TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR Meeting #1747 – September 25, 2018

MEETING MINUTES

*****Minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting *****

The Meeting was called to order in the Town Hall Meeting Room, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT. at 6:30 P. M. by Chairman Ouellette.

PRESENT: Regular Members: Joe Ouellette (Chairman), Michael Kowalski, Tim

Moore, David Sullivan, and Jim Thurz.

Alternate Members: Anne Gobin, Frank Gowdy, and Marti Zhigailo.

ABSENT: Regular Members: All Regular Members were present.

Alternate Members: All Alternate members were present this evening.

Also present was Assistant Town Planner Tyksinski.

SPEAKERS: Terri Hahn, principle in LADA Land Consultants; **WSG, LLC:** Adam Westhaver, Applicant; Marek Kement, Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor, Anchor Engineering;

<u>Public:</u> Paul Anderson, Carol Arrowsmith, Alan Baker, Kristin Bromley, Austin Burt, Steve Dearborn, Deputy First Selectman; Albert Grant, Director, Northern Connecticut Land Trust; David King, Ron Masters, Robert Maynard, First Selectman; Michaela Mullarky, Stan Paleski, Margaret Ryglisyn, Charlie Szymanski, Selectman; Jerrold Webber, Lynn Wooding, Keith Yagaloff, Linda York, Gloria Zuzik, Lori Zuzik.

Press: Anthony Branciforte, Journal Inquirer.

Chairman Ouellette requested everyone put their cell phones on vibrate, or shut them off.

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM:

A quorum was established as five Regular Members and three Alternate Members were present at the Call to Order. Alternate Members would also join the Board regarding discussion and action on all Items of Business this evening as well.

LEGAL NOTICE: None.

ADDED AGENDA ITEMS:

Assistant Town Planner Tyksinski requested the addition of an update of the TOD (Transit Oriented Development) Smart Growth Grant for Warehouse Point.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Chairman Ouellette queried the audience for comments regarding items/issues not posted on the Agenda. No one requested to speak.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES/September 11, 2018 Regular Meeting:

MOTION: To ACCEPT the Minutes of Regular Meeting #1746 dated September

11, 2018, as amended:

Page 3, <u>NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS – WSG, LLC</u> – Special Use Permit/Excavation to allow commercial sand and gravel excavation operation...., line #133, "access distance from another pit; the distance was reduced from 1 mile to <u>1½ mile</u> ½ mile arlier this year"

Moore moved/Sullivan seconded/DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous (Ouellette/Kowalski/Moore/Sullivan/Thurz)

MOTION: To GO OUT OF THE POSTED AGENDA ORDER to take Item XIV

BUSINESS MEETING/(1) TOD Smart Growth Grant for Warehouse

Point next.

Sullivan moved/Thurz seconded/DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous (Ouellette/Kowalski/Moore/Sullivan/Thurz)

Terri Anne Hahn, of LADA, joined the Commission. Mrs. Hahn reported the last time she was before the Commission she was working on the Warehouse Point Growth Study which was incorporated into the POCD (Plan of Conservation and Development). The potential development/growth of the Warehouse Point Village was developed based on workshops held at that time. Mrs. Hahn reported the Town submitted a grant in 2016, which was not received; the grant request was resubmitted in 2017 and awarded for a study for planning stormwater management and village center redevelopment in Warehouse Point.

Mrs. Hahn reported that when they were working on the overall master plan they kept coming up with a plan but questioned if they could do that as Warehouse Point has the Blue Ditch and stormwater issues. This grant allows for the study of the relationship between stormwater and future redevelopment to figure out what really could happen for future development and growth for Warehouse Point. It ties in stormwater management and what we're able to learn about that because when you do new development there's an automatic increase in the amount of impervious surface which generates more stormwater in a situation that's already rather difficult in Warehouse Point . This study will include 2 workshops; they'll also look at the Zoning Regulations for Warehouse Point for future development, bike paths, and pedestrian traffic. The grant process will occur over the next 15 months; Mrs. Hahn expects to have completed the study around Christmas, 2019.

Mrs. Hahn reported the watershed is on the other side of Route 5 around the area of Prospect Hill Road. With the assistance of the Public Works Department they'll be looking at where the catch basins are located; she'll return to the Commission in November to show the Commission the results of their initial investigation, and develop site plans for individual areas and make recommendations for stormwater improvements.

Mrs. Hahn suggested that usually in areas near the Connecticut River you want to get the stormwater out as quickly as possible, however, the Blue Ditch has surface water conditions and backwater from the Connecticut River. They are considering options for management of those issues. Many sites in Warehouse Point are half acre parcels.

Mrs. Hahn provided the Commission with a schedule of the work on this study. (Schedule is available in the Planning Office)

Chairman Ouellette questioned if Mrs. Hahn had been coordinating her work with the Town Engineer? Mrs. Hahn indicated she's just starting to collect the existing information, such as locating the catch basins. Mrs. Hahn reported the DPW recently cleaned out the catch basin where the Blue Ditch crosses Bridge Street.

Chairman Ouellette referenced the 2019 completion date, he questioned if that date was tied to when the grant ends; what's the controlling factor? Mrs. Hahn noted there are 2 required Public Hearings; at this point she's looking at February and October. Mrs. Hahn reported she'll return to the Commission for discussions on a regular basis; she'll provide information to the Planning Office in advance of those meetings. Mrs. Hahn requested to be scheduled at the beginning of the Agendas. She suggested considering this meeting a kick off.

RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS:

Chairman Ouellette noted receipt of the following new Applications:

 Application of ACI Auto Group for Site Plan Approval for construction of a 10,500 +/- sq. ft. building for used car sales and auto repair at 206 South Main Street, owned by KBT Realty, LLC. (B-2, M-1 & A-2 zones; Map 22, Block 5, Lot 81)

<u>PERFORMANCE BONDS – ACTIONS; PERMIT EXTENSIONS; ROAD ACCEPTANCE</u>

No requests presented under this Item of Business this evening.

<u>CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS: WSG, LLC</u> - Special Use Permit/Excavation to allow commercial sand and gravel excavation operation, to be done in four phases at 4

(should be 140) Wapping Road. [M-1 & A-1 Zones; Map 17, Block 65, Lot 8-34] (Deadline to close hearing 10/16/2018):

Chairman Ouellette read the description of this Public Hearing.

Chairman Ouellette noted he had not been present at the previous Meeting but he has read the Minutes and all the information provided to the Commissioners; he reported he's comfortable sitting in and making an informed decision on this Application.

Marek Kement, Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor for Anchor Engineering, introduced himself, and Adam Westhaver, the Applicant.

