



**MEETING MINUTES  
FOR  
BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD  
IN PERSON LOCATION**

**Early Childhood Learning Center  
77 Ramsdell Lane  
Barrington, NH 03825**

**OR**

**You are invited to appear by audio phone or computer see below:**

**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: 439 155 986# OR link [bit.ly/BarrPB210720](https://bit.ly/BarrPB210720)**

**(APPROVED August 3, 2021)**

**Tuesday, July 20, 2021**

**6:30 p.m.**

**MEETING MINUTES NOTE: THESE ARE SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES ONLY. A COMPLETE COPY OF THE MEETING AUDIO IS AVAILABLE AT THE LANDUSE DEPARTMENT.**

**Members Present**

J. Jennison, Chair  
J. Brann, Vice Chair  
S. Diamond-Remotely  
A. Knapp ex- officio  
R. Allard  
C. Krans  
D. Massucci-filled in for Buddy Hackett

**Absent Members**

Buddy Hackett

**Alternate Member**

Andrew Melnikas-Remotely

Town Planner: Marcia Gasses

Staff: Barbara Irvine

Town Administrator: Conner MacIver

## **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

1. Approval of June 15, 2021 meeting minutes.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard that without objection the meeting minutes of June 15, 2021, were approved as written. The motion carried unanimously.*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely-Covid reasons)

A. Knapp-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

C. Krans-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

## **ACTION ITEMS**

2. [223-24&26-RC-21-AmendSub2 \(Owners: Route 125 Development, LLC\)](#) Request by applicant for an amendment to a subdivision that was originally conditionally approved on August 18, 2019, and amended on November 3, 2020. Then an extension request on June 1, 2021, for a one-year extension to May 3, 2022. The purpose of this proposal is to request an amendment to waive the conditions on Town Hall Lot (C1) on a 5.82-acre site on Calef Highway (aka Route 125) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. This would allow the Town to begin construction of the Town Hall project which was conditionally approved in March of 2019.

J. Jennison gave a brief description application.

A. Knapp recused himself.

A. Melnikas seated for A. Knapp for this application.

Conner MacIver, Town Administrator for the Town of Barrington, represented the Route 125 Development, LLC for Lot C1 only. Conner explained that the Town Hall was approved by the voters in 2019 to be built on Calef Highway (Route 125) and has had continued delays with State permitting. Conner explained that the Town has 100% approval and ready to start construction. Conner explained to the Board that recently the Town received news from Congress Pappas' office that this project was selected 10 out of 300 submitted for direct federal funding of up to a million and half dollars that would go directly to this project. Conner explained that there was a timeline on the funding, and we would not want to lose access to the funds. Conner explained that he has had conversation with the Town attorney and staff to see if there were alternatives to waiting for the larger development approvals and he noted that State Law does not require the Town to follow the site review rules. Conner explained to the Board that he was asking the Board to consider the request to allow the project to continue. The overall project was conditionally approved and explained that the State permits are holding up the developer from deeding Lot C1 to the Town to allow construction to begin. Conner explained that they are asking the Board to waive the conditions of approval for Lot C1 only, allowing the developer to turn this lot over to the Town in early August. Conner explained to the Board that the Town has a separate AoT permit through NHDES for Lot C1 only. Conner explained that he has had a conversation with NHDES, and they do not have a problem with the temporary construction entrance. Conner explained that if for the bigger project should fold, proceeding with the Town Hall next to vacant land was a risk that the Town was willing to take as if this happened the Town would need to have access to Lot C1.

J. Brann expressed that he supports this as he does not want to hold up the project due to approves from the larger project.

J. Brann asked if there was anything in the original notice of decision that may impact this project. The Board reviewed the Notice of Decision from August 18, 2019 and were satisfied there were no issues.

J. Jennison asked if the cisterns would be needed per the Fire Chief.

Conner stated that they can talk to the Fire Chief.

M. Gasses explained that the cistern could be part of the Site Review.

Conner explained that the cistern was on the Town Hall lot, and he showed location.

S. Diamond expressed those underground utilities should be kept. He referenced Conner's letter and read the last line that the Town was willing to accept this risk with proper access protections in place. S. Diamond asked Conner if that risk was the entrance and what class road this would be. S. Diamond asked if the Town would maintain this road.

Conner stated that would be a risk and the follow up answer would be if the development failed completely, the Town needed a permanent access off Calef Highway (aka Route 125) to the Town Hall lot and it would be an access driveway that would come off Calef Highway (aka Route 125). Conner explained that the Town would maintain that access.

