



## **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: 899 820 143#

**(Approved April 6, 2021)**

**Tuesday, March 2, 2021**

**6:30 p.m.**

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

### **Roll Call**

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

### **Members Present**

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

### **Members Absent**

Andy Knapp ex-officio  
Ron Allard

J. Jennison welcomed the two new member Planning Board Members once sworn in; Candice Krans and Buddy Hackett.

Town Planner: Marcia Gasses  
Staff: Barbara Irvine

## **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

1. Approval of February 16, 2021 meeting minutes.

*The minutes of February 16, 2021 were approved as written with a minor typo.*

Roll Call:

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

## **ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 1, 2020**

2. [236-4-GR-20-SR \(Owner: Sunset Rock LLC\)](#) Request by applicant for Site Review to increase their operation in Barrington from 83.3 acres to a total of 88.8 acres (Map 236, Lot 4) (Map 222, Lot 13) and for a 3.4 Conditional Use Permit located backland off Tolend Road in the General Residential Zoning District. BY: Michael Wright, RESPEC; 67 Water Street, STE 109, Laconia, NH 03246.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Erik Stevenson from Sunset Rock LLC explained that he was here to ask for a continuance for an April meeting because they are still gathering data.

J. Jennison asked what date in April they were looking for.

Erik stated that they work like to continue until April 20, 2021.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by S. Diamond to continue the Sunset Rock, LLC application until April 20, 2021. Vote 4/0*

Roll Call:

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

## **ACTION ITEMS**

3. [220-50-RC-21-SR \(Owners: Roy Hurlbert-PEH & Son, LLC\)](#) Request by applicant for Site Review to add a storage building 5,000 s.f. to a previously approved Site Plan (Map 220, Lot 50) on a 2-acre site at 7 Tolend Road in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Joseph Coronati, Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc; PO Box 219; Stratham, NH 03885.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Joseph Coronati from Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. represented Roy Hurlbert PEH & Son, LLC. Joe explained that they have purchased the building at the corner of Tolend Road and Route 125 (Calef Highway), the former archery shop. Joe explained that this building was approved in 1988 and a larger building was approved by the Town. Joe explained that only half of the building was constructed, and they are grandfathered for the building that they are constructing now. Joe explained that they are having off-road vehicles and services on this site. Joe explained that the applicant needs additional storage for vehicles and unconstructed vehicles that come in a box. Joe explained that the property has been surveyed so that they can have a proposal for a 5000' storage building for cold storage with just electricity. Joe explained that they would only have windows on one side of the building. The building would meet the setbacks. Joe showed the Board the plan that was approved in 1988. The addition that they are building that was part of the approval in 1988 would be 50' x

100' as shown on the plan. Joe showed the Board the proposed building they want to build and the driveway that exists. There would be no change to the septic; they are only having electricity in the proposed 5000' building. Joe explained that the storm water added was just for the 5000' cold storage building and are adding stone drip edges to the sides of the building. Joe explained that this would be a wide and deep stone to help infiltrate the drip edge run off. Joe explained that they would need to remove some of the trees. The building would have 16' high walls and 5/12 pitch roof with one entry door and a wide door to bring a forklift in and out. Joe explained that the neighbor has a buffer of trees from the 80's build and they had some concerns. Joe explained that some of the trees would need to be removed to build the building and that for noise, the building would be a better screen than the trees. This would be a quiet use of this building and would only be used during business hours with no late-night usage. Joe explained that there would be a gate across the driveway with a fence along Tolend Road for site security. Joe explained that they are not looking for any variances or waivers and no State permits are required.

J. Jennison asked what the pitch of the roof of the building that was being constructed now and expressed that the proposed building should match that building. J. Jennison expressed that having a flat roof would take away the appeal. J. Jennison asked M. Gasses if the buffer trees were part of the original site plan. If they were could they be removed in a current site plan.

M. Gasses expressed that the neighbor was buffered by trees now.

J. Jennison expressed if the neighbors are buffered by trees now and they are going to remove some, they are close to the property line and if the trees are taken away there a loss of a visual buffer. J. Jennison expressed that if the trees were part of the site review that they should stay in some way.

M. Gasses agreed with J. Jennison.

J. Jennison asked what the fence was going to look like.

Roy Hurlbert, owner of the property, expressed that the tree line could use some cleanup and that they are very large pines. Roy explained that some of the trees would be removed but not all of them and would remove as few as possible, to protect the neighbors. Roy explained that they would put up an architectural black style fence and clean the site up. Roy explained that there would be vinyl siding on both buildings. Roy explained that the oil would be changed inside the facility and oil would be collected/transported by approved container by an EPA vendor.

J. Brann explained that according to the regulations there should be a landscape plan included.

Roy stated that the J. Brann was looking for a plan showing behind the building.

J. Brann explained that they need to show on the landscape plan the property line and show the neighboring structures.

Roy explained that on the plan it shows a tree line.

J. Brann explained that was not a landscape plan.

Roy stated okay.

J. Brann explained that the plan should show where the trees are, the trees that are going to be removed, and what greenery was going to be added.

Roy explained that they are showing what they want to do and asked what the Board wants to see.

J. Brann explained that they need to see more than just a wavy tree line to show the Board what it was going to look like. J. Brann asked if they plan on planting anything else for a visual border.

Joe explained that the lot line site was already built. Joe explained that all the vegetation would stay that runs along Route 125 (Calef Highway). Joe showed the location of the septic stating that there could be no planting there.

J. Brann explained that they would be going 50' east of the driveway.

Joe stated that was correct.

J. Brann asked at the top of the building up to the northeast, what was the visual buffer going to look like; what was going to be left for trees and would more be planted.

Joe explained that this lot was zoned commercial.

J. Brann explained that looking at the plan that a few trees are going to be taken out.

Joe asked the Board if they feel more trees needed to be added to the back side and that would mean 3' of grade change.

J. Brann explained that if they looked at all the pines that you would be taking out in the slope area you would only be leaving 6 to 8 trees to the east side. J. Brann explained that there would be some large gaps in the middle of the building if you take all the trees in the work area.

J. Jennison expressed that you could use bushes and fencing, not chain link, and have a 75% visual up to 6' tall for the abutters.

Roy explained that the fence that they are proposing around the southeast corner because they would not need extra security due to the number of trees that they are leaving.

J. Jennison explained that from the plan the Board cannot tell whether you are leaving enough of a visual buffer.

Joe explained that they could add planting behind the building but expressed that the building does provide screening to Route 125 (Calef Highway).

J. Jennison explained that the regulations read screening to buildings, parking areas, and to dumpsters.

Joe explained that they could supply a landscape plan with trees.

J. Brann explained that regulation Section 3.3 (20) reads the plans shall show abutting land uses less than 300' away from the property line. J. Brann asked if there were other buildings within 300' of the property line that are not shown on the plans.

Joe explained that they are not allowed to survey neighbor's property; there are other business that are 300'.

J. Brann explained that they should be an overview.

M. Gasses explained that some of the plans shows the lots and explained that they do not need to be on the plan.

J. Brann read from Section 3.3 (20) that included roads. (Page 14 Site Review)

Joe explained that he would add to the plan.

J. Brann explained that benchmarks are required and did not see them.

Joe explained that they did not have to change the septic, so he did not think they had them but the building slab height is listed.

J. Brann asked that they make a note on that plan that was what they are using for benchmarks. J. Brann asked if on the original Site plan was an AoT Permit required.

Joe explained that the original permits were so long but does not mean that they would need to get an AoT permit because it been more than 10 years.

J. Brann asked what about with the addition with a certain amount of disturbance required to get an AoT permit.

M. Gasses explained that it was 100,000 s.f.

Joe explained that the lot was only 87,000 s.f.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that they could accept the application as complete without the landscape plan and suggested that this application go for third party review to Dubois & King for the drainage.

J. Brann asked about lot coverage.

M. Gasses stated lot coverage 34,900 s.f. for lot coverage.

S. Diamond asked if the reason for not showing any interior was because they are not going to have any.

Joe stated that was correct.

S. Diamond asked if the driveway was one-way or not.

Roy explained that the driveway was going to be one-way around the building.

