

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



**BEACON FALLS
INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES
Public Hearing
January 14, 2015
MINUTES
(Subject to Revision)**

1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

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

Not Present: Walter Opuszynski

Others Present: Dave Keating; Jim Galligan; Darren Overton, Milone & MacBroom, Inc.; and 11 members of the public.

J. Smith called the Public Hearing to order at 7:06 P.M.

2. Application A-2013-306

Application A-2014-306 for Proposed Regrading Changes in Chatfield Farms, Phases 3, 4, and 5, (Map 13, Block 1, Lot 3) in Beacon Falls, CT. Application submitted by EG Homes, LLC, 100 Fieldstone Lane, Beacon Falls, CT.

J. Smith asked the clerk to read the call for tonight's public hearing.

J. Smith indicated that the applicant or their representative will make the presentation and then the Commission will open it up to the public for questions and comments.

J. Smith asked if there was any here tonight to represent the applicant and Darren Overton from Milone & MacBroom Inc. was there to make the presentation on behalf of EG Homes.

D. Overton had a rendering of the proposed plan as well as copies of the current plan at the 40-scale size that was submitted and the layout plan originally submitted by Wyndham Homes. He submitted the notified receipts of the adjacent owners within 100 feet of the perimeter.

D. Overton began by indicating the EG Homes took ownership of the property and building the new units for approximately one year. They took over where Wyndham Homes left off. The EG Homes are slightly different than the Wyndham Homes designs. Some of the units are at various styles and fit better than the original design and they rearranged the units. The roadway network was not changed at all. There is a staging area in the northwest corner and where there is a stockpile. Part of the redesign was to balance the earthwork in Phases 3 through 5. The earthwork previous done and the difference shows a two foot grade change. They would need to raise it the two feet in order to avoid trucking the material back through the developed portion of the property.

The change was evaluated and elevated the site. There is regrading to accommodate the units with having the same number, location, and same discharge location of the basins. The volume is the same, the watersheds are the same, and the road network is the same. There is an additional height adding to walls to accommodate for low sides. For the most part, they held the line along the wetlands. There were duplexes on the original plans but there are none on EG Homes' plans in Phases 3 through 5. They maintain the original separation between units so there are two less units.

Some comments were submitted by the town engineer and D. Overton made his reply and submitted them to the Commission.

The Wyndham Homes had deck options and they are proposing similar due to the desirability. The radius on the cul-de-sac on L2 was changed but they are changing it back to be consistent to the original plans. There are 2 small changes in the watersheds out in the west that would drain towards the back. None would be piped, all sheet flowing out into the wooded area. The landscape plan in Phases 3 through 5 will be the same as in Phases 1 and 2. M. Opuszynski asked if there were changes in vegetation in wetland areas and D. Overton indicated that there is no change in the proposal. There is a crossing of the intermittent watercourse above the central wetland which the pipe is already in place. There is one unit where a deck extends into the wetland review area, Unit 198 if he recalls correctly.

There are some changes in the small water discharges. Previously, there were underground concrete gallery level spreader but the new builder desires to do a preformed scour hold. Height and lengths of walls have changed due to the changes in the plans.

The sediment erosion control plan and stabilization plan were not changed but modified the construction sequence slightly. There was a question of gutter flow and didn't show any catch basins. It is intended to be a curbless design roadway. It would sheetflow off between the units with swells being between the units. There are minor changes to the details regarding the elimination of the level spreader, elimination of some details that were unique to Phases 1 and 2.

