



Application Number: PL2021295

Application Type: Engineering Plan Review

Application Name: NAPA VALLEY 5TH PLAT- Street, Stormwater, and Master Drainage Plan

Engineering Review Comments

1. Please see comments on the plat for Napa Valley 5th. Easement widths are not adequate for storm lines between lots on at least three (3) segments. Easement widths should match what is recommended in the comment letter for Napa Valley 5th Final Plat. **Revised.**
2. Please see comment above. Inadequate easement widths would pertain to Lots 173 and 174, 188 and 189, and 169 and 170. Easement width should be twice the maximum depth of the line, plus an allowance for the width of the pipe. Minimum easement width is always based on measurements from the outside of the pipe, so please ensure the easement width meets this requirement. Depth shall be measured at the deepest point along the easement, which would appear to be approximately 12 feet the first two lot groups (storm line 2), and approximately 10 feet for the last lot group (storm line 1) . It would appear the total width of the easement for storm line 2 should be 25.5 feet, and 21 feet for storm line 1. **Revised.**
3. Sheet C201: It appears from the lot corner callouts that Lot 179 and 180 are partially within the 100 year floodplain. It is our understanding that all lots would be completely removed from the floodplain. Sheet C201 does not appear to agree with the elevation callouts in terms of floodplain extent, and using the configuration shown, it would appear a CLOMR-F is required prior to moving forward. **Revised. See Final Plat.**
4. Sheet C201: Lot corner callouts do not appear to be pointing to the actual lot corners. It appears they are pointing to easement corners or some other undefined feature. Please revise as appropriate. **Revised. See Final Plat.**
5. Sheet C201: Lot 180 is missing a lot corner callout. **Added.**
6. Sheet C205: Detail 2 on the ADA accessible ramp is missing details on the turning space behind the ramp on the east side of the street. It is also missing the design details for the portion of the ramp after the turning space that ties into the ADA-accessible ramp. Please call if any questions. **Revised.**
7. The ADA-accessible ramp at the end of the cul-de-sac did not appear to be shown as a detail. **Added.**

Traffic Review Comments

1. Connection to Stoney Brook still showing a radius of 150'. A 200' minimum is required. **Revised.**
2. Existing city standards reflect the correct sign lettering. **Added.**

Feel free to contact me should you have any additional questions regarding this project.

Thank You,

Matt Schlicht