

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)
MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, AUGUST 8, 2024**

The Glastonbury Conservation Commission/Inlands Wetlands & Watercourses Agency, along 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

Justin Blain

Brian Davis

Anna Gault Galjan

Commission Members – Excused

Dustin Kach

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. Brief Introduction of the Glastonbury Forestry Inventory Project - Connecticut DEEP Urban and Community Forestry Planning Grant, presented by consultant Carina Hart, Mosaic Eco-Solutions

Ms. Carina Hart, Project Manager, detailed the project.

- **Task 1-** Existing Conditions Mapping: Completed by Town and included selecting parcels for inventory.
- **Task 2-** Community Survey: Launched last week (100+ completed so far). Establish what is most important for the Glastonbury community members. Will be evaluated throughout the project to direct inventory criteria and will be summarized in final report.

Tasks 1 and 2 are still active and noted that they have received 107 responses. She directed the Commission to the Town of Glastonbury website which has the project information and survey. Ms. Hart said that the survey is straightforward and should take about 8 minutes to complete.

Ms. Hart explained that the inventory consists of 1,500 acres of Town-owned land.

- **Task 3-** Forest Inventory and Assessing Planning: Completed. Conducting a standard forest inventory.
 - Identify overstory and understory, including identification of species both native and non- native

- Identify habitat features and ecosystem
- **Task 4-** Field Investigation. Began this week (week of 8/5/24)
 - Completed parcels 176, 217, 206 (southwest corner of Glastonbury)
 - Began parcel 76 (8/8/24)
 - Noted agricultural space that is actively being farmed
 - Noted abandoned nursery spaces with significant amount of non-native invasives
 - Estimated completion by the end of September

Ms. Hart pointed out the parcels on the map. She reiterated that the inventory consists of 1,500 acres. The survey on the Town website was highlighted. Task 5 will begin following the field investigation, sometime in October. The final report is due by the end of December.

There was a brief discussion on the Commission's role in the project. Ms. Simone discussed the potential for additional grants.

2. Declaratory Ruling that the proposed Timber Harvest on 3 parcels (north of Three Mile Road) is nonregulated pursuant to Section 4.2.b of the Town's wetlands regulations – N0062, N0062A & N0064A New London Turnpike – Rural Residence Zone – Joseph Quirk, Forester – Matchacam Ally LLC, owner

Mr. Joseph Quirk, Forester, introduced himself for the record. The property owner was present as well. Mr. Quirk provided a brief summary of his credentials and offered to answer questions regarding the proposed timber harvest.

Vice-Chairman Temple asked if there were any wetland crossings in the area. Mr. Quirk replied that there is a band of wetlands with no moving water; it is an easy spot to avoid and explained that an existing road with access to a cell tower is in the area. Mr. Quirk stated that there will be no impact to the wetlands. Mr. Temple asked when the work will be conducted. Mr. Quirk responded on the 15th, or when the Town grants approval. Mr. Kaputa asked for more information on the hemlock. Mr. Quirk replied that the hemlock stand is just a few trees is off the property. Mr. Kaputa asked if the hemlock will be harvested. Mr. Quirk answered no and explained that the hemlock is not in the harvesting area. Mr. Kaputa remarked that it sounds like there is not much hemlock. The property owner confirmed this.

Motion by: Secretary McClain

Seconded by: Vice-Chairman Temple

MOVED, that the Inland Wetland and Watercourses Agency reviewed the forestry proposal for New London Turnpike parcels N-62, N-62A and N-64A and finds the following:

1. The project will utilize existing utility road on neighboring parcel; 374 Three Mile Road.
2. The forest harvest will be conducted as described in the July 5, 2024 Notification of Timber Harvest and narrative; best management practices will be employed.

Based on these findings, the information provided, the assumed use of proper harvesting techniques and interpretation of Section 4.1.a of the Glastonbury Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, the Conservation Commission/Inland Wetland and Watercourses Agency declares that the proposed timber harvest activity is a permitted use as of right/nonregulated and therefore does not require a permit.

