

DEERFIELD PLANNING BOARD  
DEERFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
OCTOBER 14, 2015

MINUTES OF MEETING

PRESENT: Board members Fred McGarry, Kate Hartnett, William Perron, Peter Schibbelhute. Alternate member David Doran and Secretary Jane Boucher.

Chair Fred McGarry called the meeting to order at 7PM.

7:PM INFORMAL CONSULTATION; BROWNS MILL;  
George Chadwick was present.

Mr. Chadwick , Bedford Design Consultants, said that they were hired by Attorney Pat Panciocco who represents Deborah Gadd. He said that in 2006 the Browns Mill Subdivision was approved by the Planning Board. Back in 2014 Jim Franklin was hired to put together a Yield Plan to see what could be done with the remainder of land on Corey Road. Mr. Chadwick provided copies of the plan.

Mr. Chadwick said that they found that the wetlands on the southern part actually grew which was depicted on the plan. He noted that his proposal is for six open space lots with no additional road construction on Corey Road. They are proposing a 100 foot buffer along Hidden Drive. He questioned the buffer along Corey Road and if they would require a variance. Mr. Chadwick noted a common driveway for Lots 3 and 4 and questioned if that would be acceptable. He said that there would be 26.4 acres of open space. Based on test pits done in the past, he felt they could get acceptable test pits.

Chair McGarry noted that the 50 foot buffer off of Lot 45-7 seems to be included in the area of Lot 45-6 and the intention of 50 foot buffer is to have it included with the open space. Mr. McGarry said the same situation goes for the 100 foot buffer on Lot 1, which should be part of the open space.

Mr. McGarry said although this is informal, his thought may be to add 200 feet to the existing road.

Kate Hartnett referred to the Deerfield Open Space Plan and also to the Lamprey Headwater on the plan. She said, from her point of view, the less hardscape and the more condensed we can make this, the better considering what has already occurred.

Mr. Chadwick said that they would also like to convert the remainder lot and open space to some other means of protection.

PLANNING BOARD 10/14/15

Kate Hartnett suggested that Mr. Chadwick come back for another Informal Meeting.

Mr. Chadwick will meet with the Board on November 4, 2015 at 7:15PM.

7:30PM CONTINUATION; PUBLIC HEARING; OPEN SPACE SUBDIVISION  
DAVID PELLETIER; MIDDLE ROAD  
David Pelletier, Scott Frankiewicz, Brown Engineering, as well as abutters Nate Archer, Harold Archer and James Spence were present.

Chair McGarry noted that, at the last meeting, the Board granted the requested waiver for the 100 foot setback but did not grant the waiver for the 50 foot setback.

Mr. Frankiewicz said that the cistern is now part of the right of way, taken out of Lot 8. This will increase the buffer for the abutter. He noted that he is going through Steve Keach's comments.

Kate Hartnett felt the land absolutely lends itself to an Open Space Development and questioned if a cistern on the property is necessary.

David Pelletier noted that he would be willing to cut down the lot number if he didn't have to install a \$50,000 cistern but it is required by the Fire Chief.

Abutter Nate Archer spoke in opposition to the proposed subdivision.

Chair McGarry said that the following need to be submitted;

- . include stone bounds in legend
- . revisions outlined by KNA
- . estimate of bond
- . Homeowners Association/ reviewed by Town Counsel

The Board agreed to extend the 65 day clock if necessary.

William Perron moved and Peter Schibbelhute seconded to continue the public hearing for David Pelletier to December 9, 2015 at 7:15PM. Voted in favor.

APPROVAL OF MANIFEST

Kate Hartnett moved and Peter Schibbelhute seconded to approve the manifest for a time sheet for Jane Boucher (17 1/2 hours). Voted in favor.

8PM CONTINUATION; SUBDIVISION; MARY AUSTIN AND SHELLEY  
TETREAULT; GRIFFIN ROAD

Shelley Tetreault and Tobin Farwell were present.

Mr. Farwell reviewed the letter from Steve Keach, KNA, dated October 12, 2015. A copy of the letter is attached to these minutes. During his review Mr. Farwell noted that under "Planning Design Matters" , iron pins will be substituted. He also noted that under "Waiver requests" no waivers will be requested for:

.Any existing wells serving Lot 6 be depicted on the final plat per section III-3.C3(a)20

. A note acknowledging whether or note any portion of the subject property is situation in a FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard area be added to the final plat per section III-3-C.3 (a)22.

These will be shown on the plan.

Mr. Farwell submitted a letter outlining requests for waivers. A copy is attached to these minutes.

1. Section III-3 Minor Subdivision C-3-b-2 Topographic plan showing 2 foot contours: Reason This is a 2 lot subdivision one is 15 acres and the other 6 acres. There is reasonable amount of room for house and septic. Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to grant the waiver. Voted in favor.

2. Section III-3-C-3-b-3 Bench marks Reason: there is minor construction for the road. No need for bench marks. William Perron moved to grant the waiver. Peter Schibbelhute seconded. Voted in favor.

3. Section III-3..C-3 b-4 Site Specific Soil Mapping. Reason: Given the size of the lots soil mapping will not be necessary. Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to grant the waiver. Voted in favor.

4. Section III-3 C-3-b-6 & Section III-3 C-4 and IV 1 G Test Pits. Reason Given the large area of land there is plenty of room for a septic. A test pit will need to performed for septic design. William Perron moved and Peter Schibbelhute seconded to grant the waiver. Voted in favor.

5. Section III 3 C-3b-9 Existing tree lines. Reason The site is mostly wooded, a tree line will provide little usable information. Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to grant the waiver. voted in favor.

6. Section III-3-3b-10 Ledge outcrops. Reason. Given the large lot sizes there is suitable area on site for a septic.

Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to grant the waiver. Voted in favor.

7. Section III-3.C.3(a)(17) Location of all Jurisdictional wetlands. Reason. The subdivision is creating 2 large lots (greater than 5 acres) wetlands on site is not a limiting factor.

Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to grant the waiver. Voted in favor.

8. Section III-3 C.3 (b)1 All information required in Section III.3C.3 (a) 1-24. Reason we have requested waiver to some of the requirements of (a) see specific requests.

Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to grant the waiver. Voted in favor.

9. Section IV-4B.2 through IV-4.B.4 Geometric Design Standards and Table IV-1 Table of Geometric Roadway Design standards.

a. Deviation include 14 ' wide gravel where 20 ' paved is required.

b. Max slope of 16% where 9% is required

c. gravel cross section requirements. We have no information as to what they are.

d. Provisions for a turn around are not met

Reason: This street is intended to service two homes and has little traffic therefore does not need to have the required width other road standards. These deviations from the required.

William Perron moved to grant the waiver. Peter Schibbelhute seconded. During discussion Kate Hartnett noted that based on the experience of the owner for 15 years, traffic has never been an issue. Voted in favor.

10. Section IV-4B.4(b).(4) Max slope of 3% near intersection or road. We are proposing 3% for 30 '. Reason: we should be allowed a waiver to this requirement due to the low vehicle use.

Peter Schibbelhute moved to grant the waiver. William Perron seconded . Voted in favor.

11. Section IV-4B.4(b)(6) requires a minimum of 335' of all season safe sight distance. We have 300 ' of sight distance to the south. Reason: We should be allowed a waiver to this requirement due to the low vehicle use. This driveway has been used for many years without an incident.

William Perron moved and Peter Schibbelhute seconded to grant the waiver. During discussion Kate Hartnett said that Griffin Road has a low traffic count. Voted in favor.

12. Section IV-5 Design and construction standards for Drainage and stormwater management facilities. Reason: This impervious area percentage for this project is very low and does not

require drainage improvements.

Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to grant the waiver. During discussion Shelley Tetreault indicated she has never seen any icing or runoff from the existing culvert. Voted in favor.

13. Section I4-2-c(b).

Substitute Iron pins to be set.

William Perron moved and Peter Schibbelhute seconded to grant the waiver. Voted in favor.

William Perron moved to grant conditional approval for a Minor Subdivision for Mary Austin and Shelley Tetreault for property on Griffin Road with the following conditions:

- . No further subdivision added to plan
- . Construction shown regarding driveway
- . Homeowners Association documents
- . Setting of pins
- . Plan showing revisions outlined in Steve Keach's letter.

Peter Schibbelhute seconded. Conditional Approval to lapse in 60 days. December 14, 2015. Voted in favor.

8:45PM APPLICATION FOR PUBLIC HEARING; SITE PLAN REVIEW; NELLIE ROLLINS; PARADE ROAD

Earl Sandford and Steve Rollins were present. Several abutters were also present.

Chair McGarry read the Notice of Public Hearing to consider an application for a Site Plan Review for Steve Rollins 35 Parade Road, Deerfield, NH for property location on Parade Road (identified as Tax Map 209 Lot 36) consisting of 154 acres and owned by Nellie Rollins, 30 Raymond Road, Deerfield, NH. The intent of the application is to improve the gravel operation site by adding equipment shed, night watchman's residence, septic system and pavement.

Chair McGarry read a memo from Gerald Coogan (copy attached to minutes) noting that the applicant proposed to construct a 4,000 SF garage (80x50), a future shed (20 x 89) and a 1,344 SF three bedroom home to serve as a "night watchman's quarters."

Peter Schibbelhute move to accept the application. William Perron seconded. Voted in favor.

Earl Sandford provided proposed plans showing the 154 acre site and indicated the location of the gravel operation. The plan showed the location of the proposed buildings. He said the space around it will be used for stockpiling but no more excavation will be taking place on the space. It will be used as the main access to the operation. Mr. Sandford showed the

proposed area for this Site Plan Review noting that paving is included , but will not be installed until a later date.

Chair McGarry questioned the location of Deerfield Sand & Gravel Trucks currently parked on Route 43 and asked if they would be removed. Steve Rollins said he had not intended to move the trucks.

Mr. McGarry felt that if the trucks were to remain in that location additional screening would be necessary.

Chair McGarry asked if anyone in the audience had any comments.

Cheryl Brosnahan, an abutter, spoke in opposition. She expressed concern regarding additional noise and dust, which she felt this addition would cause more dust, noise.

Earl Sandford said that the new building will be more than 300 feet away from Ms. Brosnahan's house and the objective of paving would certainly help with any dust.

Ms. Brosnahan complained that the problem of dust has kept her family from being outside. She said that the anticipated noise from the new building will be more disturbing. She also complained about the hours.

Chair McGarry said that issue is one the Planning Board will be discussing during the Site Plan Review hearing.

Joanne Frechett, 23 Parade Road, questioned drainage into a small pond across the street from her home. Mr. Sandford pointed to the location of the pond in relation to Parade Road, which is away from her property.

Kathy Shigo said that she is upset about this expansion on the property. She said that both roads coming into Deerfield pass by this site which is unsightly to the eye.

Kate Hartnett said that this evening the Board is her, not to discuss the gravel operation, but the proposed buildings.

Mark Todd , an abutter, expressed concern regarding noise from the site.

Steve Rollins felt that the proposed house will help the abutter with the noise.

Abutters questioned how much noise will be coming from the garage, when work is being done on trucks.

Chair McGarry stressed that these issues will be discussed by

the Board during the Site Plan Review process.

Earl Sandford reviewed the letter from Steve Keach dated October 13, 2015. A copy is attached to these minutes. Mr. Sandford indicated that they intend to comply with Mr. Keach's requests stated in his review.

The Planning Board will conduct a site visit to the Rollins property on Sunday, October 18, 2015 at 9AM.

William Perron moved and Peter Schibbelhute seconded to continue the public hearing for a site plan review for Steve Rollins to November 4, 2015 at 8PM. Voted in favor.

9:50PM INFORMAL CONSULTATION; JAY MCGRATH AND DONNA LOBSIEN;  
RIDGE ROAD

Jay McGrath, Donna Lobsien and Donna Carter were present.

Ms. Carter provided a conceptual drawing of a proposed subdivision for property on Ridge Road (Map 414 Lot 29) consisting of 134 acres. The owners would like to subdivide one lot consisting of 12 acres with the existing home and build a home on the remaining 122 acres. They propose to use the existing driveway to access both homes. They indicated that they were present during the hearing for Shelley Tetrault and felt that concept would be ideal for them.

They will work with James Franklin and Tobin Farwell and come to the Board at a later date.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25PM.