Mr. Kement reported this Application is for a Special Use Permit for a gravel and sand excavation and filling operation at 140 Wapping Road. Mr. Kement addressed the following:

- Town Engineer Norton's memo, which was received the day after the previous Meeting: That memo had comments about adding a wash rack. Mr. Kement reported he felt that COMMENT was adequately addressed in the General Conditions of Assistant Town Planner Tyksinksi's memo dated 9/20/2017, line item #36. Mr. Kement read the condition. He suggested that by putting that as a condition up front it allows Town Staff to review the situation, and, if there is a situation they'll address it at that time.
- Letters from Albert Grant, Director of the Northern Connecticut Land Trust: Mr. Kement reported they are not going to go past what's already been disturbed.
- Traffic on Morris Road and Plantation Road: Mr. Kement suggested they can't control the traffic, but they'll discourage drivers from using those roads.

Chairman Ouellette queried Commissioner Gobin if she had questions for the Applicant?

<u>Commissioner Gobin</u> noted she wasn't present at the previous Meeting but she offered the following comments:

- Regulation changes: Commissioner Gobin felt she may have received an outdated version of the regulations as her copy indicates that with regard to Section 814 it says permits can't be issued within 1 mile of entrance or exit of another pit while from the Minutes it appears the regulations have changed to ½ mile. Assistant Town Planner Tyksinski concurred, noting the regulations are being updated currently.
- Assistant Town Planner Tyksinski's Memo of 9/20: Commissioner Gobin noted the regulations say the hours of operation will be 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, while Condition #24 of the memo references 7:30 p.m.; she questioned that should be 7:30 a.m.? Assistant Town Planner Tyksinski replied affirmatively.

• Regulation 814: Commissioner Gobin indicated it seemed to her that in her read of the regulations the binding decision for us is Section 814.f; it requires us to grant a permit if it complies with Section 814.

Mr. Kement noted the Commissioners had no plans before them; did they need copies? Chairman Ouellette noted they were mailed to the Commissioners. He questioned if anything was different regarding the plans tonight? Mr. Kement replied negatively.

Chairman Ouellette had the following questions:

- Application description: Chairman Ouellette noted the Application is for a Special Use Permit for a commercial sand and gravel excavation operation, but he didn't see anything referenced on the application form about filling. Chairman Ouellette indicated he's heard testimony about fill coming to the site; he questioned if the Application should be amended? Mr. Kement indicated there is no area on the application form to reference "filling", only "excavation". It should be amended to reflect that.
- Chairman Ouellette cited that should the Commission get to a motion for approval the filling activity should be clarified.
- Certificate of Mailing/Abutters: Chairman Ouellette noted the plans show the State of Connecticut owns a right-of-way which bisects the site. Chairman Ouellette indicated he didn't see that the State was notified; he clarified that they are an interested party, and in the past the DOT officer of rails has attended and offered testimony to the Commission regarding crossings or any activity in or around the rail right-of-way. Chairman Ouellette queried if Mr. Kement had notified DOT? Mr. Kement cited he needed time to review the mailings.
- Clarify the number of trips per day: Chairman Ouellette suggested the regulations are silent on what's permitted but the Commission has full discretion. He noted that there has been some past practice and some for some thresholds for other applications which have been revised along the way but as far as he's concerned we're starting at ground zero here. Chairman Ouellette cited there seems to be inconsistencies regarding how many truck trips are requested. Chairman Ouellette felt people get confused when you talk about the number of trucks and trips; they are two different things.. Chairman Ouellette suggested a trip is one way destination of a vehicle, so if you're talking about 60 trucks that's 120 trips. Where I'm going with this is at the last Public Hearing it was stated that 120 truck trips per day 60 in and 60 out. The traffic study says 120 trucks a day, which would be 240 trips. Chairman Ouellette suggested he's not sure what the Applicant is asking for.
- Site drive: Chairman Ouellette noted he understands there's an existing paved drive of 400+/- feet; he questioned if it would be adequate to accommodate additional trucks, is it wide enough, is there proper sight distance? Chairman Ouellette acknowledged it's an existing driveway but he noted the land use potential will be much different. The sight distances for exiting trucks, those

values will be a lot higher than a passenger car or any other vehicles that exited that driveway in the past.

- **Emergency access:** Chairman Ouellette indicated he was curious to learn what the opportunities for emergency access might be.
- Width of Wapping Road: Chairman Ouellette noted the frontage along Wapping Road varies - he scaled it and found it's 28 feet, sometimes 26 feet, or 24 feet; it's all over the place. Chairman Ouellette suggested he didn't personally measure the distance but he has concerns regarding the ability for two trucks passing side by side along Wapping Road. With the potential for increased traffic he questions if the road is wide enough. Chairman Ouellette cited that's within the Commission's purview; it's one of the things they need to consider under the Special Use Permit – are the roads that provide access to the site an adequate width? Chairman Ouellette noted that under the Traffic Study it indicates you have enough capacity to handle the additional trucks but he questions if there's adequate width? Chairman Ouellette suggested that when talking about the width of dump trucks no two are alike. He suggested an average truck is 8 ½ wide, but if you consider the mirror it could be 13 feet clearance of the mirrors side by side - so you have the potential to need a road 27 feet wide to allow 2 simultaneous trucks to pass side by side. Chairman Ouellette cited this is a public road open to all traffic, so it could be not just the site trucks who use it, it could also be trucks from another activity from some other town, it could be a moving trucks. The roads need to be wide enough to accommodate bi-directional traffic.

Commissioner Gobin also noted there is no shoulder for a bike, so if you had two trucks and a bike.... Chairman Ouellette cited that's an existing condition/deficiency, and someone could argue that the existing width of the road is an existing deficiency too, but if we're talking about increasing the number of truck trips, particularly along the site frontage, and near the site driveway where the road has an "S" turn in that area Chairman Ouellette questioned if the road is wide enough to safely accommodate 2 trucks.

Hearing no further requests for comments from Commissioners at this time Chairman Ouellette opened discussion to the public. He questioned if there were any members of the public who had not attended the previous Public Hearing and had not had a chance to speak?

Paul Anderson, 89 Main Street, Broad Brook:

• Clarify what type of fill material is being returned to the site: Mr. Anderson reported he didn't attend the previous Meeting but he did read the Minutes. Mr. Anderson questioned what type of material would replace the sand and gravel being removed? He noted the Applicant had stated it would be blue and red soil; as a member of the public that terminology means nothing to him. Mr. Anderson indicated he would like to understand those terms.

- **DEEP Permit:** Mr. Anderson referenced that Mr. Westhaver had said that DEEP is overseeing this; does that mean there is a permit involved? The DEEP doesn't do things for fun; they do it when there is a request and when it's appropriate within their regulations to be involved.
- Is the fill contaminated in any way: Mr. Anderson suggested the term hazardous has a different connotation, and if it is, he wants to know what it is. Mr. Anderson didn't feel the Town of East Windsor needed anything else to add to its contamination; we have quite a bit now.

Steve Dearborn, 144 East Road, Deputy First Selectman: Mr. Dearborn suggested their job as Selectmen is to make sure the people in Town are protected, including their water, and it's your job, too.

In answer to Mr. Anderson's questions about the material, and I think you all got the packets, the material coming in - First off, the application doesn't say anything about "filling".

Out of 55 borings 16 of the samples have shown arsenic, 28 nickel, lead, and zinc. It's near an aquifer protection area. People use wells. Mr. Dearborn indicated that he's said at Selectmen's Meetings this Town is always getting dumped on; these people come here thinking we're morons and we'll go along with whatever is thrown in our faces. This shouldn't happen. Mr. Dearborn doesn't know why you lowered the distance between pits from a mile to ½ mile to allow this to happen.

They were not truthful with the Wetlands Commission. The tests were done before the Wetlands Meeting and he didn't tell them about this.

They formed a fictitious company for this project. Mr. Dearborn indicated he had a packet on the company. They do a lot of clean up and then need a place to dump their stuff so they picked East Windsor – no, use your heads tonight; do what you've got to do; this shouldn't happen.

Mr. Dearborn read a statement for the record:

Mr. Dearborn indicated he may read this statement a little slow but that's ok. He went through 12 grades; he went to East Windsor High School; he's proud of that. His statement follows:

Why should East Windsor residents allow a company to create a toxic dump that would pollute our groundwater?

 WSG LLC filed this application. Why would you file a fictitious company for this operation unless they thought down the road there could be a problem and you wanted to protect your real company. Many people use different names for many reasons.

- The former Town Planner thought this was a great idea because after this is filled in we'll have a park. Isn't that generous that we have a park. This will be no better than what's happening in the center of Broad Brook where they want to pile up all that material and cover it up.
- WSG LLC submitted a permit for a gravel operation; they didn't say they wanted to fill it in. It's not on the permit to dump. We have another one in Town that was allowed to bring in fill but with this type of material Mr. Dearborn thought it shouldn't be allowed in pit in East Windsor. No pits in East Windsor should accept this material unless it's only clean fill because if it doesn't go here it will go to the other place.
- They didn't tell the Wetlands Commission about the stuff that was in the material, and the dates show it was tested before the Wetlands Meeting. They weren't truthful with the Wetlands Commission. Mr. Dearborn questioned what they can do; can they take the permit back? Mr. Dearborn indicated he didn't know but you're talking about arsenic and heavy metals and the people weren't truthful; they want to dump it on us.
- This is a fictitious company that was made in case something goes wrong and there is no way as a Selectman that he would take that property for the residents of East Windsor.

Keith Yagaloff, 125 Depot Street: Mr. Yagaloff suggested he would ask for a condition on this application that all fill be clean fill and non-contaminated soils. Mr. Yagaloff indicated that everything he says may not be a concern because the applicant may simply agree to that, and there may be some misnomers/misconstructions about what's happened at other meetings, however, he has the following concerns:

- WSG was formed in 2017 and is owned by a Delaware company called D A. Buck, LLC. There's no information on who owns D. A. Buck but they're all nested in LLCs.
- WSG came before this Commission for a Text Amendment for the ½ mile access distance. The activity was described as a gravel operation; there was no mention of filling.
- WSG paid over \$600,000 for the 2 parcels containing 40+ acres plus the house. They made an application to the Wetlands Commission. The Applicant is one of the owners of the family business, which is Red Technologies, which does environmental excavation/work. At the Wetlands Commission they said it would be clean fill, but Inland/Wetlands didn't impose any conditions on the application, however, there was much discussion, according to the Minutes, about the differentiation between hazardous waste and hazardous materials, and the applicant clearly said they were not putting in hazardous materials. But no one asked about contaminated soils. And contaminated soils is totally different than hazardous waste, and DEEP regulates contaminates soils, and DEEP can give a Transfer Permit for transporting contaminated soil, and you should ask the

•

applicant if they intend to apply for a Transfer Permit for contaminated soils for this project.

- The reason the issue of contaminated soils has come up is because the MDC published a contract for this project and the addendum said the site has some contaminated soils in an urban area, and they expect that some of the soils that haven't been tested may be contaminated soils. And there were also businesses in that area, including an auto shop, a dry cleaning business, and they said there's a likelihood there may be contaminated soils there.
- They said they would be shipping materials to Massachusetts and Alabama, and, one of the questions you should be asking is that this has nothing to do with this application because those are hazardous materials and those will be shipped out of State.
- And then they promised you that this will be returned to an agricultural use, and that they expect the Town will take it, and then you have to bond for this. The questions is, if there are going to be contaminated soils that are going to be brought onto this site? If it's going to be regulated by DEEP then you have no control over that once you issue a permit for fill; you have no control for anything beyond that because DEEP can issue a Transfer Permit.
- Where is the money coming from? They are bonding for this project in case they bring in soils that may have to be removed. Why would this Town take a site that has contaminated soils 30 years done the road; why would they accept the liability for that? And what are the conditions to restore this to agricultural uses if contaminated soils come onto the site? Have they provided any information about the future reuse of this site which is one of your conditions for allowing for this permit? Mr. Yagaloff cited this is a very unusual permit, because usually with an excavation operation you fill on site by moving materials around to create the conditions to do the gravel excavation and then you put on the top soil. There are a million tons of material coming out of the MDC project, according to their contract. That's probably in the range of 500,000 to 1 million yards of material; is that contaminated soils, or not? Mr. Yagaloff suggested that basically if they agree to clean soils only, non-contaminated soils, non-hazardous waste then the issue is moot, but if they're not willing to commit to that then they should explain.
- In 2007 you reviewed a similar application adjacent to this for a gravel permit and one of the conditions you had was that there would be no hazardous materials brought onsite. You have the ability to impose a condition that states what may or may not be brought onto this property.

<u>Charlie Szymanski, 57 Rockville Road, Selectman:</u> Mr. Szymanski reported he is familiar with the area; they've been hauling materials there for 30 to 40 years.

Mr. Szymanski suggested Chairman Ouellette's comments about the width of the road are correct. The road is not wide enough. As evidence if you cross the rail tracks going southwest and just as it starts going uphill you'll see that where the trucks couldn't make

it going side by side the embankment is worn down where the trucks go up the embankment. There are also a lot of mirrors and other parts of trucks all along the road that smashed off from trucks over a long period of time.

Regarding the road being used only 15% used, Mr. Szymanski questions that. He didn't know what that definition is or how they got those numbers. He cited the Merritt Parkway is in great condition because they prohibited trucks. Wapping Road is in terrible condition; it needs to be repaved. Trucks create the weight and that creates the damage. To put that kind of load on it will destroy what's left and we won't be able to accommodate the citizens of the Town that need to travel in that direction; that whole infrastructure is bad. Mr. Szymanski didn't see that the Director of Public Works has looked at that and the road being able to take the loads in the condition it's **in**.

Alan Baker, 340 Rye Street: Mr. Baker felt that if the Commission gets to the point of approving this application there should be a condition requiring the applicant to pay for a licensed soil professional to determine/verify what's brought in is actually clean fill. Mr. Baker cited a condition of the Wetlands approval was that they provide daily reports to staff on a weekly basis to be reviewed and corroborated.

