
888 Boylston Street, Suite 510 Boston, MA 02199 T:617.824-9100 F:617.824.9101

To: Steven Reichert, Fuss & O'Neill

From: Tim O'Neill, P.E./Langan

Info: Brian Kutz/Hillwood
Gary Fredrick/Hillwood
John Smolack/S&V
John Plante/Langan
Frank Holmes/Langan

Date: February 26, 2021

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 comments dated February 19, 2021. Below please find each comment followed by our response in **bold**.

3. Subdivision Review Codes (HR 289)

- f. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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 the 3 proposed buildings are now a single lot. No information about a proposed street sign was shown on the updated site plans.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that roadway signage for the private main access drive will be included in the final plan set of drawings to be issued to the Town. This information was not included in the plan set received by Fuss & O'Neill for this fourth review.

COMMENT RESPONSE: *Signage and Striping Plans have been added to the drawing set, and include roadway signage for the main access drive.*

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

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that the final layout of the driveway in question is being coordinated with the owners of the Mercury Systems property, and final design of this drawing will be part of the final permit drawings. The plans received by Fuss & O'Neill for this fourth review include a revised driveway layout for the Mercury property. It appears that WB-67 trucks leaving the Mercury driveway cannot turn right onto the main entrance drive without encroaching onto the opposite curb and sidewalk, so we recommend that the Mercury driveway be appropriately signed to prevent trucks intended for the Hudson Logistics Center from mistakenly entering this driveway.

COMMENT RESPONSE: *Signage has been added to as suggested. See drawing CP107.*

6 Utility Design/Conflicts

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

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that a detail will be added to the CU500 series drawings depicting the bollard layout around the fire hydrants located in paved areas. This detail was not within the CU500 utility detail drawings in the current plan submission.

- s. **New Fuss & O'Neill Comment:** The applicant has proposed a Water Trench Section that notes a minimum cover of 42". We note that the minimum cover allowed by the Hudson Engineering Technical Guidelines & Typical Details (Detail W-2) is five feet (60").

COMMENT RESPONSE: *Detail 7 on drawing CU502 has been updated to require a minimum cover of 60".*

7. DRAINAGE DESIGN/STORMWATER MANAGEMENT (HR 275-9.A./CHAPTER 290)

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

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that revised snow storage locations were included in the updated plan submission. We note that the proposed snow storage area on sheet CS128 still appears to be inaccessible due to the adjacent 8 foot chain link fence.

COMMENT RESPONSE: A double swing maintenance gate has been added to the plans to allow access to the snow storage area.

Please refer to Fuss & O'Neill's stormwater design review letter dated February 8, 2021, for resolution of other comments related to drainage design / stormwater management.

12. OTHER

- e. **New Fuss & O'Neill Comment:** We were unable to locate design details for the proposed sound fence in the plans.

COMMENT RESPONSE: Sound fence detail has been added as detail #4 on drawing CS505.

The following items require Town evaluation or input:

1. Site Plan Review Codes (HR 275)

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted on the plans that a waiver from this Regulation is being requested. The applicant has noted that the

total number of parking spaces proposed is 1,806 with a total number of 4,359 spaces required.

COMMENT RESPONSE: A waiver request has been filed with the Planning Board for a reduction in the number of provided parking spaces. The waiver requests a reduction of 2,553 parking space from the required 4,777 stalls to the proposed 1,806 parking stalls.

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

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted on the plans that a waiver from this Regulation is being requested.

COMMENT RESPONSE: A waiver request has been filed with the Planning Board to allow 9' X 18' parking spaces.

- k. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has updated the pavement sections to reflect the 12 inch base course in drive aisle areas where heavy duty asphalt pavement is called for, with the reduced thickness maintained in passenger vehicle parking and circulation areas with standard duty asphalt pavement. The Town should confirm that they are comfortable with this arrangement.

COMMENT RESPONSE: Our pavement section has been designed by our geotechnical engineer, meets tenant requirements and has been discussed with the Town Engineer.

3. Subdivision Review Codes (HR 289)

- g. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that proposed easement locations are being *finalized* and will be coordinated with Town staff.

The applicant indicated that preliminary easement drafts will be provided to the Town, and that final easements would be subject to the approval of the Town attorney as a condition of approval from the Planning Board.

COMMENT RESPONSE: We concur, no additional response required.

- 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.*

Former/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 project no longer proposes a subdivision, and so roadways meeting the Town's Subdivision Regulations are not required. The entrances will be private driveways.

- n. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that they intend 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 other Town-related purpose or benefit to be determined in consultation with the Town. These updates are not included in the plan set received by Fuss & O'Neill for this fourth review.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The access way is shown on the revised plan set. See drawings CS120 and CS125-CS129.

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

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted on the plans that a waiver from this Regulation is being requested.

COMMENT RESPONSE: A waiver request has been filed with the Planning Board to allow two driveways on the parcel.

- e. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that the subdivision application for this project is being withdrawn, and the entrance drive will be a private drive where there isn't a requirement to provide these profiles. We note that HR 193-10.C. requires "...the establishment of grades, i.e., profiles and/or cross sections..." to adequately protect and promote drainage and for a safe and controlled approach to the highway. The applicant should review this requirement with the Town to determine if a waiver from this Regulation is required.

COMMENT RESPONSE: Per our discussion with the Town Engineer, profiles and cross sections are not required for the private driveways and no waiver is required.

6. Utility Design/Conflicts

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that the sewer size and capacity is being coordinated with Town staff including the Town Engineer. The proposed sewer system design for this site will be subject to a separate review and acceptance.

COMMENT RESPONSE: We agree. No additional response required.

- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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 competition of the revised sewer layout. 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.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: Invert elevations have been provided for sewer manholes within the site. There is a proposed 0.1 foot elevation difference between the lowest inlet and the outlets within the manholes. We note that other inlets into the manholes have a much larger invert separation (in some cases over 1.0 feet) which when combined with steep pipe slopes for some of those inlets may impact the ability to construct the manhole invert for smooth sewage flow to the outlet. The applicant has noted that the final sewer layout and design is being discussed with Town staff including the Town Engineer. The proposed sewer system design for this site will be subject to a separate review and acceptance.

COMMENT RESPONSE: We agree. No additional response required.

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. The applicant has stated that a separate sewer review will be completed for the site.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that the final sewer layout and design is being discussed with Town staff including the Town Engineer. The proposed sewer system design for this site will be subject to a separate review and acceptance.

COMMENT RESPONSE: We agree. No additional response required.

- h. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comments: 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. The applicant has stated that additional information will be provided as the building demands are completed.

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that the final sewer layout and design is being discussed with Town staff including the Town Engineer. The proposed sewer system design for this site will be subject to a separate review and acceptance.

COMMENT RESPONSE: *We agree. No additional response required.*

- r. **New Fuss & O'Neill Comment:** HR 276-13. The applicant has noted on the plans that a waiver is being requested to allow overhead lines for approximately 950 linear feet to provide service from Lowell Road to the existent abutter Mercury Systems.

COMMENT RESPONSE: *A list of requested waivers, including the one referenced above is included on sheet CS002*

\\langan.com\data\BOS\data1\151010101\Project Data\Correspondence\Comment Response\F&O\2021-02-19 Site Plan review outstanding\2021-02-22 Fuss & O'Neill.docx