

July 26, 2024

Mr. Robbie Schwartz
Planning Director
City of Loganville
4303 Lawrenceville Road
P.O. Box 39
Loganville, Georgia 30052

Re: Blanchard Auto
164 Bobby Boss Dr
Loganville, Ga.
Development Review No. 2
K&W Ref. No. 000018

Dear Mr. Schwartz:

As requested, I have reviewed the initial submittal of the proposed auto service center plans to be located at the eastern quadrant of the intersection of Tommy Lee Fuller Drive and Bobby Boss Drive. The Zoning of the development is identified as within a CH Zoning District. The electronic submittal was received on November 17, 2023. The proposed development consists of miscellaneous on-site improvements for the 2.47 acre parcel and includes creation of an auto service center. The plans were prepared by Bullard Land Planning under the landscape architect seal of Robert F. Bullard. My comments are as follows:

1. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
2. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
3. Any conditions or restrictions associated with the zoning of the property should be stated on the cover sheet. **Applicant should provide all approved variances and associated conditions on the plans.**
4. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
5. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
6. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
7. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
8. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
9. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
10. The provisions to address the acceleration/deceleration lane are not adequate. Each lane should be 200-feet in length based from turn-in, followed by a 50-foot taper section. The petitioner is referred to Section 6.3.4.c. of the Development Regulations for guidance. **Applicant should provide all approved variances and associated conditions on the plans.**
11. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
12. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
13. Applicant should clarify how drainage from the roadway will have positive drainage. **No response was provided to this. Currently, the plans appear to show stormwater draining to a curb with minimal slope. Based on the provided spot elevations, it appears to have a slope of 0.08% from north to south. The purpose of the French drain is not clear as the current design appears to only show stormwater from the sidewalk entering it. There are also a lot of stray lines that should be cleaned up as it is not clear of what improvements are being proposed. Applicant should clarify the proposed grading and clearly show how all stormwater is being handled.**
14. Dimensions of the pavement and right of way lines at Tommy Lee Fuller Drive should be shown to verify compliance with Section 6.3.4.c of the Loganville Development Regulations.

15. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
16. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
17. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
18. The drainage easement for the stormwater facility should encompass the entire facility and not be offset on the inside of the pond. The easement is to be provided for the entire facility. **Variance should be provided on plans.**
19. Because the project adds more than 5,000 square feet of impervious area, City code chapter 115 applies. A proposed stormwater management and inspection agreement per Section 115-38 of the Code of Loganville should be provided for review. Execution of the final agreement will be necessary before permit issuance. An executed access easement agreement and estimated annual maintenance costs of the stormwater facilities should also be provided.
20. Construction details of the proposed retaining walls should be shown on the drawings.
21. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
22. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
23. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
24. The developer is responsible for preparing and filing the Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan to comply with the Georgia EPD General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES) for storm water discharges from construction activities. A copy of the EPD online GEOS NOI submittal receipt for proof that the plan and Notice of Intent was filed before construction activities are begun should be furnished to the City for record purposes.
25. A copy of the GSWCC approval should be provided to the City for record purposes.
26. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
27. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
28. Not addressed. **It appears as though the stormwater discharging from the OCS is now being proposed to flow to a new low point at the neighboring driveway. This is unacceptable and all stormwater discharging from the site should be transported away from the site in a way that will not result in potentially adverse conditions. The proposed layout appears to potentially create ponding issues for the adjacent property.**
29. Not addressed. Applicant should clarify where the stormwater will drain as the provided contours do not indicate there will be positive drainage at the discharge location. **The spot elevation at the wall appears to be 992. The nearest contour, which is about 20' away, appears to be 992. The discharge location of the french drain is shown to be somewhere between 991 and 992. The grading is also not clear in the deceleration lane and the proposed grades behind the sidewalk. There is a spot elevation at the discharge location of 992.1 and 991, however there is no contour for 992.**
30. Not addressed. Applicant should clarify the proposed grading behind the buildings. **The northern building appears to have a swale with a slope of less than 0.50%, which will struggle to drain sufficiently. The southern building has arrows pointing to the north, however, the grades appear to provide a 1.3% slope to the south.**
31. When the necessary revisions are made, applicant should be aware that Channel Protection will be required if the post-development flow rate exceeds 2 cfs at the outfall.
32. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
33. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
34. Results of a nearby fire hydrant flow test in accordance with the Loganville Water Main Design and Construction Standards Section 2.1.13 and 2.2.6 should be provided on the drawings to show availability of water flow and pressure to the development.
35. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
36. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
37. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
38. Comment addressed by re-submittal.
39. Hydrology report does not appear to have been updated to reflect the changes made to the plans.
40. Per Section 8.2.1.a. of the Development Regulations, the hydrologic analysis and detention pond hydraulics, pipe and open channel hydraulics, culvert hydraulics, and water quality best management practices shall be

certified by a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Georgia. Applicant should provide a hydrology report sealed by a Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Georgia.

41. Applicant should turn utilities off on plan sheets that do not apply to utilities in an effort to clarify what is being proposed.
42. Landscape design standards require 4:1 slopes in a pond. No more than 50% of a detention pond may have retaining walls. Variance required.
43. The grading inside the pond is not clear. Applicant should provide spot elevations to verify minimum 2% slope across the bottom. Additionally, the spot elevations that have been provided do not clearly explain the proposed elevations. For example, the eastern corner of the pond shows "BIW" of 996.5. If this is Bottom of Inside Wall, there should be contours on the inside of the pond to reflect the grades. The BOW states an elevation of 993, however the proposed contour appears to be 994.
44. Invert of pond and orifice is not clear. The plans indicate the pond bottom to be 992.50, however the BIW label near the OCS is 992.
45. Proposed channels should be graded in with spot elevations clearly indicated.

I have retained the electronic copy of the plans provided for review in the event there are questions. The applicant 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 process. Re-submittals should include a narrative indicating how and where the review comments were addressed.

Sincerely,
KECK & WOOD, INC.



Aaron Humphrey, P.E.
Project Engineer

CC: Greg Sistrunk, PE (Keck+Wood)