



BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING

NEW LOCATION: EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING CENTER

77 RAMSDELL LANE

Barrington, NH 03825

Tuesday April 16, 2019

6:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

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

Members Present

James Jennison, Chair

Jeff Brann, Vice Chair

Steve Diamond

Donna Massucci

Ron Allard

Robert Pimpis

Member Absent

Andy Knapp ex- officio

Alternate Member Present

Rondi Boyer

Dan Ayer ex-officio arrived at 8:20 pm

Town Planner: Marcia Gasses

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of the April 2, 2019 meeting minutes.

R. Allard questioned whether the Board could grant a 2-year extension.

M. Gasses explained the Board could for Subdivision and Site review regulations.

Without objection the minutes were approved as amended at line 422.

CONCEPTUAL

2. Phil Auger conceptual for [Stonehouse Forest Parking Lots](#).

Tabled to later in the meeting due to Mr. Auger's Absence.

Mr. Auger arrived at 6:45 pm.

Phil Auger the property manager for South East Land Trust of NH was there to discuss two parking areas they wanted to install for the 1500-acre Stonehouse Forest. One on Route 9 just north of the second Hearthside Drive Entrance, for which they had reapplied to the State for a permit, and one on Merry Hill Road where there was an existing gate and entrance. Each lot would be approximately 50' -75' feet in length and 35' – 40' in width (6-12 cars). The one on Route 9 would be large enough for cars to turn around and exit front first; both actually would be that way. The terrain was nearly level on both sites. There were no wetlands to be impacted. The entrance and parking area will be finished with processed gravel.

M. Gasses explained why Mr. Auger was there. She had explained to Mr. Auger that she could not waive the requirement to come to the Planning Board for site review. He would need to go to the Board to ask whether he would be required to go for site review, and second, if required, was what would be required for a submittal.

Mr. Auger explained he had probably put in twenty of these lots on property they owned and never had been required to go for site review.

J. Jennison expressed it would be important for the abutters to be able to speak if they had issues and it was worth going through that process.

R. Pimpis expressed he had said 6-12 cars, but he had not provided any type of arrangement.

M. Gasses expressed that he was there to see if the Board would require any information.

R. Pimpis expressed his understanding of the regulations was that parking lots require review and plans.

Phil Auger asked if they were asking for an engineered plan.

J. Jennison expressed that in the past they had asked for some form of drawing and what was going to be constructed, and not give an open plate to what was going to go in. There needed to be some understanding of what was going to take place.

J. Brann expressed they would need to have the basic information on the drawing showing where people were going to park, enter, and exit.

Phil Auger expressed on the information he provided you could see the entrance to the parking area would be to the north of the gate. They would line the area with the stones from the site so that people could not bypass the parking area to get onto the area where the walking trail would be. The dimension would be about 70' X 40'-50'.

J. Jennison asked if the plans were certified.

Phil Auger expressed the plan was a copy of a survey that was done.

J. Brann expressed that the entrance was shown to the side of the gate and there appeared to be a stonewall there.

Phil Auger expressed there was a gap in the stonewall.

S. Diamond asked if the existing access road off Merry Hill; was it Long Marsh Road?

Phil Auger expressed that the access was actually their woods road and Long Marsh Road was one-half mile to the north. The woods road went all the way through and in about three miles connected to Long Marsh Road.

S. Diamond asked if the gate was already there.

Phil Auger stated yes, that the entrance was existing.

M. Gasses expressed that they would still need to get a driveway permit from the Town unless a permit had been given for the entrance.

Phil Auger believed a permit had been issued in 1991.

M. Gasses expressed that they would need to verify the permit. If it was done the Town should have a copy of it.

J. Brann expressed the basic information was a drawing that has the description of the area where people would be parking, the entrance, what erosion control was in place during construction of the lot, what materials would be used, the depth of the materials in the lot, and restoration of the areas of the lot around the lot once the construction was done.

Phil Auger expressed he could answer those questions now. That there was almost no slope to the site, there was no intent to use silt fence, there were no abutting wetlands, they would remove the boulders, and stump it. The boulders would be used to block people from going around [the gates]. They would use processed gravel for the entrance and throughout the parking area. There would probably be 12" of processed gravel placed on the area. The gravel would be deeper on the areas where it was sloped down.

J. Brann asked if he was correct in thinking an application needed to be submitted for this project.

M. Gasses expressed that in her opinion consistent with what they had required of others is an application needed to be filed. What Mr. Auger was describing appeared sufficient, but an application needed to be filed. The application needed to be accepted and a public hearing held.

J. Jennison expressed it needed an application and needed some type of information. The information Mr. Auger described needed to be placed on the application. There needed to be a paper trail behind the process.

R. Allard expressed that the parking lot needed to be paved.

Phil Auger expressed they would not do that.

M. Gasses expressed that it did not need to be paved depending on the number of spaces and the Board could waive paving if required.

J. Jennison expressed an application was required and it needed the information stated.

J. Brann expressed the application does kick in the requirement to notify abutters and provide the general public an opportunity to provide input.

S. Diamond expressed in the past there had been some neighbor concerns; traffic, noise or whatever, but it did give abutters the chance to be heard. He did not believe it would be a problem in this situation, but you don't know.

M. Gasses expressed one of the concerns in the past was making sure the lot was visible from the road to cut down on illegal and inappropriate behavior that could occur because they were out of sight.

J. Brann expressed when they had dealt with the last application for a lot on conservation land, the police in their comments had expressed that illegal activities occurred on the site.

Phil Auger expressed they were dealing with that at Stonehouse Pond. He expressed he was not sure how open he could make these sites, but he could brush out the young growth.

J. Brann expressed the information from abutters was good input.

Phil Auger expressed he did not hear topography mentioned.

M. Gasses expressed that they need to be specific about what they would require so that they were not waiving items.

M. Gasses expressed they had hit on it with the dimensions and the depth of the materials being used.

J. Brann expressed he was not concerned with topography as long as a hill was not going to wash out because of the construction, or the parking lot runoff was not causing an issue by running downhill.

S. Diamond expressed he would just go there and look; he did not need a lot of paper.

M. Gasses expressed she believed Mr. Auger was going to put together a pretty good diagram of what they were going to do; definitely the materials and how they were going to be constructed would be included. The Board had reviewed the small lot off Town Farm Road and the lot off Route 9 that was a little more complex, and Dubois & King had designed that. She believed Mr. Auger would come up with something in between.

Mr. Auger expressed the Board wanted the dimensions, the depth of material, how the site was going to be divided, how they were going to prepare the site, abutter notification, and he would see what he could do about improved visibility.

ACTION ITEMS

- 3. 270-26-RC-19-SR (Owner: Eric Burgess)** Request by applicant for a Site Review proposal for a landscape yard on Route 4 (aka Old Concord Turnpike) on a 5.49 acre site (Map 270, Lot 26) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Scott Frankiewicz; Brown Engineering and Surveying, LLC; 683C First NH Turnpike; Northwood, NH 03261.

Scott Frankiewicz, LLS with Brown Engineering explained the application for a minor site plan. The wetlands had been delineated by Gove Environmental. The lot had been subdivided in 2002 to create the 5.49-acre lot. The lot was a mixture of uplands and wetlands, and was partially cleared. The land

was vacant with a driveway and small turnaround in place. There were no proposed wetland impacts. A NHDOT permit was in place for a landscape business. The lot was being graded for a landscape business. There were plans to park 8 vehicles and 8 trailers, and 100-200 yds of yard waste would be stored on site to compost and reuse. There would be no increase in stormwater. There was a small detention area at the west side that would handle all the stormwater.

J. Brann expressed he was trying to visualize the area and questioned what was going in the area.

S. Frankiewicz expressed it was an approximately 400' X 150' cleared area.

E. Burgess explained the area would be a lay down lot for their equipment, materials, and there would temporary buildings. There would be storage containers. They currently had 6 trailers and 5 trucks.

J. Brann asked if the area that was to be graded would be seeded.

E. Burgess explained it would be crushed stone.

J. Brann expressed that it would basically be a gravel parking area.

J. Jennison expressed that any temporary shelter over 200 sq. ft. would need a permit.

J. Brann asked about storage of any fuels.

E. Burgess explained there would be only small cans that were legal, and they would be stored outside, possibly inside trailers.

D. Massucci asked how big the trailers were.

E. Burgess expressed they were from 7 ½' X 14' all the way up to 8 ½' X 20'

E. Burgess explained that they currently had 6 trailers and 5 trucks, and they planned to grow. In addition, they have a lot of loose equipment that went out day to day and would be stored on site.

D. Massucci asked if there would be water or bathroom facilities.

E. Burgess stated no.

J. Brann asked about fuel and other chemical storage.

E. Burgess explained the fuel would be stored on the trucks, usually two containers per trailer or truck. The fuel whether diesel or gasoline would be stored on the trailers.

D. Massucci asked if there would be lighting and if they would be pulling out at night.

E. Burgess explained that there wasn't lighting, and they shouldn't be pulling out at night unless it was in the winter during snow and then they would be operating 24/7. Future proposed plans would include lighting.

J. Brann questioned whether they planned to bring power out in the future.

M. Gasses explained any future expansion would require the applicant to come back before the Board.

J. Brann questioned the detail for the driveway entrance. The detail called for 3-inch stone.

E. Burgess explained the stone was for the logging operation in order to clean off the tires.

J. Brann wanted to know how they could clean the mud off the tires without water and where was the sediment trapping device.

S. Frankiewicz expressed the detail was the standard construction detail that NHDES used for construction entrances.

J. Brann explained he had to go by what was on the plan.

J. Brann questioned how they would wash the vehicles.

S. Frankiewicz explained that the purpose of the 3" stone was to remove the material from the tires before they entered the road.

M. Gasses expressed that the removal of the mud was a NHDOT permit requirement and that the State would be after them, not the Town if material was dragged into the State right of way. However, J. Brann had a legitimate concern.

E. Burgess explained they could use high powered leaf blowers as well as pressure washers. They had two 300-gallon tanks they could use for water to facilitate washing. They could keep a gas pressure washer on site.

J. Jennison expressed that E. Burgess's response would be acceptable to add as a requirement.

S. Diamond questioned the slope and whether the landscape yard would be graded level.

S. Frankiewicz expressed it was at a 2% grade to the west at a consistent slope.

J. Brann questioned whether there would be a culvert at the driveway entrance.

E. Burgess expressed there was a culvert installed as part of the approved NHDOT driveway permit for the landscape business use. NHDOT had done a traffic study and a few other things before issuing the permit and he had actually waited until the driveway permit was approved before purchasing the property.

J. Jennison asked whether the driveway was already constructed.

E. Burgess explained the driveway was existing and had previously been constructed.

S. Frankiewicz explained it was constructed with the 3" stone at the entrance.

M. Gasses expressed her concern was that the width for a commercial driveway was 18' and it was represented the driveway varied from 11'-15'.

E. Burgess expressed that since the loggers have been in, the driveway was at least 20' across all the entire length.

J. Brann expressed that the plan detail stated the driveway entrance would be a minimum of 22' in width and 75' in length, where in the plan view it shows a minimum of 50' in length.

S. Frankiewicz expressed it should be a minimum of 50', which is the NHDOT standard and that was just for the temporary construction entrance.

S. Diamond questioned if there were drainage accommodations where the driveway crossed in proximity to the wetlands.

S. Frankiewicz expressed there was an existing culvert in place.

J. Brann expressed that the existing driveway appeared to be on an adjacent lot.

S. Frankiewicz expressed it was located in the existing easement area that was part of the subdivision approval.

J. Brann expressed that the driveway did not actually cross the wetland area.

S. Frankiewicz agreed and expressed that Gove Environmental had gone out and delineated the wetland area.

J. Brann expressed he was trying to discern where the wetland buffer areas were on the plan.

S. Frankiewicz expressed they were shown on Sheets 2 and 3. They had not been shown where it had overlapped.

J. Brann expressed the current driveway does go through the buffer in two places.

S. Frankiewicz expressed the driveway had been in for 10 years or more.

J. Brann questioned whether they would be making improvements to the driveway.

S. Frankiewicz expressed that M. Gasses had told him the minimum driveway width for a commercial lot was 18'.

E. Burgess had expressed that the driveway was already that wide, but they would bring the driveway up to whatever code the plans specify.

J. Brann asked if they would need a 9.6 permit if they were to make improvements to the driveway.

M. Gasses expressed that currently the Board makes a point to address buffer impacts for driveways at the time of subdivision. The issue had come up in the past and you would have to assume when the Planning Board approved the location of the driveway they were also approving the impact to the buffer for the driveway to be located there.

J. Jennison questioned whether the driveway had been constructed to standard or was just a logging road.

E. Burgess expressed that the buffer did apply because in his research prior to purchasing the lot he had reviewed with M. Gasses.

M. Gasses expressed that if they were going to expand to the full 18' she believed they would need the 9.6 permit.

J. Brann asked the applicant to describe any proposed changes to the existing driveway.

E. Burgess asked if they could ask for a waiver where it was an existing driveway.

J. Brann expressed that they needed to know what changes if any would be made.

E. Burgess expressed they had cleared 6 acres of land over a week and a half and had 18 wheelers in and out of the property without an issue. He believed the existing driveway would suffice for years to come.

J. Jennison questioned whether they planned to expand beyond what was shown. He was looking to see how they got from the existing area to the landscape area.

E. Burgess explained there was a small landing area that was used for logging and the laydown area would start at that point.

J. Jennison expressed that if they could verify that the driveway met the 18' width then it would be acceptable to use the driveway as is.

E. Burgess expressed that without going into measurements he could turn around an 18' landscape trailer in the driveway.

R. Allard expressed that it sounded like work had been done recently to expand the driveway in the buffer zone.

E. Burgess expressed he had not done any work on the road. They had a landing as part of their logging but did not go into any of the buffers.

J. Jennison expressed the driveway would need to meet the minimum; James Jennison, Chair verify that it currently did and then go from there.

R. Allen asked if the Conservation Commission should be allowed to way in.

M. Gasses expressed the Conservation Commission was provided the plan but did not understand the project. She felt the plan was very busy and understood why the Conservation Commission was confused.

R. Allard was concerned that the Conservation Commission had not given their consent.

J. Jennison explained that the Conservation Commission role was advisory and the surveyors and engineers that stamp the plan were the experts. The Conservation Commission supplies an opinion, they do not go out and verify wetlands. In this instance the applicant was not going through the wetlands.

M. Gasses expressed that the driveway was an impact to the buffer. On older plans the driveway locations were approved in the buffer as part of the subdivision approval.

J. Jennison asked what the next step should be.

S. Frankiewicz expressed that the applicant planned to use the driveway as it currently existed. He asked if they could have a waiver.

M. Gasses expressed that the plan did not reflect what currently existed. The plan needed to reflect the width that currently existed in order for the Board to act.

J. Jennison expressed it was like they were asking for a waiver from providing information, but the Board needed the information to act.

B. Pimpis pointed out on Sheet 4 in called for a 22' minimum.

S. Frankiewicz expressed that was for the construction entrance.

J. Jennison expressed that it was confusing.

S. Frankiewicz expressed the 22' was a NHDOT requirement.

M. Gasses expressed NHDOT requirements and the Town's requirements did not always match and we needed to let NHDOT worry about their right of way.

J. Jennison asked M. Gasses what she thought would be appropriate for the Board to do.

M. Gasses asked if the Board wanted to continue consideration until the May 7th meeting to allow the applicant to update their plans or did they want to accept the application as complete and continue the application. The applicant had provided the application; the Board was just looking for more information.

J. Brann expressed he was not comfortable with accepting the application.

S. Diamond expressed he would need to know more about the base of the driveway near the wetland. The applicant would also want to know about it to make sure they would not get stuck there.

M. Gasses expressed the material had been supplied, whether we agreed with it or not was another issue, but it had been supplied. If they needed a 9.6 permit they would have needed to submit today.

J. Jennison expressed they would not know the answer to the 9.6 until they did more evaluation.

M. Gasses suggested that the applicant provide a plan sheet that included the wetlands and buffers, but not the topography so that the buffers would be more clearly visible. She explained that the staff recommendations had pointed out that the driveway needed to be a minimum of 18' in width and that had been added to a revised plan that had been provided to her on Thursday, but not to the Board.

E. Burgess explained he appreciated the concern with the driveway and the buffer, but they had thought they were all set with the driveway because they had a permit from NHDOT.

J. Jennison explained that the permit was for the entrance.

E. Burgess expressed this was a minor site plan just so that they could park some trucks and move some dirt; he had six full time guys and waiting a month was going to kill them. He did understand the Board's concern.

J. Jennison expressed it was the regulations. There was confusion whether they were doing work or not, whether the driveway was 16' or 22', and whether there was a waiver to be granted.

M. Gasses expressed the 18' was in the site review regulations and there would be no retail sales.

J. Jennison expressed that his concern with giving a waiver for the width of the driveway. Then they would have to come back for an expansion of the driveway and if there was an expansion into the buffer, he may be prevented from future uses.

E. Burgess expressed that expansion was planned for the future and if they needed to widen the driveway then they would.

J. Brann asked if there was anything else they needed to know to move forward aside from the driveway.

M. Gasses expressed they had designed the drainage, which was fairly simple. Her recommendation was that Mr. Frankiewicz would have to certify the drainage was constructed as designed. An as built would be required. She had asked the Fire Chief if he was concerned with the lack of water out there given the nature of the business and he was not.

J. Brann expressed that he felt there was sufficient delineation for him to determine that the lay down area was not in the buffer.

The Board concurred.

J. Brann asked if there was a maintenance plan for the drainage area.

S. Frankiewicz stated yes.

The Board discussed the width of the existing driveway and the fact that although a note was added to the plans of April 11th with a width of 11' to 16', it was not a surveyed width of the existing driveway and the Board did not know the actual width of the driveway. The Board could not wave the width of the driveway if they did not know how wide the existing driveway was.

E. Burgess expressed that he needed to come back to the Board with the surveyed width of the driveway on the revised plan and disregard the 11' to 16' note.

J. Brann expressed he would then need to decide whether he wanted a waiver from the width or that he did not need one because the driveway was already 18' in width.

S. Diamond expressed that he was not particularly concerned about significant wetlands impacts, but if filling of the wetlands occurred it would be important to document when they had occurred and what requirements were made and met for what development.

S. Burgess asked if it would be better to just hold off and come back after they make all the changes to the plans.

J. Jennison expressed they could not grant a waiver based upon hearsay.

E. Burgess asked if he could cut trees.

J. Jennison explained you could cut but not stump.

M. Gasses expressed she thought the Board should accept the application as complete. The applicant had submitted the necessary paper work and they would come back with revisions. The Board would be able to open the public hearing and take comment. In essence the Board had talked more about the nitty gritty that was normally talked about after the application was accepted as complete. After they get into the nitty gritty the Board can ask for more information.

J. Brann noted they would need the following:

- Better delineation of the buffers, separate overlay with no topo

- Delineating exactly what the driveway dimensions were
- Decide on whether they want a 9.6 for construction of the driveway or a waiver for the width
- A better description of what this landscape area was and how it was going to function
- If making changes what the proposed driveway dimensions would be
- Correct Sheet four to make sure the dimensions match

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by S. Diamond to accept the application as complete. The motion carried 5-1

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Sandy Wentworth of Franklin Pierce Highway asked what a landscape yard consisted of. If the business could grow, they should address future use on the plan in order to save themselves money. The description of the operation was quite broad.

S. Diamond expressed he would be interested in knowing what “100 to 200 yards of yard waste would be brought on site” consisted of.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Brann asked the applicant to describe the proposed composting.

E. Burgess described the composting process, which included separating out sticks and stones, taking anything that was decomposable and turn it two to three times a year, separate the fines, and you get to reuse it as organic material. It was no different then what Great View was doing on their property.

B. Pimpis asked if it would be appropriate to have that indicated on the plan.

J. Brann agreed that the location would be appropriate.

S. Diamond asked if the compost would be dyed.

E. Burgess stated no, but he had not composted yet because he had not had the room.

B. Pimpis asked if it would make methane gas.

E. Burgess expressed it would be no different than yard waste in your own yard.

M. Gasses expressed appropriate turning limited the odor.

J. Jennison asked for hours of operation and dumpster location.

J. Brann expressed the layout of the yard including temporary buildings and vehicle area should be on the plans.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by S. Diamond to continue the application to May 7. The motion carried unanimously.

4. [238-16-V-19-SR \(Owner: Drew Pond, LLC\)](#) 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.

D. Ayer arrived at 8:20 p.m.

J. Jennison introduced the application.

Chris Berry with Berry Surveying and Engineering explained the application proposed by Robert Baldwin, the principal member of Drew Pond. The site was located across the street from the Barrington Middle School. The top of the hill was the top of the sheet abutting the open space for Village Place. The site sloped down to the Route 9 corridor. There was a large wetland identified with Drew Pond as well as a prime wetland. Drew Pond every now and then gets dammed up and stormwater is stored there. NHDOT would come by and remove the blockage every now and then and the pond dries. Stony Ridge Environmental delineated the wetlands on site. A 100' buffer was required from a prime wetland. With the purchase of the property, a 50' right of way was established. An AoT permit was required. There was on-site specific soil testing done by Stony Ridge Environmental. The test pit data as well as the results of infiltration testing were included in the packet information.

The proposal included a 20' wide access road with 4 foot at grade sidewalk back to 20-unit pad sites. The locations for the pad sites were identified by finding the best location based upon topography. The units on the north side were drive under units, basically driving into the slope. On the south side they were also drive under but used the concrete as a retaining wall. The proposal was for two phases. The units would have two bedrooms. The units were staggered to achieve an appealing look. There were to be multiple on-site effluent disposal locations. The backs would have decks and porches where applicable. The systems were advance enviro systems so that the nitrogen would be utilized on site. The systems were high performance low profile. The common water supply had not been designed yet. They were scheduled to hire a company to permit the water supply source with NHDES. They did have a preferred location based upon the proposed effluent disposal units and impervious surfaces. The well had to be 50' from any impervious surface. The protective radius needed to stay on site.

The AoT permit was really concerned with stormwater management and how they were dealing with impervious surfaces on site, vegetation loss, and sedimentation control throughout construction and long-term BMP's. Looking at Hanoverian Drive, the site sloped toward the prime wetland. There concern was with the treatment of the stormwater. They were at the headwaters of Mallego Brook, which was a Class A water body and again concerned about the nitrogen. They had such good soils they were able to capture stormwater and rein filtrate the nitrogen to address it. All the stormwater would be sent to a traditional infiltration pond. The pond contained two feet of bioretention media. All the storm flow up to the 50-year storm would reinfiltrate back into the ground. They needed recharge as well as flow decrease to the prime wetland.

The Oldenburg side of the project stormwater puddled and pooled against the side of Route 9. They attempted to capture the flow in low impact devices including a large and small rain garden on the eastern side of the project, and a dry swale at the entrance to the project so that all that stormwater was captured, attenuated, and reinfiltrated back into the ground.

They had done one large global drainage analysis but broken it down into two pieces so that they knew the effect of both pad sites on the stormwater. They wanted to be sure the stormwater for both sites could work independently from one another.

The project was one project, so that if the project was eventually turned over to the final ownership there would be one association. Until such time as the ownership changed, Drew Pond LLC or its subsidiary would be responsible for managing it and the stormwater system.

TEP LLC did the traffic analysis. They usually performed traffic analysis in house, but TEP LLC had different credentials. The reason was the interaction with Haley Drive and the Middle School, and the turning movements to and from the site during the am and pm peak traffic. TEP LLC found the trip generation for this type of development was very low and split between two pad sites. The hours for the residential units in the afternoon were off peak from the school hours. The hours in the morning were slightly off peak. The peak hours for the school were between 7 and 8. The peak hours for the development were between 7 and 9, with most between 8 and 9 for this type of housing stock. TEP LLC found there was no conflict based on the low trip generation and ultimately NHDOT would review the traffic impact analysis as well as part of the driveway permit.

They were applying for a few waivers. The waivers were the result of a conflict in the regulations and how they were applied. The Site Review regulations refer to the subdivision regulations for road design. The regulations discuss trips per days and units (4) on a proposed street. Ordinarily trips per day was used to determine the usage and geometric design. The problem was that the trips per day for a private road was set at 200, which was about twenty units, then the maximum number of units on a private roadway was four. The two were inherently in conflict.

J. Brann expressed they were meeting the requirements for a private road based upon traffic. The traffic was split between the two roads with 130 trips on each road.

C. Berry expressed on the second line it had the maximum of four units.

J. Brann expressed they had dealt with that issue before.

C. Berry expressed the first waiver (1) they were requesting was from 12.2.1 – The maximum of 9% grade for a private roadway and they were requesting 9.25 % for a short distance. They had approached the design as a hybrid between a driveway and a road based upon the number of units. The maximum road grade for a driveway was less than 10%. They had a small section of approximately 100' that was .25% over the 9%. The reason was to keep the proposed profile as close to the existing profile as possible so as to limit the amount of disturbance on the upslope as well as the downslope. To meet the 9%, they would need to do a considerable amount of cutting and ditching and they would not be able to keep the curve quite as fat.

J. Brann questioned the distance looking at Sheets 15 & 16. He believed it was between 125 and 150 feet. He expressed that he felt he could drop the level on the top of the hill by 4"-6" and they would not need a waiver at all. The soils up there were sandy as noted by the test pit results and he did not believe it would be a significant cost.

C. Berry expressed when they originally did the design they were simply trying to stay under 10%. If the Board preferred for them to adjust the design to eliminate the .25%, they would take a look at it.

S. Diamond expressed he felt kind of strongly about slope. It was not a private home where the individual could be responsible for sanding the road, and there would be more significant traffic.

D. Ayer asked if he had spoken with the Fire Department regarding bump outs and turn arounds.

C. Berry expressed they had spoken with him during conceptual discussions.

J. Brann expressed they had hammerheads for the Fire Department on the plans.

J. Jennison expressed that Mr. Berry would work to reach 9%.

C. Berry expressed waiver (2) 12.2.1 minimum tangent of 100' between reverse curves. They were proposing an immediate reverse curve. When they were dealing with higher speeds and larger subdivision roads they wanted larger tangents, but in this design it would push the design up hill and create more of a cut and earth disturbance that they were trying to avoid.

M. Gasses expressed that with the curve it may slow down the speed on the road.

R. Allard expressed that it was a significant slope as well as a curve.

M. Gassed expressed not compared to other roads in Town.

J. Brann commented that Oak Hill Road was 14%.

C. Berry expressed that Ramsdell Lane was 13%.

R. Allard expressed he was impressed the Board knew this stuff.

J. Brann expressed he would be just like them in another 6 months.

J. Jennison expressed he had no aversions to that, although it wasn't ideal.

C. Berry expressed waiver (3) was from 12.2.1 Table 1 shoulder width of 6 feet in cut and 3 feet in fill. They were asking for 2-foot shoulders for both cut and fill. This was based upon the 4 foot at grade walk; they already had an additional 4 feet inside the actual cross section itself. All the slopes were pretty much fill slopes. The cross-section width would be almost 28' and to have 30' of cross section width seemed excessive. Part of the cross-section width was an at grade walk. There was proposed curbing at the entrance to control stormwater.

J. Brann found the 4' sidewalk on some of the plans and questioned where they were.

C. Berry showed the walk delineated on Sheet 8 of 59.

J. Brann expressed he could see the sidewalk on were between 7 and 9, with most between 8 and 9 for this type of housing stock. TEP LLC found there was no conflict based on the low trip generation and ultimately NHDOT would review the traffic impact analysis as well as part of the driveway permit.

C. Berry expressed it was shown as a 4' at grade walkway.

J. Brann questioned that there was a limited amount of curbing, but it did not go up the hill and it was only on one side.

C. Berry expressed that the curbing was on both sides.

J. Brann expressed that curbing in the Village District was required on both sides for the entire length.

M. Gasses expressed this was more of a driveway.

J. Brann questioned whether a private road needed to meet this standard.

C. Berry expressed a private road would need to meet the private road standard and a Village District Road would need to meet the Village District standard.

M. Gasses expressed this road was not open to the general public to access.

J. Jennison expressed the road would never be adopted by the Town.

J. Brann read from 12.8.9(1) – Curbing may be required in the following locations if the Board determines their application is appropriate: in the Village District; for major access roads for residential subdivisions; for intersections with arterial or collector roads; and any road that exceeds 8% grade or 6% when the developed length exceeds 250 feet. The regulation said in the Village District.

M. Gasses expressed the regulation said “may”.

J. Brann expressed than if that was the case a waiver would not be needed.

M. Gasses expressed the regulations only say may in some instances and if they did not, a waiver would be required.

J. Brann expressed they had to give a waiver on Meetinghouse Road.

C. Berry expressed the waiver was necessary because the slopes exceeded 8% on Meetinghouse Road.

J. Brann expressed that he was just trying to clarify so they knew in the future how to proceed. If it was “may” for the curbing it would be “may” on any road that exceeded 8% grade.

M. Gasses expressed based upon the regulation you would first need to determine whether curbing was appropriate or not.

C. Berry asked for a 5-minute break.

C. Berry expressed the Board was discussing what “may” might mean. They had always understood it to be required and especially in this instance, which was a site review not a residential subdivision. The trigger for curbing was usually whether you had long excessive slopes.

M. Gasses expressed she felt the others were regulated by “may,” but the requirement kicked in when the grade was exceeded.

R. Allard expressed that when you have a steep slope you have scalloping along the road and you begin to lose the edge. He believed that condition existed here.

D. Ayer suggest shot rock.

C. Berry expressed that in this specific area they could look at adding curbing. They would prefer not to add rock in a residential area like this where the units would not be inexpensive. The curb line would be more appealing and the end product better.

J. Jennison asked if they would need drains if they put curbing.

C. Berry expressed no, because if they curbed it all the way down to the spreader system they would just scupper it off the road with a rock line pad.

J. Brann expressed the initial cost of installing the curb would likely be less than performing repairs after.

J. Jennison brought the conversation back to waiver (3) for the shoulders.

C. Berry expressed a standard road had 10' lanes and 2' shoulders.

J. Jennison expressed his only concern would be in the switchback areas having that extra width, if people were hugging one curve and crossing over to the other.

J. Brann expressed the question would be whether that extra foot would make a difference.

J. Jennison expressed probably not.

J. Brann questioned what affect the curbing would have on the grading of the shoulder.

C. Berry expressed he would place a 1' shoulder on the other side of the curb.

J. Brann expressed they were running water into a catch basin on the southeast corner of the curve. If they decreased the shoulder were they increasing the angle of decline from the pavement.

C. Berry expressed he would have to push the slope out. The whole section would be widened.

J. Brann expressed with respect to erosion if the slope would be the same.

C. Berry expressed there would arguably be a minuscule increase in flow to the slope.

J. Brann expressed he was satisfied.

S. Diamond expressed that space for snow storage and whether people were going to park on the road were concerns in the past.

J. Brann expressed that snow storage had been addressed on the plan.

C. Berry expressed they were all fill slopes on the road so snow storage would not be a problem. In addition, one of the Police Chief's comments was always providing enough parking on the site and they believed they had done that.

C. Berry expressed waiver (4) 12.7 Table 2, maximum of 2% of a road grade within 100 feet of an intersection.

At Hanoverian they met the Town's regulation but would need to fight with NHDOT for it.

The proposed roadway with a platform of 3% or less for 75' and 4% for 25' at Oldenburg Drive. N.H. and Route 9 is a NHDOT controlled roadway. The proposed entrance design was done to conform to the regulations of NHDOT, which required a road grade of -4% off a DOT controlled roadway, or a continuation of the existing grade coming off the existing shoulder grade. The proposed roadway was designed at a -3% road grade in order to match the grade coming off the existing shoulder. From there the road would transition into a positive road grade that would not exceed 4% within 100' of the intersection. The sag curve would allow vehicles to come to a natural stop as they approached N.H. Route 9. The 2% regulation had to do with someone's interpretation of the old Green Book, when you we're designing highways not subdivision roads. The ultimate consideration was whether there was a large enough platform for someone to safely stop. They were able to keep it at less than 4% for 125'.

J. Brann expressed that the plan did not meet what was being stated.

C. Berry explained there were two curves with a tangent between the two curves at 4% and it zero's out.

J. Brann expressed his questions were answered on the waiver.

C. Berry explained waiver request (5) 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. The proposed roadway without curbing above 8% grade and ditches with a 9.25% grade for 100 feet.

C. Berry asked if they had satisfied this during the earlier conversation.

J. Brann was not sure if they had total consensus, but the regulations read the "curbing may be required if the Board so decides". The Board needed to decide whether curbing would be required and if so, it would be required on both sides.

J. Jennison expressed that the Board had already determined they wanted curbing on the steep slope where they had asked them to place it.

J. Brann expressed from a technical standpoint, a waiver was not required, that the Board would stipulate where curbing was required, and the applicant would have to comply. It was appropriate for Berry Surveying and Engineering to assess where curbing may be required and for the Board to discuss it.

M. Gasses pointed out that a waiver would still be required from 12.8.8(4) "Ditches shall not be permitted at grades above 8 percent, which require curbing, culverts and basins, or at grades above 6 percent when the developed length exceeds 250 feet".

J. Brann discuss the grammar behind the interpretation of 12.8.9 Curbing and that after each semi colon was an instance where they could require curbing.

M. Gasses expressed it was time to move on to 12.8.8(4) ditches.

C. Berry identified where they would include a length of curbing, which was in the area of greater than 8% slope.

J. Brann asked where the water from the northeast corner of the curve above the cistern was going to flow.

C. Berry expressed that the cistern was currently a place holder. They knew they needed to put in a cistern, but they have not decided that the current location was the best place for it. If it was the best location, they would simply run the swale around the backside.

J. Brann expressed that the buildings were sprinklered and the applicant was providing two post hydrants.

C. Berry expressed they could not hitch on to a post hydrant, they were simple blow offs.

J. Brann asked if there had been a conversation with the Chief on whether a cistern would even be required.

M. Gasses explained that a cistern would be required and was discussed at the TRC. The question had been whether NHDOT would allow them to place the cistern down along the State road so that they could have a broader utilization of it. It would be more of a community asset than just for this development. The cistern was required in addition to sprinklers because this was a multifamily project. The sprinklers were just to allow people to escape the building.

J. Brann asked if one well would be sufficient to supply the entire development.

C. Berry expressed that NHDES would likely require two wells right next to each other. Until they drilled a hole in the ground and monitored that hole for 24 hours, they had no idea of what kind of volume/refill rate they were going to have, which meant they did not know how much storage they would need on the back side of the well.

J. Brann asked if the pumps were internal to the well.

C. Berry explained that the pumps were typically internal to the well, but because of how this water system may have to work the pumps may be external.

J. Brann expressed that if the well became dry or contaminated there would be a whole lot of people suffering.

C. Berry expressed that is why NHDES would likely make them place a second well next to the first one.

D. Ayer expressed there would be a well, tank, bladder, and pumps, and there would be a level of water maintained over time.

M. Gasses asked if the Board could go back to the ditches.

C. Berry explained Hanoverian had the largest fill slope. It was on a curve, so he proposed curving the road so that the water went down their curve line and into the spreader and treatment swale.

J. Brann expressed they did have catch basins along the slope.

C. Berry described the location of the catch basins.

J. Brann expressed there was one at the bottom of the 9% grade.

C. Berry explained all the water that comes off the hill and off the building came down through the site and they could not just put a road in the way and dam off the site. There was a basin with a treatment cell and a cross culvert to catch abutting flow and send it across. He described the direction of the flow.

J. Jennison asked where the ditch section was that was above 8%.

C. Berry explained it was on Hanoverian.

M. Gasses asked if they did or did not need the waiver. She suggested they leave it for now.

C. Berry explained waiver request (6) 4.7.7(1) minimum pipe diameter of 15" in any drain system. A proposed drain system with some 12" culverts. As part of the construction of the two private roadways, an integral drainage system was designed in order to capture, treat, and infiltrate the

runoff generated from the roads and town house units. The proposed drainage system was sized so that it could accommodate the rain falls from the design storm events. Hydrologically they did not need bigger culverts; you do not put in wasted material for no good reason. The reason the regulation was written was for cross culverts and they were not proposing any of their cross culverts to be less than 15”.

M. Gasses expressed that Dubois & King would evaluate their calculations to confirm the pipes are sized correctly.

J. Brann confirmed they were just requesting that they could use culverts as small as 12” where appropriate; other larger culverts were also being used.

R. Allen expressed 15” carried almost twice the volume, kept things from backing up, and there was not much of a price difference.

D. Ayer expressed there was quite a price difference.

M. Gasses expressed that it was more important to be sure the system was designed appropriately for the storm event, which is why they had the Town’s engineer review the calculations. You didn’t want to undersize, but you didn’t want to oversize either because that would affect the efficiency of the system.

A motion made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to accept the application as complete. The motion carried unanimously

J. Jennison opened the public hearing.

Sharon Reynolds, daughter of Linda Reynolds, expressed she did not have major concerns but asked about the offset from the property lines. She was concerned with the addition of decks and proximity to the property line. She felt more [drain] pipe capacity would be better, expressing concern over climate change and extreme weather events. She expressed that wells can vary differently from location to location.

J. Brann explained the setbacks in the Village District were 30’ from the sides and back, and 40’ from the front.

M. Gasses explained that setbacks were measure from the farthest projection and a septic setback she believed was 10’ but was regulated by NHDES.

Jim Sorbello, an abutter from Village Place, expressed he had the 100’ buffer and wanted to know if any further tree cutting would be done because he felt there were more trees that could possibly be cut.

Chris Berry expressed he believed the property had been cleared to the property line, but he would check. He did not believe further cutting would take place, but he would return at the next meeting with the answer.

Jim Sorbello expressed Village Place had less erosion where there was curbing.

Sharon Reynolds mentioned her desire for sidewalks on Route 9 if the Board desired Barrington to be a walkable community.

J. Jennison expressed that the Board had recently been talking about sidewalks and were planning to work on a project through the State to have sidewalks down Route 9 and on Route 125.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Brann expressed for next time he wanted to look at landscaping, and a maintenance plan for the drainage systems.

R. Allard asked if the driveways would be 18' wide.

Chris Berry stated they were.

A motion was made by J. Jennison and seconded by S. Diamond to continue to the May 21st meeting. The motion carried unanimously

Without objection the meeting was adjourned.

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

M. Gasses reminded members to sign up for the Planning and Zoning Conference.

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

May 7, 2019 6:30 pm Early Childhood Learning Center

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia J. Gasses
Town Planner