



BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING

As Chair of the Barrington Planning Board, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this Board is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are:

We are utilizing the Microsoft Team for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through the Microsoft Team, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in the meeting through dialing the following phone #1-929-338-4464 and Conference ID: 757 087 504

**Tuesday April 21, 2020
6:30 p.m.**

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

Roll Call:

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

Members Present

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

Members Absent

Andy Knapp ex- officio
Rondi Boyer

Staff Present

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

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of the April 7, 2020 meeting minutes.

Without objection the minutes of April 7, 2020 were approved as written.

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM March 3, 2020

2. [220-54.1 & 54-7.2-RC/GR-LL/9.6 \(Albert Estes-Mills Falls Realty LLC\)](#) Request by applicant to adjust boundary lines between lots 54.7.1 and 54.7.2 for a site review for 43 commercial storage-office units with a 9.6 Special Permit in the wetland buffer and also a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit on a total of 8.691 -acre lot on Calef Highway (Map 220, Lots 54.7.1& 54.7.2) in the Residential Commercial and General Residential Zoning Districts. BY Robert Stowell, Trittech Engineering Corporation; 755 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
(Application, 3.4 CUP and Lot Line were approved on December 3, 2019)

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Al Estes from Mill Falls Realty, LLC explained that they are asking for a continuance until June 2, 2020 due to the coronavirus.

M. Gasses asked if the applicant knew where they stand with the State permits. M. Gasses asked if the AoT permit has been, or when this permit would be, submitted.

Al Estes explained that he has given the check to Bob Stowell from Trittech to send to the State and that the check has been signed but he was stuck in Florida through the pandemic and had not been able to get back. Al explained that he has tried the office and it's been hard to reach anyone.

M. Gasses explained that this would have bearing on what the Board would decide to do if they are going to have Dubois and King look at your application also or just go with the State review where you need to do an AoT permit.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to continue the application until June 2, 2020. Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

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

DESIGN REVIEW CONTINUED FROM April 7, 2020

3. [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.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application that was continued from April 7, 2020.

Scott Cole from Beals Associates represented J & L Terra and explained to the Board that they have a proposal to subdivide and develop 21 acres. Scott explained that the owner would keep the remaining 8 acres on the commercial side of Route 125 (Calef Highway). Scott explained that the parcel currently has frontage on Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway) and Route 125 (Calef Highway). Scott showed the Board the location of where the proposed development would be. Scott explained that this would be in the Village District and the applicant was looking to do a multi-family development. Scott explained that this would be a private road with 84 units and the proposed road would be approximately 500' with a loop configuration to provide for emergency vehicles and safe circulation. Scott explained that the road would be 24' wide with a hammerhead at the end and there would be 21 units per building. Scott explained that this would be a private loop driveway. Some units would have one or two car garage bays for each building, and there would be a community well toward the back of the property with septic systems that would be in a couple of places. Scott explained that they met with the Fire Chief Rick Walker and proposed a 30-gallon fire cistern that would be located midway into the development. Scott explained that they know that a mail kiosk would be required that they plan on having at the entrance of the road. Scott explained to the Board that this was a preliminary design they wanted to bring before the Board. Scott expressed to the Board that they did receive a letter from an abutter and did reply to the abutter.

S. Diamond asked if there would be a connection to route 125 (Calef Highway).

Scott explained that he would need to talk to the owner, but the owner didn't want a through section to Route 125 (Calef Highway).

S. Diamond asked if there was going to be green space like a picnic table area on the property.

Scott explained that on the plan he showed open space behind the units of 14 acres.

J. Jennison asked where the wetlands were there would not have future development.

Scott explained that area would not be developed that area would be open space.

J. Brann asked how this would be buffered for Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway) and the abutting lots.

Scott explained they would like to leave the vegetation the way it was with added landscape buffer and the front would stay as it was. The setbacks would be eastside sideline 45', rear setback would be 70' and the left side [west] setback would be 35'.

