

SOUTHINGTON INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
 Regular Meeting
 Thursday, November 5, 2009
 7:00 pm - Town Hall Council Chambers
 75 Main Street, Southington, Connecticut

MINUTES

The Southington Inland Wetlands Agency held a regular meeting on Thursday, November 5, 2009. Acting Chairperson James Sullivan called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Councilpersons were present, viz:

Ted Cabata, Kevin Conroy, John DeMello and Anne Hulick

Alternates: William Camp
 (Unfilled seat)

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

David Lavallee, Assistant Town Planner
 Joseph DePaolo, Assistant Town Attorney

Absent: Chris Borowy, Commissioner
 Theresa Pereyo, Chair

The Chair seated William Camp for Chris Borowy. A quorum was determined.

THERESA PEREYO, Chair, presiding:

Approval of Minutes - Regular Meeting: October 1, 2009

Mr. DeMello made a motion to approve the Minutes. Mr. Conroy seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

- Special Meeting of October 10, 2009

Mr. Conroy made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Mr. Camp seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. DeMello and Mr. Cabata abstaining.

Treasurer's Report

Mr. Conroy made a motion to waive the reading the Treasurer's Report. Mr. Cabata seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Reports from Public, Press and Ex-Officio members regarding items scheduled for action.

No response.

Inland Wetland/Floodplain Filling Applications:

A. Information/Action - IW #1164, application of Southington Land Associates seeking to fill 4,951 sf of wetlands for road crossings and disturb upland review area for a 9 building industrial park. Property located on West Queen Street.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates representing the application noted that the property is 27.7 acres of industrial land, I-1 zoned, on West Queen Street. It's served by public water and sewer. There are 6.7 acres of wetlands. The proposing filling of wetlands is 4,951 sf which is the minimum amount that we can fill to achieve this proposal. And, all those crossings are water related dependent crossings.

We're proposing 9 lots, industrial lots, which range in size from 1.2 acres to 5.2 acres and the zoning allows for 20,000 sf.

We received staff comments in additions to concerns of the commission during the site walk. We responded in writing to Dave's comments and I have copies for you to see the responses while we discuss the application.

(Submitted & passed around)

Changes to the plan were made in response to the following items:

- On site concerns were with Lot 4 which is the northwest boundary, west of the cul de sac.
- Concerns about the crossing where the canal ends.
- Generally concerns about filling in wetlands and buffer area.
- Also the discharge of water from the street into the canal and being treated with a stormceptor. There was indication that the commission was not happy with that.

Mr. Bovino gave a brief history of the site in response to questions at the site walk about what the conditions of the site were 30, 40 years ago.

Discussion.

The cul de sac was moved outside the 50' buffer. The building was totally moved out of the buffer as the commission had concerns with leaving this area intact. All activities take place outside of the buffer. Drainage was explained from the swales to the wetland areas. We moved the parking area to avoid being too close to the wetlands. The plans have orange construction fence, silt fence and we can add boulders if you want to in the areas where we are closer to the wetlands.

Discussion.

We also eliminated the road discharge with the stormceptor into the canal so now the drainage is picked up and taken out through the pipes down into the detention area alongside the stream. There'll be a treatment train longer than originally proposed.

The pipe that was across the two lots (indicating) is a 48 inch pipe with a natural bottom to it.

We are eliminating the berms along the canal on the east side under the Ass't Town Planner's advisement. There will not be any disturbance of the buffer or wetlands in that area.

We also changed the discharge point of the detention area/water quality basin to the northerly end of the system so we have more distance for the water to be treated before discharging into the pond. We are proposing a stormceptor at that location.

As for the mitigation area, it is recommended that we do not provide the 3:1 mitigation but maybe increase the plantings and utilizing the bottom of the detention areas for mitigation. The soil scientist will address that.

We were asked to provide an alternate layout to you for this. If you were wondering if a roadway could be placed so there was no crossing of the wetland in this area (indicating). Mr. Bovino explained the alternate layout pointing out the disadvantages of it.

David Lord, wetland scientist, discussed the wetlands mitigation plan which is dated July 22, 2009 and on file in the Planner's Office. It is a wetland creation plan and planting details.

Explained the plan.

If the commission does not feel this much compensation, restoration is necessary, we can reduce that as noted by the Ass't Town Planner.

The Storm Water Quality Detention Basin Planting Details for each of the three storm water detention basins was discussed. (Report on file in the Town Planner's Office.) Mr. Lavalley has suggested the plantings be doubled and we have no problem with that.

Discussion.

Surface water runoff to the wetlands was described.

Mr. Bovino noted another change: the crossing where the canal ends, we are now proposing a box culvert with a natural bottom versus the pipe. Submitted pictures of one which was done on Winding Ridge a few years back.

(Submitted pre and post development pictures)

Andrew Quirk, Professional Engineer, with Kratzert, Jones, went through some of the drainage changes along with handouts that illustrate the changes.

He specifically discussed comments regarding the watershed areas and how the areas were going to be treated versus the areas that bypass the site as well as the larger drainage area that comes from Westwoods Drive, Captain Lewis and through the site.

A second handout, a 10-scale grading plan for the proposed box culvert at the end of the canal was explained. The drainage system was discussed for this area.

The property was reflagged, noted Mr. Bovino, in response to a comment by Mr. Sullivan.

The Acting Chair brought up the comment about clearing the vegetation close to canal and that will have some impact. Mr. Bovino noted that with this plan, we are filling the minimum amount we can fill to get to the good areas of the site. As far as the trees along the canal, there are trees at the edge of the canal and brush growing there. We are not going to cut right up to the canal. The trees on the east side of the canal are going to be left as is.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy asked for clarification of some of the impact areas.
Discussion.

(End of Tape #1, Side A)

(Beginning of Tape #1, Side B)

Discussion about whether this is a significant impact application and should require a public hearing.

Mr. Conroy made a motion to schedule a public hearing for this application. Mr. DeMello seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Public Hearing will be scheduled for the December meeting.

B. Information - IW #1166/FF#220, application of the Southington Water Department seeking to complete a previously approved water line crossing below the Eight Mile River on Welch Road.

Randy Brown, Tighe & Bond Engineers, on behalf of the applicant, the Southington Water Department, presented.

This is a project that was previously before this Board a couple of years ago. The Eight Mile Brook (sic) crosses Welch Road and flows down into Grannis Pond. The Southington Water Department had a project to install a new water main on Welch Road. Part of that project was to cross the twin 60-inch by 84-inch culverts. Both culverts are corrugated metal pipe.

When the contractor went to install the water main underneath the pipe within the roadway, last year, the contractor noted that the pipe was deteriorated and installation was to continue installation underneath the culvers, the culvert would likely fail. The integrity of the pipes would have been jeopardized.

So at that time, the contractor and the water department decided to cap both ends of the water main and not make that crossing and put that off to a future date.

That's what this project is for. We sat down with the Town Engineer and discussed our options. We felt the best option was to basically by-pass the culverts by installing the water main off the roadway on the southern side as shown on the plan.

About 80 feet of the proposed water main will be installed within the wetlands and most of that is within what is now standing water. All work will be within the 50 feet buffer zone. There's a total about 150 feet of new 12-inch water main.

The proposed method for installation is to insert twin culverts. Explained the procedure as plugging the upstream end, divert flow through one of the culverts and at that time there would be a sandbag barrier used on the downstream side on one half of the crossing. Install the water main up to that point and at that time he would flip roles to plug the opposite culvert, divert the stream to the opposite culvert and move the sandbag barrier over to install the water main on the other side of the crossing.

For sediment control, the contractor would be required to put a silt fence along the roadway. Explained.

Sediment traps would be used for any water discharged back into the stream. A silt sack would be put on all the catch basins in the area.

Restoration is once the water main is installed, the contractor would backfill with the native material, and then there would be a rip rapped area placed over the top of the location of the water main installed.

I'll entertain questions.

Mr. Lavallee said he had a couple of reservations about just using the simple sand bag method. I think it will be necessary to get some sheeting in-between while they close it or totally block it off upstream and run the hoses through one of the culverts and pump the entire water upstream further downstream beyond the work area. Just because I am familiar with the site and I've seen how much water goes through there.

During low flow conditions it will probably be a lot easier. I don't think at this point just blocking it with sand bags and excavating that close to the groundwater and the surface water is flowing through the culverts would be advisable.

I think it would be a contingency in the field to have a couple of different set ups ready.

Discussion.

Also, the property ownership where the work is actually being done, that may be private property and the applicant should get permission from the property owner to do the work there. I don't think it is within the town right of way or within the easement.

The project was approved, noted Mr. Lavallee, with two ways of doing it. One was to go under and one was to go around.

Discussion.

I think we could revise going through the culvert by pumping it.

Discussion about having this come back before us in a fairly short amount of time since they are not replacing the piping or the culverts. Mr. Conroy would like to see the town get involved regarding the culverts. That will be explored.

Mr. Conroy made a motion to table IW#1166 and FF #220. Mr. Cabata seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Site walk set for November 21, 2009.

C. Information - IW #1167, application of Carpenter Realty Co. seeking to pipe a watercourse along Lazy Lane.

Stephen Giudice, with Harry Cole & Son, presented the application. The applicant owns property along Lazy Lane in the vicinity of house #135. This property was part of a subdivision application that was approved by this commission in 2006.

It's I-2 zoned property. Proposed roadway located in this location (indicating) which is known as Triano Drive. Construction was started but never completed. The applicant went in and did some work on the site that wasn't necessarily in compliance with the Army Corp permit.

Explained.

The property has been going through a remediation process with the Army Corp of Engineers. Mr. Carpenter has spent a lot of money and prepared the mitigation plan that was approved and implemented. A lot of work on site.

Discussion.

Mr. Carpenter has installed a sanitary sewer main that runs from the police station up to this location here (indicating). This was part of the approval for that subdivision. Another applicant then extended that sewer main up to this location. And, then a water main was extended up to this point here (indicating).

While this was going on, Lazy Lane is being repaved. That necessitated the urgency to get the sewer main in before the repaving was done.

Mr. Carpenter approached Mr. Lavallee and me with the idea of widening Lazy Lane in this location for the benefit of his future building lots. Its I-2 industrial lots and they'll most likely be having pretty large deliveries. Typically in industrial zones we have pavement widths of 24 to 30 feet.

We proposed some improvements to Lazy Lane. The property is technically the Town of Southington right of way although the applicant is Carpenter Construction.

We have a series of channels, ditches and swales, watercourses that run along the frontage of the property. Explained the northerly side and westerly side piping.

Mr. Carpenter would like to widen the roadway in this area, taper the road to a 30 foot width. What they are proposing to do with improvements was explained being illustrated on the plan.

In that widening we are proposing catch basins and pipe - 750' of drainage improvements along Lazy Lane. I believe that this is something that the Town probably would have done with Lazy Lane if the funds were available.

Discussion.

Mr. Carpenter would like to install the drainage before the binder course of pavement and the final course of pavement.

We've matched the pipes that are there. An outfall is proposed at this location (indicating). It's a little farther east than the original outfall. Explained the topography of the area. And, the limit of the wetland locations were explained. We are proposing rip rap, plunge pools, standard catch basins and concrete piping.

Discussion.

Mr. Lavalley offered staff comments. It's always preferable to an open swale along a roadside with all the sands, et cetera. Maybe some thought can be given to improving the entrance but I don't know about the downstream. You'll see the character of it on site.

Mr. Camp made a motion to table. Mr. DeMello seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Site walk set for November 21, 2009.

8. Communications

A. Reports from Public, press and Ex-Officio members regarding items other than those scheduled for action.

None at this time.

9. Conservation Issues/Unfinished Business/ Miscellaneous

- Extension request for IW #965

Mr. Lavalley advised the commission this was a request from Forestville Lumber Company. They had approval for discharge of some stormwater into the watercourse/ditch on Townline Road. It was approved August 12, 2004. The five years was up and they missed it by a couple of months. Our statutes don't say if you can or can't extend it after it expired. It would be a good idea to set some policy on that. But at this point, I don't see an issue with the request.

The upland review area changed from 40 to 50 during that time. But it was a discharge to a roadside ditch that was considered a resource.

The Chair asked Mr. Lavallee to make a note next time the regulations are opened up to put that item in there as a policy.

Per their letter, they were not in the middle of doing any development and none has taken place since the approval.

Discussion.

Mr. Cabata suggested a motion on the grounds it will have to go through the PZC, to deny the request. They are not in the middle of building.

Discussion.

Mr. Cabata then made a motion to deny the extension for the fact it is past five years. Mr. DeMello seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

- Review of plans for the multi-use recreational fields off of Meriden Waterbury Turnpike

Mr. Lavallee reported this is the old drive in. They want to pretty much make the drive in site a recreation field. The river is down at the bottom of the slope. The top of the slope, each side is wetlands and the whole area has been filled and flattened. They want to regrade it flat, put in some parking.

Do you want to look at it and determine if it needs an application or just have me approve it? I've made comments on the plan and the plan has been revised to show certain things like erosion controls, some extra plantings provided on site.

This is the parking, fields and drainage improvements.

Mr. Conroy said he would like to see the master plan than just approve piecemeal improvements. A phased concept plan to move forward.

- Other items for the commission

Vice Chairman Sullivan advised there is CACIWK conference in Wallingford. The Chair recommends it. The title is the Role of Municipalities in Preserving Threatened Bird Habitats in Connecticut. It's over at Mountain Ridge in Wallingford on Saturday, November 14th.

In light of that, site walks will be set up for the 21st of November, 2009.

- Mr. Lavallee reported he is keeping an eye on the house at the corner of Berlin and East Street. They are respecting the wetlands edge. We will see long term how it is.

10. Adjournment

Mr. Conroy made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Camp seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 o'clock, p.m.)