FULLER ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING, LLC
525 John Street – Second Floor – Bridgeport, CT 06604
Phone: (203) 333-9465 Fax: (203) 336-1769

27 March 2025

Mrs. Meredith Badalucca
Assistant Planner
Town of Montville

RE: Response to Comments
Madison Place, Luxury Townhouse Development
145 Route 32 & 18 Powerhouse Road
Montville, Connecticut

The following are our responses to comments from the Wright-Pierce. Our responses are designated in ***bold and italics***. Engineers, Inc.

Technical Review by Wright-Pierce dated 3/24/2025

Plans

1. The site grading overall doesn't appear to account for curbing and may need to be adjusted.

   Response: Adjustments for curbing have been added to the grading plan.

2. The 104 and 103 contour east of Unit 8 and the 102 contour at the Powerhouse Road driveway don't connect to existing contours. The 102 contour ends off the property. The grading should be revised.

   Response: Grading has been revised.

3. Call-outs for the subsurface stormwater retention systems sizing and inverts don't correspond to what is depicted on the plans or in the calculations and should be coordinated.

   Response: The revised stormwater system has been coordinated between the report and plans.

4. Clean-outs are recommended at each end of each row of the subsurface stormwater retention systems.

   Response: Cleanouts have been added.

5. The grading and drainage plan should note that all roof leaders shall be piped to the subsurface drainage system (similar to note 15 on the utility plan.

   Response: The design of the stormwater system does not include (or require) all of the roof areas to be routed to the infiltration system. Those roof areas routed to the infiltration system have been noted on Sheet C-3.1 and is graphically depicted on the DA-PR sketch included with the drainage report materials.

6. A photometric plan showing that light from the development won't impact neighboring properties should be provided.

   Response: A photometric plan has been generated on Sheet C-5.1. The sheet has been renamed Landscape & Lighting Plan.

   Off-site light levels are minimal since the proposed building units directly shield the light source from the neighboring properties.

   Additionally, the 6'ht stockade fence and southern buffer plantings provide further screening of the low-level patio and front entrance light fixtures.

Engineering Report

1. The watershed map provided does not appear to be accurate. The existing condition mapping depicts one watershed; there appears to be at least two watersheds for the properties (one flowing west toward Route 32 and one flowing east toward the neighboring properties.) The watershed mapping should be revised to accurately reflect the existing condition.

   Response: Both DA-EX and DA-PR have been modified to reflect the additional watersheds. Additional references have been added to reflect the drainage calculations in the Engineering Report.

2. The post development calculations are split into two phases, watershed mapping for the two phases should be provided.

   Response: The drainage report has been revised to analyze the site based on the two drainage basins. As such, Phase 1 and Phase 2 has been modeled as a combined system with each galley system (Ponds 1P and 2P). The watershed mapping has been modified to indicate Drainage Basins 'A' and 'B' .

3. The existing condition watershed area used in the calculations does not correspond to the watershed mapping.

   The watershed maps and analysis have been revised:

4. The existing condition (pre-development) stormwater flow rates and volumes leaving each watershed should be the basis for comparison for the post development stormwater flow rates and volumes. These existing condition baseline rates and volumes should not change with each phase of the development.

   See response 2 above.

5. A comparison between the existing and post development runoff volume should be provided. A comparison of rates has been included, but not the volume. The Engineer should address if there is an increase in runoff volume from the development and potential impacts to downstream properties.

   Please see the revised Engineering Report.

6. The post development Phase 2 & 3 calculations don't appear to include or account for Phase 1 of the development.

   Please see the revised Engineering Report.

7. A direct comparison between the pre-development and post-development (full buildout) peak flow rates and runoff volumes should be provided for each watershed.

   Please see the revised Engineering Report.

8. The Engineer should demonstrate that the CTDEEP Water Quality Volume requirements are met with the reduced subsurface stormwater retention system.

   Please see the revised Engineering Report.

9. *Pipe capacities were stated for the drainage piping at less than the 1% slop in the calculations. The 8" and 10" diameter piping may be prone to clogging; larger diameter piping should be considered if feasible.*

   Pipe pitches have been increased throughout are anticipated to function as designed.