

**INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY
OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BRISTOL
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF MONDAY DECEMBER 1, 2025**

By: Chairman Fisk

Time: 6:30 P.M.

Place: City Hall
Council Chambers
111 North Main St.
First Floor

ROLL CALL:

MEMBERS	NAME:	PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS	Zachary Fisk (Chairman)	X	
	Michael Robinson (Vice Chairman)	X	
	David Rooks (Secretary)	X	
	James Carros		X
	Daniel Massaro, Jr.	X	
	Faye Duquette	X	
	Laura Valentino	X	
ALTERNATE MEMBERS	Greg Klimek	X	
	Joseph Longo	X	
	Justin Bridges	X	
STAFF	Anthony Lorenzetti, P.E., City Staff	X	
	William Stango, City Staff	X	
	Janet Little, Recording secretary	X	

1. Call to Order

Per the order of Chairman Fisk, the meeting was called to order at 6:30 P.M.

Chairman Fisk reminded the Agency the next Regular Meeting of the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency of the Conservation Commission of the City of Bristol is Monday, January 5th, 2026.

Chairman Fisk designated himself, regular Commissioners Duquette, Robinson, Massaro, Valentino, Rooks to vote on all items.

2. Public Participation

Alan Stewart, Jr., 371 Fairfield Woods Rd., Fairfield, CT. Mr. Stewart explained he is looking to purchase 355 Fall Mountain Road, Bristol, CT. There was a lot of work done without permits and was looking to see if the commission would work with him if he purchased the home. The current homeowner did work 10 years ago that violated the 7.4 regulation. Land is within the upland review.

Chairman Fisk stated if you come prepared and can answer questions and show feasible, alternatives to what you're doing. We could move forward on this, but we'll have to take a look at it.

Commissioner Massaro stated that you have a goal in mind, and as long as you're working with the city engineer, you're working with, you know, staff to make sure that you're getting done what they feel you need to get done to adhere to the rules. We work with people all the time on projects.

Alan Stewart, Jr., 371 Fairfield Woods Rd., Fairfield, CT, based on the response, I'll probably move forward, close on the property, pay the... start paying the architects, get the surveyor, and then come up with a full application with everything.

No one else from the public spoke

3. Approval of Minutes

a. Regular Meeting – November 3, 2025

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2025, regular meeting, as written.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, C, Massaro, Rooks, Klimek, and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

b. On-Site Inspection-November 22, 2025

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of the On-Site Inspection- November 22, 2025 as presented.

By: Duquette

Seconded: Robinson

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Longo, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

4. Public Hearings

- a. Application #2056 – Wetlands application for earth removal activity within the upland review area associated with the development of two residential dwelling units at 45 & 51 Grassy Road; Lot 216 & Lot 217 Ambler Road; Assessor's Map 20, Lots 214, 215, 216 and 217. H&T Holdings of Bristol, LLC, applicant. (PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 3, 2025 MEETING).

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. application form
- b. stormwater report dated September 2, 2025, from Robert Green Associates, LLC
- c. mapping: floodplain, wetlands, topo and aerial
- d. email dated November 18, 2025, from Raymond Rogozinski, P.E., Director of Public Works, regarding Undocumented Wetlands in the Hoppers
- e. intervenor status letter dated October 19, 2025
- f. site plan

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY:

- a. Intervener Status Letter dated October 19, 2019
- b. Supporting Documents for Special Permit for Earth Removal, dated September 2, 2025
 - a. Revised application
 - b. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
 - c. Application
 - d. Plan (Electronic Copy Only)
 - e. Report, dated September 2, 2025, Hydrology Report (28 Pages.)

MOTION: Move to continue the public hearing for Application #2056

By: Robinson

Seconded: Massaro

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Klimek, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was continued.

Attorney James Ziogas, 104 Bellevue Ave, representing the applicant addressed the Commission sharing, at the conclusion of that portion of the hearing there were some issues that had been raised that needed further vetting, and as a result of that, the applicant has taken some steps to present additional information to the Commission. One of the speakers had indicated that there was a fear that there was going to be a million, or a million yards of material being removed from the site, which was incorrect and maybe a little inflammatory when we had presented an application that talked about 145,000 yards of material, and that was basically the expectation. And it coincides with the application that we filed with the Zoning Commission for a gravel removal Permit. There was also a concern raised that the property sat on top of an enormous, aquifer. Going back to the GIS, we checked the aquifer records, and there is no aquifer underneath this site. That was a misconception, and I filed materials with the, Wetlands Commission last week, Wednesday. It is in the packet.

Paper copies of the maps were submitted for the record, showing the upland review area. Attorney Ziogas stated that some feasible and prudent alternatives were provided with their latest filing. He provided 3 scenarios two of which were discarded as they would have been excessive. Scenario 3 is the site grading which was the plan presented with the application. With 3-in-1 slopes on the 30-foot setback line inward. A grading within the upland reviewer area is necessary, for the purposes of discouraging runoff from leaving the site with the development as it is re-graded. Instead, what we would do is we would grade the property so that our water is contained on site, and the use of our sedimentation basin would then be employed to handle our water and keep it from shedding to other parts of the, neighbor's properties.

Robert Green, Robert Green Associates, 6 Old Waterbury Rd, shared the three scenarios and shared the 3rd scenario as the option they choose. At the southerly side of the property is a swale coming from west to east along the 30-foot setback line and the grading is not contained 100% on the property. As a result, when we submitted the plan, we ended up having to extend our grading into the upland review area slightly and, impacted about 6 hundredths of an acre. To do that, for that reason, we contain, as Jim stated, we contain all the water from the site into our sedimentation basin.

Chairman Fisk asked if they had a soil scientist come out as well for that report?

Attorney Ziogas stated yes, Furthermore, as, the discussion took place last month. The issue about, the, Wetland's area, to the east of our property, which is the City of Bristol property, was raised by a few of the speakers, so we took it upon ourselves to have a soil scientist go out to the site and do an evaluation. of the area, which is not our property, but is the city property, to the east of Grassy Road. Jim McManus from, McManus, JMM Water Consulting is here, and he's going to present.

Jim McManus, McManus, JMM Water Consulting, 23 Horseshoe Ridge Rd, Newtown, CT, certified soil scientist. Stated on November 14th he visited he site and his focus was on the eastern side or Grassy Rd on the City Property. Soils were examined and the line was further back than what people were discussing. He went over his report with the commission and also reviewed and compared his report against Alexandra Moch's report. He stated that the first finger she flagged if you dig there you will see very quickly that it is gray colored soil. That's what we're looking for. Chroma 2, gray colors within 20 inches is a wetland. However, if you look at the landscape position in the plant community. Because when we saw it, I'm like, there's something going on, because it's not making any sense. The plant community is all upland, and the landscape position isn't correct. It's much more of a landscape position to at least look for a well. What we see here in this picture, at about between 15 and 17 inches, depending on where you dig within that finger. If you look at the first picture, picture number 1, you can see the bottom of the augment. If you look at the bottom of the auger, where the bit hits the

shaft, you see some gray-colored soils there, and then you'll see some much darker colored soils. If you look at the second picture, you'll see it better. You see the topsoil, and then it goes into an upland soil, mildly well-drained, outwash soil. So that gray soil that you were seeing there was fill. It's either put there or deposited there, somehow the soil got there. It's not indicative of the current hydrology of the area.

Chairman Fisk asked what was the depth of the soil?

Jim McManus, it was about 15 inches. And then underneath that, you saw that buried. Mother Nature doesn't do that, man put that on top. It just happened to be gray. But the plant community doesn't line up. The reason it drew my attention is if you saw soil that gray, you would see a much different plant community. That's very poorly drained soil and it wasn't very poorly drained, and it doesn't even draw your attention.

William Stango P.E., City Engineer, approximately how many test falls did you do in the subject area?

Jim McManus, I didn't count them, I never do. It's just enough, it's over 10, and I did probably 7 just in that finger. And then I did a shuffle, too. That's where the sections were consistent. I did a number of holes.

William Stango, City Engineer, and the soil sections you were seeing were consistent with that light gray color on top?

Jim McManus, No, the only place I saw the light gray color on top was that finger that goes up. Everything else was just a normal profile.

William Stango, City Engineer, So that's the area you're claiming was believed filled, was in that finger.

Jim McManus, And the rest of it, I wouldn't call it disturbed, I wouldn't call it natural either, but the profiles were natural. That's the only area unnatural. It made sense. I mean, it had topsoil, and it went down.

Continued discussion on the soil testing of the area.

Chairman Fisk, with the wetlands that you mapped, and their new borders, how do you see this project keeping those wetlands recharged? Does it affect what the proposal is, will affect recharge of these wetlands?

Jim McManus, No, because this wetland, this entire system is not...only... being fed by this one site. There's a large... Community... large watershed, underground and above ground, that feeds this whole system. And the further you go down slope. Obviously, you get into the recharge, the aquifer protection zone. So, there's water moving through this system. But we're looking at impacts to wetlands. I'm not quite sure where the impact of the wetland is. Off the site, And with my delineation, would be over 100 feet away from any proposed activity.

Commissioner Klimek, How much of a difference between what you've delineated and what their soil scientists delineated. How much have you seen?

Jim McManus, she has 27 feet from the road and I have 90 feet.

Commissioner Klimek, there's somewhat of a wide difference between what you've seen and what, their soil scientists have seen.

Jim McManus, that means somebody interpreted the soils incorrectly.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, representing the Friends of the Hoppers Birge Pond Nature Preserve, we are rebutting this presentation, application for a wetlands Permit Number 2056. We would like to present some additional information, including expert testimony, to confirm what we introduced at the last meeting. We found these seeps, or springs that we called them. some additional information, including expert testimony, to confirm what we introduced at the last meeting. To further document the springs and associated wetlands, we retained soil scientist Alexandra Mock of Stanford, Connecticut, who does have a bunch of letters after her name, I'm not sure what they are, and she is not here to defend herself. She assessed the extent of the watercourses and wetland soils in the area. Dug about 75 holes. And, flagged about of two wetland areas, which are close Closest to the applicant's property. I will just read the short description in her report. In fact, the first

thing that she did was she went to our little spring and said, oh, it's a watercourse, I don't need to dig here. And then she dug anyway. She said, the areas flagged in the field consist of the northeastern and eastern wetlands. Both systems are located on the slopes, and are fed by groundwater emerging from the toe of the slopes. The northeastern wetland is initiated by several of them, indicating springs. The emerging groundwater flow concentrates downslope, forming an intermittent water course flowing towards the pond. The eastern wetland area is very similar in nature. Several springs feed the sloping wetland area. In the middle portion of the wetland edge, the entire slope bleeds the groundwater. We obviously have a difference in opinion. And, I do not know how long Ms. Mock has been practicing, but she does have a soil sedimentation and erosion degree or certification. It's not specifically a soil scientist degree, but it supersedes that, because you need to know soil science in order to get that degree, or certification. She was very adamant that there were wetlands there.

Continued discussion and presentation given by Michele Rudy, Friends of the Hoppers. Michele then invited Brian Neff to speak.

Dr. Brian Neff, PhD, bpnHydro Consulting, Denver, Co. shared a presentation on how water flows and the hydrologic effects of proposed Mining Near Birge Pond, CT. Also included in the packet. a key aspect of hydraulic theory, hydrologic theory that I would like to point out is as landscapes are concave down, the water table tends to fall away from the land surface. We see that everywhere, almost. There are some caveats that come with that, but generally speaking, that's exactly what we expect to see. Then when you get a concave up part of the landscape, ground water table tends to creep up toward the surface and to the surface in many cases. And these are your ideal places to see wetlands form. We'd call these, it could be a seepage face, could be a spring there, whatever. It's just a general theory of hydrology. Now, that caveat I was talking about is geology also plays a pretty big role here. What's relevant to this site, there's coarse geology of the sand, there's fine geology of the till, in short, I'll say that coarse geology, sand, encourages very rapid infiltration. My best guess, from my professional opinion, from what the literature supports, As far as we can tell, this is how this works. You might move this line with the till and sand a little bit one way or the other, but it's in general, this is it. Basically, the glacial till sits underneath, the sand sits on top, almost all of your groundwater flow will infiltrate the sand and shoot on down toward Birge Pond. In fact, I think of this as a highway of groundwater. Like, this hits sand, it's going to shoot off toward Birge Pond. Now, in the mining situation, in the post-mining situation, the gray line is where we'll be excavating, and it'll be creating this flat area here, and then it'll slope down. So what you're doing is you're changing this from a relatively steep hillside where it flattens out a little bit to get toward Burge Pond, and you have that concave up situation.

Dr. Neff's presentation continued for several minutes.

Attorney Ziogas challenged Dr. Neff's hypothesis of the area. He asked if Dr. Neff's was able to review the applicants Soil Scientist report? Dr. Neff's stated he had not.

Jim McManus, clarified what the USDA soil mapping, web soil survey is a good tool, it is not used to do fine delineations that's why soil scientists are hired. Now, a spring and a seep mean two very different things to me, as a soil scientist. So there's seeps out here. I don't know if they're springs. I didn't examine them, but there's definitely groundwater seeps.

Commissioner Fisk, Can you describe the differences in them?

Jim McManus, The seep is more of just seasonal brown water that comes out of the ground. You can see it on the surface. A spring is actually water flowing. It's flowing water coming out of the ground. I've seen both. The pond is man-made. This is not a glacial pond. It was dammed, and it was probably excavated at one point. We have significant, residents to the north. We have 3 homes on site now, with 2 that have been taken down recently, plus roads. Not only adjacent to, but within the watershed. I was just wondering if all that was taken into account, how that will affect the groundwater seeps, and or the pond itself? Or did you just sort of focus on the study area, which is the mining operation and the potential building of new residences.

Dr. Neff, the main focus was on Madsen Spring and surrounding wetlands. Now as a necessity to understand how groundwater flows in the area, I had to consider Birge Pond. really, it's irrelevant from a hydraulic perspective if it's man-made or not. It's water, it's there, it has a certain pressure head, it's the bottom, it's where everything's discharging to.

Attorney Ziogas, The field investigation by our certified professional soil scientists found no regulated water, wetlands or watercourses within the project site. We presented feasible and prudent alternatives. They were evaluated and preferred development plan was the plan that was submitted with our application. And while a downgradient forested wetland exists east of this site, there's no evidence to demonstrate the excavation will cause substantial diminution of flow, or destruction off the wetlands.

Chairman Fisk, One of the things I was bringing up earlier is I don't see any calculations for where the groundwater is, what the elevations are for the current groundwater conditions. It's something I think we should see before we would make any recommendations on this application? We should understand the infiltration rate for that recharge of that groundwater as well. We have some numbers there for the stormwater control, which seem adequate, but the groundwater itself ensuring that any excavation is 3 to 5 feet above that.

Attorney Ziogas, So what you're suggesting, I think, is, Mr. Green, is that they do test pits out there to determine seepage? And how many would you be looking for?

Chairman Fisk, whatever is necessary

Commissioner Robinson , we have a difference of opinion between two soil scientists. I don't know if Ms. Mott is able to come out for a walk with auger and everything. I am curious about the springs we will call them for now.

Attorney Ziogas, And you're right, it brought something to my attention, Commissioner, is unfortunately, In the law. when somebody presents a report, and is not there to be cross-examined or questioned by the Commission, it tends to diminish the value of what's being said. And to have one person give us a recitation of what the soil scientists said, about what she saw. Well, first of all, it's hearsay nonetheless, but not to be concerned with that. But it's inherently unreliable. If you don't hear it from the person who actually did the testing. And the fact that she's not here by Zoom or otherwise. I think speaks to some of the validity. What may be in that report? Why would you not want to be cross-examined? And why would you not want to answer questions?

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, Bristol, CT, Ms. Moch is not available she is on vacation until the 8th.

Commissioner Rooks, I'm a firm believer that if your soil scientist is not here, to me, it's hearsay. Unfortunately, that's the way I look at things. Going back to what the attorney was saying, where do we draw the line in who's responsible for all this other testing? I don't think that the applicant should be required to be delineating the city's wetlands. I mean, so where does that fall now? I mean, it is city property, do we ask for a third party?

Commissioner Klimek, I think to add to the validity of this application. Their soil scientists should be here to, to talk about her findings. Right now, I agree, with the two commissioners. This is hearsay right now. We don't have any actual validity without her being here. if she is a soil scientist, she needs to be here to answer our questions, and to really make the validity of this application.

Michele, again the soil scientist is not available and as soon as she is available, she can make a statement defending herself and her report, which as far as I am concerned is valid.

Commissioner Robinson stated we have a disagreement and we will have to have a site walk with the two soil scientists.

Chairman Rooks, it is interesting what we learned tonight is that the wetlands are closer than we thought. We will need to ask for an extension. Are you agreeable to the extension?

Attorney Ziogas yes I am, I will send an email to the engineering department tomorrow.

MOTION: Move to continue the public hearing for Application #2056 with extension of 35 days and with a site walk with the soil scientist on December 20th 8:00 am with December 27th, being the snow date.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

Against: None.
Abstained: None.
For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Longo, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was continued.

Meeting was recessed at 8:54 and reconvened at 9:04 pm.

- b. Application #2057 – Wetlands application for the repair of an existing culvert including replacement of concrete slabs/decks, stabilization of abutments, installation of rip-rap and other repairs at 197, 211, 213, 215, 219 and 225 Park Street; Assessor's Map 12, Lots 111, 112, 113, 114, 115 and 116; Curt Michael Freedman, P.E., applicant.
- c. Application # 25-462F-312 – Floodplain application for the repair of an existing culvert including replacement of concrete slabs/decks, stabilization of abutments, installation of rip-rap and other repairs within the floodplain at 197, 211, 213, 215, 219 and 225 Park Street; Assessor's Map 12, Lots 111, 112, 113, 114, 115 and 116; Curt Michael Freedman, P.E., applicant.

Chairman Fisk explained Applications #2057 and #25-462F-312 would be heard concurrently but voted on separately.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets for Application #2057:

- a. Application (attached hyperlinks)
- b. mapping: floodplain, wetlands, topo and aerial dated 9/18/2025
- c. photo report dated October 11, 2025, regarding 213 Park St., et al. (31 Pgs.)
- d. exterior photos - storm photos – estimated date July18, 2023 (12 Pgs.)
- e. e-mail dated November 24, 2025, regarding 213 Park St. – reports for beam theory, hydraulic evaluation and project scope
- f. e-mail dated October 27, 2025, regarding video/photos _Park St. – storm photos (12 Pgs.)
- g. e-mail dated November 25, 2025 for the documentation of the removal of the natural gas lines
- h. CMF_Bristol_Signatures_ParkStreet received December 1st, 2025

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets for Application #2057:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. Site photos (Exterior), from Curt Freedman, P.E., regarding 213 Park St., Et Al. (21 Pgs.)
- d. Site photos (Culvert Photos), from Curt Freedman, P.E., regarding 213 Park St., Et Al. (17 Pgs.)

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets for Application #25-462F-312:

- a. Application (attached hyperlinks)
- b. mapping: floodplain, wetlands, topo and aerial dated 9/18/2025
- c. photo report dated October 11, 2025, regarding 213 Park St., et al. (31 Pgs.)
- d. exterior photos - storm photos – estimated date July18, 2023 (12 Pgs.)
- e. e-mail dated November 24, 2025, regarding 213 Park St. – reports for beam theory, hydraulic evaluation and project scope
- f. e-mail dated October 27, 2025, regarding video/photos _Park St. – storm photos (12 Pgs.)
- g. e-mail dated November 25, 2025 for the documentation of the removal of the natural gas lines
- h. CMF_Bristol_Signatures_ParkStreet received December 1st, 2025

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets for Application #25-462F-312:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. List of Property Owners

MOTION: Move to continue the public hearing for Application #2057.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Massaro

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Klimek, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was continued.

MOTION: Move to continue the public hearing for Application # 25-462F-312

By: Robinson

Seconded: Massarro

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Klimek, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was continued.

Commissioner Robinson stated he had an issue with the wording on the signed letters from the homeowners stating my signature allows access to my property from time to time to enable work to be done on the subject culvert. Any work done that holds me financially responsible requires full written disclosure and will require my signed approval. I do not feel in my mind that we have a signature saying we can proceed with this application because they are throwing stipulations in there. We need to have clear concise understanding of all property owners that when they sign they're signing and whatever we come across, that they're going to have to come along. The other question I have is las month we asked for a survey, do we have a survey?

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, no we do not have a survey

Commissioner Robinson then we do not have an application. There's no sense wasting any more time. We're right back where we started a month ago, and we do not have the information that we've required. So, no, I don't think we have an application. Let's move on.

Commissioner Rooks, in my eyes we do not have a completed application.

Commissioner Robinson asked the applicant if we have the survey?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, representing the applicant, said no

Commissioner Robinson stated the commission is done, we do not have a survey or a complete application.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, representing the applicant, stated that the abandoned gas pipe has been removed.

MOTION: Move to close the public hearing for Application #2057.

By: Rooks

Seconded: Robinson

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Klimek, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was closed.

MOTION: Move to deny Wetlands Application #2057 without prejudice as an incomplete application requiring a further survey, site plans and all engineering recommendations.

By: Rooks

Seconded: Robinson

Against: Rooks.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Klimek, Massaro, and Fisk.

MOTION: Move to close the public hearing for Floodplain Application # 25-462F-312

By: Rooks

Seconded: Robinson

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Klimek, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was closed.

MOTION: Move to deny Application #25-462F-312 with same stipulations as the wetland application.

By: Rooks

Seconded: Robinson

Against: Rooks.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Klimek, Massaro, and Fisk.

- d. Application #2062 Wetlands application for the reconfiguration of existing pavement areas to accommodate additional parking spaces for a total of 161 spaces. Additional improvements include a 45' wide drive-in-door to Building A and multiple stormwater basin/floodplain compensation areas for proposed and future parking at 300 Broad Street; Assessor's Map 43, Lot 100; 300 Broad Street Property LLC, applicant.
- e. Application #25-466F-314 - Floodplain application for the reconfiguration of existing pavement areas to accommodate additional parking spaces for a total of 161 spaces. Additional improvements include a 45' wide drive-in-door to Building A and multiple stormwater basin/floodplain compensation areas for proposed and future parking at 300 Broad Street; Assessor's Map 43, Lot 100; 300 Broad Street Property LLC, applicant.

Chairman Fisk explained Applications #2062 and #25-466F-314 would be heard concurrently but voted on separately.

The following items were submitted into the record: updated plans dated November 26, 2025, Rock Edmond.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets for Application #2062:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. link to soil scientist report & impact assessment, dated October 21, 2025, from SLR International Corporation
- d. link to: drainage report dated October 23, 2025, from SLR International Corporation
- e. property survey
- f. site plan set

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets for Application #25-466F-314:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. link to soil scientist report & impact assessment, dated October 21, 2025, from SLR International Corporation
- d. link to: drainage report dated October 23, 2025, from SLR International Corporation
- e. property survey
- f. site plan set

MOTION: Move to Open the public hearing for Application #2062.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Bridges, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was continued.

- d. Application #25-466F-314 - Floodplain application for the reconfiguration of existing pavement areas to accommodate additional parking spaces for a total of 161 spaces. Additional improvements include a 45' wide drive-in-door to Building A and multiple stormwater basin/floodplain compensation areas for proposed and future parking at 300 Broad Street; Assessor's Map 43, Lot 100; 300 Broad Street Property LLC, applicant

MOTION: Move to open the public hearing for Application #25-466F-314.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Massaro

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Bridges, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was continued.

Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, Bristol, CT, representing the applicant gave a brief synopsis of the project. Stated that the fence height, the fence is being relocated, within the flood plain, not within the flood way, and we adjusted, the height literally by several inches, to, make sure there was no, change in, or actually to improve

what was there.

Rock Emmond, Senior Civil Engineer with SLR International Corporation, 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, CT.,
Essentially, what's going on is we're looking to expand the parking to meet the minimum zoning requirements.
And by doing so, we have some stormwater mitigations, which are also, in tangent, doing some, floodplain
mitigations as well, so we're kind of double-dipping there.

Site plans were presented and reviewed with the commission.

Rock Emmond, Senior Civil Engineer with SLR International Corporation, 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, CT.,
Essentially what we're trying to do is get to 161 parking spaces, both outside the building, as well as some
parking spaces within the building. So what we're doing is, specifically in these areas, we're expanding the
driveway that wraps around the building, by approximately 45 feet, and then it would start, new parking spaces,
perpendicular parking spaces along this area that are gray-shaded. Those occur both in the, upland review area,
as well as the floodplain, specifically the majority of this portion that you're looking at right now is actually within
the 500-year floodplain. We're obviously kicking out the existing fence line, that's out there today, to essentially
enhance the water quality and provide, floodplain compensation. So essentially what we're doing is we're doing
these small depressions where the, the parking lot or the parking spaces are draining directly towards them,
providing a filter strip that's directly adjacent to the parking space. There's a section that's located within there.
That allows for us to filter the particulates that are going towards the, the depressions, as well as providing a,
sort of an infiltration strip within there to help propagate infiltration to the surrounding soils. We're having a net
increase in the amount of volume within the floodplain by about, 590 cubic yards. When you really think about
the large 23-some-odd acre property, it's small potatoes. But, you know, based on your regulations, we are
providing, the floodplain compensation to make sure that we're not making anything worse. Based on the
conversations that I had with Tony, there's an existing chain link fence that is what, you know, you technically
can construe as an obstruction to floodwaters as they move by. What we're doing is, in the one section that's
actually not at the elevation of the floodplain, we're going to make sure that the bottom rail is just above the
floodplain by about a quarter of an inch.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, what is the date on the revised plans that you did based on the comments?

Rock Emmond, plans revised to November 26, 2025.

Steve Donaghy, 94 Frederick Street, what I am gathering nothing is going to be on the Frederick Street side? Is
there any proposal for anything to be on Frederick St? I want to make sure that property which was a parking
lot is never a parking lot again on the Frederick St side, that is floodplain.

Timothy Furey, Just for the record, there is no current plan to utilize the parking field on the other side of the
river. There was, at one time many of you remembered, I didn't remember, but I know I've seen the structures.
a bridge, and the employees would walk through, and there is a gate and part of the fence system that's going
to be preserved. There are actually cameras over there.

MOTION: Move to close the public hearing for Application #2062.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Bridges, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was closed
No one else spoke.

MOTION: Move to close the public hearing for Application #25-466F-314.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

Against: None.

Abstained: None.
For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Bridges, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was closed.
No one else spoke.

MOTION: Move to approve Application #2062 – Wetlands application for the reconfiguration of existing pavement areas to accommodate additional parking spaces for a total of 161 spaces. Additional improvements include a 45' wide drive-in-door to Building A and multiple stormwater basin/floodplain compensation areas for proposed and future parking at 300 Broad Street; Assessor's Map 43, Lot 100; 300 Broad Street Property LLC, applicant, in accordance with the plot plan and information dated November 26, 2025 with standard stipulations and additional stipulations, partial construction of new parking would allow for increased storage within the floodplain, additional parking added in 5 years can be approved by staff as long as they are following the plans dated November 26, 2025.

By: Robinson Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Bridges, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.
Against: None.
Abstained: None.

The application is approved.

MOTION: Move to approve Application #25-466F-314 - Floodplain application for the reconfiguration of existing pavement areas to accommodate additional parking spaces for a total of 161 spaces. Additional improvements include a 45' wide drive-in-door to Building A and multiple stormwater basin/floodplain compensation areas for proposed and future parking at 300 Broad Street; Assessor's Map 43, Lot 100; 300 Broad Street Property LLC, applicant in accordance with the plot plan dated November 26, 2025 and information submitted with standard stipulations.

By: Robinson Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Bridges, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.
Against: None.
Abstained: None.

The application is approved.

MOTION: Move to write a recommendation to Zoning Commission to endorse the deferral of the additional parking spaces. For Application #2062 and Application #25-466F-314

By: Robinson Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Bridges, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.
Against: None.
Abstained: None.

The referral is approved.

- f. Application #2064 - Wetlands application for the construction of a new multi-tenant industrial development, parking areas, and other associated improvements within the upland review boundary at 894 Middle Street; Assessor's Map 4, Lot 17-3 & 17-4-1; Carrier Construction Incorporated, applicant

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. supporting documents report dated October 23, 2025, regarding 894 Middle St., Map 4, Lot 17-3 & Lot 17-4-1, Bristol, CT, from Robert Green Associates, LLC
- d. concept plan
- e. boundary & topo survey

Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, representing the applicant, Carrier Construction, Inc., asked the commission to delay the opening of the public hearing until the January 5th meeting date. A letter was submitted to City Staff on December 1st. We retained B&L, and B&L is making some recommendations. The biggest change that's occurred from our initial, draft plans is we have, determined by going there to do the initial research, and you may have seen, as you left, that going out onto Middle Street is probably not a good idea. Moving the entrances, all of them, onto the side road, trying to stay away, which makes us move everything around. They had two drainage basins located, they may only need one.

MOTION: Move to delay the public hearing for Application #2064.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Longo, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

The Public Hearing opening was delayed until the January 5th meeting.

5. Receipt of New Applications

There were no new applications.

6. Old Business

- a. Cease & Correct - 360 King Street & Map 47, Lot 5-1 King Street

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets

- a. Written owner authorization
- b. cease and correct – dated 3/10/25
- c. photos of site activity
- d. staff maps and photos
- e. public provided materials
- f. historical photos
- g. mapping: floodplain, wetlands, topo and aerial

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets

- a. Map "entitled Skytop Enterprises, LLC, revised date July 21, 2025, prepared by Cole Civil + Survey.
- b. Map "entitled Skytop Enterprises, LLC, dated June 26, 2025, prepared by Cole Civil + Survey.

Anthony Lorenzetti stated that he spoke with the City Attorneys who suggested fining the homeowners, however after speaking with Zach Norton, it was made clear that a deadline was never given to Skytop Enterprises. He suggested inviting the however and Skytop Enterprises back to the January meeting.

MOTION: Move to invite the homeowners and Jeremy to the January 5th meeting to give them a deadline to complete the repairs.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Bridges, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

7. New Business

There was no new business.

8. Staff Reports

- a. IWWA Report - November 2025

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer report, dated November 2025, from Zachary Norton, Zoning Enforcement Officer, (Environmental Protection Technician)

MOTION Move to file the report from the Inland Wetlands Zoning Enforcement Officer.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Klimek, Klimek, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The report is filed.

9. Communications

- a. Letter dated November 3, 2025, from Zachary Fisk, Chairman of the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency of the Conservation Commission of the City of Bristol, to the Little League Baseball, Inc., regarding parking at the Giamatti Little League property.

10. Conservation Topics

- a. Public and Commissioner Concerns

11. Adjournment

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 10:23 P.M.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Klimek, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.
Against: None.
Abstained: None.

This meeting was recorded.

Respectfully submitted,
Janet Little

Zachary Fisk, Chairman
Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency
of the Conservation Commission of the City of Bristol

David Rooks, Secretary