Town of Trumbull
CONNECTICUT

Planning and Zoning Department
Telephone (203) 452-5044
Fax (203) 452-5169

Town Hall
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2026, MINUTES

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, May 20, 2026, at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Trumbull Town Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Fred Garrity, Chairman
Anthony Silber, Vice-Chairman
Rich Deecken, Secretary
Karen DelVecchio
Rich Croll
Alissa Hall, Alternate
Dean Fabrizio, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT: Rob Librandi, Land U se Planner
James Cordone, Town Attorney
Abigail Farrell, Administrative Clerk

ABSENT: None.

A quorum being present, the Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN/ZONE CHANGE/OTHER

1. **2135, 2145 & 2155 Reservoir Avenue:** Applicant, Vessel RE Holdings, LLC, is requesting reconsideration of their previously denied application for a Site Plan Approval of a multifamily development containing 150 units, pursuant to Sec 8-30g(h) of the Connecticut General Statutes. **File #26-10** ***Continued from April 22, 2026***

Joshua Levy (11 Beresford Lane, Livingston, New Jersey), Executive Vice President of Vessel, introduced the application.

Rob Librandi, Land Use Planner, reported that since the last meeting there have been several correspondences, primarily between the Town Engineering staff and Solli Engineering, the applicant's engineers. Mr. Librandi read three correspondences from Tattiana Solovey, Assistant Town Engineer, into the record. These stated that engineering sign-off has not been granted and that IWWC representatives must be contacted to submit an application or request a site walk to determine whether wetlands are present on the site. To Mr. Librandi's knowledge, no materials have been submitted to correct these concerns.

Mr. Levy read the applicant's closing statement into the record, outlining the chronology of the application to date and addressing the environmental concerns, the status of engineering sign-off, the question of potential wetlands on the site, and other aspects of the application (attached).

Jay Soltis (301 Catherine Terrace, Fairfield, CT 06824), Licensed Environmental Professional with Reef Environmental, read into the record Reef Environmental's response to the May 18, 2026 memorandum written by the Town's third-party environmental consultant, WSP (attached).

Luke Mauro (501 Main Street, Monroe, CT), a Professional and Traffic Operations Engineer with Solli Engineering, discussed the items requested by the commission at the last meeting, including clarification on the remediation plan and the presence of wetlands, as well as obtaining approval for the stormwater management plan and from the Fire Marshal. Mr. Mauro noted that a letter from the applicant's soil and wetlands scientist, James Sipperly, had been submitted with the original application and resubmitted with the revised materials, and that staff had not indicated that wetlands were present or that an application to the IWWC was required. He added that truck turning templates were submitted in January and, having received no feedback from town fire staff, so the applicant is assuming the figures are acceptable. Mr. Mauro also addressed the lack of engineering review related to potential environmental concerns by reading portions of his May 19, 2026 engineering memorandum into the record. He concluded by summarizing that no wetlands or watercourses are located on the property, their LEP has provided evidence demonstrating the site's suitability for residential development, remediation activities will not significantly affect the stormwater management design, and the engineering designs comply with state code; affirming that the project poses no health or safety concerns and that the site is suitable for development.

Commissioner Hall questioned the level of detail provided in the plans submitted for fire and life safety approval. Joseph Versteeg (Torrington, CT), Principal of Versteeg Associates LLC and the applicant's fire and building code consultant, explained that for planning and zoning purposes, rough floor plan schematics and a watercolor rendering of the site are submitted. If the project is approved, the architects then prepare full construction documents for the building permit process, and the plans must meet all code requirements in order for the project to receive a certificate of occupancy. Mr. Mauro added that in regard to the engineering plans, those are considered to be 70-80% complete when submitted to planning and zoning.

Vice-Chairman Silber asked staff whether they had confirmed that no wetlands exist on the site. Chairman Garrity responded that the Town engineers did not concur with that conclusion, which Mr. Librandi read into the record.

Chairman Garrity addressed the discrepancies between the applicant's presentation and the Town staff's review, particularly regarding the environmental evaluation and potential wetlands on site. He noted that while the applicant's environmental consultant stated that the findings to date do not prohibit residential development, and that additional testing would occur after approval, the independent third-party environmental consultant hired by the Town believes more testing is needed upfront to fully understand the contamination on the site before any approvals are considered. Regarding wetlands, Mr. Garrity explained that the potential presence of wetlands was first raised in the applicant's own report and has continued to be a point of discussion, including in the Commission's previous denial letter. That letter identified both potential environmental contamination and the presence of wetlands as concerns, and to date, no steps have been taken to address or resolve those issues.

Mr. Mauro responded that town staff has not definitively determined whether wetlands exist on the site, as no site visit has been conducted. He also expressed confusion about how the Planning and Zoning Commission accepted two of their applications if a wetlands application was required. Chairman Garrity explained that while the town typically requires applicants to obtain all other necessary commission approvals before proceeding to Planning and Zoning, this requirement is not enforced in the same way for an 8-30g application. He added that the wetlands concern arose during the public hearing, not beforehand.

Mr. Levy stated that the applicant did not proceed to the wetlands commission because their understanding was that no wetlands existed on the site. Chairman Garrity questioned this position, noting that their own submission referenced a potential wetlands issue. Mr. Levy clarified that the potential watercourse had been mentioned in a Phase I environmental report, which was not completed by a certified wetlands scientist. Since then, a certified soil and wetlands scientist visited the site and prepared a report confirming that no wetlands are present.

Chairman Garrity further noted that the Phase I report was not included in the initial submission and was only provided after questions arose regarding the property's prior use.

Attorney Jay Klein (1055 Washington Boulevard, Stamford, CT) reiterated that the Phase I report was completed, followed by the site visit from the soil scientist, whose report confirmed the absence of wetlands. He emphasized that no evidence to the contrary exists in the record.

Commissioner Deecken questioned why a report submitted by the applicant should determine whether a wetlands review is required. Mr. Levy responded that if the Town chose to pursue a third-party review, that would be their decision; however, at present the only expert testimony on the record indicates that no wetlands are present. Mr. Mauro asked why this remains an unresolved matter when the Town has not requested an application or a site walk in several months. Chairman Garrity replied that submitting applications is the responsibility of the applicant and read from the February 20th denial letter, which stated that the applicant should have their application reviewed by the IWWC due presence of an intermittent brook.

Attorney Klein explained that the wetlands issue was introduced very late in the deliberations on the original application, and the applicant submitted the wetlands delineation report in response to that point of denial. Since the refiling, Town staff have not indicated that the expert testimony provided was in any way insufficient for approval, and ultimately the only expert evidence in the record is the certification stating that no wetlands exist on the site.

Mr. Levy responded to Chairman Garrity's remarks regarding discrepancies among environmental consultants, stating that Reef Environmental has made it clear that nothing on the site would prevent multifamily residential development. The only remaining question is the extent of remediation required and, consequently, how much soil will need to be removed. He explained that a final remediation plan cannot be completed until the site is fully cleared, which requires project approval. He emphasized that all recommended remediation will be conducted in compliance with state and local regulations, and that no permits can be issued until CT DEEP regulations are satisfied, ensuring that no health or safety risks will be present on the site.

Chairman Garrity asked the applicant whether they had any comments regarding the development in Cheshire and the reported stop work order. Mr. Levy responded by neither confirming nor denying that a stop work order exists. He added that Greg Grew, their licensed Connecticut architect and code consultant, has assured the team that all plans will meet building and fire code requirements. Mr.

Versteeg also expressed support for the commitment to code compliance. Mr. Levy noted that, due to the innovative design of the buildings, they have undergone extensive review, but the team has worked with the state building official and the State Fire Marshal to obtain the necessary sign-offs, and therefore they have no concerns about moving forward with construction at this time.

Commissioner Deecken noted that while the applicant has described the site as suitable for residential development because there is existing residential use, 2155 Reservoir Avenue is not residential. It is the former Park City Assault property, making the claim that the entire site is already used residentially inaccurate.

Public Comment:

Rachel Saracino (27 Lincoln Street) questioned the number of apartment complexes being added in Trumbull and how the public can weigh in to prevent additional developments. Chairman Garrity explained the difference between a standard site plan application and an affordable housing project under the Connecticut General Statutes, noting that Trumbull is subject to these types of applications because the town has less than 10% affordable housing.

Motion Made (Croll), Seconded (Deecken), to close public hearing for Application File #26-10.

Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

Work Session:

Chairman Garrity highlighted comments from the Town's third-party environmental consultant, WSP, whose May 18, 2026 memorandum stated that WSP does not believe the investigations were adequate to assess the parcel for residential reuse. Their concerns included an incomplete list of constituents of concern during testing, the Phase II report not being completed to industry standards, a lack of understanding regarding the nature and magnitude of groundwater contamination, and the potential need for further Phase III investigation.

Chairman Garrity summarized that the applicant's environmental consultant indicated additional testing could be conducted after the fact, while the town-hired expert maintained it must be completed beforehand. He further noted that the applicant chose to present testimony from their own expert rather than seek a wetlands review by the town's commission, as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Department.

Commissioners agreed with Chairman Garrity's remarks, emphasizing their support for the need to thoroughly review the wetlands and for the concerns outlined in the WSP report to be addressed.

Chairman Garrity stated the following reasons for denial:

1. **There is a Substantial Public Interest to Protect the Environment**. Relying on the independent expert's review, additional investigations are required prior to site plan approval to determine the nature and extent of environmental contamination. The applicant's environmental review is not sufficient to assess risks to human health and the environment. This is a health and safety issue that clearly outweighs the need for affordable housing.
2. **There is a Substantial Public Interest to have complete and final stormwater management plans**. The town engineering review letter states that review of the stormwater management system cannot move forward until the environmental

investigations and remediation scope have been adequately defined. This is a health and safety issue that clearly outweighs the need for affordable housing.

3. **There is a Substantial Public Interest to protect the Wetlands.** The application should be reviewed and approved by the Trumbull Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission (IWWC) regarding the existence of an intermittent brook. Connecticut law requires that the applicant obtain IWWC approval prior to site plan approval. This issue clearly outweighs the need for affordable housing.

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to DENY Application File #26-10.
Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to accept the stated reasons for denial of Application File #26-10
Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

REGULAR MEETING

PLANNERS REPORT

Land Use Planner, Rob Librandi stated that progress is being made with the POCD and we are hoping to present that to the commission in the coming months with the consultant.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Acceptance of the Minutes from April 22, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission Regular. Meeting

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to approve the minutes from the PZC April 22, 2026, Regular Meeting
Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll) and unanimously carried to adjourn the May 20, 2026, PZC Regular Meeting at 8:57 p.m.

Dated at Trumbull, CT this 27th day of May 2026.
By: Abigail Farrell, Clerk.

I. Introduction and Requested Action

Vessel RE Holdings, LLC (the "Applicant") respectfully submits this final closing statement and consolidated exhibit package in support of its modified affordable housing application for the proposed multifamily residential development at 2135, 2145 and 2155 Reservoir Avenue (the "Property"). The application is before the Commission pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes § 8-30g(h), following the Commission's February 18, 2026 denial of the prior application and the Applicant's timely March 6, 2026 resubmission responding to the stated reasons for denial. See Exhibit AG and Exhibits A and B.

The record now before the Commission addresses each stated reasons for denial, along with any requests for additional information and includes:

(i) WPCA approval,
(ii) A revised stormwater system,
(iii) A detailed engineering report,
(iv) Written responses to Town Engineering comments,
(v) An environmental memoranda from a Connecticut Licensed Environmental Professional,
(vi) A third-party environmental review and direct response,
(vii) Wetlands clarification materials from James Sipperly, a certified soil scientist and Connecticut wetlands scientist,
(viii) A fire apparatus turning analysis,
(ix) Information from the Applicants expert design consultants (Joseph Versteeg and Gregory Grew) addressing all comments and questions related to fire code, building code, and life safety for the project,
(x) Resumes for the Applicant's expert consultants who have provided submissions, as well as written and verbal communications, and
(xi) Email correspondence documenting follow-up and attempts to resolve every open issue, See Exhibits C through AI.

The record is clear, (i) all questions and comments have been responded to by the Applicant or their expert consultants, (ii) there are no health or safety issues which have been presented to date which outweigh the need for affordable housing, and (iii) all of the reasons for denial have been successful and clearly addressed. Based on the foregoing, we respectfully submit that the application should be approved, as the proposed development does not represent a substantial public interest in health or safety, any remaining concerns can be protected by reasonable conditions, and no technical reviewer has established a public health or safety risk that clearly outweighs the need for affordable housing.

II. Governing 8-30g Standard

Connecticut General Statutes § 8-30g places the burden on the Commission, not the Applicant, in the event of an appeal. If an affordable housing application is denied, the Commission must prove, based on the evidence in the record, that the decision and the cited reasons are supported by sufficient evidence and that the decision is necessary to protect substantial public interests in health, safety, or other legally cognizable matters; that those interests clearly outweigh the need for affordable housing; and that those interests cannot be protected by reasonable changes to the development (*CGS § 8-30g(g)*).

Connecticut appellate decisions applying § 8-30g confirm that this statutory burden is substantive and must be satisfied on the basis of evidence in the record, not generalized concerns, preferences, or speculation. See West Hartford Interfaith Coalition, Inc. v. Town Council, 228 Conn. 498 (1994); Christian Activities Council, Congregational v. Town Council, 249 Conn. 566 (1999). The Commission must identify a substantial public interest in health, safety, or another legally cognizable matter, demonstrate that the interest clearly outweighs the need for affordable housing, and further demonstrate that the interest cannot be protected by reasonable changes to,

or conditions of approval for, the development. See Quarry Knoll II Corp. v. Planning & Zoning Commission, 256 Conn. 674 (2001); River Bend Associates, Inc. v. Zoning Commission, 271 Conn. 1 (2004). Speculation, generalized concerns, or requests for additional post-approval technical refinement do not satisfy that burden where the record demonstrates that the issue can be addressed through ordinary permitting, final engineering review, regulatory compliance, or reasonable conditions. See AvalonBay Communities, Inc. v. Zoning Commission, 280 Conn. 405 (2006).

Section 8-30g(h) expressly permits an applicant, after denial, to submit a proposed modification responding to the objections articulated by the Commission. The Applicant has done exactly that through its March 6 resubmission, which addressed the specific reasons stated by the Commission for denial, including environmental investigation, drainage and engineering, WPCA approval, wetlands/watercourse jurisdiction, and asserted local zoning/procedural issues. *See Exhibit A.*

III. Procedural Chronology and Applicant Responsiveness

Below, please find a chronology associated with the Applicant's resubmission. We believe that this chronology is illustrative of the Applicant's diligence and transparency and shows our continued and repeated attempts to provide Town staff and the Commission with whatever information was requested.

- **February 18, 2026:** Trumbull's Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission") issues a denial of Vessel's application.
  February 20, 2026: The Town issued its written decision letter denying the original application and identifying five stated reasons for denial: environmental investigation, drainage and engineering, WPCA approval, wetlands/watercourse review, and Article II, Section 2.3. See Exhibit AG.
- **February 26, 2026:** Following the Commission's denial the Applicant receives a unanimous approval from WPCA in connection with the sanitary sewer connection. It should be noted that Vessel agreed to improve the infrastructure of the town and surrounding area by providing a contribution that will be used to increase the sanitary sewer pipe size. *See Exhibit I.*
- **March 6, 2026:** The Applicant filed the resubmission pursuant to CGS § 8-30g(h), with receipt by Planning and Zoning stamped on March 6, 2026. See Exhibits A and B. Included in this resubmission were the following documents:
  - A full engineering report with hydrology, storm drainage calculations, design plans, and long-term maintenance materials prepared by Solli Engineering (See Exhibit J).
  - A revised truck-turning plan responding to Fire Marshal comments and showing emergency apparatus circulation and turning movements prepared by Solli Engineering. See Exhibit L.
  - Written responses from Solli Engineering to the Town Engineer address their review comments, including relocation of detention away from Reservoir Avenue, updated drainage calculations, emergency spillway, 10-foot embankment top width, maintenance access, erosion-control details, and pre-construction submittals. See Exhibit H.
  - A wetlands clarification letter correcting the Phase I, prepared by Reef Environmental. This letter clearly stated that the reference to a small intermittent stream was not an assertion that it existed and was stated in error and confirming that such feature was a drainage ditch for rainwater, with Reef expressly relying on Mr. Sipperly, a licensed wetlands scientist and explaining that Mr. Sipperly was the appropriate expert to relay on because Reef does not offer wetlands delineation services. *See Exhibit C.*
  - A wetlands investigation and delineation report prepared by Certified Soil Scientist and Connecticut Wetland Scientist James Sipperly issued after visiting the site on July 3, 2025, in which Mr. Sipperly concluded that he did not find inland wetland soils or watercourses on the referenced sites and described the southern feature as a manmade drainage ditch that does not

meet the definition of an intermittent watercourse See Exhibit G. It should be noted that there have been no other qualified experts who have presented a different finding them Mr. Sipperly and therefore any question regarding the presence of wetlands onsite should be considered resolved.

- **April 20, 2026:** The Town Engineer issued a letter stating that it was unable to fully review stormwater because the environmental remediation approach had not yet been finalized but providing no specific information on what was lacking or needed to be corrected in either the environmental reports or civil engineering design documents. *See Exhibit N.*
- **April 22, 2026:** The Applicant attended a hearing with the Commission, during which the Commission asked (i) that the Applicant address the question of wetlands on-site, (ii) that the Applicant address remaining questions regarding the sites environmental review, (iii) that the Applicant work with town staff to address any remaining questions by the Fire Marshal, and (iv) that the Applicant provide information on the building's design and any issues that may exist with respect to building or fire code on its other projects in Connecticut, specifically with respect a developer's in Cheshire, CT being developed by an affiliate of the Applicant. The Applicant stated that it would work with staff and provide additional information. *See Exhibit AB.*
- **April 23, 2026:** Luke Mauro from Solli Engineering sent an email to Tatiana Solovey, William Maurer, Rob Librandi, and James Cordone addressing the question of wetlands on site and noting the submission of the report provided by James Sipperly, the submission of Solli's updated stormwater management design, and confirming that any environmental remediation would not impact Solli's site design and stormwater management plan and requesting a call or meeting to resolve any open questions or concerns. *See Exhibits P and R.*
- **April 30, 2026:** On April 30, 2026, the following was provided:
    - Reef submitted an Environmental Response Memorandum explaining the scope of Phase I and Phase II work, confirming that identified soil and groundwater detections were below residential standards/RBCR criteria, and outlining pre-construction investigation and remediation under the RBCR program. In this report Reef unequivocally explained that there were no health or safety issues that would prevent the development of this site in conformity with state standards and that any remediation work performed would not materially change the site design, stormwater management design, or any other applicable aspect of the Applicant's submission, which was also confirmed by Solli Engineering in their May 1st memorandum. *See Exhibit M.*
    - Solli followed up with Fire Marshal coordination and resubmitted the truck-turning analysis, requesting confirmation that it satisfied site-plan concerns. *See Exhibit Z.*
- **May 1, 2026:** On May 1, 2026, the following was provided:
    - Luke Mauro of Solli Engineering followed up on his April 23rd email to the same group in which he provided a memo prepared by Reef Environmental, submitted a supplemental memo from Solli explaining that the expected remediation would not materially affect location, grading, size, drainage patterns, or design intent for the detention facilities. Mr. Mauro also requested that he be informed if there were any further questions or comments and asking that town staff confirm that no further action was required with respect to wetlands, as there were none present on the site. *See Exhibit AC.*
    - Josh Levy, on behalf of the Applicant sent a comprehensive supplemental submission to Mr. Librandi identifying all the materials that had been submitted in response to questions and comments from the Commission at the last public meeting, which included materials that addresses questions on (i) the properties environmental status and required remediation, (ii) stormwater design, (iii) the lack of wetlands on the property, (iv) the ability of the fire department to enter the site and maneuver around the site in a safe manner, (v) updated site design information, and (vi) information attesting to the expert qualifications of the Applicant's consultants. *See Exhibits T and AD.*

