

SUBDIVISION REVIEW MEMORANDUM

Date: April 10, 2014

To: Madbury Planning Board

From: Jack Mettee, AICP
Mettee Planning Consultants

Project Name: Huckins Road Subdivision, (8 Lots)

Project Background:

Type of Application: Subdivision Review
Property Owner(s): Louise Abbott
38 Huckins Road
Madbury, NH 03820

Applicant: One Home Builders LLC
Beals Associates, PLLC
70 Portsmouth Avenue
Stratham, NH 03885

Property Address: Huckins Road
Madbury, New Hampshire 03820

Tax Map & Lot Number(s): Map 1, Lot 20

Lot Area: 36 Acres

Zoning District: General Residential/Agricultural
Minimum Lot Area: 80,000 SF
Frontage Required: 200 feet (less with Planning Board Approval)

Proposed Project

The applicant is seeking a subdivision approval for an eight (8)-lot subdivision on a 38.25 acre parcel on Huckins Road. The subdivision plans indicate that seven (7) new lots will be created with proposed house locations and driveways as well as leach field reserve areas and water well locations for each lot.

Information Provided

As part of the review of this proposed project, the following information was provided:

- Subdivision Application and Abutter List
- Application File Checklist
- Quitclaim Deed
- Subdivision Plan Set, Sheets 1 through 10 prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC and McEaney Survey Associates, March, 2014
- Test Pit Data for each test pit undertaken by Gove Environmental Services, December, 2013
- Test Pit Observation Letter from the Rockingham County Conservation District, April 4, 2013
- Subdivision Impact Statement, March 18, 2014
- HISS Letter Report, April 17, 2011
- Drainage Analysis and Sediment & Erosion Control Plan Report, dated March 18, 2014

No general narrative explanation of proposed subdivision was provided.

Type of Review

This subdivision review is limited to review of consistency of the subject application with Madbury's Zoning ordinance and Subdivision Regulations and general clarity and accuracy of the information provided. It is not an engineering review of the technical aspects of the proposed project.

Consistency with the Town of Madbury Zoning Ordinance

The following discussion identifies only those articles and standards that are relevant to this project.

Article IV: General Provisions, Section 4. Septic Locations

All lots comply with this section (and Article IX Wet Area Conservation Overlay District, Section 5, B) for septic area setbacks—50 feet from poorly drained soils (See Sheet 2 of 10, Subdivision Plan) and 75 feet from proposed well locations. (See Sheet 3 of 10, Subdivision Sire Plan)

***Comment:** It would be helpful if the applicant revised the plan sheets to amend the building set back note to include the fact that it is also a septic system setback (Sheet 2 of 10). It would also help if the Sheet 2 of 10 included typical setback dimensions on the plan.*

Article IV: General Provisions, Section 7. Minimum Lot Size

As delineated on the submitted plans, all lots: 1) are greater than 80,00 sf; 2) meet the standard of not exceeding 25% undeveloped land toward the minimum lot size; and 3)

provide developable areas on each lot that are contiguous. See Sheet 2 of 10, Subdivision Plan, Lot Areas Table.

Article V: General Agricultural and Residential District

As illustrated on the submitted plan set, all eight (8) lots conform to the dimensional standards of this article as shown on Sheets 2 and 3 of 10.

Comment:

Four (4) of the eight (8) of the lots have contiguous areas of greater than 90,000 sf and could conceivably accommodate a two-family dwelling. The applicant has indicated that the lots will be for single-family dwellings. The Board may want to confirm this with the applicant and issue a condition of approval either verifying this or requesting that in the future if any of the lots are two-family dwellings, the Board may also seek a subsequent review.

Article IX: Wet Area Conservation District

As shown on the submitted plans, the applicant has complied with the provisions of this Article. There does not appear to be any wetland disturbance created by the proposed subdivision road or any of the conceptual driveways noted on each of the lots.

Comment:

There are no vernal pools indicated. The Board may want to ask the applicant to verify this.

Consistency with Subdivision Requirements/Standards

The following discussion identifies those articles and standards that are relevant to this project.

Article III: Procedures

Section 2: Waivers: No waivers to the Subdivision Regulations have been requested.

Section 5: Pit & Perc. Tests to be Witnessed—All test pits and perc. tests were witnessed by Michael Cuomo, NH Certified Soil Scientist, of the Rockingham County Conservation District. The results are documented in a letter of April 4, 2013 to Colette Clickman, Town of Madbury which were attached to the application.

Section 15: Monuments—permanent monuments should be set as required by the Planning Board.

Article IV: Required Exhibits and Data

The application has been submitted to the Madbury Planning Board for a completeness review for the required exhibits and data. The applicant has generally complied with this provision of the Subdivision Regulations as noted below.

Section	Exhibit/Data	Provided
1	Names	Not complete
2	Abutters	Yes
3	Dimensions & Bearings	Yes
4	Site Features	Yes
5	Streets	Yes
6	Easements	No
7	Public Use	N/A
8	Bridges/Culverts	N/A
9	Future Streets	N/A
10	Proposed Leach Fields	Yes
11	Test Pits	Yes
12	Impact Statement	Yes
13	High Intensity Soil Survey	Yes
14	Lot Line Adjustment	N/A

Comments:

1. **Section 1, Names:** *The cover sheet does not specifically name the subdivision. Subsequent plan sheets refer to it as **Residential Development, Long Hill Road**. The proposed subdivision is actually on Huckins Road. This nomenclature should be amended.*

2. **Section 5, Streets:**

- *There will need to be a name for the proposed subdivision street.*
- *The applicant will need to meet the requirements for building on a Class VI roads per RSA 674:41*

(1) The local governing body after review and comment by the planning board has voted to authorize the issuance of building permits for the erection of buildings on said class VI highway or a portion thereof; and

(2) The municipality neither assumes responsibility for maintenance of said class VI highway nor liability for any damages resulting from the use thereof; and

(3) Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall produce evidence that notice of the limits of municipal responsibility and liability has been recorded in the county registry of deeds

Section 6, Easements: *No easements are documented on Existing Conditions Plan or any other plan sheets. See also Article V: Subdivision Standards, Section 14 comment.*

3. **Section 10, Proposed Leach Fields:** *The applicant has provided evidence that there are two (2) test pits within the septic reserve area that are separated by at least fifty (50) feet for each lot. Septic reserve areas have been identified for each of the seven (7) newly proposed lots.*
4. **Section 11, Test Pits:** *The applicant appears to have complied with the dimensional requirements of this section.*
5. **Section 12: Impact Statement** – *The applicant has prepared an Impact Statement. Comments are noted below.*
6. **Section 13: High Intensity Soil Survey** – *Provided by the applicant with soil types identified on the Existing Conditions Plan, Sheet 1 of 10.*

Article V: Subdivision Standards

Section 1: Driveway Access – N/A; No Comment

Section 2: Driveway Visibility – The applicant is required to provide 200 feet for site distance for each driveway for each lot for access on to the unnamed subdivision road.

***Comment:** The lots on the cul-de-sac may not literally meet this standard. The applicant should provide a note indicating this standard is met or request a waiver, if necessary. In addition, while the site distance from the intersection of the proposed subdivision road and Huckins Road seems to be sufficient, a note on the plan indicating this would be helpful.*

Section 3: Shared Driveways - The applicant has not indicated the need for any shared driveways.

***Comment:** The Planning Board may want to inquire if the applicant has any intention of installing such driveways.*

Sections 4 through 7: N/A; No Comment

Section 8: Required Off-Site Improvements—The applicant will need to extend Huckins Road approximately 350 feet in order to provide access to the proposed unnamed subdivision road.

***Comment:** While this activity is addressed on the P1 Plan and Profile, Sheet 4 of 10, it would be helpful to provide a note on the Subdivision Plan to indicate this off-site construction activity is to be undertaken.*

Sections 9 through 11 – N/A; No Comment

Section 12: Septic Systems and Water Supply – The applicant has provided for individual on-site septic systems and on-site water supplies for each lot. Potential well sites and associated 75-foot radii are depicted on Subdivision Site Plan, Sheets 3 of 10.

Comment: The applicant would make the drawing clearer if at least one water well radius image was labeled with a 75-foot label.

Section 13: More Stringent Standards: -- N/A; No Comment

Section 14: Proof of Compliance: The applicant needs to provide proof of compliance for each of the following:

- Feasible locations for water supply/waste water disposal
- Easements
- Topographic limitations
- Test pits
- Percolation Tests

Comment: The applicant has provided evidence for feasible locations for water supply/waste water disposal, test pits and percolation tests. There appear to be no topographic limitations. The subdivision Plan P 2 Plan and Profile, Sheet 5 of 10 indicates a drainage discharge location that will require a drainage easement. This should be noted on the plan and a condition should be placed on any approval requiring that a legal description be provided to the Planning Board and made part of the submission to the Registry of Deeds.

Sections 15 through 17: N/A or No Comment

Section 18: Storm-water Runoff – No separate stormwater or erosion/sediment control plan drawing has been provided by the applicant. Stormwater management measures can be surmised from various drawings such as Plan P 2 Plan and Profile, Sheet 5 of 10 and Sheets 9 (Construction Details) and 10 (Erosion Control Details). The applicant has provided a Drainage Study that addresses the requirement to ensure post development stormwater discharge at the perimeter of the subdivided property should not exceed the pre-development rate.

Comment: The Planning Board should ask the applicant to fully discuss how stormwater will be managed. I would be interested in having a further explanation of how the constructed gravel wetland will function, how it will be maintained, etc. The Road Construction Standards of the Subdivision Regulations (Section 4.) encourages landscaping in the center of cul de sacs. How does the applicant intend to address this provision? Further discussion of this issue is also in the Impact Statement Section below.

I received the Drainage Analysis and Sediment & Erosion Control Plan Report, dated March 18, 2014 at the last PB meeting on April 2nd. I have reviewed the report and have the following comments.

- As an engineering explanation of the HydroCAD modeling, the report is satisfactory. It analyzes the pre- and post-development stormwater flows and peak discharge rates for standard year/rainfall intervals and explains the post development stormwater management system that provides the setting for proper stormwater management.*
- There is a statement on an unnumbered page under the ANALYSIS heading that claims that the installed stormwater system (culverts, etc.) will maintain the existing drainage pattern and surface water hydrology. I know what is being said, but the existing natural drainage “pattern” has been disrupted so I don’t know how it can be stated that it is maintained.*
- In the text there are several locations where the report refers to drawing sheets that do not appear to be included in the report. E.g., on page 1, Reference: Sheet W-1 Existing Conditions Watershed Plan—the plan included but it is labeled Sheet No. 1 of 2 not W-1. A reviewer can discern the difference, but it does cause confusion.*
- On page 3, Section 4.3 there is a reference to “Green Book”. Can the applicant explain what this is?*
- On page 4, the Construction Sequence differs from the one on the plan Sheet 10 of 10. Please explain/rectify. In addition, a number of the Maintenance procedure/standards in Section 4.10, page 5 are not consistent with what is on plan Sheet 10 of 10, Erosion Control Details Some of these do not seem to apply to this development, such as #2 that references bioretention systems. Similarly #'s 3, 6, and 10.*
- Are Sheets 1 and 2 in this report the same as Sheets 9 and 10 in the plan set? Please verify.*

Other Comments on the Subdivision Plan Sheets

Overall these plans are suitable for illustrating the nature of the proposed subdivision. Below are general comments with respect to the format of the plan sheets. The following would be helpful to the overall readability and presentation of data for Planning Board review.

- Providing a subdivision name and having this name be place on all sheets.
- Changing the reference on various plan sheets from Long Hill Road to Huckins Road.
- Editing plan sheets for typos; e.g. Cover Sheet, Index Listing 6—“*Secttions*” misspelled.

- d. Sheet 1 of 10 under HISS Key to Soil Types under #6 there is a reference to a publication, but not clear which publication this is. Also in the legend on the lower right of drawing there is missing data for zoning dimensions. These are noted elsewhere (Sheet 2 of 10), but should be included here if the applicant chooses to maintain these notes on both sheets.
- e. Sheet 3 of 10: there are several test pit types (acceptable/failed) and labels that are difficult to read under the septic reserve area cross-hatch. These should be made clearer. Acceptable/failed test pit symbols in legend are also difficult to distinguish. Drainage easement on Lot 3 should be identified.
- f. Sheet 9 of 10, Details: This sheet is crowded with details for subdivision construction from utility trench details, to sign post installation to stormwater devices making it a challenge to read and review. In addition, it is difficult to correlate the stormwater details with those illustrated on the Road Plan and Profile (Sheet 5 of 10). The applicant should consider providing a separate drainage and erosion control plan as a new/separate sheet. While some of the details are clarified in the Subdivision Impact Statement, improving the clarity of this drawing or adding another would be helpful.
- g. Similar to Sheet 9, Sheet 10 is crowded with detail and it is not always clear which diagram goes with which explanatory text. Can the applicant improve the layout/clarity?

Subdivision Impact Statement

The applicant provided a written Subdivision Impact Statement. The following comments address statements made in these documents.

- Under **Schools** the applicant cites 0.53 students per dwelling unit based on the 2000 census. This ratio should be clarified since the number of school children is usually a function of the number of bedrooms in a residential unit and this application has no information in this regard. Also since the 2010 Census has been published, can this ratio be updated? The applicant also refers to improving the subdivision road to accommodate school bus service. This should be further clarified.
- Under **Traffic** the applicant suggests that there will be a total of 14 vehicle trips during the am and pm peaks. While the numbers may be small, it might also be useful to know what the daily trip end total is expected to be.
- Under **Population** the applicant indicates there would be approximately 17-18 new residents assuming two adults. No comment.
- Under **Municipal Costs** the applicant considers just municipal costs. Considering only municipal costs, the applicant suggests that municipal costs will not create major change. While this may be correct intuitively, it would be helpful if the applicant provided information with expected per unit tax revenues versus per unit costs for services—road, police, fire, etc. School costs also need to be addressed.
- **Utilities/Safety**—No Comment

- Under **Taxes**—can the applicant provide approximate revenues to be expected. In addition, can the applicant provide the amount of Current Use penalty tax to be expected.
- Under **Drainage**—it would be helpful if the applicant better described the drainage system including the constructed gravel wetland in the cul-de-sac. Can Low Impact BMP's (e.g., small on-site rain gardens) be employed? It would also be helpful if the applicant provided information about the long-term maintenance of the stormwater/drainage system. See also Note f. in section above.
- **Solid Waste; Groundwater; Pollution**—No Comment
- Under **Erosion**, the applicant indicates that there will be minimal disturbance to vegetative cover, although this does not include the disturbance for each house lot. Can the applicant offer a rule-of thumb for such disturbance?
- Under **Ecology**, the applicant states that the subdivision would not impact the ecology of the site. Although minimal, there will some impact to the existing ecology. It is not clear what information this statement is based on, since, for example, there was no reporting on such site ecological phenomena as wildlife. Some further information on this would be helpful.

This concludes the review of the proposed Huckins Road subdivision. Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.