
Langan Engineering & Environmental Services, Inc
888 Boylston Street Suite 510 Boston, MA 02199 T: 617-824-9100

To: Steven W. Reichert P.E., Fuss & O'Neill

From: Timothy O'Neill, PE
Nathan L. Kirschner

CC: Brian Groth AICP, Town of Hudson
Elvis Dhima P.E., Town of Hudson
Brian Kutz, Hillwood

Date: February 24th, 2020

Re: **Town of Hudson Planning Board Review
Hudson Logistics Center, Lowell Road
Tax Map 239, Lot 1, Acct.#1350-949
Reference No. 03-0249.1930
Langan Project No.: 151010101**

Enclosed please find our responses to the peer review comment letter provided by Fuss & O'Neill, dated December 21, 2020. Below please find each comment followed by our response in bold.

1. **Site Plan Review Codes (HR 275)**

1. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has not provided a detail for ADA curb ramps in sidewalks. The detail should include curb ramps for both 6" and 12" curbing.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added curb ramp details to the plan set for the 6 inch sidewalk and stated that they have removed the locations required for 12 inch curb. We note there still seems to be a 12 inch curb ramp by the three fire tank and pump houses.

Comment Response: All curb ramp locations will reflect a 6 inch rise. Guard house and water tank locations will be adjusted. 12 inch curbing is no longer proposed where ramp locations exist.

2. **Administrative Review Codes**

- h. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(17). We were unable to locate any benchmarks within the Site plan. We note that they were provided on the Subdivision plan. The applicant has added a note to the plan set referencing the subdivision plan set for benchmark information. The Town should confirm that they*

are comfortable with this arrangement or if the applicable subdivision sheets should be added to the site plan.

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: Since it appears that the Subdivision Plan may no longer be part of the plan set, we recommend that the applicant add benchmark information to the site plans.

Comment Response: The applicant intends to withdraw the subdivision application. Accordingly, benchmark locations have been added to the Existing Conditions Series EC.

3. Subdivision Review Codes (HR 289)

- f. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 289-18.O. *The applicant has not shown on the plans nor provided details for a street name sign for Green Meadow Drive at the Lowell Road intersection. /The applicant has added the detail to the plan set and noted that the sign is to be reviewed by the Town of Hudson Road Agent prior to installation. We note that since Hudson does not have a Road Agent, the applicant should change the note to reference the Public Works Director.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 289-18.O. We note that updated subdivision plans have not been received. It appears that Green Meadow Drive is no longer shown on the plan set and it is instead a driveway and they 3 proposed buildings are now a single lot. No information about a proposed street sign was shown on the updated site plans.

Comment Response: Roadway signage for the private main access drive will be included in the final plan set of drawings to be issued to the town.

- g. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 289-26.B.(3). *The applicant has shown several existing easements on the plan set. Copies of these easements were not included in the review package.*

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that proposed easements have not yet been prepared. We note that the easements existing to the site were not received as part of the package for review.

Comment Response: Proposed easement locations are being finalized and will be coordinated with the Town of Hudson staff. It has been discussed that preliminary easement drafts will be provided to the Town, and that final easements would be subject to approval of the Town Attorney as a condition of approval from the planning board.

- n. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: *The Subdivision plans note that a portion of Steele Road is to be "Discontinued, Released, or Relocated". The applicant should provide further clarification of this action and define the limits of this section of the Steele Road Right-of-way.*

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that both the project and Town attorneys are discussing the issue and the information will be added to the plans once a resolution is reached.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment. The Applicant intends to transition and relocate the end of Steele Road from a public way to an easement such that the access way will provide for emergency or other Town access for fire safety or for some other Town-related purpose or benefit to be determined in consultation with the Town.

4. Driveway Review Codes (HR 275-8.B. (34)/Chapter 193)

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 193.10.D. The applicant has proposed a driveway layout for the first new driveway at Map 234 Lot 35 (Mercury) where WB-67 trucks cannot access without travelling off of the proposed paved surface. The applicant should review the need for a wider driveway entrance at this location with the tenant of that building to allow adequate truck access.*

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that this driveway leads to a small dead end parking lot therefore they do not believe it is necessary. We note that this driveway also leads to the larger site lot. The applicant should review the need to at least provide a 'no trucks' sign at this entrance to direct trucks to the next driveway.

Comment Response: The final layout of the driveway in question is being coordinated with the owners of the Mercury Systems property. Final design of this driveway will be part of the final permit drawings.

- e. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has proposed retaining walls adjacent to the driveways and the proposed roadway. The applicant has provided a typical detail for the walls but individual designs were not provided. We note that some of these walls are nearly 10 feet tall, and while they are outside of the proposed Town Right-of-way, they pose a risk to the proposed Town roadway if they were to fail. The applicant should provide detailed designs for each proposed wall, stamped by an Engineer licensed in the State of New Hampshire, for Town review prior to construction. /The applicant has stated that detailed plans will be provided as part of the building permit. It is our understanding that plans are being updated to make Green Meadow Drive a private road. The applicant will still need to provide detailed wall design plans to the Town for their review and records.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has removed wall locations from the plan set. We note that new profiles of the driveway were not provided with this plan set for review as they were located on the subdivision plans and the site no longer appears to be subdivided. We recommend that updated profiles be provided for review.

Comment Response: Profiles for the Green Meadow Drive were provided as part of the subdivision application as required by town regulations. As the subdivision application has been withdrawn and this is no longer a public drive there is no requirement for profiles to be provided. As such profiles of the access driveway have not been included in the plan set.

5. Traffic

Fuss & O'Neill did not review the traffic study for this project.

Comment Response: It is understood that VHB was hired by the town of Hudson to review materials related to traffic.

6. Utility Design/Conflicts

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.E, 276-13, and 289-27.B.(4). The applicant has not provided a sewer design for Green Meadow Drive. We note the Site plan shows proposed sewer lines from the 3 sites coming to the cul-de-sac but there does not appear to be any sewer designed which this sewer main would connect to on Green Meadow Drive.*

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has revised the sewer locations and has shown the force mains connecting to the sewer manhole on Sagamore Bridge Road. We note that the applicant has not provided any information about the downstream sewer size and capacity.

Comment Response: The sewer size and capacity is being coordinated with Town staff including the Town Engineer. The proposed sewer facilities and infrastructure for the project will be subject to the Town's sewer line acceptance procedures.

- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.E. The applicant has not shown inverts into sewer manholes from various sewer force mains throughout the plan set. / The applicant has stated that the invert information will be provided upon completion of the revised sewer layout.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has not provided any comments making it difficult to be sure that the sewer design is complete. We note that per NHDES Env-Wq 704.12.(o), the elevation difference between the invert in and the invert out of proposed sewer manholes should be 0.1 feet per. The current design does not show any difference in invert elevations within the proposed manholes.

Comment Response: Final sanitary layout and design is currently under discussion with the Town of Hudson engineering staff. The proposed sewer facilities and infrastructure for the project will be subject to the Town's sewer line acceptance procedures.

- c. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.E. The applicant should review the proposed sewer design with the Town of Hudson Sewer Department to ensure that enough capacity exists in the Lowell Road sewer main or other existing sewer mains to handle the flow that will be generated by the proposed project.

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that a separate sewer review will be completed for the site.

Comment Response: Final sanitary layout and design is currently under discussion with the Town of Hudson engineering staff. The proposed sewer facilities and infrastructure for the project will be subject to the Town's sewer line acceptance procedures.

- h. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HETGTD 720.5. The applicant has shown pump stations on the proposed site plan and provided a typical detail on the plan set. We note that no design information was provided for the review of these private pump stations and therefore a detailed review of them was not done.

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that additional information will be provided as the building demands are completed.

Comment Response: Final sanitary layout and design is currently under discussion with the Town of Hudson engineering staff. The proposed sewer facilities and infrastructure for the project will be subject to the Town's sewer line acceptance procedures.

- o. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has proposed several fire hydrants to be located within paved areas adjacent to warehouse buildings where it appears trucks could back into them. These hydrants are shown to be protected by bollards, but the applicant should review these locations with the Hudson Fire Department to confirm that these are acceptable.

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted bollards are typical near the hydrants. We recommend a detail for the bollards be added to the plan set.

Comment Response: A detail will be added to the CU500 Series depicting bollard layout around the fire hydrants located in paved areas.

7. **Drainage Design/Stormwater Management (HR 275-9.A./Chapter 290**

- ak. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 290-5.K.(22). The applicant has not shown proposed snow storage areas on the plans.

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added snow storage locations to the plan set. We note that the snow storage location on sheet CS128 is beyond the 8 foot fence and therefore may be inaccessible by the plow trucks on site. The applicant should review this location for access.

Please refer to Fuss & O'Neill's stormwater design review letter dated December 17, 2020, for resolution of other comments related to drainage design/stormwater management.

Comment Response: Revised snow storage locations have been included in the updated site plan submission.

8. Zoning (ZO 334)

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: Zoning Ordinance (ZO) 334-14.A. The applicant should provide more detailed building height calculations. The ordinance states that the maximum building height shall be 50 feet and be measured from the average elevation of finished grade within 5 feet of the structure to the highest point of the roof. Roof elevations have not been provided, and we note that several building grades extend 51'-6" from the finish floor elevation (FFE) to the top of parapet grade (TOP). A large portion of the site grading within 5 feet of the buildings includes finished grade elevations for truck loading docks which are up to 5 feet below the FFE. We are unable to determine if the Ordinance has been met without roof grades being shown on the architectural plans.*

Former/Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added the building heights to the plan set in the Dimensional Requirements table on sheet CS100. However, we are still unable to confirm that the Ordinance has been met without specific roof heights being shown on the plans. Protuberances such as parapets are not considered when determining building heights so actual roof elevations need to be provided to determine compliance with the Ordinance.

