

## MINUTES

### SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

#### CONFERENCE ROOM A CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

2:00 PM

JULY 31, 2018

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Peter Stith, Principal Planner; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department and Robert Marsilio, Chief Building Inspector

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director;

---

#### I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Clipper Traders, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street, Portsmouth Lumber and Hardware, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street**, and **Boston and Maine Corporation, Owner**, for railroad property located between **Bartlett Street and Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Preliminary Subdivision Approval to consolidate and subdivide five lots and a portion of another into 5 lots, a right-of-way, and a remainder of one lot as follows:

- (1) Proposed Lot #1 having an area of 20,667 ± s.f. (0.4747 ± acres) and 143.44' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.
- (2) Proposed Lot #2 having an area of 51,952 ± s.f. (1.1927 ± acres) and 80.91' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street and 386.88' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (3) Proposed Lot #3 having an area of 102,003± s.f. (2.3417 ± acres) and 809.23' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (4) Proposed Lot #4 having an area of 61,781 ± s.f. (1.4183 ± acres) and 481'± of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (5) Proposed Lot #5 having an area of 177,435 ± s.f. (4.0733 ± acres) and 297.42' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (6) Proposed Right-of-Way having an area of 69,621 ± s.f. (1.5983 ± acres).
- (7) Map 164 Lot 4 reducing in area from 13 ± acres to 4.7 ± acres and having 75'± of continuous street frontage on Maplewood Avenue, and decreasing intermittent street frontage of 234'± on Bartlett Street to 105'± of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.

Said properties are shown on Assessors Map 157 as Lots 1 & 2 and Assessors Map 164 as Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and are located within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W), Office Research (OR) and Transportation Corridor (TC) Zoning Districts. (This application was postponed at the June 5, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering and Steven Pernaw with Pernaw and Company spoke to the application. Mr. Pernaw presented the traffic study. Mr. Pernaw met with City staff in March and performed traffic counts and analysis for three intersections. Mr. Pernaw looked at the morning and evening peak hours and did pedestrian counts. Background data showed that traffic was highest in the evening peak hour. In the morning each intersection had its own peak order. The Islington St. intersection had over 900 cars in the morning. In the evening all of the intersections reached peak levels between 4:45 and 5:45 p.m. There were a higher number of cars in the evening. This data was used for future projections. The existing access road accommodates 166 trips per hour in the morning and 100 per hour in the evening. The City gave 4 other development projects that are pending, so they was factored in. In the morning this site would generate approximately 41 trips mostly exiting the site. The evening would generate 53 trips. These would be the highest hour volumes. There were projections for the future in 2020 and 2030. The report showed the impact the project would make and compared it to the no build projections. The impact to the front door is a 4% increase in traffic. At Cate St. it would be a 2% increase and on the Islington St. intersection the impact would be 1%. As the site traffic disperses the impact goes down. The good news from the table is that all movements will operate well below capacity. The bad news is the delays. 2030 is projecting level of service "E." Cars will have to wait; this analysis confirms that. Long vehicle queues are not expected. The Cate St. level of service would be "C" or higher in peak hour. In 2020 the Islington St. intersection level of service would be operating very close to capacity without the development. Adding on the 1% increase fills the intersection. It would be an additional 1-second for vehicle. In 2030 the intersection would be over capacity. The impact of this development is pretty small. The City has a project to upgrade the signal system. Mr. Pernaw looked at the need for a left hand treatment on a major street for Bartlett St. into the access road and Cate St. The existing left hand movement meets the criteria for left hand treatment. It would be a good thing to have at both. The exit lanes analysis showed that for 2030 everything would work fine at both intersections with one lane. Mr. Pernaw came up with a suggestion for a signal with a continuous turn lane from the RR bridge to the access road. The road could be restriped to provide the left-hand pocket. Left turning cars prevent cars from going northbound.

### TAC Comments:

- Please complete a subdivision application check list.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.
- Disagree with the recommendation for a two-way left turn lane on Bartlett Street. There are too many driveways too close together for this treatment to safely work in this area.
  - Mr. Chagnon questioned if Mr. Pernaw should talk to Mr. Eby. Ms. Walker responded that they would likely recommend a peer review on the study because of the complexity and existing concerns. Any issues raised on the traffic will be handled in that process.
- For the traffic analysis, a couple of the background developments will need updating and their trip distributions need adjustment.
- Sight lines at the site driveway intersection with Bartlett Street should be documented, and whether any obstructions need to be removed to ensure adequate sight lines.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this would be on the plans.

- The traffic study should be peer reviewed by a third party traffic engineer.
- The Traffic Impact and Site Access Study continually refers to a “shared site driveway”, the subdivision plan refers to the driveway as a “right of way”. Whether public or privately owner and maintained, this road is a subdivision road, and should be labeled as such. Furthermore, if proposed as a private road, details on how the road will be constructed, owned, and maintained should be provided.
  - Mr. Pernaw responded that there were no cars coming out of the driveways. Bartlett is a city street. The guidelines say there should be a left hand pocket.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the road proposed on the subdivision plan is labeled as a right of way. Ms. Walker noted that there was a contradiction on how it’s referred to on the traffic study, so it should be clarified. Mr. Chagnon responded that it would be updated as a road. Information about a maintenance plan and the waivers required for a private road will be submitted.
- Any subdivision road (public or private) needs to meet the requirements of the subdivision regulations or request waivers from the Planning Board as part of the subdivision approval process. A list of any requested waivers should accompany the submission to TAC. For example, a waiver shall be required for the length of the proposed cul-de-sac. Also likely required for the road standards.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this would be taken care of.
- The access to these new lots must be a road that is named and mapped through E911. All of the new lots will be numbered based on the new road. If the road is not built to City standards, it must be a minimum of 20’ in width with no on-street parallel parking. The dimensions of the cul-de-sac must be capable of supporting the turning radius of Portsmouth Tower 5. Please provide a turning template verifying such.
  - Mr. Chagnon understood and confirmed this would be addressed.
- Profiles of the road and utilities are required submissions for subdivision approval, none have been provided to date. Road widths should be clearly indicated on the plan set.
- Subdivision plan must show location and size of existing and proposed water services to all buildings as well as location of all hydrants.
- Variances granted should be listed on the plan set (not just the date of approval).
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this would be added.
- Zoning requirements are incorrect – Max. Structure height in OR is 60’ (45’ within 200’ of North Mill Pond), Building Coverage is 30%, Open Space Coverage is 30%. CD4-W Requirements do not specify a height, that is a separate section of the zoning ordinance and should be listed as such. The height area along Bartlett St should be listed as 2-3 Stories (Short 4<sup>th</sup>) / 45’.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this would be corrected.
- Please show existing and proposed easements for any public utilities.
- Are any utilities proposed to be added or relocated as part of the subdivision?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that he would like to do another work session and proposed setting up a meeting with DPW to go over the utility issues. Ms. Walker confirmed that would be fine.

Ms. Walker questioned if any utilities would be added or relocated for the subdivision. Mr. Chagnon responded that they would need to make some changes for the utilities. Changes may be needed to separate the water and figure out where the services are. There may be a need for an additional sewer

structure. They are working with Eversource on the electricity. Currently it is overhead to Great Rhythm. Mr. Chagnon noted that the parking along the road on the plans earlier would be changed. Updated plans would be provided showing changes to the parking backing out into the right of way. They will include parallel parking. Ms. Walker noted that the clear space was not outlined. Mr. Roediger added that there needs to be 20 feet of clear space. Ms. Walker confirmed that the road detail would answer some of the concerns. Mr. Chagnon clarified that they would be 12-foot lanes so there would be 24 feet of clear space. The cul-de-sac meets the standards. The middle will be the right size so the truck can go around.

Mr. Chagnon noted that they talked about the fact that it's a subdivision with an existing road servicing existing businesses. It is likely that some improvements are required. The current owners are not interested in making the improvements. They just want to sell to Clipper Traders. It would be good for the sale to go through and do the improvements later. Ms. Walker added that they should make a note of that in the plans.

Mr. Roediger noted that one of the problems with this site is that multiple buildings have the same address. When this new road goes in there will be some long established businesses that will have address changes. This will allow unique addresses for everybody, which will help the situation.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Britz moved to **postpone** to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting on July 31, 2018, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....  
B. The application of **Barbara R. Frankel, Owner, and Greengard Residences, Applicant**, for property located at **89 Brewery Lane**, requesting Site Plan approval to construction of a 2-story assisted living home, with a footprint of 3,146 s.f. and gross floor area of 9,438 s.f. , with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 146 as Lot 263 and lies within the within the Character District-4 L2 (CD4-L2) District. (This application was postponed at the June 5, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

John Lorden with MSC and Brian Wyatt spoke to the application.

