From: BarnesT@bceo.org
To: Eric Morris
Cc: HartkeS@bceo.org; PottengerE@bceo.org
Subject: Re: 8315 Cin-Day Shell Redevelopment
Date: Friday, September 26, 2014 9:41:06 AM
Attachments: pic19677.jpg

Eric

This site is under different circumstances than the site on 747 and Smith.
Due to the Butler Tech being constructed nearby, the intersection of Cincinnati-Dayton and Woodbridge on the Lake will be redone. This includes the storm drainage system in the area.
Unfortunately, given some existing site constraints, the new raod system is virtually at capacity.
Therefore, analysis of the proposed Dunkin Donuts would be required. Any additional run-off from the site that exceeds the capacity of the proposed system will have to be detained on-site.
If the difference between the amount of run-off and the capacity of the new roadway system is not to large, it might be able to be handled in an on-site water quality feature. If the water quality feature is not an option, upsizing of the pipes might be required with control orifices in place to ensure that the roadway system does not surcharge.
I believe that Etta has the calculations for the proposed new system for use when working on the previously proposed McDonald's.
Let me know if you have any questions.
THANKS

Teresa

(Embedded image moved to file: pic19677.jpg)

From: Eric Morris <ericmorris@bayerbecker.com>
To: "barnest@bceo.org" <barnest@bceo.org>,
Date: 09/25/2014 04:52 PM
Subject: 8315 Cin-Day Shell Redevelopment

Teresa,

We are working on another site plan for Pat Gilligan, this one is at 8315 Cin-Day Road. We are taking the old Shell station and tearing off the existing canopy & carwash. What's left of the old building is going to be converted to a standalone Dunkin Donuts (no Shell component, no future gasoline service or sales).

Pat is hoping he can do this without the need for storm detention. I know at the 747 & Smith Rd store we only did water quality, and the detention requirement was waived as the impervious areas on the pre-developed and post-developed sites were comparable. Can we do the same here? (Minus the WQ part, since we are well under 1 ac and won't have to file an NOI).

I've ran the numbers already and we are not adding any additional impervious area. Even if I include the changes in the ROW to the entrance drives, we are still at the same impervious area, pre vs post.

Eric

Eric Morris, PE, CFM
Project Manager
Professional Engineer
Certified Floodplain Manager
Bayer Becker
(513) 336-6600
ericmorris@bayerbecker.com

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit http://www.symanteccloud.com

---