### **Department of Land Use Preliminary Plan Report**

To: Andrew Hayes – ForeSite Associates – Inc.

Date - November 13, 2008

Application Number - 2008-0419-S Name of Project - The Pilot School

Description - Proposed 75,099 sq. ft. School and Facilities

Type of Plan - Major Land Development Plan

Date of 1<sup>st</sup> Review - June 9, 2008

Project Review Team -

Planner Antoni Sekowski at 395-5414
Engineer Doug Hokuf, Jr. at 395-5448
Historic Christine Quinn at 395-5521
Transportation John Janowski at 395-5426
Special Services Robert Magnotti at 395-5722

Hearings:

Planning Board Public Hearing – December 3, 2008

Status — Engineering comments must be addressed with a revised Preliminary Plan submittal and associated fees. Once the applicant obtains Engineering approval of the Preliminary Plan, a complete Record Plan submittal should be provided to this office.

#### **Planning:**

Plan Submittal Complete: October 15, 2008

Plan Review Complete by Planning: November 7, 2008

Number of Days to Complete Review: 16

- 1. As you are aware, the plan proposes an alternative entrance (roundabout) design. Once the applicant and DelDOT determine which entrance design will be required for this site, the plan will need be updated accordingly. It appears that the proposed roundabout would impose a street yard building restriction line on the adjoining easterly tax parcel. The plan would need to reflect a 50 foot building setback from the right-of-way for the adjoining residential parcel. Proposed setback encroachments would require a Board of Adjustment approval. The adjoining property owner would need to sign the plan;
- 2. As previously noted, if the alternative entrance is utilized, it may impose a setback encroachment for the existing dwelling on this parcel. The applicant may need to proceed to the Board of Adjustment to revise their prior Board of Adjustment approval;
- 3. Revise your note 4 to reference the updated wetlands report;
- 4. The Department has conditionally approved the parking reduction request to permit a minimum of 154 of the required 167 spaces. Revise your parking rationale note to remove

references to the PDNA calculation and references to 120 spaces. As discussed, the plan may be revised to remove the 8 spaces located at the southerly end of the school and the 5 spaces located at the entrance to the school:

- 5. The applicants request to provide 34 parking spaces with an alternative surface is currently under review with the Department of Land Use. Additionally, the applicants request to create a parking area with out full circulation is currently under review with the Department of Land Use:
- 6. As previously noted, the LOD must demonstrate protection of the specimen trees. Any grading within the drip line of the specimen trees may require mitigation. Disturbance should be avoided:
- 7. Provide depressed curbing for the handicapped parking spaces located at the southerly end of the school. Additionally, provide a sidewalk access point for the parking spaces located at the northerly end of the school;
- 8. It has been noted that the applicant has been in contact with DNREC to address Section 40.10.370 of the NCCC for the Critical Natural Areas located on this parcel;
- 9. Your note 3 will need to reference the non-delineated floodplain study;
- 10. The Record Plan will not need to show existing improvements to be removed or topography;
- 11. Transportation related issues outlined in your notes 18 and 21 will need to be addressed prior to plan recordation. Notes should be removed from the Record Plan;
- 12. Remove note 27 from the Record Plan;
- 13. Provide notes 72 and 80 from Appendix 1 of the County Code;

#### **Engineering:**

Date received: 10/15/08 Review completed: 11/12/08 Total review time: 19-days

The Engineering Section has reviewed the construction plan submission, finds the plan unacceptable in its current form and offers the following comments. A cover letter addressing each comment within this review letter must accompany any resubmission of this project. The letter must describe, in detail, the manner in which each comment was addressed:

- 1. The stormwater management facilities shall be uniquely labeled such that they can be easily referenced and related to back to the stormwater report.
- 2. The test pits and boring locations shall be labeled on the plan so that the accompanying report can be easily referenced and reviewed.

- 3. As you intend to put the extensive infiltration testing off for the proposed facilities in the southwestern corner of the site until the record stage, what contingencies are in place to provide stormwater management should the infiltration rates be found inadequate? As the preliminary plan needs to demonstrate design feasibility prior to engineering approval, either the follow-up infiltration tests will need completed or a backup plan is in place.
- 4. Clarity regarding the proposed reinforced grass shall be provided, specifically identifying which product is proposed and how it will function in relationship to the surrounding and underlying soils.
- 5. In order for the application to receive credit for infiltration in areas where the measured infiltration rate is less than the state's minimum of 1.02-inches per hour, a variance request must be submitted and approved.
- 6. Given the extreme unlikelihood that the final 100-year determination will affect the proposed layout given the conservative preliminary analysis the application can proceed onto the record stage, at the owner's risk, without its completion. Be advised that should the final 100-year delineation require a modification of site design, the application may be returned to the preliminary stage.
- 7. Work with the Department of Special Services to determine the fee amount for the Stormwater Maintenance Fund in accordance with the NCCC Section 40.27.240. Once the fee has been determined the following note shall be placed on the record plan: "The Owner/Developer shall pay, to New Castle County, funds for non-residential stormwater management facility maintenance pursuant to Section 40.27.240 of the County Code. The funds shall be used for the costs associated with facility maintenance and inspections. An amount of **XXXX** shall be funded prior receiving the first Certificate of Occupancy. The Department of Land Use shall withhold the issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy until satisfactory written proof that the funds have been paid to New Castle County is furnished in accordance with the requirements."
- 8. A re-submission fee of \$500 is required with the revised application.

## **Transportation:**

The applicant has completed a TIS and it was approved meeting the County's concurrency requirements in Article 11. Required off-site improvements must be stated on the plan including:

- TIS note of completion dated September 9, 2008 and DelDOT review letter September 29, 2008
- Improve Woodlawn Road from the site entrance to Rocky Run Parkway to meet DelDOT Standards.
- Replace existing guard rails along Woodlawn Road near Hurricane Run Creek.
- Notes should indicate that agreements between DelDOT and the applicant must be signed prior to CO's.

# **Standard Approvals and Comments before Recordation**

- 1. Approval from DelDOT will be required;
- 2. Approval from the Office of the State Fire Marshal will be required;
- 3. A Landscape and Lighting Plan must be reviewed and approved prior to plan recordation. Please note that a Scenic Corridor may be required in accordance with Section 40.04.240 of the NCCC;
- 4. Provide certification from the water supplier in accordance with Section 40.05.310 of the NCCC:
- 5. Please obtain approval from the Mapping Section of the Department of Land Use for proposed postal addresses;
- 6. Performance Surety must be provided in accordance with Chapter 40, Division 31.800 of the NCCC and current Department of Land Use policy. Initiate the Land Development Improvement Agreement by submitting the Land Development Improvement Agreement Information Sheet to this office. The LDIA must be recorded prior to plan recordation;
- 7. Please note that Table 40.31.390 of the NCCC outlines time limits for expiration of plan;

CC: Vernon Green Kathy Craven Michael J. Bennett file