<u>Carol Arrowsmith, 9 Morris Road:</u> Ms. Arrowsmith reported her property abuts this property – 100 feet; the driveway will be right across the street from this property. Her concern is that they've been there for 35 years and before they purchased the property they asked the Town about the plans for the dump and they were told it would close in 10 years – that was 1982. It took longer than that for the dump to close and longer for it to be remediated; she was told there would be farmland all around it.

Mrs. Arrowsmith indicated that in 2007 there was a Town Meeting for a sand pit, the concern was the access route. They needed to have special permission to go through the Wagon Shed trees because they couldn't use the dump access road because it was too close to the Charbonneau pit that was less than a mile away. The public complained and the Board said they understood the concerns and they wouldn't permit the application because of the mile, which was outside of the regulations. The next year they drove by and noticed a driveway and a sand pit back there. Mrs. Arrowsmith reported they had no knowledge that the driveway had been approved by a text amendment, which is done by the Board; she guessed all you have to do is put a notice in the paper. All you had to do was change the txt, as if it were a type, from one mile to ½ mile and suddenly everything changed. So now we had a sand pit back there; it's been there since 2008; it was supposed to be 10 years and she guessed the 10 years is ending now, but it's creeping closer to their property. Mrs. Arrowsmith suggested the whole area is an ancient lake bed; we all sit on a gravel pit, which is highly valuable. Mrs. Arrowsmith suggested it may actually benefit all of the residents to tear down their homes and dig into their own yards, especially if you're going to have to live across from a gravel pit the property value is probably going to plummet. Mrs. Arrowsmith suggested it's a shame; they've all worked hard on their homes. Now they can hear the back-up noise from the trucks;

we've been complaining about the dirt bikes and the atvs the entire they've been there. The Police don't want to go in because they were fearful because they had guns; the noise is like a mosquito in your ear. They're talking about a 50 foot buffer with the trees that are already there, not even a berm; when the leaves come off in the Winter we'll be looking at a big, open pit mine. And it's dangerous; if they're walking up the piles of dirt the footing is bad. It all comes down to quality of life vs. profit, productivity, and business concerns and if the Town becomes that there completely there will be no people in Town and maybe that's what you want East Windsor to become — a business park. Mrs. Arrowsmith indicated she'll fight this; she'll appeal this decision if your go for it.

Lori Zuzik, 15 Morris Road: Mrs. Zuzik reported that one night last week she went around the neighborhood to get signatures. Her daughter got married last week and she brought this to the wedding; that's how passionate she feels about this. The people that signed were concerned about the truck traffic, decreased property value, noise, dust. Mrs. Zuzik suggested she would like to share this with the Board. Mrs. Zuzik cited she only had two nights to get signatures; she felt she could get many more. There wasn't one person that she asked that didn't sign. Chairman Ouellette indicated the board would be happy to take the petition; he cautioned that once the public hearing was closed they couldn't take any additional information. (Petition is available in the Planning Office).

Stan Paleski, 354 Rye Street: Mr. Paleski reported he's lived in East Windsor for 53 years; he grew up with NORCAP so he's had a chance to see the truck traffic. The area of Wapping Road is small; now people come along with their bikes and there isn't enough road between them, and the trucks. We also another contractor going down Rye Street on a regular basis; now we're going to bring more traffic. Mr. Paleski said it wasn't fun growing up with NORCAP – truck after truck after truck. Mr. Paleski realized people have to make a living, but not so much.

Regarding the hazardous material, DEEP doesn't test their well water in East Windsor any longer. Mr. Paleski reported he's one of those people who got tested; he's on the aquifer – sorry, not in his back yard. Mr. Paleski noted he came to the former Town Planner about the people goofing around with the bog and the one on Apothecaries Hall Road; that's precious as well. The people on Morris Road will get it; Morris Road is a tiny road.

Mr. Paleski reported if DEEP is involved it doesn't pass the smell test.

Please don't allow this to go forward. Mr. Paleski reported he's been through the hazardous waste dump near Barber Hill and Griffin Road, and the shooting range. We are not the dumping ground for the State of Connecticut.

Lynn Wooding, 21 Plantation Road: Mr. Wooding noted the pits have been there for many years. They attract people from Hartford and everyone else on the weekends. There's been one death from the 4-wheelers. Mr. Wooding questioned if anyone would

secure the site? On a good weekend she sees 4 or more trucks with 4-wheelers running up the road. We don't need another pit with the traffic; who will repair the roads when they're done?

Michaela Mullarky, 43 Graham Road: Ms. Mullarky indicated she shares many of the same concerns about traffic and security and she's read the Minutes to educate herself. She saw the promises to control them after the fact but the Town isn't in a position to count trucks and monitor speeds and the safety concerns. Also, from the Minutes, some resident asked if they would use Wapping Road and Graham Road and cited the impact of the noise on her home. Ms. Mullarky cited the impact on her home as well; they've lived here since the dump was there and recalls the decreased quality of life; there's still quite a bit of traffic as well. Ms. Mullarky recalled the response was that the trucks would be using Windsorville Road to get to Wapping Road; they wouldn't be using Morris Road. The question of using Graham Road wasn't addressed in the response, or it wasn't addressed in the Minutes. Mrs. Mullarky acknowledged Mr. Westhaver shaking his head no.

Referencing the Minutes again, Mrs. Mullarky recalled Mr. King's comment, which she didn't know if it was true or not, that access to industrial from agricultural has never been allowed.

Albert Grant, Director, Northern Connecticut Land Trust, 128 Melrose Road: Mr. Grant cited that more run off from the pit he is concerned that the road improvements will add water to the bog. There are already 2 culverts nearby that aren't working now and if they're made to work well they'll send water into the bog. He is concerned the road improvements and widening of Wapping Road will impact the bog.

Austin Burt, 43 Graham Road: Mr. Burt questioned if this is to bolster the tax rolls; he questioned whether the road improvements will offset any financial gains to the Town? Mr. Burt questioned how much did it cost to pave Graham Road this summer? This will probably have to happen with all these access routes with all these multi-ton trucks rolling up and down on a daily basis. He can't wait for that.

Chairman Ouellette noted the Commission would keep the Public Hearing open. He suggested he'd like to take comments from the Board and then would return to the public. Chairman Ouellette queried the Commission members for comments.

Commissioner Gobin:

• Additional information on incoming fill/additional testing/concern for bog:
Commissioner Gobin would like more information of what type of fill would be
coming in that could be potentially contaminated. When she thinks of excavation
she thinks of working the material within the property. Commissioner Gobin felt
the Commission should have more testing provisions on every load so we don't
end up with problems, especially with the bog and the wells.

<u>Commissioner Zhigailo</u> felt that between the Board and the public most everything everyone has a handful of comments to consider.

Commissioner Gowdy:

• Concerns regarding the contaminated soils/soil testing/correlation between testing and delivery: Commissioner Gowdy cited he worked Summers with a company called Contest, which was air and earth development. Mr. Gowdy suggested that when you do soil tests it takes a week or longer to get the results back; how will you test and keep the traffic flowing? If the requirements are to have a certified contamination person doing this work how will that affect the trucks coming in. If they're digging in Hartford and you take a sample out of a load you can't dump until the load as fill until it's tested. It could take a week; what's he going to do, keep the truck full? There's a real problem with logistics with testing. You could test afterward but you might have already brought in 500 yards of contaminated soil. So there's a real problem with logistics for the testing; I can speak from experience about that.

Commissioner Kowalski:

- Comments from the Town Engineer: Commissioner Kowalski felt Town Engineer Norton's memo didn't address explaining the stormwater sedimentation basin. Mr. Kement suggested there should be another memo dated September 12th responding to Town Engineer Norton's comments.
- **Description of proposed activities:** Commissioner Kowalski felt it seemed like there should be two issues an excavation permit and a fill permit not combining them; fill seems to have more questions and problems and requires more details and scrutiny than a straight excavation permit. Chairman Ouellette suggested it's a different set of issues. Commissioner Kowalski agreed; he felt that making a pen change and adding "and filling" on the application isn't the way to handle it. Commissioner Kowalski felt there should be a separate application for a fill permit.

<u>Commissioner Thurz</u> suggested this is a quality of life issue, he referenced Section 101, which is "Purpose" of the Zoning Regulations promotes health, safety, and general welfare, and further down - preserving the value of buildings and property. Commissioner Thurz cited there are 6 or 7 things there that pertain to the Town; keep those things in mind.

<u>Commissioner Moore</u> referenced Commissioner Thurz's comments, he suggested number three was the one that he questioned. The soils coming out of there pack real hard, even if you did excavate to the bottom and filled it back up to the top he questioned how you would be able to contain the groundwater, especially with rain like we got today. If it did run away and there were any contaminates in it they would run into the vicinity of the bog. Commissioner Moore cited other spots in Town we we've dumped

stuff previously; he felt the dump in town had some pretty heavy metals in it but, going there, he didn't see it as much of a problem as a site that's not been touched with anything contaminated now. Mr. Kement indicated the drainage water doesn't leave the site currently, and won't with this proposal. They are proposing a settling basin for the sedimentation so it won't go into the wetlands. The Applicant has received a Wetlands Permit; Town Engineer Norton had many comments regarding the drainage during the Wetlands presentation; we did iron those out with him. Commissioner Moore suggested that if you put like a hard packed sand in there it will sheet drain over that. Mr. Westhaver cited there will be different kinds of soil, it's not just hard pan and not just the material from the MDC job being referenced, and it won't be contaminated as people perceive it to be. There'll be material from all over the State, and it will meet the requirements of the State and the Town. Mr. Kement recalled that Town Engineer Norton required him to provide calculations with no infiltration, and the site works with no infiltration.

Commissioner Sullivan:

- Landscape issues along the berm: Commissioner Sullivan suggested the Applicant has enough trees on the site to put in a double or triple row of evergreens on the berm, if you build one, then no one would see anything.
- Licensed Inspector/testing process: Commissioner Sullivan questioned how the testing will occur? I know you can't test every truck. Will the material be tested as it comes out of the ground? Do they stockpile it first? How many people inspect the soil, one person or three? How will it work?

Mr. Westhaver indicated there are multiple tiers. You have the owner and the owner's consultants, you will have the general contractor who usually has a third party consultant; everybody in the world goes out there and it gets excavated, stockpiled, it gets tested six ways 'til Tuesday. They determine where it can go, whether it's clean, contaminated, hazardous or whatever, and the soils are sent out to the appropriate receiving facilities based on the disposition that the third party LSPs come up with. Commissioner Sullivan questioned who decides what's a safe amount of hard materials? Mr. Westhaver suggested there are State regulations.

Chairman Ouellette returned to the public for additional comments.

Ron Masters, 312 Rye Street:

• Lack of clarity of source of fill: Mr. Masters recalled the Applicant had said the materials could come in from other parts of the State but he thought the material was to come from the Hartford tunnel. Mr. Masters questioned if that had been a misstatement or would the fill come from other projects; he'd like some clarity on that. Mr. Westhaver indicated there are multiple projects going on, the fill wouldn't be from one project. Someone could be excavating a house; if the fill were clean it could be brought here. it's not limited to one particular project.

Margaret Ryglison, 57 Graham Road: Mrs. Ryglison advised the Commission she's lived in East Windsor for 31 years. She's glad to hear more about the fill issue. She would encourage the Commission to consider why filling was left out of the application wording; she questioned if that was an oversight.

She thanked the Commission for bringing the testing issue up. She indicated there's a lot to understand about the testing, she understands about the State. Mrs. Ryglison suggested it seems like the State has looked at East Windsor to dump whatever going back 20 years — she recalled the nuclear waste dump; she's really concerned about the type of fill they want to bring here. And how does it get tested; they could slip a truck through. Mrs. Ryglison has spoken to people who have actually witnessed trucks slipping through for midnight visits to NORCAP. She's heard there are demolished brownstones from Boston in NORCAP. The fill issues is a great concern of hers.

Keith Yagaloff, 125 Depot Street:

• Expectation for clarity on description of fill and testing: Mr. Yagaloff cites the applicant's ambiguity to Commissioner Sullivan's questions. He asked who determines the levels, I think he was talking about the levels of heavy metals. And the response was DEEP, or it will go out to the appropriate sites once those levels are determined. Mr. Yagaloff didn't hear that only clean fill materials that are uncontaminated would be coming to East Windsor, which would be the response if that was the intent. If the intent was to bring in only clean materials, the response would have been there shall be no contaminated soils, it will be only clean material. The question Mr. Yagaloff still had was are they intending to get a DEEP Transfer Permit to bring these soils to East Windsor? If the answer is no that could be a condition; that they will not utilize a Transfer Permit to bring in contaminated soils. Mr. Yagaloff found the response to Commissioner Sullivan's question ambiguous and unclear; he didn't think their response clarified for the public clearly the concern that they will only bring in clean materials, and that they would agree to that conditions as part of the permitting process.

Alan Baker, 340 Rye Street:

• Trips per day: Regarding the trips per day, on the ground how are you able to control the numbers of trips per day coming from multiple and varied sites on a daily basis? Would they quit at 11 a.m. if they get to their maximum trips? How is that dealt with, or is it just "I'll let you know?" Mr. Baker indicated he lived on Rye Street, there are trucks going down there, far too many, already. Chairman Ouellette indicated that practicality has come up time and time again; how does the Town monitor that? Chairman Ouellette indicated he still didn't have a good answer to that.

Bob Maynard, 7 Blue Heron Way; First Selectman:

• **Multiple applications:** Mr. Maynard liked the idea of 2 applications, one for excavation and one for filling. .

