

**MADISON INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, October 6, 2008
Meeting Room A, Town Campus**

A regular meeting of the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency (IWA) was held on Monday, October 6, 2008 at 7:30 p.m. in Meeting Room A, Madison Town Campus. With Chairman Thomas Paul presiding, the meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

Present: Thomas Paul, David Newton, Rodney Bascom (joined the meeting in progress), Glenn Falk, Barbara Yaeger and Alternates: Bill Freeman and Ted Aub. Inland Wetlands Officer Robert Kuchta and Assistant Director of Public Works and Town Engineer Mike Ott were also present. Lee Schumacher, John Mathieu and alternate Robert Speziale were absent.

In order to expedite the agenda, applications and agenda items were addressed in the order that best served the Agency.

REGULAR MEETING

08-27: 53 MADISON AVENUE. Owner: Christopher J. & Sherry T. Puricelli;
Applicant: Ronald G. Freitas. Regulated Activity Permit for proposed garage, driveway, and sanitary system within 100 ft. of a wetland.

Tom Stevens, Stevens and Associates, Madison, CT

As representative for the applicants he explained the property is a 22,500 SF lot in a 40,000 SF zone; the flood zone is Zone X. Last year, when they had an application for a Site Plan, Richard Snarski, soil scientist looked at the property and found no inland wetlands. Since then, they have built a house. The current application is for construction of a garage on the south end of the lot. Total building coverage is under the 10% allowed by Zoning. When Mr. Freitas began clearing the site, prior to receiving the building permit, it became apparent that this property is deemed to have two front yards and Marilyn Ozols pointed out that they would need a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals as a result. The neighbors to the east had an application before the IWA where Mr. Snarski had flagged an intermittent watercourse which is subject to Agency review. Construction clearing was immediately stopped. Mr. Snarski's report is in the file. The intermittent watercourse on the neighboring property and where it touches the Puricelli property is shown on the map. As a result, the driveway, garage and sanitary system are within the 100' upland review area. There was a flyer sent around the neighborhood that shows the neighbors are concerned about drainage. For that reason the first inch of rainfall for the garage is being caught and retained subsurface. The garage is proposed with an office above. A septic system is being proposed for the garage as well. The proposed system was large enough for a two-bedroom system which is the State minimum. Since its design, it was determined that that large size was not necessary as estimated office use is 47 gallons a day. The current plans show 20 LF of 48" trench. All that is required is 11 LF. Much of the neighborhood is low lying. There is a depression to the east and one in the front yard of this property. The proposed driveway is on a relatively high point which is why it is located so close to the property line. It is elevated to pitch onto the applicant's property where the water will end up in a depression at the south side of the garage.

An alternative plan was done just to demonstrate the affect of shifting the driveway westerly. This alternative puts the driveway in the middle of the depressed area. He would prefer not to use this plan because he wants to retain that depression for runoff storage. He doesn't want it filled as that would force the water out onto Pheasant Lane. The first plan shows the driveway within 2' of the regulated area and the second is 29' feet away. Sheet 3 of the drawings was submitted today, a landscape plan provided by John Cunningham of Tech Landscape Associates. Details of the plantings were noted. Since the second plan was designed, he was informed of a large Red Maple that they would like to keep and which will affect location of the drive. All of the planting would be supervised by John Cunningham and would have a two-year guarantee. The driveway would not be paved; it would be pervious processed stone. Any areas graded would be lawn unless otherwise shown in the landscape plan.

D. Newton – is this garage going to service the house?

Tom Stevens – the house has a one-car garage and this will serve as more parking for the house. The most important feature is the remote office space for the client who is a writer.

B. Yaeger – what is the net fill on this?

Tom Stevens – 60yds on the first plan, no calculations on the alternative.

Chairman Thomas Paul – Mike Ott, have you looked at this application?

M. Ott – Yes, he has looked at it and doesn't have any comments.

Chairman Thomas Paul – asked for comments from audience.

Atty. Michael Sweeny, Crosby and Cronan, Madison

He represents a neighbor with concerns. They would like to see a public hearing held as this is a regulated activity. They feel it will have a significant impact on the watercourse and that it would be a significant activity due to the proximity to the watercourse and the amount of fill.

