

TOWN OF EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 •FAX 772-4709 <u>www.exeternh.gov</u>

LEGAL NOTICE EXETER PLANNING BOARD AGENDA

The Exeter Planning Board will meet on Thursday, April 24. 2025 at 7:00 P.M. in the Nowak Room of the Town Office building located at 10 Front Street, Exeter, New Hampshire, to consider the following:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 27 and April 10, 2025

NEW BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

Continued public hearing on the application of StoneArch Development for a multi-family site plan review for the proposed construction of a six (6) unit townhouse style residential condominium development along with associated parking and site improvements. The subject property is located at 57 Portsmouth Avenue, in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #73-14. PB Case #25-1.

The application of Willey Creek Company for design review of the site plans, lot line adjustment and Wetlands and Shoreland conditional use permits for the proposed relocation of Building D of the Ray Farm Condominium development and associated site improvements off of Ray Farmstead Road. The subject properties are located in the C-3, Epping Road Highway Commercial zoning district and are identified as Tax Map Parcel #47-8 and #47-8.1. PB Case #22-3.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Master Plan Discussion
- Land Use Regulations Review
- Field Modifications
- Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Releases

EXETER PLANNING BOARD

Langdon J. Plumer, Chairman

Posted 04/11/25: Exeter Town Office and Town of Exeter website

1	TOWN OF EXETER				
2	PLANNING BOARD				
3	NOWAK ROOM				
4	10 FRONT STREET				
5	MARCH 27, 2025				
6	DRAFT MINUTES				
7	7:00 PM				
8	I. PRELIMINARIES:				
9					
10	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT BY ROLL CALL: Chair Langdon Plumer, Vice-Chair Aaron Brown, Gwen				
11	English, Jen Martel, Nancy Belanger Select Board Representative. Alternate Marty Kennedy, and				
12	Alternate Dean Hubbard				
13					
14	STAFF PRESENT: Town Planner Dave Sharples				
15					
16	II. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Plumer called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and introduced the				
17	members. Alternates, Marty Kennedy and Dean Hubbard were activated.				
18					
19	III. <u>NEW BUSINESS:</u>				
20	1. Continued public hearing on the application of StoneArch Development for site plan review of a				
21	proposal for the redevelopment of the property located at 112 Front Street. The proposal includes the				
22	demolition of the existing buildings and new construction of seventeen (17) townhouse style				
23	condominium units and associated site improvements. The subject property is located in the C-1,				
24	Central Area Commercial zoning district and identified as Tax Map Parcel #73-14. PB Case #24-17.				
25					
26	Chair Plumer referenced a request for a continuance from the applicant to the Board's April 10, 2025				
27	meeting.				
28					
29	Vice-Chair Brown motioned to continue Planning Board Case #24-17 to the Board's April 10, 2025				
30	meeting at 7 PM at Town Offices in the Nowak Room. Ms. English seconded the motion. A vote was				
31	taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.				
32					
33	2. Continued public hearing on the application of Green & Company for site plan review and Wetlands				
34 25	conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a proposed Mixed-Use Neighborhood Development (MUND) project				
35	consisting of a townhouse development (of haven Lane) with thirty-two (32) three-bedroom units, a four story mixed use building on Portsmouth Avenue baying 4 418 S.E. commercial use on the first floor				
30	and thirty-six (36) one-bedroom units above, and one separate duplex structure with three-bedroom				
38	units on Haven Lane, along with associated site improvements. The subject property is located at 76				
39	Portsmouth Avenue, in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #65-118, PB Case				
40	#24-8.				
41					
42	Chair Plumer read the Public Hearing Notice out loud.				

- Alternate, Marty Kennedy, recused himself from this application and left the meeting table to sit withthe public.
- 45
- 46 Mr. Sharples summarized that the application was proposed to the Board on December 19[,] 2024. A site
- 47 walk was held on January 9, 2025. The applicant returned to the Board on January 23, 2025. The
- 48 applicant appeared at the Conservation Commission's January 14, 2025 and February 11, 2025 meeting.
- 49 The Commission voted that they had no objection to the wetland Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
- application with two conditions of approval. Mr. Sharples referenced a memo from the Commission
- 51 dated February 12, 2025.
- 52

Mr. Sharples noted that a second Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting was conducted on
 February 27, 2025 and comment letters from Underwood Engineers (UEI) and TRC were provided to the

- 55 Board.
- 56

57 Mr. Sharples noted that the applicant submitted revised plans and supporting documents dated March

- 58 19, 2025 to the Planning Board. The TRC issued another comment letter on March 5, 2025 and
- 59 Underwood Engineers (UEI) provided comments in their March 4 letter. There are two waivers being
- 60 requested as outlined in the waiver request letter from Jones & Beach dated January 13, 2025.
- 61
- 62 Mr. Sharples indicated that at the prior Planning Board meeting, several items were discussed that
- 63 included traffic, sidewalk access, construction hours, hydrant location, one access point vs two access
- 64 points.
- 65

66 Mr. Sharples noted that regarding traffic, the Planning Board agreed to forego a full traffic impact

- 67 analysis and instead impose an exaction as agreed by the applicant to offset some of the cost to
- 68 coordinate the three (3) traffic signals on Portsmouth Ave between High St and Alumni Drive. He spoke
- 69 with Electric Light who does our signal work and they estimated that connecting the three signals
- 70 (equipment and labor), preparing a timing plan, and implementing said plan would be approximately \$7-
- 71 10K per signal. To this end, the applicant has agreed to provide the town with \$20,000 toward this effort
- 72 and Mr. Sharples noted that he believes this is more than fair.
- 73
- Mr. Sharples noted sidewalk access was discussed. It appeared that there was a concern that the lease
 in the front of the parcel could prohibit pedestrian access on the proposed sidewalk that runs from the
- 76 Haven Lane side of the development to Portsmouth Ave. He noted he will be prepared with a condition
- of approval if needed to address this matter.
- 78
- 79 Mr. Sharples noted that construction hours were also discussed by an abutter, and it was requested that
- 80 the Planning Board restrict the construction hours to beyond the Town's current ordinance. Mr.
- 81 Sharples told the board that he would reach out to the applicant to see if they would voluntarily restrict
- 82 the hours. They have agreed to restrict the hours from 7am to 7pm daily and only inside work on
- 83 Sundays.84
- 85 Mr. Sharples noted regarding the hydrant location, the Fire Department reviewed the latest location
- 86 shown on the plans and found that location acceptable.

- 87 Mr. Sharples noted that he also spoke to the Fire Department about the two access points on Haven
- Lane and they prefer this configuration over the one access point and turnaround.
- 89
- 90 Paige Libbey of Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. noted that the applicant and Attorney Bosen were
- 91 present. Minor modifications were made to the plans to address UEI comments concerning utilities.92
- 93 She noted that the applicant made changes to break up two of the buildings into four units and three 94 units. Any buildings with four or more units had horizontal jogs added to break up the façade. She 95 noted changes to parking for buildings 2, 3 and 11 with the road widened for a better turn radius from 96 garages without backing into the travel lane. She provided a handout showing the proposed changes.
- 97 She noted changes to architectural elevations for buildings 8, 1 and 11 which will have the height
- 98 decreased from 35' to 30.'
- 99
- Ms. Libbey noted that the town's 3rd party review engineer, Jason Plourde, of VHB addressed traffic at
 the last meeting and recommended that it would be more beneficial to make a contribution to address
 those issues rather than do a traffic study.
- 103
- 104 Ms. Libbey noted that the Board requested architectural renderings at the last meeting, and she posted 105 photos from above showing access to Portsmouth Ave, from Haven Lane in from the western entrance 106 by building 11, a zoomed in version which included building 11 and a portion of building 1 with a slightly 107 different roof line at 30' height instead of 35.' She posted photos of the view facing building 1 which is 108 pulled forward. She posted photos of the eastern entrance of Haven Lane with buildings 7 and 6 in the 109 distance. She showed where the green space will be near the mail house. She posted photos facing building 3 and building 10 and a view down the sidewalk away from Portsmouth Avenue, a photo 110 111 between buildings perpendicular to Haven Lane, a view of buildings 8 and 9, from Portsmouth Avenue 112 facing the side, and buildings 4 and 5. She posted the view from Haven Lane with the 8' fence, building 1 113 fence at the perimeter of the property line entrance of Haven Lane, the rear property of the three
- abutters showing fence and where it ends close to the wetland buffer.
- 115
- 116 Chair Plumer asked about 11 Bonny Drive and whether the wide areas of trees will remain. Ms. Libbey 117 referenced sheet L1 of the Landscaping Plan.
- 118
- Ms. Martel asked about the fence and Ms. Libbey noted it would be white, vinyl, stockade and that shewould add the detail to the plan set.
- 121
- 122 Ms. Martel asked about the balconies facing into the development and Ms. Libbey noted that was
- because otherwise the view would be the Thirsty Moose property where 5 and 6 have balconies facingthe woodland.
- 125
- 126 Ms. English noted there was a lot of pavement, and asked about putting a living island in the middle.
- 127 Ms. Libbey noted it would obstruct car's view backing in and out, and angled parking was not a solution
- 128 that would work behind the garages. She noted the spaces would not be striped but open. Mr. Sharples
- 129 noted the pavement is porous and Ms. English expressed concerns with heat.
- 130

- 131 Chair Plumer asked about the gray hashed area by building 11 and Ms. Libbey noted there is an open
- area between the buildings, also building 3. She noted adding another island may make plowing
- 133 difficult, but she can look into that.
- 134
- Ms. English asked if 11 could be outside the buffer. Ms. Libbey noted they would lose parking becauseof the curve in the road.
- 137

138 Chair Plumer asked about two-way traffic through the middle. Vice-Chair Brown noted it is a driveway
139 not a road so safety for cars to move is a bigger priority than an island. The pavement is already porous
140 and he noted he liked the layout. He noted flexibility makes sense for construction hours on holidays.

141

Ms. English questioned TRC and UEi notes with regard to a comment about NH DOT. Ms. Libbey notedthe area was urban compact and Paul Vlasich was fine with the way it was drawn. Mr. Sharples

- addressed the driveway flare radius and the improved layout.
- 145
- Ms. English questioned #55 guardrail removal and Ms. Libbey noted the guardrail is still there in front
 of parking spaces, snow will be removed at the building on Portsmouth Avenue.
- 148

Ms. English asked about concerns with patches of porous pavement and depth to high water table. Ms.
Libbey noted the patches are gone and the sections will be regulated with signage. She noted the areas
with the islands are difficult to clean but described the process with the access door.

152

Ms. English asked about planting trees near porous pavement (#67) and Ms. Libbey noted the treeswere moved not eliminated and showed the area.

155

156 Ms. English asked about the guidelines not met referenced on page 7. Ms. Libbey noted a narrative was

provided. Mr. Sharples noted it was his comment concerning the front building on Portsmouth Aveconcerning windows and the windows were changed ,and he had no further comments.

159

160 Ms. English asked about the sidewalk (page 8) and Ms. Libbey noted the flare was questioned to connect

- 161 the sidewalk and was removed entirely. Mr. Sharples asked how that would work with "phase 1." Ms.
- 162 Libbey noted it will go straight to Portsmouth Avenue in Phase 2.
- 163

164 Ms. Belanger asked about #9 on page 8 and Ms. Libbey indicated it is shown on sheet C-1, the property 165 juts out which comes from when Portsmouth Avenue was widened but not in front of this property and 166 they are talking with DOT to clean that up.

167

168 Ms. Martel asked about the waiver for grading within 5' of property lines and Ms. Libbey referenced

169 sheet C-3 where the sidewalk runs along the property line, to install buffering and make sure the

- drainage swale works, to maintain connectivity to wetland, the fence, plantings along the buffer. The
- 171 Right of Way is only 40' wide so 24' with road, curbing, grading, excavation it will get close. There will
- be silt fencing and construction fencing to protect abutting land.
- 173

175 pretty tight with the grade and culvert. 176 177 Chair Plumer asked about the flow of the culvert and Ms. Libbey depicted the flow path, same as today. 178 179 Ms. Martel asked about the sidewalk and Ms. Libbey showed the sidewalk with Portsmouth Avenue 180 wider in line with MUND (Mixed Used Neighborhood Development). 181 182 Chair Plumer asked about parking in front of stores and Ms. Libbey noted there will be no parking in 183 front of stores and showed the areas of parking. Ms. Martel asked about resident parking in back and 184 Ms. Libbey noted it would not be limited only to residents. 185 186 Ms. Martel asked about trash, utilities, elevator and stores. Ms. Libbey showed the loading area and 187 noted there would be private trash removal. 188 189 Ms. English asked about curbing and signage for plowing. Ms. Libbey depicted the guardrail, curbing and 190 retaining wall. Ms. Libbey discussed underground detention, the filtration treatment and runoff 191 treatment for the front sidewalk. 192 193 Ms. English asked about the culvert between building 5 and the parking area which she referred to as a 194 ditch. She noted she was nervous about a severe rain event being 10' away. Ms. Libbey referenced the 195 48" culvert perpendicular to the stream and the culvert being replaced at the backside of the Thirsty 196 Moose property and how the two culverts will be tied into the structure to allow addition outlet with 197 the usual parallel flow with the stream, future erosion prevention and sizing up to 50-year storm from a 198 runoff perspective. 199 200 Chair Plumer asked about the washed out gully and Ms. Libbey noted a wetland permit would be filed 201 with the state for the southwest most end filled in for construction of sidewalk and drainage. The area 202 will be cleaned up and restored where erosion was happening. She noted the elevation of the building 203 and that the pipe would be well overtopped before it could ever flood that building. 204 205 Ms. English asked if there were enough snow storage and Ms. Libbey noted areas designated and plans 206 to truck excess off site. 207 208 Ms. Martel noted landscape island plantings would die is used for snow storage. Ms. Libbey noted they 209 could look for better locations. 210 211 Ms. English recommended having as much vegetation as possible and recommended moving the snow 212 storage so that the plantings won't be damaged. Vice-Chair Brown asked to review snow storage for 213 "phase 1." Ms. Libbey noted the entranceway, parking area at the edge of the building, sidewalk, 214 islands and along the mail house pull off, and the location where the town pushes snow off Haven Lane. 215 Vice-Chair Brown noted that between building 6 and 7 would be ideal. Ms. Belanger noted concerns 216 with treatment of melting snow. Ms. Libbey noted the area could be graded to flow away from 217 wetlands and to porous pavement.

Ms. Martel asked if the sidewalk fence on Haven Lane could be pulled back and Ms. Libbey noted it was

218	
219	Chair Plumer asked if the long strip between building 6 and 7 were a retaining wall and Ms. Libbey
220	indicated yes.
221	
222	Ms. English asked to identify plantings on the landscape plan especially the northern border exit into
223	haven Lane on the left side of the road. She asked if the 7-8 plantings were tall enough to provide
224	screening. Ms. Libbey noted there were arborvitae, grasses and taller trees. She noted the label on the
225	plan. Ms. Martel noted there was a symbol on the plan.
226	
227	Ms. English asked about HVAC in "Phase 2." Ms. Libbey noted it would be on the roof but dropped
228	down, not visible. "Phase 1" would be internal.
229	
230	Ms. English asked about bike racks and Ms. Libbey noted she needed to add those as part of "phase 2."
231	
232	Ms. English asked about the proposed trail and whether there was a significant grade. Ms. Libbey noted
233	it would loop and follow the contours. There would also be a couple of steps so it would not be as
234	steep.
235	
236	Ms. English asked about removal of invasives, and Ms. Libbey noted that would require permitting with
237	the wetland bureau and so it is not proposed.
238	
239	Ms. English asked about recreation areas and Ms. Libbey noted it meets regulations, the green space
240	around the units and trail as well. Ms. Martel recommended taking out the area by "phase 2."
241	
242	Ms. Martel asked about the drainage plans in "phases 1 and 2." Ms. Libbey reviewed the grading plan,
243	porous pavement area, infiltration, and jellyfish system. She noted the front was trickier and would
244	have underground detention.
245	
246	Ms. Martel asked about roof runoff for "phase 1." Ms. Libbey noted filtration drip edges behind
247	buildings to be treated with a filter course and stone reservoir. She described the impermeable liner to
248	lower sections underground to the sections that can infiltrate stormwater.
249	
250	Ms. Martel noted the proposed snow storage area recommended by Vice-Chair Brown would not be
251	treated and drain to the wetland.
252	
253	Ms. Belanger asked about #58 on page 2. Ms. Libbey noted the road was widened in sections setback to
254	gage, with the second floor cantilevered. She noted that adding would interfere with plowing.
255	
256	Ms. Belanger asked about #65-66 on page 4 and 5 and whether they were still waiting on DPW. Ms.
257	Libbey noted she spoke to Paul Vlasich yesterday and he wants to meet to finalize the layout.
258	
259	Vice-Chair Brown asked about electric vehicle charging stations and Ms. Libbey noted the conduit note
260	plan plans as part of "phase 2." Mr. Sharples noted that in "phase 1" residents have garages.
261	

- 262 Vice-Chair Brown asked about the pedestrian access in "phase 1 and phase 2." Ms. Libbey noted from
- Haven Lane to Portsmouth Avenue the neighborhood could walk through. Ms. Libbey noted she did not
- 264 envision the public going behind the units. Ms. Libbey noted it is clear where the sidewalk and parking
- 265

are.

266

Ms. English asked about landscaping behind 11 Bonny Drive and whether it would be adequately
shielded. She noted she would like to see that beefed up. Ms. Libbey noted there would be a few more
trees in the section. The Board provided Ms. Libbey with a letter dated March 23rd from the abutter.
Ms. Libbey noted they would not disturb the wetland by cutting trees and putting in a fence. Ms. Martel
agreed that shrubs can't be planted in the woods and wetland and noted the best screening would be
on 11 Bonny Drive. Ms. Belanger encouraged the applicant and abutter to have conversations.
Craig Boudreau of 11 Bonny Drive noted he was concerned with flooding and lighting. He noted he

- wouldn't want to walk through people's back yards. He noted his preference was natural screening and
- a fence. He noted the buffer proposed was unrealistic and wants it to go up to the unit. Ms. Libbey
 noted where the fence is proposed to end and not wanting additional wetland impact. She noted they
- 278 were happy to reach out and work with the abutter.
- 279

Susan Taylor of 30 Haven Lane noted it is wet behind the Thirsty Moose property and behind the AutoParts store and there are cones and yellow tape at this point.

282

Vice-Chair Brown asked why it couldn't be one-way. Ms. Libbey asked which way they would want it to
go and noted it would be difficult to enforce. She noted she cannot reduce the parking aisle width.

286 Ms. Belanger asked about phases and when the approval expires. She asked about the lease being 287 extended. Chair Plumer noted it could be continued when ready to build "phase 2." Vice-Chair Brown 288 noted it was recommended that drainage and access should be done now. Attorney Bosen discussed 289 vesting under the regulations and concerns if MUND were to go away. He discussed the terminology of 290 phasing and how the applicant did not propose phasing, and the lack of a definition. He noted it could 291 be referred to as one project. Ms. Libbey noted it was not referred to until TRC discussed water and 292 access. Attorney Bosen discussed active and substantial building. Mr. Sharples noted it could be vested 293 five years and hope for an extension. There is four more years on the lease with the auto parts store 294 and the tenant's option to extend for five more. Mr. Green noted they could know 30 days before it 295 renews, or the lessee could leave early. Mr. Sharples noted the building permit is good for a year to 18 296 months. Mr. Sharples noted the Board follows Section 13.8 of the site plan regulations. Mr. Sharples 297 noted the Board has the authority to waive 13.8.4 but if they waived it, it would not be defined. 298 299 The Board recessed briefly to continue Case #25-1 to their next meeting due to being late in the evening 300 and not likely to be finished by 10 PM which is when no new business is conducted.

301

302 The hearing resumed at 9:24 PM.

304 Ms. English asked about the lighting plan and expressed concerns that bulbs not hang down past the 305 shade as she has seen in other properties. Ms. Libbey referenced L-3 and noted there will be a couple of 306 decorative street lights and lights at the rear of the parking lot, rear of building and front in "phase 2." 307

308 Ms. Libbey addressed the waiver for grading within 5' of the property line for buffering and fencing. She 309 noted the restoration plan. Mr. Sharples noted the access is exempt from the provision.

310

311 Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting waivers, to approve the request of

312 Green and Company for a waiver from Section 9.3.6.7 of the site plan review and subdivision

313 regulations regarding grading within 5' of the property line for Planning Board Case #24-8. Mr.

314 Hubbard seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Belanger voted aye, Ms. English voted

315 aye, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Chair Plumer voted aye, Mr. Hubbard voted aye and Ms. Martel 316 voted aye. The motion passed 6-0-0.

317

318 Ms. Libbey addressed the waiver for the standard specifications for construction – Section E(II)(D)(1)

319 Curb Radius Intersections (DPW construction standards). She noted the ROW is 40' wide and she

320 outlined the turning template used by the Fire Department. She noted a wider radius could not be fit.

321 Chair Plumer noted it is unique to the situation.

322 323 Ms. Belanger asked if iit would be affected if sidewalks were put in. Ms. Libbey noted that would reduce 324 the road width and then they would have the radius at that point.

325

326 Vice-Chair Brown agreed it was a unique situation.

327

328 Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting waivers, to approve the request of 329 Green and Company for a waiver of Section E(II)(D)(1) - Curb Radius Intersections (DPW construction)

330 standards) for Planning Board Case #24-8. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was

331 taken, Ms. Martel voted aye, Mr. Hubbard voted aye, Chair Plumer voted aye, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Ms. English voted aye, and Ms. Belanger voted aye. The motion passed 6-0-0.

332 333

334 Ms. Libbey read the responses to the wetlands Conditional Use Permit (CUP) into the record. She noted 335 it was a permitted use in the zone for MUND in C-2. She noted there were alternate designs submitted 336 and revised and referenced wetlands D and C crossing which are limited value. She noted 7.7% of the 337 limited use buffer and plaques to be placed along the tree line. She noted the language to be contained 338 in the condominium documents. She referenced the function and value report from the wetland 339 scientist who concluded the impact was not detrimental to the wetland as all have been degraded, flood 340 flow is not compromised, and the erosion of the existing channel was noted. Wetland C and D are 341 manmade with little to no value. She noted the design was altered to maintain connectivity. She noted 342 the NH DES Alteration of Terrain application (AoT), wastewater and EPA general permits, and that 343 flooding would not increase to neighboring property. She addressed mitigation elsewhere on the site 344 and noted the existing vegetated area to be permanently conserved as greenspace. She discussed 345 restoration proposal to all areas not permanently impacted.

Ms. Martel indicated that snow storage was not addressed adequately enough for the impact marked
temporary to the buffer which is more likely permanent and noted she was uncomfortable voting to
approve the CUP when she has not seen how it will be addressed.

350

Ms. Libbey noted the proposal for grading to porous pavement where stormwater would be treated.
She noted road salt can't be used for maintenance, they will not use multiple treatments and bring one.

Ms. Martel indicated the stairs by the kiosk would make the proposal challenging, they were not going to get a berm there. Attorney Bosen recommended it be a condition of approval to not use salt or chloride products. Ms. Martel indicated salt or not, there would be other solvents, such as motor oil. Ms. Libbey noted the slope was not huge, only 6" and UEI could review on their end.

358

359 Vice-Chair Brown asked if it was not permitted to truck off snow from the property. Mr. Sharples noted 360 it was not required in the regulations. Vice-Chair Brown noted the islands were not practical with 361 vegetation. Ms. Libbey indicated the grades could be changed to make it work and snow could be 362 trucked off in a bad winter. Vice-Chair Brown agreed grading should work and the town engineer was 363 more qualified. Mr. Green noted the grading was not a significant change. Vice-Chair Brown indicated 364 he was comfortable making it a condition of approval. Chair Plumer agreed. Ms. English noted she was 365 concerned with it. Vice-Chair Brown indicated he was less comfortable with the Board making a 366 redesign than the town engineer. Chair Plumer agreed. Ms. Libbey noted the change was in line with 367 others that could come up waiting for state approvals.

368

Ms. Martel noted there was more parking than needed and more asphalt. Ms. English agreed with Ms.Martel. She noted she believed it was too much of a buffer impact for this site.

371

Mr. Sharples read the Conservation Commission's proposed conditions concerning upgrade of the 18"
culvert as discussed; and the deed restriction be executed to permanently protect the passive recreation
trail.

375

Ms. Libbey noted the wetland in the protected greenspace was a higher value and the application went
through extensive process with Conservation, and they felt comfortable after hearing the testimony
from Gove Environmental with the conditions Mr. Sharples outlined.

379

Ms. Libbey noted that the condition could read that UEI review and insure that all stormwater flows to
be treated. Mr. Sharples added and be reviewed by the town engineer or designee, or a design that
achieves that. Vice-Chair Brown recommended giving the flexibility.

383

384 Mr. Sharples read the proposed conditions.

385

386 Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for a wetlands Conditional Use Permit to

387 approve the request of Green and Company with the conditions read by Town Planner Dave Sharples.

388 Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Belanger voted aye, Ms. English

389 voted nay, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Chair Plumer voted aye, Mr. Hubbard voted aye and Ms.

390 Martel voted nay. The motion passed 4-2-0.

391 392 The Board discussed phasing and approval time. Vice-Chair Brown noted they would likely finish the 393 first portion in three years and sell and quick as they are built in this market leaving a potential gap in 394 time for the front portion of the project. The applicant is concerned about zoning changes and don't 395 want to lose their approval. The front of the project is what the public desired with rezoning. Attorney 396 Bosen noted there could be a waiver so that the residential units can be completed, utilities and walking 397 path. 398 399 Ms. Belanger asked if it were typical to approve a project for that many years and Chair Plumer 400 referenced Riverwoods. Vice-Chair Brown noted it was very typical, right now the market is very fluid. 401 Mr. Sharples noted there is one that has been approved for five years. Ms. Belanger noted phasing 402 came up at TRC. Mr. Sharples noted in order to identify what to do first. Chair Plumer noted that 403 granting an extension was no big problem. Mr. Sharples advised that if the approval time is waived it 404 would be in perpetuity unless otherwise stated. Vice-Chair Brown recommended 15 years. Ms. Libbey 405 noted they would also need to extend their state approvals. Mr. Green noted this was designed under 406 MUND and that may change, the Board may change. He noted they intend to move rapidly, 15 years 407 would be wonderful, 11-12 ok, one year would not work. Ms. English noted Portsmouth Ave could 408 change, stormwater regs could change. Attorney Bosen recommended focusing on the here and now 409 and not being speculative. Mr. Green noted they could do 12. Mr. Sharples read the proposed 410 condition: "this approval shall be valid for a period of 12 years from today's date." 411 412 Vice-Chair Brown asked what would happen if they didn't do anything. He would like to see improved 413 screening for 11 Bonny Drive. Mr. Green recommended discussing that with the homeowner on site. 414 415 Ms. Green noted they could add a row of trees behind the building. The fence was shown on the plan to 416 the point of wetlands buffer and then the row of trees could continue behind the building. Mr. 417 Boudreau noted a 10' fence would be better, he noted he wanted a fence. 418 419 Mr. Sharples read the proposed condition: "to construct a living fence a minimum of 8' height which 420 shall be shown on the plans the length of building 1 between building 1 and 11 Bonny Drive." 421 422 Mr. Green noted they could extend the fence shown on the plan by 20' and have a living fence to the 423 end of the building shown on plan. Mr. Sharples added the language "as discussed at the meeting." 424 425 Vice-Chair Brown motioned to approvel the request of Green and Company, Planning Board Case #24-426 8 for multi-family site plan with the conditions read by the Town Planner. Mr. Hubbard seconded the 427 motion. A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Martel voted nay, Mr. Hubbard voted aye, Chair Plumer voted 428 aye, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Ms. English voted nay and Ms. Belanger voted nay. The motion 429 failed 3-3-0. 430 431 Mr. Sharples read the standard conditions and additional conditions of approval: 432

434 of a certificate of occupancy. This plan must be in a dwg or dxf file format and in NAD 1983 State Plane 435 New Hampshire FIPS 2800 feet coordinates; 436 437 2. A preconstruction meeting shall be arranged by the applicant and his contractor with the Town 438 engineer prior to any site work commencing. The following must be submitted for review and approval 439 prior to the preconstruction meeting: 440 441 i. the SWPPP (storm water pollution prevention plan), if applicable, be submitted to and 442 reviewed for approval by DPW prior to the preconstruction meeting; and 443 ii. A project schedule and construction cost estimate. 444 445 3. Third party construction inspection fees shall be paid prior to scheduling the preconstruction 446 meeting. 447 448 The annual operations and stormwater maintenance report in the stormwater management 449 operation and maintenance manual)revised March 15, 2025) shall be completed and submitted to the 450 Town engineer annually on or before January 31st. This requirement shall be an ongoing condition of 451 approval and included in the condominium documents. 452 453 5. All comments in the UEI review letter dated 3/26/25 shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the 454 Town Planner and Town Engineer, or their designee, prior to signing the final plans. 455 456 6. All condominium documents including declaration and by laws shall be submitted to the Town 457 Planner for review and approval prior to signing the final plans. The documents submitted to the Town 458 shall include language regarding the maintenance requirements of the pervious pavers and stormwater 459 practices shown on the plans and other applicable conditions of this approval. The condominium 460 documents shall be reviewed by the town's attorney, at the applicant's expense. 461 462 7. All applicable state permit approval numbers shall be noted on the final plans. 463 464 8. All applicable fees to be paid including, but not limited to sewer/water connection fees, impact fees 465 and inspection fees (including third party inspection fees) prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. 466 467 9. All landscaping shown on plans shall be maintained and any dead or dying vegetation shall be 468 replaced, no later than the following growing season. as long as the site plan remains valid. 469 470 10. All outdoor lighting (including security lights) shall be down lit and shielded so no direct light is 471 visible from adjacent properties and/or right of ways. 472 473 11. The applicant shall submit the land use and stormwater management information about the project 474 using the PTAPP online municipal tracking tool. The PTAPP submittal must be accepted by DPW prior to 475 the preconstruction meeting. 476

1. An electronic as built plan with details acceptable to the Town shall be provided prior to the issuance

477 12. Use of the proposed sidewalk from the residential units to Portsmouth Avenue shall be unrestricted 478 for use by the residents of this project. The intent of this condition is to insure that any lease of the 479 front portion of the lot will not impede pedestrian access to the sidewalk. 480 481 13. No building shall be closer than 20' from the side property lines and this shall be reflected on the 482 final plans. 483 484 14. As agreed by the applicant, the applicant shall provide a \$20,000 contribution to be used toward the 485 improvement of vehicular traffic flow from the site to Portsmouth Ave which includes as a minimum the 486 signalized intersection at Green Hill Road and Portsmouth Ave. This contribution shall be made when 487 submitting for a building permit. 488 489 15. As agreed by the applicant, all construction hours shall be limited to 7 AM to 7 PM daily with only 490 inside construction on Sundays. 491 492 16. On the final plans bike racks shall be added to phase 2 to the satisfaction of the Town Planner. 493 494 17. A constructed and living fence a minimum of 8' in height shall be shown on the final plans between 495 the length of building 1 and 11 Bonny Drive, as discussed at the meeting. 496 497 18. This approval shall be valid for a period for 12 years from today's date. (revised to 10 years from 498 today's date). 499 500 19. The proposed pedestrian trail shall be reviewed by the Conservation and Sustainability Planner prior 501 to signing the final plans. 502 503 Ms. Belanger asked about the ROW along Portsmouth Avenue being transferred. Mr. Sharples will do 504 more research on why the state didn't take it and whether the Town would want it. 505 506 Ms. Belanger noted her issue was the length of years of approval, she noted she would be fine with ten 507 years. Mr. Sharples noted with the building permit it will likely go to 12 anyway. 508 509 Ms. Martel noted she had a hard time approving the CUP and is not comfortable with so much impact 510 from pavement in wetlands buffers. She noted the spirit of the MUND to have limited parking and four 511 per unit. Ms. English agreed. 512 513 Ms. Libbey asked about the as built plans for phase 1 and phase 2 and whether they would be separate, 514 and Mr. Sharples indicated yes. 515 516 Ms. Belanger motioned to approve the request of Green and Company, Planning Board Case #24-8 for 517 a multi-family site plan with the conditions read by Town Planner Dave Sharples, with said site plan 518 approval valid for a period of ten years from today's date. Mr. Hubbard seconded the motion. A roll 519 call vote was taken: Ms. Belanger voted aye, Ms. English voted nay, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, 520 Chair Plumer voted aye, Mr. Hubbard voted aye and Ms. Martel voted nay. The motion passed 4-2-0.

