

TOWN OF MONROE
APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM COMMENTS

For: Planning and Zoning Commission Applications

PZC Application Number: SEP 2022-01 (previously submitted as SEP 2021-14)

Comments By:

Development Description: Yearling Real Estate Group, new Building

___ Town Planner

___ Fire Marshal

Location of Development: 24 Commerce Drive

X Town Engineer

___ Police

Department File Number: not provided

___ Building Official

___ Health

Revised Submission Data Received by Engineering (Date): 4-20-22

1. Items marked with (*) are outstanding issues that must be addressed prior to completing the hearing. Please call to discuss these items as soon as possible.

Submission Data:

Plans:

- Sheet 1 of 12, Title Sheet, 24 Commerce Drive Site Improvements in Monroe..., for Yearling Real Estate Group, LLC, by Spath-Bjorklund..., dated 10-27-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- **AP-1, Area Plan 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., Yearling Real Estate Group, LLC, by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to 4-5-22.**
- **S-0, Existing Conditions Plan 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., Yearling Real Estate Group, LLC, by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to 4-5-22.**
- Topographic Survey Existing Conditions Plan of Property Located At 24 Commerce Drive...Prepared for Commerce Holdings, LLC, by Lewis Associates..., dated 7-20-10, revised to 7-13-17.
- S-1, Site Development Plan, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- E-1, Erosion Control Plan, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- LP-1, Landscape Plan, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by Environmental Land Solutions, LLC, dated 4-11-17, revised to ~~10-18-21~~ 3-29-22.
- SL-1, Lighting Plan, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- SL-2, Lighting Plan, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- A-1, Architectural Plans, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- **A-2, Architectural Plans, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to 4-5-22.**
- D-1, Details, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- D-2, Details, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- D-3, Details, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.
- D-4, Details, 24 Commerce Drive, Monroe..., by SBA, dated 3-2-21, revised to ~~12-3-21~~ 4-5-22.

Other:

- Engineering Report, 24 Commerce Road..., by SBA, dated 9-14-21, revised to ~~2-20-22~~ 2-28-22 (not provided for this application but provided for the IWC)

COMMENTS:

Changes to initial comments/data (when applicable) are indicated as follows: (new or additional information is shown in bold type, while resolved items are shown as lightly shaded and crossed off).

A. Public Improvements:

1. The existing water main located in Commerce Drive should be extended to service this property. (refer to the Health and/or Zoning Department for input).

B. Traffic and Safety:

1. Handicap parking should be provided for Building #1.
2. The handicap parking space for Building #2 should be protected with raised islands or bollards.
3. Guide rail should be provided along the parking at the easterly side of the site.
4. The concave grading in the main entrance/exit drive should be avoided.

C. Drainage and Utilities:

1. ~~Since the test pits reflect no issues with the water table and/or redoximorphic conditions, and the nearby wetlands are down slope at an elevation 6' lower than the bottom of the detention system, primary water quality treatment in the form of a sump volume in the galleries should be a consideration, contingent on verification of no water issues per an additional test pit to an elevation 18" lower than said sump. Given~~

TOWN OF MONROE
APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM COMMENTS
SEP 2022-01

~~the proposed use, the secondary treatment mechanical device as proposed is also a good idea. The added depth for WQV (voids in stone under the galleries) is noted. However,~~ the following should be addressed:

- ~~a. The larger stone (1 ¼" or 2") should be indicated in the detention gallery detail for the base.~~
 - ~~b. The detention gallery detail should indicate the perforations on the side walls.~~
 - ~~c. Since the only interconnection between the rows of galleries is via travel through the side wall backfill areas, and voids are being utilized for some of the attenuation volume, the detail should provide a width dimension between rows, and should indicate the stone and not the option for screened gravel. A manifold interconnection of the rows should really be provided.~~
 - ~~d. The detention gallery inlet and outlet should not be in the same row. With consideration of the above, the inlet should be as far away from the outlet as possible (move inlet to the southwest corner, or outlet to the northwest corner of the gallery system).~~
 - ~~e. The overall outer limits of the detention gallery system (top, bottom, and sides) should be wrapped in non-woven filter fabric (show in detail).~~
 - f. **As discussed**, test pit confirmation of adequate clearance between the bottom of the stone bedding (WQV) and water table or redoximorphic conditions should be provided prior to the start of construction. ~~approval. Otherwise, there's no guarantee that it can be provided.~~
2. ~~The narrative on page 1 of the Engineering Report should be revised to indicate "...the objective of the detention study is to design facilities to maintain the peak flow at or below the" Pre-disturbance conditions" (in lieu of "the current conditions"). It appears that the revision to this sentence in the revised Engineering Report (2-20-22) still does not reflect the above detailed objective (typo??) Also, the calculations should be revised to reflect this in the curve number/s and time of concentration, noting that existing conditions should be wooded for the whole site, and disturbed area/gravel should not be utilized. Although the summary table appears to reflect that this was done, the revised hydrographs for the existing DA 1 & DA 2 should be included.~~ Note that a final comprehensive report should be provided (post-approvals).
 3. **As a policy regarding methodology for attenuation (for calculating purposes), the UGS routing should not include exfiltration.**

D. Sedimentation and Erosion Control (MS4 issues):

1. The temporary sediment trap should be formed as a cut section.

E. Other:

1. Certification for the design of the boulder retaining wall should be provided prior to construction, and upon completion of construction.
- ~~2. At least the updated (more recent) plans submitted for the IWC application should be submitted for this PZC application, noting that further revisions are typically provided via the subsequent PZC application. Accordingly, the revisions that were made to the plans/submission data to address some of the IWC review comments should be incorporated into this application (plans/submission data).~~
3. An approval should be contingent on procurement of a Public Works Highway Modification permit.

BOND RECOMMEDATION: \$25,000.00

DATE REVIEWED: 4-19-22, **4-21-22**



REVIEWED BY: Scott H. Schatzlein, P.E.
(203) 452-8631 Phone