## TAC Comments:

- Sign D, if allowed by zoning, should be white lettering on green background, since it is directional, not regulatory.
  - Mr. Lorden responded that would be updated.
- TAC shall recommend a condition of approval to PB that the applicant shall work with the Planning, PW and Legal Departments regarding provision of an easement or ROW to the City for the portion of the road and or future sidewalk on the parcel to connect to public portion of Albany Street.
  - Mr. Lorden confirmed this was understood.
- Pavement patch limit along access road/drive from Albany should be to edge of north side of pavement.
  - Mr. Lorden responded that they would square it up to the edge of the pavement.
- Intersection at Albany will need mill and overlay.
  - Mr. Lorden confirmed that they would work with Mr. Desfosses to figure out the limits.
- Overflow pipe from proposed Rain Garden #1 to access road/drive should not have bends without manholes. Suggest straight pipe to a standard drain manhole in access road/drive. Pipe size from manhole to Albany need to be 12" diameter.
  - Mr. Lorden responded that they would add a manhole and a straight shot based on Mr. Desfosses' recommendation.
- Use City's standard pipe trench detail.
  - Mr. Lorden confirmed this would be updated.
- Easement needed for overhead electric to pole on abutting property.
  - Mr. Lorden responded that because of the elevator surge required it will go underground along Albany St. to a transformer. Then the power would go to the site and continue to the lights in the parking lot. Mr. Wyatt added that the Malthouse Exchange really wants that road fixed and they will have success in negotiating it. They don't foresee a problem. Mr. Lorden confirmed that the utility plan was revised after that meeting.
- Why is access drive/road labeled "Albany Street"?
  - Mr. Lorden responded that it was not called that on the tax maps, but they will take it off and call it a private road. Mr. Roediger questioned what the road would be called. Ms. Walker responded that it was not a road yet. Once it is a road, then it will probably be Albany St. Mr. Roediger would be involved in the process.
- Where/what is POI-4 as indicated in Tables 1 and 4 in drainage report?
  - Mr. Lorden responded that the new point would be tied into the city infrastructure. It wasn't shown on the post development plan, but it's entering into the town system.

Mr. Pezzullo confirmed that the drainage line would be a 12-inch line with standard drain manholes. Mr. Lorden responded that they would continue the 8-inch pipe into the rain garden and then the 12-inch to the connection.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Britz recc approval to planning seconded by cracknell

Mr. Britz moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

1. Sign D, if allowed by zoning, should be white lettering on green background, since it is directional, not regulatory.
2. The applicant shall work with the Planning, Public Works and Legal Departments regarding provision of an easement or ROW to the City for the portion of the road and or future sidewalk on the parcel to connect to the public portion of Albany Street.
3. Pavement patch limit along access road/drive from Albany Street should be to edge of north side of pavement.
4. Intersection at Albany Street will need mill and overlay.
5. Change overflow pipe from proposed Rain Garden #1 to access road/drive to straight pipe to a standard drain manhole in access road/drive. Pipe size from manhole to Albany Street needs to be 12” diameter.
6. Use City’s standard pipe trench detail.
7. Update electrical service based on recent meeting with Eversource and provide easement as needed.
8. Change labeling of access drive.
9. Define “POI-4” as indicated in Tables 1 and 4 in drainage report.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Lonza Biologics, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **70 and 80 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval, under Chapter 400 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Site Review Regulations, for the construction of three proposed industrial buildings with heights of 105 feet: Proposed Building #1: 132,000 s.f. footprint and 440,000 s.f. Gross Floor Area; Proposed Building #2: 150,000 s.f. footprint and 490,000 s.f. Gross Floor Area; Proposed Building #3: 62,000 s.f. footprint and 220,000 s.f. Gross Floor Area; and two 4-story parking garages, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lots 1 & 2 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district. (This application was postponed at the June 5, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Britz moved to **postpone** to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting on July 31, 2018, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....  
D. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Lonza Biologics, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **70 and 80 Corporate Drive**, requesting Subdivision approval, under Chapter 500 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Subdivision Regulations, to merge Map 305, Lots 5 & 6 (17.10 acres), Map 305, Lot 1 (13.87 acres), Map 305, Lot 2 (10.18 acres) and a discontinued portion of Goosebay Drive to create Map 305, Lot 6 (43.37 acres). Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lots 1 & 2 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district. (This application was postponed at the June 5, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Cracknell moved to **postpone** to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting on July 31, 2018, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....  
E. The application of **Dorothy Kiersted and Theresa Sessions, Owners**, for property located at **50 Lovell Street**, requesting Site Plan approval to demolish the rear deck on the existing house and the existing garage; to retain the existing building as a single family residence with a footprint of 1,001 s.f. and Gross Floor Area 3,095; to construct a three story, two unit residence with a footprint of 1,660 and Gross Floor Area of 4,634 s.f.; to construct a three story single residence with a footprint of 1,165 and Gross Floor Area of 3,360; with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 147 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residential C (GRC) District. (This application was postponed at the June 5, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Roediger moved to **postpone** to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting on July 31, 2018, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....  
**II. NEW BUSINESS**

