

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)
Corrected REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2019**

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

ROLL CALL

Commission Members – Present

Mrs. Judy Harper, Chairperson
Ms. Kim McClain, Secretary
Mr. Frank Kaputa
Mr. Mark Temple

Commission Members - Excused

Dennis McInerney, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Brian Davis
vacancy

Chairperson Harper called the meeting to order at 7:32 P.M.

I. INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

- 1. Proposed four-story, 131-room hotel and associated site improvements with 145 on-site surface parking spaces - 75 Glastonbury Boulevard, which is currently a 2.88± acre unimproved lot on the northerly side of Glastonbury Boulevard - Somerset Square Planned Area Development, with portions of the site located in the Flood Zone – Attorneys Peter Alter & Meghan Hope – Megson, Heagle & Friend, C.E. & L.S., LLC - 75 Glastonbury Land, LLC, applicant**

Mr. Peter Alter presented the proposal on behalf of the applicant. He explained that the subject property would be the last piece available for development in Somerset Square. Mr. Alter then explained the history of the project, which was originally intended to be developed as a twin site. He stated that, previous to this proposal, the applicant brought a proposal to construct 155 apartment units, which was approved by the Town Council, but never built because the design was economically flawed and did not meet a provisional requirement of Somerset Square to allow residential use to all of its property owners.

Mr. Alter continued by explaining that the applicant has now brought forward a plan to develop the parcel as an additional full-service hotel. One of the Marriott brands would be the user of the property. 131 rooms would be offered, and 144 parking spaces are proposed for the site. Access to the hotel would be by private roadway. He explained that the applicant is heeding the advice from the Town Council to create a green space along Glastonbury Boulevard, which will connect to all sidewalks, ensuring good pedestrian access within Somerset Square. He noted that about 32% of the site is open, green space.

Attorney Alter went on to describe some of the environmental aspects of the plan, noting that there is no wetland activity or permit required on this site, but acknowledged that the area has been disturbed more than once and is on a grassy field surrounded by large-scale development. Mr. Alter stated that he has *not* presented an environmental impact statement to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and to the Town Council. The Beautification Committee has recommended some changes, which the applicant has agreed to address, such as the landscaping elements. Mr. Alter closed by remarking that the applicant is aware of an encroachment from the second hotel but does not wish to disturb that.

Mr. Jeff Bord from Bohler Engineering presented the engineering and landscaping components of the site plan. He explained that the majority of the site is under the 100-year floodplain elevation, which is 28. He further explained that the Town of Glastonbury's requirement is to adhere to the 500-year elevation in residential areas, which is 32. Mr. Bord stated that the flood storage plan was submitted to Mr. Mocko and Mr. Pennington to discuss the engineering difficulties of the project.

Mr. Bord went on to describe the compensatory storage component of the site, noting that the 28-contour portion posed challenges, but the groundwater elevation helped. He further explained that the additional storage they were unable to make up via grading because of the raising of this site will be handled on the lawn area to the right side of the building. Mr. Bord stated that they did an analysis on the site in February 2019 to show that, in the worst-case scenario, they could store the flood storage that was lost as part of the proposed development.

Mr. Mocko asked what the proposed subsurface elevation of the underground flood storage is. Mr. Bord said that the top of the underside is at 28 feet, the bottom elevation of the chamber is 23 feet, and the groundwater in that area is 22.5 feet. He stated that no water gets to that location, so there is no need for the 2 feet of separation in that area. He also noted that previous applications have been handled in a different way, which do not work from an engineering standpoint, since this is only being utilized in the event of a massive storm event. He stated that it is odd that there are 100-year floodplains in Somerset Square because those are usually associated with rivers or waterways.

Mr. Mocko then asked if it is watertight. Mr. Bord said it is not, so that the groundwater can come up, but it is not a concern because there would have to be some sort of measure for it to percolate and get out. He added that the 3 years of data they have aggregated indicates that they will be okay in the event of a storm, noting that this is above and beyond what was originally planned.

Mr. Temple asked for seasonal information that reveals something about the groundwater elevation consistent with the applicant's proposal because the elevations are really close. Mr. Bord responded that they could gather historical data from previous approvals. Mr. Temple stressed that if the information cannot be provided, they will have to go with a bigger product that is thinner. Mr. Bord stated that they still have access to monitoring wells on the site so they will go and take reads to confirm if the groundwater elevation stabilized or not. Mr. Temple noted that some write-up in this regard in the environmental impact assessment would be beneficial.

Chairperson Harper asked if the applicant has to select a shallower and thinner product, is there an undesignated area that it could be moved into. Mr. Bord said yes, all of these chambers are very maneuverable. Mr. Mocko asked if Mr. Temple would be comfortable with moving the groundwater elevation from 5 feet to 4 feet, to be conservative. Mr. Temple said yes but is open to hearing what data Mr. Bord will come back and present on to make his case.

Mr. Bord presented on the stormwater quality of the site, explaining that this is a storm trap concrete system because it provides more volume for infiltration. The storage is 5,100 cubic feet, which exceeds the state requirement. Mr. Bord explained that they picked that area of the site because it was the deepest groundwater found on the site. Mr. Bord said that additional readings will be taken in the coming weeks to verify the monitoring out there now. Mr. Mocko asked if any soil analysis was done on the site. Mr. Bord said that no falling head permeability test was conducted, but some other analyses were done.

Mr. Bord then presented on the site's utilities, explaining that there are utilities all around the site, as well as an existing gas main whose easement will be shifted over. The stormwater is utilizing an existing stub. The water service will be tied up to Glastonbury Boulevard. Some existing trees will be preserved, as per request of the Beautification Committee. Lighting will be dark sky compliant with LED fixtures that are energy efficient.

In regard to the landscaping plan, Mr. Bord explained that the Beautification Committee had some suggestions on plant types and islands, which will be made in the forthcoming submission. Mr. Bord noted that their application does not include the installation of sediment traps, which will be in their forthcoming submission. Mr. Bord explained that the client wants to add a bike rack in the back location, and in the event of a large snow event, snow will be hauled off-site for storage. There will also be 5 handicap accessible stalls, which will be ADA compliant.

Mr. Mocko stated that a red flag is raised by the wording in the submitted erosion and sediment control narrative, which states that the site disturbance will take place on a type of wetlands soil, but there are no wetlands soils on the site. Mr. Bord said that he will double-check with the soil scientist who was on site.

Mr. Mocko stated that the foremost areas of focus in a limited environmental statement would be the following:

- Flood zone compensatory issue
- Water quality issue
- How the site as developed and planted will change temperatures of ambient air and runoff
- Provide mitigation measures for the issue of bird species flying into high-rise buildings and dying
- Erosion control

Ms. McClain asked which type of trees exist on the parking lot that are shade-related. Mr. Bord said that the Beautification Committee agreed that they liked maple in the parking islands. Ms. McClain said that this is a big concern because they need shade, especially with all of that black

top. She then asked who owns the 42 parking spaces next door. Mr. Alter responded that it is owned by the owners of 45 Glastonbury Boulevard. He explained that there is a constant dispute about who gets the parking nearest the buildings. A discussion ensued about the parking issue. Ms. McClain maintained that they need to be more aggressive about shade trees to mitigate the black top, as well as maintenance and the parking issue. Mr. Mocko agreed that the shade is needed and should be included in the environmental impact statement. Mr. Alter said that they do not want to bounce back between the two commissions.

Mr. Mocko asked what color the roof is. Mr. Alter said that they are not sure yet which color they will go with. Mr. Mocko asked if irrigation is part of the landscape plan. Mr. Bord said no, not at this time. Mr. Mocko said that he had offered up the idea of rooftop storage. Ms. McClain agreed that that would be a great way to go about it because it is more environmentally friendly. Mr. Alter concluded by stating that the applicant will address the concerns of the Commission; provide an environmental impact statement; Mr. Bord will revisit with Mr. Mocko, and they will return to the Commission on a formal basis.

2. Proposed four-lot Equestrian Ridge Subdivision (formerly Foote Hills Subdivision) - 582 Main Street, located on the easterly side of Main Street and the southerly side of Foote Road with a total acreage of 6.53± acres after conveyances - Lot 1 is proposed to be located in the Residence AA Zone & Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and Lots 2, 3, and 4 are proposed to be located in the Rural Residence Zone & Groundwater Protection Zone 2 - Mark Reynolds, Reynolds Engineering Services, LLC - Newberry Homes Company, LLC, applicant

Mr. Mark Reynolds, professional engineer, presented the plans for his applicant's proposed subdivision on 582 Main Street, just south of Foote Road. It is a sloping site that drops really flat along Main Street. In addition to the 6.5 acres, there is a tentative agreement to swap some land with a neighbor. The purpose is to gain access for a common driveway and to provide a buffer to the neighbor for a proposed lot location. The entire site is wooded, with no wetlands on the site. An intermittent watercourse runs to the east of the property up to Foote Road.

Mr. Reynolds explained that his presentation will focus mostly on drainage, since stormwater management is the largest element for the site. He explained that there is a ridge and all of the runoff on the site is represented by 3 sub-areas: a portion of the site drains to Foote Road, another portion also drains eventually to Foote Road, and a third section drains to a culvert on Main Street. Mr. Mocko asked if these are the existing or proposed drainage patterns. Mr. Reynolds said these are the existing drainage patterns and noted that he tried to match the drainage patterns out there with the proposed development, seeing an opportunity to improve the situation by shifting some of the drainage over to the culvert.

Mr. Mocko asked where the emergency spillway would go when the pipe becomes impaired. Mr. Reynolds said that everything is designed for a 100-year storm event but there is currently no designed spillway. He agreed with Mr. Mocko that in an emergency, this slope is really steep. Mr. Mocko expressed concern at the lack of an emergency spillway. Mr. Reynolds stated that a structural modification would make more sense because putting something on the slope would make it very unreliable.

Mr. Reynolds continued with other elements of the stormwater design, namely incorporating individual lot retention areas for the roof runoff. He also discussed the test ~~bits~~ *pits* for septic, noting that they have located places for a septic system that are the best soils on the site and that meet both the state and town health codes. Mr. Reynolds also explained the water service on the site. Currently, ~~wells~~ *test pits* are laid out all over the site. On the survey plan, there is also a potential strip for an easement for water, should the MDC want to serve them, though that will be unlikely. The plan incorporates both of those options at this time.

In regard to erosion and sediment controls, Mr. Reynolds noted that he has incorporated standard lot development erosion controls, as well as a ~~silk~~ *silt* fence along the retention basin. He stated that a couple of swales are incorporated to help shift the runoff from one area to another. Mr. Reynolds concluded by stating that he is open to working with Mr. Mocko on the detailing of the retention area to work out an emergency ~~situation~~ *spillway* that is maintenance-free.

Mr. Kaputa noted that he was at the site earlier today and saw that there was water flowing out of it. He asked for details on the monitoring of the groundwater. Mr. Reynolds answered that there was no specific groundwater monitoring done but estimates were done through the department. Mr. Mocko stated that he did not see anything that would be considered an open well, as noted in the site plan. Mr. Temple and Mr. Kaputa agreed. Mr. Reynolds explained that that is the location, but it is a spring ~~seat~~ *seep*, acknowledging that ‘open well’ is not the right wording. Mr. Mocko stated that it should be noted what and where it is so that it does not become problematic.

Chairperson Harper asked what kind of reaction the owners take to this. Mr. Mocko said that he has seen people fill areas on the site slope because they did not think there were any wetlands problems and the pressure of the water caused erosion and slope failure. Chairperson Harper said that, in anticipation of that kind of logic, the Commission should put some provisions as part of the approval process. Mr. Mocko explained that they can clearly state on the plan that it is a spring in a side hill that is active as a flow pattern, so they can understand upfront that an open well 8 feet by 8 feet is different than a spring. Mr. Reynolds suggested creating a treatment as part of the subdivision plan.

Chairperson Harper asked if there any other spring-type elements on the property. Mr. Reynolds said no, the biggest thing they noticed was that there are areas that are less than 5 feet to the ledge on the site. Mr. Temple asked if the drilled well on the property boundary is active. Mr. Reynolds said yes. Mr. Temple also stated that the applicant’s notes on dust control, specifically the paragraphs on spreading emulsion and excavations, need to be revised. He also expressed concern about the rain garden and asked for more information on the cross section that was provided. Mr. Reynolds responded that the rain garden is a BMP and it is up on the rise. He stated that he likes to call them out as grassed areas. Mr. Temple said that is fine, but they should be called out as something. He also noted a typo in the paragraph in the operation maintenance plan: “nay” should be “may”. Ms. McClain added that, in regard to the rain garden, it would be great to include suggested maintenance standards so that the homeowners know for what they are responsible. Mr. Mocko suggested a deed restriction or caveat. Ms. McClain and Mr. Temple agreed. Mr. Reynolds explained that there is no health department for stormwater, so it is something that falls through the cracks.

Chairperson Harper asked if a wetlands permit is necessary. Mr. Mocko said if no one wants to pursue that as a wetlands area, then it probably is not necessary, though it is a grey area. Mr. Mocko also explained that the sequencing for the erosion and sediment control plan could use beefing up. Mr. Reynolds agreed.

