

November 15, 2021

## MEMORANDUM

### INFORMAL DISCUSSION MEETING OF 11-18-21

To: Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency

From: Tom Mocko, Environmental Planner

Re: Proposed **Mixed-Use Redevelopment of five contiguous properties** along the **west side of Main Street (#2283-2289, #2327-2233, #2341-2355, #2377 and #2389)** on 10.5 acres **with an emphasis on** whether to locate the proposed **stormwater mitigation measures: within a disturbed wetland area** (in which the abundance of non-native, invasive plants can be more effectively removed); **OR immediately outside of the eastern limits of the site's wetlands** in a much more linear fashion (where no direct wetlands impact would occur, but make it more difficult to effectively manage the invasive plants) – Town Center Zone & Flood Zone – Alter & Pearson, LLC, Counsel – Alfred Benesch & Company, Engineering – Martin Brogie, Inc., Environmental Services – **HB Nitkin, Developers**

**PROPOSAL:** To redevelop these five properties on the west side of Main Street opposite the intersection with Hebron Avenue. Initially, the set of submitted plans did not encroach into the wetlands and proposed their stormwater management mitigation measures just beyond/outside the wetlands' limits along their easterly edge. Staff commented that the initial did not: identify all of the site's existing vegetation; and present any means to control the non-native invasive plant species located westward of the project's western disturbance limits. A large stand of the invasive Japanese Knotweed exists in a northeastern portion of the site's wetlands and this species is difficult to eradicate; therefore, a discussion about directly disturbing the wetland soils (to possibly remove the Knotweed's roots and/or to place a barrier above the remaining Knotweed roots in order to prevent stems from reaching the land surface) resulted, in which here we all are to consider whether or not to encourage direct impacts upon the wetlands for the sake of more effectively controlling the Knotweed. And, if we are promoting disturbance into the wetlands, then there is good reason to design a bio-retention basin or pond in that northeastern portion of the wetlands to facilitate both (control of Knotweed and providing more effective water quality mitigation) interests.

**REVIEW:** Please review the submitted materials (a written narrative, a wetlands assessment report & reduced-sized plans) within your packet.

Do note that the initial submittal represented: no direct wetlands disturbance; a 150-foot upland review area is involved; 92 percent or 2.6 acres of the site's already disturbed/impacted upland review area is proposed; and no control plan for the site's non-native, invasive plant species.

The revised plans within your packet provided spatial representation of the site's floodplain regulatory flood zone, inland wetlands and their upland review area. There's information on test pits and their ensuing groundwater monitoring. **Please peruse the two, C-3.1 "Lower Level Grading"** plans included; the first C-3.1 plan exhibits what was initially proposed, and the second plan is a conceptually red-lined version that illustrates the concept of a bio-retention pond's/basin's location within the wetlands, and the scaled-down previous extent of a more-linear bio-retention swale/basin system further south along the western limits of the redevelopment. The former Environmental Planner prefers to construct a bio-retention pond/basin with the wetlands in order to: provide more effective water quality treatment of the redeveloped site's runoff; provide more effective means of controlling the Japanese Knotweed. What is the consensus of the Commission/Agency.

The Commission/Agency may also wish to comment at this time on:

- The areas on the site where the existing large trees (species and diameter) should be located on future plans; and
- Any locations of the site that should be further protected by conservation easement areas.

TM:gfm