



**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: 133 874 607# OR link bit.ly/BarrPB20211102

**(Approved November 16, 2021)
Tuesday, November 2, 2021
6:30 p.m.**

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

Members Present

Jeff Brann, Vice Chair-acting chair for James Jennison
Steve Diamond-(Remotely)
Ron Allard
Andrew Melnikas
Donna Massucci-filling in for full member Buddy Hackett

Members Absent

James Jennison, Chair
Buddy Hackett
Andy Knapp ex-officio

Code Enforcement Officer: John Huckins
Staff: Barbara Irvine
Planning Consultant: Carol Ogilvie
Town Administrator: Conner MacIver

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of October 19, 2021, meeting minutes.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to approve the minutes with an amendment on line 109.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)

J. Brann-Yay

J. Brann addressed the applicants by reading the rules of procedure and reminded them that materials need to be to the Land Use office no later than 7 days prior to the meeting. J. Brann explained that this would give the Board time to review the information before the public hearing.

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM September 7, 2021

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. Brann gave a brief description of the application. J. Brann explained that they received a scope of work for a review from CMA Engineers this afternoon.

Attorney Ari Pollack from Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell Law Firm represented the applicant, Sunset Rock LLC, along with Eric Stevenson from Brox Industries. Also present was Josh Bouchard from CMA Engineers. Attorney Pollack explained to the Board that the last time they were before the Board that the City of Dover may not be aware the application is progressing, but they are involved in the conversation.

Conner MacIver explained to the Board that they were sharing the proposed task scope with them to make sure the third-party review from CMA Engineers was reviewing everything the Board wanted. Conner explained once the Board has reviewed the scope of work it would go to the applicant and have the applicant sign so that CMA Engineers could begin their review.

J. Brann asked the Board if they had time to review the proposed task scope. J. Brann asked the Board if it was comfortable discussing the proposed scope. J. Brann asked Josh about the materials that he had not received.

Josh explained that they have not received the materials from the City of Dover and from Mike Wright from Brox.

J. Brann asked Josh if he has communicated to City of Dover and Brox what he needed.

Josh stated that he had. Josh explained that they had a meeting with Mike Wright from Brox and asked them for the existing NHDOT and AoT permits only with the existing applicant with the groundwater permit.

J. Brann asked if there were any issues with supplying the materials.

Attorney Pollack explained that they have the materials and would supply them.

J. Brann explained that he felt that the concerns of the Board were there. J. Brann asked if CMA Engineers could also evaluate, if the proposal wasn't acceptable, the impact of raising the lowest deep cut that they were proposing and increasing the distance from the edge of expansion to the property line.

R. Allard asked that the City of Dover's comments get reviewed.

Josh explained to the Board that the City of Dover was working with Emery and Garrett, and they would also review that information. Josh explained that they would be having a talk with the City of Dover.

R. Allard asked about a reasonable time frame and the City of Dover can't claim this rushed.

S. Diamond read the following from the proposed task scope:

Task Order Number: 6

c. It appears the existing permitted areas shows a quarry floor at 36ft MSL, and the proposed expansion shows a quarry floor at 90ft MSL, with a stepped transition between the two areas.

S. Diamond asked of 5 or so acre expansion of the area, what was involved that was to be 90ft deep.

R. Allard explained to S. Diamond that was a quote for the work; it hasn't been done yet.

Attorney Pollack explained that was a detail on the plan set but didn't know the answer. Attorney Pollack suggested that they continued until January 4, 2022, because the review would take 4-6 weeks.

John Huckins reminded the applicant that the proposal and fees need to be paid before they can start the review.

Attorney Pollack stated that they understood.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to continue the application for Sunset Rock until January 4, 2022.

Roll Call:

S. Diamond-Yay (remotely)

J. Brann-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

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. Brann gave a brief description of the application.

Chris Berry from Berry Surveying and Engineering represented Dove Development. Chris updated the Board to let them know that they have been working with CMA Engineers; they have three comment letters back and forth. Chris and Josh at CMA Engineers agreed that what was left was for State

permitting and they were not Site Plan Review requirements. Chris explained that he answered PUD questions, coverage for residential use and addressed the headlight issue. Chris explained that on the CMA Engineers comments, Fish & Game wants the deep sumps to be removed from the catch basins and explained that NHDES would want them kept there.

J. Brann expressed that in the past Fish & Game got in the middle of this and they do have say.

Chris expressed that he didn't want to agree to something then AoT and Fish & Game come back with a change.

J. Brann asked how CMA feels about this.

Josh explained that was their recommendation and if AoT comes back and said they can eliminate everywhere in the project.

Chris explained that Josh pointed out in his letter that NHDES had said no deep sumps in rural areas.

R. Allard expressed that if they say take them out, then that was a hard process to take them out.

J. Brann asked if the plans have deep sumps in the basins.

Chris stated no.

S. Diamond expressed that the sumps do serve a purpose; they are a settling tank and another opportunity for removal. S. Diamond explained not knowing if for the protection of the wildlife they opportunity for adjustments to the deep sumps or slope of the edge of sump had to allow escape.

Chris explained that the species of concern are too small unless sumps are filled with silt.

S. Diamond asked if the edge could be a slope to allow them to escape.

Chris explained to S. Diamond how it works and that wasn't feasible.

J. Brann asked if the regulations require this.

Chris stated no.

J. Brann asked about the runoff of the new development and the size of the detention pond.

Chris explained that there are three concerns about stormwater, and they are rate, volume, and treatment. Chris expressed to the Board that he didn't believe that the Town of Barrington Regulations discuss treatment. Chris explained that the Town of Barrington Regulations discuss rate and volumetric increases. Chris explained that what Josh was talking about has to do with treatment, not rate and volume or how much water there're dispersing off the project site. Chris explained that when Community Way was conceived there was a stormwater cell rain garden in that location. Chris explained that there was a certain amount of impervious surface that existed on the site prior to the new development. Chris explained from an existing treatment standpoint, there was not room on the site to enlarge the rain garden. This was accepted by the Board and by the review engineer. Chris explained that they are proposing to extend Community Way out and there's about 200' of impervious surface in the new Community Way that was directed to the same rain garden. Chris explained that they have proven they have the water quality

| volume to accept the 200' and all of the existing Community Way that has been constructed. Chris explained that they still have not treated the 39,000 s.f. of existing parking lot. This was not included in the water quality calculation. Chris explained that this has been submitted to AoT, they have response with a no comment back, so they assumed this was acceptable practice. Chris explained that Josh pointed out the area was physically not included for water quality volume. The stormwater cell was designed for the events that Barrington requires and explained that Josh and he agree that the treatment issue was an issue to be addressed by AoT.

Josh explained that they are concerned the number was about 68,000 s.f. impervious surface runoff was flowing to the rain garden and was only sized to treat about half of that volume or half the square footage. Josh explained from the start that rain garden was undersized and it's not going to perform as it should.

J. Brann asked if it could handle the volume and flow pre-treatment was where the issue was.

Josh stated that was correct and if twice as much water was flowing to it then it would not function properly; that was their concern. Josh explained that there are no sumps in the basins with no pretreatment before it gets there and there were a handful of deep sumps in the new development.

J. Brann asked about at the bottom of the 200' on the northerly side; wasn't there a pair of basins in question.

Chris explained that they put double grates on it based on capacity/inflow.

J. Brann questioned the detention pond in the corner.

Chris stated that was correct. Chris explained the location where they have a gravel wetland that captures all from the developed site. Chris explained that the existing Community Way does have sumps and hoods in it. This was done three or four years ago prior to this new stuff. There was pretreatment at the front end of the project but the 200' proposed not to have that for treatment.

Josh asked what the basis for sizing Rain Garden 102 in the 2019 project was.

Chris explained the basis was the inclusion of all the stormwater off the slope from a flow and volume standpoint for the develop site. Chris explained that the basics for the design of treatment volume was the new proposed infrastructure.

S. Diamond asked if the nature of the concern was around the water quality that was being treated in the rain garden. S. Diamond asked if the concern was around turbidity or nitrogen and what were the main things that the rain garden was doing regarding water quality from these areas.

Chris explained that the treatment cell was designed for water quality volume treatment that functions to take TSS out phosphorus nitric fossils. Chris explained that in the operations and maintenance manual for the project there would need to be more frequent inspection and as Josh pointed out there may need to be more frequent modifications to the bio media over time.

J. Brann asked if there was any way that the runoff from the 200' could be directed to the area that you're draining the rest of the development without impacting the gravel wetlands.

Chris stated no based on elevation.

J. Brann expressed he understands that they know this Rain Garden 102 was under the previous project. J. Brann explained that he wasn't aware that they would be taking water from another development or part of the roadway and flowing that into 102.

Chris explained that it was designed for what they are proposing as a project at that time.

J. Brann expressed that he didn't recall any suggestion that future development might tie to the system.

Chris explained that it was relatively implied when you have a linear roadway that continues up slope.

J. Brann expressed that doesn't mean that we would think or understand that it's implied.

D. Massucci expressed that she noticed the tree line in the front and asked if there was going to be signage?

Chris explained that they own the Community Way infrastructure, they have spoken with the Christmas Dove owners, and talked about someday having a community signage.

D. Massucci expressed that she felt someone wouldn't notice without signage and no sidewalks.

Chris explained that there were sidewalks and explained to the Board that as they go further into the development the intent is to provide for additional parking and then wrap that sidewalk around.

