

October 8, 2014

**MINUTES: THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION**, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing & Regular Meeting on Wednesday, October 1, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in the Thornton Wilder Hall, Miller Memorial Library Complex, 2901 Dixwell Avenue, Hamden, CT with the following results:

*Commissioners in attendance:*

Nancy Rosenbaum, Chairperson  
Joan Lakin  
Kirsten Jensen  
Mike Stone  
Kirk Shadle  
Bob Gnida  
Daniel Liston  
Stephanie Wilson

*Staff in attendance:*

Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner  
Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney  
Tom Vocelli, IW Enforcement Officer  
Stacy Shellard, Commission Clerk  
Genevieve Bertolini, Stenographer

Ms. Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 7:03p.m. Ms. Lakin called the roll and there was a quorum. Ms. Rosenbaum introduced the Commission and Staff. She welcomed Mr. Daniel Liston to the Commission.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked for a motion to move Application 14-1203 after Application 14-1206.

***Ms. Lakin made the motion to move Application 14-1203. Mr. Gnida seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously***

**I. New Applications:**

- a. 14-1204** Hillfield Road over Eaton Brook Bridge Replacement  
Town of Hamden Applicant

Mr. Bob Brinton, Town Engineer, addressed the Commission and reviewed the existing conditions of the bridge. He reviewed the previous application that had been denied and current proposal to replace the bridge. He stated that prior to the proposed plan being submitted he had met with the neighbors and reviewed the options for replacing the bridge. Mr. Brinton submitted the abutter list and certified mailing verification to the clerk.

***Ms. Lakin made the motion to table this item for site inspection. Mr. Gnida seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

**b. 14-1205** Johnson Road over Brookdale Stream Bridge Replacement  
Town of Hamden, Applicant

Mr. Bob Brinton, Town Engineer, addressed the Commission and reviewed the existing conditions of the bridge. He reviewed the previous application that had been denied and current proposal to replace the bridge. He stated that prior to the proposed plan being submitted he had met with the neighbors and reviewed the options for replacing the bridge. Mr. Brinton submitted the abutter list and certified mailing verification to the clerk.

*Ms. Lakin made the motion to table this item for site inspection. Mr. Gnida seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

**c. 14-1206** 60 Overlook Drive-construction of a manufacturing facility  
Sixty Overlook Realty Associates, LLC, Applicant

Mr. Christopher Juliano, Professional Engineer, addressed the Commission and reviewed the existing conditions of the site, the proposed site plan and stormwater management plan.

Mr. Gnida asked how far the level spreader is located from the wetlands. Mr. Juliano stated the closest point of the project to the wetlands is 82 feet and the level spreader is over 100 feet from the wetlands. The lot at its closest point is 80 feet.

*Mr. Shadle made the motion to table this item for site inspection. Mr. Gnida seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

**II. Public Hearing:**

**a. 14-1202** 275 & 475 Mt Carmel Avenue - reconstruction of athletic fields  
Quinnipiac University, Applicant

Ms. Rosenbaum explained that the intervener's attorney, Ms. Marjorie Shansky sent a letter stating that she was unable to attend this meeting. Ms. Shansky has requested the Public Hearing remain open until the next IWC meeting on November 5, 2014. Ms. Rosenbaum asked Mr. Bernard Pellegrino, attorney for the applicant, if he was willing to grant a 35 day extension and Mr. Pellegrino replied yes.

Ms. Rosenbaum stated that the Commissioner's resumes are available for review. She revised the procedure for the Public Hearing.

Mr. Bernard Pellegrino, Attorney, addressed the Commission and stated that the application is a request to improve two existing athletic fields. The field closest to Mount Carmel Avenue is referred to as the north field and is utilized for lacrosse and field hockey use. The field on Hogan Road is referred to as the south field and is used for rugby. The south field is a natural grass field and the north field is knitted nylon turf field. The proposed north field will be infill turf field (grass type field with rubber infield turf) and the south field will be a knitted nylon field hockey turf field. The proposed plan for the stadium will include locker rooms, team rooms, restrooms, stadium seating, and field lighting. The proposed plan is in response to the Title IX Consent Decree which was submitted as part of the application. Mr. Pellegrino reviewed the Consent Decree. He noted that the proposed application would bring the University into compliance as required by the court order and it is the only prudent and feasible approach.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that a prior application was denied in April, 2014. The proposed application has been redesigned and tailored to address the nine reasons set forth in the motion to deny the previous application. There are two wetland areas that are proximate to the proposed project. Mr. Pellegrino referred to sheet C1.0 (General Plan). Wetland one is

