

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)  
MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 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

Dustin Kach (*logged in around 7:00pm*)

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**

**A. TONIGHT'S APPLICATIONS**

**1. 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. Daniel Pennington, Town Engineer, provided a brief summary of the application. He stated that the 4-mile continuous sidewalk project has taken 2 decades and added that they are on the last section. Mr. Pennington said that currently there is no water treatment and explained that the proposal will treat discharge before it enters Holland Brook. He said that they discussed the drainage plan with catch basin and grass swale at the last meeting.

Mr. Kaputa asked Mr. Pennington to display the plans for the grass swale. Mr. Pennington briefly summarized the drainage plan and explained that the project will improve safety on the roadway. Commissioner Davis asked if there were any changes to the plan. Mr. Pennington replied no. Commissioner Gault Galjan spoke about the pooling of water in the Main Street area and added the project is timely and an improvement to safety. The Commission thanked Mr. Pennington.

*Motion by:* Secretary McClain

*Seconded by:* Commissioner Davis

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency grants an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to the Town of Glastonbury for construction of a new storm water drainage discharge associated with the Main Street sidewalk project, in the vicinity of 1287 Main Street, in accordance with plans entitled “Town of Glastonbury Main Street Sidewalk, Phase 3C, located between Red Hill Drive and Chestnut Hill Rd and Cider Mill Property, Dated July 7, 2024” 12 Sheets and in compliance with the following stipulations:

1. Permittee is responsible for the proper installation and consistent monitoring of the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures. Permittee or designee shall inspect the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures 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. Necessary erosion control repairs shall be completed within 48 hours of inspection.
2. Site work shall be conducted in low flow conditions. The dewatering plan shall adhere to best management practices to prevent downstream erosion and sedimentation.
3. Area of disturbance is limited to the area shown on the site plan.
4. The permit is valid for 5 years from date of issuance and shall expire on September 12, 2029.

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

**Motion by:** Secretary McClain

**Seconded by:** Vice-Chairman Temple

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approval of a Section 4.11 (Flood Zone) Special Permit for Town of Glastonbury for construction of a new storm water drainage discharge associated with the Main Street sidewalk project, in the vicinity of 1287 Main Street, in accordance with plans entitled “Town of Glastonbury Main Street Sidewalk, Phase 3C, located between Red Hill Drive and Chestnut Hill Rd and Cider Mill Property, Dated July 7, 2024” 12 Sheets and in compliance with the following stipulations:

1. Permittee is responsible for the proper installation and consistent monitoring of the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures. Permittee or designee shall inspect the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures 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. Necessary erosion control repairs shall be completed within 48 hours of inspection.
2. Site work shall be conducted in low flow conditions. The dewatering plan shall adhere to best management practices to prevent downstream erosion and sedimentation.

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

**2. 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 provided a brief overview of the application. He explained that the existing drainage system is hydraulically undersized, creating ponding into the roadway and flowing over the curb into Belltown Orchards, causing agricultural damage. This has been a longstanding problem and has become worse due to the increased intensity and frequency of storm events. Mr. Pennington recapped the proposal discussed at the last meeting. He stated that the 18-inch pipe will remain and that a 36-inch concrete pipe will be installed. A sedimentation chamber will treat the runoff that will flow to the existing discharge point. Mr. Pennington said that they are proposing a double catch basin and explained that riprap will be installed on the slope to prevent erosion. He explained that the project will increase the runoff capacity, eliminate damage to the orchards, remove the public safety hazard of water pooling in the road, and improve water quality with the sedimentation chamber. Mr. Pennington said that they have worked extensively with the property owner and added the water treatment is necessary because the farm ponds silt up over time.

Mr. Davis asked if the proposed 36-inch pipe will still have capacity as the storm events increase. Mr. Pennington replied yes and explained that the oversized pipe would flush the debris and prevent clogging of the system. There were no further questions. The Commission thanked Mr. Pennington.

*Motion by:* Secretary McClain

*Seconded by:* Commissioner Blain

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency grants an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to the Town of Glastonbury for public road drainage improvements in between #483 and #532 Matson Hill Rd, in accordance with plans entitled “Town of Glastonbury Drainage Improvements, PW-2402 Located at 483-532 Matson Hill Rd. Dated July 5, 2024” 4 Sheets, and in compliance with the following stipulations:

1. Permittee is responsible for the proper installation and consistent monitoring of the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures. Permittee or designee shall inspect the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures 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. Necessary erosion control repairs shall be completed within 48 hours of inspection.
2. Site work shall be conducted in low flow conditions. The dewatering plan shall adhere to best management practices to prevent downstream erosion and sedimentation.
3. Area of disturbance is limited to the area shown on the site plan.
4. The permit is valid for 5 years from date of issuance and shall expire on September 12, 2029.

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

**3. 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, P.E., introduced himself and the team. Mr. Kaputa asked Ms. Simone to recap the open items. Ms. Simone replied that the conservation easement line is to be marked and the proposed trees to be cut to determine the canopy coverage are to be reviewed. She noted that the applicants submitted more information that addresses the open items. Mr. Reynolds said that the diagram he provided measures the distances and offsets in the areas of concern. He directed the Commission to the diagram detailing the canopy inventory/analysis. He stated that tree #10, a 24-inch maple will be preserved. Mr. Reynolds added that trees numbered 6-9 do not directly contribute to the wetland canopy and trees numbered 1-5 are within the conservation easement and provide wetland canopy. Mr. Reynolds reiterated that tree #10 will be preserved and added that it is in good shape and far enough from the deck and house. He addressed Mr. Braun's comments and will speak about the 3 revisions to the plan.

Commissioner Gault Gajan asked Mr. Reynolds to point out trees 1-5; Mr. Reynolds did. He explained that he spoke with Mr. Braun and they will construct a 2-foot high berm to maintain the existing drainage pattern. Mr. Reynolds went over the other revisions which include planting a row of appropriate shrubs along the conservation easement and preserving the 24-inch maple tree.

Mr. Kaputa asked for more detail on the berm. Mr. Reynolds responded that the plan is to accentuate what is out there and explained that the goal is to direct the runoff to the detention basin and to protect the watercourse from further erosion. He noted that water tends to collect in an area and they want to address it to avoid problems. Ms. Simone asked if there is any advantage to keeping the vegetation. Mr. Reynolds replied that there will be no clearing in that area. Mr. Kaputa said that the trees and vegetation would soak up the water. Mr. Davis asked the applicants to outline the measures to protect tree roots from damage. Mr. Reynolds said that they will use fill and added that they will leave room for the base of the trees. Mr. Kaputa noted that the shrubs are a good idea and asked others to weigh in. Mr. Davis explained that a continuous line detracts from an organic aesthetic and suggested the shrubs not be placed in a straight line. Secretary McClain explained that a clear demarcation is needed. Mr. Davis said that placards will be put in place. Ms. McClain suggested a line of blueberry bushes and added that they do not all grow in the same size. Mr. Davis suggested a mixture of shrubs, not in a straight line. He remarked that they should not have to sacrifice one advantage for another. Ms. Gault Galjan explained that her view is that the Commission should not impose plantings that are outside of the easement and agreed with Mr. Davis's middle ground approach. Mr. Blain agreed with Ms. Gault Galjan and added that the homeowner should choose. He asked if there was language in the condition of approval that defines encroachment. Ms. Simone responded that it is a not a standard topic that gets addressed and added that this is worked out in the site plan phase. Mr. Kaputa explained that the Commission does not have a say if the plantings are outside of the easement and pointed out that the site is part of the upland review area which falls

under the Agency's purview. Mr. Kaputa suggested that recommendations are made once the area is clear and explained that there could be some gaps that open up to the lawn and added that placards disappear. Ms. Simone asked the Commission if this is something they would like to see in the draft motion, requiring the applicant to plant more shrubs depending on the field results. Mr. Kaputa replied yes. Ms. McClain noted that it sounds reasonable. Mr. Reynolds stated that they are agreeable to the condition; Mr. Ogunro agreed as well. There was a brief discussion on whether a planting plan with general quantities was required. The consensus was that the applicants will follow up with Ms. Simone following the site clearing and the area will be evaluated to see if plantings are needed in some areas. Mr. Davis thanked Mr. Reynolds for providing the information on the canopy analysis. Mr. Kaputa thanked the applicants.

**4. 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 Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC provided a brief update on the meeting that took place yesterday with Ms. Simone and Vice-Chairman Temple. Ms. Hope noted that the soil and test pit report was submitted in the packet. She stated that a soil management plan will be created which will identify the location of stockpile areas, with soils placed under pavement or under a building. Ms. Hope said that the plans can be included in the erosion and sedimentation plan or it can be a separate plan. Ms. Simone said that the takeaway from the meeting was that further investigation is needed and asked the Commission if they agree to Vice-Chairman Temple being the lead person on this. The Commission members agreed. Ms. Gault Galjan asked for a summary of the report. Mr. Temple explained that he asked for the laboratory analysis to be done and the report came back that the fill is contaminated with a number of things including pesticides, petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, lead, etc. He explained that the results indicate that the pollutants exceed the direct exposure criteria. Mr. Temple said that the focus of the report was the wetlands and not the concern about soil leaching. He explained that the concern is elevated arsenic and lead levels in the soil can cause harm to children and the public. Mr. Temple stated that the applicant agreed to conduct test pits to determine the extent of the exposure and to come up with a plan that keeps the public safe. Ms. Gault Galjan commended Mr. Temple for his efforts. Mr. Temple stated that the lead is twice the direct exposure limit and added that it is harmful to young children. He explained that the lead and contaminated soils can be encapsulated to prevent exposure. Ms. McClain also thanked Mr. Temple. Mr. Davis asked if the developer is on board with the plans. Ms. Hope replied yes and added that they will have all of the information at the next meeting.

