

MINUTES

CONSERVATION COMMISSION INLAND/WETLAND AGENCY

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2008 - 7:00 P.M.
WATERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL TECHNOLOGY CENTER

APPLICATION #623 – CHERRY AVENUE, LLC

- Members Present:** Mr. Ed Undercuffler, Chairman
Mr. Donato Orsini, Vice Chairman
Mr. Joe Polletta
Mr. Jim Zawadzki
- Members Absent:** Mr. Tom Murphy, Secretary
Mr. Tony DiBona
Mr. Glen Dupliese
- Alternates Present:** Ms. Martha Sturgis – Seated for Mr. Glen Dupliese
Ms. Denise Russ – Seated for Mr. Tony DiBona
- Alternates Absent:** Mr. Michael Brown
- Others Present:** Mr. Moosa Rafey, Assistant Zoning Enforcement Officer
Mr. Sean Hayden, Northwest Conservation District Soil Scientist

1. Call Meeting to Order

Mr. Undercuffler, Chairman, Called the Public Hearing to Order at about 7:00 PM (7:06 PM).

2. Roll Call

Mr. Undercuffler executed the Roll Call.
Mr. Undercuffler, Chairman, read aloud the Ground Rules as follows for the record:

“GROUND RULES FOR CONSERVATION COMMISSION/ INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY”

1. The applicant or his representative will make his formal presentation to the commission stating the proposed regulated activities, the wetland impacts, and the alternatives which were considered by the applicant.

**WATERTOWN CONSERVATION COMMISSION INLAND/WETLAND AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING
APPLICATION #623 – CHERRY AVENUE, LLC
MARCH 13, 2008**

2. All comments, discussion and observations shall be made through the Chair after proper recognition by the Chairman. This is necessary to ensure that only one person at a time speaks on any issue, thus making it easier for everyone to understand and for clearer legal transcription.
3. All persons addressing the Commission shall begin by first clearly stating their name and address for the record. If necessary, the person may be asked to spell his name for the record.
4. Following the presentation of the application, the Conservation Commission Inland Wetland Agency will ask specific questions of the applicant.
5. After the Commission has asked its questions of the applicant, I shall then allow any members of the public who wishes to speak either in favor of this application or against it to address the Commission.
6. I shall then allow the applicant to respond to the comments of the members of the general public.
7. I shall then allow any members of the general public who wish to present any additional information or clarifying discussion to do so.
8. I shall then provide an opportunity for the applicant to respond to these additional remarks if he or his representative so wishes.
9. The Conservation Commission/Inland Wetland Agency has thirty five days from the date the public hearing commences to complete the public hearing. The Commission may ask the applicant for a thirty five day extension of the public hearing period if the commission requires any additional information or wishes to schedule a site walk to observe the situation for them.
10. The Conservation Commission/Inland Wetland Agency has thirty five days from the date when the Public Hearing is closed to render its decision.

3. Hearing of Applications

- A. Continuation of the Public Hearing from February 14, 2008 - Application #623 of Cherry Avenue, LLC for construction of 3-Lot residential subdivision on Cherry Avenue, Watertown, CT.

Recess or adjourn the Public Hearing must be closed by March 20, 2008 unless applicant grants an extension of time.

**WATERTOWN CONSERVATION COMMISSION INLAND/WETLAND AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING
APPLICATION #623 – CHERRY AVENUE, LLC
MARCH 13, 2008**

David Rhode, Compass Engineering

Mr. Rhode asked for Sean Hayden to give his report.

Sean Hayden, Northwest Conservation District Soil Scientist

Mr. Hayden verified the delineation of the uplands and wetlands of the property. He also reviewed the storm water management strategies. He really liked the infiltration trenches proposed for the roofs. He commented that maybe in the areas where the infiltration trenches for the roof drains are going the perk rates of the soils should be looked at. He felt that there was a better way to manage the storm water that would cause less impact to the wetland. He explained as the storm water management grass line swales and the bio-retention areas are designed now and cut off surface water from half of the wetland. If that is it's only water source that could possibly turn that wetland into upland. Mr. Rhode questioned whether Mr. Hayden wanted a perk or permeability test.

Mr. Hayden clarified that he wanted a permeability test to know how permeable the soil is where the bottom of the infiltrator is planned to be. Mr. Rhode explained that as of now they only show a box for the lot and they are unsure what the house will be or what it will look like. He wanted it to be a condition of approval. Mr. Polletta expressed concerned about someone buying the lot and not being able to build on it and does not want a condition. Mr. Orsini told Mr. Rhode to have a set footage that is feasible and let the property owner know that and if they choose to make it larger they will have to take care of it.

Mr. Hayden also made the point having to do with the drainage channel that comes down off the property. Houses stacked on the hill behind houses already existing ones cause storm water issues because they create lawns and impervious surfaces and the houses below have trouble. He mentioned the channel between the houses and if it would be handled properly when flooding occurs. Mr. Rafey explained that development should not add to the problem and the condition is pre-existing.

Mr. Hayden explained those wetlands are partially responsible for reducing flows and infiltrating water that fills that channel. Mr. Orsini wanted to know if based on what was currently proposed would water be an issue. He questioned also if the rain gardens would help the problem or make it worse.

Mr. Hayden explained that he would like the silt fencing doubled up on for the sediment and erosion control issues. He also did not see any feasible and prudent alternatives with the application and was wondering if any were presented. Mr. Undercuffler explained there was and one example was the common driveway alternative on the previous application. Mr. Hayden also explained that they wouldn't spend any money or time doing bio-retention or grass line swales if they design the driveway properly.

**WATERTOWN CONSERVATION COMMISSION INLAND/WETLAND AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING
APPLICATION #623 – CHERRY AVENUE, LLC
MARCH 13, 2008**

Mr. Rafey explained that he thought they had submitted to Planning and Zoning and got denied but they never did. It wasn't until he took their CCIWA application he realized they went to Planning and Zoning informally. It was just a discussion. Mr. Rhode explained the Planning and Zoning Commission members voted against approving a common driveway in a R12.5 zone. Mr. Rafey responded that the zoning regulations do not prohibit a common driveway in a R12.5 zone. The commission can approve or deny it.

Mr. Hayden asked Mr. Rhode if Civil One was able to look at his comments and if Emily had any response? Mr. Rhode explained that Ms. Emily Jones, the engineer who designed the drainage for the site, agreed that the common driveway is the most prudent alternative. Mr. Hayden questioned Mr. Rhode if he thought it would be easy to mimic what the surface what is doing now once the driveway goes in. Mr. Rhode responded yes because it follows the natural contour of the land. Mr. Rhode wanted an extension for the application and to get some feedback first from Planning and Zoning.

Lou Hart, 474 Cherry Avenue Watertown, CT

Mr. Hart and his neighbors concern was water in their backyards. When there is heavy rain the little ditch or brook in the back does fill with water. His concern is water running out onto the street and making dangerous conditions. He wanted to know if it would add more water in the road or will it divert it a different way. Mr. Hayden felt that any water coming out onto Cherry Avenue was not from this property. Mr. Rhode felt with the rain gardens in this proposal they will reduce the rate of run-off and slow the water down. Mr. Rafey explained the permeability test needed to be done first and then they would have more information to see if the soil is good enough to handle all the water from the impervious surface area that they are creating for this property.

Motion was made by Mr. Polletta to continue the public hearing to April 10, 2008 with an extension letter and seconded by Mr. Orsini.

Discussion: None Vote: 6 in favor Abstained: 0 Opposed: 0

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Attest:

Ed Undercuffler, Chairman
Conservation Commission
Inland/Wetland Agency

Approved by: Jennifer Guerrero, Minutes Secretary