



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

Town Planner's Project Review
Wednesday, September 13, 2017

- VIII. **Public Hearing - Riverwoods Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC) – Stone Quarry Drive**. Site plan, lot line adjustment, and conditional use application for CCRC to be located on a vacant 11.3-acre site in the northeast quadrant of the junction of Route 108 and Route 4 (one lot in from Route 108). The project will contain independent 150 living apartments, 24 assisted-living apartments, 24 memory-care units, and 24 skilled-nursing units. Applicant - The RiverWoods Group, c/o Justine Vogel, CEO. Property owner - Rockingham Properties, c/o Dave Garvey, partner. Engineer – Jeff Clifford, Altus Engineering. Landscape architect – Robbi Woodburn. Attorney – Sharon Cuddy Somers, DT&C. Map 11, Lot 8-1 through 8-15. Office Research District. Recommended action: Discussion, public hearing, and continuation to September 27 meeting.
- ***I recommend the board discuss the project – going through the list of items below one at a time***, hold the public hearing, and continue the review and public hearing to September 27.

Please note the following:

*** *I have marked items below which I believe that Planning Board needs to address with this symbol: **.

I have marked items below where the applicant needs to submit additional information or documentation with this symbol: #.

&&& *I have marked items that I believe should be changed/included on revised plans with this symbol: &*.

Process

- 1) Additional information and revised plans. I note below numerous items that need to be submitted. The applicant should clarify when the outstanding items and revised plans will be submitted. This timing will affect the timeframe for staff and Planning Board review and final action.
- 2) * Schedule from here. The applicant has stated that they hope for the Planning Board to take final action on their project in October. The Planning Board's workshop is scheduled for October 25. Thus, if the Planning Board were to be able to take final action in October

this would be on October 11 which allows for only three meetings: September 13, September 27, and October 11. I think there are far too many items to complete the review in three meetings. The timing for the board will also depend substantially on when the applicant submits outstanding items. One option for the board would be to change the date of the workshop to the November 8 meeting and hold a regular meeting on October 25. The applicant hopes to start construction in 2018, and to move in late 2019/early 2020.

- 3) Presentation. The Planning Board okayed the applicant's focusing on appearance and architectural design at the public hearing on August 23. For the September 13 meeting the applicant will focus on site engineering and traffic. Of course, other matters can be discussed as well. Traffic engineer Steve Pernaw will present his traffic study.
- 4) * Site walk. The board held a site walk for the preliminary design. Would another site walk be helpful?
- 5) # Conditional Use. A conditional use will be needed for the driveway, parking areas, and any other structures within the Wetland Conservation Overlay District and to exceed the minimum requirement for parking by more than 10%. The applicant will submit the application soon and expects to meet with the Conservation Commission at their September 14 meeting.
- 6) # Boundary line adjustment. The applicant said they would submit the two lot line adjustments soon - one with Lot 12 (the DPW parcel to the east) and one with Lot 8-0 (the Land Options, LLC parcel to the west). The applicant is discussing the land swap with the Town Council.
- 7) # Color site plan. Per Section 2.2 5. Of the Site Plan Regulations, the applicant should submit a color site plan. We need 15 11x17 copies. This should be provided soon.

Appearance

- 8) # Retaining wall. There will be a significant retaining wall on the Route 4 side of the building. I think we need to see a profile/elevation view of the wall above grade. According to the applicant, the highest point of the retaining wall above grade on the Route 4 side will be about 16 A sample or photograph of the material for the segmented block wall and the stone retaining wall should be submitted. See detail on Sheet L-7. It should be clarified where the stone retaining wall will be used. It may be worth reusing the existing stone on site instead of using the Pennsylvania fieldstone.
- 9) # Building height. The maximum building height in the OR zone is 50 feet or 75 feet at the reasonable discretion of the Planning Board. Building height is defined in the zoning ordinance as: *The vertical distance from the mean grade elevation (average grade around the perimeter of the building) to the mean roof elevation [one-half (1/2) of the vertical distance from eave to ridge]*. According to the applicant the building will be about 57 feet high. There will be different grades around the building, different floor elevations, and

various stories around the building so it would be useful for the applicant to submit a separate drawing showing these elements very clearly.