3. Proposed one-story, 7,500 square foot commercial building - 108 Sequin Drive, which is currently an unimproved 72,382 square foot lot located on the southerly side of Sequin Drive, to the east of 80 Sequin Drive; southwestern corner of the site is located in the 100-foot Upland Review Area - Planned Commerce Zone & Groundwater Protection Zone 1 - Attorneys Peter Alter & Meghan Hope – Wes Wentworth, Wentworth Civil Engineers LLC - JKS Systems, LLC, applicant

Attorney Alter presented the site plan on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the site is a 1.6-acre parcel, where the applicant proposes to build a commercial building that will house his office and non-manufacturing warehouse for electrical equipment. Currently, the business is operating in South Windsor, but the owner would like to move to Glastonbury. The site is in the middle of the Planned Commerce Zone, so it is a permitted use by Special Permit with Design Review. There is a wetland off the site to the side, and some of the activity is within 100 feet of that identified wetland.

Mr. Alter explained that since the building is relatively small and parking demand is low, only 16 parking spaces will be built. He also stated that the landscape architect for the project went to the Beautification Committee, who approved the proposal with no changes. Mr. Alter noted that it is a very low-intensity proposal, with just 11% building coverage and 72% green space on the site.

Mr. Wes Wentworth presented the engineering plans for the site. He explained that Sequin Drive is relatively level coming in from the west, but it does come up across the frontage to 12 feet at the center of the cul-de-sac. It is moderately sloped, but there are some elevation challenges. He stated that the parking is a vertical question and there is a 6-8% grade coming down the entrance from the driveway road. The site is mostly cleared, up to about 30 feet of the rear property line and the eastern portion has trees that will remain uncleared.

The storm drainage is designed with a sheet flow into an infiltration of detention basin. There is a suitable overly-sized storm drainage pipe in the street but everything currently drains down to the man-made wetlands, which is an 8 to 10-foot-wide ditch in the older sections of Sequin Drive. Mr. Wentworth stated that during a 1-inch rain storm, the whole basin will only fill up a few inches, noting that once they get up to the 100-year storm, they can charge up any increase in volume. He reported that because of the low impact and small amount of impervious area relative to the site, they were able to maximize the size of infiltration and detention basin. Mr. Wentworth further outlined additional elements of the site plan, noting that all of the lighting will be dark sky compliant. He noted that Mr. Mocko had pointed out that a lot of the trees approved by the Beautification Committee were more ornamental and not shade trees, so the applicant will revisit that to provide more shade in the parking lot. Ms. McClain stated that she was glad to see that the applicant will be leaving the meadow there and doing a mix of wild flowers and asked if the applicant would consider adding something to attract honey bees. Mr.

Wentworth said that they can look into that. She also inquired about the roof and the parking spaces, stating that the requirement is 13 spaces, but the applicant is going with 16. Mr. Wentworth replied that it is a peaked roof and the stated minimums were set forth by the zoning regulation, but the applicant/business owner has 16 employees, so he needs 16 spaces.

Mr. Wentworth stated that they have done test ~~bits~~ *pits* to check for groundwater and soil conditions in the first week of February but forgot to include it on the plans, though he did bring copies of it for the Commission to reference. He explained that he also left standpipes in the ground to read groundwater elevations but noted that the site had a history of being disturbed. Mr. Wentworth said that he read the groundwater elevations of the standpipes today: two were dry and the other two had 18 inches of water. Mr. Wentworth stated that this seemed like an inaccurate reading so he will reinvestigate. He explained that he had this all designed so that the infiltration capacity would be maximized.

Mr. Kaputa stated that he also noticed that the test pits had high water in them. He asked if the applicant did any soils testing down in that southwest corner, as far as looking for wetland soils. Mr. Wentworth said that he saw nothing in the test pits but will take another reading to see if the two 18-inch readings are accurate or not. Mr. Temple asked if he could do that by hand. Mr. Wentworth stated that he has been taught not to slot or perforate the pipe. Mr. Temple said to do it by hand and requested that he elevate the top of the standpipe so that the measurements reveal the groundwater elevation and not the depth.

Mr. Temple also asked about the snow shelf, stating that it is pretty close to the treatment body/rain garden, and if any thought has been made for snow in that area. Mr. Wentworth stated that he suspects that they will plow the snow into that rain garden. Chairperson Harper noted that if the applicant likes the concept of a meadow, they will have to mow it once a year. Ms. McClain stated that it is a good idea to include a maintenance plan as part of the conditions.

II. COMMENTS BY CITIZENS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (none)

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Special Meeting of March 14, 2019

While the members present reviewed the minutes and found no fault with them, they felt a vote could not be held because a quorum was not met. Instead, the Commission opted to accept the minutes for the Special Meeting of March 14, 2019 as presented.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Harper reported that Commission member Helen Stern has officially resigned, so the Commission is down to 6 members. She stated that Ms. Kim McClain is working on finding a replacement.

With no other business to discuss, Chairman Harper adjourned the meeting at 9:44pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lilly Torosyan
Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk