

REVIEW COMMENT RESOLUTION



PARADISE VALLEY WATERSHED STUDIES

Designer: Dibble Engineering
Reviewed By: Town of Paradise Valley Staff

Disposition Codes:

- A. Will Comply
- B. Consultant to Evaluate
- C. Client to Evaluate
- D. No Further Action



Responses: May 24, 2017

Scope of Review: Storm Drainage Design Manual (Dated 2/1/17)

MASTER ITEM #	ITEM #	REVIEWED BY	SHEET/PAGE	SECTION/PARA.	REVIEW COMMENT	DISPOSITION		RESPONSE
						INITIAL	FINAL	
1	1	Mayor Collins	8	3.3.B.2	Appears the manual prohibits underground retention for single family residential, is this true?	B	A	Revised to state... "Single family residences with an underground storage easement instead of a drainage easement."
2	1	Vice Mayor Bien-Willner	41	8-1.A	Is there another mechanism for documenting retention basins in lieu of an easement?	B/C	D	An easement is the least "invasive" method for ensuring that drainage infrastructure on private property continues to function to protect downstream property owners. A deed restriction is essentially the same. Other methods such as quitclaim deeds involve taking ownership of property
3	1	Councilmbr. Pace	11	3-5.F.1	The manual only discusses what's prohibited in regards to backwashing pools, can we list possible alternatives?	B/C	A	The Town's two sanitary sewer providers (City's of Scottsdale and Phoenix) currently allow the disposal of pool or spa water into their collection systems, as such we are recommending changing town policy to align with the sewer provider practice. If discharging into a sanitary sewer, pool or spa water shall enter the sanitary sewer on private property by appropriate means, such as through a sanitary clean out. Some other examples of appropriate locations to backwash a pool or spa water may include an onsite retention basin with adequate volume, and a private water hauling service.
4	1	Councilmbr. Moore	1	1-1.A	Change the word entitled to titled in final draft	A	A	Revised
5	2	Councilmbr. Moore	5	3-2.A.2	Remove the text "unless the drainage can be conveyed directly to an existing major channel or natural drainageway, and the developer can demonstrate no adverse off-site impacts to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer."	B/C	D	It is common practice within the valley to include such text, an in certain, but rare occasions, this approach may be the most appropriate way to deal with onsite drainage. It is the responsibility of the developer's engineer to ensure there will be no negative off-site impacts
6	3	Councilmbr. Moore	Cover	Cover	Reformat the entire document. It jumps in and out all through the document from residential to master planned community to public streets and ROW' to SUP's to multifamily to parks and open space and on and on.	C		For further discussion among Town staff. The voluntary LID and landscape guidelines sections could be separated out into a separate appendix or document for information that is not adopted as part of an ordinance.
7	4	Councilmbr. Moore	1	1-1.A	Titled?	A	A	Revised
8	5	Councilmbr. Moore	5	3-2.A.2	You can't convey additional storm water to an existing channel without impacting the channel. If we don't minimize additional runoff then what's the point of trying to solve our flooding?	C		For further wording discussion among Town staff. Same as #5 above.
9	6	Councilmbr. Moore	6	3-2.B.2.a	At no point is runoff from disturbed areas allowed to impact adjoining properties.	A	A	Edited to include text
10	7	Councilmbr. Moore	6	3-2.B.3.c	or a final landscape or building permit clearance.	A	A	Added
11	8	Councilmbr. Moore	7	3-2.C.4	but in no event can they drain to adjoining properties.	A	A	Added "to an historic outflow" in lieu of suggested revision
12	9	Councilmbr. Moore	7	3-2.C.11.a	Delete this sentence.(It's overstepping the Town's intent. Any cure facilitated by the Town can assume the cost for all mitigation will be a judgment against the property and owner.)	C		Wording discussion for Town staff - Policy question
13	10	Councilmbr. Moore	7	3-2.C.12	valley gutter? What type of gutter?	D	D	refers to any type of gutter
14	11	Councilmbr. Moore	8	3-2.C.14	provide an exhibit as an example of an approved method.	B	A	After further review, this requirement may not be feasible and has been deleted, in part.
15	12	Councilmbr. Moore	8	3-2.C.16	clarify- are we talking underground only or depressed if the surface is DG or a absorbent surface	C		Wording discussion for Town staff

REVIEW COMMENT RESOLUTION



PARADISE VALLEY WATERSHED STUDIES

Designer: Dibble Engineering
Reviewed By: Town of Paradise Valley Staff

Disposition Codes:

- A. Will Comply
- B. Consultant to Evaluate
- C. Client to Evaluate
- D. No Further Action



Responses: May 24, 2017

Scope of Review: Storm Drainage Design Manual (Dated 2/1/17)

MASTER ITEM #	ITEM #	REVIEWED BY	SHEET/PAGE	SECTION/PARA.	REVIEW COMMENT	DISPOSITION		RESPONSE
						INITIAL	FINAL	
16	13	Councilmbr. Moore	10	3-5.A	satisfactorily	B/C		Clarify that if it a new "subdivision" (in lieu of "development"), then this section applies. Town discussion needed.
17	14	Councilmbr. Moore	10	3-5.B	Once again, what streets? If we're referring to a master planned community I understand, if not, then further explanation of what the intent is.	B/C		Clarify that if it a new "subdivision" (in lieu of "development"), then this section applies. Town discussion needed.
18	15	Councilmbr. Moore	11	3-5.C	Define maximum depth of flow.	B/C		
19	16	Councilmbr. Moore	13	3-5.E	highlighted but no comment?	C		Needs further explanation and direction by Town
20	17	Councilmbr. Moore	14	3-7.H	Top of headwall should have a 4" curb for erosion control.	A	A	Edited to reflect this
21	18	Councilmbr. Moore	13	3-7.J	Yes, all true but.... what is the intent of this section? mitigating solutions?	C		Wording discussion for Town staff. Move to end of 3-6?
22	19	Councilmbr. Moore	13	3-7.K	Seems like a "cut and paste" problem. Once again the reason is to do what? Maintenance of what facilities? Call out the specific improvements that need vehicular access.	C		Wording discussion for Town staff. Move to end of 3-6?
23	20	Councilmbr. Moore	15	4-2.C	Areas that have little or no soil and are predominantly rock the Town engineer may consider these areas as extreme conditions that require little or no mitigation.	A	A	Section 4-2 has been moved to page 6 replacing previous paragraph "e".
24	21	Councilmbr. Moore	19	6-1	seems redundant to earlier information.	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
25	22	Councilmbr. Moore	19	6-2	Section needed?	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
26	23	Councilmbr. Moore	22	6-4.A	This section seems too general and unnecessary	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
27	24	Councilmbr. Moore	23	6-5	Reduce size of this section	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
28	25	Councilmbr. Moore	24	6-5 Description	How many master planned communities do we have that all of this should be in the manual? We have Mag std details	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
29	26	Councilmbr. Moore	35	7-2.A.2	Look at C of Scottsdale language	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff. Make section discussion more broad?
30	27	Councilmbr. Moore	39	7-6.A	We don't have multifamily zoning- remove	A	A	Striked "and Multifamily"
31	28	Councilmbr. Moore	41	8-1.B	Reword the sentence to be more clear of the intent.	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
32	29	Councilmbr. Moore	46	10-2.G	Seems as I said before a little overreaching when it comes to set aside access. This changes fence locations.	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
33	30	Councilmbr. Moore	46	10-3.A	Once again redundancy is what has already been said in previous areas. This document is too long.	D		
34	31	Councilmbr. Moore	47	10-3.B.1	information has already been conveyed.	B/C		Some technical requirements may need to be moved forward in the document.
35	32	Councilmbr. Moore	47	10-3.B.7.b	Don't jump from private single family to master planned community. It makes it confusing to the average person.	B/C		Is this related to subdivisions or single family lots? Need to clarify. Others as well.
36	33	Councilmbr. Moore	47	10-3.C.4	Why? Crushed rock (DG) will "crust" over and prevent absorption. river rock allows water to penetrate to the soil.	B/C		Substitute "fractured rock" in lieu of "crushed rock". Also use "drainage channel" instead of "drainage facility".

REVIEW COMMENT RESOLUTION



PARADISE VALLEY WATERSHED STUDIES

Designer: Dibble Engineering
Reviewed By: Town of Paradise Valley Staff

Disposition Codes:

- A. Will Comply
- B. Consultant to Evaluate
- C. Client to Evaluate
- D. No Further Action



Responses: May 24, 2017

Scope of Review: Storm Drainage Design Manual (Dated 2/1/17)

MASTER ITEM #	ITEM #	REVIEWED BY	SHEET/PAGE	SECTION/PARA.	REVIEW COMMENT	DISPOSITION		RESPONSE
						INITIAL	FINAL	
37	34	Councilmbr. Moore	48	10-4.A	sounds like a cut and paste from a master planned communities.	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
38	35	Councilmbr. Moore	48	10-4.B	remove paragraph	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
39	36	Councilmbr. Moore	48	10-4.C	this is common all over Town	B/C		Change to read, "the use of riprap for entire channel protection is discouraged". Also, "Channel protection measures should be designed and constructed to blend into the natural environment."
40	37	Councilmbr. Moore	48	10-5	this is in direct conflict with being able to redirect washes on the interior of lots as long as the entrance and exit are maintained.	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
41	38	Councilmbr. Moore	48	10-5.A	Consider is to arbitrary and may adversely effect one development and not another, depending on the reviewer that day	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
42	39	Councilmbr. Moore	49	10-5.B	as I said this goes against what has always been allowed	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
43	40	Councilmbr. Moore	49	10-5.C	here we go again a "cut and paste" from a municipality that does typical subdivisions	B/C		State that this is for master planned development. Define what it is for.
44	41	Councilmbr. Moore	49	10-5.C.4	What?	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
45	42	Councilmbr. Moore	49	10-5.D.1	What?	D		
46	43	Councilmbr. Moore	49	10-5.D.4	All part of engineered and sealed plans	D		
47	44	Councilmbr. Moore	49	10-5.E	already covered in other chapters.	D		
48	45	Councilmbr. Moore	49	10-5.E.2	What?	A	A	Changed to MAG standard details.
49	46	Councilmbr. Moore	50	10-6	Supervision and sealed by an engineer is a given	D		
50	47	Councilmbr. Moore	50	10-6.A.6	What?	B	A	Changed to read "...is defined as..." for the purposes of defining max height
51	48	Councilmbr. Moore	50	10-6.A.7	What?	B	A	Changed to read "...maximum average height..."
52	49	Councilmbr. Moore	50	10-6.A.8	What?	B	A	deleted "... at any 1 station..."
53	50	Councilmbr. Moore	50	10-6.A.9	What? Hillside and other ordinances may contribute before the Town engineer can override the ordinance. Remember, the engineer only has administrative authority and not legislative authority and therefore cannot override code.	B	A	added "...all town codes and ordinances..."
54	51	Councilmbr. Moore	50	10-6.A.10	Already been said many times over	B	D	
55	52	Councilmbr. Moore	50	10-6.A.11	Same comment as above about authority	B	D	
56	53	Councilmbr. Moore	50	10-6.B.1	only up to 8 ft	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
57	54	Councilmbr. Moore	51	10-6.C	what? this has already been discussed in other chapters.	D		

REVIEW COMMENT RESOLUTION



PARADISE VALLEY WATERSHED STUDIES

Designer: Dibble Engineering
Reviewed By: Town of Paradise Valley Staff

Disposition Codes:

- A. Will Comply
- B. Consultant to Evaluate
- C. Client to Evaluate
- D. No Further Action



Responses: May 24, 2017

Scope of Review: Storm Drainage Design Manual (Dated 2/1/17)

MASTER ITEM #	ITEM #	REVIEWED BY	SHEET/PAGE	SECTION/PARA.	REVIEW COMMENT	DISPOSITION		RESPONSE
						INITIAL	FINAL	
58	55	Councilmbr. Moore	51	10-6.D	Not practical. The site may not be able to provide automatic irrigation to do plants within 90 days.	A/D		Sentence was cut off. Fixed and added clarification for erosion control.
59	56	Councilmbr. Moore	51	10-7.A	PV doesn't have a Native Plant Ordinance	A		Revised to eliminate reference to ordinance.
60	57	Councilmbr. Moore	52	10-7.B.1.h&i	who has the designated scenic and vista corridor mapping?	B/C	A	Verbiage was borrowed from City of Scottsdale. Deleted
61	58	Councilmbr. Moore	54	10-7.B	What?	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
62	59	Councilmbr. Moore	54	10-7.B	Same sentence as above and with it my same answer	B/C		Wording discussion for Town staff
63	60	Councilmbr. Moore	56	App 6A.A.7.d	What? and we are not a City also include this with section above- formatting issue	A	A	Changed City to Town
64	61	Councilmbr. Moore	56	App 6A.A.9	Do we do this?	A	A	Changed to Building Permit number. Also change "Chapter" to Section" in 6A.A.10.
65	62	Councilmbr. Moore	56	App 6A.A.11	We don't do this	D		
66	63	Councilmbr. Moore	56	App 6A.B	numbering from cut and paste all off	D		
67	64	Councilmbr. Moore	56	App 6A.B.3.a	just said this above cut and paste all out of whack	D		
68	65	Councilmbr. Moore	57	App 6A.B.6	as applicable	D		
69	66	Councilmbr. Moore	59	App 6A.D.6.c	What?	B/C	A	Revised for consistency
70	1	J. Knapp	6	3-2.B.2.a	Is the town obligated by a federal or state requirement to require first flush retention or is it a policy decision each municipality can make on its own?	A	A	Revised to state..."Where detention is allowed, first flush volume shall be retained on all lots or within a common area, and a reasonable attempt shall be made to route all runoff from disturbed areas to the first flush basin(s) subject to grading plan approval."
71	2	J. Knapp	45	10-2.E	Remove the term visually significant corridors and the reference to guidelines being developed. . Maybe talk about how they are important landscapes to preserve naturally.	A	A	Revised to state..."Town rights-of-way and easements along natural wash corridors are important to maintain and preserve the natural environment and landscape features. Natural Wash Corridors shall include, whenever feasible, a landscape buffer area of at least 5 feet each side, perpendicular from the top of the bank."
72	3	J. Knapp	46	10-2.G	There are concerns regarding requiring a 10' wide clear zone along the wash. Revise to suggest during design incorporating a 10' wide access area to the wash for maintenance from the nearest driveway.	A	A	Revised to state..."For Natural Washes, new development should provide, if possible, a minimum 10-foot wide accessible clear zone area for emergency and ordinary maintenance vehicle access. For access to minor drainageways and basins including roadside swales, ditches and sediment basins, allow for reasonable access for regular maintenance and emergency use. Access may be combined with trails."
73	1	F. Fleet	5	3-2.A.1	Town code reference invalid	C	A	Stormwater storage facilities are designed primarily as retention facilities. Other stormwater management facilities, such as detention basins, dry wells, pumps and injection wells, will only be allowed as approved by the Town Engineer.

REVIEW COMMENT RESOLUTION



PARADISE VALLEY WATERSHED STUDIES

Designer: Dibble Engineering
Reviewed By: Town of Paradise Valley Staff

Disposition Codes:

- A. Will Comply
- B. Consultant to Evaluate
- C. Client to Evaluate
- D. No Further Action



Responses: May 24, 2017

Scope of Review: Storm Drainage Design Manual (Dated 2/1/17)

MASTER ITEM #	ITEM #	REVIEWED BY	SHEET/PAGE	SECTION/PARA.	REVIEW COMMENT	DISPOSITION		RESPONSE
						INITIAL	FINAL	
74	2	F. Fleet	5	3-2.A.3	May want to wordsmith lot to lot drainage to be clear we aren't talking about existing offsite flows	A	A	Revise to state..."Lot to Lot drainage within a new development is prohibited unless permanent drainage facilities are constructed in dedicated drainage easements or tracts that are maintained by the Town or a homeowners association (HOA)."
75	4	F. Fleet	6	3-2.B.2.c	What's referenced by "safety factor of 2"?	B/C	A	Revise to state..."If retention of the first flush volume is provided, the stormwater storage facility must be fully evacuated within 36 hours. The maximum allowable infiltration rate shall be 50% of the in-situ tested rate of the as-constructed basin. Testing shall be conducted using double-ring infiltrometer methodology in accordance with FCDMC standards.
76	5	F. Fleet	8	3-3.C.5.b	Vector control?	B/C	D	No need to define "vector control"
77	6	F. Fleet	8	3-3.D.2	Why are we prohibiting corrugated pipe for underground storage?	B/C	A	Corrugated pipes commonly trap debris within the pipe voids, lowering the pipe capacity. They also allow water to stand in the voids which is a potential breeding ground for mosquitos.
78	1	P. Peshkin			Involve Planning Dept. at the beginning when elevation is involved.	C	C	Planning Department is involved with every permit at the beginning now as a policy
79	2	P. Peshkin			Observe adjacent existing properties and provide/require drainage protection to protect those properties. Do not rely on calculations to determine "meeting engineering requirements". For example if Retention Basins are included in the plans and they will capture runoff meeting the engineering requirements, look at the location of the retention basins and identify that they will capture runoff that could injure and cause harm to adjacent existing properties. This should be the Town's responsibility especially when alerted ahead of time by the neighbors living in those adjacent properties, i.e. prior to construction starting.	B/C	C	The town is reliant on the professional judgment of the professional who signs and seals the grading and drainage plan. It is their responsibility to address these concerns.
80	7	P. Peshkin			Evaluate Velocity issues affected by: elevation, impervious area, enlarged structure footprint, slanted roofs, front landscaping runoff direction, etc. which affects the existing neighboring properties. This violates the increased FLOW not allowed code	B/C	C	The town is reliant on the professional judgment of the professional who signs and seals the grading and drainage plan. It is their responsibility to address these concerns.
81	8	P. Peshkin			Review locations of retention basins on the property. Should be constructed where storm runoff will cause harm to existing properties.	B/C	C	This is a case by case review of the proposed plan by town staff.
82	9	P. Peshkin			Require provisions to capture storm runoff in submitted plans: culverts, catch basins, spillways, equalizer pipes...	B/C	C	This is a case by case review of the proposed plan by town staff.
83	10	P. Peshkin			Poll neighboring properties when not in a Floodplain, and in Zone X (less than 1% chance of flooding) to ask their experience with flooding and stormwater drainage BEFORE requiring (per TPV)to elevate a home. When a home is not in a Floodplain, not in a Special Hazard Zone, they will get NO professional support from FEMA. The damaged property will also NOT have a valid FLOOD claim with Flood Insurance NFIP due to the FEMA definition of a flood. Perhaps a modified elevation could be considered if there has been no history of flooding.	B/C	C	While this may be a good practice, it is difficult to require a professional engineer to design projects based on anecdotal information.



REVIEW COMMENT RESOLUTION

PARADISE VALLEY WATERSHED STUDIES

Designer: Dibble Engineering
Reviewed By: Town of Paradise Valley Staff

Disposition Codes:

- A. Will Comply
- B. Consultant to Evaluate
- C. Client to Evaluate
- D. No Further Action



Responses: May 24, 2017

Scope of Review: Storm Drainage Design Manual (Dated 2/1/17)

MASTER ITEM #	ITEM #	REVIEWED BY	SHEET/PAGE	SECTION/PARA.	REVIEW COMMENT	DISPOSITION		RESPONSE
						INITIAL	FINAL	
84	11	P. Peshkin			When elevating a structure look at the design of the house and require a design that is compatible with the existing neighborhood and does not interfere with drainage. For example a split level design where the garage area/front area is lower (not interfering with runoff pattern) and the home in the front elevates to the main floor which is elevated in the back. This maintains the existing storm runoff design that historically works.	C	C	The town does not have flatland architectural standards to enforce this type of requirement.
85	12	P. Peshkin			Require monsoon protection at the beginning of construction and extra protection when a storm is predicted in Monsoon Season.	C	C	Town and state required Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans address runoff of construction debris during construction.
86	13	P. Peshkin			Research origination of calculation comparisons submitted by the engineer when historical calculations DO NOT EXIST. Calculations were never required in 1973. Verify current calculations and not rely on data from 1987 since the land has constantly changed due to erosion, construction, walls, etc. and these calculations are NOT always accurate.	C	C	Town requires existing conditions to be documented when a new project is proposed. The existing conditions are those on the site as of just prior to initiating the project, not historical conditions.
87	14	P. Peshkin			Give more authority to the onsite inspectors to question construction that although it was approved per the plan, it is not compliant with the existing site, the engineer, architect, contractor, owner, etc. must be advised that the submitted plan has deficiencies and must be corrected. Currently the onsite inspector just verifies that what is on the plan is what is being built. A second layer of protection to the residents should be enforced. Also contact with the adjacent property owners/residents should be available and considered valuable information throughout the construction.	C	C	The town inspectors are responsible to ensure the plans are built to the approved plans.
88	15	P. Peshkin			Keep ALL required G/D documents, AS BUILT plans and any other studies on file at a minimum, a digital file.	C	C	This is the policy of the town as of the early 2000's.
89	16	P. Peshkin			Do not encourage lawsuits/civil disputes between neighbors but rather have the town enforce the codes during the permitting process, onsite inspections, proactive/preventive alerts from neighbors, etc.	C	C	The town does not encourage lawsuits between neighbors.
90	17	P. Peshkin			Have the Town's Planning and Zoning Dept. be involved at the beginning of all construction when elevation is involved. An onsite visit with the neighboring residents should be required in situations where a larger footprint, elevation, change of natural water path, landscaping that does not respect the natural wash will complicate the development. A drainage review should be conducted.	C	C	The planning department is involved with all construction projects at the beginning.
91	18	P. Peshkin			Devise ways to protect existing residents in older properties when they do not own any property to correct a storm drainage challenge.	B/C	C	Town code requires individual residents to address storm water issues on their individual properties.
92	1	N. Prodanov	1	1-3	AS THESE CODES ARE SUBJECT TO UPDATES, THE LINKS MAY NOT WORK 3 YEARS FROM NOW. CONSIDER REMOVING.	B/C	D	Noted. Document can be updated as links change.
93	2	N. Prodanov	5	3-2.A.2	PLEASE CONFIRM INCREASE FROM THE CURRENTLY REQUIRED PRE- V. POST-DEVELOPMENT.	B	D	The proposed calculation more accurately reflects the actual impervious area of a development as opposed to the currently used Pre vs. Post. In some cases, more retention will be required, in others, it may not.
94	3	N. Prodanov	5	3-2.B.1.a	RUNOFF COEFFICIENT IS LEFT FOR OPEN INTERPRETATION. PLEASE CONSIDER ADDING A REFERENCE.	A	A	Revised to state..."C = Weighted average runoff coefficient over entire site, per the FCDMC Hydrology Manual tables 3.2 and 3.3."
95	4	N. Prodanov	6	3-2.B.2.b	TYPICALLY C=1.0 FOR FIRST FLUSH CONDITIONS.	B	D	Preference is to use the weighted C value.
96	5	N. Prodanov	6	3-2.B.3	ADD A TABLE TO THE PLAN VOLUME PROVIDED.	B/C	C	The calculation table, showing basins and area for certifying as built conditions is a good idea. "This is an in Town policy and will be added to Appendix 6A."

REVIEW COMMENT RESOLUTION



PARADISE VALLEY WATERSHED STUDIES

Designer: Dibble Engineering
Reviewed By: Town of Paradise Valley Staff

Disposition Codes:

- A. Will Comply
- B. Consultant to Evaluate
- C. Client to Evaluate
- D. No Further Action



Responses: May 24, 2017

Scope of Review: Storm Drainage Design Manual (Dated 2/1/17)

MASTER ITEM #	ITEM #	REVIEWED BY	SHEET/PAGE	SECTION/PARA.	REVIEW COMMENT	DISPOSITION		RESPONSE
						INITIAL	FINAL	
97	6	N. Prodanov	6	3-2.C.1	CONSIDER ADDING REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE RETENTION FOR EACH CORRESPONDING TRIBUTARY AREA WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT. IT DOES NOT MAKE SENSE TO HAVE RETENTION BASIN IF LIMITED RUNOFF COULD GET TO IT.	B/C	A	Added to 3-2.c.1
98	7	N. Prodanov	7	3-2.C.6	POOL BARRIER IS REQUIRED FOR OVER 18" DEEP BASIN. DRY WELL OR PERC TESTS WILL BE REQUIRED.	B	D	The building code only requires fences for inground, above ground, and on-ground swimming pools, hot tubs, and spas that contain 18" of water or more. It does not require a pool barrier for retention.
99	8	N. Prodanov	35	7-1.A	REQUIRE DRAINAGE REPORTS TO BE SUBMITTED ON EACH SITE WITH OFFSITE FLOWS IMPACTING THE DEVELOPMENT. HISTORIC, CURRENT AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS TO BE DISCUSSED AND ANALYZED.	B/C	D	This section states which activities may trigger the need for a drainage report. The existence of offsite flows onto a parcel would not be a triggering event. Making improvements to the parcel would.
100	9	N. Prodanov	40	7-6	CONSIDER ADDING NARRATIVE FOR LOTS THAT ARE HAVE GRADES BELOW THE STREET LEVEL.THE OUTFALL SHALL BE 14" BELOW THE FFE OF THE HOUSE.DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE TO HAVE 6" RIDGE ABOVE THE ADJACENT STREET PAVEMENT.TOP OF WINDOW WELL SERVING BASEMENT TO BE 12" ABOVE FINISH GRADE.	B/C	D	The Town may want to add a statement requiring protection of structures with FFE's lower than adjacent roads. However, we do not recommend requiring specific standards such as the ones proposed. They could result in unanticipated challenges. This should be left to the design engineer to propose and the Town to review/approve.
101	10	N. Prodanov	41	8-1.B	THE TOWN REQUIRES FROM TOP OF BANK TO TOP OF BANK +5' FOR EROSION.	B/C	A	Noted. See comment 3 response. However, this comment is not necessarily for erosion purposes.
102	1	Dibble Team	6	3-2.B.2.a	Change First Flush requirements for all lots to say "or within common retention areas."	A	A	Revised
103	2	Dibble Team	7	3-2.C.4	Change "Retention" to be "Retention/Detention"	A	A	Revised
104	3	Dibble Team	7	3-2.C.10	Change "As provided in 10..." to be "As provided in 11..."	A	A	Revised
105	4	Dibble Team	7	3-2.C.11.a and b	Combine into one subheading	A	A	Revised
106	5	Dibble Team	24	A.2	Change "Retention" to be "Retention/Detention"	A	A	Revised
107	6	Dibble Team	46	10-2.G	1st sentence, change "are" to "area"	A	A	Revised
108	7	Dibble Team	46	10-3.A.9	Change "detention" to "retention and detention"	A	A	Revised
109	8	Dibble Team	46	10-3.A.10	Change "detention" to "retention and detention"	A	A	Revised
110	9	Dibble Team	53	Header	Change "Detention" to "Retention and detention"	A	A	Revised
111	10	Dibble Team	53	1st Para.	Change "detention" to "retention and detention"	A	A	Revised