

SUBDIVISION REVIEW MEMORANDUM

Date: September 15, 2015

To: Madbury Planning Board

From: Jack Mettee, AICP
Mettee Planning Consultants

Project Name: Hayes Road Subdivision, (8 Lots)

Project Background:

Type of Application: Subdivision Review

Property Owner(s): Marsha Putnam
14A Putnam Road
Barrington NH 03825

Applicant: Maple Heights Realty LLC
149 Epping Road
Exeter, NH 03833

Property Address: Hayes Road
Madbury, New Hampshire 03820

Tax Map & Lot Number(s): Map 5, Lot 8

Lot Area: 59.0 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 59.0-acre parcel on Hayes Road. The subdivision plan indicates 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. The remainder lot –Lot M-8—is to be transferred to the adjacent property owner (Map 5, Lot 2A).

Information Provided

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

- Subdivision Application and Application for Conditional Use Permit
- Subdivision application checklist
- Letter of Authorization from owner to allow Representative from Tuck Realty (Maple Heights Realty) or Jones & Beach Engineering to represent her.
- Letter of Authorization from Maple Heights Realty, LLC to allow Representative from Jones & Beach Engineering to represent the firm (applicant).
- Court documents & will for property transfer to Marsha Putnam
- Subdivision Plan Set, Sheets 1 through 3 prepared by Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc., September 2, 2015
- Warranty Deed
- Abutter List and Associated Tax Maps indicating abutter locations
- Application File Checklist

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 appear to comply with this section for septic area setbacks—75 feet from proposed well locations. **See Drawing C 2, Site Plan.**

***Comment:** Based on the soil information provided there does not appear to be any poorly drained soils, which require a 50-foot setback. The applicant should clarify this.*

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) *appear* to provide developable areas on each lot that are contiguous. However, it appears

that Lot M7 may not meet this standard since the uplands areas are broken up. **See Drawing C 2, Site Plan**

***Comment:** The applicant should confirm that there is sufficient contiguous upland for all the proposed lots, esp. Lot M7.*

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 **Drawing C 2, Site Plan**.

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.

The applicant may also want to comment on its understanding of the effect on the "Old Road" with the transfer of the remainder lot M-8 to the adjacent land owner.

Article IX: Wet Area Conservation District

As shown on the submitted plans, the applicant has generally avoided any wetland impact. There is one wetland crossing on Lot M7 requiring the installation of a culvert that will disturb 430 sf of wetland. This action will require a Conditional Use Permit. All lots appear to comply with Section 5, B for setbacks including the 50 feet from Poorly Drained Soils.

Comment:

On Drawing C2 on Lot M7 a portion of the wetland boundary at the rear of the lot seems to be missing. The applicant should correct this.

There does not appear to be any Poorly Drained Soils affecting the 50-foot setback. The applicant should confirm this. There are no vernal pools indicated. The Board may want to ask the applicant to verify this.

The Board should ensure that the applicant address all the relevant criteria for a Conditional Use Permit in in Section 8 of General Provisions and Section 8 of Article IX: Wet Area Conservation District.

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: The applicant has requested a waiver to the requirement for a High Intensity Soil Survey because: (1) the lots are in excess of 5 acres and (2) the lots comply with the state lot size by soils type work sheets that include a sewage loading factor for septic systems.

Section 5: Pit & Perc. Tests to be Witnessed—There is no submitted documentation on the results of the test pits, nor is there a letter that all test pits and perc. tests were witnessed by a NH Certified Soil Scientist.

Comment:

Request that the applicant provide the perc. test documentation and a witness letter. The applicant should make more of an effort to ensure that the test pit labels are readable in order to compare with the perc. test documentation. Drawing C 2 is difficult to read with all of the information provided.

Section 6: Prior to final approval the applicant will need to have approval of sewage disposal plans from NHDES.

Section 14: With the submission of final plans, the applicant will need to provide an LCHIP check in the amount of \$25.00

Section 15: Monuments—permanent monuments will need to 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	Yes
2	Abutters	Yes
3	Dimensions & Bearings	Yes
4	Site Features	Yes
5	Streets	Yes
6	Easements	Yes
7	Public Use	N/A

8	Bridges/Culverts	Yes
9	Future Streets	N/A
10	Proposed Leach Fields	Yes
11	Test Pits	Yes
12	Impact Statement	N/A
13	High Intensity Soil Survey	Waiver Request
14	Lot Line Adjustment	N/A

Comments on Exhibits:

1. **Section 1, Names:** *The cover sheet indicates that the owner is Maple Heights Realty LLC whereas the application indicates the owner is Marsha Putnam. This should be clarified.*
2. **Section 6, Easements:** *No existing easements are documented on the Existing Conditions Plan. The applicant should confirm this. The applicant proposes a trail easement on Lots M2 and M3. Does this easement connect to an existing trail? Could it be extended to Hayes Road? Does the applicant have draft easement language for the Board to review?*

See also Article V: Subdivision Standards, Section 14 comment below.

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. The clarity of test pit labels should be improved.*
4. **Section 11, Test Pits:** *The applicant appears to have complied with the dimensional requirements of this section.*
5. **Section 12: Impact Statement** – *Since the subdivision is less than 10 lots, no Impact Statement is required.*
6. **Section 13: High Intensity Soil Survey** – *A waiver has been requested.*

Comment: *See comment at Article III: Procedures, above. The applicant should be prepared to explain why the proposed soil analysis is an acceptable practice for determining the soil characteristics of the site, especially with respect to the suitability of the soils for septic systems.*

Article V: Subdivision Standards

Section 1: Driveway Access – 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:** It appears that the proposed subdivision lay out meets this provision. A note to this effect would be helpful.*

Section 3: Shared Driveways - The applicant has the potential for two common driveways. No Comment

Sections 4 through 11: 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 **Site Plan Drawing C2**. No additional comment; but see Comment #6 on previous page.

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 and test pits. There appear to be no topographic limitations or new easements required. There no documented existing easements on the Existing Conditions Plan. The applicant should confirm this fact. The applicant should also elaborate on the proposed easement as noted above in the comment under Exhibits, Section 6 Easements. The applicant should also provide evidence of successful Percolation Tests as confirmed by a qualified soil scientist.*

Sections 15 through 17: N/A or No Comment

Section 18: Storm-water Runoff –

***Comment:** The applicant should comment on measures to be taken during and after construction to prevent erosion and sedimentation. How will stormwater be managed?*

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.

- a. Cover Sheet. It would be helpful if the applicant included the town boundaries on the Locus Map—Lee/Madbury; Barrington/Madbury. Also the Owner of Record Block indicates that Maple Heights Realty LLC is the owner, though in the application it is Marsha Putnam. This should be clarified
- b. Drawing C 1. This drawing has a legend that includes boundary line definitions for various features on the plan. It appears that the Tree Line boundary symbol does not match what is on the drawing. Can this be clarified? It would also be helpful to carry the relevant sections of this legend forward to Drawings C 2 and S 1.
- c. Test pit labels that are difficult to read under the septic reserve area crosshatch. These should be made clearer.

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