



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

Town Planner's Project Review
Wednesday, June 10, 2020

- X. **Harmony Homes – Mixed-Use Building.** 40 Briggs Way (off Route 4). Site plan application for new building with 7 one-bedroom residential units, office space, and child care on site with existing eldercare building. John Randolph, Harmony Homes, applicant. Maggie Randolph, architect. Mike Sievert, MJS Engineering, Engineer. Tax Map 11, Lot 27-. Durham Business Park Zone.
- I recommend that the board accept the application as complete, schedule a site walk, and set a public hearing for June 24.

Please note the following:

- 1) **Acceptance.** The application is substantially complete. The board can accept the application. A simple explanation about drainage is included in the narrative. Erosion control structures should be included on the plans (This can be a precedent condition). A construction management plan is probably not needed provided all staging occurs outside of the buffers. The applicant will need to sign the application. There are some issues to address below. If all is in order, final action could be taken on June 24. The police and economic development departments did not have any concerns. We will need signoffs from the Public Works, Fire, and Building departments. I don't think any revisions to the plans are needed now. There will be changes to incorporate as a precedent condition. The applicant submitted an earlier set of plans and then revised plans on June 4.
- 2) **Site walk.** Does the board want to do a site walk?
- 3) **Permitted Use B.** A permitted use B review is needed for grading around the building within the shoreland and wetland overlay districts.
- 4) **Conditional use.** A conditional use is needed for changes to the driveway including adding the gravel. However, note that the original site plan included approval of a conditional use for the driveway. The changes are fairly minor. Does the board think a new conditional use is needed for the driveway and a permitted use B for the grading or are these changes quite minor and consistent with the original approval?
- 5) **TRG.** The project was reviewed by the Technical Review Group on June 2. The minutes are enclosed.
- 6) **Floor plans.** The applicant submitted floor plans. These will be useful in reviewing the residential, day care, and office uses in the building.

- 7) Design committee. When this property was known as the Durham Business Park (different from the Durham Business Park zoning district) it was owned by the Town of Durham. The Town set up design guidelines to evaluate aesthetic aspects of any development. The committee is composed of Todd Selig, Kitty Marple, Barbara Dill, and me. Sarah Wrightsman is the Planning Board alternate. See the minutes from the meeting held on May 1. The committee gave a preliminary endorsement for the project and did not see significant concerns. The committee will meet once more, likely during the week of June 15, to possibly give its final okay. This review is separate from the site plan review but should be coordinated. Any Planning Board approval should be contingent on an okay from the committee, though we may have the okay prior to board final action. The committee looked at various design issues.
- 8) Architecture. The Planning Board does not review architecture but submission of elevations is required. These are shown on the website. The Design committee is reviewing the architecture.
- 9) Day care facility. Note that child care as a primary use is a conditional use in this zone. If it serves only the only site employees it is accessory and allowed. This is the applicant's intention. If they want to allow any outside people, including the other Harmony Homes site on Route 108, then a conditional use would be needed. We spoke about the drop off for children at the TRG. They will be dropped off in front by the entrance. A gravel way was added to facilitate turning around for vehicles. A permit from the NH Health and Human Services Department will be needed. I believe the department will require an outside play area. If so, the location should be shown on the plans.
- 10) Residential use. The zone allows only senior housing. The applicant received a variance for non-seniors to live here. The required habitable area per occupant is not applicable if there is one occupant per unit, 300 square feet per occupant for 2 occupants, and 400 square feet per occupant if three or more.
- 11) Solid waste and recycling. How will solid waste and recycling be handled? The applicant prefers to not have a dumpster. The TRG discussed using bins on rollers and rolling them to a location beyond the drainage basins. Inclusion of some kind of shelter there was suggested. The applicant should speak with Public Works about a recycling plan.
- 12) Snow removal. The applicant plows the snow himself around the site. If it will be plowed off the end of the parking lot by the shoreland buffer is this a concern? Perhaps construction of an earthen berm there (as done with the ATO site) would be appropriate to prevent snow melt from running directly into the river. This would require a conditional use.
- 13) Parking. The Planning Board will need to approve the parking in the front court under Section 175-111 B. 4. I think this meets the requirement. A waiver will be needed for the number of parking spaces. That can be submitted later.
- 14) Signage. Will there be any signage for the building?

- 15) Landscaping. The applicant does not intend to include any landscaping as part of this plan. They may add some vegetation later. The Design Committee did not think requiring landscaping was needed since this building will be minimally visible from Route 4. A waiver will probably be needed at least for foundation planting. This can be submitted later.
- 16) Lighting. Is any lighting proposed? It may be beneficial to include some building mounted lights. As long as these are shielded this could be submitted later.
- 17) Erosion control. An erosion and sedimentation plan should be shown on the drawings as a precedent condition.
- 18) Fire access. The driveway is 20 feet wide – 16 feet of pavement plus 2 foot gravel shoulders on each side. A turnaround area is shown in gravel. We will need an okay from the department. The driveway on the plans measures 20 feet wide so we should confirm that the detail showing 16 feet and shoulders is what is intended.
- 19) Sidewalk. The sidewalk is concrete with a vertical granite curb. The TRG discussed with the applicant including a path off the road from the apartments to the main facility. I think the road should be sufficient given the minimal traffic so the applicant should advise whether they would like to include a path. A detail is included of an asphalt path.
- 20) Bike racks. Two racks are shown on the left side of the parking area.
- 21) Energy checklist. The applicant will submit the energy checklist shortly. It is needed prior to final action.
- 22) Solar panels. The applicant said they are thinking about including solar panels for the entire site and possibly for this building.
- 23) Zoning amendment. John Randolph requested a postponement of the site plan review because of concerns about density constraints for future development. The Planning Board initiated and the Town Council adopted on June 1 a zoning amendment changing the density in the Durham Business Park zone from 35,000 square feet of land per dwelling unit to 20,000 square feet.