



CITY OF CONCORD

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

Staff Report for Planning Board

Meeting on July 15, 2026
Project Summary – Design Review Phase

Project: Steeplegate & Regal Redevelopments (2026-069)
Property Owner: Onyx Regal Concord LLC, Onyx Steeplegate Concord LLC, Onyx TD Concord LLC, and MH Concord LLC,
Applicant: Gallagher, Callahan, & Gartrell PC
Property Address: 282 Loudon Rd, 270 Loudon Rd, 277 Sheep Davis Rd, and 260 Loudon Rd
Tax Map Lot: 611Z 39, 611Z 40, 61Z 9, and 611Z 41

Determination of Completeness:

To determine completeness of a design review application, the Board shall consider the requirements of Section 14.02 of the Subdivision Regulations, the written recommendation of the Planning Division, and any written communications from the applicant, abutters, and parties of interest; **however, no hearing shall be opened nor shall testimony be received on a determination of completeness.** If it is determined that the application is complete, the Board shall accept the application for consideration, which may take place at the same meeting as the determination of completeness. An application which is determined to be incomplete may be revised and resubmitted to a subsequent meeting of the Board for another determination of completeness. *Staff notes that the completeness requirements stated above are purely a local regulatory requirement, as the statutory language in RSA 676:4-II(b) does not require a completeness of determination for a design review application (because it is a non-binding preliminary land use review function).*

Project Description:

The applicant requests a preliminary, non-binding design review consultation for a mixed-use development and subdivision at 282 Loudon Rd, 270 Loudon Rd, 277 Sheep Davis Rd, and 260 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. As part of the plan, the existing condominium will be dissolved, the site consolidated and resubdivided accordingly:

Tax Map 611Z Lot 39, is addressed as 282 Loudon Road and contains the former Regal Cinema movie theatre on 9.11 acres. The applicant proposes two new lots: a 0.9-acre lot containing a bank; and, an 8.60 acres lot containing two retail buildings.

Tax Map 611Z Lot 40, is addressed as 270 Loudon Road and contained the former Steeplegate Mall on 50.19 acres. The applicant proposes two new lots: an 18.33-acre lot containing a proposed wholesale retail with accessory uses; and, a 31.20-acre lot containing a mixed use including: the existing trampoline park and a relocated health club in an existing structure; three residential multifamily buildings containing a total of 600 residential units; 2 6,000-square-foot retail buildings; and, 2 7,500 square-foot retail buildings.

Tax Map 61Z Lot 9, is addressed as 277 Sheep Davis Road and contains an existing bank on 0.56 acres.

The applicant proposes to maintain the same bank use on a new 0.66-acre lot.

Tax Map 611Z Lot 41, is addressed as 260 Loudon Road and contains the Applebee's restaurant on 1.05 acres. The applicant proposes to maintain the same restaurant use on a new 1.22-acre lot.

This Design Review application has been submitted concurrently with Planning Case 2026-041, a comprehensive development plan (CDP) application. Both applications consist of the same applicant and owner, and are intended to serve the same project. This design review application remains as a non-binding forum for the project, while the comprehensive development plan, once acted on by the Board, will be a binding decision as it relates to the Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance.

Compliance:

The following analysis of compliance with the Subdivision Regulations is based on a 1-page narrative, dated June, 2026; and a 24-sheet plan set titled "Steeplegate & Regal Redevelopments", dated June 17, 2026, with revisions noted through April 14, 2026; and, an undated, 11-page photo log, prepared by Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc.

1. Project Details and Zoning Ordinance Compliance:

Zoning District: Gateway Performance (GWP) District

Overlay Districts:

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

2. General Comments:

- 2.1 Section 8.01 *Extent of Consideration* states a design review phase discussion with the Planning Board may be sought pursuant to RSA 676:4 II (b) for the purpose of discussing the subdivision design and layout before preparing the final plat for a major subdivision. The applicant may discuss with the Planning Board the procedure for application of a subdivision plat and the requirements as to general layout of streets and for reservations of land, street improvements, drainage, utilities, fire protection, and similar matters, as well as the availability of existing services.
- 2.2 Section 8.02 *Process* states the prospective applicant may seek the advice of the Planning Board only at a regularly scheduled meeting when the agenda category of "Design Review Plans" or "other business" is called. Public notice is required, and abutters are noticed by certified mail, for all meetings where the Planning Board considers subdivisions during the Design Review Phase. A public hearing shall not be held for the Design Review but comments may be received from abutters or other parties of interest.
- 2.3 Section 8.07(2) *Board Action on the Design Review Phase* states, pursuant to 676:4 II(b), statements, comments, suggestions and recommendations made by the Planning Board are non-binding statements. Representations, comments, suggestions and alternatives made by the applicant or the applicant's agents are equally non-binding. After reviewing and discussing the design review plan, the Planning Division report and other reports as submitted by invited agencies and officials, the Planning Board may advise the applicant of the specific changes or additions, if any, in the layout and the character and extent of required improvements and reservations, which it will require as a prerequisite to the approval of the subdivision plat.