S. Diamond asked if the driveway was going to be clockwise.

Roy stated correct.

S. Diamond asked about the door in the corner and about site lines for people walking out that door and trucks going around the building.

Roy explained that this was an emergency exit only.

S. Diamond asked about people backing up and not seeing someone coming around the building.

Joe explained that was employee parking and customers would park on the pavement in the front of the building.

S. Diamond asked why angled parking which is different from the original plan?

Joe explained that the rear paved area was narrower than originally proposed.

S. Diamond asked about the drip edge drainage and his concern was the gravel drive getting wet and sending mud to Tolend Road.

Joe explained that the drip edge catch was a clean ¾" stone that would be 3' deep and 2' wide with geotextile fiber around it so water would soak into the ground through the stone and fabric.

S. Diamond asked if they planned on plowing this part of the driveway.

Joe stated that they would right up to the building where the doors are.

S. Diamond expressed that they might have issues with gravel moving around. S. Diamond asked if there would be an amount time with the equipment running without a muffler?

Roy stated no and the vehicles would be inside the building currently under construction so there would be minimal noise and the new building was just for storage.

S. Diamond expressed that the pine trees in the buffer can get hazardous as they get bigger. S. Diamond explained that they could cut the tops off them and maintain them to a certain height, which may not look good, but it would effectively maintain them. S. Diamond stated in his opinion for the buffer he would suggest evergreens as a visual buffer for all seasons. S. Diamond asked about the paved part of the driveway and explained that the Town regulations favor frontage roads for connecting the parking lot to the next commercial lot to the north.

Joe explained that there was a wetland showed on the plan. Joe explained that they did have Gove Environmental Services flag the wetlands to see if there were any wetlands on site and the north side of the property has a wet meadow before you get to their fence that separates the two properties.

D. Massucci asked about the back building that was proposed; was it just for storage and no repairs.

Joe stated that was correct.

D. Massucci asked about the lighting outside the building; how would that affect the neighbors.

Joe explained that they did supply a lighting plan, but the only lights are on the front of the building towards the gravel drive side and would have no lights on the other three sides.

D. Massucci asked what type of lighting would be inside the storage building are you just going to have overhead turn on switch or different lighting that would require more voltage.

Joe explained that he assumed that the lighting would be halogen overhead lights to light up the inside and no lights would be seen from the outside.

D. Massucci expressed that she wanted to make sure they had enough electricity going to the building.

Roy explained that they are currently working with Eversource and explained that lighting that would be used for minimal periods and not an excessive load.

D. Massucci asked what kind of ventilation was being used for the building.

Roy explained that there would be none in the storage building.

D. Massucci asked about heat.

Roy explained that this building was for cold storage and they would have only electricity.

D. Massucci asked if the building was going to be on a slab.

Joe stated the building would be on a slab and explained that the pitch of the roof was 5/12 pitch.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to accept the application for Venture Motorsports as substantially complete. Vote 4/0*

Roll Call:

S. Diamond-Yay

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

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison read the following concerns from Manual & Pureza Martinez of 17 Tolend Road:

When are the engines of the vehicles cleaned and/or oil drained will there be an approved oil basin to collect and dispose of the used oil in the approved manner?

The bottom line is to make sure that no waste oil seeps into the ground. Our main concern is that the common water table in the area from which we all get our drinking water does not get contaminated.

Also were the buffer line of trees being cut down.

J. Jennison asked the applicant to make a note on the plan on how the waste would be disposed. J. Jennison stated that due to an emergency in a manufactured housing park there may be more comments from abutting properties at a future date.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Brann expressed that the applicant did supply an illumination plan for around the building and explained that the requirements in the Site Review Regulations in Section 3.8 (5) requires that you show the illumination on the elevations on Sheet A2.

Joe asked if this needs to be on the plans or the elevation plan.

J. Brann explained that it needs to be on the elevation plans to show the location and the luminance location on the side of the building from the light fixtures. J. Brann explained that they would also need to show where the snow storage area would be. J. Brann supports the Town Planner comment to send for third party review to Dubois & King.

S. Diamond asked about secondary containment for gasoline storage. S. Diamond shared that he learned that concrete was not necessarily an impervious surface at least not against gasoline.

Roy asked if they were talking about gasoline storage, which would be in an approved container and very small quantity.

J. Brann asked how many gallons would be a small quantity.

Roy explained that it would be about 8 to 10 gallons in approved storage containers.

S. Diamond explained that he asks because in the [Barrington] area there are leaking underground storage tanks that are a water quality problem.

Roy explained that this would be storage in the repair center, not in the storage building, and nothing would be outside.

D. Massucci asked about signage and where the dumpster would be.

Roy explained that they have already got a sign permit for one on the roof where the current sign was and having a highway sign that meets the setbacks. Roy explained that the highway sign that was proposed meets the requirement including height and as shown on C2 it would be located at the end of the parking lot center facing Route 125.

D. Massucci asked what the hours and days of operation are.

Roy explained the following:



**Hours:****8:00-5:00 Tuesday through Friday****8:00-1:00 Saturdays****Sunday & Monday Closed**

J. Jennison asked that these be put on the plan. J. Jennison asked if there was a dumpster on site currently.

Roy explained that there was not a dumpster on site, but they would be thinking of putting the dumpster in the V of the existing building.

J. Jennison asked that when they determine where the dumpster it would be added to plan. J. Jennison read the following from the Departments:

**Police:**

- If they are going to alarm the main business, consideration should be given to adding it onto the cold storage.

**Fire Chief, Rick Walker:**

- Cold Storage is limited 12-foot max height.
- Any storage over 12ft. required building to be sprinklered.
- Building must meet all applicable fire code requirements for Storage Facilities.
- No Parking Signs placed along 20' wide driveway to protect the integrity of the required Fire Lane.
- Would like to see the delivery driveway traffic to be one way directional around the complex to avoid the commercial vehicle deliveries from backing onto or from the property with proper signage directing such.

J. Brann asked if they knew about the 12' high stacking restriction.

Roy asked if this could be explained.

J. Jennison explained that code reads anything stacked over 12' high inside a building would require sprinklers installed. He explained that they could have a higher ceiling but if they stacked material over 12' sprinklers would be required.

Roy explained that he would be right at 12'.

J. Brann explained that this was a fire requirement. J. Brann asked if the width of the pavement behind the main building was going to be sufficient to support an 18-wheeler coming around the end of the building.

Joe explained that it would and that they have noted what the minimum requirements were on the plan for the aisle width for the one-way travel and they have more than what they need for one-way travel. Joe explained that if they get deliveries, they are not daily tractor trailers deliveries. They would stock up at the beginning of the season and there would not be many deliveries the rest of the season. Joe explained that the other deliveries would be small UPS deliveries.

S. Diamond expressed that he noticed on the drainage analysis that the lot was quite sandy. S. Diamond asked if they were trying to keep grass alive in the area, would they consider some sort of rainwater catchment to meet landscaping water requirements.

Joe explained that the site was all lawn now and not the type of lawn that you would want to cut very short in the middle of summer.

Roy explained that most of the lawn was on the Route 125 (Calef Highway) side and they are going to maintain it.

J. Brann listed the following items to be addressed by the applicant based on the Board's discussion of the plans:

**Adding the illumination of the lights on the elevation**

**Need landscape plan.**

**Show where the buffers were.**

**Add operating hours.**



**Show snow storage location**

**Show dumpster location**

Joe asked who sends plans to Dubois & King.

M. Gasses explained that they could send the plans to Dubois & King and cc her. M. Gasses explained that they would give an estimate for the drainage only.

*A motion was made by S. Diamond and second by J. Brann to continue the application for Venture Motorsports to April 6, 2021. Vote 4/0*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

4. **235-1.1&3-TC-21-Design (Owners: Dove Development Group, LLC)** Request by applicant for a Design Review proposing 24-unit mixed use building and 25 Townhouses on Community Way (Map 235, Lots 1.1 & 3) in the Town Center Zoning District. BY: Christopher Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road, Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering represented Dove Development Group, LLC. Chris explained that this project location was off Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway) and this was the third phase of a previous project that was presented before the Board. Chris explained that land on the former Christmas Lane was subdivided off from the Christmas Dove (Phase 1). Chris explained that this created a commercial lot at the corner of Christmas Lane and Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway). Chris explained that they have a parking easement around the parking lot utilized by Christmas Dove and the second phase of the subdivision was to construct Christmas Lane in the boulevard style completed in the last couple of years. Chris explained that the boulevard in the front contains two exit lanes, a raised concrete sidewalk, and a small parking array with some stormwater system designs closed drainage and rain garden design at the front of the site with a potential commercial development on the corner. Chris explained to the Board that this project received a variance to allow single family style development on this project with the caveat that a certain percentage of this project would remain commercial and was granted by the Zoning Board about 4 ½ years ago. Chris explained to the Board that Dove Development Group has purchased the project, so they have the rights to develop, the remaining two sites that the Svenson's owned. Chris explained that this project was for Lot 1.1 and the rear lot, Lot 3. The first part of the project would extend the former Christmas Lane and are proposing to do in a boulevard style. There would be two 12' lanes, one on each side of the boulevard, and they would continue the raised concrete sidewalk down the easterly side of the roadway on to Lot 3. Then the roadway would be terminated in a cul-de-sac format. Chris explained that the former Christmas Lane was going to be subdivided off and would be a municipally owned roadway. Chris explained that all the infrastructures has been designed and built so far to be eventually municipally owned. Chris explained that they also wanted to show where future private development would be. Chris explained that because they are in the Town Center, they have a mixed-use pad site and there would be an 8,500 footprint in the front for commercial use on the first floor. Chris explained that the ground floor would be commercial with residential above. Parking would be to the front and side and some pedestrian connectivity to the eastern side of the site. The pedestrian connectivity would then connect to the pad site itself so that there would be sidewalks in and around the entire structure so that users of the residential units may also use the commercial activities on the first floor. Chris explained the second, third and fourth floor of the mixed-use building would be residential style with 24 units within that structure that was permitted. Chris explained that in the future there would be additional mixed use moving forward around the site. Chris explained that the only limiting factor for that would be for that style development would be sewage loading and water availability for potable water.

Chris went on explain that the mixed-use project with single family density that was permitted by Zoning Board,

this would provide for up to 25 townhouse style structures towards the middle and rear of the site. Chris explained that these units would be accessed through its own roadway that slopes up with a cul-de-sac format end and would provide connectivity to the mixed-use site. Chris explained the reason for doing this was so that traffic could move from one to another, residents do not need to enter onto the boulevard for pedestrian access to the site. This would also supply access for emergency vehicles without having to turn around on the site. Chris showed the Board that there had a pretty good slope up to the top of the hill. They are proposing a center drain roadway system with runoff draining to the detention basin. Chris explained that the landscape would fit in with the development that they are proposing. Chris explained that all of the former Christmas Lane drains to a rain garden and showed the location next to the Christmas Dove. Chris explained that they would have other drainage areas, one in the cul-de-sac, and two additional ones. Chris stated that the applicant would need an **AoT Permit**. Chris explained that the mixed-use building would be sprinkled units and the townhouses would also be sprinkled.

Chris explained there would be a community well in the rear of the property [Lot 3]. There would be a small road to the community well with a waterline extending to the well and well pump house. NHDES would need to review the well and community well sighting. This would be onsite septic systems, in the rear area a small system to handle the mixed used building and/or one larger system placed on the uphill side of the project, so they meet all required nitrate setbacks for the proposal. NHDES would need to review the design and placement of the sewage disposal systems on the site. They would need to update the study that was conducted for Christmas Lane and submit to NHDOT. Chris showed the Board the preliminary renderings for the structures:

- 40' tall mixed use structure which was allowed and permitted by Zoning.

- Townhouses would be at the rear of the site - They would supply pictures of the actual look when they come back before the Board.

- The applicant is trying to give this site an urban type of feel

J. Jennison asked if Lot 3 would have no further development.

Chris explained that there was currently no development on this application; it only focuses on Lot 1.1 and the cul-de-sac on Lot 3 but there could be future development on Lot 3.

