

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)
MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2023**

The Glastonbury Conservation Commission (Inlands Wetlands & Watercourses Agency), with Ms. Suzanne Simone, Environmental Planner, in attendance held a Meeting via ZOOM video conferencing.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members-Present

Frank Kaputa, Chairman

Mark Temple, Vice-Chairman

Kim McClain, Secretary

Anna Gault Galjan

Jim Thompson

Commission Members – Excused

Brian Davis

James Parry

Chairman Kaputa called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. and explained the public meeting process to the applicants and members of the public.

I. INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY

1. Application of Bradford Wainman & Draft Motion for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit for removal of pesticide-containing soil and replacement with clean fill within a wetlands area at 470 Chestnut Hill Road (former Carini Berry Farm) – Residence AA Zone

Chairman Kaputa asked the Commission if there were any questions or discussions. The Chairman asked Ms. Simone to confirm that the application is complete. Ms. Simone replied that there is nothing outstanding and added that the application can proceed with voting on the motion to grant a permit. Mr. Kaputa noted that Secretary McClain has not signed on to the meeting yet and asked a Commissioner to read the motion. Vice-Chairman Temple offered to read the motion.

Motion by: Vice-Chairman Temple

Seconded by: Commissioner Thompson

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency grants an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to WFI Property Holdings LLC c/o Bradford Wainman for removal of pesticide laden soil and import of fill within a wetland area and upland review area, in accordance with the narrative and plans (19 pages) Dated March 6, 2022 and in compliance with the following stipulations:

1. The Town of Glastonbury Health Department Memo, dated March 8, 2023 and the Town of Glastonbury Health Department *Policy Regarding Pesticide in Soil on Development Proposals* Memo, dated September 15, 2017 shall be adhered to.

2. Best management practices will be utilized, in accordance with local and state laws and policies, for the removal of pesticide laden soils in the areas identified in the above referenced application material.
3. The permit is valid for 5 years from date of issuance, and shall expire on April 13, 2028.

Result: Motion passes unanimously. (5-0-0)

2. Application of Amer & Carrie Skopic for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to allow for single-family house construction within the upland review area at 119 Ledgewood – Residence AA Zone

Mr. Jonathan Sczurek, Project Engineer, stated that he would be representing the homeowners. Mr. Kaputa said that Ms. Simone sent out an email earlier today regarding the previous property owners who came before the Commission in 2012. Ms. Simone recapped the violations of the conservation easement in 2012. Mr. Kaputa asked for clarification as to why two different conservation easements show up in the documentation. He asked which is the correct one. Ms. Simone replied that both appear to be correct. She explained that the area highlighted in orange is the removed easement area and the area highlighted in blue is the newly created conservation easement area. The Commission discussed the violations discovered in 2012, and there were long discussions regarding swapping of easements and creating a drainage easement. Several Commissioners said that they do not remember all of the details. Ms. Simone said that she will get more information. Mr. Sczurek remarked that this is the first time he is hearing about this and asked Ms. Simone to forward the information. Ms. Simone explained that the previous owners at 107 Stonepost wanted to put in a curtain drain system and reiterated that the highlighted area in orange is no longer the conservation area and the area in blue is the conservation easement. Ms. Simone will email the document to Mr. Sczurek.

Mr. Sczurek stated that the site is located at 119 Ledgewood Drive in Residence AA Zone. He said that the owners live at the abutting property, 107 Stonepost Road. Mr. Sczurek added that the applicants purchased both parcels in 2014. He explained that the plans were approved in 2002 and renewed in 2007. The wetland is in the northern portion of the site. The house is in a southerly position on the lot. The site plans include on-site well and public sanitary sewer. Mr. Sczurek explained that a change on the plans is the location of the sanitary sewer lateral which is located in the middle of the lot. The location of the well was changed to the back to meet the health code distance requirement. Approximately 2,050 square feet of lawn area was put into the conservation easement and approximately 2,660 square feet of fill area was placed into the wetland area. Mr. Sczurek explained that the activity occurred in 2008 and added that the area was cleared, graded and lawn was established. He reiterated that 2,050 square feet of lawn area is in the conservation easement and 2,660 square feet of fill is in the wetland area. He said that he is here to discuss how to move forward and added that he is open to ideas. Mr. Sczurek added that he wants to make sure that the plans depicted are regarding the correct conservation easement. Ms. Simone said that she emailed the information to Mr. Sczurek.