Comment Response: Architectural elevation plans are included in the submission showing building height from finished floor elevations for buildings A and B. Building heights in the dimensional requirements table found on the overall site plan CS100 include an additional height, accounting for the proposed grade 5 feet off the face of the buildings, resulting in an overall building height below the maximum 50 feet height. Building C has not been fully designed and will be listed as less than 50 feet in height. It is understood that prior to construction of building C elevations will be required confirming the final design and building height.

9. Erosion Control/Wetland Impacts

There are no outstanding Fuss & O'Neill comments related to erosion controls and wetland impacts that require additional input or information from the applicant.

- e. *New Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 290-1. We note that the EPA has finalized the MS4 permit modifications for New Hampshire communities and they will go into effect on January 6, 2021. The applicant shall ensure they are in compliance with all requirements of the MS4 permit for construction site stormwater runoff control. The*

Town of Hudson shall enforce the terms of the permit, including performing compliance inspections and initiating enforcement actions as required.

Comment Response: The project will be in compliance with the 2017 NH Small MS4 General Permit including modifications to the same made on December 7, 2020, and which became effective on January 6, 2021.

10. Landscaping (HR 275.8.C.(7) & 276-11.1.B.(20)) and Lighting (HR 276-11.1.B.(14))

There are no outstanding Fuss & O'Neill comments related to landscaping and lighting that require additional input or information from the applicant.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

11. State and Local Permits (HR 275-9.G.)

There are no outstanding Fuss & O'Neill comments related to state and local permits that require additional input or information from the applicant.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

12. Other

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ETGTD Detail R-12. The applicant should provide a curb and sidewalk tip down detail on the subdivision plan for all driveway locations. The applicant has provided these locations and a closer scale drawing. We continue to recommend a detail be provided showing ramp details and detectable warning locations.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: We note that tip down locations are not shown on the site plan were they has previously been shown on the Subdivision plan. We note that as the Subdivision Plan is no longer part of the package, they should be added to the site plan set.

Comment Response: The Town Engineer commented that the site access should be considered a roadway and not a driveway. The site access off of Lowell Road and the modified Mercury systems entrance do conform to the profile slope criteria outlined in the engineering and technical guidelines.

The following items require Town evaluation or input:

1. Site Plan Review Codes (HR 275)

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-8.C.(2) and Zoning Ordinance (ZO) 334-15.A. The applicant should provide parking calculations on the plan set showing that*

the proposed spaces meet the use proposed per the Regulations. The applicant has stated that the required spaces are as required by the planning board but no specific calculations were provided for review.

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that parking calculations were based on the Traffic Report that was approved by the NHDOT Bureau of traffic and that they have provided adequate spaces to promote safety, efficiency and peak retail season. The Town should confirm they are comfortable with this approach and evaluate if a waiver is needed from this section.

Comment Response: The applicant will be requesting a parking waiver. Off-street parking requirements in Hudson are regulated by 275-8(C)(2) of the Site Plan Ordinance. For the Project, the applicant is proposing the following numbers of parking spaces:

For Building A = 1008 spaces

For Building B = 380 spaces

For Building C = 418 spaces

Total parking spaces proposed: 1,806 spaces.

Section 275-8. C.2 provides that facilities classified as Industrial uses require 1 space for every 600 s.f. of gross floor space or 0.75 space for each employee of the combined employment of the two largest shifts, whichever is larger.

If the applicant applied these parking requirements to the project, then a total of 4,359 spaces would be required.

- For Lot A, this would require 1,800 spaces. We are proposing to provide 1,008 spaces on this Lot.***
- For Lot B, this would require 1,676 spaces. We are proposing to provide 380 spaces on this Lot.***
- For Lot C, this would require 883 spaces. We are proposing to provide 418 spaces on this Lot.***

Accordingly, the applicant will be requesting a parking waiver.

- d. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-8.C.(4) The applicant has proposed parking spaces that measure 9 feet by 18 feet. This will require approval by the Planning Board.

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant had noted this requirement on the plan set and stated that a waiver has been requested from the Planning Board.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment, and had filed a request for waiver of this requirement.

- k. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HETGTD Detail R-8. The applicant has proposed an asphalt pavement section in the Site Plans which includes 8 inches of processed

aggregate base course. Hudson details require 12 inches of crushed gravel for driveways.

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has revised the base course for the access drive but has kept the 8 inches for passenger car drive aisles and parking stalls. The Town should confirm that they are comfortable with this arrangement.