- 2.4 Section 8.07(3) *End of Design Review Phase* requires the design review phase shall be complete at the end of the public meeting, unless the Planning Board elects to table consideration of the Design Review Phase to allow the applicant to submit additional information and for additional staff review and comment. If, within 65 days of the tabling by the Board, the applicant has not submitted the requested information for further consideration by the Board, the Design Review Phase shall automatically be terminated. The one-year vesting period, established pursuant to RSA 676:12 VI, shall commence at the close of the public meeting. Notice of the Planning Board decision shall be provided to the applicant pursuant to RSA 676:4.
- 2.5 Staff notes that, per Section 12.01 *Research*, applicants shall familiarize themselves with all city, state, and federal regulations relative to zoning, subdivision, land sales, utilities, drainage, health, buildings, roads, and other pertinent data so that the applicants are aware of the obligations, standards expected, and documents to be submitted.
- 2.6 Section 14.02(3) *Site Analysis Plan* requires the applicant to provide a site analysis plan as part of the design review application. Staff notes that a requirement for the applicant's concurrent comprehensive development plan is to provide a site analysis plan, as noted in the associated staff report. Understanding that a site analysis will be provided for the comprehensive development plan, and the extensive history of this project with the Planning Board, staff believes the plans submitted by the applicant provide sufficient information for the Board's consideration without providing a site analysis plan as part of the design review application.
- 2.7 As part of the design review phase application consideration, the Board and the Applicant should also consider any comments provided by staff as part of the CDP, submitted prior to this design review application, and still under consideration by the Board.
- 2.8 The Engineering Services Division reviewed the application and comments are noted in the attached 9-page memo to Alec Bass from Paul Gildersleeve and Pete Kohalmi, dated July 8, 2026.
- 2.9 The Planning Division reviewed the application and provided the following comments, which staff recommends the applicant consider as part of the forthcoming formal applications:
- a. The applicant has provided the approximate location of loading areas on the overall site plan. The applicant should closely consider Section 28-7-13 *Off-Street Loading Requirements* of the Zoning Ordinance and Section 20 *Loading, Solid Waste and Disposal* of the Site Plan Regulations. As it appears as though the proposed locations may conflict with certain location (cannot be located in parking or access ways) and screening requirements required both by the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Regulations.
 - b. The applicant should closely consider Section 28-7-14 *Off-Street Loading Area for Refuse Containers* and Section 20 *Loading, Solid Waste and Disposal* of the Site Plan Regulations to ensure compliance can be achieved while also satisfying other parking, circulation, and drainage requirements that govern the preparation of the site.
 - c. The applicant should consider adding additional description in their parking calculations explaining why a parcel may exceed, or not meet the required parking tabulation and how it is being satisfied. It appears as though several parcels do not meet the required parking requirements, and it appears as though there is a mix of previous zoning relief obtained, as well as shared off-site parking, which may require additional easements and conditional use permits.
 - d. The applicant should provide a very clear plan and description for required easements associated with the dissolution of the condominium and creation of separate lots proposed.

