



BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING

NEW LOCATION: EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING CENTER

77 RAMSDELL LANE

Barrington, NH 03825

(Approved January 7, 2020)

Tuesday December 17, 2019

6:30 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.

Members Present

James Jennison, Chair
Jeff Brann, Vice Chair
Steve Diamond
Ron Allard
Robert Pimpis

Members Absent

Donna Massucci
Andy Knapp ex- officio
Rondi Boyer

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

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of the December 3, 2019 meeting minutes.

Without objection the minutes of December 3, 2019 were approved as amended at lines 97, 137, 138, and 140.

ACTION ITEM CONTINUED FROM THE December 3, 2019

2. **233-77, 234-1.2&1.4-V-19-SR (Owner: Town of Barrington)** Request by applicant RRB5, LLC (Turbocam) for a Site Review proposal to construct a light industrial building (27,640 s.f.) used for training and educational purposes with associated parking, utilities, and drainage with a 9.6 Special Permit in wetland buffer and a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit on Route 9/Redemption Road in the Village Zoning District. (Map 233-77 & 234-1.2 & 1.4). BY: Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering; 118 Portsmouth Avenue; Stratham, NH 03885.
(Application has been accepted as complete/9.6 Permit and 3.4 permit have been approved.)

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Eliot Wilkins representing Turbocam asked to continue the application until January 7, 2020. Eliot explained that they are still working with the State on how to get rid of the water. Eliot explained that they are working UNH engineering that wrote the law and work with the State.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by B. Pimpis to continue the application until January 7, 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

- 2a. **234-1.5-V-14-SR-3.4 & 9.6 (Applicant: Turbocam, Owner Town of Barrington)** Request by applicant to present a Site Review for the purpose of constructing a building footprint with 26,640 s.f. of industrial space and 6,240 s.f. of office space, 3.4 Conditional Use Permit for a light manufacturing use within the Village District and a 9.6 Special Permit for a 478 s.f. of grading within the 50' wetland buffer on a 3 acre lot located on Redemption Road (Map 234, Lot 1.5) in the Village (V) Zoning District. By: Michael Sievert, P.E.; MJS Engineering, PC; PO Box 359; Newmarket, NH 03857

Eliot Wilkins representing Turbocam asked the Select Board on Monday if they could do the site work on Lot 1.5 and stated that they were all set with that. Eliot explained that now he was before the Board to ask to use the same submission materials from the case back on November 18, 2014 where they did not meet all conditions and needed to submit a new application.

J. Brann asked if the Town still owned the property.

Eliot explained that the ownership transfer should be done this week.

J. Huckins explained that it was the site that was approved by the Board a few years ago. J. Huckins explained that we have the full file and a copy of the notice of decision when it was approved. J. Huckins explained that they had already had third party review from Dubois & King and zoning, and site review has not changed since the approval.

J. Jennison asked if they planned on building the building.

Eliot explained that right now only site work would be done. Eliot explained that they would be doing both sites at the same time. Eliot explained that he would need to put fill on the site anyways and has a quote to work on both sites at the same time.

J. Brann asked if he was talking about work being done on Lot 1.5 and the new training center work on Lot 1.2. J. Brann asked if they were talking about doing the site work on Lot 1.5. J. Brann asked if the Town still owned Lot 1.5.

Eliot stated that the Town still owns Lot 1.5. Eliot explained that they would be building on that site in 2022.

J. Huckins explained that once they started within 6 months, they would have 5 years for completion. J. Brann asked where the materials were going from Lot 1.5.

Eliot explained that the materials are going to Lot 1.2.

J. Brann asked if this was to level off the lot.

Eliot stated yes.

R. Allard asked if Lot 1.2 was still owned by the Town.

Eliot explained that by the end of the week the lots would be owned by Turbocam.

J. Huckins explained that by the time they get final approval they would be given approval to Turbocam.

Eliot explained that Lots 1, 1.2 and 77 would all be merged together to one lot.

R. Allard asked if you can ask permission to work on property that you don't own.

J. Brann explained that you could with permission from the property owner with was the Town. J. Brann asked what about the work on Lot 1.2. J. Brann stated that they can not start blasting or doing any work.

J. Huckins stated Lot 1.2 was the case before the Board and Lot 1.5 would be a new application.

J. Brann stated that he could not do any work on Lot 1.2 and the new application would be for only Lot 1.5.

J. Huckins explained that they want to resubmit the packet that has same information with the application that was conditionally approved in 2014 but expired.

J. Brann asked if there were any new regulations that have changed since this was last before the Board.

J. Huckins explained that there are no zoning or site review changes. J. Huckins explained that the AoT permit was still valid.

J. Jennison asked if the Board would except the Dubois & King review that was already on file.

J. Brann asked if the Town had the review.

J. Huckins explained that was in the file and explained that the Board had the copy of the notice of decision from 2014.

J. Jennison asked the Board if they felt that the applicant could resubmit what they had in 2014.

J. Brann asked if they could come before the Board for an amended site review.

J. Huckins explained that they would have had to come to the Board before the application expired.

The Board came to a decision to go ahead and accept the application materials as presented in 2014.

ACTION ITEMS

3. **219-45-GR-19-Parking Area (Owners: Jason Nash & Alisha Gallagher)** Request by applicant for a proposal to construct a 5-car parking area at 58 Seavey Bridge Road (Map 219, Lot 45) in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. BY: John Wallace, Barrington Conservation Commission; POB 660; Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

J. Huckins explained that this was the application that John Wallace was representing for the Conservation Land on Seavey Bridge Road.

S. Diamond explained to the Board that John Wallace sent over an email that they would not make it tonight.

J. Huckins asked if where this was Town, do they need someone here for the case or could the Board go ahead.

J. Brann expressed that he had questions about the culvert.

A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by R. Allard to continue the application to January 7, 2020 due to the applicant was not present. The motion carried unanimously.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

4. **210-44&57-GR-19-ConceptRev (Owners: Trinity Conservation Inc.)** Review by applicant for a conceptual review on Green Hill Road (Map 210, Lots 44 & 57) in the General Residential Zoning District. BY: Joseph Coronati; Jones & Beach Engineers, PO Box 219, Stratham, NH 03885.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

J. Huckins explained to the Board that this could only be general discussion for this application because there was no abutter notification, and this was clearly conceptual.

Joe Coronati from Jones & Beach Engineers Inc. represented Chris Annis who was with the development group that was looking at this property. Joe explained to the Board that this was the property that received a gravel pit approval 7 years ago on half of the land. Joe explained that the property has access off Green Hill Road with an existing gravel driveway with parts that are asphalt that turns into gravel. Joe explained that these lots also have access from an old right of way from Hansonville Road. Joe explained that this was two different pieces of property owned by the same owners. Joe explained that with the two properties together are approximately 200 acres. Joe explained that they got most of their information online and explained that they could get topo and rough property lines. Joe explained the to the Board that all this information was approximate.

S. Diamond asked why the difference between the indexes of wetlands.

Joe explained that the information was from two different websites.

J. Brann asked if the wetlands were as combination of the green areas on the drawing.

Joe explained that they used both. Joe explained that they walked 2/3 of the property and explained that there are two sides to it; one was along the Isinglass River and gravel side on the right side. Joe showed

an ariel photo of the two parcels. Joe explained as the topo changed it got hillier and some areas may have ledge in it. Joe explained that the main reason they are before the Board was for a proposed subdivision and find the best way to lay out house lots on the property. Joe explained that he sketched out a layout of the property and showed with the standard lot size (78 lots yielded out) requirements a rough layout.

J. Brann asked about some of the lots showing the wetlands.

Joe explained that they would have to show the uplands area.

J. Huckins explained that they would need 35,000 sq. ft. contiguous, 60,000 sq. ft. for the hybrid A and ledge 80,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size, 7% road grade, and 10% driveway grade on a yield plan.

Joe asked about the steep driveway.

J. Huckins explained that they need a realistic yield plan. J. Huckins explained that he was sure the wetlands are not showing on this plan.

J. Brann asked about buffers around the wetlands.

J. Huckins explained that you could count it, but you need to show a buildable area outside the wetland buffer.

J. Brann expressed that you may be okay with the uplands but need to consider the wetland buffers.

J. Huckins explained that the buffer was to the fill extension material, not to the edge of the building. J. Huckins explained the fill needs to stay outside the buffer. J. Huckins explained to the applicant that he would set down with them and go over all the regulations that would be needed to be met.

Joe explained that once they lay it out, they would see how the cluster would work. Joe explained that they are not there for the yield.

J. Brann explained that this was a conceptual review and stated that he understood that they are there for primarily for discussion of the road.

Joe explained that the next plan was an open space conceptual subdivision with open space shown. Joe explained that they are trying to use the existing road pattern going out to the gravel pit. Joe explained that the plan was to have a loop and cul-de-sacs in the neighborhood to help with the phases. Joe explained that they are showing a connection out to Rochester through Stillwater which was a neighboring subdivision. Joe showed the Board of an ariel of what this all looks like showing Route 125 connections to Hansonville and Green Hill Road. Joe showed a long access road with a bridge close to the Isinglass. Joe explained that apparently Rochester had contacted existing owners in the development first to ask they would be interested in a connection to their development as his understanding was, they had issues during the Mother's Day storm and the people were trapped out there. Joe explained that they know that was a Rochester concern and Barrington's regulations required a second means of egress. Joe stated that they started to look at this as a second means of egress and would be a great way to have emergency access out of the Rochester development.

J. Jennison asked about this being a problem if there was an emergency and given the phasing, in an emergency they couldn't get out that way. It also concerns him with this being the second means of egress.

Joe asked if he meant during construction.

J. Jennison explained that at anytime and when complete, if that was a bottle neck now exiting the Rochester subdivision and there was a problem, with all these added houses it becomes a problem with all traffic flowing that way to go out.

Joe showed on the plan if these areas were built out and have this connection.

J. Huckins explained that even in the phases, you can't have more than 1,000 feet of roadway to the furthest end of the development by Town's regulations.

Joe expressed that they could talk about if this was the second means of egress, they would need to build it in the first phase.

J. Brann stated that they have two conceptual plans; one where the egress goes out and ties into Stillwater, and the other one going out to Hansonville. J. Brann asked as far as egress going into Hansonville versus Stillwater, what was the advantage of either.

Joe explained that the advantage to go out to Stillwater was that they could leave larger tracks of open space and 1,200 feet of road reduction. Joe explained both layouts would have the same amount of lots on them. Joe explained that if they went out to Hansonville there would be no reason to connect to Rochester and it would be 100 feet of road they would not need to build. Joe explained that they were hoping that Barrington and Rochester would work together on this. Chris Annis met with the Fire Chief today.

J. Huckins asked if he meant with the Barrington one.

Chris Annis stated that he meant with the Barrington Fire Chief.

Joe explained that the Barrington Fire Chief and Police Chief wanted to see it opened for Rochester to go through Barrington and Barrington go through to Rochester. Joe explained that Chris also had a meeting with the City of Rochester staff, and they want to see a gate.

J. Brann asked why they wanted a gate.

Chris stated when he talked with the Town Planner in Rochester that his understanding was that when the people in the Stillwater development first heard about a pit being done in the subdivision that they didn't like the idea of vehicles going through a quiet neighborhood where kids play in the road and for safety wanted a dead end street. Chris explained that at one time they thought about hiring an attorney. Chris explained that when he spoke to staff in Rochester, they all were concerned about safety with cars going through.

J. Brann expressed that this would have been an advantage during the Mother's Day flood.

Chris explained that they Rochester Town Planner interacted to their Planning Board and they wanted it gated.

S. Diamond asked about the gravel pit access that was all through Green Hill Road and would it never go through there [Stillwater].

J. Huckins explained that there was no gravel extraction and stated that they are just trying to do a subdivision.

S. Diamond expressed the concern about the traffic.

Chris explained that Rochester did have another means of egress for the subdivision via Barrington; it was on their Master Plan. Chris explained that one of the neighbors heard about it and they didn't want a road going through. Chris explained to the Rochester Town Planner that the residents from Rochester would be coming our way and it was unlikely Barrington residents would be going through Stillwater. Chris explained that Chief Walker stated that they would need to do a traffic study like that have done on other subdivisions in Town.

J. Huckins explained the subdivision access from Village Place through Deer Ridge and neighbors do not cut through. J. Huckins expressed that this subdivision was in the middle of nowhere and felt people are not going to go through.

Joe explained that it would be faster for them to go out to Route 125 than through the proposed subdivision and explained that they are both lighted intersections.

J. Huckins explained that for the people from Rochester it would be safer for them if they had a through road connected. J. Huckins expressed that if the residents pursued a law suit, the City of Rochester would win because they are trying to protect their residents.

J. Brann asked with respect to snow removal, how you would keep the gate access opened up all the time.

Chris explained that he talked to the Rochester Town Planner and he said it would be up to them to maintain the right of way. Chris explained that Chief Walker felt that this cross connect was a good idea for emergency vehicles and first responders. Chris explained that he talked to a company that the gate would have a light and remote operation so first responders would not need to get out of the vehicles to open the gate. Chris explained that the gate would be like a railroad gate, but Chief Walker was against this or any type of gate. Chris explained that it would be good if Rochester could take care of this.

R. Allard asked if the plow guy was going to get out and open the gate, then plow.

J. Jennison stated if he had his truck equipped, it would open as he went through.

J. Brann asked if on the plan the dark black line was where the Town line was.

Joe stated that was the Barrington line so the gate could be in Rochester.

J. Brann expressed that he hoped this could be worked out but stated that if the Town of Barrington said no gate in Barrington, that he wasn't sure if the Town of Barrington could prevent the City of Rochester from putting up a gate.

R. Allard asked if they wanted two points of access with one unpassable.

J. Brann expressed that was the problem Chief Walker brought up.

R. Allard stated that they wanted the opening because they couldn't get through before if there was a problem.

Joe explained that if you see the gate it would prevent cars from driving through.

J. Huckins explained that they are talking about the bridge being blocked and they wouldn't have a

through road.

J. Jennison expressed that if there was a gate there would be not be two ways of egress there would only be one means of egress. J. Jennison explained that Stillwater and this subdivision would only have one means of egress. J. Jennison expressed that this was his concern and with the 1,000 feet, that's a lot of road for a loop road.

J. Huckins explained that it's 1,000 feet to the longest part of the road and explained that they previously measured to where the loop started but then did a definition change 5 years ago so now limit it to the farthest point of 1,000 feet for a dead-end road.

J. Brann asked if they were to loop back out for the second egress to Hansonville, then the number of lots sizes are approximately the same, but more road would need to be built.

Joe stated that was correct and more road to be maintained.

J. Brann asked if this would ever be taken over by the Town.

Joe explained to the Board that one of the reasons that they are there was that someday this would be a future Town road.

J. Brann asked if this was going to be built to Town standards.

Joe stated that was correct.

J. Brann expressed that for getting along with our neighboring Town, the egress to Hansonville made sense because both egresses are in the same town.

J. Jennison stated he would like to see both put in because it would serve so many good purposes.

J. Huckins explained that they could always give an easement to Rochester and Rochester give an easement to the Town of Barrington and build the section for access.

J. Jennison expressed as this moves forward, he would like to see an easement for connection in the future.

J. Jennison stated that the last one that the Board did wedged in a road.

J. Huckins explained that the Planning Board for about 15 years has done paper streets to abutting properties.

J. Brann asked if they were proposing a conservation subdivision.

Joe stated that was correct.

J. Brann stated that there were requirements you need to meet and you would need to deal with the Conservation Commission.

R. Allard stated that this seems better because the big open space this was closer to the Isinglass and Conservation Commission would like this one better. R. Allard asked what was the one closest to this area.

J. Huckins stated that R. Allard liked the Hansonville one better.

J. Huckins stated that both designs have a protection for the Isinglass which would be Conservation's biggest concern.

J. Brann stated given the breakup of the left-hand area, and the other area right in the middle/closer to the Isinglass, he agreed with R. Allard that the Hansonville access seems to provide better corridors there.

J. Huckins explained that if you read the Conservation Subdivision regulations, they give what was needed and how you have met them.

Joe expressed that he felt that no one likes the gated access but asked the Board if they could ask Rochester to allow the gate to stay open.

J. Brann stated to be a true access it would need to be no gate as the Fire Chief and Police agree on no gate.

J. Huckins stated that then it would meet the requirements.

Joe would only engineer one plan and not going forward on both plans. Joe explained the area where the gravel pit was is all clear cut.

R. Allard expressed that he had a concern about putting in the road and people not wanted any traffic at all and anyone driving through would get a lot of attitude.

S. Diamond explained that it was important to connect to Stillwater, but he explained that it was important to connect to it with no gate to the going east into Stillwater.

J. Huckins explained that it kind of does follow the road.

S. Diamond explained that he would like Stillwater to follow the southern part of Stillwater.

J. Huckins explained that part was owned by the City of Rochester and it was part of the open space.

S. Diamond expressed that he would like to see a straight shot into Stillwater.

J. Brann stated that he felt the residents wouldn't be happy with a stop sign. J. Brann explained on the Hansonville connection that he liked the layout of the area.

R. Allard expressed he didn't like the plan [Stillwater access] showing houses that would be above someone's backyard.

J. Jennison asked if there was a wetland crossing.

J. Huckins explained that they did have a wetland crossing.

Joe explained that they were a lot of elevation change so lots would be above [on the Stillwater access plan].

J. Brann asked about the plan that R. Allard was talking about; would some homes be looking up at the other houses.

Joe explained that it goes up very steep.

R. Allard was very concerned about privacy.

Joe explained that they are looking at half size plans.

Chris asked if Rochester said no way to Stillwater access, is there a variance or yield plan to get more than 76 lots.

J. Huckins explained that the yield plan was based on what you can get with a conventional subdivision.

Chris asked if there's any way to change that.

J. Huckins explained that all changed four or five years ago. J. Huckins explained that it was written that a variance could go to zoning, but he didn't know what the hardship would be to get relief. J. Huckins explained that they are not allowing the crash gate.

J. Huckins suggested talking to the Fire Chief about the cistern and what would be needed.

Joe explained this would help them to go to the City of Rochester with what Barrington wants. Joe asked about road width.

J. Huckins stated 20' or 22' paved depending on what you do.

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 January 7, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. at the ECLC 77 Ramsdell Lane.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully,

Barbara Irvine