

**New Hartford Inland Wetlands Commission
TOWN OF NEW HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 6, 2023 - 7:00 PM
Sessions Conference Room / Hybrid**

PRESENT: Chairman James Hall, Anne Hall, Wayne Ryznar, Charles Blow, Steve Unger, Gerald Tabaka & Wetlands Agent Mike Lucas

ABSENT: Ira Kline

Chairman James Hall called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

1. NEW APPLICATIONS: None

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. New Hartford Village, LLC / Tim Bobroske / Applicant – Owner: New Hartford Market Place – Map 044 – Block 013 – Lot 020 / 173C Main Street. Development of 291 rental residential dwelling units, garages, a community center, a landscape / nursery facility, maintenance facility, and barn.

Todd Clark, of Clark Surveying in Bristol, states they added a few more units, from 291 to 296 as upstairs units, no buildings or sizes have changed. Only major change is a detention basin that was proposed near the southern bordering property, the Krohner's, they were not comfortable with. The detention area will now consist of a 3-4' berm.

Wayne Zirolli, the engineer for the project, states that they have been working to make sure that they are able to handle the storm water, store it and meter it out to below construction levels. In working with Todd Parsons (Town's Engineer) of Haley Ward, who has been reviewing the project and sent their most recent review yesterday, there is a little bit of tweaking to still be done as far as the routing of the storm water, but it's minimal and no major changes. May end up having to make some of the fields bigger or add some level spreaders. We do have a small infiltration component for groundwater recharge as far as the units, but the units are primarily for storage of storm water and then metering it out to half or below original conditions. So, zero increase in runoff, which I know that you're all familiar with. So, we've been working with Haley Ward, they've gone through their calculations. I've got to get our hydrologists to adjust a little bit more of those routing calculations, but virtually nothing changes. Some timings will change, possibly some storage will change a little bit, but what you see is essentially what we design and what we'll hold in the future. One of the major things brought up is rerouting from the detention base on the Krohner property, taking that pipe at the end, run it down behind the units to a bio-swale which would also be an infiltration trench filled with two feet of stone so that water could be diverted back over and then drop whatever might be left into the wetlands. At the end of that there would be a bit of a level spreader. With any of that storm water that would be collected right here running down and then into that diversion/bio -swell, it's expected that traveling that 400 foot length or so, there would not be very much water actually coming out the end of that through the infiltration in that trench along that whole length. But if there is water, there's a plan for it, there is that berm to store that like amount of volume that would have been stored here. These changes have been submitted to Haley Ward for review. Calculations haven't been done on that, but fairly certain that the calculations with this diversion swale acting as a bioswale filled with stone that this would provide plenty of capacity equal to or better than what was planned over on the Krohner's property. Per stormwater regulations, when there are galleries or detention basins, the infiltration component is a bonus, it is not included in the calculations for storage.

Clint Webb, Environmental Scientist, continues adding on to Mr. Zirolli's comments, commenting on the flattest part of the site, which is not completely flat and still has a fair amount of slope. So to take the volume of water that was going to go into the soon-to-be-abandoned sand mine, they needed to find another spot to send that water to. The proposed berm that would form the downhill side is connected to the bridge to the back wall that forms the road up to the bridge. So now added is a stone berm, which would be enough to detain the storm water for a short period of time. To build this berm, need to cross a short stretch of wetlands, and increase the fill by about 600 sq ft. So this basically acting as a storage of water that has been cleaned and a chance to cool it down before it leeches into the tributary that goes into the Farmington River. Mr. Hall asks what the outlet control on this system would be. Mr. Zirolli replies that it will look like a block structure with a catch basin at the top at the emergency overflow. It will be at the same level as the spillway with a low level orifice (approx. 6") at the bottom with another orifice (another foot and half) two feet higher and then the emergency overflow. It's expected that the low flow orifice in most cases will handle the storm water, especially since the divergence well is rerouted and coming across. Ms. Hall notes that they've now stated that there has been a lot of change to the level spreaders, as well as keeping the measures to clean and cool the water when it's in the detention basin, but those seem a little bit in conflict. She asks if its possible to walk the commission through where the water in that detention basin is being pretreated ahead of time where the level spreaders are and other stormwater management not on the big scale. Mr. Zirolli replies that this updated portion of the plan is only taking care of the drainage that would be coming down the road that was previously designed to output into the Krohner's sand pit and then have any overflow come back into the property. What was changed was a pipe rerouted to now empty into a two foot deep stone trench that would take the water and divert it across with a level spreader at the end and down to the area below. Ms. Hall requests to be shown the area on the bigger plan so the commission can see where else on the road that water is coming from. Tim Bobroske (applicant) states that his team won't have a good answer for that right now, as they are hypothetically taking a pen and going 'here, here, here'. Water goes downhill, and can show a specific plan that shows exactly how that issue is being handled at the next meeting. Mr. Webb notes that they have a plan with all the sub watersheds. Ms. Hall asks to confirm that there are a lot of hypotheticals, which is confirmed. Mr. Bobroske states that two things he noted to his team were that he didn't want to put any water on either abutting property (Kern or Krohner) and that they have 160 acres to do the designing for and be sure they are responsible for for every drop of water on the property. So Mr. Bobroske ensures that the list of questions received the day before will be addressed. Mr. Bobroske relates how the drainage system proposed is put in place on his property in Wolcott and it's working well. Mr. Ryznar asks for clarification on which detention basing they are referring to at this time, and it's noted that it is 1-5x as detailed in the HaleyWard report. He continues his question to ask for confirmation or hear again that the assessment of the impacts due to the more frequent and deeper inundation of that wetland area is going to be minimal or is the team not comfortable in saying that yet? Mr. Webb confirms they are comfortable saying that because unlike a normal basin the water is always moving. Any impact would be positive. Mr. Hall notes that the commission's task is to take what is proposed, HaleyWard's comments and own intelligence to determine whether or not it's an acceptable procedure. He continues on to note that some questions really do need to be fully and coherently answered by next meeting so they can hopefully make a decision. Mr. Hall notes that there were some backup engineering ways that Todd Parsons of HaleyWard highlighted that the commission need to have or have a justification for not having. Ms. Hall continues to clarify the construction and location of this newly proposed stone berm, and then inquires about the maintenance. Mr. Webb replies that they expect minimal maintenance and just to the wall. Mr. Zirolli states the worst time for sediment is as things are being constructed, and once things are stabilized the sediment load drops way down. Most similar basins he's seen that are actively managed require attention once every year or once every two years outside of the occasional leaves or brush that need to be cleared. Ms. Hall inquires if there is a written maintenance plan for the upstream spreaders and catch basins. Mr. Bobroske states that something can be provided for the next meeting. Ms. Hall also requests erosion control measures for all stages of the plan. Mr. Hall agrees and said that a plan would need to be presented how erosion control would be

handled in the upper phases, with the understanding that it may need to be modified and that it will not be done until those phases are to be started. He also mentions that, if this permit is approved, that it only valid for 5 years and would need to be renewed or this whole process would have to be restarted. Ms. Hall voices her agreement, and mentions that there are some concerns in HaleyWard's review letter. Ms. Hall states she would like to see the responses to these concerns prior to the commission approving the application. Mr. Hall and Mr. Ryznar voice their agreement with Ms. Hall's observations. Mr. Hall does note that Mr. Zirolli can also explain why he feels that the design is satisfactory despite not meeting recommendations as they are recommendations not requirements. Mr. Clark, to address some of the comments, states that even before the current plan was presented they had tested several other locations. Having encountered ledge at some of those points they adjusted their proposal accordingly. Mr. Hall states that this is exactly the type of information they are looking for, more of a narrative of why things are proposed the way they are. From the public attending the meeting, Shelley Lloyd of Pioneer Dr comments that as a resident of town she is very in favor of this project and requests the commission to approve this application.

3. PENDING APPLICATIONS:

A. New Hartford Village, LLC / Tim Bobroske / Applicant – Owner: New Hartford Market Place – Map 044 – Block 013 – Lot 020 / 173C Main Street. Development of 291 rental residential dwelling units, garages, a community center, a landscape / nursery facility, maintenance facility, and barn.

MOTION: Made to continue the public hearing by Ms. Hall, second by Mr. Ryznar, all approve.

4. MEETING MINUTES: August 2, 2023: Not yet submitted

5. INLAND WETLANDS OFFICER'S ENFORCEMENT REPORT: None, but would like to note that the abutting property owners, the Krohner's, have some questions and concerns. Mr. Hall notes that some of the aspects of what they are requesting that as a commission or as a town simply cannot provide a written guarantee from the board, which is not something they should even suggest they are capable of doing. Ms. Hall requests that an appropriate response be crafted with input from the lawyer.

7. COORESPONDENCE: None

MOTION: Made by Ms. Hall to adjourn, Second by Mr. Unger, all approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine Rhoades