

**Beacon Falls Inland Wetlands & Watercourses
Commission
10 Maple Avenue
Beacon Falls, CT 06403**



**BEACON FALLS
INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES
Public Hearing
August 13, 2014
MINUTES
(Subject to Revision)**

1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman John Smith made an announcement that the Public Hearing will start at 7:30 P.M. based on an error made by the Applicant. The notices went out with the time of 7:30 P.M. instead of 7:00 P.M. as stated in the Legal Notice.

Members Present: John Smith, Stephen Knapik, Arlene Brumer, Bill Giglio, and Michael Opuszynski

Not Present: Walter Opuszynski and David D'Amico

Others Present: Dave Keating; Jim Galligan; Jim Swift, Professional Landscape Architect; Mark Tice, the owner of the property on West Road; and Tom Hamilton, the Engineer for Pond Spring; and 20 members of the public.

2. Application A-2013-304

**Mark Tice, 186 West Road, Beacon Falls, CT
Subdivision Name for 5 lots – Hillside Estates for proposed use/activity/alteration of
Single Family Residential at the property located at 186 West Road, Beacon Falls, CT.**

J. Smith called the Public Hearing to order at 7:36 P.M. and asked the clerk to read the call. The clerk read the call with the time of 7:30 instead of the time of 7:00 as printed in the newspaper to reflect the actual start time.

Jim Swift, a professional engineer and landscape architect, began by apologizing to the Board regarding the start of the Public Hearing and submitted the returned certificates from everyone within 100'. The property is 6.9 acres located off West Road with rear access to Ellen Drive. The lots around there are pretty fully developed with single family lots. It is an R1 Zone. The wetlands that exist are on fairly steep slope are at 8% to 10% and due to that percentage are a C type wetland, no standing water or heavy organic base. Through something in the ground, it forces the water to the surface and forms the wetland soil, then disappears. There are no distinct watercourses leading into or out of there. It is constructed man-made ditches and uncontrolled flows on the existing house property. It washes down to West Road after finding its way, where it has drainage and catch basin. Under regulatory purposes, it falls under the watercourses criteria. Under the application, there are 4 proposed houses with the 5th being the existing houses. One house would be off Ellen Drive and the other 3 would be off a common driveway. It was designed with having a stormwater detention pond in the rear of the site and catching enough of the common driveway and the lots. They performed calculations that show through the "2 to 100 year storm". They are proposing to fill a portion of the man-made ditch and the uncontrolled runoff watercourses down to the street. Once it goes to the pond, it will be discharged to a pipe that goes down to a structure in the street and improve the conditions of the flow of stormwater to West Road. Other disturbances that are regulated under the regulations are upland disturbances in a few places. The 100' upland review area was treated with improvements in their proposal. When you get to the wetlands proper, the 100' upland disturbance on the existing house has been already taken place. The distances that they are providing are between 25' and 30' for the disturbance of the upland view, leaving plenty of room for a buffer to the wetland thinking it's more than 60'. Given the nature of the wetlands, he feels that this plan will not impact the wetland area negatively. Regarding the impact to the man-made ditches, it will improve the conditions with the town on West Road.

They do have sanitary sewer in the street but do not have water. All the lots will be connected to sanitary sewer in the street and operating with individual on-site wells. They developed an erosion control plan that requires the sedimentation basin constructed. They need to put controls on the edge. The subdivision plan is clear on the detention pond, which is not a requirement of maintenance for the town of Beacon Falls. It is on the landowner's lot who will be responsible for the maintenance of the detention pond. They did come up with an alternative plan with the moving of the common driveway a little farther from the wetland. The detention basin would be in the front. One advantage is a greater disturbance setback from Wetland A. Disadvantages are a greater overall disturbance within the upland review area, which is minor but more square footage; a longer common driveway, plays a part with the homeowners; and the distance of the common driveway at 12%, being at its entire length.

When the application was accepted at the last IWWC meeting, there was a letter from the town engineer and revisions were made based on that letter. J. Smith asked if it was the letter dated August 5, 2014 with three comments on it and J. Swift indicated that he did not have that. J. Smith read the letter aloud to the public. J. Swift indicated that he has no objections to those comments and agrees to modify to those comments.

J. Smith asked the Commission if anyone had questions and B. Giglio asked about the uncontrolled flow and connecting into the street, making it a controlled flow. His concern was with the pipe in the street adequate in taking on the addition flow. J. Swift responded that they did not analyze the pipe itself but did analyze the discharge of the site and that discharge was less than now. B. Giglio asked if it's finding its way via storm drains into that pipe and J. Swift indicated yes, that they will be providing less. S. Knapik noted that Option B is better with having the detention pond at the lowest point by the road, if it fails then it goes into the road. J. Swift indicated that there are a couple ways of doing a detention pond, especially on a slope. One way is half-excavation then half-buildup, building a berm. DEEP gets involved indicating that a dam has been built. Rather than doing that, he likes to do a hole in the ground reducing the chance of failing since a dam wasn't built. The second thing to consider is that this is a dry detention pond, not holding water all the time. S. Knapik commented that if it's maintained all the time, it won't hold water all the time. J. Swift indicated that there are openings in the structures in the bottom of the pond and it will stay longer if it's not maintained. There are emergency overflow systems designed to help and S. Knapik asked if that fails then it goes down to West Road.

M. Opuszynski asked if J. Swift has the flow calculations for in and out of the lots, and for the flow on the detention pond for all scenarios and J. Swift responded yes he does. He indicated that the stormwater drainage calculations report was issued to the town engineer. They are specific to the plan they submitted and not going to change. B. Giglio asked if the responsibility of the detention pond care going to fall on Lot 4 and J. Swift indicated yes, according to his understanding that the town of Beacon Falls requires it. B. Giglio indicated that something should be incorporated where it falls to all four or five to formalize and have it not fall through the cracks. M. Opuszynski noted that that may be good so there is no finger-pointing and the feature is on multiple lots. A. Brumer noted that the use common driveway is used by all, which goes by the pond. S. Knapik asked if the driveway has to be paved since it's at 2%, under P & Z requirements and J. Swift indicated yes. J. Smith asked

3. Adjournment - Continuation

Motion to continue the Public Hearing on Wednesday, September 10, 2014, at 7:00 P.M., at 9:00 P.M.: Knapik/M. Opuszynski; no discussion; all ayes.

Respectfully submitted,

Marla Scirpo
Clerk, Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission