

Mr. Ron Nanni
Stormwater Engineer
Department of Community Development
Goochland County
1800 Sandy Hook Road
Post Office Box 103
Goochland, Virginia 23060

January 30, 2023

RE: POD-2022-00013 - Cognito Moto

Dear Mr. Nanni:

Please find enclosed, for your review seven (7) sets of plans for the above referenced project. This Site Plan has been revised in accordance with various letters from Goochland County departments. Those comments and our responses to the comments are listed below:

PLANNING & ZONING COMMENTS FROM RAY CASH

- **NO COMMENTS** - In an email dated November 30, 2022, **Ron Nanni** informed **sekiv**solutions that the previous submission of revised site plans satisfied the comments from this agency.

BUILDING INSPECTION COMMENTS FROM GARY FISHER

- **NO COMMENTS** - In an email dated November 30, 2022, **Ron Nanni** informed **sekiv**solutions that the previous submission of revised site plans satisfied the comments from this agency.

FIRE MARSHAL COMMENTS FROM DOUG DAVIES

- **NO COMMENTS** - In an email dated November 30, 2022, **Ron Nanni** informed **sekiv**solutions that the previous submission of revised site plans satisfied the comments from this agency.

PUBLIC UTILITIES FROM MATT LONGSHORE

- **NO COMMENTS** - In an email dated November 30, 2022, **Ron Nanni** informed **sekiv**solutions that the previous submission of revised site plans satisfied the comments from this agency. In addition, the building will be served by a domestic well and a septic tank and drainfield that has been approved by the Virginia Department of Health and the issuance of an OSE Construction Permit dated August 19, 2022.

E&SC COMMENTS FROM RON NANNI DATED NOV. 28, 2022

1. Section C.3. of 9VAC25-870-66 addresses the 10-yr flood protection limits-of-analysis and does not provide any remedy for the channel protection limits-of-analysis, which is addressed separately in subdivision B.4. Under B.4. the options are to meet the 1% threshold for either area or peak flow rate, or to demonstrate energy balance.

Response: Channel protection to the James River is demonstrated on sheet C-703.

2. As far as the digital file request for stormwater calculations, this is a regular request as we are trying to have digital copies of all files. This could be PDFs or Excel files.

Response: Provided as requested (via email).



ENVIRONMENT & LAND DEV. COMMENTS FROM RON NANNI DATED NOV. 28, 2022

1. Please provide the proposed area to be disturbed on the cover sheet.

Response: Provided as requested.

VDOT COMMENTS FROM ADAM MOORE DATED NOVEMBER 17, 2022

1. In response to comment #2, Please provide your traffic according to the current ITE standard. If the count is lower than 50 vpd the Low Volume Commercial Entrance will be acceptable, but if the count shows traffic at 51 or above use the "Moderate Volume Commercial Entrance Design Along Highways With Shoulders" which looks more like what you have depicted on the current plan set. This alternative may be found in Appendix F of the Road Design Manual as Figure 4-15.

Response: The projected traffic count is based on Machinery Sales & Service (B-1) or General Light Industrial per the ITE Manual. The Average rate for this use is 3 trips per day per employee. With 6 employees, this will equate to 18 trips per day, well under the 50 vehicles per day requirement for a Low Volume Commercial Entrance.

2. The entrance must have a minimum of 25 radii within the right of way
Response: The radius of the entrance has been revised to 25' for that portion within the right-of-way.

3. The provided sight distance profiles appear to be within 3" of the ground in multiple locations. This is a very slim margin for error during construction. The eventual entrance permit will not be permitted to be released until appropriate sight distance is provided in the field. Furthermore, it appears that a sight distance easement is required as the sight distance left crosses the neighbor s property. Additionally the note on the sight distance profile not being based on field verified elevations is not acceptable. The department highly recommends field verifying these elevations. Again, without acceptable sight distance the entrance permit will not be released and if off site grades limit sight distance corrective measures may be extremely limited.

Response: The site distance profile and grading has been adjusted to maintain an approximate 9" of clearance. The site distance left now does not cross onto another property so no additional easements are needed. The site distance profiles are now based off of field run topography, so the note mentioned has been removed.

Additional Comments per Email on 12/21/22:

1. Also, the curb returns must be offset from the edge of pavement or stop the curb outside the R/W.
Response: The eastern curb has been shifted two feet off the existing edge of pavement and the western curb is two feet off the edge of pavement with the gutter pan adjacent.
2. I didn't notice a SWM/BMP so the applicant will have to prove the discharge from pipe #8 will not erode the roadside ditch.

Response: Ditch calculations are provided on page C-704.

As always, should you have any questions, or should need any additional information, please call me.

Sincerely,



Stig Owens
sekivsolutions