Recorded and transcribed by Jane Boucher  
Pending Approval by the Planning Board

October 12, 2015

Mr. Frederick McGarry, P.E.; Chair  
Deerfield Planning Board  
Post Office Box 159  
Deerfield, New Hampshire 03034

Subject: **Proposed Subdivision of the Land of Mary M. Austin & Shelley A. Tetreault  
165 Griffin Road (Map 205 – Lot 6); Deerfield, New Hampshire  
KNA Project No. 15-0901-1**

Dear Mr. McGarry:

As you may recall, on September 23<sup>rd</sup> we issued a letter report regarding the subject application. Within that report we offered a series of comments and recommendations generated as a result of our consideration and review of project plans and application materials received through that date. On October 8<sup>th</sup> we received a subsequent submittal from the applicant's consultants consisting of a copy of a proposed subdivision plat (one drawing, dated August 21, 2015 and last revised on October 05, 2015); and a roadway plan & profile (one drawing, dated August 24, 2015 and last revised on October 05, 2015). Based upon our consideration and review of the foregoing information, we are pleased to report that it appears that with recent design revisions, the applicant's consultants have been able to advance a proposal that substantially conforms to applicable requirements of Section 207.1.B of the Deerfield Zoning Ordinance, as well as RSA 674:41. On that basis, we offer the following comments and recommendations at this time:

**General Comments**

1. As currently presented, it does not appear any State project permits will be required under this application.
2. The subject application is being advanced under applicable provisions of Section 207.1.B of the Zoning Ordinance (aka "Smith Ordinance"); as such the platted private way shall be privately owned and maintained. Accordingly, in order to satisfy the requirements of Section III-6.E (2) of the Subdivision Regulations we recommend your Board receive homeowner's association documents, having form and content acceptable to Town Counsel, acknowledging private ownership and future maintenance responsibilities for this platted private way. We further recommend: (a) the final draft of such documents be recorded of even date with the final plat; and (b) a note be added to the final plat acknowledging both the existence of such documents as well as the book and page number at which such documents are recorded at the RCRD.

*Civil Engineering*

*Land Surveying*

*Landscape Architecture*

### Planning/Design Matters

1. The subdivision plat identifies a partial list of waivers from specific requirements of the Subdivision Regulations requested by the applicant. This note also suggests this application involves a *Minor* Subdivision. Since this proposal involves the platting of a new private street the subject application must be classified as a *Major* Subdivision under Section III-2 of the Subdivision Regulations (See definition of the term "Subdivision, Major" provided in Section II-2 of the Subdivision Regulations). We recommend the cited note be edited accordingly.
2. In reworking this proposal to achieve compliance with applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, the geometry of proposed Lot 6-1 was revised in such a manner that could be misconstrued to suggest the triangular shaped portion of future Lot 6-1 is a separate parcel rather than an integral part of that parcel. Based on conversation with the applicant's consulting engineer we understand the lines of Lot 6-1 were computed so as to maintain continuity between this "triangle" and the balance of Lot 6-1 by maintaining a small width of land (approximately one foot wide) between the platted northerly line of Levi Hill Road and the southeasterly corner of abutting Lot 205-5. Since this provision is not currently discernable, we recommend the applicant's land surveyor provide an enlarged detail graphically depicting the contiguous geometry of Lot 6-1 on the final plat.
3. The proposed subdivision plat makes reference to Plan D-20070 recorded at the RCRD. In reviewing this recorded plat we noted that the land surveyor who prepared the same acknowledged the existence of a then existing (1947) easement held by the NH Electric Cooperative over a portion of the subject premises situated immediately adjacent to Griffin Road as well as the intent to convey "a highway construction easement for 25 feet easterly of the centerline of Griffin Road ..." to the Town of Deerfield. If either of those easements referenced on Plan D-20070 remain in effect, in order to satisfy the requirements of Section III-3.C.3 (a) (12) of the Subdivision Regulations we recommend the current plat be expanded to acknowledge the same. If the second of the two cited easements was never properly conveyed to the Town we recommend the portion of that easement intended to be conveyed along the frontage of the subject parcel be conveyed prior to or as a condition of approval of the current application pursuant to applicable requirements of Section IV-1.F of the Subdivision Regulations.
4. In order to satisfy the requirements of Section III-3.C.3 (a) (10) of the Subdivision Regulations we recommend the subdivision plat be expanded to note the status (Class V), as well as the widths of existing right-of-way and traveled way at Griffin Road.
5. In order to satisfy the requirements of Section IV-2 of the Subdivision Regulations we recommend: (a) the plat be revised to indicate the intent to set an iron pin at the northerly end of a proposed boundary course having a length of 240.91 feet to be situated between Lots 6 and 6-1 (IV-2.C); (b) the plat be revised to indicate the intent to set stone bounds, rather than iron pins, at each point forming the lines of the platted Levi Hill Road right-of-way (IV-2.B); and (c) any approval granted to this application occur subsequent to or

be conditional upon installation of all boundary monuments specified on the final plat or otherwise required in order to satisfy the requirements of Section IV-2 of the Regulations.

6. In order to satisfy applicable requirements of Sections III-3.C.3 of the Subdivision Regulations, unless specifically waived by the Planning Board, we recommend the following information be provided as part of this application:
  - The location of all jurisdictional wetlands, if any, situated on the subject parcel, per Section III-3.C.3 (a) (17), be depicted on the final plat with such delineation stamped by the Certified Wetland Scientist who prepared the same;
  - The location of each required yard, setback or buffer required under applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance be graphically depicted on the final plat per Section III-3.C.3 (a) (19);
  - Any existing wells serving Lot 6 be depicted on the final plat per Section III-3.C.3 (a) (20);
  - A note acknowledging whether or not any portion of the subject property is situated in a FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard Area be added to the final plat per Section III-3.C.3 (a) (22);
  - A topographic subdivision plan, conforming with applicable requirements of Section III-3.C.3 (b) (1 through 10 inclusive) be prepared and submitted;
  - Test pit data sufficient to demonstrate suitability of platted Lot 6-1 for installation of an on-site water supply well and septic system be provided per the requirements of Sections III-3.C.4 & IV-1.G of the Subdivision Regulations.
  
7. Based on recent discussion with the applicant and her consulting engineer we understand the applicant intends to seek a series of waivers from applicable requirements of the Subdivision Regulations, which if granted would enable the existing private driveway serving the subject property to be maintained with only limited improvement to serve as a private way or street providing access to not only the existing home on future Lot 6, but a second future home on Lot 6-1 as well. On that basis, the applicant's consulting engineer has provided a non-exhaustive list of waivers from applicable requirements of the Subdivision Regulations the applicant will need to obtain in order to achieve the preferred outcome. This recitation is presented in the form of a series of notes provided on the roadway plan and profile drawing. Given the number and variety of waivers so requested, the Town Planner and this writer recently advised the applicant to seek formal input from the Fire Chief for your Board to consider when acting on these requests. As a baseline for consideration of this series of waiver requests, we recommend the Board recognize that as a private way or street intended to serve two residential lots (an ADT of approximately 19 vehicles per day) Levi Hill Road is properly classified as a "Local Street - 1" under Section IV-4.B.1 of the Subdivision Regulations (i.e. a street with an ADT of not more than 200 VPD). This classification invokes the need to improve Levi Hill Road to a standard conforming to applicable requirements for horizontal, vertical and cross-sectional geometry corresponding to a "Local Street -1" condition specified in Sections IV-4.B.2 through IV-4.B.4 and Table IV-1 if all applicable requirements of the Subdivision Regulations are to be satisfied. The series of waivers sought by the applicant

Mr. Frederick McGarry, P.E.  
October 12, 2015

is significant. If approved, the series of waivers sought by the applicant would yield a private road having the following departures from the current Regulations:

- A 14± foot wide gravel surfaced traveled way where a 18 foot wide paved traveled way flanked by 2 foot wide graded gravel shoulders is required;
- A vertical alignment with a longitudinal slope of as much as 16-percent where a maximum slope of 9-percent is permitted;
- Significant variations in cross-section from Table IV-1 Standards in regard to gravel, crushed gravel and pavement thicknesses, as well as dimensional departures from the overall cross-sectional roadway geometry illustrated on Figure IV-1 to the Regulations;
- Provision for a turnaround which does not conform with requirements provided under Section IV-4.B.4 (a) of the Regulations;
- A vertical roadway geometry at the approach to Griffin Road which varies significantly from the requirements of Section IV-4.B.4 (b) (4) with a reported measure of sight distance (to and from the south) at Griffin Road which does not conform to the requirements of Section IV-4.B (b) (6); and
- Roadside drainage conditions which in all probability do not conform to applicable requirements of Section IV-5 of the Regulations.

We recommend the Board carefully consider each waiver request presented by or on behalf of the applicant in accordance with criteria established under RSA 674:36 II (n) and Section I-8 of the Subdivision Regulations. Should your Board elect to grant one or more waivers from specific requirements of the Subdivision Regulations, we recommend notes be provided on the final plat acknowledging the same.

8. Lastly, in the event the Board ultimately elects to grant approval to this application, we recommend that one condition of such approval require that the applicant satisfy applicable requirements of Article V of the Subdivision Regulations related to Performance Guarantees and Construction Procedures if the application, as approved by the Board, includes an expectation that specific betterments be made to Levi Hill Road.

We trust your Board will find the content of this letter report useful in its consideration and review of the subject application. As always, please contact the writer in the event you should have specific questions or further instructions at this time.

Sincerely:

Steven B. Keach, P.E.  
President  
Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc.



265 Wadleigh Falls Road Lee, NH 03861 Ph(603)292-5787  
WWW.FARWELLENGINEERING.COM

October 13, 2015

Deerfield Planning Board  
8 Raymond Rd  
Deerfield, NH 03037

**Re: Minor Subdivision  
Tax map 205 Lot 6  
Deerfield, NH**

Dear Planning Board,  
Farwell Engineering Services is submitting the attached subdivision application on behalf of the applicant Ms. Shelley Tetrault. We are requesting to be placed on the September 9 2015, Planning Board Agenda. The application is for a 2 lot residential subdivision. We are requesting the use of Section 207 of the Deerfield Zoning ordinance 207.1-B allowing a private ROW for frontage.

We are requesting waivers to the following requirements from the town of Deerfield Subdivision Regulations.

1. Section III-3 Minor subdivision C-3-b-2 Topographic plan showing 2 foot contours  
Reason: This is a 2 lot subdivision one is 15 + acres and 6+ acres. There is reasonable amount of room for house and septic etc.
2. Section III-3 C-3-b-3 Bench marks  
Reason: There is minor construction for the road. No need for benchmarks.
3. Section III-3 C-3-b-4 Site specific soil mapping  
Reason: Given the size of the lots soil mapping is not necessary.
4. Section III-3 C-3-b-6 & Section III-3.C.4 and IV-1.G Test pits  
Reason: Given the large area of land there is plenty of room for a septic. A test pit will need to be performed with the septic design.
5. Section III-3 C-3-b -9 Existing tree lines  
Reason: The site is mostly wooded, a tree line will provide little usable information.
6. Section III-3 C-3-b-10 Ledge outcrops  
Reason: Given the large lot sizes there is suitable area on site for a septic.
7. Section III-3.C.3(a)(17) location of all Jurisdictional wetlands.  
Reason: The subdivision is creating 2 large lots (greater than 5 Acres) wetlands on site is not a limiting factor.
8. Section III -3 C.3 (b) 1 All information required in Section III-3.C.3(a) 1-24  
Reason: We have requested waivers to some of the requirements of (a) see specific requests.

9. Sections IV-4.B.2 through IV-4.B.4 Geometric Design Standards and Table IV-1 Table of Geometric Roadway Design Standards.
- a. Deviation include 14' wide gravel where 20' paved is required
  - b. Max slope of 16% where 9 % is required
  - c. Gravel cross section requirements. We have no information as to what they are.
  - d. Provisions for a turn around are not met.

Reason: This street is intended to service 2 homes and has little traffic therefore does not need to have the required width other road standards.

These deviations from the required

10. Section IV-4.B.4(b) (4) Max slope of 3% near intersection of road. We are proposing 3% for 30'.

Reason: We should be allowed a waiver to this requirement due to the low vehicle use.

11. Section IV-4.B (b) (6) requires a minimum of 335' feet of all season safe sight distance. We have 300' of sight distance to the south.

Reason: We should be allowed a waiver to this requirement due to the low vehicle use. This driveway has been used for many years without incident.

12. Section IV-5 Design and construction standards for Drainage and stormwater management facilities.

Reason: This impervious area percentage for this project is very low and does not require drainage improvements.

Given that the proposed lots area 6 acres + and 15 acres + with an existing house, we believe that the above requested information is not necessary to review the proposed subdivision.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,  
**Farwell Engineering Services**

Tobin Farwell, P.E.  
Principal

## MEMORANDUM

October 14, 2015

TO: Deerfield Planning Board  
FR: Gerald Coogan  
RE: Plan Review – Site Plan for Garage Tax Map 413, Lot

**Owner:** Nellie Rollins, 30 Raymond Road, Deerfield, NH  
**Applicant:** Steve Rollins, 30 Raymond Road, Deerfield, NH  
**Agent:** Earl Sandford, P.E., CWS Lic # 209 and Lic. NH Land Surveyor # 700  
**Wetlands scientist:** Earl Sandford, P.E., CWS Lic # 209  
**Lot Area:** 154 acres  
**Location:** 35 Parade Road, Deerfield, NH, Tax Map 209, Lot 36

Project description: The applicant proposes to construct a 4,000 SF garage (80' by 50'), a future shed (20' by 80') and a 1,344 SF 3 bedroom manufactured home to serve as a "night watchman quarters."

### Comments:

Planning authority: The office Notice of Public Hearing refers to this case as an application for site plan review for property on 35 Parade Road. If the Board desires to modify items related to the excavation area under RSA 155 E, this should occur at a properly notice public hearing in accordance with RSA 155 E. KNA will suggest that a line be established on the site plan that clearly shows where the site activity will occur. The activity can be considered an Accessory Use Outbuilding.

Excavation area: It appears that active excavation in Phase 1 is complete and this activity is part of the restoration process. Agent to verify this. NH DES AOT permit will be renewed in 2016.

Management of fuels and lubricants: See Note # 16. Shall be handled in compliance with state laws or rules. Suggest that all fuels and lubricants be handled in accordance with Best Management Practices (BMPs) for same.

Stormwater management: Drainage is directed to the upper stormwater basin, which was designed in 2006.

Elevations: Applicant to bring to the hearing.

Septic system: Received NH DES subsurface disposal approval – eCA2015091004.

Check Plan Note # 12 and update

### Recommendations:

1. The Board can accept the site plan application as complete and begin the public hearing.

Cc: Earl Sandford, P.E.

October 13, 2015

Mr. Frederick McGarry, P.E.; Chairman  
Deerfield Planning Board  
Post Office Box 159  
Deerfield, New Hampshire 03037

Subject: **Site Plan Review Application – Land of Nellie A. Rollins**  
**35 Parade Road (Map 209 – Lot 35); Deerfield, New Hampshire**  
KNA Project No. 07-0125-1

Dear Mr. McGarry:

At the request of the Town Planner we have completed a technical review of project plans and supporting information submitted to your Board by or on behalf of the applicant in the subject matter. Specifically, we acknowledge receipt of the following information, which was the subject of our review: (a) a copy of a site plan (3 drawings, dated September 22, 2015); and (b) A copy of supplementary drainage calculations dated September 25, 2015. Based on our careful consideration and review of application materials received through this date we offer the following comments and recommendations at this time:

### **General Comments**

1. 2015 Note No. 1 provided on Sheet 2 of the current site plan indicates “this plan is an addendum to the 5 sheet set of plans for a gravel excavation operation approved and on file at the Town of Deerfield Planning Board.” While this note may be correct from a drawing context it must be recognized that the current application involves a site plan for proposed buildings and related improvements, which happen to be situated on a portion of the same tract that remains an active excavation site previously permitted by your Board in accordance with applicable provisions of Section 321 of the Deerfield Zoning Ordinance and Excavation Regulations under the authority of RSA 155-E. The current application for site plan approval, which will affect an estimated 42,000 square feet of the subject 153.95 acre tract, will be considered and reviewed by your Board in accordance with applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Review Regulations under the authority of RSA 674:43. We remind the applicant that your Board’s purview under the current application varies from its function as “Regulator” under RSA 155-E. On that basis, in the event the planning, design or implementation of work contemplated under the current site plan ultimately necessitates amendment of the previously approved Excavation Permit, it may be necessary for the applicant to advance a separate application for such amendment(s) under applicable provisions of the Deerfield Excavation Regulations and RSA 155-E.

2. We understand the applicant has received NHDES Construction Approval for a planned on-site subsurface sewage disposal system intended to serve the proposed building(s). It appears the only other State project permit required under this application is amendment of the previously issued NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit for facilitation of the currently planned building and site improvements.

### **Zoning Matters**

1. The subject parcel is situated in the Agricultural-Residential District in its entirety. Under the current application the owner seeks site plan approval for a garage, which we understand will be used to facilitate on-going excavation operations including the storage and maintenance of equipment, as well as a "night watchman's quarters", which we understand will essentially function as a single-family dwelling. Construction of this dwelling is permitted by right in the Agricultural-Residential District pursuant to Section 204 of the Zoning Ordinance. The planned non-residential use of the proposed garage will invoke need for the applicant to satisfy applicable terms and conditions of the Commercial/Industrial Flexible Overlay District Ordinance (see Section 212). We understand the Town Planner will review and comment on this application accordingly.

### **Planning/Design Matters**

1. As acknowledged above, under this application the owner/applicant seeks approval to construct both a residential dwelling unit and a non-residential garage on a portion of a site having benefit of a previously issued Excavation Permit. Being somewhat familiar with the subject property, this writer recognizes the planned construction is intended to occupy a portion of the Phase 1A excavation area identified on the previously approved excavation plan over which previously approved excavation activities are now substantially complete. Given the need for both the applicant and your Board to consider work planned under the current site plan application separately from administration of on-going excavation activities, we recommend the current site plan "box out" a limit of work area around the currently planned improvements for the purposes of conveniently identifying and delineating "what is site plan from what is remaining excavation site".
2. We recommend the list of reference plans provided on the current site plan be expanded to cite the previously approved excavation plan.
3. Given the need to treat the current site plan application separately and distinctly from the previous approved excavation plan we recommend the applicant's consultant revisit the text of several of those "General Notes (2007)" provided on Sheet 2 of the current site plan and remove any of the same which pertain to the previously approved excavation plan rather than the current site plan.
4. In order to satisfy applicable requirements of Section III-3.E.3 (a) of the Site Plan Review Regulations we recommend the current site plan be expanded or revised as follows:

- To include the standard notation required under Section III-3.E.3 (a) (3);

*Civil Engineering*

*Land Surveying*

*Landscape Architecture*

Mr. Frederick McGarry, P.E.  
October 13, 2015

- To specify the height of each proposed building;
  - To identify the locations of each planned building entrance;
  - To indicate typical dimensions of proposed parking spaces including accommodations for compliance with applicable requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA);
  - To provide detailed parking calculations sufficient to demonstrate compliance with Section IV-II.B.4 of the Site Plan Review Regulations;
  - To identify the manner in which solid waste generated on site is to be stored prior to off-site disposal;
  - To specify planned exterior lighting accommodations, if any;
  - To specify suitable accommodations for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period;
  - To provide construction details for applicable elements of site work (pavement, drainage, etc.);
  - To provide a detailed grading plan; and
  - To provide architectural elevation drawings of proposed building construction.
5. We recommend the site plan be expanded to address applicable requirements of Section IV-3 of the Site Plan Review Regulations pertaining to landscape and visual buffering, especially at the site entrance and along Parade Road.
  6. Site Note No. 5 provided on Sheet 3 of the site plan reads: "For every 1,000 square feet of impervious area (pavement/roofs) must be matched by 75 square feet of loam and seeded area (for this plan 30,000 square feet of roofs and paving is to be offset by 22,500 square feet of reclaimed green area." We recommend the final site plan indicate the limits of planned site restoration/reclamation.
  7. We recommend the applicant identify intended non-residential uses beyond those currently permitted at the site so as to enable the Planning Board to make a determination if mitigation of impacts resulting from the same are warranted pursuant to the provisions of Section IV-6.F of the Site Plan Review Regulations.
  8. Does the applicant intend to install floor drains within the proposed garage? If so, we recommend the site plan be expanded to address applicable requirements of Part Env-Wq 402.35 of the New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules governing the same.

We trust the foregoing comments and recommendations will prove useful to your Board in your consideration of the subject application. In the event you should have specific questions or further instructions related to this matter, please contact the writer at your convenience.

Sincerely:

Steven B. Keach, P.E.; President  
Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc.

*Civil Engineering*

*Land Surveying*

*Landscape Architecture*