



BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING

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

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are: We are utilizing the Microsoft Team for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through the Microsoft Team, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in the meeting through dialing the following phone #603-664-0240 and Conference ID: 341880740
Call 603-664-0182 or email: birvine@barrington.nh.gov

(Approved July 7, 2020)
Tuesday June 16, 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

Roll Call Vote

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

Member Present

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

Andy Knapp ex- officio
Ron Allard

Members Absent

Rondi Boyer

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

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of the June 2, 2020 meeting minutes.

Without objection the minutes of June 2, 2020 were approved as written.

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay
J. Brann-Yay
A. Knapp-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM June 2, 2020

2. [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.

Tobin Farwell from Farwell Engineering Services reviewed the site walk that took place on June 9, 2020. Tobin explained that during the site walk they talked about the boats tied to shore location and showed the Board the proposed limit of the area for tying boats to shore from the boat launch at about 125 feet. Tobin explained that the size of the boats would determine the number of boats that could be put there. Tobin explained that 10 large boats could be put there or larger number of smaller boats can be tied to shore. Tobin explained that they would define the area by having a sign stating it was the boat tying location and it would be the only location for boats tied to shore. Tobin explained that they like to define the area for the boats but asked would the Board like more discussion.

J. Jennison agreed with a defined area because size does vary.

Tobin showed the Board on a plan the location of the boats and showed that no boats beyond this area.

A. Knapp asked what the boxed in area above it was.

Tobin explained that was the existing boat dock.

A. Knapp asked if the tie off area was at the edge of the boat dock.

Tobin explained that there was room for a boat to tie onto the dock and that would be the limit of the tie to shore location.

A. Knapp stated that they are using every aspect from the shoreland.

Tobin explained every location from there to the boat launch and explained that was 125' of the length. Tobin then explained the coverage area of the site showing buildings and the gravel area on site and the maximum lot coverage limit of 40% coverage. Tobin explained that anyone coming in would have a proposed maximum of 600 s.f. per site and explained that this would not include RV's because this would be a vehicle on wheels. Tobin explained that any driveways or decks would be limited to the 600 s.f. Tobin explained that with the proposed gravel road and the 27 sites it would be an additional 13,400 s.f. of impervious surface.

S. Diamond asked what the total square feet would be.

Tobin explained that it would be 1,082,130 s.f.

A. Knapp asked if the total included all the current roadways.

Tobin explained that the included the existing gravel, pavement roadways and existing buildings.

A. Knapp asked if this included the already graveled in sites with decks.

Tobin explained that this did not include them, and this was the infrastructure area.

J. Brann asked if you take the infrastructure total and subtract from the 40%.

Tobin explained that what's happening now with 148 total sites with all the infrastructure and divide in by would allow the 1,425 s.f. per site impervious surface to get to the 40%.

A. Knapp state that means that the current sites are 100% pervious in the current state.

Tobin explained that most sites are under 600 s.f. and felt that was a high number.

S. Diamond asked if campers or tents would be considered impervious.

Tobin stated no because they are a temporary structure and explained that campers are on wheels and tents are not. Tobin explained the landscaping plan that showed the existing conditions and a profile of where the fence would go. Tobin showed the profile of the existing grade and explained the different areas for the fence.

J. Brann asked what the height of the fence would be between proposed Campsites 9 & 10 and Mrs. Pantano's property.

Tobin explained that the height the fence along Campsites 9 & 10 would vary from 8 to 9.8 feet in height with vegetation as well.

J. Jennison asked could they maintain the [100'] buffer if they were closer to the thousand square feet with smaller campsites.

Tobin explained with the 100' setback and with the buffer there wouldn't be anything left.

J. Jennison explained that a lot of the sites are doubled the site size that was required. With a 1000 s.f. sites more of a buffer would be maintained.

Tobin explained that it would not.

Ray explained that for 1,000 s.f. sites they would need to clear cut the area. Ray explained that the 100-foot buffer was hard because of the terrain and roadway.

J. Jennison stated there were questions asked earlier with the size of the sites, having trees removed would force having the need for a larger buffer you would cut less trees in the buffer would have a clear-cut campground like the field. J. Jennison suggested that they could do another safari campsite.

Ray explained that not doing a clear cut was what they wanted for seasonal sites.

S. Diamond expressed that when they were on the site walk it was hard for him because some of the tree branches were low to the ground you could keep many of the trees. S. Diamond suggested that if you cut everything to 20' cut clean so breaks to an angle to shed water and you could keep more trees not having to plant so many later.

Tobin explained that he was not an expert on this but sounded good to him and they would discuss with UNH and so we would get their input. Tobin explained that they were looking to keep a variation of tree heights.

S. Diamond expressed that the white pines would get dangerous quick.

Tobin explained that when they walked around quite a few have stayed.

J. Jennison asked about the site that would be 29' from the property line.

Tobin explained that was Campsite 28 that they got rid of. Tobin explained to the Board that they were looking for some type of discussion on landscaping, buffer and 3.4 Conditional Use Permit how to move forward with engineer review.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison read question from Mr. Goodwin from 193 Hall Road. His comment/question was: He would like the boats tied to a tree to have a limit, not how many would fill the area, and not have the area look like a boat marina. Mr. Goodwin asked if the sites would be for tenting.

J. Jennison stated that the sites would not be for tenting. J. Jennison asked if they would allow tents on the seasonal sites.

Ray asked if they were referring to accessory to a camper or just a tent.

J. Jennison stated that he was suggesting tent sites and the goal was to be seasonal.

Ray explained that these were going to be hookup sites and stated that he couldn't say if a visitor would come and put a tent on the site.

J. Jennison asked Mr. Goodwin if that answered his question that these are for RV's with possible tents occasionally.

J. Jennison read another question from Mr. O'Brien - Why wasn't there no additional guest parking with the additional sites?

Ray stated that he wasn't sure why they would need more guest parking than what they already have available.

J. Jennison explained that he wasn't sure if there was anything in the regulations for additional parking for campgrounds.

Ray explained to the Board that they have a whole center area in the middle of the campground and explained the location.

J. Jennison asked another question from Mr. O'Brien - Is there a rule on how high the fence could be? J. Jennison stated Building Permit.

J. Huckins explained over 7' requires a Building Permit and if over 8' it needs to be approved by the Planning Board as part of the site approval.

J. Jennison read Mr. Goodwin comment he believes that it should be a tie up boats with a number not length of shoreland to keep less congested.

Question 2 what the purpose is to have to buffer 50' to 100'.

J. Jennison explained that applicant ask for waivers all the time.

Tobin explained that they would be improving the buffer.

S. Diamond asked about the boat storage racks by the boat launch. If they were rebuilt, could they take the small boats out of the water and store on these racks.

Ray explained that the racks are for kayaks and canoes. Along the shore people can have row boats and explained that if there are larger boats.

S. Diamond explained that if you have fewer boats in the water it would be better, S. Diamond also explained that if you had racks this could help address the concern.

Ray explained that he was in the area and there are a lot of boats that are not from Barrington Shores. Ray explained that these boats are in a cove.

A. Knapp questioned Ray where he was seeing this because he was in the area regularly with his boat.

Ray explained that if you look at the plan and stand at the shore at the 125' dimension looking at Rosemary Lane area you would see the boats not part of Barrington Shores.

J. Jennison asked if he brought a canoe would that be where he would put his canoe.

Ray stated that if there was an open spot along the shoreline.

J. Jennison stated that this was the concern with the boats, canoes and kayaks tied up.

Ray explained that the kayaks are taken out of the water; motorboats are tied up to shore.

J. Jennison asked where the rules on what was allowed and there were doesn't seem to be any and asked what was recommended. J. Jennison asked what the width of a boat was.

A. Knapp stated 8'6" was the maximum width of a boat and it was the standard.

Ray explained that after talking to Tim (manager) that you can't reserve that spot and he would tell the people to take down the signs.

J. Jennison expressed that he felt better if there was number limit for boats.

Ray explained that they could go with a number but what if there but if they have bigger boats does that mean that they can go on the other side on shore.

J. Jennison expressed that they need number of boats would work.

Ray asked if the Board was looking for distance and a maximum number of boats.

J. Jennison stated that makes the sense for the neighbors.

A. Knapp explained that you must keep in mind that a boat from 12 to 20 feet long in at an angle and another one straight that the beam would be like 14 to 16 feet based on the length of the boat. A. Knapp reminded the Board they are tied at the shoreland and its not straight contour.

Ray explained that Tim stated 14 boats would be the maximum at the shore.

J. Jennison asked if the Board was satisfied with that number.

J. Brann stated that they could go with no more than 10 or 12 boats.

Matt Niswender from 28 Rosemary Lane stated plus or minus with space between so that it doesn't look like a marina and felt like 14 was a high number to have.

J. Jennison stated that he didn't know how that could be enforced unless you put permanent poles on the shoreland.

Tobin explained the 10 boats was for the big boats.

Matt Niswender explained that maybe add the poles and once there all used then no more boats and he explained that he doesn't want this looking like a cluster of boats all in one spot.

J. Jennison asked Matt if this was how he described this area currently.

Matt Niswender explained that they are concerned about the expansion with no rules in place as a resident and the traffic out on the lake.

J. Jennison expressed without the expansion currently they could pack in as many as they want.

J. Brann expressed to J. Jennison his question to Matt about how it looks now and when they did the site walk there were boats tied up to shore that went beyond the 125' close to the assisting boat launch.

Ray explained that the 125' mark is the last one tied to a tree and the next boat over would be tied to the dock.

J. Brann explained that they are not talking about expanding the area at all.

Ray explained that the boats in the cove; if you are out in the water the first few boats are what you see. Ray explained that the only one that would see these would be the Robinsons and it has been like this for years.

Matt Niswender expressed that this has been this way for years but now that they are having this conversation it was the time to fix this with the expansion.

J. Jennison expressed that they are now decreasing the number of boats and putting this in place [as part of the site approval]. J. Jennison expressed that as of right now they could put as many boats as they want there.

A. Knapp explained that the problem he sees was that someone needs to manage this.

J. Jennison explained that this would be like any regulation that they put on it.

R. Allard explained that without rules there was no way to manage it and explained that he felt that the impact wasn't going to change things anyway its already pretty much jammed now. R. Allard expressed some defined number limit would help.

J. Jennison asked R. Allard, being a lake resident, did he feel 14 was a good maximum number.

R. Allard explained that when they were on the site walk there were 8 or 9 boats and felt that 12 was a good number for the maximum.

Tobin explained to the Board that they are trying to cover the bases. If smaller boats are there, you could get more boats in the 125' area.

R. Allard explained that on the site walk there were 8 or 9 boats with one big boat.

J. Jennison expressed that if the number of boats were limited at 12, he felt it was reasonable and if more boats are there and they do a head count no one would make them move.

J. Brann expressed that he agreed with R. Allard and that 12 boats would be fine.

A. Knapp agreed that 10 boats with 12 as a maximum for the prevention of shore land damage.

Pat Gingrich of 32 Peabody Way was concerned when the wind stirs up, the boats go to the left and right and would take up more space. Pat expressed that too many boats would run into each other.

J. Jennison explained that if one boat goes to the left all boats would go to the left and felt that this was the owner's responsibility.

Ray explained that most boats tied to shore are tied with two ropes, so they don't sway as much.

Casey O'Brien from 24 Hall Road asked about visitors parking with one vehicle at the site but if they have 4 children under 18 years old and visitors for 30 more sites, where will they park.

J. Jennison explained that if you are expanding the campground, it would expand guest parking too.

Ray explained that they have additional parking where the leach field was, additional parking and additional overflow parking.

J. Brann asked what the percent of guest parking do they have.

Ray explained that during holiday weekends the overflow parking was probably maxed and during prime time they are probably not.

J. Jennison explained that there was not a regulation for parking in a campground so it would be hard to come up with numbers on it.

Casey stated that when campers come up, they have young adults with their own vehicle. This would be where the traffic study wouldn't be correct as to how many people are coming and going this was the concern for Hall and Beauty Hill Roads.

R. Allard asked Casey if he was looking for more guest parking or the same.

Casey explained that he counts vehicles every day and especially with additional sites that would be more vehicles every day.

J. Jennison stated that they were no rules of campground vehicles and most campgrounds allow one extra car per site.

Ray explained that Tim said they only max out parking on vehicles on holidays.

Mr. Goodwin from 193 Hall Road asked if there was a policy for the number of vehicles per camp site.

J. Jennison explained that they would go back to the policy for vehicles at the campground.

Matt Niswender explained that on the site walk they talked about a limited number of boats not by size and was concerned that it would look like a marina.

J. Jennison explained that the Board has stated they proposed no more than 12 boats and asked Ray about the letter from the Swain Water District about the drought we're experiencing and to verify that Barrington Shores was on the Swains Lake Water District.

Ray stated that they are and use for showers/bathrooms limited water use. Ray explained that they do not have lawns and was not sure if they had a policy in place for this.

J. Jennison asked if there was a spot for washing boats when they pull them out.

Ray explained that they don't have anything for this.

Andy explained that for a private boat launch there is no way to wash off species.

Tobin expressed that the boats that are there only use Swain Lake.

R. Allard explained that at the site walk they talked to the manager and he felt they could do 1 or 2 a week as they come in.

Ray stated that Tim said that when the boats come in, they can wash them, but they are not allowed to wash cars or campers.

A. Knapp expressed that he read the Swains Lake Water District letter from June 7, 2020 and with the additional 27 sites that is a lot of toilet flushing and asked if everything was hooked up to the septic.

J. Jennison explained that most campers have showers not tubs; people bring bottled water and do not drink the tap water. J. Jennison explained that most people with holding tanks use less water to flush; they must empty that tank. J. Jennison expressed that water usage was much lower for a camper than a household.

Ray explained that the campground was 25% occupied during the week and 100% on weekends. There was less water used in a camper.

J. Brann explained to the Board that they [campground] were here for action on the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and the waiver for the buffer, and the rest could be addressed after the Dubois & King review/response.

R. Allard agreed with J. Jennison that water use would be less for a camper than a house but in a house, it would be one per 80,000 s.f. lot, much more than at a camp site.

A. Knapp explained that water usage for a camper from his research was 150 gallons per day and that would be 4,050 gallons per day for the proposed expansion.

Tobin asked A. Knapp where he got this information and NHDES design states 60 gallons per day.

A. Knapp explained that he got the information from North Carolina.

Tobin explained that we live in New Hampshire.

A. Knapp explained that if you look at New Hampshire, North Carolina was going to be a general amount of usage on RV parks based on North Carolina State website.

Tobin explained that the NHDES and we are in New Hampshire so we should use this one.

A. Knapp agreed if New Hampshire had one.

M. Gasses explained that they Swains Water District could tell them how many gallons a day their current usage is because they a meter.

J. Brann asked if the water district ruled on this.

J. Jennison stated no, they just sent a letter acknowledging the expansion and were working on determining issues with well flow rate.

A. Knapp explained that he has the letter from the Swain Water District and said they had a conversation he would like more information on formal letterhead.

J. Brann explained that the water district knows how much water they are using and can divide it by the number of sites.

Ray explained to the Board that they received a letter from Swains Lake Water District dated April 2, 2020. Ray explained that they are working on Well #7 because it was not working properly.

J. Jennison read the letter from the Swains Lake Water District and it said it would be in touch with the campground.

J. Brann expressed that they need to hear from the water district before they act on this.

S. Diamond suggested to the Board that year-round residents should have a guaranteed basic amount of water even if there's a drought.

J. Jennison agreed, even with the expansion, but need to hear from the water district to ensure they have the capacity to serve the residents.

Ray would reach out to the water district and get answer on Well #7 also.

R. Allard expressed that on the expansion and the boat tie up, he would like to see this part of the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit.

A. Knapp stated that he agreed with R. Allard. A. Knapp asked about the 50' buffer that the Board hasn't really talked about it.

Ray discussed the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and if you deny the application the Conditional Use Permit wouldn't happen.

R. Allard explained that they would need to be voted on separately.

Richard McKenney from 350 Calef Island Road asked if the Board read the letter that he submitted yesterday morning.

J. Jennison read Mr. McKenney's letter. J. Jennison asked if a letter was received from Mrs. Pantano. (no new letter on file)

Matt Niswender stated that Mrs. Pantano said she sent a letter asking that she receive a letter with the conditions to protect her from the site walk in the letter from Barrington Shores.

J. Jennison explained that her comments were about the fence during the site walk and that was now on the plan, which is almost 9' in front of her property.

Matt explained that it was something about if the campground was ever sold that the next owners would have to follow through and adhere to the rules.

J. Jennison explained that if it was sold, the new owners would need to go with the conditions and if they wanted something different, they would have to revisit this process.

Matt explained that he would pass this information on to Mrs. Pantano.

Ray explained that he also had the same conversation with Mrs. Pantano, and he explained to her the Planning Board requires that these conditions get put on the plan. Ray wanted to let Mr. McKenney that the rest for the fence would be to also have as a buffer and to stop people from walking down Rosemary Lane.

Matt Niswender has a message from a resident on Rosemary Lane. They want to know if the 50' buffer with the fence instead of the 100' was not granted, how many sites would be where 27 sites would be.

Ray explained that he would need to do a concept review to see what they could do. Ray explained that they would need to clear cut that whole hill and would require a lot more work to do it. Ray expressed that they would need to go with the 1000' standard size site. They would be packed in and they were looking to have the sites spread out.

Matt Niswender asked if it would benefit the surrounding neighbors to have the greenery and the fence verses the 100' setback. Was that what they [campground] are saying.

Ray stated that was correct and everything with the 50' buffer that was proposed would provide a sound barrier. Ray explained that he spoke to Mrs. Pantano and she asked about cleaning up some of the dead trees and branches. Ray explained that the 50' buffer was going to enhance the area more than going with the 100' packing the sites in.

M. Gasses suggested to the Board that they need to go through the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Goodwin suggested that they need to put up a fence and the 100' buffer.

J. Jennison explained that if they have the 100' buffer they are not required to put up the fence.

A. Knapp stated to J. Jennison that could be part of the conditions of use on how they develop it.

J. Jennison asked if he was talking about the 100' buffer.

A. Knapp stated that he believed so.

J. Jennison expressed if they maintained the requirement of the 100' buffer that the Board could enforce adding fence as well.

J. Brann expressed that the Board needs to be careful on what they want verses what in the regulations and go over the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit for requirements.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Brann expressed that the Board has gone through the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and the applicant came back with a change to address the Board's concern about the answer to #7.

R. Allard explained that the Board also had issues with #8 as well.

J. Jennison read #7 and the response from the revised application dated June 3, 2020.

J. Brann expressed that this answer was better than the previous one.

J. Jennison reopened public comment.

Glen Perry from 67 Rosemary Lane stated that he wants the 100' buffer and if the Board grants the 50' buffer he still wants a fence up.

J. Jennison asked Mr. Perry if he saw the proposed plan.

Mr. Perry stated that he did see the plan.

J. Jennison explained the height of the fence in different areas around the campground and it was on the plan set.

Mr. Perry stated that he still wants a fence.

J. Jennison explained to Mr. Perry that if this was approved, it was on the plan and the fence would need to be put up as shown on the plan.

Mr. Perry wants this left open and talk to the developer.

J. Jennison explained to Mr. Perry that if approved, this needs to be on the plan so wanted his information now and try to talk to them.

Mr. Perry expressed that he doesn't want to see the campground and he doesn't want to see any trailers.

Matt Niswender added to Glen Perry's location that he was in the back corner where the fence was cut off and was an abutter. Matt expressed that it might be good to extend the fence in that corner.

J. Jennison explained that this was discussed at the site walk and Mr. Robinson did not want a fence up that's why it was wrapped around the corner to protect Mr. Perry but went no further.

Matt Niswender stated that if he was in Mr. Perry's shoes, he would probably want a tall fence.

Mr. Perry that at the site walk they [the Board] could not see how far up the hill they [Perry's] can see and were not able to show anyone on the Board.

J. Jennison explained that if this goes through, they would work to have the fencing and planting enhance the view.

Mrs. Perry expressed that they are not going to change their mind about the waiver and wanted the campground owners to know that. Mrs. Perry expressed that the buffer would be too close.

J. Jennison closed public comment for second time.

J. Jennison asked the Board if they were satisfied with the answer to #7 of the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit. J. Jennison expressed that they were still questions about the resource question answer.

J. Brann explained that the drainage has no system now so treating runoff was a good thing. J. Brann explained that they already have a sewage system that was old so a new system designed to modern standards was better than what they have today.

J. Jennison explained that they are not tying into the old system.

Tobin explained that the old leach field was being rebuilt as well.

A. Knapp expressed that there are another leach field that are not being impacted as well.

Tobin explained that was true but they are talking about the leach field near the safari area would be rebuilt and the new one for the expansion would be new as well.

Ray explained that the water runoff would be captured in the safari field as well.

J. Jennison read the answer to #8 from the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit. J. Jennison asked R. Allard if his concern was that Swain Lake Water District has not formally commented on this.

R. Allard expressed that this should be an open question until Swain Lake Water District formally replies.

A. Knapp agreed with R. Allard and that the response in the letter that was received isn't sufficient.

J. Jennison asked the Board if they wanted to table the 3.4 Conditional Use Permit until they receive a response from the Swain Lake Water District.

S. Diamond agreed and stated that Questions 3 & 4 were also related to #8.

J. Jennison outlined additional changes/details needed from the public hearing:

1. 10 to 12 boats at the shoreland
2. Additional fencing to address Mr. & Mrs. Perry's concerns
3. Revised **3.4 CUP** answers for #'s 8 & 9

Tobin asked for more information on what the Board wants on the landscaping plan.

The Board had a lengthy discussion on the 100' buffer, waiver and 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and came to a decision to continue the application.

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by J. Brann to continue the application, 3.4 Conditional Use Permit and waivers to August 4, 2020. Vote 6/0

Roll Call:

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

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

S. Diamond asked about Fire Chief being able to get a fire truck all the way though Long Shores Drive.

A. Knapp explained that the Fire Chief spoke to the Select Board and that he could get a fire truck to the end of Long Shores Drive.

S. Diamond accepted the answer for now.

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

The next meeting will be on July 7, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. electronic meeting; no meeting place.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully,

Barbara Irvine