

March 21, 2019

Ms. Adrienne Senter  
Planning & Development Coordinator  
Department of Economic Development  
City of Hapeville  
3468 N. Fulton Avenue  
P.O. Box 82311  
Hapeville, Georgia 30354

Re: Hapeville Branch Library  
525 King Arnold Street  
Development Review No. 2  
K&W Ref. No. 191051.00

Dear Ms. Senter:

As requested, I have reviewed the Site Plans for the Hapeville Branch Library to be located on a 19 acre parcel at 525 King Arnold Street, within a V Zoning District. The re-submittal was received on March 19, 2019. The site plans were prepared by Atwell Group under the engineering seal of Brian E. Kay. With regard to my letter dated February 6, 2019, my comments are as follows:

1. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
2. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
3. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
4. Comment not addressed. The projected peak and average utility usage for all City provided utility services (such as water and sanitary sewer) should be indicated on the plans to verify proper meter sizing to record low flows.
5. Comment partially addressed by the re-submittal. The hydrology study outlet structure orifice size of 15 inches does not agree with the 12 inch orifice shown in the drawing details. It is not clear how the 12 inch or 15 inch orifice is intended to be constructed in the catch basin structure. Is there an interior wall to be built for the orifice placement? Further details should be shown.
6. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
7. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
8. Comment not addressed. Use of existing driveways in a project does not automatically waive compliance with the regulations. City approval to use existing driveway widths less than required and a spacing closer than required must be obtained and shown on the drawings. It cannot be verified from the information provided if the project complies with the interior driveways width criteria of Section 93-23 of the Zoning Ordinance. It appears the driveway spacing along King Arnold Street does not meet the minimum separation of 50 feet per Section 93-23-2.
9. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
10. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
11. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
12. Comment partially addressed by the re-submittal. With the soil infiltration test results showing rates are far below the minimum of 0.5 inches per hour required, perforated underdrain and crushed stone are shown beneath the porous pavement. However, the gradation of the crushed stone is not shown and it is not clear if the storage volume shown in the hydrology study is based on partial volume fill with crushed stone.
13. Comment partially addressed. Provisions demonstrating compliance to the Tree Conservation Ordinance Appendix A on tree canopy requirements are not shown.
14. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.

Ms. Adrienne Senter, Hapeville Planning & Development Coordinator

March 21, 2019

Page 2 of 2

15. Comment partially addressed. Provisions to be provided to the City should include the storm water management inspection and maintenance schedule and agreement, performance and maintenance bond, bond fees, and the detailed estimate of the plan annual maintenance costs.
16. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
17. Comment considered addressed since the disturbed area is shown to be less than 1 acre.
18. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
19. Comment considered addressed since sewer service line is shown to be a private line.
20. Comment considered addressed since water main line is shown to be a private line.
21. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
22. Comment can be considered addressed if the Fire Chief has reviewed the plans to verify adequate access for emergency vehicles is provided.
23. Comment addressed by the re-submittal.
24. The total impervious area of 0.67 acres shown on sheet 1 will be used for stormwater utility billing purposes for the development unless more accurate information is provided.

I have retained one copy of the plans provided for review in the event there are questions. The petitioner should be made aware that the review does not constitute a waiver of City Ordinance requirements or assumption of responsibility for full review of City Ordinance requirements. Deviations from Ordinance requirements may be noted at any time during the review, permitting or construction processes. Re-submittals should include a narrative indicating how and where the review comments were addressed.

Very truly yours,

**KECK & WOOD, INC.**



Michael J. Moffitt, P.E.