Discussion: Commissioner Blain wanted to confirm that the application is for a residential property. The property owner replied yes.

Result: Motion passes unanimously. (6-0-0)

3. Application of Daniel Pennington P.E., Town Engineer/Manager of Physical Services, Town of Glastonbury, for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to allow the construction of sidewalks along the west side of Main Street/Route 17 between Chestnut Hill Road and the Town-owned Cider Mill property at 1287 Main Street including drainage system construction – Flood Zone, Reserved Land & Residence AA Zone

Mr. Pennington introduced himself for the record and provided a brief overview of the application. He commented that this project had been before the Town Council nine times. He displayed the proposed plans. Mr. Pennington said that this is the final segment of sidewalk necessary to complete the Main Street network. The Town received grant funding for this project and explained that the most difficult section of the work was saved for last. Mr. Pennington directed the Agency to the magenta lines on the plan which depict the new sidewalk. He explained that the steep slope and sandy soils were a challenge and they investigated solutions. Mr. Pennington said that excavating the area puts the homes perched on top of the slope at risk. He explained that they looked into putting in a retaining wall that will be constructed from the top down to avoid excavation. They also looked into shifting the section of the road and added that Route 17 is a State of Connecticut roadway. He added that they received State approval to shift the road because it was the only allowable option. Mr. Pennington explained that shifting the road east also means that a retaining wall would not be needed on the west side of the site. Residents did not like the proposal to shift the road with the curb line closer to their homes; homeowners raised concerns of loss of historic character and brought up concerns about road vibrations adversely impacting their homes. The State of Connecticut paid for the study and it was found that the risk to homes from road vibration was remote. The study also found that shifting the road decreases the potential for adverse effects when compared with the option of constructing a retaining wall on sandy soils.

Mr. Pennington reiterated that the project is grant-funded. He went over the plans to install a storm drainage system and explained that there is no treatment system in place. The proposed system would treat the stormwater and would be safer because it would prevent water from pooling into the road. He directed the Agency to the plans and pointed out the proposed catch basins, discharge pipe, and grass swale. Mr. Pennington noted that erosion control measures will be in place and offered to provide more details.

Mr. Temple noted that the grass swale terminates into Holland Brook. He asked for more detail. Mr. Pennington answered that it is a pretty flat grade and added that it will terminate right at the

high water elevation. He reiterated that erosion and sedimentation controls will be in place and explained that they do not need anything elaborate at the end of the outlet. Mr. Temple said that he appreciates the swale. There was a brief discussion on intense storm events. Secretary McClain thanked Mr. Pennington for his work on the sidewalk project. Commissioner Davis asked about the utility poles. Mr. Pennington responded that they are working with Eversource and will relocate the absolute minimum number of utility poles. Property owners are sensitive about utility poles moving closer to their homes. The Agency briefly discussed formal action that will take place at the next meeting.

4. Application of Daniel Pennington P.E., Town Engineer/Manager of Physical Services, Town of Glastonbury, for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to replace a storm drainage pipe between 483 and 532 Matson Hill Road – Rural Residence Zone

Mr. Pennington noted that the Town's decision to move forward with this project is unrelated to issues with the nearby property owner. He explained that the Town has known that the 18-inch pipe is hydraulically undersized. The drainage plans were displayed. Mr. Pennington said that intense rain events have made the situation worse and added that it is an intolerable situation for public safety. He noted that the debris clogs the pipe, creating more problems, with the flow ending up in the road and over the curb. The flow has eroded the nearby agricultural areas, causing damage to the orchards. Mr. Pennington stated that the 18-inch pipe will remain and added that a 36-inch concrete pipe will be added to the drainage system. A sedimentation chamber will treat the runoff that will flow to the existing discharge point. They are proposing a double catch basin and explained that riprap will be installed on the slope to prevent erosion. He recapped that the project will increase the runoff capacity, eliminate damage to the orchards, remove the public safety hazard of water ponding in the road, and improve water quality with the sedimentation chamber.