D. Newton – is this 60yds. in the wetlands?

Tom Stevens – it is in the buffer; there is no filling of wetlands.

IWO Kuchta – how wide is the lot?

Tom Stevens – 75'.

B. Freeman – is there any advantage to do a mirror image of page 1?

Tom Stevens – that is a very low area and they didn't want to affect any drainage in the area. They picked what they thought would have the least impact. It could be done that way if the IW wanted it. Their big concern is not to affect any flow patterns between adjoining properties.

B. Yaeger – that is surface flow you are avoiding, not any underground flow?

Tom Stevens – correct the groundwater table is down around 23”.

B. Yaeger – will that area be compacted?

Tom Stevens – they would excavate, gravel and stone it.

B. Yaeger – what is the source of the intermittent stream; is it runoff from neighboring properties?

Tom Stevens – that is his understanding.

Elaine Wrightman – property owner opposite the applicant's property on Pheasant Dr. Though she respects the rights of the applicant to do what they are proposing, she is concerned over it. It should not increase water runoff in that area. She would like to also see more screening than has been provided in the plan. Quite a few trees were taken down along the road.

Tom Stevens – There are controls in place for these concerns.

D. Newton – would like to see the option Bill Freeman suggested with the driveway in a mirrored image of page 1, on a plan

B. Yaeger – would like to see the runoff calculations for that proposal also.

D. Newton – This other option is a feasible and prudent alternative.

Tom Stevens – Summarized; a mirrored image of option 1, runoff calculations for that plan and an enhanced landscaping plan for the next meeting?

D. Newton – yes

A motion was made by Barbara Yaeger, seconded by David Newton, the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to continue application 08-27: 53 MADISON AVENUE to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

A motion was made by Barbara Yaeger, seconded by Glenn Falk, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to open the public hearing for application 08-26: 297 Boston Post Road.

08-26: 297 BOSTON POST ROAD. Owner/Applicant: Shoreline Unitarian Universalist Society. Regulated Activity Permit to expand parking and associated stormwater management measures within 100 ft. of a wetland.

Mark Young, Waldo Associates

As representative for the applicant he explained that the new parking lot will have 90 spaces. Larry Appleton has provided the landscape plan. They are proposing that the southerly portion of the lot be paved and the northerly portion have a “gravel/pave” surface. Their stormwater treatment measures will be basically the gravel bed underneath the “gravel/pave” area. They have sized the stormwater treatment for the first 1” of runoff from the entire paved area; actually the stormwater treatment area is almost double the size that would be required. The area under the “gravel/pave” must be excavated down to the clean sand that exists there so the volume will be greater than required, 1.7 times that first inch of rain. There will be a 1’ layer of bank run gravel topped by approximately 1” of 1” crushed stone underlying the “gravel/pave” area of 60x90’. They had a lighting consultant design the parking lot lighting and that has been included in the application. The current dirt parking lot is a hazard for the elderly and those with mobility impairment. Runoff sheet-flows across the parking lot, across the grass and into the wetlands. With the proposed scheme, all runoff will be directed to the infiltration bed.

Margaret Fikrig, Vice President, Shoreline Unitarian Universalist Society – read her comment into the record (on file). (Exhibit 1 10/6/08)

Mark Young – a diagonal parking plan was also considered as an alternative. It narrowed the parking lot but put the parking closer to the wetlands. The possibility of using just “gravel/pave” in the parking lot was also considered but he did not feel it would hold up in the heavy trafficked portions of the lot and snow plowing would be an issue. Those who are mobility impaired would have problems with it. A mixture of the two would make problems with snow plowing.

D. Newton – expressed concern over silt compaction in the “gravel/pave” impairing its permeability.

Mark Young – the “gravel/pave” area will probably not be plowed routinely unless it is a heavy snow and it won’t be sanded.

B. Yaeger – asked Mike Ott if the problems he previously observed with the details had been resolved?

Chairman Thomas Paul – the fabric between the layers.

Mark Young – he suggested a layer of filter-fabric be placed between the stone and the existing sand. That was added to the detail.

B. Yaeger – is something like that as effective as a retention basin? Is the functionality of the two the same?

M. Ott – no. This is an infiltration practice. There are highly drainable sands in that area and they are building a storage area above it to store the surface water runoff; it should infiltrate into the existing soils. It is assumed that the majority of pollutants are located within the first 1” of runoff. In this proposal, the first inch of runoff from the pavement should flow to the “gravel/pave” area and filter through to the soils underneath, cleaning those pollutants. If there is more than 1” of runoff, it will overflow the area and continue to the wetlands. He is unclear as to how that will occur.

B. Yaeger – the first flush goes through the gravel and then the remainder flows directly into the wetlands off the surface of the “gravel/pave”?

M. Ott – not directly. It will flow overland toward the wetlands.

Mark Young – it will flow 30 -50’ overland. There is a berm to insure the water flows toward the “gravel/pave” area and then it flows off the end and disperses.

M. Ott – The two concerns he expressed at the last meeting have been addressed. In simple terms this proposal is how the applicant chooses to treat stormwater runoff. It is a 90-space parking lot, 70 are paved. The paved area is fairly large and is located very close to inland wetlands associated with the Neck River. In theory, it should work. There are other ways to treat the runoff. He listed 4 other options. There is nothing wrong with the proposed option, assuming it works. All runoff from the paved area comes to a neck before it proceeds to the “gravel/pave”. He suggested the applicant consider a trench drain at that point, which would cause that runoff to drop down to a pipe and be directed to the storage reservoir. This would eliminate the possibility that the pea stone on top and/or gravel sub-base would lose its infiltration capacity.

Chairman Thomas Paul – the trench drain could be cleaned out?

M. Ott – Yes. If the whole thing, as proposed, clogs, the water will run off toward the wetlands.

R. Bascom – has seen this type of system used to reduce runoff but he has not seen it used as treatment for the first 1” of runoff. He asked if Waldo & Associates has used this at other sites.

Mark Young – no. They started out with a conventional subsurface gallery type infiltration system. They felt that by using the entire “gravel/pave” area, they would be spreading out the stormwater, infiltrating it over a larger area. They are also utilizing the entire surface. The aerobic bacteria on the surface of the stone and the gravel underneath do provide some pollutant renovation for treating the runoff. If a trench drain is directly connecting to the stone bed, that will reduce the utilization of the surface area for pollutant reduction.

Herb Graham – why can’t this entire parking lot be done in “gravel-pave” with pavement for the handicapped areas?

A motion was made by Bill Freeman, seconded by David Newton, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted to approve application 08-26: 297 Boston Post Road with a trench drain and berm to be sized and located by Town Staff. Bill Freeman, Ted Aub, Tom

Paul and David Newton voted in favor; Barbara Yaeger, Rodney Bascom and Glenn Falk voted to deny. The motion passed 4-3.

08-18: Applicant: Madison Inland Wetlands Agency. Request to amend various sections of the town of Madison Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations to bring them into conformity with State mandates. **(Continued from July 7, 2008)**

All comments from the Conservation Commission and the Agency have been combined and a draft proposal provided for the Agency's review.

A motion was made by Glenn Falk, seconded by David Newton, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to close the public hearing for application 08-18: Madison Inland Wetlands, at 10:15 p.m.

A motion was made by Glenn Falk, seconded by Barbara Yaeger, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve proposed amendments to the Madison Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations.

SECTION 13 APPROVALS:

08-32: 26 BEACH AVENUE. Owner/Applicant: Kerry A. Lombard. Regulated Activity Permit to allow construction of storage shed within 100 ft. of a wetland.

08-33: 49 MADISON AVENUE. Owners: Gregory & Limor Makoul; Applicant: Duo Dickinson. Regulated Activity Permit to allow construction of portion of porch within 100 ft. of a wetland.

APPROVAL OF BILLS

A motion was made by Glenn Falk, seconded by David Newton, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve payment of the bills as submitted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Glenn Falk, seconded by Barbara Yaeger, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2008 meeting as submitted.

LITIGATION: Executive Session as Required

REMARKS – INLAND WETLANDS CHAIRMAN – INLAND WETLANDS OFFICER

A motion was made by Glenn Falk, seconded by Barbara Yaeger, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to adjourn at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Donnette Stahnke
Recording Secretary, Inland Wetlands Agency