

85 Portsmouth Avenue, PO Box 219, Stratham, NH 03885 603.772.4746 - JonesandBeach.com

December 6, 2021

Fremont Planning Board Attn: Paul Powers, Chairman 295 Main Street PO Box 120 Fremont, NH 03044

RE: Response Letter
Main Street, Fremont, NH
Tax Map 2, Lot 70
JBE Project No. 20724

Dear Mr. Powers,

We are in receipt of comments from Steven Keach from Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. dated November 30, 2021. Review comments are listed below with our responses in bold.

General Comments:

1. It appears this proposal requires the following State Agency permits: (a) NHDES Subdivision Approval; (b) a NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit; (c) a NHDOT Driveway Permit; (d) NHDES Water Supply Bureau Approval; and (e) NHDES Construction Approval for each of two planned on-site community subsurface sewage disposal (septic) systems. We recommend: each required State Agency permit be received prior to or as a condition of any approval ultimately granted by your Board; and each resulting permit be referenced in the form of a note on the Cover Sheet of the final site plan.

RESPONSE: Applicant will be submitting to NHDES and NHDOT for the appropriate permits. Required permits have been labelled on the Cover Sheet.

2. We recommend any approval granted to this application be conditional upon the applicant's execution of a Site Plan Development Agreement, as well as submittal of a performance guarantee, in an amount and form acceptable to the Town, pursuant to the requirements of Sections 1.18 and 1.21 of the Site Plan Review Regulations respectively. RESPONSE: Applicant is aware of this requirement.

Zoning Matters:

1. This application is being advanced as an Elderly Open Space Development under authority of Article 13- Section 1301 of the Zoning Ordinance. Based upon our careful consideration and review of the applicant's submittal we offer the following remarks at this time:

a. We continue to recommend note No. 1 on Sheet 4 be expended to reference Article 13 – Section 1301 of the Fremont Zoning Ordinance.

RESPONSE: Note 1 on Sheet 4 has been expanded to reference Article 13, Section 1301 of the Fremont Zoning Ordinance.

b. We continue to recommend the Planning Board confirm total number of existing and proposed elderly housing units available within the Town of Fremont will not exceed the maximum permitted under Article 13 – Section 1301.2.B of the Zoning Ordinance upon approval of the current application.

RESPONSE: Applicant has discussed this issue with Town Staff.

c. As correctly acknowledged by the test of Note No 4. On Sheet 5 of the site plan, pursuant to applicable provisions of Article 13- Section 1301.2.C. of the Zoning Ordinance the subject tract enjoys a maximum permissible residential density of 25 bedrooms. Since a total of 13 dwellings are proposed, it must be presumed a total of 12 dwelling units are to contain 2-bedrooms with the 13th unit containing a single bedroom. We recommend notes provided on Sheet 5 be expanded to both indicate the same and to specify which dwelling unit is intended to be a single bedroom dwelling.

RESPONSE: Notes #1-#5 on sheet C2 have been revised to clarify this issue.

d. Article 13- Section 1301.2.J. of the Zoning Ordinance specifies requirements for pedestrian access. We previously recommended the applicant address these standards to the satisfaction of the Planning Board. In response, the applicant's consultant offered the following remarks: "Pedestrian access to occur via the one-way street and existing woods road trails through the open space." We recommend the applicant and Planning Board discuss accommodations for pedestrian access and the final project plans be extended or revised as necessary to reflect the outcome of such discussion.

RESPONSE: A connection to the existing trail system has been included. This issue was discussed with the board, who determined pedestrian access is sufficient.

e. Article 13- Section 1301.2.L. of the Ordinance contains specific requirements for landscape installation. Again, we previously remarked that "as presented the site plan is currently silent in regards to proposed landscape." In response, the applicant's consultant added Sheet 12 to the site plan. As shown on this drawing, the applicant currently proposes to install a prototypical arrangement consisting of a single tree and ten shrubs in a uniform manner in immediate vicinity of each of the thirteen proposed dwellings. While this approach for individual unit landscape accommodations may be find, given the language of Section 1301.2.L. it appears this approach may be somewhat less than that envisioned by the Ordinance which states: "elderly housing developments shall be landscaped to enhance their compatibility with the surrounding areas, with emphasis given to utilization of natural features where possible…". We recommend the applicant and Planning Board review and discuss landscape treatment and the final site plan be amended or revised to the extent necessary to reflect outcome of such discussion. **RESPONSE: This item was discussed with the Planning Board and site walk held to**

review existing vegetation.



f. Article 13- Section 1301.2.P. of the Ordinance requires compliance with HUD's Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines. We continue to recommend that the applicant demonstrate intent to comply with this requirement.

RESPONSE: A note to this effect has been added to Sheet C2, see note #23.

2. We continue to recommend the applicant submit draft copies of future condominium or homeowners' association documents intended to satisfy the requirements of Article 13-Section 1301.3.C, relative to protection of common land and open space; Section 1301.4, relative to ownership, governance and operation of the future condominium; and section 1301.7, relative to age based residency restriction. Upon receipt, we recommend the draft documents be submitted to Town Counsel for review and comments.

RESPONSE: Applicant is currently preparing condo docs and HOA docs for review by the board.

Planning/Design Matters:

1. We continue to recommend the project plans be stamped by each of the various licensed professionals who contributed to preparation of the same.

RESPONSE: The plans will be stamped all licensed professionals for the final submission.

2. We recommend the Sheet Index provided on Sheet 1 be expanded to acknowledge drawings C3A, C3B & H1 have been added to the site plan.

RESPONSE: Sheet 1 has been updated to include all sheets included in the plan set

3. We continue to recommend the word "show" be replaced with the word "shown" at Note No. 2 on Sheet 2. Similarly, we recommend the spelling of the word "perimeter" be corrected in the text of Site Note No. 2 on Sheet 4.

RESPONSE: Note No. 2 on Sheet 2 has been revised to say "shown" not "show". Also, the word perimeter has been corrected in the text of Site Note No. 2 on Sheet 4.

4. We continue to recommend Copp Drive and Leblanc Road be labeled on each applicable drawing.

RESPONSE: Both Copp Drive and Leblanc Road have been labeled on the applicable sheets.

5. We recommend Sheet 4 be expanded to include: (a) a north arrow; (b) a graphic scale; and (c) a curve table providing the metes and bounds data for horizontal curves identifies as C1 through C10 in the drawings. In addition, we recommend the text of Note No. 1 be edited to provided a proper description of the intent of this drawing.

RESPONSE: Sheet 4 has been updated to include a north arrow, graphic scale, and curve table. Note #1 has been updated accordingly.

6. Sheet 6 references a "Note 14" pertaining to a discontinued road. Note 12 on Sheet 6 speaks to stop signs and pavement markings. We recommend the drawings be reconciled accordingly.

RESPONSE: Notes and references have been updated as required.

7. We recommend tract boundaries be defined by metes and bounds on Sheet 5.

RESPONSE: Metes and bounds have been added to Sheet 5.



- 8. We recommend Sheet 4 & 5 indicate the name of the proposed private street.

 RESPONSE: Sheet 4 & 5 have been updated to show the name of the proposed street.
- 9. In the event the applicant anticipates phasing of roadway and infrastructure construction, we recommend a detailed phasing plan be provided.

 RESPONSE: Phasing is not anticipated.
- 10. The site plan suggests this is to be served by two on-site community water supply systems. If so, we continue to recommend detailed plans and specifications for system construction be provided either prior to or as a condition of site approval.

RESPONSE: Applicant believes the water system is not required to meet community water supply requirements.

- 11. As shown on Sheet 10, it appears as many as four septic tanks and corresponding sanitary sewer lines are to be situated within the protective radii of both proposed on-site water wells. This appears inconsistent with applicable NHDES requirements.

 RESPONSE: Applicant believes the water system is not required to meet community water supply requirements.
- 12. We previously recommended the site plan be expanded to include details of any proposed exterior lighting accommodations, to which the applicant's consultant responded "No site lighting is proposed". Given the combination of project location and intended occupancy, coupled with sheer practicality, we find it very unlikely this response mirrors the applicant's true intent. We continue to recommend an appropriate lighting plan, consistent with applicable requirements of Section 1.19 of the Site Plan Review Regulations be prepared and incorporated with the final plan set.

RESPONSE: A lighting plan has been provided on sheet L1.

13. Sheet 6 identifies the location of a proposed dumpster pad, yet the drawings provide no details for a pad or screening. We recommend the site plan be expanded accordingly. Returning to our remarks regarding landscape installation above, we recommend consideration be given to screening and enhancement of the vicinity if the proposed pad area.

RESPONSE: A detail for the proposed dumpster pad has been added to sheet D1.

- 14. We recommend Sheets 9, 11 & 19 specify flared end-sections (with corresponding invert elevations) at each of three segments of storm drain discharging at Forebay #1, as well as installation of headwall (with corresponding invert elevations) at Rip Rap Apron #1. RESPONSE: Flared end-sections have been labeled. Headwall has been added at Rip-Rap Apron #1.
- 15. We recommend detail drawings entitled "Outlet Structure #1 (OS #1)" and "Wet Pond Section" provided on Sheet 19 be rechecked for accuracy, consistency in terms of specified design elevation and otherwise reconciled with computations provided in the Drainage Report.

RESPONSE: Details have been updated.



- 16. We recommend the "Emergency Spillway" detail provided on Sheet 19 be expanded to insert site specific dimensions at locations which currently read "Distance- See Plan". **RESPONSE: Emergency Spillway detail has been updated.**
- 17. Given relatively shallow storm drain depths contemplated throughout the site we recommend the typical "Catch Basins" detail provided on Sheet 19 be expanded to include specifications for a "flat top" section.

RESPONSE: Alternate slab option for catch basin is located on sheet D2.

- 18. In order to satisfy requirements of Section 1.15.M of the Site Plan Review Regulations. We recommend the applicant prepare and submit trip generation memorandum. RESPONSE: Trip generation memo has been included with this resubmittal.
- 19. We recommend the Drainage Report be expanded to fully address all applicable requirements of Section 1.20 of the Site Plan Review Regulations relative to stormwater management.

RESPONSE: Drainage Report has been revised to address all applicable requirements of section 1.2

Included with this submission are the following:

- 1. Four (4) Full Size Plan Sets.
- 2. Seven (7) Half Size Plan Sets.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office. Thank you for your time.

Very truly yours,

JONES & BEACH ENGINEERS, INC.

Barry Ger, P.E.

Vice President

cc: Gary Densen, Densen Construction, Inc. (via email)

Steve Keach, Keach-Nordstrom Assoc, Inc. (via email & U.S. Mail)

