



Heather Shank
City Planner

CITY OF CONCORD

New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department

Planning Board

February 17, 2021

Project Summary – Major Site Plan

Project: Multi-Family Residential Development Plan (2021-04)
Property Owners: ZJBV Properties LLC
Address: 70 Pembroke Road
Map/Block/Lot: Map 632Z, Lot 87

Determination of Completeness:

Determine this application complete and set the public hearing for the March 17, 2021, Planning Board meeting. As part of the motion, indicate that the project does not meet the criteria for a Development of Regional Impact (DRI), per RSA 36:55.

Project Description:

The applicant is proposing a multi-phased mixed use project consisting of multifamily structures, attached residential structures, and a commercial use at 70 Pembroke Road in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District. The Major Site Plan approval is for the construction of Phase 1A, consisting of three (3) residential apartment buildings totaling 236 units, with associated parking and site improvements.

Project Details:

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Zoning: | Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District |
| Existing Use: | Commercial/Warehouse |
| Proposed Use: | Multi-family Residential and Mixed use commercial |
| Lot Coverage Max.: | 85% |
| Lot Coverage Proposed: | 52% *conflicting information provided, Applicant to update |
| Building Setbacks Required: | 15' front, 15' side, 15' rear |
| Building Setbacks Provided: | 15' front, 15' side, 15' rear |
| Parking spaces required | 628 spaces |
| Parking spaces provided | 624 spaces (CUP requested, see Section 2 below) |

1. General Comments

- 1.1 The following comments pertain to the site development plan set titled "Multi-Family Development, 70 Pembroke Road, Concord, New Hampshire" prepared by TFMoran, dated

January 20, 2021.

- 1.2 Architectural Design Review (ADR) is required for the Major Site Plan application. The Applicant is scheduled to go before the ADR Committee at their **March 2, 2021** meeting.
- 1.3 See comments from the Engineering Division in a separate memo dated February 2021. Please also see Traffic Study review comments in a memo prepared by VHB, dated February 5, 2021.
- 1.4 The Applicant is requesting the following Waivers to the Site Plan Regulations:
 - Waiver to Section 12.03(6) Existing Soils to allow the existing soil conditions to be identified and classified utilizing the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) system rather than a NH Certified Soil Scientist. The applicant provided test pit data and indicated that soil observations along with infiltration tests support the NRCS data. Sufficient information has been provided for review; therefore, staff supports this request.
 - Waiver to Section 16.03(11) Signs to provide the sign package at a later date. Staff supports this request.
 - Waiver to Section 22.07(2) Stormwater Recharge, to maintain 3 ft of separation where 4 ft is required between the bottom of an infiltration system and groundwater. The stormwater management system is designed in accordance with NHDES Alteration of Terrain Regulations. NHDES revised their regulations to allow for the 3 ft separation since the City adopted this standard. Staff supports this request.
2. **Conditional Use Permit(s)**
 - 2.1 The Applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in accordance with Section 28-7-11(b), Construction of Fewer Parking Spaces, of the Zoning Ordinance (ZO) to construct fewer parking spaces than are required.
 - 2.2 Please see the attached narrative provided by the applicant describing how the criteria of the applicable sections of the Ordinance are met, including Section 28-9-4(b) (4) (ZO), which states the criteria for the Planning Board decision.
 - 2.3 The Applicant must demonstrate that there is sufficient area to construct the spaces in the future, if required. The future parking spaces conflict with future phases, and does not appear to be feasible based on conditions provided for future phasing. Phase 2A parking and Phase 2B townhouses and associated green space, are proposed in the area of the “future parking spaces” for Phase 1A. Please clearly mark those areas for future parking on the CDP, and provide information about how the parking will be incorporated into Phases 2A and 2B, if the Planning Board requires the spaces to be built in the future. ***Staff cannot support the CUP based on the information provided.***
3. **Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) Comments**
 - 3.1 The Planning Board granted Comprehensive Development Plan at their December 19, 2018 meeting as part of a minor subdivision approval, with the following conditions.
 - 3.2 Add timeline and phasing boundaries to the Plan.
 - 3.3 Future lot line for the proposed subdivision should be clarified, the western boundary is obscured by other lines.
 - 3.4 Delete Note 10, it includes incorrect reference to City Standards; however, correct reference is provided in Note 16.

- 3.5 Clean up hatching for sidewalk north of the Phase 1A buildings.
- 3.6 Remove drain lines shown within Phase 1A for clarity.
- 3.7 Revise parking calculations to indicate Phase 1A (not just 1, since it does not include parking for Phase 1B).
- 3.8 Based on the information provided for Phase 2B, there is insufficient parking provided for the multi-family building and a variance for parking would be required. The layout provided in the CDP should be buildable and conform to the Zoning Ordinance requirements.
- 3.9 See Note 2.3 above regarding future Phase 1A parking. Further, within the plan view, the label with the Phase 1A information should indicate the number of spaces actually provided, and reference the CUP for future spaces, if granted.

4. Site Layout Comments

- 4.1 Per Section 18.10, no driveway shall exceed 28 ft in width except where the Planning Board requires a driveway of 3 lanes or more as part of the approval of a site plan. The driveway connection to Regional Drive is 36 ft in width. The Applicant shall provide information demonstrating the need for 3 lanes. To determine the intersection geometry at the proposed site driveways, the applicant should conduct auxiliary lane warrant evaluations at the Regional Drive and Pembroke Road site driveway intersections under 2022 Phase 1 Build, 2032 Phase 1 Build, and 2032 Phase 2 (Full Build) traffic volume conditions. These analyses should be prepared in accordance with National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 457 for the need of mainline left turn lanes, mainline right turn lanes, and minor road approach geometry.
- 4.2 Staff recommends that the Applicant consider adding a pathway through the central islands in the Building A and B parking lots to align with the pathways shown between the buildings. There appears to be sufficient space, and this will provide a safer pedestrian connection from the southern-most spaces to the buildings.
- 4.3 The amount of pavement and dimensions of the turnaround for the dumpsters is excessive. The dumpster location also seems inconvenient for building residents. Staff recommends that the Applicant reconsider the configuration to reduce the amount of pavement. Also, consider providing a separate dumpster location for Building C residents, which will be more convenient and will also reduce the size of the dumpster areas.
- 4.4 Staff recommends additional bicycle parking be provided for Phase 1A buildings, or centralize bike parking at the front entrance to each building. Further, staff recommends that the Applicant reconsider the bike rack detail and use a more efficient rack that matches the architecture of the proposed buildings, and provides more parking in the space allotted.
- 4.5 Site Plan shall be revised to show proposed site layout and materials information in the area of the future parking spaces if the CUP is approved and the spaces are not built.

5. Landscape and Lighting Comments

- 5.1 Verify tree locations do not interfere with lighting and other utilities. The tree location in the parking island closest to Building A is located on top of a light pole.
- 5.2 Staff recommends that the Landscape Architect reconsider the number of evergreen plantings along Regional Drive, especially at the southeast portion of the site where the trees are closer to the parking area. The evergreens will shade the parking spaces during the winter months, which could potentially cause icing issues. By replacing with shade trees, more sun will reach this portion of the parking lot in the winter, and the canopy of a shade tree is larger to provide more shade in the summer months.

- 5.3 Provide shrub plantings for Building A.
- 5.4 In general, the Landscape Plans are difficult to read. Staff requests that the Landscape Architect provide labels within the plan view, and not rely only on symbols.
- 5.5 The light level numbers on the Lighting Plan are not legible, please provide an updated, legible plan.
- 5.6 Provide details and information for lighting fixture, as required per Section 16.02(16).