521							
521	Ms. English asked about stop signs and Ms. Belanger noted she brough that up at the Select Board						
522	mosting. Mr. Sharples noted he would follow up						
524							
525	3 The application of StoneArch Development for a multi-family site plan review for the proposed						
526	construction of a six (6) unit townhouse style residential condominium development along with						
520	associated parking and site improvements. The subject preperty is located at 57 Pertemputh Avenue, it						
528	the C-2 Highway Commercial zoning district. Tax Man Parcel #73-14, PB Case #25-1						
520							
530	The Board scheduled a site walk at the proposed site for April 10, 2025 at 8 AM						
531							
532	Vice-Chair Brown motioned to continue Planning Board Case #25-1 to the Board's April 10, 2025						
533	meeting at 7 PM at the Exeter Town Offices in the Nowak Room. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion.						
534	A vote was taken all were in favor the motion passed 6_{-0-0}						
535	······································						
536	IV. OLD BUSINESS						
537							
538	APPROVAL OF MINUTES						
539							
540	March 13, 2025						
541							
542	February 27, 2025						
543							
544	Ms. Belanger motioned to table approval of the February 27, 2025 and March 13, 2025 meeting						
545	minutes. Ms. English seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 6-						
546	<i>0-0.</i>						
547							
548	V. OTHER BUSINESS						
549							
550	Master Plan Discussion						
551	Mr. Sharples noted that he was on the agenda for the Select Board's meeting Monday night to						
552	present the Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan. There would be one meeting rather than two.						
553							
554	Field Modifications						
555							
555	 Bond and/or Latter of Credit Peductions and Pelease 						
557	Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Release						
558	VI. TOWN PLANNER'S ITEMS						
559	VII. CHAIRPERSON'S ITEMS						
560	VIII. PB REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT ON "OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITY"						

561 IX. ADJOURN

- 562 Chair Plumer adjourned the meeting at 11:20
- 563 PM.
- 564 Respectfully submitted.
- 565 Daniel Hoijer,
- 566 Recording Secretary (Via Exeter TV)

1	TOWN OF EXETER				
2	PLANNING BOARD				
3	NOWAK ROOM				
4	10 FRONT STREET				
5	APRIL 10, 2025				
6	DRAFT MINUTES				
7	7:00 PM				
8	I. PRELIMINARIES:				
9					
10	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT BY ROLL CALL: Chair Langdon Plumer, Vice-Chair Aaron Brown, Gwen				
11	English, John Grueter, Jen Martel, Alternate Marty Kennedy, and Alternate Dean Hubbard				
12					
13	STAFF PRESENT: Conservation & Sustainability Planner Kristen Murphy				
14					
15	II. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Plumer called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and introduced the				
16	members. Alternates, Marty Kennedy and Dean Hubbard were activated.				
17					
18	III. <u>NEW BUSINESS:</u>				
19	1. Continued public hearing on the application of StoneArch Development for site plan review of a				
20	proposal for the redevelopment of the property located at 112 Front Street. The proposal includes the				
21	demolition of the existing buildings and new construction of seventeen (17) townhouse style				
22	condominium units and associated site improvements. The subject property is located in the C-1,				
23	Central Area Commercial zoning district and identified as Tax Map Parcel #73-14. PB Case #24-17.				
24					
25	Chair Plumer read the Public Hearing Notice out loud.				
26					
27	Ms. Murphy read Town Planner Dave Sharple's comments out loud noting that the applicant originally				
28	appeared before the Board on January 23, 2025. A site walk was conducted on February 6, 2025. The				
29	applicant returned to the Board on February 27, 2025, March 13, 2025 and March 27, 2025 requesting a				
3U 21	Continuance to tonight's meeting to address comments and concerns. She noted in his memo that Mir.				
27 21	applicant's request for a continuance until this meeting and recommended working with the applicant				
32	to record an extension in the event the Board does not reach action on the application at this meeting				
34	The applicant submitted revised plans and supporting documents dated April 2, 2025. The applicant				
35	originally requested three waivers from the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations as outlined in				
36	the request letters dated January 21, 2025 and February 19, 2025. She noted that Mr. Sharples did not				
37	believe the waiver from Section 9.3.6.4 for grading within 5' of the exterior property line was necessary				
38	any longer given revisions to the site plan. Proposed Conditions for Approval are provided.				
39					
40	Christian Smith noted that John O'Neil was present. He reviewed calculations for the driveway and				
41	three-unit building, and 30.75' separation to the parcel at 114 Front Street. He noted the lighting plan				

42 was provided, snow storage plantings were relocated as shown on sheet 8B. The mail kiosk was

relocated out of snow storage. Trash will be handled privately by the condominium association. No 43 44 handicapped parking is required as access is through the garages. The detail on sheet 10 was erased. 45 He reviewed the removal of curbing and extension of pervious pavement to the property line 46 eliminating the need for a stormwater waiver. He reviewed the temporary concrete washout depicted 47 on sheet 5 while paving foundations with details on sheet 10. He reviewed the enhanced landscape 48 buffers and specimen tree to be located to the northwest of the first building, unit 6 which he described 49 as a forest eastern red bud which will be partially visible from Front Street. He provided elevations for 50 all five buildings and noted all fencing on the landscape plan was added to sheet 6. He discussed the 51 need for a 22' drive aisle waiver, rather than the 24' required. 52 53 Chair Plumer noted that an email was received from Charlie French of 9 Gill Street which he read out 54 loud concerning the promise by the developer of a 6' cedar fence. Chair Plumer provided a copy to Mr. 55 Smith. Mr. Smith referenced the fence called out on the landscaping plan and that it is vinyl. 56 57 Ms. English asked about damage to roots of trees during construction. Mr. Smith noted there are some 58 breaks in the fence on the northwest boundary specific to not damaging tree roots and there will be no 59 grading within the 5' of the property line. 60 61 Mr. Kennedy noted that he liked the reduction to three units up front but questioned if the units got 62 larger. Mr. Smith indicated that the original building was four 22' units and was reduced. 63 64 Mr. Hubbard noted that the driveway was still close to the property line, at 5.5.' Mr. Smith indicated 65 they were not grading the soil. Mr. Hubbard questioned the proximity of the existing tree roots and Mr. 66 Smith noted if the system is maintained the tree has a good chance of surviving. Ms. Martel 67 recommended adding the tree protection plans to the drawings and noting the critical zone during 68 construction. Mr. Smith noted he would discuss that with the landscape architect. Vice-Chair Brown 69 recommended going ahead with the waiver for grading within 5' of the property line in the event it was 70 needed. 71 72 Mr. Grueter asked about the two parking spots in front of the garage of building 4, and whether there 73 was enough room to get in and out. Mr. Smith noted the parking space is 19' deep and driveway is 20.' 74 75 Ms. English asked about the snow storage area and whether pedestrian access to the walkway would be 76 blocked. Mr. Smith noted that the maintenance company would clear the walkways and any snow 77 accumulating near the drive aisle would be trucked off. 78 79 Adele asked about treatment when the snow melts and becomes a sheet of ice. Mr. Smith explained 80 that the infiltration system would take care of that. 81 82 Mr. Hubbard asked about the easement to the northern end. Mr. Smith noted there is now a walkway 83 at 114 Front Street that encroaches on the property and Mr. O'Neil will provide an easement and it will 84 be part of the recordable condominium site plan as each unit obtains their certificate of occupancy. 85

86 Ms. English asked about the UEI comments on April 2 and response concerning gutters being large

- 87 enough to capture water without a downspout or underground piping. Mr. Smith noted that UEI was
- 88 satisfied and noted the latest architectural plans provide comment.
- 89
- 90 Chair Plumer noted that a letter was received dated April 2, 2025 from the Garskas of 111-113 Front
 91 Street.
- 92

Ms. Martel asked about parking with a two-car garage and two spaces outside not included in the
parking count and whether all that pavement was necessary. She counted 51 spaces on the plan., four
spaces per unit. Mr. Smith described the 19' length and standard depth and goal to give each unit two
additional spaces and room to access their garages. He noted the need for turnaround space and
emergency vehicles.

98

99 Rory Morrisette, the Exeter Cemetery Trustee, asked about additional screening for 13-12 Parker Street.

- 100 Mr. Smith reviewed the plan on sheet 5 the northwest side and some breaks for the trees and existing
- 101 chain link fence on the cemetery property. He noted they can't have two fences on top of each other
- that would leave an unsightly weeded area between that could not be maintained. Ms. Martel reviewed
 the planting plan which had Hick's Yews, a naturalistic, living fence.
- 104
- Ms. English questioned the distance to Gill Street entering and exiting and whether the proximity would
 cause conflicts. Mr. Smith described the sight distance and noted that the traffic engineer was good
 with both directions.
- 108

109 Mr. Hubbard questioned the landscaping plan and deciduous tree comment of UEI near the porous

- 110 pavement is used. Mr. Smith explained the stormwater inspection and maintenance manual,
- 111 condominium documents, use of non-steel plow, no sanding and blowing out of the system twice a year
- and noted it would not be an issue.
- 113

Jeff Garska of 111-113 Front Street asked about adequate parking and green space. He stated that if all
buildings were only three units there would be adequate room for both. He questioned the density,
character of the neighborhood, surrounding property values and not saving the existing historical house.
He indicated concerns with traffic, noise, parking and snow. He stated that traffic studies are useless
and doesn't believe there is no impact. He questioned the zoning of the parcel which changed after a
vote on a bifurcation article. He noted that the tax card showed the property zoned as R2, but the tax

- 120 map shows something else. He asked if they could check this with the town attorney as the information
- is incorrect and misleading.
- 122
- Adele Robertson of 106 Front Street asked for an explanation of the waivers and why the cement proposed at the entrance was changed to pervious. She stated concerns with privacy and impacts to her property. She questioned the red and blue flagging and noted that there was additional traffic and parking from the church and vocational-ed. She noted concerns with sight and snow banks and there
- being no sun on the driveways because of the height of the buildings.
- 128

129 Mr. Smith explained the waivers and movement of the driveway away from her boundary. He explained 130 the engineer wanted to keep water off Front Street and to tie into the catch basin which is prohibited 131 without a waiver. He noted the Board wanted the curbing to go away. There will be a lot less runoff to 132 Front Street as a result. He explained that a 24' drive aisle is required and it will be 22' which was 133 reviewed by the traffic engineer. 134 135 Kristen of 5 Gill Street stated that the project is too dense, out of character for the neighborhood, out of 136 scale and inappropriate for the neighborhood. She agreed that the issues would be solved if the project 137 was a lower density. 138 139 Chair Plumer closed public comment at 8:32 PM. 140 141 Ms. English stated that she agreed with abutters that the historic character was being lost, especially 142 with the historic home being gone but the owner has a right to do what they want with their property 143 and there is a limitation to what the Board can do. 144 145 Mr. Grueter asked whether the Board was comfortable with the zoning question and Vice-Chair Brown 146 noted that Dave Sharples and Doug Eastman already weighed in on that. He noted in his own 147 experience maps take precedence, but a condition could be made. He noted that having variety is

- healthy, people have different tastes and some prefer modern. Mr. Kennedy asked what the conditionwould be specifically, and Vice-Chair Brown recommended verifying the question with town counsel.
- 150

Ms. Martel noted that she agreed with the density already stated and would like to see more green space and parking spaces were exceeded. Vice-Chair Brown noted that the two outside spots are also access to their garage. Mr. Grueter noted there is no guest parking anywhere else. A condition could be additional landscape aisle between B and C. Chair Plumer noted he would like to see less units as well. Mr. Smith noted the minimum parking spaces are 36. Vice-Chair Brown noted the only way to reduce it is to reduce the garage spaces, but he is not suggesting it.

- Chair Plumer asked about the weight limit data on the porous pavement. Mr. Smith noted that tractor
 trailer turning would damage it but not a box truck or passenger cars. (unidentified from the public
 asked about fire trucks).
- 161

Ms. Smith indicated that the Board could vote on the stormwater waiver although Mr. Sharples indicated it was no longer necessary, but he hasn't discussed it with him since he left. He read the letter requesting a waiver from 9.3.2.7 and the minimal impact and prohibited discharge to the municipal stormwater system and that public works felt it had no negative impact. He noted it would not threaten public health, welfare or safety or be injurious to other property. He noted the uniqueness and not wanting stormwater flow into Front Street and that the waiver doesn't vary zoning or the master plan.

- 168
- 169 Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting waivers that the request of
- 170 Stonearch Development, Planning Board Case #24-17 for a waiver from Section 9.3.2.7 of the Site Plan
- 171 Review and Subdivision Regulations regarding stormwater management be approved. Mr. Kennedy
- seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.

173 174 Mr. Smith discussed the criteria for the waiver for the 22' drive aisle. He noted that the Fire Chief, DPW 175 and UEi had no objection at TRC. 176 177 Ms. English motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting waivers that the request of Stonearch 178 Development, Planning Board Case #24-17 for a waiver from Section 9.1.4.9 of the Site Plan Review 179 and Subdivision Regulations for a waiver to permit the proposed drive aisle and fire lane width to be 180 22' rather than 24' be approved. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, all were 181 in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0. 182 183 Mr. Smith discussed the criteria for the waiver for grading within 5' of the property line and the 184 relocation of the driveway to 5.5.' He noted there may be some disturbance for fence, screening and 185 vegetation, trees and shrubs which would be beneficial to the abutters directly. 186 187 Mr. Kennedy asked if this would allow him to move the driveway and Ms. Murphy indicated no. 188 189 Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting waivers that the request of 190 Stonearch Development, Planning Board Case #24-17 for a waiver from Section 9.3.6.4 of the Site Plan 191 Review and Subdivision Regulations for grading within 5' of the property line be approved. Mr. 192 Grueter seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0. 193 194 Ms. Murphy reviewed the additional conditions of approval: 195 196 1. Tree protection during construction. 197 2. Easement in favor of 114 Front Street to allow continuance of existing walkway. 198 3. Applicant add landscape island between Building 1, B and C. 199 4. Town Attorney to verify the zoning is accurate as presented by the developer. 200 201 Ms. Murphy reviewed the standard conditions of approval: 202 203 1. An electronic as built plan with details acceptable to the Town shall be provided prior to the issuance 204 of a certificate of occupancy. This plan must be in a dwg or dxf file format and in NAD 1983 State Plane 205 New Hampshire FIPS 2800 feet coordinates; 206 207 2. A preconstruction meeting shall be arranged by the applicant and his contractor with the Town 208 engineer prior to any site work commencing. The following must be submitted for review and approval 209 prior to the preconstruction meeting: 210 211 i. the SWPPP (storm water pollution prevention plan), if applicable, be submitted to and 212 reviewed for approval by DPW prior to the preconstruction meeting; and 213 ii. A project schedule and construction cost estimate. 214 215 3. Third party construction inspection fees shall be paid prior to scheduling the preconstruction 216 meeting.

217						
218	4. The inspection and maintenance manual log form and inspection checklist and maintenance guidance					
219	infiltration pond inspection checklist in the stormwater management and bmp inspection and					
220	maintenance plan dated December 20, 2024 shall be completed and submitted to the Town Engineer					
221	annually on or before January 31 st . This requirement shall be an ongoing condition of approval.					
222						
223	5. The annual report section of the stormwater best management practices inspection and maintenance					
224	plan shall be revised to be consistent with condition #4 above. The annual report section currently					
225	states that the annual report will be prepared and submitted to the town engineer upon request.					
226						
227	6. All condominium documents including declaration and by laws shall be submitted to the Town					
228	Planner for review and approval prior to signing the final plans. The documents submitted to the Town					
229	shall include language regarding the maintenance requirements of the pervious pavers and all other					
230	stormwater practices shown on the plans and other applicable conditions of this approval. In the event					
231	the Town Planner deems necessary, the condominium documents shall be reviewed by the town's					
232	attorney, at the applicant's expense.					
233						
234	7. All applicable state permit approval numbers shall be noted on the final plans.					
235						
236	8. All applicable fees to be paid including, but not limited to sewer/water connection fees, impact fees					
237	and inspection fees (including third party inspection fees) prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.					
238						
239	9. All landscaping shown on plans shall be maintained and any dead or dying vegetation shall be					
240	replaced, no later than the following growing season. as long as the site plan remains valid. This					
241	condition is not intended to circumvent the revocation procedures set forth in state statutes.					
242						
243	10. All outdoor lighting (including security lights) shall be down lit and shielded so no direct light is					
244	visible from adjacent properties and/or right of ways.					
245						
246	11. The applicant shall submit the land use and stormwater management information about the project					
247	using the PTAPP online municipal tracking tool. The PTAPP submittal must be accepted by DPW phor to					
248	the preconstruction meeting.					
249	Ma Martal mationed that the request of Stangard Douglonment Diagning Deard Cree #24.17 for a					
250	multi family cite plan be approved with the conditions read by Kristen Myraby. Mr. Kennedy					
251	multi-jumily site plan be approved with the conditions read by Kristen Marphy. Wr. Kennedy					
252	Seconded the motion. A fon can vote was taken. Wr. Habbard voted ave, Wis. Marter voted ave, Mr.					
233	Ms. English voted new. The motion passed 6.1.0					
254	Nis. English Voleu huy. The motion pusseu 6-1-0.					
255	2. The application of StoneArch Development for a multi-family site plan review for the proposed					
250	construction of a six (6) unit townhouse style residential condominium development along with					
252	associated narking and site improvements. The subject property is located at 57 Portsmouth Avenue in					
259	the C-2 Highway Commercial zoning district Tax Man Parcel #73-14 PR Case #25-1					
260	the c_2 , manway commercial zoning district. Tax map r and r					
200						

261 262 Chair Plumer read the Public Hearing Notice out loud and asked if the case was ready to be heard. Ms. 263 Murphy indicated the case was ready for review purposes. 264 Ms. English motioned to open Planning Board Case #25-1. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A vote 265 266 was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0. 267 268 Ms. Murphy read the comments from Town Planner, Dave Sharples indicating that the application was 269 originally scheduled for the March 27, 2025 meeting, however due to time restrictions the Board voted 270 to table the presentation to tonight's meeting. The Board held a site walk this morning at 8 AM. The 271 applicant submitted plans and supporting documents dated January 28, 2025 and a Technical Review 272 Committee meeting was held on February 20, 2025. Underwood Engineering (UEI) provided a comment 273 letter dated February 18, 2025. The applicant obtained several variances for the proposed construction 274 and the notices of decision and minutes were provided from the November 19, 2024 meeting. The 275 applicant is requesting two waivers in their letter dated January 28, 2025. The applicant submitted 276 revised plans and supporting documents dated March 19, 2025. 277 278 Christian Smith presented the application for townhouse style condominiums at 57 Portsmouth Avenue 279 and posted the proposed plan showing the driveway entrance and extended sidewalk. He noted the 280 Fire Department expressed no objection to the 22' wide aisle. There will be underground utilities and 281 municipal water and sewer. He noted landscape plantings. He noted a second comment letter from UEI. 282 283 Mr. Grueter asked about the walkway for the back of building two. Mr. Smith indicated the location on 284 the architectural drawing and noted the service door is in the garage. Architect Robert Baldwin 285 explained the slope grade and two visitor spots with granite steps to the walkway. 286 287 Vice-Chair Brown asked if there could be any balconies or decking. 288 289 Ms. English questioned the purpose of the lighting up in the eaves facing Portsmouth Avenue. 290 291 Ms. Martel asked about the sidewalk on Portsmouth Avenue and asked if the curb cut could be 292 tightened because it is not in line with the road. Mr. Smith noted the tip down for handicapped access 293 and that it could be adjusted. 294 295 Chair Plumer opened the hearing to public comment at 8:40 PM and being none closed public comment. 296 297 Mr. Smith discussed the second UEI review concerning retaining walls which will be part of the 298 foundation and recommended design by a structural engineer. 299 300 Ms. Martel noted it would be helpful to see the grading on plan and asked if there were any fall 301 protection. Mr. Baldwin indicated the height of the wall. 302 303 Ms. Martel asked about snow storage and Mr. Smith depicted the areas on the plans. 304

305Vice-Chair Brown motioned to table Planning Board Case #25-1 to the Planning Board's April 24, 2025306meeting at 7 PM at the Nowak Room and revised plans and supporting documents shall be submitted307to the Planning Office at least 8 days prior to the scheduled meeting or the application may remain on308the table until a future meeting. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in309favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.

310

3. The application of Dade Auto Holdings Realty Trust (Volvo Cars of Exeter) for a minor site plan review
and Wetland Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the for the proposed construction of a 6,200 SF addition
to the rear of the existing Volvo dealership at 140 Portsmouth Avenue along with associated site
improvements. The subject property is located in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district and is

identified as Tax Map Parcel #52-108 and #51-1. PB Case #25-2.

316

Chair Plumer read the Public Hearing Notice out loud and asked if the case was ready to be heard. Ms.Murphy noted the application was complete for review purposes.

319

Vice-Chair Brown motioned to open Planning Board Case #25-2. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.

322

Ms. Murphy read Town Planner, Dave Sharple's comments. She noted that The applicant submitted plans and supporting documents dated February 19, 2025. A Technical Review Committee meeting was held on March 20, 2025. The applicant is requesting a waiver from Section 9.2.4-1a regarding the pitch of the roof. The applicant submitted revised plans and supporting documents dated April 2, 2025 and presented their wetlands Conditional Use Permit application to the Conservation Commission at their April 8, 2025 meeting. Mr. Sharples provided standard conditions of approval if the Board decides to forego a site walk and act on the application.

330

Corey Belden of Altus Engineers presented the application and noted that Jonathan Smith was present from Warren Street Architects. He posted the proposed plan of the expansion of the auto service center in the rear of the existing building. He noted no increase to impervious area because the addition is being constructed over the existing parking area. Mr. Belden reviewed stormwater treatment on site and the 2020 wetland pond constructed. He noted that Dade Auto also owned the adjacent property. He noted that roof runoff is collected by underground downspouts and the system drains to the wet pond which has the capacity for the additional flow. The outlet structure would be raised by 1.'

339 Mr. Belden noted that they met with the Technical Review Committee on the 20th and displayed the 340 wetland buffer and noted 210 SF of disturbance which may be exempt because of the existing pavement

in the buffer. He noted 165 SF of disturbance for the new pipe to the wet pond

342

343 Mr. Belden reviewed the waiver request for the roof pitch which was necessary to tie into the existing344 building which also had a 1:12 pitch not matching the 3:12 required.

345

346 Mr. Belden reviewed the additional building mounted light fixtures and noted that the solar on the 347 existing building will be expanded onto the new roof.

- Chair Plumer opened the hearing to the public for comments and questions at 10:03 PM and being noneclosed public comment.
- 351

352 Vice-Chair Brown commented that it was an excellent use and the CUP was warranted with minimal

353 impact and no additional impervious surface and is out of sight of the general public. Chair Plumer

- noted they would make use of the existing stormwater management plan and match the pitch of theexisting roof.
- 356

Ms. Martel asked if a photometric plan should be required, and Mr. Belden noted there is no additional
lighting on the wetland side. Ms. Martel indicated she was satisfied that a photometric plan was not
necessary to provide but is always a good practice to complete.

360

Ms. English asked about the vegetation on the front of the building on the Portsmouth Avenue side and
 Mr. Belden described the existing vegetation. Ms. English asked about snow plowing and Mr. Belden
 described the snow stakes.

364

Mr. Belden reviewed the criteria for the roof pitch waiver under Section 9.2.4-1a and read the waiver request letter into the record. He noted it was not detrimental to public, health, welfare and safety or injurious to other property and noted the unique conditions and noted the hardship was the existing pitch tie-in and that the request would not alter zoning or the master plan.

369

Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting waivers that the request of Dade
 Auto Holdings, Planning Board Case #25-2 for a waiver from Section 9.2.4-1a of the Site Plan Review
 and Subdivision Regulations for roof pitch of 3:12 or greater, be approved. Ms. English seconded the

- 373 *motion.* A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.
- 374

Mr. Belden presented the required for a wetlands Conditional Use Permit with 375 SF of disturbance
 from 210 SF of existing pavement and 165 for the new drain to the existing wet pond to collect runoff.

377 Ms. Murphy noted the Conservation Commission had no objection to the CUP as presented.

378

379Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting wetland CUP that the request of380Dade Auto Holdings, Planning Board Case #25-2 for a wetland Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Grueter

seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.

382

384

383 Ms. Murphy read out loud the proposed conditions of approval for the minor site plan:

An electronic as built plan with details acceptable to the Town shall be provided prior to the issuance
 of a certificate of occupancy. This plan must be in a dwg or dxf file format and in NAD 1983 State Plane
 New Hampshire FIPS 2800 feet coordinates;

388

A preconstruction meeting shall be arranged by the applicant and his contractor with the Town
 engineer prior to any site work commencing. The following must be submitted for review and approval

391 prior to the preconstruction meeting:

393 394 395 396	i. the SWPPP (storm water pollution prevention plan), if applicable, be submitted to and reviewed for approval by DPW prior to the preconstruction meeting; and ii. A project schedule and construction cost estimate.
397 398 399	3. Third party construction inspection fees shall be paid prior to scheduling the preconstruction meeting.
400 401 402 403	4. The annual operations and stormwater maintenance report in the stormwater management operation and maintenance manual dated February 19, 2025 shall be completed and submitted to the Town engineer annually on or before January 31 st . This requirement shall be an ongoing condition of approval.
404 405 406	5. All applicable state permit approval numbers shall be noted on the final plans.
400 407 408 409	6. All applicable fees to be paid including, but not limited to sewer/water connection fees, impact fees and inspection fees (including third party inspection fees) prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
410 411 412 413	7. All landscaping shown on plans shall be maintained and any dead or dying vegetation shall be replaced, no later than the following growing season. as long as the site plan remains valid. This condition is not intended to circumvent the revocation process set forth in state statutes.
414 415 416	8. All outdoor lighting (including security lights) shall be down lit and shielded so no direct light is visible from adjacent properties and/or right of ways.
417 418 419 420	9. The applicant shall submit the land use and stormwater management information about the project using the PTAPP online municipal tracking tool. The PTAPP submittal must be accepted by DPW prior to the preconstruction meeting.
421 422 423 424	Vice-Chair Brown motioned that the request of Dade Auto Holdings, Planning Board Case #25-2 for a minor site plan be approved with the conditions read by Kristen Murphy. Ms. English seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.
425	IV. OLD BUSINESS
426 427 428	APPROVAL OF MINUTES
429 430	February 27, 2025
431 432	Ms. English, Mr. Grueter, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Hubbard recommended edits.
433 434 435	Mr. Grueter motioned to approve the February 27, 2025 meeting minutes, as amended. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.

436	March 13, 2025						
437 438 739	Ms. English recommended edits.						
435 440 441	Ms. English motioned to approve the March 13, 2025 minutes, as amended. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion A vote was taken all were in favor, the motion passed 7.0-0						
442	motion. A vote was taken, an were in javor, the motion passed 7-0-0.						
443	V. OTHER BUSINESS						
444							
445	•	Master Plan Discussion					
446							
447	•	Field Modifications					
448							
449	•	Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Release					
450							
451	VI. TOWN PLANNER'S ITEMS						
452	VII. CHAIRPERSON'S ITEMS						
453	VIII. PB REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT ON "OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITY"						
454	IX. ADJOURN						
455	Vice-Chair Brown motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:34 PM.						
456	Respectfully submitted.						
457	Daniel Hoije	r,					
458	Recording Secretary (Via Exeter TV)						



TOWN OF EXETER

Planning and Building Department 10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 • FAX 772-4709 www.exeternh.gov

Date: April 17, 2025

To: Planning Board

From: Dave Sharples, Town Planner

Re: StoneArch Development 57 Portsmouth Avenue PB Case #25-1

The Applicant has submitted a multi-family site plan review application for the proposed development of the vacant property located at 57 Portsmouth Avenue. The developer is proposing the construction of a six (6) unit townhouse style residential condominium development (two 3-unit buildings) along with associated parking and site improvements. The property is located in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district and is identified as Tax Map Parcel #65-137.

The Applicant appeared before the Board at the April 10th, 2025 meeting to present their plans for the proposed project. The Board tabled the application for further discussion at the April 24th, 2025 meeting. A site walk was also held on the morning of April 10th, to view site conditions. The minutes from the site walk are attached for your review.

As previously noted, the Applicant obtained several variances for the proposed construction of this project from the Zoning Board of Adjustment at their November 19th, 2024 meeting. Copies of the ZBA notice of decision and minutes from that meeting were included in previous meeting materials.

The Applicant has submitted revised plans and supporting documents, dated 04/16/25, and those materials are enclosed for your review. Staff is still in the process of reviewing these materials and I will provide the Board with an update at the meeting.

The Applicant is requesting two (2) waivers from the Board's Site Plan Review & Subdivision Regulations in conjunction with the application. Please see the waiver request letter from Beals Associates, PLLC, dated 01/28/25, included in the meeting materials previously mailed.

I have provided motions below for your convenience. I will be prepared with conditions of approval at the meeting should the Board decide to act on the application.

Waiver Motions:

Roadway and Fire Lanes Less than 24' Width waiver motion: After reviewing the criteria for granting waivers, I move that the request of StoneArch Development (PB Case #25-1) for a waiver from Section 9.14.9 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations to permit proposed roadway and fire lanes to be less than 24' in width be APPROVED / APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS / TABLED / DENIED.

Grading within 5 feet of exterior property line waiver motion: After reviewing the criteria for granting waivers, I move that the request of StoneArch Development (PB Case #25-1) for a waiver from Section 9.3.6.4. of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations regarding grading within 5 feet of an exterior property line be APPROVED / APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS / TABLED / DENIED.

Planning Board Motions:

Multi-Family Site Plan Motion: I move that the request of StoneArch Development (PB Case #25-1) for Multi-Family Site Plan approval be APPROVED / APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS / DENIED.

Thank You.

Enclosures



Land Planning • Civil Engineering Landscape Architecture • Septic Design & Evaluation Stratham, NH

Exeter Planning Board, David Sharples, Town Planner Town Planning Office, Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

April 16, 2025

Re: 57 Portsmouth Ave. – Residential Development Response to UEI Comments – Review #2

Dear Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, & Mr. Sharples:

We are in receipt of a second review letter from Underwood Engineers, dated March 26, 2025 and we offer the following responses to the noted comments. Each comment is followed by our response in **bold italics**.

<u>Plan Sheets</u>

As shown, the retaining wall along the back and side of units D through F appears to be the building foundation, rather than a separate wall. Please clarify.
 BA Response: The foundation for the building will be a separate structure with the retaining wall tying into it on each side.

