



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: 792 663 187#

Call 603-664-0182 or email: birvine@barrington.nh.gov

**Tuesday, December 15, 2020
6:30 p.m.**

Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote.

Roll Call Vote

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

Members Present

James Jennison, Chair
Jeff Brann, Vice Chair
Steve Diamond
Donna Massucci
Andy Knapp ex- officio
Ron Allard

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

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of December 1, 2020 meeting minutes.

[Barrington Planning Board Meeting Minutes/bi](#)
[December 15, 2020/](#) pg. 1 of 7

A motion was made by A. Knapp and seconded by J. Brann approve the December 1, 2020 minutes as written.

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM December 1, 2020

2. **238-36-V-20-SR (Owner: Waldron B. Haley Revoc Trust)** Request by applicant for Site Review to amend application for a multi-family Development **ADDED** 3.4 Conditional Use Permit located off Franklin Pierce Highway (Map 238, Lot 36) in the Village District. BY: Scott D. Cole, Beal Associates, PLLC; 70 Portsmouth Avenue; Stratham, NH 03885.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

A. Knapp asked the chair if he could take some of the Boards time about an email that he received in November 18th that he didn't see until now from M. Gasses concerning this application. A. Knapp explained that there was a concern that he worked for Turbocam who was an abutter to the project. A. Knapp explained that he had reached out to the developer Peter Russell when the land was for sale and he was told that it had been sold. A. Knapp explained that they had a piece for sale, but this wasn't something Turbocam was interested in. A. Knapp explained that this wasn't brought up at any of the meetings and wasn't to make sure the Board was ok with him proceeding on this application and felt there was no conflict on this application.

J. Jennison expressed that he and the other Board members had a problem with A. Knapp staying on this application.

Scott Cole from Beal Associates, PLLC represented J & L Terra Holdings. Scott explained that he was there to give the Board an update on where they are at. Scott explained that the first thing that he would like to go over would be about the septic systems and wetlands based on a letter from the Conservation Commission. Scott explained that he had supplied the Board with a plan outlined that shows the septic nitrate setbacks supplied by NHDES criteria. Joe Nichols from Beals Associates who was there licensed septic and inspector would explain.

Joe Nichols explained that nitrate setbacks are the distance developed for the State based on the amount of loading for the number of gallons per day that the leach fields are receiving. Joe explained that it takes a larger amount from the leach field down slope then with half the distance of the side slope and half the distance of the upload of the upside of the leach field. Joe explained how all this works before they go off property. Joe explained that the circles around the plan are the limits of what the nitrates can do. Joe explained that they must retain them on site this was one of the State's requirement and the State would not waive this.

J. Brann asked how they know they would exceed that.

Joe explained that based on the State's criteria and explained that they are pretreating and explained that the nitrate setbacks are based on a conventional system. Joe explained that they are well below where the nitrates would travel and explained that they need to use the worst case.

J. Brann asked about the wells that are in the circle by the southerly leach fields and asked if any concerns about nitrates linking into the wells.

Joe explained that was all based on the water bureau and the protected well radius.

J. Brann asked if there were concerns about fracturing the well.

Joe explained that based on the drinking water standards they were not concerned.

J. Jennison asked how you keep the F1 from flowing in the odd shaped circles.

Joe explained that it was based on the travel distance the shape of the slope and the topography of the soil itself. Joe explained that the F1 would travel further down slope and up slope.

J. Brann asked about the flow going into the wetland area there's not going to be any migration in the southeast area where there's an outlet for the wetland area there wasn't going to be nitrate for that area.

Joe explained that NHDES if the nitrate contact meets the wetland that wetland treats or slows down the nitrate better than the soil.

R. Allard asked about the line on the one on the bottom that was close to the property line.

Joe explained that was the up-slope line that was parallel with the grades out there and explained that you need to take the grades into consideration.

A. Knapp asked about looking at the ark around it where and the gradate where it abuts the property line the tights circles are a downhill slope coming off the hill. A. Knapp asked about leaching septic field into wetlands and one of the big things with insurance carries was the concern of species from the by products from humans' medications. A. Knapp asked how was this factored into this and septic systems do not clean up medication.

Joe explained that they have seen in the lagoons in Exeter effects due to fish and explained that they have done studies on this. Joe explained that on the mediation 10% of human maintain the mediation and the rest goes out to the septic tank and gets diluted out to the process. NHDES hasn't came up with a standard in the surface regulations and explained that the NHDES main concern was nitrates. Joe explained that they have meant all the State standards on this.

A. Knapp asked about the property line that was parallel to the westside of the property that there would be no further migration of the nitrate because of flat topography of three of the four sides.

Joe explained that was correct and that it would all flow down slope from there.

S. Diamond asked about what if in a dredge that we have had up to 15" of rain in a 3-day period what would the impact be.

Joe explained that there should not be any impact at all and explained that all the tanks are sealed tight. The collection units are inside the system and pumped out into the tanks. Joe explained that everything was surface and based on season high water tables that are at the high point in the spring not based on dredge conditions.

S. Diamond asked if any of the drainage fed into the septic systems?

Joe explained that no drainage feds into the septic systems.

J. Brann asked what pretreatment consist of.

Joe explained how the pretreatment works and that it breaks down everything. Joe explained the F1 was air rated breaks everything down.

Scott addressed the following changes by the Board:

No parking signs added at the entrance for no parking in roadways.

Buildings revised showing the updated new design.

Internal loop sidewalk.

Roads have been lowered 2' in some areas where possible to better suit the building designs.

Lighting:

Added candle foot to it where the parking spaces are, they are luminate for safety.

Security light over the garages

**Landscape note added to the Eastern abutter in case of thin areas. Following note has been added to the plan:
Screening to be provided along eastern edge in specific areas where vegetative voids are determined to exit.
Waiting for Traffic study from Vanasse & Associates, Inc.
Waiting to hear from Dubois & King
Waiting to hear from NHDOT**

Scott explained that in short, they said the design is adequate from the current buildout they do not need deceleration lanes or turning lanes off Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway). Scott stated that he was hoping that he would have all Dubois & King responses completed and a good package for the Board at their next meeting.

J. Brann asked if NHDOT has agreed to no left-hand turn.

Scott explained that they have not received a response from NHDOT, and they are awaiting the traffic study from Vanasse & Associates, Inc.

R. Allard asked about the left hand turn to be justified and the next sentence said not necessary.

Scott explained that Vanasse & Associates, Inc was not available, but he understood that it would be current situation and built-out of the program which has been done. Then they would need to assume what may happen in the area at 10 years time frame. If other projects are added to Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway) it may warrant a left-hand turn lane off Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway). Scott explained that currently they do not but, in the future,, it may need a left-hand turn.

A. Knapp asked how that works once the project was built out, they can make you go back and build out a turnout.

Scott explained that they would keep on a bookmark and if another job comes along that criteria maybe added to it.

J. Brann questioned that it was based on 1 hour at the peak of the day.

J. Jennison explained that this would be NHDOT decision whether yes or no this was a State road.

R. Allard questioned the lot size states 918,807 s.f. and contiguous uploads are 895, 420 +/- so wetlands would be 23,000 and stated that it seems larger.

Scott explained that .5 acres was the wetlands area.

J. Jennison asked if the cistern was on the plan.

Scott explained that he added to the legends in multiple places.

R. Allard asked for the size of the buildings.

Scott expressed that each building was 80' long and 34' wide.

S. Diamond asked if the X's were lighting and asked if there was a half candle power covering the main area to the hammerhead. S. Diamond why in the islands but not for the other buildings.

Scott explained they were trying to luminate the main way in and any other parking areas with turnaround as well.

S. Diamond asked if the lights were automatic or how are they controlled.

Scott explained that the lighting was controlled by the association and there automatic. Scott explained that he would get move information.

J. Brann read the following for Site Review 3.8 (5) Illumination Requirements the following:

Drawing of all relevant building elevations showing the fixtures, the portions of the walls to be illuminated, the luminance levels of the walls, and the aiming points for any remote light fixtures.

J. Brann explained that he didn't see any elevations so it wouldn't meet the requirements.

Scott explained that after reading the Site Review he didn't feel that he needed that much detail.

J. Brann asked about the Sun Valley Lighting Sigma Series LED that in the parking area these lights would be pointing down to reduce light luminaire and not disturb the neighbors they don't meet that.

Scott explained that they have a notation that they do meet it.

J. Brann asked where they were installed.

Scott explained that they were installed post in the main entrance with the cones.

J. Brann asked if the other Sun Valley lights are the ones on the building.

Scott explained that the small security lights are a small pack above each garage door. Scott explained that he needs to take the Sun Valley lights off plan.

J. Brann expressed the following items:

The Sun Valley lights need to come off they don't belong there,

Needs to show units on the house,

No elevations are shown

Need to show the Illuminates

J. Brann addressed the lighting table in these areas are the standard lighten levels and asked where it shows that they are not exceeding the maximum light levels.

Scott explained that since they are down shielded, they can go over the property line.

J. Brann explained that there was a table showing the minimum and has the maximum what the lighting level should be.

J. Brann explained that they to address that they are meeting the minimum lighting levels for the parking areas also show your no going to exceed the maximum.

Scott expressed that they are no near the maximum, but they would check both.

J. Jennison explained that in the Site Review section 4.12 that they would be in the medium.

S. Diamond asked about at the bottom of the traffic study report #2 Traffic Study report asked if Scott could walk him through the report of what C and E mean.

Scott explained that he couldn't because this wasn't his background and they really needed this discussed he could try and have Jeffrey at the next meeting. Scott explained that Dubois & King are also looking at this too and he wasn't the one to talk about this.

S. Diamond asked if this was 2031 change time going by or development around the rea.

Scott explained that it was the development around it to decrease.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Brann explained that on the plan C-1 sheet 1 building 11 and 2 show water going in but no sewer going out.

Scott said he would correct this by surveyor.

J. Brann explained that they also need to correct building 19 this one shows sewer going in and no water going out.

J. Brann stated that on the plan it shows 30' private road was this referencing to the easement waiver that you received.

J. Brann questioned that was not how wide the pavement would be.

Scott explained that the pavement would be 24'.

J. Brann expressed that this could be misleading saying 30' private road and if this was for the easement it should state that. J. Brann stated that it needs to be noted that they were a 50' easement for the first 150'.

Scott stated he would give information to the surveyor.

J. Brann explained that on sheet 12 road was 12' on the details sheet shows the pavement 10' to 12'.

Scott explained that the main through road was 24' the remainder going to the 2 units to the left and the horseshoe was 20' because of the private driveway this has always been designed like this.

J. Brann explained that the parking calculations need to be shown in Table 3 in Site Review Regulations states minimum Dimensions are for parking and wanted to know where this was.

Scott stated that it may not be on the plan and he would add it.

J. Brann asked about on Sheet 9 should there be on the side going southwest road was there going to be signage (Stop sign) there at the intersection.

Scott explained that he could add one there wasn't one and they would restrict traffic coming into it and they can take a left- or right-hand turn but existing could come to a complete stop.

J. Brann asked about in the Site Review Regulations Section 3.2.10 (16,17,18 and 19)

Scott explained to J. Brann that they are on Sheet 5.

M. Gasses explained that they must deal with the AoT permit.

R. Allard expressed that they meet the parking calculations, but 20 parking spaces doesn't seem like a lot to him. R. Allard explained that if he looks at the plan seems like the northern part of the property and on the southeast corner it doesn't seem like enough parking spaces there. R. Allard expressed that he felt more parking spaces could be over by Building 19.

Scott explained that if R. Allard looked at the profile plan, he would see the drainage, and this would not be suitable for additional parking. Scott stated that he would look but this has been brought up before and they are way over what was required.

A. Knapp stated that the people living in the house would take up the 2 parking spaces.

Scott explained that they can parking in the garage and 2 parking spaces outside.

M. Gasses explained that the Fire Chief was all set.

A. Knapp asked the Board if the nitrate should be added to the Dubois & King review.

M. Gasses explained that this was really a NHDES review.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by S. Diamond to continue to the application to January 19, 2021.

Vote 6/0

Roll Call:

R. Allard-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

3. Review of a request for a building permit at Berry River Road, a Private Road, for James P. Maravelias and Sarah Battista ([Map 104, Lot 56](#)).

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to send the standard memo to the Select Board.

Vote 5/0

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

A. Knapp-Abstain

S. Diamond-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

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

The next meeting will be on January 5, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. electronic meeting; no meeting place.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.