D. Overton asked the Commission if they had any questions. S. Knapik asked by raising it two feet if it changed the percentage of grade. D. Overton indicated that it changed the matching point but ramped up a little. This part of the property does have a steep grade as the first two phases. He doesn't believe anything is over 8%. S. Knapik asked about doing the shoulder and running into the wetland setback at all, except for the one spot. D. Overton indicated that they lost one unit and to avoid wrapping the retention wall around, they utilized a little bit more grading. S. Knapik asked about a list of the decks that were in the setback area. D. Overton indicated that they were trying to avoid that with the redesign. The plans show one being 12x12, being either a deck or screened porch. Wyndham Homes had both on their units. J. Smith asked if the plans reflect all the comments and D. Overton indicated that the plans have not been revised yet. J. Smith asked if the square footage of the units is the same, with the same amount of roof and area on the lot. D. Overton indicated that a few dimensions are smaller, no bigger than what Wyndham Homes had.

D. Keating asked when the stormwater calculations, where the decks counted as pervious or impervious. D. Overton was not sure. D. Keating asked to have that double-checked. J. Smith noted that that was one of their concerns.

J. Smith asked if the Commission members had any questions before opening the comments up to the public. M. Opuszynski asked if the regrading changed the direction of the flow. D. Overton indicated that the watersheds are substantially similar and the stormwater management basins are located in the same place. The driveway locations may shift the catch basins catching the flow. They tried to maintain to the same prosed watersheds, which was not difficult since they were only raising it by two feet. One watershed increased by one-hundredth and another one increased by seven-hundredths which was related to runoff in the back half of the units. There was no road drainage or pipe discharges. The other watersheds decreased in pervious from 2008.

J. Smith asked if D. Keating or J. Galligan had any questions prior to opening the comments up to the public. J. Galligan asked to have the upland review area impact changes for the next meeting. There is confusion on the decks. He does not remember the units on the west side all having decks in the original plans. D. Overton indicated the some of the units backed up to the upland review area did not have deck because they did not want them extended into the review area. Where there are outside the upland review area, they are shown with a deck or a screened-in porch. J. Galligan asked for the comparison. D. Overton mentioned that a number of units are shorter than Wyndham Homes' plan. They did not encroach into the 50-foot review that was not approved before. J. Smith asked that the units are that much shorter where they are not encroaching now. D. Overton indicated that the model could have been changed.

B. Giglio asked when they lost the two units, did they increase the size of the single-family houses or has there been a new loss therefore, the use of the decks being used to offset the loss. D. Overton noted that with the two units lost and the dimensions being smaller, there was a loss in the square footage. They did not compare the two.

J. Galligan asked if it was his intention to gather the information from tonight's hearing and combine it with the items agreed to do based on the letter, to modify the plans to present at the next meeting. D. Overton indicated that was correct. He wanted to modify the plans once knowing that there were probably going to be changes after tonight's meeting.

J. Smith asked if there were any one present to speak in favor of the applicant and there were none at this time. He then asked if there were any questions to be addressed to the applicant at this time.

Randy Bruce, Blackberry Hill Road, asked what the reason to the raising of the grade. D. Overton indicated that there is a large stock pile of material in the staging area and they are trying to avoid trucking the material through the developed units. Also, there is ledge on the site, helping with utilities being installed. The continual truck traffic was the main reason. R. Bruce asked if this will affect the drainage towards Miller Road/Blackberry Hill Road side. D. Overton indicated that the watersheds were looked at and there is very little change.

Adam Vossbrinck, project manager for EG Homes, indicated that when the new house construction was started on Phase 2, they were under the impression that the original plans left them 100,000 yards of material. The goal was to absorb all that and keep it on site so they decreased the impact on the community as far as truck traffic.

R. Bruce asked about the intent of the emergency access that goes out to Miller Road. D. Overton indicated that the emergency access drive is proposed to have regrading and have a processed stone base put down in order to have emergency vehicles pass on it when needed. They are proposing collecting, redirecting, or putting drainage in that road. R. Bruce indicated that there is drainage at the end of the road. D. Overton indicated that the intention is to improve it for the passing of emergency vehicles. R. Bruce asked who would maintain the road and D. Overton did not know. A. Brumer indicated that it should be in the by-laws and brought to Planning and Zoning. R. Bruce asked if there is a gate to the property going from Miller Road. D. Overton indicated that there is a proposed gate just inside the property line.