R. Allard asked if the temporary driveway would be where it was now.

Conner explained that it would, and the temporary access would be the first thing that would be opened up per the plan for Signature Drive access. There would be in the deed an access easement that would be eventually Signature Drive.

R. Allard asked if the driveway would be similar construction as shown on the plan for the short piece.

Conner explained that the construction access would not and if not part of the subdivision it would not be the same road as proposed; it would be an access driveway of a smaller scope. Conner outlined the proposed schedules for construction:

#### **TIMELINE FOR NEW TOWN HALL:**

Construction would start as early as August.

Temporary access would be where the proposed Signature Drive would be.

Construction would begin in spring (2022) or early summer.

#### **TIMING OF THE LARGE SUBDIVISION**

Permits should be approved by the end of the year.

The developer plans on constructing the road as soon as possible; probably not this year because of permitting but should be early next year.

If the timing of construction of the road is known and the Town Hall is complete in April, the developer should have permits approved by then and the road could be completed in June.

If so, the Town may wait to open the new Town Hall until the subdivision road is built.

This would be a decision of the Select Board as well as the risk of added cost to add an access driveway when you know a subdivision road was not going to be built.

Conner expressed that he did not feel the State or developer was going to fail as they have a lot invested in this project.

A. Knapp spoke as a Select Board member that if a driveway were put in, they would abandon the driveway to make sure the appropriate cut at the road is made for Signature Drive.

J. Jennison expressed that the new road would be two lanes wide and he felt that this was not a major concern.

Conner expressed that the Select Board discussed the risks and losing the federal funding with continued delays. The answer to S. Diamond's question about underground utilities is they do plan to have underground services for the Town Hall.

J. Brann stated that was in the Notice of Decision.

Conner explained that the services on Signature Drive were separate from the Town Hall.

S. Diamond asked what the difference in cost if we were to build the driveway access to be used for Signature Drive to Class 5 standards and could we charge the developer if they go ahead.

Conner stated that was a valuable question to ask and felt that would need to be talked about should we actively consider having to build access off Calef Highway (Route 125). Conner expressed that he would not rule this out but felt that they were not to the point to talk about that point for consideration.

S. Diamond asked what the difference in cost would be.

Conner explained that they do not have the costs for the access driveway versus a road.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Dan Ayer from 334 Old Concord Turnpike expressed that he was a resident, Select Board member, and a member of the building committee. Dan expressed agreement and support for what Conner proposed regarding access and utility construction, and that it would better position the Town if the larger development were shut down. Dan expressed that he felt that the State had agreed to the temporary access, changing the permit proposal to a road would cause confusion and the State might not go along.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

R. Allard had a question on the conditions being waived, specifically the cistern. If the Town Hall were going to be in place for a while it could be serviced by the cistern.

J. Jennison explained that there may be another on the road that was within the distance that could service it.

R. Allard expressed that he would like the Fire Chief to weigh in on this.

Conner explained the way the building is designed, the point of the building being sprinkled the code was different depending on access. Conner explained that having access all around the building of so many feet was a design feature for the building to ensure code compliance and access.

J. Brann asked about location of the cistern as part of the overall road project and if where the cistern was to be located would require the Town to construct a much more substantial road. J. Brann also noted that the cistern is there to service the commercial lots not just the Town.

A. Melnikas asked about the size of the building and assumed it was two stories.

Conner explained that the Town Hall would be one floor.

A. Melnikas asked if the building was wood frame construction.

Conner explained that the building would be ICF with wood frame on the inside.

A. Melnikas asked if the building was it prefab with trusses.

Conner stated that he believed that was what they designed.

A. Melnikas asked if the Fire Chief asked for sprinklers in the building.

J. Jennison expressed that he appreciated the question, but they have been through all of this during the initial approval and didn't want to rehash it all over again. J. Jennison explained that there would be a cistern, and this would not go away.

J. Brann asked if the Fire Chief commented or not.

A. Melnikas asked if the Building Inspection would say if building would require one or not.

M. Gasses stated the Fire Chief would be the one to determine this.

J. Brann asked if all the conditions were waived except the cistern that would require a signoff from the Fire Chief, would this be acceptable.

Conner stated that was a fair to have the Planning Board Chair and Fire Chief to sign off.



## Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0195

[mgasses@barrington.nh.gov](mailto:mgasses@barrington.nh.gov)

## NOTICE OF DECISION

July 21, 2021

Route 125 Development, LLC  
7B Emery Lane  
Stratham, NH 03885

Christian O Smith & Scott Cole  
Beals Associates, PLLC  
70 Portsmouth Avenue  
Stratham, NH 03885

**Re: 223-24&26-RC-20-AmendedSub (Owner: Route 125 Development, LLC)** On November 3, 2020, the applicant received Conditional Approval

The Town requests consideration of amendment of an amendment to the conditionally approved 62-lot subdivision in order to wave the conditions of the subdivision for proposed Lot C-I only prior to a full proposed approval of the subdivision which would allow the conveyance of Lot C1 to the Town.

**223-24&26-RC-20-AmendSub (Owner: Route 125 Development, LLC)**

Request by applicant to amend the previous conditional approval from 55 residential lot and 5 commercial lots to 58 residential lots and 4 commercial, lots adjacent to Route 125 (Calef Highway) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. BY: Scott D. Cole, Beals Associates, PLLC; 70 Portsmouth Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Unit 2; Stratham, NH 03885.

**223-24&26-RC-21-AmendSub2 (Owners: Route 125 Development, LLC)** Request by applicant for an amendment to a subdivision that was originally conditionally approved on August 18, 2019, and amended on November 3, 2020. Then an extension request on June 1, 2021, for a one-year extension to May 3, 2022. The purpose of this proposal is to request an amendment to waive the conditions on Town Hall Lot (C1) on a 5.82-acre site on Calef Highway (aka Route 125) in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. This would allow the Town to begin construction of the Town Hall project which was conditionally approved in March of 2019.

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its, 2021, meeting **APPROVED** your application for an Amendment to the application referenced above.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Marcia J. Gasses

Town Planner

cc: File

*A motion made by J. Brann and seconded by D. Massucci to approve the amendment to exempt Lot C-1 only from the conditions of the Route 125 Development, LLC conditionally approved subdivision contingent of the approval from the Fire Chief. The motion carried unanimously.*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely-Covid reasons)

A. Melnikas-Yay (Remotely)

R. Allard-Yay

C. Krans-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Knapp returned to the Board.

3. **235-1.1&3-TC-21-SR/LL/9.6 (Owners: Dove Development Group, LLC)** Request by applicant for a Site Review, Lot Line Adjustment and a 9.6 Special Permit along with a waiver request proposing 20-unit mixed use building and 25 Townhouses off the proposed extension of Community Way (Map 235, Lots 1.1 & 3) on 23.63 acres 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 represented applicant/owner Dove Development Group, LLC.. Chris explained that

are before the Board for the Zoning Board for a variance part of the plan use development for the density for attached single homes they are before the Board for Site Review, 9.6 Conditional Use permit and a Lot Line? Adjustment. Chris explained to the Board that they have had two follow up meeting with staff, code enforcement and the plans have been submitted to the review consultants CMA engineers for their review and comments. Chris explained that State permits that are required are AoT, update NHDOT permit and small wetlands permit. Also, storm water pollution prevention plan permit is required along with septic disposal permits and community water system design with permit.

J. Brann asked what the existing easements were.

Chris explained that the existing easements that they were referring to relate to the parking lot easement that was on the 926 property that services Christmas Dove. Chris explained it's not substantially important for their application and explained that because they show the front of the plan as they did on their prior application so checked off as an existing shown.

J. Brann asked about the Zoning Ordinance under 14.5. He explained that it talks about the impact fees and says that if there are any that the applicant wants any relief from then that needs to be brought forward. The Board can waive impact fees with the concurrence of Select Board. J. Brann expressed that he sees nothing in the application addressing impact fees. J. Brann asked if the Board was to assume that the applicant wasn't requesting any waivers.

Chris stated no he didn't know of any or that his applicants ever asked for waivers for impact fees.

J. Brann asked about PUD requirements in the Zoning Ordinance and noted the Zoning Board granted a couple of variances back in July of 2016. J. Brann explained that there has been lot line revisions and this application deals with Lots 1.1 and 2 where the variance dealt with Map 239 Lot 2 and Map 235 Lots 1, 2 and 3. J. Brann explained Lot 1.1 was broken off and doesn't include Lot 2 or 3 on either of the Maps of 235 and 239. J. Brann expressed that they should consult with the Town attorney to make sure that the variances are still valid.

Chris explained that in this case he thinks he could simplify; when the Zoning Board noted all the lots, they were really attempting to regulate a land mass. Chris explained that this was for ownership and that was through tax mapping. Chris expressed that this could be solved through simply showing what land mass that the variances were granted on. Chris explained that this could be shown on plans that were provided the lots are what they are there for tonight on land that was owned by Dove Development Group, LLC., this is land that was built by 926.

J. Brann expressed that he didn't disagree but doesn't like assuming what the Zoning Board were thinking. J. Brann expressed that he felt that he would prefer the attorney to look at it and say yes.

J. Jennison expressed that the clarification on what development rights is left on the other land once this has been accomplished and has taken their portion for these two lots.

M. Gasses explained that Code Enforcement and she had a conversation they have basically used them all up.

A. Knapp asked so only from a single family detached and attached.

J. Jennison explained so future development on the other two parts would be commercial first floor and potential units upstairs.

Chris stated that was correct and asked if they could check with the attorney to confirm the variances are still valid even though there's been a lot line adjustments on the development. Chris explained that the development was only for these two parts.

J. Brann explained that the variances covered a couple specific subsections within the requirements, but it did not give a variance from the requirements for which you didn't ask.



Chris agreed.

J. Brann asked about Note #29 on Page 2; it references the Zoning Board decision for Map 239, Lot 2 and Map 235, Lots 1,2 & 3 and it does not include Lot 1.1. J. Brann asked if that should have been on the plan because it was previously part of one that's covered.

Chris stated that would be the clarifying comment from the Town attorney.

J. Brann asked where the calculation is that shows the residential portion of the project doesn't exceed 25% of the development.

Chris explained that the calculation does not exist because of the way the variance was granted. Chris explained the type of residential density that's being proposed for the rest of the body or mixed-use development. Chris explained that the 25 single family residences were permitted as part of the variance. The remainder of the residential units on the second and third floor are of the mixed-use structure was permitted by right. Chris explained the rest was permitted by right so there's no further calculation needed to show to have a mixed-use structure was not listed as a residential structure in the Zoning Ordinance. Chris explained that mixed-use structures are permitted as a matter of right in next year's development.

J. Brann asked about the residential portion of the proposal.

Chris explained that the single family attached they didn't provide that calculation because that calculation was based on the total land mass. Chris explained that the percentage of perceived commercial use at the front of both the Dove site and the 926 site and those were representations that were made at the Zoning Board.

J. Brann explained that he understood that they granted the applicant the variance with respect to lot size, but lot size and the percentages are separate requirements given of his reading of the zoning ordinance.

Chris explained that the variance granted was for section 16.2.2 PUD's, residential use was permitted, and net density simple coverage must be based on sixteen thousand two hundred and fifty square feet. Chris explained the commercial component was a certain percentage in size which was based on the existing Dove.

J. Brann agreed and it specifically says in ZBA decision they granted a variance to 16.3.2 that addresses those requirements of ten thousand square feet and net density of one unit for forty thousand square feet. J. Brann explained that the requirement was specific to density. J. Brann explained 16.5.3 in the Zoning Ordinance was a separate requirement and they didn't have a variance for this.

Chris expressed that he felt that they don't need a variance for that particular requirement, and he didn't show that calculation on the plan.

J. Brann explained that he didn't know if he needed a variance and wanted them to know that this was a required calculation.

Chris explained the Board standpoint they would need to provide a calculation of a plan that proves that the square footage of the single family attached or detached residential units the square footage of those units does not exceed 25 percent of the total.

J. Brann asked M. Gasses if it would be based on not just the square footage of the house but of the house lots.

Chris explained that they do not have house lots. Chris explained that the little boxes on the plan are the addition of all the little boxes.

J. Brann asked M. Gasses if she has dealt with this before.



Chris explained that this was the first PUD in Town.

J. Brann expressed that they [Town/Planning Board] need to determine what area they [Applicant] use for calculations.

J. Jennison read total land area devoted to such use.

M. Gasses asked are they talking about the building driveways.

Chris explained that he doesn't consider a roadway a residential use but he may consider decks or porches or other structures.

J. Jennison asked about leach field or required parking.

Chris said not the leach field or required parking an accessory to the unit.

R. Allard asked why you wouldn't include the driveway.

J. Jennison explained that the driveway was a common access for all.

J. Brann explained that the Land Use Office needs to come up with the area of use.

M. Gasses explained that the regulations can't and could only use reasonable judgement.

Chris expressed that the residential coverage is what's physically covering the earth dedicated to residential and accessories because that compares to the total site.

J. Brann felt that was reasonable and thinks that Planning Use Office needs to occur. J. Brann asked about the Zoning Ordinance 16.5.1 Civic Center requirement that a PUD needs to have 25% open space. J. Brann explained that the Planning Board needs to approve uses and he didn't find anything in the application regarding the open space.

Chris explained that it was not specifically addressed on this application, but it was discussed and common uses that were taking place in the past.

J. Brann explained that this is a new application and the past experiences that you cite have no bearing on this.

Chris explained that it's not that they asked for a variance; the variance request cited these civic uses that commonly occur at the existing development. Chris explained that they are happy to review the list of approved civic uses in the Zoning Ordinances and find some space.

J. Brann explained that the location needs to be approved by the Planning Board as part of this application. J. Brann explained that sub section 3.9.1 Protective Covenants the Site Review Regulations also requires that any covenants should be submitted with the application. J. Brann explained that it would need to have public access even though it specifically says it can be privately owned.

Chris explained that was another reason they are proposing a lot of public infrastructure.

J. Brann asked about the memorandum that was in the application from the New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau. Specifically, it makes the comment that they conduct a vernal pool study between April 15<sup>th</sup> and the end of May; was this done?

Chris explained that this was completed. He could furnish to the Board and explained that this was a document that they supply to the Wetlands Bureau that was part of the wetland's application. Chris explained that John Hayes, the Wetlands

Scientist, did conduct a pool study this spring and found no pools. Chris explained that because they require an AoT permit, they also have to do a wildlife study that when complete can be supplied.

J. Brann explained that they have the wildlife in the plans that identifies and has pictures of wildlife and asked if they were taken from the Bureau memorandum.

Chris explained that they are a list of threatened and endangered species that are common to New Hampshire and it was very common now that both the Wetlands Bureau, Army Corps of Engineers and AoT requests educational details be included in the plans.

J. Brann asked about Page 2 of the fiscal analysis; it states this project is in the Village District.

Chris explained that was an error; this project was in the Town Center.

J. Brann asked about in the Drainage Analysis and has a note in one of the four paragraphs under the construction that was now built. There was a discussion of 15" straight pipe that connects to the basins that currently runs along Community Way. J. Brann asked about the statement in that discussion that applicants moving forward would be expected to adequately mitigate flows prior to entering the flow's closed system to avoid exceeding its potential. J. Brann asked if he was reading the plans correctly; you are tying a couple of basins and an outlet at the catch basin Number 104. It's on Sheets 35 and 36. J. Brann asked where they address the concern that they raised about tying into that system.

Chris explained that he addressed that through the mitigation design of the site.

J. Brann asked where he would find that.

Chris explained the area on the plan shows a pond that was a gravel wetland pond that captures and mitigates our flow prior to entering that closed system so that's the mitigation that would need to take place. Chris explained that it also has two catch basins would get to this.

J. Brann noted when you go to the plans, they have 220' of sloping road that's going to feed those two-catch basins.

Chris explained that they designed the gravel wetlands size big enough so that they offset the flow that comes from that first 200' of roadway. Chris explained the combined flow off-site and the flow from the gravel wetland as well as the 200'. Chris explained that all those offsetting peak flows and volumes are reduced so that pipe was not impacted.

J. Brann stated that was what he figured. J. Brann asked on the drainage analysis to explain why for the 50-year event for Final Reach #800 that the peak discharge rate decreases after construction and development the peak volume increases.

Chris explained that the drainage and explained that they are not required to mitigate volume by either Town or State. The 50-year event drainage was a function of the amount of volume of water over a time period. Chris explained the storm flow to the Board.

J. Brann asked about the lot lines on Sheets 21 and 22 to combine Lot 1.1 and Lot 3. J. Brann asked about Sheet 21 that indicates a revision to carve out a lot surrounding the Community Way extension. J. Brann asked why the revision and who would own the lot.

Chris showed the Board Sheet 22 and explained the lot line revision they were proposing.

J. Brann asked for further clarification of Sheet 21.

Chris explained on the lot line plan that they have two lots and the first lot they own has the neck that goes all the way down to

Franklin Pierce Highway (aka Route 9). Chris explained it comes out and takes this hard westerly direction and incorporate this land mass and explained location of the second lot all the way to the tip of the triangle down around. What they are proposing was to do take the lot line and revise it to wrap it around Community Way: the remaining would all be one parcel.

J. Brann asked who ends up owning the neck.

Chris explained that the applicants would own it until such time as it was dedicated to the Town and accepted.

J. Brann asked if it was all one separate lot.

Chris explained that this was a separate lot. Chris explained that this would be a ROW.

J. Brann asked if the intent was for the ROW to Community Way and the developer would own. J. Brann asked about Sheet 27 that shows a proposed permanent nitrate easement number five on the abutting property and asked what the purpose was.

Chris explained that the purpose was for further development for their site and would require further nitrogen theoretically to transverse their boundary line. Chris explained that they would be working with Mrs. Boyer on providing them nitrate easement and they wanted to ratify that now on the plan because they have also worked with her on access for a further roadway. Chris explained that would provide her with formal access to Franklin Pierce Highway (aka Route 9) and they have proposed some drainage improvements on their site and require easements.

J. Brann asked about in Site Review Regulations 4.7.1 (5) and read the following:

**“When a proposed drainage system will carry water across land outside the site appropriate drainage rights must be secured and indicated on the plan.”**

J. Brann asked if he read the drainage plan correctly, it appears that you are going to have water being carried on to another lot. J. Brann asked if they were taking water off this development.

Chris stated that was incorrect and explained that that regulation was referring to be an instance where you’re redirecting flow, increasing flow or otherwise modifying flow onto other private lands. Chris explained that in this instance they are not doing that because of all the mitigation; the issue they are proposing was that you don’t need to increase flows that are going off from there site. Chris explained that the mitigation they have worked with Mrs. Boyer on to ensure that they are reducing flow to this point entering her property that it not just floats from flow over her driveway. Chris explained that they negotiated with Mrs. Boyer so that they would install a proper culvert under her driveway.

J. Brann asked about the temporary easement that was on the plan and asked why that wouldn’t be a permanent easement.

Chris expressed that he didn’t see temporary.

J. Brann explained it seemed associated with proposed access construction and assumed that’s where he got temporary.

Chris explained the period that it was under construction and access.

J. Brann asked about the maintenance requirements for the rain gardens but for the wetlands on Pond #110 there are no maintenance requirements.

Chris explained that typically detention ponds don’t have maintenance as part of construction other than during the storm water pollution prevention inspections. Chris explained that if they burdened with sediment, they require that they remove the sediment so they can add construction maintenance notes to the detention pond. Chris explained that there are long-term maintenance considerations in the maintenance manual concerning that.

J. Brann asked does the maintenance manual incorporates notification or reporting.

Chris stated yes; must be done every year and submitted to the Town by December 15<sup>th</sup>.

J. Brann asked if there would be any phases with this project.

Chris explained that they looked at phases and that was not an option. You have to build Community Way to get to the pad site. The pad site needs to be modified to construct that was shown. Chris explained there would be no phasing but there would be construction phasing so that's taken care of part of the construction documents.

J. Brann explained that in Site Review 4.6.2 pertaining to community disposal systems states proposed ownership and operation shall be acceptable to the Town of Barrington, including all necessary easements, agreements, and licenses.

M. Gasses explained that was regulated by the State.

Chris explained that this would be owned and operated by the applicant. They don't know if they are going to be for sale.

J. Brann asked how the mixed use and building and residences were going to be heated. The reason he was asking was he didn't see anything on utilities plan that addressed propane installed.

Chris explained that they don't show gas lines and the LP tanks are really placeholders.

A. Melnikas asked how big the tanks were.

Chris explained that they are 500 to 1000 gallons.

A. Melnikas asked if the tanks were above or underground tanks.

Chris stated that they were proposed to be underground tanks.

A. Melnikas expressed that when the tanks are underground, and they develop a leak, you don't often know.

Chris explained that these are basic residential units, so they have the same risks of leaks than any other single home. Chris explained that Sheet 73 has the utilities on it.

S. Diamond asked about a roadway being conveyed to the Town automatically with Town's responsibility for ownership and maintenance in certain circumstances; could you clarify if this was one of them.

S. Diamond asked if this would go to Town vote before it becomes a Town road.

M. Gasses explained that this would go to the Select Board would approve and there was a process.

J. Brann asked about the assumptions for the retail space building on Sheet 64 sewer system and how you arrived at a loading of 1360 gallons per day.

Chris explained that this was based on fictional knowledge of who might use the building at some point.

J. Brann expressed that he felt the number was low and one of those you incorporated was the cafe being a relatively low rating. J. Brann asked what the applicant was doing to preclude exceeding the loading. The Board expectation was that the final use of the space would to the loading that was estimated.

Chris explained that anytime a commercial space turns over for change of use, it goes through the building department. The building official was required to have a letter by a stamped licensed designer, in this case it would also be a professional engineer, based on sewage load that requirement were fulfilled.

J. Brann expressed concern about being low volume after he compared to the four and seven residential units with businesses that include a food café.

Chris expressed that he felt that it was realistic, and they could certainly look at increasing the loading if the Board would like them to do that.

J. Brann expressed if the loading was too small then it would limit the ability of the applicant to be able to utilize that space.

J. Jennison expressed that it would be a limiting factor and advocated being less conservative [i.e. higher loading]. His concern leans more towards the Town's ability to have a good tenant in there that adds to desired effect in that area. J. Jennison expressed that if it was just four store/office fronts.

J. Brann asked about Sheet 101, Detail L6, which states all planting shall be watered during the first year and maintained permanently in good growing conditions as an effective visual screen. J. Brann asked where is this maintenance addressed in the application and are there documents that legally define who is responsible.

Chris explained that there are other notes inside on how the applicant could address watering during construction.

J. Brann expressed that he wasn't worried about during construction, but after that.

Chris explained as part of the Site Plan Review regulations in this plan the vegetation needs to be maintained so how the applicant chooses to ensure its life and longevity was up to them. Chris explained that they are not permitted to have sprinkler systems or anything like that as part of our community well system. Chris explained that on a project site like this there would be a maintenance company that would be hired to come in and maintain on a weekly or bi-weekly basis.

J. Brann stated that he understood that was not his responsibility, but this was an application by an applicant who then must demonstrate the Board. J. Brann explained that in fact that they can follow through so the Board would expect something in the annotation that addresses the long term.

Chris explained in his notes how that might take place.

J. Brann stated that there needs to be commitment on the part of the applicant as to how going forward after construction that's going to be maintained.

Chris explained that they could prepare a MOU that states this.

J. Brann asked M. Gasses if that would be adequate.

M. Gasses expressed the hope that someone making this large of an investment would maintain their property.

Chris explained that his applicant owns hundreds of sites, that's not an exaggeration, and they maintain every single one of them.

J. Brann asked about Section 3.7 [of the Site Plan Review regulations] regarding sufficient building renderings as part of the application.

Chris explained that was what they received tonight.

J. Brann expressed that he felt they did not cover everything.

Chris explained that they have previously submitted the architectural but they have since changed them as the Board wasn't happy with the simplicity.

J. Brann explained there's renderings showing the front side and the rear-view elevation that they posted.

M. Gasses expressed that there were some comments on the residential architecture that they know about and explained that J. Jennison has a good sample suggestion.

J. Brann asked about Site Plan Review 3.2.7 Legend that requires one shall be placed on each sheet of the plans.

Chris expressed that he would add a waiver.

J. Brann expressed that there are some sheets that they may be appropriate to have a legend; for instance Sheet 72 at the start of the utilities plans.

J. Brann asked about Site Plan Review Section 3.8 (5) that states the plans illumination plans would include building rendering showing the fixture and the portions of the walls illuminated.

Chris explained the renderings show the lamps.

R. Allard expressed that he looks at the renderings and he sees headlights hitting those buildings from the road in a the straight shot.

Chris asked about the straight shot and he showed on the plan that the straight shots go right into garage doors. Chris explained there's no living space on the first floor.

J. Jennison asked Chris how far did he want to go with the application tonight.

Chris explained that J. Brann brings up a lot of good points. What we didn't do as we went along was to find whether this would impact whether the Board would consider the application as substantially complete.

J. Brann explained that some of the things like dealing with the open space documentation, plan fixes and renderings that need to be resolved, given the comprehensiveness of the plans, drainage analysis, and the maintenance manual for the drainage system submitted, he was comfortable the application was substantially complete.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to accept the application as substantially complete.*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely-Covid reasons)

R. Allard-Yay

C. Krans-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

J. Brann explained that the Board was looking that there be a short stretch of sidewalk or walkway between the single family residences and the commercial space so residents didn't have to walk in the road.

J. Jennison suggested a wider roadway or some function to indicate where to walk.

R. Allard asked about visitor parking.

Chris explained that they talked about visitor parking in TRC meeting, and they are happy to add some additional visitor

parking to the upper portion of the project.

J. Brann explained that on Sheet 36 it indicates 220' on a slope from Community Way leading down to the two catch basins. J. Brann explained that there was no catch basin up the slope.

Chris asked if J. Brann was worried about the flow.

J. Brann state yes.

Chris explained that they could take another look at it and explained that they have added double grates to the situations like this in the past.

J. Brann asked about on Sheet 42 addressing the emergency access and show in the profile that has a 9.75 slope. On Sheet 105 you've done the calculations to ensure that a fire truck could get in and out on to the private drive. J. Brann stated that it only the addresses turning radius, but it looks like a fire truck would be trying to turn the corner going upgrade. J. Brann asked if they looked at whether as the engine goes up that you can end up grounding the rear bumper.

Chris explained that they have looked at the landing platform and it was 50' long before you get to 175' incline. Chris discussed the platform with the Board and would work on the reductions.

A. Knapp asked if the fire department had input on the buildings.

Chris explained that they initially had a four-story building there and reduced to a three-story building which was in response to design review comments.

A. Knapp expressed that he was concerned about the width of each building and if fire apparatus were able to reach.

Chris explained that there was an adequate fire lane around the structure and the front of the structure in the back of the structure was nearly 10' different from one another. Chris explained that they could access from all four sides.

A. Knapp expressed that he was concerned about was the standpoint that they have parking all the way around the structure which means it's likely that in the event of a fire that all kinds of cars would be there. A. Knapp explained that they would be 25' back from the building before they even start reaching.

Chris stated that he would make sure Fire Chief was okay with that.

J. Brann asked about on Sheets 75, 76 and 77 that state 1 ½' separation between water and sewer lines and in a later detail talks about the separation of electric, cable and gas lines. J. Brann if there were similar requirements for separation of electrical lines and water/sewer lines.

Chris explained that there really wasn't. It's more of a constructability separation requirement and explained that they set at different depths. Chris explained that electric was one of the lower profile utilities.

S. Diamond expressed on the landscaping that he was interested in seeing London plain as a choice and read that if you were trying to keep vegetation small, the circle was smaller. S. Diamond explained that he knows they can be pruned hard on a regular basis.

Chris explained that the pruning regimen wouldn't start for about two years or so and pruned on a as needed basis only to be ensure that sight line distances are maintained.

S. Diamond expressed that he understands that it was a tough tree that could grow large and noticed a lot of red maples. S. Diamond asked if for historical reasons you could switch from red maple to sugar maple for the potential of it being sugared more readily in the future. S. Diamond explained that they needed the same care.



Chris explained that they would look into that and were not opposed.

S. Diamond stated that he loved the lilacs and blueberry chosen.

J. Brann asked about Sheet 30; there was no signage to prevent people from using that emergency access road.

Chris explained that they could put some signage there and they are not proposing gates.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Rondi Boyer from 68 Community Way asked if they would be blasting.

Chris explained that there would be some ledge removal that needs to take place either through blasting or mechanical means and this was one of the final things he wanted to talk about is how to mitigate that.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

Chris explained so that to meet the Town's regulations, they kept the platform at 75' and then came into a 70' slope into the site. Chris explained that through test pitting that they have the amount of material that needs to be removed through there they would likely either hammer or blast. Chris asked if the Board would entertain a waiver from the Site Review Regulations that would modify the distance in which the pvi takes place off from Community Way.

J. Brann explained that a proposed waiver for Community Way was less severe than a similar one approved for a similar situation on Meetinghouse Road coming down the slope to the intersection.

Chris explained that this would be a better application for it. Chris explained that they would shorten the pvi to 60', the length of two or three cars, and then come into a 7% slope. Chris explained that the materials can be crushed and used on site.

A. Knapp asked if they would be a stop sign or just a drive through.

Chris stated there would be a stop sign. Chris explained that they would like to reduce the distance and showed on the plan to reduce it to around 60' or so.

S. Diamond asked was the maximum grade on that section.

Chris stated that the maximum grade was at 6% and explained that was a function of sloping into North Point Common and then sloping into the townhouses.

J. Brann asked if they were only talking about a two percent slope behind and his only concern would be trailer trucks.

J. Brann asked about the dumpsters and the size.

Chris explained that if a box truck of any kind they would want to ensure that the grade they are creating can accommodate a box truck.

J. Jennison asked that Chris show the benefit.

Chris explained that he would show the profile at that time.

J. Jennison asked about the school bus situation.

Chris explained that he has not talked to the school department.

J. Jennison has if Chris could get the school bus answer when he comes back.

R. Allard asked about speed limit signage.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to continue the application until September 7, 2021.*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely-Covid reasons)

R. Allard-Yay

C. Krans-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay

## **REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

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

4. Review of a request for a building permit at Long Shores Drive, a Private Road, for Matthew Castonguay ([Map 101, Lot 56](#))

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to send the standard letter with corrections to the Select Board. The motion carried unanimously.*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely-Covid reasons)

R. Allard-Yay

C. Krans-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Knapp-Abstained

5. Review of a request for a building permit on Merry Hill Road and take access at Marsh Road, a Class VI Road, for Matthew Rogers ([Map 117, Lot 46](#))

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to send the standard letter to the Select Board. The motion carried unanimously.*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely-Covid reasons)

R. Allard-Yay

C. Krans-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Knapp-Abstained

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

The next meeting will be on August 3, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. at the ECLC at 77 Ramsdell lane.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

*A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to adjourn the meeting at 9:12 p.m.*

Roll Call:

J. Jennison-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely-Covid reasons)

R. Allard-Yay

C. Krans-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Knapp-Yay