

Public Hearing
Inland Wetland and Watercourses Commission
Tuesday, June 2, 2026 – Town Hall – Council Chambers – 7:30 PM

I. Call to Order

Chairman Charles Dimmick called the meeting to order at 7:30PM.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Roll Call

Tim Graver called the roll.

Present: Charles Dimmick, Chairman; Will McPhee, Vice Chairman; Tim Graver, Greg Guyer, Francisco Perez

Absent: Joe Davis, Chuck Thompson

Staff Member Present: Michael Glidden, Town Planner

IV. Determination of Quorum

Following roll call, it was determined there were enough members present for a quorum

V. New Business

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Site Plan | APP #2026-009 |
| 869 West Main St. Associates | DOR 5/5/2026 |
| West Main St. and Mountain Road | MAD 7/9/2026 |

Andrea Gomes, Esq., of Hinckley Allen, addressed the commission. A. Gomes introduces the team working on the application. She states that they are seeking approval for regulated activities proposed in connection with a 74 multi-family community. A. Gomes explains that the site is mostly wooded and currently unimproved and there are approximately 4 acres of delineated wetlands. She states that the regulated activities require no direct wetlands disturbance and there will be .26 acres of disturbance within the upland review area. A. Gomes explains that a wetlands commission can only look at if the proposed regulated activities adversely impact the functions and values of the wetlands. They can only deny the application if they receive evidence that a proposed regulated activity will cause an adverse impact of the wetland. A. Gomes states that a member of the public had submitted a CGS 22a19 environmental intervention petition via email and staff had received it as a correspondence, but it is not valid since it was not sworn and signed. Further, there was a petition submitted opposing the rezoning which was already approved and is not part of this commission's jurisdiction.

Ryan McEvoy, Licensed Professional Engineer, of SLR Consulting, addressed the commission. R. McEvoy explains the layout and the existing conditions of the site. He states that the property has been vacant since about 2000. He explains the direction in which the site drains and the utilities that are available.

Matt Sanford, Senior Professional Wetlands Scientist, and registered Soil Scientist, of SLR Consulting addressed the commission. M. Sanford explains the existing wetlands, soil types, and vegetation on site. He shows a map of the wetlands with pictures of the area to further explain. He states that they looked at the DEEP Natural Diversity Database and that there are no species of concern that are likely to occur in the development area. M. Sanford explains the values and functions of each wetland area on the site.

R. McEvoy explains the proposed development and shows the layout of it. He states that there will be accessway in and out of Mountain Rd. and on West Main there will be a right in and right out driveway. There will also be outdoor amenities including a pool, patio, and walking path. R. McEvoy explains that

Public Hearing
Inland Wetland and Watercourses Commission
Tuesday, June 2, 2026 – Town Hall – Council Chambers – 7:30 PM

40 they have confirmation from RWA that it will be served, and they have received approval from WPCA
41 for connection into the sewer line. He further explains in depth the stormwater management system and
42 the erosion and sediment control plan. R. McEvoy states that they have addressed comments from RWA
43 and the Town Engineering Department.

44 M. Sanford reiterates that the proposal does not have any direct wetland impacts with only a little impact
45 in the upland review area. He talks about stormwater infiltration and recharging the wetlands. M. Stanford
46 states that with the protective measures in place the proposed development does not have an adverse
47 impact to the functions and values of the wetlands in his professional opinion.

48 George Logan, of REMA Ecological Services, addressed the commission. G. Logan states that he
49 evaluated the wetland boundaries, vegetation, hydrology, and ecology of the site which can be found in
50 his report. He shows a picture of a map of where there were soil pits dug and explains the types of soils
51 and drainage of them. G. Logan further explains that he independently looked at the functions and values
52 of the wetland system. He states that he has come to the same conclusion as SLR in that there is not going
53 to be a short or long-term adverse impact to the functions and values that the wetlands provide.

54 C. Dimmick asks R. McEvoy to clarify in the infiltration basin how much is in the first flush. R. McEvoy
55 explains what that means and how that would be. C. Dimmick also asks about maintenance of it. R.
56 McEvoy explains that every once in a while, it will need to be cleaned out and that there is a long-term
57 maintenance plan, which would be included as part of the approval. A. Gomes mentions that legally the
58 applicant is entitled to a presumption that they will comply in perpetuity with the application as approved.

59 W. McPhee brings up the level spreader and asks for more details. R. McEvoy explains the grade of the
60 surrounding areas and why its being put where it is. W. McPhee asks about the effects it'll have on the
61 wetlands. M. Sanford explains the hydrology of the area.

62 T. Graver asks how the retaining wall around the northerly upper portion of the wetland is not changing
63 how water is getting into that wetland. R. McEvoy explains that the construction of the retaining wall will
64 include weep holes so any water behind the retaining wall can get through. M. Sanford explains that that
65 wetland is primarily being fed from groundwater and they are not changing the watershed.

66 F. Perez brings up how can they be certain that runoff, especially pollutants from the parking area, not get
67 into the wetlands. R. McEvoy explains that they implement as many practical devices as they can to limit
68 the potential of any pollutants. He further explains how the water is captured and treated.

69 Kathleen Williams, of 921 Marion Rd., addressed the commission. K. Williams brings up the petition that
70 was improperly filed and asked if that person was made aware of it. M. Glidden explains that for the
71 intervener he has responded to their email letting them know that it was not valid via email and the other
72 petition had referenced a subject that is not relevant to this hearing. She also asks about the walking path
73 and if it is going to be constructed in the wetlands. R. McEvoy explains that there will be no clearing of
74 trees and it will be a 4-foot wide woodchip path. It is not in the wetlands or the upland review area.

75 Sharon Van Wie, of 65 Carter Lane, addressed the commission. S. Van Wie asks about the maintenance
76 of the trees and if they would use blowers that would blow tree debris into the wetlands.

77 Michael Sorrentino, of 660 Moss Farms Rd., addressed the commission. M. Sorrentino brings up the flow
78 of water from West Main onto the site and if the driveways as they are proposed will affect this.

Public Hearing
Inland Wetland and Watercourses Commission
Tuesday, June 2, 2026 – Town Hall – Council Chambers – 7:30 PM

79 Christine Robidoux, of 795 W. Main St., addressed the commission. C. Robidoux asks about where
80 exactly the walking trail will be located. She brings up a concern of people going off the path and into the
81 wetlands.

82 R. McEvoy shows the site plan and where the walking path will be located and explains that it will not be
83 in the wetlands or the upland review area. He states that there is no discharge from drainage on W. Main
84 St. R. McEvoy also explains that there is a maintenance plan for landscaping, and they will not be putting
85 debris in the wetlands.

86 G. Guyer asks about snow removal and the water runoff from where it gets plowed into large piles. R.
87 McEvoy explains that there is ample area on the proposed development for snow storage and it wouldn't
88 be pushed into the wetlands.

89 Christine Robidoux, of 795 W. Main St., addressed the commission. She states that she believes the
90 walking path should be taken out of the plans and that it is inviting people towards the wetlands. R.
91 McEvoy explains that it is not located within the jurisdictional area for this commission to consider. He
92 also states that passive recreation allows for people to see these wetland features and that in the
93 regulations it states that passive recreation is allowed in wetlands.

94 The public hearing meeting was closed.

95 **VI. Adjournment**

96 C. Dimmick closed the public hearing at 9:53PM.

97

98

99 Attest: Colleen Costello