D. Massucci explained that she noticed the vegetation that was around the mailboxes.

Chris explained that they are still working with the postmaster, but they are currently proposing a gang box at the end of the cul-de-sac; there wouldn't be individual mailboxes.

A. Melnikas asked if all Chief Walker's concerns were addressed.

Chris stated yes.

A. Melnikas expressed he was concerned of the placement of the no parking signs in front of the multi-purpose building.

Chris explained that Fire Chief was referring to the fire lanes.

A. Melnikas asked where the fire lanes are.

Chris explained that any roadway that provides access was considered a fire lane so if was not wide enough to be considered a fire lane with parking on the side, the roadway is the fire lane. The sign comment was from the Fire Chief for them to show additional parking on the project.

A. Melnikas expressed that a fire lane was in the front.

Chris explained that in a commercial setting, such as fire lanes in front of a big box store, anything that provides for fire services was considered a fire lane.

S. Diamond expressed that the confusion was what the Fire Chief said on whether or not parking can be between the fire lane and the building.

A. Melnikas expressed that apparently you spoke with Chief Walker and he's okay with the parking and gets it down the road. A. Melnikas ask how tall the building was.

Chris stated that it was 40 feet.

J. Brann asked about the issues with the Rain Garden Number 102. Was this going to be left to the AoT process to resolve the issue?

Josh asked Chris if AoT thought that the rain garden was undersized for the improvements in the area?

Chris explained that AoT didn't comment on whether they saw this or not.

J. Brann expressed that they don't know if there were any issues for AoT or if it was an oversight.

Chris explained that they will know when they get a permit and asked J. Brann if he wanted him to contact them and see if they find fault in his design. Chris expressed that he does not want to do that.

J. Brann expressed they can't find a fault that doesn't exist.

Chris explained that they may agree with their assessment of it.

J. Brann stated that if AoT doesn't have a problem then he was okay with it too.

Chris explained that treatment was not addressed in the Town of Barrington Regulations.

J. Brann expressed that there are a lot of things that the Board relies on the State well, septic, etc.

J. Brann asked does the Board know that AoT would review this.

Chris explained when he gives a package, they review it, and explained that in the comment section, and Josh probably read, that this was the methodology used for sizing this system. Chris explained that it wasn't like they hid in a hundred-page plan set with a 300-page document.

Josh explained that it does show up in the water quality form right from the worksheet.

Chris explained that they spell it out right at the bottom in the comments.

J. Brann asked about a note saying no sumps with AoT.

Chris explained that AoT has already reviewed this with no sumps, didn't raise an issue, and it appears they're okay with that.

John Huckins explained that he felt the point that Chris was trying to make was the Town's Regulations do not require the things that you keep discussing. John explained that the Board does not have authority to enforce State Regulations; it only has authority for the Town Regulations.

J. Brann expressed that they are not trying to do that. The Board has a question that should be answered by the State Regulations that the Board is relying upon. J. Brann expressed that the Board was relying on the State to make sure that there was proper drainage treatment.

R. Allard explained that the Board has an obligation to look out for the public interest environmental issues. R. Allard explained that the issue here has been identified and wants a solution; maybe this can be taken care of by doing more frequent inspections.

J. Brann expressed that the State has regulations and if the State said they meet the requirements, then the Board relies on the State.

R. Allard expressed that the Board has an obligation to protect the environment. The Board said there is a problem, the applicant agrees there's a problem, and wants to put something regardless of what the State does.

J. Brann asked what they were proposing for maintenance on rain garden. It's proposed as annual, so it'd be a spring and fall inspection instead of just the fall inspection. J. Brann asked if Chris felt this would help or mitigate.

Chris stated it would help.

S. Diamond agreed with Chris that we don't have treatment included in Town Regulations and maybe the Board should change that. The information was very out of date and this was the right moment to raise it.

Chris explained that they have a 9.6 permit and Lot line.

J. Brann read the 9.6 Permit application:

Section 9.6 narrative
Village at Barrington Square ~ Community Way

June 14, 2021
Page 2 of 3

the walks provided in Community Way. The project proposes 12,831 SF of disturbance within the wetland buffer.

1. The proposed use is in keeping with the intent and proposes set forth in the zoning ordinance as permitted in the base zoning district. If the base zoning district requires a conditional use permit or special exception for the proposed use, one must already been obtained; or if the proposed use is not listed on the Table of Uses or is listed but not permitted, one must already have obtained a variance.
A conditional use permit is not needed to allow a PUD within the Town Center. However, a variance was granted for the proposed density for the parcel.
2. After review of all reasonable alternatives, it is determined to be infeasible to place the proposed structure or use outside the buffer zone.
The wetland disturbance is broken up into 3 separate areas. The first is for the proposed construction of Community Way. There is an existing wetland on the abutting lot that runs up to the shared boundary line. This causes the 50' buffer to stick out into the 50' right of way off existing Community Way. There would be no feasible way to extend Community Way into Lot 1-1 without disturbing the buffer. The second disturbance area is for the construction of a proposed gravel wetland. This gravel wetland is proposed to be placed at the lowest topographic elevation as possible in order to capture as much runoff from the proposed development. This requires some buffer disturbance. The final disturbance area is for the well access road and pad. Given the topography and shape of the lot the well had to be placed in an upland area near the northeast corner of the lot. In order to access this area, two small wetland fingers will have to be crossed.
3. The proposed structure or use must be setback as far as possible from the delineated edge of the wetland or surface water.
The proposed use is setback as far as possible, while still achieving the design intent.
4. Appropriate erosion control measures must be in place prior to and during construction.
An intensive erosion and sediment control plan is included in the submittal. Included in that design specifically, is the use of double perimeter control and orange construction fence for construction within the buffer.
5. Any disturbance to the surrounding buffer zone must be repaired and restored upon completion of construction.
All disturbed areas will receive loam and conservation mix seed after construction is complete. Additionally, plantings are proposed along the buffer disturbance to enhance the remaining buffer.

RECEIVED

JUN 17 2021

LAND USE OFFICE



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING
335 Second Crown Pt. Rd., Barrington, NH 03825
(603) 332-2863 / (603) 335-4623 FAX
www.BerrySurveying.com

Section 9.6 narrative
Village at Barrington Square ~ Community Way

June 14, 2021
Page 3 of 3

6. All available mitigation measures to address changes in water quality and quantity be implemented, along with design and construction methods to minimize adverse impacts, if required by the Planning Board.
An in depth drainage analysis has been conducted for the project. Through the use of rain gardens and gravel wetlands, the peak rate has been reduced to offsite final reaches and the post development volumes are compliant with NHDES Alteration of Terrain.

Please let us know if you have further questions.

BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

Christopher R. Berry - Project Manager

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to approve the 9.6 Permit for the Dove Development.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

J. Brann-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to approve for the Lot Line Adjustment for the Dove Development.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)

J. Brann-Yay

J. Brann opened public comment.

J. Brann closed public comment.

J. Brann read the Conditions Precedent:



Planning & Land Use Department

Town of Barrington

PO Box 660

333 Calef Highway

Barrington, NH 03825

603.664.0330

jhuckins@barrington.nh.gov

DRAFT NOTICE OF DECISION

Office use only	Date certified:	As built plans received:	Surety returned:
<i>"Applicant", herein, refers to the property owner, business owner, individual(s), or organization submitting this application and to his/her/its agents, successors, and assigns.</i>			
Re: <u>235-1.1&3-TC-21-SR/LL/9.6 (Owners: Dove Development Group, LLC)</u> 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.			
Owner: Dove Development Group LLC 242 Central Ave Dover, NH 03820			

Applicant:
Christopher Berry
Berry Surveying and Engineering
335 Second Crown Point Road
Barrington, NH 03825

Professional:
Kenneth A. Berry, PE LLS

Dated: November 2, 2021

Dear applicant:

This is to inform you that the Barrington Planning Board at its November 2, 2021 meeting **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED** your application referenced above.

All of the precedent conditions below must be met by the applicant, at the expense of the applicant, prior to the plans being certified by the Planning Board. Certification of the plans is required prior to commencement of any site work or recording of any plans. Once these precedent conditions are met and the plans are certified the approval is considered final.

Please Note If all of the precedent conditions are not met within 12 calendar months to the day, November 2, 2022, the Board's approval will be considered to have lapsed, unless a mutually agreeable extension has been granted by the Board.

Conditions Precedent

- 1) Add the following plan notes:
 - a) The following waivers were approved at the Planning Board Meeting *of* September 7, 2021:
 1. 12.7 Table 2 Intersection Design Standards
 2. Section 12.2.1 Figure 4A, Road Design Standards
 3. Section 12.2.1 Figure 4C, Road Design Standards
 4. Section 12.3.2(5) Curbing, Driveway Design
 - b) Final Landscape Design is part of this approval.
 - c) The Operations and Maintenance Plan is part of this approval and shall include a schedule for semi-annual inspections and maintenance.
 - d) Special Permit 9.6 was approved by the Planning Board on 11-2-21.
- 2) Revise the following plan notes:

- a) Add the NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit #
 - b) Add the NHDES Subsurface Bureau C.A. #
 - c) Add the NHDES Water Supply Permit #
 - d) Add the NHDOT Driveway Permit #
- 3) Any outstanding fees shall be paid to the Town.
- 4) Prior to obtaining Board signature, the Applicant shall submit three (3) complete paper print plan sets and supporting documents as required in Article 3 with a letter explaining how the Applicant addressed the conditions of approval. This shall include final and complete reports for all items submitted during review for the Town of Barrington's file. The Chairman shall endorse three copies of the approved plan(s) meeting the conditions of approval. The Town shall retain a signed and approved reproducible 11"X17", and PDF format with supporting documents for Town records.

General and Subsequent Conditions

- 1) The applicants engineer shall certify in writing all improvements have been constructed as approved prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
- 2) School Impact Fee will be accessed at the time of the building permit submittal by the Building Inspector and paid prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
- 3) Where no active and substantial work, required under this approval has commenced upon the site within two years from the date the plan is signed, this approval shall expire. An extension, not to exceed one year, may be granted, by majority vote of the Board so long as it is applied for at least thirty days prior to the expiration date. The Board may grant only one such extension for any proposed site plan. All other plans must be submitted to the Board for review to ensure compliance with these and other Town ordinances. Active and substantial work is defined in this section as being the expenditure of at least 25% of the infrastructure improvements required under this approval. Infrastructure shall mean in this instance, the construction of roads, storm drains, and improvements indicated on the site plan. RSA 674:39

I wish you the best of luck with your project. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

John Huckins
Zoning Administrator

cc: File

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to approve the Site Plan for the Dove Development.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)
J. Brann-Yay

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to have the Chair on sign the cover sheet, site plan pages and the Lot Line of Adjustment that gets recorded.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)
J. Brann-Yay

4. **270-2&3 273-49-GR-21Sub (11) (Owner: Anthony Serra)** Request by applicant Sal Ragonese to construct an 11-lot Conservation Subdivision with a 690' cul-de-sac and a 9.6 Special Permit at 44 Meadowbrook Drive (Map 270, Lots 2&3 and Map 273, Lot 49) on 58.57 +/- acres in the General Residential Zoning District. BY: Barry Gier, P.E., Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc.; Po Box 219; Stratham, NH 03885.

J. Brann gave a brief description of the application.

Barry Gier from Jones and Beach Engineers represented the owner Anthony Serra and applicant Sal Ragonese. Barry explained that the applicant was for an 11-lot conservation Subdivision with a 690' cul-de-sac. Barry explained that they have been before the Board a couple of times, agreeing on the yield plan and approval of a 9.6 Special Permit. Barry explained that they agreed to modify some of the lots based upon adding of the wetland area to the open space to protect it. They agreed that the intersection should go to a three-way stop and on the design of the culvert at the road entrance. Barry explained that they took a site walk to view the vegetation or screening adjacent the east portion of the property. Barry explained that the site walk was on Friday, so they were unable to get review plans to the Board in a week. Barry explained that he did make the changes that were discussed. Barry explained that they are having CMA engineers are review the drainage, so they would be asking for a continuance to allow them to review the drainage. Barry explained that the rear of Lots 7, 8 and 9 have been revised to provide for relocating some of the wetlands into the open space to protect it. Barry explained that he shows a stop at the intersection and a three-way stop along with the sign to say stop sign ahead. Barry expressed that they wanted to talk about the lack of need for additional vegetation in the buffer or in the external setback.

J. Brann explained that the Board members J. Jennison, R. Allard, S. Diamond, and himself were at the site walk. J. Brann explained that they heard comments previously that area was clear cut, but it turns out that they did clear a portion of the boundary of the lot, but they did leave hardwoods and hemlocks. J. Brann explained looking at the houses that are along the lot line, there was a particular individual that represented that he could see in the person's living room, but they verified that in fact they could not see that there. J. Brann explained that they can see that the tree density has been reduced so it was possible to see from one property to another although other people on other properties seem like they had more of a visual. J. Brann explained that after walking and looking at the site, they asked Mr. Gier about visual buffering, and he said they don't have any intention adding vegetation other than relocating some hemlocks from lot clearance into the buffer.

R. Allard agreed with J. Brann that there was some green buffer existing, and people would rather than taking the hemlock out during lot clearance would just relocate them.

S. Diamond explained the abutter's comments and comments from other neighbors. S. Diamond explained that quite often everyone makes assumptions that currently undeveloped land was going remain that way. S. Diamond expressed that the reason people move to Barrington was to live in the woods and expressed that a good degree of visual buffering is good so that everyone in this community and external to this community feels like they are in the woods on Meadowbrook Drive. The trees that were remain in the buffer area were crowded by the trees that had been removed so their buffering functionality was somewhat degraded. S. Diamond expressed that since heavy equipment would already be on site that they could move some of the one-to-three-inch caliper hemlocks that are already on site into the buffer zone. S. Diamond explained that in 5 to 10 years they would probably have 75% coverage to 12 feet.

J. Brann explained that there was more buffering than he expected, and he was surprised that the person that made public comment has more visual screening then other abutters. J. Brann explained that he would be okay with a line of hemlock or something else just along the property line.

Barry explained that the applicant would okay with what Mr. Allard indicated, picking up some of the trees that are currently there and move them to the buffer. Barry explained that if they need to purchase them, they're not inexpensive. Barry expressed that there was a good buffer out there currently.

S. Diamond explained to the Board after doing the site walk, Meadowbrook Drive itself, because of combination of slope and narrow radius turns, has sight lines that weren't all that great. S. Diamond asked at what point of development of Meadowbrook Drive changes the design of the road itself. S. Diamond explained that the speed limit was 25 and questioned to what extent a very slow speed limit encourages multi modes of transportation. S. Diamond asked what level of development would warrant changes to that road.

J. Brann explained to S. Diamond that they can discuss when they come back before the Board.

J. Brann opened public comment.

Barbara Locke from 228 Steppingstone Road explained the history of Meadowbrook Drive showing a slide show beginning the area in 1953.

J. Brann explained that they are not planning to develop the area that concerns Barbara Locke.

Barry confirmed that was correct and CMA Engineers would be reviewing all the drainage going through there.

J. Brann explained that was part of the open space and there would be no development.

Barbara Locke explained that the Homeowners Association would be responsible for maintaining drainage and so forth from the development into the wetlands.

J. Brann explained that the developer would submit their plans and we send them to CMA Engineers for third party review for a whole drainage plan.

J. Brann closed public comment.

A motion by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to continue the 44 Meadowbrook Drive application until December 7, 2021.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)
J. Brann-Yay

5. [251-63-RC-21-SR \(Owners: Steven & Pamela Lenzi\)](#) Request by applicant Robert Russell from 2A Tactical, LLC for Site Review and waivers to construct a 6,000 s.f. will have 2 story building with 11,080 s.f. useable space. The building will have 4,120 s.f. office/classroom space and 2,624 s.f. of retail space, 3,376 s.f. of warehouse/storage space with 960 s.f. of gunsmithing space and have classes with maximum 20 students that will occur during off hours. The location will be on the corner of Calef Highway (aka Route 125) and Bumford Road on 8.6 acres in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. (Map 251, Lot 63). BY: Scott Frankiewicz, LLS & Bernie Temple, PE; New Hampshire Land Consultants, PLLC.; 683C First NH Turnpike; Northwood, NH 03261.

J. Brann gave a brief Description of the application.

Scott Frankiewicz from New Hampshire Land Consultants represented 2A Tactical, LLC. Scott explained to the Board that they met with the Select Board on October 18, 2021, to talk about Bumford Road realignment. Scott explained that the discussion was whether there was going to be an easement or a transfer, and it was decided that it was going to be a transfer to the Town. Scott explained that the corner of the property has been submitted to NHDOT and have not heard back. Scott explained that they have reached out to CMA Engineers but have not submitted anything yet. They also received comments from the Fire Chief on October 22, 2021 and would like to continue until December 7, 2021.

John Huckins explained that the road plan still shows 50' setback on Calef Highway and 40' on Bumford Road. John explained that if they left these setbacks, they would need to go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Scott explained that they would need to submit a Lot Line and the Select Board agreed to waive the fees.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to continue the application for 2A Tactical, LLC to December 7, 2021.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay
A. Melnikas-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)
J. Brann-Yay

DESIGN REVIEWS

6. [223-26-C2-RC-21-DESIGN \(Owner: Joseph Falzone-Route 125 Development, LLC\)](#) Request by applicant for Design Review for a Commercial Site on Route 125 for multi-use located on Calef Highway (aka Route 125) on a 3.8-acre lot in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. By: Scott Cole; Beals Associates, PLLC; 70 Portsmouth Avenue; Stratham, NH 03885.

J. Brann gave a brief description of the application.

Scott Cole from Beals Associates represented owner Joe Falzone and applicant John O'Neil from Stonearch Development Corporation. Scott explained that they are before the Board for a Design Review

to show the Board what their thoughts are for a commercial development. Scott explained that this lot would be to the left of the primary access road going into the subdivision on the left and would be the first commercial lot. Scott explained that they are looking to put in a multi-use building which would have 8 commercial units and 8 residential on the second and third floor. The building itself would be 40' by 192' long; the units themselves would be 24' by 40'. Scott explained what they are proposing was a multi-use building so the bottom would be commercial to a depth of 18' and then behind that would be 22' depth with garage space. This [garage] space would be used by the commercial units and/or residential upstairs. There was adequate traffic circulation around the building and received preliminary review back from the Fire Department. Scott explained that they have provided adequate parking for the building by the Town's calculations. There would be roughly 3456' of commercial office space and with the residential spaces, they are proposing a total of 52 spaces. Scott explained that this lot development was part of the original design for the subdivision and explained that they have are not currently part of the built drainage system in front of that. Scott explained that they would have a separate detention pond to the left and would be serviced by both private septic area and proposed private well. Scott explained that they are looking for an opinion from the Board and know the architectural has been somewhat of issue in the past with the Board. Scott showed the proposed design of what the building would look like. Scott explained that this design has been done in other municipalities and explained that the bottoms would be commercial units they would all have their own parking. Scott explained that the above the commercial units would be a different roof line and then the residential units above.

R. Allard asked if there was a loading dock.

Scott stated not on this one.

J. Brann asked if for businesses there's going to be proposed parking in the rear.

Scott explained that parking spaces with the upstairs residential is in the rear and commercial parking in the front.

J. Brann asked how trucks are going around and supply the businesses if the residents own the spaces behind the businesses.

Scott explained that deliveries would be made during non-functional hours for commercial deliveries and designed to not interfere with any vehicles parked there.

J. Brann asked if they were splitting the lower floor from end-to-end with garages on the back.

Scott stated yes.

J. Brann asked about the deliveries from the back to the front.

John O'Neill from Stonearch Development Corporation explained that they are a family business and they have done a lot of holdings for rental and construction. John explained that they have done this concept in Dover and their plan was to make the bottom level their offices. John explained that they have 12

employees now and they have their own staff along with own rendering, design, and management company. John explained that the whole bottom of the business would be Stonearch; they are moving. John explained that they are just an office with a bunch of computers.

R. Allard asked if there could get 16 parking spots in the back.

John O'Neill stated yes.

J. Brann expressed his concern about people renting a garage and end up living there.

John O'Neill explained that life and safety is involved; these would all be sprinkled and there's buffer partitioning that takes place to make that fire safe and separate for those different uses.

J. Brann expressed that the Board would want to know what activities are going to be allowed the in-garage spaces.

John O'Neill explained that they rent to over 200 and they are very hard on who they rent too.

John Huckins explained that in the past with multiple units to rent, applicants have given the Board a list of uses so that they do not need to keep coming before the Board as long as the parking works.

J. Brann explained that the Fire Chief made a comment for a 30,000 gallon within one thousand drivable feet.

John O'Neill stated the one across the street was 20,000.

Joe Falzone said 35.

J. Brann explained that the Fire Chief mentioned 20-foot drive around access unimpeded by parking spaces around the building. J. Brann expressed that it was a good first effort with the architecture design but needs some work. J. Brann asked that sewage usage for the lower floor usage be looked at and ensure it's adequate for possible uses in the lower level.

John Huckins explained that the sewage would be on the uses that they want there.

John O'Neill explained that this was the first swing at what they are looking to do, and they take the water and septic seriously.

J. Brann asked, looking at the plan, if they are going to have their own drainage area as the drainage and infiltration system that already exists has been approved as part of the larger subdivision.

Scott explained for that the commercial lots whether they meet the disturbance or not it was a requirement from AoT. They would be doing a AoT permit individually that was one of their requests because these were already pre-designed and meant for actual residential subdivision.

J. Brann explained to Scott to remember there's illumination requirements for the Site Plan.

Scott stated he understood that.

J. Brann explained that they would need to see rendering of the building showing where the lighting was going to illuminate, along with full legend on each sheet of plans.

S. Diamond suggested signage to show where each business was, and he liked the masonry at the bottom edge. S. Diamond suggested looking at how the Dove project did theirs's and suggested it would be good if there was any degree of curbing or even grass, little islands for grass, something that breaks up the pavement from being just pavement with paint on it.

A. Melnikas asked if there was going to be sprinklers in the attic. A. Melnikas explained the reason he asked was that the roof trusses are going to be prefab.

John O'Neill explained that they must have a fire system and they would have a petition between every single unit that runs right up to the ridge. John O'Neill explained that there are ratings and systems so if there's a system that allows them to fire rate the ceiling of the unit and they have partitions going up the side, there's no issue.

John Huckins asked how close the subdivision was from getting complete approval.

Joe Falzone explained that it should be within the month.

J. Brann opened public comment.

J. Brann closed public comment.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to close the Design Review for 223-26-C2-RC-21-Design.

Roll Call:

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)

J. Brann-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

7. [223-26-C4-RC-21-DESIGN \(Owner: Joseph Falzone- Route 125 Development, LLC\)](#) Request by applicant for Design Review for a Commercial Site on Route 125 for motorsports on Calef Highway (aka Route 125) on a 8.8 acre lot in the Regional Commercial Zoning District. By: Scott Cole; Beals Associates, PLLC; 70 Portsmouth Avenue; Stratham, NH 03885.

J. Brann gave a brief description of the application.

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

Roll Call:

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

D. Massucci-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)

J. Brann-Yay

Scott Cole from Beals Associates represented Josh St. Hilaire from St. Hilaire Motorsports for a Design Review. Scott explained that the site would be on C3 and C5 to be a combined. Scott explained that this would consist of two buildings, and this would be in two phases. Scott explained that the first phase includes the first large building which would be 100' by 150' and would be 15,000 s.f. This would be the office, retail space, and service in the rear of the building. Scott explained that the loading would be around the building with trucks loading and unloading recreational vehicles. Scott explained that Phase 2 would be in the rear of the building, the rectangular building that would be their warehouse and storage. The storage building would be done at a later date and the building would have a loading bay on the left that would be four feet below the elevation of the building so it would be a normal loading bay. The trucks would go in a counterclockwise circle around the Phase 1 building, and they could back right up to that building load and unload. Scott explained that they have provided adequate parking; there was parking for the retail and service. Scott explained that they would have overflow parking for trailers and large trucks there would be gravel areas to the east and west of the building. The building would have private utilities along with its own septic system and private well. The access from Calef Highway (aka Route 125) has been agreed upon but not permitted when they were dealing with the subdivision behind for the access. The subdivision original design had two access points, this being one of them. After further revision, the one access to this location could still be utilized for these commercial lots with an easement left for this. Scott explained that by combining these two lots the easement would not need to be utilized. Scott explained that there was a drainage area on the left. This detention pond was for the large subdivision in the back, but this pond was oversized, and they had mathematical detail to provide to AoT it could be used. However, they could provide at least a pond with additional capacity if needed volume and may have a discharge directly into that pond. Scott explained that they do understand that there was a greenbelt along Calef Highway (aka Route 125) that does have substantial frontage. This would be a raised site with some grading and some steep slope right in front of it with some landscape pods and then a good display area.

Josh St. Hilaire explained that the design would be cargo trailers, open trailers, utility trailers and recreational vehicles.

J. Brann opened public comment.

J. Brann closed public comment.

John Huckins asked about the actual total display area that they are going to have lined-up. John explained that if this area was highlighted, he would know if someone came in for a zoning violation, he could see the area on the plan that was approved.

J. Brann commented that its needs to be dimensioned so that the Board understands the actual area and the displays would be restricted to that area.

R. Allard asked when the truck was at the loading dock into the warehouse and eliminating two spaces that might interfere a truck pulling straight to level out. R. Allard asked about loading/loading dock plans for Phase 2 and Phase 1.

Josh St. Hilaire owner of St. Hilaire Motorsports explained to the Board that he has tractor trailer trucks that come periodically but it wouldn't be a weekly occurrence but sometimes is multiple times in a week. Sometimes they don't see them for a month or two. Josh explained that currently they have to remove the vehicles or crates from the truck by strapping them and pulling them out and then forklifting them into their storage areas. The reason they want the loading bay would be to cut down the time to do that as now it's a time-consuming process.

J. Brann opened public comment.

J. Brann closed public comment.

S. Diamond explained that he recognizes it was far from the final plan, but the site has quite a bit of a grade change. S. Diamond asked what the maximum grade would of the road around the building.

Scott explained that the differential between the two buildings conceptually graded that with the four-foot reveal for the loading bay right: now no more than 4 ½ %.

J. Brann asked if the office retail building was one store.

Josh asked if J. Brann was asking one business, one store; it would be one store.

Scott asked if he could give a quick example of the footprint and wanted to get the Board's opinion.

R. Allard expressed that he felt the drawing doesn't have sidewalks.

Josh explained that they like the timber frame entrance way and want it to look good. They would like the awning to go further across the building.

J. Brann explained that they covered building rendering. The Fire Chief raised the issue of cisterns.

Scott explained that he was going to set up a meeting with the Fire Chief by roadway. The one by the entrance way is just over thousand feet.

J. Brann asked if they were going to sprinkle the building.

Josh wasn't hoping not to.

J. Brann explained that they can't stack anything higher than 12' or they would need to sprinkle.

John Huckins explained that the way the code reads the ceiling can't be more than 12' because technically at that point you can stack over 12'.

Josh explained that it would depend on the type building according to Chief Walker.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to close the Design Review.

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)

J. Brann-Yay

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 November 16, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. at the ECLC at 77 Ramsdell Lane.

Without objection the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

A motion was made by R. Allard and seconded by J. Brann to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Roll Call:

D. Massucci-Yay

A. Melnikas-Yay

R. Allard-Yay

S. Diamond-Yay (Remotely)

J. Brann-Yay