

**To:** Howard Resnik  
**From:** Nicole Smith, Associate Planner; 910-341-1611  
**CC:** File;  
**Date:** 10/27/2020  
**Re:** Ardmore

The following is a list of comments for review from planning regarding the project. Please provide your corrections as listed below. Additional review will be required once all the needed documents have been provided. Items or documents not provided on initial submission will be subject to further review. Please contact me for any further questions.

Review	Department	Comments
Nicole Smith	Planning	See comments below
Richard Christensen	Engineering	See comments below
Chris Walker	Fire	Nothing Further. Prepared to sign.
Bill McDow	Transportation Planning	See comments below
Mitesh Baxi	Traffic Engineering	See comments below
Patrick Wurzel	NCDOT	See comments below
Anna Reh-Gingerich	Stormwater Services	See comments below

Planning Comments (Nicole Smith):

Site Plan Comments:

- Missing site data table contents:
  - Add the maximum parking calculations (i.e. 25 residential units & 1700 sq. ft. of commercial).
  - Update bicycle parking compliance: 30 spaces minimum required (25 for residential units and 5 for commercial units)

Landscaping Plan and Tree Removal Comments:

- Why is 5" Dogwood proposed for removal? Need to ensure compliance with Sec. 18-474

UMX Comments (Sec. 18-204):

- Site lighting: All site lighting shall be located, angled, and/or limited in intensity so as to cast no direct light upon adjacent properties, shall minimize off-site backlighting glare, and up lighting. Light posts shall be no taller than 12 feet. Provide additional details of path lighting to ensure compliance.
- Add note regarding screening of utility and electrical equipment on elevations to ensure compliance.

CD-15-118-M420 Comments:

- What is the status of conversations with NCDOT regarding installation of crosswalk at S. 17<sup>th</sup> Street and Church?

Engineering (Richard Christensen):

Engineering has reviewed the plans for the Ardmore project submitted September 4, 2020 for TRC review and have the following comments:

**Stormwater Management Permit Application Form**

1. II. Permit Information; #2: 'Yes' was checked to state that this project is currently covered by an existing City or State Stormwater Permit, but no permit numbers were provided. I believe this was meant to be checked 'No'? I can make the change on my end if that is the case.
2. Note only: IV. Project Information; #12: The total impervious surface was not entered. I can write that in for you.
3. IV. Project Information; #13: Only list the information for each SCM (pervious concrete), the first column info can be omitted.

**Stormwater Calculations**

4. Pervious Pavement Calculations for PA #1:
  - a. The drawdown time exceeds what is allowable...72 hours for infiltrating PP. See MDC 8 in the permeable pavement section.
  - b. Aggregate depth to infiltrate the 10-Yr 24 HR storm is no longer a requirement.
  - c. Two drawdown calculations were provided. Which one is correct, 3.47 days or 1.14 days?
5. Pervious Pavement Calculations for PA #2:
  - a. Aggregate depth to infiltrate the 10-Yr 24 HR storm is no longer a requirement.
  - b. Two drawdown calculations were provided. Which one is correct, 2.60 days or 0.56 days?

**Supplement-EZ**

6. Drainage Area Information: #6 and #7: If the three existing parcels are going to be recombined into a single parcel, all three entries under #6 (Entire Site, 1 and 2) will need to be relocated to #7.
7. Drainage Area Information: #11 and #12: Same for 11 and 12 as in #6 and #7 above.
8. Drainage Area Information: #15: Enter the amount of existing BUA that will be removed (80sf) for the Entire Site.
9. Drainage Area Information: #16: Enter the percent BUA of the Entire Site.
10. Permeable Pavement: #7: SCMs are not sized to treat the SW from all surfaces at build-out. Change from 'yes' to 'no'.
11. Permeable Pavement: #19: Subgrade slope must be less than or equal to two (2) percent.
12. Permeable Pavement: #22: Enter the storage elevation of the design rainfall depth.
13. Permeable Pavement: #33: Enter the soil infiltration rate for PP #2.
14. Permeable Pavement: #36: Subgrade slope must be less than or equal to two (2) percent.
15. Permeable Pavement: #37: Enter the top of the subgrade for PP #2.

**Construction Drawings**

16. Existing Conditions (sheet 2 of 8): The existing vegetation along the eastern side of the alley is not shown. It appears this vegetation may be impacted by the alley improvements. Please address.
17. Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 8):
  - a. Site & Building Data: Minor discrepancy: The \*\* denotes 2,411 sf of pervious concrete. Should be 2,455? Please clarify.
  - b. Site & Building Data: Onsite soils are Kureb-Urban (HSG A). The Technical Standards Manual in Table H-1 (pg. 5-52) requires field judgment to determine the HSG. The soils report, based on the low infiltration rates, would put the soils in the HSG of 'D'?

Transportation Comments (Bill McDow):

**TECHNICAL STANDARDS – TRAFFIC IMPACT**

1. The estimated Trip Generation Numbers appear to be incorrect. Please use whole numbers for AM Peak HR Trips and PM Peak HR Trips.

**TECHNICAL STANDARDS – ACCESS (driveway, sidewalk, and sight distance):**

2. The proposed building appears to have stairs; however, the stairwell does not appear to be labeled. Please revise.

**TECHNICAL STANDARDS – PARKING:**

3. Please show the ADA entrance to the building.

4. The proposed limits of construction appear to extend into the adjacent parking lot for 702 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street. Please clarify the access between the adjacent parcels, including the location of existing parking spaces and the location of any proposed fences or barriers between the two properties.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance as this development moves through the review process.

TrafficEngineering(MiteshBaxi):

**TECHNICAL STANDARDS:**

**1. SIGHT DISTANCE TRIANGLE FOR ANY STREET INTERSECTIONS WITH SAID THOROUGHFARES**

S 17th St is a major thoroughfare [Chap VII (C) (2) (a) of C of W Tech Stds]. The required triangular sight distance for any street intersections with said thoroughfares shall be provided in compliance with the AASHTO sight distance standards. Applicable for the NW corner of the development [Sec.18-556 C of W LDC] Please dimension.

Refer 'AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets', Chapter 9.5.2.2 Departure Sight Triangles.

2. Please clarify the purpose of providing a concrete slab on the plaza off Church St outside the northern boundary of the property. If it is proposed, label it accordingly.
3. Detectable warning domes are recommended at the transition of parking aisle and ADA ramp provided for the accessible parking space.

**GENERAL NOTE TO ADD TO THE PLAN:**

A. Contact 811 prior to contacting City of Wilmington, Traffic Engineering regarding the utilities in ROW.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance.

NCDOT Comments (Patrick Wurzel):

These preliminary comments are based on the plans as submitted for the proposed site and are subject to further review upon receipt of any additional information. Subsequently, additional comments and/or requirements may be necessary for this site.

- A NCDOT Encroachment Agreement is required for any utility connections or installation within NCDOT right-of-way.
- A separate encroachment agreement is required for sidewalk installation and replacement of curbing on 17th Street.
- There shall be no obstructions placed within NCDOT 10x70 sight triangles

• NCDOT Division 3 District 3 is now paperless. When ready to submit email all documents to [Div3Dist3@ncdot.gov](mailto:Div3Dist3@ncdot.gov)

Stormwater Services Comments (Anna Reh-Gingerich):

To Whom It May Concern:

The Ardmore project falls within the Burnt Mill Creek Watershed. Burnt Mill Creek is listed by the State for high chlorophyll and a poor benthic community. Any additional infiltration on-site would help reduce the amount of stormwater runoff and pollution that could enter Burnt Mill Creek and contribute to the current pollution problems.

My comments:

1. Incorporate native plants wherever possible. Native plants require less maintenance than nonnative plants to grow successfully since they are already acclimated to local conditions. There are a lot of great options in this booklet, including trees, flowers, shrubs, and groundcovers: <https://ncwildflower.org/handouts/Coastal-Landscaping-Guide-Book.pdf>

Thank you for the opportunity to review! Please do not hesitate to reach out to me if you have any other questions or would like to explore other ways to improve infiltration on-site.

Thank you,  
Anna Reh-Gingerich

Interim Watershed Coordinator - Heal Our Waterways Program City of Wilmington Stormwater Services

209 Coleman Drive Wilmington, NC 28412

Ph: 910-765-0629 | Fax: 910-341-7832

[anna.reh-gingerich@wilmingtonnc.gov](mailto:anna.reh-gingerich@wilmingtonnc.gov)

[www.healourwaterways.org](http://www.healourwaterways.org)