TOWN OF HADDAM
INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION
COMMUNITY CENTER
7 CANDLEWOOD HILL ROAD, HIGGANUM, CT 06441
REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, 17 OCTOBER 2022
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
Subject to Approval by the Commission

ATTENDANCE

X	Paul Best
A	Curt Chadwick
X	Jeremy DeCarli, Chairman
X	Dan Iwanicki, Vice Chairman
X	Joe Stephens
X	Mark Stephens, Secretary
A	Thomas Worthley
X	David Costa, Alternate – Seated
X	Gail Reynolds, Alternate - Seated
X	Leon Mularski, Zoning and Wetlands Enforcement Officer
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

1. Call to Order & Attendance/Seating of Alternates

Mr. DeCarli, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. All regular members were seated as well as alternate members, Mr. Costa and Mrs. Reynolds.

2. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

There were no additions/corrections to the agenda.

3. Public Comment

There was no public present.

4. Old Business

None.

5. New Business

a. Site Plan Review of Associated Earthwork to Allow for a 10,000 Square Foot Retail Building on Killingworth Road. Map 60/Lot 26-7 – Adjacent to 968 Killingworth Road. Applicant: MPA Realty Associates

Meghan Hope, Esq., Alter & Pearson, and Jessica Bates, Principal Engineer, BL Companies, representing the applicant, were present.

Mr. Best questioned which lots where a part of the application. Ms. Hope stated she and Ms. Bates are representing MPA Realty Associates, the applicant and contract purchaser for the site. Using the map, Ms. Hope pointed out Lots 9, 8, and 7 (wraps around to the back of Lots 9 and 8) and stated they are proposing to use Lots 9 and 8 and portions of Lot 7 (there will be a lot line revision).

Mr. Best asked which lot is/was for sale. Matt Eucalitto, the developer, stated the owner (Trading Post Development LLC) is selling two of the lots and will cut into the third lot. Mr. Eucalitto stated one sign is being utilized but two lots are for sale. Using the map, Mr. Eucalitto pointed out the lots to be used and noted the lot lines will be adjusted.

Mrs. Reynolds asked if the applicants have the plans but do not own the lots. Ms. Hope stated correct. Mr. DeCarli stated they're the applicant and are probably in the process of purchasing the lots. Ms. Hope stated there is typically a zoning contingency within the contract and then once approval is received, the closing is within a couple of days.

Ms. Hope stated the proposal is for a 10,700 square foot retail building (pointed out on the map) and noted there are wetlands located offsite (pond located to the south of the site with associated wetlands, green line with arrows the delineated wetland area). There are no wetland impacts with the proposal. Do have some regulated activity due to the 100-foot review area (blue line) clips the southern corner of the site and that activity includes grading, minor landscaping, and replacing the electric transformer.

Ms. Bates stated the lots are in the Commercial-1 Zone where retail is allowed by site plan approval. Ms. Bates also stated it is a minor activity in terms of upland review as disturbances are in the upland review area only. There are no direct impacts to the wetland system. Proposing a 10,700 square foot retail building with associated parking lots.

Utilities - Ms. Bates stated there is an onsite septic system and a well. Proposal calls for the installation of a propane tank and relocation of a transformer (currently showing it closer to the wetland system). Eversource will dictate where the transformer goes and will probably keep it as close to the building as possible. Transformer could be pole mounted.

Stormwater Management – Ms. Bates stated working to maintain the hydrology from existing to proposed condition. There was some run-on water across the parcel that has been going down to the pond and anticipate capturing it in an above ground minor detention area as well as the roof runoff from the building. It will be impounded in the detention area and will overflow into a pipe system that will run around into underground system.

Ms. Bates stated runoff from the parking lot area will be captured in deep sump hooded catch basins and conveyed to the underground detention system. Currently spec'ing a concrete chamber system that will be placed under the pavement in the parking lot. The underground system will discharge to a rip rap discharge area (have it in a slight bowl for energy dissipation). There is a curbed level spreader along the discharge to make sure it is not like a point source discharge, but more of a gentle overland type of flow.

Mrs. Reynolds asked if the water would infiltrate. Ms. Bates stated it will infiltrate down into the two catch basins. Ms. Bates stated the permeability is 7.8 and they will be using less than half of that for the infiltration rate in their modeling system. This was done on purpose in order to maintain the hydrology going to the wetland system – do not want to dry it out because too much water and too little water is bad for it. Mrs. Reynolds asked if a particular area would be all pavement. Ms. Bates pointed out the proposed area for asphalt pavement – a little bit of concrete for the loading area and a sidewalk in the front and an area that will be pervious – limited disturbance will be seeded.

Ms. Bates pointed out a pipe discharge from the underground system that will come out and go through a rip rap energy dissipater and a curb level spreader to get it back into a sheet flow before its overland discharge to the wetland.

Mr. Best asked if there will be a basement. Ms. Bates stated no, slab on grade.

Mr. J. Stephens asked about a vernal pool. Mr. DeCarli stated the Commission permitted the filling of that area (a borrow pit that was turned into a wetland) on16 May 2022.

Mr. DeCarli asked the size of the stormwater system. Ms. Bates stated it's designed for 100-year storm.

Mr. Iwanicki asked for the process of the water coming off the pavement. Ms. Bates stated the paved area is captured in a couple of catch basins (only one basin on the plan). Deep sump hooded catch basin with a four-foot sump and it will discharge to a point. Mr. Iwanicki asked what the box with the little squares on the map depicts. Ms. Bates stated the underground system.

Mr. Best asked if there's any idea what will be in the building. Ms. Hope stated retail.

Using the larger maps placed before the Commissioners, Ms. Bates pointed out the catch basin and the underground system (Sheet GD-1). Mr. Iwanicki stated he didn't believe the Commission had handled anything like this. Mr. DeCarli stated he handles these types of systems in his work all the time and he prefers them (far less maintenance than an above ground). Ms. Bates moved between the three maps and provided each group the same information. Ms. Bates pointed out how the roof water will come down a series of roof leaders and where it will discharge, sheet flow, and be captured in a basin. The larger storm flows will go around and discharge into the underground system.

Ms. Bates pointed out the well (to the back of the building) and the septic system (to the front of the building) to confirm proper separation distance. A side discussion concerning runoff being tied into a catch basin on Killingworth Road confirmed the applicant will not be doing so. Mr. Iwanicki asked if the septic system will be under the pavement. Ms. Bates stated yes.

Mr. DeCarli asked if the level spreader was concrete (off to the side, a discharge from the in-ground tank). Ms. Bates stated yes, pointing out the rip rap pad for discharge, a slight pool, and then a piece of concrete curb to act as a level spreader to try to spread the flow before it discharges into the wetlands.

Mr. DeCarli asked if the propane tank would be inground and noted it's outside of the review area. Ms. Bates stated yes.

Mr. J. Stephens asked about a pump. Ms. Bates stated there is no pump, everything will be drained by gravity for the septic and everything else will sheet flow down to the basin. Another area sheet flows to the gutter and the gutter drains to the catch basin. Catch basin drains to the tank. Ms. Bates stated all the discharge from the underground tank will discharge underground. The lowest point over the underground system is approximately 557 and then it will come out at approximately 545. Mr. DeCarli asked if the overflow was sitting at the bottom of the chamber – 551 and the out on the invert is 551. Ms. Bates stated she believes it's an outlet control structure so there's a raised orifice (pipe is at the bottom).

Erosion and Sediment Control - The Commission reviewed Sheet EC-1. Ms. Bates stated due to the site being under five acres they can drain to a temporary sedimentation trap that can be near but not on top of the infiltration basin (not allowed per the erosion and sedimentation control manual and the stormwater quality manual). It will be used as a means and method as the contractor moves through construction (could end up moving as construction progresses and will only be used while there are erodible surfaces). Once the surfaces are to a non-erodible condition, they will then be protected by silt sacks and silt fence at the base of all work. Fully rimmed by silt fence except for on the uphill side. Anticipation of stockpile to the back of the building location (short term). Ms. Bates noted the soil was good (cobbly sandy soil).

Mr. DeCarli asked if they would like to start work in November. Ms. Bates stated they would like to. Relatively short construction schedule.

Ms. Bates pointed out the anti-tracking pad at Killingworth Road. Mr. DeCarli stated DOT will make sure that's in place.

Mr. J. Stephens asked about timber removal. Ms. Bates stated she believes some of it had already been done as part of the wetland filling; however, she does anticipate some additional clearing onsite.

Ms. Bates stated they like to keep the water clean, therefore, they will be diverting the upland flow while getting the site stabilized.

Landscaping Plan – Ms. Bates stated the plan calls for canopy trees, lawn seed mix, a few evergreens, and shrubs. Mrs. Reynolds asked Ms. Bates if she plans on using native plants. Ms. Bates reviewed some of the tree species. Mr. Best asked if there would be any grass areas. Ms. Bates stated the areas around the basin, the well, and any disturbed areas. Ms. Bates reviewed the plant list with the Commission.

Ms. Bates concluded by stating as the Commission can see the work in the upland review area is very minor – some grading, utilities, things of that nature. No direct impact to the wetland system maintaining hydrology patterns pre/post.

Mr. J. Stephens asked if all the utilities were above ground. Ms. Bates stated they are all underground. As all the utilities are across the street, as opposed to trenching across Killingworth Road, they are anticipating a new pole set on the side of the street to service and then underground. Ms. Bates stated then a conduit system to the building and the transformer. The transformer would have an underground component with the transformer itself being above ground and bollards placed around it for vehicular protection (Eversource requirement).

Mr. Iwanicki asked for Ms. Bates to review Sheet SD-1 – as it gave a better overview of the site and surrounding area.

Mr. Iwanicki stated there's a note on the plans for Lot 7 about "possible encroachment gravel parking exemption #3"; and asked what it is all about. Ms. Bates stated that's on the survey and the gravel parking of an adjacent parcel extends onto the proposed property line. Ms. Hope stated the surveyor called out the encroachment and before the closing either the parties enter into an easement agreement or it's removed so it is no longer an encroachment. Ms. Hope pointed it out on the map.

Mr. Iwanicki stated based on the stormwater drainage no one can pave that area or should not pave the area. Ms. Bates stated that area is downstream from where they will be doing their work. It's accounted for as gravel in both the existing and proposed model. If they want to change the surface, they would have to come in for their own permit.

Mr. Iwanicki asked for an explanation of the stormwater retention basin (how does it work). Mr. DeCarli stated it's like a leach field. Ms. Bates agreed and noted permeability was 7.8. The entire site sheet flows to one catch basin and it has a grate similar to what you see on the side of roadways. The water will fall through that and there's a pipe that discharges out. The pipe will connect to the underground chamber which has an open bottom that sits on crushed stone and it allows the water to infiltrate in. Once the water fills up in that, it will be engaged to the orifices for the outlet control structure. Another manhole that will have a weir wall built across the front of it with a pipe to the back that will allow the water to discharge out and on the front side of it all the water is ponded up against it and there are holes built into the concrete wall that allow the water

to go through it and exit out the back side of it. Ms. Bates pointed out a particular structure, a large circular structure with a wall built half way through it that have holes at specific elevations and then a top elevation that is not as high as the chamber top that will hold the water back but then miter it out letting a little bit of it out at every storm to keep the wetlands wet and to maintain the hydrology that was in the existing condition.

Mr. J. Stephens asked if there was any maintenance required. Ms. Bates stated debris removal isn't usually an issue as that would be handled by the catch basin. There are access ports along the top (circles) and maintenance can pop the top to see what's going on. Will have to go in at least quarterly for the first year and figure out thereafter how often to go in to clean it out. Ms. Bates explained the catch basin is a square wall structure with a pipe going out the back, but it has a hood on top of it that holds the petroleum products, bottles, leaf debris, and the sump below the invert out will hold the sediments, etc., but must be vacuumed out. Again quarterly for the first year to figure out it's pattern. Pointed out the water quality unit that is upstream from the basin. Ms. Bates stated as part of the Stormwater Quality Manual 80 percent of the total suspended solids need to be removed and they will be using a Barracuda developed by ADS in addition to the deep sump hooded catch basin and the underground infiltration system.

MOTION: Paul Best motioned to approve a site plan review of associated earthwork to allow for a 10,000 square foot retail building Killingworth Road, Map 60/Lot 26-7, adjacent to 968 Killingworth Road. Applicant: MPA Realty Associates. **Conditions:** None. Mark Stephens second. Motion carried unanimously.

Prior to the vote on the motion, Mr. Iwanicki asked if someone from the town would be looking at the site plan. Mr. Mularski stated it will be going before Planning and Zoning and that he had looked at the plans extensively and saw no problem. Mr. Mularski stated he has the stormwater calculations before him and it all looks very well done (well detailed).

Mr. J. Stephens asked about the storm calculations. Ms. Bates stated National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) atlas 14 and it's constantly changing. Just received rainfall rates in the last three months and every time they do a model they get NOAA's most recent updates. Mr. J. Stephens asked if it were regional. Ms. Bates stated it's for the actual location and is based on rain gauges around Connecticut.

6. Wetland Enforcement Officer's Report

Mr. Mularski reviewed his report dated 12 October 2022.

Notice of Code Violation, 316 Candlewood Hill Road – Have a couple of phone calls in to the property owner. Would like to get him moving.

143 Injun Hollow Road, Wetlands Violation – Both the owner and DEEP have signed the Consent Order regarding the mitigation work DEEP has requested. The owner is in the process of getting an engineer plan that will need to be presented to DEEP on how the stone wall will be removed and possibly how they will deal with the irrigation system that was put into the river (is allowed under DEEP regulations). Irrigation system went through the Tidal Wetlands and some of Haddam's wetlands. The property owner has been fined two $5,000 fines plus the cost of the cleanup. As the site is fairly steep they will need equipment to pull the rocks out. A brief summary of what has transpired on the site was given. Waiting to see what transpires with DEEP before moving forward regarding the town's wetlands.

Review Septic Repair in Upland Review Area – Reviewed with Roger Nemergut, P.E., a septic system off Hidden Lake. Granted administrative approval as it met all the requirements of Section 4 and Section 6. Minor repaired system sits behind existing system. No increase in size.

27 Old Turnpike Road, Possible Flooding – Mr. M. Stephens asked if there was an update. A brief summary of what brought this matter to light. Approximately 75 percent of the water gets in the town's culvert, but 25 percent goes across the street into the neighbor's property. Short of the town doing something with the town's apron to capture the last 25 percent there isn't anything more to do. The property owner will not do anymore. Have spoken to the town's engineer who has indicted the matter could be brought before the town's attorney to discuss it. A major portion of the problem has been solved. The neighbor across the street has a drop of about 2.5 - 3 feet to her front yard right off the road and it's like a waterfall. She could alleviate some of it with an apron curb to get the water by the high spot and then the water can drain off onto the property down past her house. Mr. Mularski will speak to Bill Warner and the town attorney on Tuesday, 18 October 2022. When the road was graded, doesn't believe the sloping was right (would have made it steeper in front of the driveway when crowning the road). Crown is almost non-existent.

1292 Saybrook Road, Fill Deposited into Gateway Zone – Has done everything the town has asked in regard to mitigation – reseeded, graded, and stabilized. Disagree with the finish of the project and where DEEP goes as there's a gully in the area of the tracks – 15 foot drop off the tracks to the gully.

7. Approval/Correction of Minutes

MOTION: Gail Reynolds motioned to approve the 15 August 2022 minutes as submitted. Joe Stephens second. Motion carried with Joe Stephens and Mark Stephens abstaining.

MOTION: Mark Stephens motioned to approve the 19 September 2022 minutes as submitted. Joe Stephens second. Motion carried with Gail Reynolds and Dan Iwanicki abstaining.

8. Adjournment

MOTION: Mark Stephens motioned to adjourn. Gail Reynolds second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bunny Hall Batzner
Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk

The next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, 21 November 2022.