



TOWN OF DURHAM
15 NEWMARKET RD
DURHAM, NH 03824-2898
603/868-8064 603/868-8065
FAX 603/868-8033
www.ci.durham.nh.us

Town Planner's Recommendation
Wednesday, December 4, 2013

- IX. ***Public Hearing - 17 & 21 Madbury Road.*** Design Review for site plan and conditional use application for "Madbury Commons," a complete redevelopment of a multifamily site known as "The Greens" for **mixed use project** with multifamily housing for 460 +/- residents, office/retail, a new street, public spaces, and parking. **Golden Goose Properties** c/o Barrett Bilotta, Ken Rubin, and Eamon Healey, applicant; Rose Lawn Properties c/o Laura Gangwer (owner of 17 Madbury); GP Madbury 17 c/o Barrett Bilotta (owner of 21 Madbury), owners; Michael Sievert, MJS Engineering, engineer; Shannon Alther, TMS Architects, architect; Robbi Woodburn, Landscape Architect. Tax Map 2, Lots 12-3 & 12-4. Central Business Zoning District.
- I recommend discussion, keeping the public hearing open, and continuing to December 11. *The applicant has requested that the board hold an extra meeting to discuss Madbury Commons.* I think this is an appropriate request given the size of this project. If the board is inclined to hold an extra meeting, two possibilities are December 18 (though I know at least two Planning Board members would not be able to make Dec 18) and January 15. ***I have compiled below a list of all of the issues that I can think of with * for items that the board should look at.*** Items that are more for the applicant to address I marked with a GG (Golden Goose).

A construction management plan and updated landscaping plan are enclosed.

Process

- 1) *The applicant will need approval from the board for the extra building height (to 50 feet), the parking exemption, and waiver of school impact fees.
- 2) *Does the Planning Board see any other outstanding issues/items that should be submitted?
- 3) *Should this be considered a development of regional impact? I do not think so but the board should make this determination.
- 4) GG - For the conditional use, the applicant has met with the Conservation Commission several times and had site walks. The applicant addressed the conditional use criteria in the application. We received comments from the Commission.
- 5) GG - Does the applicant seek any flexibility in a prospective approval to allow for different contingencies?
- 6) This was accepted as complete on November 6, 2013.

- 7) While certainly ambitious, if everything can be satisfactorily addressed, I am suggesting shooting for final action on January 22.
- 8) The applicant has requested that the Planning Board hold an extra meeting dedicated to review of this project. This request may be considered on December 4. Possible Wednesdays would include December 18 and January 15.
- 9) The applicant's goal is to break ground June 2014.
- 10) The lots will need to be combined.
- 11) I will check to see if any waivers would be needed from the Site Plan Regulations
- 12) I will confirm that the application conforms with all zoning requirements (parking, landscaping, etc.)
- 13) There are numerous standard conditions that will be incorporated into a prospective approval. These will be included when a prospective set of conditions is presented to the Planning Board.

Documents and Plans

The landscaping plan and other drawings are inconsistent in some areas.

Architecture

- 1) GG - The applicant has submitted new perspective aerial drawings. Some have requested perspectives from each of the four directions and a very simple three-dimensional model. If a model is provided it should include a few neighboring buildings for context.
- 2) GG – Arrangements should be made for Shannon Alther and me to spend some time discussing the architecture.
- 3) Note that all of the elevations are shown but they are still in a somewhat schematic form (on page P4.0). As the architecture is firmed up it will be presented in a harder format (like that on page P1.7).
- 4) We would like to receive a separate electronic link to the architecture so that can be posted separately on the Town's website for those specifically interested in the architecture.
- 5) General comments. I think that the architectural design is generally very good. Some more detail, embellishment, and breaking up of masses is needed. I will work closely with Shannon Alther, the architect, to refine the architecture. The overall architectural theme has integrity and fits the site well, so it is pretty easy to work off this and make adjustments. The elevation along Madbury Road is quite good. The buildings are broken into smaller masses and well articulated with a variety of rich, harmonious treatments (gambrel roofs, gable roofs, shed dormers, semicircular windows, oval window, window canopy, curvilinear cap over pedestrian entrance, cupolas, roof balustrades, brackets, sign panels, lanterns, etc.). We want to be sure the larger building on the right will not be too prominent from Madbury Road. It will be partly obscured by the existing Kappa Delta Sorority building. More embellishment and methods to break up the massing is needed on the elevation along the boulevard looking north (Note the finials/weather vanes and oriel windows). Better

treatment is needed for the gaping maw on the left under the building where the 4 parking spaces are. A little more is needed to break up the elevation along the boulevard looking south. Perhaps 4 blocks of buildings would work better than 3. For the elevation along Pettee Brook lane methods should be employed to add interest to the flat roof building and break up the rear buildings more. How visible will the large building be from Pettee Brook Lane? Plants might be needed to soften the view toward the parking floor. Perhaps the lower slope on the gambrel roofs should be a little steeper. All double windows should have a strong mullion in between. One board member questioned use of the large swan's neck pediment on the back building.

- 6) Soon, we will also need the less visible southerly elevation of the southerly building, and northerly elevation of the northerly building(s).
- 7) Materials and colors will be specified later.

Other Design Issues

- 1) GG - We should start to look at some sample pavers in both concrete and brick. Would they be set in dirt or mortar of some type? Would the pavers be permeable at all?
- 2) GG - The overall width of the "boulevard" or "court" seems a little tight. Can the southerly building be moved to the south a few feet? Mike Sievert and Shannon Alther will look at this, possibly 3 feet or so.
- 3) GG - Because of the high sensitivity of the site, samples (or photos) of certain elements should be submitted, such as the collapsible bollard. What color would the bollards be?
- 4) GG – we should see some cross section views and simulated views of the various pedestrian ways and the boulevard. Can TMS Architects provide this?
- 5) All of the asphalt would be permeable. We should consider making the travel way pavers and keeping the parking spaces asphalt (so that they can be striped). Using pavers would slow down traffic; communicate to all that this is somewhat of a shared and special space, not a typical street; and be more attractive.
- 6) The plan shows two types of pavers. The ones closer to the brook would be permeable and those further away would not be. Presumably, these would be two different designs/colors/maybe materials. We will continue to explore what types of pavers would be most functional and attractive.
- 7) The pavers could be concrete or brick. Either could be strong enough provided they have the right compressive strength. Mike Sievert suggested 8,000 psi pavers.
- 8) Show the height of the reveal on vertical granite next to the sidewalks as 6".
- 9) A focal point in the interior courtyard is needed. A sculpture, tree, benches, etc. A fountain is not practical.
- 10) The herringbone patten on the plans is impervious; the brick hatch pattern is porous.
- 11) Can/should any transit facility be included?

Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues

- 1) * Is any analysis needed on pedestrian/bicycle issues?
- 2) * What is the right number of bike storage spaces to have? One resident suggested 1 for 25% of the occupants.
- 3) * Steve Pesci aptly points out that there is not a good pedestrian connection beyond the bridge into/through the Town's Pettee Brook Parking Lot. How can this be addressed?
- 4) * See email from Steve Pesci, UNH Transportation Planner.
- 5) GG - For the 4 parking spaces on the northerly side of the court, the sidewalk with pavers should extend straight across to separate the parking spaces from the roadway (rather than running behind the parking spaces, next to the building, under the overhang). Thus, the parking spaces would probably need to be pushed closer to the building. Or better, these parking spaces should be eliminated.
- 6) GG - There should be a sidewalk on both sides of the court extending the whole way from Madbury Road to the plaza. The landscaping strip on the northerly side should be eliminated in place of a sidewalk.
- 7) The passageway from Madbury Road – the first section is 9 feet wide, about 60 feet long and covered by building (What is the ceiling height here?). The second section is 12 feet wide and open to the sky.
- 8) A sidewalk should not be added around the back of the building, linking the parking garage to the plaza. This is allowed by conditional use in the Shoreland and Wetland Zones. I discussed this with the applicant and agree it would not be useful and might invite inappropriate use of the area.
- 9) The pedestrian passageways will need to be well lit for security and attracting pedestrians.
- 10) The bike lane should be removed from the drawings. It is only in one direction and bicyclists should walk their bikes here in this shared area. I don't think that a separate bike lane in the court is needed. One is shown only on the northerly side anyway. Bicyclists will probably walk their bikes here. This area is probably appropriate for a sharrow (like those shown on the updated College Road at UNH near Main Street).
- 11) Covered bike storage should be moved from the center courtyard and another location found. This is an important part of the interior courtyard to give its shape some character. There should also be a few bicycle racks, on Madbury Road and in the plaza.
- 12) The applicant suggested preparing various locations for bicycle storage but not building all of it up front. It could be created in later years if determines useful. A condition could spell this out.
- 13) A path from the plaza should probably extend to the south along the brook to connect with the Bragdon-Dugas property.

Landscaping

- 1) GG - The landscaping plan looks good. I think the strip along the northerly side of the court should be eliminated in place of a sidewalk (as mentioned above).
- 2) GG - The trees within the site and along the court should probably be smaller ornamental trees while those on Madbury Road should be larger shade trees.
- 3) The planters along Madbury Road are for shrubbery/flowers. The trees will be planted in the ground.
- 4) Keep the healthy existing trees along Madbury Road if possible. Clarify which ones will be retained, how much space around them will remain, and what strategies will be employed to protect the trees.
- 5) Move the hydrant in the landscaping peninsula along the court back a little so that a tree can be placed at the tip of the peninsula.
- 6) John Parry's notes about tree planting and protection should be incorporated as appropriate.
- 7) Screen the transformers and other utility elements with landscaping and/or fencing.

Environmental Issues

- 1) GG - The TRG discussed pursuing LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design), whether for certification or just for benchmarking.
- 2) GG - The applicant discussed possibly adding solar panels onto the flat roofs. These are shown on the building elevations. This could be for water heating and/or electric.
- 3) GG - The applicant is meeting with the Energy Committee on November 19 to discuss the Energy checklist.
- 4) GG - We need to see a detailed plan for the rehabilitation of Pettee Brook (removal of invasive vegetation, replanting, erosion control, removal of debris). The applicant discussed removing the invasive plants, raising the tree canopy, and stabilizing the shore. The applicant was going to meet with the Conservation Commission on this (November 14?). Robbi Woodburn is preparing a plan. The updated landscaping plan shows the area alongside the brook as being lawn. Is this appropriate?
- 5) Richard Kelley suggested that if there are significant changes to the site plan as a result of the NHDES Alteration of Terrain permit (precedent condition) then the plans should come back to the Planning Board for review. This makes sense.
- 6) The applicant will not be using geothermal.
- 7) Is a fence needed along the brook?
- 8) How will invasive species on the property and in/by the brook be removed?

Parking

- 1) * The \$750 parking fee would be due for any reduction in the number of spaces below what is required. The applicant spoke to me about asking for a reduction/waiver of the fee. It is not clear whether this could be done or what the process would be.
- 2) * The applicant would like to convert parallel parking in front of the site on Madbury Road to diagonal parking. We will want to look at Madbury Road soon in terms of parking, bicycle use, and pedestrian use.
- 3) * Will any improvements to the Town's Pettee Brook parking lot be needed?
- 4) * The Planning Board discussed parking in the downtown, in general, in its recent workshop. It was the consensus of the board that we should have a parking analysis/study as part of significant projects downtown to ensure that the amount and arrangement of parking is appropriate. The study would include a review of the various proposed uses; residents, employees, and customers; pedestrian, bicycle, and transit service to mitigate parking need: parking available on site, on neighboring streets, on other private lots, and on municipal lots.
- 5) GG - Golden Goose might want to offer parking off site for some students. They own some other properties nearby.
- 6) GG - Provide parking for mopeds as suggested by Steve Pesci.
- 7) Leases for apartments should probably be very clear that no on-site parking is included.
- 8) There are about 100 parking spaces now; 42 are proposed.
- 9) The plan calls for relocating the parking sign on Madbury Road. Where would this be moved to?
- 10) Chief Kurz notes in his memo of October 18 that there is no overnight parking for apartment renters on adjacent streets nor Town property. There is an opportunity to purchase annual business permits for the businesses who could park at several satellite locations.
- 11) The applicant estimates that less than 20% of the students will have cars.

Street and Traffic

- 1) * What improvements to the sidewalk on Madbury Road are needed? This should be discussed as part of the project. If significant foot traffic will be occasioned by the project then some upgrades may be appropriate as part of the project.
- 2) * The idea of having the Town maintain some aspect of the court has been discussed. Who could more effectively manage and maintain the court?
- 3) Robin Mower suggested asking the community for ideas for naming the court/boulevard. Any ideas?
- 4) The Planning Board determined that a conventional traffic study is not needed.

Housing

- 1) GG - We should get floor plans of each floor as soon as they are available.
- 2) GG - The applicant said there would be 4 or 5 basement units. Where would these be? How many beds would there be?
- 3) Is there a possibility for any workforce housing? senior housing? non-student housing? The applicant thinks that workforce housing and elderly housing are not practical, stating that the mix with student housing would be problematic and these residents would probably have cars aggravating the parking situation.
- 4) There will be laundry in units
- 5) According to the applicant, 15% of the units/beds will be earmarked for graduate students (This cannot be a requirement but the applicant said they expect to do this). Is this really intended? How would this be pursued?
- 6) The applicant said all units will have 4 or fewer beds. 4 bedroom units would be about 1,200 square feet with 4 beds, 2 baths, and inside washer/dryer.
- 7) We would like to see units should be designed so that they can be repurposed in the future for users other than college students. How can this be addressed?
- 8) The Town should probably review draft leases (recognizing that they are subject to change).
- 9) The applicant said there would be ~90% 4 bedroom, 2 bath units, with about 1,100 square feet serving 4 students. There will be a small number of 3 bedroom and 2 bedroom units and possibly some studios. They don't expect to have any 1 bedroom units.

Construction

- 1) GG - The applicant will need to pay for an inspector working for the Town to oversee the construction. Meet with Tom Johnson and Dave Cedarholm to address.
- 2) A construction management plan was just submitted. It is in the packets.
- 3) How will this project be phased? The applicant suggested they would build it all together, expecting a 13-month construction period.
- 4) Chief Kurz notes that any closure or blockage of traffic lanes must be approved by the Police Department in advance. The department will also determine whether any traffic control is needed (see memo of October 18)
- 5) The applicant suggested they will need about 14 months for construction. This seems a little tight. They will want the maximum number of hours to build. What limitations, if any, should be placed on hours of construction?

Square Footage and Commercial Uses

- 1) *** A goal now is to bring the UNH Interoperability Laboratory to the project. I think this is a major priority. How are those discussions going? The IOL stated that they need 60 parking spaces. Is this excessive? How can the necessary number of spaces be provided?
- 2) The IOL needs 25,000 contiguous square feet for the laboratory and 10-15,000 contiguous square feet for the offices.
- 3) A variance was granted for nonresidential uses but it stipulated that at least one half of the first floor (not counting parking) must be nonresidential. Less than one half is now shown now on the plans.
- 4) Here is the square footage provided by the applicant:

Total square footage

171,000 w/out parking

180,000 w/ parking

First Floor

43,000 total first floor square footage

23,300 non residential sf space w/out parking

30,100 non residential sf space w/parking

Utilities

- 1) GG - Public Works may need model of water service.
- 2) The Town Engineer will review the drainage plan, utilities, and other pertinent matters. Does he need any additional materials?
- 3) Richard Kelley asked me about access to the drainage basin for maintenance. This needs to be clarified.
- 4) A trash room is shown. We need more details on the layout and function of this room. Trash collection will be challenging. The applicant should work with the DPW on recycling. Trash needs to be out of sight, smell must be dealt with, access for trucks must be provided. A lot of trash will be generated. Frequent pick up is recommended.
- 5) Snow removal will be a challenge. It will need to be removed from site over a certain level.
- 6) Water service is on the opposite side of Madbury Road. There is probably an existing 4" stub but that would probably not be sufficient.
- 7) Sewer is on the opposite side of the brook.
- 8) The site has natural gas in Madbury Road.
- 9) There will be 2 bathrooms in each unit (around 225 total) and a washer dryer in each unit.

- 10) The transformer at the rear near the plaza should be moved away from the plaza or well screened or perhaps given some special treatment.
- 11) How does the drainage plan coordinate with the drainage improvements for Kappa Delta?
- 12) Approval from Kappa Delta for stormwater?

Public Safety

- 1) * We will need to review the security and property management plan.
- 2) Will need final okay from Fire Department on plans.
- 3) Will need final okay from Police Department on plans.
- 4) Will need final okay from Building Official on plans.
- 5) There is 10-11 feet of clearance above parking
- 6) There will be full time security with video surveillance. Somebody will be there 24-7. Clarify this.
- 7) The building will be sprinkled. All buildings?
- 8) There will be key card entry.
- 9) Exterior doors will be connected to alarm.
- 10) We will need apartment numbers later. They must be prominently displayed so that emergency services can quickly locate units.
- 11) Video monitoring in stairwells, hallways, and exterior walkways is encouraged.
- 12) See Chief Kurz's memo of October 18 regarding hardware for windows and doors.

Other Issues

- 1) GG - How many beds will there be exactly? The applicant states 460 +/- . This will be firmed up soon.
- 2) GG - A master signage plan is needed.
- 3) GG – a lighting plan including footcandles and fixtures is needed. Decorative lamps along the court would be appropriate, perhaps similar to others in the downtown.
- 4) GG – the Planning Board determined that a fiscal impact study is needed.
- 5) GG – Is the design yet in compliance with the ZBA conditions on the variances?
- 6) Two new bridges are shown across Pettee Brook. The northerly bridge would be 5 feet wide. The southerly bridge is shown as 20 feet wide. These would be for pedestrians only.

- 7) Are there impacts upon Kappa Delta? Will any construction or other easements be needed?
- 8) A name will be needed for the boulevard. Is this a court, boulevard, way, etc.?
- 9) Are all ADA marking shown on the plans?