

**Comments Addressed by Applicant
Peer Review – Puddingstone at Chestnut Hill**

Comprehensive Permit Plans

1. L-0700 – Note #16 provides limited information about water/sewer crossings. The Applicant should update the plans to fully meet the requirements of the Guidelines, Chapter 9, Section 8 – Separation of Water Mains and Sewers.
2. L-0700 – The Guidelines require water mains to be pressure tested and disinfected in accordance with AWWA standards. The Applicant does not note this on the plans.
3. L-0700 – Most proposed stormwater inlets for pavement runoff have an associated water quality device; however, runoff that enters trench drain TD8A does not receive any pretreatment prior to discharging to the recharge area. The Applicant should address the pretreatment requirements of Standard 4 of the Stormwater Management Standards.
4. L-1004 – The Applicant should show the proposed limits of bedrock on the details.
5. L-1004 – The 30-inch CMP system (D-1B) does not include any stone cover or stone base. The Applicant should confirm that this design is in accordance with Contech's specifications.
6. L-1004 – The Applicant should verify that the proposed 12x3 chambers meet all required Contech specifications, particularly regarding cover and base. For example, the 12x3 chambers appear to require 12 inches of compactable fill, and it is not clear whether pavement can be included in the 12 inches of compactable fill.

Stormwater Report

1. Table 2.1 – The pre-development rates for the 2-year and 10-year storms for Independence Drive do not match the HydroCAD calculations.
2. Section 2.3.3 – The Applicant should evaluate potential time of concentration flow paths, particularly for the pre-development condition. It is unusual to have short times of concentration for undeveloped watersheds.
3. Subcatchment PR-1A – The Applicant shows proposed curbing work along Gerry Road north of the proposed entrance. The Applicant should explain why this area is excluded from the study area.
4. Standard 4 – The Applicant claims significant TSS removal credit by using the proposed Contech separators. The Applicant should provide the appropriate TSS removal documentation for these proprietary separators as required in Volume 2, Chapter 4 of the Handbook.

5. Standard 4 – The long-term pollution prevention plan does not address the following items: storing materials and waste products inside or under cover; vehicle washing; storage of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides; and pet waste management.
6. Standard 5 – According to a March 10, 2016 memorandum from the Applicant's transportation consultants, the proposed project is expected to generate approximately 1,324 vehicle trips per day. This exceeds the Handbook's threshold for a high intensity parking lot (1,000 trips per day or more). Consequently, this development should be classified as a land use with higher potential pollutant load (LUHPPL) and subject to the requirements of Standard 5. The Applicant should document compliance with Standard 5 and provide the required best management practices.
7. Standard 8 – The Applicant does not show the location of the proposed stabilized construction entrance on the plans, and the Applicant does not include a detail.
8. Standard 9 – The Applicant has not provided a description and delineation of public safety features nor an estimated operations and maintenance budget.
9. Appendix A – The Checklist is not stamped. The Town should verify that a stamped version is on file or request this from the Applicant.

Additional Comments

1. The Applicant should review the landscaping plan and utility plans for conflicts. For example, proposed DMH-5 appears to be very close to the roots of a proposed deciduous tree. Catch basins, manholes, valves, curb stops, inspection ports, hydrants, etc. should be easily accessible.