J. Jennison expressed that the load density was taken from Lot 3 and put onto Lot 1.1.

Chris explained that he was referring to the zoning variance that permitted 25 single-family housing units to be constructed on these pieces of property. Chris explained that instead of spreading the permitted single-family units all over the site they have put 25 units in a central area. Chris explained that the remainder of the project they would look at other permissible uses.

J. Jennison questioned additional residential use.

Chris explained that residences on the second floor of the mixed-use building was permitted with no density requirements.

J. Jennison asked M. Gasses if she agreed with the interpretation of the regulation.

M. Gasses explained that the idea was that the residential development like Chris stated would need to be on the second floor and commercial use would need to be on the first floor.

Chris explained that single-family residential development was not permitted in this zone and the variance permitted the 25 single-family units. Chris explained that this does not limit the residential capacity of the site. Chris explained that there was no limit to the number of residences you could put in a mixed-use building, only on single family houses.

D. Massucci asked how far behind the Christmas Dove these structures would be and asked if she would see the buildings from the Christmas Dove.

Chris explained that there was about 150' of boulevard, maybe 200', before you get to the corner of the mixed-use building. Chris explained that with the landscaping you would not see the buildings from Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway).

S. Diamond asked about the two areas of slope near the residential buildings uphill and towards the commercial building, and asked what the grades were and how steep are.

Chris stated that he was not sure as he has not checked and if he had to guess he would say 15 to 20 percent and that would be just the knob behind the building. Chris explained that the grades by the road are at 5%.

S. Diamond expressed that the commercial buildings were lovely but had a lot of flat roof and felt there were pros and cons to that approach. S. Diamond asked about future connectivity. He loved the circles and the park like effect and asked about the possibilities for connectivity. He asked if they could ensure that the well placement and other infrastructure does not inhibit the possibility of creating a road to Route 125 (Calef Highway).

Chris explained the existing features that were completed at the time of the design review submission and showed that the proposed cul-de-sac was put right in the flatter areas. Chris explained that at the tip of the site and near the proposed well location there were a pretty good number of wetlands. Chris stated that he could not guarantee that they will not do anything that precludes connectivity but there might be some natural features that preclude that connectivity moving forward. Chris explained that they have talked to the applicant about an access off the western side of the cul-de-sac on Lot 3 to provide some connectivity into the two larger vacant parcels of land. Chris explained that there was a future connectivity potential.

S. Diamond expressed that he noticed the railroad right of way nearby and on the contour going to the north it seems somewhat intuitive that a road could go that way that would be sort of straight.

J. Brann asked about the detention pond and if you start putting septic fields and wells in Lot 3 would you have limited potential development of Lot 3.

Chris explained that Lot 3 was 16 acres, and the systems should handle this type of flow and there would be some developable potential left.

J. Brann expressed that if you look at the aerial map you can see a couple of commercial buildings off Route 125 (Calef Highway) and it appears that access for development in the north part of property could be provided using the access already provided by the entry from Route 125 (Calef Highway) to the two commercial buildings. J. Brann if given the development in the parking lots around Lot 1.1, was the parking lot on the existing Community Way going to be maintained or affect it in any way.

Chris stated no that is not even on their site, so they have not making any changes to that.

J. Brann asked about in the write up on High Point Drive that states the slope is to the center of the roadway and asked about the location of the sloping to the center of the road.

Chris explained that for the upper buildings that for the center of the roadway you create a sag, and the reason was that you would have a negative slope away from the units with a low point in the middle. Chris showed on the plan the catch basin in the middle of the roadway and water basically flows right into the basin.

J. Brann asked if in other areas in New England that this has been used.

Chris showed the high and low point then showed where it flows to.

J. Brann asked what the detention pond was in the circle.

Chris explained that would capture all the flow that comes down the roadway and showed the Board the way it would flow into the detention stall.

J. Brann asked if there would be any flow out of the upper detention pond into the drainage system or have infiltration there plus also flow into in your system.

Chris stated you would have a mix of both you would have infiltration along the way and would flow into the center of the cul-de-sac and they would have detention along the way.

J. Brann asked if there was some type of blockage of the drains in the center of the roadway, would you still have downward flow on the road as snow is melting.

Chris agreed.

J. Brann stated that they are going to intersect with Community Way down where the lower circle was, but there is a rise to get up to Community Way, so no water was going to flush right down on to Community Way. J. Brann asked about the parking area behind the pad site.

Chris explained that was elevated and explained that you would have to go down slope to get to High Point Drive. Chris expressed that this was one of the more elevated pieces of this pad site. Chris showed on the plan the private and public drives on the plan.

J. Brann asked about the rendering for the mixed-use building. Per Table 2 Article 4 the 40' height meets the standards, but they proposed 3 stories of residences on top of a commercial story and asked how this meets the requirements given the requirements also state it cannot be more than 3 stories.

Chris explained that he would need to look at the requirements and if there was a requirement for three stories they would need to review.

J. Brann asked that they consider, consistent with the requirements of 4.2.4 (6) for visual screening, a visual buffer between the parking area behind the mixed use/non-residential area and the upper residential units.

M. Gasses asked Chris to briefly describe what the maintenance for the stormwater system for the roadway would entail and what the Town Highway Department might have to do.

Chris explained that the roadway itself would be closed system so they would need to consider how to clean out catch basins and the sumps; this would be one maintenance consideration. Chris explained that depends on how this layout in design works whether the gravel wetlands are part of the municipal or Town roadway responsibility. The gravel wetland needs very little maintenance but needs to be weeded on a regular basis. Chris explained that if the Town were going to require sidewalks, they would need to come up with a plan on how to clear snow from them.

J. Brann asked about the sidewalks on the east side of Community Way. Pedestrian traffic walking down to the pad site and residences would need to walk across an intersection of the entrance to the pad site.

Chris explained they would supply a small sidewalk crossing so someone can stop look and then continue walking.

J. Brann suggested some marked up sidewalks crossings from the east side of Community Way.

Chris explained the internal cross area and they would add more as needed.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by S. Diamond to accept the application for Design Review for Dove Development. Vote 4/0*

Roll Call:

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

J. Jennison opened public comment.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

D. Massucci expressed that she liked the plan, but her vision for Town Center was walking from business to business and felt this was more a drive in and out development and wondered how this would play out with the Town people.

M. Gasses explained that there would be a street front if you connect everything but one thing that was unique to Barrington that would not be like Dover is the Town uses septic systems. M. Gasses that the buildings cannot be side by side all hitched together because of the septic system limitations. M. Gasses explained that the units would be more spread apart and installed sidewalks would just have more space in between buildings.

D. Massucci expressed that she did understand, but she also sees townhouses that are lined upside by side, and they have a well and septic somewhere. D. Massucci explained that it appears that with modification of the single-family aspect you increase mixed use density.

M. Gasses explained that there would be other proposals coming for adjacent property, but this was what they are proposing for this piece of land, and on land adjacent to it they would probably have to do something different but for proposal they used their density for homes allowed by their variance.

D. Massucci expressed that she would have like to see this be more colonial in style and stated she had a different vision. D. Massucci expressed that she knows that the Town needs to grow but was thinking of a softer look.

S. Diamond expressed that he understood where D. Massucci was coming from and agreed with her. S. Diamond that this was a sincere effort but it was not exactly what he was picturing nor the commercial integration quite as much as officially called for.

J. Jennison asked D. Massucci if she wanted to see more commercial integrated into the townhouses as well. J. Jennison expressed that if commercial were in all the buildings there would never be enough businesses to occupy them, and they would be empty.

D. Massucci explained that her vision was if you were coming by the Christmas Dove would be other businesses.

D. Massucci expressed that she thinks it should be little shops in the first phase to welcome them in; that was her opinion.

J. Jennison expressed that the further back up the road there are two sites in front of this site and hopefully that would carry down to The Christmas Dove and you will get that build out before you hit this proposed building.