Mr. Kaputa remarked that it looks like a good design. Mr. Temple said that it seems like an expensive option for the Town. Mr. Pennington explained that he had extensive conversations with the nearby property owner and added that there was opposition to granting the Town a drainage easement. He explained that the easement would benefit the property owners and neighboring properties. Mr. Pennington noted that the sedimentation chamber is an important component of the project and explained that untreated flow is detrimental to the surrounding downstream areas.

5. Application of Babatunde Ogunro, T & M Building Company for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit for single family house construction at 39 Saddle Ridge Road – Rural Residence Zone

Mr. Mark Reynolds, Project Engineer, said that the updated plans were reviewed by Town staff and added that he will go over the updates. The site plan, a GIS subdivision map and an aerial photo of the subdivision were displayed. Mr. Reynolds said that Ian Cole delineated the wetlands. The conservation easement was shown in orange. Mr. Reynolds stated that they plan to put in a retaining wall. He directed the Agency to the text on the plans:

- Soil suitable for septic

- Driveway grade max
- House location fixed by driveway, septic & grading limitations
- Short retaining wall necessary for grading

Mr. Reynolds moved on to the draining plan:

- Roof & driveway runoff directed to existing detention basin for stormwater quality & stormwater quantity
- Septic system less than 50 feet from intermittent watercourse
- E&S Perimeter Controls
- 4-foot high retaining wall

Mr. Reynolds explained that the yellow arrows on the plans indicate the surface runoff. Surface runoff will be directed to the existing basin across the street. Mr. Reynolds said that they propose a curbed driveway to collect the stormwater which will end up in the retention area, shown in purple on the plans. They will put in erosion and sedimentation controls during the construction period. Property owners will be responsible for the maintenance of the catch basin and added that this note is included in the plans. Plans were reviewed and concurred with by Town staff. Mr. Reynolds explained that they made it clear in the notes on the plan that it is the property owners who will maintain the catch basin. He noted that the plans meet the Health Department regulations and explained that the leaching system will be a minimum of 50 feet away. Mr. Reynolds pointed out the area on the plans and stated that the plans meet the public health code requirement. He added that they reduced the trench and pointed out the 55-foot distance in one direction and the 50-foot distance in the other direction. Soils are suitable for a septic system and added that they went over the plans at the last meeting. There will be no direct impact to the wetlands. Mr. Reynolds stated that the project involves 17,730 square feet (0.4 acres) of activity in the upland review area.

Mr. Kaputa mentioned that he was not at the last meeting. He read the minutes and saw that Ms. Simone brought up his concerns. Mr. Kaputa asked the Agency if there was any agreement or plan on how to protect the easement. Mr. Davis recapped the discussion on straight boundary lines versus organic boundaries. Mr. Kaputa remarked that changing an easement is possible and added that he is not saying that he is in favor of changing this easement: The easement was put there for a reason and added that the Conservation Commission is charged with preserving the easement. There was continued discussion on what transpired at the last meeting. Mr. Kaputa remarked that there was discussion on split rail fencing. Mr. Ogunro stated that the homeowners do not want a split rail fence and asked for other alternatives; they would put in a split rail fence if there were no other alternatives. Mr. Steve Temkin of T & M Building Company stated that the natural beauty of the property will diminish with a fence. Mr. Kaputa explained that the Agency is looking to protect the easement and pointed out that the deck is too close. There was discussion about past applicants requesting to cut large trees that are too close to their house. Mr. Reynolds stated that he understands that the Commission is charged with protecting the easement. He said that the logic of 80-foot high trees that have to be 80 feet away is highly restricting and creates an unbuildable lot. Their intent is to protect the wetlands and watercourse

and pointed out that there is a 47-foot separation. Mr. Kaputa explained that they want to continue to protect the wetlands and that encroaching lawn and lawn chemicals into conservation easements are happening all over town. Ms. Simone noted that wetland flag 5 is the closest point to the deck. Mr. Reynolds added that it is about 16 feet from the wetlands. Ms. Simone explained that a buffer is needed and added that there can be no further expansion of lawn. Ms. McClain agreed and added that there should be a clear line. Ms. Simone recapped the discussion for new conservation easements that include the planting of a shrubbery buffer zone and tree zone. Ms. McClain suggested a line of shrubbery instead of the split rail fence. Ms. Simone asked the applicants to provide a planting plan. Mr. Davis asked if the plantings will be put in the conservation area. Ms. Simone remarked that if the plantings are proposed within the conservation easement it can be part of the application. She asked the applicants to conduct a field investigation and provide a planting plan for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Gault Galjan noted that the applicants are not in violation of the easement; Mr. Davis agreed. Mr. Kaputa remarked that the matter was brought up to prevent problems in the future. Mr. Temple also agreed and said that perhaps the applicants can do something adjacent to the deck and not an entire straight line. Mr. Ogunro asked Ms. Simone if she would agree to a line of shrubs in the area of concern and added that it can be done right away. Mr. Davis asked the applicants to present a detailed planting plan and to flag the wetlands boundary. Mr. Kaputa asked for details about avoiding the conservation easement area during construction. Mr. Reynolds said that they plan to put in a retaining wall and added that there is about 15 feet of space from the corner of the house to bring in equipment. He explained that this area is also the access point for drainage. Mr. Davis asked if the stormwater calculations and capacity of the existing basin were approved. Mr. Reynolds responded that the plans were approved and added that the subdivision envisioned future development of this lot. Ms. Simone asked the applicants to look at what trees will remain and present the planting plan at the next meeting. She said that the planting plan can be part of the wetlands permit. Mr. Kaputa asked if the conservation easement area was marked. Mr. Reynolds replied that it is their intent to mark it.

Mr. Kaputa said that there was a machine in the conservation easement area, located up along the watercourse. Mitigation would have to be done if there is a violation. Mr. Kaputa noted that an acknowledgement of a machine was mentioned in the minutes. Mr. Reynolds stated that he is not aware and asked for clarification on the inventory and planting plan. Ms. Simone explained that they are looking to see if there is adequate coverage on the easement line and added that the removal of large trees might create a void. She noted that the planting plan can include shrubs to mark the conservation easement line. Mr. Reynolds said that locating large trees for removal was mentioned and asked for more information. Ms. Simone replied that trees should be inventoried in the area of the proposed deck, 20 feet on each side. She explained that, once the trees are cut, it creates large vacant spots. Ms. Simone explained that additional plantings of trees or shrubs will have to be put in to ensure the conservation easement is protected. Mr. Reynolds asked if they were looking for a general assessment. Ms. Simone responded that they are looking at how much exposure would result from trees coming down and asked them to come up with a planting plan. Mr. Reynolds replied that they will keep smaller shrubs in mind to

create a canopy of coverage. Ms. Simone asked the Agency if they were in agreement about a planting plan along wetland flag 5 to create a buffer to the wetland area. Mr. Reynolds stated that shrubs would make sense in the area of concern near the deck. Mr. Davis agreed about a planting buffer and asked the applicants to come back with a plan; Ms. Gault Galjan agreed. Mr. Temple asked the applicants to locate the largest trees, take pictures, and added that this might go a long way. Ms. Simone asked the applicants to revise the plans to reflect where the markers will be placed. Mr. Reynold replied that they had already done this. Mr. Temple suggested adding another placard near the wetlands area that bisects the property to better mark the boundary; Mr. Reynolds agreed. Mr. Kaputa asked when the area would be surveyed. Mr. Reynolds replied that it will be prior to the start of construction. Mr. Kaputa asked if this can be done before the next meeting and explained that it would be helpful to see how the canopy would look. Mr. Reynolds responded that they can stake the conservation easement line. Mr. Kaputa remarked that staking the area would clear up where the machine was. Ms. Simone asked the applicants to let her know when the staking is done; Mr. Reynolds agreed. Mr. Kaputa said that he will go out to the site once the staking is complete. He noted that, when he went out to the site, there were no markings and he was going by guesses based on the watercourse distance. Mr. Kaputa stated that they will look to see if mitigation has to be done and added that there was a pile of something covered in tarp. Mr. Reynolds stated that the area was used as a dumping area. Mr. Kaputa said that it something is in the wetland area and covered with a tarp. Mr. Reynolds added that he did not see it and he will go to the site and take a look. Mr. Kaputa said that the area could be found by walking up by the road near the watercourse. Mr. Ogunro stated that the machinery was brought in for the test pits and added that nothing else happened. He noted that the damage happened before the property owners purchased the lot. They will go out there to see what has been happening and added that they did not authorize anyone to knock down trees. Mr. Kaputa explained that he was there a couple of months ago and saw tracks in the road and freshly broken saplings. He took some pictures and added that one of the test holes appeared to be in the conservation easement area. Mr. Reynolds is not sure what to do about the plantings. Mr. Temple asked him to speak with Ms. Simone to arrive at an agreement; Mr. Reynolds agreed. Mr. Kaputa asked the applicants to mark the conservation easement boundary. He remarked that he will re-visit the site to review the machine activity to get a better feel of where things happened.

