



## **BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**NEW LOCATION: EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING CENTER**

**77 RAMSDELL LANE**

**Barrington, NH 03825**

**Tuesday August 7, 2018**

**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.**

### **Members Present**

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

Town Planner: Marcia Gasses

### **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

1. Approval of the July 10, 2018 meeting minutes.

*Without objection the Board approved the July 10, 2018 meeting minutes with minor changes to lines 110, 351, 391 and 401.*

### **ACTION ITEM CONTINUED FROM JULY 10, 2018**

2. [263-13.1,13.2,18&19-RC-18-9.6 263-13.1,13.2,18&19-RC-18-SR \(Owners: Town of Barrington, John Scruton, Town Administrator and Liberty International Trucks of Barrington, LLC\)](#) Request by Applicant Arleigh Green, Hard Rock Development, LLC, for development of an excavation project for the sale of sand/gravel. Construction to include the

construction of proposed roads shown to road base and proposed drainage features on Route 125 (Calef Highway) and Pierce Road (Map 269, Lots 13.1, 13.2, 18, & 19) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Barry W. Gier, PE, Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc.: 85 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH 03885. **Application has been accepted as complete.**

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Barry Gier from Jones & Beach Engineering Inc. explained that he was there to request a continuance for the Hard Rock Development to September 4<sup>th</sup>. He explained that since the last time that he was before the Board the applicant had a pre-application meeting with NHDES, NH Fish & Game, U. S. Corps of Engineers, U. S. EPA and a site walk. He explained that the meetings requested major revisions to the proposed plan requirements for hydrogeological reports. He explained that they were currently working with hydrogeologist on a report as requested, and making changes to the plans.

S. Diamond asked if Barry Gier would share the scope of the hydrogeological material.

Barry Gier explained that hydrogeological study was to insure there were no adverse impacts to the nearby Samuel Tamposi Water Reserve and Atlantic Cedar Swamp that are adjacent to this project. He explained that one of the issues they are working on was the scope and are working with a hydrogeologist to come up with a scope that would answer whether this project would impact the water supply reserve or the Atlantic Cedar Swamp.

J. Brann asked if this was a work in progress.

Barry Gier explained that it was a work in progress and people were in the middle of vacations.

J. Brann questioned the continuance date of September 4<sup>th</sup> given the technical nature of what the applicant was doing and they were still early in the process. He explained that the information still needed to get to the Board for review prior to any meeting or public comment and some extensive work remains to be done with the plans based on the information from the State and EPA.

Barry Gier agreed that September 4<sup>th</sup> was an optimistic date to have everything complete.

J. Brann expressed that he felt that the applicant needed to get the information to the Town Planner and to the Board with sufficient time for review. He explained that concerned parties also need to have time to review the plans. He explained that there was going to be a public hearing, they keep getting delayed, which impacts the participants, and asked if September 4<sup>th</sup> was a realistic date.

Barry Gier explained that he felt that he wouldn't have everything done by September 4<sup>th</sup>. He explained that his intent was to come in on September 4<sup>th</sup> to explain when it was going to be complete. He explained that he was still working on the scope of the project with the hydrogeologist to get the reports to answer the questions.

Brann asked if September 4<sup>th</sup> was just to give updates on where the project stands.

Barry Gier stated that was correct.

J. Brann asked if this was just going to be an update, would there not be a public hearing because the

public would not be able to speak.

M. Gasses explained that the applicant could continue to the October meeting and just send the Board an update on where the project stood. She explained that people plan to come to the meeting and then if the case gets continued they don't get to participate.

Barry Gier explained to the Board that he needed to have a date set.

M. Gasses explained that the applicant could continue until the October date and send an update for September 4th.

J. Jennison suggested to have an update on September 4<sup>th</sup> and continue the case until October 2<sup>nd</sup>.

M. Gasses explained if a letter was sent, the letter could be upload so the public had access on where the project stood.

*S. Diamond made a motion that we declare this matter a Development of Potential Regional Impact potentially affecting abutters in Lee, Madbury, Durham, Dover, Portsmouth and UNH.*

M. Gasses asked the Board if they understood what S. Diamond was proposing.

J. Jennison stated no.

M. Gasses explained that by the Board voting to declare project of regional impact, SRPC would conduct a review on certain criteria that they have set in place.