D. Massucci agreed with J. Jennison that was what she was saying.

Chris explained that when they come back, they would have more detail on how this building was going to lay out and they would show a much better streetscape view. They would a better view of what the front of the building would look like. Chris explained that they are trying to create small space users that come in and out of these buildings. Chris explained this project was not for the larger retailers; that was not what this project was going to be. Chris explained to the Board that they decided not to do the full buildout plans and they would come back again after they finish this design. Chris expressed that there would be more mixed-used buildings that create more commercial space and more streetscape appeal. Chris explained that they were hoping that they could connect their project to the community trail and would bring in a lot of foot traffic with potential business and right into the Christmas Dove and project site.

J. Jennison expressed that he does not care for the townhouse style home and was hoping for adjoined single-family type homes.

S. Diamond explained reiterated what D. Massucci was saying about colonial style and noted you can make something look 400 years old. S. Diamond expressed that Chris did a good job breaking up the boxes, so they do not look like one big box, like staggering the structures using different colors and shapes within the larger structure. However, S. Diamond expressed that it would be better if the look was more of a colonial style and broken up physically even if there was only 10' between with some of the structures.

J. Brann asked Chris to address housing for older people and people with disabilities. The Townhouses have garages with living space on the second and third floors. J. Brann asked about having a bedroom on main floor for easy access.

Chris explained that this application does not address that, and they understand that there is a shortage of that type of housing. Based on some of the slopes they have on the site, that type of housing really does not fit well but there are other flatter areas on the site that can be developed later. Chris explained that with respect to disabilities, this mixed-use structure (the bigger 8,500 s.f. building) would have to meet the Fair Housing Act and ADA requirements. They would need to have accessibility inside of that structure for that type of housing.

J. Jennison asked if the larger mixed use building upfront would have elevator access.

Chris stated he wanted to say yes but he doesn't want to commit to that because there are other ways to address the ADA requirements. Chris explained that there may not be a lobby style elevator to get to the second and third floors for ADA access. Chris explained that they may be special ADA routes that need to be taken for those housing units but would meet the Fair Housing Act.

D. Massucci asked about the height requirements discussed earlier.

J. Brann explained that the height limitations in the Town Center were 3 stories and 40'.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to close the Design Review for Dove Development, LLC.  
Vote 4/0*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

## **REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD**

M. Gasses explained to the Board that after speaking with the Town Administrator, Conner suggested instead of going directly to the attorney with questions that the Town would be willing to pay for some two-hour training blocks through the Municipal Association. M. Gasses explained that since there would be a couple of new Board members this might be helpful and asked the Board if they would be supportive for arranging these training sessions.

J. Jennison agreed that this would be a good time; would this be done during a meeting like a workshop or another time.

M. Gasses explained that she would need to ask Conner for the specifics since this was his idea and explained that it would be convenient if it was during one of the regular meetings.

Board agreed but S. Diamond would also like to meet with the attorney.



J. Jennison explained that he thought Conner was thinking that it could be a workshop to discuss Barrington specific zoning scattered and premature regulations and anything else that the Board may want specific counsel on. Then the next step would be going to the Town attorney.

M. Gasses expressed that a lot of answers may be answered by the training.

J. Brann gave an update on the engineering selection committee and explained that they met last Wednesday. J. Brann explained that they did reviews of 12 firms and interviews of 3 firms. J. Brann explained that the interviews are complete, the committee submitted their rating sheets, and they will review the results then discuss the recommendation to the Select Board.

S. Diamond updated the Board on Regional Planning the Resiliency Committee and explained the best-case scenario on how much you can conserve of water by limiting lawn watering was 40% of your overall use. S. Diamond explained the regulatory environment was structured to only restrict watering lawns for public systems. S. Diamond explained that there are no restrictions that would make sense potentially in a more severe drought.

J. Jennison asked if you could regulate private wells as public water.

S. Diamond stated that public water has more regulations but some of the community systems have the biggest problems.

M. Gasses explained that when Dover had their restrictions it applied to all.

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

The next meeting will be on March 16, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. electronic meeting, no meeting place.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Roll Call:

S. Diamond-Yay

J. Jennison-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

Respectfully,

Barbara Irvine

Planning & Land Use

Administrative Assistant