

POINT AT POLARIS VARIANCE RESPONSE

Variance lacking on a strong supporting justification of hardship:

- It is understood that this is a “phased” development (over 20 acres un-developed) of which this variance only applies to approximately ½ of the overall area.
- The overall property is of significant size wherein the justification provided did not explore various potential BMP options (i.e. within the first phase in areas such as the proposed 2 courtyards as well as the remaining un-developed property)
- Please explain the comments in the proposed “executive summary” which state that the proposed wet basin cannot fully incorporate the water quality volume which is a SWDM requirement.
- Is the “permanent pool” sized for 75% WQv PLUS an additional 20% for sediment accumulation as required?
- The reference to approvals for previous similar plans without a variance seems to be providing an argument along the lines of “two wrongs make it right”.
- Regarding the following sentence on the Preferred Alternative– “Due to the proposed wall along these two sides, the 4:1 side slopes are not met and a safety bench is not proposed because it would not be accessible or maintainable.” The safety bench would not be “constructible” under this condition versus “accessible or maintainable”.
- It is understood that there will be pedestrian traffic within the development further encouraged with a sidewalk running along the proposed retaining wall to which you are seeking a variance to the “safety” requirements.
 - it was encouraged to incorporate as many safety features as possible into the variance request
 - the only safety feature appears to be the 42-inch pedestrian guard-rail along the retaining wall
 - no dimensions, wall heights, total water depth, etc were included in the variance narrative. Based on review of the attached exhibits with difficult text size it appears the proposed retaining wall is approximately 15 feet in height which creates a high safety risk. In addition, the daily normal pool depth of 6 feet increases to nearly 8 feet during a 100 year storm event. There was a lack of discussion or detail of how the proposed wet basin is accessible in either “emergency” or “maintenance” conditions. The exhibits were not clear as to whether there is an adequate maintenance access along the proposed basin’s perimeter.
 - explain how the WQv calculation based on 20+ acres (in Stormwater report) is used but about ¼ of the OVERALL development does not appear to drain to the basin and 6+ ac drains in an “undeveloped” state. Will the outlet be retro fitted between this phase and the future southeastern phase?