I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

I. ROLL CALL

III. BUSINESS MEETING

III-A. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

III-B. OLD BUSINESS
1. Permit-Application #17-15, LOT 75-79, WEYBOSSETT STREET. Proposal to extend Weybossett Street to access parcels involving fill and grading within regulated area, upland review area and stormwater discharge.

III-C. NEW BUSINESS
1. PERMIT-APPLICATION #18-1, DEROZA PROPERTY – 68 Birchbank Road. Unauthorized construction of a descending concrete walkway: 40+ feet of cinder block; poured concrete dock projecting into the Housatonic River without a permit. Application submitted to sustain and receive permit after-the-fact. (See below)

2. Permit-Application #18-2, BOOTH HILL ESTATES – Booth Hill Road/Waverly Road. Proposal to create a 23-lot DRD development in a R-1 zone within upland review area, road construction and culverting intermittent watercourse for access.

III-D. MISCELLANEOUS
A. Agent Reviewed Applications:

B. Violations:
   1. MATURO PROPERTY-58 KINGS HIGHWAY (Status Report)

   2. IWV #16-03: 68 Birchbank Road – DaRosa Property. Unauthorized construction of a descending concrete walkway: 40+ feet of cinder block; poured concrete dock projecting into the Housatonic River without a permit.

IV. MINUTES
1. January 11, 2018 Regular

V. ADJOURNMENT
CITY OF SHELTON  
INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, February 8, 2018  
7:00 P.M., Room 302

Chairman Zahornasky called the Regular Meeting of the Inland Wetlands Commission to order at 7:03 P.M.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. ROLL CALL:

    Robert Dunford, Commissioner  
    Jack Goncalves, Commissioner  
    Michele Kawalutzki, Commissioner  
    Ken Nalli, Commissioner  
    Gary Zahornasky, Chairman  

Absent:  

    Joseph Reilly, Commissioner  
    Charlie Wilson, Vice-Chairman

Also Present:  

    John Cook, Staff

III. BUSINESS MEETING

III-A. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

III-B. OLD BUSINESS

1. Permit-Application #17-15, LOT 75-79, WEYBOSSETT STREET. Proposal to extend Weybossett Street to access parcels involving fill and grading within regulated area, upland review area and stormwater discharge.
WCEO REPORT
February 8, 2018

PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-15, LOT 75-79, WEYBOSSET STREET.
Weybossett Street to access parcels involving fill and grading within regulated area, upland review area and stormwater discharge.

STATUS:
1. NEW application clock starts February 8, 2018
2. 65-day clock to decide action or schedule public hearing expires March 17, 2018
3. Email for continuance received 2.6.18
4. Nearby land owner letter received 1.31.18

PLANS: PLAN & PROFILE PREPARED FOR ALPHONSE CAMMAROTTA
December 26, 2017

COMMENTS:
Last month the application was not signed by the owner of the parcel in question for home development. The office has now received that confirmation for endorsement by the parcel owner for the regulated activity associated with the land to be accessed by the road extension.

As noted at the January meeting the Engineering Department has identified multiple technical and significant shortcomings with the proposal. Their report is expected this evening. In addition, the Shelton Land Conservation Trust filed objection to grading on their property for a road and objection to the road extension proper. Prior to expending any additional funds, it is believed a legal determination must be made as to who is the responsible party to consent to the regulated activity within the right of way (ROW). Thomas Dingle, Assistant P/2 Administrator stated to staff that former Corporation Counsel ruled on a nearby ROW within the same development that City had no involvement when a party blocked upland ROW and that it was an issue for entities of the development. This would indicate that the City is not the responsible party to sign an application for the regulated activities. It is understood prior applications that this question did not arise. But there was not the established objection to the regulated activities.

The applicant met with this office on several occasions. Staff identified the fact of past consistent efforts on the part of the Inland Wetlands Commission to consolidate parcels to balance for acceptable more workable lots from a collection of parcels. There is no attempt at this juncture. For example this includes nearby parcels of 30 & 31 Weybossett combining 4 parcels into two lots. Also, exists the example of 56 Weybossett in 1997 whereby an owner of a collection 7 parcels combined 3 into one lot and 4 were permanently encumbered with a recorded deed restriction of no building. There is the permanent restriction of Wells Avenue extension to create 2 lots. Also, the combination of 3 parcels into 2 lots and 3 parcels into one lot at 70/72 and 76 Wells Avenue respectively. In 1988 directly at this location of Providence Avenue the Commission denied its road extension and 19 parcels because of the significant wetlands present. Of particular note was the wetlands proper were in fact part of the headwater system for Ivy Brook. The City of Shelton now has ownership of 8 parcels on Pawtucket Avenue ROW and 2.57 acres within the is headwaters wetland system. These facts demonstrate two points:
1. The amount of City and Land Trust open space is expanding in the headwaters wetland.
2. If the vested interests (heirs or assigns) of Coram Gardens Development and/or the City do not wish the road extended then there is no consent to impact on the regulated areas in the ROW and the application is not proper or complete.

In spite of the request to continue by the applicant we suggest the application is premature and full confirmation of the issue may be reviewed by Corporation Counsel and to minimize further expenditure by the applicant and the Commission may deny the application without prejudice as incomplete.
February 8, 2018

John R. Cook
Wetlands Coordinator
City of Shelton
54 Hill Street
Shelton, CT 06484

Re: Extension of Weybosset Street;
Plan and Profile dated December 26, 2017

Dear Mr. Cook:

This office has reviewed the above referenced application to extend Weybosset Street from its current terminus, and construct five single family homes. The proposed 265 foot road extension will follow the existing layout of Weybosset Street, which was established in the 1930's by the Coram Gardens Subdivision.

The Coram Gardens Subdivision was laid out to create approximately 350 building lots and their streets, without considering grade, wetlands or other natural resources. This undeveloped section of Weybosset Street does not support development due to the extensive wetlands and the fact that this area is the headwaters of Ivy Brook. In addition, the properties which abut the opposite (east) side of the proposed road extension are owned by the Shelton Land Trust.

In regards to the roadway plan and profile, this proposal is unacceptable since it has major deficiencies and does not meet city design standards. The major deficiencies are the following:

- The plan fails to show Ivy Brook, which is located immediately east of and abuts the proposed cul-de-sac.
- The proposed cul-de-sac requires filling and grading of property owned by the Shelton Land Conservation Trust (SLCT).
- The SLCT is opposed to this project and will not grant slope rights or easements to perform any work on their property.
- The road cross section is not acceptable. In lieu of a crowned road, a super elevated cross section is proposed.
- The horizontal alignment has an unnecessary curve, and the pavement is not centered in the established right-of-way.
- No grass shoulder is provided in front of the five parcels. The pavement edge is located only one foot from the property lines and leaves no room for a snow shelf or for utility poles.

- Over 75% of the road extension would be built on designated wetlands, which would require significant excavation to remove unsuitable subgrade soils and the filling and compaction of those excavated areas.

I strongly recommend that this application be denied due to extensive regulated areas and natural resources that would be impacted, and the major design deficiencies cited. A vicinity map of the area which depicts Ivy Brook is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

Robert F. Kulacz, P.E.
City Engineer

cc: Richard D. Schultz, Planning & Zoning Administrator
    George Stachowicz, Superintendent of Highway & Bridges
    Paul DiMauro, Director of Public Works
    Street Committee, Board of Aldermen

Enclosure: Vicinity Map

File: Weybosset Street – Paper Street

RFK:lv
City of Shelton
Geographic Information System (GIS)

MAP DISCLAIMER - NOTICE OF LIABILITY
This map is for assessment purposes only. It is not for legal description or conveyance. All information is subject to verification by any user.
The City of Shelton and its mapping contractors assume no legal responsibility for the information contained herein.

IVY BROOK
SWAMP (from aerial photogrammetry)
PROPOSED HOMES (5)
CITY ENGINEER
Vern Krill  
29 Weybossett Street

John Cook

From: Vern Krill <krillvern@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:12 AM  
To: John Cook  
Subject: Permit application #17-15 lots 75-79 Weybosset St

Dear Inland Wetland Commission Members,

My name is Vern Krill and I live at 29 Weybosset St. in Shelton. I am writing this letter in regards to permit application #17-15 lots #75-79 Weybosset St. to access parcels involving fill and grading within regulated area and discharge of storm water.

The purpose of this letter is not to object to the road extension of Weybosset St. to access lots #75-79, but to remind the Commission and to inform the applicant of my experience involving the fill and grading within a regulated upland review area and storm water discharge on Weybosset St. (i.e. lots #59,60,61 &62).

Approximately ten (10) years ago, I had purchased the last of my family’s undeveloped lots on Weybosset St., mentioned above. Due to the fact that said lots were adjacent to a regulated wetland area, I also had to submit my proposal for the lots on Weybosset St. to the Inland Wetlands Commission Commission (see permit application #07-34).

Subsequently, it was determined by the Commission that prior to any proposed development of the property the following requirements would have to be performed,

1. Combination of lot  
The four (4) deeded lots #59, 60, 61 & 62 were to be combined as follows:  
Lots #59 & 60 were to be combined into  
one (1) lot  
Lots #61 & 62 were to be combined into  
one (1) lot

2. Deeded Conservation Easement  
Lots #61 & 62 (combined) totals 13,600 s/f of which 6,382 s/f (slightly less than half) was to be designated as a conservation easement  
Lots #59 & 60 (combined) totals 14,000 s/f of which 4,723 s/f (slightly less than one third) was to be designated as a conservation easement

3. Deeded Drainage Easement  
A thirty (30) foot wide drainage easement on lots #61 & 62 for drainage of storm water from Weybosset St. and all costs related to the installation and construction of said storm drain system.
With that being said, it is evident that development of property within a regulated wetland area in Shelton is a costly well planned process with the consideration of the preservation of sensitive wetland being primary to its development. However, it is the duty of the Commission to protect the wetland within the community of Shelton for future generations.

Sincerely,

Vern Krill 01/31/18

Sent from my iPhone
Hi John thanks for getting back to me. I want to ask to postpone my meeting for Marc. I am having problem with one of the coronary veins and doctors are running test and I can leave. Include find the doctor report.

Thanks Alfonso

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 6, 2018, at 8:56 AM, John Cook <jcook@cityofshelton.org> wrote:

Hi Alphonse, Sorry have not gotten back to you at present. Working on agenda, reports, payroll, budget and multiple other items this week. I will forward agenda once available. Weybossett will be on agenda for Thursday. Engineering department is expected to have report for this meeting. I have instructed Nancy to take my calls at least through this morning.

John
Ed McCreery
Shelton Land Trust

I'm Counsel for the Land Trust, if you haven't been down there you really should check it out, the parcel that they want to fill is a series of meandering brooks with classic skunk cabbage vegetation and all it forms the Ivy Brook. It is a very key important wetlands area that both the Land Trust and the City have been expending a lot of resources to put together parcels to preserve and recently there have been parcels at the end of the Providence trail that 40 neighbors on the east side signed a petition asking the City to acquire that.

Certainly no one has asked permission of the Land Trust, we were sort of surprised that someone wanted to put a road and would require a shoulder on our property. We are not conceive of to that.

Thirdly, it has never been done historically, to look at who owns this road. They're proposing to build a road on property they have not proposed who owns it. The City actually doesn't not own the road. I've run into this situation and Dominick has as well in the past where back in the 30's they would carve up these little lots, never get the City's permission, carve them and start handing out 1 or 2 lots. There's a similar one in Monroe where they conveyed. But they never conveyed the road. You find that the road beds are actually in the title of these 30's corporations. You can't submit an application to build on something when you don't have the permission of the owners. They haven't provided to you a title search that the City owns title to this road. We don't.

So for all those reasons and inappropriate filling of the wetlands, we strenuously object to this application.