A. The application of **Portsmouth Housing Authority, Owner**, for property located at **140 Court Street**, and **Ed Pac, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **152 Court Street**, requesting Site Plan

Review to demolish a portion of the existing building on 152 Court Street and to construct a 5-story, 64 unit workforce housing building with a footprint of 11,500 ± s.f. and Gross Floor Area of 60,000 ± s.f.; with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lots 37 & 38 and lie within the Character District 4 (CD4) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering, Craig Welch from the Portsmouth Housing Authority, John Bosen from Bosen & Associates PLLC, Doug Greiner from G2+1 Landscaping, Carla Goodknight from CJ Architects and Joe Malleti spoke to the application. The project is for the Portsmouth Housing Authority site. The cover sheet shows the zoning in the area. It's in character district CD4 and close to the downtown overlay but is not in it. The Feaster apartment building is a 100 unit building already on the site. The first sheet shows boundary survey of the parcel. There is a lot in the middle. The PHA is a "U" shape around the abutting property. The PHA has entered a purchase and sale agreement with that property. The lot line will be relocated. It will start at the street building with 5 feet on each side. The lot is essentially that building. A large part of that building will be removed to open up for development. The new building will observe the 10-foot setback and there will be an easement in the corner. Property C will be moved and there will be a conveyance on that side to allow for circulation around the building and for parking to remain. Currently there is a parking area that has some paved spots used by the City. The other parking is for PHA tenants and the dead end on the right side has some parking. There is a gravel drive down the middle. The property lines don't match what is perceived when you go there. The parking lot and rear building will be removed and reshaped. An access way will be created to connect around the buildings. There is an existing set of utilities. Some utilities cross over the lot. The electric line will be removed temporarily and then replaced. The site layout will keep the parking and entrance off Court St. Parking and a 20-foot wide drive will be added to allow fire access. There will be a dead end with some parking and access to the lower level parking under the proposed 64-unit workforce housing building. The sidewalk will be replaced in the same location. The area between the buildings is gravel. The proposal is to create a serpentine walkway with ADA access allowance. The area in the front will stay the same with benches. Brick sidewalk will surround it. There is a Zagster rack proposed with a brick sidewalk connecting the community space. The brick area will be expanded up to the building and PHA is creating an interior space for the Fire Department to house a piece of vintage fire equipment. ADA access will be through the main entrance. The building will have two levels on the first floor. The lower level will allow for ADA access and the higher level in the back will accommodate the garage below. This garage will have 25 parking spaces assigned to the units in the building. The garage also has an elevator, moped parking and bicycle parking for about 30 bikes. The plans show the bedroom counts. 126 units are less than 500 square feet. 100 of those units already exist in the Feaster building. 35 units will be between 500-750 square feet and the rest will be over 750 square feet. The table in the plans show all the units and corresponding square footage. The open space exhibit shows they will create more than 20% open space, so the project qualifies for the height incentive. The utility plan shows connections coming in from Court St. for water and gas. There is an existing sewer line in the rear. It does have some drainage. The new building would connect the sewer to that location. The grading and drainage will take the roof runoff and divert it to an underground infiltration system. That system will overflow and



connect to the drainage system. The landscape plans detail the plant material and hardscape material. There is a photometric lighting plan. Mr. Chagnon handed out some revised documents based on the comments received from TAC.

TAC Comments:

- A properly designed speed hump reduces vehicle speeds to 20 mph. If the desire is to reduce speeds to lower than 20, this is not the appropriate application.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they are proposing a speed hump on the west side because it's an access to the back. This will discourage speeding. This is an appropriate application for the situation. It's a reminder to travel at safe speeds. Signs will be added to the plan to prohibit through traffic.
- Proposed taxi or uber space on the public street will need approval from PTS and City Council.
  - Mr. Chagnon agreed that was left off the note. The plans have been revised and the note has been updated. It is understood that approval is required.
- Entrance at Court Street is very tight for fire truck as shown under ideal conditions. Snow banks will narrow the entrance. Should consider widening driveway.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that he would review that.
- Consider rounding the corners at the entrance to the existing driveway.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that no work was contemplated at that part of the property, so they would rather not do site work over there. If the fire template works, then they would like to leave it as is.
- If proposed treatments at pocket park at front of existing building are to remain, these should be noted as such on the site plan (to be consistent with Landscape Plan).
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that on sheet C3 note 8 was added to address this. It will be clear they will remain. Ms. Walker responded that they needed to be consistent with the landscaping plans.
- Is the bike rack on side of existing building an existing rack? Please indicate if so, location is not preferable as it is not visible and requires crossing a lawn to access. Racks should be next to existing entryways and off of paved areas.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be addressed.
- Are you proposing to add any bicycle racks at the new building other than the proposed Zagster location?
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that on C4 the basement level showed additional storage. Ms. Walker questioned how accessible that bike storage was. That's good for long-term parking. It may be good to add additional bike racks. There is a possibility to make the Zagster and bike rack a shared space. Mr. Cracknell pointed out a space that a bike rack could go or additional moped parking. Mr. Marsilia noted that was a walkway. There was no room for bikes there.
  - Mr. Marsilia questioned where the door to the elevator entrance was. Ms. Goodknight pointed it out. Mr. Marsilia requested that the plans show the door swing. What is the other door? Ms. Goodknight confirmed the plans would be updated and noted the other door went to a utility room. Ms. Goodknight confirmed they were working with the Fire Department. Mr. Marsilia requested that all the exits on be shown C4 as well. Ms. Goodknight confirmed that would be updated.

- Mr. Chagnon questioned if 30 was enough? Ms. Walker responded that there are standards in the parking, so if that was used then it should be. If there's a way to add exterior space to make it more accessible, then that's good.
- Mr. Greiner noted that the Zagster pad was 9 by 24. Is there a smaller version of that? Ms. Walker confirmed there were smaller units.
- What is the existing / proposed surface (e.g. lawn or otherwise) of the space on the southwest side of the existing building (next to the sidewalk)? Please confirm and add to landscape plan.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the area was intended to be grass and the revised plan has a label for that.
- Why is the southwest lot line of 116/37 angled?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that was the property line. It was angled to allow for some landscape treatment between the path and the property line. Mr. Cracknell was concerned that two vehicles stacked would cause the second vehicle to come close to the sidewalk. It would be nice to give a few more feet to allow more room for a vehicle. Mr. Greiner responded they could add a section of curbing to know where the wheels are. That can be modified to address the issue. Mr. Chagnon added they would revise and come out a couple more feet. Ms. Walker responded that the lot line revision doesn't require TAC approval. It will go to Planning.
- Community space is supposed to be accessible and inviting to the public at large (not just those who live at this site). Please explain how the current design will invite / encourage public access to and through the community space from Court St.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they had to accommodate parking for the lot. It is a little narrow. Signage can be added and the Zagster will attract the public. Ms. Walker responded that the Planning Board would bring this up again. Mr. Greiner added that using smaller zagster could have it be a little deeper in the path. More landscaping can be added to show there's more going on. The serpentine pathway is more inviting too. Mr. Cracknell noted that signage would be very important. It does make sense to try to do something beyond the Feaster to make it more inviting. Mr. Britz questioned if there were any benches on the patio area. Mr. Greiner responded that nothing was proposed yet, but it could be added.
  - Mr. Marsilia questioned if there would be washer and dryers in the units? Ms. Goodknight responded that they would be in the basement right off the elevator. Mr. Marsilia responded that it would be important to show the dryer duct. Ms. Goodknight confirmed that it would be added.
- Provide detail of transition treatment between brick plaza and grass edge for community space on Fire Station side.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that right now the fire station brick goes to a point that has a couple of steps. The plan is to extend on the other side of the steps to create a seating wall. Ms. Walker questioned what was happening at the seam. Mr. Cracknell added that it looked abrupt. Mr. Greiner responded that the backside of the seating wall has a perennial bed. There's an evergreen there as well. All of the brick construction has a hidden PVC edge restraint and lawn up to the edge. A little bit more attention can go there.
- Please list all variances granted on the Site Plan.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be added.

- Please update os table to separate proposed community space from open space. An indoor museum is neither, please remove from this table.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the revised sheet C4 shows that. Ms. Walker noted that open space does not automatically equal community space. The plans need to clarify what is community space and what is just open space. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would label it better. Mr. Cracknell requested they remove “monument plaza” and just use “plaza” on the plan. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.
- Review of drainage design/report could not be completed due to missing design points.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was provided to DPW.
- DPW had discussion with engineer including the following: Engineer to evaluate capacity of drainage pipe in easement on 127 Parrott Ave. that was intended to accept all stormwater flows from 140 Court St. property. Evaluation to determine any surcharge effects if all stormwater flows to pipe, what size pipe without surcharge, etc., design points to be shown on pre/post subcatchment plans, review/correct conclusion statement.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was discussed with DPW. The goal is to try to figure out where the roof drains on Feaster go. Mr. Welch tracked down the original plans. There is a drain line along the east side of the building. The roof drains connect to that line and then connects into the combined outlet. It flows to the sewer. The plans show a quick review of the subcatchments. The green is the area that goes to the combined sewer and the blue goes to the separated drain that crosses the abutter’s property. Because the drainage from the roof wasn’t included the area in the green would overwhelm the offsite pipe. So in the analysis it was flipped around and the second sheet shows the new proposal. The area in blue would drain across the abutter pipe and the green goes to the combined sewer. Mr. Pezzullo responded that was not exactly what they were looking for. Ms. Walker clarified that further review was needed. Mr. Pezzullo confirmed that was correct. Swapping the area is not an acceptable approach. Todays flow goes into the sewer. There was a provision to make a connection to the lower catch basin. It was never actually connected. If that were done there wouldn’t be any combined sewer. Ms. Walker questioned if that was a requirement of a previous site plan approval. Mr. Pezzullo confirmed that it was. They weren’t aware of that until last night.
- Sewer easement might be required for section of City’s sewer crossing southeast corner of property.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that was shown on the boundary plan. The only caveat is that there is no manhole to connect point to point.

Ms. Walker questioned if there were any concerns about the property lines and the proximity to the buildings. Mr. Marsilia responded that they have already been addressed. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would need easements. Ms. Walker noted they should be on the plan. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would.

Mr. Roediger questioned if the 4 parking spots that were used by the Fire Department on the PHA property were counted in the parking calculations. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they were. Ms. Walker noted that the parking on the site doesn’t have to be for the site. The goal is just increasing parking inventory. Mr. Bosen responded that the PHA has counted those spots toward the parking

calculations to be used by tenants. Ms. Walker questioned if they would be assigned to tenants. Mr. Bosen confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Roediger requested more information about the roof deck? Ms. Goodknight responded that it would be located on the Court St. side. There would be two means of egress on that level in the building to service that.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if it was possible to consider moving two spaces from the interior to make four spaces. It would be better suited for tenants. Mr. Chagnon questioned if the lawn area was used for certain things? Mr. Roediger responded that on a recall every inch of that space is used. Mr. Chagnon questioned if parking could go there. Mr. Roediger responded that they could look into it.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Dan Hoefle from Hoefle and Phoenix is a direct abutter. Mr. Hoefle has been working with team to improve the opening in fence to get from Parrot Ave. to Court St. The concern was a safety one because of the increase in pedestrian and vehicle traffic. There is sufficient space on the side of the district court building to give an easement to follow the sidewalk and give easement down side of property for Parrot Ave. Mr. Hoefle is happy to do that. Would that be incorporated later in the plans? Ms. Walker responded that it should be part of the plan, but could be identified as a future easement. The plan should be modified to reflect what the abutter is willing to do.

Eric Weinrieb from 133 Court St. is a direct abutter. Mr. Weinrieb's biggest concern was the cigarette butts. Adding more homes will increase this. The applicants need to look hard at how they are dealing the public transportation and waiting pedestrians. Another issue is having two parking spaces backing out and driving into Court St. There are two stacked parking spots on the other side of the street. The visibility will be very challenging there. This will be a safety issue. There is a large evergreen in front of the PHA that was a healthy buffer. The tree has been cut and it opens the starkness of the building. A lot of residents hang out there and now there is no shade. Mr. Weinrieb had drainage concerns for Mr. Hoefle any surcharge could flood his parking and basement. The proposed infiltration basin in between the two buildings looks like it's higher than the PHA building. It's good idea to do infiltration, but there could be unintended consequences. Hopefully this application will not be approved today because it needs further review.

The Chair asked if anyone else was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one else rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Ms. Walker noted that another round of revisions was needed. The team should consider the comments raised by the public and be prepared to address them at the next meeting.

Mr. Cracknell moved to **postpone** to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting on July 31, 2018, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Roediger moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:03 pm, seconded by Mr. Pezzullo. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee