



Ian Cole, LLC

Professional Registered Soil Scientist / Professional Wetland Scientist

PO BOX 619

Middletown, CT 06457

Itcole@gmail.com

860-514-5642

August 14, 2025

Ms. Stacy Radford
 Zoning & Wetland Officer
 Department of Land Use & Development
 Town of Montville
 310 Norwich-New London Turnpike
 Uncasville, CT 06382

**Re: SITE PLAN APPLICATION REVIEW FOR:
 APPLICATION 25 IWC16
 DEVELOPMENT OF SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE
 GLEN ROAD (055-051-00A) UNCASVILLE**

Dear Ms. Radford and Commission Members:

On behalf of the Town of Montville, I have received and reviewed the subject application materials and visited the site on July 24, 2025, for the above referenced project.

After completing a site walk and review of the application materials, I am in agreement with CLA that there is no less impactful way to enter the property. I would also add that the upper edge of the wetlands that are slated to be impacted are along the wetland transition and not as highly functioning in comparison to the interior / downgradient portion of the wetland and where Stony Brook flows which are the more sensitive and beneficial part of the wetland system.

CLA recently provided updated information that the flood storage compensation area is no longer needed as the site is not located in a FEMA regulated zone that requires compensation for filling a floodplain. Before this new important update the main concern with this site was the necessity to clear a well-functioning self-sustaining mature forest for flood storage compensation. Because of this required disturbance initially it was going to be recommended that the applicant consider a wetland mitigation plan within that compensation area to help offset the physical loss of the 4200 SF of wetlands with the entrance to the property. But with that regulatory requirement absent, there is little

ecological benefit in disturbing more vegetated land within the 50' upland review area that is in good condition in the pursuit of mitigation for an unavoidable wetland impact. I would suggest that if mitigation is required it could instead of physical replacement other alternatives could be included like a conservation easement around the existing wetlands and/or the remainder of the 50' URA to protect the wetlands in perpetuity, and/or signage along said easement boundary to protect against potential future encroachments.

Additional comments for consideration:

1. Acknowledging that most activities are outside the 50' URA where activities are within 50' of a wetland resource, a double row of E&S control measures should be installed where appropriate.
2. I have reviewed the wetland boundary and agree with Mr. Russo's delineation. The wetland flagging was somewhat degraded and should be re-flagged before construction, so the wetland boundary is visible and obvious to civil contractors and inspectors during the construction phase.

In closing, while the proposed activity is significant in the fact it will be crossing a wetland and will result in the permanent filling, it likely will not have a major effect or negative impact due to the nature of the subject wetland at the crossing location.

In my professional opinion the proposed regulated activities:

1. Should not result in an adverse impact to the overall wetland function and values;
2. Are consistent with and satisfy the statutory factors for consideration provided by Section 22a-41 of the Connecticut General Statutes; and
3. Are consistent with and satisfy the criteria for consideration provided by the Town of Montville's Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at itcole@gmail.com or (860) 514-5642.

Sincerely,



Ian T. Cole
Professional Registered Soil Scientist
Professional Wetland Scientist #2006