

NORWALK CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

APRIL 8, 2003

ATTENDANCE: Matt Caputo, Chairman (6:10pm); Ed Holowinko; Anne Cagnina; Andrew Kydes; Marny Smith; Jane Corcillo (6:05pm); Karen DeStefanis (6:10pm).

STAFF: Alexis Cherichetti, Snr. Environmental Officer, Planning & Zoning; Erin Leonard.

Mr. Caputo called the meeting to order at 6:10pm. Ms. Leonard called the roll. There were 7 commissioners present.

RECEIPT AND DISCUSSION

A. 442 MAIN AVENUE - SELIGSON PROPERTIES - #S03-138 - CONSTRUCTION OF A MULTI-FAMILY (25 UNIT) RESIDENTIAL COMPLEX AND ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING IN AND ADJACENT TO A WETLAND

Ms. Cherichetti said that all the requests of staff have been met with the exception of a drainage report from a professional engineer. She recommended that a decision be put off until that report had been submitted and reviewed by staff.

**** MS. SMITH MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION**

**** MR. KYDES SECONDED**

**** MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Ms. Suchy, the attorney representing Seligson Properties, said that the applicant was before the Commission with a summary permit application. There was a small pocket of wetland that straddled the property line. The property currently had a single-family residence with a driveway. The proposed construction would be a multi-residential development with 25 units. She stated that there was 600 square feet of limited quality wetlands. She then requested that the Commission consider the findings of the Soil Scientist secured to evaluate the wetland, before determining if a public hearing would be

necessary. She added that there would be no work conducted within the wetland area itself, only on the regulated area that surrounded the wetland.

Mr. Kenny, a Soil Scientist and registered Landscape Architect, then gave his report on the wetland. He said that he was responsible for delineating and evaluating the wetland accordingly. He stated that the wetland was a small with a lot of invasive species. It is a sloping system which was indicative of a lower quality wetland due to its incapacity to perform typical wetland functions. He pointed out that due to the proximity, wild life that would use the property was well adapted to living in close proximity to humans. The primary function of the wetland was brown water discharge. The soil on the property was relatively shallow and did not have a large capacity to hold water. The wetland was not connected to a stream, which reduced the value of the wetland even more. He continued to state that the proposed development would direct storm water away from it. In addition, there would be native wetland plants that would be aggressive enough to discourage the invasive plants from re-growing. Mr. Kenny then summarized by saying that due to the low quality combined with the fact that the development was occurring around the property, that there would be very little, significant impact to the wetland.

Ms. Smith wondered if it would be possible for the neighboring property owners to work with Seligson on an approved planting plan.

Mr. Kydes inquired if there would be any blasting occurring and what affect would it have on the gas pipeline. Mr. Wardell, the landscape designer, responded that some blasting was anticipated, but said that necessary precautions would be taken to protect the pipeline. He added that since the pipeline was not embedded in the rock, he did not foresee any problems.

Ms. Suchy then commented that the applicant would also be applying for a minimum variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, which required a mandatory public hearing. She further added that the project had to also go before the Zoning Commission for special permit and would be the last of the required agencies that they needed to apply. She commented that if there was concern about public interest, these hearing would provide ample opportunity for the public to be heard.

Mr. Kydes inquired about the location of parking for the unit. Ms. Suchy answered saying that each unit would be assigned one parking space under the facility and one outside.

Ms. Corcillo then asked if there was any consideration to placing the back patios a little further out away from the wetlands. Mr. Wardell stated that the patios had already been adjusted from the original plans. He said that the patios might be eliminated and that above grade balconies were being considered in its place.

Mr. Kydes wanted to know how the change would affect the recreation area. Mr. Wardell responded that it would not affect the recreation area.

Ms. Cherichetti commented that staff needed a drainage report, which would give a detail of the proposed overflow outlets located east of the wetland. Also, she would like to see a more specific planting plan for the mitigation area.

Mr. Caputo inquired about the timeframe needed by the applicant in order to provide the information requested. Mr. Wardell responded that the drainage report was currently in the process of being completed and he anticipated that it would be done this week. He then said that he would be able to provide a more detailed planting plan much sooner.

Ms. Smith asked what type of surface the patio or balcony would be made up of. Mr. Wardell responded that the patio would be either a cut bluestone or random bluestone surface. Ms. Smith then asked if there would be some permeability into the soil. Mr. Wardell indicated that the proposed surface would provide a greater potential for ground water recharge.

Mr. Holowinko asked if it would be possible to come up with another plan. He expressed concern with the proximity of the building to the wetland. He also suggested that the parking area above the wetland be left as a natural slope. Mr. Wardell said that they could try to stabilize the slope by putting in some plants which would be of greater benefit to the system than increasing the setback.

Mr. Seligson spoke saying that the site plan had been revised from its original 32 units to currently 25 units but may go down to 23. He stated that the project would be high quality in every way. He said that the only to reconfigure the project was to no longer consider building townhouses but rather one building. He continued to state that there would be a 6% slope on one of the rows of townhouses. He added that when he first went to contract for the property, he believed the wetland was actually a puddle. It was later found to be wetland after they flagged the area. Mr. Holowinko commented that the DEP did not differentiate between high quality and low quality wetland but implied that he was open to improving the quality of the wetland if it were possible.

B. 7 ALLEN ROAD - PINSKY - #S03-139 - CONSTRUCTION OF TWO REAR ADDITIONS AND REMOVAL OF A SHADE TREE ADJACENT TO A POND

Ms. Cherichetti asked the applicant whether a variance was needed for the proposed work. She commented that the existing deck did not have a permit and that the applicant would need to get a signoff from Planning and Zoning. She added that the applicant should consider adding the deck construction to the application.

Mr. Pinsky commented that he did not need a variance for the proposed work. He explained that he and his wife planned to add an extra bedroom closet to their home. The original plan placed the bedroom approximately 4 feet from the setback. However,

he now planned to swap 5 feet with his neighbor, who had most of the pond on his property.

Ms. Cherichetti asked if a new map would be filed. Mr. Pinsky indicated that a new map would be filed.

Ms. Smith inquired if the permit for the deck needed to be in place before the Commission would have any input. Ms. Cherichetti responded negatively.

Ms. Smith also wondered how machinery would be able to get onto the property. Mr. Pinsky indicated that there was a path that led to the back.

Ms. Corcillo asked if the deck would have to be removed in order to do the addition. Mr. Pinsky indicated that the deck would remain intact.

Ms. Smith inquired if the existing deck would be used as part of the construction of the addition. Mr. Pinsky responded that there was no need.

Ms. Smith expressed concern about the lack of a vegetated buffer between the house, the deck and the water. She added that the Commission normally requested that there be a vegetated buffer in order to protect run-off into the wetlands. Mr. Pinsky responded that there was not a lot of room but he did intend to put in some trees. He added that a buffer would decrease visibility for them.

Mr. Holowinko wanted to know why the tree near the deck was being removed. Mr. Pinsky responded that the tree large, old and has outgrown the area. He further added that it was coming through the deck and had cracked the foundation of the deck.

Ms. Holowinko then asked if they would consider only making one addition instead of two. Mr. Pinsky said that the additions served to give his new wife a closet, as there was none now, and to also give more living space.

Ms. Smith inquired if there was a way to get the additional space by building out more towards Allen Road. Mr. Pinsky explained that his home was a split and there was no foundation to build out to Allen Road.

Mr. Holowinko asked if they were open to moving a portion of the existing deck in order to put in more plantings. Mr. Pinsky explained that the area Mr. Holowinko suggested moving was all concrete.

Ms. Smith then asked if the trees he intended to plant were wetland appropriate trees. Mr. Pinsky said he intended to put in silky dogwoods and other that his landscaper had suggested. He said though he was concerned about a buffer, his main purpose was to provide some type of screen for the house. He said he would plant whatever was approved by the Commission.

Ms. DeStefanis then asked if a specific planting plan would be provided as the current map only showed a spot for trees. Ms. Cherichetti recommended that the applicant worked on a better mitigation plan for the area that had more of a buffer in addition to the silky dogwoods. She then inquired if there was a fence between the proposed planting plan and the pond. Mr. Pinsky responded affirmatively. Ms. Cherichetti then asked if the fence could be relocated to make the plantings more directly adjacent to the pond. Mr. Pinsky stated that a fence had to be there for safety purposes. He indicated that the area was very small and that the little pathway there would be taken up with plantings. Ms. Cherichetti then stated that the Commission was concerned about the lack of a mitigation plan and wondered if a fence between the plants and the pond served a purpose. Mr. Pinsky responded that the 12 foot area did not leave many choices, but he was open to any recommendations or suggestions about appropriate shrubs.

Ms. Destefanis then expressed that she was not pleased with the map. She added that the map was not specific enough regarding the location of the fence or what types or number of plants would be put in. She indicated that she would like to see an alternative plan.

Mr. Caputo explained to the applicant that by law, they were allowed to ask for an alternative plan. Mr. Pinsky stated that there were not many other options. Mr. Holowinko suggested that an alternative plan be provided without the closet addition and a planting plan. Mr. Pinsky then commented that Mr. Holowinko's suggestion was not an alternative but rather a lesser plan. Ms. Smith stated that sometimes an alternative was a lesser plan. Mr. Caputo then commented that failure to provide an alternative plan would be parts of a reason to deny the application.

**C. CROOKED TRAIL - CITY OF NORWALK, DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS -
#S03-140 - INSTALLATION OF A SANITARY SEWER PIPE IN AND
ADJACENT TO A WETLAND**

Ms. Cherichetti recapped that a previous application for a similar proposal had already been to public hearing. After that public hearing was closed, the Commission had requested additional information. DPW was here to present the alternative plan they had prepared, which was discussed but not shown at the public hearing last September. Ms. Destefanis then inquired if another public hearing was necessary. Ms. Cherichetti indicated that it was up to the Commission to decide.

Mr. Linnartz, the current Director of Public Works, said that this was an 8-year project to provide sewer service over a trunk line that began at McKinley Street and would replace the need for the Rowayton Woods Condominium pump station. He added that sewer service would be provided to 205 units and would present a solution to the watercourse.

He further stated that almost everything was completed and had cost \$2 million dollars

Ms. Smith inquired about the cost of running a pump station. Mr. Linnartz indicated that it was not very expensive to run the station. However, to replace the pumps and the piping would cost over \$300,000.

Mr. Linnartz continued making his presentation while referring to a map that outlined where the line would run. He pointed out that the original plan had the primary line running in the wetland. The alternative plan had the sewer line closer to the West along the property line, which would affect over 30 trees. A property owner close to the area had expressed dissatisfaction with the removal of so many trees and it had been requested that an alternative plan be made. Accordingly, the plan being presented showed the pipeline running along side Crooked Trail, outside the tree line and slightly touching the edge of the wetland. He stated that the alternate plan reduced the impact on the wetland from .2 acres to .01 acre.

Ms. Smith commented that this plan was 150% better.

Ms. Destefanis said that her concern was with the neighbor. She added that she could not see anyone having a problem with the new plan.

Ms. Smith then said that she did not see a need for a public hearing. Mr. Caputo concurred.

**** MR. HOLOWINKO MOVED TO ACCEPT APPLICATION #S03-140**

**** MS. SMITH SECONDED**

**** MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr. Kydes then asked if there would be any manholes. Mr. Linnartz responded that there would be several manholes extending from Crooked Trail to beyond the railroad tracks.

D. 16 WOODCHUCK LANE - DRAGOVIC - #S03-142 - CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW IN-GROUND POOL ADJACENT TO A WETLAND AND WATERCOURSE

Ms. Cherichetti said that she was not able to contact Mr. Dragovic regarding this application. She stated that most of the applicant's backyard was wetlands and historically been all lawn. She added that he had an aboveground pool that was partially in the wetlands.

Mr. Caputo wanted to know how long did he live there. Ms. Cherichetti responded that she was not sure of the exact length of time but that it was over a decade.

Ms. Smith inquired if Ms. Cherichetti had noticed during her recent visit, a large dip in the trench leading from Woodchuck Lane to the garage area. Ms. Cherichetti indicated that she did not. Ms. Cagnina then added that there was a hole and a trench just to the

right of the stream. Ms. Cherichetti indicated that she would take another look because that issue had not been discussed with the applicant. She added that she also let the applicant know that a mitigation-planting plan would be needed in order to help stabilize the wetland.

Ms. Smith commented that there was a vegetable garden in the wetland, but that may be a permitted agricultural use. Ms. Cherichetti added that it had been there for some time.

E. 101 PERRY AVENUE - VIGNEAULT - #S03-141 - INSTALLATION OF A NEW DRAINAGE PIPE IN AND ADJACENT TO A WETLAND AND WATERCOURSE

Mr. Allen, a professional Wetland Scientist from Landtech Consultants, spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said that the Vigneaults would like to replace a crushed clay, tile, drainage pipe that brought water from one side of the property to an existing outlet on the other side of the property. The disrepair was currently causing water to get into their basement. The proposed pipe would be 125 feet of corrugated metal. He added that the Commission's previous concern with the elevation of the pipe was addressed. There would be no change to the inlet elevation of the pipe as it would match the existing pipe.

Ms. Cherichetti said that the application was completed sufficiently to be accepted by the Commission.

**** MS. DESTEFANIS MOVED TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION**

**** MS. CORCILLO SECONDED**

**** MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr. Cherichetti added that the applicant had previously altered the plan to include a pool. However, because there was not enough information on the pool, the application was denied without prejudice. She further stated that staff had requested that the pipe be designed by a professional engineer. The applicant complied and removed the pool from the plans as well. Mr. Caputo then inquired if the all the information that had been requested last September had been provided. Ms. Cherichetti responded affirmatively.

Mr. Caputo then commented that the Commission could not vote on this application for another two weeks.

DECISION

A. 97 WOLFPIT AVENUE - REITH - #S03-137 - CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH ASSOCIATED DRIVEWAY AND LANDSCAPING ADJACENT TO A WETLAND

Mr. Caputo inquired about the earliest time that a decision had to be made. Ms. Cherichetti responded that a decision had to be made by the second meeting in May.

Ms. Smith said that she hoped that the waterline would be repaired before the commencement of the driveway.

**** MS. SMITH MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION #S03-137
SUBJECT TO THE**

**CONDITIONS LISTED IN THE ATTACHED MEMORANDUM DATED
MARCH 28TH, 2003**

FROM MS. CHERICHETTI

**** MS. CAGNINA SECONDED**

**** MOTION CARRIED WITH 6 IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (MR. KYDES)**

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

**** MR. KYDES MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA IN ORDER TO
CONSIDER THE**

MARCH 25, 2003 MINUTES

**** MR. HOLOWINKO SECONDED**

**** MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

A. MARCH 11, 2003 MINUTES

Ms. Cherichetti said that the minutes for March 11th had already been previously approved.

B. MARCH 18, 2003

Ms. Cherichetti commented that the minutes from March 18th had to be tabled once again.

C. MARCH 25, 2003

Corrections:

Page 2, 1st paragraph, second sentence: denotes the center of the property..change to
...denotes the center of the driveway

Page 2, 3rd paragraph, ..Otto Field..change to **Otto Theall**

Page 2, 5th paragraph, 1st sentence, ...ciduous trees..change to...**deciduous trees**

Page 3, 1st sentence, ...encroaching on the property..change to ...**encroaching on the wetland**

Page 5, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence, ...might not be in their purview to plan it..change to..**might not be in the Conservation Commission's purview to plan it.**

**** MS. CORCILLO MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS AMENDED**

**** MS. SMITH SECONDED**

**** MOTION CARRIED WITH 6 IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (MR. KYDES)**

REFERRALS

A. ZONING - PRUDENTIAL CENTER FOR LEARNING & INNOVATION - 32 WEED AVENUE - AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS TO REVISE THE TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES ALLOWED IN THE RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT ZONE

Ms. Cherichetti explained that a referral allowed the Commission to make a recommendation or a comment. The applicant had the choice to follow the recommendation or not.

Ms. Cherichetti stated that the Prudential Center, which was currently located on 32 Weed Avenue, operated as an educational facility but had a very limited capacity. The purpose of the application was to revise the zoning regulation to allow them to hold conventions and other events. She pointed out that there would be no physical change to the property only the amount of use would be affected. She added that Prudential was considering doing some kind of conservation easement along the front of the property in conjunction with the homeowners adjacent to the pond.

Ms. Smith said that she understood that Prudential was seeking the zoning amendment even though the property was currently up for sale. She added that she did not see a reason to not grant the zone change.

Ms. DeStefanis wondered if Norwalk residents were allowed access to the facility since the property had exchanged hands. Ms. Cherichetti said that she would check but she believed that it was private property. She added that a portion of the easement may include public access.

Mr. Holowinko suggested that a note should be sent to Zoning stating that the Commission encouraged the use of the conservation easement. The Commissioners indicated to be in agreement with this idea.

Ms. DeStefanis expressed that she was concerned that the amendment could be used in the future to form the basis of an application to expand the property.

Ms. Cagnina asked if the amendment was quantitative. Ms. Cherichetti responded that the application was simply to allow them to broaden the use of the facility. She said that it would not be opened to every group and would be primarily for corporate use. She added that she would write a note from the Conservation Commission to Planning & Zoning stating that there was no comment regarding the amendment. The amendment however, could not be used as a basis for future physical expansion of the site and that the Conservation Commission endorsed the use of the conservation easement.

COMMENTS OF STAFF

A. DECLARATORY PERMITS

Ms. Cherichetti stated that there were two declaratory permits. The first was for an aboveground swimming pool on 32 Starlight Drive. The other was issued for a construction of a side yard addition on 170 Silvermine Avenue. The addition would be over 60 feet from a watercourse.

B. PROGRESS REPORT

Ms. Cherichetti stated that there one notice of violation that had been sent out on March 28th for clear-cutting all vegetation adjacent to a watercourse and wetland. The limit of where they stopped was 80 feet from the wetland. The applicant was directed to bring in a site plan depicting all the work they have done and a mitigation plan. She stated that the house was condemned due to structural damage caused by a large tree falling on the house. She stated that an extension was given to the applicant and that there would be an update in May. She added that the owners might come before the Commission in May for a new home.

C. REVIEW OF GENERAL MEETING PROCEDURES

Ms. Cherichetti said that tonight she would address general procedures of conservation commissions in general. At the next meeting, she would go over specifics of being an inland/wetland agency.

She began by stating that conservation commissions themselves had no regulatory jurisdiction and gained power by making sound recommendations. She said that this conservation commission had a dual role in that it was both a non-regulatory agency and a regulatory inland/wetland agency. She stated that 70 out of 140 conservation commissions were combined with inland/wetland commissions. According to the Connecticut Association of Conservation and Inland/Wetland commission (CACIWC), found that the combined commissions tended to do less conservation oriented projects because so much time was taken up by permits.

She handed out copies of the State statutes that defined a conservation commission as well as Norwalk city codes, which was the local paper that gave the Commission its powers. She stated that the general regulations were adopted in 1973. She added that later in 1973, the Conservation Commission was also designated as an inland wetland agency. She commented that technically Common Council could change the City code and designate another entity as the Inland/Wetland Agency. She stated that the code discussed the terms and the expirations.

She went on to explain that the Conservation Commission purview was non-regulatory, which meant that it was mandated to essentially compile and analyze information and hopefully disseminate that information to other land use agencies.

She then referred to the handbook for conservation commissions, which was a publication done by CACIWC. She said it dealt with what could and could not be done, tangible goals within the purview of the Conservation Commission. It also addressed many issues that were addressed in the State statutes.

She then handed out general information on running a meeting, making a motion, public hearings etc. Specifically she stated that the agenda for the next meeting was very broad and needed to be amended to show some kind of order of priority. She said that there were 3 active goals: open space, Conservation Commission education and public education.

Ms. Smith stated that Mr. Kraus had inquired if there was some way to get a realistic idea what was open space. Ms. Cherichetti then referred to a map stating that she would get a copy of the GIS map that showed all the wetland permits that had been issued by location. She added that there was a copy of the existing open space map in the room next to P&Z. She commented that the Conservation handbook was very specific about having clear goals for each meeting.

She continued to speak about what to do in a regular meeting. It addressed issues on appointing a Vice-Chairman or Acting Chairman. Ms. Cagnina asked if a Vice-Chairman had been appointed. Ms. Cherichetti suggested that they might want to schedule an

election for a Vice-Chairman. Mr. Caputo stated that per the rules, elections for a Vice Chair could not occur until July.

She then handed out a sheet about making a motion. She pointed out that there should be no discussion about a motion until it has been seconded and that all motions need to be seconded or they did not carry. There also should not be any discussion about the motion with the applicant involved. She continued to state that four votes were needed to carry a motion. She then gave a few verbatim examples of how to make a motion and approve an application.

Ms. DeStefanis inquired on the rule regarding accepting an application. Ms. Cherichetti commented that there was a full sheet regarding applications that would be discussed on April 22nd.