6. Technical Review Comments

- 6.1 Phasing limits shall be shown on the CDP and Sheet C-05, Overall Site Plan. Phase 1A limit of work shall be clearly marked on all Site Plans.
- 6.2 Match lines should be shown on all sheets, where applicable.
- 6.3 Per Section 11.10 and 16.02(11) (SPR), phasing boundaries shall be shown on the Site Plans. The limit of work for Phase 1A should be clearly shown and labelled on the Site Layout and Grading Plans.
- 6.4 Per Section 12.05, provide a separate Vicinity Plan at scale of 1" = 1000' to 1"=5000'.
- 6.5 Per Section 13.01(7) Phasing Plan, provide the percentage of total residential and nonresidential uses, and the improvements and facilities provided in each phase.
- 6.6 Per Section 15.03(19), setbacks and buffers shall be shown and dimensioned on the Existing Conditions Plan.
- 6.7 Per Section 15.03(23)(d), tabulations for impervious surface coverage shall be provided, including square feet and percentage tabulations.
- 6.8 On Sheet C-05, revise Note 3 to state Phase 1A.
- 6.9 The tabulation for lot coverage provided on Sheets C-05, C-08, and C-09 in the Notes section and in separate Tabulations table to do not match. Please verify and provide the correct number. Also, please clarify if the lot coverage includes all other existing lot coverage, including the existing building and all parking to remain as part of Phase 1A (including the easement area). For assessing purposes, please provide a breakdown of pavement and buildings.
- 6.10 Delete Note 16, it includes incorrect reference to City Standards; however, the correct reference is provided in Note 21.
- 6.11 Per Section 15.04(5), include the addresses assigned for each building by the Engineering Services Division.
- 6.12 Per Section 15.04(22), all setbacks shall be shown and dimensioned on the Site Plan.
- 6.13 Per Section 15.04(23), the Zoning District Boundary shall be shown on the Site Plan.
- 6.14 Please confirm whether parking calculations include those within the Parking Easement area utilized by Concord Christian Academy.
- 6.15 Remove utility information from Sheets C-08 and C-09, there is a lot of overlapping text and it is difficult to read layout information.

Prepared by: BAF

S:\Plan\Development Review\Project Files\2021\2021-04_70_Pembroke_MAS_CUP\StaffReport_70Pembroke_DOC.docx



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

David Cedarholm, PE
City Engineer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Beth Fenstermacher, Assistant City Planner
FROM: Gary Lemay P.E., Associate Engineer
DATE: 2/11/2021
SUBJECT: Major Site Plan and Comprehensive Development Plan Review, 70 Pembroke Road; Map 632Z, Lot 87; (2021-004)

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

- *Site Development Plans*, Multi-Family Development, 70 Pembroke Road, prepared by TFMoran, dated January 20, 2021 (received on January 20, 2021)
- *Stormwater Management Report*, Multi-Family Development, 70 Pembroke Road, dated January 20, 2021 (received on Jan 20, 2021)

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

Existing Condition Plans (Sheets V-102, V-102, and V-104)

1. All of the Map and Lot numbers are incorrect; the correct notation is Tax Map 632Z – Lot 87. The letter “Z” goes with the map number, not the lot number. This includes lot numbers in the plan view and various notes.
2. The title block indicates that the project is Map 110, Block 1, Lot 1. The new designation is Tax Map 632Z – Lot 87.
3. The easement at the northeast corner of the parcel does not match the easement in the deed recorded at MCRD Book 2410, Page 134, or as shown on the 5th plan reference recorded at the MCRD as plan number 16078. Has an additional easement been conveyed? Please clarify.
4. The first plan reference is actually MCRD plan 16073, not 16037.

Site Plans

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

Sheet C-02

5. The legend for the electric manhole and the traffic control cabinet appears to be overlapped.

Sheet C-04 (Comprehensive Development Plan)

6. The label for the bus stop does not align with the bus stop bump-out; please correct.
7. The site is subject to reservations and conditions as found in MCRD Book 794, Page 31. Has the site been designed in conformance to these conditions, specifically as the conditions relate to the height of buildings in relation to the transitional surfaces of the Concord Airport? Engineering is conducting further research to determine if the property is subject to an aviation easement for the benefit of the City.
8. The addressing of Phases 1B, 2A, and 2B may require that the main north/south driveway from Pembroke Road to Regional Drive will need a private street name, and that the interior roadway for Phase 2B will also need a private street name. Please submit at least two proposed street names for City review. The proposed names shall not duplicate, or be confusingly similar to any other street name within the City.
9. Building A will have an address of 29 Regional Drive; Building B will have an address of 31 Regional Drive, and Building C will have an address of 33 Regional Drive. Please add this info to the plan view within each building. The physical address of the buildings will also include an apartment number, for instance 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 101, 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 102, 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 207, etc. Please add a note to the plan regarding the addressing.
10. The easement at the northeast corner of the parcel does not match the easement in the deed recorded at MCRD Book 2410, Page 134, or as shown on the 5th plan reference recorded at the MCRD as plan number 16078. Has an additional easement been conveyed? Please clarify. Also, private improvements are being proposed within the easement, which is for the benefit of the abutting property. Are these private improvements authorized by the easement?

Sheet C-05 (Overall Site Layout Plan)

11. Note 16 can be removed as the City of Concord Construction standards are referenced in note 21. Please also add that City of Concord construction standards shall take precedence in the event of any conflicts with site plans, details, or other drawings. Please search for consistency with similar notes other sheets (e.g., C-09).
12. Please add the following notes:
 - a. The contractor shall obtain Utility Connection Permits from the Engineering Services Division for the proposed water service, sewer service, and storm drain connection(s). Individual permits will be required for each connection.

- b. The contractor shall obtain a Driveway Permit from the Engineering Services Division for the proposed driveway.
 - c. A Temporary Traffic Control Plan (TTCP) will be required for all work in and adjacent to the City ROW that will require lane closures. The TTCP should be submitted to the ESD for review and approval a minimum of two weeks prior to the construction activities that require the lane closure(s).
13. The phasing lines along the parking lot to the rear of the proposed building are difficult to follow; please clarify where the boundary for phase 1 will be. The lines also appear to conflict with the site preparation and demolition plan.
14. Also, it is not totally clear what the future spaces mean – does that mean for phase 2, or for phase 1? These spaces appear to conflict with the proposed comprehensive development plan, which shows a building and access aisles in these locations.
15. Building A will have an address of 29 Regional Drive; Building B will have an address of 31 Regional Drive, and Building C will have an address of 33 Regional Drive. Please add this info to the plan view within each building. The physical address of the buildings will also include an apartment number, for instance 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 101, 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 102, 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 207, etc. Please add a note to the plan regarding the addressing.
16. In Note 1, the correct notation of the parcel number is Map 632Z Lot 87.

Sheet C-06 (Site Preparation and Demolition Plan)

17. Sight line labels appear to be turned on without the accompanying sight line layer.
18. The location of the existing water main in Regional Drive appears to be inconsistent with City GIS records; please consult with Engineering to clarify.

Sheet C-07 (Site Preparation and Demolition Plan)

19. Sight line labels appear to be turned on without the accompanying sight line layer.

Sheet C-08 (Site Layout Plan)

20. There are many overlapping labels, etc. that make the plan difficult to interpret; please correct the overlapping and crowded labels.
21. Please clarify the curbing material for the center islands, as it is currently unclear.
22. Building A will have an address of 29 Regional Drive; Building B will have an address of 31 Regional Drive, and Building C will have an address of 33 Regional Drive. Please add this info to the plan view within each building. The physical address of the buildings will also include an apartment number, for instance 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 101, 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 102, 29 Regional Drive, Apt. 207, etc. Please add a note to the plan regarding the addressing.

23. In Note 1, the correct notation of the parcel number is Map 632Z Lot 87.
24. The relocated sidewalk to the east of the entrance from Regional Drive will require a Sidewalk Easement Deed. The proposed easement should be clearly shown with bearings, distances, or curve data on the Site Layout Plan. The sidewalk easement should also include a buffer area from the proposed edge of sidewalk.

Sheet C-09 (Site Layout Plan)

25. City Site Plan Regulation 21.05 requires sidewalk to be a minimum of 5 feet wide excluding curbing width; please confirm the width of curbing is excluded from the 5-foot sidewalk width; we would recommend assuming a “curbing” width of 6 inches in the case of integrated curbing that is being proposed on the site.
26. The tabulation table and note 3 don’t appear to be consistent for the proposed coverage amount (33.9% versus 52%). Please clarify.
27. The driveway entrance should be double-checked for consistency with the Site Plan Regulations in Section 19, Table 19-2 regarding minimum and maximum driveway widths. Engineering is available for a discussion if there are questions.
28. The driveway radius appears irregular in shape, and the curbing and sidewalk may be run over by turning vehicles, as shown in plans T-01 and T-02 for buses. Please make the radiuses more regular in shape and redesign the driveway entrance/exit so that vehicles can turn into and out of the site without driving on the curbing or sidewalk.
29. Engineering has concerns about pedestrian safety when crossing the proposed driveway given the proposed width of 46 feet before accounting for driveway radius flares and traffic volumes.
- a. Engineering is asking the Applicant to consider ways to improve pedestrian safety when crossing the proposed driveway, including methods to minimizing the crossing width, such as a pedestrian island or refuge.
 - b. Please confirm that the driveway will be stop-controlled. If so, Engineering would expect to see a striped crosswalk at this location including ADA-compliant concrete tipdown with tactile plates, consistent with City Construction Standards and Details.
 - c. Engineering would recommend extending the proposed median at least to the ROW edge, instead of the proposed striping, to ensure traffic separation and improve pedestrian safety. A pedestrian refuge island may also be warranted for consideration, as noted above.
30. The proposed snow storage area on the eastern edge of the site appears to be in an ungraded area that may run toward the City ROW and sidewalk when the snow melts;

please incorporate grading or other design elements to capture and contain this runoff on-site. Please review any other snow storage areas for similar concerns.

31. The two crosswalks between Building B and C should be slightly moved to be located at the narrowest opening to minimize crossing distance.

Sheet C-10 (Grading and Drainage Plan)

32. Due to the size of this development and extensive above- and below-ground drainage detail, would it be possible to separate the above- and below-ground drainage systems onto separate sheets with the other greyed out in the background? This will make reviewing the drainage plans simpler.
33. Please re-create, if possible, the drainage schedule shown on the utility plan on the grading and drainage drawings for clarity. Additionally, please add labels indicating the size, slope, and material of the underground drainage pipes, similar to the sewer plan/profile drawings, to ensure compliance with minimum slope and depth requirements.

Sheet C-13 (Entrance Sight Line Plan and Profile)

34. Please re-list the driveway and median widths and radiuses on this plan for clarity.

Sheet C-15 (Utility Plan)

35. The current plan shows two taps from the City water main in Regional Drive; please re-configure the water lines on-site to account for a single water tap from the City main in Regional Drive that can be split on-site.
36. Please review City detail SM-6 for required minimum slopes; the 8" line has a proposed slope of 0.004, which is less than the City minimum of 0.006 for a line of that size.
37. The existing sewer stubs for the property appear to be 6" diameter, meaning the on-site 8" sewer would not be able to connect to those stubs. Please confirm the size of the existing sewer stubs, or consider tying in with a new sewer stub. If a new connection to the sewer manhole in Regional Drive is necessary, we would expect a single sewer tie-in for the entire development.
38. When practical, Engineering prefers to coordinate the location of any utility cuts to minimize the number of patches in the roadway; please keep this in consideration if there are new proposed roadway.

