

Town of Farmington  
Planning Board Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, June 21, 2023  
Selectmen's Chambers  
356 Main Street-Farmington, NH 03835

**Board Members Present:**

Rick Pelkey, Chairman  
Bill Fisher, Vice Chairman  
Stephen Henry, Secretary  
Mike Day  
Rebecca Paton-Sanderson

**Board Members Absent:**

Charlie King, Selectmen's Rep, excused  
Jeremy Squires, excused

**Others Present:**

Kyle Pimental, Planning Director  
Ian MacKinnon, Jones & Beach Engineers  
Larry Gorney, Donna Gorney, abutters

**1). Call to Order:**

Chairman Pelkey called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

**2). Pledge of Allegiance:**

All present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3). Review of Minutes:**

**June 7, 2023-Public Meeting Minutes-** No errors or omissions

**Motion:** Henry, second Day) to approve the minutes as written passed 5-0.

**4).Public Comment:** None

**5).Old Business:**

**Public Hearing and Consideration of an Excavation Application for PatriciaTorr Aiken and Franklin Torr, Tax Map R32, Lot 6. The applicant is proposing to remove approximately 410,000 cubic yards of material from an approximately 31 acre site. The proposed project is located on Chestnut Hill Road and is within the Rural Residential Zoning District.**

Chairman Pelkey read the above notice aloud and said there has been a request made to continue the application to July 19 meeting to allow the applicant to address safety concerns. He asked if they would like him to list those concerns for the record.

Mr. Pimental said he didn't think so unless the board wanted to go through them. He said what he put in the memo was an internal list of questions for the applicant to respond to that would then be reviewed by the Town's third party engineer and there wasn't enough time to go into this amount of detail and do a site visit to be ready to present this to the board at this meeting

so the applicant has requested that we move this out to the July 19 meeting. He said if they have an opportunity to look through the staff memo it focuses a lot on existing safety measures, braking time from coming over the hill, the sight distance, the issue of stacking with multiple vehicles and someone coming up over the hill and if any other offsite improvements may be needed. He said those are the types of safety issues they have asked the applicant to address so they will have that information for the board at the July 19 meeting.

Mr. Henry said he was looking at the list of safety requirements and he did not remember talking about a lot of these things at any of their meetings.

Mr. Pimental said some of these were from conversations with the public and from abutters that submitted.

Mr. Pelkey said he recalled talking about people stacking up to turn and the sight line over the hill.

Mr. Henry asked if an abutter came in and mentioned 3.75 ft. vs. 3.50 ft. for the driver's eye height 7.9 ft. above the road surface and that he didn't remember a lot of this stuff coming up at any of their meetings.

Mr. Pelkey asked if that was a comment from our engineering oversight.

Mr. Pimental said it was a comment from one of the abutters that came in after this meeting along with a board member and that he had some notes he brought to the meeting. He said he had talked about the sight distance but he didn't think he was as specific as he was when he came into the office than he was when he was at the hearing.

He said when he talked about the driver's eye distance in AASHTO standards he was a little bit vague at the public hearing but provided more of a written note of exactly what he was pointing to when he came into the Planning Office.

Mr. Henry said these expectations did not come from this board.

Mr. Pelkey agreed.

Mr. Pimental said not specifically but there was a Planning Board member that was with him.

Mr. Henry said he was not comfortable with a single Planning Board member creating a whole bunch of requirements for an applicant to meet. He said these decisions need to come from this board.

Mr. Pelkey said they should be brought up in front of the board before they delay a project. He said the applicant is not here to present tonight and they have requested it.

Mr. Henry said they are not here to present because all of these requirements that were not discussed by this board have been imposed upon them.

Mr. Pelkey said these may be standards that they didn't consider that they need to consider. He said he had a copy of the AASHTO standards sent to him today and it's a fairly deep document and he would be happy to share it with him if he would like to have it.

Mr. Henry said he would like it to be on the record that he is uncomfortable with putting requirements on applicants outside of board meetings because one member brought some

stuff to staff.

Mr. Pimental said some of these things were discussed at the meeting.

Mr. Henry said he recognized some of these things but...

Mr. Pimental said the ones that were not had to do with the time gap that was not discussed at the meeting, but the braking reactions, the sight distance, the stacking of trucks and the 350 ft. of sight distance were all discussed at the meeting. He said the speed limit being mislabeled was mentioned so he would say a majority of these were discussed but they were not discussed at this level of detail. He said that did not take place with this board and they were able to fine tune exactly what the questions were but some of these were discussed in much more vague terms with the board.

Mr. Pelkey said this says to provide additional calculations and provide justifications and those are things that the board would be telling the applicant to do and that should be done as a board even if the board member wanted to come to the meeting and say I want this and while they discuss it maybe they need to continue it while they have that discussion. But to just put those on the applicant is a different story he said.

Mr. Henry said that's their job to put that on the applicant.

**Motion:** (Pelkey, second Henry) to continue this application to the 19<sup>th</sup> of July passed 5-0.

Mr. Henry said people will not receive a new notice and this is the notice.

#### **6). New Business:**

**Public Hearing and Possible Vote on Amended Site Plan for 603 Self Storage, Tax Map R64, Lot 3. The proposal is to demolish and replace the existing garage and office building, which was to remain as part of the prior approval, with a new self-storage building. The proposed new self-storage building will increase the number of new buildings from two to three, totaling 18,380 square feet of new construction (this does not include the existing storage building on the property that is set to remain). The amended plan addresses an existing setback non-conformity and reduces storm water runoff. The parcel is in the Commercial Business Zoning District and will abandon the existing on-site well and septic.**

Mr. Pelkey read the above notice aloud and asked the applicant's rep to come forward.

Mr. Henry said that this says 3 new buildings instead of 2 and asked if one of the buildings is essentially a replacement building.

Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. Project Manager Ian MacKinnon said in terms of numbering to make it easier they called building #1 the existing drive up storage building the one you see there now kind of up higher off the road. He said originally in July 2022 they got the approval and then they came back in Dec. 2022 for a compliance hearing and that application was for buildings #2 and #3 so with this proposal they are proposing a total of 3 new structures one of them will be a replacement of an existing garage and office.

Mr. MacKinnon said he was here on behalf of 603 Storage, LLC and at the time of submission

the previous owner was technically still the landowner and they actually just closed Thursday of last week. He said 603 was the applicant and they are now the owner too so they have full authority over the project and they are working on their behalf.

He said this is Tax Map R64, Lot 3 and there are no changes to the previous lot area that they showed and a total of 3 new storage buildings are now proposed instead of the 2 they came to the board with last year. He said the biggest point as noted in the notice is the amended plan tears down the existing garage and office space and the new structure in its place is fully conforming with any building setbacks whether it be wetland or from the front lot line so they are fully conforming with the building now.

Mr. MacKinnon said there are no changes to the storm water system and because they were able to add some green space they reduced their storm water flows in all storm events except for the 2 year where they're about 5% over which was approved last year but it's still 20% less than the existing so they are still in all storm events decreased from the pre-existing condition for peak rates of runoff and that was provided in an updated drainage analysis as well.

He said there was some discussion around the driveway location so they moved the northerly driveway a little further north and obtained a DOT permit which was part of the reason they came to the board in Dec. for a compliance hearing because that did drive a couple of minor changes to the drainage system so that still applies. He said they did some trip generation and they are waiting on feedback from the DOT because they wanted their confirmation but what they're proposing here is less impactful in terms of trip generation than what is there now because of the office and garage use. We don't foresee any need for an amended DOT permit but hopefully we'll get the confirmation from District #6 he said.

He said there are no additional waivers that this requires and they may recall that they got a waiver from the buffer requirements on the northwest property line with that abutter and they did some fencing there. He said this changes on the other side of the lot so there are no changes to that side of the project so they are not seeking any additional relief and the biggest thing here that was nice to see was they were able to get some green space back.

He said the gravel drops into that seasonal stream and as part of this design they are also installing curbing to make sure there is no direct run off and they can do it through a focused location and also adding some vegetation likely on the back curve and they will fill those areas in and vegetate them most likely with some lawn space.

Mr. MacKinnon said 603 does some very nice sites and they have a site over in Lee on Rt. 125 just north of the Market Basket and they produce some good products and they're excited to expand their footprint in this area. He said he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Pimental said he covered all of his comments in the staff memo but asked if the driveway that's at District #6 right now is an update to the existing driveway permit that they have.

Mr. MacKinnon said they didn't think it would require them to re-issue a permit but they e-mailed them with some info and background and they haven't heard back yet. He said they like

to have correspondence that they've seen that they've amended it but it wouldn't have any change to the design or the layout you see. It's mostly just them acknowledging from a use perspective that we're now all of one use and the trip generation is going to be "x" trips lower than if you did what the existing office and garage is he said.

Mr. Pimental said he asked because if it was going to require an amended driveway permit they would want to make that a condition of approval but it sounds like they are not going to need that.

Mr. MacKinnon said they don't anticipate it but from a condition perspective if it makes the board comfortable they will provide the communication with the DOT once they get confirmation from them.

Mr. Pimental said when they get there that's up to the board. He said the only reasonable place to put it, he didn't think they should do it prior to the signing of the plans but they could do it prior to the issuance of a demolition permit because that's a little bit further out so that would allow the applicant to move forward. He said if they feel comfortable because the trip generation is decreasing there's really no need for DOT to do anything with this driveway permit then they don't need to make any additional conditions.

Mr. Pelkey said it's approved for a higher impact usage anyway. He then asked the board to take care of a couple of "housekeeping" items.

**Motion:** (Henry, second Fisher) to accept this application as complete passed 5-0.

**Motion:** (Pelkey, second Henry) that this development is not of regional impact passed 5-0.

Mr. Pelkey said they may be adding another storage building but if they are taking out the office building there shouldn't be any impact to the number of parking spaces on the lot.

Mr. Henry said he would think it would decrease the parking requirements.

Mr. Pelkey said he didn't look to see if there was a decrease he knew where they are shown and he just wanted to validate that.

Mr. Henry asked if there are parking space requirements and if there would be an office for 603 on site.

Mr. MacKinnon said sometimes they use a "kiosk office" where they might keep keys or a closet space in one of the corners. He said there is no permanently staffed office and they do the booking online, meet somebody at the site, throw a lock on it and you're good to go. They have other locations where they run their office operations and they come here as needed he said. He said because of the office/garage space 11 spaces were required last time and this time they used an estimate of 1 employee and the company vehicles overlap so there shouldn't be a need for parking permanently of a company vehicle so they are at a requirement of 5-6 spaces. He said based on the size of the site it just made sense to continue some parallel parking along the frontage so they ended up with 8 spaces and they are fine with that and if people have a bunch of people helping them move stuff into a storage unit there is space for them. Even with still having those parking spaces we still have a reduction in impervious surface too he said.



Mr. Pelkey said and they have an Americans with Disabilities Act space so that is good to go.

Mr. MacKinnon said although maybe not required by code it's important for every site to have that if for some reason there is an office that is renovated in this space in the future.

Chairman Pelkey opened this application for public comment.

Mr. Henry asked if they have a calculation for parking at storage facilities.

Mr. Pimental said they use the gross floor area so for roughly 25,000 sq. ft. it equates to about 3 spaces so they're showing more spaces than what they actually need.

Mr. Pelkey said the staff didn't see any conditions or waivers as far as this approval and asked if anybody on the board saw any conditions or waivers that should be required.

Mr. Fisher said it looks neater than what was there before because there is now curbing all the way around. He said there are a couple of penetrations in the curbing that have rocks for a little bit of overflow but primarily it flows out down toward Rt. 11 which has retention ponds right there. It's cleaner layout than what there was before he said.

Mr. Day asked if they are still in agreement with the abutter.

Mr. MacKinnon said yes and his understanding is because there is no change to the design he doesn't have any issue with it and that whole half of the lot is unchanged.

Mr. Henry said there was an issue with an abutter and some encroachment and asked if there was a lot line adjustment.

Mr. MacKinnon said they haven't pursued that yet. He said it's separated by the wetland and they could ask them to move the shed and alter the driveway but the new owners are aware of it and maybe it's something to think about when they get around to it. He said they helped the previous owner figure out what that might look like conceptually and it's basically carving out a triangle of land and this lot would still meet any zoning if that moved forward but he hasn't heard of that moving forward.

Mr. Henry asked if that encroachment is noted on here.

Mr. MacKinnon said it is noted on the existing conditions plan and usually they place some notes relative to that.

Chairman Pelkey closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

**Motion:** (Henry, second Day) to approve the application;

**Discussion:** Mr. Pimental suggested that they keep the conditions that were part of the prior approval which are prior to the signing of plans we need plan copies with professional stamps and signatures and prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy that as-built plans get submitted.

Mr. Pelkey asked if they are currently listed on here and if they are as submitted.

Mr. Pimental said yes and those are the same conditions that were part of the prior approval so long as they want to state that those conditions as well as the waiver and the Special Use permit still carry forward he is fine with that as well.

**Amendment:** by Mr. Henry: and to approve it with the existing conditions of approval from the

July 20, 2022 meeting.

Mr. Day accepted the amendment.

**Vote:** the motion passed 5-0.

**7). Member Comments:** None

**8). Any Other Business before the Board:**

**Community Development Finance Authority-**Mr. Pimental said staff participated in a meeting last week with the CDFA and they are looking to explore some funding options that might help through their Community Facilities Energy Assessment Program to look at the Municipal Office Building or the Town Hall. He said the discussions with the Town Administrator were if they were going to place a higher priority it may be the Town Hall and that is something they are going to at least explore.

He said as he mentioned at the last meeting they are already partnering up with Milton for a USDA Rural Development Grant to help look at this building for a potential redesign or some funding to make some changes there but they are also exploring this energy assessment program for the Town Hall.

**Upcoming Design Review Applications-** Mr. Pimental said there are 2 design review applications coming before the board at the July 19 meeting and asked the board to be prepared for 2 design reviews as well as the Torr excavation at that meeting so they would have a pretty full agenda that night. He said one design review would be for the Peaceful Pines Manufactured Housing Park and the other will be to get some feedback on a potential subdivision off of Grondin Drive. He said it is kind of a weird lot and they have a couple of different options but they want to get an idea of what the board would rather have them do before they get too far down the line.

**Cancel the Next Meeting-** Mr. Pimental asked whether or not the board wanted to officially vote to cancel the July 5 meeting.

Mr. Pelkey said it was on his list to discuss with the board.

**Age-Friendly Action Plan-**Mr. Pimental said as a separate e-mail he sent along the age-friendly action plan that was put together by SRPC. He said it was part of a series of grants that were obtained by Tufts and Farmington was part of a much larger regional look at as communities get older what things can be done to ensure that aging populations are able to stay in that community, feel comfortable and have the same types of access. He said the plan was looking to make recommendations on how to improve some programs for seniors, address accessibility issues. He said the reason they shared it with the Planning Board was when this grant was obtained and that work started to happen in Farmington there was a lot of transition with the resignation of the former Town Administrator, then the temporary TA came on board and current TA was here part time and there were a lot of other staff transitions that were happening and they didn't really have the amount of feedback during the process that they

would have normally liked. He said the participation was very small so the person that wrote the plan left and the person who took over taking it to the finish line said they should try and get some feedback even though this is kind of at the end of this process. He said it was shared with the Selectmen, the Planning Board, the Conservation Commission and the Economic Development Committee and asked if they have an opportunity to look through it and have any comments on the recommendations...

Mr. Pelkey said there are some action items for the Planning Board on there so when they come back on the 19<sup>th</sup> if they have time they would list out the things they are supposed to do and try to figure out when they would be able to do them and put it on a schedule.

Mr. Pimental said in the mean time if they have an opportunity to look through it to feel free to send him an e-mail so they can get some feedback. He said the Town Administrator said the Rec. Dept. Director is going to put out a questionnaire or something at Bingo as that seems to be a large draw and it may be an opportunity for folks to participate in terms of what seniors might be looking for in town that they could include into the plan.


**9). Next Meeting: Wednesday, July 19, 2023**

**Motion:** (Pelkey, second Day) to cancel the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting passed 5-0.

**10). Adjournment:**

**Motion:** (Fisher, second Day) to adjourn the meeting passed 5-0 at 6:35 p.m.

Kathleen Magoon  
Recording Secretary

  
Richard "Rick" Pelkey, Chairman  
