

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 27, 2017

- VIII. Public Hearing <u>Riverwoods Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC) –</u> <u>Stone Quarry Drive</u>. 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 150 independent-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. Office Research District
- ➢ I recommend that the board discuss the project and then continue the review and the public hearing to October 11.

Please note the following:

***The applicant will submit revised site plans and other supplementary information by this Monday, September 25. This is the date that I asked for them to submit the materials. I will send an email to the Planning Board by the end of the day on Monday updating the board on what is received. A number of the items below will likely be addressed with the revised plans and new materials.

I have updated my Planner's Review to include those items that are current, many of which should be addressed by the applicant with Monday's submittal.

Process

- 1) <u>Additional information and revised plans</u>. I note below numerous items that need to be submitted.
- 2) <u>Schedule from here</u>. The applicant has stated that they hope for the Planning Board to take final action on their project in October. We have two more meetings after tonight October 11 and October 25. If the applicant provides sufficient documentation shortly, I will prepare a draft set of conditions of approval at the October 11 meeting to help prepare for potential final action on October 25.

- 3) <u>Site walk</u>. The board held a site walk for the preliminary design. Some Planning Board members stated that an additional site walk would be useful now. The board left it open whether or not to schedule one.
- 4) <u>Conditional Use</u>. 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 Conservation Commission recommends approval of the conditional use for activity within the wetland bufferss. We will need a separate application for the excess parking.
- 5) <u>Boundary line adjustment</u>. We will need the application shortly for 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 Town Council approved the land swap at its meeting on September 11.
- 6) <u>Color site plan</u>. The applicant submitted the color site plan which I emailed to the board.

Appearance

- 7) <u>Retaining wall.</u> There will be a significant retaining wall on the Route 4 side of the building. Some kind of rendering should be submitted making it clear what the height above grade will be at various locations. According to the applicant, the highest point of the retaining wall above grade on the Route 4 side will be about 16 feet. 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.
- 8) <u>Building height</u>. 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. <u>See the new drawings submitted by the applicant addressing this</u>.
- 9) <u>Video</u>. 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.
- 10) <u>Views</u>. In addition to the video several people have noted that it would be helpful to have various static views toward the building. <u>See the new drawings submitted by the applicant addressing this</u>.

Town Planner's Project Review – Riverwoods CCRC

- 11) <u>Stone</u>. Once the stone to be used for the building foundation/lower level is selected the applicant should send a link to an image of the stone. Several members of the architectural committee offered comments about the three samples that were displayed at the Planning Board meeting on September 13.
- 12) <u>Model of building</u>. The Planning Board spoke with the applicant about possibly providing some kind of video image depicting the building in three dimensions.
- 13) <u>Elevation drawings</u>. See the revised drawings that were submitted on September 22. We will need detailed drawings of the entrance with the carriage porch and other outstanding elevations and details.

Landscaping

- 14) <u>Irrigation</u>. It should be clarified if irrigation will be included or if hose connections will be used.
- 15) <u>Route 4 Buffer</u>. 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

- 16) <u>Existing features</u>. 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?
- 17) <u>Several questions</u>. The Conservation Commission asked several questions in the course of its discussion about the project on September 14:

1. Information that describes sewer loading from the project and whether the current sewer treatment plant has capacity for the additional loading (Jeff Clifford provided information and April will confirm capacity).

2. A drawing with a cut line for existing trees on the property. It is the desire of the Conservation Commission to retain as many large healthy trees as possible especially the mature hardwoods on the east and South sides of the property.

3. Any information the applicant has on the volume of mature trees that will be removed. This would help to develop an assessment of total valuable biomass that will be removed in the project.

4. Construction management plan with details on how the project will ensure the impacts of civil work is confined to the property. A lot of dirt is moving and we don't want impacts to adjacent wetlands or from roadway runoff due to trucking.

Town Planner's Project Review – Riverwoods CCRC

Andrew Corrow noted: "...I'm sure their techniques to mitigate any construction run off into the wetlands will be industry standard but I would like to see it on a plan or in written into a Construction Management Plan...This is by far the largest "movement of earth" we have ever seen in Durham. They are cutting 18 ft of earth off the hill in order to create the "dinner plate" for construction. During the site walk I asked how much earth would be leaving. The engineer stated that most of it would remain on the site as it would be graded to fill other areas. I'm not an engineer but I'm sure all of it won't remain...How many truck loads will be coming out of Stone Query Drive onto Route 108. Which where will they be going? Route 4? ...Will they have traffic control while large trucks are entering the roadway etc. It is quite active."

Project engineer Jeff Clifford noted: "For reference, there are also extensive erosion & sediment control notes on Sheet C-6.0 and related erosion control details on the subsequent sheets. In addition, the NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit conditions of approval will be made part of the construction documents. There are also the USEPA NPDES Construction General Permit (CGP) requirements that include the preparation of an extensive stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) for a project of this size. We require that the contractor prepare the SWPPP so they are familiar with EPA long list of requirements (the contractors usually hire a consultant to work with them). Both the NHDES AoT and EPA –CGP SWPPP regulations require weekly inspections and reports by a qualified person throughout the construction period. I monitor these reports and make comment as may be appropriate."

Cultural Resources

- 18) <u>Archaeological Resources</u>. The applicant is hiring an archaeologist to provide a report addressing the concern raised by the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources as part of its Section 106 review. We encourage the applicant to have their archaeologist coordinate with Janet Mackie, an officer with the Durham Historical Association.
- 19) <u>Stone walls</u>. 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, Parking, and Circulation

- 20) <u>Study Conclusion</u>. The traffic study makes no recommended traffic improvements off site. We look forward to hearing comments from NHDOT.
- 21) <u>Parking count.</u> 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.

- 22) <u>Driveway width</u>. The applicant received a variance for the driveway widths within the front setback area to exceed 22 feet.
- 23) <u>Driveway grades</u>. What are the steepest driveways on site and what are the grades?
- 24) <u>Garage layout</u>. It would be useful to have a floor plan of the garage parking area.
- 25) <u>Parking spaces</u>. 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.
- 26) <u>Accessible/handicap spaces</u>. 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

- 27) <u>Sidewalk width</u>. 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.
- 28) <u>Sidewalk on Stone Quarry</u>. I recommend that the sidewalk along Stone Quarry Drive should be concrete rather than asphalt.
- 29) <u>Sidewalk on easterly side</u>. 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?
- 30) <u>Crosswalks</u>. 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.
- 31) <u>Trails</u>. One person asked at the September 13 meeting what the total length of the trails is. It appears that there may be some relatively steep areas along the trail. If improvements are desired the future residents will likely ask for steps to be added or other measures to be taken.

Bicycles

- 32) <u>Outdoor storage</u>. 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.
- 33) <u>Indoor storage</u>. Information on indoor storage should be provided. It is required in the Site Plan Regulations. The applicant noted indoor storage on the energy checklist.

Site Details

- 34) <u>Curbing</u>. The plans should show where curbing will be installed and which type vertical or sloped granite.
- 35) <u>Grading</u>. 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.
- 36) <u>Traffic signs</u>. Which types of traffic control signage will be needed on site and where?
- 37) <u>Street furniture</u>. Are there places around the site to add street furniture such as benches and picnic tables?
- 38) <u>Limits of construction</u>. The limited of construction tree boundary and erosion control? should be labeled.
- 39) <u>Paving at entrance</u>. 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.
- 40) <u>Retaining wall</u>. The retaining wall should be labeled on the plans.
- 41) <u>Dashed lines</u>. What are the dashed lines around the building on Sheet C-2.0?
- 42) <u>Entrance median</u>. Can the landscaped median at the entrance be extended a short ways?
- 43) <u>Sheet L-2.</u> What surface is demarcated by the stippled markings next to the building? The small squares near the building (bases for columns?) should be labeled.

Emergency Services

- 44) <u>Hydrants</u>. 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.
- 45) <u>McGregor Ambulance</u>. Bill Cote, Director of McGregor, noted two concerns: "...(1) Access to all segments of the project - especially the supportive care wing. Certainly the Fire Department will also have concerns and requirements. Optimally, having a covered drive-through arrangement is ideal in that it eliminates backing an ambulance to an entrance. While difficult to see on the plan, I'm assuming there are two entrances one Main entrance into the Commons and another into the Supportive Care wing. Both these areas must accommodate Type III ambulances (truck-based chassis). (2) Elevators always tend to pose a problem in that they cannot accommodate a patient needing to lie fully reclined. In other facilities, we have to place our stretcherin an extreme upright position just to fit it into the elevator. For someone who cannot sit up or for an unconscious patient - this poses significant patient care issues. I urge

Town Planner's Project Review – Riverwoods CCRC

Riverwoods to install an elevator capable of accommodating an ambulance stretcher..."

Utilities

- 46) <u>Water service</u>. 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.
- 47) <u>Sewer service</u>. 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.
- 48) <u>Stormwater Management</u>. 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

- 49) <u>Trash</u>. 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.
- 50) <u>Recycling</u>. Riverwoods is coordinating with the Durham Integrated Waste Management Advisory Committee to give them a tour of their recycling operation in Exeter. We will need a recycling plan as well.
- 51) <u>Snow storage</u>. 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.
- 52) <u>Salt shed</u>. Will sand and salt be stored on site?

Other Issues

53) <u>Energy Checklist</u>. The applicant completed the energy checklist. The staff and Energy Committee chair are meeting with the applicant to discuss the checklist on September 27 in the afternoon.

- 54) <u>Senior housing</u>. 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%.
- 55) <u>Lot combination</u>. 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.
- 56) <u>Signage</u>. 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.
- 57) <u>Solar panels</u>. Is it possible to include solar panels on site?
- 58) <u>Transit</u>. Is there an opportunity for a location on site for a transit stop? Could Wildcat Transit stop here?
- 59) *<u>Other issues</u>. What other outstanding concerns are there?