Sheet C-16 (Sewer Plan and Profile)

39. There appear to be several less relevant layers turned on for the sewer plan and profile that could be turned off or greyed out, such as grading contours, spot elevations, water line details.

- 40. Please also add individual labels or a schedule listing manhole rim elevations and elevations, including the tie-in to the street.
- 41. Please revise the sewer plan to show the tie-in to the City main in the street.
- 42. Some of the proposed sewer lines cross the proposed water lines with less than 18" of separation. Please review the City Construction Standards and Details for specifics, but generally these crossings shall be constructed with force main materials when separation is less than 18"; please revise the drawings accordingly.

Sheet C-17 (Stormwater Management Plan)

- 43. There appear to be several less relevant layers turned on for the sewer plan and profile that could be turned off or greyed out. Please review the plans and grey out or remove irrelevant details.

Sheet T-01 and T-02 (Turning Movement Plan)

- 44. We understand that the turning motions shown as "inter-city bus" are, in fact, a firetruck. Please confirm this and the size/dimensions of the firetruck.
- 45. Please show firetruck access turning motions passing along the front of Building A and B.

General Comments

- 46. Many sheets have overlapping on drawings, or layers turned on that don't need to be (e.g., sewer slope labels for the driveway plan) and it is hard to read some conflicting labels. Please review all sheets and make sure the relevant layers are turned on/off, or are greyed out as appropriate.
- 47. It is not clear how utilities will be provided to Phase 2 of the project.
 - a. Is the intent to loop the future private water system will be looped between Regional Drive and Pembroke Road? If so, we would expect to see a water stub running toward the back of the site.
 - b. How will sewer service be provided to the proposed development as part of Phase 2? Given the size and depth of the sewer in Regional Drive, it may be advantageous to direct the site's sewer in that direction.
- 48. The proposed bus stop to the east of the proposed driveway is within the proposed sight distance triangle and will block vision for those turning left and right out of the driveway when a bus is present. Please consider alternative bus stop locations that won't impact sight distances. Engineering recommends moving the bus stop to the west of the driveway, as far as practical, to minimize or eliminate sight distance encroachments from the bus stop.

49. Has the applicant had any talks with Capital Area Transit (CAT) about the proposed bus stop at this site? Engineering would like to be involved with any future discussions about a bus stop at this site.
50. If the bus stop is incorporated into the final site plans, please consult with Engineering on the layout and details of the bus stop to ensure proper length/width, taper length, sidewalk width for handicap lift access, etc. Specific elements will include:
- The sidewalk will likely need to be up to 8 feet wide at the bus pull off to allow for safe maneuvering onto and off of the lowered bus lift;
 - The pulloff should be at least 8 feet deep, 50 feet long, and contain 4:1 entrance and exit tapers;
51. Would the Applicant consider conveying a bus shelter easement for potential future use at the location of the bus stop?
52. A bike rack detail is included in the plan set, however it is not clear where bicycle parking is proposed on the site layout plans. Please add the bicycle parking locations based on Section 30.03 of the Site Plan Regulations and the 2010 Bicycle Master Plan; and designed as follows:
- Located as close to the main entrance as practicable;
 - The City's preferred rack designs are an inverted "U" or a post and ring type where the center post is the same dimension as the rings.
 - Acceptable racks are the Square U Rack by MADRAX, Downtown Rack by Dero or similar.
 - Refer to the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) Bicycle Parking Guidelines or the City of Cambridge Bicycle Parking Guide (Appendix L, 2010 Concord Bicycle Master Plan) for additional information of acceptable rack types and layouts. A copy of the Bicycle Master Plan is available on the Planning Division section of the City's web page, www.concordnh.gov.
53. Prior to final Engineering approval of the design plans, a fire protection engineer shall provide, on their letterhead, a document certifying that the new proposed water service line is adequately sized and designed for the proposed site conditions, including addressing whether domestic water is also tapped off of the same line.
54. When there is a City of Concord detail available for a given item/detail it shall be used. The details used shall be the ones from the recently updated standards. A City of Concord detail is available for multiple items, including parking striping, stabilized construction entrance, vertical granite curbing, drain manhole, sewer manhole, and bicycle parking; please review for any additional appropriate details, as this list may be incomplete.