**B. APPLICATIONS RECEIVED FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS**

**1. 108 Chamberlain Lane – 1-lot subdivision - Date of Receipt: September 12, 2024 - Presentation: September 26, 2024 (tentative)**

**2. 1597 New London Turnpike – 2-lot subdivision - Date of Receipt: September 12, 2024 - Presentation: September 26, 2024 (tentative)**

**3. 36 Hopewell Road – multi-family apartment building - Date of Receipt: September 12, 2024 - Presentation: September 26, 2024 (tentative)**

The Commission briefly discussed the upcoming agenda items and agreed to include this category in future agendas.

## **II. CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**1. Recommendation to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission regarding a Section 4.11 Flood Zone Special 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 Zones**

The Commission provided a favorable recommendation for this agenda item during its wetlands permit discussion.

**2. Recommendation to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission regarding a Section 4.11 Flood Zone Special Permit concerning a building addition at the Glastonbury Veterinary Hospital – 121 Pratt Street – Town Center Mixed Use & Flood Zones – Attorney Meghan Hope –Haviar Real Estate, LLC, applicant**

Attorney Hope introduced herself for the record. Mr. Jim Dutton was present for the meeting. Ms. Hope stated that no work is proposed in the wetlands and upland review area. The proposed addition is just under 900 square feet. The line indicating the flood zone limits was displayed. Ms. Hope said that everything is outside of the flood zone except for the light posts. She stated that Mr. Dutton has done the calculations and found that the site has more than enough compensatory flood storage. Underground chambers were pointed out. Mr. Dutton confirmed the information.

Mr. Kaputa remarked that the site is flat and added that he did not visit the site. Mr. Dutton explained that Mr. Braun did not approve the initial plans for the runoff to enter the roof drains, but the current plans are approved by the Engineering Department. Mr. Dutton stated that they have 10 times the compensatory flood storage needed. Ms. McClain wanted to confirm that the lighting is dark sky compliant. Mr. Dutton replied yes. Ms. McClain asked about the height of the light poles. Mr. Davis responded that the lights are residential in scale, and Mr. Blain said that the light appears to be 10 feet tall. Mr. Davis noted that the Architectural Site and Design Review Committee (ASDRC) reviewed the lighting and the application. There were no further questions.

***Motion by:*** Secretary McClain

***Seconded by:*** Vice-Chairman Temple

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approval of a Section 4.11 (Flood Zone) Special Permit for Town of Glastonbury for installation of two light posts within the flood zone in accordance with plans entitled “Proposed Addition, 121 Pratt Street, Glastonbury CT. Dated September 3, 2024” 7 Sheets and in compliance with the following stipulations:

1. Permittee is responsible for the proper installation and consistent monitoring of the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures. Permittee or designee 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. Necessary repairs shall be conducted within 48 hours of inspection.
2. Area of disturbance is limited to the area shown on the site plan.

**Result:** Motion passes unanimously. (7-0-0)

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

### **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

#### **1. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 27, 2024**

The minutes were approved as presented. (7-0-0)

#### **2. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 8, 2024**

Ms. Gault Galjan directed the Commission to page 7, top of the page, which reads: “Mr. Davis agreed about a planting buffer and asked the applicants to come back with a plan; Ms. Gault Galjan agreed.” The Commission agreed to change the sentence to: “Mr. Davis disagreed that a planting plan should be required. Ms. Gault Galjan disagreed that a planting should be required.”

The minutes were approved as corrected. (7-0-0)

### **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **1. Chairman’s Report NONE**

#### **2. Commissioner’s Report NONE**

### **3. Environmental Planner's Report**

Ms. Simone provided an update on 216 Thompson Street. She said that the property owners received approval to spray for invasives and remove the bittersweet. Ms. Simone noted that the next step in the process is the planting of pine trees in the spring.

Ms. Simone stated that the upcoming native plant talk is slated for October 23, 2024, from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm. The Commission briefly discussed the upcoming meeting format and agenda. Ms. Simone added that the meeting will be noticed and open to the public. The Commission discussed the objectives of the meeting and possible moderators. Ms. McClain suggested creating a working group to come up with a shared template. Several Commission members agreed to the suggestion. Ms. Gault Galjan offered to work with Ms. Simone on the upcoming agenda.

With no other business to discuss, Chairman Kaputa adjourned the meeting at 8:02 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Nadya Yuskaev*

Recording Secretary