I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL

III. BUSINESS MEETING

III-A. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

III-B. OLD BUSINESS

1. PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-04, MIXED USE BUILDING – 62-66 CENTER STREET/325 CORAM AVENUE. Proposal to demolish existing buildings and construct new mixed use building and parking structure with upland review area.

2. PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-06, 194 MOHEGAN ESTATES – 194 MOHEGAN ROAD. Proposal to create a 4-lot subdivision involving grading and discharge of storm water to a regulated area (storm water conduit as stated in application).

III-C. NEW BUSINESS

1. PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-09, CAMMAROTA – 272 WAVERLY ROAD. Proposed 24 foot above ground pool off 8’x16’ deck.

2. PERMIT=APPLICATION #17-10. Proposal: Replacement of Lane Street Bridge over Means Brook. State Project No. 126-71. (Regulated Impacts)
   a. Regulated activities include the installation of bridge abutments, the construction of a temporary pedestrian bridge.
   b. Activities within the upland review area include the installation of an embankment wall, approach slab and other associated bridge appurtenances.

III-D. VIOLATIONS

1. MATURO PROPERTY-58 KINGS HIGHWAY
2. IWV #16-03: 68 BIRCHBANK ROAD-DEROSA PROPERTY. Unauthorized construction of a descending concrete walkway: 40+ feet of cinder block; poured concrete dock projecting into the Housatonic River without a permit (Status Report)

IV. MINUTES

1. July 13, 2017

V. ADJOURNMENT
Chairman Zahornasky called the Regular Meeting of the Inland Wetlands Commission to order at 7:04 P.M.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. ROLL CALL:

Robert Dunford, Commissioner
Ken Nappi, Commissioner
Joseph Reilly, Commissioner
Gary Zahornasky, Chairman

Absent:
Jack Goncalves, Commissioner
Michele Kawalautzki, Commissioner
Charlie Wilson, Vice-Chairman
John Cook, Staff

III. BUSINESS MEETING

III-A. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

III-B. OLD BUSINESS

1. PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-04, MIXED USE BUILDING – 62-66 CENTER STREET/325 CORAM AVENUE. Proposal to demolish existing buildings and construct new mixed use building and parking structure with upland review area.

Jim Swift
Professional Engineer

Just as a reminder, we had an issue with the City Engineer who was looking for perhaps some improvements in that creek and that’s going to involve the DEEP. We have not gotten our ducks in a row with the DEEP yet so I think that the way we’re going to proceed with that, is that we’re going to have a meeting with them, to see what their intentions are as far as they see what needs to be done. I ask that the Commission table this item.

Commissioner Reilly motioned to table PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-04, MIXED USE BUILDING – 62-66 CENTER STREET/325 CORAM AVENUE. Proposal to demolish existing buildings and construct new mixed use building and parking structure with upland review area, to the next meeting. Commissioner Dunford seconded the motion.

Commissioner Nappi asked how long do you anticipate this to take with DEEP. Mr. Swift responded it’s hard to say because we’re still working with some of the neighbors with other issues. I’d like to say that we’ll have it straightened out by next month but not sure. I don’t thinks it’s a particular big issue right now, but we’re still looking for zone change. So if it really starts to drag out we’ll just withdraw the application and re-submit when we have a timeframe.
A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

2. PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-06, 194 MOHEGAN ESTATES – 194 MOHEGAN ROAD. Proposal to create a 4-lot subdivision involving grading and discharge of storm water to a regulated area (storm water conduit as stated in application).

Jim Swift
Professional Engineer

This is the previous application; one of the issues is that we have a little wetlands down in here. This area here is an existing lawn area for the existing veterinary operation and there’s a stone wall right through here, that’s more or less the delineation between lawn areas and a wooded area. There was a gentleman that came to the meeting last month and took some pictures of this area here that was standing water and he questioned whether this wetland was bigger, we’re comfortable with the wetland delineation because of Tom Petros who is a very reputable guy, but again this old plan showed us encroaching to the other side of the stone wall and into the upland review area. So what our plan now is just to simplify, and I did have a chance to talk to John about this and I’m not sure if he gave you anything in writing, but our intention is that on that existing stone wall we’re just going to take all our disturbance out of there. So in other words, where that stone wall is we’re going to keep all out proposed construction, galleys, grading, everything to this side of that stone wall which is basically a lawn area now, and so this are here which is the only remaining area, we’re within the 50’ upland review area what it is now is lawn, leave it as lawn. So basically, we believe that we’ve taken everything out of that questionable area. We’re going to keep everything on our side of the stone wall.

Within this area, there’s an old foundation, there’s an old fireplace because there used to be a house there. The well is right there and since we’re going to be bringing in city water, we’re going to band it in place and Valley Health has a method for that. Basically you fill it in with sand and cap it so even though it’s in our construction we’re going to cap it and not going to use it.

We have a low spot that collects this water and I think it’s piped out to the street and what we did for her an even though I don’t think we’re obligated to it but it seemed like a good idea is this house is going to take 1” of rainfall and put it in infiltrators and we’re going to take the overflow of that infiltrator and we’re going to bring it back out this way. We’re doing every thing we can to take that water, get it back in that direction.

Commissioner Reilly motioned to approve PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-06, 194 MOHEGAN ESTATES – 194 MOHEGAN ROAD. Proposal to create a 4-lot subdivision involving grading and discharge of storm water to a regulated area (storm water conduit as stated in application). Commissioner Dunford seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

III-C. NEW BUSINESS

2. PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-10. Proposal: Replacement of Lane Street Bridge over Means Brook. State Project No. 126-71. (Regulated Impacts)

a. Regulated activities include the installation of bridge abutments, the construction of a temporary pedestrian bridge.

b. Activities within the upland review area include the installation of an embankment wall, approach slab and other associated bridge appurtenances.
I’m just going to give an overview of the project. This is a bridge replacement for Lane Street over Means Brook. The bridge isn’t but just a few feet from Huntington Street and the road slopes down to the Lane Street bridge and the road continues to pitch away from the bridge. There’s a low point about 130’ east of the bridge. Lane Street is narrow, it’s residential. Yes, we have the cemetery but it is mostly residential and very narrow. There’s a trail head just east of the bridge and some makeshift parking spaces. The end of Lane Street comes to a cul-de-sac and also a City right of way and it takes you from the cul-de-sac to Wesley Drive and it’s a gravel path, a recreational path as you will. That’s important because when we close the bridge for construction and it’s too narrow because we have to do the bridge half at a time, traffic will use this 700’ corridor during construction.

The job is replacement of the metal arches which have deteriorated since they were installed in 1940 and it’s a pretty low bridge. The bridge has slope face and it’s a stone veneer and stone masonry. There’s a recreation path that is Wesley Drive it’s a lightly improved gravel path. The stone masonry has been undermined and is in dis-repair and with this type of structure rebuilding wasn’t an option so the City went ahead and applied for funding and got it for full replacement, so we mentioned that it was a State project but funding is from the Federal Highway Administration and they pick up 80% of the bridge; designing and construction and they pay for the inspection and there is a shared fund for that. With that DOT oversees and administers the project so in that sense it is a State project. We worked close with Bob Kulacz and I believe he gave you a letter of support.

So what we’re proposing is replacing the bridge with a pier stand bridge, removing the arches and the center pier and replace it with a more traditional pier stand. It scales about 40’ and the width of the bridge is about 32’ outside of the railings. The roadway itself is only 24’, the road is all over the place in some places its 60’ in some areas to 18’ in others. So a 24’ road over the bridge with a 5’ sidewalk. The project proposes mostly concrete components for longevity, reduces maintenance fees and also speeds up construction. Using that temporary road for any duration, it will be an improvement over the road that’s already there. There is a scenic road that we have to participate in. The new bridge will be concrete beams, they come pre-cast and they’ll go on pre-cast abutments, even the railing are pre-fabricated.

The construction project is usually a 6 month window, the goal is to start late spring and the reason is we want to time our in-water activity below flow in the summer and we have some restrictions from DEP, so we want to start in May. The first thing is we build a temporary pedestrian bridge so we can start on that bridge and then we can improve that access road and then we come back and demolish the bridge. I believe that the demolition begins in June and we have people back on the road by November. While the project is slated to go from end of May to the 1st week of December. Certainly not convenient but we are doing as many pre-cast components as possible to expedite the construction. We want to be buttoned up by the 1st week of December. The temporary road goes about 700’ to Wesley Drive and the proposal is to take and to broaden it to 22’ of gravel and then pave it 20’ wide with 3” of asphalt. When the bridge is done and the road is back to traffic the contractors will remove the asphalt. Folks were
concerned about that remaining in the roadway. This road floods and the when the water floods, the water enters the channel and it actually comes over the low point of the road at 130’ east of the bridge. It serves as your emergency contingency plan, should there be an emergency and Lane Street is under 3’ of water, you have a contingency plan, after construction the gate goes back up and this is a contingency plan and we pitched it to DEP to say allow us this bridge we can serve our residents and respond during an emergency. So basically it reverts back to a trail, much wider than the trail that’s there.

The flooding occurs here, the channel is here. The low point in the road is 130’ to the bridge and if you look at the profile the road falls off and so what happens is that the road is actually 4’ lower, so water comes out of the bank well outside the limits of this bridge and it finds its way down here and over the road. No matter what we do with the bridge we still have to do something about the channel upstream.

DOT is responsible for the inspection every 2 years.
August 10, 2017

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

Re: Lane Street Bridge Replacement Project;
Application No. 17-10

Dear Mr. Cook:

This office strongly endorses the current plan to replace the deteriorated and functionally
obsolete Lane Street bridge structure. Our consultant has worked diligently to limit the
footprint of the new bridge structure and to address the concerns of the residents and
the regulatory agencies (CT DEEP, USACEO and ConnDOT).

The construction of the temporary access road is required to provide access for the
residents on Lane Street and emergency services while the existing structure is removed and
replaced. There is insufficient room at the bridge site to allow the installation of a
temporary access bridge across Means Brook for vehicular traffic. However, a temporary
pedestrian bridge will be provided for the adjacent business parking lot, pedestrians and
users of the Shelton trail network.

Very truly yours,

Robert F. Kulacz, P.E.
City Engineer

cc: Paul DiMauro, Director of Public Works
File: Lane Street Bridge
RFF: lv
1. PERMIT-APPLICATION #17-09, CAMMAROTA – 272 WAVERLY ROAD. Proposed 24 foot above ground pool off 8’x16’ deck. Applicant was not present; application tabled

III-D. VIOLATIONS

1. MATURO PROPERTY-58 KINGS HIGHWAY – No update

2. IWV #16-03: 68 BIRCHBANK ROAD-DEROSA PROPERTY. Unauthorized construction of a descending concrete walkway: 40+ feet of cinder block; poured concrete dock projecting into the Housatonic River without a permit (Status Report) – Dominic Thomas has updated information but will need John Cook to overlook info. – Tabled

IV. MINUTES

1. July 13, 2017

Commissioner Dunford motioned to approve the minutes of July 14, 2017. Commissioner Reilly seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

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

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Zahornasky adjourned the Regular Meeting of the Inland Wetlands Commission at 7:47 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sophia V. Belade
Clerk – Inland Wetlands

1 Tape on file in the City/Town Clerk’s Office