55. A waiver has been requested from Section 22.07(2) of the Site Plan Regulations to reduce the requirement for groundwater separation from an infiltration system from 4 feet to 3 feet, which is in accordance with NHDES Alteration of Terrain regulations. Engineering supports this waiver for the reasons cited by the Applicant.

Traffic Study

56. Engineering refers to the review letter sent by VHB dated 2/5/2021 for detailed traffic comments.

57. In addition to VHB's comments, Engineering expects that any future traffic studies for this site as part of later phases will collect new traffic count data. The purpose would be to replace COVID-related traffic count impacts and assumptions with new data at that time. Please add a note or paragraph to the study making this understanding clear.

Drainage Report

58. Engineering would like the Applicant to provide a copy of the HydroCAD files used to develop this drainage report. Further comments will be provided upon review of the electronic data.

State/Federal Permits

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

- EPA Construction General Permit – Notice of Intent
- FAA Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis (OE/AAA) – Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form FAA 7460-1)
- NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit
- NHDES Registration and Notification for Storm Water Infiltration to Groundwater
- NHDES Sewer Connection Permit

A copy of the permit(s) should be submitted to the City once they are issued.

Post-Approval/Pre-Construction Items

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

1. Prior to engineering sign-off on the building permit, 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 avigation easement (if deemed necessary by Engineering) shall be recorded prior to issuance of a building permit for this property.
3. The following permit(s) will need to be obtained from the Engineering Services Division:
 - a. Driveway Permit

- b. Encumbrance Permit (for work that will encumber the ROW, public sidewalks, and/or metered parking spaces)
 - c. Excavation Permit (for work within the ROW)
 - d. Utility Connection Permits for each sewer, water, or storm drain connection(s)
4. 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 Engineering for review and approval a minimum of two weeks prior to the pre-construction meeting)
 5. Performance surety (letter of credit, or cash deposit) for site stabilization. The surety amount for this project has been set at \$52,000 based on an approximate 9.5 acre disturbance area, with up to 0.5 acres requiring additional topsoil. The surety shall be established prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting.
 6. Performance surety (bond, letter of credit, or cash deposit) for work within the right-of-way and any proposed public improvements. An engineer's cost estimate, based on the current NHDOT weighted average unit prices, should be submitted a min. of two weeks prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting. The surety shall be established at least one week prior to the pre-construction meeting.
 - a. Engineering can provide a template sheet for calculating this surety upon request.
 7. Advanced deposit for site construction inspection fees (initial deposit amount determined by Engineering based on the project schedule and estimated services, final inspection fee to be adjusted based on actual services rendered). A project schedule and itemized cost estimate should be submitted a minimum of two weeks prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting for use in establishing the deposit amount. The deposit shall be submitted at least a week prior to the pre-construction meeting.
 - a. Please contact Engineering for a spreadsheet to estimate the initial fee deposit (this is only an estimate as the fee will be based on actual time spent by Engineering inspectors for this project).
 8. Water and Sewer Investment Fees will need to be paid as part of the utility connection permit process.
 9. Shop drawings/submittals should be submitted to Engineering for the proposed water, sewer, and drainage improvements, and for any proposed improvements within the ROW.
 10. Prior to the construction of any future site improvements the applicant/owner should consult the Planning Division to determine if Site Plan Approval will be required.

Re: Site Plan Review Comments (2021-004)

70 Pembroke Road

Date: 2/11/2021

11. Upon completion of construction the contractor shall submit as-built drawings to the Engineering Services Division. A copy of the as built drawing requirements is available upon request to Engineering.