



CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT
TOWN HALL – 110 MYRTLE AVENUE
WESTPORT, CT 06880
P 203.341.1170 F 203.341.1088

WESTPORT™

**DRAFT
MINUTES
WESTPORT CONSERVATION COMMISSION
JUNE 4, 2025**

The June 4, 2025 Special Meeting of the Westport Conservation Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom.

ATTENDANCE

Commission Members:

Patrick Ryll, Vice Chair, Acting Chair
Diana McDowell, Secretary
Brian Whiting, Sergeant at Arms
Timothy Kwong
Paul Davis, Alternate

Staff Members:

Colin Kelly, Conservation Director
Andrew Hally, Conservation Analyst
Susan Voris, Admin. Asst. III
Edward Gill, PE, Engineering Department
Peter Gelderman, Asst. Town Atty.

This is to certify that these minutes and resolutions were filed with the Westport Town Clerk within 7 days of the DATE Public Hearing of the Westport Conservation Commission pursuant to Section 1-225 of the Freedom of Information Act.

Colin Kelly
Conservation Director

Public Hearing:

- 1. 13 Hyde Lane (aka Long Lots School):** Application #WPL-12151-25 by the Town of Westport to construct a new elementary school, parking lot, athletic fields, playgrounds, and associated site and utility work. Portions of the work are within the upland review area setbacks and the WPLO area of an unnamed tributary of Muddy Brook

The Conservation Commission met jointly with the Flood and Erosion Control Board for this meeting. Each board was holding a separate meeting while listening to the presentation jointly.

Peter Gelderman, Asst. Town Atty. gave an overview for the evening's proceedings, since this is a joint hearing between the Flood and Erosion Control Board and the Conservation Commission. Both Commission will open their hearing separately. The applicant will make their presentation, then each board and staff will separately ask questions of the applicant separately and review their staff report separately. Then the public will be invited to address both Boards. The Commissions can ask final questions. Then the Flood Board will discuss and decide if they can approve the application. If the Flood Board approves the application, the Conservation Commission will then have the opportunity to discuss and determine whether they can approve the application.

Jay Keenan, Long Lots School Building Committee Member, introduced the Committee members and the team present for the hearing. He thanked the members of both boards for agreeing to meet on this tightened timeline.

Michael Doherty of SLR Consulting, oriented the Boards to the existing site conditions, with the existing school, the bus loop, the parent drop-off area, parking lot, recreation/community facilities areas and the stormwater basin.

Matthew Sanford, soil scientist and wetland scientist with SLR Consulting, reviewed the wetlands and watercourses on the site. He discussed the existing wetland mapping and town GIS mapping of the site. They delineated 3 wetland areas and the stormwater basin that is considered a waterbody. He discussed the characteristics of these wetlands.

Mr. Doherty reviewed the proposed site conditions, which includes:

- A new school building,
- A Hyde lane bus loop,
- A separate parent drop-off,
- The parking lot,
- The recreation/community facilities, and
- The stormwater basins.

Mr. Doherty showed the directions of the proposed grading.

Ryan McEvoy, PE, discussed the stormwater management for the project. He reviewed the existing watersheds contributing runoff to the site. He reviewed how the stormwater would be captured for the entire site. There will be two additional drainage ponds and underground drainage systems added. He noted there was a minor change was made to the plans on May 30th to allow a larger buffer at the northern property line. This change also reoriented the playing fields and included some grading changes. Included in the stormwater plans are vegetative swales, hydrodynamic separators,

and stormwater basins. The new stormwater basins will also be suitable for infiltration. He stated he believes their plans meet and exceed the Town's and State's requirements for stormwater management. It also complies with 2024 CT DEEP Stormwater Plan.

Mr. Sanford discussed the proposed Regulated Activities including:

- Replace outlet in Stormwater Basin A,
- Removal trapezoidal section in wetland 3,
- Replacement of the headwall,
- The installation of the stormwater basins, which will be revegetated with appropriate vegetation for the hydrology; and
- The removal of some trees for the installation of the stormwater basins.

Mr. Sanford indicated that overall, he does not believe there will be any impacts to the wetlands or watercourses.

Ted Gill, PE, presented the Flood Board staff report. He gave an overview of how this drainage plan will make improvements. Staff was brought in at the beginning of the design process and asked for comments about what would be needed. The staff's comments were incorporated in their design of the project. The drainage proposal complies with all requirements. He recommend approval to the Flood Board.

Mr. Kelly presented the staff report. He stated he had no issues with the analysis of the wetlands and watercourses on the site. He asked for the more clarification of the headwall activity and the wing wall work.

Mr. McEvoy explained they would anchor the area behind the headwall and the wingwalls with sandbags to prevent erosion. The replacement would only take a few days.

Mr. Kelly asked if there would be any issues with staff oversight since this is an area of concern.

Mr. McEvoy stated none.

Mr. Kelly noted that this work area is an already impacted area. He asked about the pipe upgrade and how that would be done.

Mr. McEvoy stated they will dry lay the new pipe, then will make the connection. This will limit the time of disruption and need to divert the flow. He noted this is a part of construction sequence that is a part of the submission package.

Mr. Kelly asked about the existing stormwater basin's outlet replacement.

Mr. McEvoy stated this is a stormwater structure. As such it need maintenance from time to time. They are upgrading the outlet structure to handle updates to the drainage requirements and the plan changes.

Mr. Kelly asked about the building time frame.

Mr. Keenan stated that ideally the initial stage which includes the new building would be 18 to 20 months, they would move into the new school, demo the old school and then complete final stages including the parking lot, which would add about another 9 to 12 months.

Mr. Kelly noted there are regular sediment and erosion control reports built into the project, and he indicated that staff would like to be included on any reports. This is large ongoing project and the more eyes reviewing the project the better. He noted there is mitigation being proposed within the project and there is a treatment train within the parking areas. He discussed the Commission's practice to incorporate native species within the regulated areas and the benefits of native species within the landscape. He asked for a review of the landscape plan.

Mr. McEvoy discussed the landscaping in the parking areas. These areas will be lawn with ornamental shade trees. In the stormwater basin, at the bottom of the pond, there would be seed mix that would be suitable for that area. The vegetation in the basin is tied to the hydrology.

Mr. Doherty agreed with the idea to incorporate more native species.

Mr. Kelly asked about monitoring the stormwater systems for long term maintenance.

Mr. McEvoy stated the structures need to be checked quarterly. The sediment basins should be mowed yearly and the sediment removed once it reaches a foot in depth. Oil spills should be removed from parking areas and the hydrodynamic separators vacuumed to remove captured sediments as necessary.

Mr. Davis asked if there are any plantings proposed along the stream, wetland 3.

Mr. Doherty stated once they have completed the invasive removal and grading, they would use a wetland seed mix.

Mr. Davis asked if the stormwater ponds are open.

Mr. Sanford stated the stormwater ponds will be open to the air.

Mr. Davis asked how the ponds would not be a habitat to mosquitos.

Mr. McEvoy stated there will not be standing water in the ponds over a long term. The ponds are meant to infiltrate water.

Mr. Kelly noted the proposed stormwater ponds may become wetlands in the future as the existing stormwater basin has, which was constructed in 2005.

The hearing was opened to public comment.

Janine Scotti, 36 Riverside Avenue discussed drainage maintenance and flooding.

Wendy Batteau, 6 Arlen Road and a RTM member, stated that the presentation was really clear and well thought out. She noted the larger playing field is to be a grass playing field. The plan calls for runoff to be directed into the stormwater ponds. The grass playing field have drainage systems

incorporated, if they want to put install artificial turf at a later date. Artificial turf is impermeable. Should it be decided to install artificial turf, those plans would have to come back to the boards because the artificial turfs are toxic and may require a different drainage system.

Jennifer Johnson, 28 Tamarac Road and a RTM member noted that it was said the plan exceeds drainage standards. She asked if the neighbors have neighbors on this plan and if they are satisfied.

Mr. Keenan stated the plan has been presented but they have not gone to each individual neighbor.

Ms. J Johnson stated the number one question for everyone is safety. The number one is construction of this building while school is in session adjacent to the construction. She noted concerns for the students during construction as well as the air quality during construction and demolition.

Joe Nader, 36 Westfair, gym will access the lower fields. He noted the lower fields do get very wet. He asked how the proposed drainage help this situation.

Mr. McEvoy stated the grade changes of those lower fields and the perimeter drains should help reduce the number of times that the fields are not able to be used by directing the runoff to the retention systems. The playing fields may have limited use immediately after a rainstorm.

Toni Simonetti, 27 Evergreen Parkway, noted she submitted two letters into the record. She asked questions:

- Questioned runoff coming onto the site from other properties and how this applies. – Mr. Gill noted that the natural drainage path for surrounding properties goes towards Long Lots School as water runs downhill. The goal of the plan is to ensure that the new proposal does not increase flooding onto those uphill properties by changing the natural drainage patterns.
- She stated the playing fields are not a part of the school activities – It was stated Terrace 4 is used by the gym classes. The property is owned by the Town and is operated as one property.
- She noted that she is against turf fields. They are not permeable and are toxic.
- She acknowledged Ms. Johnson's comments regarding the construction details.
- She acknowledge Ms. Scotti's comments regarding the drainage.
- She asked about the soil remediation. – Mr. McEvoy stated this is limited to the area around a buried tank. The work is limited in duration and the materials will be removed from the site.

Ellen Lautenberg, 10 Woody Lane and a RTM member for this district, stated she appreciates the effort that has gone into this project. She knows some trees will be taken down during construction and some will be replaced. She asked if there will be an ongoing conversation so that the neighbors are comfortable that the buffer is adequate.

Mr. Keenan said yes and indicated they have already indicated to some of the neighbors that they need to get through this process and then will walk the properties.

Valerie Seiling Jacobs, 11 Compo Parkway, asked why we cannot use the lower fields as flood storage in an emergency. She agreed with what others said about artificial turf fields. He suggested a condition of no artificial turf fields. She noted that berms need to be maintained.

Sam Anderson, 29 Hyde Lane, stated he lives adjacent to the lower field. He asked questions regarding the changes to the berms and drainage in this area. The presentation by the Town Engineer

**Town of Westport
Conservation Commission
FINDINGS
13 Hyde Lane (aka: Long Lots School)
Application # IWW, WPL-12151-25
Assessor's Map: G10 Tax Lot: 058
Public Hearing: June 4, 2025**

- 1. Receipt Date:** May 21, 2025
- 2. Application Classification:** Plenary
- 3. Application Request:** To construct a new elementary school, parking lot, athletic fields, playgrounds, and associated site and utility work. Portions of the work are within the upland review area setbacks and the WPLO area of an unnamed tributary of Muddy Brook
- 4. Plans Reviewed:**
 - a. Wetland Delineation Report and Impact Assessment,** Long Lots Elementary School, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by SLR International Corporation, dated May 14, 2025.
 - b. Property and Topographic Survey,** Town of Westport Long Lots Elementary School, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by Lindquist Surveying LLC, dated May 9, 2024, Scale 1"=40', 4 sheets.
 - c. Long Lots Elementary School, Regulatory Permit Submission,** 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by SLR dated May 14, 2025 portions revised to May 30, 2025, Scale: as noted, Sheets 0-24.
 - d. Drainage Report,** Long Lots Elementary School, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by SLR dated May 14, 2025,
 - e. Building Height Calculation,** Long Lots Elementary School, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by SLR dated April 22, 2025,
- 5. Past Permits:**
 - a. 1995:** Wall repair
 - b. AA-WPL/E-6511-01:** Playground equipment
 - c. IWW/M 7115-03,** Amend wetland map #**G-10, G-9, H-9, & H-10.**
 - d. IWW, WPL 7212-03:** Expansion and reconstruction of a parking lot, upgrade of the stormwater management system and associated improvements.
 - e. AA-WPL/E-7740-05:** Community Garden, 30 plots and storage shed
 - f. AA-WPL/E-8611-10:** Community Garden expansion from 30-58 plots
 - g. AA-WPL/E- 11148-20:** Covered pavilion
 - h. AA, WPL/E-11658-22:** Install a two-classroom modular building with covered walkway
- 6. IWW and WPLO Regulated Areas**

The onsite wetlands are mostly found as part of the undeveloped western portion of the site. They are within a forested area dominated by red maple trees. Four regulated areas were identified onsite and are listed as: Wetland 1, Wetland 2, Wetland/Watercourse 3, and Stormwater Basin/Waterbody A. The Waterway Protection Line is associated with watercourses and waterbodies onsite. The site generally drains towards the west, with perennial watercourse Muddy Brook located ~80' to the from the western property line at its closest point.

The Inland Wetland and Watercourse Regulations (IWW) setbacks determined for regulated activities on this property include:

100' upland review area for presence of steep slopes of 25% or greater,
75' upland review area for a non-residential structure,

30' upland review area for a parking lot and driveway,
25' upland review area for fence,
20' upland review area for the proposed cut, fill, grading, and other alterations.

The proposed structure for the school is located ~130' from the closest point to the onsite wetland/watercourse. The closest parking area and driveway are located ~47' from the closest wetland. There are four locations with proposed grading changes located within the 20' upland review areas. Three of these areas are proposed to be ~15' from wetland areas on site and one area includes grading within ~10' from the wetland areas. This grading is associated with the proposed stormwater management for the project and includes construction of two stormwater basins. These areas are proposed within the generally wooded area to the west of the school structure.

The application proposes two locations onsite with direct impacts to regulated wetland areas. This work totals 303 sq. ft. of direct impacts to wetland/watercourse areas, (171 sq. ft. and 132 sq. ft.). One area (171sq. ft.) is associated with work to repair and replace an existing deteriorated concrete headwall at the discharge outlet of existing drainpipes located on the northern portion of the site. This headwall represents the origin of the "Wetland/Watercourse 3" onsite and is noted as "Regulated Activity F" on the Site Plan – Grading sheet. The other area is an installation of an outlet control structure within the existing stormwater detention pond noted as "Stormwater Basin/Waterbody A" onsite and is noted as "Regulated Activity C" on the Site Plan – Grading sheet.

The Commission finds that this plan denotes areas of sitework within the 75' upland review areas associated with regulated areas onsite. These six (6) areas are highlighted and include various grading and drainage related activities that total ~39,360 sq. ft. (0.9 acres) of work area. These areas represent possible sources of indirect impacts to resources onsite.

The Commission finds that the location of the headwall at "Wetland/Watercourse 3" is the legacy discharge location of two pipes that are the existing drainage for the lower athletic field in the north of the site and the outlet from a pass-through drainage pipe that is leading from Trailing Rock Lane. This pipe carries stormwater and overflow from the collective properties to the east of Hyde Lane noted as "Watershed 12" in the "Drainage Report". This represents an area that is 39.57 acres. The Commission finds that this proposal maintains that connection to the east of the site and will remain as a "pass through" of that water. The existing pipe is an 18" reinforced concrete pipe, and the proposal includes a new pipe (24" HDPE) in a new path that is slightly adjusted to the north as it crosses the property but discharges to the same location. The pipe will maintain and carry the flow as it currently exists and is adjusted to allow for building siting and amenities from the northern side of the structure.

The Commission finds that all other proposed work lies within upland areas of the site.

The applicant provides a site-specific soil review for the property within the "Wetland Delineation Report and Impact Assessment" as part of the current application. These findings are reflected on the "Property and Topographic Survey". Previously, the 2003 map amendment application was considered and approved by the Conservation Commission. The "Wetland Delineation Report" identifies wetlands and watercourses in their current state, after the last site improvements were completed. The Commission finds that the current surveyed line is acceptable for this permit and represents an insignificant difference from the 2003 map amendment application. A map amendment is not necessary for this application. The existing mapping incorporates the site

conditions from the last significant work onsite and provides an appropriate level of mapping for determination of any impacts to wetlands for the current application. This mapping includes and incorporates the changes to the improved water detention facility that was modified by the 2003 permit. The current application provides a report indicating field investigation that identifies soil units listed as described below.

7. Wetland soils found on the properties

Aquents: This soil unit is found disturbed areas that generally have less than two (2) feet of fill over naturally occurring poorly or very poorly drained soils, or are located where the naturally occurring wetland soils are no longer identifiable, or the original soil materials have been excavated to the ground water table within twenty (20) inches of the soil surface, have an aquatic moisture regime and can be expected to support hydrophytic vegetation.

Non-wetland soils found on the properties

- a. **Agawam fine sandy loam, 3-8% slopes (29B)** – Well drained
- b. **Sutton fine sandy loam, 3-8% slopes (50B)** – Moderately well drained
- c. **Canton and Charlton fine sandy loams, 8-15% slopes (60C)** – Well drained
- d. **Sutton-Urban land complex, 0-8% slopes (250B)** – Moderately well drained
- e. **Charlton-Urban land complex, 3-8% slopes (260B)** – Well drained
- f. **Urban land (307)** – Variable
- g. **Udorthents, smoothed (308)** – Moderately well drained

8. Property Description and Relative Facts:

- a. The existing property contains an elementary school building that was built in 1954. It also includes parking, playgrounds, athletic fields and other auxiliary uses. It is served by sewer.
- b. The property is **28.076 acres** (1,223,013 sq. ft.) in size.
- c. The property is located mostly in Residential Zone AA with portions of the southern area within Zone A.
- d. The parcel is located within the Muddy Brook Watershed.
- e. The property is situated in Flood Zone X as shown on F.I.R.M. Panel 09001C0414G Map revised to July 8, 2013.
- f. FEMA maps
- g. The property is **not** within the Coastal Area Management Zone.
- h. The property is not within the Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone.
- i. The Waterway Protection Line is established 15' from the wetland line.
- j. The proposed school building is **127,945 sq. ft.** (*existing school building is 152,795 sq. ft.*)
- k. Parking lot: **250 spaces.** (*existing: 196 spaces*)
- l. **Amenities include:** 2 multipurpose natural turf athletic fields, 2 playgrounds, basketball court, and play area

9. CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION

In carrying out the purposes and policies of the IWW regulations for the Town of Westport Section 5.0 and Sections 22a-36 to 22a-45(a,) inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes, including matters relating to regulating, permitting and enforcing of the provisions thereof, the Commission shall take into consideration all relevant facts and circumstances, including, but not limited to:

- a. The environmental impact of the proposed regulated activity on wetlands or watercourses;
- b. The applicant's purpose for, and any feasible and prudent alternatives to, the proposed regulated activity which alternatives would cause less or no environmental impact to wetlands or watercourses;

- c. The relationship between the **short-term** and **long-term impacts** of the proposed regulated activity on wetland or watercourses and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity of such wetlands or watercourses.
- d. Irreversible and irretrievable loss of wetland or watercourse resources which would be caused by the proposed regulated activity, including the extent to which such activity **would foreclose a future ability to protect**, enhance or restore such resource and any mitigation measures which may be considered as a condition of issuing a permit for such activity
- e. The character and degree of injury to, or interference with, safety, health or reasonable use of property which is caused or threatened by the proposed regulated activity
- f. Impacts of the proposed regulated activity on wetlands or watercourses outside the area for which the activity is proposed and **future activities** associated with, or reasonably related to, the proposed regulated activity **which are made inevitable** by the proposed regulated activity and which may have an impact on wetlands or watercourses. ; and
- g. The degree to which the proposed activity is consistent with all applicable goals and policies set forth in Section 1.3 and 1.4 of these Regulations and Section 22a-36 of the Connecticut General Statutes, as amended.

10. Conformance to Section 6.1 GENERAL STANDARDS

- a. disturbance and pollution are minimized;
- b. minimize height, width, length of structures are limited to the minimum; dimension to accomplish the intended function;
- c. loss of fish, other beneficial organisms, wildlife and vegetation are prevented;
- d. potable fresh water supplies are protected from dangers of drought, overdraft, pollution, misuse and mismanagement;
- e. maintain conservation, economic, recreational and aesthetic qualities;
- f. consider historical sites

Discussion:

The Commission finds that in previous Commission reviews Application # IWW, WPL 7212-03 (for the expansion and reconstruction of a parking lot, upgrade of the stormwater management system and associated improvements). A consultant provided It is REMA's opinion that from a functional perspective the wetland areas on the site would not be considered significant. Overall, Wetlands A through C were evaluated as providing low quality functions and values. Some of the reasons that these wetlands did not score higher included their relatively small size, disturbance from residential activities for many years, low vegetative and wetland class and subclass diversity, presence of invasive species and influence by human activities, such as stormwater runoff discharge to and from Wetland A.”

(The staff report from 2004 is added as an addendum to this report -Addendum A.)

As part of this current proposal, SLR prepared a “Wetland Delineation Report and Impact Assessment” that includes a thorough wetland investigation, narrative of work, wetland impact review, sediment and erosion control, and stormwater management. This review concludes with the following statement:

- a) *“Existing structures within the project area will be demolished, and a new school and necessary appurtenances will be constructed. Direct wetland impacts are limited to 303 SF, which are necessary to improve stormwater quality and flow conditions.*
- b) *The proposed stormwater management system will provide protections for water quality and*
- c) *ensure no increase in the peak rate of discharge from the property. A comprehensive S&E*
- d) *Control Plan has been designed and will be used through the construction period. Direct*

- e) *wetland impacts and work in the URA have been minimized to the maximum extent practicable.*
- f) *Through the avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to the maximum extent possible, the use of*
- g) *S&E controls and stormwater management measures are being implemented to avoid short term and long-term impacts. It is SLR's professional opinion that the proposed project will not result in any significant adverse impacts or effect on regulated wetland/watercourse/waterbody resources."*

Trees are proposed as landscape features for the building and as a property line buffer in the developed portions of the site. These trees are a mixture of native and non-native species. There are two general areas of vegetation within the upland review areas that will be disturbed onsite. These areas are associated with the installation of the two stormwater basins as part of this proposal. The removal of mature trees is limited to areas of required grading/excavation for the proposed footprint. The Commission finds that vegetation removal will total ~ 53,000 sq. ft. (~1.22 acres) of area. The remaining forest canopy will remain intact. The restoration plans provided "Site Plan – Landscaping" identifies several larger trees as part of the selections for restoration, The area of the proposed drainage basins are proposed to be planted with appropriate seed mixtures to provide stabilization and functionality of the drainage feature.

Habitat within the nearby watercourse corridor will be left undisturbed. The Commission finds that disturbed conditions are temporary and do not pose any long-term adverse impacts to wildlife, vegetative communities, and or fish habitat which are limited onsite..

The Commission finds that the application includes the installation of an array of geothermal wells located in the northern athletic field. The Commission finds that this is done as a means to reduce energy consumption for the building. The Commission finds that the applicant provided information on a additional reserve or "back- up" system that would be conventional heating sources (gas or electric) for the proposed structure.

11. Conformance to Section 6.2 WATER QUALITY

- a. flushing rates, freshwater sources, existing basin characteristics and channel contours will not be adversely altered;
- b. water stagnation will neither be contributed nor caused;
- c. water pollution will not affect fauna, flora, physical or chemical nature of a regulated area, or the propagation and habitats of fish and wildlife, will not result;
- d. pollution of groundwater or a significant aquifer will not result (*groundwater recharge area or Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone*);
- e. all applicable state and local health codes shall be met;
- f. water quality will be maintained or improved in accordance with the standards set by federal, state, and local authority including section 25-54(e) of the Connecticut General Statutes
- g. prevents pollution of surface water

Discussion:

To the west of the property lies Muddy Brook (State Waterbody ID: CT7000-16_01 (Connecticut Environmental Conditions Online, <http://www.cteco.uconn.edu/>) It is listed as a Class A water for Inland Surface Water Class. The Class A designation indicates that the water is suitable habitat for fish other aquatic life and wildlife and recreation.

The Commission referenced UConn's CLEAR Local Watershed Assessment Tool. The local watershed basin for Muddy Brook has a combined condition index (CCI) score of 0.19. A CCI score of less than 0.43 indicates the watershed basin may be significantly impaired. The Tool defines Muddy Brook's Recovery Status as "Mitigation", identifying that the watershed condition can be improved with mitigation efforts such as restoring naturalized riparian zones.

The Commission finds that the surface water quality of Muddy Brook, located offsite, will not be impacted from the proposed activity across the subject property. The project proposes limited areas of temporary, direct impacts to a watercourse (303 sq. ft. of direct impacts) that can be managed and mitigated onsite during excavation. Due to the nature of these actions, the Commission requires that the Conservation Department is notified 48 hours to the start of work and Conservation technical Staff shall be present for oversight of the work within the stream.

The Commission finds that the design engineers incorporated Low Impact Development (LID) features onsite to reduce stormwater runoff volume and provide treatment of pollutants in the water. This concept is achieved by incorporating raingardens, bio-filtration swales within the parking islands, hydrodynamic separators, and other considerations. LID was already in use onsite, as the existing parking areas included sunken islands in the 2003 permit to act as bio-filtration swales. The collective sum of this work allows for the capture of the "first flush" of stormwater runoff from the first 1.3" of rain. This is Water Quality Volume that is calculated and held within the proposed drainage to provide the treatment of pollutants.

12. Conformance to Section 6.3 EROSION AND SEDIMENT

- a. temporary erosion control measures shall be utilized during construction and for the stabilization period following construction;
- b. permanent erosion control measures shall be utilized using nonstructural alternatives whenever possible and structural alternatives when avoidable;
- c. existing circulation patterns, water velocity, or exposure to storm and flood conditions shall not be adversely altered;
- d. formation of deposits harmful to aquatic life and or wetlands habitat will not occur;
- e. applicable state, federal and local guidelines shall be met.

Discussion:

Due to the size of the proposed project and the necessary amount of excavation across the subject property, assessing potential adverse impacts should focus on the site utilizing the adequate type and amount of erosion and sediment controls to prevent a large-scale release of loose sediment during storm conditions. The potential for sedimentation into the wetlands will be related to E&S inadequacies or failures.

The Commission finds that the applicant has provided sediment and erosion controls in the project "Site Plan - Sediment & Erosion control Plan" and the "Wetland Delineation Report and Impact Assessment" which specifies the use of a multitude of controls to limit migration of soil onsite. This included the use of geotextile silt fence, staked hay bales, diversion berms, temporary sediment traps, stockpile areas, erosion blankets, construction entrances, and inlet protections. The sediment traps will be converted to stormwater infiltration basins at the end of construction. The SLR plan states:

"All S&E controls provided are in accordance with the Town of Westport regulations as well as the 2024 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control."

The Commission finds that the proposal provides sufficient controls as stated above, however they note that the size, scope, and length of time to construct this project will place a burden on these controls if not properly maintained and monitored. The Commission finds that the proposed plans recommend monitoring be utilized to complete a weekly check of all erosion controls and after 0.5 inch storms to be maintained in records onsite. The Commission finds that the monitor shall provide those weekly reports directly to the Conservation Department throughout the projects exterior sitework phases until the site is suitably stable.

The Commission finds that the “Site Plan” requires a final report on stabilization of the completed site for erosion for three months post construction. The Commission finds that an additional review of the stormwater basins shall be completed one year after the completed construction.

The Commission finds that proper installation and continued maintenance of the above listed Sediment & Erosion controls should be adequate to contain sediments onsite and prevent impacts due to sedimentation.

13. Conformance to Section 6.4 NATURAL HABITAT STANDARDS

- a. critical habitats areas,
- b. the existing biological productivity of any Wetland and Watercourse shall be maintained or improved;
- c. breeding, nesting and or feeding habitats of wildlife will not be significantly altered;
- d. movements and lifestyles of fish and wildlife (plant and aquatic life)will not be significantly affected;
- e. periods of seasonal fish runs and bird migrations shall not be impeded;
- f. conservation or open space easements will be deeded whenever appropriate to protect these natural habitats.

Discussion:

The applicant’s review of current data maintained by the CT DEEP for the Natural Diversity Database (NDDDB) demonstrated that no populations of State listed species or critical habitats have been documented within or in close proximity to the project area. The Commission finds there will be no impacts to state listed species or critical habitat as a result of the proposed project.

The Commission finds that the project narrative states the areas of disturbed ground surface will be seeded when left untouched for one month or longer according to the “Sediment and Erosion Control Plan” or at the completions of the project. The Commission finds that this as a suitable solution to stabilize the loose soil. The Commission finds that any disturbance within areas of constructed slopes should be seeded as soon as practicable with proposed mixes to promote stabilization.

The Commission finds that the on-site wetlands will remain generally unchanged. The capacity of the wetlands and watercourses to provide wildlife habitat will most likely not show improvement with the proposed landscaping buffer. The Commission has a policy that supports selecting native plantings for any projects that include new vegetation. Native plants provide general benefits to wildlife that would utilize the adjacent wetlands. These plants provide beneficial habitat opportunities and food sources. The areas of raingardens and sunken parking islands provide an opportunity for this opportunity. This could provide some benefit to habitat restoration to offset the removal of vegetation associated with the drainage basins. However, The Commission acknowledges the buffer plantings along the property lines will likely have less benefit. The Commission finds that a portion of the plantings shall be native, non-invasive species. The Commission finds that plants that benefit

local pollinating insects are preferred and that the school could benefit from the inclusion of a native pollinator garden.

14. Conformance to Section 6.5 DISCHARGE AND RUNOFF

- a. the potential for flood damage on adjacent or adjoining properties will not be increased;
- b. the velocity or volume of flood waters both into and out of Wetlands and Watercourses will not be adversely altered;
- c. the capacity of any wetland or watercourse to transmit or absorb flood waters will not be significantly reduced;
- d. flooding upstream or downstream of the location site will not be significantly increased;
- e. the activity is acceptable to the Flood & Erosion Control Board and or the Town Engineer of the municipality of Westport.

Discussion:

The Commission finds that the stormwater from the impervious areas of the site will be managed by several different methods in accordance with the 2024 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual. This includes a “treatment train” methodology as part of the design. This is a Best Management Practice for stormwater where multiple structural components are combined in series to meet water quality improvements. The SLR “Wetland Delineation Report and Impact Assessment” details this here:

The system design and components employ standard engineering practices that are regularly used throughout the Town and the Northeast to prevent stormwater pollution. The stormwater management system includes water quantity and water quality protections. The proposed stormwater treatment train consists of two additional stormwater basins, catch basins with 2-foot sumps, underground detention systems, and hydrodynamic separators. The existing stormwater basin near the center of the site will remain in place, with outlet structure improvements as previously described. In addition, two new basins will be constructed, both of which will be seeded with native seed mixes.

The southern basin will primarily receive stormwater from the parking lot and larger athletic field. Stormwater will be conveyed through a series of seven underground detention systems followed by a hydrodynamic separator to receive valuable retention time and sediment removal prior to reaching the basin. A riprap spillway will convey any excess stormwater into the existing central stormwater basin.

The northern basin will collect runoff from the school’s roof and internal courtyard as well as the bus loop, the latter of which will first be routed through a hydrodynamic separator. The basin will include a sediment forebay and discharge via a level spreader to uplands adjacent to Wetland/Watercourse 3. A riprap-lined spillway will provide secondary overflow routing in the same direction.

Runoff from the northern athletic field will continue to be directed to the man-made channel of Wetland/Watercourse 3 through two new underground detention systems, offering additional peak flow control, and a new outfall with flared end section.

Hydrologic analysis demonstrates no increases in peak-flow rates from the proposed development (drainage report prepared by SLR under separate cover). The proposed stormwater management system provides sufficient water quality protection and water volume retention to comply with regulations. No impacts to the hydrology of wetlands or watercourses resulting from the proposed stormwater management measures are anticipated.

Ted Gill of the Town Engineering Department provided an application review for the project and determined the project, as proposed, meets the minimum drainage standards for the Town of Westport. His comment:

The proposed drainage consist of facilities to manage on-site runoff and mitigate impacts from development, as well as conveyance of a watercourse through the property. Each set of designs has been prepared in accordance with the recommendations of the Engineering Department, meets the minimum drainage standards of the Town of Westport, and meets the more restrictive design standards that the applicant determined to set to address neighbors concerns..”

The Commission finds that the location of the headwall at “Wetland/Watercourse 3” is the legacy discharge location of two pipes that are the existing drainage for the lower athletic field in the north of the site and the outlet from a pass-through drainage pipe that is leading from Trailing Rock Lane to the east of the subject property. This includes properties located on Trailing Rock Lane, portions of Long Lots Road, portions of Maple Avenue North and Hyde Lane which roughly measures ~35 acres. This area is known to our Conservation Department to contain wetlands, watercourses, and relic drainage components that have been poorly mapped and/or documented over the years. The Commission finds that the application maintains the stormwater discharge and runoff patterns for this neighborhood and should not realize any notable changes from current conditions.

The Commission does not anticipate this project will diminish the capacity of existing wetlands or watercourses onsite to transmit or absorb waters from its current function.

15. Conformance to Section 6.6 RECREATIONAL AND PUBLIC USES

- a. access to and use of public recreational and open space facilities, both existing and planned, will not be prevented;
- b. navigable channels and or small craft navigation will not be obstructed;
- c. open space, recreational or other easements will be deeded whenever appropriate to protect these existing or potential recreational or public uses;
- d. wetlands and watercourses held in public trust will not be adversely affected.

Discussion:

The Commission finds that the proposed development will have a positive impact/enhancement of the recreational and public uses on through the use of athletic fields. The wetlands and watercourses onsite will not have a significant impact on recreation or public use.

16. Waterway Protection Line Ordinance (WPLO)

Section 148-9 of the Waterway Protection Line Ordinance states that the applicant shall submit information to the Conservation Commission showing that such activity will not cause water pollution, erosion and/or environmentally related hazards to life and property and will not have an adverse impact on the preservation of the natural resources and ecosystem of the waterway, including but not limited to impact on ground and surface water, aquifers, plant and aquatic life, nutrient exchange and supply, thermal energy flow, natural pollution filtration and decomposition, habitat diversity, viability and productivity and the natural rates and processes of erosion and sedimentation.

The Commission finds that the WPLO boundary is located 15’ from the wetland boundary associated with any watercourse onsite. A portion of the proposed activity will occur within the WPLO boundary. With the proper installation, monitoring, and maintenance of the E&S as well as the immediate stabilization of disturbed soils within the wetland and upland, The Commission finds that impacts to water quality and natural resources will be mitigated.

Addendum A: Application #IWW, WPL 7212-03, Second Staff Report, 11-13 Hyde Lane, Public Hearing January 21, 2004

SECOND STAFF REPORT
Application #IWW, WPL 7212-03
11-13 Hyde Lane
Public Hearing January 21, 2004
Prepared January 14, 2004

Application Request: Application by the Town of Westport School Building Committee for the expansion and reconstruction of a parking lot, upgrade of the stormwater management system and associated improvements. This work includes redesign of the existing parking lot and expansion to create 196 parking spaces, replacement of a concrete swale with earthen swales and plunge pools along Meadow Brook Lane. The project also includes enlargement of an existing detention basin that will also require approval from the Connecticut DEP. Though the parking lot itself is not within the regulated areas, drainage work is located within IWW setbacks and the WPLO area.

Background

The applicant has submitted a revised plan on December 16, 2003. These plans were distributed to the Commission on the evening of the public hearing on December 17, 2003. The hearing was opened and the applicant presented their application. Staff did not offer any comments as review of the plan was not completed at that time. Staff had submitted a letter, dated November 19, 2003 requesting additional information needed to assess activities. Staff offered preliminary comments in its December 12, 2003 staff report.

The primary revision on this plan included drainage islands within the proposed parking lot and a redesign of the parking lot. These revisions were included in an effort to improve water quality in stormwater prior to discharge into the stormwater system. The applicant has revised calculations to include this revision so that sediment removal rates have increased prior to discharge into proposed forebays adjacent to wetland A. As indicated in the preliminary staff report, prepared December 11, 2003, "*Staff is supportive, in concept, of the proposed application. Details relating to **maintaining vegetation within wetlands, biofiltration areas within proposed parking areas, detailed grading design, sediment removal, prior to discharge into wetland areas** still need to be worked out.*" The revised plans addressed some of these above issues.

As previously stated, staff is supportive in concept of directing stormwater to the existing wetland system, however, assessment of environmental impact is still necessary. Excavation is indicated on the plans in order to increase the volume of water detained in wetland A. Through the process of excavation extensive clearing is proposed around Wetland A (man-made created detention basin but has evolved into a wetland that supports wetland vegetative communities/habitat and functions). In staff's letter dated November 19, 2003, it was requested that the applicant survey trees over 8" dbh within the regulated areas to further clarify the extent of clearing so that there may be some effort to protect vegetation where feasible in all regulated areas. At this time surveying in the vicinity of the concrete watercourse is being conducted. Staff has asked the project engineer to consider an alternative where clearing could be reduced within the regulated area around Wetland A. Two options for this scenario would be to 1) reduce the volume of water entering Wetland A and 2) raise the berm where the dam exists in order to compensate for a portion of existing trees to remain.

A plan indicating this concept was submitted to staff on January 14, 2004. The Commission is to determine whether the recent alternative presents more or less of an environmental impact than the present design. Existing wetlands physically impacted by this proposed design are the following: Wetland A, B & C.

General Description –Wetland A

Vegetation identified and documented in a report prepared by Rema Ecological Consultants consists of red maples, spice bush, sensitive fern, jewel weed, skunk cabbage, canary reed grass, golden rods, pondweed, multiflora rose and barberry. Wildlife observed included green frogs, eastern toad, Carolina wren, house sparrow, grackle, raccoon and deer. Additional species commonly associated with suburban areas can also be expected here. This wetland was created when a dam and detention basin was installed. The wetland soil is identified as Aquents, or recently developed wetland soil. The wetland is evolving and as this occurs also improves in function over time.

General Description – Wetland B

Vegetation identified and documented in a report prepared by Rema Ecological Consultants consists of red maples, hickory, ash, spice bush, winterberry, honeysuckle and multiflora rose. Also existent is jewel weed, jack in the pulpit, clearweed, sedges, enchanters nightshade and skunk cabbage. The wetland can be described as a woodland swamp that is fed by surface water and groundwater. Wildlife observed includes green frog, spring peeper, raccoon, cardinal, robin, red eyed vireo, and deer. Additional species commonly associated with suburban areas can also be expected here.

General Description- Wetland C

Vegetation observed is typical to the above wetland and dominated as spicebush and red maple.

Rema Ecological Consultants indicates the following in report dated August 11, 2003.

“It is REMA’s opinion that from a functional perspective the wetland areas on the site would not be considered significant. Overall, Wetlands A through C were evaluated as providing low quality functions and values. Some of the reasons that these wetlands did not score higher included their relatively small size, disturbance from residential activities for many years, low vegetative and wetland class and subclass diversity, presence of invasive species and influence by human activities, such as stormwater runoff discharge to and from Wetland A.”

Plans Reviewed

1. Property Survey prepared for The Town of Westport Long Lots School Hyde Lane, Westport, Connecticut, prepared by F. A. Hesketh & Associates, Inc., date 8/4/97, revision date 10/13/03, Scale 1" = 40' prepared by F.A. Hesketh & Associates, Inc. sheets 1-3, revision date 12/16/03
2. Long Lots Elementary School-Parking and Circulation Improvement, 13 Hyde Lane, Conservation Commission Documents, Location Map, General Notes and Abbreviations, Drawing Index, Site Demolition, Site Layout, Site Grading and Drainage Plan, scale 1"=40'-0", sheets C.01-C.05B, date 11/13/03, prepared by Diversified Technology Consultants revision date 12/16/03
3. Long Lots Elementary School-Parking and Circulation Improvement, 13 Hyde Lane, Conservation Commission Documents, Detention Basin Plan and Details, Soil & Sedimentation Control Plan, Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Narrative, Site Construction Drainage Details, Drainage Details, Site Construction Details, scale :as noted, sheets C.06-C.12, date 11/13/03, prepared by Diversified Technology Consultants revision date 12/16/03

4. Long Lots Elementary School-Parking and Circulation Improvement, 13 Hyde Lane, Conservation Commission Documents, Planting Plan, scale :1"=40'-0", sheets L.01A-L.01B, date 11/13/03, prepared by Diversified Technology Consultants revision date 12/16/03
5. Conceptual Plan for heightened berm dated submitted 1/14/04.

Conformance to Section 6 of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations

6.1 GENERAL STANDARDS

- a) disturbance and pollution are minimized;
- b) minimize height, width, length of structures are limited to the minimum; dimension to accomplish the intended function;
- b) loss of fish, other beneficial organisms, wildlife and vegetation are prevented;
- c) potable fresh water supplies are protected from dangers of drought, overdraft, pollution, misuse and mismanagement;
- d) maintain conservation, economic, recreational and aesthetic qualities;
- e) consider historical sites

Discussion

Alternative submitted December 16, 2003

The application indicates improvements to stormwater design so that sediment removal rates are improved prior to discharge into Wetland A. These include the water quality swales within the proposed parking areas and a sediment forebay located near wetland A. Secondary stormwater treatment includes the vortech system, deep sumps and hoods in the catch basins. In this scenario extensive clearing is proposed adjacent to wetland A limits.

Alternative submitted January 14, 2004

In this scenario, all the above improvements are proposed with the reduction of clearing within Wetland A. Approximately, an additional 5,400 sf of existing vegetation is maintained near wetland A with this concept. On the other hand additional clearing is proposed on the north side of the proposed berm in the direction of wetland B. An additional twenty feet is proposed to be cleared in the vicinity of the intermittent watercourse connecting wetland A and Wetland B. Also included is an extension of pipe in this vicinity to make up for the increase in berm height. As per a conversation with the project engineer it appears feasible to reduce the extension of the pipe by increasing the height of the head wall in order to maintain the extent of disturbance where the intermittent watercourse is located. This would maintain the existing disturbance limit in this area as the first alternative. As per our conversation clearing limits in this scenario are very similar to the limits proposed in the first alternative.

The Commission is to determine whether this alternative presents less or more of an environmental impact than the first scenario. It is staff opinion that the Alternative submitted on January 14th presents less of an environmental impact than plans submitted previously. The previous impact associated with wetland A is decreased by allowing a portion of existing vegetation to remain in the uplands directly around the existing wetland area. This provides a combination of different habitats that are directly associated with this isolated wetland. In this scenario a diversity of canopy, midstory, groundcover vegetative types remain immediately post construction. Established vegetative cover provides functions of filtration, absorption, adsorption, sediment removal etc to occur immediately while the rest of the detention basin will need time for the newly installed plants to establish. Surface runoff from this direction will be filtered and sediment and erosion will be reduced within wetland limits by maintaining

existing vegetation in this area. By allowing more existing vegetation to remain near the wetland allows additional area to perform these functions without a waiting period for establishment.

6.2 WATER QUALITY

- a) flushing rates, freshwater sources, existing basin characteristics and channel contours will not be adversely altered;
- b) water stagnation will neither be contributed nor caused;
- c) water pollution will not affect fauna, flora, physical or chemical nature of a regulated area, or the propagation and habitats of fish and wildlife, will not result;
- d) pollution of groundwater or a significant aquifer will not result (*groundwater recharge area or Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone*);
- e) all applicable state and local health codes shall be met;
- f) water quality will be maintained or improved in accordance with the standards set by federal, state, and local authority including section 25-54(e) of the Connecticut General Statutes
- g) prevents pollution of surface water

Discussion

The applicant has submitted revised calculations that include water quality swales within the parking lot area. This change along with the proposed forebay, micropool, secondary stormwater treatment BMPs such as the deep sumps and vortechinics will decrease sediment deposits entering wetland A. Proposed calculations indicate sediment removals 95.4% TSS. Once stormwater reaches the stormwater system by Meadow Brook Lane 98% TSS is expected prior to discharge into Muddy Brook.

The concrete channel will be removed near Meadow Brook Lane and replaced with an earthen swale will be installed. Trees over 8" dbh will be maintained where feasible along this corridor. A grass swale is proposed along the ball fields. Staff recommends that this area be planted with native plantings as well as to improve filtration and absorption functions.

6.3 EROSION AND SEDIMENT

- a) temporary erosion control measures shall be utilized during construction and for the stabilization period following construction;
- b) permanent erosion control measures shall be utilized using nonstructural alternatives whenever possible and structural alternatives when avoidable;
- c) existing circulation patterns, water velocity, or exposure to storm and flood conditions shall not be adversely altered;
- d) formation of deposits harmful to aquatic life and or wetlands habitat will not occur;
- e) applicable state, federal and local guidelines shall be met.

Discussion:

Additional erosion controls such as silt fence is recommended to be installed directly around Wetland A and around the existing vegetation to remain near wetland A. Existing vegetation larger than 8" dbh should be surveyed along the perimeter to ensure its protection during and post construction. The Erosion control plan should be revised to include controls at the stormwater discharge outlets to reduce sediment load into wetland A and around the micropool.

6.4 NATURAL HABITAT STANDARDS

- a) critical habitats areas,
- b) the existing biological productivity of any Wetland and Watercourse shall be maintained or improved;
- c) breeding, nesting and or feeding habitats of wildlife will not be significantly altered;

- d) movements and lifestyles of fish and wildlife (plant and aquatic life) will not be significantly affected;
- e) periods of seasonal fish runs and bird migrations shall not be impeded;
- f) conservation or open space easements will be deeded whenever appropriate to protect these natural habitats.

Discussion

The Commission requires additional native plantings within all proposed water quality swales located within the parking lot, loop road, and swale along the ballfields within contract limit lines. Lawn is not recommended in these areas and should be removed from the plans in these areas. The plants planned for these areas should be designed with the intent that maintenance is not necessary. The exception to this is the removal of litter that may present an obstacle near drainage outlets. Plant maintenance for reasons of fertilizing or regular mowing is to be avoided. The intent is to present a vegetative island that acts as a biofiltration area. The only way these areas will function efficiently is if the area is allowed to establish naturally. If appearance is of particular concern then a planting plan with specific plant types and quantities should be completed for these areas and hydroseed avoided. Hydroseed that utilizes a native plant mix will utilize many varieties and creates diversity which is positive from an environmental standpoint, however, this may result in a weedy appearance in parking lot islands. The idea is to allow the area to establish itself naturally after plant installation. If the result requires maintenance by mowing then this is in opposition of the design intent. Landscape plans are to be revised to remove lawn at minimum in these areas. The Commission requires that the applicant reconsider plant types for design intent and maintenance aspect. If the applicant is agreeable to allowing hydroseeded areas to establish themselves naturally and unmowed then staff is also agreeable to using the seed mix.

The Commission may also consider requiring the applicant to monitor the wetland post construction to determine whether stormwater management practices are working efficiently. During this process management of invasives may be considered in effort to improve overall wetland functions on the property.

6.5 DISCHARGE AND RUNOFF

- a) the potential for flood damage on adjacent or adjoining properties will not be increased;
- b) the velocity or volume of flood waters both into and out of Wetlands and Watercourses will not be adversely altered;
- c) the capacity of any wetland or watercourse to transmit or absorb flood waters will not be significantly reduced;
- d) flooding upstream or downstream of the location site will not be significantly increased;
- e) the activity is acceptable to the Flood & Erosion Control Board and or the Town Engineer of the municipality of Westport

Discussion

The proposed water quality swales will reduce water velocities prior to discharge into wetlands and the stormwater system in Meadowbrook Lane. By reducing water velocities more pollutant removal is expected throughout the design. The F&ECB has approved this application on December 3, 2003 with conditions. Staff has reviewed the proposed alternative with the Deputy Engineer who is agreeable to this concept.

6.6 RECREATIONAL AND PUBLIC USES

- a) access to and use of public recreational and open space facilities, both existing and planned, will not be prevented;
- b) navigable channels and or small craft navigation will not be obstructed;

- c) open space, recreational or other easements will be deeded whenever appropriate to protect these existing or potential recreational or public uses;
- d) wetlands and watercourses held in public trust will not be adversely affected.

Discussion

The proposed activities will help to improve recreational and public uses as drainage swales along the edge of the ball fields will help to dry the field more readily.

Waterway Protection Line Ordinance

Section 148-9 of the WPLO ordinance states the following: An applicant shall submit information to the Conservation Commission showing that such activity will not cause water pollution, erosion and or environmentally related hazards to life and property and will not have an adverse impact on the preservation of the natural resources and ecosystems of the waterway, including but not limited to, impact on ground and surface waters, aquifers, plant and aquatic life, nutrient exchange and supply, thermal energy flow, natural pollution filtration and decomposition, habitat diversity, viability and productivity and the natural rates and processes of erosion and sedimentation.

The Flood & Erosion Control Board approved application on December 3, 2003 with conditions.

It is the opinion of staff that provided additional native plantings are included within water quality treatment areas, lawn is removed from areas where water quality swales are proposed, trees are surveyed as recommended, tree protection devices are installed prior to construction and erosion controls are installed as recommended and the alternative that is considered to minimize disturbance within regulated area the most is utilized the proposed activities will not adversely impact resources as protected by the Waterway Protection Line Ordinance.

**Town of Westport
Conservation Commission
Conditions of Approval
Application # IWW, WPL-12151-25
13 Hyde Lane (aka: Long Lots School)
Assessor's Map: G10 Tax Lot: 058
Public Hearing: June 4, 2025**

Project Description: To construct a new elementary school, parking lot, athletic fields, playgrounds, and associated site and utility work. Portions of the work are within the upland review area setbacks and the WPLO area of an unnamed tributary of Muddy Brook

**Owner of Record: Town of Westport
Applicant: Town of Westport**

In accordance with Section 6 of the *Regulations for the Protection and Preservation of Wetlands and Watercourses of Westport* and Section 30-93 of the *Waterway Protection Line Ordinance* and on the basis of the evidence of record, the Conservation Commission resolves to **APPROVE** Application # **IWW, WPL-12151-25** with the following conditions:

Completion of the regulated activity shall be within FIVE (5) years following the date of approval. Any application to renew a permit shall be granted upon request of the permit holder unless the Commission finds there has been a substantial change in circumstances which requires a new permit application, or an enforcement action has been undertaken with regard to the regulated activity for which the permit was issued provided no permit may be valid for more than TEN (10) years.

STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Permits are not transferable without the prior written consent of the Conservation Commission.
2. It is the responsibility of the applicant to obtain any other assent, permit or license required by law or regulation of the Government of the United States, State of Connecticut, or of any political subdivision thereof.
3. If an activity also requires zoning or subdivision approval, special permit or special exception under section 8.3(g), 8-3c, or 8-26 of the Connecticut General Statutes, no work pursuant to the wetland permit shall commence until such approval is obtained.
4. If an approval or permit is granted by another Agency and contains conditions affecting wetlands and/or watercourses, the applicant must resubmit the application for further consideration by the Commission for a decision before work on the activity is to take place.
5. The Conservation Department shall be notified at least **forty-eight (48)** hours in advance of the initiation of the regulated activity for inspection of the erosion and sediment controls.
6. All activities for the prevention of erosion, such as silt fences and hay bales shall be under the direct supervision of the site contractor who shall employ the best management practices to control storm water discharges and to prevent erosion and sedimentation to otherwise prevent pollution, impairment, or destruction of wetlands or watercourses. Erosion controls are to be inspected by the applicant or agent weekly and after rains and all deficiencies must be remediated with twenty-four hours of finding them.
7. The applicant shall take all necessary steps to control storm water discharges to prevent erosion and sedimentation, and to otherwise prevent pollution of wetlands and watercourse.
8. Organic Landscaping practices are recommended as described by the Northeast Organic Farming Association.
9. All plants proposed in regulated areas must be non-invasive and native to North America.
10. Trees to remain are to be protected with tree protection fencing prior to construction commencement.
11. The bottom of all storm water retention structures shall be placed no less than 1 foot above seasonal high groundwater elevation.
12. The applicant shall immediately inform the Conservation Department of problems involving sedimentation, erosion, downstream siltation or any unexpected adverse impacts, which development in the course or are caused by the work.
13. Any material, man-made or natural which is in any way disturbed and/or utilized during the work shall not be deposited in any wetlands or watercourse unless authorized by this permit.
14. A final inspection and submittal of an "as built" survey is required prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance.
15. All on-site dumpsters shall be covered at the end of each workday and or when not in use.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

16. Conformance to the plans entitled:

- a. Wetland Delineation Report and Impact Assessment**, Long Lots Elementary School, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by SLR International Corporation, dated May 14, 2025.
 - b. Property and Topographic Survey**, Town of Westport Long Lots Elementary School, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by Lindquist Surveying LLC, dated May 9, 2024, Scale 1"=40', 4 sheets.
 - c. Long Lots Elementary School, Regulatory Permit Submission**, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by SLR dated May 14, 2025, portions revised to **May 30, 2025**, Scale: as noted, Sheets 0-24.
 - d. Drainage Report**, Long Lots Elementary School, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by SLR dated May 14, 2025,
 - e. Building Height Calculation**, Long Lots Elementary School, 13 Hyde Lane, Westport, CT, prepared by SLR dated April 22, 2025,
- 17.** All disturbed ground surfaces shall be stabilized and restored before final sign off.
 - 18.** The Conservation Department shall be notified 48 hours prior to the work within "Wetland/Watercourse 3". Staff shall be onsite to monitor dewatering and excavation activities.
 - 19.** A site monitor shall provide sediment and erosion control reports weekly and after 0.5 inch storm events to the Conservation Department.
 - 20.** A review of the stormwater basins shall be complete one year after the completed construction and a report shall be provided to the Conservation Department
 - 21.** The Landscape Plan shall be revised to include native trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants. A portion of the plants shall be beneficial to local pollinator species. Revisions to the Landscape plan shall be approved by Conservation Staff prior to the start of work.

This is a conditional approval. Each and every condition is an integral part of the Commission decision. Should any of the conditions, on appeal from this decision, be found to be void or of no legal effect, then this conditional approval is likewise void. The applicant may refile another application for review. This approval may be revoked or suspended if the applicant exceeds the conditions or limitations of this approval or has secured this application through inaccurate information.

Motion: Davis **Second: McDowell**
Ayes: Davis, McDowell, Ryll, Kwong, Whiting
Nays: None **Abstentions: None** **Vote: 5:0:0**

The June 4, 2025 Special Meeting of the Westport Conservation Commission adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Motion: Kwong **Second: Whiting**
Ayes: Kwong, Whiting, Davis, McDowell, Ryll
Nays: None **Abstentions: None** **Vote: 5:0:0**