- 10) # Video. The applicant needs to send a copy of the video that was presented so that we can post this on the website for interested citizens to review. There were various views toward the building from the perspective of a driver but those direct views were intermittent. Many views were not toward the building. Should a revised video be submitted with all views toward the building?
- 11) * # Views. In addition to the video several people have noted that it would be helpful to have various static views toward the building.

Architecture

- 12) Architectural Committee. The board designated a committee of six people to meet with the applicant. We had a productive meeting with Justine Vogel, Sharon Somers, and architects Russ McLaughlin and Jim Klett on Thursday, September 7. The committee offered numerous suggestions. It is now up to the applicant to determine which ones they will incorporate. The applicant will submit revised plans soon. I will send minutes of the meeting to the Planning Board on Monday or Tuesday.
- 13) * # Model of building. I strongly recommend that the applicant prepare a physical three-dimensional model of the building showing how it will sit on the site. While the applicant presented a video of the prospective building, there is no substitute for a physical model to fully convey the character, scale, and siting of the building. It need not be rendered in high detail but only in sufficient detail to convey the sense of the building.
- 14) # Elevation drawings. We will need updated architectural drawings when they are ready. The drawings submitted only cover portions of the building. There should be revised drawings of every building façade and there are numerous given the wings and courtyards. Also, there should be four general elevations from the compass directions showing the overall building (less detail is needed for these drawings).

Landscaping

- 15) & Irrigation. Later on it should be clarified if irrigation will be included or if hose connections will be used.
- 16) Invasive species. The applicant may wish to inspect the site beyond the limits of construction to see if there are invasive or noxious plant species that should be removed/treated.
- 17) & Route 4 Buffer. The applicant can increase the buffer to 12 feet along Route 4. This should be shown on revised plans. We will need to work out language to specify that

appropriate, substantial plantings be installed within the buffer in the future should NHDOT remove significant tree cover along Route 4.

Natural Resources

- 18) & Regrading of site. There will be extensive regrading of the site. The Planning Board should be aware of this and confirm that it is acceptable. Section 8.2.1 of the Site Plan Regulations states: “*Buildings, parking areas, travel ways, and other site elements shall be located and designed in such a manner as to preserve natural resources and maintain natural topography to the extent practicable. Extensive grading and filling shall be avoided.*” Section 8.2.3 states: “*Development shall follow the natural contours of the landscape to the extent practicable to minimize grading.*”
- 19) & Existing features. Are there any existing natural features – such as large boulders or specimen trees – that can be preserved, such as in the courtyards and open area in front of the site?
- 20) Wetland District. The applicant will submit the conditional use application soon for activity occurring in the wetland buffers. At that time, we will identify all of the accessory structures within the buffers.

Cultural Resources

- 21) Archaeological Resources. Janet Mackie, President of the Durham Historical Association, commented on the historical and archaeological significance of the site in an email to Andrea Bodo, Vice Chair of the Heritage Commission, that I forwarded to the Planning Board. Her comments included the adjacent lot 8-16 located to the north of the subject parcel. I will contact her to clarify whether there appear to be resources on the subject parcel. Section 4.2 of the Site Plan Regulations addresses archaeological resources.
- 22) & Stone walls. Extensive stone walls will be removed. Is it possible to rebuild some of these elsewhere on site, such as along the front of the site (See Sheet L-1)? See Section 4.2 of the Site Plan Regulations.

Traffic Issues

- 23) Traffic study. A traffic study by Steve Pernaw has been submitted. The study was based on potential impacts to the Stone Quarry Drive/Route 108 intersection. The study notes that the traffic count (AADT) near this section of Route 108 was 11,000 vehicles per day (total both directions) in 2015.
- 24) Peak traffic. The Pernaw traffic study notes that peak traffic periods on Route 108 near the intersection occur from 7:30 to 8:30 AM in the morning with 1,099 vehicles traveling in both directions and from 4:45 to 5:45 PM in the afternoon with 1,206 vehicles traveling in both directions. The study estimates that this project would

generate 50 trips in the morning peak hour and 88 trips in the afternoon peak hour at the intersection.