Mr. Kaputa said that the first concern is the ongoing violation of the conservation easement that has been mowed continuously by the previous owner and the current owner. Mr. Sczurek said that the current owners asked him to stake the conservation easement area. He explained that the pins are still there, as well as the stakes, and they were informed of the conservation area by Dick Megson. Mr. Kaputa asked how deep they had to dig down to locate the pins and asked about the fill. Mr. Sczurek

explained that, up near the road, there was approximately 2 feet of material, a foot of material in the middle, and then tapering off to 6 inches. Mr. Kaputa stated that the previous owners came before the Commission and were supposed to put in restorative plantings. The Chairman added that the plantings were not put in and the area continued to be cut. He asked the Commission to discuss how to convert the lawn area back to an easement. Mr. Kaputa also noted that the proposed house location is near the conservation easement and the wetlands. He explained that he was on site and observed healthy wetlands, some invasives, and added that the brook appeared to be healthy. Mr. Sczurek said a solution might be a split-rail fence and added that it is aesthetically pleasing and would provide a boundary.

Mr. Temple wanted to confirm if the building design is approved or lapsed. Mr. Sczurek said that it lapsed in 2009. Mr. Temple agrees with Mr. Pennington's assessment that the proposed house is too close to the wetlands. He suggested for the house to be moved away from the wetlands and added that they may have to plan for a smaller house. Mr. Temple added that the sanitary sewer has to be placed at least 75 feet away from the well. Mr. Sczurek explained that moving the house away from the wetlands would require a variance to the rear yard setback which is granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). Mr. Temple reiterated that the lapsed plans are too close to the wetlands and noted that they have a difficult lot which provides the applicant an opportunity to request a variance from the ZBA. Ms. McClain agreed. Mr. Sczurek said that they can look into a possible boundary line adjustment between the two lots. He explained that moving the boundary line by 20 feet might provide more room. Mr. Temple agreed with that suggestion. Mr. Sczurek said that they will look into other options as well.

Ms. Simone noted that the application was received on March 16, 2023. She added that the deadline for the mandatory action date would be the May 11, 2023 regular meeting. Ms. Simone explained that the applicants can request an extension of 65 days or the applicants can decide to withdraw the application and come back with updated design plans. Mr. Sczurek said that he will need to discuss this with the applicant first and added that he would like an extension. He asked if the 65-day extension starts on May 11th. Ms. Simone stated that it would begin from May 20th. Mr. Sczurek remarked that they have a couple of months. Mr. Temple asked Ms. Simone if she would write a letter to the ZBA outlining the rationale behind the variance request, wetlands proximity, correcting the violations in the easement, and other considerations. Ms. Simone agreed to write the letter and added that the ZBA evaluates hardships. She stated that this property likely meets the hardship criteria. Mr. Temple explained that the Commission is not trying to make the lot unbuildable, and instead is trying to find a solution that works better for the conservation easement and wetlands. He reiterated that the house location on the lapsed plans is too close to the wetlands.

There was a brief discussion on how to address the violations. Ms. Simone suggested a restoration plan to be included in the application. Commissioner Gault Galjan was in agreement. Ms. Simone asked the Commission for their thoughts on addressing the filling of the wetlands. Mr. Kaputa noted that he went to the site and did not see any new fill. He explained that he did not pay close attention and would like to look at the area again and added that it might not make sense to dig up the wetlands area. Mr. Sczurek stated that approximately 90 cubic yards of fill was placed in the wetlands area. Mr. Temple wanted to confirm that the Commission is not suggesting the current applicants placed the fill in the wetlands. Ms. Simone replied correct. Mr. Sczurek said that the previous owners placed the fill. Mr. Temple suggested giving the applicants some leeway and added that the soil may not have to be removed if the area is established. Ms. Simone suggested for an evaluation to be conducted on-site which details the impacts of removing the fill and the impacts of leaving the fill. She explained that this evaluation can help the Commission make the decision. Ms. Gault Galjan asked what it would take to

restore the wetlands. There was a discussion on evaluating and restoring the wetlands area. Ms. Gault Galjan suggested the applicants hire an ecologist to come up with a wetlands assessment.

Mr. Temple noted that moving the house is better overall for the wetlands system and added that he could probably overlook the wetlands filling as long as it is not a serious issue. He said that the current homeowners did not add the fill and that the cost of restoring the wetlands fill and area might be around \$30,000. Ms. Gault Galjan suggested that an ecologist define what a wetlands restoration would entail. Ms. Simone asked the Commission if there was a preference for a soil scientist or an ecologist. Mr. Temple noted that the submitted wetlands report did not contain any information on the function and values of the wetlands.

Mr. Gault Galjan suggested putting in a visual barrier and noted that several homeowners claimed that they did not know where the wetlands boundary was. Ms. McClain said that they do not have enough information and added that the Commission needs a detailed report. Mr. Kaputa stated that the Commission would like an evaluation report done by an ecologist. The Chairman asked Commissioner Thompson to provide a legal perspective on whether the new owner is on the hook for the violations. Mr. Thompson explained that, when the applicants purchased the property, professionals should have informed them about the conservation easement and wetlands. He explained that the applicants are responsible for the conditions on the property and suggested engaging the applicants and working out a solution. He said that the Commission is not trying to bankrupt the applicants and added that he has seen restorations plans and they do not have to be expensive. Mr. Thompson added that he agrees with Mr. Temple's points on moving the house and added that he is not in favor of excavation because it can create more problems. Mr. Kaputa remarked that his gut feeling is that an excavation is not needed and suggested a professional evaluate the conditions. The Chairman noted that there are 2 components to the violations, filling the wetlands and mowing the easement. He remarked that addressing the easement is easier because a split-rail fence can be put in to mark the boundary. The Chairman reiterated that there is a consensus for a professional to evaluate the wetlands. He noted that the homeowners are welcome to attend the meeting.

3. Request of MAIN STREET 2815 LLC to transfer the previously issued inland wetlands and watercourses permit from Sharpshoot, LLC –for redevelopment of 2807, 2813 and 2815 Main Street concerning a commercial building – Flood Zone and Planned Business & Development Zone – Alter & Pearson, LLC

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC represented the applicant. The site is located in the Planned Business & Development Zone and Flood Zone. Ms. Hope recapped that the site was initially approved for a free-standing restaurant in 2019. She explained that the applicant is planning to construct a bank, which would be much smaller than a restaurant and would have less parking than a restaurant. There was a brief discussion as to why Sharpshoot, LLC does not show up in the submitted documentation. Ms. Hope noted that the records show that it was sold in 2020 and explained that the tenant walked away from the restaurant proposal. She added that the client sold the property and what is needed now is the transfer of the permit. Ms. Simone confirmed the information. Ms. Hope stated that she submitted the letter for the first property transfer on October 3, 2019. She remarked that they will need to come back before the Commission for a recommendation to TPZ.

Motion by: Secretary McClain

Seconded by: Vice-Chairman Temple

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency approves the transfer of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency Permit (#19-03) for a proposed commercial building at 2807, 2813 and 2815 Main Street from Sharpshooter, LLC to MAIN STREET 2815 LLC in accordance with the approved plans on file in the Town Clerk's Office and in compliance with the May 16, 2019 approval, with stipulations. Permit #19-03 is valid until May 16, 2024.

Result: Motion passes unanimously. (5-0-0)

4. Informal Discussion on proposed commercial redevelopment at 2800 Main Street & 21- 37A Spring Street – Planned Business & Development Zone & Flood Zone – Alter & Pearson, LLC – All-Points Technology Corporation, applicant

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC represented the applicant. The site is approximately one acre in size and bordered by commercial and residential properties, including a Dairy Queen. An existing 5,000 square foot building built in the 1970s is on-site. The site is in the Planned Business & Development Zone and the Flood Zone. Ms. Hope said they cannot lose any flood storage capacity. She added that there is complicated grading on site. A two-family home was built on the higher elevation on-site. Ms. Hope remarked that not much has changed. She noted that the portion of the tributary located on the site was piped in the 1970s in conjunction with the other site development. Ms. Hope stated that there is little to no treatment of the water that goes into Salmon Brook. She added that they will incorporate a water treatment system into the plans.

Dean Gustafson, Senior Wetland Scientist introduced himself for the record. He explained that wetland 1 is an unnamed, narrow, perennial watercourse tributary to Salmon Brook. He explained that this wetland and stream system conveys stormwater discharges from the surrounding commercial development. Mr. Gustafson noted that the wetlands area is in a highly urbanized setting which has significantly compromised the function and value of the wetlands. He said that a high volume of untreated storm water runoff flows into the watercourse resulting in a degraded wetland that does not support wildlife habitat functions. Mr. Gustafson noted that the new plans will treat the stormwater discharge.

Ms. Hope said that they are redeveloping an existing building. She explained that they would keep the existing footprint which meets the building code regulations. Ms. Hope said that they plan on expanding the parking area on the easterly side. She stated that the Town Engineer indicated that a drop-off area for trucks is needed if the site will house a restaurant. Ms. Hope added that the Town Engineer does not want trucks on the street when making deliveries. She understands that the Commission has a hardline approach about permanently destroying the wetlands. Ms. Hope has asked the project engineers to look for an alternative approach that will not damage the wetlands. She explained that the engineers came up with a new and creative system. Under this proposed plan, the existing impervious coverage to be reconstructed is 8,274 square feet. The proposed impervious coverage (excluding existing) is 15,931 square feet. The net flood storage is 6.88 C.Y. The net flood storage is 50.95 cubic yards. Ms. Hope remarked that she discussed the preliminary plans with Ms. Simone and Ms. Simone suggested adding a cross section diagram of the 3-sided bottomless concrete box. Ms. Hope said that Mr. Gustafson's report details the mitigation and enhancements to the site. She added that the detailed plans were submitted and they are looking for feedback on this new approach. Ms. Hope stated that the landscape architect, engineer and Mr. Gustafson are all on call and are happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Temple asked about the size of the watershed. Mr. Chris Zibbideo, Senior Project Engineer, stated that the plans are in the preliminary stages and added that they will not change the pipe sizes. Ms. Hope added that they will confirm that the pipes are still adequate. Mr. Temple noted that there is no stormwater management report. Ms. Hope said that they will provide that later. Mr. Temple asked about the roof size of the 3-sided bottomless concrete box. Mr. Zibbideo replied that it is approximately 12' by 20' on the outside and smaller on the inside. Mr. Temple remarked that he would like to hear what the wetland scientist says about shaded wetlands. Mr. Gustafson noted that the evaluation begins with the existing functions and values. He explained that they are proposing a span-over feature, an arch crossing, in this urbanized stream system. He stated that the water quality is impaired and added that it does not support any fishery habitat. Mr. Gustafson added that the wetlands do not support amphibian life forms either. He said that adding shade to a stream is not a bad thing from a temperature or thermal impact standpoint. Mr. Gustafson explained that the feature satisfies the project objectives and minimizes the adverse impacts. He added that both options enhance the degraded wetlands. Mr. Gustafson explained that the main components of the project is to create compensatory flood storage, enhance the upland review area, and create a new wetland habitat. He stated that there are some invasive plants in the area and that this project provides the opportunity to create a more natural and functional wetland system and better water quality flowing into Salmon Brook with limited impact.

Ms. Gault Galjan asked what time of the year were the wetlands evaluated. Mr. Gustafson replied May and September. Mr. Thompson asked the applicants to outline the measures to protect the wetlands during construction. Mr. Gustafson responded that they would protect the area and adjacent streams. He said that a comprehensive mitigation plan will be included in the proposal. Mr. Gustafson explained that the wetlands protection plan during construction will include wetlands monitoring and contractor training. He added that there would be regular monitoring during construction to prevent any adverse impacts.

Ms. Gault Galjan noted that the building is small and asked if all of that parking was needed. Ms. Hope said that they need all of the parking spots due to the zoning regulations. She explained that there are currently two tenants, one with a restaurant and one with a different business. Ms. Hope explained that what is driving the number of spaces is the restaurant use. Mr. Zibbideo added that the restaurant requires a designated food delivery area. Ms. Hope is hoping for positive memoranda from the Town Engineer and the Police Department.

Ms. McClain said that she was also struck by the volume of parking and asked about landscaping plans. She suggested the plans include a solar canopy. Ms. Hope replied that they will consider that and added that they will speak to the neighbors about the landscaping plan and fencing. Ms. Hope said that they will go before the Architectural Site Design & Review Committee (ASDRC). Ms. McClain asked the applicants if they are using the guidelines about native plants. Ms. Hope has forwarded the document to the landscape architect. Mr. Temple asked the applicants to provide more information on the watershed and plans to improve it. Mr. Zibbideo responded that they can clean the area. Mr. Temple asked the applicants to give it thought and provide a discussion on ways to improve the watershed. Mr. Gustafson said that they will look into the options and will come up with a plan that improves the aquatic habitat. Mr. Zibbideo added that they will put in careful erosion controls and install the 3-sided bottomless concrete box without unnecessary damage.

Mr. Kaputa noted that the site appears to be on a corner lot. He wanted to confirm that the building footprint would be kept as is and the parking area would be expanded. Ms. Hope replied yes and added

that Mr. Pennington, Town Engineer, wanted two turnaround spots. She remarked that he does not want the turnaround spots to be mistaken for parking spots. Ms. Hope said that they will come up with something different. Mr. Kaputa remarked that a stormwater management plan has not been included in the plans. Ms. Hope explained that she wanted the project team to get information from this informal discussion first. Mr. Kaputa asked Mr. Zibbideo if he could provide some information on the proposed stormwater management system. Mr. Zibbideo replied that they will submit the plans which will include details on the primary water quality feature, a storm trench and basin. He explained that filter fabric will be utilized in the water quality treatment system. There was a brief discussion regarding preference for plan F or plan G. There was no consensus on which plan is preferable. Mr. Kaputa remarked that the box over the wetlands is unusual and like a bridge. He noted that there is a roof and added that he is not sure what to make of it and asked if the size is too large. Mr. Zibbideo said that a smaller box could be used which would measure 6' by 18' instead of 12' by 18'. There was a discussion on placing a reduced-sized box in an alternative spot. The nearby snow belt area was pointed out on the screen as a possibility. Mr. Temple stated that he would like to see the green belts/snow belts to remain on the plans and added that they function as green space, keep the heat down, provide snow storage, and beautify the site. He asked how wide the green space is. Mr. Zibbideo responded 10 feet. Mr. Temple said that shade trees can be added. There was a brief discussion on whether it is possible to change the parking lot from a two-way drive to a one-way drive. The Commission asked the applicants to provide more detailed information on the design plans, stormwater management plan, and asked for written documentation from the wetlands scientist on the impact of shading a wetland.

II. CONSERVATION COMMISSION

1. Recommendations to: the Town Plan & Zoning Commission for subdivision approval concerning the proposed 7-lot Crosby II Subdivision; and the Water Pollution Control Authority concerning a waiver of capped sanitary sewers – 539 & 551 Manchester Road – Rural Residence Zone & Groundwater Protection Zone 1 – Megson, Heagle & Friend C.E. & L.S., LLC – Rejean Jacques, applicant

Mr. Jonathan Sczurek, Project Engineer, represented the applicant. The site is located at 539 & 551 Manchester Road in the Rural Residence Zone and Groundwater Protection Zone 1. Mr. Sczurek stated that there are steep slopes along Manchester Road. The wetlands soils are located in the rear portion of the property adjacent to Route 2. The proposal entails 6 single family residential lots and 1 existing house. On-site wells and septic systems are proposed. Soil testing was performed with the Health Department. The soils are sand and gravel. The wetlands are located in the rear portion of lots 5 and 6. A conservation easement is proposed. All new lots will have driveway access to Crosby Road. The storm drainage will connect to the existing drainage system located on Crosby Road. The existing detention pond will attenuate peak flows up through the 100-year storm. The outlet structure will be modified to meet the current MS4 requirements. A 4-inch PVC pipe is proposed in the outlet structure. Roof and driveway infiltration, along with trenches are proposed to improve the water quality. Mr. Sczurek said that the issue of the farm dump was addressed. A letter from Loureiro Engineering Associates (LEA) determined that the volume of the solid waste on-site is under the amount defined as a solid waste disposal area as defined by Section 22a-207 of the Connecticut General Statutes. Mr. Sczurek said that they received a response from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP) Natural Diversity Database (NDDDB) regarding the species of concern; that letter was added to the plans. Mr. Sczurek stated that no activity is planned within the wetland area.

Mr. Kaputa asked about the size of the conservation easement. Mr. Sczurek responded that it is approximately 40,000 square feet, just under an acre in size. Mr. Kaputa noted that Ms. Simone included a motion to WPCA and asked if there was anything that needs to be discussed. Ms. Simone explained that the capped sewers are there in case the septic systems cannot be used on-site. Mr. Sczurek said that in some areas of Town the soils are not suitable for septic. Mr. Temple thanked Mr. Sczurek for the thorough analysis on the farm dump area and asked him to convey his thanks to the developer as well. Ms. McClain remarked that the language in the guidance document should be stronger and asked Mr. Sczurek to speak with the developer on the benefits of solar and geo-thermal energy for homeowners. She explained that solar and geo-thermal energies are a benefit which adds value to a home and also reduces energy costs. Mr. Sczurek said that they will look into that and added that, in the nearby development, a house put in three geo-thermal wells, and other homeowners are considering it as well. Mr. Kaputa noted that homeowners can see this as an investment that will pay for itself.

Motion by: Secretary McClain

Seconded by: Vice-Chairman Temple

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approval of a subdivision, in accordance with plans entitled “Crosby II Subdivision, 539 & 551 Manchester Road, Prepared for Rejean Jacques, Glastonbury CT, Dated February 28, 2023” 11 Sheets, with the following recommendations:

1. Permittee is responsible for the proper installation, maintenance and consistent monitoring of the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures. Permittee shall inspect the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures a minimum of once a week and within 24 hours prior to a forecasted rain event, and within 24 hours of the end of a weather event producing a rainfall amount of 0.5 inch or greater, to be conducted throughout the construction phase and until the site is vegetatively stabilized. The Environmental Planner is hereby authorized to require increased inspections and additional soil erosion and sediment controls and stabilization measures as warranted by field conditions.
2. The Construction Sequence shall be adhered to.
3. A private conservation easement shall be established as directed by the Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency and this area shall henceforth not be disturbed from the site condition as stated on the approved plan. The precise delineation shall be recorded by bearings and distances and shall be recorded on the land records prior to land clearing, excavation, or construction anywhere on the property. The recorded easement shall include the Town of Glastonbury Town Clerk’s Office recorded subdivision map number. The field located conservation easement boundary shall be marked with oak stakes labeled “conservation easement” with waterproof ink and tied with red flags, prior to land clearing, excavation or construction. The stakes are to be located at each change of boundary direction and at every 100-foot intervals on straight-aways. All conservation easement corners shall be permanently marked with iron pins.
4. The property is identified on the CT DEEP NDDDB recent map edition. A request for reviews shall be submitted to the CT DEEP NDDDB and the best management practices provided by the CT DEEP NDDDB in support of species protection shall be stringently adhered to.

5. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, certification from a landscape architect shall be required, confirming that the landscape plantings were installed in conformance with the approved landscape plan.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, certification from a professional engineer shall be required confirming that the stormwater management system was constructed in conformance with the approved design.
7. Trees to remain in the landscape, as shown on the approved plans, shall be protected with the use of high visibility construction fence during land clearing, excavation, and construction. Office of Community Development staff may require additional protection measures, as warranted by site conditions. The clearing limit shall be surveyed and flagged with high visibility tape prior to tree cutting.

Result: Motion passes unanimously. (5-0-0)

Motion by: Secretary McClain

Seconded by: Vice-Chairman Temple

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Water Pollution Control Authority approval of a waiver of capped sanitary sewers for the seven lot Crosby II Subdivision in accordance with the memorandum from the Glastonbury Health Department dated March 27, 2023.

Result: Motion passes unanimously. (5-0-0)

2. Recommendation to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review concerning construction of a ±2,750 square foot warehouse building with material storage and office space for a landscaping contractor – 115 Sequin Drive - Planned Commerce Zone – Matt Stephan, PE for BSC Group – EDI Holdings, LLC, applicant

Mr. Matt Stephan, PE for BSC Group, introduced himself for the record. The conservation easement area in the rear portion of the site and the tree-lined area were pointed out. Mr. Stephan said that the area contains sandy-loam soils. The proposal is for a commercial building measuring approximately 2,700 square feet. Mr. Stephan stated that the plans include a turnaround area in the parking lot, parking spaces, asphalt milling in the parking area, material storage bays, lawn area to store burlap trees, and a couple of retaining walls. He added that the erosion control plans are in accordance with state regulations. The proposed detention basin was pointed out. Mr. Stephan said that they propose several stockpile areas. He explained that material storage bays are needed for the business operation. Mr. Stephan stated that the drainage plans comply with the MS4 regulations and added that the runoff on-site will be captured. He explained that the soils are extremely good and have high infiltration. Mr. Stephan explained that the water is held in the basin until it is infiltrated. He said that the utilities on-site include natural gas, connecting to the existing sanitary sewer lateral, and connecting to domestic water service.

Mr. Kaputa did not see a landscaping plan. Mr. Stephan said that they can provide one and explained that mostly lawn will be added and the tree line will be kept intact. He explained that the applicant owns a landscaping business and will be open to putting in additional plantings if needed. Mr. Kaputa explained that the Commission typically receives a landscaping plan. He stated that the Commission does not want to see non-native invasive plants and added that they cannot evaluate without a plan. Mr.

Stephan said that they have the recommended species list and can add plants from the list if needed. Mr. Kaputa wanted to confirm that there are no plants that will be added to the site. Mr. Stephan replied correct and added that they can add some. Mr. Kaputa explained that the Commission does not want the wrong types of plantings put in and suggested adding shade trees for pavement cooling. Ms. McClain suggested pollinator plants to be added on-site and asked if there was any lighting. Mr. Stephan replied that there will be no light other than on the buildings, which will be dark sky compliant, and explained that the property will be gated and locked. He stated that they will provide a detailed lighting plan to TPZ. Mr. Kaputa said that the Commission reviews a landscaping plan as well as a photometric plan.

