

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

Call to Order

Members Present: Eduard Viel, Chair; Ian MacKinnon, Vice Chair; Susan Mooney, Secretary; Charlene Andersen, SRPC Rep; Sherry Sandler, Member; Robert “Buzz” Davies, Alternate; Sandra Jones, Alternate.

Members Absent: Ben Bartlett, BOS Ex-Officio Member; Gary Anderson, SRPC Rep.

Alternate Seated and Voting: Robert “Buzz”: Davies was seated for Gary Anderson.

Others: Kevin Lemieux, Land Use Clerk; Blair Haney, SRPC Planner; David Beati, BSC Group; Magdalene Locke, Abutter; Son of Ms. Locke (no name given); Robert Stewart, RCS Designs; Emily Stewart, RCS Designs; Matt Bergeron, Applicant; Izabella Linsky, Applicant; Greg Stratis, Shea Concrete Products; Doug MacGuire, Dubay Group; Bobby Marcotte, Kung Food LLC

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 PM.

Roll call

Roll call was completed.

Public Hearings

Case# 22-005-LLA: Application from Matt and Paul Bergeron requesting a lot line adjustment (LLA) of three (3) adjacent lots. The properties are located at 8 and 9 Cahill Lane, in Nottingham, NH, and are identified as Tax Map 68, Lots 49, 49-1 and 49-2.

Matt Bergeron, the applicant, came forward and introduced himself. He stated that his father owns Lot 49, and he owns Lots 49-1 and 49-2. The property was subdivided around 2010-2012. He is looking to adjust the lot lines in response to the Town Road Warrant Article recently passed (2021). The adjustment would give each lot a minimum of two (2) acres and some road frontage.

Mr. Haney said that the application is complete.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to accept the application for Case# 22-005-LLA as complete. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mooney. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. MacKinnon made a motion that Case# 22-007-LLA is not a Development of Regional Impact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andersen. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

Mr. Bergeron continued that part of the Warrant Articles that terminated Cahill Lane at Map 68, Lot 49 was an easement agreement for town trucks to turn around. He had met with Shawn McClean, Director of Public Works, to determine the dimensions needed for the turnaround.

Mr. Haney outlined his Staff Review. He explained that the lot line adjustments were quite detailed and that he needed to reach out to Peter Landry, the surveyor, to confirm that he, Mr. Haney, had the correct understanding of what was being presented. Mr. Haney further elaborated on his review as follows:

- There were two (2) Warrant Articles from 2021 and 2022 that impact the properties.
- Two (2) of the lots had zero (0) feet of frontage and gained ten (10) feet of frontage.
- There is a need for the town truck turnaround at the end of Cahill Lane.
- It is a complex Lot Line Adjustment
- There are two (2) waiver requests
- There is a proposed easement that would be granted to the town which would require proper documentation.

Mr. Viel responded that the Board does not handle easements. The Select Board would be the body that would deal with the easement details. This item can be added as a Condition of Approval.

Mr. Bergeron explained that the Warrant Articles outline that the termination of Cahill Lane is the northwestern boundary of Map 68, Lot 51.

Mr. MacKinnon asked which current lots do not have frontage. Mr. Bergeron replied that Lot 49 and Lot 49-1 do not currently have frontage. The original lay-out of the lots never planned that Cahill Lane would be designated as a public way.

Mr. Bergeron said no lake frontage will be changed and only areas that would be changed are those around the frontage on Cahill Lane. He pointed out details of the proposal to the Board on the site map. He stated that in his conversation with the Road Agent, the plan was to allow for minimal disturbance to the land.

Mr. Viel asked if the travel easement that currently exists would be discontinued. Mr. Bergeron responded that it would. He obtained a shoreland permit before the Warrant Article that directed the travel easement area to be reclaimed with vegetation.

Mr. Viel opened the hearing for Public Comment. There was no public comment.

Mr. Viel asked if Mr. Bergeron had been before the Select Board regarding the easement. Mr. Bergeron replied that he had not as he believed it best to have Planning Board and Road Agent feedback before doing so. He said he is open to whatever language that the Select Board wishes to be added to the deed.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to approve the waiver request from the Subdivision Regulations, Section 11.8, requiring granite monuments. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andersen. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

The Board discussed if an approval condition needed to be added regarding the easement language that was approved by the Select Board. Mr. MacKinnon recommended that the applicant write the easement language. The Select Board would likely send the language off to town counsel for review.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to approve Case #22-005-LLA with the standard set of conditions and the following additional conditions:

- The location of the rebar markers be included on the final plans.***
- The easement language on the plans must be approved by the Select Board within twelve (12) months.***

The motion was seconded by Ms. Sandler. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Case# 22-006-SUB: Application from Izabella and Elizabeth Linsky requesting a two (2) lot subdivision. The property is located at 64 Priest Road, in Nottingham, NH, and is identified as Tax Map 20, Lot 2-1. Priest Road is designated as a Scenic Road.

Robert Stewart of RCS Designs introduced himself as the septic designer and wetland scientist for the proposed subdivision. He is representing the applicant. He gave an overview of the project that highlights the following:

- The property is currently a 5.59-acre lot.***
- The proposal is for a two-lot subdivision. One lot will be 3.51 acres and the second will be 2.08 acres.***

Mr. Haney noted in his brief staff review that the plan date is from 2018. There were also two waiver requests, one is for test pits. He added that the perc tests were outside of the 4,000 SqFt area town requirement on the plan.

Ms. Mooney made the motion to accept the application for Case# 22-006-SUB as complete. The motion was seconded by Mr. MacKinnon. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Ms. Andersen made the motion that Case# 22-006-SUB is not a Development of Regional Impact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mooney. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Stewart showed on a site map where a proposed easement would be for access to an existing barn. He also said that he made the test pit and perc test error as they were not in line with the town regulations. He agreed to fix the errors. He added that the plan meets state subdivision approval.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

Mr. Viel inquired about the road frontage on proposed #26, parcel A. Mr. Stewart replied that it was 220 plus feet including the distance of the easement. The easement represents 30 feet and is the only driveway entry for the lot and house.

Mr. Viel said that the town regulations state that the well radius must be entirely contained on the lot. The existing conditions of the well don't necessarily meet the requirements from Priest Road; however, the location of the proposed lot line can be made to meet such requirements.

Mr. Viel added that a shared driveway would probably be a better access solution than the proposed easement. Mr. Stewart responded that he is not opposed to such a change, but the lots are more marketable with their own driveways.

Ms. Mooney suggested keeping the current drive with the current lot and then applying for a variance from the Zoning Board for less than 200 feet of frontage. Mr. Stewart replied that the plan is written to avoid going before the Zoning Board. Mr. MacKinnon added that the current plan does not meet the town regulations for a common driveway as it does not straddle the common boundary. Mr. Stewart offered to reconfigure the plan to make the easement a common driveway per town regulations.

Mr. Viel asked if proposed parcel B showed a 30,000 SqFt contiguous buildable area. Mr. Stewart said that it was not indicated on the plan, however, there is plenty of area. When the State Subdivision Plan was submitted, the total buildable area was 93,600 SqFt. Mr. Viel asked that it be added to the plan.

Mr. Viel mentioned that the shared driveway access does not create an issue with frontage. He added that the well radius piece could be acceptable by a waiver.

Mr. MacKinnon referenced that the pins to be set must be granite unless a waiver is requested to use iron. He added that every 300 feet, a monument must be set. Mr. Viel stated that the regulations state granite markers be placed at the corner and angles of the property, thus an every 300-foot placed iron pin on a straight-line boundary was acceptable.

Mr. Viel opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment.

Mr. Viel said that given the needed additions and changes, a continuance of the hearing would have to take place. He asked Mr. Stewart if the changes to the plan can be delivered to the Board a week ahead of time before the next meeting on June 22, 2022. Mr. Stewart said that he could have them done in time for the next meeting.

The Board discussed the area of the road that is designated as Scenic. Mr. Viel said that if it is a Scenic Road, it needs to be identified on all public notices of the case.

Mr. Stewart reviewed all the changes that would be needed. The changes include:

- Identify and label the area of the shared driveway on the plans.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

- A well radius waiver will need to be submitted.
- Correctly locate granite and iron marker sites on the plan.
- Add lot calculations for Map 20, Lot 6, the parent lot.
- Include the 4,000 SqFt area for the test pits and perc tests.

Mr. MacKinnon requested that the setback lines in accordance with the town regulations be added to the plans.

Ms. Mooney made the motion to continue Case# 22-006-SUB until the June 22, 2022, meeting with deliverables due by June 15, 2022. The motion was seconded by Mr. Davies. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Case# 22-007-SIT: Application from David Beati of BSC Group representing Concrete Products of Londonderry requesting approval to build a pre-cast concrete manufacturing facility. The property is located at 160 Old Turnpike Road, in Nottingham, NH, and is identified as Tax Map 3, Lot 2-2.

Mr. Viel recused himself from the case as he is a direct abutter to the property. Mr. MacKinnon assumed the position Chair and sat Ms. Jones as a voting alternate for Mr. Viel.

Mr. Dave Beati, the Project Manager at BSC Group, and Mr. Greg Stratis, the President of Shea Concrete Products, approached to the applicant desk and introduced themselves.

Mr. Beati gave a synopsis of the proposed project. He indicated that the proposal is a need to expand the current building to a larger, 22,250 SqFt production facility due to an increase of demand for the Shea Concrete's products. The proposal includes the installation of a concrete apron around the building and to increase the height of the facility to 40 feet. Both the concrete apron installation and the 40-foot height will need a variance from the Zoning Board. The applicants are scheduled to go before the Zoning Board on June 21, 2022.

Mr. MacKinnon asked Mr. Haney, the SRPC Planner, to present his Staff Review. Mr. Haney highlighted the following:

- There will be more than 30,00 SqFt of disturbance to the property which requires a Stormwater Management Plan per town Site Plan Regulations.
- Plan Sheets 200 and 201 are labeled "Existing Conditions Plan"; however, they are clearly Construction Details.
- He indicated that there is confusion regarding parking between the Zoning Ordinances, which calls for "adequate parking" and Site Plan Regulations have minimums for manufacturing and office parking. The Site Plan Review Regulations also state that there is no parking in the setback areas.
- There is no surveyor stamp on the plans. He said a licensed surveyor's name needs to be on the plans.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

Mr. Beati responded to Mr. Haney's review. He said that he does have a 284-page Stormwater Report ready to submit. He added that there is a surveyor stamp on the Zoning Board Plans submitted. He said that parking in the setbacks can be moved.

Mr. MacKinnon said that many missing items can be added as the review moves forward.

Ms. Mooney said that given the location near the Little River Watershed, she would like for the Stormwater Report to be properly reviewed. Mr. MacKinnon added that the Stormwater Report is typically reviewed by CMA Engineers, the town review engineer. Mr. Beati provided an abbreviated 16-page overview to Mr. MacKinnon of the Stormwater Report.

Mr. Beati summarized the Stormwater Report as a reduction of run-off within the 5-, 10-, 25- and 50-year event periods.

Ms. Mooney made the motion to accept Case# 22-007-SIT as complete. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jones. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Ms. Anderson made the motion that Case#22-007-SIT is a Development of Regional Impact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mooney.

Mr. MacKinnon asked if there is any discussion on the Regional Impact motion. Ms. Andersen replied that her motion is regarding the expansive wetland impacted that eventually drains into the Lamprey River. She is also concerned with the increase of traffic in and out of the property due to the larger building.

Mr. Beati replied to the traffic concern by saying that currently there are 2-4 truckloads of materials delivered to the site daily. The anticipated increase is 8-10 truckloads daily. He added that the impact to retail is minimal, 2-3 customers weekly, as retail customers are not the company's core clientele.

Mr. MacKinnon believes that the traffic flow jurisdiction falls to the NHDOT. He did agree with the concern regarding the watershed.

Mr. MacKinnon asked Ms. Mooney if she would like to focus on the watershed aspect of the Regional Impact for the motion. Ms. Mooney replied that she did. She added that the Little River is the closest river that could be impacted.

The Board voted on the motion for Case# 22-007-SIT as a Development of Regional Impact. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. MacKinnon added that Mr. Lemieux will reach out to the neighboring communities through the proper channels to make them aware of the proposed project and the Regional Impact vote.

Mr. Beati expanded on his previous overview of the project with the following points:

- There will be minor alterations to the end of the existing driveway.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

- He outlined the location of the fire cisterns per the Fire Chief's request.
- A large portion of the property is a gravel lot.
- The wetlands have been located and delineated with no plan to encroach on the wetland buffers.

Mr. Haney apologetically interrupted Mr. Beati by asking the Board if the hearing needed to be put on hold due to the vote on Regional Impact until all the abutters, which would include the neighboring towns, have been notified.

Mr. Beati asked if the project met the NHDES standards, reduced the water run-off and met all water quality criteria, do they need to wait until the Regional Impact Review has been completed. He argued that the project will make the conditions better than they currently are.

Mr. Haney replied that the project is cutting into large swaths of forested areas. He added that the Board has yet to receive the Stormwater Report from the applicant. He said that this case needs to go through the correct process.

Ms. Andersen and Mr. Haney reviewed the State Regulations; however, the Regional Impact process was a bit unclear. Mr. Haney said that the minutes must be issued to the impacted towns within five days. He added that the meeting must be continued. He said that the applicant could continue with the current presentation but the Public Hearing cannot be opened. He added that the Regional Impact vote essentially grants the surrounding towns abutter status, thus notification to the abutters and towns will be needed.

Mr. Beati asked again if there is a need to move in the Regional Impact direction as the Stormwater Report analysis shows an improvement to current conditions regarding wetland impacts. Mr. MacKinnon explained the need for the Regional Impact process. He agreed to continue hearing the applicants, but not open the Public Hearing.

Mr. Haney returned to his Staff Review and mentioned that he wondered if an increase of traffic would require the applicant to revise the existing state permit with the NHDOT for Route 4 access. Mr. Beati agreed to look into it.

Mr. Haney continued by requesting exterior lighting locations and details on the plans.

Mr. Haney then referred to the feedback from the Nottingham Fire Chief. He said that the Chief's comments regarding the cistern will need to be worked out and may be a condition of approval.

Mr. Beati talked about the screening and buffering plans. He also indicated that the location of snow storage will be finalized after discussing cistern location with the Fire Chief. Ms. Andersen identified a location highlighted on the submitted plans for snow storage.

Ms. Andersen inquired about parking. She noted that on the plans, car and van parking was accounted for, yet there was no indication on location of truck parking. Mr. Stratis replied that

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

there is no designated location for trucks as there is plenty of room for trucks to park. He added that designated truck parking can be included if needed.

Ms. Andersen noted that the wooded area up to the property line of 164 Old Turnpike Road will be cleared and a berm will be added. Mr. Beati responded that the berm is a natural formation with some downward regrading needed.

Ms. Andersen recommended a site walk to the property so the Board can get a grasp of the location, size, and scope of the building/proposal.

Mr. Stratis gave an overview of a similarly built building in Amesbury, MA. He said that he would be open to a site walk.

Mr. MacKinnon recommended including a fence as a year-round buffer from the building.

Mr. MacKinnon offered to review the Stormwater Report as he has a background in such work. Ms. Andersen believes it would be best left to an independent review of the large report by CMA Engineering.

Mr. MacKinnon had a list of items for the client which include the following:

- Planning Board signature block needs to be added to the final plans.
- Survey certification needed and boundary notes/certifications needed.
- A need for more detailed test pit information.
- Parking details refined and correct ADA spaces if needed.
- Final plans will have PE (Professional Engineer) stamps regarding site grading.

Mr. MacKinnon asked if the “current proposed new disturbance” on the plan was regarding an Alteration of Terrain permit. Mr. Beati replied that they will likely need one.

Mr. MacKinnon requested more detail regarding the level spreader located on the plans as it is in close proximity to the wetland area.

Mr. MacKinnon said that a benchmark needs to be shown on the plans. He added that details of all things added to the plan should be outlined to help the Building Inspector.

Mr. Beati asked if the AOT and the Regional Impact reviews are successful, including all other items mentioned, would the Board approve this application at the next meeting.

Mr. MacKinnon replied that he could not answer that question definitively.

Ms. Andersen made a motion for peer review by the town’s contracted engineer for the Stormwater Report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mooney. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

The Board and applicant talked about times and dates for both the site walk and the continuation of the hearing.

Ms. Mooney made the motion to conduct a site walk for Case# 22-007-SIT on June 29, 2022, at 5:30PM on site. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andersen. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Ms. Mooney made the motion to continue Case#22-007-SIT until July 13, 2022, at 7:00PM. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andersen. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Case# 22-008-SIT: Application from Kung Food, LLC requesting approval for a wedding venue business and restoration of an existing structure. The property is located at 2 Merry Hill Road, in Nottingham, NH, and is identified as Tax Map 4, Lot 2-1.

Mr. Viel returned as the Board Chair while Ms. Jones returned to a non-voting alternate.

Doug MacGuire, an Engineer from the Dubai Group, introduced himself as a representative for the applicant, Bobby Marcotte. Mr. MacGuire highlighted the project proposals as follows:

- The proposal is for a venue for events such as weddings.
- The main residence building has been taken down.
- Existing barn and residence extension building on site.
- Plan is to restore barn and renovate the extension.

Mr. Haney said that he did not have any items that would prevent the Board as voting the application as complete.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to accept the application for Case# 22-008-SIT as complete. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mooney. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Ms. Mooney made the motion that Case# 22-008-SIT is not a Development of Regional Impact. The motion was seconded by Mr. MacKinnon.

Ms. Andersen stated that she was not sure if this was not a case of regional impact. She stated the increased traffic and noise may be of concern to the surrounding town of Barrington. Mr. Viel requested that the town of Barrington be notified of the proposal and hearing.
The motion was approved by a vote of 5-1. Ms. Andersen voted not to approve.

Mr. MacGuire started his presentation. His outline included the following points.

- The property currently has nice vegetative growth, and the applicant plans to add to the beauty.
- The plantings will include evergreens to provide year-round buffering.
- Existing bricks and masonry will be used on the hardscape.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

- The parking access will use the existing access on Merry Hill Road.
- There is a secondary access on Merry Hill Road.
- Two (2) of the three (3) existing curb cuts are planned to be removed.
- The proposed access is at the existing access on Merry Hill Road.
- One (1) waiver is to use a gravel parking surface instead of asphalt. They are willing to incorporate the suggestion by Mr. Haney to add a transition apron at the parking area and Merry Hill Road.
- The parking area is being expanded from current size. The parking area will be buffered with plantings.
- The site is on well water and private septic.
- There is an existing nitrate loading easement.
- The parking lot has an intercept swale.
- The plan is to maintain the current sheet flow of water. The gravel parking area will absorb much of the water run-off.
- Due to the gravel proposal, the applicant is hoping that no further studies will be required for run-off.
- There is an erosion control plan in place.
- A lighting plan includes pole mounted lights that are Dark Skies compliant.

Mr. Haney gave the following synopsis of his Staff Review.

- He did not have a hardline approach to either of the two (2) waiver requests and would leave it to the Board to comment.
- Any calculations for water sheet flow from the engineer would be useful.
- He approved the proposed apron at the entry.
- And reducing the number of curb cuts is a good idea.
- What if 58 parking spaces will not be enough. Is there a plan?
- He also recommended that noise management would be required.

Mr. MacGuire responded to Haney's review points.

- There is 3500 SqFt of gravel in the front area proposed. That number offsets the area of hardscape as it is roughly the same surface area.
- The rear gravel area is at least 5,000 SqFt; however, he believes it closer to 20,000 SqFt.
- He suggested keeping the drive area a two-way direction as opposed to a one way.
- The current owners have an agreement in place to buy the abutting property. This could open parking space and further expansion if needed.
- The proposal is for a 150-person maximum event capacity.
- The applicant plans to come back to the Board in the future with ideas re: the abutting property should they purchase it.
- The applicant is comfortable with a "no street parking" condition of approval.

Mr. Haney noted that the Fire Chief submitted a letter regarding the project that states "insufficient information". He said that more information will need to be forthcoming and can be a condition of approval. Mr. MacGuire replied that he understood that to be referring to the building plan and permitting aspect of the site, which has yet to be composed. Mr. Haney added

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

that he did not see a fire lane, which may be of importance to the Fire Department. Mr. MacGuire agreed to collaborate with the Fire Chief to appease a fire lane stipulation.

Ms. Sandler asked if the septic is currently built to accommodate a 150-person venue. Mr. MacGuire said that there is a proposed replacement system upgrade that would need state approval. He added that test pits have not been dug yet. He believes that the nitrate easement is recorded on the deed and he will confirm to ensure it is and will cite the deed.

Mr. Viel noted that the setback for commercial use is not clearly identified. Mr. MacGuire said that the setbacks are noted on the plan and the parking area meets town required setbacks.

Mr. MacGuire addressed Mr. Viel's concern for sound and buffering by stating that the outdoor gathering area is on the opposite side of the barn. The plan was for the outdoor gathering space to be away from the residential abutters.

Mr. Viel inquired about anticipated volume, number of events and hours of operation. Mr. MacGuire asked if the town has a noise ordinance. Mr. Viel responded that it does not; however, sound can be considered a noise pollution violation.

Mr. Viel opened the floor for public comment. An abutter at 1 Merry Hill Road, Magdalene Locke, and her son (no name given) came forward to add concerns about parking, noise, property damage, traffic, and inebriated driving. Ms. Locke pointed to the many, recent accidents at the corner of Merry Hill Road and Route 4. Her biggest concern is the noise.

Mr. Marcotte responded that it is the responsibility of the establishment to monitor closely for inebriated drivers. He has run the Tuckaway Tavern for several years without incident and wants to work with neighbors to be respectful for the sound. He further offered to address and take care of any damage done from vehicles working on the current site to Ms. Locke's property.

Mr. Viel said that more information from the Fire Department will be needed. He asked Mr. Lemieux if the Police Chief had given feedback. Mr. Lemieux replied that she had not. Mr. Viel further suggested that the applicant contact the NHDOT for any feedback regarding Route 4. He added that the town has an event permit that would coincide with details such as hours and event capacity. Select Board approval may be required as well.

Ms. Andersen inquired about the lighting for the property. Mr. MacGuire said there is low voltage, landscape lighting. Mr. Marcotte added that there is no plan to add lights to the business road sign. Mr. Viel mentioned that the town does have sign regulations.

Ms. Mooney asked if an arborist was consulted for the landscape design because spruce and hemlock are doing poorly in the area. Mr. MacGuire responded that his firm employs a licensed landscape architect.

Mr. MacKinnon said that the gravel driveway and parking area will eventually be packed down. He is concerned with the drainage flow but not enough to deny the waiver request to by-pass a

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: June 8, 2022

Official Minutes

Stormwater Review Report. He suggested adding a shallow basin or level spreader to address the run-off. Mr. MacGuire mentioned his company has utilized a stone trenched edge in past projects. He would be willing to specify a stone drip edge, which is similar to a French drain system.

The Board discussed the need for “no-parking” signs on Merry Hill Road. Ms. Jones thinks it is something that should be added. Mr. Haney added that the Select Board would likely need to make the “no-parking” a law in which the Police Department can point to as a violation.

Ms. Sandler asked if an adjacent store is planned for the site. Mr. Marcotte said not for this site but possibly for the adjacent lot.

Ms. Andersen suggested requesting that the Police Chief provide feedback on the parking and the overall site from a safety perspective.

Mr. MacKinnon inquired about the ADA parking spaces and compliance. Mr. MacGuire agreed to consider additional space for such concerns.

Mr. Viel gave an overview of items needed as the plan moves forward which include:

- Further Fire Chief consultation regarding Fire Lane needs.
- Police Chief feedback pertaining to overall plan including concerns of parking and traffic flow.
- Consultation with the Select Board and the Road Agent regarding parking on Merry Hill Road.
- Easement is to be recorded and placed on the Site Plan.
- Barrington and NHDOT will be contacted regarding the proposal.
- Clarification of hours of operation by the applicant.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to approve the Waiver Request from Site Plan Regulation Section 10.3.1.a, pertaining to the Stormwater Management Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Davies. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to approve the Waiver Request from Site Plan Regulation Section 10.5.2.d.2, for the use of gravel parking in lieu of pavement. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mooney. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to continue Case# 22-008-SIT to the July 13, 2022, meeting at 7:00PM. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mooney. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Ms. Mooney made the motion to Adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. MacKinnon. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 PM.