- 25) Study Conclusion. Mr. Pernaw concludes: *“The auxiliary turn lane warrants analyses indicate that the ideal lane configuration for the NH108/Stone Quarry Drive intersection includes an exclusive northbound right-turn lane on NH108 by 2030. This finding is a borderline situation where the guideline is exceeded by only 2 vehicles during the 2030 PM peak hour period. The 2030 auxiliary turn lane warrants analyses also indicates that a single lane on Stone Quarry Drive is sufficient for departures and the existing shared through-left lane on NH108 southbound is sufficient for the anticipated volumes.”* We look forward to hearing comments from NHDOT.

Parking and Circulation

- 26) # Parking count. The applicant will need to submit a conditional use since the number of parking spaces will be slightly greater than 10% above the minimum required. This is the process specified in the parking section of the zoning ordinance.
- 27) Driveway width. The applicant is on the agenda of the ZBA for this Tuesday for a variance for the width of the driveways. The zoning ordinance does not allow driveway widths to exceed 22 feet within the front setback area.
- 28) & Driveway grades. Are there any steep driveways on site?
- 29) # Garage layout. It would be useful to have a floor plan of the garage parking area.
- 30) & Parking spaces. A note should be added confirming that the parking spaces will be 9 feet x 18 feet. It is difficult to scale off from the site plan precisely.
- 31) & Accessible/handicap spaces. The Site Plan Regulations (and I believe ADA) specify 7 rather than 6 accessible parking spaces. I believe that a “No Parking” sign is needed in front of the diagonal lines (See detail on Sheet C-6.5).

Sidewalks and Pedestrian Paths

- 32) & Sidewalk width. The Site Plan Regulations call for sidewalks and paths to be at least 5 feet in width. This should be noted accordingly on the plans probably on the detail sheet C-6.5. A minimum of 4 feet for the trails as noted on Sheet L-7 may be adequate.
- 33) Easement. A trail easement will need to be executed (as a precedent condition) as noted on Sheet C-2.0.
- 34) Trail Parking. I infer that the applicant will construct the trail parking for Durham residents as shown on Sheet C-2.0.

- 35) & Sidewalk on Stone Quarry. I recommend that the sidewalk along Stone Quarry Drive should be concrete rather than asphalt.
- 36) & Sidewalk on easterly side. I recommend that the sidewalk along the easterly side of the site be all concrete rather than half asphalt. Also, is it possible to add a landscaped median between the sidewalk and the entrance driveway at the easterly side of the site?
- 37) & Bridge. Two pedestrian bridges will be built in the open space area on the easterly side of the site. A design should be submitted at the appropriate time. NHDES approval and a conditional use will be needed.
- 38) & Crosswalks. Several crosswalks should probably be added where the sidewalk crosses the main driveway, including where it connects with the footpath in the open space area.

Bicycles

- 39) & Outdoor storage. I see minimal locations on the plans for bike storage – 4 individual racks on the easterly side of the site near the supportive living wing and 2 individual racks on the right side of the main entrance. See Section 11.3.3 of the Site Plan Regulations (The number required under subsection g is probably more than needed). Additional locations and bike spaces are probably needed.
- 40) & Indoor storage. Information on indoor storage should be provided. It is required in the Site Plan Regulations. The applicant noted indoor storage on the energy checklist.
- 41) * Route 4. Are there any appropriate improvements which should be made within the Route 4 right of way to better accommodate those residents who will want to bike to the downtown?

Site Details

- 42) & Curbing. The plans should show where curbing will be installed and which type – vertical or sloped granite.
- 43) & Grading. The applicant will eliminate the retaining wall on the Route 108 side of the site. A revised grading plan is needed for this. As a precedent condition, also, the applicant will need to submit a copy of an easement allowing for grading and landscaping there.
- 44) & Traffic signs. Which types of traffic control signage will be needed on site and where?
- 45) & Street furniture. Are there places around the site to add street furniture such as benches and picnic tables?

- 46) & Limits of construction. The limited of construction – tree boundary and erosion control? - should be labeled.
- 47) & Paving at entrance. I recommend that special pavers, rather than concrete – or perhaps specially treated/tinted concrete - be used in front of the main entrance. See Sheet L-2.
- 48) & Retaining wall. The retaining wall should be labeled on the plans.
- 49) & Dashed lines. What are the dashed lines around the building on Sheet C-2.0?
- 50) & Fence. A design for the fence along Route 4 should be submitted later.
- 51) & Entrance median. Can the landscaped median at the entrance be extended a short ways?
- 52) & Sheet L-2. What surface is demarcated by the stippled markings next to the building? The small squares near the building (bases for columns?) should be labeled.

Police Issues

- 53) Police sign off. The Police Department has signed off on the project. The issues mentioned are either already addressed or are incorporated here.
- 54) Firing Range. The applicant has expressed concern about the Police Firing Range located on the Public Works site. It is uncertain when and if Strafford County will establish a range that the Town could use. Justine Vogel is speaking with Chief Kurz about the range.

Fire Issues

- 55) & Hydrants. Two fire hydrants are shown now, one on each side of the building. The TRG discussed possibly looping the water line and adding a third hydrant at the rear.
- 56) McGregor Ambulance. I will check with Bill Cote, Director of McGregor if there are any concerns.

Utilities

- 57) & Water service. The plans show the extension of water service. Existing lines are located around 1,100 feet to Stone Quarry Drive. Water lines enter the site near both driveways. The TRG discussed looping the water line around the site and including a third hydrant at the rear.
- 58) & Sewer service. Sewer is located around 2,050 feet from Stone Quarry Drive. It will run cross country across the Marketing Center lot. The Town prefers to own and maintain even the portion located on that other lot. The applicant would need to provide an easement to the Town. The plans show a 25 foot easement across the lot, whereas the

Site Plan Regulations call for a 30 foot easement. We can clarify with Public Works how much is needed.

- 59) Stormwater Management. The applicant submitted a detailed plan – posted on the website - which will be reviewed by April Talon. An alteration of terrain permit will be need from NHDES since over 100,000 square feet of area is being disturbed. According to the applicant, there will be no net increase of peak water flow at the property lines of post development vs. predevelopment conditions during the 2, 10, and 25 year storm events.

Operational Issues

- 60) & Trash. I don't see an area on the plans for a dumpster, unless this is the rectangle shown near the receiving area. It should be clarified how trash will be handled. Is one dumpster sufficient? We will need a detail of the dumpster, dumpster pad, and enclosure.
- 61) # Recycling. Given the size of this project a detailed recycling plan should be submitted. I recommend that the applicant meet with the Integrated Waste Management Advisory Committee to discuss the plan once it is developed.
- 62) & Snow storage. There is minimal area shown for snow storage on the site plan (Sheet C-20). We certainly want to avoid storing snow near landscaping. It seems that additional areas would be needed. See Section 9.3 of the Site Plan Regulations.
- 63) & Salt shed. Will sand and salt be stored on site?

Construction

- 64) * Construction management plan. The board may wish to ask for more details regarding construction. There will likely be blasting. The applicant plans to do a sonar study for a more detailed picture of the soils.
- 65) * Truck traffic. We will want to discuss routing for trucks during construction.
- 66) * Hours of construction. The board will want to determine if hours of construction should be limited. The plan states that standard hours are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm.

Other Issues

- 67) Energy Checklist. The applicant completed the energy checklist. The staff and Energy Committee chair will meet with the applicant soon.
- 68) # Senior housing. We will need to clarify whether the residents will be all 62 + or 55 years old, and if the latter whether it would be 80% or 100%.
- 69) # Lot combination. As a precedent condition the multiple lots will need to be combined into one lot. That can be done in conjunction with the lot line adjustments.

- 70) # Signage. At the appropriate time, the applicant should submit the proposed design for the Riverwoods sign. The sign is planned to be placed on the wall next to the main entrance.
- 71) & Solar panels. Is it possible to include solar panels on site?
- 72) & Transit. Is there an opportunity for a location on site for a transit stop? Could Wildcat Transit stop here?
- 73) *Other issues. What other outstanding concerns are there?