Mr. Temple said that he heard that pavement millings will be used. He explained that pavement millings can be used as a subbase and not the top base because it leaches off toxic substances. Mr. Temple asked the applicants to use crushed stone or something other than pavement millings. He suggested for Mr. Stephan to talk with CT DEEP or Town staff about the issue. Mr. Temple asked about the grassy area on the plans, the ones that will store burlap trees. He remarked that it sounds like an area that will have heavy machinery driving in and out of the lawn area. Mr. Temple explained that in muddy conditions, the area will be subject to erosion and added that the area may not be able to drain properly. Mr. Stephan said that the property owner is present in the Zoom meeting and can address any questions. Mr. Thompson asked about the waste that would be stored in the dumpster. Mr. Stephan responded that the dumpster would store debris from light construction, plant debris, and sweeping up the area.

Mr. Thompson asked if any liquid would be dumped. Mr. Stephan responded said that they do not anticipate dumping of any liquid. Mr. Eduart Cela, property owner and applicant, stated that the area is very steep with a 7 percent grade. He explained that the milling provides more stability and will only be used on-site temporarily. Mr. Cela said that in about a year or two, they will put asphalt everywhere, but they cannot put in the asphalt in the first year. Mr. Temple suggested adding this as a condition. Mr. Cela said that they can put in any stone. He added that, if the mills are not acceptable, they can use stone. Mr. Temple explained that there is nothing wrong with using recycled millings as a subgrade; it cannot be used as the top layer for anything in Connecticut because it leaches into the groundwater. Mr. Temple explained that adding asphalt as the top layer makes the material impervious. Mr. Cela said that he will pave the site within 2 years. Mr. Kaputa asked Ms. Simone if this can be part of the condition of approval. Ms. Simone noted that she just wrote that the area will be paved one year within certificate of occupancy. Mr. Temple remarked that this sounds like it would meet the applicant's timeline. Mr. Cela agreed and reiterated that they do not plan to dump any liquid. He explained that it is a small dumpster, which will also be used to dump leftover plastic wrap.

Mr. Temple asked the applicant to discuss the lawn area use. Mr. Cela responded that they will store stones, pavers, and other landscaping material. He can park the two trailers on the other side if needed. Mr. Temple said that he is concerned about erosion on the site and explained that heavy machinery, like a fork lift, will damage the grass and flatten the area. He noted that, if the area erodes, the flow off to the north and north west will not drain. Mr. Cela offered to pave the area. Mr. Kaputa remarked that it could work and added that a curb would have to be put in to allow the water to flow. He asked the applicants to include this on the plans so it can be reviewed. Ms. Simone asked Mr. Stephan if they can work on the revisions to the plans and have that ready for the April 27th meeting. Mr. Stephan replied yes and asked if the Commission would like to see gravel in that area or full pavement. Mr. Temple noted that gravel would be okay if the stormwater can be infiltrated and explained that they might have to put a swale on west side to ensure that the runoff is properly drained and infiltrated. He added that

the Commission wants to ensure that dirty water is not running off the property. Mr. Kaputa asked Mr. Cela if he is in agreement. Mr. Cela replied that they can do it. The Commission asked the applicants to come back with a revised plan that includes the changes that were discussed. They also asked the applicants to include a lighting plan and landscaping plan if plantings are proposed on-site.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Meeting of March 16, 2023

The minutes of the March 16, 2023 meeting were accepted as presented.

IV. COMMENTS BY CITIZENS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None

V. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Approvals Quarterly Report

Ms. Simone outlined the new quarterly schedule for the administrative reports. The Commissioners were in agreement with the new schedule.

2. Chairman's Report - None

3. Environmental Planner's Report

Ms. Simone briefed the Commission on the Great Pond Preserve Stewardship Committee meeting that was held on April 11, 2023. She noted that Mr. Kaputa and Ms. Gault Galjan were also in attendance.

Ms. Simone provided the Commissioners with an update from the CT Department of Public Health and the statewide measures to address drought. She explained that the State is promoting the use of native plants because they require less water and care and added that this reinforces the work the Commission has done in creating the guidance document.

There was a brief discussion on the changed agenda format. The Commissioners agreed to the format change.

With no other business to discuss, Chairman Kaputa adjourned the meeting at 9:02 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadya Yuskaev

Nadya Yuskaev
Recording Secretary