



**TOWN OF DURHAM**  
8 NEWMARKET RD  
DURHAM, NH 03824-2898  
603/868-8064  
[www.ci.durham.nh.us](http://www.ci.durham.nh.us)

**Town Planner's Project Review**  
**Wednesday, June 24, 2020**

- IX. **Bagdad Wood – 3-story addition.** 38 Madbury Road. Site plan for addition with 26 dwelling units and expansion of parking area by 33 spaces. Bagdad Wood, a nonprofit development, includes 40 apartments for residents who are at least 62 years old or handicapped/disabled. Bill Walker, c/o Housing Initiatives of New England Corporation, property owner. Mike Sievert, MJS Engineering, engineer. Mike Lassel, Lassel Architects. Robbi Woodburn, Woodburn & Company Landscape Architecture. Tax Map 2, Lot 10-4. Professional Office District.
- I recommend that the board accept the application as complete (\*See Building Height, below), schedule a public hearing, and schedule a site walk.

Please note the following:

- 1) **Senior housing.** Senior housing is allowed by right in the Professional Office District. The addition will be for residents 62 and older. Handicap/disabled residents will need to be 62 and older. The existing building does include handicap/disabled residents who are under 62.
- 2) **Site walk.** I suggest the board hold a site walk. It would be helpful to see the inside of the existing building as well to better understand the operation of the facility.
- 3) **Building height.** The maximum building height in the zone is 30 feet. The height may go to 35 feet by conditional use. We are reviewing the building height with the architect now and are not clear yet what it is as the calculation is complicated by the building design. It will either be just under 35 feet and require a conditional use or be over 35 feet which will require a variance or the applicant lowering the roof. It appears there is room to lower the roof if necessary to meet the height limits.
- 4) **Conditional use.** The applicant has addressed the conditional use criteria for building height in the likelihood that a conditional use will be needed.
- 5) **Nonprofit organization.** The property is owned by Housing Initiatives of New England, a nonprofit organization. The property makes a payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT). The applicant should meet with Jim Rice, assessor, to discuss this.
- 6) **Original site plan.** The project was approved in 1982. We have detailed plans which we will post on the website.

- 7) TRG. The project was presented to the Technical Review Group on Tuesday. I will forward notes of the meeting shortly.
- 8) Police memo. Chief Kurz commented on lighting and unit numbering and said he does not believe that a traffic study is warranted for this project. He did not have other concerns.
- 9) Timeframe. The applicant hopes to start construction in the fall for occupancy fall 2021.
- 10) Energy checklist. The applicant will need to submit the checklist prior to final action.
- 11) State approvals. Is any state approval required for this affordable senior development?
- 12) Architecture. Architectural design is subject to review in the PO District. It is typical for additions to be differentiated from existing buildings but harmonious with them. Distinguishing additions conveys that the additions were built later which is interesting but not essential information. The applicant wishes to match the existing building in order to give a sense of unity for all of the residents. This seems like a reasonable approach. The clapboards and shingles will be painted wood.
- 13) Density. I will look at the density of the project (3,000 square feet of land per resident in the PO zone with the senior density bonus) and minimum habitable area per resident in an unrelated household (200 square feet for senior housing).
- 14) Parking. The requirement is one space per dwelling plus one per employee. We will review this.
- 15) Lighting. The maximum lighting level allowed in the PO District is 8 footcandles on the ground. Along the addition it is as high as 15 footcandles. The bollards are not shielded but this may be acceptable for 50" high bollards.
- 16) Sidewalks. We will review further the locations of the sidewalks including new sidewalks at the perimeter of the property. The sidewalks are asphalt. The curbing alongside the driveway is 6" vertical granite.
- 17) Retaining wall. We need a detail about the retaining wall. Is this intended for residents to be able to sit on it?
- 18) Snow storage. Snow storage areas are shown on the site plan in cross hatching along the perimeter.
- 19) Stormwater. April Talon is reviewing the stormwater plan. Several basins are situated in the setbacks. They are permitted in the setback areas.
- 20) Utilities. April Talon will review the proposed expansion of water and sewer to serve the addition.

- 21) Landscaping. Landscaping is shown on Sheet LA-1. The parking lot is broken up well with two landscaped medians. Four elms are shown in the medians in the parking lot. Would it be better to locate these in wider peninsulas at the end of the medians? Thirteen arborvitae are shown along Dennison Road. Are there any locations around the existing site where landscaping should be added? It should be clarified whether there is curbing around the medians. 6" vertical granite curbing is preferred if possible.
- 22) Solid waste. There is an existing dumpster at the front of the property. It is well screened and barely noticeable. The location works well for trucks so I don't think it needs to be relocated. The applicant should meet with the Public Works Department and a representative from IWMAC about recycling.
- 23) Buffering. We will look closely at buffering from Dennison Road. A number of trees are being removed including numerous mature oak trees. There will be several drainage structures along the perimeter. The site backs up to two houses on Dennison (rented to tenants?) and the middle school for which site walk has begun on the new school.
- 24) Solar. Is the applicant willing to explore adding solar panels to the roof?
- 25) Permeable pavement. The TRG discussed permeable pavement at the TRG. Permeable pavement is shown for the patio and new walkways but Mike Sievert did not think it appropriate for the parking lot. The maximum impervious surface in the district is 50%. The impervious surface for the site as now proposed will be 49.8% according to Mike Sievert.
- 26) Sign. No new sign is proposed.
- 27) Addressing. We will need information about how the existing building and addition are addressed.
- 28) Bike storage. Bicycle facilities should be incorporated.
- 29) Fire Department. The existing building is sprinkled and the addition will be sprinkled.
- 30) Construction Management Plan. A basic site layout would probably be helpful. Should hours of construction be limited?