- **May 10, 2026:** Joseph Versteeg issued an independent code compliance and fire safety letter to the Commission, confirming his review of the zoning-stage architectural floor plan and elevation schematics and site plans, explaining the distinction between zoning schematics and permit-level construction documents, and concluding that the project does not pose a significant risk to life or property and does not adversely affect a substantial public interest or pose safety concerns. *See Exhibit AE.*
- **May 11, 2026:** Josh levy, on behalf of the Applicant sent Greg Grew's code and life-safety letter and asked whether any staff or third-party professional had further open comments, questions, or concerns. In this email, Mr. Levy informs Mr. Librandi that the Applicant has received no response to their previous submission, nor to their outreach to town staff regarding the same. *See Exhibit S.*
- **May 13, 2026:** Greg Grew offered to meet with Trumbull planning, building or fire officials to address any questions about Vesel's Trumbull application or its affiliates development in Cheshire, or with respect to questions regarding code compliance, and State-level review. *See Exhibit O.*
- **May 18, 2026:**
    - The Town's Chief Building Official responded to Mr. Grew's March 13th offer and stated that a meeting was premature before zoning and engineering approval. *See Exhibit O.*
    - On May 18th Luke Mauro also responded to the Town's request to resend the information provided in his May 1st email, in which he included the previous email from May 1st and attached the Reef and Solli memoranda. *See Exhibit Q.*
    - After weeks of requesting a response to their submission the Applicant was provided a memo from WSP, the town's consultant. This memorandum was received only approximately 48 hours before the continued hearing, after multiple outreach attempts by the Applicant and its consultants seeking any remaining comments, after the Town had the March 6 resubmission for 73 days, and after 61 days had elapsed from the March 18 statutory date of receipt placed on the record by Town counsel. The timing is significant because the Applicant had repeatedly requested any open comments or needed clarifications well in advance of the continued hearing. In substance, the WSP memorandum recommends supplemental investigation and related characterization work; those items are capable of being addressed through reasonable conditions tied to pre-construction/sitework and prior to vertical construction, and do not establish a present substantial public health or safety interest requiring denial under CGS § 8-30g. *See Exhibit AF.*
- **May 19, 2026:** Solli Engineering submitted a response to the supplemental engineering memorandum. In that response, Luke Mauro, P.E., PTOE expressly referenced Jay Soltis's May 19 response to the second third-party environmental peer review and confirmed that, based on the environmental investigations completed to date, no observed condition prohibits residential development of the Property. Mr. Mauro further explained that supplemental investigation, sampling, and focused remediation are typical post-land-use approval processes in Connecticut, are regulated and overseen by CT DEEP, and will not materially affect the stormwater management design. He also confirmed that the stormwater and drainage design remains consistent with the plans submitted for approval and that the March 4, 2026 Site Plan Application Re-Filing Set is final for purposes of engineering review of the Site Plan Application. *See Exhibit AH.*
- **May 20, 2026:** Reef Environmental submitted a second response to WSP's May 18 memorandum. Jay Soltis, LEP, explained that WSP identified supplemental investigation items and sequencing preferences, not an environmental condition that precludes residential redevelopment or provides a technical basis for denial. Reef confirmed that supplemental investigation, remediation, confirmation sampling, RBCR reporting, and LEP documentation can be completed through reasonable conditions of approval and that the property remains suitable for residential redevelopment subject to that process. *See Exhibit AI.*

IV. Summary of Materials Submitted and Resubmitted

The Applicant has provided the Commission with a complete record of information that addresses all its stated questions and concerns. The materials include not only technical reports, but also follow-up correspondence and expert credentials so the Commission can assess reliability, competence, and responsiveness.

- Application and procedural materials: March 6 resubmission cover letter, receipt-stamped filing confirmation, original denial decision letter, and May 1 supplemental cover materials. *See Exhibits A, B, T, AD and AG.*
- Environmental materials: Reef environmental summaries; April 30 Reef memorandum; Phase I wetlands clarification; WSP third-party environmental review memoranda; Solli response to the supplemental engineering memorandum; Reef second response to WSP's supplemental memorandum; and testimony transcript materials. *See Exhibits C, D, E, F, M, AB, AF, AH and AI.*
- Wetlands materials: Sipperly wetlands investigation and delineation report, Reef clarification, related email correspondence, and Sipperly qualifications. *See Exhibits C, G, P, R and W.*
- Engineering and stormwater materials: Solli engineering report, site plan refiling set, engineering comment responses, Town Engineering letter, May 1 stormwater/environmental coordination memorandum, May 19 supplemental response, and related environmental responses confirming that remediation will not materially affect the stormwater design. *See Exhibits H, J, K, N, AC, AH and AI.*
- Sewer/WPCA materials: WPCA minutes documenting approval and conditions. *See Exhibit I.*
- Fire access and code/life-safety materials: revised truck-turning plan, Fire Marshal coordination correspondence, Greg Grew letter, Greg Grew resume, Joseph Versteeg resume and May 10, 2026 letter, and Solli team resumes. *See Exhibits L, Z, U, V, Y, AE and AA.*
- Correspondence record: emails to Town Planning, Town Engineering, Fire Marshal coordination, and follow-up to Abigail Farrell documenting that the Applicant repeatedly offered to meet and provide any further information. *See Exhibits O, P, Q, R, S and T.*

V. Environmental Conditions and Site Suitability

The environmental record cannot support a legally sustainable denial. The evidence establishes a former contractor storage yard with limited, localized and shallow impacts that are typical for such historic use, are capable of standard remediation, and do not create a public health or safety condition that precludes multifamily residential development.

Reef's Phase II work included soil borings and temporary groundwater monitoring wells. Reef's April 30 memorandum states that the Phase II results identified low levels of gasoline-related VOCs near the southeastern corner of the construction yard, low levels of ETPH adjacent to a former garage foundation slab, and low levels of ETPH adjacent to aboveground storage tanks. Reef further states that all contaminant concentrations were well below RBCR residential criteria, and that groundwater concentrations were well below the most stringent RBCR groundwater criteria. *See Exhibit M.*

WSP, the Town's own third-party reviewer, did not identify a condition that made residential development impossible or unsafe in its February 12, 2026 memorandum. WSP recommended additional investigation and management measures. Reef responded directly and accepted that additional work would be performed: removal of visibly stained soil, confirmation sampling, additional analysis, Phase III delineation where appropriate, and compliance under the new RBCR program. See Exhibits E and F.

On May 18, 2026, WSP issued a further memorandum recommending supplemental Phase II investigation, additional constituent testing, and permanent groundwater monitoring before approval. The Applicant notes that this additional memorandum was issued only approximately 48 hours before the continued hearing, after the

Applicant and its consultants had made repeated outreach seeking any remaining staff or third-party comments and after the Town had possessed the March 6 resubmission for 73 days. The memorandum does not identify a condition that cannot be investigated, remediated, documented, and regulated through the RBCR process and appropriate conditions before construction proceeds. See Exhibit AF.

On May 19, 2026, Solli Engineering responded to the supplemental engineering memorandum and, relying on the environmental work performed to date and Jay Soltis's response to the second peer review, confirmed that no definitive evidence has been submitted suggesting that the site is unsuitable for residential development. Solli further stated that any necessary supplemental investigation, sampling, and focused remediation can occur before construction, through the ordinary CT DEEP-regulated process, and that such work will not materially affect the stormwater management design, grading, drainage patterns, or the Site Plan Application Re-Filing Set submitted for approval. See Exhibit AH.

On May 20, 2026, Reef submitted a second response to WSP's May 18 memorandum. Reef expressly stated that it does not dispute that additional investigation and remediation of stained surficial soil should occur, but explained that WSP's comments identify future work items and sequencing preferences rather than a condition that provides a technical basis for denial. Reef confirmed that WSP had not identified any environmental condition that cannot be addressed through standard investigation, remediation, confirmation sampling, institutional controls, engineering controls, or other CT DEEP-accepted measures based on the work completed to date. Reef further recommended a condition requiring LEP-prepared supplemental investigation before vertical construction, RBCR reporting, any required remedial action plan, and LEP documentation before certificate of occupancy. See Exhibit AI.

It's important to realize that additional remediation documentation is not the same as a substantial public health or safety interest requiring denial. Reef has stated repeatedly that the conditions identified do not preclude residential redevelopment and can be effectively remediated. The planned work is ordinary pre-construction/sitework environmental management: remove the visibly stained soils, characterize and dispose of affected material, perform confirmation sampling, document the work, and submit results to the Town and CT DEEP as required. *See Exhibits D, E and M.*

At the April 22 hearing, the Commission expressed concern that future testing could identify additional contamination. The Applicant addressed this directly on the record: any additional surficial material identified during site preparation would be removed and replaced with clean fill as necessary, without changing the grades or stormwater design intent. That issue is properly addressed through a condition requiring environmental reporting before vertical construction, not through denial. *See Exhibits AB and AC.*

The record contains a qualified LEP's analysis, a defined remediation pathway, state regulatory oversight under RBCR, and an offer to provide documentation before vertical construction. Reasonable conditions are plainly available and have already been specifically noted as part of the scope to be performed by Reef.

VI. Stormwater, Drainage, Engineering, and Site Feasibility

The revised engineering submission directly addresses the prior drainage and engineering concerns. Solli relocated the stormwater detention system away from Reservoir Avenue and into a central location, provided updated hydrology and drainage calculations, supplied a full engineering report, and responded item-by-item to Town Engineering comments. *See Exhibits H, J and K.*

The engineering report states that the proposed stormwater management system has been designed to comply with the Town of Trumbull Zoning Regulations, the 2024 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual, and the CT DOT Drainage Manual. It further states that the proposed system provides reduced peak discharge rates compared to existing conditions for all analyzed storm events. *See Exhibit J.*

The peak flow comparison in the Solli report shows reductions for the 2-year, 5-year, 10-year, 25-year, 50-year and 100-year storm events. The proposed system includes catch basins, drainage piping, hydrodynamic separators, and an above-ground detention basin with an outlet control structure and emergency spillway. See *Exhibit J.*

The Town Engineering letter dated April 20, 2026, stated that stormwater review could not be completed until the environmental remediation approach was finalized. The Applicant did not ignore that comment. Reef and Solli submitted additional memoranda explaining the remediation approach and the relationship between remediation and stormwater design and explaining that the design would not be materially impacted by any change to the remediation scope. *See Exhibits M, N and AC.*

Solli's May 1 memorandum states that, based on Reef's analysis and ongoing coordination, the stormwater management facilities can be constructed substantially as designed; remediation should not significantly impact the location, grading, or size of the proposed detention facilities; remediation is anticipated to involve little to no change in overall site grading; and any necessary clean fill can be imported without materially impacting the proposed stormwater management system, drainage patterns, or overall design intent. *See Exhibit AC.*

Solli's May 19 response further confirms that the on-site stormwater systems have been designed to comply with local regulations, the 2024 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual, and the 2004 CTDOT Drainage Manual; that grading has been designed to mimic existing drainage patterns to the extent practicable; that stormwater runoff will be treated and infiltrated to meet stormwater quality requirements; and that the detention facilities have been sized and designed to reduce runoff rates compared to predevelopment conditions. See Exhibit AH.

Reef's May 20 response is consistent with Solli's engineering conclusion. Reef confirmed that the supplemental investigation and remediation program can proceed within the ordinary redevelopment sequence, under CT DEEP's RBCR framework and LEP oversight, and without establishing a denial-level public health or safety concern. Together, the Solli and Reef responses demonstrate that the environmental and engineering issues are capable of being managed through reasonable conditions tied to pre-construction/sitework, vertical construction, and occupancy milestones. See Exhibits AH and AI.

Accordingly, the stormwater issue has been narrowed to staff comfort with sequencing and documentation. That is not a valid basis for denial. A condition can require updated final engineering drawings, any required environmental closeout documentation, and confirmation from the project engineer and LEP before vertical construction proceeds.

VII. Wetlands and Watercourses

The wetlands issue has been fully clarified. James Sipperly, a Certified Soil Scientist and Connecticut Wetland Scientist, inspected and sampled the site. He concluded that he did not find inland wetland soils or watercourses on the referenced sites. He specifically described the southern property-line feature as a manmade drainage ditch, approximately three feet wide and three feet deep, dry, with no indication of flow, no scour, no recent alluvium or detritus, no standing or flowing water, and no hydrophytic vegetation. He concluded it does not meet the definition of an intermittent watercourse. *See Exhibit G.*

Reef separately issued a March 3, 2026, clarification correcting the Phase I reference to a small intermittent stream and explaining that the feature is a drainage ditch for rainwater. Reef expressly deferred to Mr. Sipperly because Reef is not a wetlands delineation firm and was instead calling out a potential issue for expert review, not making an expert determination, which they are not qualified to do, whereas Mr. Sipperly is such an expert and has all appropriate qualifications to render the determination. *See Exhibit C.*

The Applicant and Solli repeatedly asked Town Engineering for written confirmation that no wetlands review was required, including the April 23 and May 1 correspondence. *See Exhibits P and R.* The only competent wetlands evidence in the record states that no wetlands or regulated watercourse exists on the property.

VIII. WPCA Approval and Sewer Capacity

The WPCA February 26, 2026 minutes document that Attorney Jason Klein, Kevin Solli, and Josh Levy appeared on behalf of Vessel; the Authority reviewed flow estimates and sewer capacity matters; and the sanitary sewer connection was approved by unanimous consent, with conditions including the Applicant's $400,000 contribution to increase the sanitary sewer pipe size from 8 inches to 10 inches, the developer-installed unit fee, and a 24-month approval period tied to obtaining a building permit. *See Exhibit I.*

Because WPCA approval was one of the prior denial reasons, its resolution is significant. There is no remaining record basis to deny on sewer connection or WPCA sequencing grounds.

IX. Fire Access, Code Compliance, and Life Safety

The fire access and code/life-safety record is likewise appropriate for approval. Solli submitted a revised truck-turning plan revised per Fire Marshal comments on December 17, 2025 and February 18, 2026. The plan depicts Trumbull fire apparatus and SU-30 circulation paths, fire lanes, no-parking areas, and loading areas. *See Exhibit L.*

Solli's April 30 correspondence to the Fire Marshal asked for confirmation that the updated plan satisfied site-plan concerns and resubmitted the revised truck-turning plan. *See Exhibit Z.* The Applicant also retained and submitted credentials for code and life-safety experts to address concerns about building code compliance, fire-resistance assemblies, exterior egress, and comparisons to other Vessel projects. *See Exhibits U, V and Y.*

Greg Grew, AIA, a Connecticut-licensed architect and licensed building official, reviewed the plans and stated that final construction documents will meet the Connecticut State Building Code, Connecticut Fire Safety Code, and local requirements. He explained that the zoning-stage plans are the appropriate level of detail for site-plan review and that permit-level construction documents will be sealed and submitted for review before any building permit can issue. *See Exhibit U.*

Mr. Grew also directly addressed any comparisons to a development by a Vessel affiliated in Cheshire, stating that issues referenced in Cheshire are not indicative of the Trumbull proposal and that Trumbull will proceed with a fully coordinated, current permit set reflecting the latest design, testing, and regulatory input. *See Exhibit U.*

Joseph Versteeg's May 10, 2026 letter separately confirms that, after independent review of the architectural schematics and site plans, he found the building configuration, construction materials, life-safety systems, siting, and fire department access compliant with Connecticut's building-safety regulatory framework and concluded that the development does not pose a significant risk to life or property or an adverse impact on a substantial public interest. See Exhibit AE.

The Applicant has also identified Joseph Versteeg as a fire/life-safety expert. Mr. Versteeg's resume reflects service as Commanding Officer of the Technical Services Section and Supervisor of the Fire Safety Code and Plan Review Units in the Office of the Connecticut State Fire Marshal, as well as Certified Fire Marshal and Licensed Building Official credentials. In a May 10, 2026 letter, Mr. Versteeg further stated that he independently reviewed the architectural floor plan and elevation schematics and site plans and concluded, as a professional opinion, that the building's height, footprint, interior configuration, construction materials, fire protection and life safety systems, location on the property, and fire department access are compliant with Connecticut's adopted administrative regulations addressing building safety; that the development does not pose a significant risk to life and property; and that the project will not have an adverse impact on a substantial public interest or pose safety concerns. See Exhibits Y and AE.

This record does not contain expert evidence establishing that the Trumbull design is unsafe. To the contrary, the Applicant has provided qualified experts, offered meetings, and confirmed that the final permit set cannot be approved unless it complies with the applicable building and fire codes. Any remaining fire-code or construction-document item can be handled through standard conditions and permit review.

X. Expert Qualifications

Vesel's submission is supported by a deep team of credentialed professionals.

- **Greg Grew, AIA.** Mr. Grew has more than 35 years of experience in building design, construction, code consulting, plan review, and municipal permitting. He is a Connecticut Licensed Architect and Licensed Building Official, has served as a municipal chief building official, and has provided third-party plan review for large and technically complex projects throughout Connecticut. *See Exhibit V.*
- **Jay Soltis, LEP.** Mr. Soltis is a Connecticut Licensed Environmental Professional with more than 20 years of environmental consulting, compliance management, and laboratory experience. He has completed numerous site assessments and developed remediation strategies resulting in regulatory closure for industrial, commercial, and residential clients. Mr. Soltis also provided the May 20, 2026 second response to WSP, confirming that the site remains suitable for residential redevelopment subject to supplemental investigation, remediation, and RBCR compliance. *See Exhibits X and AI.*
- **James Sipperly.** Mr. Sipperly is a Certified Soil Scientist and Connecticut Wetland Scientist with municipal wetlands and environmental resource experience, including Environmental Resource Specialist for the City of Middletown and Wetland Agent for the Town of Portland. *See Exhibit W.*
- **Joseph Versteeg.** Mr. Versteeg is a Certified Fire Marshal and Licensed Building Official, former senior official in the Office of the Connecticut State Fire Marshal, NFPA committee participant, instructor, author, and principal of a fire/life-safety code consulting firm. Mr. Versteeg also provided a May 10, 2026 letter confirming his professional opinion regarding code compliance, life safety, fire department access, and the absence of any significant risk to life or property. *See Exhibits Y and AE.*
- **Solli Engineering.** Solli Engineering's materials identify extensive experience in site/civil engineering, stormwater, traffic, land development, landscape architecture, permitting, and municipal presentations. Kevin Solli, P.E., PTOE, CPESC, LEED AP BD+C and the Solli team have extensive residential and affordable housing experience. *See Exhibit AA.*

XI. Conclusion

The Applicant has done what § 8-30g(h) is designed to encourage: it took the Commission's prior stated reasons for denial, resubmitted materials directed to those issues, obtained WPCA approval, revised and documented the stormwater design, clarified wetlands jurisdiction, responded to third-party environmental comments, submitted additional environmental and stormwater memoranda, supplied expert credentials, followed up with Town staff, offered meetings, and asked repeatedly for any remaining comments or concerns before the record closed.

The resulting record is complete, careful, and more than sufficient. It does not support a finding that denial is necessary to protect a substantial public interest in health or safety. It does not support a finding that any such public interest clearly outweighs the need for affordable housing. And it certainly does not support a finding that the identified concerns cannot be protected by reasonable conditions.

- **Environmental uncertainty is not a substantial public interest requiring denial.**
    - The record contains Phase I/Phase II work, third-party review, LEP responses, a remedial pathway, and RBCR oversight. Reef has repeatedly stated that environmental conditions do not preclude residential development and that any localized impacts can be remediated. Although WSP issued a further memorandum on May 18, 2026 recommending additional pre-approval

investigation, that memorandum was received only approximately 48 hours before the continued hearing, after the Town had the March 6 resubmission for 73 days and after repeated Applicant outreach seeking any remaining comments. Reef's May 20, 2026 response directly addresses WSP's supplemental comments and confirms that WSP identified supplemental investigation items and sequencing preferences, not an unmitigable environmental condition supporting denial. The proper remedy for documentation sequencing remains a condition requiring completion of the defined investigation/remediation steps before vertical construction and occupancy, not denial. See Exhibits AF and AI.

- **Stormwater review has been sufficiently supported and can be addressed further through conditions of approval.**
    - Solli submitted a revised engineering report, revised drainage design, updated calculations, and point-by-point responses to Engineering comments. Solli and Reef explained why remediation should not materially alter grading, drainage patterns, or stormwater function. Solli's May 19 response and Reef's May 20 response further confirm that the stormwater design is final for site-plan engineering review and that environmental follow-up can be addressed through CT DEEP-regulated processes and reasonable conditions. If Town Engineering wants final sign-off after environmental sitework documents are completed, that can be made a condition of Planning & Zoning Commission approval. See Exhibits AH and AI.

- **Wetlands concerns have been resolved by qualified evidence.**
    - The only qualified wetlands evidence in the record is Mr. Sipperly's report concluding that no wetlands or watercourses are present. Reef corrected its earlier Phase I reference and expressly agreed with Sipperly's conclusion.

- **WPCA approval has been obtained.**
    - The prior WPCA issue is resolved by unanimous WPCA approval with stated conditions. There is no basis for denial on sewer connection grounds.

- **Fire access and life safety concerns are addressed by plans, experts, and permit-stage safeguards.**
    - The revised truck-turning plan addresses emergency circulation. Greg Grew and Joseph Versteeg provide expert code and life-safety support, including Mr. Versteeg's May 10, 2026 letter confirming his professional opinion that the project does not pose a significant risk to life or property and does not adversely affect a substantial public interest. The Commission may condition approval on Fire Marshal review of the final permit drawings and code-compliant construction documents. That is the ordinary process and fully protects any legitimate public safety interest. See Exhibit AE.

For these reasons, Vessel RE Holdings, LLC respectfully requests that the Trumbull Planning and Zoning Commission approve the resubmitted application, with reasonable conditions as appropriate, and incorporate this final submission and all exhibits into the record.

REEF
environmental

May 20, 2026

Ms. Tatiana Solovey
Assistant Town Engineer
Town of Trumbull
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, CT 06611

Re: **Third-Party Review of Environmental Investigations, 2nd Response**
2135, 2145 & 2155 Reservoir Avenue, Trumbull, Connecticut
Reef Environmental Project No. 25-1012

Dear Ms. Solovey,

Reef Environmental, LLC (Reef) has reviewed the May 18, 2026 Third-Party Review of Environmental Investigations memorandum prepared by WSP USA of Shelton, Connecticut (WSP) concerning the above-referenced property. Reef provides this response to clarify the environmental record, address WSP's specific technical comments, and confirm the supplemental investigation and remediation commitments that will be completed as the redevelopment proceeds.

Because WSP's May 18 memorandum was provided only forty-eight (48) hours before the scheduled Commission meeting, this response focuses on the issues most material to the pending land use review. Reef's prior written submissions dated February 12, 2026, March 5, 2026, and April 30, 2026 should be considered part of Reef's complete response to WSP and the Town. Copies of those submissions are attached as Exhibits A through C. A copy of my curriculum vitae is attached as Exhibit D to document the qualifications and experience underlying the professional opinions set forth below.

It is my understanding and experience that environmental investigations are generally not required for ordinary site plan approvals, including site plan approvals for affordable housing developments pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-30g. The Phase I and Phase II reports were submitted voluntarily and for informational purposes. They were prepared before final construction drawings and were intended to demonstrate the applicant's diligence and to evaluate whether environmental conditions would make residential redevelopment infeasible or inappropriate.

The Phase I report is consistent with ASTM E1527-21. The Phase II work was conducted as an initial, targeted subsurface investigation consistent with the iterative approach used in the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection's (CT DEP's) Site Characterization Guidance Document (SCGD) and Release Characterization Guidance (RCG) document. Both reports identify the need for additional inspection and sampling, which would be completed once the site was vacant and under the control of the applicant.

Reef does not dispute that additional investigation and remediation of the stained surficial soil should occur. The critical distinction is that WSP identifies future work items and sequencing preferences, not a condition that provides a technical basis for denial. WSP has not identified any environmental condition that cannot be addressed through standard investigation, remediation, confirmation sampling, institutional controls, engineering controls, or other CT DEEP-accepted measures based on the work completed to date.

Summary of Reef's Opinion

Based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, the Phase II Subsurface Investigation, site observations, prior submissions, and experience with multifamily residential redevelopment projects, no environmental condition that would preclude residential redevelopment of the property has been identified.

The environmental information developed to date supports residential redevelopment subject to the normal sequence of supplemental investigation, remedial planning/remediation, confirmation sampling, and documentation, which will all be required under the provisions of Release-Based Cleanup Regulation (RBCR) program. While WSP's memorandum identifies additional investigation that WSP would prefer to be completed earlier in the process, that is not the same as identifying a denial-level health or safety concern.

Accordingly, WSP's comments support, at most, reasonable conditions of approval requiring compliance with the RBCR program. Reef and the applicant have already agreed that such activities will occur and that they will be performed under Reef's professional oversight in compliance with applicable state requirements.

Qualifications

I am a Connecticut Licensed Environmental Professional (LEP #551) and Principal of Reef Environmental. As reflected in Exhibit D, I have nearly 30 years of experience in environmental consulting, compliance management, site assessment, remedial strategy, regulatory closure, and redevelopment of industrial, commercial, and residential properties in Connecticut.

That experience forms the basis for my opinion that the environmental conditions identified to date are manageable through standard investigation, remediation, and institutional/engineered controls.

Purpose and Stage of the Environmental Work Completed to Date

The Phase I and Phase II work completed to date was performed at a pre-purchase/pre-development stage. The work was designed to evaluate whether the property presented environmental conditions that would make residential redevelopment infeasible or inappropriate. It was not intended to fully characterize site environmental conditions before land use approval.

In redevelopment projects involving historically commercial or industrial properties, environmental investigation and remediation proceeds in phases. WSP's comments would require full characterization of the site before seeking land use approval. WSP does not identify a technical or regulatory requirement that final environmental closure must precede land use approval, particularly where no residential exposure can occur until after construction and occupancy approvals and where environmental milestones can be imposed as conditions of approval.

Identified Data Gaps

I agree with WSP's finding that supplemental sampling should include additional constituents of concern, where warranted, in accordance with CT DEEP guidance. Removal of stained surficial soils, additional inspection of areas currently covered by materials and equipment, and additional soil and groundwater sampling has already been recommended and agreed to by the applicant.

WSP's conclusion that additional investigation is warranted does not establish that the site is unsuitable for residential redevelopment. A reasonable approach would be to require additional investigation and entry into the RBCR program, which would ensure compliance with the residential criteria.

Affordable Housing / Section 8-30g Context

Reef understands that the pending application has been submitted pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-30g. Although certainly not a legal opinion, the technical conclusions in the environmental reports and documents are directly relevant to the health-and-safety inquiry under that statute. In general terms, Section 8-30g requires a commission defending a denial to establish, based on the record, that the denial is necessary to protect substantial public interests in health, safety, or other matters the Commission may legally consider, that those interests clearly outweigh the need for affordable housing, and that those interests cannot be protected by reasonable changes or conditions of approval.

WSP's memorandum does not identify the type of specific, confirmed, and unmitigable environmental condition that would support denial under that framework. WSP identifies additional sampling, release characterization, groundwater evaluation, and timing preferences. Reef agrees that supplemental investigation, remediation and compliance with the requirements of the RBCR program. Those measures are reasonable conditions of approval; they are not a technical basis for denial.

Connecticut affordable housing decisions distinguish between actual public health or safety risks and concerns that can be addressed through reasonable modifications, conditions, mitigation, or compliance with other regulatory programs. WSP has not identified a comparable site-specific, unmitigable public health or safety risk here.

Response to WSP's Specific Technical Comments

The following table responds to the principal technical issues raised by WSP and clarifies how Reef recommends those issues be addressed in the record and through conditions of approval.

WSP Comment	Reef Response	Appropriate Regulatory/Land Use Treatment
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and metals were not included in the initial analyte list.	Those analytes can and should be included in supplemental investigation or waste characterization sampling where warranted.	This is a supplemental investigation scope item to be completed once the site is vacant, not evidence that residential use is precluded.
Samples in stained areas were collected at depth rather than directly from surficial staining.	Remediation via excavation and off-site disposal has been recommended for visibly stained soil with confirmation sampling to follow.	This supports a condition requiring compliance with applicable environmental regulations including the Connecticut RBCR.
Former asphalt operations may require additional PAH investigation.	As noted above, additional analytes can and should be included in supplemental investigation or waste characterization sampling where warranted. Removal and off-site disposal of stockpiled soil with asphalt and concrete has been recommended with	This supports a condition requiring compliance with applicable environmental regulations including the Connecticut RBCR.

	confirmation sampling to follow.	
The "sweet" smell observed near boring B-5 may suggest tetrachloroethylene (PCE), a chlorinated solvent.	According to the owner, stained soil in this area is from concrete form release oil stored in drums. Any odor is likely from this material since no volatile organic compounds were identified in field screening or laboratory analytical reports for soil below the staining. Remediation of stained soil has been recommended and agreed to by the applicant	Since remediation is anticipated, this supports a condition requiring compliance with applicable environmental regulations including the Connecticut RBCR.
Groundwater characterization is incomplete.	Additional groundwater evaluation will be completed once the site is vacant and owned by the applicant. The proposed project will utilize the public water supply.	This is a supplemental investigation scope item to be completed once the site is vacant, not evidence that residential use is precluded.
Additional investigation should occur before approval.	WSP identifies a sequencing preference, not a technical necessity for denial. No residential exposure will occur until after construction and occupancy approvals, and environmental work can be required before those milestones.	The Commission can impose conditions of approval requiring supplemental work, remediation, confirmation sampling, and compliance with applicable environmental regulations.

RBCR Program Entry and CT DEEP Oversight

Reef and the applicant are aware that additional investigation or remediation will require notification to CT DEEP and entry into the Release-Based Cleanup Regulation (RBCR) program. That requirement does not mean the property is unsafe for residential redevelopment. It means that any identified releases will be characterized, reported, and remediated in accordance with the CT DEEP's requirements and guidance.

Reef will use the RCG to develop release-specific conceptual site models and will submit required investigation reports, remedial action plans, remedial action reports, and related documentation to the CT DEEP. This State-level oversight and LEP involvement are the appropriate mechanisms for ensuring that the property is protective of human health and the environment for the proposed residential use.

The existence of the RBCR program supports conditional approval. It does not support denial. Connecticut has an established regulatory framework for release characterization, remediation, verification, and closure. The applicant has committed to comply with that framework.

Supplemental Investigation and Remediation Commitment

To remove any ambiguity, Reef recommends that the following supplemental environmental work be completed as part of the pre-construction/construction-phase environmental program and before occupancy, as applicable:

- Visual inspection of the property after removal of remaining equipment, concrete forms, form-oil release drums, out-of-service heating oil tanks, roll-off containers, and other obstructions;
- Direct sampling of stained or suspect surficial soils identified during that inspection for waste characterization;
- Soil analysis for ETPH, VOCs, PAHs, PCBs, metals, and/or other constituents of concern as appropriate based on the RCG document;
- Groundwater evaluation sufficient to assess groundwater flow, groundwater quality, and potential on-site or off-site receptors;
- Preparation and implementation of a remedial action plan for stained surficial soil and any other areas requiring remediation;
- Use of excavation and off-site disposal/confirmation sampling, engineered controls, Environmental Use Restrictions, or other CT DEEP-accepted remedial measures as appropriate; and
- LEP documentation and verification that the site is compliant with RBCR criteria, which is protective of human health and the environment.

Recommended Condition of Approval

If the Commission believes additional assurance is appropriate, Reef recommends that the Commission address WSP's comments through conditions of approval. Reef recommends language substantially as follows:

> *Prior to issuance of a building permit for vertical construction, the applicant shall submit documentation prepared by a Connecticut Licensed Environmental Professional confirming that supplemental environmental investigation has been completed in accordance with applicable CT DEEP requirements and that any required RBCR reporting*

> *has been made. If such investigation identifies environmental impacts requiring remediation, the applicant shall submit a remedial action plan prepared by a Connecticut Licensed Environmental Professional. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall submit LEP documentation confirming that required remediation and confirmation sampling or other means of demonstrating compliance have been completed or are otherwise being managed pursuant to applicable state requirements.*

Such a condition directly addresses WSP's comments while allowing the redevelopment process to proceed in the normal sequence. It also ensures that any environmental issues are addressed under professional oversight and the applicable State regulatory framework before occupancy.

Prior Reef Submissions and Exhibits

Reef's prior responses remain part of the environmental record and should be considered together with this letter. Those prior submissions explained that the environmental work completed to date was appropriate for the stage of review, that additional testing and remediation would be performed as part of the redevelopment process, and that the site can be brought into compliance for residential use through standard remedial measures and CT DEEP oversight.

For clarity, Reef recommends that the final submission package include the following exhibits:

Exhibit	Document	Status
Exhibit A	Reef Environmental Third-Party Review Response, dated February 12, 2026	Attached.
Exhibit B	Reef Environmental Summary Memo, dated March 5, 2026	Attached.
Exhibit C	Reef Environmental Response Memorandum for Appeal Hearing, dated April 30, 2026	Attached.
Exhibit D	Curriculum Vitae of Jay Soltis, LEP	Attached.

Conclusion

WSP's memorandum does not identify a confirmed environmental condition that precludes residential redevelopment. It identifies the need for additional investigation that WSP would like completed earlier in the process. Reef agrees that additional investigation and remediation should and will occur, but those items can be addressed through reasonable conditions of approval since the site will need to be vacant prior to proceeding.

Based on the information developed to date, Reef's professional opinion is that the property is suitable for the proposed residential redevelopment subject to completion of supplemental investigation, remediation, or other means to demonstrate compliance with the RBCR criteria. The reports prepared to date are appropriate given the stage of the project. Vessel has agreed to conduct further testing and remediation as needed to ensure that the future residential use of the property complies with applicable environmental standards and regulations. This iterative process is consistent with the local land use entitlement process, where a site plan approval precedes the more granular construction drawing, building permit, and pre-occupancy reviews.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss the project further, please feel free to call me at (860) 841-5530.

Kind regards,
Reef Environmental, LLC

Jay Soltis, LEP
Principal