S. Diamond explained that he had the brochure.

M. Gasses explained that it would include addressing a lengthy list of questions.

J. Brann explained that even if the Board went through the six points, the case has been continued and the Board would not act on this until the next meeting.

S. Diamond expressed that this should have happened before the application was voted as being complete.

M. Gasses explained that she felt this should be put off until the October meeting but keep in mind that multiple state and federal agencies were reviewing the information. She explained if the Board wanted to review what a project of Regional Impact was she would send them information and the Board could vote in October.

S. Diamond expressed that was too late.

*J. Jennison asked if there was a second motion.*

S. Diamond explained that if there was any doubt concerning potential regional impact it should be determined to be a development of potential regional impact and referenced RSA 36:54.

J. Brann explained that the Board was not dismissing this was a valid issue but springing this on the Board without having any information and asking for a vote was not right.

S. Diamond stated that this was a stone throw from two other towns.

J. Brann expressed that they were well aware of where the site was.

J. Jennison expressed that in his opinion that this issue was a little premature and not getting a second on the matter it would be hard to move forward. He explained that if there was more information at the next meeting this could be considered.

F. Nichols suggested putting on a work session.

M. Gasses explained that that this would not be a work session. She explained that she agreed with S. Diamond that if this was going to be declared a project of regional impact, SRPC would need to time to Review it. She explained that if she had heads up that S. Diamond was going to raise this she would have sent the information to the Board so they would have had time to think about it.

J. Brann asked if M. Gasses could give information to the Board.

M. Gasses stated that she would send information to the Board with the questions that SRPC would address.

S. Diamond explained that involving regional planning with DRI declaration would not change the fact that the decision on the application would be decided by a vote by the Planning Board.

J. Jennison explained that they would bring up at the next meeting so they could understand what they are considering.

M. Gasses suggested that she could notify the adjacent towns that S. Diamond mentioned of the project as a heads up. The Board agreed.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by F. Nichols to continue the case to October 2, 2018. The motion carried unanimously.*

## **Design Review**

3. [239-2&235-1.1,1-TC-18DesignReview \(Owners: John & Linda Svenson\)](#) Request by applicant for a design review to develop a plan demonstrating the realignment of Christmas Lane and the removal of various driveways which currently take access from NH Route 9 located at 9 Christmas Lane (Map 239, Lot 2 and Map 235, Lots 1.1 & 1) in the Town Center (TC) Zoning District. BY: Chris Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the Design Review.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering explained that he was representing John & Linda Svenson and 1962 Real Estate, LLC. Also present was Attorney Franklin Jones and Brian Hughes, President/CEO from Holy Rosary Credit Union that also have an interest in the projects. He explained that the applicant was looking at realignment of Christmas Lane in the Town Center Zoning District and were here to get input from the Board. He explained that they were before the Board to design and

reconstruct Christmas Lane roadway for the bank branch and Christmas Dove. He explained that he was here to finalize the roadway and send plans to the Town engineers Dubois & King and to the Board for the September meeting. He explained that starting at Route 9 they were planning a small landscaped separated entrance that would be a new entrance to Route 9. He explained that they would reduce two curbs cuts one to service Christmas Lane and the one that would service the three houses which would no longer take access from Route 9 [i.e., would be off Christmas Lane]. He explained that there would be a small ADA access to the side of Christmas Dove. He explained that the Christmas Dove parking area would stay to the left and pedestrian access across the new Christmas Lane to the Christmas Dove door. He explained that there would be no walk up ATM at Holy Rosary Credit Union for safety reasons and the public would prefer not to get out of their car. He explained that a sidewalk would be to the east side for foot traffic to and from the Christmas Dove and explained that there may be sidewalks in the future on Route 9. He explained that they have been working on final drainage design improvements and a construction contractor has been chosen for the project. He explained the improvements in stormwater design. The existing Christmas Dove project was built in the 80's and per the regulations they would take the stormwater from existing Christmas Dove structures to direct to low impact management devices on site next to the new roadway on the two private sites. He explained that they have decided to go with the two rain garden designs but explained that this was subject to changes. He explained that the Town Planner brought up the following three points from the regulations that they would like input from the Board:

#### **12.5.2 Sidewalks on both sides of the street**

Chris Berry explained that this was a rural area and the sidewalks would go to nowhere. He explained that the bank would have self-sufficient parking and that he felt no reason to connect to other side of the roadway.

##### **12.5.2(2) Concrete sidewalks**

Chris Berry explained that this would be the first sidewalk in town and did not agree with concrete sidewalks where there are none in town. He explained that with the concrete it would be more maintenance in the future. He expressed that concrete was not necessary given the size. He suggested that asphalt be allowed instead of concrete with a granite raised curb. He asked what other sidewalks in town that would be maintained and compared to this one. He explained that he would like input from the Board on this.

##### **12.5.2(1) Calls for a minimum of five feet wide and setback five feet from the curb face.**

Chris Berry explained that separation of the curb line and the sidewalk itself. He explained that in the Town of Barrington we do not have sidewalks. He explained to the Board he didn't feel this was needed and that he would like input so he could move on to final design. He explained to the Board that this was a small section and he would like the Board to consider this. He explained to the Board that he also understood that this sidewalk was a first of this kind in Barrington.

J. Brann asked where at the north end of the road ties into.

Chris Berry explained that the Zoning Board of Adjustment had granted increase density for residential development of the project and showed on the map where the location was. He explained that they were actively seeking bidders for quality developers for this project with his group.

J. Jennison asked if there was another commercial lot behind the parking lot.

Chris Berry stated that the 1962 lot was about a 7 acre lot and it [new roadway] would also supply access to the developable property.

S. Diamond stated that he had no problem with sidewalks on one side as long as sometime in the future another sidewalk could be added on the other side without undoing too much of the infrastructure that was being built. He asked what materials the sidewalks would be.

J. Jennison asked if there would be anything in that area to interfere with installation if another sidewalk was required.

Chris Berry explained that there would be no structures. He explained that there was one lamp but after talking to Eversource that lamp would be moved to 1962 lot when the branch was constructed.

S. Diamond asked M. Gasses the reasoning between concrete and asphalt.

M. Gasses explained that was what was in the regulations and if the State was going to put in sidewalks she was 99% sure that they would be concrete sidewalks on Route 9 & 125. She explained bituminous pavement doesn't wear as well as concrete. She expressed to the Board that she would hesitate to say that the Town was going to use wings to plow especially to plow a paved sidewalk. She explained that was why she said to start with what the regulations requires first.

S. Diamond explained that he understood that concrete sidewalks had expansion joints.

Chris Berry explained that asphalt material was flexible and didn't need them. He explained that M. Gasses point was that there would be more wear and tear of asphalt.

J. Brann explained that there are no sidewalks in town, someone has to be first, and he felt that if you look at both ends of the sidewalks, M. Gasses has already addressed that the sidewalks on Route 9 would be concrete. He explained if Town Center was developed that would have concrete walkways too.

M. Gasses expressed that she felt concrete had the longer life.

J. Jennison stated that if the Town was going to take over the maintenance that they would want what material lasts longer.

A. Knapp asked what was the chance that the State putting in sidewalks on Route 9.

M. Gasses explained that she believed that it was not going to happen next year but one of the transportation programs that would enhance safety in the area as more businesses come in includes people would be walking on Route 9 and Route 125. She explained that after one sidewalk goes in they would work with safety in the area. She explained that this has been on Strafford Regional radar but when there wasn't enough development there so, they tend to hold back.

A. Knapp asked when developing a project would it make more sense to put wider asphalt there and stripe it as a walkway so it doesn't create a barrier. He expressed that this could create a walkway and bike path that is easier to maintain and plow as the town grows.

M. Gasses explained that the cost of adding sidewalks after the project is complete would be more than doing them now. She explained where they are at the point of starting the Town Center, she would hate to see us back off the requirement.

J. Brann stated that concrete was what was required. He explained that most sidewalks are right up to the curb. He asked what the percentage difference was between concrete and asphalt.

Chris Berry explained that it would be 2 or 3 times the cost for concrete.

J. Brann asked how that figures in over the cost of the project.

Chris Berry explained if the Board would not grant that waivers, it would likely not fit in the budget and have to find way to reduce other parts of the project. He explained that the boulevard would be replaced with a standard entrance and some of the stormwater design would need to be changed. He explained that only parts of stormwater would be treated and that they wanted to enhance the entrance and the stormwater quality.

J. Brann asked what the length of the sidewalk would be.

Chris Berry explained that it would be 500' or so.

J. Brann questioned that the applicant only wanted to do the sidewalks on one side and eliminate the green space in between the sidewalks and roadway. He felt that the applicant was asking for a lot of concessions and felt that asking for asphalt instead of concrete. He asked why there wasn't a designated walkway from the Christmas Dove side of the roadway to Holy Rosary Credit Union.

Chris Berry explained that there was no reason they couldn't.

J. Brann expressed that way they could use the sidewalk.

D. Massucci asked if the reason for not having the green strip was its cost.

Chris Berry explained it involved considerable cost as the fill width increased.

D. Massucci expressed that some kind of buffer was necessary for the safety of young families with small children. She felt that it needed some kind of buffer; trees or something should be planted every so many feet.

F. Nichols asked if cars would be parked on Christmas Lane.

Chris Berry stated no cars on Christmas Lane.

F. Nichols asked about snow removed; are they just going to plow to the sides.

Chris Berry explained that was correct except where sidewalks are; that would be removed.

F. Nichols asked if there were going to be utility poles, signs or nothing in the sidewalks.

Chris Berry explained that there would be nothing in the sidewalks.

F. Nichols asked the further away the sidewalks are from the roadway, what it would do to the project.

Chris Berry explained that it would need more fill.

F. Nichols asked who would use the sidewalks.

Chris Berry explained that currently none but in the future as this area develops more and more people would use sidewalks.



J. Jennison expressed in the future it could increase.

J. Brann asked if the applicant knew what the recommended speed limit was in this area.

Chris Berry explained that it would be 25 as private road unless the Town takes it over, and then he didn't believe that it would be less than 30.

M. Gasses explained that anything less than speed limit of 30 would be "suggested".

F. Nichols asked is there any way to plow from the center lane so that it doesn't go on the sidewalks.

Chris Berry explained that there was no center lane.

M. Gasses explained that the trucks do not have wingman on the plows. She explained that it's going to remain a storage area and it will take extra man hours.

J. Brann expressed that one way or the other the Town will have to figure a way to plow the sidewalks.

A. Knapp stated that would not happen until the Town accepted the road.

J. Jennison stated that this would be private until the Town takes it over.

J. Brann stated that the sidewalks would be the responsibly of the owner until the Town takes it's over.

S. Diamond expressed that a sidewalk on one side of the road was fine, needs to be elevated and for the future should be concrete.

M. Gasses felt the Board needs to comment on the 5' setback stripe.

J. Jennison felt that he would get rid of the boulevard for the well maintained strip. He expressed that would be much nicer.

J. Brann asked the Board how they felt about concrete vs asphalt.

D. Massucci felt concrete was fine with her.

A. Knapp felt that anything was better than nothing.

J. Jennison agreed with concrete.

F. Nichols explained that he wanted the entrance to be divided landscaped street and a sidewalk with asphalt needs to be evaluated.

Chris Berry explained that you could have trees and bushes in a strip but was not what you would want.

F. Nichols suggested a landscaped strip and asphalt 5' level with the street, looks landscaped and doesn't have to be raised up.

J. Brann explained that either way there needed to be a base on the sidewalk. He expressed that most of the Board appeared to agree with concrete.



J. Jennison opened public comment.

Franklin Jones Attorney from Wensley Jones PLLC, Rochester, NH represents 1962 Real Estate and was there with Brian Hughes, President/CEO of Holy Rosary Credit Union. He explained that he was in support of this project and has been before the Board a few times in the last 3 years. He explained that the parties involved have already recorded at the Registry of Deeds a Road Improvement and Maintenance Agreement. He explained that until the road was accepted by the Town, they have a maintenance plan in place. He explained that after listening to the conversation about the sidewalk between the Board members. He believed that Mr. Diamond stated concrete with no buffers but with the curbs and they would be willing to do this. He explained that they would ultimately purchase the back property too. He explained that they have not done final plans for a commercial site review. He explained that they do want to go forward putting the road in.

Brian Lenzi from 155 Young Road explained to the Board that he was an engineer for NHDOT for 10 years. He explained that asphalt was easier to maintain than concrete. He explained that in 10 years or so with concrete would flake and chip after time due salt use. He explained that weeds would come through the straight wall curbing.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

J. Brann asked if the base needed to be extended to accommodate the five foot setback. He asked if it would be as expensive.

Chris Berry explained that most specifications for quality construction standard would carry the fill out under the sidewalk. He explained that they have done projects where gravel wasn't carried out. He explained that whether or not the gravel was carried out, they still have all that to provide base fill for the sidewalk. He explained that the fill needed to be clean and it could be just as expensive.

J. Jennison asked if a five foot buffer with asphalt sidewalks be a better price point than concrete.

Chris Berry stated he would need to run numbers.

J. Brann asked if you cut green space from 5' to 2 ½' between the sidewalks abutting the road, would that make a difference.

M. Gasses stated a lot of weeds.

J. Brann stated one way or the other you are going to have green space to take care of.

A. Knapp expressed that this would not solve the snow issue; it would make it worst.

J. Brann stated that it was not going to be worse than have it on the sidewalk on the end of the road.

Chris Berry explained that sidewalks against the road without green space are very common.

J. Jennison questioned the mailboxes by the bridge on Tolend Road.

M. Gasses stated that you have to remember there was a lack of right of way width when you are dealing with roads that have been there 3 or 4 hundreds years.

F. Nichols asked Brian Lenzi about him recommending asphalt over concrete and moving the sidewalks off of the street.

Brian Lenzi explained that it always looks nice now but in 4 or 5 years it would have rust stains and not look good. He explained that salt does a job on concrete and weeds would come through.

F. Nichols asked if Brian Lenzi recommend no curbing.

Brian Lenzi explained that he was not saying no curbing. He likes it but over time with the salt it would not look as nice in 4 or 5 years.

F. Nichols explained that it could save money by not having a second sidewalk.

S. Diamond asked if less base might be needed, given the sandiness of the area.

A. Knapp stated very mushy on that side.

J. Jennison explained that from what he has been hearing the Board was saying concrete or does the Board want to reconsider asphalt.

J. Brann explained that if there was a lot salt used Mr. Lenzi was correct it would wear over time.

M. Gasses explained that State of NH uses a lot of salt. The Town of Barrington does not they use a lot of sand and this was not in the regulations. She explained pavement up to the edge of the granite curb does get beat up.

F. Nichols express that he preferred the asphalt and the spacing between the curb.

S. Diamond stated that he prefers concrete and everyone else uses it.

J. Jennison stated that it seems like the Board supports concrete.

J. Brann expressed that the Board was leaning toward the concrete but as far as the green space was concerned, the green space would add to the cost of the project. He explained that if they go with concrete they need a good base.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that the center island was not a concrete island it was a planted island.

D. Massucci explained that she preferred green space.

A. Knapp expressed that he preferred granite curb with concrete or asphalt and explained that he could live without the green space.

Chris Berry reviewed what the Board preferred: one sidewalk [on the east side], granite curb, concrete preferred and no buffer strip with a boulevard at the entrance. He would like to close the design review and would like to submit for third party review at the time of submittal.

*A motion was made by S. Diamond and seconded by A. Knapp to close the design review. The motion carried unanimously.*

4. [234-25,31,31.4-GR/V-18DesignReview \(Owners: Michael & Lisa McMahon & Donetta Haley\)](#) Request by applicant for a design review for a 24 lot Conservation subdivision on Tax Map 234, Lots 25, 31 & 31.4 on Meetinghouse Road in the Village (V) and General Residential Zoning Districts. BY: Chris Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; 335 Second Crown Point Road; Barrington, NH 03825.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the design review.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying & Engineering explained that he was representing applicants Michael & Lisa McMahon and Donetta Haley for a design review. He explained to the Board that Mike McMahon owned land to the south side and Donetta Haley owned frontage on Meetinghouse Road. He explained that Mike McMahon and his partner have a chance to purchase the land from Donetta Haley. He explained that the last time he was before the Board it was a different project that was not supported by the abutters so the applicant came up with a slightly different project. He explained that this project requires a Zoning Board variance. He explained to the Board that they have submitted a yield plan for single family homes and take that the yield utilized Meetinghouse Road as the interior subdivision road using that as the developable land and keep the remaining area as open space. He explained that it would require one variance on each lot and he explained that there was a requirement of 100' buffer perimeter from any boundary was needed for any development.

