

## M E M O R A N D U M

TO: File

FROM: Steven W. Reichert PE

DATE: August 27, 2021 *SWR*

RE: Town of Hudson Planning Board Review  
Friars Drive Industrial Facility Site Plan  
Tax Map 209, Lot 1; Acct. #1350-975  
Fuss & O'Neill Reference No. 20030249.2060

---

The following list itemizes the set of documents reviewed related to the Friars Drive Industrial Facility Site Plan, located at 161 Lowell Road in Hudson, New Hampshire.

- Email correspondence between the Town of Hudson and Fuss & O'Neill, dated on August 10, 2021.
- Package from the Dubay Group, Inc. received by Fuss & O'Neill on August 10, 2021, including the following:
  1. Copy of *Project Narrative*, prepared by GFI Partners, dated August 3, 2021.
  2. Copy of *Town of Hudson, Site Plan Application*, signed July 29, 2021.
  3. Copy of *Traffic Memorandum*, prepared by TFM, dated August 3, 2021.
  4. Copy of *Site Plan, Friars Drive, Parcel 209-001-000 @ Sagamore Industrial Park, Hudson, New Hampshire*, prepared by the Dubay Group, Inc., dated August 3, 2021, with no revisions noted, unless otherwise noted, including the following:
    - a. *Title Sheet*, Sheet 1.
    - b. *Zoning Ordinance Compliance Notes*, Sheet 2.
    - c. *Site Regulations Compliance Notes*, Sheet 3.
    - d. *Existing Conditions Overview Plan*, Sheet 4.
    - e. *Existing Conditions Plan - A to G*, Sheets 5 to 11.
    - f. *Tract Overview Plan*, Sheet 13.
    - g. *Site Overview Plan*, Sheet 14.
    - h. *Site Plan - A to H*, Sheets 15 to 22.
    - i. *Access Summary*, Sheet 23.
    - j. *Main Entrance Detail*, Sheet 24.
    - k. *Site Circulation Plan*, Sheet 25.
    - l. *Landscape Overview*, Sheet 26.
    - m. *Landscape Plan - A to H*, Sheets 27 to 34.
    - n. *Landscape Details*, Sheet 35.
    - o. *Parking Compliance & Landscape Summary*, Sheet 36.
    - p. *Site Sections*, Sheet 37.
    - q. *Green Space & Impervious Area Summary*, Sheet 38.
    - r. *Grading & Drainage Overview Plan*, Sheet 39.
    - s. *Cut/Fill Balance Plan*, Sheet 40.
    - t. *Drainage & Grading Plan - A to H*, Sheets 41 to 48.
    - u. *Utility Overview Plan*, Sheet 49.
    - v. *Utility Plan - A to H*, Sheets 50 to 57.

Memo to File

Fuss & O'Neill Reference No. 20030249.2060

August 27, 2021

Page 2 of 2

- w. *Lighting Overview Plan*, Sheet 58.
- x. *Lighting Plan* - 1 to 4, Sheets 59 to 62.
- y. *Lighting Details*, Sheet 63.
- z. *Sewer Service Overview Plan*, Sheet 64.
- aa. *Sewer Plan* - A to C, Sheets 65 to 67.
- bb. *Sewer Profile* - A to C, Sheets 68 to 70.
- cc. *Sewer Details*, Sheet 71.
- dd. *Site Details* - 1 to 17, Sheet D1 to D17.
- ee. *Proposed East and West Elevations*, Sheet A101, prepared by Applied Form+Space, dated August 2, 2021.
- ff. *Proposed North and South Elevations Building Sections*, Sheet A102, prepared by Applied Form+Space, dated August 2, 2021.

SWR:elc

cc: Brian Groth – Town of Hudson  
Town of Hudson Engineering Division – File



FUSS & O'NEILL

August 27, 2021

Mr. Brian Groth  
Town Planner  
Town of Hudson  
12 School Street  
Hudson, NH 03051

Re: Town of Hudson Planning Board Review  
Friars Drive Industrial Facility Site Plan, 161 Lowell Road  
Tax Map 209 Lot 1; Acct. #1350-975  
Reference No. 20030249.2060

Dear Mr. Groth:

Fuss & O'Neill (F&O) has reviewed the first submission of the materials received on August 10, 2021, related to the above-referenced project. Authorization to proceed was received on August 10, 2021. A list of items reviewed is enclosed. The scope of our review is based on the Site Plan Review Codes, Stormwater Codes, Driveway Review Codes, Sewer Use Ordinance 77, Zoning Regulations, and criteria outlined in the CLD Consulting Engineers Proposal approved September 16, 2003, revised September 20, 2004, June 4, 2007, September 3, 2008, and October 2015.

We have included a copy of Fuss & O'Neill's evaluation of the checklist for your reference. We note that several items could not be verified by Fuss & O'Neill and require action by the Town.

The project appears to consist of the development of a 504,000 square foot industrial building project on a previously undeveloped site. Proposed improvements to the site also include the construction of a driveway, parking areas, drainage improvements, landscaping, lighting and other associated site improvements. The proposed buildings will be serviced by public water and sewer.

The following items are noted:

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

- a. Hudson Regulation (HR) 275-6.C. The applicant has proposed a sidewalk along Friars Drive that will tie into the existing sidewalk in front of 22 Friars Drive.
- b. HR 275-6.I. The scope of this review does not include the adequacy of any fire protection provisions for the proposed buildings. Multiple fire service connections to the buildings are shown along with multiple fire hydrants and a water pumping station with storage onsite. We note that details for the tank and pump station were not provided for review.
- c. HR 275-6.V. The applicant has not shown any outside dumpster enclosures. The applicant should provide information on how trash will be stored/disposed of.
- d. HR 275-8.C.(2) and Zoning Ordinance (ZO) 334-15.A. The applicant has provided parking calculations on the plan set. The applicant has noted that 840 parking spaces are required based on 1 space per 600 square feet or 0.75 spaces per employee for the 2 largest shifts combined. The applicant has proposed 362 spaces and has noted that a maximum

50 Commercial Street  
Manchester, NH  
03101  
t 603.668.8223  
800.286.2469  
[www.fando.com](http://www.fando.com)

California  
Connecticut  
Maine  
Massachusetts  
New Hampshire  
Rhode Island  
Vermont

Mr. Brian Groth  
August 27, 2021  
Page 2 of 5

employee count would be controlled by the building owner at 241 employees per shift to meet the 362 spaces. We note that the applicant should update the parking space number for Lot C on Sheet 36 as it appears 51 spaces are provided and 40 spaces are noted.

- e. HR 275-8.C.(6). The applicant has noted 51 loading spaces are required for the site and has provided more than required. The applicant has also met the size requirements and demonstrated maneuverability on the site circulation plan.
- f. HR 275-9.C.(11). The applicant has provided twelve handicap spaces for the site which exceeds the eight spaces required.
- g. HR 275-9.F. The applicant did not provide copies of any easements or deeds as part of the package received for review, and has not shown any existing or proposed easements on the plans.

## **2. Administrative Review Codes (HR 276)**

- a. HR 276-11.1.B.(6). The owner's signature is not shown on the plan set.
- b. HR 276-11.1.B.(9). The surveyor has stamped the existing conditions plans but has not signed the certification statement.
- c. HR 276-11.1.B.(12).(b). The applicant has provided the required 200 foot distance from abutting residential use. The applicant has also provided a Site Sections plan which shows sight lines from abutting buildings.
- d. HR 276-11.1.B.(13). The applicant has not included details for any proposed site signage other than traffic signs. The applicant should include a note stating that, "All signs are subject to approval by the Hudson PLANNING BOARD prior to installation thereof."
- e. HR 276-11.1.B.(17). We were unable to locate benchmarks upon the plans.
- f. HR 276-11.1.B.(18). The applicant has not shown proposed grading in the majority of the paved areas around the building.
- g. HR 276-11.1.B.(23). The applicant has not noted any pertinent highway projects on the plan set.
- h. HR 276-15. The applicant should add the Dig Safe logo and/or phone number to the plan set.

## **3. Driveway Review Codes (HR 275-8.B. (34)/Chapter 193)**

- a. HR 193.10.E. The applicant should provide sight distance information for the proposed driveway connection to Friars Drive on the plan set.

## **4. Traffic**

- a. HR 275-9.B. The applicant has noted that a full Traffic Study for the site will be completed in the near future. Comments from our review of that Traffic Study will be provided separately.

## **5. Utility Design/Conflicts**

- a. HR 275-9.E and 276-13. The applicant has proposed a water tank and pump system for the water system on site but has not provided any details for these systems on the plans.

Mr. Brian Groth

August 27, 2021

Page 3 of 5

- b. Engineering Technical Guideline & Typical Details (ETGTD) Section 825.2.13. The applicant has noted 'Approved Fire Hydrant' on the Hydrant Installation detail but has not noted the proposed hydrant brand or model. Hydrant models approved for use in Hudson are included in the referenced technical specification.
- c. The applicant should include a pavement patch detail in the plans for the water service connection at Friars Drive.
- d. ETGTD Section 720. The applicant should provide anticipated sewer flows for the facility if available so the Town can verify that capacity exists within the adjacent existing sewer system to accommodate those flows.
- e. Town of Hudson Sewer Use Ordinance (SUO) 77. The applicant has noted that there may be an industrial use or uses within the proposed building. Any industrial user discharging to the Town sewer system must be permitted for that discharge. The individual industries will need to coordinate with the Town for this permitting approval.
- f. The applicant is proposing an invert in at existing SMH E1 (125.02) that is higher than the proposed invert out of SMH 1 (124.50).

#### **6. Drainage Design/Stormwater Management (HR 275-9.A./Chapter 290)**

- a. HR 275-9.A. & 290. Drainage design comments will be provided separately once the design is complete and submitted by the applicant.
- b. ETGTD Details D-1 and D-2. We note that the Typical Drain Manhole and Typical Catch Basin Details included in the plans show flat tops, whereas the Town's standard details require an eccentric cone section at the tops of these structures.
- c. ETGTD Detail D-4. The Nyloplast Envirohood Detail doesn't agree with the Town's Oil-Grease Separator detail D-4. The applicant should review this with the Town for acceptance.
- d. HR 290-7.B.(16). The applicant has not shown snow storage locations on the plans.

#### **7. Zoning (ZO 334)**

- a. ZO 334-14.A. The applicant has provided building elevations showing the proposed maximum building height of 50 feet. However, the Ordinance measures the building height from an average elevation within 5 feet of the building. The grading plans do not include proposed grading around the buildings so the 50 foot building height cannot be verified.
- b. ZO 334-17 & 334-21. The applicant has noted that the subject parcel is located within the General (G) zoning district. The applicant has noted that the building may be used for industrial and/or manufacturing uses. These proposed uses are all allowed in the district.
- c. ZO 334-33. The applicant has shown wetlands within the site but has not proposed any impacts to the wetlands. The applicant has proposed some grading and drainage work within the wetlands buffer in the drainage easement to the south of the driveway. These impacts appear to be a conditional use of the wetlands buffer.
- d. ZO 334-60. The applicant has noted size information and locations for proposed site signage. We note that they appear to meet the Ordinance. Details of the proposed signs were not provided for review and the applicant has noted that a sign permit application will be completed.

Mr. Brian Groth

August 27, 2021

Page 4 of 5

- e. ZO 334-83 and HR 218-4.E. The applicant has noted that a portion of the site is located within a designated flood hazard area along the Merrimack River. We note that the applicant has not proposed any impacts or changes within the 100 year flood zone.

#### **8. Erosion Control/Wetland Impacts**

- a. The applicant has not included erosion and sedimentation control plans in the current plan review submission. Fuss & O'Neill will review these with a future submission when provided.
- b. The Town of Hudson should reserve the right to require any additional erosion control measures as needed.

#### **9. Landscaping (HR 275-8.C.(7) & 276-11.1.B.(20)) and Lighting (HR 276-11.1.B.(14))**

- a. HR 275-8.C.(7). The applicant has met the landscaping requirements for parking lot areas. We note that some lots are single access lanes and therefore exempt, however, the applicant met the requirements in those lots as well.
- b. HR 275-8.C.(8). The applicant has provided screening for the residential use to the east by adding a line of large evergreen trees and maintaining some of the existing tree line. The applicant has proposed to maintain the existing vegetation on the north and east sides of the site.
- c. HR 276-11.1.B.(14). The applicant has shown lighting fixture locations on the plans with details and photometric information, and it appears that the light locations have been coordinated with the Landscape plans.
- d. HR 276-11.1.B.(14). The applicant is proposing 32 foot light poles mounted on foundations with 3' exposed bases, for a total height of 35 feet. We recommend the applicant include the light poles on the Site Sections plan to demonstrate the site lines from abutting properties to these lights.

#### **10. State and Local Permits (HR 275-9.G.)**

- a. HR 275-9.G. The applicant has listed required permits and their statuses on the plan set.
- b. HR 275-9.G. The applicant did not provide copies of any applicable Town, State or Federal approvals or permits in the review package.
- c. Additional local and state permitting may be required, including for the proposed underground propane storage tanks.

#### **11. Other**

- a. The applicant has included a retaining wall detail in the plans. The applicant should provide a copy of that wall design, signed and stamped by a New Hampshire registered professional engineer, to the Town for their records.
- b. The applicant has provided a guardrail detail on the plan set but has not shown the location for this guardrail on the plans.
- c. The applicant has not provided spot grades on the parking lot. They are currently shown as "x"s. We will continue our grading review once the information is complete.
- d. The applicant should review the building square footage labels on sheet 13. It appears that

Mr. Brian Groth  
August 27, 2021  
Page 5 of 5

- the “k” in “ksf” should be removed.
- e. ETGTD Section 565.1.1. The applicant is reminded of Town of Hudson requirements for the importing of off-site fill materials for use in constructing this project. It is recommended that these requirements be stated on the plans for the Contractors attention.

Please feel free to call if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,



Steven W. Reichert, P.E.

**Steven W.  
Reichert, PE**

Digitally signed by Steven W. Reichert,  
PE  
DN: cn=Steven W. Reichert, PE, c=US,  
o=Fuss & O'Neill, Inc., ou=Fuss &  
O'Neill, Inc.,  
email=sreichert@fando.com  
Date: 2021.08.27 15:39:32 -0400

SWR:

Enclosure

cc: Town of Hudson Engineering Division – File  
The Dubay Group – karl@thedubaygroup.com

## M E M O R A N D U M

TO: File

FROM: Steven W. Reichert PE *SWR*

DATE: October 7, 2021

RE: Town of Hudson Planning Board Review  
Friars Drive Industrial Facility Site Plan  
Tax Map 209, Lot 1; Acct. #1350-975  
Fuss & O'Neill Reference No. 20030249.2060

---

The following list itemizes the set of documents reviewed related to the Friars Drive Industrial Facility Site Plan, located at 161 Lowell Road in Hudson, New Hampshire.

- Package from the Dubay Group, Inc. received by Fuss & O'Neill on September 23, 2021, including the following:
  1. Copy of a *Memorandum*, from the Dubay Group, Inc., to the Town of Hudson, dated September 22, 2021.
  2. Copy of *Site Plan, Friars Drive, Parcel 209-001-000 @ Sagamore Industrial Park, Hudson, New Hampshire*, prepared by the Dubay Group, Inc., dated August 3, 2021, revised September 20, 2021, unless otherwise noted, including the following:
    - a. *Title Sheet*, Sheet 1.
    - b. *Zoning Ordinance Compliance Notes*, Sheet 2.
    - c. *Site Regulations Compliance Notes*, Sheet 3.
    - d. *Existing Conditions Overview Plan*, Sheet 4.
    - e. *Site Specific Soils Plan*, Sheet 12, dated September 16, 2021, with no revisions noted.
    - f. *Tract Overview Plan*, Sheet 13.
    - g. *Site Overview Plan*, Sheet 14.
    - h. *Landscape Overview*, Sheet 26.
    - i. *Landscape Plan - A to H*, Sheets 27 to 34.
    - j. *Landscape Details*, Sheet 35.
    - k. *Parking Compliance & Landscape Summary*, Sheet 36.
    - l. *Site Sections*, Sheet 37.
    - m. *Grading & Drainage Overview Plan*, Sheet 39.
    - n. *Drainage & Grading Plan - A to H*, Sheets 41 to 48.
    - o. *Sewer Plan - A*, Sheet 65.
    - p. *Erosion Control Overview Plan*, Sheet 72, with no revisions noted.
    - q. *Erosion Control Plan – A*, Sheet 73, with no revisions noted.
    - r. *Landscape Plan – B*, Sheet 74, with no revisions noted.
    - s. *Erosion Control Plan – C to H*, Sheets 75 to 80, with no revisions noted.
    - t. *Site Details – 3 to 5*, Sheet D3 to D5.

SWR:elc

cc: Brian Groth – Town of Hudson  
Town of Hudson Engineering Division – File





FUSS & O'NEILL

October 7, 2021

Mr. Brian Groth  
Town Planner  
Town of Hudson  
12 School Street  
Hudson, NH 03051

Re: Town of Hudson Planning Board Review  
Friars Drive Industrial Facility Site Plan, 161 Lowell Road  
Tax Map 209 Lot 1; Acct. #1350-975  
Reference No. 20030249.2060

Dear Mr. Groth:

Fuss & O'Neill (F&O) has reviewed the second submission of the materials received on September 23, 2021, related to the above-referenced project. Authorization to proceed was received on September 23, 2021. A list of items reviewed is enclosed. The scope of our review is based on the Site Plan Review Codes, Stormwater Codes, Driveway Review Codes, Sewer Use Ordinance 77, Zoning Regulations, and criteria outlined in the CLD Consulting Engineers Proposal approved September 16, 2003, revised September 20, 2004, June 4, 2007, September 3, 2008, and October 2015.

The project appears to consist of the development of a 504,000 square foot industrial building project on a previously undeveloped site. Proposed improvements to the site also include the construction of a driveway, parking areas, drainage improvements, landscaping, lighting and other associated site improvements. The proposed buildings will be serviced by public water and sewer.

The following items have outstanding issues:

#### 4. Traffic

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.B. The applicant has noted that a full Traffic Study for the site will be completed in the near future. Comments from our review of that Traffic Study will be provided separately.*

**Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment:** Traffic Study Review comments were provided separately on September 21, 2021.

#### 5. Utility Design/Conflicts

- e. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: Town of Hudson Sewer Use Ordinance (SUO) 77. The applicant has noted that there may be an industrial use or uses within the proposed building. Any industrial user discharging to the Town sewer system must be permitted for that discharge. The individual industries will need to coordinate with the Town for this permitting approval.*

**Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment:** The applicant has noted that industrial sewer discharges are not anticipated with this permit. The applicant should be aware that if any industry within the building meets the definition of an industrial user in the Hudson Sewer

50 Commercial Street  
Manchester, NH  
03101  
t 603.668.8223  
800.286.2469  
[www.fando.com](http://www.fando.com)

California  
Connecticut  
Maine  
Massachusetts  
New Hampshire  
Rhode Island  
Vermont

Mr. Brian Groth  
October 7, 2021  
Page 2 of 7

Use Ordinance then they would be required to participate in the Industrial Pretreatment Program, even if no industrial discharge is anticipated.

#### **6. Drainage Design/Stormwater Management (HR 275-9.A./Chapter 290)**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.A. & 290. Drainage design comments will be provided separately once the design is complete and submitted by the applicant.*

**Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment:** We are in receipt of the drainage report and associated plans for the site and will provide review comments separately.

#### **8. Erosion Control/Wetland Impacts**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has not included erosion and sedimentation control plans in the current plan review submission. Fuss & O'Neill will review these with a future submission when provided.*

**Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment:** The applicant has provided erosion and sediment control plans as part of this review. The applicant should provide inlet protection for the catch basins shown adjacent to the stabilized construction entrance. Please note that additional erosion and sedimentation control review comments may be forthcoming with the review of the drainage plans.

#### **11. Other**

- f. **New Fuss and O'Neill Comment:** The applicant should review the sheet title on sheet 74. It appears an Erosion Control Plan has been labeled as a Landscape Plan.

The following items require Town evaluation or input:

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

- d. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-8.C.(2) and Zoning Ordinance (ZO) 334-15.A. The applicant has provided parking calculations on the plan set. The applicant has noted that 840 parking spaces are required based on 1 space per 600 square feet or 0.75 spaces per employee for the 2 largest shifts combined. The applicant has proposed 362 spaces and has noted that a maximum employee count would be controlled by the building owner at 241 employees per shift to meet the 362 spaces. We note that the applicant should update the parking space number for Lot C on Sheet 36 as it appears 51 spaces are provided and 40 spaces are noted.*

**Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment:** The applicant has updated the plan note. The applicant should review the with Town the need to submit a waiver request for the number of parking spaces proposed.

The following items are resolved or have no further Fuss & O'Neill input:

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

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: Hudson Regulation (HR) 275-6.C. The applicant has proposed a sidewalk along Friars Drive that will tie into the existing sidewalk in front of 22 Friars Drive.*
- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-6.I. The scope of this review does not include the adequacy*

Mr. Brian Groth

October 7, 2021

Page 3 of 7

*of any fire protection provisions for the proposed buildings. Multiple fire service connections to the buildings are shown along with multiple fire hydrants and a water pumping station with storage onsite. We note that details for the tank and pump station were not provided for review.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that they are working with the Town's water consultant to design the looped water main and once complete will coordinate with the Hudson Fire Department. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-6.V. The applicant has not shown any outside dumpster enclosures. The applicant should provide information on how trash will be stored/disposed of.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has confirmed that dumpsters will not be needed onsite and that materials will be handled internally within the building. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- e. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-8.C.(6). The applicant has noted 51 loading spaces are required for the site and has provided more than required. The applicant has also met the size requirements and demonstrated maneuverability on the site circulation plan.*
- f. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.C.(11). The applicant has provided twelve handicap spaces for the site which exceeds the eight spaces required.*
- g. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.F. The applicant did not provide copies of any easements or deeds as part of the package received for review and has not shown any existing or proposed easements on the plans.*

## **2. Administrative Review Codes (HR 276)**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(6). The owner's signature is not shown on the plan set.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The owner and developers' signatures have been added to the plan set. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(9). The surveyor has stamped the existing conditions plans but has not signed the certification statement.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The surveyor's signature has been added to the plan set. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(12).(b). The applicant has provided the required 200 foot distance from abutting residential use. The applicant has also provided a Site Sections plan which shows sight lines from abutting buildings.*

- d. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(13). The applicant has not included details for any proposed site signage other than traffic signs. The applicant should include a note stating that, "All signs are subject to approval by the Hudson PLANNING BOARD prior to installation thereof."*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added the note to Sheet 2 of the plan. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- e. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(17). We were unable to locate benchmarks upon the plans.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added temporary benchmarks to the Grading and Drainage Plans. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- f. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(18). The applicant has not shown proposed grading in the majority of the paved areas around the building.*

Mr. Brian Groth  
October 7, 2021  
Page 4 of 7

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added grading to the paved areas around the building. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- g. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(23). The applicant has not noted any pertinent highway projects on the plan set.*
- h. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-15. The applicant should add the Dig Safe logo and/or phone number to the plan set.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added Dig Safe info to the plan set. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

### **3. Driveway Review Codes (HR 275-8.B. (34)/Chapter 193)**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 193.10.E. The applicant should provide sight distance information for the proposed driveway connection to Friars Drive on the plan set.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant as added sight distance information to the plan showing that adequate sight distance is provided. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

### **5. Utility Design/Conflicts**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.E and 276-13. The applicant has proposed a water tank and pump system for the water system on site but has not provided any details for these systems on the plans.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that they are working with the Town's water consultant to design the looped water main and once complete will coordinate with the Hudson Fire Department. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: Engineering Technical Guideline & Typical Details (ETGTD) Section 825.2.13. The applicant has noted 'Approved Fire Hydrant' on the Hydrant Installation detail but has not noted the proposed hydrant brand or model. Hydrant models approved for use in Hudson are included in the referenced technical specification.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added a acceptable fire hydrant brand and model. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant should include a pavement patch detail in the plans for the water service connection at Friars Drive.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that pavement patch details are not required because the connection will not be within the roadway. A stub was previously installed. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- d. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ETGTD Section 720. The applicant should provide anticipated sewer flows for the facility if available so the Town can verify that capacity exists within the adjacent existing sewer system to accommodate those flows.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has stated that sewer flows were provided to the Town and NHDES for review. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- f. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant is proposing an invert in at existing SMH E1 (125.02) that is higher than the proposed invert out of SMH 1 (124.50).*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has revised the sewer elevation. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

Mr. Brian Groth  
October 7, 2021  
Page 5 of 7

## **6. Drainage Design/Stormwater Management (HR 275-9.A./Chapter 290)**

- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ETGTD Details D-1 and D-2. We note that the Typical Drain Manhole and Typical Catch Basin Details included in the plans show flat tops, whereas the Town's standard details require an eccentric cone section at the tops of these structures.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has replaced the details with Town of Hudson standard details. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ETGTD Detail D-4. The Nyloplast Envirohood Detail doesn't agree with the Town's Oil-Grease Separator detail D-4. The applicant should review this with the Town for acceptance.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that hydrodynamic treatment separators are intended for the dock/slip areas and they will coordinate the details for the hood with reviewers if needed. See separate drainage review letter for further comments.

- d. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 290-7.B.(16). The applicant has not shown snow storage locations on the plans.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added snow storage areas to the plan set. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

## **7. Zoning (ZO 334)**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ZO 334-14.A. The applicant has provided building elevations showing the proposed maximum building height of 50 feet. However, the Ordinance measures the building height from an average elevation within 5 feet of the building. The grading plans do not include proposed grading around the buildings so the 50-foot building height cannot be verified.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added building grading to the plan set and the elevation has been verified. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment

- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ZO 334-17 & 334-21. The applicant has noted that the subject parcel is located within the General (G) zoning district. The applicant has noted that the building may be used for industrial and/or manufacturing uses. These proposed uses are all allowed in the district.*

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ZO 334-33. The applicant has shown wetlands within the site but has not proposed any impacts to the wetlands. The applicant has proposed some grading and drainage work within the wetlands buffer in the drainage easement to the south of the driveway. These impacts appear to be a conditional use of the wetlands buffer.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has updated the plans to show this area had been previously built as part of the recent project. No new construction will take place in this area therefore additional permitting appears unnecessary. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- d. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ZO 334-60. The applicant has noted size information and locations for proposed site signage. We note that they appear to meet the Ordinance. Details of the proposed signs were not provided for review and the applicant has noted that a sign permit application will be completed.*

- e. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ZO 334-83 and HR 218-4.E. The applicant has noted that a portion of the site is located within a designated flood hazard area along the Merrimack River. We note that the applicant has not proposed any impacts or changes within the 100 year flood zone.*

Mr. Brian Groth  
October 7, 2021  
Page 6 of 7

## **8. Erosion Control/Wetland Impacts**

- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The Town of Hudson should reserve the right to require any additional erosion control measures as needed.*

## **9. Landscaping (HR 275-8.C.(7) & 276-11.1.B.(20)) and Lighting (HR 276-11.1.B.(14))**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-8.C.(7). The applicant has met the landscaping requirements for parking lot areas. We note that some lots are single access lanes and therefore exempt, however, the applicant met the requirements in those lots as well.*
- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-8.C.(8). The applicant has provided screening for the residential use to the east by adding a line of large evergreen trees and maintaining some of the existing tree line. The applicant has proposed to maintain the existing vegetation on the north and east sides of the site.*
- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(14). The applicant has shown lighting fixture locations on the plans with details and photometric information, and it appears that the light locations have been coordinated with the Landscape plans.*
- d. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 276-11.1.B.(14). The applicant is proposing 32 foot light poles mounted on foundations with 3' exposed bases, for a total height of 35 feet. We recommend the applicant include the light poles on the Site Sections plan to demonstrate the site lines from abutting properties to these lights.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added the light pole to the Site Sections. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

## **10. State and Local Permits (HR 275-9.G.)**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.G. The applicant has listed required permits and their statuses on the plan set.*
- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: HR 275-9.G. The applicant did not provide copies of any applicable Town, State or Federal approvals or permits in the review package.*
- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: Additional local and state permitting may be required, including for the proposed underground propane storage tanks.*

## **11. Other**

- a. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has included a retaining wall detail in the plans. The applicant should provide a copy of that wall design, signed and stamped by a New Hampshire registered professional engineer, to the Town for their records.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted that the wall design will be provided/reviewed prior to construction. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- b. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has provided a guardrail detail on the plan set but has not shown the location for this guardrail on the plans.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has added the guardrail location to the plan set. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- c. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant as not provided spot grades on the parking lot. They are currently shown as "x"s. We will continue our grading review once the information is complete.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The remaining grading has been provided. No further

Mr. Brian Groth  
October 7, 2021  
Page 7 of 7

Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- d. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant should review the building square footage labels on sheet 13. It appears that the "k" in "ksf" should be removed.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has revised the labels. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

- e. *Former Fuss & O'Neill Comment: ETGTD Section 565.1.1. The applicant is reminded of Town of Hudson requirements for the importing of off-site fill materials for use in constructing this project. It is recommended that these requirements be stated on the plans for the Contractors attention.*

Current Fuss & O'Neill Comment: The applicant has noted the requirement on the plan set. No further Fuss & O'Neill comment.

Please feel free to call if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,



**Steven W.  
Reichert, PE**

Digitally signed by Steven W. Reichert,  
PE  
DN: cn=Steven W. Reichert, PE, c=US,  
o=Fuss & O'Neill, Inc., ou=Fuss &  
O'Neill, Inc.,  
email=sreichert@fando.com  
Date: 2021.10.07 15:07:34 -0400

Steven W. Reichert, P.E.

SWR:

Enclosure

cc: Town of Hudson Engineering Division – File  
The Dubay Group – karl@thedubaygroup.com