



TOWN OF MIDDLEBURY

Planning & Zoning Commission

1212 Whittemore Road

Middlebury, Connecticut 06762

(203) 577-4162 ph

(203) 598-7640 fx

April 6, 2023

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEMBERS PRESENT

Terry Smith, Chairman

Matthew Robison

Joseph Drauss

REGULAR MEMBERS ABSENT

William Stowell, Vice Chairman

Erika Carrington

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT

Frank Mirovsky (arrived @ 7:18 pm)

Gerald Lukowski

ALTERNATE MEMBERS ABSENT

Paul Anderson

ALSO PRESENT

John Calabrese, P.E.

Curtis Bosco, Z.E.O.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Smith called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL AND DESIGNATION OF ALTERNATES

Chairman Smith announced Regular Members Smith, Robison & Drauss and Alternate Member Lukowski as present. Alternate Member Mirovsky arrived at 7:18 pm. Regular Members Stowell & Carrington and Alternate Member Anderson were absent. He appointed Alternate Member Lukowski to act in place of absent Regular Member Carrington.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **GB Middlebury, LLC/80 Turnpike Drive – Application for a Site Plan – (Application #2022-11-2) *Graziano Brothers, LLC (prior owner)(Continued)**
2. **GB Middlebury, LLC/80 Turnpike Drive – Application for a Special Exception for Section 64 Excavation & Grading – (Application #2022-11-3) *Graziano Brothers, LLC (prior owner) (Continued)**

Chairman Smith called the public hearings to order at 7:03 pm. He confirmed receipt of the attached Engineering Review from John Calabrese, P.E. dated 4-6-2023 as well as the attached Review from town planner Hiram Peck of Plan Three dated 4-2-2023.

Emily Jones, P.E. with Civil 1 Engineering in Woodbury, CT spoke on behalf of the applicant, GB Middlebury, LLC. She confirmed that WPCA approval was granted last month, adding to the previous approvals provided by the Conservation Commission, Economic Development Commission, Police Chief and Fire Marshal. There is an existing building and paved area on the site which they are looking to expand towards the rear with a new building consisting of ten (1) individual suites. There will be access from both sides and each suite will have a loading overhead door with a man door. Storm drainage design is built in along with sanitary sewer. She submitted revised plans as well as her two (2) attached response letters in response to the reviews submitted by John Calabrese, P.E. and Hiram Peck, which she then read for the record. She expressed her concerns with respect to the subject property incorrectly being zoned R-40 on the GIS map and on the Assessor's field card online as opposed to the correct zone of LI-80.

Chairman Smith confirmed that it is not up to the applicant to ensure that the subject site is zoned correctly as LI-80 on the GIS map and Assessor's field card.

Emily Jones, P.E. stated that while she believes the fully screened dumpster location is fine where it is but would move it to an alternate location if requested.

Frank Mirovsky joined the meeting at 7:18 pm.

Joseph Drauss questioned how many handicap parking spaces are being proposed.

Emily Jones, P.E. replied that there is one (1) but could add more.

Joseph Drauss requested that one (1) more be added.

Emily Jones, P.E. agreed to do so.

John Calabrese, P.E. made mention that the proposed hours of operation are Monday-Saturday are 6:00 am – 5:00 pm. In addition, he put a note about the blasting plan and requested that the proposed start and completion dates be added to the plans.

Chairman Smith commented that the hours of operation will be changed.

Matthew Robison questioned if a letter from the Assessor's office could be obtained confirming that the proper zone for the subject property is LI-80.

Chairman Smith replied that the Zoning Map is the official map, not the GIS map. He confirmed that it will be corrected. He then stated that he walked the site and voiced his concerns with respect to the 14' high lights and the homes abutting the back of the property. He does not believe that the 2'-4' shrubs will provide an adequate shield and suggested that shields be put on the lights. He also requested that the plantings be extended, that the dumpster be moved per Hiram Peck's recommendation and that the wall packs be brought down.

Emily Jones, P.E. agreed to all.

Chairman Smith then requested that Curtis Bosco, Z.E.O. ensure that the existing dumpster in the middle of the parking lot be moved.

Gerald Lukowski questioned if there was an access drive and a documented maintenance plan.

Emily Jones, P.E. stated that they did not provide an access drive as they feel it is fairly close and 4'-5' above the bottom of the sediment basin and that it could be accessed from the driveway itself.

Gerald Lukowski added that they would still need to use a larger excavator to reach into it.

Emily Jones, P.E. offered an adjustment.

Gerald Lukowski suggested that she focus on the inlet side as he believes it is where the sediment will exit.

Emily Jones, P.E. claimed that there should be minimal sediment due to the hydrodynamic separator accompanied by a maintenance plan. After some thought, she offered to push the grading further up the hill and add a pull off.

Gerald Lukowski mentioned the sheet flow coming from the newer facility in a different direction and questioned if consideration was given for a second basin.

Emily Jones, P.E. replied that per the drainage calculations, under existing and proposed conditions, they over detained everything else and reduced the drainage area so much so that there is less flow going to the basins now. Essentially much of the flow will be cut off and redirected into the renovation area.

Chairman Smith stated that the public hearing would be closed and not take action until next month in order to give the members of the commission ample time to review everything.

Motion: to close the public hearing for GB Middlebury, LLC/80 Turnpike Drive – Application for a Site Plan – (Application #2022-11-2) at 7:35 pm. Made by Matthew Robison, seconded by Joseph Drauss. Unanimous Approval.

Motion: to close the public hearing for GB Middlebury, LLC/80 Turnpike Drive – Application for a Special Exception for Section 64 Excavation & Grading – (Application #2022-11-3) at 7:35 pm. Made by Matthew Robison, seconded by Joseph Drauss. Unanimous Approval.

3. 1365 LLC/1321 West Street-Application for a Zoning Map Change from R-40 to CA-40 (Application #2022-12-2)

Chairman Smith confirmed receipt of a letter from Attorney McVerry, dated 4-5-2023, requesting an extension to next month. Therefore, the public hearing will be continued at the 5-4-2023 meeting.

MINUTE APPROVAL

4. Discussion of the Minutes of the Special Meeting held on March 2, 2023

Motion: to approve the minutes as submitted. Made by Matthew Robison, seconded by Gerald Lukowski. Unanimous Approval.

5. Discussion of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting held on March 2, 2023

Motion: to approve the Minutes as submitted. Made by Joseph Drauss, seconded by Gerald Lukowski. Unanimous Approval.

OLD BUSINESS

6. GB Middlebury, LLC/80 Turnpike Drive – Application for a Site Plan – (Application #2022-11-2) *Graziano Brothers, LLC (prior owner)

Discussion was tabled.

7. GB Middlebury, LLC/80 Turnpike Drive – Application for a Special Exception for Section 64 Excavation & Grading – (Application #2022-11-3) *Graziano Brothers, LLC (prior owner)

Discussion was tabled.

8. 1365 LLC/1321 West Street-Application for a Zoning Map Change from R-40 to CA-40 (Application #2022-12-2)

Discussion was tabled.

NEW BUSINESS

9. Peter Amara/1570 & 1582 Straits Turnpike – Application to amend approved site plan (Application #2023-2-1)

Peter Amara, of 140 High Meadow Drive, Southbury, CT and architect for the development indicated that he received approval from the Conservation Commission during their Special Meeting held on April 4, 2023.

Motion: to amend the approved site plan. Made by Gerald Lukowski, seconded by Joseph Drauss. Unanimous Approval.

OTHER BUSINESS

10. Any other business added to the agenda by a 2/3 vote of the Commission

None

11. Enforcement Report

Chairman Smith stated that the commission will have an informal discussion on 5-4-2023 regarding the governor's executive order on outdoor dining and requested that the members give thought as to how best to help the restaurants in town.

Curtis Bosco, Z.E.O. stated that approval was granted by this commission in 2022 for the Granite Woods development. He shared renderings of two (2) twelve (12) sf signs being proposed, which will be located at each entrance. He added that they comply with the Regulations and he wishes

to grant them administrative approval.

Gerald Lukowski stressed the need for them to be out of the right-of-way and to not obstruct sight lines.

Chairman Smith agreed that they should be made conditions of approval.

12. Adjournment

Motion: to adjourn the meeting at 7:48 p.m. Made by Matthew Robison, seconded by Joseph Drauss. Unanimous Approval.

*The next Regular Meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission is scheduled for May 4, 2023.

Filed Subject to Approval,

Respectfully Submitted,

Rachelle Behuniak, Clerk

Original to Brigitte Bessette, Town Clerk

cc: P&Z Commission Members
Paul Bowler, Chairman, Conservation Commission
Mark Lubus, Building Official
Curtis Bosco, Z.E.O.
Ken Long, Chairman, Z.B.A.
Attorney Dana D'Angelo
Rob Rubbo, Director of Health

CALABRESE ENGINEERING

601 Quassapaug Rd.
Watertown, CT 06795
(203) 598-4390

April 3, 2023

Mr. Terry Smith, Chairman
Middlebury Planning and Zoning Commission
1212 Whittemore Rd.
Middlebury, CT 06762

Re: 80 Turnpike Drive
Engineering review

Dear Mr. Smith;

I have reviewed the following:

- Plans titled 80 Turnpike Drive, Permitting Set, Not For Construction, Middlebury, CT, Lot 050 Assessor's Map 4-10, by Civil 1, dated October 7, 2022, revision dated February 21, 2023, 11 pages.
- Report titled Stormwater Management Report, 80 Turnpike Drive, Middlebury, Connecticut, Prepared by Civil 1, dated October 10, 2022.

The following are observations made upon my review:

- 1) A 13,900 sq ft building is proposed on an existing 10.42 acre site in an LI-80 zone. The site has an existing building and paved parking area, and a stormwater collection system for the existing use.
- 2) The proposed building will have 19 parking spaces calculated as industrial use 1 parking space per 1.5 employees. The existing building has 20 parking spaces which was calculated the same as the proposed building.
- 3) A landscaping plan has been provided indicating trees and shrubs are proposed only along Turnpike Drive.
- 4) A photometric plan has been provided.
- 5) No signs have been proposed on this plan.
- 6) A dumpster enclosure detail has been provided.
- 7) The proposed storm drainage system will consist on catch basins to collect the stormwater and discharge into a proposed Stormwater Renovation Area. A portion of the proposed parking area will flow into the existing parking area stormwater system. An existing catch basin will be replaced by a Contech 201504 treatment unit.
- 8) The proposed building will have roof drains which will discharge into the Stormwater Renovation Area.
- 9) Calculations have been provided indicating a decrease in the peak rate of runoff for the 2-100 year storm events.
- 10) Plans have been revised to include the 100 ft buffer from a residential zone.
- 11) Additional plantings have been added to the landscape plan.
- 12) Lighting plan has been revised and all fixtures are proposed to be 3000K.
- 13) Proposed rock processing equipment location should has added to the plan.

The following are my recommendations:


- A) A note should be added to the plans stating that the construction of the proposed temporary sediment traps to be constructed under the supervision of the engineer and the engineer must

submit certification to Town of Middlebury that the temporary sediment traps have been constructed per the approved plans.

- B) If ledge is found during construction of the Stormwater Renovation Area notes to be provided for treatment of the bottom and sides along with material to be installed for the proposed plantings
- C) A planting detail should be provided showing the installation of the proposed plantings and minimum amount of soil required.
- D) A slope stabilization mat has been shown in a detail, will that be installed on the proposed slope to the west and anywhere else?
- E) Architectural plans of the proposed building should be provided.
- F) A bond in amount to be determined by Planning & Zoning Commission and Board of Selectmen

If you have any questions or comments please contact me.

Yours truly,


John N. Calabrese P.E.

cc Members Planning and Zoning Commission
Curt Bosco, Zoning, Enforcement Officer
Emily Jones P.E.



Hiram W. Peck III, AICP
Planning Consultant
P.O. Box 741
Woodbury, CT 06798
203.266.0551
planthree@earthlink.net

April 2, 2023

Mr. Terry Smith, Chairman
Middlebury Planning and Zoning Commission
Town Hall
Middlebury, CT 06762

Re: 80 Turnpike Drive, Middlebury, CT

Mr. Smith and Commission members:

I have visited the subject site and have reviewed the revised plans last dated 2/21/23 and have the following comments. I hope they do not unnecessarily overlap with other staff or Commission reviews. I do hope they serve to clarify any remaining questions and insert information in the record which is helpful to the Commission in deciding this matter.

While it may be well known to many, the records of the actual property zone for the subject site are unclear and need to be clarified. The subject site is shown as zoned R40 on the GIS map and on the Assessor's field card on line. If this is incorrect, it should be revised. The Commission should be very certain of the actual zone prior to making a decision on this application. While it may also be of interest, it should be noted that the two lots closest to Turnpike Drive on either side of Turnpike Drive are zoned LI 80.

The stormwater management report, Section A contains a drainage area map which is helpful. The Commission may wish to examine this map and note a few of the items it shows. For example the site grading on the west side of the site, in closest proximity to the residences to the west, is significant. This grading comes within 40 feet of the residential property line, as also measured on the submitted map sheet C1.1. The Commission needs to determine whether this grading and the proposed landscaping shown comply with Section 52.6.3 of the zoning regulations. I recommend some additional landscaping may need to be done in this area in order to comply with the above regulation.

The report from Willian Kenny, Section G of the stormwater report also contains a map of interest. The soils on the site, and in fact the rock on the site should be carefully noted in this case. This map Shows generally, not specifically, the areas of Hollis Rock outcrop in the area where the building is proposed. While it may have already been discussed, the location of rock which may not be able to be ripped, but instead must be blasted should be clearly known before construction begins in earnest. While I understand that pre-blast surveys have been offered to the residential abutters, this matter should be made clear in any Commission decision.

The fact that there is a likely chance of rock removal on this site also means that a significant amount of attention needs to be given to the soil characteristics and its ability to support proposed landscaping in the required 100 foot buffer area between this commercial site and the abutting residences. More details on the proposed landscaping a bit later.

The Conservation/Wetlands Commission approved this application late in 2022. The minutes do not reflect any specific requirements as part of that approval. These requirements may already exist in the wetlands approval, but just to insure that they are considered, the following is offered.

The soils on the site especially in the area of the stormwater “renovation” area are critical. It should be noted that a outlet pipe and rip rap apron are proposed to discharge to the mapped wetland (Wooster Brook). The construction of this “renovation” area is important given the soils or rock in this area. Again, this may have already been addressed by wetlands, but it is a very important aspect of the drainage system on this site and should be overseen. This is explained in Section 52.6.5 Surface Water Drainage and Section 52.6.6 Preservation of Water Quality and Quantity, in the zoning regulations.

The site plan shows a dumpster location in the southwest corner of the proposed parking lot. The site plan does not show a dumpster location already on the site for the existing building. It is recommended that the dumpster location be revised for two reasons. First the dumpster could also serve the existing building, and the dumpster unloading noise could be minimized for the abutting neighbors. Especially if the dumpster service comes a 4 am as some do. It is suggested the dumpster be relocated next to the driveway in between the existing and proposed buildings.

The number of required parking spaces is a simple calculation. However the site plan showing the parking spaces does not appear to match the building sketch that was submitted with the application. If this is of concern to the Commission the parking spaces should be reassessed as to location and possible number. If the patrons/workers are simply going to park in front of the proposed garage doors then this issue may not matter.

As to the proposed tree plantings, I recommend the number of plantings be significantly increased for several reasons. The first row of plantings next to the proposed new driveway are likely to be in very questionable soils right next to the new pavement. The second row of plantings is again in a straight line. The loss of any of these plantings will leave a gap in the *required* 100 buffer which is already only 40 feet from the residential property line of 1996 Straits Tpke. I recommend these plantings be increased in number and that they be staggered as to their location. Finally I recommend these plantings be bonded for at least two (2) growing seasons after they are planted.

I also recommend that the proposed rock processing area be clarified. Is this going to be a crusher or Some other type of operation. It appears the applicant acknowledges the rock processing will need to take place on the site. The specifics of this operation and the hours of operation should be made clear if the Commission decides to approve this application. This are of the site should be restored soon after the building is constructed.

The Commission should be clear as to what, if any, difference there is between a “TST” Temporary Sediment Trap (Sheet 2.1) and a “stormwater renovation area.” If these are intended to be the same then it is recommended that a simple maintenance program be submitted to insure the silt and sediment from the TST do not simply empty into the adjacent wetlands area when it fills up.

It is also recommended that while the photometric plan shows no light trespass onto abutting residential properties, the *source* of the light also not be visible from the residential properties. This is required by Section 8.11 of the Zoning Regulations regarding light visibility from another site. This issue should be checked with the closest residential neighbors after the building is constructed and in operation. If lighting needs to be adjusted or shielded it should be done within six months of the building being open and operational. Bonding of this item may not be required if the applicant agrees to this point on the record before a decision is made. This should avoid a costly enforcement action later.

The Commission may also wish to ask where the earth material from this site is to be taken and where The material coming to the site is coming from in order to prevent import of export of any unwanted soils, either from or to the site.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. If the Commission has any questions, or needs any please clarification, let me know.

Yours truly,

Hiram W. Peck 999

Hiram Peck, AICP, CFM, CZEO
Licensed CT arborist #4795

April 6, 2023

Mr. Terry Smith, Chairman
Middlebury Planning and Zoning Commission
1212 Whittemore Road
Middlebury, CT 06762

Re: 80 Turnpike Drive
Engineering Review

Dear Mr. Smith:

We have received a review letter from John Calabrese, P.E., dated April 3, 2023, for the above referenced site plan and special exception applications. Enclosed please find three revised sets of plans with a revision date of April 6, 2023. Additionally, we offer the following responses to each of Mr. Calabrese's comments.

CA. A note should be added to the plans stating that the construction of the proposed temporary sediment traps to be constructed under the supervision of the engineer and the engineer must submit certification to Town of Middlebury that the temporary sediment traps have been constructed per the approved plans.

RA. The requested note has been added to the plans on Sheet C 2.1.

CB. If ledge is found during construction of the Stormwater Renovation Area notes to be provided for treatment of the bottom and sides along with material to be installed for the proposed plantings.

RB. We concur and a note stating this has been added to the plans on Sheet C 2.1.

CC. A planting detail should be provided showing the installation of the proposed plantings and minimum amount of soil required.

RC. A planting detail has been added to Sheet C 5.2.

CD. The A slope stabilization mat has been shown in a detail, will that be installed on the proposed slope to the west and anywhere else?

RD. The erosion control blanket shall be installed on the western slope of the parking area and the western cut slope of the detention basin. A symbol for this and the proposed locations have been added to the plans on Sheet C 2.1.

CE. Architectural plans for the proposed building should be provided.

RE. We request that the submission of architectural plans to the town for review be a condition of approval. Detailed architectural plans for the building have not been prepared at this time, but examples of the proposed building colors and materials were previously submitted. The applicant has constructed similar buildings and is planning to utilize a steel structure with some stone façade for aesthetic purposes. The colors will be neutral, in the beige family to match the existing building on site as closely as possible. We met with the Economic Development commission in their role as Architectural Review and received a positive referral from their commission.

CF. A bond in amount to be determined by the Planning & Zoning Commission and Board of Selectmen.

RF. We concur.

Please contact me with any questions or if you need any additional information.

Sincerely yours,

CIVIL 1

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'EMJ', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Emily M. Jones, P.E.

T 203 266 0778
F 203 266 4759

Cornerstone
Professional Park
Suite D-101
43 Sherman Hill Road
Woodbury, CT 06798
info@CIVIL1.com
www.CIVIL1.com

April 6, 2023

Mr. Terry Smith, Chairman
Middlebury Planning and Zoning Commission
1212 Whittemore Road
Middlebury, CT 06762

Re: 80 Turnpike Drive
Plan Three Planning Consultant Review

Dear Mr. Smith:

We have received a review letter from Hiram Peck, P.E., dated April 2, 2023, for the above referenced site plan and special exception applications. Enclosed please find three revised sets of plans with a revision date of April 6, 2023. Additionally, we offer the following responses to each of Mr. Peck's comments.

CA. While it may be well known to many, the records of the actual property zone for the subject site are unclear and need to be clarified. The subject site is shown as zoned R40 on the GIS map and on the Assessor's field card online. If this is incorrect, it should be revised. The Commission should be very certain of the actual zone prior to making a decision on this application. While it may also be of interest, it should be noted that the two lots closest to Turnpike Drive on either side of Turnpike Drive are zoned LI 80.

RA. The zoning of the property was researched to a great extent prior to the applicant's purchase of the property and submission of the land use applications. The GIS Mapping and assessor's field card are INCORRECT and the parcel is zoned as LI 80. The Middlebury Zoning Map is correct and shows the lot as LI 80. We agree this should be rectified, but believe it is a town issue and not an item for the applicant to act upon.

CB. The stormwater management report, Section A contains a drainage area map which is helpful. The Commission may wish to examine this map and note a few of the items it shows. For example, the site grading on the west side of the site, in closest proximity to the residences to the west, is significant. This grading comes within 40 feet of the residential property line, as also measured on the submitted map sheet C1.1. The Commission needs to determine whether this grading and the proposed landscaping shown comply with Section 52.6.3 of the zoning regulations. I recommend some additional landscaping may need to be done in this area in order to comply with the above regulation.

RB. Landscaping trees and large shrubs are proposed for screening at both the top and bottom of the graded slope. Green giant arborvitae is proposed as a screening buffer closest to the property line and evergreen hedgerow shrubs are proposed as additional screening adjacent to the parking area. We believe that these plantings, as well as the remaining wooded buffer between the edge of clearing and the property line will allow the development to have minimal visual impact on the neighboring residential properties. If the commission wishes, additional plantings on the slope or to replace previously cleared area can be investigated and coordinated with the town engineer as a condition of approval.

CC. The report from William Kenny, Section G of the stormwater report also contains a map of interest. The soil on the site, and in fact the rock on the site should be carefully noted in this case. This map shows generally, not specifically, the areas of Hollis Rock outcrop in the area where the building is proposed. While it may have already been discussed, the location of rock which may not be able to be ripped, but instead must be blasted should be clearly known

before construction begins in earnest. While I understand that pre-blast surveys have been offered to the residential abutters, this matter should be made clear in any Commission decision. The fact that there is a likely chance of rock removal on this site also means that a significant amount of attention needs to be given to the soil characteristics and its ability to support proposed landscaping in the required 100-foot buffer area between this commercial site and the abutting residences. More details on the proposed landscaping a bit later.

RC. The possibility of rock excavation has been made clear in the plan set and the measures that are required to be taken prior to any rock excavation, blasting, or processing are clearly laid out on Sheet C 6.1. We have no objection to the commission adding these conditions to their decision.

CD. The Conservation/Wetlands Commission approved this application late in 2022. The minutes do not reflect any specific requirements as part of that approval. These requirements may already exist in the wetlands approval, but just to insure that they are considered, the following is offered.

The soils on the site especially in the area of the stormwater "renovation" area are critical. It should be noted that an outlet pipe and rip rap apron are proposed to discharge to the mapped wetland (Wooster Brook). The construction of this "renovation" area is important given the soils or rock in this area. Again, this may have already been addressed by wetlands, but it is a very important aspect of the drainage system on this site and should be overseen. This is explained in Section 52.6.5 Surface Water Drainage and Section 52.6.6 Preservation of Water Quality and Quantity, in the zoning regulations.

RD. We understand the critical nature of any stormwater renovation features on a project and the design has been prepared according to best engineering practices. Notes have been added to the plans on Sheet C 2.1 regarding oversight and signoff of the temporary sediment trap construction by the design engineer. Additionally and as mentioned above, the applicant obtained approval from the Middlebury Conservation Commission in 2022 and will abide by any conditions set forth in said approval.

CE. The site plan shows a dumpster location in the southwest corner of the proposed parking lot. The site plan does not show a dumpster location already on the site for the existing building. It is recommended that the dumpster location be revised for two reasons. First the dumpster could also serve the existing building, and the dumpster unloading noise could be minimized for the abutting neighbors. Especially if the dumpster service comes at 4 am as some do. It is suggested the dumpster be relocated next to the driveway in between the existing and proposed buildings.

RE. We would prefer to leave the dumpster location as proposed on the site plan. The driveway for the existing building between the two buildings is steeper and closer to the wetland area. The proposed location provides the widest area and best access for refuse trucks.

CF. The number of required parking spaces is a simple calculation. However, the site plan showing the parking spaces does not appear to match the building sketch that was submitted with the application. If this is of concern to the Commission the parking spaces should be reassessed as to location and possible number. If the patrons/workers are simply going to park in front of the proposed garage doors, then this issue may not matter.

RF. We disagree and believe that the site plan accurately reflects the number of proposed parking spaces. There are 8 visitor parking spaces in the front of the building, including an ADA accessible space. There are 5 parking spaces on each side of the building in front of each unit, in addition to the loading spaces that are also used for parking and loading.

CG. As to the proposed tree plantings, I recommend the number of plantings be significantly

increased for several reasons. The first row of plantings next to the proposed new driveway are likely to be in very questionable soils right next to the new pavement. The second row of plantings is again in a straight line. The loss of any of these plantings will leave a gap in the required 100 buffer which is already only 40 feet from the residential property line of 1996 Straits Tpke. I recommend these plantings be increased in number and that they be staggered as to their location. Finally, I recommend these plantings be bonded for at least two (2) growing seasons after they are planted.

RG. The applicant will comply with any conditions the commission feels are appropriate regarding the planting plan, including the replacement of plants that do not survive the first two growing seasons. The western edge of the parking area has approximately 8' of fill so appropriate soil layering and topsoiling is easily achieved in this area. The plants selected are intended to be used as a hedgerow with some additional groupings of plants arranged to break up the hedge for aesthetic purposes. Additionally, the plantings selected are hardy, New England appropriate plantings. A planting detail has been added to the plans on Sheet C 5.2.

CH. I also recommend that the proposed rock processing area be clarified. Is this going to be a crusher or some other type of operation. It appears the applicant acknowledges the rock processing will need to take place on the site. The specifics of this operation and the hours of operation should be made clear if the Commission decides to approve this application. This area of the site should be restored soon after the building is constructed.

RH. The rock processing area on Sheet C 2.1 is shown schematically to illustrate the best location on the site for the processing work. Additional details are outlined on Sheet C 6.1 as far as equipment, hours, and procedure. As stated on the plans, if rock excavation is encountered, a blasting expert shall be retained to provide pre-blast surveys, detailed blasting procedures, safety measures, etc. This shall all be done prior to commencement of rock excavation.

CI. The Commission should be clear as to what, if any, difference there is between a "TST" Temporary Sediment Trap (Sheet 2.1) and a "stormwater renovation area." If these are intended to be the same, then it is recommended that a simple maintenance program be submitted to insure the silt and sediment from the TST do not simply empty into the adjacent wetlands area when it fills up.

RI. The details for both the TST and the stormwater renovation area can be found on Sheets C 5.1 and 5.3. The stormwater renovation area shall be excavated and used as a TST during construction. At that time, the outlet control structure shall be installed and modified so that it can be used as a temporary outlet per the detail on Sheet C 5.3. Upon stabilization of the site, the basin shall be cleaned, re-graded as necessary, and planted to function as the long-term stormwater renovation area. The outlet control structure temporary pipe shall also be removed and the outlet control structure will function as intended in the post-development stormwater calculations. As outlined by the erosion control measures and the CT E&S Guidelines, the temporary sediment trap shall be cleaned out when sediment build up reaches 1/2 of the wet storage height.

CJ. It is also recommended that while the photometric plan shows no light trespass onto abutting residential properties, the source of the light also not be visible from the residential properties. This is required by Section 8.11 of the Zoning Regulations regarding light visibility from another site. This issue should be checked with the closest residential neighbors after the building is constructed and in operation. If lighting needs to be adjusted or shielded it should be done within six months of the building being open and operational. Bonding of this item may not be required if the applicant agrees to this point on the record before a decision is made. This should avoid a costly enforcement action later.

RJ. We concur and the applicant agrees that additional shielding or aiming of light fixtures shall be reviewed upon construction and any corrections be made within six months of the

building being open and operational. The light fixtures chosen are full-cutoff and dark sky compliant. We ask that the commission make this a condition of approval if possible and not a bonded item.

CK. The Commission may also wish to ask where the earth material from this site is to be taken and where the material coming to the site is coming from in order to prevent import of export of any unwanted soils, either from or to the site.

RK. Material imported to the site consists of road subbase, trench backfill, and other building materials that will come from licensed sources. There is approximately 1,600 CY of material from the site that will need to be exported and the applicant has several contractor that are looking to accept the fill for their project. The route taken by trucks in and out of the site is outlined on Sheet C 6.1.

Please contact me with any questions or if you need any additional information.

Sincerely yours,

CIVIL 1



Emily M. Jones, P.E.

T 203 266 0773
F 203 266 4759

Cornerstone
Professional Park
Suite D-101
43 Sherman Hill Road
Woodbury, CT 06798
info@CIVIL1.com
www.CIVIL1.com