

NORTHEASTERN CONNECTICUT COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

ENGINEERING PLAN REVIEW PERTAINING TO A 3-LOT SUBDIVISION (ASSESSOR'S MAP/LOT NOS. 019-37-17, 019-37-20 & 019-37-21) CHURCH STREET BROOKLYN, CT (May 7, 2021)

The comments contained herein pertain to my review of plans for a proposed 3-lot residential subdivision located on Church Street in Brooklyn, Connecticut, consisting of four (4) sheets, prepared for A. Kausch & Sons by Archer Surveying, LLC and CLA Engineers, dated April 10, 2021 and April 30, 2021, respectively. Also reviewed were the CLA Drainage Report of April 2021 and the CLA Wetlands Report, dated May 3, 2021. Comments pertain to both wetlands and planning and zoning concerns.

(Comments in black ink are the Regional Engineer's May 7, 2021 review comments.)
(Comments in red ink are the Regional Engineer's June 24, 2021 review comments for the revised plans with revision date of May 10, 2021.)

Sheet 1 of 4 – Property Survey Plan

1. Location Map is missing a north arrow.

Comment has been incorporated into the plan.

2. Note 1 under "Notes" does not include the accuracy of the topographic elevations shown on the plan. The accuracy needs to be included as part of this note.

Comment has been incorporated into the plan.

3. Zoning criteria is missing on this plan.

Comment has been incorporated into the plan.

4. A "property line symbol" covers some stone wall symbols but not others in the lots of interest. Why is this so?

Comment has been incorporated into the plan.

5. Wetland delineation certification block and signature of the certified Connecticut soil scientist is missing on the plan.

Comment has been incorporated into the plan.

6. A silt fence, compost/silt sock and/or hay bale sediment control symbol needs to be included in the "Legend."

A symbol has been added to the plan, however it does not match the symbol used on Sheets 3 & 4 and needs to be corrected.

Sheets 2 & 3 of 4 – Grading & Site Design Plan

1. The area of disturbed wetlands is not noted on the plan (driveway crossing and underground utilities installation). The areas of disturbance need to be noted on the plan.

Comment has been incorporated in the plan.

2. Underground utilities will disturb wetlands. The route of the utilities should be shown on the plan.

Underground utilities are not shown on the plan and must be added.

3. Different symbols are used for "Silt Fence." Use one symbol only and make changes to the plan to reflect this.

This discrepancy requires changing the symbol in the Legend on Sheet 1 of 4.

4. The drainage report for this project was also reviewed. It states that Wetlands Crossing 2 needs three (3) 15" pipes. The site plan and wetland crossing profile only show two (2) pipes. Therefore, an additional pipe needs to be added to the plan and profile along with distances to be maintained between the pipes.

Revised drainage calculations demonstrate the adequacy of two pipes and three pipes are not necessary.

5. Due to the proposed driveway being finished so close to the level of the wetlands, soil test pits should be dug to look for presence of groundwater and mottling, especially within the wetland crossings, to further validate the driveway cross section design depicted on Sheet 4 of 4.

Comment has been incorporated into the plan.

6. Different symbols are used for "Silt Fence." Use one symbol only and make changes to the plan to reflect this.

Duplicate comment (see #3 above)

7. Different symbols are used for “New Property Line.” Use one symbol only and make changes to the plan to reflect this.

Comment has not been addressed.

Sheet 4 of 4 – Notes & Construction Details

1. Any reference to CT DOT Form 817 is to be changed to the current Form 818 designation.

Comment has been incorporated into the plan.

General Comments

2. Even though USDA NRCS soils types with boundaries are included in the wetlands report, they should also be included on the project plans.

This comment has not been addressed.

3. An overall plan showing the “new” lot lines should be included in the plan set. As it is presented now, it is difficult to see how the proposed subdivision relates to the existing lot configurations.

This comment has not been addressed.

Syl Pauley, Jr., P.E.

By: _____
Syl Pauley, Jr., P.E., NECCOG Regional Engineer