

NORWALK CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

MARCH 22, 2005

ATTENDANCE: Karen DeStefanis; Chair, Matthew Caputo, Marny Smith, Elizabeth Ackerman, Susan Llorca, Andrew Kyriakides, Ed Holowinko

STAFF: Michael Wrinn

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. DeStefanis called the meeting to order at 6:11 p.m.

The roll call was taken and the following Commission members were present: Karen DeStefanis; Chair, Matthew Caputo, Marny Smith, Elizabeth Ackerman, Susan Llorca, Andrew Kyriakides, Ed Holowinko

RECEIPT/DISCUSSION

a) 12 Allen Road - #S05-212 - Canevari - Two lot subdivision of land in and adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Mr. Wrinn referred to the staff report from Ms. Cherichetti. He said the applicant was present tonight to show what they want to do. He noted a decision needed to be rendered by May 10.

Attorney Suchy stated she would represent the applicant. She said there was a comment by staff that the application should be scheduled for a plenary hearing. The project is similar to what was heard during the fall. They are looking to subdivide the parcel into two lots where two (2) single-family residences would be constructed. She said also asked for updated topography lines and they should have that available next week.

Ms. Smith said it would also be helpful to have a soils map. Attorney Suchy said she would contact the soil scientist to get it.

Mr. Wrinn thought they should have the applicant come in with an entire application.

Attorney Suchy said the application would be revised to make it a plenary.

Mr. Steve McAllister stated they needed two weeks to get the changes from the surveyor.

Mr. Wrinn noted the public hearing could be scheduled on April 26. Mr. Caputo said the applicant should get all the information to staff by April 5 for their review.

Attorney Suchy noted the requisite fee was submitted for plenary.

** MR. CAPUTO MADE A MOTION TO HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING ON APRIL 26, 2005. THE APPLICATION SHOULD BE REVISED TO REFLECT THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED

** MS. SMITH SECONDED

Mr. Holowinko pointed out that the commission was suppose to hire a soil scientist. Ms. DeStefanis said she would prefer the report from the soil scientist before they hold the public hearing. Mr. Wrinn noted that if they waited, it would mean the difference between having an April 26 or a May 10 hearing.

* MR. CAPUTO WITHDREW HIS MOTION, AND:

** MR. CAPUTO MADE A MOTION TO HIRE A SOIL SCIENTIST TO CARRY OUT SUCH WORK AS RECOMMENDED BY ALEXIS CHERICHETTI PER HER MEMO DATED FEBRUARY 22, 2005

** MS. LLORCA SECONDED

** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

b) 216 Scribner Avenue - #S05-213 - St. Matthew Church Corp. - Corrective Action installation of storm water quality improvements

Mr. Wrinn said the commission saw this application a while back. They put an addition on the rear of the church, but they also went ahead and put in an additional parking lot that is now paved. They were present to address the wetlands issues and to come to a possible resolution.

Mr. Carl Lecher approached to speak as the representative for the church. He stated that he was also the contractor who paved the lot.

Ms. Smith asked if the additional catch basins accommodated the increase of impervious sheet flow. Mr. Lecher said no additional catch basins were required by the engineer, but the existing ones will accommodate the parking lot.

Ms. Smith said there's quite a bit of increase to the impervious surface. She wondered if more catch basins would do the job.

Mr. McAllister said he didn't calculate increase of storm water run off and to add more catch basins would be a big job.

Mr. Lecher said the catch basins there now worked fine. Ms. Smith said but it drains into the watercourse.

Mr. Lecher commented that there was remedial action taken a few years ago.

Ms. Smith asked if there would be a maintenance schedule to check the pillows. Mr. Lecher said yes. There's a plan recommended by the manufacturer and the church would oversee that.

Ms. DeStefanis stated the storm drains would separate any sediments and oils, and all will discharge to the wetlands as it does now. Mr. Lecher said that was correct.

Ms. DeStefanis asked about installation of erosion control measures. Mr. McAllister said there would be silt fencing in the area of construction, it will either be replaced or a new one. They are also replacing two catch basins and the silt fence will be downgrade of the parking lot.

Ms. DeStefanis asked about removal of the debris. Mr. Lecher said it would all be taken off site.

Ms. DeStefanis asked the other commissioners if they thought this matter should be scheduled for a public hearing. The consensus was that it wasn't necessary.

Ms. Smith asked if when it rained heavily, to keep the seed from washing away, they could put hay over the top to hold the seed. Mr. Lecher said they intended to use the spray process.

Ms. Ackerman thought they needed more extensive buffer between the parking lot and wetlands. Mr. Lecher said that area was very dense. He thought that putting in more buffers would do more harm than good.

It was noted that no decision was made tonight.

c) 118 Murray Street - #S05-214 - Haynie - Construction of a new single-family residence adjacent to a wetland

Ms. Sue-Lynn Haynie approached.

Ms. DeStefanis asked if she was proposing to tear down the existing house and construct a new single-family residence. Ms. Haynie said that was correct.

Ms. Smith stated the silt fence would be 7 ft. from the wetlands. She asked if there was any chance of building the house on the same footprint to avoid it being too close to the wetlands. Mr. James Siperly approached to answer to the question. He said if they visited the site, they would see that the proposed location of the silt fence was about where the existing lawn was now with the existing layout. So that was the reason for proposing the house where it is. The intention was to follow the contours of the stone wall that exists. But they tried to keep it in the approximate area of the existing house.

Mr. Siperly said there is an existing stone wall and the intention was to extend it to connect to the other stone wall or to plant vegetative buffer to aid the wetland area. Ms. Smith thought that would be a good idea.

Mr. Siperly said the wetlands were in isolated depression with no inlet or outlet. Basically, it's low-lying depression, but he never saw standing water. However, it is a wetland by classification. As far as vegetation, red maples are the predominant tree species and the 30' oak will remain. The shrubs are primarily burning bush and everything is invasive species. He noted there was no major wildlife function.

Ms. Smith asked if there was burning bush in the wetlands. Mr. Siperly said it's all over.

Mr. McAllister noted the swimming pool would be pumped dry and filled with material.

Ms. Smith thought vegetative buffer would be nice to put in. She suggested they reference the list Ms. Cherichetti devised.

Mr. Siperly noted the stonewall existing was very low at 2 ½ ft. He noted that it was quite old.

Ms. DeStefanis said if they go with vegetative buffer, they needed to see the plan report. Mr. Siperly said they could have that developed that for the next meeting.

d) 74 Cranbury Road - #S05-215 - Tarzia - Construction of a new single-family residence adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Mr. Wrinn said the commission was familiar with this application because the first application was denied by them. They were here tonight with a layout of the house.

Attorney Waters stated he would represent the applicant. He said the application was made for the property indicated, but it was denied due to concerns of whether a different house layout would be preferable, in view of the house being within the 100-year flood zone. So they supplied the plans for a different house configuration. He pointed out that the house was reconfigured to see the setback lines running along where he indicated on the plan. They pushed it to the far southwest, and by doing so, this reduced the area that was within the 100-year flood zone. He explained that it is now basically narrower, but slightly deeper than before.

Ms. Smith said in Ms. Cherichetti's memo, it points out that there is a footprint increase larger than the one previously denied. Attorney Waters said that was true, but it is significantly more outside of the flood line.

Don Strait, Landscape Architect approached. He explained the builders tried to get away from the corner. When they computed it, they found it was actually 378 sq. ft. less in the flood zone. Also, they moved a driveway out of the flood zone. They also increased the buffer to 10 ft. behind the patio and they will plant a variety to shrub species.

Ms. DeStefanis said so it will be a 96.5 elevation and the floodplain will be at 95. Mr. Strait said that was correct. He noted the residence would also have a basement.

Mr. Holowinko commented that he would feel better if the house was smaller. He said it seemed like there was a lot of “dead space” that didn’t need to be there.

Ms. Smith said they did a lot to correct some of the concerns. But there was still a concern of the long-term impacts to the lawn. Although the buffer would lessen the impact a lot, but she wasn’t sure it would make a big difference.

Attorney Waters said that right now, the lawn was long. Ms. Smith said she realized that, but she has found that people tend to use fertilizers etc. even for a small lawn, thus this creates more impact.

Mr. Strait pointed out on the plan that there was a substantial buffer.

Ms. Smith questioned what happens to the buffer if the floodway becomes a flood that may result in wetlands plants getting wiped out. Mr. Strait asked what they would prefer then and he mentioned that perhaps they could do a seed mix. Ms. Smith didn’t think that was a good idea next to the stream.

Attorney Waters stated it’s a buildable lot. Ms. DeStefanis asked if they considered other alternatives. Attorney Waters said what they presented tonight was the other alternative.

Mr. Strait pointed out the areas where plantings would be. Mr. Wrinn noted that they could condition the approval upon the plantings always being there. And should they ever get wiped out, they will have to return to the commission.

Mr. Caputo asked the applicant to compare the previous alternative buffer with the one presented tonight. Mr. Strait displayed the other alternative showing the house was longer with a driveway. It was 56 ft. from the corner to the wetland line, but with the current plan, it will now be 63 ft. from the corner to the wetland line. It is also narrower and longer, allowing for the increased buffer.

Ms. Smith commented that given that it’s a [buildable] lot, they probably did the best they could to protect the wetlands.

Mr. Holowinko said as an alternative, he thought the house could have a smaller footprint as an option. This would bring it back farther from the watercourse.

e) 2 & 8 Wilson Avenue - #S03-151a - 6th Taxing District - Modification of permit to allow house relocation path to be closer to wetland

Mr. Wrinn said this was a small house located on Wilson Avenue. The idea was to take the house, go up to the road and back into the lot. They are now looking to slide it up the hill on rails.

Mr. Burt Shatz, the Administrator for the 6th Taxing District approached. He explained they would like to move the house directly eastward of the existing location. It will be done on rails and the front will be within 5 ft. of the wetlands for only one day. He said they intended to cut down seven (7) additional trees, but to counter balance this, they will be able to save three (3) larger trees in front of the residence. They will also have to take down a section of the stonewall that is very low and not in good shape, but they intend to maintain it. He further explained that the district intends to retain ownership, update the house and maintain the historic significance of it. They will also bring the electrical and plumbing up to code, while maintaining the historic integrity. They will leave the existing foundation and put in concrete block and raise the house about a foot.

Ms. Smith said she knew the house well. She said she would like to see a sequence of events occur first, such as:

- Removing the trash and debris. And then determine if it was possible to grade for the proposed rails.

Mr. Shatz said the moving contractor felt it would be a problem that could be dealt with easily and the process only takes a day.

Ms. DeStefanis asked if they would provide a planting plan. Mr. Shatz said they had a significant budget for planting.

Ms. Smith said that she thought it was important to see the plantings as buffer in the area where the rails would be. Mr. Shatz said there would be heavy plantings around the parking area. Ms. Smith said but this was a different area she was speaking of. She said she would like something there to protect the wetland from Wilson Avenue.

Mr. Caputo stressed that they should submit the planting plan soon. Mr. Shatz said they were up against a tight schedule and they didn't have much time to wait much longer. Mr. Wrinn asked about doing a grading plan. Mr. Shatz responded that trees would be cut and the house will be moved. But there won't be much construction equipment on site at all.

Mr. Caputo asked if they had anyone to put together a planting plan.

There was a question whether they could approve the application as a modification with the stipulation that the planting plan and erosion control plan be submitted to the satisfaction of staff.

Mr. Caputo asked how long it would take him to devise a planting plan. Mr. Shatz said he could probably find a landscape architect to do it within two weeks. Mr. Caputo emphasized the importance of staff seeing the plan prior to approval. Mr. Shatz said he would make every effort to provide the plan within two weeks. But he needed to find a landscape architect.

Ms. Smith said she didn't see a silt fence or barrier on the plan. Mr. Shatz questioned if they were necessary for a rail. Ms. Smith said they would be digging though.

Mr. Wrinn asked how they would be actually moving the house on rails. Mr. Shatz said the house is put on rollers, but he wasn't sure of the source that would be used.

Mr. Wrinn repeated that the plantings and erosion control plans must be submitted to Ms. Cherichetti before approval. He asked the commission members if they should leave the matter of providing the information up to Ms. Cherichetti or did they want to see this application before them again. The response was that they would leave it to Ms. Cherichetti.

**** MS. SMITH MADE A MOTION TO GRANT THE REQUEST TO MODIFY THE ORIGINAL ROUTE THAT RUNS PARALLEL TO WILSON AVENUE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITONS:**

1. THE PLANTING PLAN AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER
2. THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT A NARRATIVE OF EXACTLY HOW THE HOUSE WILL BE MOVED, I.E., THE ENERGY SOURCE TO BE USED MUST MEET WITH STAFF APPROVAL

**** MR. KYDES SECONDED**

Mr. Caputo stated that he was opposed and not comfortable with approving the request without having the plans in place beforehand.

**** MOTION FAILED WITH ONE VOTE IN FAVOR AND FIVE VOTES IN OPPOSITION (COMMISSIONER'S: CAPUTO, KYDES, ACKERMAN, LLORCA, DESTEFANIS) AND ONE ABSTENTION (HOLOWINKO)**

Ms. DeStefanis urged Mr. Shatz to get the information to Ms. Cherichetti as soon as possible.

The Chair went out of order of the agenda and called the public hearing to order at 7:25 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING (to begin at 7:00 p.m.) and DISCUSSION

a) 3 Blue Mountain Road -#S04-207 - Petrucci Builders, LLC - Construction of a 7-unit Conservation Development, with associated common drive, stormwater drainage, retaining walls and landscaping, in and adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Attorney Waters submitted the proof of mailings to abutters. He said there was a public hearing that commenced on February 8 for a 7-unit Conservation Development. He explained that by zoning standards, they are entitled to do 8-units, but they were proposing 7-units. He pointed out that 50% of the area would be left as open space. He noted that at the public hearing, it was said that there may be too many units, but that

Conservation Development was preferable. However, there were still some items to be addressed as follows:

1. Site construction sequences and time line - they submitted this to staff, but there is one area of information they didn't get onto the plan. That is the stockpile area. But he had the information tonight for review.
2. Long-term drainage management plan - they did provide this with an analysis and storm water plan. It has been devised and submitted for the file.
3. Information sheets on the filters proposed for flow guard and for the catch basins - they will incorporate this as a condition of approval.
4. Larger trees and whether they can do something to preserve them - for the tree outside residence #3, the retaining wall continued on a point.

Mr. Strait further explained that at the last meeting, it was shown that the wall was practically on top of the tree, but they found that with some regrading they could correct that.

Ms. Smith asked if the 35' oak tree on residence #5 would be gone. Mr. Strait said yes.

5. There are invasive species around the pond - they were asked to look at removing them.

Ms. Slayback of Environmental Land Solutions approached. She said she submitted a response to that. She stated that with regard to the removal, to keep invasive species out, they devised an aggressive plan to be followed. She suggested new plantings not be installed for at least two to three years to make sure all invasive species have been taken out. She further noted there was a new chemical called "Tricolvir" that Ms. Smith recommended could possibly be used. It's a new remedy used by the DEP.

Ms. Slayback continued and said however, they couldn't guarantee invasive species would be kept at bay and that was the reason they came up with an aggressive plan.

Ms. Smith said it occurred to her that perhaps smothering would be a better way to get rid of the invasive. Ms. Slayback agreed they could probably use landscape fabric blankets to smother them.

Mr. Strait summarized the drainage report findings. He said that as far as drainage, it's meant to go out to the street and down Westrocks drainage system. Ms. Smith asked what was Westrocks system. Mr. Strait said it goes down to Betts Brook down to Cannon Street.

Ms. Smith emphasized they needed to be mindful of where storm drains end up and how much additional flow goes into the water bodies.

Ms. Smith asked if there would be an association for the Conservation Development. Attorney Waters said that was correct. He said Ms. Cherichetti suggested a maintenance plan be incorporated into the Declaration of Covenants.

Attorney Waters said the last topic had to do with parking spaces. They were proposing seven (7) on-grade spaces. He said each house had a 2-car garage and seven spaces were proposed to provide adequate parking for visitors. But if the commission was opposed to the number of spaces, he said they could be deleted. He also suggested they be done with a paver system. But another alternative would be to reduce the number of spaces. So he suggested that parking spaces #6 and 7 and #3, 4 and 6 could be maintained, and possibly eliminate spaces 1 and 2 where he indicated on the plan.

Ms. Smith asked what a storage layer was. Mr. Strait explained water would be able to permeate that. In some designs they use it as water storage that consists of washed gravel.

Mr. Strait said all the grading numbers were also missing on the contours. As well as the notes that referred to the erosion control issues. He had replacement sheet #2 to cover those items.

Mr. Strait further noted that they will leave the site open for a period of time, but they will seal it off with a type of hydro-seed.

Ms. Smith asked if they considered having six houses instead of seven. Attorney Waters said then it would become a standard subdivision. He showed the plan for the subdivision and said they had issues with the second lot with the width and wetlands. But they would make lot #6 stretch out and the rest of the lot would become lot #2, where they will incorporate most of the pond.

Ms. DeStefanis said there were a lot of trees being mowed down for the project. Ms. Smith agreed. Attorney Waters said if they did the subdivision, the commission wouldn't have any control. Ms. DeStefanis said but they would have control over 50% of them. Attorney Waters said true, but they would have little control of what trees could or couldn't be taken down.

Attorney Waters said with a subdivision, they would end up with two driveways off West Rocks and two off of Blue Mountain Road, but to get the grades, they would end up regrading significantly to get up to the site. He expressed that was one reason the Conservation Development was a bonus, because they can maintain it as an association. He said that everything that gets planted was subject to approval, but for a subdivision, there are no controls.

Mr. Caputo asked if more trees were being saved or less as a result of the Conservation Development. Attorney Waters said he thought more trees were being saved, because the way it is proposed, this will preserve more of the areas he pointed to on the plan.

Ms. Ackerman said she was concerned about the units being near the wetlands. She thought by not being able to see what could have been done by means of a subdivision, it was difficult to determine if the Conservation Development was a better option.

Ms. Smith spoke to the matter of doing a subdivision and the possibility that this type of proposal would save trees. She pointed out that trees aid in absorbing water a great deal.

Ms. DeStefanis asked about the sequence of building. It was stated they would build the first two houses as soon as possible, but once the site disturbance begins, it will be approximately 8 months to complete. And then they will start the next phase to build two more houses and then three more. Mr. Strait thought that a year per phase was a reasonable time line.

Attorney Waters said for the last public hearing, there were about four people in favor out of the thirty (30) people that were in attendance. But the primary concern was the project going forward as a conservation development vs. a subdivision.

The Chair asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the application
The Chair asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition of the application
Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

**** MS. SMITH MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEAIRNG**

**** MS. ACKERMAN SECONDED**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

DISCUSION/DECISION

a) 125 & 129 Perry Avenue - #S05-210 - Loudon
Three lot subdivision of land adjacent to a wetland

Mr. Wrinn said the Planning Commission was waiting on a vote to give them time to review the report. He explained this project involved a rear lot in the center where it slopes back to a stone wall. There are wetlands on the other side of the wall. He noted there was a draft resolution in the packet.

Ms. Smith said she had a concern if the application was granted; that the applicant should understand there may be problems building on the lot because of impacts from the septic system. So if it is approved, they will have to make sure there are no negative impacts.

**** MR. CAPUTO MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE 129 PERRY AVENUE - #S05-210 - LOUDON - THREE LOT SUBDIVISION OF LAND ADJACENT TO A WETLAND. SUBJECT TO THE CONDTIONS OUTLINED IN THE MEMO DATED MARCH 2, 2005**

RESOLVED: THAT CONSERVATION APPLICATION #S05-210, FOR A THREE (3) LOT SUBDIVISION ADJACENT TO A WETLAND AND WATERCOURSE, BE GRANTED TO LISA L. LOUDON AND ARTHUR ALAN AND DIANE LOUDON FOR PROPERTY AT 125 and 127 PERRY AVENUE, NORWALK, CT [DISTRICT 5, BLOCK 43, TAX LOTS 2A AND 3] WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. ANY SITE DEVELOPMENT ON LOT "2" WOULD REQUIRE THE PRIOR APPROVAL OF A CONSERATION PERMIT. THIS CURRENT CONSERVATION PERMIT, SOLELY FOR SUBDIVISION OF THE PROPERTY, DOES NOT REPRESENT AN APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY SITE DEVELOPMENT LAYOUT NOR IS IT AN APPROVAL TO ALTER ANY LAND ADJACENT TO ANY WETLAND OR WATERCOURSE WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION.

2. ANY CHANGE TO THE PLANS PRESENTED FOR THIS APPLICATION, ENTITLED "SUBDIVISION MAP PREPARED FOR ARTHUR ALAN LOUDON, 129 PERRY AVENUE AND LISA L. LOUDON, 125 PERRY AVENUE", AS DATED JULY 11, 2003 AND LAST REVISED FEBRUARY 3, 2005 AND PREPARED BY CHARLES L. LEONARD, LAND SURVEYOR, WILL REQUIRE A RETURN TO THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION FOR REVIEW.

** MR. KYDES SECONDED

** MOTION PASSED WITH FIVE VOTES IN FAVOR AND TWO VOTES IN OPPOSITION (COMMISSIONERS: ACKERMAN AND HOLOWINKO)

b) 595 Westport Avenue (Pepperidge Farm) - #S05-211 - FF Realty, LLC
Construction of three multi-unit residential structures, additional office space, and associated parking lots and garages, storm water drainage and landscaping in and adjacent to wetlands and watercourses

Attorney Waters stated he would speak as the representative for the applicant. He said this property was the Pepperidge Farm site. They were proposing to eliminate the bakery and put in (235) units. They were talking about 16-acres of the property that is located predominantly in the B#2-Zone. He said what will be permitted by zoning is (357) units, but they were only proposing (235). They are proposing 111,000 sq. ft of space. He said he submitted a full set of the application with responses to staff comments. They were here to present additional information that would be presented by the project professionals.

Attorney Waters further walked the commission through the project. He displayed the current conditions of the property near Hills Lane and Fullen Road that connects to Lois Street. There are currently two driveways used for primary access to the property. He pointed out the 3-story existing office building and where the bakery was. He indicated the area of wetlands in front of the property and another area near Hills Lane and Fullin Road that was denoted in pink.

Ms. Smith asked if there was only one area of concern for wetlands along Westport Avenue. Attorney Waters pointed out the areas of impact. He said there were wetlands in

the front and two other areas which he pointed to. He further pointed to the trees on the plan that they were proposing to plant. He pointed to an area where they would drive in. He pointed out there were three residential buildings next to each other. All the parking is located underground. The driveway will continue onto an existing parking area and new deck area which he pointed to. He said this area would provide parking services for all of the Pepperidge Farm use.

Ms. Smith asked if there would be new retail and she asked if Pepperidge Farm planned to stay there. Attorney Waters said they would stay there. There is also a provision for expansion sometime in the future.

Attorney Waters continued to explain the plan. He said they would have walking trails and a boardwalk system around the wetlands. In addition, there will be a significant planting plan. He clarified no retail was proposed.

Mr. Ted Hart, the Professional Engineer talked about the drainage. He said they had a drainage system that circles the new residential building. The drainage will be picked up and piped through plumbing and then discharged to the main access way back to the parking lot. There is also new drainage on the easterly side near Hills Lane. They also picked up drainage from Hills Lane and Terra Nova where the water comes down to the wetland area in front. He noted the area used to continually flood, but the Department of Transportation inserted an 18" pipe to correct that. So the drainage in that area will remain unchanged. He further noted there was a lot of impervious cover, but they will reduce it by 4/10ths of an acre. He said they would submit a hydrology study to Ms. Cherichetti.

Mr. Hart addressed the comment of having a sidewalk on Westport Avenue. They looked at the situation to see if they could bridge a portion of wetlands down to Route-1. He said he met with Dick Linnartz and discussed this. They provided four (4) vortech units to collect oil and sediment prior to going into the wetlands area. Also, all parking is underground and it gets drained to the sanitary sewer system. They also provide a wetland-planting plan.

Mr. William Root, Soil Scientist said he flagged the wetlands on site and prepared a report. He explained there is a natural drainage divide that breaks the watershed in small pieces; one is on Fullen Road and Hills Lane. The wetlands are perched and they are very small narrow disturbed areas. The wetland in back has been impacted by construction on Hills Lane. Overall, the wetlands have low functional value. He further noted some mitigation work was done in the area he pointed to and he flagged those areas also. He explained that for other wetlands along Fullen Road, the area has been heavily impacted and the base of the slope is very rocky, so it's extremely disturbed.

Mr. Dave Dickson, the Landscape Architect spoke about the mitigation proposed. He pointed out the area depicted on the plan from the corner to the parking lot. All the pavement sheet flows down and across and free flows through the paved scuppers. He noted the entire paved area would have curbing. He said they developed a swale

restoration plan of three treatments. They are proposing a stabilized grass swale seeded with conservation wildlife seed mix. He further noted the second phase is more reinforced with a cobble bottom. And at every 30 ft., they will have a cobble check dam. They also intend to go back to the natural look of weathered cobbles.

Ms. Smith asked what was meant by reinforced cobbles. Mr. Dickson said the bottom of the channel will be seeded and check dam will be introduced every 30 ft.

Mr. Dickson went on to say they will use a variety of wetlands plants. The intent is to provide for habitat back to the area. They will save some significant trees by putting a well around some of them. He pointed out where the bridge and boardwalk would be. He noted some time in the future, the area would probably dry up, so they needed to try to interpret what would happen. He said the amount of water would persist, so they would propose a conservation wildlife mix. Overall, the site will be maintained. They will also create a riprap effect in the area he pointed to on the plan.

He further reviewed what was planned for the wetlands.

Attorney Waters said procedurally, they met with staff persons in Westport; they sent comments back and he will submit them for review. He noted they also filed with the Zoning Commission.

Ms. DeStefanis asked if he had a copy of Ms. Cherichetti's memo dated March 15, 2005 outlining the items requested. Attorney Waters s □

