

Auburn Angara Oaks Final Site Plan Comments Response		
Sheet	Comment	Response
G-1.0	NA per WRC Email	Has been removed from this sheet.
	Is this the permit for Wetland Use? If not, shouldn't there be a permit for Wetland Use by EGLE?	Yes, this EGLE permit for Wetland Use. It has been relabeled Part 303 Wetland Permit and number added.
Site Survey	Is this a third benchmark?	This has not been included as an official benchmark, but could be used as one. Two benchmarks have already been included.
V-1.1	This line (current grade) does not appear on the Legend above.	This has been added to the legend.
C-1.0	These can be shown with the paving plan sheets (include the full standard sheet for each and source (City or MDOT)).	Replaced applicable individual paving sections with typical section for private "city" road paving on Sheet C-1.0. Typical for MDOT ROW shown on C-10.0. Changed shading pattern for MDOT paving. Added leadered note to Auburn Road HMA pathway to see sheet C-11.0 for Pathway section.
	Per City of Rochester Hills Standard detail for Residential Cul-de-Sac No Island, this needs to be a min of 67'.	This radius is now met.
	Per City of Rochester Hills Engineering Design Standards, Chapter 6 Roads: The minimum radius of dul-ssacs is as follows: without island, the minimum outside radius of a cul-de-sac (b/c) shall be forty seven feet (47'). All right of way shall be sixty-three feet (63') minimum. Refer to City of Rochester Hills Standard Detail Cul-de-Sac No Island for details.	The minimum radius b/c is 49 feet, meets standard. Cul de sac ROW radius is 63 feet. Engineering standards do NOT meet IFC standards, so the typical detail was deviated from per the Fire Department comments.
	Per City of Rochester Hills Standard detail for Residential Cul-de-Sac No Island, needs to be a 4" mountable curb.	Revised to the mountable curb detail provided by city. Curb detail added to sheet C-11.1
	Per City of Rochester Hills Standard detail for Residential Cul-de-Sac No Island, this needs to be a min of 16'.	This minimum distance is met.

C-1.1	Based on the calculation from the table to the right for multifamily parking spaces required, this number should be 74.	Total number of spaces being provided, including ADA spaces, is 78, exceeding the 74 required.
	Provide details for the parking spaces (dimensions, offset from sidewalk if applicable), as well as signs and markings to be used for the various parking spots as applicable.	Striping details provided to this sheet for crosswalks and exterior parking spaces. Interior building parking details are shown on architectural plans, reviewed by other departments.
C-1.2	Provide paving and dimensions plan for the Auburn Rd and Angara Ct intersection, if paving at the entrance of Angara Oaks from Auburn Rd is going to change.	See Sheet C-10.6 for striping in Auburn Road and intersection. Other striping is noted on this sheet and details have been added to Sheet C-1.1.
	No outside parking for these units on Building D or Building E?	Outside parking is not assigned to individual buildings. All parking in the street ROW serves all of the buildings.
	Show profile plans for the typical cross section of Angara Drive, Harvey St, sidewalk, and pathway here or in subsequent sheet.	See Sheet C-1.0 for the cross section, including an alternate parallel parking section. See Sheet C-1.3 for curve table.
	Regarding Arrow to ADA Ramp not provided for one ramp	The typical note has been modified to "typical for all sidewalk street crossings," to reduce the clutter caused by arrows pointing to each one.
C-1.3	Show profile plan for cul-de-sac cross section	Typical street section profile added to Sheet C-1.0. Notes are added on this typical section, showing additional width for cul de sacs.
	where are these on the plan? Label each	The term ROW has been added to the title of curve table.
C-2.2	Code revisions	Revised all codes as noted.
C-4.1	Revise to Rochester Hills	Revised.
C-4.2	Revise to Rochester Hills	Revised.
	5 + 18 Revise	Revised.
C-7.4	Per City of Rochester Hills Engineering Design Standards, Chapter 10 Pathways, Design Criteria: Pathway ramps shall not exceed five percent (5%) longitudinal slope, with two percent (2%) maximum transverse slope. A minimum eight-foot (8') by five-foot (5') level landing area shall be	Reduced ramp grade to 5%.

	constructed adjacent to the pathway ramp. The slope shall not exceed two percent (2%) in any direction within the level landing area.	
	Per City of Rochester Hills, Engineering Design Standards, Chapter 9 Sidewalks, Design Criteria: 2.Sidewalks shall generally conform to the grade of the existing topography. Transverse slopes shall not exceed two percent (2%), and longitudinal slopes shall not exceed eight percent (8%) for mainline sidewalks, with five to seven percent (5% - 7%) being the recommended range. Sidewalk ramps shall not exceed five percent (5%) longitudinal slope or two percent (2%) cross-slope.	Regraded to reduce all grades to 8.0% or less.
C-7.5	Per City of Rochester Hills Engineering Design Standards, Chapter 10 Pathways, Design Criteria:5.In general, longitudinal slopes of proposed paths shall not exceed eight percent (8%), and shall follow the natural contour of the land. Transverse slopes shall be a minimum of one percent (1%) and not exceed two percent (2%)	Reduced grades to 8.0% and transverse grades to 2.0%.
	Per City of Rochester Hills, Engineering Design Standards, Chapter 9 Sidewalks, Design Criteria: 2.Sidewalks shall generally conform to the grade of the existing topography. Transverse slopes shall not exceed two percent (2%), and longitudinal slopes shall not exceed eight percent (8%) for mainline sidewalks, with five to seven percent (5% - 7%) being the recommended range. Sidewalk ramps shall not exceed five percent (5%) longitudinal slope or two percent (2%) cross-slope.	Shifted northerly parking spaces to the north and regraded all slopes to 8.0% or less.
C-7.6	Per City of Rochester Hills, Engineering Design Standards, Chapter 9 Sidewalks, Design Criteria:	Regraded to reduce these slopes to 8.0%

	2.Sidewalks shall generally conform to the grade of the existing topography. Transverse slopes shall not exceed two percent (2%), and longitudinal slopes shall not exceed eight percent (8%) for mainline sidewalks, with five to seven percent (5% - 7%) being the recommended range. Sidewalk ramps shall not exceed five percent (5%) longitudinal slope or two percent (2%) cross-slope.	
C-7.7	Per City of Rochester Hills Engineering Design Standards, Chapter 9 Sidewalks, Design Criteria: Sidewalk ramps shall not exceed five percent (5%) longitudinal slope or two percent (2%) cross-slope.	Per discussion with City engineering, grading for the ramp at the southeast corner of Angara and Harvey will remain the same with the short 8% ramp in order to maintain drainage away from the ramp landing to the curb. (NWC and SWC of Angara/Harvey). Revised all other ramps to obtain maximum 5% grades.
C-7.8	Per City of Rochester Hills Engineering Design Standards, Chapter 9 Sidewalks, Design Criteria: Sidewalk ramps shall not exceed five percent (5%) longitudinal slope or two percent (2%) cross-slope.	Revised ramp grades to 5% maximum.
C-10.0	Add typical sections for other (road, pathway, sidewalk) cross sections in this page or subsequent page.	C-10.0 sheets are for improvements within MDOT ROW only. Added typical section for Angar/Harvey to Sheet C-1.0.
C-10.6	Pavement marking and signage plan for other areas (parking spaces, crosswalks)?	Added striping details to Sheet C-1.1
C-11.2	Per City of RH Engineering Design Standards, Ch 8, Section B4:"The minimum allowable slope is two percent (2%) with maximum allowable slopes of eight percent (8%) along roads with posted speed limits of 40 MPH or greater and ten percent (10%) along roads with a posted speed limit of 35 MPH or less. Note: driveway slopes shall not exceed two percent (2%) through the portion of the driveway that is to be utilized for existing and/or proposed pedestrian facilities, i.e., pathways and	This is a detail for work within the MDOT ROW, the party with jurisdiction. MDOT required that we add this detail. This is an MDOT standard detail and we are not allowed to change it. We have revised the note to indicate that the drive profile is only for use on individual driveways in MDOT ROW and driveway grading outside of the MDOT controlled Auburn Road ROW is identified on the grading plans.

	sidewalks, in order to meet American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements."	