

Site Walk of April 3, 2013

Preliminary Conceptual Review for a Site Plan and Conditional Use Application. 17 & 21 Madbury Road. Complete redevelopment of multifamily site known as “The Greens” for mixed use project with multifamily housing for 460 +/- residents, office/retail, and parking for 57 to 100 cars, to be called “Madbury Commons.” Golden Goose Properties c/o Barrett Bilotta and Ken Rubin (applicant); Rose Lawn Properties c/o Laura Gangwer (owner of 17 Madbury); GP Madbury 17 c/o Barrett Bilotta (owner of 21 Madbury); Michael Sievert PE, MJS Engineering (engineer); Shannon Alther, TMS Architects (Architect). Tax Map 2, Lots 12-3 & 12-4. Central Business Zoning District.

Present -

Representative Applicant: Ken Rubin, Barrett Bilotta, Michael Sievert, Shannon Alther, Robbi Woodburn, Sam Gangwer

Planning Board Members: Peter Wolfe, Richard Kelley, Lorne Parnell, Andrew Corrow, David Williams, Richard Ozenich, Councilor Jim Lawson and Councilor Julian Smith

Town Planner: Michael Behrendt

Members of the Public: Councilor Robin Mower, Councilor Diana Carroll, Councilor Jay Gooze, Councilor Carden Welsh, Councilor Kitty Marple, Dudley Dudley, Beth Olshansky, Deputy Chief John Powers (DFD), Nancy Sandberg, Tom Richardson, Pete Marple, Esther Tardy-Wolfe, Heidi Ely, Ann Welsh

Site walk began at approximately 5:00 PM

1. Mr. Rubin provided the group with an introduction to the site and an introduction to a new early stage rendering of a 3-story, downscaled concept with 20% fewer units from the original “pentagon” rendering.
2. Shannon Alther, architect, provided an explanation of the new site using the new renderings.
3. Councilor Mower asked what the square footage of encroachment into the wetland buffer was going to be. Mr. Alther did not have the numbers readily available but it had been calculated.
4. There was a question on parking. There was further discussion on where parking would be on the 2.6 acres.
5. There was a question about how many beds there would be with the new rendering. Mr. Rubin indicated that there would be 350-400 beds.
6. There was a question about the proposed building’s setback from the street. Mr. Alther explained that the structure would be set back 15 feet from the sidewalk. With the width of the sidewalk it would be a total of 22 feet from the road.

7. There was a question about the setback from the lots southern property line. Mr. Alther indicated that it would be 20 feet.
8. Mr. Kelley asked how much grade work and how much material would be taken off or brought onto the site. Mr. Alther indicated that since this plan is in the preliminary phase the engineering work has not been done yet.
9. There was discussion about the grade on the site. Mr. Rubin mentioned that there was a 7.5 foot to 13.5 foot drop from the front of the lot to the rear of the lot. There was further discussion of the structure's massing while taking advantage of the grade.
10. The group moved to the back of the lot. The proposed building was staked at where the corners would be. There was orange paint on the ground indicating where the wetland setback was.
11. Mr. Rubin pointed out that the Kostis building, currently under construction, is 50 feet tall. He stated that the "pentagon" height would be 48 feet but at a lower grade. As a result he said that it would appear to be approximately 9 feet shorter than the Kostis building.
12. There was a question about the second egress for emergency vehicles. Mr. Alther stated that there is an easement and that the applicants are working collaboratively with the abutters for a solution.
13. Mr. Rubin stated that the "pentagon" structure would only take up 35% of the lot size. He stated that the lot can actually support a much larger building because of the lots 2.6 acre size.
14. Resident Dudley Dudley asked that with all that land, why does the structure need to be within the wetland buffer?
15. Mr. Wolfe asked with the "pentagon", will there be more or less encroachment into the wetland buffer than there is now? The response from the applicant was that there would be less encroachment.
16. There was discussion about the difference between the two plans; the "pentagon" and the cottage/townhouse concept. The applicant stated that with the "pentagon" there would be (proposed) 20,000 feet of commercial space. With the townhouse concept there would be 32,000.
17. Mr. Behrendt stated that with the "pentagon" the massing was an issue. He asked, how about follow the same basic plan but break up the building into separate buildings with spacing in between.

Site Walk of April 3, 2013

Page 3

Site walk ended at approximately 6:00 PM

Respectfully submitted by,

Andrew Corrow