



Heather Shank
City Planner

CITY OF CONCORD

New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department

Planning Board

June 16, 2021

Project Summary – Major Site Plan

Project: Capitol Shopping Center (2020-013)
Property Owners: Brixmor Capitol SC, LLC
Address: 80 Storrs Street
Map/Block/Lot: Map 35B, Block 1, Lot 1

Determination of Completeness:

This application was determined complete at the September 16, 2020 Planning Board meeting. Staff recommends opening the public hearing.

Project Description:

The applicant is proposing to construct three new buildings for restaurant, retail, and a coffee shop with drive-through service uses consisting of 6,120 sf, 5,560, and 2,325 sf respectively, with associated site improvements.

Project Details:

Zoning:	Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District
Minimum Lot Area:	No Minimum
Existing Lot Area:	662,788 sf (15.22 ac)
Street Frontage Required:	150'
Street Frontage Provided:	1,320'
Existing Use:	Parking Lot
Proposed Use:	Restaurant and Retail Businesses
Lot Coverage Max.:	85%
Lot Coverage: Existing:	95.5%
Lot Coverage Proposed:	93.9% <i>Variance Received</i>
Building Setbacks Required:	15' Front, 15' Rear, 15' Side
Building Setbacks Existing:	65' Front, 22' Rear, 46' Side
Building Setbacks Proposed:	8' Front, 25' Rear, 46' Side <i>Variance Received</i>
Parking spaces required :	977, including 16 ADA
Parking spaces provided:	798, including 18 ADA <i>Variance Received</i>

1. General Comments

- 1.1 The following comments pertain to the 18-sheet site plan set titled “Capitol Shopping Center” prepared by Nobis Group, dated August 21, 2020 and revised through May 28, 2021, the 3-sheet landscape plan set prepared by Warrenstreet Architects dated May 28, 2021, the 15-sheet Architectural plan set titled “Capitol Shopping Center New Outparcels”, prepared by CREATE Architecture Planning & Design, PLLC, dated May 27, 2021, and the 4 sheet document titled “Covid Planning Solutions” prepared by Nyro Studio, dated 2020.

- 1.2 **Staff has had multiple meetings with the applicant over several months to discuss site layout, drive through configurations, and pedestrian access to the building entrances from Storrs Street. The layout has changed multiple times as a result of these meetings; however, the applicant was unable to negotiate a solution with the 110 Grill to orient the proposed building towards Storrs Street, as intended by City master plans for future urban development of the corridor.**

As a result, the proposal is inconsistent with the intent of the 2030 Master Plan, the Opportunity Corridor Master Plan, and the 20/20 Vision Plan, all of which make references to the urban development envisioned for Storrs Street. Storrs Street is envisioned to be an extension of the urban fabric of Main Street, including in building form, coherence of the streetscape, and orientation of uses. The documents specifically note that buildings should be on the street level, should face the street, and provide entrances on Storrs Street. They also provide multiple graphic depictions of this. Staff notes that consistency with these master plans is one of the criteria for Architectural Design Review approval.

The current proposal sets a suburban precedent for Storrs Street and redevelopment of the Central Opportunity Corridor, and is not consistent with the urban form specifically described in the master plans. In particular, the orientation of the building with the primary entrance on Storrs Street is not a minor design component of the urban streetscape. The proposed parking lot orientation is suburban, counter to the fundamental aspect of an urban street, which should provide access and engagement with the use inside the building, and connect adjacent uses in a cohesive streetscape. The applicant has acknowledged the suburban aspect of this model in pointing out that the tenant feels it is significant that his customers will drive to the site. Staff notes that *most* downtown customers *are* driving downtown parking in one of the many available parking areas and walking throughout the downtown. The restaurant’s insistence that its customers cannot do so as well, particularly when the restaurant is physically located on the same site as a parking lot, is not a credible argument.