6. Application of 2283-2289 MAIN STREET, LLC, MAIN STREET DEVELOPERS, LLC & MAIN STREET GLASTONBURY 2341 LLC for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to allow redevelopment to include residential and retail with new parking – 2277-2289, 2327-2333, 2341-2345 & 2389 Main Street – Town Center Zone – Alter & Pearson, LLC – Peter J. Christian for HB Nitkin, representing the applicants

Attorney Peter Alter of Alter & Pearson, LLC introduced the team and displayed the site plan. He said that they have been working on this project for three years in an effort to bring forward the right kind of development for the heart of Glastonbury. The project must also be economically feasible for the developer in order to move forward. There will be no changes to

the Willard Building and noted that they do propose the removal of a 3-car garage. There will also be no changes to the Gatesy building and explained that they will remove the substandard driveways and create one driveway. He noted that the application was signed by all five of the property owners. Mr. Alter provided an overview of the work and review done by ASDRC and TPZ to promote the PAD amendment process. He said that PADs allow greater flexibility and remarked that he hopes that the Town Council adopts the text amendment. Mr. Alter explained that the developers will proceed with the process by going through each individual parcel, if the PAD process is not approved. There are no plans to expand to the west and wanted to reassure the Agency that it will be the case even if the PAD is not adopted. All development will occur within the identified development envelope. There are no direct wetlands impact and added that some of the work will be done in the 100-foot upland review area. Mr. Alter noted that the site is currently cleared and paved and explained that it has been developed for a long period of time. Mr. Alter said that Soil Scientist Martin Brogie will present and added that Mr. Ryan Deane, Landscape Architect, will introduce the PAD plan that is currently on the drawing board. Mr. Alter stated that although this is not the final plan, it is final enough in terms of environmental impact. He stated that Project Engineer, Mr. Will Walter, will go over the site engineering and erosion and sedimentation controls. Mr. Alter stated that he hopes the Agency can conclude that the project has a positive impact to the wetlands.

Mr. Martin Brogie, Soil Scientist, stated that he delineated the wetlands in March 2020. Mr. Brogie said that photos were included in the submitted wetland report. He added that untreated stormwater flows into a 48-inch corrugated metal pipe located along the southern property boundary. Mr. Brogie said that a sanitary sewer easement crosses the central portion of the wetland from north to south. He reported that the easement is generally cleared of trees and added that they found a dense patch of Japanese knotweed in the northeastern portion of the wetland area. A Functions and Values Assessment was included in the report. He noted that the wetland receives volumes of untreated water and explained that the primary function is reducing flood damage by attenuation of floodwaters. They have identified two vernal pools and explained that the survey report found very low amphibian population levels and low egg mass levels, which indicate that the urbanized wetland offers very limited wildlife value.

Mr. Ryan Deane, Landscape Architect, pointed out the loop road plans that were established with the Fire Marshal. The wetland area planting plan was displayed; the plants are 100 percent native within the wetland area.

- *Betula nigra* ‘Heritage’/River Birch ‘Heritage’
- *Thuja occidentalis*/ American Arborvitae
- *Amelanchier canadensis*/ Shadbush Serviceberry Multitrunk
- *Cornus sericea*/ Red Twig Dogwood
- *Panicum virgatum*/ Switch Grass
- *Schizachyrium scoparium* ‘The Blues’/ The Blues Little Bluestem
- *Iris versicolor*/ Blue Flag
- *Ilex glabra* ‘Compacta’/ Compact Inkberry
- *Rudbeckia fulgida* ‘Goldstrum’/ Coneflower (cultivar)

- Rudbeckia hirta/ Black-Eyed Susan

Mr. Deane read out the plant list for the rest of the site, noting that they were looking to add a Ginkgo tree to provide shade in the parking area.

Mr. Will Walter, Project Engineer, stated that they have worked on this project for three years and also worked with Mr. Mocko early in the design process. It is largely the same design and explained that they have incorporated many of Mr. Mocko's suggestions. Mr. Walter added that they have had multiple meetings with Ms. Simone, Mr. Pennington, and Mr. Braun. He said that there were no problems incorporating the input from Town staff: They will continue to incorporate the feedback and added that they want to be good stewards. He has been working closely with Mr. Brogie on plantings and cover in the upland review area. Mr. Walter provided an overview on the erosion and sediment controls. A double row of hay bales will be put in along with silt fences and no wetlands will be disturbed during construction. The stormwater plans meet the latest Connecticut Stormwater Manual, the MS4 requirements, and Town of Glastonbury requirements. He explained that currently 3.45 acres of untreated stormwater flows into the wetlands. Mr. Walter explained that the proposal will capture the flow into a bio-retention area, and then release it into the wetlands, treating 99.5 percent of the area. He said that the plans meet the stormwater management capacity and will provide more than required. Mr. Walter reiterated that there will be zero impact to the wetlands. He noted that the edge of the wetlands will be defined with plantings to prevent further encroachment of invasive plants. Mr. Walter stated that the edge will be maintained by the owner. He recapped that there is currently 3.5 acres of untreated area and explained that the proposal will capture 99.5 percent of the untreated area, releasing the flow slowly into the wetlands. This is a great improvement from a stormwater management perspective.

Mr. Brogie said that the landscaping plan enhances the wetland perimeter and pointed out that it is currently disturbed with invasives. They plan to put in dark sky, full cut-off, lighting. Mr. Brogie noted that they kept the wetlands in mind when they designed the lighting plan. He reiterated that the drainage plan will capture and treat 99.5 percent of the runoff. Mr. Brogie recapped that the project will enhance the wetland function to include treatment, metering out the chemical load through the water quality basin. The plantings will also enhance the wetlands and added that the project provides a clear improvement to the wetland function and values.

Mr. Alter noted that the site is serviced by public water and sewer. He said that the development will be mixed use, with restaurants, a bakery, and small shops along Main Street. There will be a residential component as well, to support the retail and hospitality efforts. The residential use will be located to the rear of the site. Mr. Alter stated that the Love Garden will be maintained and preserved. He noted that they worked with the TPZ and ASDRC, including ASDRC Chairman Brian Davis, and added that there was cooperation with the project heading in the right direction. Mr. Alter said that he is happy with the work Mr. Brogie has done. Mr. Alter noted that this Agency was concerned about the wetlands behind St. Paul's and added that this project protects the wetlands. They will work with the Town Engineers after receiving input from this Agency.

Mr. Davis directed the applicants to the retaining wall and edge, noting that it separates the pervious and serves as a transition area and detention/retention area. Mr. Davis asked about the plans to maintain that basin and capture area. He asked if the area is difficult to access. Mr. Walter responded that the area will be mowed and any garbage will be picked out. Mr. Davis asked about the access. Mr. Deane replied that there is a very walkable trail. Mr. Davis asked if there was a way to get in without crossing the wetlands. Mr. Deane answered that access is walking along the edge, noting that they did not flag the backside. Mr. Davis asked the applicants to indicate the maintenance access and to detail the maintenance plans in the notes. Mr. Kaputa asked how the equipment would get into the area if the area will be mowed. Mr. Deane replied that it will be done with a string trimmer. He would be happy to include this in the maintenance notes. Mr. Kaputa asked the applicants to go over the elevations in the parking lot area. Mr. Deane responded that they plan to put in a retaining wall and said that there is a 6-foot drop to the lowest point. The plans include lifting of the grade. Mr. Kaputa asked if there was groundwater. Mr. Walter replied that they have standpipes in the area which do not show groundwater. He said that they have the data available. Mr. Deane directed the Agency to drainage plans. The catch basins and roof leaders were pointed out.

Mr. Temple asked the applicants to test the fill for pollutants. He said that the test pits found glass, brick, and concrete and reiterated that the soil has to be analyzed for pollutants. Mr. Brogie stated that it is not uncommon to encounter fill material and explained that there will be no export of materials, the site will be restored, paved, and top soiled. Mr. Temple explained that the regulations do not allow fill that is known to be polluted to be placed back in the site. The fill needs to be tested to properly determine if the pollutants exceed the allowable number. Mr. Brogie remarked that his thought is about consistency and asked if this is required at other sites. He thinks it is more of an issue for export. Mr. Temple said that they have required other applicants to evaluate the fill and added that he does not want to expose the public to pollutants. Mr. Brogie asked what would need to be done if they found lead levels to be in excess. Mr. Temple replied that it would have to be treated as required. Mr. Brogie understands the process and added that it is a good point. Mr. Temple noted that he is nearby and offered to discuss this more with the applicants. Mr. Brogie will talk to Mr. Walter and come up with a plan. Mr. Alter asked Mr. Temple to provide the testing information to Ms. Simone. Mr. Temple responded that a simple evaluation is needed to ensure that the public is not exposed to pollutants that exceed the allowable limits. Mr. Alter asked the Agency to bring up other requirements and explained that they want to address everything at the same time. Mr. Temple asked the applicants to include snow removal in the final plans. Ms. McClain asked the applicants to include sustainability features, energy efficiency, heat pumps, solar canopies, and other things of that nature. Mr. Alter replied that they have had long discussions with the architects and will get the information. Ms. McClain remarked that she is looking forward to the project. Mr. Davis asked the applicants to provide a detailed lighting plan. Mr. Deane agreed. Mr. Alter thanked the Agency for their time and added that they are excited to move forward. He commented that this project is very important for the center of Town and added that they want to do it right. Mr. Davis thanked the applicants and added that he appreciates the comprehensive professional attention. Mr. Alter said that they look forward to coming back with a final plan for the Agency to approve.

III. COMMENTS BY CITIZENS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - NONE

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 27, 2024 - TABLED

V. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Approvals Quarterly Report – Presented

2. Engineering’s General Permit Quarterly Maintenance Report - Presented

3. Chairman’s Report - None

4. Commissioner’s Report

Ms. Gault Galjan informed the Commission that Sarah Bailey of the Master Gardener Program at UConn will speak at the upcoming joint ASDRC meeting with the goal of brokering a common understanding of native plantings. Commission members thanked Ms. Gault Galjan for her efforts. Mr. Davis appreciated the framing of the discussion which centers on brokering a common understanding. There was a brief discussion on the timeline for the joint meeting as well as the preference that the meeting be a stand-alone meeting. Several Commissioners said that it would be great to have such a meeting as an in-person meeting. Ms. Simone will speak with Ms. Caltagirone about dates and explained that the land use commissions are expected to have full agendas with new applications. Ms. Simone noted that September or October might work for a joint meeting.

5. Environmental Planner’s Report

Ms. Simone asked Commission members to follow the link to the Forestry Project survey.

There was a brief discussion on the Chatham Hill Road application. The property owner requested an on-site meeting to go over the conservation easement. Ms. Simone said that the Chairman was not available and asked the property owner to submit any proposal in writing for the Commission to review.

There was a brief discussion on the Town Center development project.

With no other business to discuss, Chairman Kaputa adjourned the meeting at 9:19 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadya Yuskaev

Nadya Yuskaev

Recording Secretary