J. Brann asked if this was going to be a conservation subdivision.

Chris Berry stated that it was.

J. Brann explained that if you do a conservation subdivision the setback from the front was 25' under Zoning Regulations.

Chris Berry explained only if it was an interior subdivision road and that these were perimeter of the boundary. He explained that if the Board considered this an interior subdivision road this would apply. He explained that under the strictest part of the regulations the two boundaries are considered perimeter boundaries and that was why they needed to be 100' from those areas. He explained that was why they submitted the variance to the Zoning Board for relief. He explained that after he had talked with M. Gasses who proposed to keep the buffer on Oak Hill Road, they moved the proposed house lot to the end of the development. That way there would be protection from the intersection.

J. Brann asked if that space would also become part of the open space.

Chris Berry stated yes.

M. Gasses explained that was the 100' buffer.

Chris Berry explained to the Board that the applicant was asking for the Board to give input on the design so that they could go back to the Zoning Board this month and have the hearing. He explained that the Zoning Board likes the applicant to go before the Planning Board before going to them. He explained that the applicant had received some input about a through road. He explained that they may need to do a larger density project on the McMahon lot and explained that they would still propose a conservation subdivision along Meetinghouse Road on the Haley lot. He explained to the Board a through way from Smoke Street to Oak Hill Road raised cost. He explained to the Board that he would like some input on the 100' buffer and how the Board would like to handle the through road between the two streets.

J. Brann asked about the issue with a duplex.

Chris Berry explained to the Board that they are required to do a yield plan and that lot was a duplex and he counted that as two units but would only be counted as one. He explained that they could reconfigure it so that this was a single house lot not a duplex and the density would be the same.

M. Gasses expressed to the Board that all of the staff strongly recommended the road go all the way through.

J. Jennison explained that he supported the road going through. He explained that having two points of access was very important to him.

Chris Berry explained to the Board that they were prepared to deal with this. It would just need to be shaped a little different.

J. Jennison felt the 100' was flexible.

S. Diamond expressed that he really liked the conservation subdivision. He explained that it feels like a community thing and agreed with having the setback from the existing main road, Oak Hill.

A. Knapp asked for information on increased density on the other side.

Chris Berry explained that duplexes are not allowed in Village District unless they are on a standard lot size. He wanted to keep the project small but construct a roadway with a higher density on the southerly side of the project they would be triplex units.

A. Knapp asked if they would be double decker.

Chris Berry explained that they would be similar to what they had originally proposed out front but smaller scale.

J. Jennison asked if they would still take access from Meetinghouse Road.

Chris Berry stated yes. He explained that the density would still be in the same area, just a different mix of housing styles.

S. Diamond asked what the driveway access would be with these homes.

Chris Berry explained that they would be single driveway access that would branch off to the garages.

J. Brann asked if the upper right [north side circle] would be a cluster.

Chris Berry explained that they are all single family lots. He explained that there were three options.

J. Brann asked about the open space one and two, and their ownership.

Chris Berry explained that if this was done as a separate project of triplexes, that the open space would be owned by the landowners.

D. Massucci asked if she was driving down Route 9, would she see the homes.

Chris Berry explained that you would not see the homes. He explained that they were going to develop

the front to face Route 9 but they are not doing that now.

A. Knapp explained that you are less likely to see the homes.

J. Brann asked if all the lots were 20,000 feet or larger.

Chris Berry stated yes they are. He explained that these are single family and he does not want to do a cluster on that side.

J. Brann asked if these were an acre.

Chris Berry explained that each parcel on its own meets the requirements and the open space alone was 17 acres.

J. Brann expressed there was less of an impact when looking at the yield plan verses the conservation plan.

M. Gasses explained to the Board that the Zoning Board of Adjustment would want some kind of comments so she needed comments regarding your feeling on the 100' buffer. She felt that everyone was on board with this design.

S. Diamond asked what the maximum grade on Meetinghouse Road was.

Chris Berry explained that it was the maximum which was 8 or 9 percent.

J. Brann asked about high traffic going through.

M. Gasses explained that years ago when Deer Ridge was developed that they left a Class VI portion so they could connect for safety proposes. She explained that people could go down Meetinghouse Road to Smoke Street and they would not need to go down to Route 9 to Smoke Street. She explained that this has been in the CIP to help keep people in Barrington off the State roads.

M. Gasses explained that the thruway needs to be Class V standards all the way to Smoke Street and this was a recommendation from the staff.

A. Knapp expressed that from the power lines to Smoke Street was fairly manageable. He explained to the Board that he would like to see this suitable so that people could walk like Village Place.

M. Gasses explained that Village Place received a waiver because it was too narrow.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Suzanne McNeil from 82 Muchado Drive asked if anything would be done on the bad corner where Meetinghouse comes in.

Chris Berry explained that the corner would need to be improved for sight distance going in both directions. He explained that traffic studies would be done and they may look into widening the shoulder out.

S. Diamond asked what the grade of the driveways are in that area.

Chris Berry explained that they don't have the designs yet. He explained that the Town of Barrington allowance grade was at least 9%.

S. Diamond asked if it could be less on Meetinghouse Road at the junction.

Chris Berry explained that he would supply the Board with any driveways that were complicated.

M. Gasses asked if the Zoning Board does grant the 100' buffer there's a 25' setback for a conservation subdivision; would it be better to do the standard 40' setback for Meetinghouse Road.

Chris Berry stated that probably could work. He explained that he would really like to look at it first. He explained that this was a 4 rod road and explained that the width was 4 rods.

M. Gasses asked if that would include the stone walls.

Chris Berry explained that he had not done the road grading.

Pat Lavoie from 134 Smoke Street was concerned about the topo line on this side of the road for the driveways.

J. Jennison explained Chris Berry had explained the maximum grade for the driveways and you could not build beyond that.

Pat Lavoie asked how you can approve something that was not buildable. He explained that the project should be in phases.

J. Brann explained this was just design review.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

S. Diamond asked if this was going to be done in phases.

Chris Berry explained that he has not worked this out with his client yet. He didn't think that this project would be phased out.

M. Gasses explained that if this was going to be a conservation subdivision, with the increased density units on the south side, the road would need to be built all the way though. She explained that you couldn't have a hammerhead you would need to go all the way through with the drainage being addressed.

J. Jennison asked the Board for recommendations for the Zoning Board.

M. Gasses explained that she was looking for a recommendation from the Board to use Meetinghouse Road for the subdivision for an interior subdivision road.

J. Jennison expressed that the Board agreed to use the Meetinghouse Road for the subdivision as an interior subdivision road and with a 40' setback.

J. Brann questioned the setback to be 25'.

M. Gasses explained that the Board when granting a variance could make stipulations. She explained that if you had a 100' buffer then you would have a 25' setback. She explained that if you treat it as an interior subdivision road you would have a 25' setback from the road or for a standard subdivision you would have a 40' setback. She explained because each individual lot doesn't own the 100' buffer, you are actually putting it back 125'. She explained that you could tell the Zoning Board that you support them not having the 100' buffer but prefer a 40' setback instead of a 25' setback.

J. Brann asked how you would communicate that to the Zoning Board.

M. Gasses explained that she would have no problem writing a letter to the Zoning Board.

Chris Berry stated he didn't agree and wanted the 25' setback for the interior road.

J. Jennison expressed he was looking for Board recommendations and he didn't see this road as a short cut. He explained to support the 100' variance and leave the 25' setback.

J. Brann expressed that he felt the 40' setback would be nice if the variance was granted.

Chris Berry stated that if this project of the McMahon lot goes the way he thinks it will not be a conservation subdivision. He explained if this goes in triplexes and mixed housing, it would not be a conservation subdivision. He said they were still going for the variance.

A. Knapp asked if that meant they would need to come back and ask for more.

Chris Berry stated that was correct.

M. Gasses felt topography would be tough.

J. Brann expressed that from a regulation standpoint it was complicated that the south was not going to be a conservation subdivision but a standard subdivision.

M. Gasses asked if they could get it [conservation subdivision] on the north side.

Chris Berry stated yes.

S. Diamond expressed if the Board believe the Board was granting some exceptions to the rules based on the perception that everything drawn was one block of development.

Chris Berry said that these are two separate parcels. He explained that the difference between the two projects was instead of the single families they would install triplexes. He explained that was what would make this different housing style. He explained that they might still look to develop the front of this lot.

J. Jennison asked if you couldn't do triplexes and a conservation subdivision.

Chris Berry explained that triplexes are not allowed in conservation subdivisions.

A. Knapp asked if you would end up with 30 units instead of 10 units.

Chris Berry explained that he wasn't sure he could multiple by three.



S. Diamond suggested that if this was two projects proceed that maybe the setbacks should be what they are.

J. Brann stated that Chris Berry said that he would not be able to use this variance on the south side.

M. Gasses stated that the south side would have to go by whatever setbacks were required. She explained that it would just apply to the conservation subdivision side.

J. Jennison asked if that was an accurate statement that if he went to the Zoning Board and got the variance for the interior subdivision road, whether there is a conservation subdivision or a regular subdivision, would it still be an interior subdivision road.

Chris Berry stated nothing would change.

J. Jennison asked if the triplexes could be 25' from the road.

Chris Berry stated no. He explained that triplexes would need to be 40' from the road.

J. Jennison wanted to make sure it would apply or not.

Chris Berry explained that you are still having an interior throughway.

J. Jennison asked if it still was an opportunity to preserve the rest of the land and changing the plan to triplexes to offset the road going through possible eliminate further development.

Chris Berry stated he would need to discuss with his client.

J. Brann expressed that the applicant felt that they could live with a 40' setback if they do triplexes on the south side.

Chris Berry expressed that he hasn't looked into it. He explained that it was only by what he was allowed per unit. He explained that he has not figured out where the triplexes would go.

J. Jennison stated that was why he wanted that land preserved in conservation land.

Chris Berry explained that he would need to talk to his client.

M. Gasses stated she would write the memo eliminate the 100' buffer and require 40' setback.

Pat Lavoie asked about taking a town road, which Meetinghouse Road was, and turn it into an interior subdivision road why only a 40' setback on one side.

M. Gasses explained that both would have 40' setbacks and one was in the general residential district and one was Village District. She explained that they were ok to eliminate the 100' buffer but with a 40' setback.

J. Brann stated that was because this would be a conservation subdivision.

J. Jennison stated they were going to upgrade Meetinghouse Road.

M. Gasses explained that they were going to build it to town standards.

J. Jennison explained that the applicant would be doing this design to appease the public it would be the same density.

Chris Berry explained that the construction of the road would go very quickly; the houses would be based on the market.

Paula Kent from 757 Franklin Pierce Highway came to support this project with the understanding that the initial proposal of building density near Route 9 was not going to be built. She wasn't under the understanding that this project could happen in 6 months or a year we are not in favor of this part.

J. Jennison stated that the Board agreed to support the 40' setbacks on each side and eliminate the 100' buffer.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by S. Diamond to close the design review. The motion unanimously.*

### **ACTION ITEMS**

5. [238-7-TC-15-SR \(Millo's Pizza-George Tsoulakas\)](#) Request by applicant for a one-year extension to achieve active and substantial development; deadline set forth in site plan approval on the case below:

[238-7-TC-15-SR \(Millo's Pizza-George Tsoulakas\)](#) Request by applicant for Site Review to construct a water system with associated pump house, waterline, and access across the subject property between Map 238, Lot 4 and Map 238, Lot 16.21 and waiver from Section 3.2.10 (7) requiring parking lot requirements for the proposed project. This is located on 2.26 acre lot (Map 238, Lot 7) in the Town Center. Barry Gier, PE; Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc.; PO Box 219; Stratham, NH 03885

*Application was withdrawn by applicant.*

### **COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED**

M. Gasses informed the Board that RFP was sent out to wetland scientists and the next meeting of the wetlands buffer committee would be August 23, 2018.

Meeting for August 21, 2018 would be cancelled.

### **REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

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

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

The next meeting will be on September 4, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. at the ECLC 77 Ramsdell Lane.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.