J. Smith asked if there were any further questions for the applicant and there were none at this time. After a brief discussion to see when the modifications made and presented to the Commission again, a continuance was asked at 7:48 PM.

Motion to continue this public hearing on Wednesday, February 11, 2015, at 7:00 PM:
Knapik/Brumer; no discussion; all ayes.

**BEACON FALLS
INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES
Public Hearing Continuance
February 11, 2015
MINUTES
(Subject to Revision)**

1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

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

Others Present: Dave Keating; Jim Galligan; Matt Gilchrist, EG Homes; Darren Overton, Milone & MacBroom, Inc.; and 5 members of the public.

J. Smith called the continuation of the Public Hearing that began on January 14, 2015 to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. Application A-2013-306 - Continued

Continuation of the Application A-2014-306 for Proposed Regrading Changes in Chatfield Farms, Phases 3, 4, and 5, (Map 13, Block 1, Lot 3) in Beacon Falls, CT. Application submitted by EG Homes, LLC, 100 Fieldstone Lane, Beacon Falls, CT

J. Smith asked for the clerk to read the call for tonight's public hearing.

J. Smith asked if there was anyone present to speak on behalf of the applicant.

Darren Overton, from Milone & MacBroom, was representing the applicant. He has revised the plans based on the previous meeting with the Commission as well as formalizing the revisions outlined in the response to the engineer's review both Planning & Zoning and Inland Wetlands. There was a question on the upland review area impact and he submitted the revised plans to the Commission. They calculated the upland review area impact. The former plan had .9 acres and now, with raising the site and eliminating the duplexes, the line moved in and out. There is now 1.1 acres of disturbance based on the 50-foot upland review area. There was also a question on the emergency access drive maintenance. They are not looking to change that with having the homeowners association to maintain it. There was a question on the decks/enclosed porches. Looking back at the approved plans from 2005 and 2007, there were two decks/enclosed porches and a portion of a stair in the upland review area. In the current plan, there are two decks and no stairs proposed. They are about the same in square footage. The old plan had 128 sq. ft. and the new plan has 144 sq. ft. in the review area. J. Smith asked what units this is pertaining to and D. Overton indicated Unit 174 on G1 and Unit 198 on G3.

J. Smith asked if there are being counted as pervious or impervious and D. Overton indicated that they would be impervious in their analysis, being considered as an enclosed porch. D. Overton indicated that they met with the town engineer to go over the plan revisions and believe that everything has been addressed.

J. Smith asked which areas or what units were closer to the review area. D. Overton made note to the area where the duplexes were removed. By using the map as an indicator, D. Overton showed the Commission the areas where there was less impact. The blue is the upland review area on the map. The yellow is the old impact line with limited disturbance.

J. Smith asked if the Commission had any questions and S. Knapik asked about the changes in the elevation in the slab, if the pitch is to the road or is it the same. D. Overton indicated that they held the same relationship. With the units on the high side, they held a maximum of 5% to 6% grade. With the units on the low side, they held the minimum of a 2% grade.

J. Smith asked the total number of units previously approved versus the total number of units now. D. Overton indicated that they lost two, now having 232 units. S. Knapik asked about the change to the height of the detention pond and the berm. With the raising of the site, they came up too. They lifted the bottom of the berm with it. The basin all stayed in the same place. The road configuration, layout, is all the same. The access entry into the third phase changed the slope of the road to match the grade coming in.

J. Smith asked if D. Keating and J. Galligan had any questions. D. Keating noted that it was mentioned the maintenance of the emergency access will remain the same, with having the homeowners association doing this. He asked if it will be maintained from the units to the right of way or all the way out to the paved portion. D. Overton was not sure how it was handled in the past but they are not looking to change anything from the previous plan.

