

January 5, 2025

Town of Sterling  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
PO Box 157  
Oneco, CT 06373-0157

RE: Job # 25041  
Encroachment Permit for Quarry  
0 Plainfield Pike, Sterling CT

Dear Commissioners:

The following information is provided in response to the review and comment letter we received from Towne Engineering dated October 17, 2025. The following constitutes an itemized response to those comments, including explanations and any necessary revisions. We look forward to working with the commissioners and town staff to get this project approved.

1. The applicant is aware of the excavator on site, and intends to fix the equipment and use it during quarrying operations once the permit has been approved.
2. The attached site plans have been revised to include the existing limits of disturbance. My firm did an independent topographic and boundary survey of the property during the summer of 2025. We used Javad GNSS equipment for the survey, and therefore there are no cut lines and very few benchmarks or other control points visible.
3. The applicant has confirmed that some blasting had occurred on site previously.
4. Noted.
5. The attached plans have been revised to include the existing stockpile of topsoil.
6. Noted.
7. In speaking with the applicant, we believe the previous quarrying activity that occurred towards the south side of the site was done many decades ago, likely before detailed plans and permits were required for that type of activity. Quarrying activities done under the 2007 permit was very minimal, and mostly consisted of site preparation such as clearing trees, improving the access road, and stripping topsoil.
8. The attached Sheet 4 of the plans has been revised to include the correct title block and the notes have been updated to reflect current zoning requirements.
9. The paper prints submitted to the town have been signed and sealed, only the digital PDF's which are identical are unsigned. We can provide you with signed PDFs upon request. Two of the property lines were missing bearings and distances, and those have been added to the revised plans. Since Sheet 3 does not show bearings and distances or

the entire perimeter of the property, we felt it was not appropriate to express a boundary opinion on Sheet 3.

10. My firm was provided with all the CAD and DWG files for the previous 2007 Messier plans, included topographic shots. We then performed our own topographic survey of the area proposed for excavation, to confirm the site conditions had not changed. The topography shown on our plans should conform to Class T-2 standards, and is based on the latest NAVD88 datum. The plans have been updated to include a benchmark just west of the excavation area. Additional bench marks can be installed upon request from the contractor.
11. The attached plans have been revised to include a detail for the paved parking pad and to show the proposed clearing limits. We do not believe any improvements are necessary for the existing haul road or gravel driveway, other than some minor trimming of brush. The road has been used to transport heavy machinery for many years already and is in good condition. The details for the swale and check dam are included "just in case," if the contractor feels they might be necessary due to some unforeseen circumstance.
12. An updated E&S cost estimate is attached.
13. We are currently working with DOT to achieve their requested sight distances. The attached plans have been revised to include the culvert you requested.
14. Regulation Compliance
  - a. The list of abutters within 300 feet was included with our original submission to the town, but perhaps it got lost along the way. We will re-send it with this submission.
  - b. We will include a brief report discussing the proposed blasting with this submission.
  - c. We do not believe a DEEP stormwater permit is required. Since the total area of distance is under 5 acres, this should be considered a "locally approvable small construction activity" as described in Section 2.5.3 of the General Permit. If a DEEP permit is required, of course J&D will submit the necessary paperwork after receiving all town approvals.
  - d. When preparing the cover sheet to show homes within 1000' feet of the site, we used the base mapping on the town's GIS, which apparently shows most houses but not all of them. The cover sheet has been revised accordingly, using the latest aerial photography. Please let us know if we missed any specific houses.
  - e. A new sheet 4 has been added to include cross sections of the proposed excavation activities.
  - f. The attached plans have been revised to include the correct hours of operation.
  - g. The signature blocks on Sheet 1 have been revised to include an expiration date.
  - h. A cost estimate for erosion controls and site restoration is included with this submission.
  - i. This was discussed at the previous P&Z meeting. After excavation is complete, there is adequate space at the north of the site, towards the road, for a future house or other use. At least 3 acres of good buildable land should be available for future development. Additionally, the proposed excavation will not create any steep or hazardous slopes that would pose a danger to future owners.
  - j. The restoration notes have been revised to specify 4" of topsoil and 8" of subsoil, in accordance with the regulations.
  - k. The NDDDB area has been added Sheet 1 of the revised plans.

15. The applicant explained in greater detail at the previous P&Z Commission meeting the exact procedure for rock removal. The zoning regulations do not allow for "screening, sifting, washing, and crushing" within 1,000' of a residence, as that work is very loud and presents a noise pollution issue for neighbors. None of those loud activities, especially screening and crushing, are proposed with this application. The activity will include occasional blasting, perhaps once or twice a year, to create relatively large sections of stone. The largest rocks may be further split by hand. Then the rocks will be loaded into a dump truck or storage container, and removed from the site. Noise pollution should be fairly minimal, the loudest activities will be from typical excavator operation, and placing rocks into the storage containers. The goal is to remove fairly large, rectangular sections of stone, that can be transported to a final location and then cut to size. As such, very little "processing" of stone will occur on site, and noise pollution should be fairly minimal compared with a typical quarry or gravel plant.

We thank you for your attention to this matter, and look forward to your reply. Please do not hesitate to contact me with additional questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Daniel Blanchette, PE LS  
J&D Site Designs LLC