Comment Response: Based on comments from the Town Engineer, the pavement sections have been updated to reflect the 12 inch base course in drive aisle areas identified throughout the plan set as heavy duty asphalt pavement, while maintaining the reduced thickness in passenger vehicle parking and circulation areas identified as standard duty asphalt pavement.

2. Administrative Review Codes (HR 276)

- f. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(9). *Boundary dimensions and bearing are not shown on any sheets within in the Site Plan.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that to maintain legibility they are located in the Subdivision plan. The Town should confirm that they are comfortable with this arrangement or if the applicable subdivision sheets should be added to the site plan.

Comment Response: Boundary dimensions and bearings have been added in the Existing Conditions Series EC.

3. Subdivision Review Codes (HR 289)

- i. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 289-28.C. & G. *The applicant's roadway typical cross section does not match that of Subdivision Regulation Attachment 3. The applicant has proposed 5 feet between the sidewalk and roadway whereas the detail requires 7 feet. We note that the applicant has also proposed a 5 foot sidewalk instead of the 4 feet recommended.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that they have reviewed the difference with the Town Engineer and he is accepting of the 6 foot island and 5 foot sidewalk dimensions currently proposed. The Town should review the need for a waiver for the Regulation.

Comment Response: The Town of Hudson and the applicant have been made aware of this comment.

4. Driveway Review Codes (HR 275-8.B. (34)/Chapter 193)

- c. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 193.10.G. *The applicant has proposed two driveways for Map 234 Lot 35 while only one is allowed per the Regulation. We also*

note that Map 233 Lot 1 would have two driveways because it would also be tied into Wal-Mart Boulevard as well as the proposed Green Meadow Drive.

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that they have spoken with Town staff and believe that based on the frontage more than one driveway is appropriate. We note the Town should review whether a waiver is required for this Regulation.

Comment Response: The Town of Hudson and the applicant have been made aware of this comment, and a waiver will be requested.

5. Traffic

Fuss & O'Neill did not review the traffic study for this project.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

6. Utility Design/Conflicts

- i. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: *The applicant should coordinate with the Town of Hudson Water Utility and Hudson Fire Department to ensure that capacity exists in the Lowell Street water main to meet the water service needs of the proposed development, including both domestic and fire protection needs.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that as final demands become available, capacity assessment to the Town infrastructure will be assessed with the Water Utility and Fire Department.

Comment Response: The town's water peer review consultant has reviewed the fire suppression system design and discussed the specifics of the fire suppression system with the project fire protection engineer. It is our understanding that the fire protections systems are acceptable as designed. The proposed water service facilities and infrastructure for the project will be subject to the Town's " WATER LINE ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURES Approved by BOS 7/28/2020," and "CHAPTER 274 -- TOWN OF HUDSON WATER UTILITY Rules and Regulations (Approved by BOS 7/28/2020)."

- q. Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: *The applicant has not provided any details for the proposed water storage tanks.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that when final design is complete by the fire protection engineer, the information will be submitted to the Town for review.

Comment Response: The town's water peer review consultant has reviewed the fire suppression system design and discussed the specifics of the fire suppression system with the project fire protection engineer. It is our

understanding that the fire protections systems are acceptable as designed, but subject to final approval in accordance with the Town's water line acceptance procedures.

7. Drainage Design/Stormwater Management (HR 275-9.A./Chapter 290)

Please refer to Fuss & O'Neill's stormwater design review letter dated September 30, 2020, for comments related to drainage design/stormwater management.

Comment Response: The above referenced comment letter has been responded to and is included with this response letter.

8. Zoning (ZO 334)

There are no outstanding Fuss & O'Neill comments related to zoning that require Town evaluation or input.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

9. Erosion Control/Wetland Impacts

There are no outstanding Fuss & O'Neill comments related to erosion controls and wetland impacts that require Town evaluation or input.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

10. Landscaping (HR 275.8.C.(7) & 276-11.1.B.(20)) and Lighting (HR 276-11.1.B.(14))

There are no outstanding Fuss & O'Neill comments related to landscaping and lighting that require Town evaluation or input.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

11. State and Local Permits (HR 275-9.G.)

There are no outstanding Fuss & O'Neill comments related to state and local permits that require Town evaluation or input.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

12. Other

There are no outstanding 'Other' Fuss & O'Neill comments that require Town evaluation or input.

Comment Response: The applicant has been made aware of this comment.

We trust these responses adequately address your comments and concerns at this time. Please feel free to contact us at (203) 562-5771 or nkirschner@langan with any questions or should you require additional information.

\\langan.com\data\BOS\data1\151010101\Project Data\Correspondence\Comment Response\F&O\2020-12-18 Outstanding
comments Letter\Commense Response Letter 12-29-20.docx