runs out to the back of the parcel which has lake frontage on Long Pond. Chris explained that they would like to subdivide the parcel using the backlot ordinance in the center of the 50' or 75' neck. They are trying to build two equal building areas with frontage on Long Pond, and a full and complete boundary survey of the parcel has been done. Chris explained that they have John (Jack) Hayes delineate the poorly drained soils, wetlands along Long Pond and around the prime wetlands in the immediate area of development. Chris explained that the buildable areas would be in the back of the site, showing the proposed houses and wells. Chris explained that the reason he has done this as a Design Review was so that the Board and staff could review and comment on the plans. Chris explained that they would need to spend time with Chief Walker to review the driveway and make sure that he was comfortable with the driveway. There was a wetland permit that was required at the front of the site and explained that this would be an after-the-fact permit for less than 1000' impact to cross one side of the wetlands to the other side. Chris explained to the Board that they are meeting with the Conservation Commission on November 5th. Chris explained that he would be asking the Board for waivers on the following:

25a-Limits of Wetland

27-All required setbacks

31-Two-Two-foot contour interval topography over all subject parcels

Chris explained that they did two test pits in the back of the site and there were good fine granular soils with some seasonal high-water tables and no ledge.

J. Brann read from Chris's letter that a full survey of the parcel, that also included a full topographical analysis and a wetland analysis, but you are asking for a waiver. You state by denial of this waiver Mr. Diberto would be forced into a complete wetland and topographical survey of the remainder of the land. J. Brann questioned the two letters; one said that a full topographical analysis was done and yet they are asking for a waiver.

Chris explained that they did an analysis of the site; they walked much of the area and Jack walked and flagged the entire site, so they have a sketch on where the wetlands are on site.

J. Brann asked about the access to both sites; would it be through the existing gravel driveway.

Chris stated that was correct.

J. Brann stated that he doesn't see anything proposed currently for access to Lot 6. There was no access and the driveway move about halfway down into the proposed Lot 6 and then this ends in Lot 6-1 down near the survey tie line. J. Brann asked how the access was going to work because there was a proposed well up there so where does the access go up into the upper lot.

Chris explained they would need to provide an easement around the entire driveway and provide an extension of that easement over to the proposed lot to the north so that access is finalized in a legal format. There would be a legal easement plan and shared driveway for the Board to review.

J. Brann asked if the access, on the plan showing the proposed leach field and well, would be somewhere to the northwest of the well; was that where a building would go. J. Brann asked where they propose to have access to that area of the property.

Chris explained they would extend the neck of the existing driveway straight across linearly along the contour to that location and provide a proper easement so they would have access to the development zone.

J. Brann asked when was the driveway constructed.

Chris explained that the driveway was constructed in 2018/2019.

J. Brann asked if they got all the proper permits.

Chris stated no and that was one of the things they are working on now. Chris explained that they would have needed a wetland permit at the time and would have been a minor wetland permit for the crossing. Because it was after the fact, they need to file for a standard dredge and fill wetland application to gain permission to essentially utilize the driveway that has been constructed.

J. Brann asked about the requirement for a 15' culvert and the plan shows 12' culvert as he stated that he didn't see a waiver for this requirement.

Chris explained that he would propose justification for the waiver for the culvert and explained that they usually required for Site Review or new roadway construction.

J. Brann asked about the comment from the Fire Chief about the road being at least 20' wide and 50' beyond the first driveway entrance.

Chris explained that he was aware of the comment, that the Fire Chief has reviewed this with the applicant in the past, and believed that it was found to be enough. Chris explained one of the reasons he did a Design Review was that he wants to sit with the Fire Chief and understand his concerns and get this in writing.

J. Brann explained that with a subdivision this changes because you no longer have a single owner out there in their own house and now there would be a shared private drive with multiple residents.

J. Jennison asked if they take access to Lot 10 off the driveway.

Chris asked if that was the lot from the south.

J. Jennison stated that was correct.

Chris explained that the applicant owns the abutting property and that was not part of this subdivision currently.

J. Jennison asked if there were any structures on these.

Chris stated no and explained that they would need to look if the applicant wants driveway access from the newly built driveway to Lot 10 and felt that there was a large wetland there.

J. Brann asked if Lot 7 was off Sloper Road.

Chris explained that they don't own Lot 7.

S. Diamond asked what the width of the driveway was at its narrowest.

Chris explained that the drive ranges between 16' and 17' and explained that the NFPA requires that fire lanes be 20' wide or if you were going to use a road as a fire access road would need to be 20'. Unless the AHJ authority having jurisdiction decides that in specific instances due to topography wetlands or other mitigating circumstances that the 20' could be relaxed for whatever reason. Chris explained that was where Chief Walker was coming up with the requirement.

S. Diamond asked what Chief Walker's thoughts were on the 20'.

Chris explained that Chief Walker was pointing out that NFPA 101, Chapter 18, requires that a fire lane or fire access road would be anything over 50' long. Chris explained that anything over 50' long was required to be 20' and with this code the Fire Chief, within reason, can make acceptations.

J. Brann asked what the total length of the driveway was.

Chris stated he didn't know.

J. Brann explained that he has talked to Chief Walker in the past and if the driveway goes out farther than 1000' that there should be turnouts every 500' so that vehicles can be out of the way and fire vehicles can turn around for safety.

Chris stated that a guess would be 2,800' to 2,900' long.

J. Brann stated that it seems like a turnout was probably 800' in.

Chris agreed and showed location on plan.

S. Diamond suggested that width of the road be as straight as possible would be best. S. Diamond asked if the contour would be a little further skewed if the neck could be straighter from the prime wetlands.

J. Brann questioned if the driveway was existing.

Chris stated that the driveway was existing and explained to S. Diamond's point that if the driveway wasn't built then then we would be putting together an alternatives analysis.

S. Diamond expressed that he would like to see that with safer and straighter.

J. Brann asked about this subdivision being created in the early 90's prior to wetland buffers and if the new subdivision the regulations that would kick in affect this subdivision.

Chris explained what the impact would be was if Chief Walker would require the roadway to be widened and would like to know that now. Chris explained it would not affect the developability of the lots if the buffers were applied to the building areas.

R. Allard asked about the neck and explained that on Lot 61 it looks like a 25' of the neck belonging to Lot 6-1 and asked if that was correct.

Chris stated that was correct.

R. Allard expressed that he thought this doesn't comply by reading the regulations that it should be 50/50 and expressed that the subdivision line should move when the road gets wider.

Chris agreed to look at and adjust if needed.

R. Allard asked if Sloper Road was Class 5 or better.

Chris stated yes.

J. Brann asked if there was a RoW for Lot 6.

R. Allard stated there would be RoWs both ways.

Chris explained that their plans are to fit an easement around a logical easement so that there would be cross easements.

M. Gasses stated so they would not share the neck all the way and may need to ask for some type of waiver.

S. Diamond asked what the maximum grade of the driveway as it currently exists.

Chris explained that he hasn't calculated that and it not especially steep.

S. Diamond explained that there were a few spots that may be curious and because of the waiver on topography.

J. Brann asked why they didn't want to put on the drawings all required setbacks and seemed like everything was already there.

Chris explained that the reason was that he didn't want to do it would be it might imply to a future owner that you could build anywhere on the lot; if there were other wetlands that affect the lot or steep slopes that limit development, showing setback lines to the known areas could be misleading.

J. Huckins explained that by the Town regulations this would be a backlot.

J. Brann asked if all requirements were being met for a backlot.

J. Huckins explained that you would need a total of 50' and this could be shared between the two lots and they have 75' so they have more.

Waivers requested and comments:

J. Jennison asked the Board if they agreed with the waiver for **limits of wetlands** as currently delineated or would the Board want more.

Board comments:

S. Diamond expressed because a mistake was already made around the wetland crossing, he felt that it should be done thoroughly this time.

J. Jennison asked if they were doing the area of the road. Chris explained that's been complete and was shown on the plan.

R. Allard asked if this was the part that was not being subdivided off. Chris stated correct.

All required setbacks:

No concerns

Two-Out contour interval topography over all subject parcels:

S. Diamond requested a little more information in certain areas.

J. Jennison asked Board if they were satisfied with what they have today.

S. Diamond stated that if he knew the grade in the worst spots, he would be fine.

J. Brann asked where the requirements were for backlots.

J. Huckins explained that they are in subdivision and zoning with dimensions were in zoning.

R. Allard explained that he read this, and they do comply if they split the neck 50/50.

J. Brann asked about backlots being unsub dividable unless additional lots conform to Town zoning and subdivision.

J. Brann explained that his concern about the driveway was that Lot 6 that would remain after Lot 6-1 was divided off.

M. Gasses explained that if they wanted to go beyond the two lots, they would need to build a subdivision road.

Chris explained that you would need both lots to develop a road through here.

S. Diamond asked if the frontage was 50’.

Chris stated that the frontage was 75’ because of the radius at the entrance.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to accept the Design Review application as complete.

Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to close the Design Review application. Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

R. Allard-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

6. [238-16-V-20-AmendSR \(Owner: Drew Pond LLC\)](#) Request by applicant to amend Site Plan prior conditional approval due to conversations with NHDES, NHDOT for the application below:
Request by applicant for a Site Review proposal to construct two private roads each to 20 townhouse units off Route 9 with waivers (aka Franklin Pierce Highway) on an 18.02 acre-site (Map 238, Lot 16) in the Village District.
BY: Chris Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering represented Drew Pond LLC explained to the Board that they had received approval from the Board, and they had asked for a one-year extension. Chris explained to the Board that after working through there State permitting and felt that they had enough information to come back before the Board. Chris explained that the major revisions was the alteration terrain permit and submitted for review. Chris explained that there were nitrogen impaired waters downstream and they complied with the design requirements in the application and explained that a remedy for construction projects and development projects was at the time infiltration. Chris expressed by the time they applied for an alteration of terrain permit; the rules had not been modified but had received a written memo to all the consultants that they would no longer be accepting infiltration as a means of mitigating nitrogen. Chris explained that the only way to modify phosphorus and nitrogen would be an anaerobic system known as a gravel wetland. Chris explained the rain gardens that they had designed, showed the location off Oldenburg, and the large infiltration

with the rain garden designed from Hanovarian need to be modified to gravel wetlands. Because of these changes the flow characteristics changed but not substantially.

Chris explained another change in the plan was NHDOT was okay with the cistern showed on the plan in this location but explained when the NHDOT application was filed, they were told that would not be permitted. Chris stated that they worked with Chief Walker to move the cistern into the interior of the project and showed the location on the plan. Chris explained that this still doesn't meet the 1,000' rule but if the Board remembers, they granted a waiver based on the Chief's recommendation. Chris explained that the Chief said that this would be the next best place for the cistern. Chris explained that they had a dual bay exit with a left and right turn exit off Hanovarian as it enters on to Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway). They were asked to remove the left bay or the dedicated right turn bay because it was not warranted by the traffic counts created by the project. The right turn bay has been removed from the project and all comments have been sent back to NHDOT.

Chris explained that they are working with a new sewage disposal system that allows them to simplify a lot of the septic systems on site. Chris explained that on the Hanovarian side they had two other septic systems in the upper section and were able to combine all the flow to those and place them into a geomatic system on the lower side. There were also one or two septic systems across the back of the site and they were able to combine flows between the buildings to minimize the number of systems that are required on the Oldenburg site. Chris explained that at the back of each of these buildings through modification in the residence construction were able to remove some of the steeper slopes and walls at the back of the sites; they want to put decks at the back of the units.

J. Brann asked about the mailboxes that were down as you entered Oldenburg; where did they go.

Chris stated that they are still there.

S. Diamond asked about what Chris said moving rock walls.

Chris explained that at the rear of the units on Oldenburg Drive behind Units 4 through 12, because of the steep grade behind the structure, they originally proposed a retaining wall. They are making it so that the basement walls are a little bit higher and have a different design in the back to remove the retaining wall feature.

S. Diamond asked about fire truck turnarounds at the far perimeter of the property and asked if the curved that was added make that a problem.

Chris stated no and explained that it makes the turning radius easier.

J. Brann stated that they had asked for installation of some curbing on Hanovarian Drive where it makes that bend coming down past the new gravel access road. J. Brann asked if installation of the fire cistern there change the drainage in that area and asked if that had any impact.

Chris explained that it doesn't because they ended the curb in that area prior to the first reverse curb.

S. Diamond asked about wildfire risk and stated that the staggered blocks were nice so that its not just one big rectangle but was wondering if it would be sensible to have a separation between some of the buildings.

Chris explained that these are protected buildings and they are sprinkled with fire walls between each building.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to accept the amended application as complete. Vote 5/0
Roll Call:

R. Allard-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Sharon Reynolds from 34B Court Street, Dover, NH speaking for her mother Linda Reynolds from 441 Franklin Pierce Highway asked about the Oldenburg Drive part of the property and asked if there was a deceleration lane. Chris explained that there was not required by NHDOT.

Sharon Reynolds asked if there was any plan to lower the speed limit.

M. Gasses explained that this was a State Highway, and this would be regulated by the State.

S. Diamond expressed that it was no one development it would be all of them together.

Sharon Reynolds asked if there was anyone she could contact at NHDOT.

M. Gasses stated she could call NHDOT District #6.

Sharon Reynolds asked for a person or contact.

M. Gasses explained that James Hewitt does the driveway permits.

J. Jennison asked M. Gasses if the sidewalks are going that far or not.

M. Gasses explained that right now the sidewalks are planned from Christmas Lane down to the Middle School and have been added to the ten-year plan. M. Gasses explained that NHDOT as started some preliminary review.

Sharon Reynolds asked if the sidewalks could go to Village Place.

M. Gasses explained that this would be a matter of cost and phases; she could talk to Strafford Regional.

J. Brann asked if this could move forward to get the sidewalks and to get sidewalks the Middle School. Then the Town could go from the Middle School to Village Place.

M. Gasses explained that this would not be cheap and what they were proposing initially to the Middle School was \$750,000.00 estimate.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

M. Gasses expressed they did not need to send for third party review. The Board agreed.

J. Jennison read Conditions Precedent:



Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

AMENDED NOTICE OF DECISION

[Office use only]	Date certified:	As built received:	Surety returned
<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>			
Proposal Identification: <u>238-16-V-19-SR (Owner: Drew Pond, LLC)</u> Request by applicant for a Site Review proposal to construct two private roads each to serve 20 townhouse units off Route 9 with waivers (aka Franklin Pierce Highway) on an 18.02-acre site (Map 238, Lot 16) in the Village District. BY: Chris Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.			
Owner: Drew Pond, LLC 242 Central Avenue Dover, NH 03820 Applicant: Drew Pond, LLC 242 Central Avenue Dover, NH 03820 Professional: Kenneth A. Berry Berry Surveying & Engineering 335 Second Crown Point Road Barrington, NH 03825		Dated: November 5, 2020	

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its November 3, 2020 meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

Waivers Granted for:

1. 12.2.1 Table one of the Subdivision Regulations, minimum tangent of 100' between reverse curves.
2. 12.2.1 Table 1 of the Subdivision Regulations, shoulder width of 6 feet in a cut and 3 feet in fill.
3. 12.7 Table 2, maximum of 2% of a road grade within 100 feet of an intersection.
4. 12.8.8(4) & 12.8.9, No ditches at grades above 8%, which require curbing, culverts and basins, or at grades above 6% when the developed length exceeds 250 feet.

5. 4.7.7 (1) minimum pipe diameter of 15” in any drain system.
6. 4.12.2 Lighting Requirements
7. 3.1.3 Cross Sections
8. 4.14.1 (1) Full Traffic Impact Analysis

All of the precedent conditions below must be met by the applicant, at the expense of the applicant, prior to the plans being certified by the Planning Board. Certification of the plans is required prior to commencement of any site work or recording of any plans. Once these precedent conditions are met and the plans are certified the approval is considered final.

Please Note* If all of the precedent conditions are not met within 6 calendar months to the day, by May 3, 2021, the Boards approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board.

Conditions Precedent

- 1) Road names must be compliant with E911 and approved by the Town
- 2) HOA documents approved by the Town’s Attorney
- 3) Correct note #21 on page 7 to read Building addresses will be assigned through the Assessing Office
- 4) Add the following Notes to the Plan:
 - a) “Required erosion control measures shall be installed prior to any disturbance of the site’s surface area and shall be maintained through the completion of construction activities. If, during construction, it becomes apparent that additional erosion control measures are required to stop any erosion on the construction site due to actual site conditions, the owner shall be required to install the necessary erosion protection at no expense to the Town”.
- 5) Add wetland scientist stamp and signature to the final plan
- 6) Add the owner’s signature to the final plan
- 7) Add required permit numbers to coversheet
- 8) Provide complete septic designs and construction approval numbers
- 9) Provide well permit numbers and final water design
- #10) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town
- 11) Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit three (3) complete paper print plan sets and supporting documents as required in Article 3 with a letter explaining how the Applicant addressed the conditions of approval. This shall include final and complete reports for all items submitted during review for the Town of Barrington’s file. The Chairman shall endorse three copies of the approved plan(s) meeting the conditions of approval upon receipt of an executed bond for all improvements, excluding buildings. The Town shall retain a signed and approved reproducible 11” X 17”, and PDF format with supporting documents for Town records.

General and Subsequent Conditions

- #1) Where no active and substantial work, required under this approval has commenced upon the site within two years from the date the plan is signed, this approval shall expire. An extension, not to exceed one year, may be granted, by majority vote of the Board so long as it is applied for at least thirty days prior to the expiration date.

The Board may grant only one such extension for any proposed site plan. All other plans must be submitted to the Board for review to ensure compliance with these and other Town ordinances. Active and substantial work is defined in this section as being the expenditure of at least 25% of the infrastructure improvements required under this approval. Infrastructure shall mean in this instance, the construction of road, storm drains, and improvements indicted on the site plan. RSA 674:39

2) The engineer shall certify the improvements have been installed as designed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy/Use.

(Note: in both sections above, the numbered condition marked with a # and all conditions below the # are standard conditions on all or most applications of this type).

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

Sincerely,

Marcia J. Gasses
Town Planner

cc: File

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to approve the Amended Site Review. Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

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

The next meeting will be on November 17, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. electronic meeting; no meeting place.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Respectfully,

Barbara Irvine
Planning & Land Use Administrative Assistant