Ms. Cagnina asked if an application was accepted and there were no other issues, could it be turned into a declaratory application. Ms. Cherichetti responded negatively. She went on to explain that there were different fees and forms that applied. She commented that when an applicant came to her office, a determination had to be made on whether the application was declaratory, summary or plenary. Declaratory applications were usually very minor.

Mr. Caputo then commented that if a motion was made and no one seconded that the motion would die. He stated that every motion should be seconded out of courtesy in order to get the issue on the floor for discussion. Ms. Cherichetti pointed out that by seconding a motion was not equivalent to voting in favor.

She then went over the difference between public meetings, public hearings and other hearings. She said that every meeting that the Commission had was a public meeting and did not necessitate public comment. She further stated that a public meeting gave the public the right to attend but no right to participate. She then said that there were regulatory meetings and non-regulatory meetings. During a regulatory meeting, members of the Commission acted as judges and the applicant comes for more information and the Commission makes a decision. She then stressed that only the applicant and representatives of the applicant were allowed to speak in public meetings.

Mr. Caputo related that Ms. Cherichetti had shared a recent experience at a meeting at which two members of the Attorney General's office were present. These officials indicated that it was not wise to tolerate people who were not allowed to speak to make a comment. The reason being that the procedure would be tainted and any action on the application could be subject to appeal. More discussion took place on what was allowed at a public meeting. Ms. Cherichetti then read from the State statutes regarding applications and public hearings. She addressed different ways to avoid tainting a procedure including asking members of the public about their purpose for attending the meeting. She then stated that a public hearing should not be viewed as a punishment to the applicant but rather be treated as another method of holding a meeting with the

chance of public participation. She added that more public hearings would result in fewer turning out.

Ms. Cherichetti then commented that there were other hearings called show-cause hearings that occurred when there was an Inland/Wetland enforcement action that required a cease and desist order. The accused violator had to attend a show cause hearing conducted by the Commission in which he or she had to explain the reason for the violation. She said it was a specific hearing between the applicant and the Commission and no other members of the public was allowed to participate.

Mr. Holowinko then inquired about how to handle if an application was being considered in a public meeting and someone interrupted by stating that the application was misrepresented. Ms. Cherichetti responded that before the packets reach the Conservation Commission for approval, she personally tried to visit every location and tried to work with the applicant to come up with an accurate map. She said that she recommends that in those situations, the person not be allowed to speak and that the application be tabled to give staff time to investigate the allegation. Ms. DeStefanis asked if the application could be tabled and a public hearing be held. Ms. Cherichetti responded affirmatively.

Mr. Kydes left the meeting at 8:40pm.

She then said that she recommended that the Commissioners read the handbook. Also, she added that the amended agenda would be mailed to the Commissioners.

COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

A. PROPOSAL TO SUPPORT LEGISLATIVE CHANGES REGARDING THE STATE OF CT SITING COUNCIL

Mr. Holowinko proposed that a letter to the State Legislature be sent supporting the changes to the Siting Council as outlined in Bill #6578. He wanted to know whether the Commission wanted to support the proposal.

Ms. Smith said that she thought the proposal had to go through two more committees before it came to the Conservation Commission. Mr. Holowinko responded that it was suggested that he was send letters to those committees as well. He stated that he had brought a sample letter for written by Ms. Cherichetti that could be modified.

Mr. Caputo suggested that a presentation be put together that gave some information about what the changes were and what the bill does. He added that the presentation be accompanied by a letter which stated what the Commission proposed regarding the bill. Mr. Holowinko said that a letter was already sent out. Ms. Cherichetti said that she had drafted a letter, at the request of the Mr. Holowinko and the rest of the Commission, in support of the bill to the State representatives. She then read the letter into the record.

Ms. Smith indicated that it was important to have to other two committees review it and get it out favorably.

Mr. Holowinko said that the changes the bill made allowed municipalities to participate on the Siting Council.

Mr. Caputo commented that if the letter was OK with the Commissioners, that motion be made.

**** MS. SMITH MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE MS. CHERICHETTI TO PREPARE THE LETTER IN ORDER FOR IT TO BE SENT IN THE NAME OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF NORWALK TO THE MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AND MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS**

**** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED**

**** MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Ms. Cherichetti then asked Mr. Holowinko for the names and addresses.

ADJOURNMENT

**** MS. SMITH MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING**

**** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED**

**** MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Montgomery

Telesco Secretarial Services