

Good Afternoon Mr. Chairman,

I wanted to take a moment to simply itemize out our discussion points for this evening, in an effort to help organize where we are in the process, being that we are not meeting face to face:

- Alteration of Terrain Permit has been submitted to NHDES
- We have met with the conservation commission who made two minor comments which I think can easily be addressed:
  - Deeded no cut wetlands buffers with signage on site.
  - Modified pavement design to allow for animals to cross more easily. I have not fully researched this yet, but I believe we can do a modified mix to increase the stone gradation in the top coat based on a 1.5" pour. It would be more difficult with a 1" pour.
- Wetlands Permitting:
  - We have submitted and received comment from Fish and Game concerning the project. They have requested some additional information, however they have also asked that we consider placing a deed restriction with signage along the no cut buffers to wetlands. This was discussed with the conservation commission and they were also in support of this idea.
  - As part of the new wetlands permitting, a functions and values analysis is required. We are now in receipt of this analysis. Now that we have comment from NH F&G and the Functions and values analysis, we are prepared to file the wetlands permit.
- Impact Statement:
  - It seemed that the board was in favor of a more in depth environmental impact statement. Now that we have functions and values analysis and input from NH F&G we can work with our environmental consultant to prepare this.
- Historical Review:
  - We have verbal results back from our consultant on this topic and have conducted Ground Penetrating Radar on site. They have determined the extent of the area of concern and we have survey located it. Once their final report is published I will forward to the board and NH DHR post haste. The area of concern is larger than the formerly located stone, but not excessively. The standard cemetery buffer can easily be adhered to and an easement from the road to the site can be provided.
- CMA Review:
  - There was a profile of Mitchell Road provided which lifts the area around the proposed culvert to accommodate the cover needed. We will direct them to that sheet for further discussion. Same comment with regard to the Highway Department.
  - The pavement depth courses should be discussed with the Board. A 2" top coat for a simple subdivision road is excessive and not standard. The former standard 1" has now been replaced by a 1.5" course.
  - Construction of Mitchell Road. This will require discussion with the board. As you may know there needs to be a rational nexus between the offsite improvement and the impact of the project. The traffic analysis points out and CMA agrees the project generates very few trips.
  - We will work with the Developer to establish an HOA for the purposes of maintaining the stormwater systems. We often proposed an "end of pipe" approach, so that the

Email from Christopher Berry to [plan.zone@nottingham-nh.gov](mailto:plan.zone@nottingham-nh.gov)  
Wed 6/24/2020 4:38 PM

treatment cells themselves are maintained privately, but the roadway infrastructure is maintained by the town.

- Highway Department.
  - Echoed many of the same comments above.
- Fire Department:
  - The project has a compliant cistern designed.
  - Though they always recommend sprinklers, they are not required in single family homes. The fire cistern is proposed per the requirements of the town.

I will use this as a guide for tonight's conversation. I hope it is helpful.

Christopher R. Berry  
Principal, President