



**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: 797901773# OR link
www.barrington.nh.gov/pbmeeting**

**(Approved February 15, 2022)
Tuesday, February 1, 2022
6:30 p.m.**

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

ROLL CALL

Members Present

James Jennison, Chair
Jeff Brann, Vice Chair-Remotely
Steve Diamond-Remotely
Ron Allard
Buddy Hackett
Andrew Melnikas

Alternate Member

Donna Massucci

Members Absent

Andy Knapp ex- officio

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

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Approval of January 18, 2022, meeting minutes.

A motion was made by J. Brann (remotely) and seconded by R. Allard to approve the meeting minutes of January 18, 2022, with a minor change to lines 465 and 466. The motion carried unanimously.

Roll Call:

A. Melnikas-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
Buddy Hackett-Yay
J. Jennison-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay (remotely)
J. Brann-Yay (remotely)

2. Jon Kenyon owner of the property at 317 Franklin Pierce Highway would like to have a discussion with the Board to add a 60 x 120 building on the property for his business. [\(Map 237, Lot 5\)](#)

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the discussion.

Jon Kenyon explained that he owns the property at 317 Franklin Pierce Highway would like to construct a building; he runs a roofing business. Jon explained that they are proposing a 60' X 120' building depending on the cost. John asked the Board what it means to be in the Village District?

J. Jennison explained that the districts are in different categories and Village District was the district in that area with uses allowed in that district.

John Huckins explained that the property at 317 Franklin Pierce Highway would fall under mixed use and if they go to the Village District under 3.3.4 (1) (c) legally existing residential uses may be combined as part of a mixed-use development. John explained that because there was already a resident there, he's able to have a business without having a business on the second floor.

R. Allard expressed that his concern was that maximum lot coverage was 40% and includes the structures impervious surface. R. Allard explained that he thinks he's (Kenyon) going to get at the least close to that if not above.

J. Brann explained that they need to consider the driveway as well as the building.

R. Allard explained that what he meant, and all structures are included.

Jon Kenyon explained that he would run the numbers so that he doesn't go over 40%. That includes the structure and the drive paved surface.

S. Diamond expressed even if not paved.

John Huckins explained that gravel was considered impervious. There was not much difference between pavement and gravel because water runs off even on a gravel driveway.

Jon Kenyon asked if the Board could confirm the setbacks in the zone from the frontline.

John Huckins explained that they are 30' from the sides and back. John explained that until March if there are any wetlands its 50' because the petition article, if passed, would change things. John explained that if there were any wetlands on surrounding lots that are close to your property, the buffer could extend to his property.

S. Diamond explained that the GIS map shows wetlands close by but not on this lot.

J. Jennison explained that because of the citizen's petition this was effect until March voting; then the Board would know if it passed or not.

J. Brann explained that this was on a state road so there must be a NHDOT driveway permit and asked if they knew what the permit said; was it for a residence. J. Brann asked if they would need to reapply.

John Huckins explained that they would need to reapply because this has come up before on an expansion.

J. Brann asked how many vehicles would be there.

Jon Kenyon stated three to four vehicles and maybe a few trailers.

J. Brann explained that the traffic impact would need to be addressed and would probably need to be done for NHDOT.

John Huckins explained that there would need to be a location shown on the plan where they would park. John explained that it would be like a contractor's storage yard, if you have any commercial equipment there.

J. Brann asked if there were going to be employees that would be coming to work and then driving the vehicles out. J. Brann asked what the parking situation was going to be for employee parking.

Jon Kenyon asked if there was the number of spaces by the size of the building?

J. Brann explained that there are requirements in the regulations.

John Huckins explained that it was based on the use and explained that he could work with him with the regulations.

J. Jennison asked if this was a home business.

John Huckins explained that this was a mixed use because this business outside the realm of a home business given of the size of the building. John explained that was why he showed the mixed use as allowed by the Town Regulations.

J. Jennison asked if he should be a home business.

John Huckins explained that he was not allowed to have a building this size.

J. Brann asked if there would be storage of any materials outside the building.

Jon Kenyon stated that there would be minimal outside storage and explained that was the reason for the building; most everything would be inside.

J. Brann explained that if there would be material outside, that would need to be reflected on the plan.

J. Jennison explained that the Board would need a plan showing location of the building and parking spaces for employees, proposed spots for trucks being parked, and dumpster location. J. Jennison explained that if not sprinklered, you can't stack anything over a certain height in the building.

John Huckins explained that it doesn't apply to buildings that are not for storage.

J. Brann expressed that they are going to have vehicles there full of fuel and storing roofing materials, which are not highly flammable but if they ignited that could cause a problem so they should consult with the Fire Chief.

J. Jennison explained that the Fire Chief may ask how to get around the building with that size triggering any requirements to get around the building.

J. Brann asked about the driveway and if they were going to use the cut for the current u-shaped driveway and come over to the building.

Jon Kenyon stated that was correct.

J. Brann explained that the driveway needs to meet the standards for a non-residential use, which is a 20' wide driveway.

Jon Kenyon agreed.

J. Brann asked what fuels and cleaning solutions or any other liquid materials that you know might be in the building.

Jon Kenyon explained it would be what was in the vehicles with office space so the business could be ran.

J. Brann asked if there would be underground utilities to the building.

Jon Kenyon explained that it would depend where the building sets on the lot but stated probably but if it's closer to the road probably not.

J. Jennison asked where the septic was.

Jon Kenyon explained that the septic was behind the home toward Major Waldron's.

J. Brann expressed that he thought in the proposal that they would be putting a small septic in.

Jon Kenyon expressed that would be ideal and explained that it was too far from the current system to try to tie into it.

S. Diamond asked about utilities and asked if it was going to have electricity.

Jon Kenyon stated correct.

J. Brann explained an office area and a bathroom. J. Brann asked if any lighting was proposed for the driveway or on the building exterior.

Jon Kenyon explained that the only lighting would be what was required.

J. Brann explained that if they look at 3.8 of the Site Review Regulations to see what should be required to be in your plans. J. Brann explained that if the outside of the building was going to be illuminated, the plans would be required to show a profile of elevation of the building with what lighting you would have. J. Brann also explained they needed to address drainage from the impervious surfaces and need to show where the water from the building and drive are going to go.

S. Diamond explained about snow load and how much load there might be, so consider making a little more pitched roof.

Jon Kenyon explained to the Board that the lot looks flat but was not and slopes away from the road toward the back. Jon asked if there was any restriction to having the non-buildable setback area be parking area. Jon asked if it could be within the 30' buffer from the property line.

J. Jennison explained that would factor into the impervious soil.

S. Diamond explained that in some circumstances requirements for shade trees depending on how much area would be parking lot. S. Diamond explained that clearing along the road would not be particularly desirable as far as buffering goes.

Jon Kenyon explained that he would like to leave a visual buffer between the road and the lot. Jon explained that the clearing would be to the back of the lot to the property line and grade with gravel. Jon explained that he felt that it would fit the lot better.

R. Allard explained he was concerned about the forty percent coverage of the lot especially the size of the building with an existing house and driveways.

Jon Kenyon explained that he would do the math.

John Huckins explained that there was a 50' green belt buffer in the Village District. If you go to the regulations under 4.2.2 (8) there's a 50' greenbelt buffer required on Route 125 and Route 9.

B. Hackett asked if his original question was about the sides and the back for 30'.

Jon Kenyon explained that was correct and he had two separate questions.

John Huckins explained that there's no setback requirements for the driveways on the sides.

J. Brann explained that if they go to structures definition there are a list of exempt items.

Jon Kenyon asked if there are special permits for solar.

John Huckins explained that it needs just a building permit.

Jon Kenyon asked if he had extra space in his building would he be able to rent the space out to another builder.

John Huckins explained that in the past you would supply a list of possible uses and if the Board approves those uses, then you would see code enforcement then they would be allowed to go in. If not on the list, you would need to come back before the Planning Board.

Jon asked what the size restriction was for building on a slab.

John Huckins explained that you couldn't exceed 600' without frost protection and you could go larger as long as it's frost protected.

J. Brann explained that if they install solar collection system if you use a ground mount system there's a height limit; if it doesn't track its 15', if it does its 20'. J. Brann explained that if mounted on the roof it's exempt from the building height limitations. J. Brann explained that Zoning Ordinance Article 21 would give you all the requirements. J. Brann explained that with the location and the proposed building being on a State Road, make sure no glare was coming off it.

Jon Kenyon explained that the panels would be facing Route 9 (Franklin Pierce Highway). Jon asked if there were restrictions for signage as far as size of the sign and how far back off the road it needed to be.

J. Brann explained that there are requirements in Article 20 of the Zoning Ordinance for signs, which shows how they are lit, what the maximum area is, and where they can be located but not in public right of way.

John Huckins explained that there's a maximum of 48 s.f., height 10' and has to be 10' back from the edge of the property line for a free-standing sign.

J. Brann explained that flashing signs are not allow and there are lighting requirements.

At this point Jon Kenyon stated he had obtained all the information from the Board he was seeking and the Preliminary Conceptual Review was closed.

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED FROM January 4, 2022

3. [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. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Scott Frankiewicz from NH Land Consultants and Dewayne Watson from Unified Builders representing 2A Tactical LLC. Scott explained that they received the update from CMA Engineers last week and they have gone through it. Scott explained that most of the review comments were minor, and they had questions on lighting and landscaping. Scott explained that CMA Engineers said that it should have been designed as a low activity site and they designed as a high activity site due to the nature of the business. Scott asked the Board if they need to change the lighting or stick with what they have.

Scott explained the high was 3.6 which was the highest just around the building and a couple that are in the box straight down.

John Huckins stated that Jodie from CMA Engineers was online for any questions.

J. Brann expressed that the Board previously discussed this, and we were satisfied on the way it was designed and classified.

R. Allard explained that the lighting planning correcting the pictures were right.

Scott explained that they were going to add two lights on the overhead doors and then the canopy lights to the legend. Scott explained to the Board the landscaping question. One of the interpretations of the landscaping was that a shade tree every 20' around the parking lot. Scott explained that would mean that they would need to put more around the parking lot and didn't know if that was the intent. Scott explained that on their landscaping plan they show five or six.

S. Diamond expressed that he was not aware of what CMA Engineers cited in the Site Plan review and it looks like a requirement for shade trees for climate control.

Jodie from CMA Engineers referenced the Article 4.9.7 (5).

J. Brann explained that it does say one tree for 20' a parking lot perimeter but it says that portions where screening was required only needed one shade tree every 50'. J. Brann asked if it was applicable to the front of the parking lot that was bordering the vegetative buffer.

John Huckins asked if they had a bunch of trees along the front.

Scott stated they did for a different part of the regulation and then there's a section about the perimeter trees around the parking lot.

J. Brann expressed that he thought from the rear and north of the parking lot there was existing vegetation that was remaining.

Scott stated that was correct.

J. Brann asked if the planting would be to the south side.

Scott explained that was where the building was and that it would be down where the detention pond was and the north side.

John Huckins explained that the ground drops way off after that anyway so those trees wouldn't even be seemed from the road.

Scott asked the Board if they could keep the plan that they submitted with just a few trees around some bushes with the guard rail.

J. Brann explained that they could ask for a waiver for the Board to consider.

Scott explained that they do have a waiver request for the internal shade trees and was another one CMA Engineers pointed out in Section 4.9.4 Parking Space and Aisle Requirements. Scott explained that they have 11 internal spaces and if they follow the regulations, it's one tree but the islands are not raised, they are painted.

S. Diamond explained that part of the intent of those raised curbs was to direct pedestrian routes within the parking area. S. Diamond asked if it was clear on the plan where people would be walking?

Scott explained that they never presented curbed islands in the parking lot from the beginning, and it has always been painted islands for the reason of drainage. Scott explained that there's a sidewalk on the whole front of the building and two-thirds of the north side of the building.

Requested Waivers:

Article 4-Design and Construction Standards Sections 4.9.7 (4) (5) for internal shade trees and perimeter shade trees

A motion was made by J. Jennison and seconded by J. Brann to grant the waiver of 4.9.7 (4) (5) as granting the waiver given specific circumstances relative to the subdivision, or conditions of the land in such subdivision, indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations. The motion carried unanimously.

Roll Call:

A. Melnikas-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
Buddy Hackett-Yay
J. Jennison-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay (remotely)
J. Brann-Yay (remotely)

Scott explained to the Board that all they have left was minor comments from CMA Engineers and the NHDOT permit. Scott explained that NHDOT has all the data and traffic reports.

J. Brann asked if CMA Engineers have all the documents.

Scott stated that they have all the documents.

S. Diamond mentioned having a disabled parking sign and snow storage on the plan.

J. Brann asked Jodie (CMA Engineers) about the comments on the drainage system elevations, and it seemed like it was more an issue of level of detail on the plan.

Jodie explained that was correct there are a lot of them, but they are minor plan comments and the drainage design was great.

A motion was made by J. Jennison and seconded by B. Hackett to continue the application to February 15, 2022 for 2A Tactical. The motion carried unanimously.

Roll Call:

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

Buddy Hackett-Yay
J. Jennison-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay (remotely)
J. Brann-Yay (remotely)

4. **216-1-GR-22-Design (Owner: Shane Carter-Noble Homes)** Request by applicant for a Design Review for a proposal for a 3-lot subdivision on Parker Mountain Road (Route 126) in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. BY: Scott Frankiewicz; New Hampshire Land Consultants, PLLC, 683C First NH Turnpike, Northwood, NH 03261.

J. Jennison gave a brief description of the application.

Scott Frankiewicz from NH Land Consultants represented Shane Carter-Noble Homes. Scott explained that they were before the Zoning Board for a Special Exception for the driveway configuration. Scott explained that it was a 10.66-acre lot just before Boulder Drive. Scott explained that the frontage on Route 126 (Parker Mountain Road) was 885' and there would be plenty of space for curb cuts. Scott explained that NHDOT has been out to the site and there has been logging done. The driveway would be located closer to the intersection of Route 202 from where it was right now. Scott explained that they do have the site distance going both ways and they would be submitting a NHDOT permit soon. Scott explained that they are proposing a 3-lot subdivision and explained what the 3 lots would be. The proposal was for a 16' wide common driveway with two-foot shoulders with a turnaround at Lot 1.01. Scott explained that they are proposing a 30' right of way across the first two lots and there would be a road association. There would be driveway swales down to Route 126 (Parker Mountain Road). Scott showed the location of a catch basin along Route 126 (Parker Mountain Road) and explained how it runs to a culvert and then to the Isinglass. Scott explained that the driveway location was about 15' from the river; this was the furthest they could go without impacting the 50' buffer to the wetland. Scott explained that he did receive the comments from staff and the Conservation Commission saying they support the design. The reason for the design was because of the steep slope and the Town allows up to three lots on a driveway.

J. Brann asked about how they said the swale was going to drain. J. Brann asked what the structure was underneath the driveway that appears to be a drain or what that a drain that goes into the swale.

Scott explained that was for any water coming along the roadside swale and this area was flat in that area. Scott explained that the drainage wasn't fully designed; this was a preliminary.

J. Brann asked if there was a drain line underneath that driveway.

Scott explained that there was under the proposed driveway and have one right up the road right where it would come off at a negative slope.

J. Brann asked if there was another one 50' up the driveway.

Scott explained that there was another one and has a swale on each side.

J. Brann asked if it was going to be a treatment swale going directly into the Isinglass, which means the -water needs to be properly treated before it gets there.

Scott explained that they would need to have a shoreland permit and they would need to treat it before it gets to the catch basin.

J. Brann asked about the comment from the Road Agent about meeting the maximum grade in the town regulations and would need to show a profile of that driveway. This would need to be addressed in the plans.

Scott explained that he would have a full plan set with profiles and standard profile sheet with grading and everything.

J. Brann asked about underground utilities.

Scott stated yes.

J. Brann asked if there was going to be any lights along the driveway.

Scott stated that there was none proposed.

John Huckins explained that when working on the shared driveway it might be a good regulation to look at at 16' with the two-foot shoulders like they're proposing.

Scott explained that was what the road agent suggested.

J. Brann asked if it had a maximum of 18' in the regulations.

John Huckins explained that it has a maximum of 18' at the curb and a minimum of 10 by the Town regulations. John explained that the 16' with the two-foot shoulders was close to the maximum that you could do and with the little swale at the end it might slightly exceed that 18' in the regulations. John explained that they can allow if they are going to do a 16' 3-way shared drive going up there, it would make more sense to waive that radius at the road than to narrow the driveway.

J. Brann agreed with that and liked the emergency vehicle turnaround feature of this driveway plan.

S. Diamond asked what the Special Exception for the driveway was.

John Huckins explained that it was for the maximum width of 18' by the regulations for a residential driveway. John explained that if you have a 16' foot with 2' shoulders when you hit the radius at the road you may exceed that 18'.

Scott stated that they would meet the regulations. The special exception was to allow a driveway to access a lot from the side not the frontage.

John Huckins explained that normally on the plan where you have the total lot area show whether you have the 35,000 s.f. of continuous uplands or say how many contiguous uplands they have. John explained that then it was 60,000 that free of exposed ledge hybrid soils. John expressed that the way the right of ways work for the driveway that goes through the first two lots are technically a right of way. John explained that it should a 40' setback should follow along that driveway on those first two lots.

Scott asked if they need to be 40' from the proposed right of away.

John Huckins explained that if they read the definition of the regulations it talks about right of ways as being the front setback.

Conner explained that there was a list of road names so that they could have one on the final plan.

J. Jennison opened public comment.

Clay Derryberry from 35 Boulder Drive explained that there was a lynx seen exactly where this construction would go and in reviewing the documents, he didn't see any sort of wildlife mitigation plan or an environmental impact study. Clay asked if they would address the lynx and the loss of wildlife habitat especially with it being an endangered species in the State of New Hampshire. Clay asked if there was anything they were going to do to address this.

J. Jennison asked John Huckins what the requirements were.

John Huckins explained that in Zoning page 29, 7.6 environmental impact assessment, it says in projects involving 20 or more lots or at the determination of the Planning Board if a significant impact on critical areas of natural resources.

S. Diamond explained that they would need to make that case about the specifics of what the wildlife impacts your worried about would be. S. Diamond explained that they would need to document the best that they can what the situation is now and what you think the impact would be.

Clay explained that if they look at this topographically, there's a bit of a u shape because you have the Isinglass River when water was high it's a nature barrier to any sort of migration corridor or travel corridor for wildlife. Clay explained that a predator species like a lynx hunts. Then there was Nippo Lake Golf Course which was not exactly wildlife habitat and Nippo Lake Road right there. Clay explained that between the condo project and this project it effectively disrupts that travel or migration corridor that any sort of predator species like the lynx uses.

John Huckins explained to the Board that if they felt this was a critical issue, they could ask for it.

Scott explained that there are a lot of boulders out there in which to travel, this was one being cut right now, and didn't know of any other project in this area. Scott explained that what has been cut was all that would be cut.

J. Jennison closed public comment.

Scott explained that the Isinglass River committee would also be reviewing this because they're within 1500' of the Isinglass River.

A motion was made by J. Brann and seconded by R. Allard to closed Design Review. The motion carried unanimously.
Roll Call:

A. Melnikas-Yay
D. Massucci-Yay
R. Allard-Yay
Buddy Hackett-Yay
J. Jennison-Yay
S. Diamond-Yay (remotely)
J. Brann-Yay (remotely)

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

5. Review of a request for a building permit on Jillette Road, a Private/Class 6 Road, for MaryJane & Martin Coronis ([Map 126, Lot 12.1](#)).
6. Review of a request for a building permit at 68 Rocky Point Road, a Private/Class 6 Road, for Dave & Joyce Torrey ([Map 118, Lot 21](#)).
7. Review of a request for a building permit at 15 Eagle Drive, A Private/Class6 Road, for Edward Friedman ([Map 110, Lot 6](#)).

Conner MacIver explained to the Board that the Select Board discussion/decision may or may not impact these applicants. Conner explained that the Select Board conceptually liked having an option with a 10% investment of construction cost as an option of an alternative upgrading the full section of road. Conner explained that he has created a draft policy update that the Select Board would review in February. They have asked them what to do with some of the private and Class 6 applications that are pending. The Select Board asked them to talk to the applicants and ask them if they currently intend to meet the policy. They would schedule public hearings for these applications who are no earlier than the 28th pending the result of the policy so that those applicants can be asked at that point are they willing to meet policies either the 16' or make a 10% investment. Conner explained that John Huckins has spoke to all three of the applicants and they have all asked to wait.

R. Allard explained that he had a problem with on-e of the private road applicant. R. Allard explained that they are staying in the same footprint. This was for the Rocky Point Road applicant.

A motion was made by J. Jennison and by J. Brann to move the private road discussions to the February 15, 2022, meeting.

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

The next meeting will be on February 15, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. at ECLC 77 Ramsdell Lane.

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.