

MINUTES

SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

2:00 PM

AUGUST 7, 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 **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 approval to demolish a portion of the existing building on 152 Court Street and to construct a 4-story, 64 unit workforce housing building with a footprint of 12,361 \pm s.f. and Gross Floor Area of 58,975 \pm 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. (This application was postponed at the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering and Attorney John Bosen spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon thanked everyone for scheduling the meeting. They have addressed the outstanding issues. A letter was submitted that outlined the items that were completed. The proposed Uber/taxi space was eliminated. Notes were added to sheet C3. Note 10 outlined the concerns for the Fire Department about the signal and signage. Mr. Chagnon talked to the GIS coordinator and the site is now known as 160 Court Street and is reflected on the plans. The landscape plan was changed to include non-combustible mulch. It was noted that conflicts with the drainage pipes would be worked out with DPW prior to the start of construction. The details about the bricks, binder, paving, depths and trench have been updated. The offsite improvement plan for the proposed sidewalk has been taken off. Mr. Chagnon looked at the drainage, which was one of the biggest concerns. The plan was revised to show a solution to the drainage. It would come down to Roger Street. The single 12-inch pipe across Parrot Avenue would be replaced with two 12-inch pipes within the easement of the City. This would also require the

catch basins along the way to be replaced. After completing a drainage study analysis the conclusion is that there will not be flooding on the law firm's property. The new piping system can accommodate the flow. A 20-foot sewer easement was added on sheet C5. Mr. Chagnon requested more detail on how to change landscape in front of the Feaster Apartments if the Committee still wanted that done. An entrance radius was added on sheet C3. It is going to be redone and the curb will come out to tie into the curb on the street. A yield to pedestrians sign was added. A note was added to coordinate with the City about the signal controller box. A note was added to match the herringbone brick sidewalk pattern. A term sheet was also submitted. The abutters came to the meeting last week and spoke about the sidewalk, the trees and other issues. The team wanted an official agreement about the construction of the sidewalk and the drainage improvements. Attorney Bosen had a signed copy of that. Attorney Dan Hoefle, from the abutting property, had signed the term sheet. PHA will use the existing drainage easement. Temporary parking would be provided during construction. It was agreed to remove the sidewalk that was on the plan. They will continue to work on it because it's beneficial. For the plan today it has been removed.

Mr. Britz noted that the biggest concern was drainage. He asked if DPW reviewed that. Mr. Pezzullo responded that they had just received the plans. Mr. Pezzullo had not had time to fully review the calculations. The concept of the dual pipes was good. Mr. Pezzullo requested more analysis on the hydraulic condition and hydraulic grade line for the existing and proposed systems. Mr. Pezzullo also requested that the applicants look at what storm event the capacity of the existing overflows. The analysis should show where the proposed system improves upon the old one. Mr. Pezzullo suggested looking at 15-inch dual pipes. It would have a greater capacity. It may be do-able and the analysis should be done. There were some minor clarifications needed on the plan like which catch basins would be replaced and the dual trench detail will be needed. A lot of them are not major items and could be completed relatively quickly.

Mr. Britz commented that they would need new plans with the new labels on them. He asked if that could be completed before the Planning Board submission. Mr. Pezzullo commented that the 15-inch pipes would benefit the project more. The system does over flow today. It would be good to see what storm event that happens at and the volume it overflows. Mr. Chagnon responded that would be done. Mr. Pezzullo noted that it would not change much on the plan; just labels. Mr. Britz questioned if the DPW would have time to review the hydraulics before the Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Chagnon clarified that the table with the hydraulic grade line needed more information in the report. Mr. Pezzullo confirmed that was correct. Mr. Chagnon commented that to get this ready for the Planning Board, they would go with the 15-inch pipes and change plan to reflect that information. Mr. Pezzullo responded that would be fine if there was enough cover. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would talk offline about what the DPW would accept for cover. That would help determine the pipe size. Mr. Pezzullo confirmed that was fine. Mr. Britz noted that it sounded like the DPW was comfortable to review the plan and either sign off or not. It can be a conditional approval. Mr. Pezzullo confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Desfosses asked if Mr. Pezzullo looked at the structures in person. Mr. Pezzullo responded that he had not, but they will be replaced. Mr. Desfosses noted that pretty much all of the structures on the plan need to be replaced. The new system cannot be any worse than the old system. He asked if there have been any backups with the drainage system as is. Mr. Chagnon

responded there had not. Mr. Desfosses commented that they could take a look at the storm water calculations. As long as it's not higher than the existing conditions, then it should be acceptable. Mr. Desfosses questioned who the grantee for that easement was. Mr. Bosen responded that it was 127 Parrot Avenue. Mr. Desfosses questioned what needed to happen for the PHA to be grantee for the easement as well. Mr. Bosen responded that he would work with the City Attorney. Mr. Desfosses wanted to make sure that it was clear this was not a City drainpipe. Mr. Chagnon commented that the original purpose of the pipe is similar to what is there now. Mr. Desfosses agreed and noted that this was just an administrative item. The top of the pipe can't be 12 inches from the bottom of the pavement.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if the traffic signal controller for the Fire Department was being moved. Mr. Chagnon responded that because there is a driveway located across the street the signal head needs to be moved to across the street. Mr. Desfosses clarified his comment from the last meeting, which was that the building might cause the area to get dark early. The applicants may need to move the photocell so the streetlights come on at the right time. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was fine and questioned if the signal head still needed to be moved. Mr. Eby confirmed that it did.

Mr. Cracknell was concerned about the deferral of the pedestrian walkway. Mr. Cracknell wondered if the applicant would consider working with the law firm and city staff on it. It would not hold this process up to look at alternative sidewalk configurations. Having a pedestrian connection to Parrot Ave would be a benefit to the public. The existing opening is not in an operable location. The law firm is open to having a walkway. Mr. Bosen confirmed that they were happy to talk about this more. The law firm was concerned about the impact to their parking and the trees. Mr. Cracknell noted that there was a 5-foot sidewalk in the proposed plan. They should look to see if a 4-foot sidewalk could fit there without impacting parking and healthy trees.

Mr. Desfosses noted that on sheet C5 there was a note that proposed transformer work for the NH State Courthouse to be done by others. He asked who would be doing that work. Mr. Chagnon responded that Eversource would be. Mr. Desfosses clarified that they have committed to installing and paying for that. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct. The transformer is 50 years old and doesn't meet code. Eversource will replace it. Mr. Desfosses commented that there was a conduit all down Court Street to facilitate that. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct. Mr. Desfosses questioned where the power from the signal box was coming from. Mr. Chagnon responded that it would be fed from the pole. Mr. Desfosses requested that detail to be added to the plans. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Roediger requested that the standard note for radio strength testing be added to the plans. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that it would be.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend Site Plan Review approval**, seconded by Mr. Eby with the following stipulations:

To be completed by prior to Planning Board Review:

1. Applicant to provide Hydraulic Analysis and update plans and easements for consideration of dual 15" drain pipes for review and approval by DPW prior to Planning Board Review.
2. Plans to show relocation of the street lighting photocell to a location approved by DPW.
3. The applicant agrees to work with city staff in good faith in advance of the Planning Board hearing to evaluate and develop a mutually acceptable sidewalk configuration on and across 127 Parrot Ave. to and from the Portsmouth Housing Authority property and Parrot Ave. In doing so the party agrees to work in careful and due consideration of any adverse impacts to the abutting trees and parking spaces on 127 Parrot Avenue and, if feasible, provide such sidewalk without the need for additional property or easements from the State.
4. Plans to be updated to show power conduit supply for existing signal controller box.
5. Plans to be updated to include standard notation for radio strength testing as required by the Fire Department.

To be completed prior to final site plan approval:

1. Applicant to provide draft update to drainage easement on 127 Parrot Ave. property including Portsmouth Housing Authority as a benefitting party to be reviewed and approved by both the 127 Parrot Avenue property owner and the Legal Department prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
 - a. Drainage easement update should clarify intent of Stormwater O&M Plan as the responsibility of 160 Court Street property owner, Portsmouth Housing Authority.
2. Plans to show relocation of the emergency signal head to a location approved by the Fire Department and addition of the required emergency signal sign.
3. Applicant to coordinate with Homeland Security for relocation of the emergency siren.

The motion passed unanimously.

II. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Roediger moved to adjourn the meeting at 2:49 p.m., seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee