I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL

III. BUSINESS MEETING

III-A. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

III-B. OLD BUSINESS

1. PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-01, BROOKVIEW HEIGHTS – 405 LONG HILL AVENUE. Proposal to create a 4-lot residential development involving discharge of stormwater and construction and grading within upland review area.

2. PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-02, WEYBOSSET STREET HOUSING DEVELOPMENT-WEYBOSSET STREET. Proposal to create a 4-lot residential development from 5 parcels on a paper street involving wetland fill for driveway construction and disturbance for sewer line installation and construction and grading within upland review area.

3. PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-03, RIVER ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT – 85/97 RIVER ROAD. Proposal to create a 36-unit residential townhouse development involving driveway construction within upland review area and installation of a detention pond and stormwater level spreader system within upland review area that overflows to a regulated area.

III-C. NEW BUSINESS

III-D. MISCELLANEOUS

IV. MINUTES

February 14, 2019

V. ADJOURNMENT
Chairman Zahornasky called the Regular Meeting of the Inland Wetlands Commission to order at 7:15 P.M.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. ROLL CALL:

Gary Zahornasky, Chairman
Robert Dunford, Commissioner
Michele Kawalautzki, Commissioner (arrived 7:25 pm)
Ken Nappi, Commissioner (excused 7:40 pm)
Joseph Reilly, Commissioner

Excused: Jack Goncalves, Commissioner
Charlie Wilson, Vice-Chairman

Also Present: John Cook, Staff

III. BUSINESS MEETING

III-A. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS - None

III-B. OLD BUSINESS

1. PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-01, BROOKVIEW HEIGHTS – 405 LONG HILL AVENUE. Proposal to create a 4-lot residential development involving discharge of stormwater and construction and grading within upland review area.

Dominick Thomas
Cohen & Thomas
315 Main Street
Derby, CT

He is the attorney representing the applicant. He was present before the Commission requesting approval from the Wetlands Commission. They have appeared before the Zoning Commission, the applicant has dug the test pits and Mr. Thomas has given the board the report from the Soil Scientist. Staff was present for 3 of the 4 test pits that were dug. They went down 35-30’, fill was located and they did not reach virgin ground. It does verify that structurally and as the Engineer’s letter suggests that they will have to deal with the structural issues when the point comes for foundations. He also stated that Mr. D’Amico was able to pull the 2 houses in question completely out of the upland review area.

Fred D’Amico
Professional Engineer

He stated that in the new plans the houses are highlighted in yellow. He stated that pulled the 2 dwellings way over and that there is no proposed grading in this area that will go into the buffer area.
John Cook asked for verification that there is no new fill over the existing slope. Mr. D’Amico responded that they are not proposing any change in slope. The only excavation or activity in the upland review area is where the drainage goes down to the brook; that is also where the walking path is. Other than that there is no other activity in the upland review area and no activity on the wetlands. The bridge is to go over the wetlands; that will have no interference; it will have supports on either sides of the upland review area. He also stated that there were 4 test holes they did and most were 20’ deep. 1 was 30’ deep, the first 15’ the fill looked good but once they went deeper for the next 10’ there was construction debris, but at 30’ they did not hit virgin ground. It will be decided later on with the approval whether they decide to take out the debris or not for the foundation design. Most likely the material around the foundation hall where the footings are it will be stockpiled and the demolition material will be separated and removed from the site and then backfill with the good soil and compact it.

WCEO REPORT
March 14, 2019

PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-01, BROOKVIEW HEIGHTS – 405 LONG HILL AVENUE.
Proposal to create a 4-lot residential development involving discharge of stormwater and construction and grading within upland review area.

STATUS: 1. Application received January 10, 2019
2. 65-day clock to decide action or schedule public hearing expires March 16, 2019
3. City Engineer report January 18, 2019
4. Report from office of City Engineer February 27, 2019 on revised plans recommends tabling

PLANS: BROOKVIEW HEIGHTS (no revised plans as of 2.14.19)
Record Subdivision Map Jan. 3, 2016
Site Development and Erosion Control Plan Sept. 17, 2008 [correct date?]
Construction Plan and Plan & Profile Dec. 15, 2017

COMMENTS: Note the office of the City Engineer still maintains major concerns over the revised plans and these should be addressed.
The engineer for the applicant has contacted this office to indicate test holes are to be conducted March 13, 2019. These test holes while not borings are to use equipment substantial enough to reach virgin soil in the deepest presumed areas. He stated counsel for the applicant recommends the soil scientist be present to observe bottom of the test holes.
Staff contacted three independent test boring companies that are local, Oxford, Seymour and Beacon Falls. All appeared to be consistent with an initial cost estimate based on general description of the site conditions. While not a substantial difference between the two methods it seems the test borings can be more complete but more expensive. Also, after speaking with the Assistant City Engineer if the pressure on the boring machine is not set high enough a hard boulder can create a false indication of bedrock.
It seems an extension is in order for this project, one reason to digest findings from anticipated test holes, the second to allow applicant address concerns from office of City Engineer.

COMMENTS FROM FEBRUARY: The City Engineer completed a review Jan. 18, 2019 expressing major concerns. He identified:
1. As much as 20’ of fill in the vicinity of the original watercourse location.
2. Glaring conflicts how drainage and storm sewers are indicated.
3. Lack of stormwater detention calculations.
4. Due to incompleteness, conflicts with pipes and structures, fill directly adjacent to regulated areas; the application should be tabled to all issues are addressed.
The comments reinforce the concerns established by staff that regardless of when filling took place or who did the various fillings, the applicant owns the condition and there is an inadequate level of information to determine if a violation of wetlands or watercourses exist and if regulated activities have occurred without benefit of permit correcting the condition or process an application for permit after the fact to sustain. A scientific method was suggested to analyze the fill to facilitate understanding and evaluating the on-site condition.
The Commission should not be swayed by arguments whether there may be similar situations across the City and pandoras box is opened. If there are other situations then
they may be addressed as discovered. The current application is what is before the board to evaluate existing conditions and proposed regulated activities. For all the above and rationale below staff recommends tabling action until such analysis, clarification, verification and/or correction is met.

**COMMENTS FROM JANUARY:** The site for this new application has been before the P&Z several times during recent years. During those times this office undertook extensive review into past filling activities via grading maps and aerial photos and was previously noted to them. The history has been one of extensive filling by past and current property owners. Photos not attached but available. The R-1 zoned site is proposed for 4 single family dwellings on 1/3+/- acre each. A substantially scaled back layout from some of the other proposals submitted to P&Z in the last few years. Incremental filling has taken place in years since 2003 but the investigation indicates filling long before the current owners acquired the original piece. In 2013 additional regulated areas and upland were purchased from CONNDOT.

From the memo to the Planning and Zoning Commission (copy attached) there are two principal areas of concern. First, ascertaining whether any of the recent fill or past filling operations constitute a violation of local wetland authority. Filling within upland review areas, (buffer standards established in 1989) or within wetland areas since 1974 would be considered regulated activities and should be addressed. Either removal and restoration or permitting after the fact to properly sustain. Second, regardless how the filling is treated. The record indicates substantial fill has taken place at this subject property. Some test holes were conducted with a small machine and only in the most recent fill, not the old fill and not where several homes are indicated. As suggested in the memo to P&Z only through a scientific method with proper expertise to analyze can proper or best assurance be made that there is no violation, or a permit after the fact can be considered or eventually protect future land owners that acquire the subject fill sites. This concern is only to address structural concerns and not those expressed by long time landowners that assert that other components exist within the old earthen fill condition. This issue is not one to be taken likely. The record shows that in 1990/91 a homeowner experienced foundation failure years after moving into the home. Upon detailed analysis discovery showed the home was partially constructed upon multiple feet of fill over inland wetland soils. It was never determined if the fill was a violation or predated regulations. However, because of finding of unsuitable material under the foundation the following parties became part of a lawsuit by the homeowners:

1. The builder of the home.
2. The parents of the builder of the home who transferred the lot to him.
3. The inland wetlands commission as an entity.
4. The City of Shelton as an entity.
5. The Chairman of the Commission as an entity.
6. The wetlands administrator as an entity.
7. The wetlands administrator as an individual.
8. The building official as an entity.

The contention by the plaintiff was that the defendants knew or should have known of the unsuitable load bearing material. The point is it is known that material has been brought in by multiple owners over the years and construction is proposed over this fill area. Once determination is made as to how the handle the fill condition and depending on those findings staff offers the following initial comments.

1. The grades show the homes non-walkout so hatchway egress should be shown to demonstrate exit from basement areas of lots 1-3 on the Site Development Plan/E&S Plan.
2. Provide a detail of the foot bridge to cross the brook.
3. Provide two cross sections for lots 2&3 to confirm no further filling is to occur on slope areas as questionable stability may exist presently. No effort to create fill lifts or plan existed when the various fill operations took place.
4. Pending City Engineer verification a drop manhole structure should be installed to provide adequate low pitch discharge 0.05% +/- to reduce scour potential at discharge point.
5. Rotate construction plan view sheet 3/3 to same orientation as Site Development Plan to minimize confusion.
6. Insure lot numbering is the same for all sheets. Sheet 3 does not match sheets 1&2.
7. Provide elevations of profile grid to ease readability.
8. Shift silt fence to vegetation line at top of slope on lot 2; Site Development Plan.
9. Catch basins #3&4 exhibit an 8' grate elevation difference within 50' of each other over the cul-de-sac that should be nearly level. Is this a “busted” grade shot?

10. Regarding the sanitary sewer. The Plan & Profile shows as existing sanitary line when it isn’t. It shows a manhole grate at 223.0’ an invert of 205.1’ but a garage elevation of 277’. A 72’ differential but the plot shows it the top of it 20’ above the road way surface. The spot elevation of Long Hill Avenue shows 307.5’ but the grate is shown as 225.7’ over 80’ lower.

Staff has spoken with both the City Engineer and Assistant City Engineer and showed them the submitted drawings and my initial comments and based on the above findings there are significant grade issues, elevation issues and clarifications. They indicate that the applicant should or the Commission may want addressed before further review proceeds. To this end the application may be withdrawn without prejudice to work on these matters.

From: John Cook
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 12:49 PM
Subject: 19-01 Brookview Heights deep test holes

Dear Members,

The applicant commissioned an excavator to conduct deep, very deep excavation holes at the referenced site. This occurred March 12, 2019. Some demolition material was found, much large blasted rock, some metal and pipe and clean fill. The design engineer was present along with the soil scientist. Some water bled in at the deepest levels but at the 3 holes staff observed the original soil level was really not evident. This was true whether the land was originally regulated wetland soils or uplands. The depth of holes was approximately 20-25 feet deep. A fourth hole was excavated after I left and they went approximately 30’ deep with similar results. Some of the rubble and demo material existed in bands generally above the large blasted rock and below more recent clean fill.

This exercise was definitely a worthwhile endeavor and revealed valuable information. While the test holes may not be as accurate nor as linear as a grid pattern of test borings, they confirm multiple filling operations with multiple types of material that engineer D’Amico confirmed the material was unsuitable for construction as deposited and would need to be removed and or sorted in conjunction with proper foundation constructions. This would be the responsibility of others not the I/W Commission. Also, the test hole findings should not be considered as a standard through other portions of the property beyond that under consideration of the Inland Wetlands Commission. The holes were closest to the existing slope area adjacent to the current watercourse and flagged inland wetlands.

As far as Inland Wetlands considerations it is my professional opinion after closely looking at the fill slope, the tree establishment on the slope, the various layers of old fill within the test holes, and comparison to aerial photos previously mentioned that sufficient evidence exists that the old fill predates the Shelton Inland Wetlands program. The more recent fills by the current owner appear to comply with buffer aka upland review limits. We have no doubt the old mass fillings probably did push the watercourse to some degree westerly and most likely over wetlands soils adjacent to the stream. But looking at the adjacent topography and typical stream conditions with similar topography that any wetland soils that may have been present were most likely physically limited in areal extent. Simply meaning the band of wetland soils associated with the watercourse would have been narrow in width.

The applicant’s team should submit a formal report with their findings and depth readings. Please consider this email a supplement to staff comments previously submitted for your consideration.

John

Commissioner Reilly motioned to approve PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-01, BROOKVIEW HEIGHTS – 405 LONG HILL AVENUE. Proposal to create a 4-lot residential development involving discharge of stormwater and construction and grading within upland review area contingent upon approval of the City Engineer and Planning & Zoning Commission as well as any map corrections regarding dates and such being contingent on approval by Staff, Engineer and City Engineer. Commissioner Dunford second the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed 4-0, 1 abstain
2. PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-02, WEYBOSETT STREET HOUSING DEVELOPMENT-WEYBOSETT STREET. Proposal to create a 4-lot residential development from 5 parcels on a paper street involving wetland fill for driveway construction and disturbance for sewer line installation and construction and grading within upland review area.

WCEO REPORT
March 14, 2019
PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-02, WEYBOSETT STREET RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT HEIGHTS – UNIMPROVED PORTION OF WEYBOSETT STREET. Proposal to create a 4-lot residential development involving discharge of stormwater and construction and grading within upland review area.

STATUS:
1. Application received February 14, 2019
2. First discussion March 14, 2019
3. 65-day clock to decide action or schedule public hearing expires April 20, 2019

PLANS: ALFONSE CAMMAROTA
Feasibility Study Map Dec. 6, 2018

COMMENTS:
This proposal is submitted as a modified development plan from that submitted the end of 2017. The Commission recalls that plan was denied without prejudice. The earlier plan consisted if 5-homes, road extension with cul-de-sac within regulated area, and encroachment onto land n/f owned by the Shelton Land Conservation Trust. The current plan before the Commission consists of 4-homes, some common driveway construction within regulated area, common sewer line installation to existing manhole structure pavement leak off to regulated area and home construction within upland review area. Also proposed are evergreen retaining wall constructions to further limit grading encroachment within regulated areas.

The plan submitted should not be considered a fully engineered site plan though a number of engineered aspects are within it. It is not submitted along with a A-2 survey, includes both the 5 parcels from the circa 1932 subdivision and half of the 1994 abandonment of “Forest Avenue?” ROW. The purpose as a feasibility plan is to determine if there is sufficient likelihood of a favorable outcome between the Inland Wetlands Commission, and Board of Aldermen without having to incur further or excessive cost without a possibility of a favorable outcome.

The redesign attempts to reduce regulated activity by the following:
1. No road construction is proposed, driveway construction only as the access leaves the existing Weybossett Street pavement.
2. Evergreen retaining wall construction to reduce pavement within and adjacent to the regulated area.
3. Combined sanitary sewer connection to the existing sewer line rather than four individual lines.

Several points worthy of discussion involve the following though understandably if there is an unlikely favorable position to consider this proposal the applicant would not want to incur the cost of generating the additional data:

a. Other utility structures specifically gas & water; where located and what are impacts?

b. Storm water drainage both road and driveway leak off and roof and foundation drainage where located and how to be handled?

c. Since the sewer lines are proposed as combined can they be designed to discharge to the manhole structure back at the existing Weybossett versus connection into the structure more or less in the wetland portion of the existing line? No elevation demonstrates if the grades work properly.

d. There is no detail for the retaining wall design.

e. Is winter plowing expecting to always push material into regulated area? If not, how is it to be handled?

Alphonse Cammarota
4085 Park Avenue
Fairfield, CT

Mr. Cammarota, the applicant, addressed the Commission in regards to constructing a 4 lot subdivision on Weybosset Street. He continued with regards to the gas and water. He stated that each lot would have their own line and also propane gas to each property. He stated that the way he has designed the street that the trucks for snow plowing would be able to come down and back up and turn around. This is private property and the city trucks would not have to maintain for snow removal. He understands that he will have to provide
paperwork with creating an association for this location. He described that this would have to be done through the Secretary of State of Connecticut first and foremost regarding to the easements necessary on the site.

Chairman Zahornasky stated that it would be wise to have staff meet with the applicant to make the application as feasible as possible. Also have the applicant meet with the other departments need to have this application brought back to the commission.

Tabled to next month.

3. PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-03, RIVER ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT – 85/97 RIVER ROAD. Proposal to create a 36-unit residential townhouse development involving driveway construction within upland review area and installation of a detention pond and stormwater level spreader system within upland review area that overflows to a regulated area.

Manny Silva
Rose Tiso & Co

Here to represent the applicant Key Development. He stated that he is presenting some revised drawings. He presented the comments that he will present in writing.
March 14, 2019

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

Re: 85 River Road, Townhouse Development;
1) Drawings SP-1 through SP-6
2) Drawings PP1, PP2 Profile Plans
3) Site Engineering Design Report Dated January 10, 2019

Please be advised that we have reviewed the above-mentioned plans, and review letter by the Conservation Commission. The petitioner is to identify and respond, in writing, to each of the items noted below should additional reviews be desired.

1) Outdated details/notes citing CF DOT Form 816.

R. DOT notes have been updated to Form 817

2) Substantial grading and construction activities occurring within 50’ upland review limits.

R. The grade with in the 50 is primarily the entry driveway, a truck turn around area and the new retention pond.

3) All catch basins must have 4’ sumps.

R. The catch basin detail on SP-5 and SP-6 has been revised to 4 foot sumps.

4) Change subsurface level spreader detail language to: "place to a depth as directed by the Design Engineer." Test pits should be performed to determine optimal placement.

R. Language has been revised on detail on SP-2, test pits will be conducted prior to construction.

5) Verify size of outlet pipe on outlet structure detail leading to 12” level spreader.

R. The outlet pipe on the control structure detail has been revised to a 12-inch pipe.
WCEO REPORT
March 14, 2019
PERMIT-APPLICATION #19-03, RIVER ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT -- 85/97 RIVER ROAD. Proposal to create a 4-lot residential development involving discharge of stormwater and construction and grading within upland review area.

STATUS:
1. Application received February 14, 2019
2. 65-day clock to decide action or schedule public hearing expires April 20, 2019
3. Reports from office of City Engineer recommend tabling
   a. February 26, 2019 to I/W
   b. February 27, 2019 to P/Z

PLANS: RIVER ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT
Lot Line Adjustment Map 10.2.18
Site Plan 1.10.19
Grading & Utility Plan "
Soil Erosion Control Plan "
Landscape Plan "
Details SP-5 & SP-6 "
Profile PP-1 & PP-2 "

COMMENTS:
Reports have been received from the office of the City Engineer. Note there are two, one to I/W and one to P/Z. Both are referenced as some overlapping areas of concern exist. Most important within them is the recommendation to table action until deficiencies are addressed.

Staff offers the following additional comments and points.
1. Due to the severe grades it may be prudent to develop a separate E&S Plan sheet with temporary measures, stockpiles of overburden, shot rock, top soil, other materials and efforts, etc.
2. Prepare a profile of the level spreader discharge system to demonstrate its position as it relates to existing field grade. The function of this measure is critically dependent on proper horizontal installation.

3. Given the proximity of the site to the Housatonic River or the tributary feeder stream, has verification by office of City Engineer of the detention aspects of the plan been verified as a necessity? Can sufficient control be established by infiltration galleys?

4. Expand E&S Narrative to address basin construction, spreader installation, temporary measures, and phasing. At what level of completion should these facilities be operation before unit construction starts? How to address building construction, numbering of buildings, which starts first, etc.?

5. Detail shows 2’ deep minimum sumps in catch basins. Four foot deep is considered pretty much standard. If ledge is encountered twin 2’ sumps may be acceptable to provide the sediment capture volume.

6. Suggest removal of the details on the bottom of sheet SP-2 & SP-3 to show the entire parcel. Place the details on the detail sheets.

7. With 40’-45’ cuts shown with 1:1 slope, how to verify the upper limit of the cut slope? How verify stability of 1:1 slope to backs of buildings as it relates to control of soil discharge to basin? No landscaping or seeding is provided to stabilize this slope. How will plan change depending on angle of ledge encountered or deeper overburden is encountered?

8. Provide cross section through basin from West to East from stream centerline through WL #11.

Tabled to next month.
February 26, 2019

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

Re: 85 River Road, Townhouse Development;
1) Drawings SP-1 through SP-6
2) Drawings PP-1, PP-2 Profile Plans
3) Site Engineering Design Report Dated January 10, 2019

Dear Mr. Cook:

This office has reviewed the above referenced application to develop the 12.38 acre site located in an undisturbed wetland at 85 River Road. The scope of the project includes developing the wetland/riparian portion of the property.

At this time there is insufficient information with which to endorse this application, as well as several deficiencies which must be addressed. Among the information missing is a full size map of the entire drainage basin which should show the 12.38 acre site, drainage calculations for the capacity of the structure conveying the drainage under River Road, and a Plan and Profile of all utilities on site. The notable deficiencies include:

1) Outdated site/riparian data
2) Substantial grading and construction activities occurring within 50’ upland review limits.
3) All catch basins must have 4’ sumps.
4) Change subsurface level spreader detail language to: “place to a depth as directed by the Design Engineer.” Test pits should be performed to determine optimal placement.
5) Verify size of outlet pipe on outlet structure detail leading to 12” level spreader.
6) Person(s) responsible for maintenance of level spreader and detention pond needs to be listed with contact number(s).
7) Provide calculations for catch basin at end of site driveway. Show part of drainage system on development plans. This must be included in overall calculations for entire site.
8) Detail of OI-1
9) Provide drainage calculations for entire drainage basin through discharge point on east side of River Road. We have concerns about the post development runoff coefficient used in the calculations. It is anticipated the site will consist of an open rock slope with no vegetation. This condition would conservatively have a runoff coefficient of .90 instead of .40.

Very truly yours,

Rimas J. Balaya
Assistant City Engineer

cc: Ken Napo, Planning & Zoning Administrator
    Neil Cowan, District Drainage Engineer, ConnDOT
    District Engineer, ConnDOT District 3

File: 85 River Road, Townhouse Development
IRC-34
February 27, 2019

Kenneth Nappi
Planning & Zoning Administrator
City of Shelton
54 Hill Street
Shelton, CT 06484

Re: 85 River Road Townhouse Development, River Road;
1) Lot Line Adjustment Map dated Oct 2, 2018
2) Plan Sheets SP-1 through SP-6 all dated 1/10/2019
3) Plan & Profile Sheets PP-1 & PP-2 both dated 1/10/2019

Dear Mr. Nappi:

This office has reviewed the above referenced application to construct 36 units on 12.38 acres. While the concept appears to have merit, we have serious reservations regarding the slope immediately adjacent behind the buildings. If this is left as an open rock cut, the amount of runoff directed at the buildings will be significant. An open rock cut is also subject to rock being dislodged through freeze/thaw cycles. A barrier needs to be designed and installed to protect all residents and property below.

A number of other issues were noted during our review.

- Provide separate grading and utility plans. Utility plan should indicate stationing on plan view.
- Level spreader should be relocated away from pavement edge.
- Vertical scale not noted on PP-1 and PP-2.
- Dumpster placement will present an issue with snowplowing.
- Snowplowing will be an issue at STA 7+84 due to slope immediately off pavement.
- Slope stabilization details are missing.
- Drainage plans need to include River Road culvert as well as catch basin at driveway entrance.
- Drainage calculations need to be revised based on anticipated rock slope runoff vs. grass runoff.
- There are conflicting ComhDot paving details on sheets SP-5 and SP-6.
- Sanitary MH at Sta 1+19.09 has a rim elevation of 113.2 and an invert of 113.6.
- Invert out of MH at Sta 0+30.63 is missing.
• Sewer and water mains must maintain a minimum 10’ horizontal separation. Sewer must be
deeper than water.
• Electric conduit should be located behind curb.
• Proper hammerhead should be provided for fire apparatus.

This office recommends the applicant revise the plan to address these concerns.

Very truly yours,

Rimas J. Balys
Assistant City Engineer

cc: Michael Maglione, Public Safety and Emergency Management Director
    Fran Jones, Fire Chief
    James Tortora, Fire Marshal
    Sgt. Mark Piek, Traffic Division
    Sgt. Mark Siplinger, Traffic Division
    John R. Cook, Wetlands Coordinator

File: 85 River Road Townhouse Development
March 8, 2019
Virginia Harger
Chairman
Planning and Zoning Commission
Shelton City Hall
54 Hill Street
Shelton, CT 06484

RE: #19-06 Key Development LLC
85-89 River Road

Dear Chairman Harger:

The Conservation Commission has reviewed the above referenced application for the construction of thirty-six condominium units along River Road.

Shelton Open Space abuts the site on the north along a small stream, connecting with a conservation easement further upstream. Under the proposed development, the rear portion of the site would remain wooded, connecting with this existing open space. Preserving the wooded slope above the condominiums would also maintain the scenic view of Shelton as seen from the river.

The Conservation Commission has no objection to the proposal. We would, however, like to review the conservation easement language for the rear of the property before it is finalized.

Sincerely,

Thomas Harbinson
Chair

Cc: John Cook, Inland Wetlands
III-D. MISCELLANEOUS

IV. MINUTES

February 14, 2019

Commissioner Kawalautzki motioned to approve the minutes of February 14, 2019. Commissioner Reilly seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Kawalautzki motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Reilly seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Zahornasky adjourned the meeting at 8:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sophia V. Belade
Sophia V. Belade
Clerk – Inland Wetlands

1 tape available in Town Clerk’s Office