

NORWALK CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

**CITY OF NORWALK
CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MAY 14, 2002**

ATTENDANCE: Matthew Caputo, Chairman; Andrew Kydes; Karen Destefanis; Marny Smith; Les Bell
STAFF: Alexis Cherichetti, Senior Environmental Officer; Cheryl Vallerie
OTHERS: David Waters; Max Case, Michael Hopkins, Matthew Popp, Fred Canevari

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 pm.

- ** MR. BELL MOVED TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO MOVE AGENDA ITEMS OUT OF ORDER.**
- ** MS. SMITH SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

DECISIONS

Kerschner Development - 22 Betmarlea Road - #SDV-3526 - Four (4) lot subdivision adjacent to a wetland and watercourse.

Ms. Cherichetti reported that this application was for a 4 lot re-subdivision. The re-subdivision would create two lots for a new development. The two new building lots are between the existing church and the parsonage building. There are mapped wetlands and a watercourse on lot 1 and the adjacent property to the west. It is proposed that the two new lots will share a common driveway off of Bertmarlea Road. The construction of this driveway will come within 35.8 feet of the wetland and about 68 feet from the watercourse. The western property line of lot 2 is 24 feet from the wetland line. The applicant is proposing to limit disturbance to approximately 45 feet from the wetland line. She noted that the site development of this lot should return for a Conservation permit.

- ** MS. DESTEFANIS MOVED TO GRANT THIS APPLICATION WITH THE CONDITIONS STATED ON THE MAY 6, 2002 MEMORANDUM.**
- ** MS. SMITH SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (BELL).**

Ledgebrook Condominium Assoc. - Scribner Ave. and Gillies Ln. - #S02-99 - Filling & grading, landscaping, weed management, and removal of structures in and adjacent to a wetland and watercourse.

Ms. Cherichetti stated that she received a letter from the applicant, which addressed all of her concerns listed in the previous staff report. She stated that one of her concern was some kind of buffer between the watercourses. She also stated that an amended map was provided showing 5 feet of buffer between the watercourses, but she would prefer a 10 feet buffer.

**** MS. SMITH MOVED TO GRANT THIS APPLICATION FOR THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION WITH THE PROVISIO THAT THE BUFFER ZONE BE INCREASED BETWEEN THE WATER AND WHERE THE LAWN STARTS TO A 10 FEET WIDE BUFFER AND THE OTHER SPECIAL CONDITIONS LISTED ON THE MAY 6, 2002 MEMO.**

**** MR. KYDES SECONDED.**

**** MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (BELL).**

Bakken - 25 Felix Lane - #S02-90 - Filling and grading to level front yard adjacent to a wetland.

Ms. Cherichetti reported that this property has a large, approximately 0.4 acre wooded wetland system, approximately 32 feet north the house. The applicants propose to fill and grade the northern portion of their front yard and construct a 5 foot high retaining wall parallel to the wetland.

She stated that the applicants have been responsive to the Commission's requests to develop a planting plan for a wetland buffer (below and above the proposed wall) and to design the retaining wall further from the wetland. The new plan has the bottom of wall elevations of the retaining wall placed one to two feet higher in elevation than the first proposal. This results in a doubling of the distance to the wetland, from 5 feet to 10 feet. The limit of disturbance has increased from 2 feet to 3 feet along much of its length. The filled area would be maintained as a lawn area. The applicant has also proposed to lay sod, as opposed to seeding on the new graded area. The new planting plan includes plantings along the top of the wall. Three 8-10' trees, 18 three gallon container shrubs, and 12 two gallon container shrubs, all native to Connecticut are proposed along the wall. A planting plan for the buffer area between the wall and the wetland is also proposed. Thirty shrubs, all 3-4 feet in height and native to Connecticut are to be planted along the length of the wall.

Ms. Cherichetti also stated that one of her concerns with this proposal was the short term impact of erosion and sedimentation into the wetland. She noted that with the measures proposed by the applicant in addition to the additional 5 feet between the wall and the wetland, and if properly implemented, this should have only minimal impact to the wetland.

- ** MR. KYDES MOVED TO GRANT THIS APPLICATION WITH THE CONDITIONS STATED ON THE MAY 6, 2002 MEMORANDUM.
- ** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED.
- ** MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (BELL).

RECEIPT OF APPLICATION

Guerra - 24 East Rocks Road - #S02-102 - Clearing of vegetation in and adjacent to wetlands and adjacent to a pond

Ms. Cherichetti reported that Mr. Guerra submitted a permit application following a Notice of Violation of April 3, 2002. The notice stemmed from extensive landscaping work adjacent to a pond and in wetlands. The applicant removed nearly all of the existing woody growth from the banks along the Northern half of the pond's perimeter. In some of the cleared areas, the applicant has established lawn. Other areas are currently bare and not vegetated. The Notice of Violation required that he submit an application for the work that he has already done and that a restoration planting plan be submitted for these areas. The applicant has submitted a plan that was designed by a local landscape architect. It calls for the planting of 25 native shrubs along some of the cleared areas. The areas where lawn has been established will stay, but will remain uncut and the bare areas will be seeded with a native seed mix.

Additionally the residence of 24 East Rocks Road was constructed under Conservation Permit #663.S98 which was granted with conditions in April 1998. Gulick Construction built the house and Mr. Guerra purchased the property from Gulick in early 1999. Among the conditions of the permit were: The area between the proposed stone wall and the pond shall be left in its natural state and the entire slope around the pond shall be left in its natural state and the driveway shall be gravel.

The architect representing this application stated that the applicant was also asking for release of the original condition that the driveway be gravel. The applicant was also requesting walking access to the existing pond. Ms. Smith asked if there would be grass strips along the paved driveway. She replied that the driveway itself was only 8 feet in width. Mr. Bell stated that he was the only commissioner here who approved this application before it was built and that these parameters were set before approving this application and he didn't feel they should be changed. He stated that glaciers created this area and he would rather preserve it in its natural state because of its uniqueness. Mr. Bell also stated that he would prefer to see the driveway remain gravel. Ms. Smith stated that she would like to see as much vegetation as possible around the pond.

Canevari - 6 Allen Road - #S02-103 - Construction of a new single family house adjacent to wetlands

Mr. Canevari stated that this proposed house was put as far back and away from the

wetland as possible with the setback constraints he was faced with. He stated that this was a 2 story house and they would have to dig down 6 feet in the front half of the foundation and fill the back half such that the basement floor would be 2 to 2.5 feet above the rear grade necessitating a little depth on the back of the house so the owners can step out from the basement without putting in fill in the back. He submitted drawings and stated that what they have done was "a deck over a deck". Mr. Canevari stated that there would be deck for the basement and a deck for the first floor and there would be no stairs leading to the decks in either case. He stated that the only access to the decks would be from the house itself to further prevent people from the wetland. Mr. Bell stated that they could build steps. Mr. Canevari replied if they get a permit. Mr. Bell stated that they can physically build steps without a permit until someone complains. Mr. Bell also stated that this house was so closed to the wetland, he didn't see how they can keep people from making a lawn right into the wetlands. Mr. Bell asked if they were going to put boulders or a wall around the wetland area. Mr. Canevari replied that he intends to leave the wetland alone. He stated that he could put a silk fence if it was the commission's desire. Mr. Kydes suggested a small New England style stone wall. Mr. Bell stated that he would have to see a plan. Ms. Smith asked where the big apple trees were. Mr. Canevari replied that they were behind the 2 structural homes which he illustrated from the map. Mr. Bell asked why not build a smaller house. Mr. Canevari replied that they build what people want. Mr. Canevari also stated that they needed 4 concrete columns 12 inches in diameter to support the deck. He stated that everything on the front and back of the house would be restored to the existing grade and the only fill would be in the front of the house and the grade would be raised to 2 feet to match the 82 existing contour, which was about 10 feet east of the garage entrance. He stated that they would have to fill the 10 feet with as much as 2 feet of fill and the material would be the material excavated from the basement and there would be no exchange of material beyond that area. Mr. Canevari also stated that there would be exchange of material in the driveway where the driveway makes a bend. He stated that this bend was 2 feet high and before it makes a bend it is 2 feet low. They intend to push 2 feet of soil from the western portion easterly to level out the driveway.

Ms. Cherichetti stated that Mr. Canevari altered his narrative, which was inconsistent with his plan. She also stated that she was concerned that his original plan had very little grading on the driveway and that the disturbance was 15 feet from the wetland and there were some large trees near the limit of disturbance line. Mr. Canevari stated that no trees would be removed. Ms. Cherichetti stated that there were no alternatives stated other than there are no alternatives and she was concerned that the area near the driveway was opened and inviting use of the property. She stated that she would prefer to see shrubs put in.

MODIFICATION OF PERMIT

Kydes - 88 North Taylor- #S01-75a - addition of a rear deck and side yard retaining wall

Mr. Kydes left the meeting at 6:53 pm.

Ms. Cherichetti stated that the applicant wishes to amend portions of the original house construction permit which was granted in October 2001. A new 18 x 12' rear deck is proposed. The deck was not included in the final plans that were approved under the permit. The deck will be 69' from the wetland on the adjacent property. In addition, the applicant wishes to do some additional re-grading in the rear yard of the property, which would involve the construction of a 2 foot high retaining wall along the eastern property line. This wall would be approximately 75' from the wetland. From that wall, grading would occur in the rear yard.

**** MR. BELL MOVED TO APPROVE THIS MODIFICATION.**

**** MS. SMITH SECONDED.**

**** MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (KYDES).**

RELEASE OF BOND

Kydes - # S00-36 - 17 Glenwood Avenue - Construction of a two-family house.

Ms. Cherichetti stated all conditions have been met and in conformance with regulations.

**** MR. BELL MOVED TO RELEASE THE BOND ON THIS ITEM.**

**** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED.**

**** MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (KYDES).**

Mr. Kydes returned to the meeting at 6:55 pm.

Faulkner - # S-574 - 148 Chestnut Hill Rd. - Rear addition and mitigation planting plan

**** MR. BELL MOVED TO RELEASE THE BOND ON THIS ITEM.**

**** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Surace - #695.S99 - 246 East Rocks Road - Construction of single-family house

**** MR. BELL MOVED TO RELEASE THE BOND ON THIS ITEM.**

**** MS. SMITH SECONDED.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

April 9, 2002

- ** MS. SMITH MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 9, 2002.**
- ** MR. KYDES SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (BELL).**

April 23, 2002

The following changes were made the minutes of April 23, 2002:

Global replacement of Mr. Lusio to Mr. Losio.

Global replacement of Sier to Seir.

Page 1 - Attendance - Remove Erin Leonard and replace with Cheryl Vallerie.

Page 7 - Second motion passed with 4 votes in favor (Losio; Smith; Destefanis; Caputo).

Page 8 - End of discussion add the following motion:

- ** MR. SCIABBARRASSI MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.**
- ** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Page 9 - Release of Bond add:

Ms. Cherichetti stated that it appeared that all conditions of the permit have been met.

- ** MS. DESTEFANIS MOVED TO RELEASE THE BOND.**
- ** MR. LOSIO SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- ** MR. KYDES MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 23, 2002 AS CORRECTED.**
- ** MS. SMITH SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (BELL).**

PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing began at 7:15 pm. Mr. Caputo stated that the applicant had already made a presentation at the previous meeting at which point there was full and ample opportunity for the neighbors to speak in favor or in opposition. He stated that the applicant had an opportunity to rebut and Corporation Counsel have advised the Commission that if they continued the public hearing for the purpose of hearing from experts speaking in opposition to the application that they go right to that and when that is concluded, then allow the applicant to rebut. Mr. Caputo stated that at the last meeting there were 6 members of the Conservation Commission present, two of those six

members were not here this evening and that they were out of State. Mr. Caputo stated that Mr. Bell was present tonight but could not participate in the voting process because he did not hear prior testimonies relating to this application. He also stated that the Commission would have to vote on this application this evening unless the applicant agreed to an extension.

Silvermine Golf Club - North Seir Hill Rd. - #S02-97 - Installation of sewer line adjacent to wetlands

Michael Hopkins presented his testimony on behalf of the Silvermine Homeowners Association regarding this application. In it he stated that the installation of the sewer would require excavation adjacent to wetland areas. The construction would require excavation to a depth of eight feet below the existing grade in the area. The proposed extension would utilize approximately 315 feet of existing eight inch pipe. Regulated wetlands were present within 12 feet of the centerline of the existing pipe and completion of the project would require additional excavation within 24 feet of wetlands. The construction zone would be within a former roadbed and it appeared that much of the proposed corridor was currently vegetated with shrubs and small trees, which would have to be removed to facilitate construction. The applicant does not address impacts associated with the removal of this vegetation or other physical disturbances during construction and no information regarding the depth to bedrock has been provided with the application. Bedrock outcrops were present at various locations near the proposed sewer corridor, which indicates that blasting will be necessary during construction. No boring, test pit or geotechnical data was provided to determine the extent to which blasting would be required or whether blasting will be necessary in the area adjacent to the wetlands. Information regarding the depth to bedrock in the vicinity of the wetlands should be provided to allow an evaluation of this concern. Blasting can create fractures, or open existing cracks, fissures and/or bedding joints in the bedrock. This can create preferential groundwater flow pathways. The presence of such pathways in the shallow bedrock near or beneath a wetland can affect surface water elevations in the wetlands or vernal pools. In this case, it is assumed that such pathways would have the effect of enhancing the natural drainage characteristics, which could lower water table elevations. This could result in lowering the water level in the wetlands or any associated pools, which would adversely affect the wetland.

Based on the typical trench section details provided, the sewer line will be installed in a highly permeable crushed stone bedding that will be completely or partially below the seasonal high water table in the vicinity of the wetlands. This configuration creates a potential for the bedding to serve as a preferential flow pathway, which may adversely impact the wetlands. The impacts in this case would be similar to those previously discussed.

Limited information was provided on the construction procedures. Although good construction practices and other safeguards can reduce potential impacts, it is my opinion that a risk of adverse impacts to nearby wetlands is inherent in any construction activity. Therefore, construction in the vicinity of wetlands should be considered only when no

feasible or prudent alternatives are available.

No information was provided in the application as to how the proposed sewer line will be maintained. I assume that it would be necessary to provide periodic vehicle access to the manholes. No information was provided as to how such access would be provided, and therefore, it is not possible to fully evaluate associated impacts.

Alternative Evaluation - Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations require the evaluation of alternatives to the proposed action, and the basis for the selection of the proposed alternative. The narrative prepared by Grumman Engineering states that the alternatives evaluated included the relocation of portions of the extension east of Route 7 and a "no action" alternative. The first alternative would not affect the portion of the line adjacent to the wetland areas. Grumman narrative states that the proposed sewer extension is clearly preferable to the no action alternative, but does not elaborate on the basis for this position. In my opinion the no action alternative is a feasible and prudent alternative which eliminates potential impacts to the wetlands. This alternative warrants further evaluation.

This application states that the purpose of the proposed sewer line extension is to avoid potential septic problems. There is no mention of actual problems with the current system at the Golf Club. Based on research performed by the Norwalk Association of Silvermine Homeowners, the Norwalk Health department is unaware of any problems with the current septic systems at the Silvermine Golf Club, and no violations have been cited regarding sewage disposal problems. Properly designed and operated septic systems can be operated without significant environmental or public health impacts, particularly in cases where adequate land area is available. Considering the amount of land available on the Golf Club property, I am convinced that septic systems could be used effectively to handle the current and proposed future demands. It is my understanding that the Golf Club is served by public water supply. This would substantially reduce the risk associated with potential septic system failures. It is also my understanding that the septic systems at the Golf Club are located at least several hundred feet from any drinking water wells and are remote from wetlands or other sensitive receptors. Therefore, it appears that failure of these systems would not pose any imminent risk to the public health, and that time would be available to take corrective actions, if failure were to occur. On this basis, it is my opinion that alternative of not constructing the proposed sewer extension and continuing to use the existing septic systems is a feasible alternative.

Based on my estimates, the proposed sewer line extension would cost between \$200,000 and \$300,000. The cost would be significantly higher where substantial blasting was required. On this basis, it appears that the construction of the proposed sewer line would not offer substantial cost savings over the continued operation of the existing systems, even if major upgrades were required in the future. Therefore, the no action alternative appears to be a prudent alternative to the proposed sewer line extension.

Another issue related to alternatives evaluation is that by using the existing eight inch pipe beneath Route 7. The use of this pipe may make it unavailable to other future

projects. Therefore, if it were to become necessary in the future to construct additional sewers in this area, it may be necessary to install additional pipes beneath Route 7. This would involve a much larger construction project than the proposed project, which would be likely to have substantially greater adverse impacts than the proposed project.

Finally it is noted that Plan of Development for the City of Norwalk 1990-2000 states that it is the City's policy to limit extension of the sanitary sewer system solely to areas where septic systems are not viable. No demonstration has been made that indicates that septic systems are not viable in this area.

Attorney Max Case also gave his testimony on behalf of the Silvermine Homeowners Association. He stated that the report the Commission has in its files states that the sewer extension would allow the golf club to not be restricted by the limitations of its current septic and which would facilitate further development on North Seir Hill Road and on Yew Street. He stated that they find the special conditions that were attached to be inconsistent with the scope of the work especially the work that was suggested by Attorney Waters at the previous public hearing. He stated that there was testimony by him that the project would cost approximately \$200,000 and there was additional testimony that it may cost up to \$300,000 and if there was any blasting the cost could be even more. He stated that the suggestion of a \$1000 performance bond to be posted was in their opinion offered the City little or no protection from potential problems on the job. There was no incentive for the applicant to finish the job. He stated that at a minimum the performance bond should equal the projected cost of the project. He stated that they concurred with the Commission that a passbook be required to ensure that the work gets done in an orderly fashion. He stated that they also needed to have some assurances that warranties from subcontractors and contractors who perform work or supply materials on this site would go to the Commission in the event they are any difficulties in the project or if the project was not completed as have been proposed. They also needed to have the assurance that they have the right to go and inspect and that the Commission will be given ample notice if and when work is going to take place and that the Commission will have a construction schedule from the applicant and if there is any deviation from the construction schedule the Commission should be aware. He also stated that the Commission also needed to have a maintenance schedule and a mechanics lien to ensure that no third party right would supercede the Commission's right. He stated that the commission also needed to be provided assurance that they will be no further expansion.

Mr. Waters presented his rebuttal. He stated that none of the testimonies presented this evening addressed the issues for which this public hearing was held for. He stated this hearing was held to discuss water budget, blasting, vernal pools and the quality of the wetlands in the vicinity of the area and Attorney Case addressed none of these. Mr. Waters stated that he has reviewed Mr. Case's testimony and he was a little bit confused as to why he was getting into some of the issues he raised. Mr. Waters stated that this Commission deals with issues of "conservation, inland watercourses and wetlands". It does not deal with mechanics liens, WPCA agreements, or bonding to ensure completion of a project. He stated that what this commission bonds for is to ensure that there is no damage to the wetlands and if there is activity in the neighborhood of the wetlands that

there is sufficient funding to make sure those wetlands are restored if there was a problem. Mr. Waters stated that Mr. Case also may not be aware of what this Commission already requires. He noted that some of the issues Mr. Case raised such as a performance bond and notification by the applicant of the date construction is to begin are a typical condition that is required in any event. Similarly inspections by duly authorized representative of the commission are a standard condition in any event as well as delivery of a construction schedule for the job. Mr. Waters stated that items such as warranties and mechanics lien were not appropriate for this Commission. Mr. Waters stated they are required to enter into a WPCA (Water Pollution Control Authority) agreement with the City by statutes, which includes a bond established by the City for the maintenance of the a private portion of what becomes a public sewer system.

Mr. Waters stated as far as assurances regarding non-expansion, he stated that they did not make that assurance. Mr. Waters stated that what they stated was that this would be a private line because the applicant would be putting money into it. He stated that the reference that they would be back for modifications refers to the statement he made at a prior meeting in which he stated that "this particular applicant has been back before you a number of times and probably will be back before you again" because that is the nature of what they do. He stated that the fact is they are a golf course that has wetlands that are in proximity to it and he was sure that in the next year or two they will be back before this commission for something or another.

Mr. Waters asked Dean Martin to address the issue of preferential flow eluded by Mr. Hopkins in his testimony. Mr. Martin stated that the issue was raised of installation of a sewer line adjacent to existing wetland installed with crush stone bedding and that would create a natural channel for the water to flow down the bedding. Mr. Martin stated that the applicant has proposed to place impervious barriers that can be soil or clay in several locations adjacent to the wetland to basically block any water flow along the pipeline. He stated that his firm, Grumman Engineering, designed the sewer line in Westport which was installed within the last two years.

Mr. Waters also commented on Mr. Hopkins statement on a feasible and prudent alternative which was no action. Mr. Waters stated that the Golf Course was the applicant and there were other people who have an interest in this as well including the person whose property is located on the corner of Yew Street including other people with one-acre lots who were also having septic problems. He stated that the Silvermine Golf Course spends an average of \$13,000 annually just for maintenance of their septic system - and this does not incorporate the cost other people were putting into the maintenance of their septic system nor does it incorporate the potential for new systems that may be required. He stated that one can begin to see where it makes a lot of financial sense to go through with this project. He also stated that they were pretty certain of the area they were going to blast. He illustrated this area on a map and noted that the area that is in the immediate proximity to the wetland area was already disturbed and regraded as part of the construction of Super 7. He stated that there was not a lot of rock in the area where they were proposing to put the sewer line. He stated that they type of blasting they were proposing was very different from the type of blasting you often hear about. What they

were proposing was very discreet, very limited, and essentially just to get a trench through an existing roadbed. He stated that the fire marshal has jurisdiction over blasting in any area in the State.

Matthew Popp, Environmental Land Solutions, distributed his findings regarding vernal pools, and blasting. Mr. Popp confirmed that copies were also sent to the neighbors. He stated that the 3 wetlands in the area were already disturbed. He found no species (plant or wildlife) that were endangered or threatened in the area. The only significant vegetations were three white pines approximately 30 feet in height and he proposed planting 5 additional white pines and some native shrub species. Mr. Popp also testified that there were no vernal pools in the area based on the State's definition. He stated that construction of this project should have no adverse impact to the wetlands.

- ** **MS. DESTEFANIS MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.**
- ** **MR. KYDES SECONDED.**
- ** **MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (BELL).**

The public hearing was closed at 8 pm.

DECISIONS (CONTINUED)

The meeting was reconvened at 8:05 pm.

Silvermine Golf Club - North Seir Hill Rd. - #S02-97 - Installation of sewer line adjacent to wetlands

- ** **MR. KYDES MOVED TO DELAY VOTE ON THIS ITEM UNTIL MAY 28, 2002.**

Mr. Caputo asked Mr. Waters if he had any objection. Mr. Waters replied that the applicant would not have any objection to this delay. Mr. Waters confirmed this in writing and presented it to Ms. Cherichetti for the record.

- ** **MS. SMITH SECONDED.**
- ** **MOTION PASSED WITH 4 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 1 ABSTENTION (BELL).**

VIOLATIONS

Ms. Cherichetti presented a list of current wetland violations and noted that Mr. Guerra was no longer in violation.

COMMENTS OF STAFF

Current Violations - see attachment

This item was noted above.

Commissioner appointment to Housing Partnership

Mr. Caputo encouraged the members to think about participating in this commission and stated that this item should be included in the next agenda.

Mr. Bell stated that he has served on this commission for four years. Ms. Cherichetti stated that this commission met 4 times a year.

Ms. Cherichetti also advised on a referral from Darien for a 5-lot subdivision on the Norwalk line, which would be 50 feet from the wetland line. She stated that this referral was primarily for the Commissioner's comments.

- ** MR. BELL MOVED THAT A LETTER BY STAFF ON BEHALF OF THE COMMISSION TO BE SENT TO THE TOWN OF DARIEN.**
- ** MR. KYDES SECONDED.**
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Caputo commented Ms. Cherichetti and the staff for doing a good job. Ms. Smith commented that she thought it was very good thing that Ms. Cherichetti also educate the public about conservation as well providing helpful ideas to them.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

May 28th

June 11th

ADJOURNMENT

- ** MR. KYDES MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.
- ** MR. BELL SECONDED.
- ** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Gerda Adonis
Telesco Secretarial Services

