

THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF AVON HELD A MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2018 AT THE AVON TOWN HALL.

Present were Clifford Thier, Chair, Michael Beauchamp, Vice Chair, Bob Breckinridge, Dean Applefield, and Michael Feldman. Also present were John McCahill, Planning and Community Development Specialist/Wetlands Agent and Christine Campasano, IWC Clerk. Jed Usich and Martha Dean were absent.

Mr. Thier called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

No communication items from the public were received.

NEW APPLICATION:

APPL. #754 – PDP Financial LLC and Sterling Property Services LLC, owners; Sunlight Construction Inc., applicant: Requests activity within the 100' upland review area: 1) Clear, grub and construct low-pressure sanitary within setback area 2) Clear, grub, grade and establish lawns within setback area 3) Clear, grub, grade, construct dwellings, driveways, utilities and establish lawns within setback area. 110 Bronson Road, Parcel 1490110 and 125 Hollister Drive, Parcel 2770125.

Mr. Thier read the application description into the record. Attorney Bob Meyers spoke on behalf of the applicant. He explained that the application was for the northerly extension of the Stratford Crossing subdivision which was approved four (4) years ago. He stated the professionals present for this application were William Ferrigno, Sunlight Construction LLC, applicant; William Aston, Buck & Buck, LLC, engineer; and Michael Klein, certified soil scientist.

William Aston, principal at Buck & Buck Engineers designed this project which includes nine (9) lots on two (2) large parcels of land; plus one (1) existing lot which was approved in the previous subdivision along with two (2) pieces of open space. He explained the project meets the density requirement as shown on sheet OS1 of the submitted plans which allows the applicant to build nine (9) lots. Two (2) lots will have frontage on Hollister Drive and the remaining lots have frontage either on Stratford Crossing or the cul-de-sac for Beechwood Hollow. The lots will be served by public water by the existing water main at Stratford Crossing or by an extension of the water main on Hollister Drive. Big Brook runs through the eastern portion of the property from north to south. There is delineated flood plain as identified by FEMA with no determined flood elevation; the flood plain is all within the wetlands area which will be included in the proposed open space for the subdivision.

Mr. Aston then spoke to the wetland impacts as shown on the plans submitted with the application. These activities correspond to the activities listed in the package. Activity #1 is to install a force main around the top of the finger of wetlands which will terminate at Hollister Drive. The force main will be installed as a dual force main with a 2.5" force main being installed for future use by the Town of Avon to service the Oxbow and Woodhaven areas. A smaller force main will be installed in the same trench to serve the houses proposed in this subdivision. The only utility going through the center of the property is the force main.

The force main is laid out so that it has a clean-out at both ends so that there will be no need for any traffic along the force main adjacent to the wetlands in the future. They should be able to maintain on both ends. There are no manholes in that area as shown on the sewer profile.

Commissioners questioned where the sewer profile was located in the plan set. John McCahill responded by pointing out that a portion of the sewer profile was provided on the plan as shown on SD1; a small cross section of the profile was included. The relative elevation of the land is shown on the cross section.

Mr. Aston added that the advantage of the force main is that it can follow the slope of the land very closely, and it only has to be 5' deep so the excavation to install it is easy, and there is minimal disturbance.

Mr. Aston noted that all the activities he is listing correspond to the activities listed in the package of materials. Activity #1 is flagged as 4+0 – 7+0. Activity #2 is to clear, grub, grade and establish lawns in the setback areas in the back yards for the lots and .44 acres of setback will be disturbed. Activity #3 includes the installation of driveways, utilities and a portion of a house; the houses on Hollister are in the upland review area. The two (2) lots on Hollister Drive have .6 acres of disturbance in the setback area. As shown on the map, the property has a large pocket of wetlands which is included in the conservation area for the back lot and the other frontage lot on Hollister has a portion of wetlands; with the conservation area around that wetland is approximately 20' from the existing wetlands which was a previous standard.

Mr. Aston noted there will be 7.94 acres of designated open space. He finished his portion of the presentation and turned the meeting over to Michael Klein. Michael Klein introduced himself as a registered soil scientist and biologist with an office in West Hartford. Mr. Klein noted that he previously marked the wetlands boundaries on site; a major portion is associated with Big Brook which was flagged in 2012. He extended the delineation in 2013 when the land was added to the northern portion of the site. He stated he was at the site last week and many of the wetland flags from 2013 were still present and substantially correct.

He conducted biological surveys and identified the functions and values of the wetland systems. There are two (2) wetland systems associated with Big Brook; there is somewhat of a bifurcation in regards to the character of the wetlands. The lower/eastern portion is subject to flooding and has an important function for floodwater storage and the upper western portion extending up slope in the center of the site is primarily for groundwater discharge; groundwater slopes along the lower portion of wetland and near the force main.

Mr. Klein noted a correction to his report in Section 6.0 Natural Diversity Database Review. The most recent NDDDB mapping that was reviewed should read December 2017; Mr. Klein stated he went back and verified it with another database. There were no areas on the NDDDB near the site; the closest area shown on the map was 1550' to the north.

Wetland 1 includes groundwater recharge/discharge and flood flow alteration. The westernmost portion of the wetland contains areas of groundwater discharge which flows overland to Big Brook. The second function is floodwater storage. The eastern portion is subject to flooding and has an important function for floodwater storage. The upper portion along the western perimeter is primarily associated with groundwater discharge. Wetland 2 is a small isolated wetland

immediately adjacent to a heavily traveled collector street and residential development. Those factors reduce the ability for this wetland to provide significant wetland functions. There is a minor flood storage function due to the restricted outlet created by the culvert under Hollister Drive. Mr. Aston referenced the SD1 site development plan. He clarified to the Commissioners that this sheet was not provided in their materials - SD1 and the regulated activities are superimposed on the sheet.

In regards to wetland impacts, Mr. Klein stated as Mr. Aston had already mentioned, there is no activity in the wetlands and no direct impact. No wetlands or watercourses will be filled, dredged, cleared, graded, channelized or otherwise altered; however, because of the configuration of the wetlands, indirect impact may occur. Indirect wetlands impact may occur since almost any development requires work in the upland review area (URA) and may have potential for indirect adverse impacts. These impacts can be minimized by site design and best management practice or mitigation measures. These recommendations were made in regards to the preliminary site development plans as referenced in section 8.0 in his report. They include providing water quality treatment measures to meet the CT DEEP 80% TSS removal goals; establish conservation restrictions for all of the wetland areas in the subdivision; and increase the size of the conservation area and undisturbed buffer area around wetland 2.

Mr. Klein also noted additional recommendations as detailed in his environmental report. First to provide a permanent demarcation such as a split rail fence, stone wall, row of boulders to mark the limit of activity at the rear of lots 6470060 and 6470064. Install native buffer plantings to reestablish a strip of vegetation in the upland review area in front of the demarcation feature. Lastly, stabilize the force main area west of wetland with a native conservation and wildlife seed mix. The water quality treatment is provided by the storm water basins which were sized to accommodate this work. Mr. Klein expressed he believed that as long as the E&S controls are in place and restorative activities are implemented there should be no significant impacts on wetlands and watercourses. The recommendations are shown schematically since they may require minor adjustments once house configurations are finalized. Mr. Klein suggested as a condition of approval the final design of the plantings will be submitted to the agency once the home sites are finalized.

Bob Breckenridge asked if Michael Klein could talk about the water quality pond. He asked what was feeding into that pond. Mr. Klein responded that all the runoff from street and cul-de-sac go to the water quality pond. These are storm systems not sanitary sewers. Overflow goes through the treatment pond and follows over land. Mr. Breckenridge followed up his question by asking if a vernal pool was created there. Mr. Breckenridge was unclear of the ramifications of the water flowing in there. Mr. Klein responded that he has not been to the location in the springtime since the construction.

Mr. Aston added that it is the runoff from the north part of Stratford Crossing. During construction of pond it did not seep as originally designed, so there were low level drains installed through berm at the suggestion of Town Staff. He stated there is always a flow out of it and small ponding beneath those drains adjacent to the wetlands. Mr. Breckenridge continued that he brought it up because it seems like a manmade depression that could become a vernal pool. He is speculating that then there may be other regulations that would apply to it in the future.

Dean Applefield stated he felt the water quality basin met the definition of a watercourse- vernal pool or not; it is an artificial body of water; it flows and has a stream. Mr. Breckenridge had one other question. He stated that in some of the site plans the applicant spoke about mitigation and it looks like it comes right to the border of the houses based on the site plan. He asked if that was realistic that it will come that close to the house. Mr. Klein responded there is no reason it couldn't come that close to the house. Mr. Klein stated there was a substantial distance between the lots and the wetlands; that is upland review area; the hatched area is the URA.

Mr. Breckenridge asked about runoff effecting the brook. Mr. Klein responded that the distance is so substantial that runoff from a typical residential activities is very minimal. Mr. Klein also stated the pond was designed for water quality treatment; as it fills up with sediment it needs to be cleaned. DEEP standards address the total suspended solids. The fact that there is a wetland condition and mucky matter in bottom of pond, it is better for treatment as there is more surface to provide absorption.

Michael Feldman followed up on the water quality pond and asked who was responsible for the maintenance. Michael Klein replied it was the Town. The Town has an easement over this property.

Mr. Feldman asked what sort of effect is there on the water flow or quantity of water in the brook. Mr. Klein responded there was no effect; the storm water ponds were designed to accommodate runoff from the southern portion of the property.

Mr. Aston referenced OSD1 – site analysis plan to shown the two (2) major water quality ponds.

Mr. Beauchamp questioned how the pond can be accessed for maintenance. He wanted to know if there was a road nearby. Mr. Aston responded that the Town has easement across the lot, on top of the storm drainage pipe, that has been reinforced so a truck can drive on it. Mr. Aston went on to say that when the whole system was designed there were two (2) major water quality ponds that both discharged to Big Brook. There were also water quality features in the subdivision. As far as total water flowing off, they compared the water flow at Haynes Road, which has a 180 acre watershed, before and after, and after all of these improvements, the flow off Haynes is decreased slightly.

Dean Applefield asked if the water quality pond is taking some of the storm water from the site, specifically the area around the cul-de-sac at the end of Stratford Crossing. Mr. Aston replied that it is taking runoff from the cul-de-sac and three (3) lots which flow into the storm drainage system. He stated no additional storm drainage is needed. This cul-de-sac is pitched towards the existing catch basins at the end of the road that goes through a sediment chamber which the Town can pump out. This avoids sediment getting further down. There is no new storm drainage.

Mr. Applefield stated that it seems that the two (2) lots, 61 and 63, have storm water flowing down to the catch basin which goes down to the water quality pond. Lots 60 and 64 flow over land down the side of the hill. Mr. Aston confirmed Mr. Applefield's statements were correct.

Mr. Aston mentioned that they took that into effect in their calculations, and there is slightly more runoff from the lots after they are constructed.

Mr. Applefield asked if it was their sense that some of that storm water will flow into the storm water pond. He added that lots 61 and 63 are outside of their jurisdiction; however, there are activities being conducted in the upland review area (URA) on lots 60 and 64. Mr. Applefield asked if the runoff is going into the water quality pond or is the water quality pond not related. Mr. Aston responded that there will be sheet flow into the wetlands from those lots.

Mr. Applefield stated that the water quality pond has no relevance in our jurisdiction relative to the activities on lots 61, 63, 12, 10 as they are outside of our jurisdiction; those lots are not our issue. Mr. Aston replied that there is sheet flow with surface runoff. Big Brook is 200' away. Mr. Applefield stated the ground is pretty sloped. Mr. Aston replied that it was sloped to the wetlands and once you get down to the wetlands it is pretty flat. He said the sheet flow velocity will not create any erosion.

Mr. Applefield expressed that he had a very difficult time reading the maps provided. The maps were disconnected; four (4) activities were listed on one map and three (3) activities were listed on the other. The information on the maps were not labeled. Mr. Applefield expressed to the applicant that he did not feel the project was problematic from an environmental standpoint. There is no legend on SD1 showing what the heavy black line meant and that it is in fact the limit of clearing.

Mr. Applefield expressed to the applicant that he did not feel the project was problematic. He does not feel like he is in a position to understand well why they choose what they choose. He is concerned with what is going in the wetland area and he needs a map showing that. He mentioned that a lot of the clearing, the Commission has nothing to say about it. He walked the site; however, he did not feel he had the right documentation in front of him so he is concerned about that. For example the erosion control plan, SE1, he did not have a plan.

John McCahill spoke to the plans. He said Mr. Applefield was correct. The Commission did not have the most updated plans. Revised plans were received on March 1 which addressed most of Mr. McCahill's comments and makes the proposal a lot clearer. Mr. McCahill thought it was best to hold off on these plans until after the presentation.

Mr. Applefield stated there were situations that the Commission would vote right then and there on the application. He asked for an explanation of the construction schedule as far as erosion control because if the site is grubbed, given the slope, it has the possibility of adverse impacts to the wetlands.

Mr. Aston responded that they have added the construction sequence, on the coversheet, as Mr. McCahill had requested. Basically, they are going to clear everything that needs to be cleared, grub only those areas needed to install the sewer, roadway and access to the sewer. Stumps will be stockpiled. As each homesite is proposed, they will be grubbed at that time and stumps will be collected in the stockpile area. Silt fence will be installed as soon as the lots are cleared.

Mr. Applefield asked if silt fence is the primary erosion control. Mr. Aston replied yes and it is shown now on sheet SE1, of the new plans. Mr. Aston stated he addressed almost all of Mr. McCahill's comments as noted in his memo dated February 26, 2018 with the exception of (item #13) moving the sewer uphill because it is a temporary disturbance and they want to avoid a high

point in the force main. The force main flows uphill all the way so they would rather not move it. This is something that will need to be addressed when the actual clearing plan is in place. Mr. McCahill will be notified at that point. Another item not addressed (item #15) was the reconfiguration of lot 125, there is a large portion of the house in the upland review area (URA) and only a small portion of that lot is not in the URA. They chose the location of the driveway to coincide with the future easement across the street and also to provide adequate sight distance along Hollister Drive without clearing anything outside the right-of-way (ROW), which in this case, is the wetlands. He added there is still 35' of uncleared area between the wetlands and the proposed clearing line. Mr. Aston added that the force main continuation across the street will require another application to the Town. He explained that the two (2) driveways and force main will be within in the same clearing so no wetlands will have to be cleared.

Dean Applefield questioned if there was a reason that the pond discussed was not included as watercourse. Mr. Aston responded that the thought process was that it was a continuation of the same project and at that point it was there. Mr. Klein interjected that typically they do not include storm water management features because if they are regulated a permit would be needed for maintenance/cleaning. He added that, for example, the Army Corps of Engineers does not consider water treatment lagoons associated with any NPDS permits to be within their jurisdiction. He went on to say that this was not a whole lot of different from capturing water flow in a culvert under the street.

Mr. Applefield stated that from his standpoint he felt it meets the definition of watercourse; it is artificial body of water. He feels it needs to be included and it would effect lot 60 making the home in the URA. It would not change the way he views this application but he believes it should be shown as a watercourse.

Mr. Klein addressed the Commission stating he has not looked at that feature in some time. In terms of overflow there is a very specific definition for an intermittent watercourse. It is of his opinion, from a public policy standpoint, it is not a good idea to regulate all the storm water ponds or basins we are creating to treat water quality; then say once created, you have to regulate the upland review area (URA) around it. Mr. Applefield injected and said this is a pond. He does not know how deep it is but it can hold a substantial amount of water. At the time of his site visit water was flowing. Mr. Klein replied that as a rule of thumb he learned that if you can point to a definitive edge of the water you can maybe consider it a pond instead of a puddle. Mr. Klein felt that you would be getting into a situation that there is regulatory overload if every storm water structure that holds water for a few days is regulated.

Mr. McCahill added that, to put it in perspective, that they did view it at a worse case scenario. It does have a low flow drainage system and over a period of time, in theory, it should be significantly drier than it was when they were there this past weekend. There should be very little standing water. Mr. McCahill also said it could be because of construction that sediment may have built up in the pipe and it is not draining as well as it should be. He added that theoretically the design would keep it relatively dry between storms and there would be plantings that would thrive in a fairly wet environment in that area. He said the Commission could see it for what it was on Saturday or evaluate it over a long period of time; but from his perspective there are times that this area would dry up.

Mr. Applefield still feels it meets the definition of a watercourse. He wanted clarification on Table 2, as shown in the environmental report, in regards to fish and shellfish habitat and shoreline stabilization. Mr. Klein stated that there was mostly likely just small fish in Big Brook and the shoreline stabilization referenced the vegetation along the shoreline which stabilizes it.

Mr. Applefield went on to say that he appreciated Mr. Klein's recommendations found in his environmental report.

Mr. McCahill informed the Commission that new plans were received and they will be distributed for the next meeting. He then directed the applicant to discuss the responses to his review dated February 26, 2018 to address any additional changes which many be needed.

Mr. Aston addressed the comments in Mr. McCahill's memo, item by item. Item 1, the site walk plan was prepared and submitted. Item 2, conservation areas shown on the plans should be subject to Appendix E of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations; this will be addressed in the final filed map. Item 3, general legends were included on all the maps. Item 4, Michael Klein did flag the wetlands and gave a revised report with additional comments and recommendations. Those wetland flags were located and marked by the surveyor, Mr. Denno. Item 5, the floodplain line was added and there is no elevation associated with it. The label for Big Brook was added. Item 6, the stump deposition was addressed on the plans and noted on the sequence which is shown on the cover sheet. Item 7, proposed limits of clearing are shown on the plan. There is a note that Town staff will be notified prior to any clearing. Item 8, a standard E&SC detail sheet was added to the revised plans noting straw wattles, silt fence and construction entrances – one on Hollister and one at the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Applefield asked if they could identify the critical slopes and state what that were going to do. Mr. Aston stated those decisions are usually made by the contractor during construction. They can be delineated on the plan if needed but the grading may change so it should be done at the time of the individual site plans. Mr. Applefield then suggested they may want to revise the activities listed if this is the case, if the house move closer to the regulated area. Mr. Aston stated Mr. McCahill reviews the plans for compliance. Mr. McCahill confirmed that he analyzes the plans for those specifics.

Mr. Aston again addressed the items listed in Mr. McCahill's memo. Item 9, the location of the foundation drains were provided and outlet elevations. Item 10, location of the proposed stockpiles were provided on the plan with appropriate protection for control and stabilization. Item 11, the property boundaries were indicated and included in the legend on every sheet. Item 12, additional detail was provided for the driveway elevations proposed on Hollister and Town of Avon standard driveway detail is now shown on the plans. Item 13, he mentioned he commented on Item 13 already, regarding moving the location of the proposed force main. The reason they were considering this is because he believes there is a substantial tree that can be saved if they can move it uphill. Another reason they are doing this in the location shown is to keep as much buffer as possible for the neighbor without clearing up to the property line. Item 14, the site analysis plan was revised to represent the regulated activities. Item 15, in regards to the configuration of the home on Hollister Mr. McCahill suggested an alternate design with possibly a front load garage, moving the building about 30' from wetland 1. These changes have not been made.

Mr. McCahill stated he then defers back to the Commission on Item 15.

Mr. Aston continued to address item 16, a detailed sediment and erosion control narrative and construction sequence was provided. As for item 17, revised plans were not submitted seven (7) days prior to the meeting they were one (1) day late.

Mr. Thier asked if the presentation for this application was complete. The applicant and representatives stated it was.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Avon Village Center – Informal discussion and pre-application review (letter dated January 31, 2018 from Attorney Robert M. Meyers)

Locations: 21 Ensign Drive, Parcel #2210021, Avon Town Center LLC
65 Ensign Drive, Parcel #2210065, Avon Town Center III LLC
55 Bickford Drive, Parcel #1300055, Avon Town Center LLC
70 Ensign Drive, Parcel #2210070, Avon Town Center III LLC
60 West Main Street, Parcel #4540060, Town of Avon
65 Simsbury Road, Parcel #3970065, Avon Town Center LLC
93 Simsbury Road, Parcel #3970093, Avon Town Center II LLC
75 Bickford Drive, Parcel #1300075, Avon Town Center II LLC

Attorney Meyers started off the presentation. He stated this is a very large project with over 97 acres in the center of Town, north of Route 44 and west of Route 10. The master plan was approved in November 2015, this has been subject to Planning and Zoning hearings and a substantial peer review analysis. More recently the Planning and Zoning Commission selected consultants to work with the Town to develop the overall plan, grading, utilities, buildings, etc. Most recently, the Planning and Zoning Commission came to an agreement on the plan and expressed their approval. Town staff is also in favor of this.

Attorney Meyers stated this is a pre-application review, an informal presentation; there is a statute that regulates it, nothing is binding or appealable. This is an opportunity to present the concepts and receive feedback to see if everyone is heading in the right direction and if these plans will ultimately be acceptable to the Commission.

The presenters will include Michael Cegan, landscape architect and planner of Richter and Cegan; Ron Bomengan, P.E. from Fuss and O'Neill, Joshua H. Wilson, Senior Ecologist and Soil Scientist from Fuss & O'Neill. The power point presentation was provided from Richter and Cegan, on behalf of the Carpionato Group and Fuss and O'Neill will be detailing an overview of the project and the proposed wetland activities.

Mike Cegan, the landscape architect for the project walked the Commission through the site map and provided the Master Plan approved in 2015. He stated the project area to be roughly 100 acres. He referred to the presentation slide provided noting the green areas were owned by the Carpionato Group and the light blue areas were owned by the Town. He noted one of the main goals of the project was to integrate the Town Center with the Town Hall buildings. This concept

contained a mix of both residential and retail. The developer chose to move forward with Phase 1. In January, as a result of the Town staff, the Planning & Zoning Commission and the extensive peer review process, a consensus was made to add-on and enlarge the Phase 1 area. Phase 1 consists of a strong connection to the Town Hall complex, the Town Center, a new focal entrance on Route 44 and a careful integration with the existing historic brownstones.

Nod Brook was also brought into the Phase 1 area, with the opportunities and advantages that it brings. Mr. Cegan spoke to the proposed development. It is made up of two (2) distinct areas; first, the more intensively developed Town Center, the new Main Street with retail and residential, a new boulevard connecting Route 10, the reconfiguration of Climax Road, a new entrance into the Town Hall complex and the Riverwalk along Nod Brook. The second area is in the northeast corner, which is the park area, as well as an extension to the boulevard where the road comes in. The park consists of a series of passive recreational trails, it also includes the old historic oak, a sculpture garden and the Farmington Valley greenway trails.

Basically there are three (3) areas of wetlands on this site: the watercourse known as Nod Brook; ten (10) acres of wetlands some of which are floodplain soils adjacent to Nod Brook; and the isolated wetlands adjacent to the Richter and Cegan building and an intermittent stream that runs from that wetland, between the Richter and Cegan building and the Farmington Valley Arts building.

The proposed activities on the site, in the regulated areas, include the trail system in the park, the Boulevard itself, the Farmington Valley Trail and miscellaneous improvements. The proposed work around the isolated wetlands area in the center of the village are in the regulated area around the brook and a very small sliver of the parking lot on the edge of 100' regulated area.

They worked hard to reduce and minimize the direct impact in the wetlands. The only direct impact in the wetlands is a very small portion – 300' sf of wetlands in the park area. After they first graded out the new boulevard and trail system, they added retaining walls to mitigate/eliminate the impact and they moved the trail closer to the road to further reduce the impact.

Another activity in the wetlands that does not have an impact is the natural trail, at grade, that connects to the trail in the URAs. It involves some selective pruning of the trees but there are no cuts or fills and no direct impact; selective pruning for trail; they will work around trees. Mr. Cegan pointed out the white oak tree which is approximately 150 years old. He stated they are working with a consulting arborist on the health of the tree. Mr. Richter showed pictures of the area including the oak and marshy, well drained areas including wetlands.

Other than the natural trail along the brook, all other trails are in the upland review area (URA). In regards to the actual core area, there is one direct wetland activity that is in the isolated wetland, they are looking at 3,900 sf of impact but also creating 3,000 sf of wetlands. Another activity with no direct impact is the potential maintenance and repair of the walls along the brook. The isolated wetland area is rather small and full of invasive plants. Because of its isolation and its location in the Town Center it was proposed to be filled now there is a better approach proposed, to make it part of the smaller greenspace system in the village center itself and make this a feature; having educational opportunities, as well.

Mr. Cegan spoke to the wetlands activities - the construction of the road, Farmington Valley greenway trail, and walkway construction, building construction, and about 3,900 sf of wetlands impact, a wetland spur, and a sliver along the proposed road. There are two (2) intermittent streams that come into the lawn area between the arts center and the Richter & Cegan building, those two (2) little spurs will be impacted by the roadway itself. He went on to say the road squigs and they moved away from the wetlands and changed the angle in parking to avoid wetland area; in one area it is under parked, some parking is lost but this improves the wetlands area.

As it was mentioned, they intend this feature to be an educational opportunity. Their intention is to go into the wetlands area and clean it up, remove the invasives and in their place plant appropriate native vegetation. They will then look to create 3,000 sf of wetlands that they believe is a more positive form of wetlands, create a native plant shrub border around the outside, provide an opportunity for an overlook with some interpretive signage. Since there will be a lot of traffic in that area this will be a great opportunity to educate others about wetlands and invasives. They see this as an attraction, a green area to get away from all the activity- something positive.

When Phase 1 was added to project they also looked at a possible restaurant; there is a neat waterfall feature, and an opportunity for a brook walk, a river walk. The Phase 1 plan now brings the brook into the project and views it as a major amenity. The brook maintenance as it runs through the Phase 1 area may be an activity in the future for maintenance. Mr. Cegan concluded his portion of the presentation.

Ron Bomengan, professional engineer from Fuss and O'Neill introduced himself. He stated he will speak generally about the storm water management, low impact development (LID), and design techniques. This type of design approach integrates the site design and planning techniques that conserve the natural integrity of the land and hydrologic functions of the site. He wanted to point out that they are proposing a new vehicular and pedestrian bridge crossing over Nod Brook, on what they are calling the new Main Street. They are basically constructing a concrete bridge with zero direct wetlands impact but a little more activity in the URA.

As far as storm water management, they are planning to implement as many low impact design elements/techniques as possible. What this means is treating the storm water management at the micro level rather than the macro level for a project this size. This property is almost 100 acres in total. This phase alone is less than 50 acres, so they will break it to development areas and treat the water quality and storm water management within those smaller micro pad sites.

Mr. Bomengan stated some of the features that can be used are rain gardens, bio-retention swales and drainage basins, some curb cuts with leak-offs that can treat storm water quality naturally. Also grass/vegetated swales will be used to treat the storm water. They will try to eliminate structures such as hydrodynamic separators, those type of structures which need maintenance over time. They will also implement surface infiltration which will promote groundwater recharge. Isolator rows will allow the systems to provide infiltration as well as retention/detention. Stormtech infiltration units will be installed underneath the parking lots.

Mr. Bomengan added that they will be proposing a lot of impervious surface; in order to match the pre and post storm water runoff from the site they will need to detain the runoff. He

mentioned the soils are very good for infiltration so they will provide as much groundwater recharge as possible. All of the storm water from this development gets to Nod Brook so they want to match what goes to goes into Nod Brook currently. The storm water detention feature holds back the storm water and releases it slowly into Nod Brook. Mr. Bomengan concluded his portion of the presentation and turned it over to Josh Wilson for his wetlands assessment.

Josh Wilson, professional wetland scientist and certified soil scientist with Fuss and O'Neill introduced himself. He stated Nod Brook is the principle watercourse on site. There are ten (10) acres of wetlands associated with the floodplain and they are poorly drained soils, a mixture of hydric and floodplain soils. The other wetland area is a ground water discharge/seepage wetland formed a berm created by the compacted road bend and parking and it is metered out through the culvert to the intermittent stream. This wetland is ground water fed and discharges.

From a function and values standpoint, the wetland is very limited to ground water discharge and recharge, a little bit of sediment detention, and a very limited amount of wildlife habitat. As far as wetlands go this wetland is not very special. It does flood and gets wet but it drains and dries up fairly regularly. At first, they discussed filling this area but decided to incorporate these wetlands into the project; enhancing parts they could and filling a very small portion. Wetlands enhancements include habitat improvements and invasive plant management, wetland creation (3,000 sf), native shrub planting and an overlook with interpretive signage.

Mr. Wilson concluded his presentation on the wetlands areas and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Beauchamp asked what building happens first. Mr. Cegan responded that this is the initial Phase 1 of the project. The first step would be the infrastructure, the construction of the new Main Street and boulevard, and modifications to the existing road and utilities. Building construction would be the second step.

Mr. Beauchamp stated that Nod Brook has been blocked for some time with culverts and walls and there is an artificial waterfall. He asked why not make Nod Brook more natural, is it necessary to leave the waterfall.

Mr. Cegan replied that this is an historical piece of property. The waterfall and walls are a nice feature to take advantage of, as they previously mentioned. He added they are not sure if they will rebuild the walls that have fallen, or if they may leave them in their more natural state. Mr. Cegan thought Mr. Beauchamp brought up a good point.

Mr. Thier asked if there were any projections on the number of tenants. Mr. Cegan stated he could only provide the square footage of the buildings. The proposed Main Street is a mix of retail, apartments and offices with small business/shop owners possibly living above their shops. The idea is a mixed- use village with multi-function. Attorney Meyers added this is unique project and nothing like this has been contemplated anywhere in Connecticut.

Mr. Feldman asked where the parking would be located. Mr. Cegan responded that there would be parking along the streets and parking lots. The large parking areas are behind building. Attorney Meyers added there was an emphasis on hiding the parking areas with berms and plantings. There has also been a lot of attention to pedestrian connections.

Mr. Feldman asked what types of buildings will be built. Mr. Cegan responded that most of the buildings are generally one and two stories, maybe a few higher ones. He added, in future phases, there will be more commercial uses and residential homes and apartments; overall when the project is complete there will be approximately 315 residential units.

Mr. Feldman questioned if there was map delineating the wetlands. Mr. Cegan, showed on the map, where the existing wetlands were located. He also pointed out the areas where they are impacting the wetlands on the map. The total impact is 4,200 s.f.; on approximately 100 acres.

Mr. Applefield stated this was an interesting and complicated project. He had difficulty in determining where everything was in relationship to the existing roadway system. Mr. Cegan replied, although they do not have that information tonight, they will have plans which will show the existing roadway and the proposed roadways so the Commission can see the changes.

Mr. Applefield asked if any thought was given in to how much impervious pavement this project will generate, more than what we have now. Mr. Bomengan replied that they did not have that calculation yet. Mr. Applefield, again, questioned if any thought was given to using pervious pavement instead of impervious pavement. Mr. Bomengan answered that this is something they can look into but, being in the Northeast, there is more maintenance with pervious pavement. He went on to say that where they can treat it with bio-swailes or wetlands type basins and treat storm water more naturally; and achieve removal of the suspended solids better. These would be easier to maintain and would provide groundwater recharge.

Mr. Applefield asked why an impervious surface is easier to maintain. Mr. Bomengan explained that there is a lot of maintenance involved, two (2) to three (3) times a year the sand that is put down during the winter need to be removed. There is a tendency for it also to clog and basically the design benefit of pervious surface goes away after a few years. Mr. Applefield asked if they considered the same for the parking lots. Mr. Applefield believed that parking lots are not sanded like roadways and he did not think much sanding was performed in Avon. Mr. Bomengan explained they have to design the roadways to the Town's standards and that would have to be something the Town has to decide on.

Mr. Applefield said this is something that would have to be cheaper to implement. Mr. Bomegan was in disagreement, absolutely not, it is substantially more expensive to maintain. Mr. Applefield pressed on with pervious pavement being used in New England for walkways, etc. Mr. Bomengan replied the walkways need to be ADA compliant and the materials need to hold up to the elements and use. Mr. Applefield wanted to encourage the idea out of using more pervious surface, and hopes this would be something they consider.

Mr. Applefield went on to say he felt there was a lot more parking than needed and he did not know how parking was calculated. Mr. Beauchamp added he thinks this project is terrific but he does not want to see some sort of medieval village or walled city. He wanted the team to clarify how they were going to connect this area with Route 44. He wanted to know if they were going to build sidewalks and how were they going to open it up to the rest of the area. He asked if Town was going to build any sidewalks along Route 44.

Mr. McCahill added that a sidewalk system exists in the center of Town to the east of this proposed project. He stated that they are seriously looking at a good connectivity for bikes and

pedestrians. Mr. Beauchamp then asked how about as you move west up Route 44 and parallel. Mr. McCahill explained that there are unique challenges along Route 44 that make it difficult. He continued that what typically happens is that sidewalk plans are implemented when development comes along; from here to the west of the proposed Town Center is a difficult area to close the gap in the sidewalk system.

Mr. Beauchamp then finished his questioning and added that he was just concerned about making it open and inviting for the rest of the area surrounding the proposed Town Center. Attorney Meyers mentioned the Town requires developers, when they come in to get their projects approved, to add sidewalks along their property.

Mr. Cegan added the connection for pedestrians is difficult as one moves toward the west, but is better for cyclists.

Mr. Breckenridge asked how long Ensign-Bickford was there and what they manufactured. Mr. McCahill said they were there for over forty (40) years at least and manufactured gun powder and fuses. Mr. Breckenridge inquired if an environmental analysis of the soils was performed. He did not want anything washing in to watercourse. Mr. McCahill said there was an application to the Commission three (3) to four (4) years ago and Ensign-Bickford excavated and removed a lot of those materials and he believed an extensive analysis was performed before they transferred the property.

Mr. Cegan also believed test pits were done and likely a phase 2 analysis was conducted. Mr. Breckenridge stressed he would want to see a definite analysis of soils brought to the Commission when they came back.

Mr. Beauchamp inquired if this type of Town Center was done anywhere else in Connecticut. Mr. Cegan stated the only good example he could think of, that is similar in scale, is Mashpee Commons on the Cape along Route 28.

Mr. Feldman stated he would have to assume there was an environmental site assessment conducted on this site. Mr. Cegan stated that they just addressed this question and he will check and confirm if one has been performed.

Mr. Feldman added that it looks like a dense traffic usage. Mr. Bomengan responded that Fuss and O'Neill performed a traffic analysis and study. They are working with the Town and the State traffic commission in order to coordinate the required traffic improvements. The flow of traffic has been discussed and they have studied how the traffic will move out of the intersections.

Mr. Applefield asked about the bike trail relocation. Mr. Cegan stated the bike trail was fairly close to the road and explained how the bike path will flow through the Town Center. He noted how they are relocating the bike path behind the Town Hall parking lot this spring. Bikers and pedestrians will not have to go through the parking lot.

Mr. Applefield then asked if the plans show the isolated wetlands with the intermittent streams and the URA. Mr. Cegan said they did show the regulated areas around the intermittent streams.

Attorney Meyers ended the presentation and said they appreciated the feedback the Commission had.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

October 3, 2017

Motion to approve the minutes Dean Applefield, second by Robert Breckinridge.

December 5, 2017

Motion to approve the minutes Dean Applefield, second by Robert Breckinridge.

February 1, 2018

Motion to approve the minutes Dean Applefield, second by Robert Breckinridge.

STAFF COMMENTS:

John McCahill brought to the Commission's attention an issue at 12 Oakengates. Heating oil was spilled and travelled towards the rear of the home. The spill also travelled northerly along the rails to trails. The DEEP is overseeing the clean-up and a number of absorbent materials have been placed along the trail to contain the spill and seepage. The spill was approximately 125 gallons of heating oil.

NEXT MEETING:

April 3, 2018

The next regularly scheduled meeting is April 3, 2018.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Campasano, Clerk
Inland Wetlands Commission