- Sources of fill/clarity on testing: He doesn't know about the fill; it's a huge decision, and we have to understand what we're doing before we grant a permit to fill. Mr. Maynard would like to spend more time considering the filling. He was surprised to hear it was coming from more sources in Connecticut than just the MDC tunnel. Mr. Maynard would like to go through the discussion of testing more. If there's slurry do you set it aside and let the water drain out of it? How do they test it, and where are the results stored, not only for what's coming from the MDC project but the other sources as well.
- Impact fee to rebuild roads: In other cases Mr. Maynard cited there has been an impact charge for people doing trucking in other towns for rebuilding roads and monitoring testing. Mr. Maynard acknowledged East Windsor lacks the staff to monitor the testing.
- Clarification of trade name: Mr. Maynard reported he visited the Secretary of State's website for information on WSG LLC. He found D. A. Buck was the person involved, but he couldn't find anything about him. Who or what are they? Mr. Westhaver clarified that was himself; D. A. Buck is his father's name.

Stan Paleski, 354 Rye Street:

- Source of fill/testing: Mr. Paleski questioned if the applicant would be taking fill from a home where would the DEEP inspector be? We don't have enough of them in the State to test them, in Hebron, Suffield, wherever it may be. There won't be enough; that fill will end up in there. Mr. Paleski has an issue with the fill coming in from multiple areas; he felt you have very little control. Mr. Westhaver suggested that nothing comes in without being tested. Mr. Paleski questioned if Mr. Westhaver would stop the trucks? Mr. Westhaver reiterated that if someone wants to bring material into that facility the materials has to be tested; it has to meet the parameters and requirements that the State has and if it doesn't meet those requirements it doesn't come in. Mr. Westhaver indicated those documents will come to the Town and the Town has full control; they can come to the site, they can look at their records, they can look at the Town's records. It will meet the facilities requirements..
- Groundwater monitoring: Mr. Paleski indicated he didn't see anything about groundwater monitoring for the wells. Mr. Westhaver reported they have 4 or 5 wells on the site. There's a building near the bog that has a well and drinking water and their water is fine, although it's a little hard. Mr. Westhaver indicated all of the other wells are on the property itself.
- Previous problems with EDBs in well water: Mr. Paleski recalled that people in that area have had problems with EDBs in their wells throughout their lives. There were a number of homes in that area that were cold for a number of years and DEEP came down and they turned hot. There are no samples taken in that area for their water; gain, he's going back to the quality of life issue. Mr. Paleski reported won't be in Connecticut in 10 years; he's planning on selling the house and retiring. He doesn't see anyone stepping up with extra money because he has a contaminated waste site beside him.

Lori Zuzik, 15 Morris Road:

Mrs. Zuzik submitted the petition to Chairman Ouellette.

<u>Carol Arrowsmith, 9 Morris Road:</u> Mrs. Arrowsmith referenced the petition circulating throughout the public, noting it was available for those who might want to sign it. Mrs. Arrowsmith read the petition FOR THE RECORD (<u>See Attachment A</u>).

<u>Bob Maynard, 7 Blue Heron Way; First Selectman:</u> Mr. Maynard suggested that along those lines he referred to the POCD (Plan of Conservation and Development) he noted the following recommendations:

- 13 For the Scantic, Windsorville and Melrose areas develop village plans for each of these areas to establish agricultural guidelines, lot requirements, and densities to reserve the historic character, the rural agricultural character, and enhance the architectural character respectfully in each of these areas.
- 15 Develop a Program to preserve the agricultural economic and visual resources of the Town to encourage farming to continue.
- **20** Consider a 10 acre mini-farm overlay zone in areas of the Town where there is active farming.
- 23 Where possible seek Open Space funds and other available funding to preserve active farmland, to provide tax relief and barn preservation and overall preservation of prime habitats for agricultural soils. Many landowners find this benefits their ability to continue farming.

Mr. Maynard he didn't know if 6 inches of top soil was sufficient to plow and harvest crops; he felt we should check with the Agricultural Department to see if you could farm after the soils have been put back at the Christmas tree farm.

Mr. Maynard recalled Mr. Westhaver had said he would meet the requirements for the fill to be brought in; Mr. Maynard requested a copy of that information. Mr. Westhaver suggested it's a general rule that you can't bring in pollution or material that's contaminated that's at a higher level than what you have at the facility, or the site. That's the law. Mr. Maynard questioned how you determine that? Mr. Westhaver indicated you go out there and you pre-characterize material that's on the site. There are regulations that stipulate what you can and can not bring onto a groundwater classified area. Mr. Maynard questioned that Mr. Westhaver would tell the Town that? Mr. Westhaver indicated it will be held to those standards. He can provide a copy of that information to Mr. Maynard.

Kristin Bromley, 4 Plantation Road: Mrs. Bromley felt the residents were asking the panel, in addition to all the concerns they've brought up, is this beneficial to the Town after you consider the cost to maintain and to bring the roads up to code? How does it benefit the Town? Do the taxes even begin to cover the cost of repair of the roads? She was told there's no money to repair Wapping Road, it's crumbling; Plantation Road is

crumbling on both sides. At some point the Board has to decide, is this beneficial for us, both financially and a certain standard of living we're willing to accept. What do we have to gain by allowing this permit?

David King, 341 Rye Street, Chairman of the Board of Assessment Appeals: Mr. King suggested that it's concerning to him that in the previous Minutes and again tonight the Applicant has said that everything that will be brought in is less polluted than what's already here. That shouldn't be our standard; we shouldn't be shooting for "hey, it's not as bad as what's here". Mr. King felt we should think as a town; with the problem in Broad Brook do we want to be known in the State of Connecticut as where we dump polluted material?

Mr. King indicated he didn't see what's essentially going to be a dump in a residential area is not going to affect property values. He would imagine that any tax revenue from this would be offset by the pretty obvious decline in the property value of everyone around here. Mr. King indicated they are looking for the Board to deny this but if you did choose to go forward he would encourage every affected resident and property owner to come to the Board of Assessment Appeals and appeal their property value as he didn't see how it would remain the same.

Charlie Szymanski, 57 Rockville Road, Selectman: Mr. Szymanski questioned the measurement of the contaminants in the soil. How, logistically, can you do that? Mr. Gowdy answered that very well. It's impossible to do it on a load basis so there's stuff that's going to be going in there without anything being checked, unless there's some plan that's laid out so we can see that. But more importantly Mr. Szymanski is gravely concerned that there was testing and borings done and it was done prior to the Wetlands Meeting and it wasn't disclosed. What else are we not being told? Mr. Szymanski suggested that's very, very serious. He doesn't personally see the upside to the Town on a financial basis or any other basis, by allowing this excavation, and more important putting this contaminated soil into the site. Mr. Szymanski suggested there is no upside.

Keith Yagaloff, 125 Depot Street: Mr. Yagaloff felt that the applicant may have misstated the standard for bringing contaminated soil into the community. The applicant said that he can't extend the levels of pollution/contaminants that already exist. Mr. Yagaloff doesn't believe that's correct, because once you request the DEEP to give you a Transfer Permit you can bring contaminated soil in. Mr. Westhaver responded that Mr. Yagaloff's statement was incorrect. Mr. Yagaloff continued that what this discussion means tonight for you folks is that the PZC really needs an expert to come in – a traffic expert, or a soil expert, or any expert ---- to come in to allow the applicant to make statements and to give you information about what the applicant is doing. Mr. Yagaloff suggested that the applicant needs to have an expert come in to explain what the issues are with DEEP and what the circumstances are that allow for transfer of contaminated soils.

Mr. Yagaloff suggested he didn't hear that only clean fill will be brought to East Windsor. Mr. Yagaloff suggested it would be great if the applicant said that but the only responses are is that it can't exceed certain levels of soils, it's going to be regulated, it's going to be tested, but is there a single statement, other than in the Inland Wetlands meeting where they did say it was going to be clean. Has there been a statement made to Planning and Zoning that only clean uncontaminated soils will be brought into this Town? Mr. Yagaloff felt we need to have an expert come in and give you information if you don't get that assertion from the applicant. Thank you.

Stan Paleski, 354 Rye Street: Mr. Paleski advised Mr. Maynard that 6 inches of top soil isn't adequate; the average, when you plow, you need 12 to 16 inches as long as you're not hitting sub-soil. With 6 inches you won't be able to run a wheel harrow over it without coming up with sand. You better plan on having a lot more top soil. Thank you.

Margaret Ryglison, 57 Graham Road: Mrs. Ryglison suggested when considering terminology, what's the definition of clean and what's the State's definition of clean, and what's an expert's definition of clean, and what is the definition of an expert? And does the expert have the best interest of the residents of East Windsor as a priority or the best interests of the applicant as a priority? Mrs. Ryglison also felt looking at terminology in regards to the application is important.

The recording secretary requested a brief pause in the meeting.

MOTION: To TAKE A FIVE MINUTE BREAK.

Moore moved/Sullivan seconded/DISCUSSION: None

VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous (Ouellette/Kowalski/Moore/Sullivan/Thurz)

The Meeting RECESSED at 8:00 p.m. and RECONVENED at 8:12 p.m.

Chairman Ouellette advised the audience that the Commission won't be able to close the Public Hearing tonight as there are a number of unanswered questions and the Applicant hasn't had an opportunity to consider the additional information brought up tonight. Chairman Ouellette asked if anyone else would like to make additional comments?

<u>Jerrold Webber, 57 Graham Road:</u> Mr. Webber stated he's a Vietnam Vet, and proud of it. Mr. Webber noted we all live here for whatever reason we've chosen, we work, we pay taxes, we can go outside and listen to the birds and the wind in the trees. We don't want that ruined. You people at the desk have a responsibility to the people; you work for us; you have rules and regulations that are on the books now. Don't throw us to the wolves.

Mr. Webber noted we've heard a lot of talk about what the State will and will not allow. The State wanted to put a nuclear waste dump here; the State wanted to give us a gun

range that would have brought people from all over the state 24 hours a day. The State doesn't give a crap about us; talk is cheap. Do your job; do what is best for us, for our lifestyle and for why we moved here. You live here, too. Don't abandoned that and throw it all away. That hasn't been said before and Mr. Webbers just wanted to say it. Do your job; keep us in mind; you work for us. Thank you.

Linda York, 33 Graham Road: Ms. York indicated she agreed with everything that's been said tonight, but what we didn't talk about is the effect on our children that are in the neighborhood with the trucks going up and down. And the air quality, asthma, and those kinds of things that are affected by the dust and the fumes from the many trucks going up and down the roads. Mrs. York indicated she's really concerned about the effect on the families. She asked the Board to really consider what's going into that – how it affects the water, the air and their quality of life.

No one else from the public requested to speak. Chairman Ouellette queried the Commission for additional comments.

Commissioner Gowdy asked if the Applicant wished to respond to the comments discussed? Mr. Westhaver indicated they need to get their ducks in a row and answer all the questions the Chairman asked; he needed to consider the information he heard tonight and present his responses at the next meeting.

Chairman Ouellette advised everyone the Commission's next meeting would be in 2 weeks, on October 9th in the Town Hall Meeting Room at 6:30 p.m. He queried Mr. Westhaver and Mr. Kement if that would be enough time for them? He noted the date to close the Public Hearing is October 16th; the Applicant can request an extension if they choose. Mr. Westhaver and Mr. Kement felt they could be ready for October 9th. Mr. Kement requested a copy of the petition; Mr. Westhaver requested a copy of Chairman Ouellette's questions.

MOTION:

To CONTINUE the Public Hearing for the Application of WSG, LLC for a Special Use Permit/Excavation to allow commercial sand and gravel excavation operation, to be done in four phases at 140 Wapping Road. [M-1 & A-1 zones; Map 17, Block 65, Lot 8-34]. Public Hearing is continued until the Commission's regularly scheduled Meeting to be held on Tuesday, October 9, 2018, at 6:30 p.m. in the Town Hall Meeting Room, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT.

Moore moved/Kowalski seconded/DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE:

In Favor: Unanimous (Sullivan/Kowalski/Moore/Thurz/Zhigailo)

(No one opposed/No Abstentions)

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

OTHER BUSINESS: None.

CORRESPONDENCE: None.

BUSINESS MEETING/(1) TOD Smart Growth Grant for Warehouse Point:

See earlier discussion.

BUSINESS MEETING/(2) General Discussion of Planning Issues:

Commissioner Gobin requested a status update on hiring a Town Planner? Assistant Town Planner Tyksinski reported the position has been posted, application submissions will close on September 28th. He has applied for the position. Discussion continued regarding the hiring process and interview procedures.

BUSINESS MEETING/(3) Discussion on Aquifer Protection Regulations:

No discussion this evening.

BUSINESS MEETING/(7) Signing of Mylars/Plans, Motions:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: To ADJOURN this Meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Sullivan moved/Moore seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted,

Peg Hoffman, Recording Segretary, East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission

Enc: Attachment A - Petition

Petition

Deny Special Use / Excavation Permit for 140 Wapping Road!