located to the west of the north field and wetland two is south of both the south and north field. The north field has been relocated and pushed north and east to provide for greater separation from both wetlands. It maintains the previously approved 25 foot buffer area from the original approval for the field, with the exception of some minor drainage related activities. The south field has been shifted from the prior application and has been moved away from wetland number two. It meets the allowable requirement under the building code that the team room building and stadium have a required separation between it and the Public Affairs building. It was shifted significantly to increase the buffer distance and reduce the length of the retaining walls proximate to wetland number two. The drainage plan maintains and improves the drainage pattern flows. The plantings and invasive species mitigation program has been expanded. The lighting plan was revised to reduce the levels and the TV verticals were eliminated. The relocation of the fields has permitted the lighting poles to be relocated to help better direct lighting onto the field and significantly reduce the lighting flow onto wetland number two. There is an additional description of the ecological communities or lack thereof, that are on site. A study of prudent and feasible alternatives was done, other than the revised plan being presented.

Mr. John Lavy, Centerbrook Architects and Planners, LLC, addressed the Commission and stated that sheet C1.1 and C1.2 (Prudent and Feasible Alternatives Site Analysis) address the denial comments for the previous application. The maps are based on the topographical survey submitted to the Planning & Zoning Commission after the York Hill Campus was completed. The analysis includes a survey of the York Hill Campus perimeters, including work that was not done, and a digital survey of the campus. It also includes a digital and aerial survey of the Mount Carmel campus. Each drawing indicates the side slopes, the size of each facility, wetlands and wetland setbacks, and water locations. Indicated are areas with less than a 5 percent slope that are feasible for large athletic field construction based on reasonable amounts of site work. Due to the size of the fields required to satisfy the decree, many areas on the York Hill Campus are not large enough for the placement of the facilities. He reviewed the areas available and noted that they are limited due to accessibility and access to parking. On the Mount Carmel Campus the areas noted are not suited for the fields based on good campus planning practices. Mr. Lavy stated that after the analysis the proposed plan is at the previous site location based on the site conditions. The location of the fields has been adjusted. The north field has been moved as far north and east as possible. The south field has been moved west while maintaining a 25 foot fire access lane required by the fire code. Mr. Lavy stated that based on the two campus site maps the fields will be placed where they are the most prudent and feasible, and on the side of lesser impact. From a design standpoint the application contains a reasonable amount of site work, provides successful routes to the field, and provides facilities of superior quality as required by the Consent Decree.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked if it is correct that a future athletic recreation building is shown next to the rugby field with some of the existing on campus parking being removed. Mr. Lavy replied that it is a site location being held. Ms. Rosenbaum asked if it is possible that some ground parking will be removed next to the rugby field. Mr. Lavy replied it could possibly be the case.

Mr. Gnida noted that the parking area depicted on Sheet C1.2 located south of wetland two appears to be for dormitory parking. He asked if the parking area will be used for events. Mr. Lavy reviewed the dormitory lot and commuter lot and stated he is unsure how the commuter lot can be used for events parking.

Mr. Howard Pfrommer, Civil Engineer, addressed the Commission and stated that the north lot has been moved as far north and to the east as possible, and the south lot has been moved away from the wetland number two as far as possible. The stream crossings have been reduced on the west side of Hogan Road. The volume of runoff water to wetland number one has been maintained. Precast concrete jersey barrier curbs along the wetlands will be used in lieu of sediment and erosion controls. There is also an involved wetland mitigation and planting plan and an invasive species removal plan. The size of the north field is larger and moved to the north. A roadway running along the south side of the stadium was removed and a sidewalk will be installed. This removes the disturbance along the slope of the south side of the north field. Mr. Pfrommer referred to Sheet C6.0 (North Field Grading and Civil Utility Plan) which shows the slope along the south side of the north field. The entire disturbance will be along the top of the slope and there will be a minimum of 25 feet from the disturbance to the wetland line. To the east of the north field there is a drainage swale that takes runoff from the roadway and must be brought down to the wetland. In the center portion of the north field there is drainage that runs down to the wetland area. The field has been moved easterly and is now 25

feet minimum from the proposed wetland markers for the wetland line which is west of the northern field. The elevation of the field is the same as previously proposed. The northern field proposed grade is the same as the existing field. The southern field proposed grade is approximately a foot less than the existing field. Mr. Pfrommer referred to sheet C12 (Field Cross-Sections) and sheet C12.1 (Perimeter Wetland Cross-Sections). These refer back to sheets C6.0 (North Field Grading and Civil Utility Plan) and C6.1 (South Field Grading and Civil Utility Plan). On Sheet C12 the top two sections are taken transversely in a north south direction across the upper field and the proposed grades match the existing grade, and the bottom two sections are taken transversely across the southern field and the proposed grade is approximately a foot lower than the existing grade. On Sheet C12.1 (Perimeter Wetland Cross-Sections) the top sections refer back to C6.0. The three on the left were taken on the slope south of the north field. They show improvements that will be made to the top of the slope, the existing grade, the wetland line at the bottom and where the proposed jersey barriers will be placed for erosion controls. The distances from the disturbance to the wetland line is no closer than 25 feet. The three sections on the right hand side refer to the east side of the southern field where there is a retaining wall proposed. Also, it shows the distance to the wetland line and the locations of the proposed wetland barriers.

Ms. Rosenbaum referred to Sheet 6.0 and noted that there are double lines that refer to concrete walls along Mt. Carmel Avenue. There are also double lines that curve and she asked if they are another concrete wall. Mr. Pfrommer stated that there is a retaining wall on the right hand side of the driveway that comes up into the site. It is coming from a lower elevation and handicap accessibility to the upper levels of the stadium must be provided. The wall height decreases as you travel easterly and at the end if you turn 180 degrees you walk up a five percent ramp up to the upper level of the south field stadium upper level. Ms. Rosenbaum asked if there are any other retaining walls. Mr. Pfrommer explained that there is a retaining wall along the north side of the north field and the changing grade is about 10 feet from the field level to the existing grade behind the wall. Ms. Rosenbaum asked how high the retaining wall is. Mr. Pfrommer replied it is 10 feet from proposed grade of the field to the existing grade behind the wall. The wall then goes up another 3 ½ feet to avoid someone going over it. Sheet C6.1 shows the wall and is an extension of the stadium and provides handicap access behind it. Mr. Pfrommer said there is a small retaining wall on the west side of the entry road that ends where the road way turns. The other important retaining wall is proposed on the east side of the southern field. With the field being moved to the west there is a slope with a slight grade difference from the existing field down to the wetlands. The field will be moved to the west and the exposed height of the wall will be less. The current wall at the exposed height of the wall at the southern end is approximately five feet and at the northern end is one foot. The wall is not necessary, but Quinnipiac would like it to keep disturbance back as far as can be from the wetland. Mr. Pfrommer reviewed the previous application's storm management plan vs. the proposed storm management plan. The current Sheet C6 shows that more water is being captured and brought over to wetland one; that had been a previous concern because it was reducing the volume. It will now be a slight increase. There will be the same drainage pattern with the field under laid with flat drains that are run by a collective pipe and all discharge to a bio-filter basin. The southern field has similar drainage pattern with a surface detention pond. The drainage from the field is through flat drain collective pipes which drain to the detention basin and help mitigate the peak discharge. The outlet from the detention basin will connect to an existing pipe that runs transversely across the southern field. All but 20 feet will be removed so that work will not have to be done in the wetlands and disturb it. The stormwater pollution control details are similar to the last application. Precast concrete jersey barrier curbs run along the wetland line with every other barrier having a hay bale in between them. In areas with heavy flows there are sedimentation and erosion controls using hay bales and silt fences. Mr. Pfrommer further reviewed the sedimentation and erosion control measures that will be used for the southern and northern fields. He noted that Sheet C7.1(South Field Stormwater Pollution Control Plan) is similar to the previous application, however, the work is being pulled away from the wetlands other than at the northeast corner of the field. All existing wetland markers will be removed as shown on Sheet C4.0 (North Field Demolition Plan) and on Sheet C4.1 (South Field Demolition Plan) there were no wetland markers next to the existing south field. He reviewed Sheet C5.0 (North Field Layout Plan) which notes where the markers will be installed with the closest one being 25 feet to the wetlands. Along the weir outlet location from the bio filter basin the markers will be closer than 25 feet to the wetlands. Mr. Pfrommer reviewed Sheet C7.4 (Stormwater Pollution Controls, Details 2)which details the power and communication crossing of the stream west of Hogan Road and Sheet C5.2 (Stream Site Site Plan) which shows where the crossing is currently located. There is a stream that runs west on Hogan Road and one that runs south and combines to continue west. The southern Hogan Road crossing is planned to cross the stream to install communication duct banks. The same technique will be used as it was done

when the post sanitary lines were installed. Sheet C7.4 (Stormwater Pollution Controls, Details 2) details the crossing of the stream and is an accurate depiction of the crossing. The work will be done when the stream is dry and it will be completed in two days. Sheet C3.0 (North Field Existing Conditions) and Sheet C3.1 (South Field Existing Conditions) refer to the ground water measurements and include tables that depict the 23 borings and the placement of observation wells. Another table provides information about the ground water. In 1991 deep test pits were done for construction of the pre-existing natural turf northern field. The natural turf field still exists for the southern field. Mr. Pfrommer explained that the ground water is highest at the mountain and lowest at the wetlands for the north field. A similar situation (Sheet C3.1) exists for the south field which is lowest at the wetlands and at the highest in the middle of the field. Mr. Pfrommer found two locations where borings and test pits were in proximity to one another and done many years apart. The ground water at the north east corner of the south field appears to be at the same elevation with many variables. At the center of the southern field off to the west side there is a similar situation and the ground water elevation appears to be somewhat similar. A retaining wall will be constructed for construction debris. The east side of the wall will be into the ground water about 1 or 2 feet and it will be placed on crushed stone bedding to allow ground water to get under it. There will also be an under drain to help bring water around the walls and help it discharge from the mountain to the wetland. Mr. Pfrommer referred to Sheet C6.1 (South Field Grading and Civil Utility Plan) which shows a similar situation for the south field and the east retaining wall. All retaining walls will have drainage behind them to prevent the buildup of hydrostatic pressure. Sheet C10.7 (Site Details & Notes) refers to the wetland management plan from the previous application. There is also a wetlands contingency plan. If there is any blasting required to remove rock it will be removed by way of mechanical means. This is similar to the construction of dormitories on the west side of Hogan Road backed up against the slope. Mr. Pfrommer stated that the RWA comments are addressed on the plans. The Town Engineer comments will be addressed. An elevation error for the bio-filter based outlet will be fixed and computations in support of the bio-filter basin will be addressed. Sheet C10.4 (Bio Filter Basins Plan) refers to the start of the perforations and should show one foot higher than what is shown. Mr. Pfrommer reviewed Sheet C13 (Wetland Exotic Invasive Plant Eradication Plan). The planting plan is similar to the previous application.

Mr. Gnida stated that on Sheet C6.0(North Field Grading and Civil Utility Plan) at the top of the drawing there is a high point where the north retaining wall is located on Mt Carmel Avenue. He is unsure if 142.10 is the high point of the wall or the grade. Mr. Pfrommer replied that 142.10 is the height of the grade proposed behind the wall. Mr. Gnida said there are two permanent observation walls that will be removed and he asked if they will be excavated because there is nothing in the plan about their demolition. Mr. Pfrommer replied that the walls will be removed up close to grade. Mr. Gnida asked if the monitor wells should be left in place or moved because they could be a good base line for chemical analysis of the ground water. Mr. Pfrommer said that the location of observation wells is based on where they are, but Mr. Gnida's question would better be answered by another team member.

Mr. Stone asked if there is anything that shows the original location of the original fields vs. the proposed location. He noted that the new location is in response to the Commission's previous comments.

Mr. Pfrommer stated that Sheet C7.0 (exhibit 1) and sheet C 7.1 (exhibit 2) are overlays of the previous application vs. the current application.

Mr. Shadle stated that the previous application had an underground system for stormwater management for the south field because the pond was not suitable. He asked if there is a change in the design for the pond that would make the pond suitable. Mr. Pfrommer stated that in the previous application the design of the pond was to save real estate. It is now thought that the surface pond will provide habitat and become somewhat of a feature.

Ms. Wilson asked if Exhibits 1 and 2 (Sheets C7.0 and C7.1) have dimensions or is it in a different color to make the changes to the plan easy to identify. Mr. Pfrommer said that the black is the current application and the color is the previous application.

Mr. Andrew Dyjak, Sports Lighting Designer, addressed the Commission and stated that he will be referencing Sheet SL1.01 and Sheet SL1.02. During the previous application there was a recommendation from the Commission to lower the amount of spill light onto the wetland. This was done by not concentrating on television or vertical lighting.

The vertical lighting fixtures are aimed upward more so that the television can pick up the players on the field for broadcast level. The focus TV vertical lighting was eliminated by taking the aiming angles of the fixture and putting them onto the fields. Also, because the field was moved the light poles were taken further away from the wetlands. Mr. Dyjak reviewed the location of the lighting poles, the visor lengths, and where the fixtures are aimed.

Mr. Dyjak reviewed the proposed lighting vs. the previous application's lighting. The original application's first grid point into the wetland read 10 foot candles for the high mode and is now read 1 foot candle in the first grid point in the high mode. Ms. Rosenbaum asked where the first grid point is because she is reading notes it as 8.3, 7.8 and 9.2. Mr. Dyjak replied that it would be the edge of the wetland area because in the first grid point into the wetland area which is 30 feet from the first point there is a 1 foot candle level. Ms. Rosenbaum asked if it is .1. Mr. Dyjak replied for the high mode it is reading .7, .811 and 1.11. For the low mode it is reading in the first grid point into the wetland area all the foot candle levels are under 1.0. For a vast majority of the wetland area there are either 0.0 or .1 foot candles. A .1 foot candle reading on this analysis is comparable to a full moon. Ms. Rosenbaum said that at .1 foot candle is 10 times brighter than a full moon. Mr. Dyjak replied that a full moon reads approximately .025 to .05. In this analysis every foot candle reading from point you put 10 zeros then a one all the way up to .1 reads as a point one. He gave an example if there is a .0003 it would read as a point 1 for this analysis and is an average of anything under .1 which is about what a full moon is. Ms. Rosenbaum stated her information is from the Engineering Tool box and it says a full moon is .01 foot candles and that Mr. Dyjak is confusing lux and foot candles (1 FC=10 Lux). Mr. Dyjak disagreed and noted that a foot candle reading three feet above grade with a light meter is .025 to .05. He has done it in an empty field and had readings up to .05 and the IES literature reads it at .025. Each fixture has qualities to allow light on to the field. Each will have a visor, an object design. Fewer fixtures will be used to get the same light onto the field because there is a constant light technology. All the readings are done without natural screening or vegetation and do not take into consideration what is already there. In real life when the fixtures are put in the numbers will be drastically reduced because of the naturally heavily vegetated state in this area. Ms. Rosenbaum asked what the spectrum of the lights and if it visible light or does it goes into infrared or ultra-light. Mr. Dyjak replied no. Ms. Rosenbaum said 400 to 700 nanometers is visible lights and asked if the spectrum is only in that. Mr. Dyjak replied that the Kelven reading or color temperature is about 460 Kelven. He has never heard about nanometer readings or infrared in the design. Ms. Rosenbaum asked Mr. Dyjak to find out what the light spectrum is. She noted that in the plans there are not any pictures or does it state how high the poles are and how the light spreads. Mr. Dyjak stated the design provides mounting heights of each pole. Ms. Rosenbaum stated that it was not provided to the commission. Mr. Dyjak asked if the Commission would like a colored rendering of the spread or the visual spread of the light that is the numbers on the sheet. Ms. Rosenbaum asked if the light spreads out based on the height of the pole. Mr. My jack replied that the taller the pole the more light that is directed on the field. Ms. Rosenbaum clarified said that it also spreads and can overlap and be brighter on the field. Mr. Dyjak stated that an actual rendering of light from an overhead shot. He does not understand what light spread is coming out of a fixture without bring a fixture in to be seen. She asked if Mr. Dyjak has shielding reflectors, wattages, beam types, mounting heights, aiming angles, all which impact source intensities. Mr. Dyjak will provide this information. Ms. Rosenbaum is confused because down into the wetlands there is 0.1 foot candles which is 10 times brighter than the full moon and goes into a great deal of the wetlands. Mr. Dyjak replied that the majority of the wetlands are .1 and zero. He is comparing the .1 to a full moon because the rounding off of the program he uses. Ms. Rosenbaum explained that light goes across into Sleeping Giant State Park. The Planning & Zoning Commission requires 0 foot candles at the edge of a property. Ms. Rosenbaum feels that there should be 0 foot candles at the edge of a wetland. There is a distinct amount of light going into the wetlands. Mr. Dyjak replied that the previous application request was to decrease the amount of spill level and it was decreased from 10 to 1. This is a dramatic reduction and the majority of the wetlands are at 0.0 or at .1. Ms. Rosenbaum reviewed her markings on Sheet SL1.01 (Sports Lighting Illumination 75 FC (Exhibit 3)). She noted from February to mid may there will be play and with no leaves on trees a lot of light will go into the wetlands. Mr. Dyjak does not feel that 0 and .1 foot candles are a lot of light. Ms. Rosenbaum stated that it is 10 times brighter than the full moon.

Mr. Shadle asked what kind of bulbs will be used. Mr. Dyjak replied 1500 watt metal halide (HDI).

Ms. Rosenbaum stated that light spill will be going over Mt. Carmel Avenue and up into Sleeping Giant State Park. Mr. Dyjak is not aware of where Sleeping Giant State Park is located. Ms. Rosenbaum replied that it is located across the street from the proposed project. It is difficult to determine the lighting because there are no landmarks on the plan

such as Hogan Road and Mt. Carmel Avenue and the wetlands boundaries are not shown. Mr. Dyjak reviewed the location of the wetlands boundaries and stated that foot candles 30 feet down is at 1 and another 100 feet is .01. Anything going further down is 0 foot candles. Ms. Rosenbaum stated it goes quite a way into the wetlands.

Mr. Liston asked if the light analysis takes into account the light sources. Mr. Dyjak replied no.

Ms. Lakin stated that Mr. Dyjak had noted that anything less than .1 is rounded up to .1. She asked if a different program can be used. Mr. Dyjak replied that the decimal point can be moved further out and asked how many decimal points she would like it to be moved. Ms. Lakin replied that she does not want it rounded up to .1. Mr. Dyjak replied he will move it to three decimal points.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that a Power Point presentation for the field lighting was done for the previous application. He did not think it was necessary for this application, but if the Commission so desires it, he can prepare one and submit it as part of the record. It will include shield design and graphics of the light throw. The high setting will be 75 foot candles and will be used during night games only which are approximately 30 per year for both fields. The lighting for practices and recreational uses, with the majority of lighting using 50 foot candles or lower.

Ms. Jodi Chase, Wetland Ecologist, addressed the Commission and stated that a wetlands assessment was done on August 18, 2014. The wetlands assessment includes an inventory and evaluation of the wetlands on site. The evaluation method used is the Army Corp of Engineers. The assessment discusses the impacts of the projects and in the appendix it includes a list of plant and species found on the site. Field work was conducted in the fall of 2013 and the spring and summer of 2014. There are two wetlands on the site. She reviewed the wetlands locations, conditions, and plant species found. The wetland functions primarily as habitat and provides food and cover for song birds and small mammals. There is a great deal of deer browsing in the wetland system. The larger wetland system to the east of the existing athletic field supports an intermittent water course and Ms. Chase reviewed its existing condition. Closer to the athletic field there is a wetland system similar to the wetland pocket. Ms. Chase reviewed its existing condition and she noted that it provides a number of wetland functions. It provides a wildlife habitat for small mammals, song birds, deer, and wild turkey. She reviewed the stormwater management for the wetland. Ms. Chase stated that the construction of the athletic fields will not directly impact either wetland. All the activities are occurring in the upland review area. As noted by Mr. Pfrommer the only direct impact to the wetlands systems is the installation of utilities and a watercourse on the west side of Hogan Road. The direct impact will be mitigated by plantings and the replacement of natural stream bed material. The previous application denial mentioned a lack of wildlife information, and a habitat survey. These are included in Ms. Chase's report and list the species of song birds and mammals present on the site. Also listed are wetland associated species which were either observed or whose habitat is present. The site does not support wetland dependent small mammals or song birds.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked when the wildlife survey was done. Ms. Chase replied throughout 2014, early spring and summer. The wildlife survey is not only based on what was actually seen, but the existing habitat and what it will support. She noted that her report has a table that shows the species observed and the habitats that were present but not seen. Ms. Rosenbaum asked who did the planting inventory. Ms. Chase said she did along with the botanist. Ms. Rosenbaum stated that on page 12 of Ms. Chase's report the lighting plan states that the foot candle levels in the majority of the wetlands are below .01 foot candles which is similar to a full moon. Ms. Rosenbaum said that this is incorrect and is off by a factor of 10 because it is 10 times greater than the moon. Ms. Chase will review. Ms. Rosenbaum asked Ms. Chase to submit her resume to the Commission. Ms. Chase stated she will submit her resume.

Mr. Dennis Quinn, CT Herp Consultant, LLC, addressed the Commission and stated that he is an environmental scientist who specializes in reptile and amphibian research. He is also a certified soil scientist. Ms. Rosenbaum noted that the report that was submitted did not include his name, and the name of the company is unreadable. She asked that Mr. Quinn submit his resume to the Commission. Mr. Quinn stated that he was hired by Quinnipiac University to evaluate the site, and look at the habitats and the potential effects of any lighting associated with the two proposed playing fields. Mr. Quinn reviewed his assessment of the site which included observations of adjacent properties. The Commission discussed with Mr. Quinn the effects and impacts of lighting on the wetland amphibians noted in the assessment. Also discussed were the effects of the proposed lighting on Sleeping Giant State Park.

Ms. Wilson asked if someone will address what is being proposed for mitigation. Mr. Pellegrino stated that Mr. Richard Snarski, Soil Scientist, was unable to attend this meeting. Mr. Snarski will be present at the November 5, 2014 meeting and will address questions and concerns about the proposed mitigation.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked for comments from the intervener's team.

Mr. Richard Fennelly, 3711 Whitney Avenue, addressed the Commission and requested that intervener comments be heard at the November 5, 2014 meeting. Mr. Fennelly stated that the applicant has submitted new information and he would like a complete and unified presentation.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked for comments in favor of the application. There were none.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked for comments against the application:

Ms. Nancy Alderman, President of Environment and Human Health, Inc., addressed the Commission and stated her resume. Ms. Alderman read into the record comments by Dorcas MacClintock which are included in a packet submitted by Ms. Alderman (Exhibit 4). She also reviewed material included in Exhibit 4 addressing her concerns with the use of synthetic turf fields and lighting.

Mr. Stone asked if the benefit of synthetic fields eliminates the need for fertilizer. Ms. Alderman replied yes and it also eliminates the need for pesticides. She would rather play on a field that uses pesticides. Fields used by children in K through eight in Connecticut use fields that are organic. She feels that the best that can be done for the players is to get the University to use grass fields. An athlete, Abby Wambach is suing the World Cup Association because they will not let women play on grass like the men do; then why would Quinnipiac University? Every synthetic turf field costs about one million dollars with the argument that they require less maintenance. The heat on a synthetic field can go up as high as 160 degrees and they must be watered all the time. Microbians is needed because people get MRSA. Also, they are made with flame retardants. The amount of toxics on the field is not in the specs. Another argument is that grass fields are cheaper than the synthetic turf fields.

Mr. Fennelly stated that there are many members of the community who would like to speak or they can hold their comments until the intervener makes the presentation.

Mr. Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney stated that those present at this meeting can speak or hold their comments until the next meeting.

Mr. Louis Birch, 1188 Whitney Avenue, addressed the Commission and stated that he is the Connecticut program director for a local non- profit Citizens Campaign for the Environment. He reviewed the organization and its function. Mr. Birch supports Ms. Alderman's statements. He reviewed his concerns about environmental and health problems with the use of synthetic fields.

Ms. Rosenbaum continued the Public Hearing until November 5, 2014.

### **III. Regular Meeting**

#### **1. Pending Applications:**

- a. 14-1202** 275 & 475 Mt Carmel Avenue - reconstruction of athletic fields  
Quinnipiac University, Applicant

This item is tabled.

**b. 14-1203** 3594 Whitney Avenue – construction of a medical office building  
RJT Medical LLC, Applicant

Mr. Darin Overton, Professional Engineer, addressed the Commission and stated that the proposed plan is for a 7,000 square foot medical office building with 39 parking spaces. The site will be accessed from Todd Street and Whitney Avenue. Mr. Overton reviewed the proposed stormwater management plan and the site. A previous application was approved in July, 2003. Mr. Overton reviewed the previous approval vs. the current proposal. The RWA and Staff comments have been addressed. A test pit on site will be conducted as requested by the Town Engineer.

Mr. Gnida asked about plans to mitigate the invasive species. Mr. Overton stated that a conservation area maintenance schedule was approved and filed on the land records for the previous application. He explained that if approved the flood storage compensation area will be planted and the conservation maintenance plan will be followed.

Mr. Shadle asked why there will be more parking spaces than what is required in the zoning regulations. Mr. Overton stated that there are 2-3 more parking spaces than what is required in the zoning regulations. The amount of parking was based on a conversation with Dr. Henry who is the owner of the property and also the property across the street. Mr. Shadle asked if this property was purchased from the owners who developed the adult community housing complex. Mr. Overton stated that the property was part of the Trailside Village project and subsequently subdivided. Mr. Shadle asked if there is a deeded conservation area. Ms. Rosenbaum explained that there is a conservation area and it is included in the commissioner's packets. Mr. Overton explained that there are agreements for the sanitary sewer system that was part of Trailside Village, along with an easement for shared parking area that will be utilized.

Mr. Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney stated there was a covenant of restriction for the 2003 approval and Mr. Tom Vocelli, Wetlands Enforcement Officer, was unable to locate it on the land records. Mr. Lee asked if it could be re-filed on the land records as part of this approval and Mr. Overton stated yes.

***Mr. Gnida made the motion to approve Application 14-1203 with the condition that the covenant for the conservation area be submitted to the Town Attorney. Ms. Lakin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

**2. Notices-of-Violation, Cease & Desist & Restore Orders, Notices-to-Appear**

- a. N.O.V.** 64 Rocky Top Road – clearing of trees & removal of vegetation
- b. N.O.V.** 251 Welton Street – oil spill or discharg
- c. N.O.V.** Lot 10-Benham Hill Estates (aka 0 Benham Hill Place)  
Failure to repair & maintain stormwater detention basin

Mr. Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney advised the Commission that the easement for Town access to Lot 10 to date has not been returned and he will follow up on it.

All Notices-of-Violation remain tabled.

**3. Review Site Inspection Schedule**

Ms. Rosenbaum reviewed site inspection dates with the Commission and Mr. Vocelli. The site inspection for the bridges on Johnson Road and Hillfield will be on October 8, 2014 at 5:15 p.m. The site inspection for 60 Overlook Road will be on October 16, 2014 at 5:15 p.m.

**4. Review of July 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Shadle asked that the minutes be amended to reflect that he was in attendance. Mr. Gnida made the motion to approve the July 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes as amended. Ms. Jenson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **5. Other Business**

Ms. Rosenbaum stated that Mr. Alan Piscitelli has resigned from the Commission. She read his resignation and noted that he will be missed.

#### **6. Adjournment**

*A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Gnida and seconded by Mr. Shadle. It passed with no dissenting votes. The meeting ended at 9:42 p.m.*

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Stacy Shellard-Clerk of the Commission