- Such consideration should include, but not necessarily be limited to: vehicle/pedestrian access and maintenance; municipal and non-municipal utility access and maintenance; storm water access and maintenance; potential shared parking arrangements; and, potential light trespass.
- e. The applicant should look to reduce the number of internal driveways for some of the smaller retail pad sites, bank, and residential properties. Interconnectivity remains critical for overall site circulation, however the applicant may also consider measures which would assist in prevention of thru-traffic through parking areas intended for residential purposes.
 - f. The applicant should look to further improve measures for sustainability and to reduce the amount of impervious surface and heat island effects. The applicant should consider design alternatives to achieve these goals, which could include items referenced in Section 30 *Sustainable Development* of the Site Plan Regulations to assist this effort.
 - g. The applicant should consider providing additional pedestrian connections and access within the project boundaries, including sidewalks along all internal connecting roadways and within large parking areas. The applicant should also consider ensuring all pedestrian sidewalks provide a pedestrian feel and scale, which, among other considerations can be assisted by providing appropriate lighting and landscaping.
 - h. The applicant should consider a master signage plan. Specifically, if the applicant should consider possible signage location and sizing which may be desired by future tenancy, and if as a result of the dissolution of the condominium into separate lots, compliance with section 28-6 *Sign Regulations* of the Zoning Ordinance can be achieved.
 - i. The applicant should consider Section 28-7-7(j) *illumination of Parking Areas* of the Zoning Ordinance and Section 29 *Lighting* of the Site Plan Regulations to ensure that any lighting overlap beyond property boundaries resulting from the future development, or existing lighting resulting from the dissolution of the condominium remain or achieve compliance.

3. **Subdivision Regulations Design Review Phase Requirements:**

The items below are missing from the submittal and **the Subdivision Regulations require the items for the application to be deemed complete, or a waiver has been requested, or that the application contains sufficient information and detail for consideration and action by the Board:**

- 3.1 Per Section 12.02(1) *Title Block* (c), the date the plan was prepared within the title block of the design review plan is June 17, 2026. However, the plan sets derived from previous applications and the revision block still contains all listed previous revisions through May 14, 2026, which should be all be removed from this applications title block and cover sheet. With the multiple applications for this project already submitted, and more expected, it will be important to make sure the titles, dates, and revision dates are clear to assist in reviewing and associating multiple plans and applications.
- 3.2 Per Section 12.08(23) *Tabulations* (c), the applicant has provided on the existing conditions sheets impervious coverage in square feet, however the regulations require, and it would be helpful for future application submissions to provide impervious coverage in percent as well.
- 3.3 Per Section 14.02(4) *Proposed Site Plan* (c), for future application submission, the applicant should include a tabulation table for all lots, including lot coverage of buildings and total lot impervious surface coverage in square-feet and percent.

- 3.4 Per Section 14.02(5) *Site Utility and Drainage Layout Plan* (c), for the most part, the applicant has provided on the overall grading and drainage plan an approximate layout of drainage facilities. However, future applications would benefit by providing additional storm water facility information such as approximate location of structures and pipes for the proposed whole sale retail lot (611Z Lot 40) and some of the smaller retail pads on Tax Map 611Z Lot 40-1.

4. Variances:

- 4.1 There are no variances required for this application.

5. Waivers:

- 5.1 There are no waivers submitted for this application.

6. Conditional Use Permits:

- 6.1 Conditional use permits are not required for this application.

7. Architectural Design Review:

- 7.1 Architectural design review is not required for design review applications.

8. Conservation Commission:

- 8.1 Appearances before the Conservation Commission are not required for this application.

9. Recommendations:

- 9.1 Staff recommends that the Planning Board proceed to proceed accordingly
- a. Determine the application for the design review phase as complete and proceed with holding the public meeting (not a public hearing);
 - b. Discuss the proposed project with the applicant and provide non-binding statements, comments, suggestions, and recommendations; and,
 - c. Unless the applicant otherwise requests to continue the design review consideration to a future date certain (August 19, 2026), state that the design review phase shall be complete at the end of the public meeting.
- 9.2 There are no motions or actions needed for the design review phase.



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

Michael S. Bezanson, PE
City Engineer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alec Bass, Assistant City Planner

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

DATE: July 8, 2026

SUBJECT: Steeplegate & Regal Re-Developments – Comprehensive Development Plans-Engineering Design Review
270 Loudon Road; Map 611Z, Lots 39, 40, and 40-1; Project # 2026-069

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

- Design Review Plans by Jones and Beach Engineers, Inc., dated June 17, 2026
- Design Review Photo Log by Jones and Beach Engineers, Inc., received June 17, 2026
- Design Review Narrative, received June 17, 2026

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. General Information

- a. Future submissions will require a more comprehensive package including a Stormwater Management Report, detail sheets and roadway plans and profiles detailed in the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations.
- b. The relocation of City owned utilities and easements should be clearly delineated and described. Existing City easements to be extinguished will need approval by the Concord City Council.
- c. Consideration should be given to providing a bus stop on Sheep Davis Road for Concord Area Transit.

d. Many sheet numbers need to fixed:

CS – Sheet No. 1 of 24
OV1 – Sheet No. 2 of 24
C1 – Sheet 3 of 29 should be Sheet No. 3 of 24
C1.1 – Sheet 4 of 29 should be Sheet No. 4 of 24
C1.2 – Sheet 5 of 29 should be Sheet No. 5 of 24
C1.3 – Sheet 6 of 29 should be Sheet No. 6 of 24
C1.4 – Sheet 7 of 29 should be Sheet No. 7 of 24
C1.5 – Sheet 8 of 29 should be Sheet No. 8 of 24
C1.6 – Sheet 9 of 29 should be Sheet No. 9 of 24
C1.7 – Sheet 10 of 29 should be Sheet No. 10 of 24
C1.8 – Sheet 11 of 29 should be Sheet No. 11 of 24
S1.1 – Sheet 1 of 3 should be Sheet No. 12 of 24
S1.2 – Sheet 13 of 3 should be Sheet No. 13 of 24
S1.3 – Sheet 14 of 3 should be Sheet No. 14 of 24
C2 – Sheet No. 15 of 24
C2.1 – Sheet No. 16 of 24
C2.2 – Sheet No. 17 of 24
C2-P – Sheet No. 18 of 24
C2-L – Sheet No. 19 of 24
C2-PC – Sheet No. 20 of 24
C3 – Sheet No. 21 of 24
C4 – Sheet No. 22 of 24
T1 – Sheet No. 23 of 24
T2 – Sheet No. 24 of 24

2. Traffic Impact Study

- a. A revised Traffic Impact Study was submitted May 29, 2026 by Vanasse & Associates, Inc. It is currently under review by City staff and subconsultants. The traffic study and related improvements will need to be reviewed by NHDOT as well. Comments will be provided as they become available.

3. Cover Sheet (Sheet CS)

- a. List latest submittal date of June 17, 2026.

4. Overall Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C1)

- a. Provide in future submittals the ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey information referenced in Notes (2) in these plans.

5. Subdivision Plans- (Sheets S1.1-S1.3)

- a. Show existing and proposed easements for all public infrastructure, including sanitary sewer mains and pump station, and stormwater mains and structures.
- b. The right-of-way line along D'Amante Drive from Loudon Road southerly, does not appear accurate. Several bounds have been found, however, it appears that they are not being held for the right-of-way line location. This may impact the configuration of the proposed sidewalk easement.
- c. Sidewalk easement deeds will need to be submitted for City review.
- d. Within the plan view for Tax Map 611Z Lot 41, the mailing address for MH Concord, LLC, is incorrect based on the City assessor's information. Also, please include the location address of 260 Loudon Road for that property.
- e. Within the ownership information for Tax Map 61Z Lot 9, please include the location address of 277 Sheep Davis Road.

6. Overall Site Plan (Sheet C2)

- a. Existing and Proposed Lot Lines should be more distinctive. While they look different digitally, on paper they look similar.
- b. There is a long stretch of straight roadway on proposed Road #1. Despite the proposed 3-way stop sign, there is a potential for high speeds on this straight stretch as the road will likely be used as a cut-through between Loudon and Sheep Davis Roads. To address potential safety issues, a roundabout must be considered at the intersection of Roads #1 and #2.
- c. A driveway is proposed on D'Amante Drive at the Target/Best Buy Driveway intersection. The additional conflict points introduced with this driveway, combined with the expected increase in volume on D'Amante Drive, creates safety concerns. To address potential safety issues, a roundabout must be

considered at the intersection of D'Amante Drive/Target & Best Buy Driveway/Proposed Southeast Site Driveway.

- d. D'Amante Drive is expected to have increased traffic volume. For improved safety, consideration must be given to widening the roadway to accommodate bicycle lanes or install a separated facility.
- e. Portions of the sidewalk proposed on D'Amante Drive are located immediately adjacent to the roadway. For improved safety, consideration must be given to separating sidewalks from the edge of road with a grass strip.
- f. The drive-thru entrance for the restaurant on the west side of lot 40-1 appears very long and its entrance is possibly too close to the signalized complex entrance on D'Amante Drive.
- g. All existing street names should be clearly labeled.
- h. Proposed private Road #1 and Road #2 will need street names. Please submit several street names for City review.
- i. Prior to demolition of the mall, new address numbers will need to be assigned to the existing trampoline park and the relocated health club; they will not continue to use the address of 270 Loudon Road. We would envision that addresses off of D'Amante Drive will be assigned. This needs to be discussed with Onyx.
- j. In relation to the entire site, Tax Map 611Z Lot 39 and Tax Map 611Z Lot 40, and the parcels that are to be subdivided, Onyx should reach out to the City Surveyor to discuss the potential addressing.
- k. The 4 proposed retail buildings along D'Amante Drive should have D'Amante Drive addresses.
- l. The proposed wholesale retail should have an address off of Loudon Road or Road #1.
- m. Residential complex "R1" should have an address off of either Road #1 or Road #2, depending on the location of the main entrance.
- n. Residential complex "R2", with commercial areas, should have addresses off of Road #2. Multiple addresses may be necessary to distinguish between the commercial units and the residential apartments. Architectural floor plans will need to be reviewed.
- o. The proposed bank on Lot 39-1 will have an address off of Loudon Road.
- p. The proposed retail units on Lot 39 will have addresses off of Loudon Road.

- q. Within the ownership information for Tax Map 61Z Lot 9, please include the location address of 277 Sheep Davis Road.
- r. Within the ownership information for Tax Map 611Z Lot 41, the mailing address for MH Concord, LLC, is incorrect based on the City assessor's information. Also, please include the location address of 260 Loudon Road for that property.

7. Site Plan- West (Sheet C2.1)

- a. Show existing and proposed easements for all public infrastructure, including sanitary sewer mains and pump station, and stormwater mains and structures.
- b. In future submissions please ensure handicapped ramps are provided at all sidewalks and crosswalks per ADA and PROWAG Guidelines.
- c. The proposed retaining wall behind proposed retail #1 crosses property lines. This is not acceptable to the City as future maintenance would become problematic.

8. Site Plan- East (Sheet C2.2)

- a. In future submissions please provide crosswalks along Road 2 where handicap ramps and drive aisles meet, and adjacent to Residential Complexes "R2" and "R3."
- b. Show existing and proposed easements for all public infrastructure, including sanitary sewer mains and pump station, and stormwater mains and structures.

9. Exhibit: Parking Areas (Sheet C2-P)

- a. Place the colored linetypes in a legend for easier interpretation.

10. Exhibit: Pedestrian & Cyclist Routes (Sheet C2-PC)

- a. A sidewalk connection appears to be missing from the wholesale retail store to the main entrance off D'Amante Drive.
- b. Please clarify the intent of the cross-hatched area on the west side of Sheep Davis Road next to residential complex R3.

11. Overall Grading & Drainage Plan (Sheet C3)

- a. In future submittals please show test pits. If the Proposed Stormwater Systems infiltrate, please show test pits at these locations also.
- b. In future submissions label existing and proposed contours.
- c. Public drainage appears to be piped into the site at the intersection of Road #1 and Sheep Davis Road. An appropriate outlet for this public drainage flow needs to be determined and designed; this will need to be coordinated with NHDOT. Should that include a piped connection through the site, private drainage needs to be pre-treated prior to making connection to that public piped system, including separated catch basins with appropriate sumps and oil/debris traps. Appropriate easements will be required for all public infrastructure on the site.

12. Overall Utility Plan (Sheet C4)

- a. In future submittals please show sizes, material, slopes, and lengths for all the sewer lines, and sizes and materials for all the water lines, pursuant to CSR 16.04(4)(a).
- b. In future submittals provide utility profiles for water, sewer, and water, pursuant to CSPR 16.04(4)(b).
- c. Ensure the site has minimum water pressures as required under the various conditions of CSR 24.03. A 5/21/2025 Hydraulic Modeling Evaluation memo by Wright-Pierce makes certain statements regarding water pressure and available fire flow based upon a proposed water main network that includes connections at Loudon Road, Sheep Davis Road, and D'Amante Drive. There appears to be a proposed water booster pump house near Loudon Road, yet this structure does not appear to be connected to the proposed water main network. If a single water booster station is proposed, rather than individual booster pumps within only the buildings that may require them, the water main network connection will likely need to be limited and the proposed water system will need to be re-evaluated by the City's water system consultant.
- d. Proposed sewer and water services are not shown for all proposed buildings. Among those services not shown, it is not clear how the existing Applebee's Restaurant building will continue to be provided water service with this redevelopment plan. Future subdivision and site plans will need to show all proposed utility connections.

- e. Based upon proposed water demands and estimated sewer flows some water and sewer mains may not have adequate capacity. Confirm sizing of mains is adequate. Off-site water mains may need to be evaluated by the City's water system consultant. Capacity of the City sewer system is addressed in a separate comment below.
- f. The capacity of the municipal sanitary sewer system is of concern in this area of the Heights neighborhood. Capacity is limited due to physical constraints of certain sanitary sewer mains located within the Loudon Road sewershed, the physical capacity of the existing municipal sewer pump station located at the former Steeplegate Mall, as well as a 1988 sewer agreement concerning allocation of capacity within the existing sewer pump station to certain properties located on the Heights. Real estate located at 260 Loudon Road, 270 Loudon Road, and 277 Sheep Davis Road (Applebee's Restaurant, the former Steeplegate Mall, and TD Bank properties, respectively) is party to the 1988 sewer agreement and has rights to 52,000 gallons per day of sewer capacity; however, property located at 282 Loudon Road (the former Regal Cinema property) is not, and therefore does not have any special capacity rights regarding the current sewer pump station.

On October 10, 2023, the City Council approved Resolutions #9586 and #9587 which appropriated the sum of \$1,900,000 to design sewer improvements associated with Capital Improvement Projects #91 (sewer mains) and #275 (sewer pump stations) to increase capacity of the municipal sanitary sewer system in this area of the City. As part of the City's FY2025 Budget, the City Council appropriated the additional sum of \$23,150,000 for Capital Improvement Projects #91 (sewer mains) and #275 (sewer pump stations), combined, to replace the existing municipal sewer pump station located at the former Steeplegate Mall, as well as to replace sewer mains located within Loudon Road, Branch Turnpike, Pembroke Road, and Grover Street to address capacity issues. These proposed sewer improvements are currently scheduled for completion in late 2026 (sewer pump station) and early 2028 (sewer mains).

In January 2024, Wright-Pierce (the City's water and sewer engineering consultant) prepared a preliminary estimate of the average daily sewer flow that the applicant's proposed development (270 Loudon Road and 282 Loudon Road, combined) may produce, which is approximately 144,900 gallons per day at full buildout. The existing sewer pump station does not have sufficient capacity to serve this demand. However, the new pump station presently under construction by the City will have capacity to serve this proposed development, as well as future development in this area of the

community. Once the new pump station is completed, sewer capacity reservations allocated to the Steeplegate Mall in the 1988 sewer agreement will become null and void.

Due to limited capacity of the system, the applicant may need to phase its proposed development project based upon its capacity rights associated with the existing pump station per the 1988 sewer agreement, as well as future sewer capacity to support its proposed development which will be created by the City's forthcoming new sewer pump station and related sewer main improvements. The phasing issue will be further reviewed when the applicant submits formal subdivision and site plan applications to ensure that there is adequate sewer capacity for each phase and at full buildout.

- g. Currently there is an existing water service to a hydrant near the sewer pump station; the plans do not show a proposed water service extending toward the sewer pump station. The new sewer pump station requires a water service for a yard hydrant that will be installed as part of the City's construction project. Please coordinate provisions for a water service to this area. Furthermore, the pump station will require a natural gas service. It is unclear from the plan submitted if one is proposed.
- h. A new force main is shown coming from the proposed pump station. The City will require rights to access and maintain the force main.
- i. Public gravity sewer mains between Loudon Road and the sewer pump station are proposed to be relocated by the developer to a location outside of the existing public sewer easement. New easements will be required for any public utilities, including gravity sewer mains and sewer force mains, centered on the location of the new infrastructure.
- j. Hydrant locations need to be reviewed and approved by the City's Fire Marshal. There appear to be a few proposed hydrants on the plan but are difficult to see. Are the AutoCAD scales correct for the drawing?
- k. Plans do not show how existing water, sanitary sewer, and storm drain infrastructure, that is not proposed to be reused, will be formally abandoned. Future subdivision and site plans will need to show proper abandonment per Concord Construction Standards and Details.
- l. The proposed SMH at the drive to the pump station appears to be too close to the proposed retaining wall for construction and long-term maintenance.
- m. There are two existing 12" sewer mains that flow to the sewer pump station, one carrying flow from Loudon Road and one carrying flow from Sheep Davis

Road. Proposed sewer mains from the eastern side of the development must be connected to the sewer main with flow from Sheep Davis Road.

- n. Linestyles of proposed gas mains are inconsistent. Some are grey, some red.

13. Truck Motion Plan- West (Sheet T1)

- a. In the Title Block for Sheets T1 and T2, move the Project information to read more clearly.