

Rocky Hill MBTA — VHB Peer Review #3: Checklist and Meeting Notes

No.	Memo Section	Item	Status	VHB Comment — Review #3	Meeting Notes - 8/12/26
1	XI.V — MFOD	Section XI.V.6.0 Dimensional and Density Requirement	Complete	Considered addressed.	
2	XI.V — MFOD	Section XI.V.7.4 Project Phasing.	Open	The Applicant indicates that a general construction sequencing plan will supplement the submission; however, the referenced plan does not appear to have been provided with the current submission. This comment remains outstanding pending review of that information. VHB recommends that the Applicant provide the proposed general construction sequencing plan addressing building occupancy, separation of construction activities from occupied areas, and the sequencing of required access, utilities, stormwater infrastructure, and emergency services. A more detailed Construction Management Plan may be required as a condition of approval prior to construction.	Applicant agreed to provide high level phasing plan. Detailed plan to be included post-approval with Construction Management Plan.
3	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf	XI.Q.10.5.a.3. Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation.	Complete	Considered addressed.	
4	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf	XI.Q.10.5.a.5 Private Road Construction.	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The proposed roadway ownership limits, easements, and maintenance responsibilities will be addressed through the forthcoming Definitive Subdivision application. This comment remains partially outstanding pending submission and review of that documentation. VHB recommends that the Applicant provide the Definitive Subdivision materials identifying the public and private roadway limits, applicable easements, and long-term ownership and maintenance responsibilities for review by the City.	Definitive Subdivision has been submitted. Comment is closed.
5	Subdivision Rules (10.5.a.5(f)&(g))	2.02	Post-approval condition	Addressed via condition — record the Definitive Subdivision Plan (lot config, frontage, ROW) prior to construction or any dependent building permit.	Definitive Subdivision submitted
6	Subdivision Rules (10.5.a.5(f)&(g))	6.04 Environmental and Community Impact Analysis	Complete	Considered addressed.	
7	Subdivision Rules (10.5.a.5(f)&(g))	7.09.H Pedestrian and Bicycle Paths.	Complete	Considered addressed.	
8	Subdivision Rules (10.5.a.5(f)&(g))	7.10.B. Design Basis.	See Stormwater	Cross-references the Stormwater Management section.	
9	Subdivision Rules (10.5.a.5(f)&(g))	7.10.B.1 Use Low Impact Development (LID) site plann	See Stormwater	Cross-references the Stormwater Management section.	
10	Subdivision Rules (10.5.a.5(f)&(g))	7.10.B.3 Stormwater management systems	See Stormwater	Cross-references the Stormwater Management section.	
11	Subdivision Rules (10.5.a.5(f)&(g))	7.15 Earth Removal.	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The latest submission does not appear to include updated earthwork calculations, a revised construction trucking estimate, or a detailed earthwork operational plan. The Applicant indicates that additional earthwork management information will be provided in a future Construction Management Plan. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant provide, prior to commencement of construction, a Construction Management Plan addressing soil import quantities, anticipated truck volumes and duration, haul routes, traffic controls, fill specifications, placement and compaction requirements, testing and inspection procedures, and coordination with the City, MassDOT and DPW, as applicable.	Applicant agrees and will submit the Construction Management Plan prior to commencement of construction.
12	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf (cont.)	XI.Q.10.5.b. Parking.	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The revised parking summary identifies 203 counted parking spaces for 83 dwelling units in the South Neighborhood, or approximately 2.45 spaces per unit, which exceeds the maximum ratio of 1.75 spaces per unit established by Section XI.Q.10.5.b. The response clarifies that the short alley-loaded driveways are not intended for parking; however, the detached single-family homes include driveways sufficiently sized to accommodate vehicles, and those functional parking spaces do not appear to be included in the reported total. Accordingly, the actual South Neighborhood parking supply may exceed 203 spaces. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant quantify all driveway spaces that can physically and legally accommodate a vehicle, include those spaces in the final parking calculation, and demonstrate that parked vehicles will not obstruct sidewalks, shared alleys, garage access, landscaping, or roadway circulation. The Applicant should also formally request Planning Board approval for the final South Neighborhood parking supply in excess of the maximum permitted ratio.	Agreed in meeting that the 11 single family homes in the South Neighborhood are the only driveways where parking can be accommodated. City staff and VHB has confirmed they are ok with this.
13	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf (cont.)	XI.Q.10.5.b.4.e. Location of Parking.	Post-approval condition	The Applicant's response is noted. The latest submission identifies potential snow storage areas throughout the development and includes supporting calculations for the two interior South Neighborhood driveways. However, calculations have not been provided for the remaining roadways and parking areas, and the Applicant proposes off-site snow removal during larger winter events. VHB recommends that the Planning Board determine whether the proposed snow storage and off-site removal approach is sufficient. If the Board finds the approach acceptable, any approval should require a final snow management plan coordinated with the Amesbury DPW for public roadway areas and confirmation from the property management company or snow-removal contractor that off-site removal services and disposal capacity will be available when required.	Resolved as a condition. Applicant to prepare an O&M Snow Management Plan (North/South/Boulevard), delivered post-permit/pre-construction.
14	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf (cont.)	XI.Q.10.5.d. Open Space.	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. Sheet C4.0 provides the supporting delineation and area calculations for the proposed formal and informal open space. The plans also identify vegetated stormwater ponds within the community open space; however, the Applicant has not demonstrated that these stormwater facilities are consistent with the intended use and character of required open space under Section XI.Q.10.5.d.1. The submission also does not identify the design standards or criteria used for the proposed trail grades and cross slopes. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Planning Board determine whether the vegetated stormwater ponds may be included within the required community open space. VHB further recommends that the Applicant identify the design criteria applicable to the proposed trail system. If the Board finds the proposed ownership and maintenance framework acceptable, any approval should require legal documentation establishing the permanent protection, ownership, access, and maintenance responsibilities for the open space areas prior to endorsement, recording, or occupancy, as applicable.XI.Q.10.5.f.4. Stormwater Management, Wetlands and Riverfront Area. Applicant Comment 8/12/26: The Rocky Hill MFOD specifically included stormwater ponds in the community open space calculations per 2.31 and 2.33 if the RHMFOD. 2.31 Open Space, Community - As applicable to the MBTA-MFOD, an open space area that is privately-or publicly owned, permanently protected, and dedicated for shared use as a formal or informal open space area. For greenways and other large informal park areas permanent deeded public access may be required where appropriate, to the City of Amesbury. Such areas must conform to the community open space types defined as formal or informal open space areas. Community open space may contain necessary surface stormwater management system improvements.	Applicant and VHB confirmed and agreed that stormwater ponds, rain gardens, and bioretention are allowable as open space under the multifamily overlay.
15	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf (cont.)	XI.Q.10.5.f.4. Stormwater Management, Wetlands and R	Post-approval condition	Addressed subject to a condition incorporating the final Wetlands Order of Conditions and any resulting revisions.	

16	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf (cont.)	XI.Q.10.f.5. Stormwater Management, Wetlands and Riv	Open	The Applicant's response is noted. VHB acknowledges that the final SWPPP will typically be completed in coordination with the selected contractor and refined based on final construction means and methods. However, VHB is not requesting a final SWPPP at this stage. The requested draft SWPPP is intended to provide planning-level information demonstrating that temporary drainage, erosion and sediment controls, stabilization measures, construction access, stockpiling, and interim runoff management can be accommodated during the proposed full-site clearing, substantial soil import, mass grading, and phased construction. Given the proximity of wetlands and other resource areas, groundwater constraints, limited areas available for temporary controls, and the potential for conflicts with permanent stormwater facilities and occupied portions of the development, deferring this evaluation until after Site Plan Approval would not provide the Planning Board with sufficient information to determine whether the proposed construction approach is practicable. This comment remains outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant provide a draft, planning-level SWPPP prior to Site Plan Approval identifying the anticipated construction sequence, limits of disturbance, temporary drainage and sediment-control measures, construction entrances and truck-tracking controls, staging and stockpile areas, temporary stabilization measures, and the anticipated locations of temporary sediment basins or equivalent BMPs. The draft may be revised and finalized by the selected contractor prior to commencement of construction. XI.Q.10.h. Water Quality. (02/25/26) VHB Comment: See Stormwater Management Section Below.	Applicant to provide high-level draft phasing plan which will satisfy request for a draft SWPPP.
17	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf (cont.)	XI.Q.10.5. j. Lighting.	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The updated photometric plans include building-mounted lighting at building entrances and provide additional fixture and control information. However, several portions of the pedestrian and roadway network continue to show very low (0.1, 0.2 Lumens) or zero calculated illumination levels, and the submission does not identify the specific IES/ESNA design criteria used to evaluate the proposed lighting. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant identify the applicable lighting criteria used for the various site areas and demonstrate that the proposed maintained illumination levels are consistent with those criteria. Alternatively, the Planning Board should determine whether the lighting levels shown on the revised photometric plans are sufficient for the proposed residential development. The lighting plan for Rocky Hill uses a zoned approach based on ANSI/IES RP-8 residential guidelines: • Walkways & Doors: We target an average of 0.2 to 0.5 fc on active sidewalks (using bollards and wall lights) and 1.0 to 3.0 fc right at building entrances for safety. • Roads & Parking: We target an average of 0.4 to 0.6 fc along driveways using post-top streetlights. • Open Lawns & Courtyards: Unlit patches in open green space are intentional. Leaving these areas dark preserves dark skies, stops light from spilling onto neighbor properties, and meets state energy code limits. Note on the Calculations: The summary box on the drawing reads low because it measures the entire site boundary at once, including open lawns. When only the actual sidewalks and driveways are measured, the plan meets all IES light levels and uniformity guidelines.	VHB has no further comment. Considered closed.
18	XI.Q.10.5 Dev & Perf (cont.)	XI.Q.10.5.m. Utilities.	Post-approval condition	Substantially addressed - provide updated water-demand/wastewater-flow estimates to DPW prior to building-permit issuance.	
19	XI.Q.10.3 Materials	XI.Q.10.3.g. Lighting.	Complete	The Applicant's response appears to have been inadvertently copied from the utilities comment and does not address the lighting issues raised under this section. Because this comment is substantively duplicative of the lighting review under Section XI.Q.10.5.j, VHB refers to its response under that comment. As noted therein, the updated photometric plans include building-mounted entrance lighting, but additional clarification remains necessary regarding the applicable lighting criteria and the very low or zero calculated illumination levels shown in portions of the pedestrian and roadway network. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant address the outstanding lighting items identified in VHB's response under Section XI.Q.10.5.j. Resolution of that comment will also resolve this comment.	Considered addressed with prior lighting comment.
20	XI.Q.10.4 Add'l Materials	XI.Q.10.4.b. Soils.	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The proposed future geotechnical analysis is limited to building and retaining wall design and does not address the broader site-related items identified in VHB's prior response, including imported fill placement, roadway subgrades, utility trenches, slopes, groundwater control, compaction testing, and construction-phase observation. Given the extent of proposed grading and imported fill, this comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant provide a project-wide geotechnical review and construction quality-control plan addressing buildings, retaining walls, roadways, stormwater facilities, utilities, slopes, and areas of significant fill. The applicable recommendations and procedures should be incorporated into the construction documents and approved prior to commencement of the associated earthwork or construction activities. The plan should identify required subgrade evaluations, fill specifications, compaction testing, groundwater and dewatering controls, construction observation, and procedures for documenting and addressing unsuitable or differing field conditions.	Applicant agrees that sitewide construction will be completed over the course of construction as-needed. Further details to be provided with Construction Management Plan.
21	Section VIII Parking & Loading	Section VIII.G.6 Parking and Loading Space Standards	Complete	Considered addressed.	
22	Section VIII Parking & Loading	Section VIII.G.13 Parking and Loading Space Standard	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The plans identify the proposed parking and aisle dimensions, and the Applicant has clarified that the 8-foot by 23-foot parallel parking spaces are intended to provide a more appropriate configuration for on-street parallel parking than the 9-foot by 20-foot configuration illustrated in Section VIII.G.13. VHB considers the technical clarification addressed. VHB recommends that the Planning Board determine whether the proposed alternative parallel parking dimensions are acceptable.	Agreed OK in meeting. Sizing is more appropriate and will be confirmed in waiver.
23	Section VIII Parking & Loading	Section VIII.G.16 Parking and Loading Space Standard	Complete -subject to VHB confirmation	The Applicant's response is noted. VHB acknowledges the Applicant's statement that the proposed tree counts and landscaped areas within and surrounding the parking areas exceed the requirements of Section VIII.G.16, and that the parking and landscape layout was developed in accordance with the Rocky Hill Design Guidelines. VHB does not object to the Applicant's response; however, the supporting five percent interior parking lot landscaping calculation has not been provided. VHB recommends that the Planning Board determine whether the Applicant's narrative response is sufficient, or whether the supporting calculation should be provided for confirmation of compliance with Section VIII.G.16.	Exhibit is being provided confirming we are in excess of 5% in all parking areas. VHB will review exhibit provided.
24	Section VIII Parking & Loading	Section VIII.G.18 Parking and Loading Space Standard	Complete -subject to VHB confirmation	The Applicant's response is noted. The Site Layout Plans provide overall accessible parking totals by neighborhood; however, the requested calculations by parking facility have not been provided. The Applicant appears to be treating each neighborhood as a single parking facility. Pursuant to 2010 ADA Standards §208.2, accessible parking must be calculated separately for each parking facility where more than one parking facility is provided on a site. For clarity, VHB is requesting a separate required-versus-proposed accessible parking calculation for each of the following, as applicable: North Neighborhood: parking barns/garages; on-street or curbside visitor parking; clubhouse parking; fieldhouse/pool and recreational amenity parking; trail-access parking; and any other separate common-use parking area. South Neighborhood: residential garage parking; on-street or curbside visitor parking; clubhouse parking; trail-access parking; and any other separate common-use or amenity parking area. Parking areas may be grouped only where they are physically and operationally integrated and function as a single parking facility. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant provide a parking schedule for both neighborhoods identifying, for each parking facility or justified facility grouping, the total number of spaces, the number of accessible spaces required and provided, the number of van-accessible spaces required and provided, and the building or use served.	Parking chart provided. ADA spot is being added to South Neighborhood on-street. City agrees that ADA van-accessible space in the trailhead area satisfies ADA needs in City's public area.

25	Section VIII Parking & Loading	Section VIII.G.18 EV Ready Parking	Open	The Applicant's response is noted. The Cover Sheet and Site Layout Plans identify the required and proposed EV-ready parking counts and indicate the exterior spaces intended to receive EV charging equipment. The response also describes the anticipated use of charging bollards and states that a 48-inch pedestrian clearance will be maintained. However, the charging equipment itself is not shown on the plans, and several designated charger locations appear to have potential conflicts with sidewalks or accessible routes, access aisles, landscaping, and snow-storage areas. As a result, the physical feasibility of the proposed charger locations has not been fully demonstrated. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant add representative charging-equipment layouts and plan callouts showing the proposed bollard or charger locations and required clearances at the identified exterior charging spaces, particularly where the equipment may be located within or adjacent to sidewalks, accessible parking areas, or snow-storage areas. The layouts should demonstrate that the equipment can be installed without obstructing accessible routes, access aisles, pedestrian clearances, landscaping, snow-storage operations, or required parking and maneuvering areas.	Response - The areas where EV charging stations are located adjacent to sidewalks have been reviewed, and we do not anticipate any conflicts with the required ADA accessible routes. Where charging bollards are located behind the curb within the sidewalk area, a minimum 36-inch clear passage will be maintained. The applicable regulations permit a minimum clear passage of 32 inches under certain conditions. Specific snow removal procedures for areas surrounding the EV charging bollards will be incorporated into the Snow Removal O&M
26	Stormwater Management Compliance	7.10.B. Design Basis.	Complete	Considered addressed.	
27	Stormwater Management Compliance	7.10.B.1 Design Basis.	Complete	Considered addressed.	
28	Stormwater Management Compliance	7.10.B.3 TSS Removal	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The revised treatment-train calculations for the North Neighborhood apply a 25% TSS-removal credit for deep-sump hooded catch basins followed by an 80% credit for the subsurface infiltration systems, resulting in a cumulative TSS-removal efficiency of 85%. Regardless of whether the proposed catch basins satisfy the applicable MassDEP pretreatment requirements, the documented treatment train does not demonstrate compliance with the 90% average annual TSS-removal requirement of Section 7.10.B.3. In addition, a complete site-wide calculation demonstrating compliance with the applicable TSS and TP removal standards has not been provided. This comment remains outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant revise the North Neighborhood treatment trains to achieve and document at least 90% average annual TSS removal through enhanced pretreatment, an additional treatment practice, or another technically supported design revision. VHB further recommends that the Applicant complete EPA Region 1's BMP Accounting and Tracking Tool for the full project using the proposed land uses, tributary areas, impervious cover, and BMP characteristics to document site-wide TSS and TP load reductions and support applicable City MS4 and TMDL accounting.	VHB agrees that the correct approach has in fact been taken. Comment considered closed.
29	Stormwater Management Compliance	Amesbury Zoning Ordinance XI.Q.10.5.h. Water Quality	Complete	Considered addressed.	
30	Stormwater Management Compliance	Infiltration rate / field testing	Open	The Applicant's response is noted. The revised Stormwater Report includes the requested PE- stamped infiltration testing memorandum and supporting test-location information, and the erosion control plans include requirements for fill placement within infiltration areas. VHB notes that the HydroCAD model applies a design infiltration rate of 15 inches per hour to Systems 3D, 3E, and 3F, consistent with a 50% reduction of the measured 36-inch-per-hour rate; therefore, the 30-inch-per-hour value identified in the memorandum appears to be a typographical error. The memorandum date of June 1, 2028 also appears to be incorrect. VHB further notes that, during the May 28, 2026 meeting with the Applicant and Amesbury staff, the parties discussed using the highest supportable design infiltration rates, consistent with MassDEP requirements, to reduce BMP footprints and associated impacts to wetland resource areas. The revised design appears to apply rates substantially lower than 50% of the measured in-situ rates at several locations, in some cases approximately one-quarter of the measured rate, without demonstrating that the corresponding basin footprints were reduced to the maximum extent practicable. Although use of a lower design rate is conservative from a hydraulic-design standpoint, it may result in larger stormwater facilities and greater resource-area impacts than necessary. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant correct the infiltration testing memorandum date and the design- rate reference for Systems 3D, 3E, and 3F, and provide a comparison of the measured, maximum MassDEP-supported, and modeled design infiltration rates for each BMP. Where modeled rates lower than 50% of the measured in-situ rate are retained, the Applicant should explain the engineering basis for the selected rate and demonstrate that the infiltration BMP footprints and associated resource-area impacts have been minimized to the extent practicable.	The stormwater calculations have been updated using the appropriate infiltration rate for Infiltration Basin #1. As a result, the grading associated with the basin has been revised and pulled an additional ten feet away from the adjacent resource area.
31	Stormwater Management Compliance	Groundwater mounding / separation	Complete	Considered addressed.	
32	Stormwater Management Compliance	Confirmatory subsurface testing	Post-approval condition	Condition — ≥1 confirmatory test pit at Subsurface Systems 3 & 5 and Surface Basins 2 & 3 prior to constructing each BMP.	
33	Stormwater Management Compliance	OCS-18 outlet detail	Complete	Considered addressed.	
34	Stormwater Management Compliance	Test Pit 19 documentation	Complete	Considered addressed.	
35	Stormwater Management Compliance	Infiltration Basin 1 bottom elev.	Complete	Considered addressed.	
36	Stormwater Management Compliance	Constructed (pocket) wetlands	Complete	Considered addressed.	
37	Stormwater Management Compliance	O&M / Long-Term Poll. Prev. Plan	Post-approval condition	Offered as a condition — final O&M / Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan approved by the City prior to building permit; re-certify the MassDEP checklist.	Post-approval, Steve to prepare Stormwater O&M for North, South, boulevard
38	Stormwater Management Compliance	NPDES permit / draft SWPPP	Open	The Applicant's response is noted. The Applicant proposes to submit the draft NPDES Construction Permit NOI and SWPPP after Site Plan Approval and prior to construction. This issue is addressed in VHB's response under Section XI.Q.10.5.g, Erosion Control. Consistent with that response, VHB continues to recommend that a planning-level draft SWPPP be provided prior to Site Plan Approval, with the final NOI and SWPPP submitted prior to commencement of construction. This comment remains outstanding pending resolution of the referenced erosion- control comment.	Same as above. Phasing plan to be prepared which satisfy the request for a draft SWPPP.
39	Stormwater Management Compliance	Drawdown (72-hr dewater)	Complete	Considered addressed.	
40	Stormwater Management Compliance	Pretreatment sizing (WQU)	Complete	Considered addressed.	
41	Stormwater Management Compliance	Rainfall data (NOAA Atlas 14)	Complete	Considered addressed.	
42	Stormwater Management Compliance	Emergency overflow / trail bridge	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The revised plans include an emergency overflow detail identifying the spillway material and geometry and show the pedestrian trail crossing the overflow by means of a raised timber bridge above the modeled 100-year water surface elevation. The detail indicates a bridge height of 30 inches above the adjacent surface. However, at several locations, including Basins 3B and 3D, the stormwater outfall appears to discharge upstream of the proposed trail alignment, which may concentrate flow toward the trail and create a potential for erosion, washout, or recurring maintenance. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant relocate the trail upstream of the outfall locations at Basins 3B and 3D, similar to the configuration shown at Basin 1, or otherwise demonstrate through grading and erosion-protection details that discharge from the outfalls will not adversely affect the trail. VHB further recommends that the Applicant confirm that the vertical drop at the timber bridge does not exceed 30 inches at any point within 36 inches horizontally of the bridge edge; otherwise, guards should be provided in accordance with the applicable building code.	Clarified that these basin outfalls are only in effect to small degrees during 100-year storm events. Comment considered addressed by VHB and City staff.
43	Stormwater Management Compliance	Corner catch basins	Complete	Considered addressed.	
44	Stormwater Management Compliance	1-inch outlet orifices	Complete	Considered addressed.	
45	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Fire Dept. review (NFPA-1)	Complete	Considered addressed.	

46	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Shared-infrastructure easements	Post-approval condition	The Applicant's response is noted. The Applicant has clarified that the boulevard roadway, utilities within the boulevard, and trail system constitute the principal shared infrastructure and has agreed to identify the required easements on the plans. However, the easement locations, limits, purposes, and associated rights and responsibilities have not yet been documented. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant identify all required access, utility, drainage, trail, maintenance, and emergency-access easements on the plans and provide draft easement documentation establishing the applicable construction, use, maintenance, repair, and replacement responsibilities. The Planning Board should determine the appropriate timing for execution and recording; however, the required easements should be established before issuance of any permit or commencement of work dependent upon the applicable shared infrastructure.	Animal Hospital easement has been shared. Others are easements considered post-approval conditions.
47	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Roadway cross-section labeling	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The revised plans include roadway cross sections for the principal street conditions and a separate on-street parking lane section clarifying the proposed parking width, curb relationship, gutter flow line, sidewalk, and landscaped buffer configuration. The drawings do not identify the specific roadway segments or station ranges where each section applies; however, the information provided appears sufficient to illustrate the proposed typical conditions for Site Plan Review. VHB recommends that the Planning Board determine whether the current level of roadway cross-section detail is sufficient, to clearly identify the applicable section for each roadway segment and parking condition.	No issue from VHB.
48	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Trails ownership / ADA	Complete	Ownership, maintenance, public access, and trail details addressed; VHB leaves ADA-trail applicability to the Board.	
49	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Emergency access (Animal Hosp./283 Elm)	Post-approval condition	The Applicant's response is noted. The Applicant has clarified that a recorded emergency-access easement is in place across the Amesbury Animal Hospital property and that the proposed plans conform to that easement. However, the easement across 283 Elm Street has not yet been granted and remains subject to a future agreement following project approval. In addition, the South Neighborhood HOA's long-term maintenance responsibility for the full emergency-access route should be established in the applicable project documents. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant provide the recorded Amesbury Animal Hospital easement for confirmation of its applicability to the proposed development and obtain and record the required emergency-access easement across 283 Elm Street before commencement of construction dependent on that access. The HOA documents should also establish responsibility for inspection, maintenance, repair, snow removal, and continued operability of the emergency-access route.	Animal Hospital easement has been shared. Others are easements considered post-approval conditions.
50	General Engineering & Plan Comments	I-495 noise attenuation	Complete	Considered addressed.	
51	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Waste / refuse-vehicle turning	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The Applicant has clarified that both neighborhoods will be served by private haulers, with dumpsters used in the North Neighborhood and individual bins rolled to the curb for collection in the South Neighborhood. The operational approach is generally understood; however, the submitted turning exhibits are based on the Amesbury ladder apparatus and do not specifically demonstrate access and maneuvering for the anticipated refuse collection vehicle. VHB recommends that the Planning Board determine whether the proposed waste collection approach is acceptable. If additional confirmation is required, the Applicant should provide turning movements for the largest anticipated private refuse vehicle, particularly at the North Neighborhood dumpster locations and any constrained South Neighborhood collection areas, or obtain written confirmation from the selected hauler that the proposed layout can be serviced without obstructing circulation, parking, pedestrian routes, or emergency access. Additional Comment(s) May 13, 2026	No issue from VHB.
52	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Fine grading / spot grades	Complete	Considered addressed.	
53	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Parking-grade conflict (1A/1B)	Complete	Considered addressed.	
54	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Electrical equipment locations	Open	The Applicant's response is noted. VHB acknowledges that final electrical infrastructure design and equipment locations will be determined by the applicable utility providers during later design phases. However, the current submission does not identify conceptual locations for major electrical equipment or otherwise demonstrate that adequate space has been reserved for transformers, generators, switchgear, and related infrastructure. This comment remains partially outstanding. VHB recommends that the Applicant identify conceptual equipment locations or reserved utility areas on the plans sufficient to demonstrate that the required infrastructure can be accommodated without conflicts with parking, sidewalks, accessible routes, landscaping, snow storage, drainage facilities, building access, or emergency circulation. Final equipment locations and details may be refined through coordination with the utility providers.	As discussed during the review meeting, the final locations of transformers and other electrical equipment cannot be determined until the utility service provider has received a work order and finalized the service requirements. Given the extensive open space areas and setbacks between buildings, there are multiple suitable locations available for this equipment while maintaining the required clearances from buildings and other site features. The final locations will be coordinated with the applicable utility and will be selected to comply with all required setbacks and clearance requirements.
55	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Utility-crossing constructability	Post-approval condition	Condition — confirm all utility crossings reviewed for constructability/separation prior to construction.	
56	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Erosion-control coordination	Complete	Considered addressed.	
57	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Off-site grading	Complete	Considered addressed.	
58	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Driveway slopes	Complete	Considered addressed.	
59	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Sidewalks to Bldgs 4-8	Complete	The Applicant's response is noted. The Applicant has clarified that the landscaped median walkway connects the residential cluster to the broader pedestrian network and that the loop drive is expected to experience limited vehicular use. However, the proposed arrangement does not provide a continuous sidewalk connection to each of Buildings 4 through 8 and may require pedestrians to travel within or cross the shared drive. VHB recommends that the Planning Board determine whether the proposed pedestrian-access arrangement is sufficient for this residential cluster.	VHB sees explanation as sufficient.
60	General Engineering & Plan Comments	Main Boulevard ownership	Post-approval condition	Addressed subject to a condition - Definitive Subdivision defining public/private limits and responsibilities, with DPW review.	