



Formatted

## BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

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 #1-929-338-4464 and Conference ID: 710403970

(Approved April 21, 2020)

Tuesday April 7, 2020

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.**

### **Roll Call:**

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

### **Members Present**

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

### **Members Absent**

Andy Knapp ex- officio

Rondi Boyer

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

### **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

1. Approval of the March 17, 2020 meeting minutes.

*Without objection the minutes of March 17, 2020 were approved as written.*

Roll Call:

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

### **ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY 18, 2020**

2. **249-32&250-133-NR-19-SR (Owner: DWSX2 Holdings, LLC)** Request by applicant for a proposed Site Review for a gravel access, parking area with a proposed barn and greenhouse-detention basin for Wildlife Encounters at 270 Beauty Hill Road (Map 249, Lot 32 & Map 250, Lot 133) on a 77.32-/+ acre site in the Neighborhood Residential Zoning District. By: Tobin Farwell, P.E., Farwell Engineering Services, LLC; 265 Wadleigh Falls Road; Lee, NH 03861.  
**(Application has been accepted as complete and 3.4 Conditional Use Approved)**

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Ray Bisson from Stonewall Surveying represented DWSX2 Holdings, LLC with Tobin Farwell, P.E. from Farwell Engineering Services, LLC. Ray updated the Board stating the following outline of the application:

- a) At the February 18, 2020 Planning Board meeting a Conditional Use Permit was approved for classification of this project as an Educational Institution.
- b) Site Walk was performed on March 2<sup>nd</sup> showing the proposed improvements and the proposed building window.
- c) The approximate manure and compost location were shown on the boundary compilation and topography plan.
- d) The wetland crossing permits are being generated for the wetland crossing and boardwalk areas. These crossings will be built in accordance with the NH DES regulations and granted permit.
- e) Handling of Animals, Hours of Operation, number of participants, and demolition of existing garage notes have been added to the Site Plan, Page C-2, Notes 2-5 as requested by the Planning Board. The hours of operation on the cover page will be updated to reflect these hours along with adding the drainage waiver and further expansion note per Staff Review comments.
- f) The comment from Fire Chief Walker was that he was fine with the 18-foot wide gravel driveway as long as there were 2' foot shoulders and explained on the plan that left-hand side has a 12-foot shoulder and the right side has a 1-foot shoulder before slope. This creates a 31-foot-wide graded area most of the way to the parking lot.
- g) At the last meeting Ray explained the former proposed location of the educational building was going to be up by the existing garage. There was a concern about noise from people going from one building to another so Ray showed on the plan that the location has been changed. Ray

explained that he was showing concepts of the buildings that would be built. Ray stated that they would build into the grade and construct a building meeting the Town of Barrington building code.

- h) Wetlands permit are being done under the guidelines of NHDES and the construction of this would be in accordance with NHDES. Ray explained that in 2018 NHDES did a site walk for the area of the crossing and accepted that area.
- i) Lastly, Ray expressed that they have all the information for the Planning Board, and they were here looking for final approval.

Ray explained that Tobin Farwell, from Farwell Engineering Services, will address the Dubois and King comments, waiver requests, and any other construction or drainage questions.

1. We recommend that the applicant provide a site distance plan and profile in accordance with Site Plan Review Regulations 3.5.9.

Response: We have added a plan and profile of the sight (C-4) distance line of sight in both directions from the proposed end of the driveway. There is over 400 ft of safe all-season sight distance.

2. We recommend that the applicant provide the notes on the plan specified in Site Plan Review Regulations 3.2.10.

Response: We have add all notes that are required under site plan review regulations.

3. We recommend that the applicant revise the plans so that the private driveway maximum grade does not exceed 9%.

Response: The maximum slope of the driveway is proposed to be 9.7% This is less than the 10% required by subdivision regulation 12.3.2 (4). Maximum grade for a driveway is 10%.

4. We recommend that the applicant provide a legend that shows and defines each symbol and linetype used on the plans in accordance with Site Plan Review Regulations 3.2.8.

Response: We have updated the legend to include all linetypes and symbols.

5. Sheet C-2. We recommend that the applicant revise the proposed drainage pipe to meet the requirements of Site Plan Review Regulations 4.7.7(1), which requires a minimum pipe diameter of 15".

Response: The drainage pipe leaving the detention basin is used to control the flow leaving the detention basin and should be a 12" diameter pipe. We request a waiver if required.

6. Sheet C-2. We recommend that the applicant revise the plan to show all proposed temporary erosion protection measures during construction (silt fence, hay bales, etc.) on the plan and their associated details,0 in accordance with Site Plan Review Regulations 3.5.3.

Response: The review engineer did not have the complete plan set as this was intended to review the drainage only. The silt fence and silt sock detail is on details sheet D-1, and shown on the site plan.

7. Sheet C-2, Drainage Post- Development Drawing DR-2. The proposed grading and stormwater flow appears to flow directly through a line that is assumed to denote an existing rock retaining wall. It is unclear if stormwater will flow through the wall or if the wall will act as a barrier. We recommend that the applicant clarify the drainage flow pattern in this area and consider adding a defined flow path without a rock wall obstruction.

Response: The stonewall is not a barrier. The grades send the stormwater in this direction and water flows through the stone wall.

8. Sheet C-2. We recommend that the applicant perform test pits to confirm that the proposed stormwater system retention is above the estimated seasonal high water table (ESHWT) elevations.

Response: We have performed a test pit in the area of the detention basin. ESHWT was at 24". The pond bottom is above the ESHWT.

9. Sheet D-2. Details. We recommend that the applicant provide a detail of the stormwater retention pond that depicts the embankment section, embankment material compaction and gradation requirements, limits of riprap slope stabilization, and inverts of the emergency overflow spillway.

Response: We have provided grading information as well as compaction information for the detention pond. This is found on the detail sheet D-3 and the site plan C-2.

10. Sheet D-2. Details. We recommend that the applicant provide a pipe trench detail that depicts the compaction and material requirements for the stormwater drainage.

Response: We have added a trench detail on sheet D-2.

11. Sheet D-2. Details. Outlet Control Structure No. 1 Detail. We recommend that the applicant provide stone bedding wrapped in geotextile for the base of the outlet control structure.

Response: We have added a bedding detail note for the outlet control structure on Sheet D-3.

12. Sheet D-2. Details. We recommend that the applicant provide a typical section for the driveway.

Response: There is a typical section shown the profile sheet.

13. Drainage Analysis. Riprap Outlet Protection. We recommend that the applicant provide riprap apron and stone sizing calculations in the drainage analysis in accordance with Site Plan Review Regulations 4.7.2(11), and that the required dimensions and stone size are clearly defined on the drawings.

Response: We have provided rip rap sizing calculations to the drainage analysis. The rip rap information is added to the plans on sheet D-3.

14. Drainage Analysis. The outlet control structure (Pond 2P) culvert length and outlet invert elevation does not match Sheet C-2. We recommend that the applicant revise the submitted materials to match.

Response: We have updated the drainage analysis to match the plans.

15. Drainage Analysis. The Table of Contents indicate that AOT worksheets are included in the analysis. No worksheets were provided. We recommend that the applicant revise the drainage analysis to provide stormwater treatment and pre-treatment calculations that meet the requirements of the NH Stormwater Design Manual in accordance with Site Plan Review Regulations 4.7.2(10). We anticipate that the applicant can utilize the grass lined swale as a vegetated treatment swale.

Response: We have provided the pre-treatment analysis for the grass lined swale. The worksheet is included in the drainage analysis.

16. Drainage Analysis. Watershed Plans DR-1 and DR-2. We recommend that the applicant revise the pre- and post-development watershed delineations to both have at least 2 points of analysis into the receiving watershed downstream. For example, the runoff associated with "2S" in the post-development model should be a separate point of analysis so that the effects of the disturbed areas associated with the proposed gravel parking lot can be compared more accurately.

Response: We have revised the drainage analysis to include two study points. We have also elongated the swale to capture additional runoff from the newly proposed 50' x 80' Building window and gravel drive.

J. Jennison asked the Board if they had any questions.

J. Brann asked where they are asking for a waiver for parking lot lighting, he assumed that they are not going to have lighting.

Tobin explained that they would put in temporary lighting if it was needed. Tobin explained that he thought that most of the events would be a natural setting, where they are in a residential area. Tobin explained that they do not want any permanent lighting.

Ray explained that most of the events are during the day and if at night, this would be a nature walk. Ray explained that like the Conservation Commission walks, most people going out to see the moon and have their own personal lights or flashlights.

J. Jennison expressed that his concern was the parking area. For night/moon light walks, getting out of their cars and down to the paths could be a problem.

R. Allard expressed that he agrees with J. Jennison because there are 30+ spaces the Board approved and a safety issue. He felt that there should be some type of lighting but doesn't need to be on all the time.

J. Jennison explained that they could have post lights to illuminate parking spaces if they are open after dark.

R. Allard expressed that the lighting would be a safety issue and he would have a problem with no lighting.

Tobin explained that they were trying to avoid the permanent tall poles. Are you looking for permanent lighting or would temporary be acceptable to the Board?

J. Jennison asked what the temporary lighting would look like.

Tobin explained that you could rent lighting for the few times a year it's needed, and this would be a generator type lighting. Tobin explained that this would be turned on for an event so that people could get in and out of their vehicles.

J. Jennison explained the problem of noise to have a generator running during a nature walk and suggested something like solar path lighting but reiterated that there would need to be something.

Tobin explained that they also felt that they could use flashlights at the end of the walk. Tobin expressed that he felt solar panels in the wintertime could be a problem.

D. Massucci expressed that they would need to think of the neighbors with respect to the kind of lighting that they are going to have. D. Massucci explained that she felt even the low voltage lights that go around a home may work.

J. Jennison expressed that parking at night would be hard for people to navigate [without lighting].

Ray explained that if they are going on a hike at night, he felt that they would already have a flashlight. Ray expressed that this would be like the Conservation Commission going on a hike at night and explained that those parking areas are not lighted.

J. Jennison expressed his concern was the liability for Wildlife Encounters.

S. Diamond expressed that the base level of lighting could be low, illuminate down, and only have lighting where there are rock steps or elevation changes or in the most critical spots. S. Diamond explained it could include on the board walks for pedestrians or bicycles.

J. Jennison stated he would not support lighting up all the board walks through the woods. J. Jennison expressed that he would support parking lots and towards the learning structures.

Tobin state that the board walks are for walking and snowshoeing or cross-country skiing and stated that he had not heard about any biking.

S. Diamond asked if they could show on the plan where the driveway was 9% or more. S. Diamond explained that he wanted to see this on the main map.

Tobin explained that it was between stations 240 to 330 that was 9.7%.

S. Diamond asked there was going to be paving anywhere.

Tobin stated that there would be no paving.

S. Diamond asked about the driveway. He sees that there would be a shoulder with parking and asked what if people park badly there. S. Diamond asked if fire trucks or ambulances could get past them, and how are the parking spaces to be marked.

Tobin explained that this [shoulder] was a gravel parking area there would be a 12' shoulder which was 10' plus a 2' shoulder. Tobin explained that you would still have 18' for an emergency vehicle.

S. Diamond asked how this area would be marked for parking.

J. Jennison suggested that where this as for overflow parking maybe have a sign stating that.

S. Diamond stated that he agreed with J. Jennison on how the overflow parking should work.

Tobin expressed that they would like to eliminate the number of signs and that people would congregate

in the parking area before they go do their activities. Tobin explained that he felt that people would not normally parallel park along the driveway; they would park in the parking area.

J. Brann explained that Wildlife Encounters was responsible for the parking area and to ensure emergency vehicles can get vehicles parked along the driveway.

Derek Small of Wildlife Encounters explained to the Board that all the events are by appointment and they would all be staffed. Derek explained that if overflowing parking was needed, this would be staffed to show people where to park. Derek explained that the overflow parking would be roped off when not needed and if opened this area would be staffed.

D. Massucci asked about the parking for handicap accessibility.

Tobin explained that this would be all gravel and that there would not be definite parking spaces area. Tobin explained that the parking area was sloped for handicap accessibility.

Ray explained that there was handicap parking for the barn.

J. Brann explained that if they were to park in the upper parking area, they would have access to the barn. J. Brann asked if the waiver for lighting requirement were approved, would the applicant need to come back before the Board for lighting if installed in the future.

J. Huckins explained that it would depend on how they structured the waiver.

J. Jennison expressed that he felt the application would want a waiver from all.

J. Brann stated that there are building exterior lighting requirements in Section 4.12.

J. Huckins explained the waiver that they are asking for Section 4.9.8 Parking Lot Lighting. J. Huckins explained to the Board that that there was lighting on the building. J. Huckins explained that they still have lighting requirements for egress per building code.

J. Brann expressed that in the Notice of Decision that lighting should be added.

J. Huckins explained that could be added.

J. Jennison asked if they put in low voltage lighting, would the Board want them to come back. J. Jennison stated if they were going to light up the parking lot, they would need to come back.

R. Allard expressed that he feels uncomfortable with no lighting for a gravel parking area and a high slope but would be in favor of waiving some of the requirements in the regulations. R. Allard stated that he was not in favor of waiving all the requirements.

J. Huckins explained to the applicant that they would need to tell the Board what they are going to do now.

Derek explained to the Board that they are not asking for no lighting in the parking lot and having people walking around in a dark parking lot. Derek explained that if they were having an evening event that they would want everyone to be safe as this would be a liability for them. Derek explained to the Board that the waiver they are asking for would be for underground utilities and giant poles. Derek explained that there would be no lighting that would require a generator; eliminate this completely. Derek explained that they are looking for temporary lighting; something that can be turned off and on and be downward facing.



J. Huckins explained that they would need to specify what type of lighting they are going to have. J. Huckins explained that if they receive conditional approve, they would need meet the description that the Board comes up with.

Tobin explained that he felt that the question was permission or temporary lighting. Tobin asked Derek if there was something temporary that would be put out for the event and take out after the event. Tobin asked if the Planning Board was looking for something permanently placed out there.

Derek stated that he saw LED lights on fence post facing down that turned off and on using solar power. Derek explained that they were permanently installed but not permanently on after dark.

J. Jennison explained that they would be more likely to approve an application like that with some type of understanding where they are.

J. Huckins explained that the approval of lighting and what type.

J. Brann asked if the waiver was already granted for the boundary survey.

J. Huckins stated that this waiver was granted at the September 3, 2019 meeting.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

#### **Requested Waivers:**

#### **4.7.7 (1) Minimum Pipe Diameter 15"-Staff supports the waiver; 12" pipe meets the design criteria.**

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to grant the waiver to 4.7.7 (1) minimum pipe diameter 15" as not granting the waiver would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and granting the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. Vote 5/0*

Roll Call:

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

#### **4.9.8 Parking Lot Lighting-This is a rural, agricultural & residential area. Lighting of this parking lot, which will primarily be used daylight hours, would be stressful & undesirable for the animals and the residents in the immediate neighborhood.**

Board had a long discussion with the applicant to come up with an agreement on the proper and safe lighting.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to grant the waiver to 4.9.8 Parking Lot Lighting except that all parking spaces should be illuminated to .1 foot-candles to include the overflow parking as not granting the waiver would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and granting the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. Vote 5/0*

Roll Call:

R. Allard-Yay  
S. Diamond-Yay



J. Brann-Yay  
D. Massucci-Yay  
J. Jennison-Yay

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Jennison read the Staff comments as follows:

- Remove Note 7 from cover sheet
- Add Septic Permit # cover sheet
- Add Wetland Permit # cover sheet
- Add Note "Any further expansion of the scope of operation will require review by the Planning Board"

J. Jennison read Condition Precedent:



## Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0330

[jhuckins@barrington.nh.gov](mailto:jhuckins@barrington.nh.gov)

### DRAFT NOTICE OF DECISION

[Office use only]	Date certified:	As built/s 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>			
<b>Proposal Identification: 249-32 &amp; 250-133-NR-19-SR</b> (owner DWSX2 Holdings, LLC) Request by applicant Derek Small from Wildlife Encounters for a site review for an Educational Institution with gravel access and parking area/proposed barn and greenhouse/detention basin on a 77 acre lot located on (Map 249, Lot 32 & Map 250, Lot 133) 270 Beauty Hill Road in the Neighborhood Residential Zoning District. By Tobin Farwell; Farwell Engineering Services, LLC; 265 Wadleigh Falls Road; Lee NH 03861			

Owner: DWSX2 Holdings, LLC 270 Beauty Hill Road Barrington, NH 03825  Applicant:	Dated: XXX, 2020
---	------------------

Derek Small Wildlife Encounters 270 Beauty Hill Road Barrington, NH 03825	
--	--

Professional: Tobin Farwell, PE Farwell Engineering Services, LLC 265 Wadleigh Falls Road Lee, NH 03861	
---	--

**Dear applicant:**

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

**3.4 Conditional Use Permit.**

Was granted February 18, 2020

Waivers Granted for:

Site Review Regulation: 3.3(1) Boundary Survey of entire lot.

Site Review Regulation: 4.9.8 Parking Lot Lighting.

Site Review Regulation: 4.7.7(1) Minimum allowable diameter in any storm drain system shall be 15".

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 October 7, 2020, the Boards approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board.

**Conditions Precedent**

1) Add the following plan notes:

- a) Remove note 7 from cover sheet
- b) Add Septic Permit #
- c) Add Wetland Permit #
- d) Any further expansion of the scope of operation will require review by the Planning Board.
- e) Add waivers to cover sheet

#2) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town

3) 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 indicated 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,

John Huckins  
Zoning Administrator

cc: File

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to approve the application based on conditions read by the chair. Vote 5/0*

Roll Call:

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

### **ACTION ITEMS**

3. [121-28-GR-20-SR \(Owner: Mr. Todd Green-Barrington Shores, LLC\)](#) Request by applicant for expansion of 28 seasonal camp sites and waiver at 7 Barrington Shores Drive (Map 121, Lot 28) in the General Residential Zoning District. BY: Tobin Farewell, Farwell Engineering Services, LLC; 265 Wadleigh Falls Road; Lee, NH 03861.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Ray Bisson from Stonewall Surveying represented owner Todd Green of Barrington Shores along with Tobin Farwell from Farwell Engineering Services, LLC. Ray read the following about the history of the campground:

Ray Bisson explained Barrington Shores, LLC owns the Barrington Shores Campground. The campground has been around since the 1970's. They currently have approximately 148 camping sites & 8 cabins on the 24+ acre property. As for all businesses, continued growth or improvements to the operation are necessary. As examples, since the opening of the campground, a bath house, laundry facility, game room, and function hall were added. Over the recent years they have seen the need for more sites being necessary given the amount of people on the waiting list. Within the bounds of the existing campground lies an area of upland on which they would like to create 28 additional sites. The area is outside the 250' shoreland buffer zone. These sites are planned to be for more seasonal campers which limits the amount of trailer movement in the area. Most or all the seasonal campers stay for multiple years and support local business. Seasonal campers abide by campground rules more than transit campers.

Ray Bisson explained since the campground has been in existence for over 40 years, it is doubtful that the expansion of the campground would have a negative impact on abutter property values. Based upon an email with a realtor, Peter Deely, on March 22, 2019, he stated "I looked over the plan and I don't see much of a negative impact for the value of the neighbor's property. You've got 20 feet of right of way, 50 feet of setback, and then another 20 or 30 feet of road and vegetation before the actual campsites. In my opinion I don't believe this is going to affect the neighbor's property value any more than it already is by the campground."

Ray Bisson explained that per Town regulations, the minimum camp site dimensions are 15 feet of frontage and 1,000 square feet in size. The proposed sites are significantly larger than the minimum required by the ordinance with the smallest being 1,410 square feet and the largest being 2,250 square feet. Most of the site frontages are more than 30 feet. The hope with the larger size sites is to be able to retain as much of the mature vegetation as possible and be able to place campers amongst the trees instead of clear cutting the hill. There will still need to be grading and cutting for the access roads and sites, but the plan is to minimize cutting and grading as much as possible. All sites will be serviced by a sewer system that will connect to a new Fuji clean septic system. An existing leach field will also be replaced with the same Fuji clean system. Electric and cable will be run underground to each site, while water lines will run underground across the field and under any camp roads, but above ground between sites. This allows for easier maintenance of the water lines and winterizing before winter. There will be drainage swales and catch basins to capture run off and to divert the water to a detention pond. This will be discussed further by Tobin Farwell from Farwell Engineering.

Ray Bisson then explained that Article 6, Section 6.2.3(2) requires a 100-foot buffer from all campsites to property lines. This is an existing non-conforming campground and many sites are well within the 100-foot buffer. At the November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2018 conceptual meeting, it was discussed that a 50-foot buffer would be reasonable with enhanced vegetation. Based upon the Planning Board feedback, the design was created, and the current plan shows the 50-foot buffer around the proposed development area. We are asking for a waiver from this Article to the 50-foot buffer with the exception at Site #28. Site #28 is about 29 feet from the property line but falls within the existing tree line that is used for boat and vehicle storage. This site is more than 170 feet from the closest house. The proposed plan has one site at 50 feet and four sites at 70+ feet from Richard & Theresa McKenney's property line. Mrs. Pantano's property line is an additional twenty feet away from these sites. The closest site to Mrs. Pantano's house is Site #11

and is approximate 110' away. Site #5 is approximately 130' from Glen & Kathryn Perry's House. So, with these distances all exceeding 100 feet, we feel there is adequate distance from these houses and the 50-foot buffer would be adequate as discussed at the 2018 planning board meeting.

Ray Bisson showed some 3D visuals of the proposed improvement area. Ray explained that there would be more vegetation than what the visuals show. Ray explained that additional vegetation would be added as necessary to provide an adequate buffer between neighboring homes as recommended by Andy Fast from UNH Cooperative Extension. Tree clearing will be performed per the recommendations of Edward Roy from Urban Tree Service; see letters attached to this application. Ray explained that he also received a letter from the Swains Lake Village Water District (letter attached) concerning the increase in volume. Per the letter, they are working on Well #7 and believe it can support the flow rate increase the additional sites. Todd Green and Tim McClain are working with them to be sure the sites would not be adverse to the district.

J. Brann asked where the Swain Water District well was on the plan.

Ray explained that it was not on the plan; it was not part of the campground [i.e., off site].

J. Brann asked where the water source connection was on site.

Ray showed the Board on the plan where the new waterline was proposed. Ray explained that they feel the 28 proposed sites are the maximum number that can be reasonably placed in this area. During construction, exact site locations may be shifted for better placement, but there will be no increase in the number of sites. Todd Green, owner & Tim McClain, Manager were on the phone if questions arise pertaining to the daily operations of the campground. Tobin Farwell can discuss the engineering aspect of the project.

S. Diamond expressed that he wanted to make sure that they focused on the vegetation buffer.

Ray explained their conversation with Andy Fast and that he recommended native species that are already growing be incorporated into plan. Ray explained that Urban Tree came out to the site and noted trees they wouldn't recommend retaining due to diseases. Ray explained that Urban Tree also recommended removing a lot of the pines for safety reasons. Ray explained for vegetation they are using the professionals for guidance.

J. Jennison asked if there could be a vegetation plan so the Board could see, with the proposed reduced buffer close to the property lines, what the vegetative buffer would look like. J. Jennison asked if with the number of proposed sites they need to address the entrance into the campground given the turns near the entrance.

Ray explained that they have discussed the entrance. Ray explained that most of these sites are going to be for seasonal. Ray explained that the campers that would be coming in for the season and maybe for multiple years. Ray explained that the traffic of 20 plus trailers would not be increasing each weekend.

J. Jennison expressed that traffic would increase around the middle entrance island where there was a bit of a blind spot. J. Jennison asked if the additional traffic could be handled at the entrance. J. Jennison explained that with 28 extra campsites and 2 or 3 cars per site he felt that this needs to be addressed. J. Jennison asked if the Fire Chief had any input on this.

Ray explained that he talked with the Fire Chief and where it was a 14' wide gravel one-way drive in the proposed improvement area, it meets the standards of the fire code for a recreational campground facility. Ray explained that the Fire Chief wanted to make sure that they could get in and around.

J. Jennison asked if the Fire Chief looked at anything else other than the new construction. J. Jennison asked if the Fire Chief looked at the access to where it was non-conforming as it could be tight making the right-hand turn heading into the new area.

Ray explained that the entrance was fine, and the Road Agent recommended better signage.

J. Brann explained that if you go by the commercial regulations or per the subdivision regulations for a non-residential driveway in a residential area, the driveway was required to be 18'. J. Brann asked why this proposed drive was only 14' when the regulations state 18'.

Ray asked what was in the regulations for a one-way road versus a two-way driveway.

J. Brann explained that it doesn't say either way, just specifies the width.

Ray explained that 18' wide would be two-way traffic and State Fire Code states 14' for one-way.

J. Brann stated that there wasn't a different requirement for one-way.

M. Gasses stated that she felt the Board could discuss and make a reasonable judgement on this.

J. Jennison explained that he agreed, and he was looking at the one-way restriction. He asked what the width of the drive-in front of the boat storage as it looks thin through there.

M. Gasses explained that was not part of the site plan.

J. Jennison expressed that they are expanding a non-conforming use.

Ray explained that it is 20' wide until you get to the fork.

J. Jennison asked if it was 20' wide to the boats.

Ray explained to the Board where the drive was 20' wide on the plan and then he showed where it goes to 14' on the one-way.

Ray explained that one-way roads are common in campgrounds.

J. Jennison stated the Police Department had no opinion on the matter. The Road Agent was looking for improved signage for traffic turning and entering on to Hall Road on either side of the entrance.

J. Brann explained that he didn't see lot coverage percentage on the plan as required.

M. Gasses explained that her comment was to identify the approximate area in square frontage that was being developed and note on the plan.

Ray asked if he was looking on the entire campground. Ray explained that 83,000 s.f. was being disturbed.

J. Brann asked if during construction there additional erosion measures were required.

Tobin explained that was Note #7 on the coversheet.

J. Brann stated that the note doesn't cover what's in the regulations. J. Brann asked J. Huckins if a Certificate of Occupancy was required when they finished this project.

J. Huckins explained that all of them have to have Certificate of Occupancy. J. Huckins explained that when they finish drainage, roadway, and campsites, they get an inspection and that would be when they get Certificate of Occupancy.

J. Brann explained that he didn't see a note on the plan that everything needs to be done before Certificate of Occupancy.

J. Jennison stated that he does have an issue with proposed Site #28.

R. Allard stated that he agreed with J. Jennison on Site #28. R. Allard explained the requested site plan waiver of Article 6.2.3 (2) was confusing as it was proposing a reduction of the buffer to no closer than 50' to the property line but at one point no closer than 29' from the property line.

J. Jennison explained that this was for Site # 28.

R. Allard explained that it doesn't say that and was not in the waiver request.

J. Brann agreed with J. Jennison that it was for Site #28.

Ray explained to the Board that he didn't see a problem removing Site #28.

S. Diamond explained to the Board was looking at the reduction of the buffer and looked at the documents regarding vegetation. S. Diamond explained that white pines might be the best thing to grow there but he explained that if they are hazard trees, that would be a problem. S. Diamond explained to the Board that white pines do grow quickly. He also explained to keep in mind that visible buffering is most important in the on-summer season, but it is also relevant in the off season. S. Diamond explained that he was looking for a plan with what trees would be maintained and favored. S. Diamond explained that he was looking for clarification regarding maintenance of the plants and when or if they would be replaced if they died.

J. Jennison agreed with S. Diamond and explained that things are more of an eye sore during the winter months because people can cover their stuff with blue tarps. J. Jennison expressed also he would like to see a plan showing the maintenance schedule to ensure that there would be some upkeep.

J. Brann asked if they would be able to leave campers over the winter.

Ray stated yes; they could they do it now.

J. Jennison asked if there was an age restriction on the campers currently.

Ray stated that there was no age restriction but need to be maintained in looks. Ray expressed that they are also strict on what they can put up for decking. Ray explained as far as covers for wood, they would use natural colored covers.

J. Jennison asked the Board if they were interested in seeing some of these policies.

D. Massucci asked about the noise restrictions.



J. Jennison stated that there would be a fence on one side.

Ray showed the Board the location of where the fence would be installed, and they would put a buffer where it was needed. Ray asked the Board if they were looking for any trees in the buffer or a comprehensive plan.

R. Allard explained that he would like a landscaping plan that J. Huckins could review.

Ray explained that he was looking for guidelines because he hasn't had to supply one before.

J. Jennison explained that he understood that there was going to be some clearing but what they are looking for ways to show that the buffer was going to be filled.

J. Brann asked M. Gasses if there was an example of one that the Board could supply showing what was needed.

M. Gasses explained that this would be different than one of the commercial buildings. M. Gasses explained that this should show the locations for the trees and the size.

J. Jennison suggested density and maintenance on the plan.

S. Diamond explained that that he felt in the past it was 25% to 50% coverage to 10'.

M. Gasses explained that this was for vegetation.

J. Brann asked where the required benchmarks were on the plan.

Ray explained that none of the benchmarks were noted on the plan.

J. Brann explained that the benchmarks were required. J. Brann asked if there were going to be any lighting installed.

Ray stated no lighting around the campsites; there would only be lighting at the entrance.

J. Brann asked if they saw the letter from the Conservation Commission.

Ray stated that he did see the letter and Tobin would go over the engineering part.

M. Gasses explained that the Board would need to discuss the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit.

Ray explained that a recreational campground was a permitted use with a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit. Ray explained that because of the expansion in size, the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit was needed.

J. Huckins explained that you need the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit in this zone. J. Huckins explained that this was a non-conforming use. J. Huckins explained the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit makes this a legal use.

J. Brann asked if this was listed as a park.

J. Huckins explained that this was listed under Recreational Use in this zone.

J. Brann asked is it was a recreational facility.

J. Huckins stated yes because campground was not in the Zoning Regulations.

*A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by J. Brann to accept the 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 read letters from the abutters and copy of the letters are attached to these minutes. J. Jennison explained that the Board needs to discuss the right of way and drainage pipe.

Tobin explained this was a drainage pipe, not a sewage pipe.

Ray explained that the boundary shown on this plan was done in July by a title survey company.

Ray explained that this was an extensive title survey. Ray stated that this was done two years ago before he started this project and used that plan instead of redoing a lot of the work. Ray explained that according to the survey there was a 20' right of way that abuts the campground. Ray explained that there was also an easement that abuts the campground. Ray explained that there was already a survey that was done for the McKenney's that also abuts the right of way. Ray explained that this was not a right of way, it's a very steep, and this was an easement. Ray referenced the letter that he has not in the flood zone. Ray explained that he has not done the research on this.

J. Jennison asked if the campground had access to the 20' right of way.

Ray showed the location on the plan and he hasn't verified this information. The Perry's and Ms. Hunts had a title search done. Ray explained that he hasn't had a chance to look into the 20' right of way. Ray showed Berry's Survey plan to the Board with the location.

J. Jennison asked if that [right of way/easement] was on campground land and if they granted access to someone else.

Ray explained to the Board that the one the abutters are referring to be an easement.

S. Diamond explained that it has been many decades that this [flood plain] has been looked at. S. Diamond explained that the maps have not been updated. S. Diamond explained that it was a hard thing to determine.

M. Gasses explained that there has been draft update of flood maps but hasn't seen the final maps. M. Gasses explained that because Barrington was pretty rural that they are not in a higher defined area. M. Gasses explained that the flood levels are more accurate now and that this was not a regulated flood zone.

Ray explained that it would be 302' to 330' to the campsites and that the new proposed area was not in the flood zone.

J. Jennison asked if there was any reason why they couldn't use a 15" culvert instead of 12".

Tobin explained that if there were two catch basins that flow into one, he would be fine to upgrade the culvert. Tobin explained that he would use 12" and at the end upgrade to 15" culvert.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Mr. Perry from 67 Rosemary Lane explained to the Board the he was looking out the window and he could clearly see Sites # 4 and #5. Mr. Perry explained that this means that he was going to be looking into someone's bedroom window for however long it would take for the greenery to grow. Mr. Perry asked how long he would need to wait.

J. Jennison asked if a fence would work on that side.

Mr. Perry stated he really would prefer not to have a fence because of what a fence would do to his property value.

J. Jennison stated that he doesn't know the answer; that was why he asked the question.

Mr. Perry expressed that he would prefer greenery, but this could be taken years to grow.

J. Jennison explained this was why the Board was asking for a plan.

Ray explained that this would need to be discussed with the owner.

Mr. Perry expressed that he was looking out the window and he was very uncomfortable.

Ray explained that Mr. Green was the owner of the campground and he was willing to talk to any of the abutters so that they understand the process going forward.

J. Jennison asked if a wooden fence could be used for the buffer.

Mr. Perry stated this would make it look like a trailer park.

Ray stated he would give Mr. Perry Mr. Green's information.

Lisa Hunt from 72 Rosemary Lane explained that the right of way was a concern to her because several years ago she had to deal with an unhappy situation with some neighbors. Ms. Hunt explained that when someone was trying to sell their house, they were told that they had a right of way between the Robinson's and her house. Ms. Hunt explained that she went to her title company, they did research, and it was determined that the right of way went around the back side of the Robinson's house.. Ms. Hunt explained that she would like to a lot more research to make sure that the right of way was in the correct spot.

J. Jennison asked Ray if the campground claims any right to the right of way.

Ray stated that he received a text from Mr. Green that they have never used it.

J. Jennison stated that if the campground has any claim to the right of way it would be up to them. J. Jennison asked if at any point the campground would not use the right of way.

Ray stated that they would not.

Ms. Hunt asked if this should match the Town maps.

J. Jennison explained that was a Town issue and it wasn't up to Barrington Shores to survey other people's property.

M. Gasses explained that there are mistakes on the Town tax maps. M. Gasses explained that once these are brought to the attention of the Town, it corrects them.

Ms. Hunt explained that was what happened in 2007 and her title company did the research. Ms. Hunt explained that the information was supplied to the Town and the tax map was corrected according to their findings.

J. Jennison explained to Ray that the plan doesn't reflect this change and asked if he could verify the back boundary.

J. Brann asked where the location of the right of way was.

Ray explained on the tax map the location and stated this was not owned by the campground.

J. Jennison asked Ms. Hunt if this was the map she was referring too.

Ms. Hunt stated that this was correct.

Ray stated that the information that he has states that this was not owned by the campground; it was owned Mr. McKenney. Ray explained that he did read the deed and it matches the information that he has.

Mr. McKenney explained to the Board that he has lived here for 50 years and that Ms. Hunts concern was that the right of way comes down between Ms. Hunt and the Robinsons. Mr. McKenney explained that there were people given a right of way by the previous campground owner. Mr. McKenney explained that if they look at the deeds listed on the plan, this [right of way] was described in very general terms but that it was owned by the campground.

J. Brann expressed that this was good information from both Mr. McKenney and Ms. Hunt.

Ray explained that he would look into the campground property only.

J. Jennison expressed that the boundary lines need to be double checked.

Conner read the following question that came in:

**Where did the property lines come from?**

**Property line of McKenney should be consistent with the property line and additional 20'.**

Ray explained that the property line should be 20' to the right [east] and that it was 50' from the campground property line.

S. Diamond expressed that the GIS maps need to be kept up to date as much as possible.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Jennison asked if the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit was for the full campground or the proposed addition.

J. Huckins explained that the rest of the campground was already an approved use. J. Huckins explained the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit was needed because of the change they are making.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that there was a difference between a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and a Variance. M. Gasses explained that they are allowed under certain conditions. This was why you can give a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION ON THE 3.4 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:**

The Board had a discussion on what they were looking to approve on the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit. The Board discussed that part of the campground was grandfathered. They agreed that the new part would be what needed the permit.

J. Jennison explained that they are approving an allowed use to the area and they have not granted the waivers yet. J. Jennison explained that it was a conditional use and the Board could still ask for the 100' buffer. J. Jennison explained to the Board that they could approve the use without granting anything.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that they need to look at the 3.4 to see if they meet the standards first.

J. Jennison read the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and the Board requested more information on the following questions: #4 and #6 through #9.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by J. Jennison to continue the application until May 5, 2020. Vote 5/0*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

The Board asked for more information on the following:

Removal of Site #28

Detailed Plan showing vegetation buffer plans

Benchmarks

Lighting waiver

The Board also agreed to send the plans to Dubois and King for drainage only.

4. [223-26\(C1\) RC/SDAO-20-SR \(Owner: Joseph Falzone-Rte 125 Development\)](#) Request by applicant for a Site Review and 9.6 Special Permit to build an 8,880 s.f. Municipal building for a Town Hall on Calef Highway (Map 223, Lot 26) in the Regional Commercial (RC) & Stratified Drift Aquifer Overlay (SDAO) Zoning Districts. BY: Geoffrey R. Aleve, P.E., Civil Consultants; 293 Main Street, South Berwick, Maine 03908.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Geoffrey Aleve from Civil Consultants represented the applicant Conner MacIver, Town Administrator for the Town of Barrington. Geoffrey explained to the Board that the intent of this project was to construct a new 8,800 s.f. single floor Town Hall. Geoffrey explained that the new roadway comes off of Calef Highway (Route 125) and on the plan he showed parking and the ADA access. Geoffrey explained that the entrance would be from the westerly and southern side of the building and this would require an AoT permit review for stormwater. Geoffrey explained that they are getting their documents ready to submit to the State.

J. Brann asked why the building was not going to be sprinkled.

Geoffrey explained that sprinkled was not required on a single floor building.

J. Jennison asked if there was a location for a cistern for the Fire Department.

Geoffrey explained that the cistern would be tied into the larger part of the development.

Conner showed the cistern location on the plan.

J. Jennison stated that the location of the cistern can be approved by the Fire Chief at a later date.

J. Huckins explained that the spot for the cistern was already approved at the time of subdivision.

J. Brann questioned the parking spots because there would be people coming in and out. J. Brann explained that when he went to Table 6 and looked for general commercial 1 space for every 250s.f. and it came up to 35 spaces.

Geoffrey stated it does make sense and explained that they looked at leaving additional spaces for further buildout growth as they move forward.

J. Brann questioned the Conservation Commission comment about access to the open area and that people would be parking at the Town Office lot.

J. Huckins explained that the open space was for the people that are part of the subdivision.

Conner explained that the Town would be able to take deed to the open space and the Town would own it. Conner explained that parking would be allowed at the Town Hall. Conner explained that the owner agreed to supply the Conservation Commission \$10,000.00 towards the easement.

J. Brann stated that he could see the 37 parking spots but if there was additional load from using the parking lot for accessing the public space, it would change the calculations.

Conner explained that there were no plans for pertaining to the open space and that if they were to develop a trail system to the open space, there was property there that could be considered for additional parking.

J. Brann explained that then you would have issues with runoff.

Conner explained if more spaces were needed, one of the problems was additional parking could cause drainage concerns. Conner explained that this was just a recommendation from the Conservation Commission.

M. Gasses explained that the parking would be shared usage and explained that they would probably be using it on the weekends when the Town Offices are closed.

Geoffrey explained that looking at future buildout in this area, they would look at current and the future flow.

J. Jennison questioned if there was room for additional parking if needed.

Geoffrey stated that there was additional room for more parking spaces and that they could add more if needed.

R. Allard asked about parking space per four seats.

Geoffrey explained this was for meeting spaces and after hours with shared use.

J. Brann asked, given the meeting room holds 60 people, if meetings with large groups, would there be enough parking spaces.

Geoffrey explained that that they don't want a large parking area that wouldn't be used. Geoffrey explained that if a large group was expected, the meeting would be moved to a different location.

Conner explained that this was talked about at length with the building committee.

J. Jennison stated that the building committee has addressed this matter.

R. Allard asked about the fixed budget as he was concerned about the road being done by someone else and if these things don't happen, what happens.

J. Jennison explained that these things need to be completed first.

Conner explained that land that was gifted, the road would be built, and some site work would be done by the contractor. Conner explained if something goes wrong, they may need to go back to the drawing board.

J. Brann stated he didn't feel that the developer would abandon the project given the investment he has already made.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that they needed to hold this project to the same standards as any other project.

J. Huckins explained that looking at this project you need to assume that the cistern and the road was already in.

S. Diamond asked where the least bad overflow parking would be; parking off Route 125.

Conner explained the chair may have to move the meeting.

J. Jennison explained that they could have police direct people where to park.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Brann asked about the paper storage and no sprinklers.

J. Huckins explained that it was not needed.

Conner explained that it would be great to have the sprinkler, but this was not in the budget for the cost.

*A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by D. Massucci to accept the application as complete.*



Vote 5/0

Roll call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

Geoffrey asked what the Board was looking for before/at the next meeting. The Board responded:±

NHDOT review drainage only

Waiver for 12" culvert

9.6 Application

Comment from Jeff Adler at Dubois & King:

I would say that if it is being reviewed by AoT that our review is not critical for drainage. Not sure if there are any other issues or areas of concern (i.e. traffic, parking, access etc.). If not, then our review is likely not necessary. Let me know if you have any questions.

Jeffrey Adler, P.E.

Sr. Project Manager

Dubois & King, Inc

18 Constitution Drive, Suite 8

Bedford, New Hampshire

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by S. Diamond to continue the application until April 21,

2020. Vote 4/0

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

## **DESIGN REVIEW**

**5. 238-36-V-20-DESIGN (Owner: Waldron B. Haley Revoc Trust)** ) Request by applicant for a Design Review to Subdivide and leave 8 acres for the owner and 21 acres to be developed into a multifamily development in Village District along Franklin Pierce Highway (aka: Route 9) (Map 238, Lot 36) in the Village District. BY: Scott D. Cole, Beals Associates PLLC; 70 Portsmouth Avenue; Stratham, NH 03885.

Due to the late hour, the applicant's representative requested a continuation until the next meeting.

A motion was made by J. Jennison and seconded by J. Brann to continue to the application until April 21, 2020 due to the late time. 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 held on April 21, 2020 no location electronic meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 12:06 a.m.