Commissioner Dunford motioned to deny without prejudice, Permit-Application #17-15, LOT 75-79, WEyBOssett STREET. Proposal to extend Weybossett Street to access parcels involving fill and grading within regulated area, upland review area and stormwater discharge. Commissioner Kawalautzki seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

III-C.NEW BUSINESS
1. PERMIT-APPLICATION #18-1, DEROSA PROPERTY – 68 Birchbank Road.
Unauthorized construction of a descending concrete walkway: 40+ feet of cinder block; poured concrete dock projecting into the Housatonic River without a permit. Application submitted to sustain and receive permit after-the-fact. (See below)
Dominick Thomas  
Attorney for client  

My client would have been here tonight but he has the flu. This is a post activity application; we were hoping to wait for a draw down before filing. John was very cooperative as to what you wanted in the plan. This was submitted by Tracy Lewis, that was complied with and low and behold here are the pictures. The picture that I presented to you the first time, this is the dock that is in question. The 2nd picture shows what my client was able to take as a result of the draw down. You can see partially some of the remnants of the old dock underneath and how he put the facing on it. A lot of those stones you see were stones that had fallen off. The 3rd picture is from a different angle is pretty much the same thing and how they supported it. The picture that’s the most telling is the 4th picture which are taken, so you understand if you look at the map here, you see here that my clients’ property goes beyond the edge of it. These pictures, the 4th one, is taken this way, and you can see the remnants of the old stone dock, much of which had fallen into the river. My client cleaned it up during a draw down and you could see how he basically packed what was there. The 5th picture is really the same. The 6th is a closer look at the capping of the old stone that existed.  

This is not a situation of the client expanding. The other thing that I wanted to point out to you, Tracy Lewis even noted here on the adjacent property “remains of wall, concrete dock”. This is a heavily forested area that has overgrown into the river of you look at Google Earth. These things exist all the way down.  

The final picture is just to show you, and John we already talked about this, that there was an existing similar stone type dock that was there that the client capped. He didn’t do anything other than protect the broken concrete. So my client did pay, it’s been very costly for him, I explained to him that when you decide you want to do something don’t listen to your neighbors that you don’t have to get a permit. At least call your lawyer, the individual that represented him at the closing was not experienced in land use permitting, this has been very costly for him and for this he paid triple fee for the post application and I hope that you would consider approving this and realize that what he did do was take, something that he should have gotten a permit for and would have gotten a permit for, it was to re-constitute an old dock.
WCEO REPORT
February 8, 2018

PERMIT-APPLICATION #18-1, DEROSA PROPERTY – 68 Birchbank Road.
Unauthorized construction of a descending concrete walkway: 40+ feet of cinder block; poured concrete dock projecting into the Housatonic River without a permit. Application submitted to sustain and receive permit after-the-fact.

STATUS:
1. NEW application clock starts February 8, 2018
2. 65-day clock to decide action or schedule public hearing expires April 14, 2018

PLANS: IMPROVEMENT LOCATION SURVEY 68 BIRCHBANK ROAD

COMMENTS: This application is in response to the multiple meetings the Commission held the past 18 months regarding the conducting of a regulated activity along the Housatonic River. Application Fee and surcharge has been paid.

The investigation was initiated as a result of complaints to the Planning & Zoning office regarding those works and multiple dwelling units on the non-conforming parcel. While the issue of sewage may be a long-term concern with the multiple units on the parcel the Valley Health Department has investigated and there is no current failure septic discharging leachate into the river.

Counsel for the applicant is expected to submit photographs of the exposed river works during a draw down period of the river. The lack of draw down hindered the establishment of their photo evidence. Their plan is to use this evidence to substantiate the level of work.

Recommend receipt for review. This is still a new application in response to the violation and must follow the proper procedural clock. It is unknown whether adjacent or nearby parties wish to review and comment on the record of this application.

Chairman Zahornasky stated we’ll receive it for review and take into John’s recommendations and take this up next month.
2. Permit-Application #18-2, BOOTH HILL ESTATES -- Booth Hill Road/Waverly Road. Proposal to create a 23-lot DRD development in a R-1 zone within up0land review area, road construction and culverting intermittent watercourse for access.

John Paul
Applicant

I’m John Paul, the developer, I purchased the property about a year and a half ago from the Patrick family, I’m not sure if you’re familiar with this site or not but, this is where it meets Waverly. Currently there are 2 homes on the property on Waverly. If you can take a quick look back here, when Mr. Patrick the father was living, they separated these 2 parcels off.

This is the current house that’s here, here’s the 2nd little house and 2 driveways back-to-back. In going through with Zoning, the Mayor and Conservation, we originally had a plan which created the green space around the property. Mr. Patrick had a plan doing 1 acre lots which is around 21 lots, and if we did the traditional 1 acre lots we’d have to do 10% to Open Space and now if you’re familiar with, but Zoning passed the DRD which we do ½ acre lots if your acreage is large enough and you have to do 30% total to Open Space. So that’s kind of the difference of 1 acre at 10% or the 30% with the ½ acres.

Jim will walk you through what our plan is, but just the roughly to give you a quick idea these are the 2 existing properties if you look at it that way, we’re going to continue the 1 acre lots on Waverly and 1 down on Booth, then carry the new DRD which is ½ acre lots inside. Then the Open Space becomes down here towards the reservoir. So basically, all of this will be Conservation back in here so it’s 30% of the property and this is where the reservoir and the State property runs through. Aquarion has this section and the State comes here and the town has back here. Conservation also wanted us to look at and the Mayor at possibly purchasing the whole site. Conservation hired an appraiser, price tag kind of came out too steep and we tried to figure out what was the best way. The new plan was kind of giving the acreage of the 30% of the area to what they wanted to kind of connect with what they had and then create the road off of Booth and keep the 1 acres kind of on the outside according to the new DRD which was passed unanimously by Planning & Zoning maybe 6 months ago. Jim will walk you through; I just wanted to give you a quick overview of how the plan came about.

Jim Swift
Professional Engineer/Landscape Architect

As John said, it’s about a 22 acre parcel. This is Booth Hill and this is Waverly. This is the watershed for Aquarion and it’s been referred to them so we should be getting a reference from them. It’s also been purchased by the State for permanent Conservation and it goes all the way over, this is Far Mill Road, it
goes all the way up to Mohegan, it’s a huge piece and that’s why the Conservation department and the City was so interested in trying to get this piece. Hence, why things get complicated now.

So just to look at the existing conditions, the site is, everyone thinks that the field you see as you drive by there is the piece but it’s not. This is the hayfield, there are a tremendous amount of hardwoods that surround that. There are 2 existing houses and an existing lot here. Then the action for us is up in this corner. There’s 2 small wetlands here, they’re less than a quarter of an acre so they’re very small. The water shed is not very much. So what happens is there’s an 18” inch pipe that crosses the road here, there’s an excavating ditch that feeds that 1st wetland area and continues on down. This entire area has been heavily used by farmers and farmland so if you were to drive by out there you would see these out buildings and wire pens here and there, so all this area is disturbed to some extent for farm use. I’ll show you more in a bit.

So it comes out from this wetland and then there’s a slight valley that runs along Booth Hill Road, generally the topography runs from the high here and at 8-10% all the way down, so it’s pretty flat, it’s pretty consistent for a slope. So as you leave the wetland area now you get to some intermittent watercourse, it’s very, very hard to trace out. As it leaves the wetlands it’s pretty well visible for maybe 3, 4, 500’ but when the topography starts to flatter out it burns out and disappears. So you could sort of make it out in this area, but down in here it disappears and then pops up in 20’ and then runs for 50’. What I did was for regulatory reference, I showed it as a 100’ wide regulated activity upland area but I really can’t define any kind of watercourse there because it’s not there.

As you come down towards the 2 houses that were constructed some time ago there is a wetland limit line that is off of our property and a watercourse which is a little bit more defined in this area but it’s there. Up in this corner where this valley where it’s this gentleman’s property there is a dug ditch. So what he did was they just excavated the ditch right along the property line to direct water and push it out over in that direction.

So now we come to this, here is the wetland areas. This picture is taken from Booth Hill Road more or less looking back into the site, it’s the upper wetland area which you can see right here. It’s surrounded by stone and it’s got all kinds of disturbances. I suspect that this particular wetland, Wetland A here, was probably excavated for water for the animals but it’s hard to tell, it’s very old so you really can’t tell. Then you come over to this picture, this is looking from here back down towards the other wetlands. This has limited woody plants, this wetland here is probably a lot more natural soils down in here than the upper wetland area was, but having said all that there viable wetlands even though they’re disturbed and were used for farm animals and that kind of thing.

This is an overview of the plan. John explained the overall concept on how we got to this point. The City really wants as much open space as it can possibly get. When the appraisal came in and John had his meetings, it was really, I don’t
think the City felt comfortable with this scale of purchase just to buy the whole thing so they thought what could we do in an imaginable way just to maximize the open space that we could grant and with the new zoning designed which P&Z has just approved we have a method.

The method we use is we did 40,000 sq. ft. lots along Waverly to the corner including lot 19, lot 18 is a standard residential 1 acre lot and just so you know the logic, one of the logics for going with the 1 acre lots in those areas is because they all need driveways to the main street and we didn’t want any of the smaller lots to be accessing the roads that way. So then you come into the interior and basically it’s this rectangle here, which is the Designed Residential Development, those lots can be as small as ½ acre, most are larger but most are about ½ acre. So that was the concept. We owe 10% open space on the R1 lots and owe 30% open space on the land use for the DRD, so when you combine all these things, you could read this and it could bore the heck out of you, the bottom line is that we owe about 5.5 acres of open space and we’re going to deed in fee 6.1 more or less ownership to the City. Up in these areas we’re going to propose some conservation easements which is a form of open space if you will. This one protecting both the wetland areas and this one basically protecting all of the existing trees.

With that overview and that concept in mind, the bottom line is to get that 6 acres is kind of the whole point of this exercise and in that location and I have to day there’s been a lot of iterations of the design going back and forth. We’ve been working with staff; we’ve been working with the Mayor’s office. This is kind of what we came up with to make at least the conservation folks happy. You could see the obvious thing which is it takes the biggest block of open space and puts it right next to the others, all of which doesn’t necessarily have anything to do with regulated impact.

So going to the design plans. Starting at the existing 18" pipe here this again is an excavated ditch that works its way down to the wetlands area. It had a valley but not an intermittent watercourse or anything like that. The ditch was dug and if feeds that wetland. Our proposal is to pipe that for a couple of reasons, we have a septic system up here and it will make that septic system co-compliant. The house on 19, these are substantial housing; these are 3 car garages on the side, these are massive. I can’t promise that someone won’t come in and look for a bigger house; these are the ones that I’ve been using for the past 10 years. As far enough away from the house to be comfortable, 22’ and as you come along the wetlands and we demolish the farm buildings, take all the wire fences down and then the stone wall at the border of that conservation easement along the wetland area, as you may have seen from the photographs there’s stone walls all over the place. So it works out nice. This stone wall piles into the existing stone wall.

Coming on the other side, this is probably something that for points of discussion of the existing house, there are some outbuildings in that area. I don’t define it all that well as to what areas be conserved or undisturbed and it is in the upland
review area so that probably should be a point of discussion as we go forward. The existing little house is here and we're not necessarily going to tear that little house down but it's prudent to show on that lot. Lot 1 on the other side of the wetlands you can see the upland review line, we're going with basically the sort of guideline of 50' away or more, disturbance at 25'. The important factor is there's actually a stone wall, so those wetlands are getting pretty good protection.

Coming down we pick up the discharge from that wetland into our conduits and since this is a private road, we're doing something that you don't see in subdivisions which is where we put a vortex chamber, the reason we don't do it for subdivisions is Public Works isn't crazy about vortex chambers to clean out. So we have a vortex chamber piping down to our storm water detention pond. The storm water detention pond is excavated into the ground, there's no downside berm. Since we are excavating and since we know that there's very little water shed for all this area coming down here. We know that these wetlands are ground water fed; this intermittent water course just comes and goes. We know that this detention pond is going to become a de-facto wetlands, it's going to be in-ground water system. We're not claiming it as a creative wetland but when you drive by you'll find cat tails and all the other things.

Coming out of that pond as far as the discharge this is a dug ditch, it's many years old, but I'm not at all comfortable discharging to it. It's a dug ditch, it's got a steep slope and would need a lot more work to what I consider safe. I'm more interested in taking this water and bringing it around to these 2 owners. We have been talking to them, they're very nice people. They have water problems in basements on occasion, they take care of it, it goes away and then comes back again. But for that reason I'm very hesitant to take our final discharge and discharge it to that point. So what we do is bring it around the outside of those properties. We are going to provide City water to this subdivision. It exists at the intersection of Waverly Road and Booth Hill Road. It exists here on Waverly so it's a City water project and we are going to extend and provide to those acres.

The houses that do not discharge to the pond, all these house that are above the road, all the water hits the road, but some of these houses that have walk out basements and the grade is falling away not all these roof areas and lawn areas are able to get into the detention pond. So what we're doing on all lots with that kind of condition we're requiring 2" of runoff from the roof areas into retaining. So there will be infiltrator system, basic design, 2" of water.

END SIDE A, TAPE 1

So this gives you a little better idea what's going on with this discharge. I have more drawings that you'll see that you can see a little bit better, but we are piping it and bringing it down the hill to a discharge point here and then bring it to the water course there. We did consider a water course but I'm been trying to use those rip rap swales that are extra wide. There is too much topography going on, I think this is a little too steep.
This is the water shed map. Just to give you a little overview of where the water is coming from, this is the Aquarion Company, this is the Far Mill River, comes down through here. We really don't have a lot of water shed feeding into this watercourse area, it only extends a little bit. This is how we know that these wetlands are ground water fed.

We do have an engineering report submitted that shows the post development runoff is less than 3. There is no way that we're going to impact the peak flow. By the time the flood waters from the Far Mill River travel down to this point, our flows are minimal. But it's still worthwhile to, and I think Aquarion is going to require it anyways.

Here we have the road profile, not a lot to see on this drawing, this profile shows going down to the detention pond and you can see it steep pipe coming down into the ponds so we drop a manhole so it's nice and flat. This is the pipe that comes out of the detention pond and it follows the property line and then discharges around into the watercourse.
WCEO REPORT
February 8, 2018

PERMIT-APPLICATION #18-2, BOOTH HILL ESTATES — Booth Hill Road/Waverly Road.
Proposal to create a 23-lot DRD development in a R-1 zone within upland review area, road construction and culverting intermittent watercourse for access.

STATUS: 1. NEW application clock starts February 8, 2018
2. 65-day clock to decide action or schedule public hearing expires April 14, 2018

PLANS: BOOTH HILL ESTATES
Topographic Survey and Existing Conditions January 30, 2018
Subdivision Plan
Existing Conditions
Orientation Plan
Grading & Utility
Septic Testing and Design
Soil Erosion Control
Plan & Profile
Storm Drainage
Construction Details

COMMENTS: Recommend receipt for review and referral to City Engineer. This new development technique approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission provides for a combination of proposed lots that meet the existing zoning and others with an approximately ½ size for this zone. It also provides for the creation of a private road.

Historically, residential zone changes were required to demonstrate a conventional subdivision supposedly to pass muster with all boards and commissions. This facet is not part of this new design technique. A preliminary layout was based on an assumed approval of some 23-26 lots. Irrespective of the Planning & Zoning assurances at least one of these alternate layouts avoids nearly all or all regulated activity.

With the present layout, Lots 17&18 represent a poor approach to respecting the goals of the Commission. To propose dwellings directly over or directly adjacent to intermittent watercourses just to create a lot slaps in the face of the Commission effort to find proper balance of protection versus use. These two lots should be pulled from the equation. Time and again over the years the owners of lots in Shelton built like this pay the price years later with saturated lawns, wel basements etc. The goal of preventing impacts to these areas not only protects the resource for its intrinsic value but protects the interests of future owners. Clear photographic evidence dating back as far as 1934 show this wetland/watercourse condition and the farm at the time avoided substantially.

The piping of the intermittent watercourse to improve lot 19 is overly aggressive and should be eliminated. There is a cross road culvert and that should be maintained. An alternate would be to restrict the size of the house move the septic system or eliminate the lot 19. Much of the piping is to provide separation for the septic system.

The 28-lot plan entering from Waverly Road avoided crossing and filling the regulated areas.

This entire site is not only within public water supply watershed (the Means Brook Reservoir drinking water supply) but is adjacent to Connecticut Class Il fee parcel.
SHELTON INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION
APPLICATION FOR PERMIT

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT NEATLY
==ATTACH EXTRA SHEETS IF NOT ENOUGH SPACE==

1. APPLICATION NAME: Booth Hill Estates

2a. APPLICANT: John Paul Development, L.L.C.
   CONTACT NAME: (if applicant is a company) John Paul
   ADDRESS: 27 Blue Jay Drive - Trumbull, CT 06611
   TEL: ___________ FAX: ___________ CELL: 203 258-9037 EMAIL: johnpaulcorp@gmail.com
   APPLICANT SIGNATURE & DATE: ____________________________

2b. RECORD OWNER: John Paul Development L.L.C.
   CONTACT NAME: (if owner is a company)
   ADDRESS: ___________ TEL: ___________ FAX: ___________ CELL: ___________ EMAIL: ___________
   OWNER SIGNATURE & DATE: ____________________________ SUBMITTED

2c. AGENT NAME: James R. Swift, P.E., ASLA
   CONTACT NAME: (if agent is a company)
   ADDRESS: 102 Village Drive - Shelton, CT 06484
   TEL: 203 928-9665 FAX: ___________ CELL: 203 209-3746 EMAIL: jim@swiftpe.com
   AGENT SIGNATURE & DATE: ____________________________

3. PARCEL INFORMATION
3a. STREET NUMBER & STREET NAME: 439 Waverly Road
3b. AREA (acres): 22.65 3c. TAX MAP/LOT #: 44/57 3d. ZONE CLASS #: R-1 & DRD

4. REGULATED AREA & ACTIVITY QUESTIONS (Provide table with totals if multiple areas are involved)
4a. AREA OF WETLANDS/WATERCOURSES ON PROPERTY: 0.146 (n acres)
4b. AREA OF WETLANDS/WATERCOURSES ALTERED: None (in acres)
4c. AREA OF DISTURBANCE WITHIN BUFFER/UPLAND: 1.530 (n acres)
4d. AREA RESTORED, ENHANCED OR CREATED: None (n acres)
4e. NUMBER OF STORMWATER DISCHARGE POINTS: 3

5. Located in public water supply watershed? Y (Y or N) If Y, file copy of application with water company.

6. DESCRIBE REGULATED ACTIVITIES: (Attach additional sheets as needed)
   Disturbance of area within the upland review area for the construction of a private roadway and
   single family homes. Piping of intermittent watercourse.
INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION
CHECK LIST SHEET

♦ The intent of the checklist is to expedite the work of the UW Commission, Agent and/or other reviewers.

♦ The Agency considers the checklist part of the application, therefore attach it with your application packet.

♦ Follow the format of the checklist in your application packet. PLEASE TYPE ALL RESPONSES

♦ The required information will vary with each proposal, but the applicant should prepare to provide one or all of the following. Please check each item that you have provided in your packet.

A. WATERCOURSE CHARACTERISTICS (provide a table if multiple watercourses are involved)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Type of watercourse. (See regulations) i.e.: perennial stream, intermittent stream, swamp, marsh, bog, shrub swamp, pond, etc.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Average width of watercourse channel. Existing/Proposed in feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Average width of stream corridor. (Corridor width = channel width + buffers). Existing/Proposed in feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Length of watercourse involved. Existing/Proposed in feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Average depth of watercourse involved. Existing/Proposed in feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Size of pond, lake, marsh, etc. if applicable. Existing/Proposed as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Area in acres</td>
<td>b. Length in feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See attached Storm Drainage Computations

B. WETLAND CHARACTERISTICS (Provide a table if multiple wetland areas are involved)

|   | 1. Wetland Soil type (symbols and description per SCS Soil Survey Classification) |   |

C. SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

|   | 1. Describe the proposed measures to protect the regulated area on the following items. |   |
|   | a. Erosion and sedimentation. Anti-tracking Apron & Filter Fabric Fence |   |
|   | N/A |   |
|   | b. Leaching of pollutants generated by proposed activity |   |
|   | N/A |   |
|   | c. The direct discharge of pollutants generated by the proposed activity |   |
|   | N/A |   |
|   | d. The increased surface runoff hazards |   |

D. COMPUTATION OF MATERIALS TO BE DEPOSITED AND/OR EXCAVATED

(Within wetland area and buffer area. Provide tables if multiple impacts are proposed)

|   | 1. Size of regulated area and/or buffer proposed for fill or excavation in acres. |   |
|   | 2a. Depth of proposed deposition in feet | 2b. Volume in cubic yards | 2c. Depth of proposed removal in feet | 2d. Volume in cubic yards |

See Attachment A

E. SITE PLAN SPECIFICATIONS

|   | 1. Title Block: shows name of development, land owner(s), and developer(s), date of drawing. |   |
|   | 2. Revision Block: for all dates and types of subsequent revisions. |   |
|   | 3. Approximate true north point, scale, (1"=40' minimum for Grading, Utility, Erosion & Sediment Control plans), bar scale. |   |
|   | 4. Construction plan (utilities) and profile to bore soil and personally endorsed signature of the professional engineer, licensed as such by the State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors of the State of Connecticut and in accordance with the "Rules and Regulations of the State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors". |   |
|   | 5. Certification that the accuracy of the information of the Plans meets the standards for Class A-2 Transit survey established by the Connecticut Technical Council. Such Certification shall bear the seal and personally endorsed signature of the land surveyor. |   |
|   | 6. Small key or location map at approximate scale 1"=1000' showing relevant streets. |   |
|   | 7. Names, and addresses of adjacent property owners. |   |
|   | 8. Existing and proposed contours at two-foot (2') intervals. Indicate legend symbols for both. |   |
|   | 9. Show ledge outcroppings if apparent. |   |
|   | 10. Show location and floor elevations of existing and proposed buildings or other structures. |   |
|   | 11. Show location, size and composition of sidewalks, off-street parking and loading areas including driveway entrance and exits, parking and loading spaces and traffic islands and barriers. |   |
|   | 12. Location of existing and proposed tree stands shrub and other significant vegetation. |   |
|   | 13. Indicate source of water supply, locations of wells, water lines. |   |
INLAND WETLANDS APPLICATION CHECKLIST PAGE 2 OF 3

N/A 14. Location and detail of all septic tanks and leach fields proposed. (Existing structures if available)
X 15. Location, materials and sizes of existing and proposed sanitary sewer lines; locate manholes
(Show grade and invert elevations).
X 16. Locations, materials, and sizes of existing and proposed storm drainage system locate existing and
proposed manholes and catch basins (show grade and invert elevations).
X 17. Show drainages for all roof, parking lot, foundation and driveway areas.
X 18. Show planting schedules for stabilization of open drainage swales as well as other disturbed areas.
X 19. Show all buffer areas, including regulated buffers, easements and rights of way.
X 20. Show locations of all soil borings, percolation pits and observation holes and the log.
X 21a. Adequate number of cross-sections illustrating proposed and/or existing regulated disturbed areas. Cross
sections to include existing and proposed grades, slopes, high water table (As of January through June),
locations of streams and wetlands.
X 21b. Plans and profiles of all regulated area crossings to show watercourse, watercourse relocation, wetland
boundary, high water table as of January 31 to June 1, existing and proposed grades, slopes, limit of
disturbance.
X 22. Delinate boundaries of all wetlands, watercourses (both edges), floodplains, 100 year Flood Hazard
Boundary. Wetland/watercourse boundaries are required on all record maps. Numbered flag locations for
wetland/watercourse limits shall show on site plans.
X 23. Indicate soil type of wetlands as per USDA Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey.
N/A 24. If watercourse relocation is involved, show original and proposed locations.
X 25. Reroute all drainage inlets and outlets. Dimension the reroute and specify type.
X 27. Show the following ten erosion and sediment control notes and any additional list as warranted.

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PLAN

In accordance with the agency authorization the permit holder shall:
1. Keep land disturbance to a minimum and schedule stabilization as soon as practical or as directed by the Agency,
2. Install haybales and/ or fabric filters at all culvert outlets, and along the toe of all critical cut and fill slopes.
3. Protect stormwater discharges with haybales and/ or fabric filters as necessary or required.
4. Protect catch basins with haybales filters throughout the construction period and until all disturbed areas are
   thoroughly stabilized.
5. Construct all erosion/sediment control measures in accordance with the standards and specifications of the
   "Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control ".
6. Install erosion and sediment control measures before construction.
7. Maintain control measures during the construction period.
8. Install additional control measures during the construction period if necessary or required.
9. Remove sediment from control structures and dispose of it in a manner, which is consistent with the intent of the
    plan.
10. 

NAME          PHONE
The above named person is assigned the responsibility for implementing the erosion and sediment control plan.
This responsibility includes the installation and maintenance of control measures and informing all parties engaged
on the construction site of the requirements and objectives of the plan. The responsibility includes the notification to
the Inland Wetlands Commission of any transfer of this plan and for conveying a copy of the inland wetland permit
if the title to the land is transferred.
INLAND WETLAND APPLICATION CHECKLIST PAGE 3 OF 3

F. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
(Complete Section F. only if specifically required)

F.1 GENERAL DATA
X 1. Provide names and complete mailing addresses of all abutting property owners:
X 2. Land Disturbance:
X a. Percentage of parcel area covered by impervious materials (i.e. driveway, sidewalks, buildings, etc.)
27 b. Percentage of parcel area to be covered by lawn
35 c. Percentage of parcel area disturbed (NOTE: a + b + c = 100%)
X 3. Watershed Information:
   a. Name of major watershed, Far Mill River
   b. Geographic location within major watershed, Upper Third
   c. Acres of watershed above activity, 1.5 acres

F.2 WATERCOURSE INFORMATION
X 4. a. Probable effect of proposed activity on stream flow No significant impact
   b. Probable effect of proposed activity on pond/lake surface level No significant impact
X 5. a. Peak Storm Water Discharge: 25, 50, 25, 100y: events
   b. Existing/Proposed Flow in cubic feet per second (cfs) See attached Storm water Report
   c. Existing/Proposed Velocity in feet per second (fps)
X 6. Accurate topography of stream bed.
N/A Water analysis by a certified Sanitary Engineer or other qualified person, of the watercourse within or
   adjacent to the proposed activity indicating:
   a. pH or alkalinity/acidity level.
   b. Turbidity or solids in parts per million (ppm).
   c. bacteria count in coliform per milliliter.
   d. flow, if any, in cubic feet per second (cfs).
   e. narrative of the changes in a. – d. because of the proposed activity.

F.3 WETLAND CHARACTERISTICS
X 9. Complete a table of flora similar to the following for the entire wetland area.
     (Provide tables if multiple areas are involved.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cover Type</th>
<th>Percentage of Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic (including algae)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivated or pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other...

X 10. Describe effects of proposed activity on:
   a. Flora. No significant impact
   b. Fauna. No significant impact
   c. Water retention capacity of regulated area. No significant impact
   d. Water quality. No significant impact
   e. Groundwater aquifer recharge. No significant impact

N/A 11. Biological evaluation of any marsh, swamps or bogs on the property, prepared and certified
       by an ecologist indicating:
       a. dominant botanical species, rare or endangered species and forest age.
       b. habitat value of the affected property for all wildlife species.
       c. water table depth or level of water if inundated.

N/A 12. Chemical composition of all toxic substances, whether such materials are enclosed in containers or
        deposited openly.
PIETRAS ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP, LLC

WETLAND DELINEATION REPORT

Date: August 16, 2016
PEG JOB#: 2016-132
Prepared for: Lewis Associates
260 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
Project Location: 439 Waverly Road, Shelton, CT
Report Map: City of Shelton GIS Map
Inspection Date: August 11, 2016

Field Conditions: weather: partly sunny, 80's soil moisture: dry to moist

Legislative Definitions of Wetlands and Watercourses in CT (General Statutes, Chpt 440, Sec. 22a-28 to 22a-45)

Tidal Wetlands are defined as "those areas which border on or lie beneath tidal waters, such as, but not limited to banks, bogs, salt marsh, swamps, meadows, flats, or other low lands subject to tidal action, including those areas now or formerly
connected to tidal waters, and whose surface is at or below an elevation of one foot above local extreme high water, and which may grow or be capable of growing some, but not necessarily all of the following:" (Includes plant (st) sec. 22a-29(2).

Inland Wetlands "means land, including submerged land, not regulated pursuant to sections 22a-28 to 22a-35, inclusive,
which consists of any of the soil types designated as poorly drained, very poorly drained, alluvial, and floodplain by the
National Cooperative Soils Survey, as may be amended from time to time, of the Natural Resources Conservation Service
(NRCS) of the United States Department of Agriculture" section 22a-38(15).

Watercourses "means rivers, streams, brooks, waterways, lakes, ponds, marshes, swamps, bogs and all other bodies of water,
natural or artificial, vernal or intermittent, public or private which area contained within, flow through or teilder upon this
state or any portion thereof, not regulated pursuant to sections 22a-28 to 22a-35, inclusive. Intermittent watercourses shall
be delineated by a defined permanent channel and bank and the occurrence of two or more of the following characteristics:
(A) Evidence of scour or deposits of recent alluvium or debris, (B) the presence of standing or flowing water for a duration
longer than a particular storm incident, and (C) the presence of hydrophytic vegetation" section 22a-38(16).

Regulated Wetlands and Watercourses Identified:

Inland Wetlands: yes Watercourses: yes river, brook, lake, pond:
Tidal Wetlands: no intermittent watercourse: XX
Wetland boundary Peg #’s: 1 thru 10, 11 thru 20, 21 thru 26

Local Regulated Upland Review Area: From Wetlands: 25 to 50 feet From Watercourses: 50 to 100 feet

All established wetlands boundary lines are subject to change until officially adopted by local and state agencies.

Shonne W. Pietras
Thomas W. Pietras
Professional Wetland and Soil Scientist
15 Bristow Lane
Wellington, CT 06492
203-379-6036

DIGILOG Signed by Thomas W. Pietras
DN: c77/Thomw. Pietras, wPieteras
Environmental Group, LLC, no.
enga9Nv2vNQy1eEtYmIo2s0J0S
on-v-c01
Date: 02-08-16 16:47:28 -0500

PHOTLog@pieterasenvironmentalgroup.com
WEB SITE pieterasenvironmentalgroup.com
Wetland Delineation Report for 439 Waverly Road, Shelton, CT

Thomas W. Pietras, Professional Wetland and Soil Scientist, conducted a site inspection to the subject property on August 11, 2016. The 22.16± acre property contains a single family residence, agricultural fields with animal pens and coops and woodlands. The house is located in the far southern end of the property. The agricultural fields are located in the central and western portions of the parcel. The eastern and northern portions of the property are forested. Slopes on the property range from gently sloping to very steeply sloping. The grades generally fall to the north. The lands situated down slope to the north of the subject property are owned by the Anconion Water Company. The Farm River flows through the water company property.

A spade and auger were used to dig test holes on the property. The classification system of the National Cooperative Soil Survey and the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service was utilized for identification of soil drainage classes and soil types. The soil types identified on the property were assigned soil map numbers according to the State of Connecticut Soil Legend. Locations of soil types identified are shown on a sketch map that is included with this report. Inland wetlands are regulated by CT General Statutes, Chapter 446, Sections 22a-36 to 22a-45. The State defines wetlands as land consisting of any of the soil types designated as poorly drained, very poorly drained, alluvial and floodplain by the National Cooperative Soil Survey. The boundaries of the wetlands identified on the property were delineated with consecutively numbered, survey stakes. Approximate location of the wetlands are also shown on the soil and wetland sketch map. Brief descriptions of the soil mapping units are included in this report. Additional information about the soils identified on the property can be found in the Soil Survey of the State of Connecticut (www.nrcs.usda.gov/ct/survey).

Wetlands, identified as poorly drained Ridgebury fine sandy loam (2), are located in three areas in the western portion of the property. The Ridgebury is a loamy, glacial till soil which contains dense, compact lodgement till (hardpan) in the subsoil. Two small pockets of Ridgebury wetlands are located within a horse pasture which is located in the southwestern portion of the property (WF 11 thru 20 and WF 21 thru 26). These two wetlands support wet meadow vegetation. In addition, an intermittent watercourse flows through these wetlands. The intermittent watercourse continues beyond the wetlands and extends in a northerly direction toward the property at 476 Booth Hill Road where the watercourse percolates into the ground.

The third wetland (WF 1 thru 10) is located in the northwestern portion of the property. Most of this wetland appears to be located off-site in the back yards of properties at 472 & 476 Booth Hill Road. This wetland supports forested swamp vegetation. An intermittent watercourse develops within the wetland and flows in a northerly direction onto the water company land.

Respectfully submitted,

PIETRAS ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP, LLC

Thomas W. Pietras
Professional Wetland Scientist and Soil Scientist
BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF SOIL MAP UNITS IDENTIFIED

WETLAND SOILS

2 Ridgebury fine sandy loam (Aeric Epiaquepts) - This is a deep, poorly drained, glacial till soil that developed in a friable, coarse-loamy textured solum overlying dense, basalt till (hardpan). The till was derived from schist, gneiss and granite. Ridgebury soils occur on glaciated plains, hills and ridges. The hardpan is within 20 to 30 inches of the soil surface and it has very slow permeability. A seasonal, perched ground water table is typically present within a foot of the surface from late fall through mid-spring.

NON-WETLAND SOILS

45 Woodbridge fine sandy loam (Aquic Dystrudepts) - This is a deep, moderately well drained, glacial till soil that developed in a friable, coarse-loamy textured solum overlying dense, basalt till (hardpan). The till was derived from schist, gneiss and granite. Woodbridge soils occur on glaciated plains, hills and ridges. The hardpan is within 20 to 40 inches of the soil surface. A seasonal water table is present between 18 and 30 inches of the surface.

73 Charlton-Chatfield complex (Typic Dystrudepts) - These are deep and moderately deep, well drained, friable, coarse-loamy textured, glacial till soils derived from schist, gneiss and granite. Depth to bedrock ranges from 20 inches to over 5 feet. About 50% of the soils in this complex are greater than 5 feet to bedrock. Charlton-Chatfield soils occur on glaciated plains, hills and ridges. The water table is generally greater than five feet below the surface.

84 Paxton and Montauk fine sandy loams (Oxyaquic Dystrudepts) - These are deep, well drained, glacial till soils that developed in a friable, coarse-loamy textured solum overlying dense, coarse-loamy to loamy sand textured, basalt till (hardpan). The till was derived from schist, gneiss and granite. Typical depth to hardpan is 30-40 inches. An occasional perched, seasonal water table is present between 24 and 36 inches of the surface. Paxton and Montauk soils occur on glaciated plains, hills and ridges.
Property at 439 Waverly Road, Shelton, CT

A sketch map of Inland Wetlands, watercourses & soil types field identified on August 11, 2016

Thomas W. Pietras, Soil Scientist
III-D. MISCELLANEOUS
A. Agent Reviewed Applications:

B. Violations:

1. MATURO PROPERTY-58 KINGS HIGHWAY (Status Report)- Mr. Wills spoke with her and will hand deliver the necessary paperwork for her signature.

2. IWV #16-03: 68 Birchbank Road – DaRosa Property. Unauthorized construction of a descending concrete walkway: 40+ feet of cinder block; poured concrete dock projecting into the Housatonic River without a permit. - SEE ABOVE

IV. MINUTES
1. January 11, 2018 Regular

Commissioner Kawalutzki motioned to accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 11, 2018. Commissioner Dunford seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Kawalutzki motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Goncalves seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motioned passed unanimously.

Chairman Zahornasky adjourned the Regular Meeting of the Inland Wetlands Commission at 8:19P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sophia V. Belade
Sophia V. Belade
Clerk – Inland Wetlands
1 Tape on file in the City/Town Clerk’s Office