

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2019**

The Glastonbury Conservation Commission (Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency), along with Mr. Jonathan E. Mullen, Town Planner, in attendance held a Regular Meeting in Town Council Chambers, second floor of Town Hall located at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

**ROLL CALL**

**Commission Members - Present**

Mr. Dennis McInerney, Vice Chair & Acting Chair (DM)  
Ms. Kim McClain, Secretary (KM)  
Mr. Brian Davis (BD)  
Mr. Mark Temple (MT)

**Commission Members - Excused**

Mrs. Judy Harper, Chair  
Mr. Frank Kaputa  
Mrs. Helen Stern

Acting Chair McInerney called the meeting to order at 7:32 P.M.

**I. INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS**

- 1. Proposed Redevelopment of 2807, 2813 and 2815 Main Street – a 3,168 square foot, one-story building for one 188-seat restaurant, a 63-space parking lot and related infrastructure - north of Bruegger’s Bagels and south of Fire Company 1/Pratt Street – Flood Zone and Planned Business & Development Zone – Alter & Pearson, LLC, counsel – Megson, Heagle & Friend, C.E. & L.S., LLC – Glastonbury 2815 LLC (c/o Scott Leonard), landowner/applicant**

Meghan Hope, attorney for the applicant, presented the proposal. Attorney Hope explained that her client purchased the site in 2013 and a couple of different plans, varying in complexity, have been presented to the Commission. She went on to indicate that the site is almost entirely in the flood zone and there have been significant challenges because of that. Previous plans have been scrapped and the new plan presented is closer to the footprint of what was previously Raffa’s Restaurant at the same location. The foundation of the proposed building is a foot above the 100-yr flood zone; building above the 500-yr flood zone, which is required by current regulations, would mean the foundation would have to be 7-10ft above the street. They have already gone to TPZ informally to talk about a waiver provision that would allow them to build one foot above the 100-yr flood zone as long as the building will be equipped with the various flood-proofing features necessary in order to keep the foundation level closer to street level.

Ms. Hope went on to point out that there are two curb cuts along Main Street for the proposed restaurant parking lot. One is at the intersection of Main and Spring Streets, which has a traffic light, and the other is a proposed right-turn-only exit from the lot further south. The second access point was added with the intention of aiding traffic flow in the parking lot.

She also indicated that the site slopes toward a water quality basin and flood storage compensation in the rear of the lot. Though previous iterations of the plans did go into the wetlands, the current plan does not have any direct wetland impact, though the property does fall within the upland review area.

Ms. Hope then explained that they are obtaining an easement from the Town for a portion of the plans, but that easement has not been executed yet. She said that she would have it in time for the formal application, but she wanted to get the Commission's feedback first and then be able to take those into account, making necessary adjustments before finalizing the easement.

The proposed restaurant includes 40 bar-area seats (either at the bar or at high-top tables) and 129 table seats (94 indoor and 35 on the outdoor deck, when weather permits). Ms. Hope indicated that this seating capacity dictated the need for the 63 parking spaces planned.

Ms. Hope then referred to the plan provided, indicating where the dumpster will be located in the parking lot, a retaining wall around the dumpster due to an increase in grade toward the fire station, and a small retaining wall roughly 3ft in height within the parking lot, separating the parking area to the north from the one to the south, due to a difference in the grade.

Ms. Hope then explained that, because the property is adjacent to the Company 1 Fire Station, the Fire Chief did reach out about removing a couple of trees on the lot that lost some branches a few years ago, totaling a firefighter's car. Said trees were going to be removed regardless, so the request will be accommodated. Additionally, the Fire Department has utilized a small portion of the property for recreation and a memorial, and the property owner is working to accommodate them to allow for continued use of that area toward the east edge of the site.

Ms. Hope stated that they went to the Beautification Committee the evening prior with the landscape plan. It was approved with some adjustments requested from the Committee. Their main concern was the addition of street trees along Main Street, which has been addressed.

Ms. Hope then turned the floor over to Jon Sczurek from Megson, Heagle & Friend.

Mr. Sczurek spoke about drainage on the site. In the new plan, current drainage will be preserved--sheet flow off of the parking lot will move water back toward the water quality basin, away from Main Street. The only two areas that will drain toward Main Street are a high point near the building and from the back of the walk on the exit drive. This was reviewed with the Assistant Town Engineer and he was pleased that more of the water that is currently draining toward Main Street will be redirected back toward the wetlands.

Mr. Sczurek then went on to describe the water quality basin at the rear of the lot and stated that it will serve two functions: to provide water quality for storm run-off and to provide flood storage compensation. He stated that the water quality function planned is roughly three times the required amount for the site. The basin planned wound up being much larger for flood compensation purposes. The newly proposed building is much smaller than the original, there are no underground flood storage chambers planned, there are fewer parking spaces, and the large retaining walls around the perimeter of the site have been removed.

Mr. Sczurek relayed that the plans were sent to the DEEP Natural Diversity Database and said it was reported that there are no endangered species or species of concern in the immediate area. Tom Mocko also provided feedback particularly regarding erosion controls. Site-specific erosion control, especially along the water quality basin, and a new flood line with new grading were called for. Mr. Mocko also asked for details of the pond bottom and plantings for the pond. He additionally requested a “low-mow” or “no-mow” vegetation for the slopes surrounding the pond and adjustment to the pond spillway. There was an emergency overflow in place, but it will be relocated to direct toward town property. Mr. Sczurek explained that Mr. Mocko also asked that the client consider removing material on the immediately adjoining town property that separates wetlands to acquire more flood storage, but the client was not interested in doing work on the town property because he felt they were already exceeding their flood storage with the pond and didn’t feel it was necessary. With that, Mr. Sczurek concluded his portion of the presentation.

Mr. McInerney then opened the floor for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Temple asked about sheet flow and how they would protect cars from going into the pond. Mr. Sczurek replied that a guardrail will be installed or wheel-stops along the parking spaces where there is not a curb. He stated that he felt, given the length of the space, a guardrail would likely be the most cost effective. Mr. Temple then followed up with a question about protecting against erosion on the slopes. He expressed concern about runoff, especially sand and silt, and wondered if a swale would be constructed. Mr. Sczurek said they could potentially create a stone filter berm forebay to trap the majority of the sediment.

Mr. Temple then asked about pedestrian traffic and how pedestrians would get from the southern parking lot to the restaurant and what would be done to discourage pedestrians from climbing over the retaining wall that separates the northern and the southern portions of the parking lot. Mr. Sczurek explained that pedestrians will be encouraged to walk on the Main Street sidewalk up to the restaurant entrance. He stated that the idea of some stairs in the middle of the retaining wall was discussed, but the developer was not interested at this time and that he would address the issue should it become a problem. Both Mr. Sczurek and Ms. Hope pointed out plantings in a roughly 20 foot island at one end of the retaining wall and wondered if Mr. Temple felt that would be enough to discourage pedestrians from trying to climb the wall. Mr. Sczurek also said there will be a guardrail at the top of the retaining wall, both to prevent cars from the upper lot from driving off the edge and to discourage pedestrians from climbing over the wall. Ms. Hope added that the Beautification Committee requested they add climbing ivy along the retaining wall as well, though whether or not that will discourage pedestrians from attempting to go over the wall is yet to be seen.

Mr. Temple then spoke on a topic he felt Mr. Kaputa would want mentioned, specifying his previous concern about discharge toward the nearby wetlands. Mr. Sczurek said that they have taken Mr. Kaputa's previous comments into account and the new plans address his concerns. Mr. Temple expressed additional concern about sand coming off of the lot and the lack of a curb along significant portions of the lot and Mr. Sczurek stated they could curb the areas of concern.

Ms. McClain pointed out that this property will likely flood at some point and wonders if enough is being done. She also expressed concern about the pedestrian plan and wondered if people might try to climb over retaining wall because, despite being unsafe, it still provides a more direct route to the restaurant entrance. She also wondered if more shade trees might be added along the southern part of the parcel to aid in cooling the pavement in the parking lot. Ms. Hope pointed out the trees that are part of the landscaping plan but stated that she would also talk with the landscape architect. Ms. McClain reiterated that the priority is shade as that will mitigate the heat coming off of the asphalt.

Mr. McInerney then asked Mr. Davis if he had questions or comments. Mr. Davis replied that he wondered why the building is not parallel to the street. He speculated that it is because of the property lines, but he pointed out that those are not visible while Main Street itself is. He asked Mr. Sczurek and Ms. Hope if the orientation of the building could be adjusted, making it parallel to Main Street. He also did not understand why there needed to be two curb cuts for a parking lot that will only accommodate 63 cars. He asked them to consider keeping it to one.

Ms. McClain interjected that she agreed with Mr. Davis's comments about the curb cuts and she felt that one would both be more aesthetically pleasing, and it would be safer for pedestrians.

Mr. McInerney asked if the second curb cut was a requirement or if it was simply a choice on how to direct traffic through the site. Ms. Hope said the second curb cut was intended to alleviate congestion in the parking lot, but Mr. Davis stated that he did not feel it was worth the risk. Ms. McClain also pointed out that, with 63 cars, it's unlikely there will be a constant flow of cars coming and going at the same time. Ms. Hope stated that the client and tenant like the idea of two exits from the parking lot, but Mr. Davis felt it was possible they simply had not considered the impact of this decision and the potential downsides.

Mr. Temple asked about the orientation of the main entrance/exit for the parking lot and it was clarified there is an existing traffic signal at this point, which is why the entrance to the lot was planned there. Mr. Sczurek then pointed out that the main entrance/exit to the parking lot lines up with Spring Street and the corresponding traffic signal. He stated that he has spoken with the Town Engineer and the stop lines for that intersection will not be changed for this project.

Mr. Temple expressed support for the points both Mr. Davis and Ms. McClain made about the second curb cut and also expressed his support of Ms. McClain's earlier suggestion about providing more shade trees to cut down on heat emitted from parking lot. Ms. Hope pointed to the trees already on the landscape plan but reiterated that it could be revisited to include trees with larger canopies to provide additional shade.

Mr. McInerney asked about groundwater and Mr. Sczurek replied the most recent tests, conducted a week prior, were consistent with what they have seen over the past few years: the groundwater level is about 1 foot below the pond bottom. Ms. Hope said they could submit a table of the data they have gathered on the subject. Mr. McInerney then stated that, after a recent conversation with Mr. Mocko, he hoped they might be a little more innovative in regard to the flood plan and connect to nearby wetlands on town property, given the willingness of the neighboring property to cooperate with plans. Mr. Sczurek expressed that would be a cost to the owner that he was not interested in incurring since it is not usable fill and would need to be hauled away. Mr. McInerney commented that there seemed to be an opportunity here to clean things up a bit. Ms. Hope wondered if there was a compromise that could occur which would result in improvement to the property as well as benefit the Town.

Mr. McInerney also wondered about what would happen in the case of a flood and what flood-proofing measures are being put into place. Ms. Hope said there are certain doors and windows as well as drains and sewer connections that make the building flood-proofed up to the 500-year flood line. She stated it is more expensive and there are more permits required.

Mr. McInerney asked about maintenance of drainage systems and Mr. Sczurek said that, twice a year, the sediment trap will be cleaned out and the inlet/outlet will be checked.

Mr. Temple asked if the pond would be a wet bottom basin and Mr. Sczurek replied that it will likely be a “moist” bottom basin, but not truly wet.

As a final note, Mr. Sczurek noted that impervious percentage for the project is 56% impervious; Raffa’s was 76%, by comparison.

**2. Proposed 29-lot Stallion Ridge Subdivision on 36.2 acres involving a 1,500-foot, cul-de-sac public road and one rear lot – site currently an equestrian facility at 524 Bell Street – Rural Residence Zone and Groundwater Protection (overlay) Zone 1 – Dutton Associates, LLC – Dependable Construction (Dan Gassner), applicant**

Mr. Jim Dutton from Dutton Associates, representing the client, presented the plans for the Stallion Ridge Subdivision. Mr. Dan Gassner, developer for the project, was also present. The site is about 36.2 acres. There is a proposed cul-de-sac road with 11 frontage lots on Bell St and the rest on the new Stallion Ridge Drive. The property is currently occupied by an equestrian facility. Mr. Dutton reported that there is wetland area along the southern part of the parcel and another spot in northeast corner. In total, about 5.97 acres (or 16.5%) of the property is wetlands. Mr. Dutton explained that the plan for the subdivision does not call for any direct impact to these wetlands. The uplands review area accounts for another 9.5 acres around the wetlands, making the total regulated area about 41%. He said that roughly 1.6-1.7 acres of the upland review area is effected by the proposed plans (detention ponds, backyards, and grading). To the south of the site is Town-owned open space. He pointed out that areas in green on the map indicated open space – about 15.2 acres in total (42%). He said that they are in the groundwater monitoring process and also that the site is within Master Sewer Plan area.

Mr. Dutton stated that the property is fairly wet and that there has been cutting and filling for the horse paddocks that has impacted the groundwater. Mr. Dutton disclosed that his father-in-law was the owner of the farm that had been on the property previously, so he interviewed him for the purpose of developing a pesticide testing program. Historic photos of the farm as well as the Town Health Department were also consulted. However, after testing, it does not appear to have presented an issue. He also stated that, after reviewing the DEEP Natural Diversity Database map, there appear to be no problematic overlaps.

Mr. Dutton explained that sanitary sewers for the proposed subdivision will be a combination system: for Bell Street, the existing gravity system will be extended and a low-pressure pump system will be developed for Stallion Ridge Drive to connect it with the Bell Street system. He stated that the system planned is fairly shallow and that the system presented is not an accurate reflection of what will actually be put in place—he indicated that there had been a miscommunication between himself and the sewer planner. He also said that, as an added bonus of the sewer extension, 16 homes that did not previously have access to the municipal system will now be able to connect.

Although the proposed development will fall within the Town of Manchester service area, it will be serviced by MDC. Mr. Dutton reported that Manchester has no desire to provide service and MDC is much closer, so it will be much easier for them to service the site. Regarding the open space, he also pointed out that nearly every lot within the subdivision abuts one kind of open space or another. Only three lots do not directly abut open space.

Mr. Dutton explained that there has been preliminary drainage analysis and that there are several drainage directions, though all eventually wind up in Salmon Brook. He said that they are designing so that watersheds do not redirect in ways they do not currently. From a water quality standpoint, Mr. Dutton stated that they are installing basins to address runoff from roads and driveways. He explained, however, that there are some houses that will essentially sheet flow a long distance before encountering a waterway, which he felt adequately addressed water quality concerns for residential roof runoff.

Mr. Dutton finished by explaining that there is no gas service in area, so the homes planned will likely be heated with propane.

Mr. McInerney then opened floor to questions.

Mr. Temple asked about sheet flow into the MDC property on the eastern side that was mentioned and wondered whether or not there were any wetlands or watercourses in that area. In response, Mr. Dutton pointed out waterways but said the soil scientist did not indicate any wetlands within 100 feet.

Mr. Temple also asked about the sewer plans and Mr. Dutton explained that a gravity sewer will be built along Bell Street. He stated, after consulting public works about the project, that the

sewer will be built along one side of road and the water line will go down the other. This will be done to maintain traffic flow in the area through the construction process.

Mr. Temple then asked about the propane tanks and whether they will be above or below ground. Mr. Dutton said they would be underground in areas that will be easy to access for servicing. 1000 gallon tanks are planned. Mr. Temple asked about heat pump systems and whether or not they would be considered as an alternative to propane. Mr. Gassner interjected and stated that alternatives would be provided upon request by homebuyers, but he felt propane was the most efficient both in regard to resources and cost. At that point Mr. Dutton remarked that in his experience, they've been installing more geothermal than heat pumps.

Ms. McClain asked about homes that will be connected to the sewer and Mr. Dutton clarified that he meant there will be 16 additional homes connected to sewer because of the proposed development.

Ms. McClain then remarked that, after reviewing the site, she wondered if houses could be planned in a way that would maximize the capacity for solar. She encouraged the developer to adjust the design, if necessary, to achieve this end.

She also pointed out that Mr. Mocko had brought up the issue of wet basements. Mr. Dutton said there is plenty of grade planned and, where that is not enough, there will be connection to the sewer system to address groundwater.

Mr. Davis said he did not have any comments but asked for clarification about the houses planned along western side and whether or not they would have retaining wall or if the grade did not warrant it. Mr. Dutton indicated that he encourages clients to select a lot based on the kind of house they would like. At this point Mr. Dutton also mentioned that they may be seeking a waiver for the sidewalk requirement since, in his opinion, it made more sense to have the sidewalk on the opposite side of the street where a partial sidewalk already exists.

Mr. Temple asked about discharge to open grade versus to a storm system – a gravity line. Mr. Dutton explained that water does not move fast through the soil at the site.

Mr. McInerney brought up Mr. Mocko's concerns about sewer depth and Mr. Dutton explained that was a misunderstanding on the part of his engineer. He does not believe they will have issues with bedrock because the sewer will, in fact, be shallower than the plans currently indicate.

Mr. McInerney also had questions about the timing of the work and asked that they be ready to discuss it at their next presentation. Mr. Dutton explained that they had not staked the road yet but that they could for a site visit. Mr. McInerney asked if they'd be able to provide some connectivity to other adjacent open space and Mr. Dutton pointed out where the current plan does account for that.

Mr. McInerney asked about plans for control of invasive plant species and also expressed a site visit will be important before they would be ready for next steps.

## **II. FORMAL ACTION**

### **1. Application of 26 Cedar Street Associates, LLC (Peter D’Addeo) to transfer the existing inland wetlands and watercourses permit for Edge Fitness (2855 Main Street issued on July 13, 2017 to 2855 MAIN REAR, LLC (Peter D’Addeo) – Alter & Pearson, LLC, counsel**

Meghan Hope, Attorney representing Peter D’Addeo, presented the application to transfer the existing aforementioned permit from one LLC to another owned by Mr. D’Addeo. They want to make sure the permit is held by the LLC that has more substantial financial resources in the case of fees with pending litigation.

Mr. Davis asked if there is any reason they would not approve this and that it seemed to be a fairly straightforward, “rubber stamp” application.

Ms. McClain did not disagree but took the opportunity to comment on the fee for the application (\$25) and how low it is.

**Motion By:** Ms. McClain

**Seconded:** Mr. Davis

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency transfers the inland wetlands and watercourses permit previously issued for the approved Edge Fitness facility at 2855 Main Street, originally issued to 26 Cedar Ridge Associates, LLC and transfers said permit to 2855 REAR, LLC, all pursuant to Section 11.7 of Glastonbury’s Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, in accordance with the approved plans filed in the Office of Community Development, and in compliance with all ten (10) of the originally assigned conditions of approval.

**Result:** Motion passes unanimously. (4-0-0)

## **III. COMMENTS BY CITIZENS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (none)**

## **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Special Meeting of January 24, 2019**

The minutes could not be approved because the commission had not yet received them; Mr. Mocko is working on them.

## **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **1. Chairman’s Report - NONE**

### **2. Environmental Planner Report - NONE**



Mr. Temple brought up an aquifer tracker he has designed and implemented that will enable them to share live information online that will help to ascertain groundwater trends in Glastonbury.

With no other business to discuss, Acting Chair McInerney adjourned the meeting at 9:04pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Audrey P. Beatty".

Recording Clerk