UE RESPONSE. The drawings are not updated to reflect the clarification.

BA Response: The layout has been revised to depict the retaining wall as a shared foundation wall along the southwest sides of both buildings.

11. We note retaining walls are proposed as close as 4' from the property line and the guy pole supporting Utility Pole 14. Final design of retaining walls often occurs (by others) closer to the time of construction. Due to the proximity of the abutting parcel, the dimensions of the structural elements (and future maintenance) required of the proposed retaining wall need to be considered as part of the overall design approval.

BA Response: This can be discussed with the board as is normally completed post approval

UE RESPONSE. The viability of constructing the proposed retaining walls, without easements, is in question. Without the retaining walls, the project as proposed, is not possible.

BA Response: This was discussed with the Planning Board and it was agreed that post approval design is appropriate.

Truck Turning Plan

22. The truck can only turn around and drive out if the 2 parking spaces next to Unit D are empty. *BA Response: In an emergency situation if the spaces are occupied the truck can back out if needed.*

UE Response: We defer further comment to the Fire Department.

BA Response: The Fire Department indicated that a fire truck would park on Portsmouth Avenue and connect to an existing hydrant in the event of a fire, rather than entering the site.

<u>Drainage Analysis</u>

24. No stormwater detention or treatment is proposed for the project. Beals Response: Stormwater treatment and detention has been provided in the form of a stone infiltration trench behind the retaining wall.

UE Response: Several aspects of this response are unclear.

- The Applicants response to comment 3 above appears to be in conflict with the description of the infiltration trench, as it is shown being predominantly behind the building foundation, not the retaining wall.
- Generally speaking, retaining walls are designed to <u>not</u> detain water behind them and in fact, backfill materials are specified based on the capacity to quickly pass water behind the wall such that it can be drained away from the wall so as to not create additional hydrostatic forces on the wall, causing it to be pushed away from the retained slope. A wall design, capable of intentionally holding detained water behind it, is an atypical structural wall, lending further impetus to adequately addressing comment 11 as part of the approval effort, not afterward.
- The infiltration trench will only receive run-off from a small portion of the runoff from the site. Most of the detained water will be offsite runoff. The majority of the site, including proposed impervious areas, will remain undetained and untreated. The lack of area available for compliant stormwater management is an Applicant-imposed condition directly resulting from the amount of total impervious being proposed.

BA Response: The stone infiltration area is located below the permeable paver walkway at the southeast foundation wall. Additionally, the roof runoff from the rear building will be guttered to the stone reservoir below the pavers to increase the runoff to the practice.

25. Onsite treatment of stormwater is required per Exeter regulations 9.3.2....

Beals Response: See previous response.

UE Response: The infiltration trench will only treat a small portion of the runoff, predominantly generated from offsite abutting parcels. Per response 24 above, the viability of the proposed infiltration trench achieving stormwater management is also in question as the characteristics necessary for it to do so are in direct conflict with structural retaining wall design parameters.

BA Response: Treatment is provided with infiltration under the permeable paver sidewalk.

26. No increase in stormwater leaving the site is allowed per Exeter regulations 9.3.2....

Beals Response: There is only a minimal increase for both the WQV and 2-year storm events, which will not impact the capacity of the municipal stormwater system.

UE Response: The original comment still stands.

BA Response: Increases have been further mitigated by the design revisions including routing additional stormwater to the infiltration area. The de minimis increases shown under a WQV and 2-YR storm (0.01 cfs) are not deemed increases as they are within the mathematical error of the design software. The 2-YR volume is below 0.1 ac-ft which is the threshold criteria for channel protection.

- 27. Post-volume and flowrate exceed the pre-values for all evaluated storms. No onsite infiltration or storage is proposed. Almost all run-off flows toward the Town's ROW with most of it piped directly to the Town's drainage system in Portsmouth Ave. *Beals Response: See previous responses.*
 - UE Response: The original comment still stands.

BA Response: The catch basin and pipe connection to the drainage system has been removed.

- **28.** The drainage report states the increase in flow leaving the stie would have no impact on the Town's system. Provide information/data to support this statement. *Beals Response: See previous responses.*
 - UE Response: The original comment still stands.
 - BA Response: This has been confirmed with the Exeter Town Engineer.
- **31. PTAP Database:** The Applicant is requested to enter project related stormwater tracking information contained in the site plan application documents using the Great Bay Pollution Tracking and Accounting Program (PTAP) database (www.unh.edu/unhsc/ptapp). *BA Response: This will be completed after local approvals are received.*

UE RESPONSE. Comment not addressed. Submission of the PTAP post approval is too late in the process should it not demonstrate a net reduction in effective impervious, which is highly likely in this case. Changes at that point in the process may require a resubmission to the Planning Board.

BA Response: The PTAPP database appears to be down and not accepting new entries. We will complete a database entry and forward the summary report when the site is back up and running.

Thank you for your timely and professional review of the submitted plans. We hope the information provided address your concerns. Please feel free to contact our office if you have any additional question and/or comments.

Very Truly Yours,

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O. Smith

Christian O. Smith, PE Principal

CIVIL ENGINEERS:



70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, THIRD FLOOR, SUITE 2 STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860



LAND SURVEYORS:

BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING 335 SECOND CROWN POINT ROAD BARRINGTON, NH 03825 603-332-2863

WETLAND/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT:

JOHN P. HAYES III CSS, CWS 7 LIMESTONE WAY NORTH HAMPTON, NH 03862 603-205-4396



LOCATION MAP	SHEET #	TIT
		COV
	1-2	EXI
	3	PAR
	4	GRA
CLOVER ST INN INN	5	UTI
Locus	6	LIG
HIGHLAND ST	6b	COI
PROSPEC	7	ERC
EXETER HOSPITAL	8-9	CON
SCALE: 1"=500'		

RECO
STONEAR
42J I
DOV

PLAN SET LEGEND

5/8"REBAR	٠		
DRILL HOLE	۲		
CONC. BOUND		VGC	VERTICAL GRANITE CURB
UTILITY POLE	C)		
DRAIN MANHOLE	D	OVERHEAD ELEC. LINE	
SEWER MANHOLE	S	FENCING	——————————————————————————————————————
EXISTING LIGHT POLE	¢	DRAINAGE LINE	DDDDD
EXISTING CATCH BASIN		SEWER LINE	S
PROPOSED CATCH BASIN	⊞	GAS LINE	
WATER GATE	WV M	WATER LINE	www
WATER SHUT OFF	neo.	STONE WALL	eaccoccoccoccoccoccoccoccoccoccoccoccocco
HYDRANT	ж,	TREE LINE	
PINES, ETC.	*	ABUT. PROPERTY LINES	
MAPLES, ETC.	E ST	EXIST. PROPERTY LINES	——
EXIST. SPOT GRADE	کھیکیک 96×69	BUILDING SETBACK LINES	
PROP. SPOT GRADE	96x69	EXIST. CONTOUR	100
DOUBLE POST SIGN		PROP. CONTOUR	
SINGLE POST SIGN		SOIL LINES	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

PB CASE #

CHAIRMAN SIGNATURE:

1	7	\mathbb{A}	7
		\mathbb{V}	/

DRAWING INDEX

LE

VER SHEET ISTING CONDITION PLANS (BERRY SURVEY) **RKING & PAVEMENT PLAN** ADING, DRAINAGE, & EROSION CONTROL ILITY PLAN HTING PLAN LOR PLANTING PLAN OSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL DETAILS NSTRUCTION DETAILS

ORD APPLICANT

RCH DEVELOPMENT CORP. DOVER POINT ROAD 'ER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

RECORD OWNER

BLAKE PROPERTIES OF NH, LLC PO BOX 368 NEWFIELDS, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03856

REQUIRED PERMITS					
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PERMIT					
NHDES	SEWER	CONNECTI	NC		
NHDES	WATER	CONNECTIO	NC		

APPROVED ZONING RELIEF:						
Art	le 4, Section 4.4, Schedule III:	F				

Front setback less than required 50' to 9 ' Article 4, Section 4.4, Schedule III: Side setback less than required 20' to 7.7' Article 4, Section 4.4, Schedule III: Rear setback less than required 50' to 8.7' Article 4, Section 4.4, Schedule III: Density less than 5,000 sf /unit to 1,960 sf Article 4, Section 4.4, Schedule III: Builling coverage of 36.7% where 30% maximum is required.

тоо
IBD

	REVISIONS:	DATE:
1	REVISED PER REVIEW COMMENTS	03/19/25
2	REVISED PER REVIEW COMMENTS	04/16/25
3		
4		
5		









——OHW-

_ _ _ .

- SIZE VEHICLES AND TRUCKS, (DESIGN VEHICLE IS THE EXETER LADDER TRUCK OR 35' BOX TRUCK) EITHER DELIVERING TO, OR USING THE PROPERTY.
 ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED IN THE AREA(S) DEPICTED ON THIS PLAN AS SNOW STORAGE AREAS. IN THE EVENT THAT THE AREA(S) APPROVED FOR SNOW STORAGE BECOME FULL, THE OWNER SHALL REASONABLY REMOVE EXCESS SNOW FROM THE SITE, AND SHALL NOT ALLOW SNOW TO BE STORED WITHIN TRAVEL
- AISLES.
 4. ALL WASTE MATERIALS AND RECYCLABLE SHALL BE CONTAINED WITHIN THE BUILDING(S) OR APPROVED STORAGE FACILITIES AND SHALL NOT BE OTHERWISE STORED ON THE PROPERTY. REFUSE COLLECTION WILL BE BY DUMPSTER AS NEEDED.
- 5. ALL WATER, SEWER, ROAD (INCLUDING PARKING LOT), AND DRAINAGE WORK SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 9.5 GRADING, DRAINAGE, AND EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL AND THE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.



PREPARED FOR: STONEARCH DEVEL. CORP. 42J DOVER POINT ROAD DOVER, NH 03820



70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, THIRD FLOOR, SUITE 2 STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860

NOTES:

- THE PURPOSE OF THIS PLAN IS TO SHOW 6 TOWN HOUSE UNITS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING SPACES.
 ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL CONFORM TO TOWN OF EXETER STANDARDS AND
- REGULATIONS. 3. ALL WATER, SEWER, ROAD (INCLUDING PARKING LOT), AND DRAINAGE WORK SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH <u>SECTION 9.3 STORMWATER</u> MANAGEMENT STANDARDS, STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN, STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN, AND EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL STANDARDS AND THE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN EXETER NEW HAMPSHIRE" SEE SECTION 9.14 ROADWAY
- PUBLIC UTILITIES IN EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE". SEE SECTION 9.14 ROADWAYS. ACCESS POINTS, AND FIRE LANES AND SECTION 9.13 PARKING AREAS FOR EXCEPTIONS.
 4. IN ACCORDANCE WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW & SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS SECTIONS 7.15.10 AND 9.3.4 THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE THE TOWN WITH
- THREE COPIES OF THE STORWWATER POLLANT SHALL PROVIDE THE TOWN WITH AND ALSO ENSURE THAT ONE COPY REMAINS ON SITE. 5. ALL PROPOSED SIGNAGE SHALL CONFORM WITH THE TOWN ZONING
- REGULATIONS UNLESS A VARIANCE IS OTHERWISE REQUESTED. 6. TOTAL PROPOSED DISTURBANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION = $0.24\pm$ ACRES.
- 7. UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION AND PRIOR TO RELEASE OF BOND, THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT A LETTER TO THE TOWN, SIGNED AND STAMPED BY THE DESIGN ENGINEER, WHO MUST BE A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER IN NH, STATING CONSTRUCTION HAS BEEN COMPLETED IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE APPROVED PLANS.
- 8. UNDERGROUND FACILITIES, UTILITIES AND STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN LOCATED FROM FIELD OBSERVATIONS AND THEIR LOCATIONS MUST BE CONSIDERED APPROXIMATE ONLY. BEALS ASSOCIATES OR ANY OF THEIR EMPLOYEES TAKE NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE LOCATION OF ANY UNDERGROUND STRUCTURES OR UTILITIES NOT SHOWN, THAT MAY EXIST. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO HAVE ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES OR STRUCTURES LOCATED
- PRIOR TO EXCAVATION WORK BY CALLING 1-888-DIG-SAFE. 9. THIS PLAN HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR MUNICIPAL APPROVALS AND FOR CONSTRUCTION BASED ON DATA OBTAINED FROM ON-SITE FIELD SURVEY AND EXISTING MUNICIPAL RECORDS. THROUGHOUT THE CONSTRUCTION PROCESS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INFORM THE ENGINEER IMMEDIATELY OF ANY FIELD DISCREPANCY FROM DATA AS SHOWN ON THE DESIGN PLANS. THIS INCLUDES ANY UNFORESEEN CONDITIONS, SUBSURFACE OR OTHERWISE, FOR EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS. ANY CONTRADICTION BETWEEN ITEMS OF THIS PLAN/PLAN SET, OR BETWEEN THE PLANS AND ON-SITE CONDITIONS MUST BE RESOLVED BEFORE RELATED CONSTRUCTION HAS BEEN INITIATED. 10. ALL BENCHMARKS AND TOPOGRAPHY SHOULD BE FIELD VERIFIED BY THE
- CONTRACTOR. 11. THIS SITE IS NOT LOCATED IN THE 100 YEAR FLOOD ZONE.
- 12. GARBAGE WILL BE STORED IN TOTER BINS WITHIN GARAGES FOR PRIVATE PICKUP.

WETLAND NOTE:

1. WETLANDS WERE NOT FOUND ON THE LOT OR WITHIN 100 FEET OF ANY PROPERTY BOUNDARY LINES BY JOHN P. HAYES III CSS, CWS DURING A SITE EVALUATION ON DECEMBER 9, 2024.



		EXETER, NH Tax map 65 1 ot 137		
R REVIEW COMMENTS	04/16/25			
R REVIEW COMMENTS	03/19/25	DATE:	JAN 28, 2025	SCALE: 1" = 10'
	DATE:	PROJ. N0:	NH-1535	SHEET NO. 3
SDIL INFORMATION WAS OBTAINED FROM USDA NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE (NRCS): SDIL IDENTIFICATION LEGEND:

MAP UNIT	MAP_UNIT	HYDROLOGIC
SYMBOL	<u>NAME</u>	SOIL GROUP
538A 699	SQUAMSCOTT FINE SANDY LOAM URBAN LAND	C/D

SLOPE PHASES: A=0-3%, B=3-8%, C=8-15%, D=15-25%, E=25%+



UNDERGROUND FACILITIES, UTILITIES AND STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN PLOTTED FROM FIELD OBSERVATION AND THEIR LOCATION MUST BE CONSIDERED APPROXIMATE ONLY. NEITHER BEALS ASSOCIATES, NOR ANY OF THEIR EMPLOYEES TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE LOCATION OF ANY UNDERGROUND STRUCTURES OR UTILITIES NOT SHOWN THAT MAY EXIST. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO HAVE ALL UNDERGROUND STRUCTURES AND/OR UTILITIES LOCATED PRIOR TO EXCAVATION WORK BY CALLING 1–888–DIG–SAFE (1–888–344–7233) AND EXETER DPW (603) 773–6157.









AND/OR UTILITIES LOCATED PRIOR TO EXCAVATION WORK BY CALLING 1-888-DIG-SAFE (1-888-344-7233) AND EXETER DPW (603) 773-6157.

Luminaire Schedule	
Ymbol Ycy Label Arrangement Description • 6 W1 Single TMS: 33W-0-15LED-30K-VXX-WM-C	LayLuminaireLumensLumensCXX-DIMLWALL MTD 10' AFG0.9001109
	ENUE UNIT B UNIT B UNIT C UNIT E UNIT D UNIT D UNIT E UNIT D
I I UNIT F I I I I I I I	UNITE UNITD





STONEARCH DEVEL. CORP. 42J DOVER POINT ROAD DOVER, NH 03820



70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, THIRD FLOOR, SUITE 2 STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860



CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE

 CUT AND REMOVE TREES IN CONSTRUCTION AREAS AS REQUIRED OR DIRECTED 2. CONSTRUCT AND/OR INSTALL TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT SEDIMENT EROSION AND DETENTION CONTROL FACILITIES AS REQUIRED. EROSION, SEDIMENT AND DETENTION CONTROL FACILITIES SHALL BE INSTALLED AND STABILIZED PRIOR TO ANY EARTH MOVING OPERATION AND PRIOR TO DIRECTING RUNOFF TO THEM. 3. CLEAR, CUT, GRUB AND DISPOSE OF DEBRIS IN APPROVED FACILITIES. STUMPS AND

DEBRIS ARE TO BE REMOVED FROM SITE AND DISPOSED OF PER STATE AND LOCAL REGULATIONS. 4. EXCAVATE AND STOCKPILE TOPSOIL /LOAM. ALL AREAS SHALL BE STABILIZED

IMMEDIATELY AFTER GRADING. 5. CONSTRUCT TEMPORARY CULVERTS AS REQUIRED OR DIRECTED

6. CONSTRUCT THE ROADWAY AND ITS ASSOCIATED DRAINAGE STRUCTURES

7. INSTALL PIPE AND CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATED APPURTENANCES AS REQUIRED OR DIRECTED. ALL DISTURBED AREAS SHALL STABILIZED IMMEDIATELY AFTER GRADING. 8. BEGIN PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY SEEDING AND MULCHING. ALL CUT AND FILL SLOPES AND DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE SEEDED OR MULCHED AS REQUIRED, OR DIRECTED.

9. DAILY OR AS REQUIRED, CONSTRUCT TEMPORARY BERMS, DRAINAGE CHECK DAMS, DITCHES, SEDIMENT TRAPS, ETC. TO PREVENT EROSION ON THE SITE AND PREVENT ANY SILTATION OF ABUTTING WATERS OR PROPERTY.

10. INSPECT AND MAINTAIN ALL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES DURING CONSTRUCTION 11. COMPLETE PERMANENT SEEDING AND LANDSCAPING

12. REMOVE TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL MEASURES AFTER SEEDING AREAS HAVE ESTABLISHED THEMSELVES AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS ARE COMPLETE. SMOOTH AND

RE-VEGETATE ALL DISTURBED AREAS. 13. ALL SWALES AND DRAINAGE STRUCTURES WILL BE CONSTRUCTED AND STABILIZED PRIOR TO HAVING RUNOFF DIRECTED TO THEM. 14. FINISH PAVING ALL DRIVEWAYS

SILT FENCE CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS

1. WOVEN WIRE FENCE TO BE FASTENED SECURELY TO FENCE POSTS WITH WIRE TIES OR STAPLES AND FILTER CLOTH SHALL BE FASTENED TO WOVEN WIRE EVERY 24" AT TOP MID AND BOTTOM SECTIONS AND BE EMBEDDED INTO GROUND A MINIMUM OF 8" THE FENCE POSTS SHALL BE A MINIMUM 48" LONG, SPACED A

MAXIMUM 10' APART, AND DRIVEN A MINIMUM OF 16" INTO THE GROUND WHEN TWO SECTIONS OF FILTER CLOTH ADJOIN EACH OTHER. 3. THE ENDS OF THE FABRIC SHALL BE OVERLAPPED BY SIX INCHES, FOLDED AND STAPLED TO PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM BYPASSING MAINTENANCE SHALL BE PERFORMED AS NEEDED AND

SEDIMENT 4. REMOVED WHEN "BULGES" DEVELOP IN THE SILT FENCE AND PROPERLY DISPOSED OF PLACE THE ENDS OF THE SILT FENCE UP CONTOUR TO PROVIDE 5. FOR SEDIMENT STORAGE SILT FENCES SHALL BE REMOVED WHEN NO LONGER NEEDED AND

6. THE SEDIMENT COLLECTED SHALL BE DISPOSED AS DIRECTED BY THE ENGINEER. THE AREA DISTURBED BY THE REMOVAL SHALL BE SMOOTHED AND RE-VEGETATED

SILT FENCE MAINTENANCE

1. SILT FENCES SHALL BE INSPECTED IMMEDIATELY AFTER EACH RAINFALL AND AT LEAST DAILY DURING PROLONGED RAINFALL. ANY REPAIRS THAT ARE REQUIRED SHALL BE MADE IMMEDIATELY IF THE FABRIC ON A SILT FENCE SHOULD DECOMPOSE OR BECOME 2. INEFFECTIVE DURING THE EXPECTED LIFE OF THE FENCE, THE FABRIC SHALL BE REPLACED PROMPTLY. SEDIMENT DEPOSITS SHOULD BE INSPECTED AFTER EVERY STORM EVENT.

3. THE DEPOSITS SHOULD BE REMOVED WHEN THEY REACH APPROXIMATELY ONE HALF THE HEIGHT OF THE BARRIER. SEDIMENT DEPOSITS THAT ARE REMOVED OR LEFT IN PLACE AFTER THE

4. FABRIC HAS BEEN REMOVED SHALL BE GRADED TO CONFORM WITH THE EXISTING TOPOGRAPHY AND VEGETATED.

SEEDING SPECIFICATIONS

1.	GRADING	AND	SHAPING	
----	---------	-----	---------	--

- A. SLOPES SHALL NOT BE STEEPER THAN 2:1;3:1 SLOPES OR FLATTER ARE PREFERRED. WHERE MOWING WILL BE DONE, 3:1 SLOPES OR FLATTER ARE RECOMMENDED. 2. SEEDBED PREPARATION
- A. SURFACE AND SEEPAGE WATER SHOULD BE DRAINED OR DIVERTED FROM THE SITE TO PREVENT DROWNING OR WINTER KILLING OF THE PLANTS.
- D. WHEN SEEDED AREAS ARE MULCHED, PLANTINGS MAY BE MADE FROM EARLY SPRING TO EARLY OCTOBER. WHEN B. STONES LARGER THAN 4 INCHES AND TRASH SHOULD BE REMOVED BECAUSE THEY INTERFERE WITH SEEDING AND FUTURE SEEDED AREAS ARE NOT MULCHED, PLANTINGS SHOULD BE MADE FROM EARLY SPRING TO MAY 20 OR FROM AUGUST MAINTENANCE OF THE AREA. WHERE FEASIBLE, THE SOIL SHOULD BE TILLED TO A DEPTH OF ABOUT 4 INCHES TO PREPARE 10 TO SEPTEMBER 1. A SEEDBED AND MIX FERTILIZER AND LIME INTO THE SOIL. THE SEEDBED SHOULD BE LEFT IN REASONABLY FIRM AND SMOOTH CONDITION. THE LAST TILLAGE OPERATION SHOULD BE PERFORMED ACROSS THE SLOPE WHEREVER PRACTICAL. 4. MULCH

5. ESTABLISHING A STAND A. LIME AND FERTILIZER SHOULD BE APPLIED PRIOR TO OR AT THE TIME OF SEEDING AND INCORPORATED INTO THE SOIL KINDS AND AMOUNTS OF LIME AND FERTILIZER SHOULD BE BASED ON AN EVALUATION OF SOIL TESTS. WHEN A SOIL TEST IS NOT AVAILABLE, THE FOLLOWING MINIMUM AMOUNTS SHOULD BE APPLIED: AGRICULTURAL LIMESTONE, 2 TONS PER ACRE OR 100 LBS PER 1,000 SQ. FT.. NITROGEN(N), 50 LBS PER ACRE OR 1. 1 LBS PER 1,000 SQ.FT. PHOSPHATE(P205), 100 LBS PER ACRE OR 2. 2 LBS PER 1,000 SQ.FT. POTASH(K20), 100 LBS PER ACRE OR 2. 2 LBS PER 1.000 SQ.FT. (NOTE: THIS IS THE EQUIVALENT OF 500 LBS PER ACRE OF 10-20-20 FERTILIZER OR 1,000 LBS PER ACRE OF 5-10-10.)

- 1. STONE FOR A STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE SHALL BE 3 INCH STONE, RECLAIMED STONE, OR RECYCLED CONCRETE EQUIVALENT.
- 2. THE LENGTH OF THE STABILIZED ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 50 FEET, 3. THE THICKNESS OF THE STONE FOR THE STABILIZED ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 6 INCHES.
- 4. THE WIDTH OF THE ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN THE FULL WIDTH OF THE ENTRANCE WHERE INGRESS OR EGRESS OCCURS OR 10 FEET, WHICH EVER IS GREATER. 5. GEOTEXTILE FILTER CLOTH SHALL BE PLACED OVER THE ENTIRE AREA PRIOR TO PLACING THE STONE.
- 6. ALL SURFACE WATER THAT IS FLOWING TO OR DIVERTED TOWARD THE CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE SHALL BE PIPED BENEATH THE ENTRANCE. IF PIPING IS IMPRACTICAL, A BERM WITH 5:1 SLOPES THAT CAN BE CROSSED BY VEHICLES MAY BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THE PIPE
- 7. THE ENTRANCE SHALL BE MAINTAINED IN A CONDITION THAT WILL PREVENT TRACKING OR FLOWING OF SEDIMENT ONTO PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY. THIS MAY REQUIRE PERIODIC TOP DRESSING WITH ADDITIONAL STONE AS CONDITIONS DEMAND AND REPAIR AND/OR CLEAN OUT OF ANY MEASURES USED TO TRAP SEDIMENT. ALL SEDIMENT SPILLED, WASHED, OR TRACKED ONTO PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY MUST BE REMOVED PROMPTLY.

Erosion Control Mix Berm

- B. SEED SHOULD BE SPREAD UNIFORMLY BY THE METHOD MOST APPROPRIATE FOR THE SITE. METHODS INCLUDE BROADCASTING, DRILLING AND HYDROSEEDING. WHERE BROADCASTING IS USED, COVER SEED WITH .25 INCH OF SOIL OR LESS. BY CULTIPACKING OR RAKING.
- C. REFER TO TABLE(G-E1 THIS SHEET) FOR APPROPRIATE SEED MIXTURES AND TABLE(H-E1 THIS SHEET) FOR RATES OF SEEDING. ALL LEGUMES (CROWN VETCH, BIRDS FOOT TREFOIL, AND FLAT PEA) MUST BE INOCULATED WITH THEIR SPECIFIC INOCULANT.

- A. HAY, STRAW, OR OTHER MULCH, WHEN NEEDED, SHOULD BE APPLIED IMMEDIATELY AFTER SEEDING. B. MULCH WILL BE HELD IN PLACE USING APPROPRIATE TECHNIQUES FROM THE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE FOR MULCHING. HAY OR STRAW MULCH SHALL BE PLACED AT A RATE OF 90 LBS PER 1000 SQ. FT. 5. MAINTENANCE TO ESTABLISH A STAND
- A. PLANTED AREA SHOULD BE PROTECTED FROM DAMAGE BY FIRE, GRAZING, TRAFFIC, AND DENSE WEED GROWTH. B. FERTILIZATION NEEDS SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY ONSITE INSPECTIONS. SUPPLEMENTAL FERTILIZER IS USUALLY THE KEY TO FULLY COMPLETE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STAND BECAUSE MOST PERENNIAL STAKE 2 TO 3 YEARS TO BECOME ESTABLISHED. C. IN WATERWAYS, CHANNELS, OR SWALES WHERE UNIFORM FLOW CONDITIONS ARE ANTICIPATED, OCCASIONAL
- MOWING MAY BE NECESSARY TO CONTROL GROWTH OF WOODY VEGETATION

REMOVED AND DISPOSED OF.

WINTER MAINTENANCE

- GRADED AND SHAPED.
- FENCING.

		דת
	SEC	
USE	SEEDING MIXTURE*	DF
STEEP CUTS AND FILLS, BORROW AND DISPOSAL AREAS	A B C D E	FA PC PC FA FA
WATERWAYS, EMERGENCY SPILLWAYS, AND OTHER CHANNELS WITH FLOWING WATER.	A C D	00 <u>60</u> 00
LIGHTLY USED PARKING LOTS, ODD AREAS, UNUSED LANDS, AND LOW INTENSITY USE RECREATION SITES.	A B C D	GC GC GC FA
PLAY AREAS AND ATHLETIC FIELDS. (TOPSOIL IS ESSENTIAL FOR GOOD TURF.)	F G	FA FA
GRAVEL PIT, SEE NH-PM SAND AND GRAVEL PITS.	-24 IN APP	ENDIX F
* REFER TO SEEDING MIX ** POORLY DRAINED SOIL	TURES AND	RATES DESIRA

NDTE: TEMPORARY OF TURF SHALL B RATE DF 2.5 LBS. BE PLACED PRIDR SEEDING NOT YET

EDING	RA1	ΓES
	POUNDS PER ACRE	POUNDS PER <u>1,000 Sq. Ft.</u> .
E RED FESCUE	20 20 <u>2</u> 42	0.45 0.45 <u>0.05</u> 0.95
E RED FESCUE CH	15 10 15	0.35 0.25 0.35
	30 40 OR 55	0.75 0.95 OR 1.35
E RED FESCUE TREFOIL	20 20 <u>8</u> 48	0.45 0.45 <u>0.20</u> 1.10
Ξ	20 <u>30</u> 50	0.45 <u>0.75</u> 1.20
ED FESCUE <u>1/</u> BLUEGRASS <u>1/</u>	50 <u>50</u> 100	1.15 <u>1.15</u> 2.30
E 1	150	3.60

PREPARED FOR: STONEARCH DEVEL. CORP. 42J DOVER POINT ROAD DOVER, NH 03820

70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, THIRD FLOOR, SUITE 2 STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860

TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL MEASURES

1. NO MORE THAN 0.26 ACRES OF LAND SHALL BE EXPOSED AT ANY ONE TIME. 2. EROSION, SEDIMENT AND DETENTION MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS AND AT LOCATIONS AS REQUIRED OR DIRECTED BY THE ENGINEER ALL DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE RETURNED TO ORIGINAL GRADES AND ELEVATIONS. 3. DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE LOAMED WITH A MINIMUM OF 4" OF LOAM AND SEEDED WITH NOT LESS THAN 1.10 POUNDS OF SEED PER 1000 SQUARE FEET OF AREA. (48 POUNDS PER ACRE) SEE SEED SPECIFICATIONS THIS SHEET.

4. SILT FENCES AND OTHER EROSION CONTROLS SHALL BE INSPECTED WEEKLY AND AFTER EVERY RAIN EVENT GREATER THAN 0.5" DURING THE LIFE OF THE PROJECT. ALL DAMAGED AREAS SHALL BE REPAIRED, SEDIMENT DEPOSITS SHALL PERIODICALLY BE

5. AFTER ALL DISTURBED AREAS HAVE BEEN STABILIZED, THE TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL MEASURES ARE TO BE REMOVED AND THE AREA DISTURBED BY THE REMOVAL SMOOTHED AND RE-VEGETATED.

6. AREAS MUST BE SEEDED AND MULCHED WITHIN 3 DAYS OF FINAL GRADING, PERMANENTLY STABILIZED WITHIN 15 DAYS OF FINAL GRADING, OR TEMPORARILY STABILIZED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF INITIAL DISTURBANCE OF SOIL.

1. ALL DISTURBED AREAS THAT DO NOT HAVE AT LEAST 85% VEGETATIVE COVERAGE PRIOR TO OCTOBER 15TH, SHALL BE STABILIZED BY APPLYING MULCH AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. ALL SIDE SLOPES, STEEPER THAN 4:1, THAT ARE NOT DIRECTED TO SWALES OR DETENTION BASINS, SHALL BE LINED WITH BIODEGRADABLE/PHOTODEGRADABLE "JUTE MATTING" (EXCELSIOR'S CURLEX II OR EQUAL). ALL OTHER SLOPES SHALL BE MULCHED AND TACKED AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. THE APPLICATION OF MULCH AND/OR JUTE MATTING SHALL NOT OCCUR OVER EXISTING SNOW COVER. IF THE SITE IS ACTIVE AFTER OCTOBER 15TH, ANY SNOW THAT ACCUMULATES ON DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE REMOVED. PRIOR TO SPRING THAW ALL AREAS WILL BE STABILIZED, AS DIRECTED ABOVE.

2. ALL SWALES THAT DO NOT HAVE FULLY ESTABLISHED VEGETATION SHALL BE EITHER LINED WITH TEMPORARY JUTE MATTING OR TEMPORARY STONE CHECK DAMS (APPROPRIATELY SPACED). STONE CHECK DAMS WILL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT THE WINTER MONTHS. IF THE SWALES ARE TO BE MATTED WITH PERMANENT LINERS OR RIPRAP WITH ENGINEERING FABRIC, THIS SHALL BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO WINTER SHUTDOWN OR AS SOON AS THEY ARE PROPERLY

3. PRIOR TO OCT. 15TH ALL ROADWAY AND PARKING AREAS SHALL BE BROUGHT UP TO AND THROUGH THE BANK RUN GRAVEL APPLICATION. IF THESE AREAS' ELEVATIONS ARE PROPOSED TO REMAIN BELOW THE PROPOSED SUBGRADE ELEVATION. THE SUBGRADE MATERIAL SHALL BE ROUGHLY CROWNED AND A 3" LAYER OF CRUSHED GRAVEL SHALL BE PLACED AND COMPACTED. THIS WILL ALLOW THE SUBGRADE TO SHED RUNOFF AND WILL REDUCE ROADWAY EROSION. THIS CRUSHED GRAVEL DOES NOT HAVE TO CONFORM TO NH DOT 304.3, BUT SHALL HAVE BETWEEN 15-25% PASSING THE #200 SIEVE AND THE LARGEST STONE SIZE SHALL BE 2". IF THE SITE IS ACTIVE AFTER NOVEMBER 15TH, ANY ACCUMULATED SNOW SHALL BE REMOVED FROM ALL ROADWAY AND PARKING AREAS.

4. AFTER OCTOBER 15TH. THE END OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S AVERAGE GROWING SEASON. NO ADDITIONAL LOAM SHALL BE SPREAD ON SIDE SLOPES AND SWALES. THE STOCKPILES THAT WILL BE LEFT UNDISTURBED UNTIL SPRING SHALL BE SEEDED BY THIS DATE. AFTER OCTOBER 15TH, ANY NEW OR DISTURBED PILES SHALL BE MULCHED AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. ALL STOCKPILES THAT WILL REMAIN THROUGHOUT THE WINTER SHALL BE SURROUNDED WITH SILT

ING	GUIDE									
ROUGHTY	WELL DRAINED	MODERATELY WELL DRAINED	POORLY DRAINED							
AIR OOR OOR	GOOD GOOD GOOD	GOOD FAIR EXCELLENT	FAIR FAIR GOOD							
AIR AIR	FAIR EXCELLENT	GOOD EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT POOR	DED						
00D <u>00D</u> 00D	GOOD EXCELLENT EXCELLENT	GOOD EXCELLENT EXCELLENT	FAIR FAIR FAIR							
000	0000	0000	FUD	CON	REVISION	S:			DATE:	
00D 00D 00D	GOOD GOOD EXCELLENT	GOOD FAIR FXCELLENT	POOR FAIR	RE						
AIR	GOOD	GOOD	EXCELLENT			EF	ROSION &	SEDIMEN	Т	
AIR AIR	EXCELLENT EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT EXCELLENT	** **			121	CONTROL	DETAILS	1	
FOR RECO	MMENDATION REGA	ARDING RECLAM	ATION OF							
IN TABLE ABLE FOR	7–36. USE AS PLAY ARE	EAS OR ATHLETI	C FIELDS.			RE	ESIDENTIAL I	DEVELOPME	ENT	
SEED M	IX FOR STAI	BILIZATION					57 PORTSM EXETI	ER, NH		
- WINIER RYE UR UAIS AI A PER 1000 S.F. AND SHALL TO OCT 15 IE PERMANENT					TAX MAP 6	65, LOT 137				
COMPLE	TE.				DATE:		JAN 28, 2025	SCALE:	NTS'	
					PROJ.	N0:	NH-1535	SHEET NO.	7	

STONEARCH DEVEL. CORP. 42J DOVER POINT ROAD **DOVER, NH 03820**

70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, THIRD FLOOR, SUITE 2 STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860

REVISED PER R	EVIEW COMMENTS		03/19/25
REVISIONS:			DATE:
CONS	STRUCTI	ON DETA	AILS
RE	SIDENTIAL I 57 PORTSM EXETI TAX MAP (DEVELOPME OUTH AVE. ER, NH 65, LOT 137	NT
DATE:	JAN 28, 2025	SCALE:	NTS
PROJ. NO:	NH-1535	SHEET NO	0
	1011 1555	SHEET NO.	8

STONE TO REFILL JOINT SPACE AFTE

OPTIONAL GEOTEXTILE ROUTINE MAINTENANCE: VISUAL INSP TO ENSURE THAT THEY ARE CLEAN CLEANING PROCEDURES WOULD INCL SIMILAR) IN FALL, TRUCK-SWEEPING

PROPERTY ~

LINE

12" MIN.

STRIP

2" (50 MM) Thick ASTM No. 8 Bedding Stone				
Min 6" (150 MM) Thick Compacted (12" DEPTH BELOW WALKWAY No. 57 Base Stone BEHIND UNITS D, E, & F) 				
Cast-in-Place Concrete Edge Min 4" Wide Mortar or Adhere Pavers to Top				
	REVISED PER	REVIEW COMMENTS		04,
Uncompacted Native Soil Sub-grade SUBGRADE SLOPED TO DRAIN OPTIONAL GEOTEXTILE	REVISED PER REVISIONS:	REVIEW COMMENTS		03,
MAINTENANCE: VISUAL INSPECTION OF THE PERVIOUS PAVERS RE THAT THEY ARE CLEAN OF DEBRIS AND SEDIMENTS. ROUTINE G PROCEDURES WOULD INCLUDE BLOWING (WITH LEAF BLOWER OR IN FALL, TRUCK-SWEEPING AND/OR DRY VACUUMING. ADD O REFILL JOINT SPACE AFTER SWEEPING/VACUUMING IF NEEDED.	CON	STRUCTI	ON DET	AII
PERVIOUS PAVER DETAIL TO BE "TREMRON" OR APPROVED EQUAL	R	ESIDENTIAL 57 PORTSM EXET TAX MAP	DEVELOPMI Iouth ave. ER, NH 65, Lot 137	ENT
NUT TO SCALE	DATE:	JAN 28, 2025	SCALE:	NJ
	PROJ. NO:	NH-1535	SHEET NO.	9

- GRANITE CURB PAVEMENT

- PAVM'T DIMENSIONS REFER TO THIS POINT

PREPARED FOR: STONEARCH DEVEL. CORP. 42J DOVER POINT ROAD DOVER, NH 03820

70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, THIRD FLOOR, SUITE 2 STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860

04/15/25

03/19/25

DATE:

NTS

DETAILS

Exeter Planning Board Site Walk 57 Portsmouth Ave April 10, 2025 8:00 AM

Board Members in Attendance:

Planning Board: Langdon Plumer (Chair), Aaron Brown (Vice-Chair), John Grueter (Clerk), Gwen English, and Marty Kennedy

Applicant representatives: Christian Smith, John O'Neill

Staff: Kristen Murphy (Conservation and Sustainability Planner)

On Thursday April 10th, the Planning Board conducted a site walk. The committee, staff, applicant representatives walked the property to view the site conditions and proposed project layout. Stakes were not in place for road center line and building corners, but Mr. Smith approximated the layout. Additional materials were provided during the site walk (attached)

The walk concluded at 8:25 am.

Kristen Murphy Conservation and Sustainability Planner

STONEARCH DEVEL. CORP. 42J DOVER POINT ROAD DOVER, NH 03820

70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, THIRD FLOOR, SUITE 2 STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860

NOTES:

- 1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS PLAN IS TO SHOW & TOWN HOUSE UNITS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING SPACES. 2. ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL CONFORM TO TOWN OF EXETER STANDARDS AND RECULATIONS.
- REGULATIONS. 3. ALL WATER, SENER, ROAD (INCLUDING PARKING LOT), AND DRAINAGE WORK SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 3.5 STORWWATER MANAGEMENT STANDARDS. STORWWATER MANAGEMENT FLAN. STORWMATER MANAGEMENT STANDARDS. MAND SECTION AND SCHWATER MANAGEMENT STANDARDS. AND THE STANDARD SECOND. SLS PARKING AREAS FOR EXCEPTIONS.

- BUBLC LILLINGS IN EXERTER . NEW HAMPSHIRE, SEE SECTION 61.4 ROADWAYS SECTION 61.2 MILLINGS SECTION 61.2 MERKING AREAS FOR EXECTION 61.2 MERKING AREAS FOR EXECUTION 61.2 MERKING AREAS FOR EXECUTION 61.2 MERKING AREAS FOR SECTION 61.2 MERKING AREAS FOR SERVICE MERKING AREAS FOR SERVICES FOR SERV

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

- 1. CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS SHALL BE CARRIED OUT IN SUCH A MANNER SO THAT EROSION AND AIR AND WATER POLLUTION WILL BE MINIMIZED.

- NEEDED, ALL WATER, SEWER, ROAD (INCLUDING PARKING LOT), AND DRAINAGE WORK SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 3.5 GRADING, DRAINAGE, AND ERGSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL, AND THE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN EXETER, NEW HAMFSHIRE.

OF HEW PLANE	honort	GRAPHIC	SCALE	*
CHEESTLAN CL SARTH NA.59000		(IN FE i inch -	ET) 10 ft.	
Children and the	1	PRESENTAT	ION PLAN	
	RE	SIDENTIAL	DEVELOPMENT	
		57 PORTSM	OUTH AVE.	
		EXET	ER, NH	
		TAX MAP	55, LOT 137	
03/19/25	DATE:	JAN 28, 2025	SCALE: 1" = 10'	
DATE:	PROJ. NO:	NH-1535	SHEET NO. 1	

11 South Road Brentwood, NH 03833 LMLandDesign.com

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

PLANT LIST

REVISIONS:

Quantity	Botanical Name	Common Name	Suze
2	Ginkgo biloba 'Princeton Sentry™'	PRINCETON SENTRY™ GINKGO	3" Callper B&B
з	Magnolia x 'Ricki'	RICKI MAGNOLIA	2" Caliper B&E
5	Thuja occidentalis 'Nigra'	DARK AMERICAN ARBORVITAE	8-9 Ft, Ht, B&E
3	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd Emerald'	EMERALD GREEN ARBORVITAE	6-7 Ft Ht. B&B
6	Azalea 'Girard's Fuchsia'	GIRARD'S FUCHSIA AZALEA	3 Gailon
6	Deutzia 'NCDX2'	YUKI CHERRY BLOSSOM DEUTZIA	3 Gallon
2	Hydrangea panicutata 'Bobo'	BOBO PANICLE HYDRANGEA	5 Gallon
4	llex crenata 'Sky Pencil'	SKY PENCIL HOLLY	5 Gallon
3	llex verticillata 'Jim Dandy'	AM DANDY WINTERBERRY	5 Gallon
4	Ilex verticillata 'Red Sprite'	RED SPRITE WINTERBERRY	5 Gallon
:1	Physocarpus opulifolius 'SMNPOTW'	TINY WINE NINEBARK	5 Gallon
1	Pinus mugo	MUGO PINE	5 Gation
6	Rhus aromatica 'Gro-low'	GRO-LOW FRAGRANT SUMAC	3 Gallon
5	Vibumum plicatum f. tom. 'Shasta'	SHASTA DOUBLEFILE VIBURNUM	5 Gallon
10	Aster novae-angliae 'Purple Dome'	PURPLE DOME NE ASTER	i Gallon
9	Eupatorium purpureum 'Gateway'	GATEWAY JOE PYE WEED	1 Gallon
6	Heuchena micrantha 'Palace Purple'	PALACE PURPLE CORAL BELLS	1 Gallon
6	Iris sibirica 'Caesar's Brother'	CAESAR'S BROTHER IRIS	1 Gallon
15	Miscanthus sinensis 'Morning Light'	MORNING LIGHT MAIDEN GRASS	2 Gailon

NOTE: Plant container size may vary based upon availability.

DATE:

		GRAPHIC	SCALE	
0	5 10	20	30	50
	505604	(IN PEET I INCH = 20))) peet	
	COL	OR PLAN	ITING P	LAN
-	R	ESIDENTIAL 57 PORTSM EXET	DEVELOPM MOUTH AVE ER, NH	IENT E.
-	DATE:	1AX MAP MAR. 10. 2025	SCALE:	1" = 10'
	PROJ. NO:	NH- 1535	SHEET NO.	6b

5 SHERMAN STREET LLC, 242 CENTRAL AVENUE, DOVER, NH, 03820 SCALE 1/8"=1' 57 PORTSMOUTH AVENUE, EXETER NH 9

.

5 SHERMAN STREET LLC, 242 CENTRAL AVENUE, DOVER, NH, 03820 | SCALE 1/8"=1' 57 PORTSMOUTH AVENUE, EXETER NH 12

DRAINAGE ANALYSIS & SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN

Prepared for: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 57 PORTSMOUTH AVENUE, LLC

Prepared by:

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC 70 Portsmouth Avenue Stratham, NH 03885

Project Number: NH-1535 57 Portsmouth Avenue Exeter, New Hampshire January 28, 2025 Revised April 16, 2025

Table of Contents

1.0	Analysis Summary	Page 1
2.0	Existing Conditions Analysis	Page 2
3.0	Proposed Conditions Analysis	Page 2
4.0	Sediment & Erosion Control Best Management Practices	Pages 3-6
5.0	Conclusion	Page 6

Appendix I - Existing Conditions Analysis WQV (1-Inch) 24-Hour Summary 2-Year 24-Hour Summary 10-Year 24-Hour Complete 25-Year 24-Hour Summary 50-Year 24-Hour Summary

Appendix II - Proposed Conditions Analysis WQV (1-Inch) 24-Hour Summary 2-Year 24-Hour Summary 10-Year 24-Hour Complete 25-Year 24-Hour Summary 50-Year 24-Hour Summary

Appendix III - Charts, Graphs, and Calculations

Appendix IV - Plans Sheet W-1 Existing Watershed Plan Sheet W-2 Proposed Watershed Plan

1.0 ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Stonearch Development Corportation proposes to construct a residential development to establish 6 residential units on a 0.27+/--acre parcel of land located at 57 Portsmouth Avenue in Exeter, New Hampshire. A drainage analysis of 0.32 acres of the proposed site improvement was conducted for the purpose of estimating the peak rate of stormwater run-off and to subsequently design adequate drainage structures. Two models were compiled: one for the area in its existing (pre-construction) condition and a second for its proposed (post-construction) condition. The analysis was conducted using Extreme Precipitation data provided by Cornell University for the following 24-hour duration storm events:

Storm Event	Rainfall Depth (inches)
WQV	1.00
2-Year	3.22
10-Year	4.91
25-Year	6.24
50-Year	7.49

These storm events use the USDA NRCS TR-20 method within the HydroCAD Stormwater Modeling System environment to model the rainfall and predict stormwater runoff flows and volumes. A Type III storm pattern was used in the model. The purpose of this analysis is to estimate the peak rates of run-off from the site for detention adequacy purposes, and to compare the peak rate of run-off between the existing and proposed conditions.

Peak Rate of Discharge

		Component Peak Rate of Discharge (CFS)			(CFS)	
Analysis Point # Analysis Point Description	Condition	WQV	2-Year	10-Year	25-Year	50-Year
Reach #100 -	Existing	0.05	0.52	0.99	1.38	1.76
Existing Catch Basin	Proposed	0.12	0.53	0.88	1.15	1.41

Channel Protection

Analysis Point # Analysis Point Description	Condition	2-Year Storm Volume (Acre-Feet)
Reach #100 -	Existing	0.041
Existing Catch Basin	Proposed	0.044

Minor increases are shown to Reach #100 for the WQV and 2-Year storm events due to the increase in impervious on the site compared to the vacant lot. The 10-Year, 25-Year, and 50-Year storms all show a reduction in peak discharge rate. While the lot was previously developed, the undeveloped vacant condition was used for the pre- and post-development conditions. The

single analysis point is the existing catch basin in Portsmouth Avenue to the north corner of the development. These minor increases in the lower storms events will have no impact to the existing municipal system.

The proposed residential development includes a driveway off of Portsmouth Avenue at the same location as the previous development on the parcel. The driveway extends into the site and opens to a maneuvering area between the residential buildings. The proposed improvement area includes a single sub-catchment that ends at an existing catch basin to the north in Portsmouth Avenue. In addition to the slight increase in peak rate of runoff for the WQV and 2-Year storm events, the channel protection volume for the 2-year storm event increases 0.003 acre-feet, below the 0.100 allowable threshold.

In addition, the potential for increased erosion and sedimentation is handled by way of silt fence surrounding the disturbed areas. The use of Best Management Practices per the Rockingham Conservation District / DES Handbook have been applied to the design of these structures and will be observed during all stages of construction. All land disturbed during construction will be stabilized within 30 days of groundbreaking. Existing wetlands and abutters will suffer no adverse effects resulting from this proposed development.

2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

The existing property is located on a parcel consisting of a partial driveway entrance to a gravel area where previous development existed. The developed portion of the property is relatively flat with steep slopes on the west and south sides. The existing topography is such that the site analysis is divided into one sub-catchment within the area proposed to be improved. Final Reach #100 flows to the existing catch basin by the end of the driveway entrance in Portsmouth Avenue where stormwater runoff enters the municipal stormwater system.

Classified by a NRCS Soil Mapping, the land of the site is composed of relatively flat slopes surrounded on two sides by sloping land and soils categorized into a dual Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) C/D. Per Exeter Site Review Regulations, an HSG of D is used for the analysis.

3.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

The addition of impervious area causes an increase in the curve number (Cn) which results in an increase in peak rates of run-off from the site. The proposed development divides the single subcatchment from the pre-development condition into two sub-catchments in the post-development condition, with the same catch basin in Portsmouth Avenue used as the analysis point.

In an effort to prevent the sedimentation of abutting properties, all stormwater from roofs, paved areas with the use of curbing, and remainder of the site will be directed towards the catch basin. To reduce runoff and increase infiltration, a stone infiltration trench was provided below the permeable paver walkway along the back of rear building. During construction, appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) will be applied so as to negate the potential for sediment-laden

run-off to discharge towards abutting properties prior to the final stabilization of the proposed grading. The structures outlined in this proposal provide for adequate treatment of stormwater run-off for sediment control.

4.0 SEDIMENT & EROSION CONTROL PLANS BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMP's)

The proposed site development is protected from erosion and the roadways and abutting properties are protected from sediment by the use of Best Management Practices as outlined in the <u>New Hampshire Stormwater Manual</u>. Any area disturbed by construction will be re-stabilized within 30 days, and abutting properties and wetlands will not be adversely affected by this development. All swales and drainage structures will be constructed and stabilized prior to having run-off directed to them.

4.1 Silt Barrier / Construction Fence

The plan set demonstrates the location of silt barriers for sediment control. Sheet E-1, Erosion and Sediment Control Details, has the specifications for installation and maintenance of the silt barriers selected for the site. In areas where the limits of construction need to be emphasized to operators, construction fence for added visibility will be installed. Orange construction fence will be VISI Perimeter Fence by Conwed Plastic Fencing, or approved equal. The four-foot construction fencing is to be installed using six-foot posts buried at least two feet into the ground spaced six to eight feet apart.

4.2 Vegetated Stabilization

All areas that are disturbed during construction will be stabilized with vegetated material within 30 days of disturbance. Construction will be managed in such a manner that erosion is prevented and that no abutter's property will be subjected to any siltation, unless otherwise permitted. All areas to be planted with grass for long-term cover will follow the specifications on the Erosion & Sediment Controls Detail plan using the seeding mixture below:

Mixture C	Pounds per Acre	Pounds per 1,000 sf
Tall Fescue	20	0.45
Creeping Red Fescue	20	0.45
Birdsfoot Trefoil	8	0.20
Total	48	1.10

4.3 Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit

A temporary gravel construction entrance/exit provides an area where mud can be dislodged from tires before the vehicle leaves the construction site to reduce the amount of mud and sediment transported onto paved municipal and state roads. The stone size for the gravel pad should be between 1- and 2-inch coarse aggregate and the pad itself constructed to a minimum length of 50'

for the full width of the access road. The aggregate should be placed at least six inches thick. The Erosion and Sediment Control Details sheet has the plan and profile view details.

4.4 Drainage Swales / Stormwater Conveyance Channels

Drainage swales will be stabilized with vegetation for long term cover as outlined below using seed mixture C. As a general rule, velocities in the swale should not exceed 3.0 feet per second for a vegetated swale although velocities as high as 4.5 FPS are allowed under certain soil conditions.

4.5 Level Spreaders

Level spreaders enable any run-off directed towards them to be spread evenly into sheet flow prior to discharge into wetlands or treatment by a filter strip, thus allowing for better filter strip efficiency and a lesser potential for erosion.

4.6 Vegetated Buffers

Vegetated buffers are areas of land with natural or planted vegetation designed to receive sheet run-off from upgradient development. These natural areas, preferably wooded, are effective in removing sediment and sediment-laden pollutants from such run-off, although their effectiveness is severely diminished when forced to deal with concentrated flow and must therefore be equipped with a level-spreading device. Vegetated buffers should not have a slope exceeding fifteen percent and have a minimum length of seventy-five feet.

4.7 Filter Strips

Filter strips are areas of land with natural or planted vegetation designed to receive sheet run-off from upgradient development. These natural areas, preferably wooded, are effective in removing sediment and sediment-laden pollutants from such run-off, although their effectiveness is severely diminished when forced to deal with concentrated flow and must therefore be equipped with a level-spreading device. Filter strips should not have a slope exceeding fifteen percent and have a minimum length of seventy-five feet.

4.8 Environmental Dust Control

Dust will be controlled on the site using multiple Best Management Practices. Mulching and temporary seeding will be the first line of protection to be utilized where problems occur. If dust problems are not solved by these applications, the use of water and calcium chloride can be applied. Calcium chloride will be applied at a rate that will keep the surface moist but not cause pollution.

4.9 Construction Sequence

- 1. Construct and/or install temporary and permanent sediment erosion and temporary detention control facilities, as required. Erosion, sediment, and facilities shall be installed and stabilized prior to any earth moving operation, and prior to directing run-off to them.
- 2. Cut and remove brush and trees in construction areas as directed or required.

- 3. Clear, cut, grub, and dispose of debris in approved facilities.
- 4. Excavate and stockpile topsoil / loam. All disturbed areas shall be stabilized immediately after grading.
- 5. Construct the paved area, drainage, and buildings.
- 6. Begin permanent and temporary seeding and mulching. All cut and fill slopes and disturbed areas shall be seeded and mulched as required or directed.
- 7. Daily, or as required, construct temporary berms, drainage ditches, sediment traps, etc. to prevent erosion on the site and prevent any siltation of abutting waters or property.
- 8. Inspect and maintain all erosion and sediment control measures during construction.
- 9. Complete permanent seeding and landscaping.
- 10. Remove temporary erosion control measures after seeding areas have established themselves and site improvements are complete. Smooth and re-vegetate all disturbed areas.
- 11. All swales and drainage structures will be constructed and stabilized prior to having run-off being directed to them.
- 4.10 Temporary Erosion Control Measures
 - 1. The smallest practical area of land shall be exposed at any one time.
 - 2. Erosion and sediment control measures shall be installed as shown on the plans and at locations as required, or directed by the engineer.
 - 3. Disturbed areas shall be loamed with a minimum of 4" of loam and seeded with not less than 1.10 pound of seed per 1,000 square feet (48 pounds per acre) of area.
 - 4. Silt barriers shall be inspected periodically and after every rainstorm during the life of the project. All damaged areas shall be repaired and sediment deposits shall periodically be removed and properly disposed of.
 - 5. After all disturbed areas have been stabilized, the temporary erosion control measures are to be removed and the area disturbed by the removal smoothed and revegetated.

- 6. Areas must be seeded and mulched within 5 days of final grading, permanently stabilized within 15 days of final grading, or temporarily stabilized within 30 days of initial disturbance of soil.
- 4.11 Inspection and Maintenance Schedule

Silt barriers shall be inspected during and after storm events to ensure that the fence still has integrity and is not allowing sediment to pass.

5.0 CONCLUSION

This proposed site development off of Portsmouth Avenue in Exeter, NH will have no adverse effect on the abutting property owners by way of stormwater run-off or siltation. The post-construction peak rates of run-off for the site will be slightly higher than the existing conditions for the WQV and 2-Year storm events, as shown in the tables above, and will be directed into the municipal drainage system. Appropriate steps will be taken to eliminate erosion and sedimentation; these will be accomplished through the construction of a drainage system consisting of porous pavement and infiltration ponds. The Best Management Practices developed by the State of New Hampshire have been utilized in the design of this system and these applications will be enforced throughout the construction process.

An Alteration of Terrain Permit (RSA 485: A-17) is not required for this project due to the area of disturbance being less than 100,000 square feet.

Respectfully Submitted,

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC.

Christian O. Smith

Christian O Smith, PE Principal

Appendix I

Existing Conditions Analysis

WQV 24-Hour Summary

2-Year 24-Hour Summary

10-Year 24-Hour Complete

25-Year 24-Hour Complete

50-Year 24-Hour Summary

Area Listing (all nodes)

Area	CN	Description
(acres)		(subcatchment-numbers)
0.220	77	Brush, Fair, HSG D (1S)
0.042	96	Gravel surface, HSG D (1S)
0.023	98	Paved parking, HSG D (1S)
0.031	77	Woods, Good, HSG D (1S)
0.316	81	TOTAL AREA

Soil Listing (all nodes)

Area	Soil	Subcatchment
(acres)	Group	Numbers
0.000	HSG A	
0.000	HSG B	
0.000	HSG C	
0.316	HSG D	1S
0.000	Other	
0.316		TOTAL AREA

Type III 24-hr 1-INCH Rainfall=1.00" Printed 1/23/2025 LLC Page 4

Time span=0.00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment1S: Site Subcat

Runoff Area=13,746 sf 7.34% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.18" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.05 cfs 0.005 af

Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB

Inflow=0.05 cfs 0.005 af Outflow=0.05 cfs 0.005 af

Total Runoff Area = 0.316 acRunoff Volume = 0.005 afAverage Runoff Depth = 0.18"92.66% Pervious = 0.292 ac7.34% Impervious = 0.023 ac

 Type III 24-hr
 2-YR Rainfall=3.22"

 Printed
 1/23/2025

 .C
 Page 1

Time span=0.00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment1S: Site Subcat

Runoff Area=13,746 sf 7.34% Impervious Runoff Depth=1.56" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.52 cfs 0.041 af

Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB

Inflow=0.52 cfs 0.041 af Outflow=0.52 cfs 0.041 af

Total Runoff Area = 0.316 acRunoff Volume = 0.041 afAverage Runoff Depth = 1.56"92.66% Pervious = 0.292 ac7.34% Impervious = 0.023 ac
Type III 24-hr
 10-YR Rainfall=4.91"

 Printed
 1/23/2025

 LC
 Page 1

Time span=0.00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment1S: Site Subcat

Runoff Area=13,746 sf 7.34% Impervious Runoff Depth=2.96" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.99 cfs 0.078 af

Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB

Inflow=0.99 cfs 0.078 af Outflow=0.99 cfs 0.078 af

Total Runoff Area = 0.316 ac Runoff Volume = 0.078 af Average Runoff Depth = 2.96" 92.66% Pervious = 0.292 ac 7.34% Impervious = 0.023 ac

Summary for Subcatchment 1S: Site Subcat

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

Runoff	=	0.99 cfs @	12.10 hrs,	Volume=
Routed	l to	Reach #100 : Ana	alysis Point -	· Ex CB

0.078 af, Depth= 2.96"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=4.91"

A	rea (sf)	CN	Description	1		
	1,334	77	Woods, Go	od, HSG D		
	9,574	77	Brush, Fair	, HSG D		
	1,009	98	Paved park	king, HSG D		
	1,829	96	Gravel surf	ace, HSG D		
	13,746		Weighted A	verage		
	12,737		92.66% Pe	rvious Area		
	1,009		7.34% Imp	ervious Are	l i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
Tc	Length	Slop	e Velocity	Capacity	Description	
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)		
6.0					Direct Entry,	
					-	

Summary for Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB

[40] Hint: Not Described (Outflow=Inflow)

Inflow Area	a =	0.316 ac,	7.34% Impervious,	Inflow Depth = 2.	96" for 10-YR event
Inflow	=	0.99 cfs @	12.10 hrs, Volume	= 0.078 af	
Outflow	=	0.99 cfs @	12.10 hrs, Volume	;= 0.078 af,	Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

Time span=0.00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment1S: Site Subcat Runoff Area=13,746 sf 7.34% Impervious Runoff Depth=4.14" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.38 cfs 0.109 af

Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB

Inflow=1.38 cfs 0.109 af Outflow=1.38 cfs 0.109 af

Total Runoff Area = 0.316 acRunoff Volume = 0.109 afAverage Runoff Depth = 4.14"92.66% Pervious = 0.292 ac7.34% Impervious = 0.023 ac

 Type III 24-hr
 50-YR Rainfall=7.49"

 Printed
 1/23/2025

 LC
 Page 2

Time span=0.00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment1S: Site Subcat

Runoff Area=13,746 sf 7.34% Impervious Runoff Depth=5.28" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.76 cfs 0.139 af

Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB

Inflow=1.76 cfs 0.139 af Outflow=1.76 cfs 0.139 af

Total Runoff Area = 0.316 acRunoff Volume = 0.139 afAverage Runoff Depth = 5.28"92.66% Pervious = 0.292 ac7.34% Impervious = 0.023 ac

Appendix II

Proposed Conditions Analysis

WQV 24-Hour Summary

2-Year 24-Hour Summary

10-Year 24-Hour Complete

25-Year 24-Hour Complete

50-Year 24-Hour Summary



Area Listing (all nodes)

Area	CN	Description
(acres)		(subcatchment-numbers)
0.087	80	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG D (1.1S, 1.2S)
0.087	98	Paved parking, HSG D (1.1S)
0.111	98	Roofs, HSG D (1.1S, 1.2S)
0.031	77	Woods, Good, HSG D (1.1S, 1.2S)
0.316	91	TOTAL AREA

Soil Listing (all nodes)

Area	Soil	Subcatchment
(acres)	Group	Numbers
0.000	HSG A	
0.000	HSG B	
0.000	HSG C	
0.316	HSG D	1.1S, 1.2S
0.000	Other	
0.316		TOTAL AREA

NH-1535 Proposed	Type III 24-hr 1-INCH Rainfall=1.00"
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC	Printed 4/15/2025
HydroCAD® 10.20-6a s/n 01754 © 2024 HydroC	CAD Software Solutions LLC Page 4
Time span=0.00- Runoff by SCS TR-	72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points -20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind r	method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment1.1S: To Exist CB	Runoff Area=9,625 sf 64.12% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.54" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.12 cfs 0.010 af
Subcatchment1.2S: To Stone Trench	Runoff Area=4,121 sf 59.23% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.50" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.05 cfs 0.004 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB	Inflow=0.12 cfs 0.010 af Outflow=0.12 cfs 0.010 af
Pond 2P: Stone Infiltration Trench Discarded=0.05 cfs	Peak Elev=57.00' Storage=0 cf Inflow=0.05 cfs 0.004 af 0.004 af Primary=0.00 cfs 0.000 af Outflow=0.05 cfs 0.004 af
Pond XCB: CB #1055 15.0" Round C	Peak Elev=39.25' Inflow=0.12 cfs 0.010 af Culvert n=0.012 L=50.0' S=0.0100 '/' Outflow=0.12 cfs 0.010 af
Total Runoff Area = 0.316 a 3	c Runoff Volume = 0.014 af Average Runoff Depth = 0.52" 37.34% Pervious = 0.118 ac 62.66% Impervious = 0.198 ac

NH-1535 Proposed	Type III 2	Type III 24-hr 2-YR Rainfall=3.22"				
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC		Printed 4/15/2025				
HydroCAD® 10.20-6a s/n 01754 © 2024 Hydro	CAD Software Solutions LLC	Page 1				
Time span=0.00- Runoff by SCS TR Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind	-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points -20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-0 method - Pond routing by Dyn-St	ຊ or-Ind method				
Subcatchment1.1S: To Exist CB	Runoff Area=9,625 sf 64.12% Impo Tc=6.0 min CN=W	ervious Runoff Depth=2.41" Q Runoff=0.53 cfs 0.044 af				
Subcatchment1.2S: To Stone Trench	Runoff Area=4,121 sf 59.23% Impo Tc=6.0 min CN=We	ervious Runoff Depth=2.31" Q Runoff=0.22 cfs 0.018 af				
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB		Inflow=0.53 cfs 0.044 af Outflow=0.53 cfs 0.044 af				
Pond 2P: Stone Infiltration Trench Discarded=0.22 cfs	Peak Elev=57.00' Storage=0 0.018 af Primary=0.00 cfs 0.000 at	cf Inflow=0.22 cfs 0.018 af f Outflow=0.22 cfs 0.018 af				
Pond XCB: CB #1055 15.0" Round (.Peak Elev=39 /' Culvert n=0.012 L=50.0' S=0.0100	43' Inflow=0.53 cfs 0.044 af ″ Outflow=0.53 cfs 0.044 af				
Total Runoff Area = 0.316 a	ac Runoff Volume = 0.063 af A 37.34% Pervious = 0.118 ac 62	verage Runoff Depth = 2.38" .66% Impervious = 0.198 ac				

NH-1535 Proposed	Ty	be III 24-hr 10-`	YR Rainfall=4.91"
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC			Printed 4/15/2025
HydroCAD® 10.20-6a s/n 01754 © 2024 HydroC	CAD Software Solutions LLC		Page 1
_			-
Lime span=0.00-7	72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 72	points	
RUNOT by SCS TR-	20 method, UH=SCS, We	Ignted-Q	athad
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind r	nethod - Pond routing by	Dyn-Stor-Ind me	ethod
Subcatchment1.1S: To Exist CB	Runoff Area=9,625 sf 64. Tc=6.0 min	2% Impervious F CN=WQ Runof	Runoff Depth=3.99" f=0.88 cfs_0.074 af
Subcatchment1.2S: To Stone Trench	Runoff Area=4,121 sf 59.2 Tc=6.0 min	3% Impervious F CN=WQ Runof	Runoff Depth=3.86" f=0.36 cfs 0.030 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB		Inflov Outflov	v=0.88 cfs 0.074 af v=0.88 cfs 0.074 af
Pond 2P: Stone Infiltration Trench Discarded=0.36 cfs	Peak Elev=57.00' S 0.030 af Primary=0.00 cfs	orage=0 cf Inflow 0.000 af Outflow	/=0.36 cfs 0.030 af /=0.36 cfs 0.030 af
Pond XCB: CB #1055 15.0" Round C	Peak l Culvert n=0.012 L=50.0' S=	Elev=39.53' Inflov 0.0100 '/' Outflow	v=0.88 cfs 0.074 af v=0.88 cfs 0.074 af
Total Runoff Area = 0.316 a 3	c Runoff Volume = 0.10 7.34% Pervious = 0.118	4 af Average R ac 62.66% Imj	Runoff Depth = 3.95" pervious = 0.198 ac

Summary for Subcatchment 1.1S: To Exist CB

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

0.88 cfs @ 12.10 hrs, Volume= 0.074 af, Depth= 3.99" Runoff = Routed to Pond XCB : CB #1055

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=4.91"

A	rea (sf)	CN	Description			
	532	77	Woods, Go	od, HSG D		
	2,921	80	>75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG D	
	3,781	98	Paved park	ing, HSG D)	
	2,391	98	Roofs, HSC	G D		
	9,625		Weighted A	verage		
	3,453	3 35.88% Pervious Area				
	6,172	64.12% Impervious Area			ea	
Tc	Length	Slop	e Velocity	Capacity	Description	
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)		
6.0					Direct Entry,	
					•	

Summary for Subcatchment 1.2S: To Stone Trench

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

Runoff	=	0.36 cfs @	12.10 hrs, Volume=	
Routed	d to Pon	d 2P : Stone I	Infiltration Trench	

0.030 af, Depth= 3.86"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=4.91"

A	rea (sf)	CN	Description				
	803	77	Woods, Go	od, HSG D)		
	877	80	>75% Gras	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG D			
	0	98	Paved parking, HSG D				
	2,441	98	Roofs, HSC	G D			
	4,121		Weighted A	verage			
	1,680 40.77% Pervious Area						
	2,441 59.23% Impervious Area				rea		
Тс	Length	Slope	e Velocity	Capacity	Description		
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)			
6.0					Direct Entry,		

Summary for Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB

[40] Hint: Not Described (Outflow=Inflow)

Inflow Area	a =	0.316 ac, 6	62.66% Impe	ervious,	Inflow De	epth =	2.80)" for 10-	YR event	
Inflow	=	0.88 cfs @	12.10 hrs,	Volume	=	0.074 a	af			
Outflow	=	0.88 cfs @	12.10 hrs,	Volume	=	0.074 a	af, A	Atten= 0%,	Lag= 0.0) min

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

Summary for Pond 2P: Stone Infiltration Trench

[58] Hint: Peaked 4.00' above defined flood level

Inflow Area	ı =	0.095 ac, 5	9.23% Impe	ervious, Inflov	v Depth = 3	.86" fo	or 10-Y	R event
Inflow	=	0.36 cfs @	12.10 hrs,	Volume=	0.030 af	F		
Outflow	=	0.36 cfs @	12.10 hrs,	Volume=	0.030 af	f, Atten=	= 0%, L	.ag= 0.0 min
Discarded	=	0.36 cfs @	12.10 hrs,	Volume=	0.030 af	F		•
Primary	=	0.00 cfs @	0.00 hrs,	Volume=	0.000 af	F		
Routed	to Pond	XCB : CB #	1055					

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 57.00' @ 0.00 hrs Surf.Area= 470 sf Storage= 0 cf Flood Elev= 53.00' Storage= 0 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 0.0 min (770.4 - 770.4)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Stora	ge Storage D	Description	
#1	57.00'	188	cf Custom S 470 cf Ov	Stage Data (Pris erall_x 40.0% Vo	matic) Listed below (Recalc) bids
Elevatio (fee	on Sui et)	rf.Area (sq-ft) (c	Inc.Store cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	
57.0	00	470	0	0	
58.0	00	470	470	470	
Device	Routing	Invert (Outlet Devices		
#1 #2	Discarded Primary	57.00' 3 57.90' 4	3.00 cfs Exfiltr 4.0' long x 2.0 Head (feet) 0.2 2.50 3.00 3.50 Coef. (English) 2.85 3.07 3.20	ration at all elev breadth Broad 20 0.40 0.60 0.3 2.54 2.61 2.61 0 3.32	ations I-Crested Rectangular Weir 80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60 1.80 2.00 2.60 2.66 2.70 2.77 2.89 2.88

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 12.10 hrs HW=57.00' (Free Discharge) **1=Exfiltration** (Passes 0.00 cfs of 3.00 cfs potential flow)

Primary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=57.00' TW=39.09' (Dynamic Tailwater) ←2=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir(Controls 0.00 cfs)

Summary for Pond XCB: CB #1055

Inflow Ar	ea =	0.316 ac, 62.6	36% Impervious, Inflow Depth = 2.80" for 10-YR event
Inflow	=	0.88 cfs @ 12	2.10 hrs, Volume= 0.074 af
Outflow	=	0.88 cfs @ 12	2.10 hrs, Volume= 0.074 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min
Primary	=	0.88 cfs @ 12	2.10 hrs, Volume= 0.074 af
Route	ed to Reac	h #100 : Analys	is Point - Ex CB
Routing Peak Ele Flood Ele	by Dyn-Sto ev= 39.53' (ev= 43.87'	or-Ind method, 1 @ 12.10 hrs	Γime Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs
Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Primary	39.09'	15.0" Round Culvert L= 50.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 39.09' / 38.59' S= 0.0100 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.012 Concrete pipe, finished, Flow Area= 1.23 sf
		Max-0.00 ata G	\rightarrow 40.40 km LUM-20.52 TM-0.00 (Dynamia Tailyystam)

Primary OutFlow Max=0.86 cfs @ 12.10 hrs HW=39.53' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater) -1=Culvert (Inlet Controls 0.86 cfs @ 2.25 fps)

NH-1535 Proposed		Type III 24-hi	r 25-YR Rainfall=6.24"
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC			Printed 4/15/2025
HydroCAD® 10.20-6a s/n 01754 © 2024 Hydro	CAD Software Solutions L	LC	Page 1
Time span=0.00-	-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs,	721 points	
Runoff by SCS TR	-20 method, UH=SCS,	Weighted-Q	
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind	method - Pond routing	by Dyn-Stor-I	nd method
Subcatchment1.1S: To Exist CB	Runoff Area=9.625 sf	64.12% Impervi	ous Runoff Depth=5.27"
	 Tc=6.0 r	nin CN=ŴQ	Runoff=1.15 cfs [°] 0.097 af
Subcatchment1.2S: To Stone Trench	Runoff Area=4,121 sf	59.23% Impervi	ous Runoff Depth=5.12"
	1c=6.0 r	nin CN=WQ	Runoff=0.48 cfs 0.040 at
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Ex CB			Inflow=1.15 cfs 0.097 af
		(Outflow=1.15 cfs 0.097 af
Pond 2P: Stone Infiltration Trench	Peak Elev=57.00	Storage=0 cf	Inflow=0.48 cfs 0.040 af
Discarded=0.48 cfs	0.040 af Primary=0.00	cfs 0.000 af C	Outflow=0.48 cfs 0.040 af
Pond XCB: CB #1055	Pe	ak Elev=39 60'	Inflow=1 15 cfs_0 097 af
15.0" Round	Culvert n=0.012 L=50.0'	S=0.0100 '/' C	Dutflow=1.15 cfs 0.097 af
Total Runoff Area = 0.316 a	ac Runoff Volume = 0	.137 af Aver	age Runoff Depth = 5.22"
;	37.34% Pervious = 0.1′	18 ac 62.66	% Impervious = 0.198 ac

NH-1535 Proposed		Type III 24-hr 50-	-YR Rainfall=7.49"
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC			Printed 4/15/2025
HydroCAD® 10.20-6a s/n 01754 © 2024 Hydro(CAD Software Solutions L	LC	Page 2
			-
Time span=0.00-	72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs,	21 points	
Runoff by SCS TR	-20 method, UH=SCS,	Veighted-Q	
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind	method - Pond routing	by Dyn-Stor-Ind m	nethod
Subcatchment1.1S: To Exist CB	Runoff Area=9.625 sf	4.12% Impervious	Runoff Depth=6.48"
	Tc=6.0 n	nin CN=WQ Runo	ff=1.41 cfs 0.119 af
Subcatchment1.2S: To Stone Trench	Runoff Area=4,121 sf 5	9.23% Impervious	Runoff Depth=6.33"
	Tc=6.0 n	nin CN=WQ Runo	ff=0.59 cfs 0.050 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Fx CB		Inflo	w=1.41 cfs_0.119 af
		Outflo	w=1.41 cfs 0.119 af
Pond 2P: Stone Infiltration Trench	Peak Elev=57.00'	Storage=0 cf Inflo	w=0.59 cfs_0.050 af
Discarded=0.59 cfs	0.050 af Primary=0.00 (fs 0.000 af Outflow	w=0.59 cfs 0.050 af
Dand VCD, CD #1055	Doc	k Elov-20 66' Infla	w=1.41.efc. 0.110.ef
15 0" Round (Culvert n=0.012 -50.0'	S-0.0100 1/1 Outflo	w-1.41 CIS 0.119 al
13.0 Round C	Suivent II-0.012 L-30.0		w-1.41 CIS 0.119 di
Total Runoff Area = 0.316 a	ac Runoff Volume = 0	169 af Average	Runoff Depth = 6.43"
	37.34% Pervious = 0.11	8 ac 62.66% Im	pervious = 0.198 ac

Appendix III

Charts, Graphs, and Calculations

Extreme Precipitation Tables

Northeast Regional Climate Center

Data represents point estimates calculated from partial duration series. All precipitation amounts are displayed in inches.

Metadata for Point											
Smoothing	No										
State	New Hampshire										
Location	New Hampshire, United States										
Latitude	42.984 degrees North										
Longitude	70.938 degrees West										
Elevation	10 feet										
Date/Time	Wed Jan 08 2025 12:33:10 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time)										

Extreme Precipitation Estimates

	5min	10min	15min	30min	60min	120min		1hr	2hr	3hr	6hr	12hr	24hr	48hr
1yr	0.26	0.41	0.50	0.67	0.82	1.01	1yr	0.71	0.99	1.14	1.57	2.00	2.68	2.91
2yr	0.32	0.50	0.61	0.83	1.02	1.21	<mark>2yr</mark>	0.88	1.18	1.40	1.85	2.39	<mark>3.22</mark>	3.57
5yr	0.37	0.58	0.72	0.99	1.25	1.50	5yr	1.08	1.47	1.73	2.30	2.93	4.09	4.59
10yr	0.42	0.65	0.81	1.13	1.46	1.77	<mark>10yr</mark>	1.26	1.73	2.04	2.70	3.42	<mark>4.91</mark>	5.56
25yr	0.50	0.77	0.95	1.36	1.79	2.20	<mark>25yr</mark>	1.55	2.15	2.53	3.35	4.20	<mark>6.24</mark>	7.15
50yr	0.57	0.87	1.08	1.56	2.10	2.60	<mark>50yr</mark>	1.81	2.54	2.98	3.94	4.91	<mark>7.49</mark>	8.66
100yr	0.66	0.99	1.24	1.79	2.45	3.07	100yr	2.12	3.00	3.52	4.64	5.74	9.00	10.49
200yr	0.75	1.12	1.42	2.06	2.87	3.63	200yr	2.48	3.55	4.15	5.47	6.71	10.81	12.71
500yr	0.90	1.33	1.72	2.49	3.55	4.53	500yr	3.06	4.43	5.17	6.80	8.27	13.77	16.39

Lower Confidence Limits

	5min	10min	15min	30min	60min	120min		1hr	2hr	3hr	6hr	12hr	24hr	48hr
1yr	0.24	0.37	0.45	0.60	0.74	0.89	1yr	0.64	0.87	0.95	1.26	1.55	2.28	2.54
2yr	0.32	0.49	0.60	0.81	1.00	1.19	2yr	0.87	1.16	1.37	1.82	2.33	3.11	3.50
5yr	0.36	0.55	0.68	0.93	1.19	1.42	5yr	1.03	1.39	1.62	2.12	2.74	3.82	4.28
10yr	0.39	0.61	0.75	1.05	1.35	1.63	10yr	1.17	1.59	1.82	2.40	3.07	4.41	4.97
25yr	0.45	0.69	0.86	1.23	1.61	1.95	25yr	1.39	1.90	2.12	2.78	3.58	4.90	6.06
50yr	0.50	0.77	0.95	1.37	1.85	2.24	50yr	1.59	2.19	2.36	3.12	4.01	5.54	7.02
100yr	0.57	0.85	1.07	1.55	2.12	2.57	100yr	1.83	2.51	2.65	3.48	4.48	6.25	8.12
200yr	0.63	0.95	1.20	1.74	2.43	2.95	200yr	2.10	2.88	2.95	3.88	4.99	7.01	9.65
500yr	0.74	1.11	1.42	2.07	2.94	3.56	500yr	2.54	3.48	3.42	4.48	5.80	8.14	11.77

Upper Confidence Limits

	5min	10min	15min	30min	60min	120min		1hr	2hr	3hr	6hr	12hr	24hr	48hr
1yr	0.28	0.44	0.54	0.72	0.89	1.08	1yr	0.76	1.06	1.26	1.71	2.17	2.97	3.10
2yr	0.33	0.51	0.63	0.86	1.05	1.26	2yr	0.91	1.23	1.48	1.95	2.49	3.40	3.66



United States Department of Agriculture

Natural Resources

Conservation

Service

A product of the National Cooperative Soil Survey, a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local participants Custom Soil Resource Report for Rockingham County, New Hampshire



Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/? cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require

alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

Preface	2
How Soil Surveys Are Made	5
Soil Map	8
Soil Map	9
Legend	10
Map Unit Legend	11
Map Unit Descriptions	11
Rockingham County, New Hampshire	13
538A—Squamscott fine sandy loam, 0 to 5 percent slopes	13
699—Urban land	14
References	15

How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil

scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and

identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.

Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.



MAP INFORMATION	The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.	Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.	Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misuruderstanding of the detail of manning and accuracy of soil	line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of a con- contrasting solid that could have been shown at a more detailed	scale.		Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.		Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL:	Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)	Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator	projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts	usance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more	accurate calculations of distance or area are required.	This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as	of the version date(s) listed below.	Soil Survey Area: Rockingham County, New Hampshire	Survey Area Data: Version 27, Sep 3, 2024	Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales	1:50,000 or larger.	Date(s) aerial images were photographed: May 22. 2022—Jun	5, 2022	The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.
MAP LEGEND	Area of Interest (AOI) Resident Area of Interest (AOI) Area	Soils Soil Map Unit Polygons 🐡 Wet Stort	Soil Map Unit Lines	Special Point Features	Blowout Water Features	Borrow Pit	Clay Spot	Closed Depression	K Gravel Pit VS Routes	🔹 Gravelly Spot 🤝 Major Roads	Landfill Local Roads	🛝 Lava Flow Background	Marsh or swamp 📷 Aerial Photography	Mine or Quarry	Miscellaneous Water	💿 Perennial Water	Rock Outcrop	Saline Spot	👷 Sandy Spot	Severely Eroded Spot	Sinkhole	Slide or Slip	Ø Sodic Spot

Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
538A	Squamscott fine sandy loam, 0 to 5 percent slopes	0.3	48.1%
699	Urban land	0.3	51.9%
Totals for Area of Interest	•	0.7	100.0%

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however,

onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An association is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

Rockingham County, New Hampshire

538A—Squamscott fine sandy loam, 0 to 5 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9cp9 Elevation: 0 to 1,000 feet Mean annual precipitation: 30 to 55 inches Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 54 degrees F Frost-free period: 120 to 180 days Farmland classification: Farmland of local importance

Map Unit Composition

Squamscott and similar soils: 85 percent Minor components: 15 percent Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Squamscott

Setting

Landform: Marine terraces

Typical profile

H1 - 0 to 4 inches: fine sandy loam H2 - 4 to 12 inches: loamy sand H3 - 12 to 19 inches: fine sand H4 - 19 to 65 inches: silt loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 5 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Poorly drained
Runoff class: Medium
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately low to moderately high (0.06 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 0 to 12 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: High (about 9.6 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4w Hydrologic Soil Group: C/D Ecological site: F144AY019NH - Wet Lake Plain Hydric soil rating: Yes

Minor Components

Maybid

Percent of map unit: 5 percent Landform: Marine terraces Hydric soil rating: Yes

Scitico

Percent of map unit: 5 percent

Landform: Marine terraces Hydric soil rating: Yes

Eldridge

Percent of map unit: 5 percent *Hydric soil rating:* No

699—Urban land

Map Unit Composition

Urban land: 85 percent *Minor components:* 15 percent *Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.*

Minor Components

Not named

Percent of map unit: 15 percent *Hydric soil rating:* No

References

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.

Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.

Federal Register. September 18, 2002. Hydric soils of the United States.

Hurt, G.W., and L.M. Vasilas, editors. Version 6.0, 2006. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.

National Research Council. 1995. Wetlands: Characteristics and boundaries.

Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/ nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_054262

Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2 053577

Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2 053580

Tiner, R.W., Jr. 1985. Wetlands of Delaware. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Wetlands Section.

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Waterways Experiment Station Technical Report Y-87-1.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National forestry manual. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/ home/?cid=nrcs142p2 053374

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National range and pasture handbook. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/ detail/national/landuse/rangepasture/?cid=stelprdb1043084

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/ nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2_054242

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/? cid=nrcs142p2_053624

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. 1961. Land capability classification. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 210. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_052290.pdf



SSSNNE Special Publication No. 5 September, 2009

Soil Series	legend	Ksat low - B	Ksat high - B	Ksat low - C	Ksat high - C	Hyd.	Group	Land Form	Temp.	Soil Textures	Spodosol	Other
	number	in/hr	in/hr	in/hr	in/hr	Grp.					?	
Mundal	610	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.6	С	3	Firm, platy, loamy till	frigid	loamy	yes	gravelly sandy loam in Cd
Natchaug	496			0.20	2.0	D	6	Organic Materials - Freshwater	mesic	loamy	no	organic over loam
Naumburg	214	6.0	20.0	6.00	20.0	С	5	Outwash and Stream Terraces	frigid	sandy	yes	
Newfields	444	0.6	2.0	0.60	2.0	В	3	Loose till, sandy textures	mesic	loamy over sandy	no	sandy or sandy-skeletal
Nicholville	632	0.6	2.0	0.60	2.0	С	3	Terraces and glacial lake plains	frigid	silty	yes	very fine sandy loam
Ninigret	513	0.6	6.0	6.00	20.0	В	3	Outwash and Stream Terraces	mesic	loamy over sandy	no	sandy or sandy-skeletal
Occum	1	0.6	2.0	6.00	20.0	В	2	Flood Plain (Bottom Land)	mesic	loamy	no	loamy over loamy sand
Ondawa	101	0.6	6.0	6.00	20.0	В	2	Flood Plain (Bottom Land)	frigid	loamy	no	loamy over loamy sand
Ondawa	201	0.6	6.0	6.00	20.0	В	2	Flood Plain (Bottom Land)	frigid	loamy	no	occ flood, loamy over I. sand
Ossipee	495			0.20	2.0	D	6	Organic Materials - Freshwater	frigid	loamy	no	organic over loam
Pawcatuck	497			20.00	100.0	D	6	Tidal Flat	mesic	sandy or sandy-skeletal	no	organic over sand
Paxton	66	0.6	2.0	0.00	0.2	С	3	Firm, platy, loamy till	mesic	loamy	no	
Peacham	549	0.6	2.0	0.00	0.2	D	6	Firm, platy, silty till, schist & phylitte	frigid	loamy	no	organic over loam
Pemi	633	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.6	С	5	Terraces and glacial lake plains	frigid	silty	no	
Pennichuck	460	0.6	2.0	0.60	2.0	В	4	Friable till, silty, schist & phyllite	mesic	loamy-skeletal	no	20 to 40 in. deep
Peru	78	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.6	С	3	Firm, platy, loamy till	frigid	loamy	yes	
Pillsbury	646	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.2	С	5	Firm, platy, loamy till	frigid	silty	no	
Pipestone	314					В	5	Outwash and Stream Terraces	mesic	sandy	yes	
Pittstown	334	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.2	С	3	Firm, platy, silty till, schist & phyllite	mesic	loamy	no	channery silt loam in Cd
Plaisted	563	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.6	С	3	Firm, platy, silty till, schist & phyllite	frigid	loamy	yes	channery silt loam in Cd
Podunk	104	0.6	6.0	6.00	20.0	В	3	Flood Plain (Bottom Land)	frigid	loamy	no	loamy to coarse sand in C
Pondicherry	992			6.00	20.0	D	6	Organic Materials - Freshwater	frigid	sandy or sandy-skeletal	no	organic over sand
Poocham	230	0.6	2.0	0.20	2.0	В	3	Terraces and glacial lake plains	mesic	silty	no	silt loam in C
Pootatuck	4	0.6	6.0	6.00	20.0	В	3	Flood Plain (Bottom Land)	mesic	loamy	no	single grain in C
Quonset	310	2.0	20.0	20.00	100.0	Α	1	Outwash and Stream Terraces	mesic	sandy-skeletal	no	shale
Rawsonville	98	0.6	6.0	0.60	6.0	С	4	Loose till, bedrock	frigid	loamy	yes	20 to 40 in. deep
Raynham	533	0.2	2.0	0.06	0.2	С	5	Terraces and glacial lake plains	mesic	silty	no	
Raypol	540	0.6	2.0	6.00	100.0	D	5	Outwash and Stream Terraces	mesic	co. loamy over sandy (skeletal)	no	
Redstone	665	2.0	6.0	6.00	20.0	A	1	Weathered Bedrock Till	frigid	fragmental	yes	loamy cap
Ricker	674	2.0	6.0	2.00	6.0	A	4	rganic over bedrock (up to 4" of miner	cryic	fibric to hemic	no	well drained, less than 20 in. deep
Ridgebury	656	0.6	6.0	0.00	0.2	С	5	Firm, platy, loamy till	mesic	loamy	no	
Rippowam	5	0.6	6.0	6.00	20.0	С	5	Flood Plain (Bottom Land)	mesic	loamy	no	
Roundabout	333	0.2	2.0	0.06	0.6	С	5	Terraces and glacial lake plains	frigid	silty	no	silt loam in the C
Rumney	105	0.6	6.0	6.00	20.0	С	5	Flood Plain (Bottom Land)	frigid	loamy	no	
Saco	6	0.6	2.0	6.00	20.0	D	6	Flood Plain (Bottom Land)	mesic	silty	no	strata
Saddleback	673	0.6	2.0	0.60	2.0	C/D	4	Loose till, bedrock	cryic	loamy	yes	less than 20 in. deep
Salmon	630	0.6	2.0	0.60	2.0	В	2	Terraces and glacial lake plains	frigid	silty	yes	very fine sandy loam
Saugatuck	16	0.06	0.2	6.00	20.0	C	5	Outwash and Stream Terraces	mesic	sandy	yes	ortstein
Scantic	233	0.0	0.2	0.00	0.2	D	5	Silt and Clay Deposits	frigid	fine	no	
Scarboro	115	6.0	20.0	6.00	20.0	D	6	Outwash and Stream Terraces	mesic	sandy	no	organic over sand, non stony
Scio	531	0.6	2.0	0.60	2.0	В	3	Terraces and glacial lake plains	mesic	silty	no	gravelly sand in 2C
Scitico	33	0.0	0.2	0.00	0.2	C	5	Silt and Clay Deposits	mesic	fine	no	
Scituate	448	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.2	C	3	Firm, platy, sandy till	mesic	loamy	no	loamy sand in Cd
Searsport	15	6.0	20.0	6.00	20.0	D	6	Outwash and Stream Terraces	frigid	sandy	no	organic over sand
Shaker	439	2.0	6.0	0.00	0.2	C	5	Sandy/loamy over silt/clay	mesic	co. loamy over clayey	no	
Shapleigh	136					C/D	4	Sandy Till	mesic	sandy	yes	less than 20 in. deep
Sheepscot	14	6.0	20.0	6.00	20.0	В	3	Outwash and Stream Terraces	frigid	sandy-skeletal	yes	gravelly coarse sand
Sisk	667	0.6	2.0	0.00	0.6	C	3	Firm, platy, loamy till	cryic	loamy	yes	sandy loam in Cd
Skerry	558	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.6	C	3	Firm, platy, sandy till	trigid	loamy	yes	loamy sand in Cd
Squamscott	538	6.0	20.0	0.06	0.6	C	5	Sandy/loamy over silt/clay	mesic	sandy over loamy	yes	
Stetson	523	0.6	6.0	6.00	20.0	В	2	Outwash and Stream Terraces	trigid	sandy-skeletal	yes	loamy over gravelly
Stissing	340	0.6	2.0	0.06	0.2	C	5	Firm, platy, silty till, schist & phyllite	mesic	loamy	no	
Success	154	2.0	6.0	6.00	20.0	A	1	Sandy III	trigid	sandy-skeletal	yes	cemented
Sudbury	118	2.0	6.0	2.00	20.0	В	3	Outwash and Stream Terraces	mesic	sandy	no	loam over gravelly sand
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT / BMP INSPECTION & MAINTENANCE PLAN

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 57 PORTSMOUTH AVENUE, EXETER, NH

NH-1535

January 2025

Proper construction, inspections, maintenance, and repairs are key elements in maintaining a successful stormwater management program on a developed property. Routine inspections ensure permit compliance and reduce the potential for deterioration of infrastructure or reduced water quality.

For the purpose of this Stormwater Management Program, a significant rainfall event is considered an event of three (3) inches or more in a 24-hour period or at least 0.5 inches in a one-hour period. During construction, inspections should be conducted every two weeks or after a 0.25" rainfall event in a 24-hour period per the EPA NPDES Phase II SWPPP, until the entire disturbed area is fully restabilized. Upon full stabilization of the project and filing of an NOI, inspections need only be conducted after a significant rainfall event as described above or as described in the maintenance guidelines below.

During construction activities Stonearch Development Corporation with an address of 42J Dover Point Road, Dover, NH 03820 and a phone of (978) 375-3153 or their heirs and/or assigns, shall be responsible for inspections and maintenance activities for the above project site. Stonearch Development Corporation shall be responsible for *ongoing inspection and maintenance* of the BMP drainage structures and treatment areas.

The owner is responsible to ensure that any subsequent owner has copies of the Log Form and Annual Report records and fully understands the responsibilities of this plan. The grantor owner(s) will ensure this document is provided to the grantee owner(s) by duplicating the Ownership Responsibility Sheet which is found toward the back of this document, which will be maintained with the Inspection & Maintenance Logs and provided to the Town of Exeter upon request.

Documentation:

A maintenance log (i.e., report) will be kept summarizing inspections, maintenance, and any corrective actions taken. The log will include the date on which each inspection or maintenance task was performed, a description of the inspection findings or maintenance completed, and the name of the inspector or maintenance personnel performing the task (see Stormwater System Operation and Maintenance Plan Inspection & Maintenance Manual Checklist attached). If a maintenance task requires the clean-out of any sediments or debris, the location where the sediment and debris was disposed after removal shall be indicated.

Best Management Practices (BMP) Maintenance Guidelines

The following provides a list of recommendations and guidelines for managing the Stormwater facilities. The cited areas, facilities, and measures will be inspected and the identified deficiencies will be corrected. Clean-out must include the removal and legal disposal of any accumulated sediments and debris.

DURING CONSTRUCTION

1. Stabilized Construction Entrance

A temporary gravel construction entrance provides an area where mud can be dislodged from tires before the vehicle leaves the construction site to reduce the amount of mud and sediment transported onto paved municipal and state roads. The stone size for the pad should be between 1 and 2-inch coarse aggregate, and the pad itself constructed to a minimum length of 50' for the full width of the access road. The aggregate should be placed at least six inches thick. A plan view and profile are shown on Sheet E1 - Sediment and Erosion Control Detail Plan.

2. Dust Control

Dust will be controlled on the site using multiple BMPs. Mulching and temporary seeding will be the first line of protection to be utilized where problems occur. If dust problems are not solved by these applications, the use of water and calcium chloride can be applied. Calcium chloride will be applied at a rate that will keep the surface moist but not cause pollution.

3. Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control Devices / Barriers

Function – Temporary erosion and sediment control devices are utilized during construction period to divert, store and filter stormwater from non-stabilized surfaces. These devices include, but are not limited to: silt fences, hay bales, filters, sediment traps, stone check dams, mulch and erosion control blankets.

Maintenance – Temporary erosion and sediment control devices shall be inspected and maintained on a weekly basis and following a significant storm event (>0.5-inch rain event) throughout the construction period to ensure that they still have integrity and are not allowing sediment to pass. Sediment build-up in swales will be removed if it is deeper than six inches. Sediment is to be removed from sumps in the catch basin semi-annually. Refer to the Site Plan drawings for the maintenance of temporary erosion and sediment control devices.

4. Invasive Species

THE NH COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE PROHIBITS THE COLLECTION, POSSESSION, IMPORTATION, TRANSPORTATION, SALE, PROPAGATION, TRANSPLANTATION, OR CULTIVATION OF PLANTS BANNED BY NH LAW RSA 430:53 AND NH CODE ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AGR 3800. THE PROJECT

SHALL MEET ALL REQUIREMENTS AND THE INTENT OF. RSA 430:53 AND AGR 3800 RELATIVE TO INVASIVE SPECIES.

POST CONSTRUCTION / LONG TERM MAINTENANCE:

5. Catch Basins/Manholes

Inspect catch basins 2 times per year (preferably in spring and fall) to ensure that the catch basins are working in their intended fashion and that they are free of debris. Clean structures when sediment depths reach 12" from invert of outlet. If the basin outlet is designed with a hood to trap floatable materials (i.e. Snout), check to ensure watertight seal is working. Remove floating debris and hydrocarbons at the time of the inspection.

6. Culverts

Inspect culverts 2 times per year (preferably in spring and fall) to ensure that the culverts are working in their intended fashion and that they are free of debris. Remove any obstructions to flow; remove accumulated sediments and debris at the inlet, at the outlet, and within the conduit and to repair any erosion damage at the culvert's inlet and outlet. Repair/replace culvert if it becomes crushed or deteriorated.

7. Vegetated Areas

Inspect slopes and embankments early in the growing season to identify active or potential erosion problems. Replant bare areas or areas with sparse growth. Where rill erosion is evident, armor the area with an appropriate lining or divert the erosive flows to on-site areas able to withstand the concentrated flows. The facilities will be inspected after major storms and any identified deficiencies will be corrected.

8. Roadways and Paved Surfaces

Clear accumulations of winter sand along roadways at least once a year, preferably in the spring. Accumulations on pavement may be removed by pavement sweeping. Accumulations of sand along road shoulders may be removed by grading excess sand to the pavement edge and removing it manually or by a front-end loader.

9. Invasive Species

Background

Invasive plants are introduced, alien, or non-native plants, which have been moved by people from their native habitat to a new area. Some exotic plants are imported for human use such as landscaping, erosion control, or food crops. They also can arrive as "hitchhikers" among shipments of other plants, seeds, packing materials, or fresh produce. Some exotic plants become invasive and cause harm by:

- Becoming weedy and overgrown;
- Killing established shade trees;

- Obstructing pipes and drainage systems;
- Forming dense beds in water;
- Lowering water levels in lakes, streams, and wetlands;
- Destroying natural communities;
- Promoting erosion on stream banks and hillsides; and
- Resisting control except by hazardous chemical.

During maintenance activities, check for the presence of invasive plants and remove in a safe manner. They should be controlled as described on the following fact sheet prepared by the University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension entitled Methods for Disposing Non-Native Invasive Plant dated January 2010.

In the event that invasive species are noticed growing in any of the stormwater management practices, the invasive vegetation shall be removed completely to include root matter and disposed of properly. Prior to disposal, the vegetation shall be placed on and completely cover with a plastic tarp for a period of two – three weeks until plants are completely dead. If necessary or to expedite the process, spray only the invasive vegetation and roots with a systemic nonselective herbicide after placement on the tarp (to prevent chemical migration) and then cover.

Annual Report

Description: The owner is responsible to keep an **Inspection & Maintenance Activity Log** that documents inspection, maintenance, and repairs to the storm water management system, and a **Deicing Log** to track the amount and type of deicing material applied to the site. The original owner is responsible to ensure that any subsequent owner (s) have copies of the <u>Stormwater System</u> <u>Operation and Maintenance Plan & Inspection and Maintenance Manual</u>, copies of past logs and check lists. This includes any owner association for potential condominium conversion of the property. The Annual Report will be prepared and submitted to the Town of Exeter DPW upon request.

Disposal Requirements

Disposal of debris, trash, sediment, and other waste materials should be done at suitable disposal/recycling sites and in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal waste regulations.

STORMWATER SYSTEM OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLAN

Inspection & Maintenance Manual Checklist Residential Development 57 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH

BMP / System	Minimum Inspection Frequency	Minimum Inspection Requirements	Maintenance / Cleanout Threshold
Stabilized		Inspect adjacent roadway for sediment tracking	Sweep adjacent roadways as soon as sediment is tracked.
Entrance	Weekly	Inspect stone for sediment accumulation	Top dress with additional stone when necessary to prevent tracking
		Inspect accumulated	Repair or replace damaged lengths.
Sediment Control Devices / Barriers	Weekly	sediment level, rips, and tears	Remove and dispose of accumulated sediment once level reaches 1/3 of barrier height
Pavement Sweeping	Spring and Fall	Removal of sand and litter from impervious areas	N/A
Litter/Trash Removal	Routinely	Inspect dumpsters, outdoor waste receptacles area, and yard areas, as well as ponds and swale areas.	Site will be free of litter/trash.
Deicing Agents	N/A	N/A	Use salt as the primary agent for roadway safety during winter.
Landscaping	Maintained as required and mulched each Spring	N/A	Trash/debris and weed removal
Drainage Pipes & Catch Basins	Spring and Fall	Check for sediment accumulation & clogging.	More than 12" sediment depth from outlet pipe
Annual Report	1 time per year	Submit Annual Report to Town of Exeter Inspector upon request	

STORMWATER SYSTEM OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLAN

Inspection & Maintenance Manual Log Form <u>Residential Development</u> 57 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH

BMP / System	Date Inspected	Inspected By	Cleaning/Repair (List Items & Comments)	Date Repaired	Repairs Performed By

Inspection Notes:

Anti-icing Route Data Form				
Truck Station:				
Date:				_
Air Temperature	Pavement Temperature	Relative Humidity	Dew Point	Sky
Reason for applyin	ng:			
Route:				
Chemical:				
onemical.				
Application Time:				
Application Amount:				
Observation (first day):				
Observation (Irrst day):				
Observation (after event):				
Observation (before next application);				
News				



Methods for Disposing Non-Native Invasive Plants

Prepared by the Invasives Species Outreach Group, volunteers interested in helping people control invasive plants. Assistance provided by the Piscataquog Land Conservancy and the NH Invasives Species Committee. Edited by Karen Bennett, Extension Forestry Professor and Specialist.



Tatarian honeysuckle Lonicera tatarica USDA-NRCS PLANTS Database / Britton, N.L., and A. Brown. 1913. An illustrated flora of the northern United States, Canada and the British Possessions. Vol. 3: 282.

Non-native invasive plants crowd out natives in natural and managed landscapes. They cost taxpayers billions of dollars each year from lost agricultural and forest crops, decreased biodiversity, impacts to natural resources and the environment, and the cost to control and eradicate them.

Invasive plants grow well even in less than desirable conditions such as sandy soils along roadsides, shaded wooded areas, and in wetlands. In ideal conditions, they grow and spread even faster. There are many ways to remove these nonnative invasives, but once removed, care is needed to dispose the removed plant material so the plants don't grow where disposed.

Knowing how a particular plant reproduces indicates its method of spread and helps determine

the appropriate disposal method. Most are spread by seed and are dispersed by wind, water, animals, or people. Some reproduce by vegetative means from pieces of stems or roots forming new plants. Others spread through both seed and vegetative means.

Because movement and disposal of viable plant parts is restricted (see NH Regulations), viable invasive parts can't be brought to most transfer stations in the state. Check with your transfer station to see if there is an approved, designated area for invasives disposal. This fact sheet gives recommendations for rendering plant parts nonviable.

Control of invasives is beyond the scope of this fact sheet. For information about control visit <u>www.nhinvasives.org</u> or contact your UNH Cooperative Extension office.

New Hampshire Regulations

Prohibited invasive species shall only be disposed of in a manner that renders them nonliving and nonviable. (Agr. 3802.04)

No person shall collect, transport, import, export, move, buy, sell, distribute, propagate or transplant any living and viable portion of any plant species, which includes all of their cultivars and varieties, listed in Table 3800.1 of the New Hampshire prohibited invasive species list. (Agr 3802.01)

How and When to Dispose of Invasives?

To prevent seed from spreading remove invasive plants before seeds are set (produced). Some plants continue to grow, flower and set seed even after pulling or cutting. Seeds can remain viable in the ground for many years. If the plant has flowers or seeds, place the flowers and seeds in a heavy plastic bag "head first" at the weeding site and transport to the disposal site. The following are general descriptions of disposal methods. See the chart for recommendations by species.

Burning: Large woody branches and trunks can be used as firewood or burned in piles. For outside burning, a written fire permit from the local forest fire warden is required unless the ground is covered in snow. Brush larger than 5 inches in diameter can't be burned. Invasive plants with easily airborne seeds like black swallow-wort with mature seed pods (indicated by their brown color) shouldn't be burned as the seeds may disperse by the hot air created by the fire.

Bagging (solarization): Use this technique with softertissue plants. Use heavy black or clear plastic bags (contractor grade), making sure that no parts of the plants poke through. Allow the bags to sit in the sun for several weeks and on dark pavement for the best effect.

Tarping and Drying: Pile material on a sheet of plastic



Japanese knotweed Polygonum cuspidatum USDA-NRCS PLANTS Database / Britton, N.L., and A. Brown. 1913. An illustrated flora of the northern United States, Canada and the British Possessions. Vol. 1: 676.

and cover with a tarp, fastening the tarp to the ground and monitoring it for escapes. Let the material dry for several weeks, or until it is clearly nonviable.

Chipping: Use this method for woody plants that don't reproduce vegetatively.

Burying: This is risky, but can be done with watchful diligence. Lay thick plastic in a deep pit before placing the cut up plant material in the hole. Place the material away from the edge of the plastic before covering it with more heavy plastic. Eliminate as much air as possible and toss in soil to weight down the material in the pit. Note that the top of the buried material should be at least three feet underground. Japanese knotweed should be at least 5 feet underground!

Drowning: Fill a large barrel with water and place soft-tissue plants in the water. Check after a few weeks and look for rotted plant material (roots, stems, leaves, flowers). Well-rotted plant material may be composted. A word of caution- seeds may still be viable after using this method. Do this before seeds are set. This method isn't used often. Be prepared for an awful stink!

Composting: Invasive plants can take root in compost. Don't compost any invasives unless you know there is no viable (living) plant material left. Use one of the above techniques (bagging, tarping, drying, chipping, or drowning) to render the plants nonviable before composting. Closely examine the plant before composting and avoid composting seeds.

Be diligent looking for seedlings for years in areas where removal and disposal took place.

Suggested Disposal Methods for Non-Native Invasive Plants

This table provides information concerning the disposal of removed invasive plant material. If the infestation is treated with herbicide and left in place, these guidelines don't apply. Don't bring invasives to a local transfer station, unless there is a designated area for their disposal, or they have been rendered non-viable. This listing includes wetland and upland plants from the New Hampshire Prohibited Invasive Species List. The disposal of aquatic plants isn't addressed.

Woody Plants	Method of Reproducing	Methods of Disposal
Norway maple (Acer platanoides) European barberry (Berberis vulgaris) Japanese barberry (Berberis thunbergii) autumn olive (Elaeagnus umbellata) burning bush (Euonymus alatus)	Fruit and Seeds	 Prior to fruit/seed ripening Seedlings and small plants Pull or cut and leave on site with roots exposed. No special care needed. Larger plants Use as firewood. Make a brush pile. Chip. Burn.
Morrow's honeysuckle (Lonicera morrowii) Tatarian honeysuckle (Lonicera tatarica) showy bush honeysuckle (Lonicera x bella) common buckthorn (Rhamnus cathartica) glossy buckthorn (Frangula alnus)		 After fruit/seed is ripe Don't remove from site. Burn. Make a covered brush pile. Chip once all fruit has dropped from branches. Leave resulting chips on site and monitor.
oriental bittersweet (Celastrus orbiculatus) multiflora rose (Rosa multiflora)	Fruits, Seeds, Plant Fragments	 Prior to fruit/seed ripening Seedlings and small plants Pull or cut and leave on site with roots exposed. No special care needed. Larger plants Make a brush pile. Burn.
	V	 After fruit/seed is ripe Don't remove from site. Burn. Make a covered brush pile. Chip – only after material has fully dried (1 year) and all fruit has dropped from branches. Leave resulting chips on site and monitor.

Non-Woody Plants	Method of Reproducing	Methods of Disposal
<pre>garlic mustard (Alliaria petiolata) spotted knapweed (Centaurea maculosa) • Sap of related knapweed can cause skin irritation and tumors. Wear gloves when handling. black swallow-wort (Cynanchum nigrum) • May cause skin rash. Wear gloves and long sleeves when handling. pale swallow-wort (Cynanchum rossicum) giant hogweed (Heracleum mantegazzianum) • Can cause major skin rash. Wear gloves and long sleeves when handling. dame's rocket (Hesperis matronalis) perennial pepperweed (Lepidium latifolium) purple loosestrife (Lythrum salicaria) Japanese stilt grass (Microstegium vimineum) mile-a-minute weed (Polygonum perfoliatum)</pre>	Fruits and Seeds	 Prior to flowering Depends on scale of infestation Small infestation Pull or cut plant and leave on site with roots exposed. Large infestation Pull or cut plant and pile. (You can pile onto or cover with plastic sheeting). Monitor. Remove any re-sprouting material. During and following flowering Do nothing until the following year or remove flowering heads and bag and let rot. Small infestation Pull or cut plant and leave on site with roots exposed. Large infestation Pull or cut plant and pile remaining material. (You can pile onto plastic or cover with plastic sheeting). Monitor. Remove any re-sprouting material. (You can pile onto plastic or cover with plastic sheeting). Monitor. Remove any re-sprouting material.
common reed (<i>Phragmites australis</i>) Japanese knotweed (<i>Polygonum cuspidatum</i>) Bohemian knotweed (<i>Polygonum x bohemicum</i>)	Fruits, Seeds, Plant Fragments Primary means of spread in these species is by plant parts. Although all care should be given to preventing the dispersal of seed during control activities, the presence of seed doesn't materially influence disposal activities.	 Small infestation Bag all plant material and let rot. Never pile and use resulting material as compost. Burn. Large infestation Remove material to unsuitable habitat (dry, hot and sunny or dry and shaded location) and scatter or pile. Monitor and remove any sprouting material. Pile, let dry, and burn.

January 2010

UNH Cooperative Extension programs and policies are consistent with pertinent Federal and State laws and regulations, and prohibits discrimination in its programs, activities and employment on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran's, marital or family status. College of Life Sciences and Agriculture, County Governments, NH Dept. of Resources and Economic Development, Division of Forests and Lands, NH Fish and Game ,and U.S. Dept. of Agriculture cooperating.

Appendix IV

Plans







REVISED	PER
REVISED	PER
REVISION	IS:





TOWN OF EXETER

Planning and Building Department 10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 • FAX 772-4709 www.exeternh.gov

Date:April 17, 2025To:Planning BoardFrom:Dave Sharples, Town PlannerRe:Willey Creek CompanyPB Case #22-3

The Board may recall that the Applicant previously filed this application in May 2022 and subsequently, after several requests for continuance, requested at the August 25, 2022 meeting for the application to be tabled until further notice, noting that the Board had not yet taken jurisdiction to hear the application.

The Applicant re-submitted applications and plans for site plan review, lot line adjustment and Wetlands and Shoreland Conditional Use Permits along with supporting documents, (dated 8/13/24) for the proposed relocation of Building D of the Ray Farm Condominium development on Willey Creek Road (off of Ray Farmstead Road). The subject properties are located in the C-3, Epping Road Highway Commercial zoning district and are identified as Tax Map Parcel #47-8-1 and #47-9.

The Applicant was originally scheduled to appear before the Board at the November 21st, 2024 meeting and subsequently requested a continuance to the February 27th, 2025 meeting; at that meeting, a second continuance was granted by the Board to the April 24th, 2025 meeting with the understanding that the applicant needs to move forward with a hearing on that date or withdraw until they are ready to resubmit and appear before the board.

The Applicant submitted revised plans and supporting documents, dated 3/11/25, and those materials are enclosed for your review. A Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting was held on April 3, 2025 and it was determined that the plans, as submitted, were very preliminary and incomplete for Planning Board acceptance. The Applicant was asked to consider whether or not they would be resubmitting plans in anticipation of another TRC meeting, or would opt to utilize the April 24th, 2025 PB meeting for a design review to solicit input from the public and the board. Please see attached email from Attorney Tim Phoenix, dated 4/5/25, requesting a "design review" by the Board at its April 24th, 2025 meeting.

Please note that this is only a design review as the application is incomplete for Board acceptance at this time. Design review is covered under NHRSA 676:4 that allows the Planning Board and the applicant to engage in a *non-binding* discussion of the proposal. As this is design review and abutters have been notified, the Board can discuss matters beyond general and conceptual discussions which can involve specific engineering details and design. Staff will provide a complete review through the Technical Review Committee process once a complete submission has been provided by the Applicant.

In the event the Board determines that the Design Review process has ended, I would suggest the Board make that determination with a vote. If the Board determines that additional review is needed, I would ask that the Board table the item until a date certain. I have provided motions below for your convenience.

Planning Board motions:

Design Review has ended Motion: I move that the Design Review process for Willey Creek Company (PB Case #22-3) has concluded and instruct the Town Planner to notify the applicant in writing in accordance with NHRSA 676:4.

Design Review Table Motion: I move that the Design Review application for Willey Creek Company (PB Case #22-3) is **Tabled** until the <u>(date)</u> Planning Board meeting at 7:00 PM.

Thank you.

Enclosures



CKT et al, Building D PB hearing.

1 message

Tim Phoenix <TPhoenix@hpgrlaw.com>

Sat, Apr 5, 2025 at 10:08 AM

To: David Sharples <dsharples@exeternh.gov>, "Barbara Mcevoy (bmcevoy@exeternh.gov)" <bmcevoy@exeternh.gov> Cc: "Jon & Amy Shafmaster (jshafmaster@littlebaylobster.com)" <jshafmaster@littlebaylobster.com>, Kat Morrill <KMorrill@mei-ma.com>, Eric Botterman <ebotterman@mei-ma.com>, Michelle Whelan <MWhelan@hpgrlaw.com>

Good morning Dave,

Please accept this email in follow up to our TRC meeting on Thursday April 3rd, 2025. The tenor of the discussions reveals that We are going to be updating plans in support of the project. A planning board public hearing is scheduled for Thursday April 24, 2025. The question arose with respect to that hearing given that the plans will likely not be completed to an extent necessary to be accepted as complete by the planning board by the next submission date.

Notwithstanding, and as I mentioned at the hearing, we request to proceed with the planning board hearing on April 24. While noticed as a public hearing, we would consider it in effect a preliminary hearing for discussion without the intention of the planning board's acceptance of it as complete. We firmly believe that it is important to keep this moving now that it is back on the table, and it will be productive to both the applicant and the town to review the project as it is currently proposed, including plans prepared to date, in order to have a fruitful discussion and gain input from the planning board regarding future submissions and next steps. Please confirm that this will be left on the calendar for April 24, 2025.

To the above end,, And since I and MEI are relatively recently involved in this project given its pendency, is it possible for you to send or copies to be made and me pick up the conditional use permit applications as previously submitted and he submitted wetland report?

Thanks much. As always come I'm happy to discuss by phone.

HOEFLE, PHOENIX, GORMLEY & ROBERTS, PLLC

R. Timothy Phoenix, Esq. Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormley & Roberts, PLLC 127 Parrott Avenue Portsmouth, NH, 03802 t: (603) 436-0666 d: (603) 766-9102 e: tphoenix@hpgrlaw.com w: https://hpgrlaw.com/

Click Here to send files securely via ShareFile

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This communication may contain material protected by attorney-client privilege. It is privileged and confidential, and is intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. If you are neither the intended recipient(s) nor a person responsible for the delivery of this transmission to the intended recipient(s), any unauthorized distribution or copying of this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately and permanently delete this communication. If tax or other legal advice is contained in this email, please recognize that it may not reflect the level of analysis that would go into more formal advice or a formal legal opinion and is not intended to meet IRS requirements for formal tax advice.

Draft Minutes

Exeter Technical Review Committee April 3, 2025

The meeting began at 10:00 a.m. in the Nowak Room of the Exeter Town Office building.

Application

The application of Willey Creek Company for a site plan review, lot line adjustment and Wetlands and Shoreland conditional use permits along with supporting documents for the proposed relocation of Building D of the Ray Farm Condominium development off of Ray Farmstead Road. The subject properties are located in the C-3, Epping Road Highway Commercial zoning district and are identified as Tax Map Parcel #47-8-1 and #47-8.1. PB Case #22-3.

<u>Attendees</u>: Town staff: Town Planner, Dave Sharples; Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer, Douglas Eastman; Conservation and Sustainability Planner, Kristen Murphy, Town Engineer, Paul Vlasich, P.E., Deputy Fire Chief, Jason Fritz, DPW Director, Stephen Cronin.

Third Party Consultant: Allison Rees, P. E., Underwood Engineers

<u>Applicant and Representatives</u>: Jonathan Shafmaster, William Blackett & Katie Ellis, Ray Farm Company and Willey Creek, LLC, R. Timothy Phoenix, Esq. Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormley & Roberts, PLLC, Katharena Morrill, E.I.T., Millenium Engineering, Inc.

Public Representatives: Kevin Mielke and Marty Kennedy, Ray Farm residents.

The committee reviewed plans submitted to the Planning Office. Following a brief overview, items of discussion included, but were not limited to the following: roadway/driveway designation, connections, water/sewer configurations, catch basins, box culvert approvals, cul-de-sac requirements, crosswalks, turning radius for fire trucks, ev charging and basement location with regard to sprinklers, need for CUP both shoreland and wetland, incomplete, unverifiable plans, waivers. The plans submitted for this TRC were noted to be very preliminary and in need of completion.

All items discussed will be outlined in a TRC comment letter to be provided to the Applicant and their representatives by next week.

The applicant plans to consider options regarding whether or not they will resubmit plans in anticipation of another TRC or submit a Design Review/Conceptual plan for the April 24th meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Kathleen Croteau Administrative Assistant



3135.00

April 3, 2025

Mr. David Sharples, Town Planner Town Planning Office, Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

Re: Ray Farm Building D Design Review Engineering Services Exeter, New Hampshire

Site Information:

47/8 Tax Map/Lot#: Address: Ray Farmstead Road Lot Area: 15.75 acres (after lot line adjustment) Residential Proposed Use: Water: Municipal Sewer: Municipal Zoning District: C-3 Applicant: Ray Farm, LLC Millenium Engineering, Inc. Design Engineer:

Plan Set Reviewed:

- Site plan set entitled "Ray Farm 'Building D'" "Site Development Plans for an Active Adult Community off Ray Farmstead Road, Exeter, NH" dated March 10, 2025 prepared by Millenium Engineering, Inc.
- Site plan application materials prepared by Millenium Engineering
- Stormwater Management Report prepared by Millenium Engineering, dated March 11, 2025

Dear Mr. Sharples:

Based on our review of the above information, we offer the following comments relative to the documents listed above in accordance with the Town of Exeter Regulations and standard engineering practice. UE performed only a cursory review of the storm drainage system, as the NHDES will be reviewing the application as part of the Alteration of Terrain permitting.

UnderwoodEngineers.com

99 North State Street 603.230.9898 Concord, NH 03301

Review No. 1

<u>General</u>

- 1. The plans should be stamped by the engineer, surveyor, soil scientist, wetlands scientist, et al. as appropriate.
- 2. An NHDES Sewer Connection Permit and EPA CGP should be added to the list of permits required on the plan set cover.
- 3. The number of parking spaces provided is listed on the cover sheet as 73, yet they add up to 72. Thirty-six spaces are shown on the site plans. Please clarify the total number.
- 4. Note 7 on the General Notes Plan states the area of TM/L 47/8 is 22.04 acres. It is listed as 15.75 acres on the Overview Plan and the Lot Line Adjustment Plan. Please clarify.
- 5. Acknowledging the Applicant's waiver request regarding the completeness of the submission, much of UE's typical review is deferred, however UE does note that many elements are missing from the plan set. Where practical, we have endeavored to identify the missing elements as we noted them, but our list should not be considered a comprehensive summation of items required of a typical submission.
- 6. The following are missing from the submittal:
 - Landscape Plan
 - o Lighting Plan
 - $_{\odot}$ Architectural Plans, including a floor plan of the garage parking level
 - Vehicle Turning Movement Plan(s)
 - Test Pit Logs

Existing Conditions Plan

- 7. Add a north arrow.
- 8. Add the source(s) of all information not picked up by the on the ground survey noted.
- 9. The utility labels overlap and are difficult to read.
- 10. Add the existing treelines.
- 11. Will the western iron rod of the pair of iron rods at the northwest corner of the site be removed?
- 12. Proposed monumentation should be shown on the proposed adjusted lot lines.
- 13. The soils boundary linetype appears to be the same as the buffer linetype.
- 14. List the datum used.
- 15. The wetland shading masks some of the contours.



16. Add significant trees per Town regulations.

Site, Grading, and Utility Plans

- 17. Show the location of EV-ready parking spaces.
- 18. ADA parking spaces are not shown on the plan,
- 19. The parking spaces measure 18' long, where 19' long spaces are required in Exeter.
- 20. Label snow storage locations.
- 21. Show locations of dumpster pads, HVAC pads, and/or mail kiosk if applicable.
- 22. Label sidewalks, crosswalks, and curbing on the site plans.
- 23. A sidewalk is shown along part of the drive, and proposed contours indicate it continues to the trail path, but no sidewalk line is shown.
- 24. A crosswalk should be added between the front entrance and the steps to the parking area.
- 25. The aisle to the steps between the parking area and the upper drive should be striped.
- 26. There are extraneous lines on the walking path overview site plan.
- 27. The grading plans appear to be incomplete partially due to the following and will be reviewed once a revised plan has been received:
 - A. Proposed contours do not all tie in with existing contours
 - B. Some proposed contours are mislabeled, and some are not labeled at all
 - C. No proposed grading is shown at the rear of the building
 - D. The FF and garage floor elevation are not labeled
 - E. The TOW and BOW elevations of the retaining wall are not labeled
 - F. The grading along the foot path does not appear to be completed
- 28. Plan sheet 9 is incorrectly titled. The cover sheet lists it as a Grading and Drainage Plan. It is titled a Stie Plan, and no drainage systems are shown on the sheet.
- 29. No emergency overflow is shown at the detention pond.
- 30. The drainage system shown on the Utility Plan does not match the drainage system that was modeled in the stormwater report or what is shown on the Post-Development Stormwater Plan.
- 31. Drainage manholes are labeled but not shown on the Utility Plan.
- 32. No pipe is shown between CB 7 and DMH 6.
- 33. The sewer line is aligned directly underneath CB 2.

- 34. CB 8 is not located at the edge of pavement.
- 35. Overlapping labels are unreadable.
- 36. Only a few of the drainage pipes are labeled.
- 37. Two catch basins are shown to the west of the stream crossing that are unlabeled and not shown in the profile. It is unclear where those structures will outlet.
- 38. Show the location of water gate valves, reducers, and bends, and label them.
- 39. Coordinate the location of the fire hydrant with the Town of Exeter fire department.
- 40. The 12" ductile iron water main is shown as curved along the driveway at a radius not possible for installation.
- 41. Label the angle of the two water main bends shown at the turn to the building.
- 42. Add the location of UGE lines and transformers/
- 43. Add stationing to the Utility Plan.
- 44. Add SMH information to the Utility Plan.
- 45. Label the sewer pipes and add the invert at the building.

Access Road Plan and Profile

- 46. Extend the profile to the end of the access road.
- 47. Add stationing to the plan.
- 48. Extraneous layers are shown on the plan.
- 49. Add depth to water table and ledge to the profile.
- 50. Add proposed sewer and drainage information to the profile.

<u>Detail Sheets</u>

- 51. Stormtech details are included but no Stormtech system is shown or labeled on the plans.
- 52. Typical road cross-section, sidewalk and parking area details revise as applicable per Town of Exeter standards for pavement and gravels.
- 53. Some details refer to notes and other details that are not included.
- 54. Add a detail for the "Bog Bridge" indicated on the site plans along the foot path.



Stormwater Design and Modeling

55. Provide a single table of pre vs post runoff rates and volumes.

- 56. Confirm rainfall amounts have been increased by 15% per AoT regulation Env-Wq 1503.08.
- 57. Provide a narrative confirming compliance with the Pollutant Loading removal requirements per the Town of Exeter stormwater treatment regulations.
- 58. UE defers further review of the drainage study until a completed grading plan and architectural plans including roof lines and locations of gutter downspouts, if applicable, are received per the comments above.
- 59. PTAP Database: The Applicant is requested to enter project related stormwater tracking information contained in the site plan application documents using the Great Bay Pollution Tracking and Accounting Program (PTAP) database (www.unh.edu/unhsc/ptapp) and submit the entry for review.

A written response is required to facilitate future reviews. Please contact us if you have any questions.

Very truly yours, UNDERWOOD ENGINEERS, INC.

Allison M. Rees, P.E. (NH) Project Manager

RAS

Robert J. Saunders, P.E. (NH, ME, VT, PA) Senior Technical Leader



TOWN OF EXETER

Planning and Building Department 10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 • FAX 772-4709 www.exeternh.gov

Date:	April 9, 2025		
То:	Kat Morrill. Millennium Engineering Jon Shafmaster, Bill Blackett, Willey Creek Company (Ray Farm) Tim Phoenix, Esq., Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormley & Roberts, PLLC		
From:	Dave Sharples, Town Plann	ner	
Re:	Site Plan Review TRC Comments PB Case #22-3 Willey Creek/Ray Farm – Building D relocation Tax Map Parcel #47-8		

The following comments are provided as a follow-up for technical review of the site plans and supporting documents submitted on March 10, 2025 for the above-captioned project. The TRC meeting was held on April 3, 2025 and materials were reviewed by Town departments.

TOWN PLANNER COMMENTS

Lot Line Adjustment plan comments

- This states that it is a lot line adjustment which implies that no new lots are being created. However, the Overview Plan indicates that the new lot line creates lot 2. This isn't the case on the lot line adjustment plan. Please revise so they are consistent.
- Note #1 indicates encumbrances may exist. Section 7.4.17 requires all easements are shown on the plans. Please clarify note.
- Note # 2 no longer appears relevant. Revise accordingly.
- Note # 3 states that "a complete on the ground field survey shall be completed prior to application for lot line adjustment...". Since this is an application for a lot line adjustment, please verify that a complete on the ground field survey has been completed and revise or remove note as needed.
- Provide zoning information on plan per Section 7.6.6.
- Add note per Section 7.6.12.
- Show monumentation on plans in accordance with Section 9.25. it appears that at least four locations require monumentation to be shown either currently or to be set.

Site Plan comments

- Are there any known environmental hazards on the site in the area of proposed disturbance? If so, provide detail.
- Identify significant trees per Section 7.4.7.
- Provide road design details and a construction plan in accordance with Sections 7.5.7 and Section 7.7.
- Add snow storage areas on plans per Section 7.5.14.
- Please provide a proposed inspection checklist form as part of the Long Term Pollution Prevention and Operations and Maintenance Plan per Section 9.5.2.
- Provide information to determine if Section 9.6.3 is being satisfied.
- Provide landscaping plan in accordance with Section 9.7.
- A row of sixteen (16) parking stalls are proposed along the front of Building D. This requires a parking island per Section 9.7.5.5.
- Provide layout of parking garage to confirm compliance with Section 9.13 Parking Areas.
- Provide lighting plan and lighting specifications to insure compliance with Section 9.20.
- Provide updated traffic memo addressing the additional units.
- Provide information that the project meets Section 11.3.
- Drainage information appears incomplete. Drain lines just appear to end, catch basins are shown without pipes connecting to them, direction of flow is unknown, there is a "Stormtech 740" infiltrations system in the details but it is unclear where this system will be located, etc. Please provide all drainage information so the plans can be reviewed in accordance with our regulations including but not limited to Section 9.3.
- The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan appears incomplete. There are symbols but no legend on what they mean, silt fencing (or whatever is meant by the dashed line with squares) just ends in some areas that would require control, etc. Please provide a plan and all necessary information to determine compliance with Section 9.3.6.1-10.
- Confirm if there will be any grading within 5 feet of any exterior property line.
- How will trash pick-up for the residential use be handled? Will there be any internal trash storage? No dumpsters are shown on the plans.
- Please discuss potential addressing of the site/buildings with the Code Enforcement Officer and Deputy Fire Chief.
- Will natural gas be extended to the proposed building? If so, please show on plans with appropriate detail.
- The sidewalk between building C and Building D ends at a driveway without any access to Building D (see Section 9.14.6).
- Provide draft condominium documents for the proposed units.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS

Town Engineer has indicated that more detailed plans are necessary for an appropriate review of the project.

FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Basic requirements of the Exeter Fire Department. This list is not all inclusive and other requests may be made during the review process. Unless specifically required by code, some room for compromise is open.

(Rev 5: 9/7/2017) Architectural Review:

- Interior utility room access
- Interior sprinkler room access
- Adequate attic access (sized for FF, if applicable))
- Catwalk access in unfinished areas that have sprinklers (handrails preferred)
- If building has truss roof or floors, must display sign according to ordinance 1301. Knox box required for all buildings with fire alarm or sprinkler systems (ordinance 1803)

Civil/Site Review:

- Hydrant near site access and towards rear of site (if applicable)
- Fire truck turning radius site plan

Sprinkler Review:

- NFPA 13(R,D) sprinkler system where required
- FDC: 4-inch storz with at least 18" clearance to ground
- Electric bell (no water motor gong)
- Attic protection in 13R systems

Fire Alarm Review:

- Single red beacon or strobe indicator on exterior (not horn-strobe)
- NFPA72 Fire Alarm System where required
- Cat 30 keys for pull stations and FACP

Elevators:

- Heat and smoke top and bottom (heats for the shunt trip)
- Dimensions to accommodate a stretcher (usually a 2500 lbs) 3'6" by 7' at a minimum
- Elevator recall to appropriate floor during an activation
- Sprinkler protection top and bottom if ANY combustible material in shaft. (can omit per NFPA 13 guidelines)
- Phone in car needs to be able to dial 911

CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABILITY PLANNER COMMENTS

The plans lack sufficient details to provide a complete review for compliance with our regulations. The following are items of note based on what was provided:

- A second TRC is requested following resubmission
- Overall the plan is very difficult to read. For example, there is not a sheet labeled grading and erosion control (reference. 7.9). Details for erosion control and grading is spread among several different sheets for example.
- Labels for buffers are missing, symbols are missing any key to determine what they represent.
- Shading for wetland, shoreland and buffer impacts are indiscernible from each other.
- It is difficult to tell what is existing or proposed. Bold lines typically indicate proposed conditions yet the bolded tree line is larger than the area covered by the existing tree line for example.
- No details are provided for the footpath.
- Footpath does not cross wetland at the narrowest point
- The conditions need to show the full parcel. This one does not show the area where Building D was originally proposed (ref 7.1)
- Significant trees are not shown (ref. 7.4.7)
- With so many wetland survey dates, I am unable to determine when affected wetlands and wetland/shoreland buffers were delineated. Please detail boundary survey dates for wetlands where direct or buffer impacts are proposed, and clearly identify the wetland scientist who conducted the survey. Add wetland scientist stamp.
- Landscape plan is not provided (ref. 7.10)
- Snow storage is not indicated on plan. (ref. 9.16)
- Lighting Plan is not provided (ref. 9.20)
- Site is required to comply with EV Readiness requirements. Please provided documentation of how that will be achieved. If provided in the garage, please provide HOA regulations that show charging will be allowed – I will defer to Fire for their comments on charging in the garages (ref. 9.13.8).

CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER COMMENTS

The plans have been reviewed for compliance with the Town's Zoning Ordinance. It has been determined that the plans, as presented, conform to all zoning regulations and therefore, no zoning relief is necessary.

It has been determined that the Applicant will appear before the Planning Board at the April 24th, 2025 meeting, as previously scheduled, but for a design review only. Upon receipt of complete plans and supporting documents, a second TRC meeting will be scheduled prior to returning to the Planning Board for a public hearing.



March 10th, 2025

Mr. Langdon Plumer, Chair Exeter Planning Board 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

Re: Application for Site Plan Review Building D of the Active Adult Community off Ray Farmstead Road Assessors Map 47 Lot 8

Dear Chair and Members of the Board,

On behalf of Ray Farm LLC, we submit a revised site plan for the relocation of Building D for the active adult community off Ray Farmstead Road. This site plan amends the initial design presented to the board in the submittal received March 29, 2022, and initially revised on May 17, 2022.

The initial project submitted by GM2 revised the location for the 32-unit Building D with access to the building originating from Willey Creek Road. Millennium Engineering has since assumed design responsibilities for this project.

The attached site plan includes a 32 unit building that is accessed directly from Ray Farmstead Road. The parking lot is designed to accommodate 36 vehicle parking spaces in front with an additional 36 under the building and includes access from two ends of the building. The revision includes the ability to turn a fire truck around without backing up which previously had not been considered. It removes vehicle access from Building C in its entirety. All utilities tie into the existing infrastructure that was put in place during the construction of Ray Farmstead Road.

The driveway that allows access to Building D shall be 24' in width in accordance with the access road requirements set forth by the Exeter Site Plan review regulations.

This submission expands on the applications filed by GM2 on behalf of the applicant for Lot Line Adjustment and Site Plan review. This includes the architectural information for the building as previously provided.

It is our understanding that this revised proposal will also require revision to the Wetlands Conservation District Conditional Use Permit and Shoreland Protection District Conditional Use Permit. A wetland impact sheet has been provided for review at this time. However, these permit applications will follow upon the initial review of the revision package.

Massachusetts:	62 Elm Street-Salisbury, MA 01952
New Hampshire:	13 Hampton Road- Exeter, NH 03833



In addition to this letter we have enclosed the following deliverables.

Deliverable List:

- Agent Letter
- Waiver Revision Letter
- 7 Full Size Copies of the Site Plan Package
- 15 Tabloid Size Copies of the Site Plan Package
- 3 Copies Stormwater Report

We trust the above information provides the necessary details required for the Board's review and ultimate approval. If you have any questions or comments on the above information, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Millennium Engineering, Inc.

Katharena Morrill, E.I.T. Project Manager



March 10th, 2025

Mr. Langdon Plumer, Chair Exeter Planning Board 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

Re: Waiver Revision - Application for Site Plan Review Building D of the Active Adult Community off Ray Farmstead Road Assessors Map 47 Lot 8

Dear Chair and Members of the Board,

In 2022, DTC Lawyers submitted several waivers as a part of the initial submittal provided by GM2.

This letter is to withdraw some of the previously submitted waivers from the application. These waivers are:

- Waiver from parking requirements Section 5.6.5 of the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations.
 - Initially a waiver was requested to allow 58 spaces where 72 are required.
 - The redesign allows 72 spaces. 36 under the building and 36 in the parking area.
- Waiver from parking setback Section 11.3.1.2 of the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations.
 - Initially a waiver was requested to allow a 15 ft setback between the building and the parking lot.
 - The redesign allows 38' from the front of the parking spaces to the nearest point of the building. The design maintains a fire lane between the building and the parking spaces.

The following waiver requests will stand:

- Waiver for Wetland Impacts Section 9.9 Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations
 - A wetland impact sheet has been provided which details the impacts required. The site plan revision has modified the impacts to align with those previously reviewed during the TIF Road phasing. A NHDES Standard Dredge and Fill permit will be required to execute the wetlands crossing to serve Building D. Work within the buffer will still be required to allow the construction of the access road. Wetland and Shoreland impact plans have been provided with the MEI submission.
- Waiver for reduced recreational area, Section 11.3.4 of the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations
- Waiver for Construction Plans, Section 7.7 of the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations.
 - Section 7.7 is specific to Construction plans. As stated in the initial waiver this project provides a unique set of circumstances that require consideration with the Town, should



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC. Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

this project and identified configuration be considered favorable this waiver request will be withdrawn and full construction plans will be developed. .

We trust the above information provides the necessary details required for the Board's review and ultimate approval. If you have any questions or comments on the above information, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Millennium Engineering, Inc.

Katharena Morrill, E.I.T. Project Manager



THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

<u>PLAN</u>	INDEX
-------------	-------

SHEET NO.	TITLE
1	COVER SHEET
2	GENERAL NOTES AND LEGEND
3	OVERVIEW PLAN
4	LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT PLAN
5	EXISTING CONDITIONS
6-8	SITE PLAN
9, 10	GRADING & DRAINAGE PLANS
11, 12	UTILITY PLAN
13	PLAN AND PROFILE
14	EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PLAN
15	WETLAND IMPACT
16	SHORELAND IMPACT
17–23	CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

THAT THIS ACTUAL SURVEY WAS MADE ON THE GROUND BETWEEN JUNE OF 2023 AND

THAT THIS SURVEY CONFORMS TO THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCURACY FOR N.H. URBAN SURVEY.

LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR

DATE

TOWN OF EXETER PLANNING BOARD

DATE

CHAIRMAN

PLAN TITLE SITE PLAN IN TITLE EXETER, NH SHEET SHOWING BUILDING D AT RAY FARM OFF PROJECT: M244368 RAY FARM ROAD SHEET: 1 OF 23

GENERAL NOTES

- 1. ELEVATIONS BASED ON NAVD 1988. PLANS ARE NH STATE PLAIN NAD83 COORDINATE SYSTEM.
- OWNERS OF ADJOINING PROPERTIES ARE SHOWN ACCORDING TO CURRENT ASSESSOR'S MAPS AND DO NOT CONSTITUTE CERTIFICATION TO TITLE OR OW
 EXISTING CONDITIONS DATA FROM AN ON THE GROUND SURVEY CONDUCTED BY W.C. CAMMETT ENG., NOVEMBER OF 2016 THROUGH APRIL OF 2017, GN ASSOCIATES IN DECEMBER OF 2021 AND MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, 2023 AND 2024. TOPOGRAPHICAL SURFACES HAVE BEEN GENERATED USING ON THE SURVEY AND LIDAR COLLECTED BY NOAA.
- 4. ADDITIONAL ON THE GROUND TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY IS TO BE COMPLETED IN 2025 TO VERIFY PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
- WETLANDS AND SOILS INFORMATION PROVIDED BY GOVE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES.
 THERE IS NO FLOOD PLAIN ON THIS SITE ACCORDING TO THE FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP, COMMUNITY PANEL NUMBER 330130 0401 E.
 THE ORIGINAL PARCEL IS LOCATED AT 183 EPPING ROAD AND IS SHOWN AS LOT 8 ON EXETER TAX MAP 47. IT HAS AN AREA OF 960,175 S.F.± (22.0 ACRES±).
- 8. EXISTING 50' WIDE RIGHT OF WAY IS FOR THE BENEFIT OF N. SCOTT CARLISLE. SEE BOOK 3794 PAGE 1963 FOR NOTICE OF EASEMENT.
 9. THE LOCATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY AND HAVE NOT BEEN INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED BY OWNER OR ITS REPRESENTATIVE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK, AN TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES WHICH MIGHT BE OCCASIONED BY THE CONTRACTOR'S FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRE ANY AND ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAKE ALL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ALTERATION AND ADJUSTMENT OF GAS, ELECTRIC TO EXACTLY OF GAS, ELECTRIC TO EXACTLY OF GAS, ELECTRIC TO EXACTLY AND AND AND ADJUSTMENT OF GAS, ELECTRIC TO EXACTLY AND AND AND ADJUSTMENT OF GAS, ELECTRIC TO EXACTLY AND AND AND ADJUSTMENT OF GAS, ELECTRIC TO EXACTLY AND AND AND ADJUSTMENT OF GAS.
- TELEPHONE, WATER AND ANY OTHER PRIVATE OR MUNICIPAL UTILITIES WITH THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY. 10. WHERE EXISTING UTILITY IS FOUND TO CONFLICT WITH THE PROPOSED WORK, THE LOCATION, ELEVATION, AND SIZE OF THE UTILITY SHALL BE ACCURAT DETERMINED WITHOUT DELAY BY THE CONTRACTOR, AND THE INFORMATION FURNISHED TO THE ENGINEER OF RECORD FOR RESOLUTION OF THE CONFLI 11. EXISTING UTILITY POLES, WILL BE RELOCATED BY OTHERS, IF NECESSARY.
- 12. EXCAVATION SHALL ONLY OCCUR WITHIN THE LIMIT OF WORK, AS SHOWN.
- IF AREAS OUTSIDE THE LIMIT OF PROPOSED WORK IS DISTURBED BY THE CONTRACTOR'S OPERATIONS, THE AREAS SHALL BE RESTORED BY THE CONTR THEIR ORIGINAL CONDITION AT THE CONTRACTOR'S EXPENSE.
 JOINTS BETWEEN NEW BITUMINOUS CONCRETE ROADWAY PAVEMENT AND SAW CUT EXISTING PAVEMENT SHALL BE SEALED WITH BITUMEN, INFRARED SEA
- BACK SANDED.
- 15. EXISTING SIGNS AND/OR MAILBOXES WITHIN THE PROJECT LIMITS THAT ARE DISTURBED SHALL BE REMOVED AND RELOCATED AS APPLICABLE.
- 16. ALL DISTURBED AREAS OUTSIDE OF THE NEW PAVEMENT LIMITS SHALL BE LOAMED (4" MINIMUM DEPTH) AND SEEDED. 17. A MINIMUM OF 10' HORIZONTAL AND 18" VERTICAL SEPARATION SHALL BE PROVIDED BETWEEN WATER MAINS AND SEWER LINES.
- 18. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING WITH THE EXETER WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT WHEN MAKING THE CONNECTIONS.
- 19. ALL WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH EXETER'S "STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN EXETER" NHDOT STANDARD SPECIFIC FOR ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, LATEST EDITION.
- 20. ALL WATER, SEWER, ROAD (INCLUDING PARKING LOT), AND DRAINAGE WORK SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 9.3 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT STANDARDS, STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN, STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN, AND EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL STAN AND THE "STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN EXETER, NEW HAMSPHIRE"

MATERIAL NOTES

1. CRUSHED GRAVEL - NHDOT 304.3

- 2. GRAVEL NHDOT 304.2 3. SAND – NHDOT 304.1
- 4. BACKFILL MATERIAL EARTH MATERIAL FREE FROM ROCKS LARGER THAN 3", DEBRIS, STUMPS, CLAY, ORGANIC MATTER, ICE, FROZEN SOIL, AND EXCESSIVE MOISTURE.
- LOAM NHDOT 641.2.1
 CRUSHED STONE GRADED CRUSHED ROCK TO THE SIZE SPECIFIED, WITH LESS THAN 2% FINES PASSING THE #200 SIEVE.

7. PLACING AND COMPACTION OF FILL MATERIALS SHALL COMPLY WITH NHDOT STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR ROAD AND BRIDGE

CONSTRUCTION SECTION 304.3.4, 304.3.5, AND 304.3.6. 8. PAVEMENTS SHALL COMPLY WITH SECTIONS 401, 403, AND 410 OF NHDOT STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES

- 1. PRIOR TO ANY EXCAVATION, DIG-SAFE AND EXETER DPW (603-773-6157) SHALL BE NOTIFIED TO LOCATE ALL PERTINENT UTILITIES
- INCLUDING WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE. 2. THIS PROJECT IS BE TO MANAGED IN A MANNER THAT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS AND INTENT OF rsa 430:53 AND CHAPTER Agr 3800 RELATIVE TO INVASIVE SPECIES.
- 3. ALL EROSION CONTROLS SHALL BE INSPECTED WEEKLY AND AFTER EVERY RAINFALL OF ONE HALF INCH OR MORE.
- 4. DO NOT CLEAR AND STRIP THE ENTIRE SITE AT ONE TIME. THE SMALLEST PRACTICAL AREA SHALL BE DISTURBED DURING CONSTRUCTION. IN NO CASE SHALL MORE THAN 3 ACRES BE DISTURBED AT ONE TIME. STABILIZE THE AREA BEFORE MOVING ON TO THE NEXT AREA. DISTURBED AREAS REMAINING OPEN FOR MORE THAN 30 DAYS, SHALL BE STABILIZED.
- WOODY MATERIAL REMOVED DURING THE CLEARING PROCESS MAY BE GROUND UP AND USED AS MULCH FOR EROSION CONTROL TO STABILIZE APPROPRIATE AREAS.
- 6. AN AREA SHALL BE CONSIDERED STABLE IF ONE OF THE FOLLOWING HAS OCCURRED:
 BASE COURSE GRAVEL HAS BEEN INSTALLED IN AREAS TO BE PAVED
 - A MINIMUM OF 85% VEGETATED GROWTH HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED
 - A MINIMUM OF 3 INCH OF NON EROSIVE MATERIAL SUCH AS RIP-RAP HAS BEEN INSTALLED
 - OR EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS HAVE BEEN PROPERLY INSTALLED
- 7. ALL AREAS SHALL BE STABILIZED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF INITIAL DISTURBANCE
- SEEDING SPECIFICATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

TEMPORARY SEEDING FOR EROSION CONTROL DURING CONSTRUCTION:

MPORARY SEEDING FOR	R ERUSION CONTROL	DURING CONSTRUCTION:
SPECIES PO	DUNDS/1000 SF	REMARKS
WINTER RYE	2.5	BEST FOR FALL SEEDING. AUG. 15 TO SEPT. 15. SEED TO A DEPTH OF 1"
OATS	2.0	BEST FOR SPRING SEEDING. NO LATER THAN MAY 15. SEED TO A DEPTH OF 1"
ANNUAL RYEGRASS	1.0	SEED EARLY SPRING. AUG. 15 TO SEPT. 15. SEED TO A DEPTH OF 0.25"
PERINAL RYEGRASS	0.7	SEED BETWEEN APRIL 1 TO AUG. 15. SEED TO A DEPTH OF 0.5"
RMANENT VEGETATION	SEED MIXTURE.	

PERMANENT VEGETATION SEED MIXTURE:

SPECIESPOUNDS/1000 SFTALL FESCUE0.45CREEPING RED FESCUE0.45BIRDSFOOT TREFOIL0.20

OIL 0.20 TOTAL 1.10

- 8. ALL RE-VEGETATED AREAS THAT DO NOT EXHIBIT 85% VEGETATIVE GROWTH BY OCTOBER 15, OR WHICH ARE DISTURBED AFTER OCTOBER 15, SHALL BE STABILIZED BY SEEDING AND INSTALLING EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS (ON 3:1 SLOPES OR GREATER), SEEDING AND PLACING 3 TO 4 TONS OF MULCH PER ACRE, OR SECURING WITH ANCHORED NETTING. THE INSTALLATION OF EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS OR MULCH AND NETTING SHALL NOT OCCUR OVER SNOW OR FROZEN GROUND AND SHALL BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO AN ACCUMULATION OF SNOW AND/OR FROST.
- 9. ALL DITCHES OR SWALES WHICH DO NOT EXHIBIT A MINIMUM OF 85% VEGETATIVE GROWTH BY OCTOBER 15, OR WHICH ARE DISTURBED AFTER OCTOBER 15, SHALL BE STABILIZED TEMPORARILY WITH STONE OR EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS APPROPRIATE FOR THE DESIGN FLOW CONDITIONS.
- AFTER NOVEMBER 15, INCOMPLETE ROADS OR PARKING SURFACES, WHERE WORK HAS STOPPED FOR THE WINTER SEASON, SHALL BE PROTECTED WITH A MINIMUM OF 3 INCHES OF CRUSHED GRAVEL PER NHDOT ITEM 304.3.
 CONCRETE WASH OUT SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN THE AREAS SHOWN ON SHEET C1.51 AND USE THE CONCRETE WASH OUT DETAIL
- SHOWN ON SHEET C5.11. 12. NO STUMPS OR DEBRIS SHALL BE BURIED ONSITE. ALL STUMPS AND CONSTRUCTION DEBRIS SHALL BE STORED ONSITE UNTIL THEY
- CAN BE DISPOSED OFF OFFSITE IN A FACILITY CAPABLE OF HANDLING SUCH MATERIALS. 13. TEMPORARY PORTABLE TOILETS SHALL BE PROVIDED AND PROPERLY MAINTAINED ONSITE FOR THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT. 14. VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHALL BE PERFORMED OFF SITE. ANY VEHICLE LEAKING OIL OR GREASE SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPAIRED OR
- REMOVED FROM THE SITE. FUEL AND OILS SHALL BE STORED IN AN APPROVED LOCATION AND COMPLY WITH LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS. IN NO CASE SHALL THEY BE STORED WITHIN 100' OF WETLAND AREAS.

GRAPHIC SCALE:



		LE	EGEND
WNERSHIP. M2	EXISTING	PROPOSED	
HE GROUND		■ CB	CATCH BASIN (OR GUTTER INLET, OR LEACHING BASIN)
	□	■CBCI (OR GICI)	CATCH BASIN (OR GUTTER INLET) WITH CURB INLET
			CURB (OR BERM) – TYPE NOTED
.04			EDGE OF ROAD
		— 162——	CONTOUR
THE ND AGREES		≉ 100.00	SPOT GRADE
ESERVE	S	S	SEWER MANHOLE
IC,	\bigcirc	0	DRAINAGE MANHOLE
TELY	GV		GAS GATE
IC1.	WV	\bowtie	WATER GATE
	Д	*	HYDRANT
RACIOR IO	o fa	● FA	FIRE ALARM BOX
TAL, AND	¢	*	POST MOUNTED PEDESTRIAN LIGHT
	C.	D	UTILITY POLE
		— c —	CABLE, BURIED
	— D —	— D —	DRAIN PIPE
CATIONS	—— G ——	— G —	GAS SERVICE
	· · · · · · · ·	· σ σ ο ο	GUARDRAIL
NDARDS	—— S ——	— s —	SEWER MAIN
	FM	—FM—	SEWER FORCE MAIN
	RD	RD	ROOF DRAIN
	UE	UE	UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC
	W	— w —	WATER MAIN
		—-Е/Т—-	ELECTRIC/TELEPHONE DUCT
	□MB	■ MB	MAIL BOX
	••	• •	HIGHWAY GUARD (TYPE NOTED)
	X X	xx	FENCE (SIZE AND TYPE NOTED)
			EASEMENT LINE
		P	PROPERTY LINE
	•		TEST PIT
		SF	SILTATION BARRIER/LIMIT OF WORK
			WETLAND
		SURVEY	
		120 ° WE ⊡ C.B. C(ILAND DELINEATION FLAG ONCRETE BOUND
		⊡ S.B. S	TONE BOUND
		● U.H. DRIL ● PK MAS	LL HULL SONRY NAIL
		• I.P. IROI	N PIPE
		FND. FOU	JND
		N/F NOV	N OR FORMERLY

00

ASSESSORS MAP AND PARCEL

CONTRUCTION LAYOUT CONTROL

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL LOCATIONS OF SITE ELEMENTS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED BUILDINGS, UTILITIES, ROADS, AND GRADING. THE OWNER WILL PROVIDE HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL CONTROL POINT DESCRIPTIONS AND LOCATIONS TO THE CONTRACTOR. THE CONTRACTOR SHALLL BE RESPONSIBLE TO MAINTAIN, PROTECT, AND ESTABLISH NEW IF NECESSARY, ALL CONTROL POINTS DURING THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT.

GEOTECHNICAL TESTING

THE OWNER MAY RETAIN A GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER TO PERFORM TESTING OF COMPLETED SITE WORK INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE INSTALLATION OF; GRAVEL, CRUSHED STONE, SAND, COMMON FILL, COMPACTION, AND CONCRETE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COOPERATE WITH THE HIRED GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER AND ALLOW FULL ACCESS TO THE SITE AND DELIVERY RECEIPTS OF MATERIALS DELIVERED. WHEN TESTING RESULTS INDICATE NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS AND/OR STANDARD CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CORRECT THE DEFICIENCY AT NO COST TO THE OWNER.

CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBLITIES

THE OWNER SHALL PROVIDE THE CONTRACTOR COPIES OF ALL PERMITS ISSUED FOR THE PROJECT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPLYING WITH ALL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN ISSUED FOR THIS PROJECT INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO; NPDES CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PERMIT ISSUED BY THE EPA, ALTERATION OF TERRAIN PERMIT ISSUED BY NHDES, SITE PLAN REVIEW PERMIT ISSUED BY THE TOWN OF EXETER, AND THE DREDGE AND FILL PERMIT ISSUED BY NHDES WETLANDS BUREAU.

CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN THE SITE IN AN ORDERLY FASHION. ALL CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT SHALL BE PROPERLY MAINTAINED AND SECURED WHEN NOT IN USE.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN RECORDS OF THE SIZE AND LOCATION (INCLUDING SWING TIES), OF ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES INSTALLED. THE RECORDS SHALL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE OWNER UPON REQUEST. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE A CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE TO THE OWNER FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO COMMENCING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. THE SCHEDULE SHALL BE UPDATED ON A WEEKLY BASIS AT A MINIMUM.

RECORD OWNER CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801				MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC. ENGINEERING AND LAND SURVEYING 62 ELM ST. SALISBURY, MA 01952 (978) 463-8980		SITE PLAN IN EXETER, NH	⁹ LAN TITLE GENERAL NOTES	
APPLICANT RAY FARM LLC				13 HAMPTON RD. EXETER, NH 03833 (603) 778-0528			SHOWING	
158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO. DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	SCALE: NO SCALE DATE: MAR. 10, 2025	CALC. BY: K.I.M. CHKD. BY: J.T.M.	PROJECT: M244368	OFF RAY FARM ROAD	SHEET: 2 OF 23

ABBRE VIA HONS

UTILITIES

RCP	REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE					
PVC	POLYVINYLCHLORIDE PIPE					
C.I.	CAST IRON PIPE					
COND	CONDUIT					
D.I.	DUCTILE IRON PIPE					
HYD.	HYDRANT					
INV.	INVERT ELEVATION					
UP	UTILITY POLE					
TSV & B	TAPPING SLEEVE, VALVE AND BC					

GENERAL

PROP.	PROPOSED
MIN.	МІЛІМИМ
MAX.	MAXIMUM
EXIST.	EXISTING
STA	STATION
GRAN.	GRANITE
DRIVE	DRIVEWAY
ELEV	ELEVATION
N.T.S.	NOT TO SCALE
TYP.	TYPICAL
APPROX.	APPROXIMATE
CEM. CONC.	CEMENT CONCRETE
BIT. CONC.	BITUMINOUS CONCRETE
ROW	RIGHT OF WAY
ę	CENTERLINE
WALK	SIDEWALK
TBM	TEMPORARY BENCH MARK
SGE	SLOPED GRANITE EDGING

TREES

12"	В	12"	BIRCH
12"	С	12"	CEDAR
12"	Μ	12"	MAPLE
12"	0	12"	OAK
12"	Ρ	12"	PINE

ROADWAY

H.P.	HIGH POINT					
L.P.	LOW POINT					
A.D.	ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENCE					
PC	POINT OF CURVATURE					
PT	POINT OF TANGENCY					
PRC	POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE					
PCC	POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE					
СС	CENTER OF CURVE					
PVC	POINT OF VERTICAL CURVATURE					
PVT	POINT OF VERTICAL TANGENCY					
PVRC	POINT OF VERTICAL REVERSE CURVATURE	-				
PVI	POINT OF VERTICAL INTERSECTION					
PGL	PROFILE GRADE LINE					
PI	POINT OF INTERSECTION					
OD	OUTSIDE DIAMETER					
ID	INSIDE DIAMETER					TOLL FREE 1-888-DIG-SAFE
DIA. Ø	DIAMETER					(1-888-344-7233)
R	RADIUS					
TYP.	TYPICAL	TOWN	OF	EXEIER	PLANNI	NG BUARD
L	LENGTH					
DP.	DEPTH –		СН	AIRMAN		DATE
EQ.	EQUIVALENT					



THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

>		PLA	N REFERENCES	
			"TIF ROAD RIGHT PORTION OF TAX SCALE: 1"=20' DA ENGINEERING, INC	-OF-WAY PLAN OVER A MAP 47 LOT 8" TE:06/14/19 BY:AMBIT
		D-40281	"MINOR SUBDIVISI ACTIVE ADULT CO SCALE: 1"=60' DA BY: CAMMETT ENG	ON PLAN 'RAY FARM' DMMUNITY" TE: 02/17/18 DINEERINIG
		D-26425	"CONSOLIDATION ICE CENTER OF E AND TAX MAP 5 SCALE: 1"=200' E	AND RESUBDIVISION PLAN EXETER TAX MAP 47, LOT 9 5, LOT 59" DATE: 03/04/1998
	40 13 N/F TOWN OF EXETER 10 FRONT STREET	D-27641	"LOT LINE REVISIO 2 AND TAX MAP ASSOCIATES EXET COMMERCE WAY I SCALE: 1"=50' DA BY: DOUCET SURV	DN OF TAX MAP 48, LOT 47, LOT 9 FOR J.S.S. & TER INDUSTRIAL PARK EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE" TE: 07/01/1999 TEY, INC.
	EXETER, NH 03833 BK. 3667 PG. 2469	D-16287	"SUBDIVISION PLA BROOK WOOD CO. SCALE: 1"=200' D BY: HOLDEN ENGIN INC.	N OF LAND WATSON EXETER, NH" ATE:12/24/86 IEERING & SURVEYING
		D-6403	"REVISED PLAN O FOR THE EXETER COMMISSION" SCALE: 1"=100' DA BY: HOYLE, TANNE	F SUBDIVISION OF LAND DEVELOPMENT ATE: NOVEMBER 1976 R AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
		D-30523	CONSULTING ENGIN "A SURVEY AND L RIGHT-OF-WAY FO SCALE: 1"=50' DAT BY: R.S.L. LAYOUT	NEERS AYOUT OF A DR W. SCOTT CARLISLE III" E: 02/07/03 & DESIGN, INC.
			DEED REFERE	NCES
		BK.	6040 DRAINAGE	EASEMENT
		PG. BK. 3	3205 UTILITY E	ASEMENT - ELECTRIC AND
		PG. (BK. 1	794 EASEMENT	∟ - RIGHT OF WAY
39		PG. BK	1963 3288 FASEMENT	- RIGHT OF WAY
FURT ROCK TOM 10 FRONT S EXETER, NH BK. 3667 PG	IN FOREST TREET 03833 5. 2470			
		THE CERTIFICATI INTENDED TO MI REQUIREMENTS TO TITLE OR OW OWNERS OF AD ACCORDING TO ASSESSORS' REG	ONS SHOWN HEREO EET REGISTRY OF D AND ARE NOT A CE INERSHIP OF PROPE IOINING PROPERTIES CURRENT TOWN/CIT CORDS.	N ARE EEDS RTIFICATION RTY SHOWN. ARE Y
		I CERTIFY: THAT THIS AC ON THE GROUI AND DECEMBEI THAT THIS PLA RULES AND RE REGISTER OF I	TUAL SURVEY WAS ND BETWEEN NOVE R, 2024. AN CONFORMS TO CGULATIONS OF DEEDS.	S MADE EMBER, 2023 THE
EALTY 85 7		THAT THIS SUI TO THE REQUII FOR N.H. URB	RVEY CONFORMS REMENTS FOR ACT AN SURVEY.	CURACY
		ALL	NRY Jo. 1. D. JR.	211-2025
		ICENSÉD LAND	SURVEYOR	DATE
	SIT	E PLAN	I	PLAN TITLE
J, INC.	EX	IN TETER, NH		OVERVIEW
-8980 8-0528	S	HOWING		PLAN
MONATED	BUILDING	D AT RAY	FARM	
WIZ44308	RAY	FARM ROA	D	SHEET: 3 OF 23





THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

SOILS DATA

CANTON, VERY STONY : HYDROLOGIC GROUP - B SCARBORO MUCK : HYDROLOGIC GROUP - D CANTON, EXTREMELY BOULDERY : HYDROLOGIC GROUP - B NEWFIELDS, VERY STONY : HYDROLOGIC GROUP - B UDORTHENTS, LOAMY : HYDROLOGIC GROUP - B WALPOLE, VERY STONY : HYDROLOGIC GROUP - C

SLOPES

0 - 8% 8 - 15% 15 - 25%

WETLAND NOTES:

The limits of jurisdictional wetlands as shown on this plan were delineated by Gove Environmental Services. Inc., between November 2014 to April 2015, November 2021, AND May 2023 in accordance

- 1. US Army Corps of Engineers Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Northcentral and Northeast Region,
- Technical Report ERDC/EL TR-12-1, January 2012, Version 2.0 Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 7.0, 2010 AND (for disturbed site) Field Indicators for
- Identifying Hydric Soils in New England, Version 3. NEIWPCC Wetlands Work Group (April

2004) 3. North American Digital Flora: National Wetland Plant List,

SOIL NOTES:

current version.

The soils mapping is within the technical standards of the National Cooperative Soil Survey. It is a special purpose product, intended for infiltration requirements by the NH DES Alteration of Terrain Bureau. It was produced by a professional soil scientist, and is not a product of the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. There is a report that accompanies this mapping.

The site specific soil survey was produced October 20, 2016, Masy 2, 2022 and was prepared by James P. Gove, CSS # 004, Gove Environmental Services, Inc..

Soils were identified with the New Hampshire State-wide Numerical Soils Legend, USDA NRCS, Durham, NH. Issue # 10, January 2011. The numerical legend was amended to identify the correct soil components of the complex.

Hydrologic Soil Gropup from Ksat Valuiesfor New Hampshire Soils, Society of Soil Scientist of New england, Special Publication No. 5, September, 2009.

> I CERTIFY: THAT THIS ACTUAL SURVEY WAS MADE ON THE GROUND BETWEEN JUNE OF 2023 AND DECEMBER OF 2024.

THAT THIS SURVEY CONFORMS TO THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCURACY FOR N.H. URBAN SURVEY.



DATE

SITE PLAN PLAN TITLE EXISTING IN EXETER, NH CONDITIONS PLAN SHOWING BUILDING D AT RAY FARM OFF PROJECT: M244368 RAY FARM ROAD SHEET: 5 OF 23

343 445 500

547

with

3

43

115


THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.





THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.



THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.



THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.



		i	O.X		
	Le ce				
5 1 ^{,6} 10 ^{,6}			A A A	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	
		Le L	P ^K '	Production of the second secon	CS PO S
					A M A
Barris Sand					
5	\checkmark	_	E E E		
8" PVC SEWER SE			for when	man	J.
ONTHIN TOUL			Current		;
		DAWATER MA	NAGEMENT		
0	STC	AREA			
THE REAL PROPERTY IN THE REAL PROPERTY INTERPOPERTY IN THE REAL PROPERTY INTERPOPERTY IN THE REAL PROPERTY INTERPOPERTY IN					
m					
3			MATCH	I TO SHEET C1.21	
RECORD OWNER			10	_k	
CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801				MILLENNIUM ENGINE engineering and land surveyin 62 elm st. salisbury, ma 01952	EE IG (97)
APPLICANT RAY FARM, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON NH 03801		DESCRIPTION	SCALE: 1"=	13 HAMPTON RD. EXETER, NH 03833 =20' CALC. BY: K.I.M. . 10. 2025 CHKD BY: JTM	(60 PRC
				, -=	





RECORD OWNER CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801					MILLE MEI ENGINEERI 62 ELM ST	NNIUM ENGINI ng and land surveyi . salisbury, ma 01952	E E] ng (97
APPLICANT RAY FARM, LLC					13 НАМРТО	N RD. EXETER, NH 0383.	3 (6
158 SHATTUCK WAY					SCALE: 1"=20'	CALC. BY: K.I.M.	
NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE: MAR. 10, 2025	CHKD. BY: J.T.M.	PR



	SITE PLAN	PLAN TITLE
RING, INC.	IN	ACCESS ROAD
78) 463-8980	EXETER, NH	UTILITY
03) 778–0528	SHOWING	PLAN
	BUILDING D AT RAY FARM	
OJECT: M244368	OFF RAY FARM ROAD	SHEET: 12 OF 23
		SHELLI. IZ OL ZJ



THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

the second secon					MATCH TO SHEET	P		211		
			A CONTRACTOR							
0-	+00 04	ACCESS D	1+50	<u>2+</u> 00		TEAD R POINT ELEV = V POINT STA = 1 PVI STA = 3+09 PVI ELEV = 112. K = 50 100' VC	OAD 111.8 2+59 4 <u>50</u>	4+00	4+50 8840E BREAK STA	
.0' 48 91 81	SMH-T4 SMH-T4 SMH-T4 GRADE BREAK STA = 0+31 CB2 CB2 CB2 CB2 CB2 CB2 CB2 CB2 CB2	C, CB-8 6+72.9 109.12 12" OUT-106.34 1_' OUT-106.33	1.00%		PVC: 2+59	SMH-8 DMH-5	CB 9 & 10 PVT: 3+59.41	3.00%	2-HWD	
35 =62,		8 [*] SDR-35 PVC. L S=0.01 ^{'/'} 3 ^{''} 4 ['] SMH-T4 6+65, RT.	WATER - 12" CLDI CL/ =197'+/- POLYSTYRENE INSU WIDE UNDER SEWEI 8.0'	ASS 52						
- SM _ 8" 8" 8"	IH-T3 RIM-109. PVC INV. IN - PVC INV. IN - PVC INV. OUT -	RIM -109.33 8" PVC INV. IN - 10 8" PVC INV. OUT -1 62 101.47 (RAY FARM) 101.47 -101.37	02.19 02.09 OPEN BOTTOM CON 5x14 BOX CU		BANK WIDTH	FULL - 3.5'+/-				
0+(00.00 0+5	50.00 1+00.00 50.00 1+00.00 E VIEW - A VIER	1+50.00	2+00.00 2+00.00 2+00 2+00 DRIVE FI	2+50.00 2+50 8 2+50 ROMRA	3+00.00 3+00.00 Y FARN	3+50.00 3+50.00 3+50 1STEAL	4+00.00 9 9 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	4+50.00	
CK NE NE	T ASSOCIATES 158 SHATTUCK EWINGTON, NH APPLICANT RAY FARM, 1 158 SHATTUCK EWINGTON, NH	S, LLC WAY 03801 - LLC WAY 03801	NO. DATE	DESCRIP1		SCALE: BY DATE:	EI MILI ENGINE 62 ELM 13 HAM 1"=40' MAR. 10, 20	CENNIUM SERING AND LAI ST. SALISBURY, PTON RD. EXETE CALC. B 025 CHKD. E	ENGINEE ND SURVEYING MA 01952 (9 ER, NH 03833 (PY: K.I.M. BY: J.T.M.	2 F 178 60 RC





Construction Notes

- 1. PRIOR TO ANY EXCAVATION, DIG-SAFE AND EXETER DPW (603-773-6157) SHALL BE NOTIFIED TO LOCATE ALL PERTINENT UTILITIES INCLUDING WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE.
- THIS PROJECT IS BE TO MANAGED IN A MANNER THAT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS AND INTENT OF rsa 430:53 AND CHAPTER Agr 3800 RELATIVE TO INVASIVE SPECIES.
- 3. ALL EROSION CONTROLS SHALL BE INSPECTED WEEKLY AND AFTER EVERY RAINFALL OF ONE HALF INCH OR MORE.
- 4. DO NOT CLEAR AND STRIP THE ENTIRE SITE AT ONE TIME. THE SMALLEST PRACTICAL AREA SHALL BE DISTURBED DURING CONSTRUCTION. IN NO CASE SHALL MORE THAN 3 ACRES BE DISTURBED AT ONE TIME. STABILIZE THE AREA BEFORE MOVING ON TO THE NEXT AREA. DISTURBED AREAS REMAINING OPEN FOR MORE THAN 30 DAYS, SHALL BE STABILIZED.
- 5. WOODY MATERIAL REMOVED DURING THE CLEARING PROCESS MAY BE GROUND UP AND USED AS INSTALLED. MULCH FOR EROSION CONTROL TO STABILIZE APPROPRIATE AREAS.
- 6. AN AREA SHALL BE CONSIDERED STABLE IF ONE OF THE FOLLOWING HAS OCCURRED:
 - BASE COURSE GRAVEL HAS BEEN INSTALLED IN AREAS TO BE PAVED • A MINIMUM OF 85% VEGETATED GROWTH HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED
 - A MINIMUM OF 3 INCH OF NON EROSIVE MATERIAL SUCH AS RIP-RAP HAS BEEN INSTALLED
 - OR EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS HAVE BEEN PROPERLY INSTALLED

SEEDING SPECIFICATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

TEMPORARY SEEDING	FOR EROSION CO	NTROL DURING CON
SPECIES	POUNDS/1000 SF	REMARKS
WINTER RYE	2.5	BEST FOR
SEPT. 15. SEED TO A DEPTH OF 1"	1	
OATS	2.0	BEST FOR SPR
MAY 15. SEED TO A DEPTH OF 1"		
ANNUAL RYEGR	ASS 1.0	SEED EARLY SI
SEED TO A DEPTH OF 0.25"		

SEED BETWEEN APRIL 1 TO AUG. 15. SEED TO PERINAL RYEGRASS 0.7 A DEPTH OF 0.5"

PERMANENT VEGETATION S	SEED MIXTURE:
SPECIES	POUNDS/1000 SF
TALL FESCUE	0.45
CREEPING RED FESCU	JE 0.45
BIRDSFOOT TREFOIL	0.20
ΤΟΤ/	AL 1.10

- 8. ALL RE-VEGETATED AREAS THAT DO NOT EXHIBIT 85% VEGETATIVE GROWTH BY OCTOBER 15, OR WHICH ARE DISTURBED AFTER OCTOBER 15, SHALL BE STABILIZED BY SEEDING AND INSTALLING EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS (ON 3:1 SLOPES OR STEEPER), SEEDING AND PLACING 3 TO 4 TONS OF MULCH PER ACRE, OR SECURING WITH ANCHORED NETTING. THE INSTALLATION OF EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS OR MULCH AND NETTING SHALL NOT OCCUR OVER SNOW OR FROZEN GROUND AND SHALL BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO AN ACCUMULATION OF OF SNOW AND/OR FROST.
- 9. ALL DITCHES OR SWALES WHICH DO NOT EXHIBIT A MINIMUM OF 85% VEGETATIVE GROWTH BY OCTOBER 15, OR WHICH ARE DISTURBED AFTER OCTOBER 15, SHALL BE STABILIZED TEMPORARILY WITH STONE OR EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS APPROPRIATE FOR THE DESIGN FLOW CONDITIONS.
- 10. AFTER NOVEMBER 15, INCOMPLETE ROADS OR PARKING SURFACES, WHERE WORK HAS STOPPED FOR THE WINTER SEASON, SHALL BE PROTECTED WITH A MINIMUM OF 3 INCHES OF CRUSHED GRAVEL PER NHDOT ITEM 304.3.
- 11. CONCRETE WASH OUT SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN THE AREAS SHOWN ON SHEETS C1.51 AND C1.52. AND USE THE CONCRETE WASH OUT DETAIL SHOWN ON SHEET C5.11.
- 12. NO STUMPS OR DEBRIS SHALL BE BURIED ONSITE. ALL STUMPS AND CONSTRUCTION DEBRIS SHALL BE STORED ONSITE UNTIL THEY CAN BE DISPOSED OFF OFFSITE IN A FACILITY CAPABLE OF HANDLING SUCH MATERIALS.
- 13. TEMPORARY PORTABLE TOILETS SHALL BE PROVIDED AND PROPERLY MAINTAINED ONSITE FOR THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT.
- 14. VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHALL BE PERFORMED OFF SITE. ANY VEHICLE LEAKING OIL OR GREASE SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPAIRED OR REMOVED FROM THE SITE. FUEL AND OILS SHALL BE STORED IN AN APPROVED LOCATION AND COMPLY WITH LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS. IN NO CASE SHALL THEY BE STORED WITHIN 100' OF WETLAND AREAS.

RECORD OWNER CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801					MILLE MEI ENGINEERI 62 ELM ST	NNIUM ENGIN ng and land surveyi . salisbury, ma 01952	EEI 'NG (97
APPLICANT RAY FARM, LLC					13 НАМРТО	N RD. EXETER, NH 0383	3 (60
158 SHATTUCK WAY					SCALE: 1"=50'	CALC. BY: K.I.M.	
NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE: MAR. 10, 2025	CHKD. BY: J.T.M.	

7. ALL AREAS SHALL BE STABILIZED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF INITIAL DISTURBANCE

NSTRUCTION:

R FALL SEEDING. AUG. 15 TO

RING SEEDING. NO LATER THAN

SPRING. AUG. 15 TO SEPT. 15.

Construction Sequence

PRIOR TO CLEARING, OR EARTH MOVING ACTIVITIES, INSTALL TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROLS AS SHOWN. SEE SHEET C5.11 FOR EROSION CONTROL DETAILS AND TECHNIQUES.

INSTALL CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE.

STRIP TOPSOIL AND STOCKPILE IN DESIGNATED AREA. INSTALL TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROLS AROUND STOCKPILE. BOULDERS AND LARGE ROCKS GREATER THAN TWO FEET IN DIAMETER SHALL BE STOCKPILED SEPARATELY IN A DESIGNATED AREA.

CONSTRUCT TEMPORARY SEDIMENT BASINS AND OUTLET SWALES IN SAME LOCATION AS THE FINAL BASINS AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY ROWS OF COMPOST SOCK MAY BE REQUIRED IN THE SWALES. INSTALL OUTLET PROTECTION RIP-RAP AS SHOWN PRIOR TO DIRECTING ANY STORMWATER TO THE BASINS. THE FORE-BAYS WILL SERVE AS CONSTRUCTION PERIOD SEDIMENT SETTLING AREAS BUT MUST BE CLEANED AFTER PARKING/LOADING AREAS ARE PAVED, BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTED, AND UTILITIES

CREATE SWALES TO DIRECT STORMWATER FROM THE DEVELOPED PORTION OF THE SITE TO THE TEMPORARY BASINS. IMMEDIATELY STABILIZE THE SLOPES OF THE BASINS BY SEEDING AND MULCHING WITHIN 72 HOURS OF ACHIEVING FINISHED GRADES. ALTERNATE METHODS OF SLOPE STABILIZATION MAY BE REQUIRED IF WORK IS PERFORMED OUTSIDE THE GROWING SEASON.

PREPARE BUILDING SITE TO BE CONSTRUCTED. INSTALL THE BUILDING FOUNDATION AND IMMEDIATELY BRING THE FILL UP TO DESIGN GRADES. CONSTRUCT THE SLOPES IN THE AREAS SHOWN ON THE GRADING PLANS. STABILIZE THE SLOPE WITH SELECTED PLANT MATERIALS AND SEED IMMEDIATELY.

ROUGH GRADE PARKING AREAS TO SUBBASE ELEVATIONS. FILL WILL BE REQUIRED TO BRING PARKING AREAS TO THE DESIGN GRADES. IMPORTED FILL SHALL BE COMPACTED TO A MINIMUM OF 95% DENSITY. WATER MAY BE REQUIRED TO BRING THE FILL TO THE APPROPRIATE MOISTURE CONTENT FOR PROPER COMPACTION. DO NOT OVER WATER AND CREATE RUNOFF. DO NOT CONTINUE THE FILLING OPERATION DURING INTENSE RAINFALL OR IF RAINFALL IS ANTICIPATED. INSTALL ADDITIONAL EROSION CONTROL AT THE BASE OF SLOPES WHEN RAIN IS ANTICIPATED, AND LEAVE IT IN PLACE UNTIL SLOPES ARE STABILIZED OR ADDITIONAL FILL IS INSTALLED.

INSTALL PERMANENT STORMWATER TREATMENT DEVICES INCLUDING THE "FOCAL POINT" BIO-RETENTION SYSTEMS AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. DO NOT ALLOW STORMWATER FLOW TO THE DEVICES FROM UNSTABILIZED AREAS. IF STORMWATER FLOWS ARE ANTICIPATED TO REACH THE TREATMENT DEVICES PRIOR TO FINAL STABILIZATION, ENCASE THE DEVISES WITH FILTER FABRIC.

INSTALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. BACKFILL AND COMPACT TRENCHES. IF DEWATERING IS REQUIRED TO INSTALL UTILITIES OR STRUCTURES, CONSTRUCT THE DEWATERING AREA AS PER THE DETAIL ON SHEET C 5.11 AND PLACE IN THE DESIGNATED AREA. ADDITIONAL ROWS OF COMPOST SOCK MAY BE REQUIRED AT THE DISCHARGE POINT IF THE WATER IS NOT CLEAR. INSTALL AND COMPACT PARKING AREA GRAVEL. INSTALL THE BINDER

COURSE IN PARKING AREAS WITHIN 72 HOURS OF PLACING GRAVEL. INSTALL UTILITY CONNECTIONS. SPREAD TOPSOIL IN GRASS AND

LANDSCAPED AREAS AND IMMEDIATELY SEED AND MULCH IF NEEDED. ADDITIONAL EROSION CONTROL MAY BE NEEDED TO CONTROL EROSION AND SILTS FROM ENTERING THE TEMPORARY SETTLEMENT BASIN.

	SITE PLAN	PLAN TITLE
RING, INC.	IN	SITE
78) 463-8980	EXETER, NH	OVERVIEW
603) 778–0528	SHOWING	PLAN
	BUILDING D AT RAY FARM	
ROJECT: M244368	OFF RAY FARM ROAD	SHEET: 14 OF 23
		-



RECORD OWNER CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801 APPLICANT RAY FARM LLC			MILLE ENGINEERI 62 ELM ST. 13 HAMPTO	NNIUM ENGIN Ng and land survey salisbury, ma 01952 n rd. exeter, nh 0383	EERING, INC. Ng (978) 463–8980 3 (603) 778–0528	SITE PLAN IN EXETER, NH SHOWING	PLAN TITLE WETLAND BUFFER PLAN
158 SHATTUCK WAY	DATE	DESCRIPTION	SCALE: 1"=40'	CALC. BY: K.I.M.	PROJECT: M244368	OFF RAY FARM ROAD	SHEET: 15 OF 23





WETLANDS — — —

40' WETLANDS SETBACK

50' WETLANDS SETBACK

75' WETLANDS SETBACK

DIRECT WETLAND IMPACT 1703 SF

WETLAND BUFFER IMPACT 9,650 SF



RECORD OWNER CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC						MILLENNIUM ENGINEI		
158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801					ENGINEERII 62 ELM ST.	NG AND LAND SURVEY SALISBURY, MA 01952	ING (97	
APPLICANT RAY FARM, LLC					13 НАМРТОІ	N RD. EXETER, NH 0383	3`(6	
158 SHATTUCK WAY					SCALE: 1"=40'	CALC. BY: K.I.M.		
NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE: MAR. 10, 2025	CHKD. BY: J.T.M.		



	AND GENEI	AL NOTES.						
							C	CHAIRMAN DATE
RECORD OWNER CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801				MILLE MEI ENGINEERII 62 ELM ST.	NNIUM ENGIN Ng and land survey salisbury, ma 01952	EERING, INC. ING (978) 463–8980	SITE PLAN ^{IN} EXETER, NH	PLAN TITLE DETAII
APPLICANT RAY FARM, LLC				13 НАМРТОІ	N RD. EXETER, NH 0383	33 (603) 778–0528	SHOWING BUILDING D AT RAY FARM	
158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO. DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	SCALE: NO SCALE DATE: MAR. 10, 2025	CALC. BY: K.I.M. CHKD. BY: J.T.M.	PROJECT: M244368	OFF RAY FARM ROAD	SHEET: 17 OF



TOWN OF EXETER PLANNING BOA





1. GRAVITY SEWER TO BE PVC SDR 35 CONFORMINFG TO ASTM

12"

MIN.

2. PLASTIC SEWER PIPE SHALL HAVE A PIPE STIFFNESS RATING OF AT LEAST 46 POUNDS PER SQUARE INCH AT 5% PIPE DIAMETER AS MEASURED WITH ASTM D2412-02 DURING MANUFACTURE.

3. JOINT SEALS OF PVC PIPE SHALL BE OIL RESISTANT COMPRESSION RINGS OF ELASTOMERIC MATERIAL CONFORMING TO ASTM D3212-96(a)el AND BE PUSH-ON, BELL-AND-SPIGOT TYPE.

4. SAND BLANKET SHALL BE FREE OF ORGANIC MATERIALS, 100% PASSING 1/2" SIEVE, AND MAXIMUM 15% PASSING #200 SIEVE.

5. COMPACT BEDDING AND SAND BLANKET IN MAXIMUM OF 12" LIFTS.

6. COMPACT BACKFILL MATERIAL IN MAXIMUM OF 12" LIFTS.

LOW PRESSURE AIR TESTS SHALL BE USED FOR ALL NEW GRAVITY SEWERS CONFORMING TO ASTM F1417

"STANDARD TEST METHOD OF INSTALLATION ACCEPTANCE OF PLASTIC GRAVITY SEWER LINES USING LOW-PRESSURE AIR" OR UNI-BELL PVC PIPE ASSOCIATION UNI-B-6, "LOW PRESSURE AIR TESTING OF

DEFLECTION TEST ALL PLASTIC SEWER PIPE NOT LESS THAN 30 DAYS NOR MORE THAN 90 DAYS FOLLOWING INSTALLATION. MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE DEFLECTION OF FLEXIBLE SEWER PIPE SHALL BE 5 1/2% OF

> SEWER TRENCH NOT TO SCALE

└-3 CUBIC FEET





1. SEE SITE PLAN FOR PIPE SIZES AND SERVICE. 2. WATER PIPE TO BE DUCTILE IRON (D.I.) CLASS 52

3. GRAVEL AS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 304 OF NHDOT SPECS

WATER TRENCH NOT TO SCALE

RECORD OWNER					à.			
CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC						MILLEN	NNILIM ENGINI	EEF
158 SHATTUCK WAY					MET		INTOIVI LINOIINI	
NEWINGTON, NH 03801						62 ELM ST.	SALISBURY, MA 01952	(978
APPLICANT						13 HAMPTON	I RD. EXETER, NH 0383	3 (60
RAY FARM, LLC					•			
158 SHATTUCK WAY					SCALE: NO S	SCALE	CALC. BY: K.I.M.	
NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE: MAR.	10, 2025	CHKD. BY: J.T.M.	PRC





THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

			<u>+</u>		FINISHED GRA	PEDESTR	IAN RAIL	OPE
RECORD OWNER CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801				MEI	MILLEN ENGINEERIN 62 ELM ST	NNIUM I Ig and lani	ENGINI d surveyii ma 01952	EE NG (9
APPLICANT RAY FARM, LLC					13 HAMPTON	RD. EXETER	, NH 03833	3 (6
158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO. DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	SCALE: NO DATE: MAR	SCALE . 10, 2025	CALC. BY: CHKD. BY	: K.I.M. : J.T.M.	PR

42



—DECORATIVE BLACK METAL

-NON-SHRINK GROUT

IN CORED HOLE FOR FENCE POSTS

---- PRECAST CONCRETE RETAINING WALL

PICKET FENCE

NOTE 'A' BOTTOM OF BASIN SHALL HAVE A BIORETENTION MEDIA.

-50-55% C-33 CONC. SAND

-20-30% MOERATELY FINE SHREDDED













THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.





CONCRETE SLAB 6" (150 mm) MIN THICKNESS

STORMTECH CHAMBER -

NOTE: INSPECTION PORTS MAY BE CONNECTED THROUGH ANY CHAMBER CORRUGATION CREST.



GRAPHIC SCALE:

THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.



RECORD OWNER							
CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801					MIL MEI ENGIN 62 ELA	LENNIUM ENGIN EERING AND LAND SURVEY 1 ST. SALISBURY. MA 01952	IEEI ring (97
APPLICANT RAY FARM, LLC					13 HAI	MPTON RD. EXETER, NH 038	33 (60
158 SHATTUCK WAY					SCALE: NO SCALE	CALC. BY: K.I.M.	
NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE: MAR. 10, 2	025 CHKD. BY: J.T.M.	

AASHIO MATE		COMPACTION / DENSITY REQUIREME	
	JNS	PREPARE PER SITE DESIGN ENGINEER'S PLANS. PAV	/ED ND
		PREPARATION REQUIREMENTS.	OVER
AASHTO M145 A-1, A-2-4, A-3		THE CHAMBERS IS REACHED. COMPACT ADDITIONAL LAY 6" (150 mm) MAX LIFTS TO A MIN. 95% PROCTOR DENSIT WELL GRADED MATERIAL AND 95% RELATIVE DENSIT	Y FOR
AASHTO M43 ¹ 3, 357, 4, 467, 5, 56, 57, 6, 67, 68,	7. 78. 8. 89. 9. 10	PROCESSED AGGREGATE MATERIALS. ROLLER GRO VEHICLE WEIGHT NOT TO EXCEED 12,000 lbs (53 kN). DY FORCE NOT TO EXCEED 20.000 lbs (89 kN).	SS NAMIC
AASHTO M43 ¹	.,	NO COMPACTION REQUIRED.	
3, 357, 4, 467, 5, 56 AASHTO M43 ¹	, 57		CE ^{2,3}
3, 357, 4, 467, 5, 56	, 57		
OR #4 STONE WOULD STATE: "CLEA JLL COVERAGES WITH A VIBRATOR Y RAKING OR DRAGGING WITHOUT	N, CRUSHED, ANGUL COMPACTOR. COMPACTION EQUIP	.AR NO. 4 (AASHTO M43) STONE". MENT. FOR SPECIAL LOAD DESIGNS, CONTACT STORMTE	CH FOR
REPLACE THE MATERIAL REQUIRE	MENTS OF LAYER 'C'	OR 'D' AT THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER'S DISCRETION.	
PAVEMENT LAY BY SITE DESIGN	ER (DESIGNED I ENGINEER)		
30TTOM OF FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT. FOR UNPAVED FIONS WHERE RUTTING FROM VEHICLES MAY OCCUP INCREASE COVER TO 24" (600 mm).		18" (2.4 m)	
	6" (150 mm) MIN MAX	
	30" (762 mn	n) **THIS CROSS SECTION DETAIL REPRESEN	TS
		MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR INSTALLATION PLEASE SEE THE LAYOUT SHEET(S) FOR PROJECT SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.	JN.
	'' 12" (30	0 mm) MIN	
N DETAIL			
		NOTES	
		1. REFER TO SHEET 2 FOR	
			LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS
		AND GENERAL NOTES.	LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS
		AND GENERAL NOTES.	LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS
		AND GENERAL NOTES.	LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS
		AND GENERAL NOTES.	LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS
		AND GENERAL NOTES. TOWN OF EXETER	LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS R PLANNING BOARD
		AND GENERAL NOTES. TOWN OF EXETER	LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS R PLANNING BOARD
		AND GENERAL NOTES. TOWN OF EXETER CHAIRMAN	LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS
		AND GENERAL NOTES. TOWN OF EXETER CHAIRMAN	LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS R PLANNING BOARD DATE PLAN TITLE
RING, INC.		AND GENERAL NOTES. TOWN OF EXETER CHAIRMAN SITE PLAN	R PLANNING BOARD DATE DETAILS
RING, INC. 3) 463–8980 3) 778–0528		AND GENERAL NOTES. TOWN OF EXETER CHAIRMAN SITE PLAN IN EXETER, NH SHOWING	R PLANNING BOARD
RING, INC. 8) 463–8980 03) 778–0528	BUILD	AND GENERAL NOTES. TOWN OF EXETER CHAIRMAN SITE PLAN IN EXETER, NH SHOWING SHOWING SING D AT RAY FARM	R PLANNING BOARD DATE DATE DETAILS

RAY FARM ROAD

SHEET: 21 OF 23



THIS PLAN IS FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

								CHAIRMAN	DATE
RECORD OWNER CKT ASSOCIATES, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY NEWINGTON, NH 03801				MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC. ENGINEERING AND LAND SURVEYING 62 FLM ST. SALISBURY MA 01952 (978) 463-8980		SITE PLAN ^{IN} EXETER, NH		plan title DETAILS	
APPLICANT RAY FARM, LLC 158 SHATTUCK WAY				13 HAMPTON SCALE: NO SCALE	RD. EXETER, NH 03833 CALC. BY: K.I.M.	3`(603́) 778–0528	SHOWING BUILDING D AT RAY FAR OFF	м	
NEWINGTON, NH 03801	NO. DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE: MAR. 10, 2025	CHKD. BY: J.T.M.	PROJECT: M244368	RAY FARM ROAD		SHEET: 22 OF 23

NOTES: 1. REFER TO SHEET 2 FOR LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS, AND GENERAL NOTES.

TOWN OF EXETER PLANNING BOARD



ALL LICANT						
	RA'	Y FAF	RM,	LLC		
	158	SHATT	UCK	WAY		
	NEWIN	IGTON,	NH	03801		

NO. DATE

DESCRIPTION ΒY

SCALE: NO SCALE CALC. BY: K.I.M. DATE: MAR. 10, 2025 CHKD. BY: J.T.M.

1. REFER TO SHEET 2 FOR LEGEND, ABBREVIATIONS,

TOWN OF EXETER PLANNING BOARD

	CHAIRMAN	DATE
	SITE PLAN	PLAN TITLE
RING, INC.	IN IN	DETAILS
8) 463–8980 03) 778–0528	EXETER, NH	
	SHOWING	
	BUILDING D AT RAY FARM	
DJECT: M244368	OFF RAY FARM ROAD	SHEET 23 OF 23
		SHELI, 2001 20