



1117 East Robinson St.
Orlando, FL 32801
Phone: 407.425.0452
Fax: 407.648.1036

November 18, 2021

Ms. Sandy Riffle, CMC
Deputy City Clerk
City of Edgewood
405 Bagshaw Way
Edgewood, FL 32809-3406

RE: 5645 Hansel Ave – Mecatos Bakery and Cafe – construction plan review
CPH project number E7601

Dear Ms. Riffle;

We are in receipt of the construction plan for the above listed project. The application and preliminary site plan were previously submitted for review. We have reviewed the plans to verify the necessary information has been provided. We have also coordinated with the City Planner for review comments. The CPH comments are to be included with the City Planner comments. Below are our comments and observations:

1. Sheet C-000 - Update the reference to contact Sunshine One Call for utility locates. Need to add the Sunshine logo to the plans reference to call at least two full business days in advance for locates. This notification will be on the Sunshine logo and is downloadable from their website.
2. Sheet C-000 - The total impervious area does not include the building area for both pre-development and post-development.
3. Sheet C-002 was not provided.
4. Sheet C-001 – General Note 5 references “any existing utility services shall be properly disconnected, plugged, removed or abandoned.” This note indicates all the water and sewer services are to be removed from the site. How will water be provided to the site?
5. Sheet C-001 - In addition, the Demo Plan references to protect BFP and/or piping to building. The only item on the demo plan is the location of the BFP. The existing water line needs to be shown on the demo plan and the Site Utility plan. The existing water line and BPD also need to be shown on the landscape plans to verify no conflicts with plantings.
6. Sheet C-001 – site and drainage to be designed to SJRWMD criteria. Revise Drainage note 1 accordingly.
7. Sheet C-001 – Drainage Note 8 references to set the proposed storm structures to the existing pavement grade. This should reference the proposed grades.
8. Sheet C-001 – Paving note 6 referencing testing for any roadway shown on the plans. Shouldn't this note reference any new pavement?
9. Sheet C-001 – Sewer and Water notes – add OUC (water provider) to note 1.
10. Sheet C-001 – Note 4 references concrete encasing the sewer main if separation cannot be met. Based on the plans, the only gravity sewer is the portion from the north side of the building and extending NE to the lift station. If there is a conflict with the water main, we recommend adjusting the water main to avoid the conflict. Concrete encasement is not a recommended option.



11. Sheet C-001 – OUC is the water provider. Revise note to include OUC. Also, the plans do not show a water main. Show the water service to the site and how it ties to the backflow prevention device.
12. Sheet C-001 – Water and Sewer notes - Do the water notes apply for this project? Revise to be specific to this project with respect to installation, testing, clearance. Will an FDEP water permit be required/submitted for this project?
13. Sheet C-001 – Water and Sewer notes 24. Include OUC in the notes (for connection to the OUC system).
14. Sheet C-003 – There is some demolition work taking place in the Hoffner Avenue ROW. Verify that an Orange County ROW permit will not be required. Provide documentation to the City.
15. Sheet C-100 – Code Section 134-142 requires vehicular and pedestrian cross access to be provided between adjacent parcels consistent with sound and generally accepted engineering practices and principles. The City’s engineer has determined it is not practical to require the cross access on the subject property. To the east is residential land. To the north is a nonresidential parcel, however, there is no benefit to connecting that parking area to that on the subject property given the one-way circulation on the subject property.
16. Sheet C-100 – Missing dimension for the paver parking on the SE portion of the site.
17. Sheet C-100 - The plans show two-way traffic on the south and west side of the site. The same plan only shows room for two cars in the drive through lane. The circulation needs to be one-way, counterclock wise through the site. See note 7 below.
18. Sheet C-100 – the drive through lane appears short. There is only room for two vehicles. If 3 or more vehicles que up, where will the balance of the cars wait? We expect they will be queued up along the south side of the drive lane blocking the parking spaces on the south side of the site. Consider extending the drive through lane around the south side of the drive lane, with striping to denote drive thru versus pass through traffic.
19. Sheet C-100 – the lane line separating the drive through from the circulating traffic should be one single solid white line.
20. Sheet C-100 – the width of the exit lane to Hansel Avenue is 12.3’ feet wide. Please verify with Orange County Fire Rescue. Their minimum width is typically 20 feet.
21. Sheet C-100 – will the raised concrete island have the mountable curbing painted yellow (recommended)?
22. Sheet C-101 – The plan sheet shows the turning movements for vehicles traveling on Hoffner Avenue and Hansel Avenue. Show how delivery trucks will circulate through the proposed site. Show how the Orange County Fire Rescue trucks will circulate through the site (this may also be a comment from OCFR).
23. Sheet C-200: The stormwater structures are not called out. Please provide the structure inlet types, grate elevations, storm pipe inverts with direction (E, W, N, S?), and sizes for the pipes.
24. Sheet C-200 – for the “clean-outs” in the open spaces, revise to show either yard inlets or typical concrete storm inlets.
25. Sheet C-200 – there appear to be numerous conflicts with either existing or proposed trees and the proposed under drain system. Show on the grading plan or the landscape plan the location of both the proposed piping and the existing/proposed trees. The concern is



the tree roots will grow to and into the pipes (water source for roots). How will this be addressed?

26. Sheet C-200: The mitered end sections in the stormwater pond should be at the bottom of the pond to prevent erosion. Call out the MES invert. Consider adding energy dissipaters at the end of the pipes for erosion protection in the pond.
27. Sheet C-200 – recommend including the existing topo and existing spot elevations on the plan to verify the proposed site grading and tie-in to existing grades (on-site and off-site).
28. Sheet C-200 – the grades for the paver parking on the SE corner of the site depict the slope from the asphalt drive lane across the parking and into the grass area to the east. How is the runoff from this area collected and drained to the storm water pond? Based on the existing survey, the area appears to drain either east or south, away from the proposed pond.
29. Sheet C-200 – one of the pond contours next to the dumpster does not appear to cross through the designated contour elevation (number). The contour appears to be too close to the back of cur and dumpster enclosure.
30. Sheet C-200 – the proposed pond is in conflict with the existing and proposed trees. Please clarify how the grading will take place around the trees to remain. We anticipate there will be more trees that will need to be removed based on the design.
31. Sheet C-200 – north parking area – why is there a portion of the under drain pipe under the pervious parking call out as PVC? Shouldn't this all be perforated pipe? Also, designs do not usually include a change in direction in pipe without an inlet or clean out.
32. Sheet C-200 – all underdrain pipes on the north and east side are at the same elevation as the pond bottom.
33. Sheet C-300 - The plans are missing the water service to the site. At a minimum, the plans should show the location of the existing water service to the site, the water meter location and the service to the building. The plans should also show the location of the gravity sewer from the building to the connection point at the property line, if any.
34. Sheet C-402 – how was the head and GPM calculated for the lift station? Provide lift station and sewer flow calculations for review.
35. Sheet C-402 – the General notes references the pumps will be 3 Phase. The same notes states the Contractor to field verify available voltage prior to procurement of pumps. How was the phase determined if the voltage has not been determined?

Storm calculation review:

36. Half the site drains to the east, to the FDOT ROW. An FDOT permit will be required.
37. Appendix A – east basin pervious/impervious post development table does not include the building. The post development map shows 100% of the building is included on the west basin. Will there be roof drains routing the runoff to the west or will a portion of the building drain to the east?
38. Based on the plans and storm calcs, the pond is sized for the required volume. This will impact the trees on the east side of the site at the pond location. Update the landscape plan accordingly.
39. The Pervious/Impervious table areas for Basin 1 and 2 add up to 0.917 acres. The cover sheet lists the site as 0.906 acres. Please verify the total site area.
40. The storm calculations did not include any additional storm events such as the 10 year or the 25 year. How will the pond stage react to a larger storm event and what will be



the post versus pre development runoff from the site. Be reminded, the site cannot create more runoff from the post development storms than from the predevelopment.

41. Also, to which direction will the discharge from the pond drain based on the 10 year or 25 year storm. We cannot have a point discharge onto adjacent properties or more runoff from the post storms. Please identify and provide additional information.

Please have the applicant revise and resubmit the necessary plans addressing the comments noted above. All changes need to be clouded and a revision note added to the plans. A response to all comments needs to be provided.

Please be reminded, approval of this application by the City of Edgewood does not grant authority to alter other portions of this property, nor does it waive any permits that may be required by Federal, State, or County agencies which may have jurisdiction.

Sincerely,
CPH, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Allen C. Lane, Jr." in a cursive script.

Allen C. Lane, Jr., P.E.
Project Engineer

CC: Ellen Hardgrove, City Planner
file

J:\E7601\Civil\Documents\City Plans-Application Review\5645 Hansel - Mecatos Bakery\Letter\5645 Hansel Ave - construction plan review 11-12-21.docx