

**EAST HADDAM INLAND WETLANDS AND WATERCOURSES COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
May 20, 2008  
(Not yet approved by the Commission)**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Randolph Dill at the Town Grange.

**2. ATTENDANCE**

**Members Present:** Randolph Dill – Chairman, Mary Augustiny, Jennifer Burton-Reeve, Bryan Goff, Wendy Goodfriend, Dan Jahne

**Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Mr. Ventres and approximately nine townspeople

**3. MINUTES**

**A) April 15, 2008 Regular Meeting**

**Motion by Mrs. Burton-Reeve to approve the minutes of the April 15, 2008 regular meeting, with the following clarification:**

- **Page 3, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence: Add “rafter” after “2x6”**
- Seconded by Ms. Augustiny, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**B) April 24, 2008 Special Meeting**

Tabled by consensus until the June 9, 2008 special meeting.

**4. BILLS**

| <u>Vendor</u>   | <u>Invoice</u> | <u>Amount</u> |
|---|----------------|---------------|
| Quality Nameplates (entrance markers)   | 00470028       | \$ 336.26     |
| Quality Nameplates (exiting markers)  | 00469946       | 205.13        |
| Hartford Courant (legal notices)  | 4980           | 40.64         |
| Shoreline Newspaper (legal notices)   | 2277853        | \$ 32.70      |
| NL Jacobson<br>(N.E. Construction, Morgan Estates, CT Valley Builders)                              | 14764          | 597.00        |
| Highland Soils, LLC (Morgan Estates)  |                | 300.00        |
| Branse, Willis, and Knapp<br>(correspondence, Mellon, Morgan Estates, discussions, GCS subdivision) |                | 522.00        |

**Motion by Ms. Augustiny to pay the bills as presented, seconded by Mrs. Burton-Reeve, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**5. PERMITS**

**A) Continued: Town of East Haddam, Phase II – proposed storm drainage on Pilgrim Way, Lake Hayward**

Mr. Roger Nemergut presented plans to the Commission. He noted that last year, the Commission approved Phase I, which was drainage plans for Ridgewood Road. He stated the plan was to protect the properties on the downhill side of Ridgewood. This is now out to bid.

Mr. Nemergut indicated that he was now presenting Phase II, which is further south. This will pick up additional drainage down Ridgewood. The proposal was to collect runoff to Ridgewood in the storm drain. There would be 15-inch pipes at the top end and 18' inch pipes at the lower end closer to the outlet. They planned to install drainage near the property lines of 40 and 44 Ridgewood. As they near Lakeshore Drive, the drainage will switch sides in order to protect the trees and the wishes of the property owners.

Mr. Nemergut noted that he met with the property owners, except the Quinn's; however, the plan avoided their property. He stated this was basically a storm drain and catch basin project. The association has a right-of-way to the gravel area, and they propose to install a sediment basin. This will pick up any silt from the gravel quickly, and will have only one catch basin downstream from it. The topography was too steep on Lakeshore Drive for the downstream sediment basin, as there was limited area in which to work.

Mr. Nemergut stated the outlet would be 18-inch pipe, protected with riprap and a silt fence during construction. He stated this was not too different than Phase I. He believed this plan reflected the input from the neighbors. Mr. Dill asked if there was a meeting, and if all of the neighbors were in agreement. Mr. Nemergut responded that they had a meeting with the neighbors to discuss alignment, etc. It seemed that the consensus was for one particular alignment, which was reflected on this plan. He added that there was one concern, #44, property of Lord. Mr. Lord's concern was that they not disturb the line of pine trees. In addition, there is a shed on the Quinn property. They thought they could work out an alignment through his property, and would take out some cedar, transplant a mountain laurel, etc.

Mr. Nemergut stated the neighbors had not yet had a chance to look at these plans, but they were done in the spirit of the conversation.

Mr. Dill asked about the timetable for this project. Mr. Fred Thumm stated this would not be done until approximately this time next year, in the next fiscal year. Mr. Dill stated if the neighbors have not looked at this yet, they should. Mr. Nemergut agreed that the neighbors should look at the plans. He commented that this project was somewhat similar to Landing Hill Road, where they worked in sections, stabilized them, and then moved on to the next section.

Ms. Augustiny asked if this project would hook into Phase I, to which Mr. Nemergut stated it would not. With the grade and pitch on Rich's Road, in order to take more runoff, they would have to reach depths that were not possible to construct. Ms. Goodfriend asked where the water was going currently. Mr. Nemergut stated as best he could tell, runoff currently sheet flows across Ridgewood. There is erosion there now, but most of it is surface runoff.

Ms. Goodfriend stated they were collecting and discharging into a lake people use for recreation. She asked if there were any opportunities for treatment at the end of the pipe, such as a step pool, open discharge basin, etc. Mr. Nemergut stated there were no test holes, so he did not know about the soils. They could put an open catch basin at the bottom. It is a fairly steep grade, so there is no flat area for a basin. They have to have enough cover on Lakeshore, so there are limits where they can end it. They have to extend the pipe until they can daylight it. Ms. Goodfriend asked if they could create a riser. She challenged them to think of a different way to get the water to sink. She pointed out that the less flow that comes out the end of the pipe; the less pollutants went into the lake.

Mr. Dill suggested as the system was being constructed, they could look at the soils. If the soils were suitable, it was possible that they could use a bottomless catch basin. Mr. Nemergut stated he would add two details to the plan.

Mr. Dill asked if they used a bottomless basin, if there was any chance this would feed into someone's basement. Mr. Nemergut stated he would look at this, but he did not believe the water was going to stay in the pipes very long.

Ms. Goodfriend asked if they could use wider bottoms or double basins. Mr. Ventres stated the existing septic systems would not allow that. Mr. Jahne asked about the water lines. Mr. Nemergut stated there was a shut off. Prior to construction, this will be field-located. Mr. Nemergut stated a bottomless catch basin might help, but it might not. He stated they would have to be careful they did not do anything at the outlet that would restrict the outlet of the pipe. He added that he would look into breaking the pipe, and then using a gravel basin so the water flows into riprap. Ms. Goodfriend stated in the future, she hoped they would look for alternatives to putting runoff into pipes. Mr. Nemergut stated he would look into this, but he believed he would put two details on the plan. Mr. Dill asked if Mr. Thumm saw this as a problem. Mr. Thumm stated he had not used this, but he has used dry wells.

Mr. Dill stated the Commission would hold this in order to give the neighbors an opportunity to look at the plans.

Mr. O'Dell stated he agreed to give an easement for the drainage, as he was severely impacted by this runoff. He commented that he has a running stream through his property. He appreciated Ms. Goodfriend's comments, as he did not like discharge water going to the lake. He stated this water was running across people's properties and over their septic systems. He stated this looked like another catch basin, with which he would not agree. He thought this would be part of another system. Mr. Nemergut explained that there was not enough capacity for that.

There was a brief discussion while they reviewed the plans. Mr. Nemergut stated if they cut back on the drainage downgradient of Ridgewood Road, they might have adequate capacity. Mr. Dill pointed out though, that if they did this, they would not accomplish what they set out to do. Mr. Nemergut stated if they did not get the easement, they would not build the system.

Mr. Dennis Quinn asked if there was another way down farther. Mr. Nemergut explained that the whole objective was to minimize the outlets and protect the property owners. Mr. O'Dell commented that they had to stop putting runoff into the lake.

Ms. Augustiny asked if the pipe was to address the issue of water going into the lake. Mr. Nemergut stated that both scenarios addressed water.

Mr. Dill stated this needed further discussion, so he recommended this application be continued.

**Motion by Mr. Dill to Town of East Haddam, Phase II – proposed storm drainage on Pilgrim Way, Lake Hayward until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by Mrs. Burton-Reeve, and carried by unanimous vote.**

Noting the time was now 8:00 p.m., the public hearing began.

## 6. PUBLIC HEARING

**A) Continued: G.C.S. Land Development, Haywardville Road, construction of single-family residence and driveway in the upland review area. Assessor's Map 80, Lot 465.  
First date: February 19, 2008 Last date: May 28, 2008**

Mr. Ventres read a faxed letter from G.C.S. dated May 12, 2008, withdrawing their application. They plan to resubmit their application in the future, once all of the reviews are completed.

Mr. Ventres stated the applicant did ask for a waiver of the fees. He will ask Attorney Branse, NL Jacobson & Associates, and Ms. Sharp what their fees are so far. Mr. Ventres stated he has been going weekly to photo-monitor the vernal pool egg masses and depths. He indicated the pool is holding water very well.

**Motion by Ms. Goodfriend to accept the withdrawal of G.C.S. Land Development, Haywardville Road, construction of single-family residence and driveway in the upland review area. Seconded by Mrs. Burton-Reeve, and carried by unanimous vote.**

## 5. PERMITS (Continued)

**B) Continued: Town of East Haddam, Clark Gates Road, proposed storm drainage.**

Mr. Fred Thumm, Public Works Director, informed the Commission that the Town was getting ready for a paving project on Clark Gates Road. Mr. Dill asked if all of the Commissioners had seen this site. Mrs. Burton-Reeve had not, and Mr. Goff stated he had not seen it recently.

Mr. Thumm presented a GIS map for review. His original request was to raise the road, but after talking with Mr. Ventres and some of the Commissioners, he withdrew that recommendation. Mr. Thumm stated it was very difficult to buy hay bales right now, so he planned to use silt fence for erosion control. He proposed to dig a trench with the machine, and then add the silt fence. Ms. Goodfriend suggested holding the silt fence down with stone might be easier. Mr. Thumm stated they would then have to go back to remove the stone. Mr. Ventres suggested woodchips could be used, and they would naturally decompose, but there were no large stockpiles around right now. Mr. Dill asked which method would be cheaper. Mr. Thumm believed the stone would be more labor intensive. Ms. Goodfriend suggested the woodchips might be the first choice, but if that would not work, then they could dig in the fence.

Mr. Thumm stated his second request was regarding the open ditch. He stated this was a safety concern, and he had intended to use either ½" or ¾" stone, with an 18-inch pipe. During the walk, one Commissioner suggested installing a guardrail, which he stated was a viable alternative. Mr. Ventres

perceived that access would be the one children would use the most. Ms. Augustiny asked if children would be walking in this area, or riding bicycles. Mr. Ventres disagreed with the use of a guardrail in this area. He stated this was a narrow road, without the benefit of a 5 or 6-foot snow shelf. He did not believe a guardrail would be a good alternative here. Ms. Goodfriend stated the guardrail was her idea. While she understood Mr. Ventres' concern for safety, the Commission's charge was for wetlands, and prudent alternatives. Mr. Goff asked if the safety concern was trumped by the wetlands. Ms. Goodfriend stated she was going by their wetlands charge, that this was an alternative.

Ms. Goodfriend questioned the upgradient drainage point. Mr. Thumm responded that it was 20 acres. Mr. Dill stated his observation was that this area was basically water flowing on ledge. His suggestion was to install a pipe and cover it with stone. This would allow water to get through the stone, and down to the pipe. Ms. Goodfriend stated that everyone agreed that this area conveyed water, but she asked if there would be other things that would be lost. Mr. Dill stated this would be a filter system of sorts. In addition, it would not restrict the road width. Mr. Goff stated he personally had wetland concerns, but he also had two children who would be on this road next year. Mr. Dill asked what the drop in this area was. Mr. Thumm responded it was approximately a 3-foot drop. Mr. Dill pointed out that if a child falls into this area on a bike, he/she would get hurt.

Responsive to inquiry by Mr. Jahne, Mr. Ventres stated the road width varied from 27 feet to 30 feet wide. Guardrails could not go directly on top of the retaining wall, which would leave very little space.

Ms. Goodfriend asked that Ms. Sharp inspect the area and write a letter for the record. She stated it was fine to not use the guardrail if it was for the Town and for safety reasons; however, they might not feel the same if it was for a private residence, and for a different purpose. Mr. Ventres stated this was a man-made cement basin and a man-made ditch. It does not support anything on the bottom, because the bottom is ledge. Mr. Dill suggested they could have Ms. Sharp look at the area. He asked for a consensus on this from the Commission. Ms. Augustiny agreed, but she asked about using just the stone, without the pipe. Mr. Dill stated it would not infiltrate quickly enough, and the water would go over the road.

Mr. Dill noted there was a lot of scour in this area. Mr. Thumm agreed, and planned to use a pre-formed DOT scour hole. He noted there was one property and driveway near Buhl Brook, and the area was approximately at 10% grade. The water crosses the road, and there is erosion. He believed this area was a good candidate for a pipe system. It would be approximately a 300-foot run, and he planned to use a 15-inch pipe outlet. A level spreader would be installed 50-feet away from where the ground flattens. Mr. Dill stated this pipe appeared to be a blind pipe, as he could not find an entrance. Mr. Thumm stated he would add a basin 40-feet from the end of the driveway. This pipe would run 130-feet to another basin. It would then run approximately 70-feet to meet the grade and the scour hole. Ms. Goodfriend inquired about the level spreader, and Mr. Thumm stated it would be smaller.

Mr. Thumm stated the property owner asked about curbing along his property. Ms. Goodfriend asked if this would taper off into the swale. Mr. Thumm believed this would be a good candidate for curbing approximately half way between the high point. It would be no more than 150-feet. Mr. Goff asked if they would lose anything by using Cape Cod curbing, to which Mr. Thumm responded there was already a bank between it. Mr. Goff stated then that it would not make any difference to amphibians.

Mr. Dill stated the Commission would have Ms. Sharp look at the open area and report on it. Mr. Ventres asked if the Commission wanted to approve Items 1 and 3, for the grinding of the road, etc. Mr. Thumm noted that they were scheduled to begin the grinding on June 16.

**Motion by Ms. Augustiny to approve the application for the Town of East Haddam, Clark Gates Road, proposed storm drainage, as follows:**

- **Part 1, the area of road that crosses the wetland farthest to the west, approved with the condition that hay bales are used, or silt fence held down by a wood chip berm be used. If that alternative is not feasible, then the silt fence may be toed into the ground.**
- **Part 2 – continued until the next regularly scheduled meeting.**
- **Part 3 – The work on the easternmost portion approval of the plans as presented.**

**Seconded by Mr. Goff, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**C) Continued: George Panciera, 48 Shore Drive, construction of roof over existing deck, activity in the upland review area. Assessor's Map 66, Lot 173.**

**First date: April 15, 2008**

**Last date: June 18, 2008**

It was noted that Ms. Augustiny, Ms. Goodfriend, and Mr. Jahne walked this site. Ms. Augustiny stated the raised second story deck is existing, and the applicant wishes to put on a roof. She stated there is a paved portion in the front of this deck, and then approximately 25-feet of grass to the lake.

Ms. Goodfriend observed that the addition of a roof would probably not change the runoff. She recalled that they had talked during the walk about using patches of something other than lawn. Mr. Panciera stated they have never had a problem with runoff, and they just put in new grass. Ms. Augustiny suggested something such as low bush blueberry would help to deter geese that may come up from the lake. Mr. Panciera stated if he had to do this, it would be one thing, but his grandchildren come to visit and they enjoy the grass and the lake. Ms. Goodfriend suggested they could slowly accumulate shrubs at the edges of the lake and see how it works for the geese. She stated in her opinion, there was no real issue for which to ask for mitigation, but she suggested this could be done to deter the geese. Mr. Ventres gave the applicant information on plantings to deter geese.

Ms. Augustiny stated one condition of approval should be that the deck does not become enclosed.

**Motion by Ms. Augustiny to approve the application of George Panciera, 48 Shore Drive, construction of roof over existing deck, activity in the upland review area with the condition that there will be no hard sides or other enclosures to the deck other than the roof. Seconded by Mrs. Burton-Reeve, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**D) Continued: James Balkus, 91 Baker Road, construction of attached two-car garage, activity in the upland review area. Assessor's Map 53, Lot 13.**

**First date: April 15, 2008**

**Last date: June 18, 2008**

Mr. Balkus addressed the Commission. It was noted that Ms. Augustiny, Ms. Goodfriend, and Mr. Jahne attended this field walk.

Ms. Augustiny informed the Commission that the location the applicant was constructing the garage was currently lawn. There is also lawn on the other side. The applicant would not be digging up anything other than grass for the construction.

Responsive to inquiry by Ms. Goodfriend, Mr. Balkus stated he would have to remove approximately four inches of topsoil, which would be approximately five yards. He would bring in gravel to go under the concrete. The excavated material would be used to backfill the sides. Ms. Goodfriend asked where the material would be stockpiled. Mr. Balkus responded that it would be stored right up against the construction area.

Ms. Goodfriend asked about a frost wall. Mr. Balkus referred to the drawing, and stated there would be a 42-inch frost wall, which was what the Town required. Ms. Augustiny inquired about gutters. Mr. Balkus explained that the gutters would run across the garage and then disperse.

Ms. Augustiny questioned the garage floor surface, to which Mr. Balkus stated it would be concrete. Mr. Jahne asked what material would be used between the garage and the road. Mr. Balkus planned to use gravel. Ms. Goodfriend asked if erosion control around the construction site would be used. Mr. Balkus stated he would have to use erosion control. Ms. Goodfriend stated that any material excavated should be kept as far away from the wetlands as possible.

**Motion by Ms. Goodfriend to approve the application of James Balkus, 91 Baker Road, construction of attached two-car garage, activity in the upland review area with the following conditions:**

- Erosion control shall be in place before the foundation is poured.
- Any excavated material should be spread close to the dug garage, and as far away from the wetland vegetation as feasibly possible.

**Seconded by Mrs. Burton-Reeve, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**E) Continued Reapplication: David Hollander and Arthur Lubow, 20 Jones Hill Road, removal of sediment from existing pond. Assessor's Map 43, Lot 20.**

**First date: April 15, 2008**

**Last date: June 18, 2008**

Mr. Dave Rocznik, contractor for the applicants, addressed the Commission. Ms. Augustiny, Ms. Goodfriend, and Mr. Jahne walked this site.

Ms. Goodfriend commented that this was a large pond with an intermittent watercourse at the northeast end. It has a fairly big sediment delta and a high dam. Ms. Augustiny noted that this feeds to the Eightmile River.

Ms. Goodfriend stated the pond was quite close to the road, and there were some trees. Most of her concerns were regarding access. Mr. Rocznik stated they planned to access the pond from Jones Hill Road with an excavator. They would bring material out onto a low area. Ms. Augustiny asked if the excavator would be able to reach the area from the street, to which Mr. Rocznik responded affirmatively.

Mr. Dill asked how much material would be excavated. Mr. Rocznik estimated approximately 200 yards. He proposed to add riprap once the island was excavated. Ms. Goodfriend questioned if the dam was regulated by the State. Mr. Ventres noted it was not on the list.

Mr. Jahne questioned the area between the inlet and outlet. Mr. Rocznik explained that once they pull out the material, the area would be 6 to 8 feet deep. Ms. Goodfriend asked if they planned to excavate right up to the inlet or outlet. Mr. Rocznik stated he did not intend to. Mr. Dill asked what would control the depth. Ms. Goodfriend indicated she would shy away from adding riprap to the embankment.

Mr. Dill asked the size of the riprap. Ms. Goodfriend asked if there would be an opportunity to reinforce the earthen berm before it filled, and suggested maybe the applicant could come back for this. Mr. Dill questioned if the riprap would be large enough. Ms. Augustiny stated there was a sandy island in the middle of the normal stream channel. Mr. Ventres suggested he could go out to the site, as he estimated it would take approximately three days. Ms. Augustiny stated the material would have to be large enough. Mr. Dill suggested that Mr. Ventres inspect the site.

It was noted this was a 75-acre watershed. Ms. Augustiny asked if the applicant would install erosion control at the end of the pond when they are working. Mr. Rocznik did not plan to need any, as he planned to do the work during the dry season in August.

Ms. Goodfriend suggested a few large, well-placed rocks would not be as egregious as riprap. Since this work was in the Eightmile River Watershed, Ms. Augustiny asked if there was anything else they needed. Mr. Ventres stated this work fell in the best management practices and maintenance. He stated this work should really be done every ten years.

Ms. Goodfriend commented that since this is in a sensitive area, that Mr. Ventres be notified when the work was to begin. Ms. Augustiny believed Mr. Ventres should monitor this site the entire time during the work. Ms. Goodfriend stated if they should need to cut any trees, they should leave the stumps. Ms. Augustiny noted that the bottom area was covered with invasive species, including bamboo and burning bush (*Euonymus*). Ms. Goodfriend asked where the dredged material would be stored for drying. Mr. Rocznik stated it would be placed behind the barn.

**Motion by Ms. Augustiny to approve the application of David Hollander and Arthur Lubow, 20 Jones Hill Road, removal of sediment from existing pond with the following conditions:**

- **All work shall be done during the driest time of the season.**
- **Before, during, and post removal of sediment, the Wetlands Enforcement Officer shall be notified.**
- **In the area of debris removal, silt fence shall be installed on the downhill side of the pile.**
- **Dredged material shall be placed behind the barn.**
- **If material is necessary to protect the bank on the road side of the pond, the Wetlands Enforcement Officer shall be notified of and agree to what material is needed.**

**Seconded by Mrs. Burton-Reeve, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**F) New: Oleg Beznosov, 261 East Haddam-Colchester Turnpike, installation of new dock. Assessor's Map 67, Lot 2.**

**First date: May 20, 2008**

**Last date: July 23, 2008**

Mr. Beznosov addressed the Commission. It was noted that Ms. Augustiny, Ms. Goodfriend, and Mr. Jahne attended this field walk. Ms. Augustiny stated this application was actually for a replacement of a dock. Mr. Beznosov submitted photographs of the proposed dock. There would be four sections, eight feet wide, for a total of 32-feet long.

Mr. Dill asked if the length in the water would not exceed 32-feet. Mr. Beznosov stated it would probably be two feet less. Mr. Dill asked the purpose of the dock, to which Mr. Beznosov responded it

was for enjoyment. Ms. Goodfriend asked if the applicant had boats. Mr. Beznosov stated he had a jet ski. Responsive to inquiry by Mr. Dill, Mr. Beznosov indicated the dock would sit on several legs. Mr. Dill asked if the dock would be removed in the winter, to which Mr. Beznosov stated he would.

Mr. Dill questioned the length of the current dock. Mr. Beznosov stated it was approximately 26 ½ feet long. Mr. Dill asked if the existing dock would be removed. Mr. Beznosov indicated the existing dock was unsafe, and would be removed. Mr. Dill asked how heavy the new dock was, and if it would be able to be removed. Mr. Beznosov stated that two people could move each section.

Mr. Beznosov stated his daughter was getting married on June 15, and he asked if there was a chance this could be approved tonight. Mr. Ventres advised the Commission that this application could be approved tonight. Mr. Dill noted that the agenda was incorrect, because it stated this was an application for a new dock. Ms. Goodfriend suggested they could add this item to the agenda for the special June 9 meeting. Mr. Goff asked what the historical practice had been. Mr. Ventres stated these were typically approved in his office, but this was a bit larger. Mr. Dill preferred to continue this to the June 9 meeting. He stated Mr. Beznosov could proceed, but if there were objections at that meeting, he may have to change the dock.

**Motion by Ms. Goodfriend to continue the application of Oleg Beznosov, 261 East Haddam-Colchester Turnpike, installation of new dock until June 9, 2008. Seconded by Ms. Augustiny, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**G) New: Denton Lane, 241 Lake Shore Drive, replacement of stonewall. Assessor's Map 87, Lot 240.**

**First date: May 20, 2008**

**Last date: July 23, 2008**

**Motion by Mr. Dill to schedule a field walk, and to continue the application of Denton Lane, 241 lake Shore Drive, replacement of stonewall until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by Ms. Augustiny, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**H) New: William Gilmore, 70 Florida Road, construction of driveway in the upland review area. Assessor's Map 12, Lot 28.**

**First date: May 20, 2008**

**Last date: July 23, 2008**

**Motion by Mr. Dill to schedule a field walk and to continue the application of William Gilmore, 70 Florida Road, construction of driveway in the upland review area until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by Mrs. Burton-Reeve, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**I) New: Phil Bloch, applicant, Grist Mill Road, proposed drainage in the upland review area. Assessor's Map 65, Lot 23.**

**First date: May 20, 2008**

**Last date: July 23, 2008**

**Motion by Mrs. Burton-Reeve to schedule a field walk and to continue the application of Phil Bloch, Grist Mill Road, proposed drainage in the upland review area until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by Ms. Augustiny, and carried by unanimous vote.**

## 7. SUBDIVISION REVIEW

**A) Continued: Application 08-03, Gary and Tracy Albanese, 136 Daniel Peck Road, subdivision review for a proposed 2-lot subdivision. Assessor's Map 59, Lot 26.**

**First date: April 15, 2008**

**Last date: June 18, 2008**

No one representing the applicant was present at this meeting. It was noted that Ms. Augustiny, Ms. Goodfriend, and Mr. Jahne attended this field walk. Ms. Augustiny stated that only the applicant's daughter was at the field walk, and she was unclear about the work to be done.

Ms. Goodfriend stated she read the minutes from the last meeting, and understood that there was an existing house and one new lot. Mr. Ventres presented the plans to the Commission. He stated they planned to split Lot 18. There would be a 3-acre parcel and an 8.7-acre parcel.

Ms. Goodfriend asked if the driveway would be modified. Mr. Ventres stated it would be for the property line purposes. There would be no other changes; they just had to file the association language to modify the property lines.

Mr. Ventres stated they should add a note that no activity in the upland review area should occur without prior notification and review.

Ms. Goodfriend asked where the cross culvert under the driveway was located. Mr. Ventres showed the area on the plan. Ms. Goodfriend asked if all of the runoff would drain away from the wetland. Mr. Ventres stated it would drain down Daniel Peck Road, and would be reviewed by Planning & Zoning.

Mr. Dill suggested the Commission might consider a maximum square footage. Mr. Ventres stated this was in the R2 zone, so the regulation stipulates 10% coverage. He agreed that 10% coverage on a 4-acre lot could be overwhelming. Ms. Goodfriend stated this could go with the letter to Planning & Zoning. She also suggested that Planning & Zoning consider a conservation easement along the upland review area line.

Ms. Augustiny asked about the limits of clearing in subdivisions. Mr. Ventres stated that this was done for the Matthews subdivision. Ms. Augustiny stated in the subdivision near her house, someone cleared 4 acres for horses. Ms. Goodfriend stated this is not regulated, so they have no means for enforcement. Mr. Ventres stated the easiest way is to have a conservation subdivision, and then individuals could have a direct civil impact from violations. Ms. Goodfriend noted this is a problem in many places.

**Motion by Mr. Dill to send a letter to the Planning & Zoning Commission stating that Application 08-03, Gary and Tracy Albanese, 136 Daniel Peck Road, subdivision review for a proposed 2-lot subdivision, meets the requirements of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission based on the map dated February 2008, and that the Planning & Zoning Commission give consideration to explore the possibility of a conservation easement and that a note be added that no activity shall occur within the upland review area without prior review. Seconded by Ms. Augustiny, and carried by unanimous vote.**

## 8. DISCUSSION

### A) File Requirements

None

## 9. IWWC ENFORCEMENT OFFICER'S REPORT

### A) Shagbark

Mr. Ventres informed the Commission that the EDC was working on this issue. The EDC informed Mr. Ventres that Shagbark has agreed to the reshaped ditch. Ms. Goodfriend asked if there was a timeline on this. Mr. Ventres stated that Shagbark could not expand until the violations were rectified.

Mr. Goff observed lime being stored outside in the parking lot. In addition, potassium chloride was being stored outside near Building 1. He asked if it was possible to get a list of the water-soluble items they have, and where they are being stored. Mr. Ventres stated it was a condition of approval that those items were to be stored under cover. Ms. Goodfriend suggested that the DEP would definitely have authority over this. She believed it was likely that Shagbark was large enough to be ruled by the DEP. Mr. Goff suggested they might want to put something in writing. Mr. Dill stated that individuals could do this, that it did not have to be from the Commission. Mr. Ventres noted that Shagbark had only a temporary Certificate of Occupancy from the Building Official.

## 10. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Ventres informed the Commission that he recently attended a two-day class at UCONN on using the GIS system with a GPS and cameras. He would like to purchase the GPS system, which would allow him to overlay catch basins, etc. He stated he would be able to walk the trail, take pictures, put them on the GPS, etc. This information could then be opened on Google. Mr. Dill asked about the software, and Mr. Ventres responded that the software was free, but the unit cost approximately \$550. Ms. Goodfriend agreed that this was a good class, and noted that Mr. Sandy Prisloe teaches some of them in Haddam as well.

Ms. Goodfriend asked who had listened to the tapes for the upcoming special public hearing application, and if she needed to listen to them, or if they had enough people to vote. Mr. Goff stated he had not listened to the tapes yet, but could bring himself up to speed if necessary. Mr. Dill stated that everyone should try to attend the next special meeting, as each Commissioner has expertise in a different area.

Mr. Dill stated he had a complaint about work being done in the Eightmile River area, on the East Haddam Fish and Game Club's property. They spoke with George, and he stated he had been doing some minor maintenance. Mr. Dill stated he had no repeat calls about this issue.

## 11. ADJOURNMENT

**Motion by Mr. Dill to adjourn at 10:05 p.m., seconded by Ms. Goodfriend, and carried by unanimous vote.**

Respectfully submitted,

Holly Pattavina