Town of Kittery Planning Board Meeting May 9, 2024

ITEM 3—77 Bartlett Road—Major Subdivision Plan Modification Review

Action: accept application as complete. Approve plan: Griffin Wood, on behalf of owner/applicant Green & Company, proposes an amendment to relocate a building on the lot of an approved subdivision for 77 Bartlett Road, Tax Map 62 Lot 26, in the Residential-Rural (R-RL) and Resource Protection Overlay (OZ-RP) Zones.

PROCESS SUMMARY

REQ'D	ACTION	COMMENTS	STATUS
YES	Planning staff determination of completeness	5/2/24	Complete
NO	Site Visit	Not required for plan modifications	TBD
NO	Public Hearing	Not required for plan modification	TBD
YES	Plan Approval	Scheduled for 5/9/24	Pending

Applicant: Prior to the signing of the approved Plan any Conditions of Approval related to the Findings of Fact along with waivers and variances (by the BOA) must be placed on the Final Plan and, when applicable, recorded at the York County Registry of Deeds. PLACE THE MAP AND LOT NUMBER IN 1/4" HIGH LETTERS AT LOWER RIGHT BORDER OF ALL PLAN SHEETS. As per Section 16.4.4.L - Grading/Construction Final Plan Required. - Grading or construction of roads, grading of land or lots, or

<u>construction of buildings is prohibited until the original copy of the approved final plan endorsed has been</u>
<u>duly recorded in the York County registry of deeds when applicable.</u>

PROJECT INTRODUCTION

77 Bartlett Road is a 19.30-acre lot and the location of a proposed 9-parcel conservation subdivision which received final planning board approval on 1/25/24. The lots are proposed to be accessed from Bartlett Road through a private right-of-way ending in one cul-de-sac, designed to meet the standards of a Class II private street with a 3-foot widened shoulder and a painted strip on the west side for pedestrian movement.

The area of proposed lot 8 contains an existing driveway, single-family home, and septic system. During the planning board process, the applicant planned to remove the driveway but leave the existing home rather than replacing it with a new building. However, the new owners of the property now propose demolishing the existing home to replace it with a new structure in the identified buildable envelope on lot 8.

Per **§16.8.11.H.(2).(a),** any relocation of a structure within a subdivision is considered a major plan modification requiring approval by planning board. As the proposal includes a suitable buildable envelope for any future house, **staff recommend the planning board approve the modification at this time.**

STAFF COMMENTS

Listed below are additional comments provided by staff in addition to general review of standards:

- 1. The applicant claims it would be easier to bring a new structure to modern energy efficiency standards than an older house, and relocating the home would allow for better orientation with the new proposed right-of-way.
- 2. The survey shows an allowable buildable area within lot 8, similar to all other proposed lots on the plan. If this modification is granted, the new single-family dwelling would need to meet the same dimensional and performance standards as the proposed homes on all other lots.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

Staff reviewed the application and provided materials and have provided their determination on the requirements and standards below. All requirements that have not been met or require further discussion are highlighted.

Code Ref.	§16.4 Land Use Zone Standards		
	Standard	Determination	
§16.4.10.B	Permitted/Special Exception Uses	The proposed subdivision is a permitted use	
§16.4.10.D.(2).(a).	Minimum area per dwelling: 40,000 sq ft.	It appears the standard is satisfied.	
§16.4.10.D.(2).(b).	Lot size: 40,000 sq ft minimum	Not all lots meet this standard. Requirements need not be met in a conservation subdivision	
§16.4.10.D.(2).(c).	Street frontage: 150 ft minimum	Not all lots meet this standard. Requirements may be modified in a conservation subdivision.	
§16.4.10.D.(2).(d).	Front setback: 40 ft minimum	Not all lots meet this standard. Requirements may be modified in a conservation subdivision.	
§16.4.10.D.(2).(e).	Building coverage: 15% maximum	Not all lots meet this standard. Requirements may be modified in a conservation subdivision.	
§16.4.10.D.(2).(f).	Rear and side setbacks: 20 ft minimum.	Not all lots meet this standard. Requirements may be modified in a conservation subdivision.	
§16.4.10.D.(2).(g).	Building height: 35 ft maximum	It appears the standard is satisfied.	
§16.4.10.D.(2).(i).	Minimum water-body setbacks: up to 100 feet from high-water line of identified wetlands	The standard appears to be satisfied for all proposed	

applicant has provided a design for the proposed septic systems, which will be reviewed by Code Enforcement if the subdivision plan is approved.
--

DISCUSSION, NEXT STEPS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed modification would allow the applicant to build a house that orients to the proposed new right-of-way, rather than Bartlett Road. Additionally, allowing a new structure meeting modern energy efficiency standards appears to conform to the intent of the conservation subdivision ordinance. Staff believe the project meets all requirements and can be approved at this time.

RECOMMENDED MOTIONS

Below are recommended motions for the Board's use and consideration:

Motion to accept the application as complete

Move to accept the major subdivision plan modification by Griffin Wood, on behalf of owner/applicant Green & Company.

Motion to approve the application

Move to approve the major subdivision plan modification by Griffin Wood, on behalf of owner/applicant Green & Company.

Kittery Planning Board Findings of Fact For 77 Bartlett Road Subdivision Modification Review

Note: This approval by the Planning Board constitutes an agreement between the Town and the Developer incorporating the Development plan and supporting documentation, the Findings of Fact, and all waivers and/or conditions approved and required by the Planning Board.

WHEREAS: Griffin Wood, on behalf of owner/applicant Green & Company, proposes an amendment to relocate a building on the lot of an approved subdivision for 77 Bartlett Road, Tax Map 62 Lot 26, in the Residential-Rural (R-RL) and Resource Protection Overlay (OZ-RP) Zones.

Pursuant to the Plan Review meetings conducted by the Planning Board as noted in the Plan Review Notes dated 5/2/24

REQ'D	ACTION	COMMENTS	STATUS
YES	Completeness Review	5/2/24	Complete
NO	Public Hearing	Optional	Held
NO	Site Visit	Optional	Held
YES	Plan Approval	5/9/24	Approved

Pursuant to the application and plan and other documents considered to be a part of a plan review decision by the Planning Board in this Finding of Fact consisting of the following (hereinafter the "Plan"):

1. Major Plan Modification received 4/29/24 from Griffin Wood of Terradyn Consultants.

NOW THEREFORE, based on the entire record before the Planning Board and pursuant to the applicable standards in the Land Use and Development Code, the Planning Board makes the following factual findings and conclusions:

Chapter 16.8 SUBDIVISION REVIEW

16.8.9.D.(4).(b). Findings of Fact

Action by the Board shall be based upon findings of fact which certify or waive compliance with all the required standards of this title, and which certify that the development satisfies the following requirements:

Development Conforms to Local Ordinances.

Standard: The proposed development conforms to a duly adopted Comprehensive Plan as per adopted provisions in the Town Code, zoning ordinance, subdivision regulation or ordinance, development plan or land use plan, if any. In making this determination, the municipal reviewing authority may interpret these ordinances and plans.

Finding: The proposed modification conforms to Title 16 and all dimensional standards in the R-RL Zone.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Freshwater Wetlands Identified

Standard: All freshwater wetlands within the project area have been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application, regardless of the size of these wetlands.

Finding: All wetlands identified during the original subdivision review are located on the modified plan.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

River, Stream, or Brook Identified.

Standard: Any river, stream or brook within or abutting the proposed project area has been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application. For purposes of this section, "river, stream or brook" has the same meaning as in 38 M.R.S.A. § 480-B, Subsection 9.

Finding: All natural resources identified during the original subdivision review are located on the modified plan.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Water Supply Sufficient.

Standard: The proposed development has sufficient water available for the needs of the development.

Finding: The proposed modification will not increase the water needs anticipated during original approval.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Municipal Water Supply Available.

Standard: The proposed development will:

The proposed development will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply, if one is to be used.

Finding: The proposed subdivision will drill wells and will not utilize Municipal Water utilities.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Sewage Disposal Adequate.

Standard: The proposed development will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal and will not cause an unreasonable burden on municipal services, if they are utilized.

Finding: The proposed modification will not increase the wastewater generation anticipated during original approval.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Municipal solid waste disposal available.

Standard: The proposed development will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste, if municipal services are to be used.

Finding: The proposed subdivision will install septic systems and will not utilize Municipal Sewer utilities.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Water body quality and shoreline protected.

Standard: Whenever situated entirely or partially within 250 feet of any wetland, the proposed development will not adversely affect the quality of that body of water or unreasonably affect the shoreline of that body of water..

Finding: The modification does not propose encroachment on any water body setbacks.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be satisfied.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Groundwater protected.

Standard: The proposed development will not, alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of groundwater.

Finding: It appears the proposed modification will not cause any unreasonable adverse effects of the quantity or quality of groundwater.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Flood areas identified and development conditioned.

Standard: All flood-prone areas within the project area have been identified on maps submitted as part of the application, based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps and information presented by

the applicant. If the proposed development, or any part of it, is in such an area, the applicant must determine the 100-year flood elevation and flood hazard boundaries within the project area. The proposed plan must include a condition of plan approval requiring that principal structures in the development will be constructed with their lowest floor, including the basement, at least one foot above the 100-year flood elevation.

Finding: All flood hazard areas are identified in the modified plan. Development will meet the requirements of the Town floodplain management regulations.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Stormwater Managed.

Standard: The proposed development will provide for adequate stormwater management.

Finding: The proposed modification does not include development that would generate more stormwater than anticipated during the original review.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Erosion Controlled.

Standard: The proposed development will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results.

Finding: The proposed modification will meet all requirements for erosion control set by Town and state guidelines. The plan proposes double-silt fences around sensitive natural resources during development, which will now include the demolition and reconstruction of a house on proposed lot 8.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Traffic Managed.

Standard: The proposed development will:

[a] Not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed; and

[b] Provide adequate traffic circulation, both on-site and off-site.

Finding: The proposed modification does not increase the intensity of anticipated traffic from original approval.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Water and Air Pollution Minimized.

Standard: The proposed development will not result in undue water or air pollution. In making this determination, the following must be considered:

- [a] Elevation of the land above sea level and its relation to the floodplains:
- **[b]** Nature of soils and subsoils and their ability to adequately support waste disposal;
- **[c]** Slope of the land and its effect on effluents;
- [d] Availability of streams for disposal of effluents;
- [e] Applicable state and local health and water resource rules and regulations; and
- **Ifl** Safe transportation, disposal and storage of hazardous materials.

Finding: The proposed modification is not anticipated to generate water or air pollution.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Aesthetic, cultural and natural values protected.

Standard: The proposed development will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas, or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline.

Finding: It appears that the proposed development is designed in a manner that respects the natural capabilities of the lot.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Developer financially and technically capable.

Standard: Developer is financially and technically capable to meet the standards of this section.

Finding: The developer appears financially and technically capable. A cost estimate is required before the subdivision may begin construction.

Conclusion: This standard does not appear applicable.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

Based on the foregoing Findings, the Kittery Planning Board finds the applicant has satisfied each of the review standards for approval and, therefore, the Kittery Planning Board hereby grants final approval for the Development at the above referenced property, including any waivers granted or conditions as noted.

Waivers:

None

<u>Conditions of Approval</u> (to be included as notes on the final plan in addition to the existing notes):

- 1. Without prior approval, no changes, erasures, modifications or revisions may be made to any Planning Board approved final plan.
- 2. Applicant/contractor will follow Maine DEP Best Management Practices for all work associated with site and building construction to ensure adequate erosion control and slope stabilization.
- 3. Prior to the commencement of grading and/or construction within a building envelope, as shown on the Plan, the owner and/or developer must stake all corners of the envelope. These markers must remain in place until the Code Enforcement Officer determines construction is completed and there is no danger of damage to areas that are, per Planning Board approval, to remain undisturbed.
- 4. All Notices to Applicant contained in the Findings of Fact (dated: 5/9/24).

Conditions of Approval (Not to be included as notes on the final plan):

1. <u>Incorporate any plan revisions on the site plan as recommended by Staff, Planning Board, or Peer Review Engineer, and submit for Staff review prior to endorsement and recording of the plan.</u>

Notices to Applicant:

- 1. Prior to the release of the signed plans, the applicant must pay all outstanding fees associated with review, including, but not limited to, Town Attorney fees, peer review, newspaper advertisements and abutter notification.
- 2. State law requires all subdivision and shoreland development plans, and any plans receiving waivers or variances, be recorded at the York County Registry of Deeds within 90 days of the final approval.
- 3. Three (3) paper copies of the final recorded plan and any and all related state/federal permits or legal documents that may be required, must be submitted to the Town Planning Department. Date of Planning Board approval shall be included on the final plan in the Signature Block.
- 4. This approval by the Town Planning Board constitutes an agreement between the Town and the Developer, incorporating the Plan and supporting documentation, the Findings of Fact, and any Conditions of Approval.

The Planning Board authorizes the Planning Board Chair, or Vice Chair, to sign the Final Plan and the Findings of Fact upon confirmation of compliance with any conditions of approval.

Vote of _ in favor _ against _ abstaining

APPROVED BY THE KITTERY PLANNING BOARD ON 5/9/24

Dutch Dunkelberger, Planning Board Chair

Per Title 16.2.12.B(1) - An aggrieved party with legal standing may appeal a final decision of the Planning Board to the York County Superior Court in accordance with Maine Rules of Civil Procedures Section 80B, within forty-five (45) days from the date the decision by the Planning Board was rendered.



April 29, 2024 Project #22-145

Jason Garnham, Director of Planning & Development Town of Kittery 200 Rogers Road Kittery, ME 03904

SUBJECT: WASHBURN FARM SUBDIVISION

SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Dear Jason:

On behalf of Green & Company, attached is a Subdivision Amendment application for Washburn Farm Subdivision, a previously approved 9-lot single-family conservation subdivision located at 77 Bartlett Road in Kittery. The project received final approval from the planning board on January 25, 2024. The subdivision amendment application form has been submitted electronically. The applicant is Green & Company, the prospective buyer of the Subdivision, the owner of the property is Beachwood Development Fund LP.

The project site is approximately 19.30 acres in size and is identified as Lot 26 on Kittery Tax Map 62. The site is located in the Residential-Rural District with a small area in the Resource Protection Overlay Zone.

APPROVED PROJECT

The approved project was a proposal to develop a nine-lot conservation subdivision, including an 808 linear-foot road, stormwater management infrastructure, underground utilities, and pedestrian accommodations.

The road and lots are located through the central portion of the site, preserving the wetlands and adjacent upland areas in the northern, western, and eastern areas of the site. Lots were designed to avoid impacts to freshwater wetlands, the existing cemetery, and stone walls throughout the site.

The approved road is approximately 808 linear feet in length, ending in a cul-de-sac. Nine proposed lots will all be accessed from the new road. The existing single family residence on Lot 8 was proposed to remain, the existing driveway connecting to Bartlett Road will be removed, and a new driveway will connect to Washburn Farm Lane.

Lots will be served by individual subsurface wastewater disposal fields and wells. The existing house on lot 8 is expected to continue to use the existing septic system and well. Electric and telecommunications services will be installed underground.

UPDATES TO SUBDIVISION PLAN

The existing single-family home on Lot 8 was previously proposed to remain, with a new driveway connecting to Washburn Farm Lane. The applicant is now proposing to remove the existing home, and replace it with a new structure that is oriented better within the subdivision, and conforms to the same style and energy efficient construction as the other lots.

CLOSURE

We request to be added to the Planning Board's May 9th meeting agenda to present this information to the Board. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at 207-210-4294 or griffin@terradynconsultants.com.

Sincerely,

TERRADYN CONSULTANTS, LLC

Griffin Wood, P.E. Project Engineer

cc. Michael & Jenna Green, Green & Company



