



CITY OF CONCORD
New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department
Planning Division

Staff Report for Planning Board

January 21, 2026

Project Summary – Major Site Plan (RSA 674:54)

Project: Concord Middle School (2025-152)
Property Owner: City of Concord School District SAU 8
Applicant: Nobis Group
Project Address: 144 South St
Tax Map Lot: 7914Z 98-1

Project Description:

The City of Concord School District is proposing to construct a new 3-story, 205,562-square-foot middle school and associated site improvements on the same site as the existing middle school at 144 South St in the Single Family Residential (RS) District.

In accordance with RSA 674:54, the project is subject to a non-binding review by the Planning Board. The Planning Board may provide non-binding written comments relative to conformity or nonconformity of the proposal with normally applicable land use regulations. In accordance with state law, governmental land uses are exempted from local land use regulations.

Compliance:

The following analysis of compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Regulations is based on a 2-page project narrative dated December 17, 2025, prepared by Nobis Group; a 1-page colored site plan rendering dated December 16, 2025, prepared by Halvorson Tighe & Bond Studio; a 79-sheet plan set titled “Concord Middle School”, dated December 17, 2025, prepared by Nobis Group; a 100-page traffic study dated December 19, 2025, prepared by GPI; and, a 2-page Wetland Buffer Disturbances plan, prepared by Nobis Group, dated January 2026.

1. Project Details and Zoning Ordinance Compliance:

Zoning District: Single Family Residential (RS) District
Existing Use: Middle School
Proposed Use: Middle School

Overlay Districts:
Flood Hazard (FH) District: None
Shoreland Protection (SP) District: Yes
Historic (HI) District: None
Penacook Lake Watershed (WS) District: None
Aquifer Protection (AP) District: None

Wetlands: None
Wetlands Buffers: None

Zoning Code Item	Required	Existing	Proposed
Minimum Total Area	12,500-square-feet	Not Provided	930,179 square feet
Minimum Buildable Land	N/A	80, 017 square feet (1.84 acres)	80, 017 square feet (1.84 acres)
Minimum Lot Frontage	100 feet	Not Provided	>100-feet
Minimum Front Yard	25 feet	Not Provided	132-feet
Minimum Rear Yard	25 feet	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Minimum Side Yard	15 feet	Not Provided	67-feet
Maximum Lot Coverage	40%	Not Provided	33 %
Maximum Building Height	35 feet	Not Provided	Not Provided
Parking Area	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Interior Landscape Area	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Required Parking	300 spaces	153 spaces	212 spaces

2. General Comments:

- 2.1 Please refer to the 8-page memorandum from Paul Gildersleeve and Pete Kohalmi to Tim Thompson and Alec Bass, dated January 14, 2026 and, the 5-page memorandum from Karen Hill to Pete Kohalmi dated January 14, 2026 for general comments from the Engineering Services Division.
- 2.2 Staff notes that certain sections of the Site Plan Regulations would require landscaping throughout the proposed parking lots. Staff notes the applicant is proposing solar parking canopy's over all parking locations. Staff recommends the applicant consult the City of Concord Fire Marshal to ensure the proposed canopy plan conforms with any applicable Fire Code. Additionally, if the solar canopies were to be removed from the project, staff would recommend the applicant install landscaping, particularly shade trees throughout the parking areas to reduce heat island effect and to conform with City Regulations.
- 2.3 Staff notes the applicant proposes to utilize the adjacent elementary school located at 152 South Street for certain events which require high amounts of required parking. Typically, a conditional use permit for alternative parking arrangements would be required as well the parking to be permanently related to the principal use by easement or some other recordable binding legal instrument. Staff further notes that even with this parking arrangement, off-street parking requirements don't appear to be achieved for certain events.

3. Site Plan Regulations Compliance:

- 3.1 Please refer to the 8-page memorandum from Paul Gildersleeve and Pete Kohalmi to Tim Thompson and Alec Bass, dated January 14, 2026 and, the 5-page memorandum from Karen Hill to Pete Kohalmi dated January 14, 2026 for compliance comments from the Engineering Services Division.
- 3.2 Section 12.07 *Wetland Delineations* would typically require a NH Certified Wetland Scientist to sign and seal the existing conditions plan and the site plan were wetlands have been delineated and note the date of delineation on the plans. Wetland Notes on Existing Conditions Sheet 6 of 6 notes the delineation information, but is missing the signature and seal of the wetland scientist.

- 3.3 Section 16.03(7) *Colors and Materials* would typically require the proposed colors and materials to be noted on the architectural elevations. Staff notes not all material or color choices have been made final and shown on the submitted elevations or renderings.
- 3.4 Section 18.03 *Required Parking* would typically require parking spaces to be provided in the amount and number as set forth in Section 28-7, Access Circulation and Parking of the City of Concord Zoning Ordinance. Staff notes the civil plans tabulate a required parking of 300 spaces and provided 212 spaces. Staff notes that as part of the traffic study the applicant reviewed the amount of anticipated parking anticipated on the site at any time. Staff notes this study states a total of 194 spaces have been provided for the middle school. Staff recommends the applicant review their parking counts to be determine which number is accurate and correct accordingly.
- 3.5 Section 18.11 *Perimeter Buffers* typically requires landscaping buffers as set forth in Section 28-4-2 of the Zoning Ordinance to be provided for non-residential uses in both residential and mixed-use zoning districts. Staff notes minimal landscaping is being added along the northern and western side of the property to screen the abutting residential uses and a 4-foot tall chain link fence with privacy fabric is proposed. Staff would recommend that applicant instead install a solid and opaque fence in lieu of the chain link to provide greater screening, aesthetics, and long-term durability of the screening intended.
- 3.6 Section 18.21 *Snow Storage* typically requires provisions for snow storage to be shown on the site plan. Staff recommends the applicant add that to the site plan to make sure locations are available which will not block pedestrian ways or other site features. Will the solar canopies impact snow storage, or pedestrian ways due to melt?
- 3.7 Staff notes there is a proposed compactor and loading area on the western side of the building. There does not appear to be any screening surrounding the compactor and loading area. It is also unclear if the loading area would provide the dimensions typically required for a loading space. Staff recommends the applicant review Section 20 *Loading, and Solid Waste Facility Standards* of the Site Plan Regulations and try to meet the screening and dimensional requirements accordingly.
- 3.8 Section 26.02 *Mechanical Equipment* typically requires screening of all ground mounted and rooftop mechanical equipment. It is unclear in the elevations where the mechanical equipment is proposed and staff would recommend the applicant screen these items as normally required per this section.
- 3.9 Section 27.02 *Zoning Compliance* typically requires landscaping to be installed in accordance with the City of Concord Construction Standards and Details. Staff notes the planting details note to remove the top 2/3 of wire baskets and burlap where typically the City of Concord Construction Standards and Details would require the entirety of the wire basket and burlap to be removed. Staff recommends the applicant revise their landscaping details to meet the standards of the City of Concord Construction Standards.
- 3.10 Section 27.07(1) *Tree Plantings* typically requires deciduous trees to have a caliper of no less than 2.5-inches to 3-inches at the time of planting. Staff notes the plant schedule on sheet L6.1 has calipers ranging from 0.5-inches to 5.5-inches. Staff would suggest the applicant review their planting schedule and revise to be compliant with this section of the Site Plan Regulations.
- 3.11 Sections 29.03 *Parking Lot Lighting*, 29.04 *Building and Façade Lighting*, and 29.05 *Canopy Lighting* all require lighting to be subject to a 4:1 uniformity ratio. These tabulations were not provided as part of the photometrics plan and staff would suggest the applicant review and add it to the plan to assure consistent lighting throughout their lit areas. Additionally, staff notes light fixtures are proposed throughout the parking areas which also have the solar canopy proposed.

This canopy is not shown on the photometric plan, and it is unclear how the solar canopy will be constructed, specifically its height. No typical detail was found in the plan. Staff would suggest the applicant review and compare their proposed solar canopy plans with the photometric plans to assure lighting can be installed as proposed.

- 3.12 Section 29.07 *Nuisance and Glare* typically does not permit any bright light to shine onto adjacent property. Staff would recommend the applicant assure all external building lighting are full cut off fixtures, and consider additional screening of the fixture to prevent unintended glare or impacts to the nearby abutting residential properties to the west and north of the building.

4. Variances:

- 4.1 Variances are not required for a project that falls under RSA 674:54.

5. Waivers:

- 5.1 Waivers are not required for a project that falls under RSA 674:54.

6. Conditional Use Permits:

- 6.1 A conditional use permit for impacts to a wetland buffer has been submitted as part of the major site plan application. No action is required for a project that falls under RSA 674:54, but the Planning Board may provide feedback to the applicant.

7. Architectural Design Review:

- 7.1 The application was presented to the Architectural Design Review Committee on January 6, 2026 and the Architectural Design Review Committee provided feedback and comments throughout the presentation which can be found in the meeting minutes.

8. Conservation Commission:

- 8.1 The application was presented to the Conservation Commission on January 14, 2026. The Conservation Commission requested that the school district be made aware of the Turkey River Watershed Restoration Management Plan and ask them if they have taken the information from the plan into consideration or if they can take the information that is in the plan into consideration before they finalize their design. There is an opportunity to preserve the water quality of Bow Brook through the south end which goes through the property.

9. Recommendation:

- 9.1 Staff recommends that the Planning Board provide feedback to the applicant relative to the overall concept and design of the project, staff general comments and compliance comments, and suggestions or concerns of any Board member.



CITY OF CONCORD
New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department

Michael S. Bezanson, PE
City Engineer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tim Thompson, AICP, Acting City Planner and Alec Bass, Assistant City Planner

FROM: Paul Gildersleeve, PE, Project Manager and Pete Kohalmi, PE, Associate Engineer

DATE: January 14, 2026

SUBJECT: Concord Middle School- Major Site Plan- Engineering Review
144 South Street; Map 7914Z, Lot 98 and 98-1; City Project 2025-152

The Engineering Services Division (Engineering) has received the following items for review:

- Project Narrative by Nobis Group, dated December 17, 2025
- Site Plans by Nobis Group, dated December 17, 2025
- Traffic Study by Greenman-Pederson Inc, dated December 19, 2025

As a supplement to any comments offered by the Planning Division, Engineering offers the following design related comments. With subsequent submissions, the applicant shall provide a response letter that acknowledges or addresses each of these comments and discusses any additional changes to the plans.

1. Stormwater Management Report

- a. Regulations would typically require the provision of a stormwater management report for review.

2. General Information

- a. The new school should be assigned a new address such as 146 South Street so that it is not confused with the existing school which is 144 South Street. School representatives should contact me to discuss this. The site plans should be revised to reflect the new number, not 144 South Street. Various

permits with the City, such as building permits will reflect the new address, not the address of the existing school.

- b. Why were the site plans prepared on a 36" X 48" sheet? The standard 24" X 36" (Arch D) sheet would be more convenient for those using paper copies, especially the contractors on site. It is also noted that half-size plans are very difficult to read due to the small text size.
- c. The enormous file size (130 MB) of the plan set pdf causes difficulties handling the file. Can the file size be reduced?

3. Traffic Study

- a. "Do Not Enter" and "One Way" signs should be added at the RMS driveway and main driveway intersection, at the main driveway and the AD exit driveway.
- b. Consider relocating the crosswalk to be positioned at this intersection versus the current "midblock" location.
- c. It is unclear whether the emergency access road behind the school is one-way, regardless, it should be signed, at a minimum, on the north side, so that vehicles do not anticipate that they can cut through and get stuck at the gate with no turn-around.
- d. The exit lane from the loop driveway to the main entrance driveway should have a "No Left Turn" sign and right turn only pavement markings.
- e. Consider making the main sidewalk a multi-use path or provide a bicycle lane along the main driveway to improve bicycle safety.
- f. Ensure that the plans reflect the proposed changes recommended in the traffic study to improve sight lines at the Shared site driveway with Conant Street.

4. Site Plan (Sheet C-2.1)

- a. Please consider showing with a directional arrow and a sign if the drive aisle west of the proposed building is one-way or two-way.
- b. The curb on the northwest corner of the building is shown as CC, or concrete curb. It is noted that regulations would typically require a waiver to utilize concrete curb in lieu of granite curb.
- c. Please consider adding handicapped ramps with detectable warning panels at the access drive on South Street to match a similar existing condition.

- d. Please consider showing and call outs on the Site Plan at locations for the use of Detectable Warning Panels Detail on Sheet C-6.1, or remove this detail from Sheet C-6.1.

5. Site Plan (Sheet C-2.2)

- a. Please consider dimensioning the grass strip between the sidewalk and the drive aisle on the north side of the drive aisle, near the intersection with South Street.

6. Grading and Drainage Plan (Sheet C-3.1)

- a. A note at ex. CB 2630 along the curve in Conant Drive southwest of the proposed building states the catch basin will remain as-is; however, a note on C-1.1 states this existing catch basin will be converted to a manhole. Please convert this catch basin to a manhole and lift it to grade, eliminate the depressed asphalt apron leading to this existing catch basin, and continue the curbing and sidewalk without tip-downs. Place a proposed catch basin along the curb in the street near the removed tip downs and connect this proposed catch basin to the storm system.
- b. Please consider placing CCSD Detail SM-4 on a detail sheet.
- c. Please consider providing a callout and a detail of the structure that captures the stormwater and trash leachate in the low area adjacent to the loading dock. If this stormwater and leachate will be mixed, please capture it and convey it to the sanitary sewer system. If they are separated please convey the leachate to the sanitary system and the stormwater to the storm system.
- d. While walls are shown to the curb return near the loading dock, it appears the curb is taller than the standard granite curb height of 7" until farther into the drive aisle. Please consider adding top of wall, bottom of wall elevations along the entire wall system to show the full extent of the walls.
- e. At the loading dock, the bottom of the loading dock appears to be at elevation 287.4'. The turn-around area ramps up to elevation 290.3' before going back down again. This means that, if the structure capturing flows at the loading dock is clogged or beyond its capacity, there could be 2.9' of ponding in the loading area before the water overflows south along the drive aisle. Please consider revising these grades so there is less ponding against the building and less of a safety concern.
- f. Please consider showing proposed sawcut lines on grading and utility sheets.

- g. The proposed curbing connecting to existing curbing at Cornell Street is hard to differentiate from each other. Please consider darkening the proposed line types better so they are easier to read.
- h. Please consider showing on the grading sheets and drainage report how the drainage flows and how it is captured from the Proposed Solar Parking Canopy and Proposed Walkway Canopies.
- i. On the grading sheets, consider showing the flow arrows and slopes under the Proposed Walkway Canopies.
- j. Please confirm DMH-20 can be a 4' dia structure with the acute angle of connecting pipes.

7. Drainage Profile (Sheet D-1)

- a. At DMH-2 on the profile, please consider placing a minimum of 0.1' drop between the invert in (DM-1) and the invert out.
- b. Regulations (CCSD Section 6(F)(2)) would typically require the addition of 2" of polystyrene thermal insulation with a minimum R value of 10 over pipe with less than 4' of cover such as at TB-1.
- c. On multiple utility profiles the existing grade and proposed grade elevations on the base of the profile are the same number even though they are at different elevations. The finished grade profiles also appear as jagged lines which does not match the grading plans. Please consider revising these profiles.

8. Drainage Profile (Sheet D-2)

- a. Consider revising the labeling of the profiles, the vertical axes, and the sheet number. Ensure the sheet numbering for this sheet and other drainage sheets match the Sheet Index on the Cover Sheet.

9. Drainage Profile (Sheet D-3-2)

- a. Consider adjusting the north arrow as it is shown in the wrong direction in the plan view.

10. Drainage Profile (Sheet D-4-2)

- a. Consider revising the profile to show the perpendicular outlet pipe to CB 6 and to show the DMH-17 inlet pipe.

11. Drainage Profile (Sheet D-5)

- a. Profile for CB-1-16 to CB-1-13 increases in size from 6" to 12" to 18". Confirm that is the design intent.

12. Utility Plan (Sheet C-4.1)

- a. Please consider re-labelling the sanitary and storm sewer structures with the City of Concord GIS numbering. Please contact Amy Ouellette, GIS Analyst, at 603-230-3624 or aouellette@concordnh.com to be given these new numbers.
- b. At the two locations the proposed 8" water connects to the existing 8" water line in Conant Drive, instead of installing stainless steel tapping sleeves, install tees or full body ductile iron tapping sleeves instead, pursuant to CCSD Section 5(3)(B)(8). Please note as such.
- c. What are the lengths of the fire hydrant extensions? If this length is 20' or greater, an 8" pipe instead of a 6" pipe will be required, pursuant to CCSD Section 5(3)(C)(5).

13. Utility Plan (Sheet C-4.2)

- a. Please move the gate valve to 2' from the connection of the proposed 8" water pipe with the existing 10" pipe, pursuant to CCSD Detail W-2. Add Detail W-2 to a detail sheet.
- b. An existing 8" PVC sewer pipe is shown going through an existing drainage structure south of the building. Please consider re-examining and relocating these existing utilities if necessary.

14. Utility Plan (Sheet U-3)

- a. Please consider showing a callout for a minimum of 5.5' of cover between the top of the water pipe to the surface grade, pursuant to CCSD Section 5(3)(D)(15).

15. Construction Details (Sheet C-6.1)

- a. Please consider replacing the Typical Sanitary/Storm Sewer Trench Detail with CCSD Detail SM-1.
- b. Show callouts and symbol in plan view for the Detectable Warning Panel Detail, or remove this detail from this sheet.
- c. Please consider placing CCSD Details CR-4, CR-8, and CR-13 on a detail sheet.

16. Construction Details (Sheet C-6.2)

- a. Please consider replacing the Underdrain Cleanout Detail with CCSD Detail SD-12.
- b. Please consider showing a symbol and callout in plan view the locations of the Dome Beehive Grate Detail, or remove this detail from this sheet.

17. Construction Details (Sheet C-6.3)

- a. Regarding the Sediment Forebay Detail, Note 3, regulations would typically require 4 feet of separation, pursuant to CSPR 22.07(2). A waiver request would typically be required for 1' of separation.
- b. Consider adding a callout on plan view for the Temporary Sedimentation/Dewatering Basin, Erosion Control Blanket Slope Installation, and Hi-Flow Silt-sack Details.

18. Front Plaza- Enlargement Grading Plan (Sheet L-5.2)

- a. On Detail 1, consider showing the cross slopes of the sidewalk draining away from the building. Indicate a general cross slope.
- b. On Detail 2, consider showing the overflow route for concrete away from the building, with drainage arrows and spot grades if necessary. Since this landscape area is a pond, please include it in the Stormwater Management Report.

19. Front Courtyard- Enlargement Grading Plan (Sheet L-5.4)

- a. The western landscape area between the building sections show two rim callouts but no storm sewer. Please consider showing the storm sewer these callouts are referencing, or remove the callouts. Since this landscape area is a pond, please include it in the Stormwater Management Report.

State/Federal Permits

The project will require the following state and/or federal permit(s) associated with the site design:

NHDES Sewer Connection
NHDES Infiltration to Groundwater
NHDES Alteration of Terrain
EPA NOI to Construct

Typically per Site Plan Regulation 13.02 (8) and/or Subdivision Regulation 13.02 (10), a copy of the State and Federal permit(s) shall be submitted to the City prior to final approval.

Post-Approval/Pre-Construction Requirements

The following items are required prior to the start of construction:

1. Per Site Plan Regulation 27.11, establish a financial guarantee (letter of credit, or cash deposit) for site stabilization.
2. The following permit(s) will need to be obtained from the Engineering Services Division:
 - Driveway,
 - Excavation,
 - Utility-Connection (Water, Sewer, and Drain), and
 - Other permits deemed necessary by the City Engineer

Please note that all Engineering permits must now be applied for online using the City's new Citizen Self Service (CSS) Permit Portal, which can be found here:

<http://concordnh.gov/1915/Engineering-Permits-Fees>

3. Per Site Plan Regulation 36.24, the Applicant is responsible for paying engineering permit inspection fees to ensure work is consistent with City standards and the Approved Plans.

Prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting, the Applicant should apply for the required Engineering permits listed above. The Applicant shall provide a project schedule when applying for the required permits.

The permit fees shall be paid prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting.

4. Establish a performance surety (bond, letter of credit, or cash deposit) for work within the Right-of-Way and proposed public improvements or common private improvements per Subdivision Regulation 10.09. An engineer's cost estimate, prepared by the Applicant and based on the current NHDOT weighted average unit

prices, shall be submitted a minimum of two weeks prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting.

5. When above requirements have been met, request to set up a pre-construction meeting with the Engineering Services Division to discuss construction requirements, site inspections, associated fees, schedules, etc. Engineering permits will not be authorized (unless explicitly stated otherwise) until final revised plans have been submitted and approved to the satisfaction of Planning and Engineering.

Construction Requirements

1. Shop drawings/submittals shall be submitted to Engineering for the proposed water, sewer, drainage improvements as applicable.
2. Per Site Plan Regulation 12.09, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO), the contractor shall submit digital as-built drawings that are to the satisfaction of Engineering and conforming to the Engineering as-built checklist. A copy of the as-built drawing requirements is available on the Engineering Services Division section of the City of Concord website.



CITY OF CONCORD
New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department

Michael S. Bezanson, PE
City Engineer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Pete Kohalmi, PE, Associate Engineer
FROM: Karen Hill, PE, Transportation Engineer
DATE: January 14, 2026
SUBJECT: Concord Middle School- Major Site Plan- Traffic Study Review
144 South Street; Map 7914Z, Lot 98 and 98-1; City Project 2025-152

As a supplement to any comments offered by the Planning Division and Engineering Division, the following comments are related to the review of the Traffic Study by Greenman-Pederson Inc, dated December 19, 2025. With subsequent submissions, the applicant shall provide a response letter that acknowledges or addresses each of these comments and discusses any additional changes to the plans.

1. Overview

- a. The City strongly recommends that a revised traffic study be submitted in order to address the following key points:
 - i. Due to discrepancies and some ambiguity in the report, it is difficult to conclude whether AM and PM school traffic will back up onto South Street, please see more detailed comments below in Section 4, Queue Analysis.
 - ii. Neighborhood concerns with pedestrian and bicycle safety and potential increased traffic on nearby streets.
 - iii. The concept plans do not depict all of the school zone and crosswalk signage improvements on South and Conant as recommended in the study.
 - iv. The intersection of Clinton/Springfield was listed during the original traffic scoping meeting, it is recommended that this intersection be added to the study.
 - v. Crashes and sight distance should be evaluated at all study area intersections.

- b. The City recommends that the District host a neighborhood traffic meeting with the abutting neighborhoods as there are many outstanding concerns with school-related traffic, particularly on Noyes, Cypress, and Springfield Streets, that are not being addressed.
 - i. The study particularly recognizes there are no bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on these roadways. With the building moving back from South Street, it is anticipated that Noyes to Cypress will be the preferred route for student walking to school from the north. Sidewalk on Noyes Street is listed in the City's Pedestrian Master Plan (*ranked 41 of 117*).
- c. Below are recommended improvements from the 2008 Rundlett Middle School Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Travel Plan and the 2013 Citywide SRTS Task Force Project Identification and Rankings, that remain outstanding and are not addressed in the study:
 - *Construct sidewalk on Broadway from Broad to South Main (City ranked: 43/117)*
 - *Construct sidewalk on South Street from Roosevelt to Bow (City ranked: 10/117)*
 - *Construct bumpouts at Pillsbury Street and Broadway, Allison Street and Broadway to reduce crossing lengths*
 - *Construct sidewalk on South Main from McKinley to Broadway (City ranked: 1/117)*
 - *Construct sidewalk on McKinley from South Main to Broadway (City ranked: 56/117)*
 - *Install raised crosswalks on the school campus roadway*
 - *Install bike lane striping and signage along Broadway and South*
 - *Improve sidewalk conditions within a two mile radius of Rundlett Middle School*
 - *Uneven and crumbling sidewalk on South Street and gaps in sidewalk on Bow Street and Carter Street where there is high peak hour traffic volume and parking*

2. Existing Conditions

- a. The study indicates that the South Street shoulder is generally used as on-street parking, this is not the case within the school zone.
- b. The recommendation to relocate the Conant Drive crosswalk should be removed from this section as it is a proposed recommendation.
- c. Existing lighting was not examined in the study, particularly the existing crosswalks on South Street do not have overhead lighting.

Below are existing conditions that are noted of concern but not addressed in recommendations:

- Parking on Noyes Street makes it difficult for two-way traffic flow, this may be a safety concern with the introduction of bus traffic.

- Parents park along the westerly side of Cornell Street in the PM to pick up students.
- There is no posted speed limit on Cypress Street.
- Springfield Street neighborhood and pedestrian safety concerns.
- Almost all study area sidewalk ramps are experiencing ADA compliance issues.
- Many of the neighboring roadways do not have existing bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

3. Traffic Flow

- a. Please confirm the accuracy of all volume figures, some example concerns are provided below:
 - i. Figure 5 – the bus volumes turning onto Noyes do not equal 19. Also, there are 7 bus trips shown as added to Conant – please confirm.
 - ii. Figure 5/6 – please explain why 13 staff trips are removed from the Noyes neighborhood when the study states 4 will be displaced.
 - iii. Figure 6 – Please confirm there are only 15 buses in the PM versus 19 in the AM and that all buses turn right out of Noyes as shown in the figure.
 - iv. Figure 7 – the bus volumes turning onto Noyes do not equal 19.
 - v. Figure 7 – shows 166 parents and 107 staff entering the driveway, which does not match 151 in the queue analysis.
 - vi. Figure 7 – shows 110 staff turning left out of the main driveway onto Conant and buses on the main driveway and Conant as well as 707 staff traveling east on Clinton, please explain or confirm volumes do not match the legend.
 - vii. Figure 8 – the bus volumes turning onto Noyes do not equal 15.
 - viii. Figure 8 – missing the parent volumes, please explain or confirm volumes do not match the legend.
- b. The Noyes/Cypress neighborhood has voiced pedestrian safety concerns with added bus traffic. What measures will be in place to stop parents from dropping children off in this neighborhood now that the building is relocated, this could increase traffic in this neighborhood which is not anticipated in the study.

4. Queue Analysis

- a. It is not clear where the queueing begins within the “parent drop-off/pick-up loop”, please confirm.
- b. AM Parent Drop-off Queues - 151 vehicles total
 - i. It is not clear from the study how many vehicles queue prior to the beginning of “drop off”. Please show queued vehicles on the plan to confirm they will not back up onto South Street.
 - ii. Please confirm if the staff arrives prior to parents or if they will contribute to the main driveway queue.

- c. PM Parent Pick-up Queues - 74 vehicles total
 - i. The study states that 49 vehicles are stacked prior to release, please confirm whether 49 vehicles is the max queue or average observed since the approximate 1265' length of the driveway only allows for 50 vehicles.
 - ii. Please show queued vehicles on the plan to confirm they will not back up onto South Street.
- d. Page 25 – The study states that 16 additional vehicles will queue back on the shared internal roadway, this should say 26 vehicles.

5. Recommendations/Conclusions

- a. All study area crosswalks should be refreshed.
- b. Noyes/Cypress and Noyes/Cornell – “All Way” Plaques should be placed beneath the stop signs.
- c. School zone signage on Conant and the crosswalk relocation to Winant are not shown on concept plans.
- d. Speed limit signs should be installed on Cypress Street.
- e. South/Conant, stop sign and stop line will require an Ordinance resolution with the Parking Committee and City Council.
- f. The recommended parking restriction along Cypress Street will require an Ordinance resolution through the Parking Committee and City Council.
- g. There are a number of ADA compliance issues specified in the study and should be listed as recommended improvements.
- h. It is recommended that overhead lighting be considered in addition to the RRFBs at the South Street crosswalks.

6. Turning Movement Plans

- a. Sheet 6 – The Arrow XT 100' tower fire truck that was used for turning movements is smaller than the City of Concord's Tower 1. Please request the template from the City's Transportation Engineer.
- b. Please provide fire truck turning movements through the site and the back access road to complete the intended path.

7. Concept plans

- a. Sheet 1 – The bus turning movement does not show a need to move the stop line back on Noyes. Please confirm.
- b. Sheet 1 – The City does not install “STOP” word markings at stop lines, please remove from plans and recommendations.
- c. Sheet 2 – Consider placing a curve warning sign on Cornell Street.
- d. Sheet 3 – The plan does not show the South/Noyes corner widening, please add to plan.
- e. Sheets 4/5 – The City does not agree with the striping of Springfield Street to address pedestrian safety concerns. Striping the roadway would require an Ordinance Resolution for “No Parking” on both sides of the road, essentially

making the road feel wider and may encourage higher speeds. 2.5' to 4' shoulders would not provide a “safe” place for students to walk to school.