

To: Rob Balland, PE with Paramounte Engineering
From: Megan Crowe, Associate Planner; 910-341-3257
CC: File;
Date: 2/4/2019
Re: Echo Farms Park TRC REV1

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.

Site Plan Comments:

- Please clearly mark the zoning designation change on this property on the site plan
- Property acreage different than listed on MB 65 PG 148
- On C2.0
 - Remove the “subdivision parcel” and “county parcel” labels leftover from the subdivision
 - Add shaded X to the flood note
 - #14 there are navigable waters on this property as indicated by DCM
 - #20 pond was considered to be Waters of the US & impacts permit will be required
 - Add conservation resource setback to this page and the site plan
- On C 2.1
 - no sidewalk is required as this is not an increase in gross floor area
 - The existing sidewalk has a gap along Echo Farms Blvd. consider adding sidewalk to fill the gap
 - The existing parking facility is not all asphalt, some areas look to be gravel. Were these counted toward the existing parking facility numbers?
- The required rear yard setback changes to 25’ is the property is adjacent to a residential district, please amend the required setback
- The site is over parked based on the parking schedule for Municipal Park. Please provide parking demand based on ITE or other reliable data to allow for up to 25% over the maximum as reviewed by TRC (18-528). Any parking over essential site improvements shall be pervious.
- Provide location and screening details regarding the trash roll out service.
- Multi Use Path
 - Is the multi-use path proposed at 5’ or 10’?
 - Show the pedestrian crossing over Chastain Drive
 - The feasibility of the path located on the adjacent apartment proposal (on the west side of the property) may be limited unless the stormwater pond is relocated

- Previous discussions with adjacent development included 2 other pedestrian connections to the multi-use path (one at the end of the hammerhead and the other by the apartment mail kiosk). Please consider incorporating these into the multi-use path design around the park.
- A tree preservation/removal permit is required
 - What is the use of the sidewalk where the 20" pine tree is to be removed?
- All federal, state and local permits are required prior to full construction release. This includes, but is not limited to: state storm water, state utility extension permits, wetland disturbance permits, city storm water, tree protection permits, etc.
 - Last discussion with DCM indicated that the pond in the middle of the Apartment phase of the adjacent development was navigable waters, CAMA permit would be required for the crossing of the multi-use path on the south side of the property
 - Depending on the field verified high water mark, CAMA permit may be required for the northern portion of the site for the future clay courts
 - Wetland impact permits required for wetland crossing in multiple locations for the path
- Conservation resource setback needs to be shown on the plans on all pages
 - Provide a calculation for impervious surface within the resource
 - This is considered a non-residential use therefore the resource setback needs to follow non-residential standards

Landscape Plan

- Please submit a landscape plan
- A buffer is required to shield the more intensive land use on the adjacent land based on LDC (18-496), the required buffer is 20' as previously discussed for the apartment property. Please show areas where landscape easement is required on this property