



Heather Shank  
City Planner

# CITY OF CONCORD

*New Hampshire's Main Street™*  
**Community Development Department**

## Planning Board

May 17, 2017

### **Project Summary – Major Site Plan**

Project: 134 Hall Street – Major Site Plan Application (2016-58)  
Property Owners: Lee B. Marden Revocable Trust 2001  
Address: 132 and 134 Hall Street  
Map/Block/Lot: 5/1/8 and 5/1/9

#### **Determination of Completeness:**

Determine this application complete and set the public hearing for the June 21, 2017 Planning Board meeting.

Please note that the applicant requested to have the public hearing held at the same meeting as the Determination of Completeness, which is allowed under Section 10.06 of the Site Plan Regulations. Staff recommends that the Board deny this request as there are several significant items that should be addressed prior to approval.

#### **Project Description:**

The applicant is requesting Major Site Plan approval for the construction of a 14,650 sf building addition, a new parking area, new access and circulation, and related site improvements at 132 and 134 Hall Street in the Industrial (IN) District. The applicant has also filed a separate Voluntary Lot Merger Application to combine 132 and 134 Hall Street.

#### **Project Details:**

Existing Lot Area: 15.54 acres  
Zoning: Industrial (IN) and Residential Open Space (RO)\*  
*\*The proposed work is entirely within the IN District, therefore, those are the standards that apply*  
Existing Use: Warehouse, Storage, and Auto Repair  
Proposed Use: Manufacturing and Fabrication  
Frontage Required: 200 ft  
Frontage Provided: 248.6 ft\*  
*\*The total frontage accounts for the merger of the two lots*  
Lot Coverage Permitted: 85%  
Lot Coverage Proposed: 68%

Setbacks Required: 50' front, 25' side, 30' rear  
 Setbacks Provided: 58' front, 31' side, 299' rear

Parking spaces required: 65 spaces, including 3 HC spaces\*  
 Parking spaces provided: 65 spaces, including 4 HC spaces

*\*See General Comment 1.4 below*

## 1. General Comments

- 1.1 The following comments pertain to the 11 sheet site plan set titled prepared by A.C. Engineering & Consulting, dated November 14, 2016, revision dates January 20, 2017, and February 28, 2017; a 2 sheet Existing Conditions plan set prepared by Richard D. Bartlett & Associates, dated October 2016, revision dates December 28, 2016 and April 11, 2017; one sheet set titled "Site Plan of the land of Lee B. Marden Rev. Trust 2001, prepared by Richard D. Bartlett & Associates, dated October 2016, revision date April 11, 2017; a 2 sheet landscape plan set prepared by g2+1 Landscape Architects, dated January 24, 2017; and, a 3 sheet architectural plan and elevation set prepared by Construx, Inc., not dated, received March 2, 2017.
- 1.2 Architectural Design Review (ADR) is required for Major Site Plan applications. The Applicant is scheduled to attend the June 13, 2017 ADR meeting.
- 1.3 Please see engineering comments in the memo from the Engineering Division, dated April 28, 2017.
- 1.4 Per Article 28-7-1 of the Zoning Ordinance (ZO), if any building or structure is enlarged, off street parking and loading spaces shall be provided for the entire use in accordance with the requirements established by the ZO.

Unit I was recently vacated by a recycling center. Assuming that the new tenant will have similar parking requirements as the other existing uses (1/800 sf or 1/1500 sf), the parking requirements for the entire site will be 62 spaces (if Unit I is leased for warehousing or storage) or 65 spaces (if Unit I is leased for manufacturing, fabrication or assembly). There are 41 existing parking spaces that meet the Zoning requirements (see Comment 3.3c below), and 24 parking spaces are proposed.

**If the leased areas change to a use that require additional parking spaces (for example Office, Warehousing, Industrial Flex Use), the owner shall return to the Planning Board to amend the site plan to provide additional parking spaces.**

- 1.5 The applicant is proposing to place guardrail along the existing parking area and screen existing dumpsters to bring the area into compliance with the ZO.
- 1.6 A non-compliant gravel parking area was constructed along the southern property line, and storage trucks are parked in a gravel area encroaching on the adjacent property. Per the ZO, parking spaces shall be clearly demarcated and constructed in accordance with the site plan regulations, and no off-street parking shall be located within 5 feet of any lot line. The applicant has agreed to remove the parking area, and require that the storage company park in the rear (west of the existing building) gravel area.
- 1.6 The Code Administrator recommends that no building permits be issued until the existing development is brought into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

## 2. Waivers

2.1 The applicant is requesting waivers from the following sections of the Site Plan Regulations:

- **Section 12.07 Wetlands Delineations** to not provide a wetland delineation stamped by a Certified Wetland Scientist since the proposed construction is limited to the eastern portion of the site is nor near a wetland area based on previous record plans. Staff supports this request.
- **Section 15.03(3) Topography** to not provide topography for the entire site since the proposed construction is limited to the eastern portion of the site. Staff supports this request.

## 3. Technical Review Comments

- 3.1 A Cover Sheet shall be provided, and shall include, at a minimum, the Project name, address, owner information, name and information for all consultants, and a sheet list with original submission and respective revision dates. This information will help document all of the plans that were reviewed by the City.
- 3.2 The Planning Board Approval signature block shall be provided on the Cover Sheet, Site Plans, and Grading Plans.
- 3.3 The following revisions shall be addressed for the Existing Conditions Plans, Sheets 1 and 2:
- a. The Side and Rear setback numbers are switched in the Zoning Summary Table.
  - b. The utilities on Sheet 1 do not agree with the location, size, material, etc., as shown on other plans in the set.
  - c. The existing parking shown on south of the building does not accurately depict parking spaces as they exist. Standard parking spaces need to be shown on the plan as 9'x19' for spaces perpendicular to the drive aisle and 9'x22' for spaces parallel to the drive aisle (up to 25% of the spaces may be designed as compact). Only those existing spaces that meet these requirements shall be shown and counted. Spaces in front of existing doors, stairways, ramps, and loading docks cannot be counted.
- 3.4 The doors shown on the architectural plans and elevations do not align with the proposed access walkways shown on the Site Plan set. The door locations shall be shown on all site plans (Site, Grading & Drainage, Utilities, Lighting and Landscape Plans), and the walkways shall be realigned to account for the correct door locations. Additional paving will be required for doors on the south and north elevation.
- 3.5 It is our understanding that the purpose of the Site Plan prepared by Richard D. Bartlett & Associates is to depict proposed improvements to bring the existing site into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. The following revisions shall be addressed on this sheet:
- a. Add a note to the plan describing the Plan intent.
  - b. Since this plan shows proposed site improvements and construction details, the plans should be stamped and sealed by the Design Engineer.

- c. Staff recommends that the plan be revised to screen back existing conditions so that proposed improvements are legible.
  - d. The plan shall be incorporated into the entire site plan set as C-2A (or other sequence), and re-named "Phase 1 Site Plan".
  - e. The proposed guardrail and dumpster enclosure shall also be shown on the Site Plan Sheet C-2 prepared by A.C. Engineering.
  - f. The existing gravel parking area and paved driveway that encroach onto the adjacent property shall be noted to be removed and restored with 6" loam placed, and seeded. Further, portions of the existing driveway that are located on the adjacent property to the south shall be removed, as noted in the attached Engineering Comments. Approval from the abutting lot owner to the south is required for any proposed work on the abutting lot.
  - g. The dumpster located furthest east shall be relocated and screened.
  - h. Provide a detail for the proposed dumpster enclosure, including height, material, and color.
- 3.6 The information provided in the Zoning Summary Tables on the Existing Conditions Plan and on Sheet C-2 do not agree. Revise each sheet with the correct information.
- 3.7 Revise the lot # under General Note 1. on Sheet C-2.
- 3.8 Add guardrail, dumpster screening to Sheet C-2.
- 3.9 Delete repetitive Erosion & Sediment Control Notes from Sheet C-3.
- 3.10 Remove "& Landscape" from the Sheet C-4 title, should just be Lighting Plan.
- 3.11 Revise the proposed site layout on Sheet LA-1.0 – the Landscape Plan shows a sidewalk and HC parking spaces south of the proposed addition.
- 3.12 Revise plantings to address revised door, window, and walkway locations.
- 3.13 Tabulations for the landscaping shall include all additional pavement, including the 2 new parking spaces south of the building, the widened access drive to access the north elevation of the building, and the access drive from the 130 Hall Street to the proposed parking area. Revise the tabulations and provide additional plantings, if necessary.
- 3.14 Revise lineweights on Sheet LA-1.0 to improve legibility. Proposed trees should be darker than existing trees and grading and utilities should be screened back.
- 3.15 A comment letter shall accompany subsequent submissions acknowledging/addressing all Planning and Engineering comments.

Prepared by: BAF

S:\Plan\Development Review\Project Files\2016\2016-58\_134HallSt\_SPR\HallStreet\_DOC.docx



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

Edward L. Roberge  
*City Engineer*

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Beth Fenstermacher, Assistant City Planner  
**FROM:** Bryant A. Anderson, PE  
**DATE:** April 28, 2017  
**SUBJECT:** Plan Review, Lee B. Marden Revocable Trust, 134 Hall Street;  
Map 5, Block 1, Los 8 & 9; (2016-58)

---

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

- *Existing Conditions Plat*, Land of Lee B. Marden Rev. Trust 2001, 134 Hall Street, Map 5, Block 1, Lots 8 & 9, prepared by Richard D. Bartlett & Associates, LLC, dated October, 2016, revised thru 12/28/2016; (received on 1/24/2017)
- *Site Plan*, Land of Lee B. Marden Rev. Trust 2001, prepared by Richard D. Bartlett & Associates, LLC, 134 Hall Street, Map 5, Block 1, Lots 8 & 9, dated October, 2016, revised thru 4/11/2017; (received on 1/24/2017)
- *Site Plans (Sheets C-1 - C-6, E-1 - E-3)*, 134 Hall Street, Tax Map 5 / Block 1 / Lot 9, prepared by A.C.Engineering & Consulting, dated October 14, 2016, revised thru 2/28/2017 (received on 1/24/2017, revised Sheet C-3 on 3/2/2017)
- *Landscape Plans (Sheets LA-1.0 and LA-1.1)*, Lee B. Marden Revocable Trust of 2001, prepared by g2+1, LLC, dated January 24, 2017; (received on 1/24/2017)
- *Elevation Sheet*, no title or date information provided; (received on 1/24/2017)
- *Floor Plans and Elevations (Sheets A1 – A3)*, Lee B. Marden Revocable Trust, Concord, NH, prepared by Construx, Inc., no date; (received 3/2/2017)
- *Drainage Calculations*, 134 Hall Street Site Development, Tax Map 5 / Block 1 / Lot 8, 134 Hall Street, Concord, New Hampshire, prepared by A.C.Engineering & Consulting, dated November 16, 2016; (received 11/21/2016)
- *Site Plans (Sheets C-1 - C-6, E-1 - E-3)*, 134 Hall Street, Tax Map 5 / Block 1 / Lot 9, prepared by A.C.Engineering & Consulting, dated October 14, 2016, revised thru 2/28/2017

*Engineering Services*  
City Hall • 41 Green Street • Concord, NH 03301 • (603) 225-8520  
[engineering@concordnh.gov](mailto:engineering@concordnh.gov)

As a supplement to any comments offered by the Planning Division, the ESD offers the following design related comments. **With subsequent submissions, the applicant should provide a response letter that acknowledges/addresses each of these comments.**

---

### **Project Plans (General)**

1. The color combinations used on the plans will make it difficult to scan, copy, and reproduce them while preserving the necessary detail. The ESD typically scans final plans that are approved and signed by the Planning Board for record purposes. As such, the ESD recommends that the final plans be submitted as a black, white, and greyscale without color.
2. The layout of the site and door locations on the Site Plan, Overall Landscape Plan, and the "A" sheets should be revised to be consistent.
3. All references to 4" of loam should be changed to 6" to comply with Site Plan Regulations. There are numerous references throughout the plan set.
4. The site design plans show proposed improvements such as a widened driveway and a detention pond that will impact both parcels. As these two parcels are currently owned by the same entity, easements cannot be created. An Agreement to Convey Easements upon the sale of either lot should be prepared.

### **Existing Conditions Plat**

5. The utilities on the plan do not agree with the location, size, material, etc. as shown on other plans in the set.
6. The limits of gravel parking encroachment onto the abutting property should be labeled.
7. The overhead utilities should be shown on Sheet 2 of 2.
8. A callout on the plan indicates that the lot lines between Map 5, Block 1, Lot 8 and Map 5, Block 1, Lot 9 will be vacated by voluntary merger. Upon the voluntary merger, the number Lot 9 will be retained and the number Lot 8 will be eliminated.
9. Within the plan view the deed referenced for Lot 8 is Vol. 2720, Page 541. The Assessors records indicates that this should be Book 3438, Page 40. This will need to be corrected on both sheets.
10. Ownership notations on the plan and the records of the City Assessing Department indicate that the two properties, Map 5, Block 1, Lot 9 and Map 5, Block 1, Lot 14 are owned by the same entity. Therefore, any easements benefitting or burdening these parcels, such as the easement recorded at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds at Book 1774, Page 797, may have been extinguished by operation of law and the doctrine of merger.

### **Site Plan (Bartlett)**

11. The plan shows proposed site improvements and construction details. As such, the plans should be stamped and sealed by the Design Engineer.
12. Portions of the existing driveway are located over the corner of the abutting lot to the south. The southern edge of the driveway should be revised to provide the following:
  - Remove pavement within 5 ft of the side lot line;
  - Provide a radius between the edge of the driveway and the curb line of the road.
  - Remove the existing pavement outside to new radius, edge the driveway, and from the abutting lot.

### **Site Plans (A.C. Engineering)**

#### **Demolition Plan (C-1)**

13. Under the Sediment & Erosion Control Notes, the first sentence should clarify that access shall be from the southern, main access to the site. The curb cut near the midpoint of the property should be closed and not be used for construction activities.
14. The former driveway for 132 Hall Street located near the midpoint of the property should be closed with curb and the existing pavement removed. This should be shown on the all of the applicable plans in the plan set.

#### **Site Plan (C-2)**

15. Note number 5 should be revised to read "Flood plain elevation is 232.0 per the Code Administer."
16. Curb should be provided at the existing entrance per Construction Standard D-4. In addition, a portion of the existing driveway crosses over the corner of the abutting lot.
17. Curb should also be placed between the access aisle and parking spaces #2 and #3 to ensure that vehicles do not track off the pavement.
18. Per Site Plan Regulations 18.21, snow storage areas should be designated on the Site and Grading Plans.
19. Is it the intent to have people walk up the 10% driveway to access the pedestrian door adjacent to the overhead door or will there be a separate walkway and stairs?

#### **Grading & Utility Plan (C-3)**

20. Spot grades should be provided at the corners of the accessible parking and along the route to the accessible entrance to ensure that the area is constructed with a maximum 2% in any direction per ADA requirements.
21. Per Site Plan Regulations 18.21, snow storage areas should be designated on the Site and Grading Plans.

22. The plan notes that the “new building to tie into existing sewer line.” Engineering assumes the connection will be accomplished in accordance with the Plumbing Code. Engineering will review/inspect the portion of the service outside of the building limits.
- a. The designer should review the building footing depth to confirm that there will not be a conflict with the sewer service. The depth of the service cannot be determined at the face of building since invert information for the sewer main in Hall Street has not been provided.
  - b. A cleanout should be added just outside the building.
23. There appear to be typo’s in the notes for Infiltration Basin 1 and Catch Basin 2130.
24. A valve should be shown on the domestic water service just outside the building.
25. The driveway leading into the building is graded at 10%. Depending on the use, some vehicles may have difficulty traversing a 10% angle point.
26. If the addition have a roof drains, they should be shown on the plan.

#### **Lighting & Landscape Plan (C-4)**

27. It appears based on an internet search, that the specified light fixture may no longer be available. If so, the plan should be revised to reflect the replacement or other fixture. A maximum 4000K lamp should be specified, preferably 3000K.
28. Per Concord Zoning Ordinance 28-7-7(j), lighting shall be designed to limit any increase in off-site illumination to a maximum of two-tenths (0.2) of a footcandles as measured at the side and rear lot lines...”
29. Per Concord Zoning Ordinance 28-7-7(j), all parking lot illumination shall be subject to a four to one uniformity ratio, which is the ratio of the average illumination to the minimum illumination. The designed uniformity ratio, and the average, maximum and minimum lighting levels should be noted on the plans for the parking areas.

#### **Drainage Calculations & Plans**

30. The “Site Conditions” references a 12” CMP which is not shown on the plans.
31. Section 22.07(2) and (4) of the Site Plan Regulations: Stormwater Design Standards for Site Plans with Significant Impact states:
- a. “A minimum separation of four (4) feet shall be maintained between the bottom of an infiltration system and the groundwater”, and
  - b. “Pre-treatment: To prevent premature failure, the design of storm water treatment devices relying on infiltration shall include a pre-treatment device or method that will trap sand and sediments, as well as oil and gas pollutants. Pre-treatment facilities must be designed to accommodate a minimum of one-year’s worth of sediment and shall be located to be easily inspected and maintained.”



Based on the test pit data provided, there appears to be 6" separation between the ESHWT and the bottom of the Infiltration Basin 2. Given the limited separation, there will be limited opportunity for infiltration and the Basin 2 should be design as a detention basin. Engineering recognizes that the 4' separation is inconsistent with the Alteration of Terrain manual if pretreatment can be provided. Basin 1 receives most of the runoff from the new parking area and should be designed as the forebay for the detention basin.

32. Section 22.07(3) states:

- a. "For new development, the volume of off-site discharge after project development shall not exceed the volume of discharge before development for the 10-year storm event. The peak rate of discharge after project development shall not exceed the peak rate of discharge before development for the 2-year, 10-year, 25-year and 100-year storms. On-site retention or detention facilities shall be provided as necessary to manage the off-site flows, and to prevent the overloading of existing downstream facilities."

Based on the limited ability to infiltrate runoff as noted above, the applicant should apply for a waiver to Section 22.07(3) relative to the requirement that the development shall not exceed the volume of discharge...

33. The detention basin should be designed to drain within 72 hours.

34. The "Outflow" for Basin 1 should be "dynamic tailwater" and not "free discharge".

### **Pre-Construction Items**

The following items will need to occur prior to the start of construction (unless otherwise noted).

1. The applicant/contractor shall set up a pre-construction meeting with the Engineering Services Division to discuss construction requirements, site inspections, associated fees, schedules, etc.
2. The following permits will need to be obtained from the Engineering Services Division:
  - a. Driveway Permit
  - b. Excavation Permit (for work within the ROW or on City property)
  - c. Utility Connection Permits (sewer and water services)
3. The contractor shall submit a Temporary Traffic Control Plan (TTCP) for all work in and adjacent to the City ROW that will require lane closures or occur adjacent to the edge of road. (submit to the ESD for review and approval a minimum of two weeks prior to the pre-construction meeting)
4. Performance surety (bond, letter of credit, or cash deposit) for site stabilization. The surety amount for this project has been set at the minimum amount, \$5,000. (establish surety prior to pre-construction meeting)

Re: Review Comments (2016-58)  
Marden, 134 Hall Street  
Date: 4/28/2017

5. Advanced deposit for site construction inspection fees (initial deposit amount determined by the ESD based on the project schedule and estimated services, final inspection fee to be adjusted based on actual services rendered). A project schedule should be submitted a min. of two weeks prior to the pre-construction meeting for use in establishing the deposit amount. (submit deposit a min. of three days prior to pre-construction meeting)
6. Water and Sewer Investment Fees will need to be paid (as part of the utility connection permit process).
7. Shop drawings/submittals should be submitted to the ESD for the proposed water, sewer, and drainage improvements.

BAA/jw