J. Galligan indicated that he met with D. Overton and Matt Gilchrist to go over the changes and went back to look at the drainage to confirm the runoffs were accurate. J. Galligan also noted a few things. One being that the stormwater detention basins now have plunge pools now instead of the level spreaders. D. Overton mentioned that Basin 290 now have a plunge pool that was put in, also known as a preform scour hole. Based on DOT requirements, it is sized determined by the length, width, and depth of the basin. They are calculations that are used based on DOT requirements. M. Opuszynski asked if he had the detail plans and D. Overton indicated that they are in the original plans. J. Smith asked if there were more or just that one. D. Overton indicated that Basin 270, Basin 290, and Basin 260.

W. Opuszynski asked if he is taking into consideration of the new regulations of the SM-4. D. Overton believed that doesn't affect this. They designed it according to the DEP stormwater quality manual so the basins are sized accordingly to the volume. W. Opuszynski thought the deadline was January 15, 2015. J. Galligan mentioned that D. Overton is correct that they will be required to meet the SM-4 requirements but post-construction maintenance and activities.

J. Smith asked if there were any other questions by the Commission before opening up the comments and questions to the public, and there were none at this time.

J. Smith asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the application. Albert Tornatore, 12 Laurel Ridge, is the president of the homeowner's association at Chatfield Farms. They have been meeting with M. Gilchrist and would like to see the stockpile moved as quickly as possible since there has been four years of delay. They are happy about the decreased truck traffic and the raising of the site. They are aware of the maintenance of the emergency access road and will maintain it to the edge of their property. He is assuming that the town of Bethany will plow up to that point but the question is how do you get the town of Bethany to plow their roads.

J. Smith asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the application and there were none at this time. He then asked if there were anyone to speak against the application and there were none at this time.

J. Galligan noted it should be mentioned about the bond and clarification on the bond. J. Smith noted that he had asked if the original bond was carried over which was set on 3, 4, and 5. We still have the bond for 1 and 2. D. Keating noted that M. Gilchrist would have some information. M. Gilchrist explained that when AM Alexandria purchased the property, one part of the transition was that they had to repost letters of credit with the town. One is \$7,500 which was a reduction from \$75,000 performance bond on the detention basins. The second is \$150,000 wetland bond that stays open until the end, getting rolled over from phase to phase. They need to refresh the \$75,000 bond for the detention basin and for Phases 3, 4, and 5. They would like to consolidate it into one letter of credit for detention basins and let it run into the next phase.

J. Smith asked if there were any other comments to the Commission. Randy Bruce, Blackberry Hill Road, asked about the maintenance of the emergency access road. J. Smith indicated that this was addressed earlier in the public hearing and it was noted that this is a concern for Planning & Zoning. Any questions regarding this should be brought to P & Z. R. Bruce then asked about the drainage issue with raising the site on the east site going toward Bear Hill Road and Miller Road. J. Smith indicated that all questions were addressed and answered to the satisfaction of the town engineer and staff.

J. Smith asked if there is any plan to the access road. D. Overton indicated that there will be minor grading and processed stone put down so there will be minor improvement but no increase runoff or no new point discharge that way. There is a certain phase where this will be done based on the requirements of Planning & Zoning.

J. Smith asked three times if there were any further questions or comments and there were none at this time.

3. Application A-2015-308 – C. Edwards Company

J. Smith stepped off the board as an adjacent property owner.

S. Knapik indicated that the applicant's engineer did not send out the notifications of the public hearing to the adjacent property owners in regards to tonight's public hearing, so there will be not public hearing for the Tiverton 2 subdivision.

After a brief discussion, it was decided that the public hearing will be held prior to next monthly meeting on Wednesday, March 11, 2015, at 7:00 PM.

4. Adjournment

Motion to close the Public Hearing at 7:45 P.M.: **S. Knapik/W. Opuszynski**; *no discussion*; all ayes.

Respectfully submitted,

Marla Scirpo
Clerk, Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission