

NORWALK CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 23, 2003

ATTENDANCE: MATT CAPUTO, CHAIRMAN; KAREN DESTEFANIS, VICE-CHAIRMAN (6:11 p.m.); JANE CORCILLO (6:07 P.M.); SUSAN LLORCA, ALTERNATE (6:10 p.m.); ANDREW KYDES; LARRY LOSIO; MARNY SMITH; ANNE CAGNINA; BETH ACKERMAN, ALTERNATE; ED HOLOWINKO, ALTERNATE

STAFF: ERIN LEONARD, ACTING SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER; MICHAEL GREENE, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

AND ZONING

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

RECEIPT & DISCUSSION

- a. **5 LedgeWood Drive-Quintana-#S03-169-**"Corrective Action"-Deposition of fill,
construction/repair of stone retaining wall, construction of rear house addition adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Ms. Corcillo arrived at 6:07 p.m.

Ms. Leonard stated that included in the packet to the Commissioners is a memorandum in reference to a notice of violation regarding this matter and that the applicant has been very active in resolving this. Ms. Leonard said that Mr. John Anderson, an environmental planner from Environmental Land Solutions (ELS), on behalf of the applicant, was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Caputo asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

Mr. Anderson stated that Mr. Quintana expressed his regrets in not being able to be present tonight. He is a maintenance worker for an estate in Greenwich, Connecticut and

is therefore unable to attend. Mr. Anderson said he is here to answer any questions the Commissioners might have.

Ms. Llorca and Ms. Destefanis arrived at 6:10 p.m.

Mr. Anderson stated that he included within the application packet an extensive narrative explaining what happened. He said the subject property is a little under a half acre located on the east side of Ledgewood Drive, just north east of Ponus Avenue. He stated that the Quintanas,

City of Norwalk Conservation Commission Meeting

September 23, 2003

Page 1

who are South American, purchased the property in 2002. He said they are a little ignorant of the language and some of the regulations of the Town and did not mean to disrespect the wetlands commission but were unclear as to what regulations there were. Mr. Anderson stated that the Quintanas did not think to ask for a permit. Mr. Anderson referring the Commissioners to the topographic plan stated that the property is fairly level with grade running from the front of the property on Ledgewood down towards the watercourse. Regulated areas of the property consist of the watercourse with fringed wetlands primarily on the eastern side of the brook. It is completely separated from the landscaped portions of the property by the stone retaining wall, which ranges from a foot and a half to about 5 feet in height. He said the wall was present at the time Mr. Quintana purchased the property. He did add approximately a half to one foot of its height and repaired it using mortar instead of a dry set wall. Mr. Quintana then placed fill within the northeastern corner of the property between the house and the stone wall to create a more usable rear yard. Mr. Anderson said the rear yard dropped off pretty dramatically just beyond the house down to the stone wall and did not create a good situation for children to play in this area, the Quintana's have children active in soccer and it did not work out very well.

Mr. Anderson stated that prior to the Quintana's purchasing the house in 2002, it was in an estate for quite some time and had fallen into a state of disrepair. Along with the placement of fill and reconstruction of the stone wall, Mr. Quintana also began constructing over an existing concrete patio, a single-level concrete block addition that would essentially be used for storing a lawn mower, rakes and shovels and yard furniture. Mr. Anderson stated that no industrial equipment or chemicals would be stored and that it is purely for the purpose of an additional storage area. Mr. Quintana would like to keep the addition as it is over an existing concrete patio and roughly 57 feet is the closest point to the watercourse. There is an existing deck that exists off the second floor of the house that the Quintanas wish to remove and replace with a larger deck over the final constructed addition.

Mr. Anderson said he visited the site. The soils were flagged by Otto Theall this summer. It was found that the regulated areas were on the down slope of the stone retaining wall. Mr. Anderson said in the opinion of ELS, the work being proposed by Mr. Quintana does not have a negative, detrimental effect on the functions and values of the wetlands and watercourse. However, they did see the need to propose some mitigation as Mr. Quintana did do the work without the prior approval of the Board. Mr. Anderson said this is shown on the mitigation plan provided by ELS. In addition, ELS provided a grading plan, which shows how the final grades will be achieved. Mr. Anderson said Mr. Quintana is proposing to put in 100 cubic yards or more to finish the work. There are some large existing trees and the grading is designed to preserve them. The drainage swale will allow the water to continue down the lower southeastern corner of the property draining into the wetlands. Mr. Anderson stated that the mitigation plan provides both woody and herbaceous material to provide a buffer between the lawn area and the watercourse. He said the stone retaining wall would also act to collect the water before it runs directly into the wetland area.

Ms. Smith said she was curious as to how the slope was going to work. She stated that it is quite

City of Norwalk Conservation Commission Meeting

September 23, 2003

Page 2

a drop off and if they are planning to have a level place, the stone wall is at the level of the lowest portion of the lawn.

Mr. Anderson said the stone wall does not represent it well. He said the stone wall is actually above existing grade. Mr. Anderson said the idea is to have a separation between the wall and the watercourse provided by the shrub buffer planting area. He said the Quintanas could also install a retaining wall between that to provide more protection. Ms. Smith said there would have to be something provided to prevent the soil from going over into the brook. She also stated that she did not like to see big chunks of blacktop for fill. Mr. Anderson said as long as it is clean material it is considered to be safe and is base material for general fill.

Mr. Greene said that he could provide the Commission with copies of DPW requirements. Mr. Anderson said that several studies have been done on the pollution potential of asphalt and it is almost negligible to the amount of material that comes out of it. There are really no contaminants associated with asphalt.

Ms. Smith asked if it had anything to do with the acidity of the soil. Mr. Anderson said no, once it has been laid the first time on a roadway, there is typically no potential for that.

Mr. Kydes asked if there is septic or sewer on the property. Mr. Anderson said he believes it is City sewer.

Mr. Losio asked for clarification as to whether there had been any disruption beyond the wall and no wetland soils on the house side of the wall. Mr. Anderson said no, there was not. Mr. Losio asked if any trees were put at risk. Mr. Anderson said he was not sure but that he could ask the client.

Mr. Losio asked if this application had anything to do with the application to build the deck. Ms. Leonard said it is included in this application. Mr. Anderson said the applicant thought it best to include everything in one application instead of coming back before the Commission again. He said Mr. Quintana is very interested in correcting the violation but also in finishing what he has started.

Ms. Corcillo asked if the property line extended to the brook. Mr. Anderson said he believes it extends to the far side of the brook. Ms. Llorca said the house is very close to the line. Mr. Anderson said it is fairly close. Ms. Ackerman expressed concerns regarding plantings. Mr. Anderson said they have tried to select plants that tolerate drier conditions, be shade tolerant and also provide a wildlife habitat.

Ms. Llorca said she was concerned about the slope. She said she does not know how adequate the buffer would be in rainy situations. Ms. Leonard stated that if the Commission preferred, an intermediate buffer could be included to accommodate it. Mr. Anderson said he does not have a

problem with providing more of a buffer. He said the grades at present are less steep than they

City of Norwalk Conservation Commission Meeting

September 23, 2003

Page 3

were at the bottom. The water coming down should not be a problem for the survival of the plants but they would be happy to provide a deeper buffer if the Commission thinks it is appropriate. Mr. Anderson said he would be happy to work with Staff to come up with an adequate solution.

DISCUSSION/DECISION

a) **16 Hilltop Road-Watson-#S03-166**-Temporary filling of wetland with gravel and

deposition of fill and landscaping adjacent to wetland

Ms. Leonard stated that included in the packet to the Commissioners is an updated resolution. She said Ms. Slayback from Environmental Solutions, on behalf of the applicant, is present to answer any additional questions. Ms. Leonard stated that the only additional information that was discussed at the last meeting was spot elevations to determine what existed prior to the work (see Special Condition #2 of memorandum dated September 10, 2003 to the Norwalk Conservation Commission).

Ms. Smith said she asked at the last meeting whether ELS intended on adding wetland soil to the swale. In reference to that, Ms. Smith asked where ELS would get wetland soil.

Ms. Slayback stated that she did not indicate that ELS would need to bring in soil. The soil will be turned to get it back to where it was. She said often they get wetland soil from someone who dredges a pond.

**** MS. CAGNINA MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE APPLICATION #S03-166-**

16 HILLTOP ROAD-WATSON WITH CONDITIONS 1 THROUGH 8 AS SET FORTH IN A MEMORANDUM TO THE NORWALK CONSERVATION COMMISSION FROM ERIN LEONARD, ACTING SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2003.

**** MS. SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7 TO 0 WITH 3 WHO DID NOT VOTE, (MS. CORCILLO, MS. ACKERMAN AND MR. HOLOWINKO).**

b) 310 Ely Avenue-Sedona Group-(310 Ely Avenue, LLC)-#S03-160-
Construction of a

10-unit apartment building and parking lot adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Ms. Leonard stated that she included a memorandum in the packet to the Commissioners. She said she spoke with Attorney David Waters today who requested that this matter be postponed until the next meeting. As a note, Ms. Leonard said she included a revised plan in the packet for the Commissioners to review and the deadline for decision is October 14, 2003. She stated that the applicant's attorney has granted an extension of 65 days because he was unable to have his environmental expert present.

Mr. Caputo asked if Mr. Waters would be presenting any additional information. Ms. Leonard said that he would..

c) **87 East Rocks Road-Oestmann-#S03-167**-Construction of a detached shed in rear yard

adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Ms. Leonard stated that at the last meeting the Commission seemed to prefer the original proposal as opposed to the alternate plan. She said it needed to be clarified whether this is a garage or storage shed, other than that there are no other comments.

**** MS. SMITH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE APPLICATION #S03-167-OESTMANN WITH THE 6 SPECIAL CONDITIONS AS OUTLINED IN A MEMORANDUM FROM ERIIN LEONARD, ACTING SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER DATED SEPTEMBER 11, 2003 TO**

THE NORWALK CONSERVATION COMMISSION.

**** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Mr. Caputo referring to Resolution #5 asked if there was a driveway leading to the shed. Ms. Leonard said there was not. Mr. Caputo said he strenuously objected to using the word "garage". Ms. Leonard said the reason she wrote garage is because it is written on the plan. Mr. Caputo said he understood that, but he is concerned that this applicant would sell the house in a few years to someone who does not share the same ethic would then have some lawyer representing him and be able to call it a garage. Mr. Caputo suggested that the applicant change the name of the plan and make it a part of the condition.

Mr. Losio stated that at the last meeting the Commission asked that all references to the garage be deleted and the applicant agreed. Ms. Leonard said that is correct, it is not being used as a garage. Mr. Losio asked if all references in the documentation to a garage been deleted. Ms. Leonard said the application had not been resubmitted.

Mr. Caputo said the Commission would accept a letter from the applicant and making it a condition of approval, that he submit a letter indicating that all references to the garage be deleted as an amendment to the application. Mr. Caputo also asked if there was anything in particular that the Commission needs to say can or cannot be stored in the shed. Ms.

Leonard stated that the applicant indicated that there would be a trailer, a lawn mower and other household items in the shed.

Mr. Caputo said he would propose: 1) that the applicant submit a letter indicating that the shed not be used as a garage, and 2) that the applicant delete all references in the application to a garage by submission of this letter as a condition to be included with the application.

Mr. Losio asked for clarification if the underlying issue is that the Commission is concerned as

City of Norwalk Conservation Commission Meeting

September 23, 2003

Page 5

to whether or not a driveway might be installed and asked if the Commission really cared whether a motorcycle was stored there or not.

Mr. Greene said the concern seemed to be the asphalt leading up to the shed. Ms. Leonard said the only reason the applicant was calling it a garage is because he was putting a garage door on it.

Mr. Losio said he would suggest that in addition to asking the applicant to have all references to the word garage stricken from the application that he also be asked to add in something that confirms that it is his understanding and that he agrees that this application and approval of it does not include any implied agreement to install a driveway.

Mr. Greene said if the Commissioners take condition #5 and add a sentence which reads: "that the plans be modified so all references to a garage be changed to shed." so that it is in the plans, in the titles, in the letters and later on the applicant can submit a letter stating that the use is for storage shed only. Mr. Greene also said condition #7 should be added stating that the use is for a storage shed only.

**** MS. SMITH MADE A MOTION TO AMEND HER MOTION TO INCORPORATE THE SUGGESTIONS MADE BY MR. GREENE, THAT A SENTENCE BE ADDED TO CONDITION #5 WHICH READS: "THAT THE PLANS BE MODIFIED SO ALL REFERENCES TO A GARAGE BE CHANGED TO SHED", AND THAT CONDITION #7 BE ADDED STATING THAT THE USE FOR THE SHED IS FOR STORAGE ONLY.**

**** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7 TO 0 WITH 3 WHO DID NOT VOTE (MS. CORCILLO, MS. LLORCA AND MR. HOLOWINKO).**

d) **71 Perry Avenue-Troisi & Corradino-#S03-168-Construct addition to single family**

house adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Ms. Leonard stated that at the last meeting the Commissioners had a few questions relative to the

application. She said the one Special Condition that was added was in the location where there

was woodchips. The woodchips were removed and plantings were added.

**** MS. DESTAFANIS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE APPLICATION #S03-168-**

TROISI & CORRADINO WITH THE 6 CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN A MEMORANDUM FROM ERIN LEONARD, ACTING SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER TO THE NORWALK CONSERVATION COMMISSION DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 2003.

**** MS. SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7 TO 0 WITH 3 WHO DID NOT VOTE (MS. CORCILLO, MS. LLORCA AND MS. ACKERMAN)**

City of Norwalk Conservation Commission Meeting

September 23, 2003

Page 6

PERMIT MODIFICATION

a) **295 Newtown Avenue-Kerschner Development Co., LLC-#S02-126a-Modification**

request to permit stone wall encroachment into wetland buffer area

Ms. Leonard handed out revised plans. She said the applicant has overlaid the existing approved landscaping plan. She stated that the square footage of the encroachment is 470 square feet and the applicant proposes to relocate 490 square feet of conservation area to the western portion of the site. Ms. Leonard said that area of the site is already vegetated and is not in the proposed planting buffer. She said there are buffer plantings in that area. The applicant has also submitted a proposed planting plan for the encroachment area as requested.

Ms. Smith asked if there was a stone wall that extends down into the area. Ms. Leonard, referring to the site plan said the area in question did not have a stone wall. She said the stone wall does not go the entire length of the property.

Attorney Genaurio, Genaurio & Conover representing the applicant stated that the problem is that when Kerschner Development began to construct the wall they made an error and constructed the wall into the area that had been proposed as a conservation development area. He said it would not be a problem except that the wall is quite sizeable and would be very difficult and cumbersome to move. He said the applicant has come to the Commission and asked for a modification. He said what the applicant has suggested was doing a planting in the area so that people would be just as far from the wetlands as they would otherwise have been. The planting would provide the buffer and by virtue of the size and elevation there was not very much concern about people trespassing into the wetland area. Attorney Genaurio said there was some discussion among the Commissioners about adding to the preservation area an amount of square footage equal to the area the applicant had omitted the wall off, approximately 470 square feet. Attorney Genaurio said the applicant has added 490 square feet in the conservation area west of the area that was suggested. (Attorney Genaurio referred the Commissioners to the site plan).

Attorney Genaurio stated that the original application, both to the Conservation Commission and the Zoning Commission included some additional plantings in this area but it had not dedicated as a conservation area. He said there would have been nothing in the restrictive covenant that would have prevented an elimination of this at some future point. Now the applicant is going to subject that area to the restrictive covenant that he has to encumber the Land Records with and that area will forever be preserved pursuant to that restrictive covenant to give to this Commission and the Zoning Commission an extra 490 square feet of property dedicated to conservation development purposes. He stated that the applicant is not suggesting that the area be subtracted from the conservation area so it is a net gain of 490 square feet.

Mr. Losio asked if the 490 square foot conservation area the applicant is proposing had been

disturbed. He said when he walked the area there were very large piles of rock and soil there.

Attorney Genaurio said he did not believe so because the intent was to keep it in its natural landscape area. Mr. Losio said he would feel a lot better knowing that it had not been disturbed. Attorney Genaurio said that is his understanding. He stated that the planting plan shown had always been proposed and the applicant did not put the planting plan along the boundary because there was an attempt to keep the area in its natural state.

Mr. Losio said that he would like that confirmed. Attorney Genaurio said that he would be happy to provide that information for the Commission.

Ms. Llorca said there was a question about using this as a swap but the applicant was going to confirm that there was a drain there. Attorney Genaurio stated that Mr. Kerschner suggested going out and taking a look at it. He said Mr. Kerschner confirmed that there were no problems whatsoever.

**** MR. KYDES MADE A MOTION TO GRANT PERMIT MODIFICATION
#S02-126a-295 NEWTOWN AVENUE-KERSCHNER DEVELOPMENT
CO.,**

**LLC WITH THE 2 SPECIAL CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN A
MEMORANDUM FROM ERIN LEONARD, ACTING
ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER DATED**

**SEPTEMBER 23, 2003 TO THE NORWALK CONSERVATION
COMMISSION AND TO INCORPORATE CONDITION #3, THAT
THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE CONSERVATION AREA
SWAP OF 490 SQUARE FEET, IF IT HAS BEEN DISTURBED, BE
RETURNED BACK TO ITS ORIGINAL STATE.**

**** MR. LOSIO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7 TO 0 WITH 3 WHO DID NOT
VOTE**

(MR. HOLOWINKO, MS. LLORCA AND MS. CORCILLO).

SHOW CAUSE HEARING

a) **6 Allen Road-Canevari-#V03-727-Failure to follow directives of Notice of
Violation**

Ms. Leonard passed out a copy of the Cease and Desist Order issued last week as a result of the applicant's failure to comply with a violation issued on September 9, 2003. She stated that there was no representative present for Mr. Canevari and that she has had no contact with him. Ms. Leonard said the notice of violation included specific deviation from the plans, which includes the construction of an expanded rear deck, extensive grading along the western side of the driveway within 45 feet of the wetland and additional grading on the southern side of the house within 55 feet of the wetlands as evidenced by the construction of retaining walls. In addition the applicant was required to submit a revised site plan on or before September 13, 2003. He was to restore the site to its original condition and submit an application to modify it. Thus far this has not been done.

City of Norwalk Conservation Commission Meeting

September 23, 2003

Page 8

Mr. Losio asked if this was the first of the rear lots. Ms. Leonard said yes. Mr. Losio said he is personally disturbed by this violation. Ms. Leonard said the Commission had 10 days to issue a decision before the Show Cause Hearing. Mr. Caputo said this is the Show Cause Hearing tonight.

Mr. Losio asked when the Cease and Desist Order was placed. Ms. Leonard stated on the 19th. Mr. Losio asked if there had been any activity since the Cease and Desist Order. Ms. Leonard said only inside the house. Mr. Losio asked if the Cease and Desist Order applied to activity inside the house as well. Mr. Greene said it did not, that the Order applies solely to the activities of the development.

Mr. Caputo said the Commission had 3 options: 1) withdraw the directives, 2) modify the directives, or 3) leave them as is.

Ms. Smith asked what the Commission expected to get except the \$500.00 fee.

Mr. Greene said the next step would be to send it to Corporation Counsel if the Commission decides to leave the Order in effect.

**** MR. LOSIO MADE A MOTION THAT THE CEASE AND DESIST ORDER FOR**

#V03-727- CANEVARI, AS REFERENCED ON ASSESSOR'S MAP 21 NW

DISTRICT 5, BLOCK 14, LOT 12 BE CONTINUED AND REMAIN IN EFFECT

AND THAT THE MATTER BE PASSED ON TO CORPORATE COUNSEL.

**** MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7 TO 0, 3 DID NOT VOTE**

(MR. HOLOWINKO, MS. LLORCA AND MS. ACKERMAN).

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

a) September 9, 2003 minutes

Corrections:

Page 1, Paragraph 1, "...by planing evergreen trees 25 feet to 20 feet..." should read **"...by planting evergreen trees 25 feet to 30 feet..."**.

Page 1, Paragraph 1, "Ms. Slayback said there is a drainage swale planted...." should read **"Ms. Slayback said there is a drainage swale over which soil must be brought in and replanted after the completion of the work."**

Page 1, Last Sentence, delete the number 32.

Page 3, 6th Paragraph from bottom of page, "She stated that they would not being..." should read **"She stated that they would not be doing..."**.

Page 7, correct the spelling of Ms. Smith's name in the motion.

Page 9, 8th Paragraph from bottom of page, "Ms. Destefanis asked if it is possible to take..."

City of Norwalk Conservation Commission Meeting

September 23, 2003

Page 9

should read **"Ms. Destefanis asked if it is possible to leave the area that has been walled in error the way it is and replace it with an area equal in size in another location."**

Page 9, 3rd Paragraph from bottom of page, "Ms. Cagnina asked if there..." should read **"Ms. Cagnina asked if the substitute area could be advantageous to the area."**

Page 10, under Comments of Staff, Mr. Canterbury should be **"Mr. Cantaveri."**

Page 10, under Comments of Commissioners, 2nd Paragraph, Strike last sentence.

**** MS. CAGNNINA MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF**

SEPTEMBER 9, 2003 AS AMENDED.

**** MS. SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 9 TO 0, (MS. CORCILLO DID NOT VOTE).**

COMMENTS OF STAFF

a. Declaratory Permits and Enforcement Actions

Ms. Leonard said there was nothing new. The last Declaratory Permit issued since the last meeting was for Oak Hills.

COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Caputo, referring to the matter of open space, said that he would like the Commissioners to contribute to the implementation of the plan.

Ms. Smith said the Board of Norwalk Land Trust, at their meeting would discuss the topic of open space and that she invited two members of that Board to the meeting tonight. She said they thought it was a good idea to have a panel discussion at the meeting on November 18, 2003 and it is her hope that some of the Commissioners attend that meeting.

Mr. Caputo invited the members of the Norwalk Land Trust to speak, both members declined.

Mr. Losio commented that there are a number of independent documents and there has to be a process to pull them all together. He said the process is very much dependent on public input. He stated that a number of the Commissioners want to take a more proactive approach. He said the Commissioners went out and identified the critical open space parcels and that aspect was not included in this proposal.

Ms. Smith said that perhaps the Commissioners could talk to residents in that area.

Mr. Greene said the same process is always there for the public.

Mr. Losio said he did not know if, within the City Code, it actually describes in some level of detail how the Commission goes about this. He said in order to make the process whole, the other half regarding the Commissioner's activities should be added into the document.

Ms. Destefanis left the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Further discussion ensued regarding the document on open space. Mr. Losio referred to the 2nd paragraph from the bottom of the page, 5th line. He said it should read "...but is not limited to...". Mr. Losio stated that he missed two meetings where the Commissioners talked about inventories and asked if the Commission had a view of open space available in the City. He said the map is a baseline for the Commission to identify property.

Mr. Greene said he had not gotten the inventory yet.

Ms. Smith said that if the Commission meets with the map and Mr. Greene, the public could attend the meeting as well. Mr. Greene stated that as soon as a property is identified the price goes up. Mr. Losio said he would like a better understanding of the map. Mr. Greene said he would be glad to meet with the Commissioners and go over it. Mr. Losio said the Commissioners needed to go through a whole inventory discussion.

Ms. Smith said a list of maps gives lots of resources in the inventory. Mr. Losio asked if the Commission came to any conclusion other than the list. He said the process needs clarify Commission and City driven activities. He said there has not been a decision made as to whether the list is good enough to identify open space parcels or whether there needs to be something else. Mr. Losio said the inventories and descriptions are base tools for the Commission. He said if everyone is comfortable with the definition of open space then there is a basis for moving on with a couple of caveats.

Ms. Smith, referring to Public Act 490, asked if owners of open space could apply for a tax reduction. She asked if anyone had ever used this.

Mr. Greene responded that the City gets the right of first refusal.

Mr. Kydes asked if there was any property the City of Norwalk is presently trying to buy. Mr. Greene said no.

Mr. Losio stated that the Commissioners might want to look at the document at the next meeting and amend it.

Ms. Smith asked if it would have to be established through the Common Council. Mr. Greene said it did not have to go to the Common Council. However, they have the money so it would be beneficial for it to go to the Council.

Mr. Caputo suggested for the next meeting that Staff proceed in coordinating a planning committee. He said he would like to build a relationship with other Boards and share with any other groups with information relevant to this subject. Mr. Caputo said at the end, there could be a special committee appointed by the Mayor, including Planning & Zoning, DPW and members

September 23, 2003

Page 11

of the committee at large.

Mr. Losio asked that all of the Commissioners take time to read the material on open space before the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

**** MS. SMITH MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**

**** MS. CORCILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Custis

Telesco Secretarial Services

