Planning Commission Regular and Public Hearing Minutes Tuesday August 1st, 2017

Present:

Brian Schuch, Chairman

Rita Palazzo, Secretary

Brenda Henderson Joan Bengtson Peter Lynch

Don Phimister, Alternate *(Sat as Regular Member)

Absent:

Kirk Scott Don

Also Present: Gary Goeschel, Planning Director

Marc Salerno, Ex-Officio

Norman Peck, Zoning Liaison

FILED

EAST LYME TOWN CLERK

Mr. Schuch called the Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m.

I. Pledge

Mr. Schuch led the Pledge.

II. Additions to the Agenda

There were none.

III. Call for Public Delegations

There were none.

IV. Public Hearings

A. Application of Anne K. Torrance, Applicant/Owner; Application for a 2-Lot Re-subdivision of approximately 2.05-acres Zoned RU-40 at 197 Upper Pattagansett Rd, East Lyme, Assessor's Map # 35.0 Lot # 30.

Mr. Goeschel briefly discussed new Exhibits R-T, all of which are available for review in the Planning Commission office.

- 1. Exhibit R- Letter from Ahmed A. Dadi, P.E. of Total Design dated March 2nd, 2017.
- 2. Exhibit S- Design Intersection Sight Line Analysis...
- 3. Exhibit T- Letter from Victor Benni, Town Engineer dated July 28th, 2017.

Jeffrey Torrance of 197 Upper Pattagansett Road came forward to speak and stated that updated plans have been submitted which incorporate both Ledge Light Health District and Mr. Benni's comments.

Mr. Torrance briefly detailed the plans for dividing the lot pretty much in half. Currently the 7 bedroom property has a septic and 2 separate wells; 1 well serves the house and 1 serves the barn. Have system in which both the barn and house will be serviced, but the barn will be removed.

Mr. Torrance noted that all staff comments have been addressed.

Mr. Dotti, the Applicant's Engineer came forward and discussed the application.

There was no public comment.

• **Motion (1)

Ms. Palazzo moved to close the Public Hearing.

Ms. Bengtson seconded the motion.

Vote: 6-0-0.

Mr. Goeschel suggested adding a condition changing the verbish from "install" to "repair the system."

B. Application of Robert Fusari, Real Estate Service of Connecticut, Inc., Applicant/Owner: Application for a 25-lot re-subdivision of approximately 97.3+ Acres, Zoned RU-40 at Spring Rock Road and Green Valley Lakes Road, East Lyme, Assessor's map 14.0 Lot 45, together with a waiver request from Section 6-10-11 of the East Lyme Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Goeschel briefly listed new Exhibits X-Z and AA-BB which are available for review in the Planning Commission office.

- 1. Exhibit X: Twin Valley 25-Lot CDD Re-Subdivision Planning Application and Plan Set titled Twin Valley 25-Lot CDD Re-Subdivision, prepared for Real Estate Service of Connecticut, Inc., Green Valley Lakes Road Map 14, Lot 45, East Lyme, CT revised to July 20th, 2017; submitted August 1st, 2017.
- 2. Exhibit Y: Full Drainage revised to July 20th, 2017; submitted August 1st, 2017.
- 3. Exhibit Z: Memo from W. Mulholland, ZO to EL Planning Commission regarding Legal opinion of Buffers, July 11th, 2017; submitted August 1st, 2017.
- 4. Exhibit AA: Memo of Town Engineer Victor Benni dated July 18th, 2017; submitted August 1st, 2017.
- 5. Exhibit BB: Letter to Planning from East Lyme Fire Marshall dated July 18th, 2017; submitted August 1st, 2017.

Joe Wren, P.E., representing the Applicant, came forward and noted the Traffic Engineer and Archeologist- who are the authors of the previously submitted exhibits, are in attendance. The Inland Wetlands Commission closed their Public Hearing last night and hopefully a decision will be made at their next meeting.

Mr. Goeschel noted that Planning cannot act until a wetlands decision is made. Mr. Harris submitted a letter consenting to an extension to the Public Hearing, to allow more time to respond to any items that might need to be addressed for the Inland Wetlands Commission.

Mr. Wren addressed the comments made by Town Staff:

- 1. The iron pins have been labeled.
- 2. The 5 year storm report has been added to the drainage report.
- 3. The DOT requested emergency spillway has been added. The grading (see Sheet 40), has been adjusted and is above the 100 year flood zone. The spillway exists for anything that might exceed the 100 storm.
- 4. The access strip servicing Lot 13 has been added.
- 5. The 5 foot street tree easement will be accommodated.
- 6. The Site Line Sheet has been updated to incorporate the Town Engineer's comments.
- 7. The foot drains have been taken out of the rain gardens.
- 8. Page 41 details the plunge pool.

Mr. Wren reviewed the beam rails, the drains under the road and the type of catch basins.

Mr. Wren discussed the Town Engineer's latest review which vigorously advises the removal of the center island despite it being required, so Planning will have to decide what they wish.

Mr. Wren and the Commission discuss the radius of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Wren pointed out Survey Sheet #12 and the drainage basin easement on Lot 10 which they decided to remove; it will now be a homeowner's association parcel.

Ms. Palazzo expressed concern over the road width given the potential of construction vehicles in close proximity with young children.

Mr. Harris came forward to discuss the 24 foot roadway. The standard for Zoning is 24 feet and he noted that he's always been advised too wide a road encourages speeding. Mr. Harris detailed some 50 plus townhouse developments that have 24 foot width roads and noted cape cod curbs actually have more space than regular 24 foot roads.

The Commission took a comfort break at 8:30 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 8:42 p.m.

Ms. Bengtson said she's also concerned about 24 foot roadway.

Mr. Salerno offered a historical context regarding the 24 foot road width; Planning and Zoning together adopted the CDC and vetted the Fire Marshall. One objective was to reduce pervious surfaces. He noted that although you may not like it, it is part of the regulations.

Greg Walwer of ACS came forward and provided the Commission with a two page summary of the archaeological survey. Mr. Walwer explained they tend to be overly inclusive in sensitivity studies and explained the difference between prehistoric and historic sites.

Traffic Engineer Consultant Jim Bubaris of Wallingford CT, came forward and gave a brief synopsis of the traffic study they performed. The study was done the third week in March as well as the third week in May. A capacity analysis was done and the impact was deemed minimal.

The Commission discussed the traffic study.

Mr. Schuch asked Mr. Bubaris to weigh in on the road width in regards to safety. Mr. Bubaris said he'd have no parking on one side- the east as opposed to the west that way you don't need to turn around. He added he's old school and feels 24 feet is too narrow because of the snow factor.

Mr. Bubaris said there is nothing statistically to prove wider roads result in greater speeds. Mr.Goeschel asked if the two curves in the road are sufficient to slow down vehicles and Mr. Bubaris responded the second one is, but not the first.

Mr. Schuch called for Public Comment:

- 1. Carolyn Nee of 8 Wynn Circle
- Asked about the HOA- how it will work and who owns the rules. What will be the relationship with the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Harris explained initially there will be no restrictions but as the HOA matures restrictions could be adopted by the Association.

Ms. Nee suggested the HOA have an initial house size requirement and the Applicant Mr. Fusari said he's never seen this as an issue but anything is possible.

- 2. Josh Chapps of 16 Green Valley Lake Road
- Side buffer not being necessary is an opinion.
- True purpose is to screen from the CDC.
- Commission could require a 50 foot buffer.
- Road will actually encroach on setback of 27 Green Valley Lake Road.

- Discussed inconsistency of planned neighborhood.
- Doesn't think the intent of the CDC is realized with this project.
- Silly to require center island when Town officials are saying it shouldn't be there.
- Concerned about safety in regards to construction vehicles.
- Wonders if Joe Wren has any interest in selling lots under his license.

Mr. Goeschel said it has nothing to do with the regulations in terms of who's selling the lots. Mr. Wren noted he is already being paid as the engineer of this project. The Applicant, Mr. Fusari said he has not yet hired anyone but will probably go with Coldwell Banker.

- 3. Craig Grimord of Niantic Sportsmen Club
- Asked if placards are required to delineate open space from bordering property. Mr.
 Goeschel said no but it can be conditioned.
- Shooting hours are 9a.m. to dusk- request that notification be included with CO's and on any plans for individual building lots.
- Utmost concern is for safety of bordering neighborhoods.
- 4. Harvey Beeman of 11 Green Valley Lake Road
- Questioned the waiver regarding secondary road.
- How is it an emergency access road if it intersects? Would not be able to get to cul-de-sac.
- In close proximately to wetlands.
- If Applicant went with 20 homes instead of 25, would not need a waiver.
- Want's it to be clear that the beaver dam is very active.
- Asked about traffic flow on Four Mile River Road.
- 5. David Dean of 3 Green Valley Lake Road- In Old Lyme
- Thinks it's strange to develop a road (Bayberry), to service one lot.
- Water supply is not great on the western side of the street and might be an issue.
- 6. Danny Pagano of 14 Green Valley Lake Road
- Biggest concern is the traffic and safety.
- When I-95 is closed because of accident people cut through the neighborhood.
- No speed signs posted on Green Valley Lake Road and very few speed signs in the whole neighborhood.
- A few years ago during snow storm an elderly woman fell and it took the paramedics 45 minutes to reach her because of the snow and lack of road width.
- 7. Attorney Jason Westcott representing the Lepkowskis' of 27 Green Valley Lake Road
- Filed an intervenor petition (attached.)
- Discussed "impermissible segmentation" (see page 3 of petition.)
- If you approve a road and there are changes, it makes it impractical to analyze the impacts properly.

- In terms of impervious surfaces, not everyone is going to have the same roof size, driveway, and driveway layout.
- Supplied Commission with maps from Town Clerk's office (attached) and stated the 1975 map does not show a road where the Applicant is attempting to enter. The road shown on prior maps showed Spring Rock Road entering the parcel.
- Under the regulations Spring Rock Road should be continued and extended.
- The flood zone map illustrates a large portion of the road is in a flood zone.
- Might have less environmental factors if utilized Spring Rock Road rather than creating a new road.
- He wondered if the traffic engineer formed an opinion as to the pre favorable entrance to the development.
- The 5th page is the open space plan; this property is in the open space and your regulations say "shall" not "may."

• **Motion (2)

Ms. Palazzo moved to continue the Public Hearing until the next regularly scheduled Planning Meeting.

Ms. Bengtson seconded the motion.

Vote: 6-0-0.

The Commission decided to table the regular meeting agenda until the next meeting.

• **Motion (3)

Ms. Palazzo moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:37 p.m. Ms. Bengtson seconded the motion.

Vote: 6-0-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brooke D. Stevens, Recording Secretary

East Lyme Planning Commission July 28, 2017 (Public Hearing Opened July 11th, 2017

IN RE: Application for Subdivision Approval by Real Estate Service of CT, Inc. c/o Bob Fusari, Jr. Green Valley Lakes Road and Spring Rock Road "Twin Valley" 25-Lot CDD Re-Subdivision (Map 14.0 Lot #45)

REQUEST FOR INTERVENOR STATUS PURSUANT TO C.G.S.§22a-19 and VERIFIED PETITION IN SUPPORT AND MEMORANDUM RE SEGMENTION OF PROJECT PERMITS APPLICATIONS

Pursuant to C.G.S. §22a-19 et seq. the undersigned East Lyme residents Brian Lepkowski of 27 Green Valley Lakes Road, East Lyme CT, concerned with environmental integrity by his attorney Jason Westcott, hereby request intervenor status in the above administrative proceeding. In support of the same, the undersigned submits this verified petition and represents as follows:

This administrative proceeding involves an application by Real Estate Service of CT, Inc. c/o Bob Fusari, Jr. to build a 25 Lot CDD Re-subdivision on a property located on Green Valley Lakes Road (Assessors Map 14.0, Lot #45). This proceeding involves conduct which has or which is reasonably likely to have, the effect of unreasonably polluting, impairing or destroying the public trust in the air, water and other natural resources of the state in some, more or all the following ways:

- a. The extent of clear cutting, regrading, connected impervious surfaces, concentrated storm-water flows, particularly back down onto Green Valley Lakes Rd. and into 4 Mile River, and across wetlands near the cul-de-sac, will adversely alter the natural flow, infiltration and drainage, and prevent proper recharge, resulting in permanent harm to the ecosystems on the site, the water quality and chemistry, concentrations of chemicals including nitrates and phosphates, all affecting downstream waterbodies and the soils and plants and trees nurtured by the groundwater.
- a. The stormwater management system is insufficient to reduce pollutant loads from the proposed development and will result or is reasonably likely to result in harmful pollutant loads being discharged into the land, affecting the flora and fauna in the property now;
- b. The proposed development will introduce metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, nitrogen, sedimentation, bacteria, road salts, and pet wastes, among other pollutants, to the land and river, from runoff resulting from the many new impervious surfaces.

- c. The development site is among and between environmentally sensitive resources, including 4 Mile River, Bridebrook, and large wetlands complexes, at least one with vernal pool, on the East, West and South Side of Parcel. There is a history of flooding, and large AE Zone, on the property, and a floodway through Four Mile River. The proportion of wetlands and water to the dry land on the site parcel was such a large percentage, that the regulations call for an ERT to be performed.
- d. The hydrological and ecological functions of vernal pools and wetlands will be adversely impacted by the proposed development due to insufficient buffer, increased runoff with sediment and harmful chemicals, warming, loss of biological diversity and permanently altering adversely of the hydrologic period and water systems/pools, and plant species dependent on it, ans these wetland and flood zones are critical to moderating floods forces and recharging, rather than polluting, groundwater which is near town wells and near DEEP noted compromised water; and finally above one of the stratified drift aquifers systems under the surface there. The proposed road is reasonably likely to have a substantial and environmentally destructive impact, including clear cutting a 50' wide corridor for the very long road, full length of the road, construction disruption of plants and trees will result in loss of shade, erosion, dust, increased noise from I-95, and eventually upon completion and use, use of chloride deicing agents on the roads and parking areas will stunt, damage and otherwise adversely affect species and plants within site and the surrounding waters.
- e. The channeling of storm water into storm drains and detention ponds will magnify the intensity, in volume and speed of storm-water flow, intensifying the flood in this relatively large AE Zone, with is close the development and in the center of the site.
- f. At least one feasible, prudent alternative exists to the proposed site development which is consistent with the reasonable requirements of the public health, safety and welfare, and required to protect the air, water, and other natural resources associated with the subject property including but not limited to reducing the number of units, as no need has been demonstrated for the scale of this intensity and scale of development.

Any person may intervene as of right in any administrative proceeding upon the filing of a verified pleading asserting that the proceeding "involves conduct which has, or which is reasonably likely to have, the effect of unreasonably polluting, impairing or destroying the public trust in the air, water or other natural resources of the State". C.G.S. Section 22a-19(a). An allegation of facts that the action at issue in the proceeding is likely to unreasonably impair the public trust in natural or historical resources of the State is sufficient. See Cannata v. Dept. Of Environmental Protection. et al, 239 Conn. 124 (1996) (alleging harm to floodplain forest resources). Once a verified application has been filed,

intervention is a matter of statutory right. In Bed Hill Coalition. Inc. V. Town Planning & Zoning Commission, 212 Conn. 727, 734 (1989) ("section 22a-19 makes intervention a matter of right once a verified pleading is filed complying with the statute"); Polymer Resources. Ltd. V. Keeney, 32 Conn. App. 340, 348-49 (1993) (22a-19 is not discretionary).

The subject application involves a major change and intensification of the existing use of the subject property and the petitioners' intervention will advance the public interest with regard to the protection of the natural resources of the State. This request for intervention will further the policies and purposes of the Connecticut Environmental Protection Act, i.e. C.G.S. §22a-19, et seq. It is best analyzed by viewing all impacts in one application. No case law authority was found supporting Applicant's approach seeking approval of just a road; there is case discussion critical of segmentation:

Segmentation is defined as "an attempt to circumvent the [environmental protection laws] by breaking up one project into smaller projects and not studying the overall impacts of the single overall project." Stewart Park and Reserve Coalition, Inc. v. Slater, 352 F.3d 545, 559 (2d Cir. 2003); Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice v. Development Options, Inc., Superior Court, judicial district of Hartford, Docket No. CV-03-0828997-S (January 5, 2005) (Berger, J.):

"Segmentation is to be avoided in order to ensure that interrelated projects . . . not be fractionalized . . . A project is properly segmented if it (1) connects logical termini and is of sufficient length to address environmental matters of a broad scope; (2) has independent utility or independent significance; and (3) will not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements . . . A project has been improperly segmented, on the other hand, if the segmented project has no independent utility, no life of its own, or is simply illogical when viewed in isolation." (Citations omitted; internal quotation marks omitted.) Stewart Park & Reserve Coalition v. Slater, 352 F.3d 545, 559 (2nd Cir. 2003).

The courts have held that "impermissible segmentation" occurs where there are two proposed actions and "the proposed component action has little or no independent utility and its completion may force the larger or related project to go forward notwithstanding the environmental consequences . . . Courts have also required that environmental effects of multiple projects be analyzed together when those projects will have a cumulative effect on a given region . . . Finally, multiple stages of a development must be analyzed together when the dependency is such that it would be irrational, or at least unwise, to undertake the first

phase if subsequent phases were not also undertaken." Hirt v. Richardson, 127 F.Sup.2d 833, 842 (W.D.Mich. 1999) Norwalk v. Connecticut Siting Council, CV 03 0524145S Superior Court of Connecticut, New Britain August 18, 2004 (Cohn, J.).

Pursuant to C.G.S. §1-227, petitioner intervenors hereby request written notice by mail of all hearings and meetings to be held in connection with this proceeding as well as all negotiations pertaining to the above captioned application. Such notice shall be sent to the intervenor at the following address: Jason Westcott One Post Hill Place New London, CT 06320. AND petitioner, who abuts the project, also requests the Commission to urge the applicant submit timely application for approval of the subdivision.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned respectfully requests Intervenor status and all rights of participation pursuant to C.G.S. §22a-19

State of Connecticut

County of New London

Personally appeared Brian Lepkowski, known to me, and who did hereby attest to the best of

his/her knowledge and belief, the matter contained in the foregoing answer is true and correct.

Brian Lepkowski

Subscribed and sworn to me this _____ day of _____, 2017

Notary Public/ Commissioner of Superior Court