Staff also notes that there is no guarantee that the next tenant will agree to an entrance on Storrs Street. The suburban layout of the 110 Grill is very likely to put pressure on the next tenant to also orient towards the parking lot. It is unlikely that the next tenant will want the front of their building adjacent to the back of their neighbor. Further, the Board will have very little standing at that point to insist that the location of the entrance be on Storrs Street, if a parking lot orientation is approved for the 110 Grill. Staff also notes that the applicant has not indicated a willingness to choose a tenant that will implement the City’s goals for this corridor, or carry through with the expectation that the buildings face the street.

Staff notes that access to the restaurant and other buildings from Storrs Street is possible, feasible, and critical to the character and function of the space as an extension of the urban fabric. Staff is also in agreement with ADR comments below.

- 1.3 The Applicant appeared before the ADR Committee on April 6th, May 4th, and June 1st, 2021. The applicant also suggested holding a design charrette with ADR members, though this did not occur. The Committee noted that the location of the buildings on the site was acceptable, though the materials, architectural character and orientation of the facades, treatment of the streetscape and outdoor spaces, and scale of signage were not in keeping with the urban intent of the corridor as envisioned by the Master Plan. Based on the fact that the Master Plans envisions Storrs Street as an extension of the Main Street urban form, members recommended:**

- **Flipping the layout of the 110 Grill to provide an entrance on Storrs Street.**
- **Redesign the architecture of all buildings to be more consistent with the urban character of Main Street.**
- **Use more substantial materials instead of CMU or EIFS, including materials that are, or that reference, brick or stone.**
- **Redesign signs to appear less like billboards directed at drivers, and more in keeping with the small-scale Main Street signage directed at pedestrians.**
- **Revise signage locations, lighting hue, and brightness to create pedestrian-scaled design.**
- **Limit the drop-off zone to deliveries only, and shift the crosswalk to the east, out of the drop-off/delivery zone.**
- **Screen and landscape the dumpsters in the drive-through island.**
- **More information relative to how the Storrs Street pedestrian access and streetscape areas will function with the grading along the Storrs Street frontage.**

ADR recommended approval of the building elevations for the middle and southern buildings at the last meeting, subject to the following conditions:

- **Replace the horizontal wood cladding on the east and west elevations of the middle building with spandrel glass;**
- **Use Option A, presented at the June 6th meeting, for the south elevation of the middle building; and**
- **Relocate the sign on the eastern elevation of the drive-through restaurant to the northern end of the elevation so that customers are not led to believe the door the sign is currently over is an entrance, as it is a service door.**

ADR did not recommend approval of the building elevations for the proposed 110 Grill. They recommended that the applicant revise the architectural design, building orientation, and materials to be more consistent with urban buildings on Main Street.

- 1.3 See comments from the Engineering Division in a separate memo.**

- 1.4 At the March 11, 2020 meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, the Board voted to grant variances from the following articles of the zoning ordinance:**

- a) **Article 28-7-2(e), Table of off-street parking requirements, to provide 754 parking spaces where 977 spaces are required (Note: 45 existing on-site parking spaces are currently leased to an off-site business, therefore the total on-site spaces is 799),**
- b) **Article 28-4-1(h), Table of Dimensional Regulations, to allow a front yard setback of 5 feet +/- where a minimum 15 foot setback is required,**

- c) Article 28-7-1(a), Applicability, to permit the continuance of existing non-conformities with respect to Article 28-7, Access, Circulation, Parking and Loading Requirements, for the portion of the lot outside of the redevelopment area as defined on the accompanying plan, sheet C-2, dated January 2020
- 1.5 At the August 10, 2020 meeting of the Concord City Council, the Council granted a request by the applicant to amend the zoning ordinance to permit drive-through facilities as a principal use in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) district and to allow for a minimum of six stacking spaces for a drive-through facility through a Conditional Use Permit with a supporting traffic study.

Staff notes that the architectural elevations and other graphics presented to City Council and the Planning Board during this process represented three buildings oriented toward Storrs Street. This orientation addressed, to some degree, staff's concerns regarding the consistency of the concept with the master plan documents. That elevation is enclosed for reference. The currently proposed plan is not consistent with the original concept.
- 1.6 Staff is operating under the assumption that the uses on the three pad sites will be a restaurant, retail or restaurant space, and a drive-through serviced coffee shop. If any of these proposed uses change, staff shall be informed and further review and permitting may be required.

2. Technical Review Comments

- 2.1 Provide required ADA signage for the proposed accessible spaces.
- 2.2 On the Demolition Plan the sawcut areas for the new islands on the eastern end of the parking lot do not line up with the locations of the new islands on the Site Plan.
- 2.3 Upgrade the existing ramp and pedestrian push button at the intersection of the site drive and Storrs Street. Also relocate the crosswalk to better align with the ADA ramps to comply with MUTCD standards.
- 2.4 A corner of the retaining wall for the ramp down to the patio in front of the middle building currently encroaches into City right-of-way. This should either be moved slightly or a license should be sought from City Council.

3. Site Layout Comments

- 3.1 The drive-through layout was revised to provide an ordering station in each lane. The second lane no longer functions as a by-pass lane, which is required per Section 18.08 of the Site Plan Regulations. Revise the drive through or request a waiver.
- 3.2 The loading area is proposed off the entrance drive. It is unclear how the design will prevent it from also being used as a drop-off area for customers. Please clarify. Staff notes that trucks making deliveries will also conflict with pedestrians in the crosswalk. Revise plans to move the crosswalk and tip downs further to the east, beyond the loading area.
- 3.3 The applicant proposes to remove many of the ADA spaces in front of Market Basket. Provide documentation that the spaces are not needed or otherwise underutilized, or provide the ADA spaces as needed.
- 3.4 There are several curb lines and other elements on the landscape plan that do not match the site plan. Revise plans to correct inconsistencies.
- 3.5 There are 14 parking spaces proposed along the northside of the building east of Marshalls. There is an existing loading dock in that area that while in use, would block 4-5 of these parking spaces. Staff recommends signing these as employee-only spaces.

- 3.6 A 15-foot landscape setback is required for parking lots with more than 750 spaces, in accordance with Section 18.12 (SPR). The landscaped area between the drive-through and the property line is 13 feet. Increase the landscaped area to 15 feet.
- 3.7 The applicant has stated that this will be a phased development, yet no phasing plan is provided. The Board must review and approve the Phasing Plan. Submit a phasing plan which identifies the boundaries of each phase, the improvements to be constructed in each phase, and a time frame for completion of each phase, in accordance with Section 11.10 (SPR) for review and approval by the Board. Staff recommends that all landscaping, sidewalks, and streetscape improvements along the Storrs Street frontage be constructed and installed as part of phase 1.
- 3.8 At the May Planning Board meeting, the Board and Staff noted the importance of providing a streetscape with shade trees between the sidewalk and the street. Revise plans to show trees in 5-foot tree wells along Storrs Street, with the sidewalk extending behind the tree wells. Staff also recommends providing an alternative hardscape in the tree well area similar to the treatment of Main Street. A stamped colored concrete would create an attractive buffer zone between the street and pedestrian zone.
- 3.9 Provide steps where the retaining wall is proposed perpendicular to the sidewalk at the bottom of the ramp between the 110 Grill and middle building for improved site circulation.
- 3.10 Add stop bars in the parking lot at the intersection of the primary site drive and the drive coming from the parking area north of the primary site drive in accordance with Sections 18.02 and 18.09 (SPR).
- 3.11 The tenant(s) for the middle building have not yet been determined, and the applicant states that the building will not be built until such a determination has been made. The Applicant has stated that changes to the building may occur once tenants are determined. Staff recommends making a condition of approval that a primary entrance remain on Storrs Street.

4. Landscape Plan Comments

- 4.1 Provide calculations for the required number of trees based on lot coverage, in accordance with Section 15.04(28)(o) (SPR).
- 4.2 The Crimson King Maple is considered an invasive. Replace with a native shade tree such as October Glory Maple *Acer rubrum*.
- 4.3 Staff recommends substituting the ginkgo trees for native shade trees as ginkgoes are not native and several have been lost around the city, indicating that they may not be appropriate for this hardiness zone. Consider American Hophornbeam *Ostrya virginiana*, European Hornbeam *Carpinus betulus*, or Espresso Kentucky Coffeetree *Gymnocladus dioica*.
- 4.4 Staff recommends that the Applicant explore alternatives to the proposed Flowering Pear trees. Flowering Pear trees are weak wooded, are susceptible to ice storm damage, and tend to split in half. They require vigilant pruning and maintenance, requiring more maintenance than a stronger wooded tree species. The City has concerns that these trees pose a public safety issue. Additionally, this tree has invasive traits and is under consideration for listing under the official invasive species list.
- 4.5 Staff recommends combining the two planting beds in front of the 110 Grill and planting a substantial native shade tree in that spot as opposed to leaving them as separate perennial flower beds.
- 4.6 Please clarify the medium used in the 2" Minus Mulch Beds. Earlier versions of the Landscape Plan indicated the application of stone mulch, which is not an acceptable mulch. Bark mulch must

be used.

- 4.7 Include the City's planting details, in accordance with Section 27.03 (SPR).
- 4.8 The label "MG" for the 6 plants in front of the 110 Grill does not match any label in the planting table, it may be a typo and is supposed to be "MAG" for Maiden Grass. Regardless, previous versions of the Storrs Street façade rendering showed arborvitaes between the spandrel glass on the 110 Grill. Staff prefers the more substantial arborvitaes or other evergreen accent trees to the low grasses and Tam Juniper proposed.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 Though the Applicant has worked in good faith with staff, the Architectural Design Review Committee and the Planning Board, significant design issues remain. Most critically is the lack of a Storrs Street entrance for the 110 Grill, as well as the architecture of the 110 Grill. Other concerns include the character of the streetscape regarding shade trees, lighting, and signage, and uncertainty regarding construction of the middle building.

The orientation of the building and design of these features is not consistent with the intent of the 2030 Master Plan, the Opportunity Corridor Master Plan, or the Vision 20/20 Plan. One of the criteria for granting ADR approval is consistency with the intent of the Master Plan. The ADRC's decision to not recommend approval of the 110 Grill's building elevations reflect this understanding which Staff concurs with. ADR approval is not recommended for this project. Since ADR approval is a requirement for Major Site Plan approval, the applicant needs to secure ADR approval from the Board in order to receive Major Site Plan approval. The Board should determine whether to deny or grant ADR approval, and subsequently Major Site Plan approval.

Prepared by: SCD

S:\Plan\Development Review\Project Files\2020\2020-13_Capitol_Shopping_Center_SPR\Reports & Letters



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

David Cedarholm, PE
City Engineer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sam Durfee, Senior Planner
FROM: Gary Lemay P.E., Associate Engineer
DATE: 5/11/2021
SUBJECT: Site Plan Review, Capitol Shopping Center, 80 Storrs Street;
Map 7412Z, Lot 1; (2020-013)

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

- *Site Plans*, Capitol Shopping Center, prepared by Nobis Group, dated August 21, 2020, revised March 25, 2021

As a supplement to any comments offered by the Planning Division, Engineering offers the following design related comments¹. **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.**

General Comments

1. The proposed project area is shown around the majority of the work, however there is additional striping and new parking areas proposed throughout the site including behind the building; please revise the project area to show all areas of work.
2. Please note any proposed snow storage areas within the redeveloped area.
3. Please confirm the map/block/lot for the property, as it may have been recently updated.
4. Please include a turning motion plan showing how a fire truck (ladder) would be able to access and get to the buildings without encroaching on parking spaces. Previous comment is addressed, however Engineering has comments on the WB-50 truck turning plan:
 - a. Please confirm that the WB-50 truck is the appropriate size truck to analyze for movement within this site.

¹ Past comments that have been addressed are included in a *grayed out* font.

- b. Please provide a truck turning motion into the site from the northbound lane of Storrs Street.
 - c. Please confirm and review compliance with Site Plan Regulation 20.03. It's not clear if the WB-50 truck can pull into the northern loading area without blocking traffic. The WB-50 truck also encroaches far into the approaching lane where vehicles may be at the stop bar.
5. The following notes should be added to Sheet G-1 (general notes and legend), if not already in other locations:
- a. All work shall be performed in accordance with the City of Concord's Construction Standards and Details (latest edition), and City standards shall take precedence in case of any details or plans in conflict.
 - b. All utilities shall be installed underground in accordance with Section 25.02(1) of the Site Plan Regulations.
 - c. Upon completion of construction the contractor shall submit as-built drawings to the Engineering Services Division prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
 - d. The contractor shall set up a preconstruction meeting with the Engineering Services Division to discuss construction requirements, site inspections, associated fees, schedules, etc.
 - e. The contractor shall obtain an Excavation Permit from the Engineering Services Division for work within the ROW.
 - f. 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.
 - g. The contractor shall obtain a Driveway Permit from the Engineering Services Division for the proposed access and impervious area adjustments.
 - h. 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).
6. To add clarity to our comments and assist in the design engineer's review of the comments, Engineering has embedded additional comments directly into the electronic design drawing PDF, which are summarized in Appendix A of this document.
7. It is not clear why an inside drop is proposed for SMH-4 based on the invert elevations provided.
8. City Construction Standards, section 6.03 (F) require rigid foam insulation for storm drain installations with less than 3 feet of cover; please confirm if and where insulation

may be needed for the proposed storm drain system, as well as adding a detail for insulating storm drain pipes. Please review the alternative loading dock plan for this requirement as well.

Drainage Report

9. The report notes an existing catch basin (CB) to the north of the site as one of the POIs established – what is the number of this catch basin? It does not appear to be identified or labeled in the plans, and is missing from the drainage schedule. Please add this information to the plans and incorporate into the drainage report.
10. The report's drainage area plans do not call out the manhole or catch basin numbers referred to in the point of interest; suggest adding a callout for clarity.
11. Please share a copy of the electronic HydroCAD files to assist in Engineering's review of the drainage report and infiltration assumptions.
12. Please provide hydraulic calculations confirming the water from this site can pass to the 36" RCP drain line at the southern end of the site. Engineering is not clear whether the existing drainage system on-site is appropriately sized.

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
- 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:
 - a. Set up a pre-construction meeting with the Engineering Services Division to discuss construction requirements, site inspections, associated fees, schedules, etc. Any 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.
 - b. Have a fire protection engineer provide, stamped and 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.

- c. Please provide PE stamped backup information on the sizing of the proposed grease trap for consistency with the City of Concord specifications, which require a minimum hydraulic detention time of 36 hours and a minimum tank size of 1,000 gallons.
 - d. Formalize and record a drainage easement for the noted storm drainage pipes (subject to City review and comment).
 - e. Formalize and record a water line easement for the noted storm drainage pipes (subject to City review and comment).
2. 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 (sewer and water services; storm drain connections)
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 Engineering for review and approval a minimum of two weeks prior to the pre-construction meeting)
4. Establish a performance surety (letter of credit, or cash deposit) for site stabilization. The surety amount for this project has been set at \$20,000 (min. amount) based on a 2.0 ac disturbance area. The surety shall be established prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting.
5. Establish a performance surety (bond, letter of credit, or cash deposit) for work within the right-of-way. 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 spreadsheet for calculating this surety upon request.
6. 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.

Re: Review Comments (2020-013)
Capitol Shopping Center, Storrs Street
Date: 5/11/2021

- 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).
7. Water and Sewer Investment Fees will need to be paid (as part of the utility connection permit process).
8. Retaining wall design drawings (stamped by a licensed structural engineer) should be submitted to Engineering for proposed retaining walls that are greater than 4 feet high. In addition, walls greater than 48 inches require a Building Permit from the Code Administration Office.
9. Shop drawings/submittals should be submitted to Engineering for the proposed water, sewer, and drainage improvements, plus any improvements within the City right-of-way.
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.
11. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO), the contractor shall submit as-built drawings that are to the satisfaction of Engineering. A copy of the as-built drawing requirements can be provided upon request.

#	PDF Page	Sheet	Sheet Title	Engineering Comments from 5/11/2021	Engineering Comments from 6/9/2021
1	1		Cover	Is it Brixmore or Brixmor?	Addressed
2	3		Existing Conditions (1)	Please adjust these text conflicts.	Addressed
3	3		Existing Conditions (1)	We would like to formalize a 25-ft-wide drainage easement to the City along the highlighted lines (from property line to property line).	Addressed. Understood that the Developer will work with the City on this easement. Please include a proposed 25-foot drainage easement in the plan set where applicable (e.g., Site Overview). A draft easement should be reviewed by the City before finalizing and recording.
4	3		Existing Conditions (1)	Please label this catch basin and include in the drainage schedule.	Addressed
5	4		Existing Conditions (2)	We would like to formalize a 25-ft-wide drainage easement to the City along the highlighted lines (from property line to property line).	See response to comment 3.
6	4		Existing Conditions (2)	Not numbered, what is the invert?	Addressed
7	4		Existing Conditions (2)	Not numbered, what is the invert? We need to know the pipe pitch in case it will result in surcharging in the new development area.	Addressed
8	4		Existing Conditions (2)	228.73' (W) What is the northern invert?	Addressed
9	4		Existing Conditions (2)	Please correct any overlapping labels	Addressed
10	4		Existing Conditions (2)	Why was this drain manhole not identified?	Addressed
11	4		Existing Conditions (2)	What is this water supply well? It isn't addressed in the demolition plans.	Addressed
12	4		Existing Conditions (2)	What are these manholes and do they connect to anything?	Addressed
13	4		Existing Conditions (2)	Is there an easement to the City for this water line? If not, we would like to formalize that as part of these plans.	Addressed. Understood that the Developer will work with the City on this easement. Please include a proposed 25-foot water line easement in the plan set where applicable (e.g., Site Overview). A draft easement should be reviewed by the City before finalizing and recording.
14	4		Existing Conditions (2)	If the lines are abandoned, are the catch basins now functioning as dry wells and taking on any runoff?	Addressed
15	5	C-1	Site Overview	Can a car fit in here with this steep of an angle?	Addressed
16	5	C-1	Site Overview	If new spaces are going into these isolated areas, proper/safe access should be ensured from the new spaces.	Engineering would like to see these isolated parking spaces marked as “employee only” to confirm that they are not public spaces (thus potentially requiring ADA access routes and handicap spaces).
17	5	C-1	Site Overview	This bumpout seems rather abrupt - may want to soften the angle a little bit.	Addressed
18	5	C-1	Site Overview	Will the lot coverage for the redeveloped area be 85% or less? This would help meet the intent of Site Plan Regulation 22.01 for redeveloped sites. If so, please add a breakdown of the redeveloped area.	Addressed. Noted that the project is reducing impervious coverage, even if it is over 85% coverage.
19	6	C-2	Demolition Plan	The City expects that any unidentified drain, sewer, or other lines discovered during work will be TV investigated by the contractor and disconnected if there are no	Addressed
20	6	C-2	Demolition Plan	Please include capping this abandoned 24" brick line at the property line as well.	Addressed
21	6	C-2	Demolition Plan	See Planning's comment about the aisle and parking spaces.	Addressed
22	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	Can a ladder truck navigate these turns?	Addressed

#	PDF Page	Sheet	Sheet Title	Engineering Comments from 5/11/2021	Engineering Comments from 6/9/2021
23	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	The traffic pattern here seems likely to lead to some confusion; consider adding arrows, do not enter signage, and modifying the islands to help direct traffic without backing up due to the drive-through.	Addressed
24	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	Have you considered closing this aisle by extending the island? May provide a bit more stacking room as well if you don't have to worry about through traffic.	Addressed
25	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	Please confirm the dumpster pads match or are consistent with City of Concord Standard Details and Specifications, per Site Plan Regulation 20.07.	Addressed
26	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	There are multiple small-size radii on-site (2' 3' 4'); may be more clear for constructability to choose a more consistent radius (e.g., 4'), but just a suggestion.	Addressed
27	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	Where will the line be between City and privately-maintained sidewalk in these locations?	Addressed
28	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	The bicycle parking should be located on private property	Addressed
29	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	Consider curving this sidewalk instead of 90-degree turns; generally easier for snow removal equipment to avoid 90-degree turns. Or consider keeping steps/ramp inline with the sidewalk.	Not addressed to Engineering’s satisfaction. Engineering would like to discuss the sidewalk layout further with the applicant.
30	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	Suggest building a small ramp here instead of 3 steps to improve accessibility. Should be enough length here to match grades without steps. Will need to make it clear the ramp maintenance falls to the private party.	Not addressed to Engineering’s satisfaction. Engineering would like to discuss the sidewalk layout further with the applicant.
31	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	Will parking be prohibited during certain hours to allow pedestrian access? Alternatively, would it be easier to move the crossing east to connect outside of the loading area?	Not addressed to Engineering’s satisfaction.
32	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	The direction of this tipdown doesn't align with the crossing. Please also follow up with engineering on if an easement will be necessary for the tipdown.	Engineering would like to further discuss pedestrian access at the 4-way intersection before final plans are approved to confirm compliance with ADA standards.
33	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan		Addressed
34	7	C-3	Proposed Site Plan	Please add a turning motion template showing how trucks will get into this loading space. Trucks should be reasonably sized for the use.	See comments above regarding turning motions.
35	8	C-4	Grading and Drainage	Re-striping	Addressed
36	8	C-4	Grading and Drainage	Please include spot elevations at the CB rims similar to CB 8987 to ensure positive drainage	Addressed
37	8	C-4	Grading and Drainage	Some of this catch basin's drainage area is being altered as part of this work; please include a deep-sump catch basin and hood similar to the newly-proposed catch basins, if it isn't already.	Addressed
38	8	C-4	Grading and Drainage	Suggest spot elevation	Addressed

#	PDF Page	Sheet	Sheet Title	Engineering Comments from 5/11/2021	Engineering Comments from 6/9/2021
39	8	C-4	Grading and Drainage	It is not clear where the runoff in this drive-through area is heading; please elaborate how water is getting into the catch basin.	Addressed
40	8	C-4	Grading and Drainage	We understand that this existing system take all the runoff currently, but given the risk level of overflows is increasing with buildings instead of just a parking lot, we would like to see the hydraulics of this system connecting to the 48" RCP.	Addressed
41	9	C-5	Utility Plan	What size will the fire and domestic water services be here?	Addressed
42	9	C-5	Utility Plan	Please provide stamped backup calculations confirming the size and dimensions of the grease trap.	Addressed
43	9	C-5	Utility Plan	Is this a 6" or 8" line?	Addressed
44	9	C-5	Utility Plan	Will this be protected with bollards in case of any errant driving/backing up?	Addressed
45	11	C-7.1	Sewer Plan and Profiles	City standards require a slope of at least 0.006 for 8" lines.	Addressed
46	13	C-7.3	Drainage Plan and Profiles	Engineering would like to discuss the layout of deep sump catch basins. Per NH stormwater manual, deep sump catch basins work best in an when they are not in-line with the flow (no inlet pipes to stir up sediment), and are instead on short laterals that tie-in to the main.	The applicant notes that the deep-sump catch basins are in lighter pollutant load areas. This is correct, except or CB-5 which collects runoff from the drive-through area. Please move CB-5 to be an offline deep sump catch basin.
47	14	C-8	Construction Details	Please confirm with contractor that 5' minimum sidewalk width is exclusive of the curbing	Addressed
48	14	C-8	Construction Details	This shows inlets are offline; please make the plan view consistent with this.	Addressed
49	15	C-9	Construction Details	Please make sure the contractor is aware of the City of Concord materials for water mains and services.	Addressed