

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD

May 2, 2006

Present: Michael Autuori
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz, Vice Chair
James McChesney
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Walter Slavin
Patrick Walsh
Lillian Willis

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Inland Wetlands Agent

Public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 8:36 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2006-021-SR:** Summary Ruling Application for construction of two-bedroom residence on steep slopes adjacent to Fox Hill Lake, at the intersection of **Waters Edge Way and Rita Road** in the RA zone. *Owner/Apl.: Patrick Costigan. Received 3/14/06. Walked 4/2/06. Public hearing commenced and closed on 5/2/06. 35- day action period ends June 6, 2006. For action.*

The hearing was closed prior to the regular meeting, and the Chairman asked for discussion on the application.

Mr. McChesney motioned to ask the Agent to draft a resolution of approval with conditions, seconded by Dr. Autuori. The conditions would include all of the language from the previous approval (for the permit that had been revoked), including the conservation easement, with additional erosion and sedimentation controls (E&S) to be installed as needed. Mr. Katz identified the new areas for E&S as south of the house location and east of the well location. These controls should be installed to the satisfaction of the Agent and the Wetlands Inspector.

Mrs. Willis asked if additional plantings should be required in the conservation easement area on the slope above the lake. Small trees would be possible, and oaks would work well because they have a long taproot. The Agent suggested that Tree Warden John Pinchbeck could provide some helpful suggestions.

Mr. Katz noted that the conservation easement would have to include provision for the area to drill the well.

Mrs. Willis asked what could be done about the fact that the applicant had committed so many violations with the previous permit. Dr. Gelfman says the Board could deny the current application, at least until there is a firm location determined for the well site. Mr. McChesney says that the well site is not part of this Board's responsibility. The Agent suggests that conditions should be included to require additional Board review and a revised wetland permit application if (1) the well location has to be changed, and (2) the house size and/or location is changed.

Dr. Gelfman is concerned that this applicant has violated all of the conditions of the past permit, and this may be no different. Dr. Autuori agrees, but says we cannot hold that against the applicant in this permit approval.

Mrs. Willis is equally concerned, but the Agent says that if the applicant meets the regulations at this time, then the permit should be issued. The construction needs to be

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Chairman points out three letters sent to applicants by new Wetlands Inspector Aimee Pardee, as examples of the attention to detail that she is giving in the review of the implementation of approved permits. Mr. McChesney asks if the letters have received response, and the Agent confirms that most are on-going issues, but the inspector is getting the attention of the permittees. Mr. Katz asks about the letter and list of specific violations for the homeowner at **85 Spring Valley Road**, and whether the Board should revoke the permit. The Agent says that progress toward resolution has been made, including on-site inspection and review by the design engineer, and the matter was discussed in the office today. The Board should give the applicant a few more weeks to comply. The Inspector is working with both the engineer and the homeowner to get the bring the site into compliance.

MINUTES

Mr. Katz motioned to approve the minutes of April 11, 2006, seconded by Dr. Autuori. The motion passed, 9-0.

Mrs. Willis motioned to approve the minutes of April 18, 2006, seconded by Mr. Slavin. The motion passed, 9-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius
Inland Wetlands Agent

majority of patrons may be older and infirm, with poor eyesight, and that supports the need for better and safer lighting. The diminution of light as proposed is warranted.

Dr. Autuori reminds the Commission that this plan greatly reduces the amount of light that was approved in the original plans. This is a better plan, with fewer lights.

Dr. Gelfman says he disagrees with Mr. Katz. He says virtually every member of the public who spoke at the hearing was against the proposal for taller poles, and he won't support the change.

The Chairman called for a vote on the motion to draft an approval. The motion passed by a vote of 6-3. Mr. Slavin, Mrs. Willis, and Dr. Gelfman were opposed.

2. **#2006-023-A:** Proposed **amendment** to the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations, Sections 411.0 through 413.0 – Business Zones and Section 417.0-Central Business District to establish better defined parameters for permitted uses involving a mix of residential and commercial uses with the business zones. *Received 3/21/06. Commission initiated. For action.*

The Chairman points out that the hearing was closed earlier in the evening, and calls for discussion on the proposed amendment. Mr. Slavin asks that a final vote be postponed, and the Commission agrees that discussion is appropriate at this time. There is no timetable for adoption of a commission-initiated amendment.

Mr. McChesney feels that the changes are fairly straight-forward, and a final draft could be prepared. The Commission agrees, as per the discussion in the public hearing, that the bonus density for affordable and age-restricted should be combined, to state that bonuses would be allowed for age-restricted with an affordable component only.

The Planner also reminds the Commission of additional reasons for the amendment, as stated by Mr. McChesney and Mr. Katz. Mr. McChesney is in favor of the amendment because it will preserve the commercial base of the business zones, and not reduce it by allowing a lot of high-density housing. Residential use should be complimentary and accessory to that zone, as stated by Mr. Katz. There is a desire to maintain the commercial component of the business zones, and to eliminate the possibility that residential development could dominate these areas. Dr. Gelfman cites the need to decrease traffic in the downtown area. Mr. Katz repeats concern expressed during the hearing about the need to control residential density.

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to bring the amendment back to the table with the changes as discussed. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0.

3. **#2006-030-PRD-PR:** subdivision application for 32-lot planned residential development on 151.562 acres of land located on **Wilton Road East, Whipstick Road and Spectacle Lane** in the RAA zone. Owner/Appl.: Downingtown Manufacturing Company. Auth. Agent: J. Casey Healy, Esq. *Received 3/28/06, walked 4/30/06, public hearing scheduled for 5/23/06. Consider designation of suitability for planned residential development.*

The Chairman recognizes that Steve Trinkaus, P.E., is present at the meeting to talk about the benefits of the proposed Planned Residential Development as compared to a conventional subdivision plan, for this property.

Mr. Katz proposes a motion to approve the suitability of the property for PRD, seconded by Dr. Autuori.

In discussion, Mrs. Willis said she prefers that the consideration for PRD designation be considered during the public hearing process and not at this time. The Planner notes that this is not the preferred option, as per the regulations, but it is a permitted

The motion to approve the proposed revision passed by a vote of 7-2. Mrs. Willis and Mr. Slavin were opposed, because they have not seen the site.

5. **#2005-160-S: 563/593 Main Street subdivision.** Request for 90-day extension to file subdivision map. Owners: Richard F. Mele, Eileen T. and Joseph R. Coffey. *For action.*

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the request for additional time to file the subdivision map. The 90-day extension was granted by a vote of 9-0.

COMMISSION WALKS

There were no new walks scheduled.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Chairman pointed out a letter written by the Planner in response to a resident of the congregate and affordable housing development on Halpin Lane, concerning conditions of the building on the site. The resident's letter has been forwarded to the Ridgefield Housing Authority, the Historical Society, and the Board of Selectmen.

MINUTES

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the minutes of April 11, 2006, seconded by Dr. Autuori. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0.

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the minutes of April 18, 2006, seconded by Dr. Autuori. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius
Director of Planning