



**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](http://www.ci.durham.nh.us)

***Town Planner's Recommendation***  
**Wednesday, November 6, 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. Tax Map 2, Lots 12-3 & 12-4. Central Business Zoning District.

- I recommend discussion of the items below, closing the design review, and continuing to November 13 for the formal review and formal public hearing. I have marked items below with an \* that the board should look at, in particular.

**Process**

The application should be ready to accept as complete at the November 13 meeting.

The applicant's goal is to break ground June 2014

The lots will need to be combined.

For the conditional use, the applicant should get onto the next Conservation Commission agenda. The applicant addressed the conditional use criteria in the application.

\* 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.

**Architecture**

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.

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).

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.

Soon, we will also need the less visible southerly elevation of the southerly building, and northerly elevation of the northerly building(s).

Perhaps the lower slope on the gambrel roofs should be a little steeper.

All double windows should have a strong mullion in between.

Materials and colors will be specified later.

\* What additional type of presentation would be useful to give the board a sense of the site? Several citizens have asked for a three-dimensional model?

### **Other Design Issues**

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.

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.

The pavers could be concrete or brick. Either could be strong enough provided they have the right compressive strength.

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?

The overall width of the “boulevard” or “court” seems a little tight. Can the southerly building be moved to the south a few feet?

Clarify height of the reveal on vertical granite next to the sidewalks (6’?).

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?

A focal point in the interior courtyard is needed. A fountain, sculpture, tree, benches, etc.

### **Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues**

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.

The sidewalk on the southerly side of the court is 8 feet wide; on the northerly side it is 5 feet wide. Can the latter be widened?

For the northerly sidewalk along the court, an alternative to a raised sidewalk would be a flush sidewalk with a different texture of the paving and vertical metal posts separating the sidewalk from the road.

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.

A sidewalk should 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.

The pedestrian passageways will need to be well lit for security and attracting pedestrians.

Covered bike storage should be moved 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.

A path from the plaza should probably extend to the south along the brook to connect with the Bragdon-Dugas property.

\* What is the right number of bike storage spaces to have? One resident suggested 1 for 25% of the occupants.

\* 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).

\* 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.

### **Landscaping**

The landscaping plan looks very good. I think the strip along the northerly side of the court should be eliminated in place of a sidewalk (as mentioned above). Later, the species will need to be specified.

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.

Keep the healthy existing trees along Madbury Road if possible.

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.

### **Environmental Issues**

The TRG discussed pursuing LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design), whether for certification or just for benchmarking.

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.

The applicant will discuss the Energy checklist with a representative of the Energy Committee.

The applicant mentioned looking into using geothermal.

\* We would like to see a detailed plan for the rehabilitation of Pettee Brook (removal of invasive vegetation, replanting, erosion control, removal of debris).

### **Parking**

Leases for apartments should probably be very clear that no on-site parking is included.

Golden Goose might want to offer parking off site for some students. They own some other properties nearby.

The plan calls for relocating the parking sign on Madbury Road. Where would this be moved to?

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.

\* 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.

\* The Planning Board discussed parking in the downtown, in general, in its recent workshop last night. 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.

### **Street and Traffic**

Loading – what is the purpose of the loading zone in the parking garage? It is only 10 feet wide.

What kind of traffic study is needed.

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.

Robin Mower suggested asking the community for ideas for naming the court/boulevard. Any ideas?

\* The idea of having the Town maintain some aspect of the court has been discussed. Who could more effectively manage and maintain the court?

### **Housing**

Is there a possibility for any workforce housing? senior housing? non-student housing?

There will be laundry in units

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).

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.

We would like to see units should be designed so that they can be repurposed in the future for users other than college students.

### **Construction**

How will this project be phased? The applicant suggested they would build it all together, expecting a 13-month construction period.

The applicant will need to pay for a full time inspector working for the Town to oversee the construction.

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)

### **Square Footage and Commercial Uses**

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.

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**

Public Works may need model of water service.

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.

Snow removal will be a challenge. It will need to be removed from site over a certain level.

Water service is on the opposite side of Madbury Road. There is probably an existing 4" stub but that would probably not be sufficient.

Sewer is on the opposite side of the brook.

The site has natural gas in Madbury Road.

The transformer at the rear near the plaza should be moved away from the plaza or well screened or perhaps given some special treatment.

How does the drainage plan coordinate with the drainage improvements for Kappa Delta?

The Town Engineer will review the drainage plan, utilities, and other pertinent matters.

## **Public Safety**

There will be full time security with video surveillance. Somebody will be there 24-7.

We will need to review the management plan.

There is 10-11 feet of clearance above parking

The building will be sprinkled.

There will be key card entry.

Exterior doors will be connected to alarm.

We will need apartment numbers later. They must be prominently displayed so that emergency services can quickly locate units.

Video monitoring in stairwells, hallways, and exterior walkways is encouraged.

See Chief Kurz's memo of October 18 regarding hardware for windows and doors.

\* We will need a management plan for addressing student behavior, etc. The applicant can review those submitted for Peak and The Cottages, if desired.

## **Other Issues**

How many beds will there be exactly?

I am pleased that the applicant told me that they would have only a handful of basement units

Two new bridges are shown across Pettee Brook. The northerly bridge would be for pedestrians only. It is shown as 5 feet wide. The southerly bridge should be for pedestrians and police cars only. It is shown as 20 feet wide.

Signage to be addressed later.

We will need a lighting soon. Decorative lamps along the court would be appropriate, perhaps similar to others in the downtown.

\* Does the Planning Board think a fiscal impact study should be prepared?