We, the undersigned, oppose the approval of a Special Use / Excavation permit applied for by WSG, LLC to allow a commercial sand and gravel excavation operation on 48+/- acres with extensive frontage on Wapping Road. The East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission has full authority to approve the permit application as presented, however, per zoning regulations, they also have the obligation to discourage the degradation of nearby property values and to preserve the current character of the area, as stated in the Town of East Windsor Zoning Regulations adopted for, among others, the purposes of "Conserving the value of buildings and property," and "Encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout the Town of East Windsor with reasonable consideration for the land's suitability for a particular use and for the existing or planned character of the area." (Chapter 1, Section 101 of the Town of East Windsor Zoning Regulations). The problem is that over the past 35 years, the town of E.W. has, against the wishes of affected residents, allowed more and more expansion of excavation operations in this area, so that now the town planners consider sand and gravel excavation operations to be perhaps more representative of the "character" of this area than farmland and quiet residential neighborhoods. The Wapping Road property, a former Christmas tree farm, extends over the railroad tracks, abuts the Northern CT Land Trust "Wapping Bog," a protected conservation parcel, and extends along Wapping Road for several hundred feet to border property owned by Leonard Mulnite. If allowed, the planned excavation operation on this property will effectively more than double the adjacent sand pit size and bring it to within 100 feet of residential property at the corner of Wapping and Morris Roads. Of primary concern to us, the residents of this part of the town of East Windsor, are the impacts over the anticipated 30 year life of the proposed operation on:

- Quality of Life as defined by the ability to enjoy the use of our own properties without being subject to undue annoyances caused by the operation of, and ancillary activities associated with, the excavation operation
- · Noise characteristics and volume levels of the operation itself during operating hours
- Truck traffic and associated noise, safety concerns, pollution, dirt/dust, and wear and tear on our roadways, potential alterations to roadways and adjacent/abutting properties.
- Noise characteristics, sound volume levels, and safety concerns associated with afterhours activity historically occurring in and around sand pits in the area - off road vehicles as ATVs, dirt bikes, and trucks, partying, underage drinking, drug use and distribution, arson, and property damage from unregistered off-road vehicles driven through residents' yards on the way to and from the sand pits.
- Aquifer, well water, and groundwater quality with disturbance of subsoils below former agricultural and landfill properties.
- Wetlands and protected plant species within abutting conservation land (Wapping Bog).
- Property values, which will inevitably fall precipitously due to potential buyers' having the exact same concerns about this issue that we have.

Other towns in CT have acted to disallow operations of this kind altogether, as they are not in line with those towns' visions for the future. What is East Windsor's vision for our future?

By my signature below, I assert that I am opposed to the proposed commercial sand and gravel excavation operation at 140 Wapping Road. I further assert that I am 18 years of age or older, a citizen of the United States, and have not been coerced into signing this petition.

Solde marie 321 RYE ST.

Printe	d Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Lon	SUZIK	Lai Swarh	ROAD Brook of	Concerned about Nos decreased property uslue	
De	ris Ciorx	And S	24 Morris Acad Broud Book et		9/19/18
Est	HER SEARS	Ether Seur	BROWN BROOK CF	CONCERNED ASSOCIUATED	9/19/18
(, N	ris loss	Clorkys	10 Month Frenk CT	Conscilled pour roise	-9/19/18
Beth	Motorick	4	Broad Brook Ct	Trucks, property yell	e 9/19/18
BRU	CE SUZIK	Touce Suite	15 MORRIS RUAD BROAD BROOK	TRAFFIC (NOISE)	9/19/18
STEP	EN CROSSY	Stylm Visin	20 PLANTATION ROAD BROAD BROX CT	concern is to keep the	Silerie
Lyu	i Wooding	Him Ward	Al Montation	0	9/19/18
gna	in Moding	mobiled	al Plantation Rd	concern of ramp	9/19/8
Jas	on Maratta		16 Plantation Rd		3 3
27	V Muratta	En las	16 Plation red		9/15/18
- Fle	1	KEVIN EVAPS	120 kgstatin R1	Trycks Concers	9/18/
6-P	1910104)	MACA	8 MALIBIL WI NO	AT LLACKS	9/19/5
40	ArraWswith	(into	9 Moris Rd, Brows Brows	K Allaftheabove	9/19/18
\bigcirc	ng Sing	Ja Ja	311 Pege Street	Pollution. Issue	9/1/18
Lin	Isay Su-all	Timalay & In	5 Winton Rd	East Windson	9/22/18
Andy	Traw	arthe	5 wingon RD	Zas Windsor	9/22/15
Don	no Kithey	Token Files	8 Winter Rd	East Windsor	etz II
Day	12 Homes	fay to	8 Winton Pa	East Windon	5/22/18
Din	Confuse	Um Cartesa	6 Winton Rd	EW.	9-22-18
11.	outive	of Center	6 Windso Rd	Cost Unda	P-12-18
	•	V'			
			k		
ļ		<u> </u>			
	1		<u> </u>		

Petition

Deny Special Use / Excavation Permit for 140 Wapping Road!

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
RICHARO: YORK	Richard York	33 GRAHAM RD	NO WAY	9/26/12
linda Mark	Linda & Vore	33 Graham Rd	very concerned about the fill I gual it is of lish	19/25/
Michaela Millacles	Millio nillio	43 Graham Rd	noise, sachty deglidate	9135/18
Austra Burt	dufin But	43 Graham Root	Dust, valer generally dance	91257.
Bonnie Snyder	Bourne Syder	39 graham Kd	Jedining property value	9/25/18
STIEVE DEARGORN	Stew London	144 ERD	NOT TRUSTIPULL	9/25/h
Day King		34 Tycy Star	Motausest district	6/7/
JOHN MATHEW	5 Mauria	169 Mereste/Cd	Henry	1/09/
Keith James	W CAN GIVE	341 Rue Street	101	9/25/1
Covid Ving	010	341 Rye Street	NO - NEMBY	9/25/10
Stan Palesci	OF R	340 Rye st,	No	9/25/18
Than Dake	D la Ch	En Packallo R	no Bonard	9-25
ANDREW MATER	Madeer Med	311 Rycomes	reject	9/28/18
Nover HOTER	June 1910			
27/20/20/20				
				···
11				
		The state of the s		
77. 40/s a			<u> </u>	
 				
1				
1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2				4:22

Petition Deny Special Use / Excavation Permit for 140 Wapping Road!

	Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
,	William Valvo	92	Mo Sullivan ave;		9/28
$A \cdot A$	Glen motozier	In Patrio	& PlANTATION NO		9125
.ئى. ئى	SharanAvinstra	of Stanger	8 Plantation Rd		9/25
4.	Kristin Bromle		4 Plantation Rd		9/25
.5.	Daniel Bromle		4 Plantation Rd		9/20
.6.	Ciffod Town	CIT	3 Planton Rd		9/25
Q_{r}	Margarat Ryglisy	Clamar Karling	57 Graham Rd		9/25
.8	YERROLD WEBBER	Chamber of Why."	57 Grann CT		/ 3
9.					
ΙĐ					
. [1]					
12	1-12-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-				
13.					
14					
15 16	-7772-77				
17					**.
:18					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
19				4	
-20			Harman temin Propins		
· 20					
· 22	, 7, 2, 2, 2, 2				
23	#772075.03 # 7872				
24				3	
25					
76	1	talanda (harazar Tawa).			
27 28					
29		1			
38	1				
Ó₹	4				