

From: [Stacy Radford](#)
To: [Stacy Radford](#)
Subject: FW: 25 IWC 16 - Glen Road, (055-051-00A) Uncasville
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 9:58:12 AM

From: Ian Cole <itcole@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 8, 2025 9:29 AM
To: Stacy Radford <sradford@montville-ct.org>
Subject: Re: 25 IWC 16 - Glen Road, (055-051-00A) Uncasville

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Stacy, thanks for reaching out.

I was able to get over to the site to get boots on the ground and familiarize myself with the site conditions. I'm glad to hear the compensation area is no longer needed. I don't have any substantial design requests for the applicant, the proposal seems like a reasonable use of the property and should not holistically impact on the wetland functions and values.

I have reviewed CLA's assessment, and I agree there is no less impactful way to enter the property. I would also add that the upper edge of the wetlands that are being impacted are along the wetland transition and not as highly functioning in comparison to the interior / downgradient portion of the wetland and where Stony Brook flows which are the more sensitive and beneficial part of the wetland system.

Before this new update my main concern with this site was the necessity to clear a nice mature forest stand and excavate for flood storage compensation. Because of this required disturbance I was going to suggest the applicant consider a wetland mitigation plan within that compensation area to help offset the physical loss of the 4200 SF of wetlands with the entrance to the property. But with that off the table I don't see a good ecological benefit in disturbing more land within the 50' regulated area that is in good existing forested / vegetated condition in the pursuit of mitigation for an unavoidable wetland impact. Unless the commission feels strongly otherwise, I would suggest that if mitigation is required it could instead include such things like a conservation easement around the existing wetlands and/or the remainder of the 50' URA to protect the wetlands in perpetuity, and/or signage along said easement boundary.

Lastly, my only other 2 comments are the following:

1. Although acknowledging that most activities are outside the 50' URA where activities are within 50' of a wetland resource, a double row of E&S control measures should be installed where appropriate.
2. I have reviewed the wetland boundary and agree with Mr. Russo's delineation. The wetland flagging was somewhat degraded and should be re-flagged before construction, so the wetland boundary is obvious to civil contractors and inspectors during the construction phase.

I will write this up in a letter to the commission, so you have a record for the file.

Let me know if you have any questions or additional thoughts I should include or focus on for

the commission.

Have a great weekend – Ian