



TOWN OF DURHAM
8 NEWMARKET RD
DURHAM, NH 03824-2898
603/868-8064
www.ci.durham.nh.us

Town Planner's Review
Wednesday, December 16, 2020

IX. **Subdivision off Gerrish Drive.** Parcel at 91 Bagdad Road (address). Formal application for conservation subdivision for single family and duplex houses (15 units total) on 16-acre lot off Gerrish Drive including conditional use for wetland crossings. Marti and Michael Mulhern, property owners. Mike Sievert, engineer. Robbi Woodburn, Landscape Architect. Map 10, Lot 8-6. Residence B District.

➤ I recommend that the board accept the application as complete and schedule a public hearing for January 13 or January 27.

Please note the following:

- 1) **Acceptance.** This is submitted now as a formal application. The Planning Board reviewed the two required phases earlier – conceptual and design review. The project is now engineered. The application was submitted to the Planning Board on November 18 but some items needed to be finalized because of a question about ownership of the road. Some additional details may be needed and they can be submitted in the course of the board's review. The final plans came in on Thursday so I have not done a complete review of the design. I will do this for the next meeting.
- 2) **TRG.** The applicant met with the Technical Review Group on November 16. Notes from the meeting were forwarded and are on the website.
- 3) **Road.** The staff has discussed the road and recommends that all of the road and utilities beyond Gerrish/Ambler be privately owned by the Homeowners Association.
- 4) The design has changed since the prior submittal and the interior road is now shown as a loop road. This is a better approach than having two cul de sacs for access, pedestrian passage, utilities, and plowing. The loop road would almost certainly be a private road.
- 5) **Loop Road.** The loop road is narrow, with a 20-foot right of way and 16 feet of pavement with 2 foot gravel shoulders on each side. The board will need to review this design carefully. It is shown as a one-way road. Is this practical? A waiver may be needed from the Road Regulations though the regulations are oriented more toward Town roads.
- 6) **Main Road.** The main road leading from Gerrish Drive is also narrow, with a 25-foot right of way and 20 feet of pavement with 4-foot gravel shoulders on each side. The board will need to review this design carefully. A waiver on the right of way width may be needed from the Road Regulations though the regulations are oriented more toward Town roads.

- 7) Utilities. The water, sewer, and electric lines are shown under the road pavement. I understand that this is commonly done but the question arises if it would be more efficient to place these utilities underground alongside the road in the right of way rather than under the pavement.
- 8) Sewer. The applicant plans to extend a pressure sewer line down Gerrish Drive. Abutters could then tie into this line in the future. The question is whether this line can then connect to the existing manhole in Sumac Lane off Canney Road or if it will need to be extended up Canney Road to a manhole on Bagdad Road. Mike Sievert is working with Public Works to determine the condition of the line on Sumac Lane. That line extends from Sumac Lane and then goes cross country to Bucks Hill Road then past the high school. Again, this line would be different from a conventional sewer line in that the line would be pressurized and would accept only liquid. Property owners, including those on Gerrish Drive, would have a septic tank on their property for solids and a pump to send the effluent to the line.
- 9) Conditional Use. A conditional use will be needed for the three wetland crossings and activity within the wetland buffer. I suggest that the board have a preliminary discussion about the eight conditional use criteria at an upcoming meeting in order that potential issues are raised soon rather than during final deliberations. The application addresses the eight criteria.
- 10) Process. With large complex projects we find that it is helpful for the board to conduct its review including taking comments at the public hearing, and then to provide a set of suggested revisions to the plans for each pertinent issue. The applicant then submits one revised set of plans for the final deliberations (There are frequently additional minor items to be changed as precedent conditions).
- 11) Outside reviews. Which outside review(s) will be needed? Rich Reine, Public Works Director, recommends that an outside review be conducted for the stormwater management plan. If one is done, we will need to specify the parameters for that review.
- 12) Stormwater management. The plan is quite complex and will need to be reviewed carefully. A detailed report is submitted.
- 13) Wetland structures. The first two wetland crossings including the structures will need to be reviewed carefully.
- 14) Wetlands analysis. I understand that Mark West will prepare a functions and values analysis of the wetlands. I don't believe this has been submitted.
- 15) Landscaping. A landscaping plan is submitted which includes plantings along the loop road, inside the green, for screening of the White property along the new road, and around the drainage structures.
- 16) Private driveways. Audrey Cline raised a question about the private driveways. We will review the zoning ordinance under Article XXI – Off Street Parking and the Public Works policy for pertinent issues. Why are some of the driveways shown with pervious pavement but not others?

- 17) House designs. Marti Mulhern, the applicant, has been looking at various house designs. It is debatable how much this is in the purview of the Planning Board. For a project proposed as a pocket neighborhood on a fairly tight overall footprint it is appropriate to provide an overall plan for placement of houses and perhaps house sizes and orientation. A general template for house designs would reinforce the plan recognizing that implementing house designs should be left to the applicant. One key element of the plan is the interior green space and walking path. We have discussed including house designs that would be welcoming to neighbors along the interior walking path with use of patios, decks, porches, and a rear entrance.
- 18) Traffic. Information from Steve Pernaw, Traffic Engineer, is included in the narrative.
- 19) Senior units. The proposal is for 80% of the 15 units to be senior units. We will review the density standards to clarify if 80% meets the density requirements.
- 20) Open space. A memo regarding the ownership and management of the open space is submitted. The board will need to review this carefully. Additional documents will be prepared later following discussion by the board.
- 21) Construction management plan. A plan will be needed later.
- 22) Development of Regional Impact. The board voted on June 10 that this was not a development of regional impact.
- 23) Other issues. What other general issues need to be discussed? What other information should be submitted?