J. Jennison expressed that he would be interested in the design of the building, where this was in the center of Town.

R. Allard asked if the units would be two-bedroom units.

Scott explained that there would be two bedrooms with the potential of three-bedroom units.

R. Allard asked about the area off Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway); were there sidewalks.

Scott explained that some units would have one or two garage bays. Scott explained that they usually put pavers to separate ownership of the parking spaces.

J. Jennison asked if the Board would be looking for sidewalks.

J. Brann expressed that there should be sidewalks in the development to connect later along Route 9.

J. Brann explained that when Christmas Dove put in sidewalks the Board talked about connecting everything in Village District by sidewalks.

S. Diamond suggested pathways away from the driving area.

M. Gasses explained that sidewalks are required in the Town Center and suggested that maybe have them internally; that way the sidewalks would have something to connect to in the future. M. Gasses explained that she was concerned about the hammerhead and asked if they were looking at this being a Town road.

Scott explained that this would be a private road.

M. Gasses explained she could see a problem when being plowed but she wouldn't have a problem with the looping area. M. Gasses explained she felt hammerheads are not popular with a maintenance crew.

J. Jennison asked if the hammerhead connected over.

Scott explained that no emergency vehicle would need to turn around; they can loop around. Scott explained that the applicant decided that they want to keep the road drive and maintain themselves with an association. Scott asked M. Gasses where they were keeping as a private driveway, do they need to show a right of way.

M. Gasses expressed that she would like to see a defined right of way.

J. Brann asked if it was going to be built to Town standards for a driveway anyway.

J. Jennison expressed that he felt there wouldn't be that much difference between a driveway or a road.

J. Huckins explained that you would build as a road with no hammerhead.

M. Gasses expressed that there should be meets and bound.

J. Brann explained that in the Village District that there needed to be a minimum lot size and read from the Site Review Regulations.

Scott explained that he did the math on this and that they couldn't add more units, but they could spread these out.

R. Allard asked if they could do fewer units.

J. Huckins explained the way the regulations were written they could do more.

S. Diamond asked if they knew how many people would be living in these units.

Scott explained that he couldn't provide that information.

R. Allard questioned the parking spaces in front of each building and stated that most families have two cars.

J. Brann asked about the garages with each unit.

Scott explained according to the regulations they would need 112 parking spaces and they are proposing 202 parking spaces.

J. Jennison asked if these were going to be mixed design units or all the same.

Scott stated that he didn't know but could check with the client.

J. Jennison expressed mixed design would be preferred.

J. Brann expressed that he would like to see designs like some of the renovated and new buildings in the area with color and design with New England character.

M. Gasses explained that there was a lot of aging population that are looking to downsize with a master on the first floor. M. Gasses explained that they could still have the townhouse design but would like to see that.

Scott explained that with the 40' setback makes it difficult to have different types of structures.

J. Jennison expressed that he agreed with S. Diamond that on the eight acres reserved area if they could look into connecting to Route 125. J. Jennison explained that maybe in the future, depending on what happens with the eight acres, the Board may require it.

Scott explained that he would need to talk to the owners.

S. Diamond expressed that best management does state frontage roads.

J. Brann asked about the vegetation buffers between the properties around this parcel. J. Brann expressed that he would like to see a landscape plan.

J. Jennison expressed that an abutter also had a concern about the buffer.

Scott explained to the Board that this was design based on a boundary plan.

D. Massucci asked if these would be ADA handicap units or would a couple of these be.

Scott explained that they have not thought about this at this point. Scott explained that they may have some that are more prepped than others.

S. Diamond expressed that M. Gasses talked the aging populations/best management practice and maybe have universal designs that people could access by wheelchair.

Scott explained that there were no steep areas; the lot was flat and clear.

J. Brann asked if these were going to be condos.

Scott stated they were going to be condos.

J. Brann explained if these were planned to be sold and have some type of homeowner's association, the Board would need to see a maintenance plan.

Scott explained that they received a letter from abutters Richard and Victoria Spinale dated April 7, 2020 and we offer the following responses to their comments. Each comment is followed by our response in **bold**.

1. Will the proposed 500' road be a private road or a town road?
Response: The main section for the project is proposed to be a private road.
2. Has DOT been contacted regarding the proposed 500' road access from Rt 9?
Response: NHDOT has not been contacted at this time as we wanted to review with the planning board first.
3. Will the proposed 500' road be only accessed (exit and entered) from this already over-burdened section of Route 9? Has a traffic study on Rt 9 been done?
Response: Yes, there is only one point of access proposed. Although we have not done a traffic study specific to this project, we did provide one for Route 9 recently for the Village Place subdivision.
4. Why isn't the entrance and/or exit on Route 125? Has a traffic study on Rt 125 been done?
Response: The owner of the property is retaining the 8 acres along the Route 125 side of the parcel and we do not have access to it. Route 125 was included in the previous study.
5. Is the recent Haley lot line adjustment of 20' reflected in the preliminary design plan?
Response: A boundary survey has not been performed at this time and the boundary shown is from a previous subdivision plan and public records. The boundary will be updated in the near future.
6. How many units per building are proposed?
Response: The proposal consists of 4-unit buildings.
7. How do you propose trash be handled?
Response: Trash in this type development is by use of dumpsters paid by association.
8. What is your proposal for land and building maintenance? Will property management be located on site?
Response: An association will be required with covenants. On-site management is unknown at this time.
9. How do you propose mail be handled (will there be a community mailbox near the entrance or exit?)?
Response: Yes, as shown on the plan near the entrance a mail kiosk and apron is proposed.
10. Are the proposed 84 units condos or rental units (low income?) and how many bedrooms per unit?
Response: The proposal is for market rate condo units typically 2-bedroom with the possibility of some 3 bedroom.

11. Do the proposed buildings have garages and basements?
Response: Yes, the units will have garages with 1-2 bays.
12. Sidewalks?
Response: This is to be discussed with the board as none exist currently on Route 9.
13. Will there be a play area? Club house? Open Green Space?
Response: There is a large area of open space approx. 13 acres provided. There is no clubhouse proposed and a play area is undetermined.
14. What type of buffer are you proposing along existing abutting property lines?
Response: The natural vegetation is to remain to the extent possible.
15. How wide is the proposed roadway?
Response: The proposed ROW is 50' and the roadway is 24' wide.
16. The preliminary design plan does not show our existing ½ acre lot (238-35-1) with a 50' DOT accepted driveway. Are you aware (the Town of Barrington has not updated the on-line maps) that we own and are talking about two (not one) lots that abut this proposed project?
Response: Yes, we were aware and the line was simply not shown and will be in the future.
17. What is the proposed plan for water and septic (one at each building or community systems?)?
Response: The proposal is for a community water and sewer system. The well is to be placed out back in the open space and the septic area is not yet designed however likely to be in more than 1 location.
18. What is the proposed distance of the proposed buildings from our property lines for Lot 238-35 and Lot 238-35-1?
Response: The distance along the side line is currently 45' at the closest and approx. 70' along the rear.
19. Lot 238-35-1 will have a well and septic system when developed. Your proposed project will need to include plans that do not impede on Code Requirements for our Lot 238-35-1.
Response: By state regulation we can't impede on abutting land.
20. What is the timetable and duration of this proposed project if approved?
Response: The project would start when fully approved. The duration would be market driven.

J. Jennison asked what the footprint of the units would be with garages.

Scott explained that the outer units would be wider than the inner units.

S. Diamond asked about best management practice for landscaping for health and safety outdoors if they can't leave their property.

Scott agreed with S. Diamond.

J. Jennison asked where the green space was if it's a pretty good walking area with trails.

Scott explained that the client would clean the area up.

S. Diamond explained that he'd like to see benches and grass.

J. Jennison asked S. Diamond if he was saying around the units.

S. Diamond replied that was correct.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Rick Spinale from 534 Franklin Pierce Highway explained that his question #11 was answered about garages but also wanted to know if there was going to be basements.

Scott explained that at this time they were not sure; some may, and others may not.

Rick Spinale explained that he was concerned about the water table and septic tanks that may affect his well.

Scott explained that the septic tanks would be to the rear of the project and they are held to design standards for which the State has their own regulations.

Rick Spinale asked if he was correct about not being able to put septic tanks in the wet area. Rick explained that he was also concerned about the septic tanks closest to the buildings. Rick also asked about the community well because he was concerned about his well because his was at 500' and was ½ gallon a minute.

Scott explained that the community well would be over 1000' away from Rick Spinale's property. Scott further explained that this well would require a State permit because it was a community water supply. Scott explained that the septic tanks would be located behind the last three units on the eastside.

S. Diamond explained that this was a high stratified drift area.

J. Jennison explained that being in this area the septic tanks need to be paid attention to.

Rick Spinale asked if the applicant was going to own the 21 acres and the 8 acres after subdividing.

Scott explained that the owner would subdivide, and the applicant would only have the 21 acres because the [current] owner would keep the remaining 8 acres.

Sharyl Murphy from 535 Franklin Pierce Highway asked about the location of the mailboxes and believes she heard they would be at the front of the property.

J. Jennison asked if the location was where the entry was on Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway).

Scott explained that as soon as you get off Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway) there would be two parking spaces and the mailboxes.

Sharyl Murphy explained that she was concerned about the traffic backing up to Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway) and asked if there was a way to have the mailboxes further into the development.

J. Jennison explained that he had the same concerns.

Sharyl Murphy suggested three or four different mailboxes separated to cut down on traffic.

Scott explained that the Post Office would like one centralized service area.

Rick Spinale asked if these were going to be townhouses or condos.

Jason White, applicant, explained that they were going to be townhouse style.

Rick Spinale asked if there was going to be a sign at the entrance.

Scott explained that was not discussed yet.

Rick Spinale stated he was fine if there wasn't one.

Sharyl Murphy asked if the entrance could be on Route 125 (Calef Highway) side.

J. Jennison explained that this was a big piece of property and explained that once this was subdivided this would be two separate lots.

Sharyl Murphy asked what if NHDOT told them that they couldn't have that many cars coming off Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway).

Scott explained that he knows that Route 9 (Franklin pierce Highway) was busy but not near as busy as Route 125 (Calef Highway) and that this would be what NHDOT would be looking at.

Susan Gaudiello from 528 Franklin Pierce Highway was concerned how close this would be to the wetlands and wished it wasn't so developed. Susan asked if these were three story buildings with a garage on the lower level.

Scott explained that was the plan.

Susan Gaudiello expressed that going back to D. Massucci's thought about handicap accessibility, they couldn't be handicap accessible unless there were chair lifts. Susan also shared Rick Spinale's concern about the septic, and also wanted to know if there could be a turning lane given the traffic. Susan explained that she was concerned about the landscaping and if they were going to leave the trees. Susan asked what kind of lighting would be in the development.

J. Jennison explained that there were lighting requirements.

Scott explained that they have not talked about the lighting and being in Barrington, they like the rural feel. Scott explained that the only thing they need to discuss in time were safety issues. Scott explained for sidewalks there may be a low-level lighting.

J. Jennison asked what the frontage on Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway) was.

Scott stated that the frontage was 250'.

Susan explained that she felt that the limited frontage would need to have an incoming lane. Susan expressed that she felt there should be one lane to turn left and one lane to turn right.

J. Jennison stated that with the existing traffic study, and they may do update, this would be determined by NHDOT.

Scott explained that would be a judgement call by NHDOT.

J. Jennison explained that the Board would be looking for a lighting plan for a project of this size.

J. Brann explained that the State would look at this project and decide if they would need a turning lane.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Jennison read the following staff comments:

Planners Comments:

- Looking for land patterns consistent with traditional New England design
- Look at how internal sidewalks are to connect to existing street
- Suggest a mix of housing designs to accommodate changing demographics

Fire Chief, Rick Walker

- 30K Cistern located within 1000' access of all units
- Proper turning radius for fire apparatus
- Adequate parking for visitors so they are not parking on the street
- Approved Street name per Town 911 committee.
- Turn around "T" at the far end of the parking lot for Fire Trucks
- "No Parking" Signs across from parking spaces along the front of the building

S. Diamond explained that there would be a lot of people in one place and that the SRPC showed that the delays are at Route 9/Route 125 (Franklin Pierce Highway/Calef Highway) intersections.

J. Jennison stated to make sure the applicant addresses the lighting.

J. Jennison closed the Design Review.

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

Roll Call:

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

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM April 7, 2020

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. Aleva, P.E., Civil Consultants; 293 Main Street, South Berwick, Maine 03908.

(Application was accepted as complete at the April 7, 2020 meeting)

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application that was continued from April 7, 2020.

Geoffrey Aleva from Civil Consultants represented the Town of Barrington. Geoff explained that the lot was part of a large lot and this was a commercial lot that fronts on Route 125 (Calef Highway). Geoff explained access to the Town Hall lot. Geoff explained that it would be from a new roadway and right of way and explained that the larger development was under review by NHDOT. Geoff explained that the building was going to be 8,800+/- s.f. and this single-story building would house all the Town offices along with meeting rooms. Geoff explained that there would be parking for in and out with a couple of waivers along with 9.6 special permit request. Geoff explained that the Board received an email from Dubois and King that the Board could rely on NHDOT review of the AoT permit for stormwater and design.

J. Brann expressed that the plan set that he has doesn't meet the requirements of the regulations and explained that it doesn't show the existing conditions so that it would conform to the Site Review Regulations.

Geoff explained that he believed that they supplied the larger part of the subdivision showing the lot for the Town Hall that was submitted by the developer was what they were using as their existing conditions.

J. Brann explained that the plan shows the entrance with the proposed road and that they would be connecting drainage to the other lot.

Geoff explained that on the subdivision plan; it shows the grading and drainage easement for the roadway. Geoff explained that the edge of pavement would go up the hill to the development. Geoff explained that on the drainage, they used the property line as the dividing line and the roadway has a ditch line with a cross under culvert and continues under the new roadway. Geoff explained to the Board the way the drainage would run.

J. Brann asked why there were utility poles when this was supposed to be underground utilities.

Geoff explained that they were not aware of this needed to have underground utilities.

J. Brann expressed that he believed that there was a note on the plan for the subdivision that this was supposed to be all underground utilities.

J. Huckins explained that this would be underground power for the subdivision according to the plan.

Geoff explained that they were not aware of that; they would change to all underground.

J. Brann asked if there was curbing.

Geoff explained that there was on the handicap side.

J. Brann asked if there was a benchmark.

Geoff explained the location of benchmarks and they would add once the construction starts.

J. Brann asked about if erosion controls were required and didn't see the note on the plan.

Geoff explained that it was Note #23 on the plan.

J. Brann asked if the erosion control was in the legend.

Geoff stated that it was not in the legend but would add it to the legend.

J. Brann asked what standards they used for the lighting in the regulations and felt that they used medium.

Geoff explained that they did use medium.

J. Brann expressed that they used 0.6 from the table and in the northwest and northeast corners were below the standard.

R. Allard expressed that the medium shouldn't apply, the high category applies as it states it applies to civic centers and felt that this building would fall under that category. R. Allard expressed that he felt that medium wasn't right for this facility.

J. Brann expressed that he felt that this would not fall under civic center.

M. Gasses stated that she agreed with J. Brann; that this was much more low-keyed operation.

Geoff explained that the minimum was .6.

J. Brann explained that he felt the Town Hall would more like an office park.

R. Allard read from the list with civic center on it and stated that he felt that the Town Hall should be at least at that level.

J. Brann expressed that it should be based on the amount of people coming into the facility.

R. Allard expressed that he felt this lower light level for the Town Hall with the aging community wasn't appropriate.

M. Gasses explained that the community was going for lower lighting not brighter lighting, but still safe, and explained that they have gone through this with other applications.

R. Allard expressed that this was across the street from commercial buildings.

J. Brann explained that the primary use of the Town Hall was during the day and medium was more suitable for this.

J. Jennison stated that he agreed with J. Brann that this was more fit for medium.

Geoff explained that most projects that he has worked on fall under the medium use for this type of facility most of the type at these types of facilities business was during the day.

J. Brann asked about the lighting on the outside of the building and didn't see lighting fixtures on the exterior of the building.

Geoff explained that they are still working on the floor plan that was why they are not on the plan.

R. Allard asked about the shade tree in the parking lot and that he saw some but wanted to make sure that they do comply with the regulations.

Geoff expressed that he did believe that they do comply with the regulations for the trees around the property other than areas that are going to be in the drainage area.

M. Gasses asked if on the final plan they could supply a colored plan rendering for the landscaping.

Geoff explained the location of all the trees on the plan.

J. Jennison read from the 9.6 Special Permit.

S. Diamond asked where the impact would be; was it towards the dumpster pad?

Geoff explained if you look at the dumpster pad to the retention pond, it was to the south.

S. Diamond asked how many s.f. were associated with the 9.6.

Geoff explained that it would be about 500 s.f. when they are complete.

J. Jennison asked if the area was shown on the plan.

Geoff explained that they did not show the area on the plan.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by J. Brann to accept the 9.6 Special Permit with a temporary impact. Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

Requested Waivers:

- 1. 4.7.7 (1) Minimum allowable pipe diameter in any storm drain system shall be 15 inches.**

Planners Comments:

- The project has two pipes of 12-inch diameter designed for controlled flows to accommodate the flow of stormwater through the pipe
- The pipes can be easily cleaned if required for maintenance
- Installation of culverts of this size will not be a detriment to the project

S. Diamond stated that he saw the 12" CCP near the dumpster pad but asked where the other one was.

Geoff explained that the other one was towards the right of way under new driveway.

S. Diamond asked how much impervious surface was being drained by this pipe.

Geoff stated he would need to look into this and was from two retention ponds.

S. Diamond asked if that was because the volume of the pond.

Geoff stated that was correct.

S. Diamond asked how much volume in the pond.

Geoff stated he would need to dig out the number and explained that was in the stormwater report.

J. Brann asked the flow rate that was required.

Geoff it was 2 feet per second.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to grant the waiver 4.7.7 (1) for minimum pipe size granting the waiver would Specific circumstances relative to the subdivision, or conditions of the land in such subdivision, indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations. Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

2. 4.7.7 (3) Minimum depth of cover for storm drain lines of 36 inches.

This project has storm drainpipes that will have portions of its installation where soil cover is not 36 inches. These locations are required due to site grading of pipe placement. The installation of the pipes will follow standard engineering practices and will not create a detriment to the project.

S. Diamond asked the reason for the waiver was because there would never be any heavy trucks.

Geoff explained that they do not want heavy trucks driving though the retention pond.

S. Diamond stated that he read that some freezing, and thawing could cause some problems.

Geoff agreed and they have strict controls on what needs to go around the pipes to bed them correctly.

S. Diamond asked if that meant more sandy type material.

Geoff explained that was correct and that they could use a lot of material that was on site.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to grant the waiver 4.7.7 (3) for minimum depth size granting the waiver would Specific circumstances relative to the subdivision, or conditions of the land in such subdivision, indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations. Vote 5/0

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

R. Allard stated that he knows that he was alone on the lighting and expressed that it this building didn't fall under civic centers, he didn't know what would.

S. Diamond expressed that he understood where R. Allard was coming from and was not quite the same as an office building and felt that this was a little different.

R. Allard explained that he wanted it known that the Board was not giving special treatment to the Town Hall.

J. Jennison read Conditions Precedent:



Planning & Land Use Department
Town of Barrington
PO Box 660
333 Calef Highway
Barrington, NH 03825
 603.664.0195
mgasses@barrington.nh.gov

**NOTICE OF DECISION
 DRAFT**

<i>[Office use only]</i>	<i>Date certified:</i>	<i>As built received:</i>	<i>Surety returned</i>
<i>"Applicant", herein, refers to the property owner, business owner, individual(s), or organization submitting this application and to his/her/its agents, successors, and assigns.</i>			
Proposal Identification: 223-26(C1) RC/SDAO-20-SR (Owner: Route 125 Development, LLC) 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. Aleva, P.E., Civil Consultants; 293 Main Street, South Berwick, Maine 09308			

Route 125 Development, LLC	
----------------------------	--

7B Emery Lane
Stratham, NH 03885

Conner Maciver – Town Administrator
Town of Barrington, NH
PO Box 660
Barrington, NH 03825

Careno Construction Company, LLC
270 West Road #4
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Port One Architects, Inc.
959 Islington Street
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Geoffrey R. Aleva, PE
Civil Consultants
293 Main Street
South Berwick, ME 03908

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its April 21, 2020 meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

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

Please Note* If all of the precedent conditions are not met within 6 calendar months to the day, by xx/xxx, 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) A waiver was granted from Section 4.7.7(3) Minimum depth of cover for storm drain lines of 36 inches
 - b) A waiver was granted from 4.7.7(1) Site Plan Regulations Minimum pipe diameter storm drain systems to allow for two 12-inch diameter pipes where 15- inch is required.
 - c) All Utilities must be underground
 - d) Lighting plan to conform to site plan regulations

- 2) Revise the following plan notes

- a) Note # page
Add the NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit #
Add the NHDES Subsurface Bureau C.A. #
- 3) Make the following plan changes
 - a) Enlarge approval block to 3"1/2 inches wide by 3" high
 - b) Revise Storm Water Management report in page2 of 3 to state Barrington, not Northwood.
 - c. Add monuments to the plan 4.2.3
 - d. Add 2 bike racks to the plan 4.14.4(3)(d)
 - e) Update legend to include erosion control in legend
- 4) Town Counsel shall approve all easement language as needed (Including possible Access)
- #5 Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town
- 6) 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"X17", 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 roads, storm drains, and improvements indicated on the site plan. RSA 674:39

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

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

Sincerely,

Marcia J. Gasses

Town Planner

cc: File

A motion was made J. Brann and seconded by S. Diamond approve the Barrington Town Hall Site Review as read by the chair. Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

5. Review of a request for a building permit at 759 Long Shores Drive a Private Road, for Patrick and Melissa Lessard ([Map 104, Lot 107](#)).

The Board had a brief discussion about the request and agreed to go with the Road Agent recommendation and send the standard letter to the Select Board.

6. Donna Massucci would like to discuss a Farmers Market at the BVS on Saturdays.

D. Massucci explained that she would like to have a farmer's market at BVS that was located on Commerce Way behind Kozys. D. Massucci explained that she has a L shaped driveway. D. Massucci explained that she would like to have the tables setup along the driveway where there was plenty of room. D. Massucci explained that she would like to have on Saturdays, maybe Sunday, so as not to conflict with another business on the road with truck traffic. D. Massucci explained that this would be 4-5 hours during a weekend day.

List of things the Board would be looking for your application:

1. Board approved for her to use her Site Plan
2. Parking check with the Police Chief for parking on the road.
3. Porta Potty location
4. Hours of operation
5. Dumpster location
6. Where tables are setup
7. Talk to Fire Chief

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

The next meeting will be on May 5, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. electronic meeting no meeting place.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 10:06 p.m.