

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD

September 12, 2006

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

Absent: Patrick Walsh

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Inland Wetlands Agent
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

A public hearing was held by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to the meeting.

At 8:13 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2006-061-SR:** Summary Ruling application to create a grazing pasture within wetlands and upland review areas on 3.599 acres of property located at **61 South Olmstead Lane** in the RA and RAA zones. Owners/Appls.: Bruce & Robin Augustadt. *65 day action period or to schedule public hearing ends 9/14/06. Received July 11, 2006. Walked 9/10/06. For discussion.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked the Board if they felt this application needed to be taken to a Public Hearing or raised to a Plenary Ruling. She then introduced the owner/applicants, Mr. & Mrs. Augustadt.

Mr. Katz said he didn't think this application needed to go to a public hearing, but said, "If it's raised to a Plenary Ruling, it will mandate a public hearing." However, he said that it represented a very significant operation and involved a very large wetland, and felt that what was being proposed was "overkill," based on the property owner's convenience and economics. However, he stated, "We're not here to judge the efficiency of the project. We're here to judge the impact on the wetlands." He cited State statutes which allow grazing without a permit. However, he felt that the proposed operation constituted clear cutting. "It's a stumped operation that requires machinery and compaction of wetlands." He added that, from personal experience, he knows that it's possible to selectively cut trees and fence around others to create grazing land. He concluded by saying, "This is a significant area of wetlands that, if

totally stumped, is a major impact on the wetlands and probably requires a Plenary Application.”

Chairman Mucchetti distributed maps and asked that the Board refer to them.

The Agent explained that a page attached to the map gives a list of the activities planned for each of the different areas.

Dr. Autori said that he hadn't walked the site, but that he wanted to comment. Referring to the Agent's memo, he cited a publication from the UConn Cooperative Extension Service stating that the Connecticut General Statutes lists grazing of animals as an exempt activity. He felt that a problem arises when the soil is mucky, necessitating that it be filled with topsoil for the planting of hay in order to be used as cropland. He asked, “If the property in question was cleared for farm animals, would it require fill?”

The Agent suggested that the Board allow the applicant to speak so that he might address some of their questions and concerns.

Mr. Augustadt explained how he had divided the property into 5 areas – Area #1: He intends to leave a string of trees with the exception of a few diseased trees; Area #2: The trees are not in good shape, and he intends to fell all trees in this area, but with no stumping; Area #3: He intends clear cutting and stumping, and feels the area is suitable for grazing once stumped. Not every tree will be taken. The trees won't be removed unless they are (1) harmful to horses, (2) dead or dying, (3) likely to be blown over in a windstorm, or (4) do not provide shade for the horses. Area #4: Nothing will be done except the removal of dead trees with no stumping; Area #5: He proposed a clear cut, but with only selective stumping.

The Board asked for some clarification. There was lengthy discussion.

Ms. Willis was concerned that with all the clear cutting in the wet areas, there will be nothing soaking up the water and there will be “incredible run-off,” and run-off onto other properties downstream. She said the pasture area will be wetter because vegetation will have been taken away, up to the wetlands and from it. She told Mr. Augustadt that, should he then choose to fill it, bringing machinery in, he would be “effectively ruining the entire wetland,” causing much sediment and erosion.

Mr. Augustadt said that he would be planting grass. He went over his plan again, area by area, explaining how he intends to control the problems cited by the Board.

Mr. Katz said that this doesn't appear to be a homeowner's job, and that, for the protection of the Town, there needs to be some professional opinion. He reiterated that the application needs to become a Plenary Application.

Dr. Autori agreed.

The Agent said that she and the Wetlands Inspector are concerned about the clear cutting and the stumping. With a stumping operation in wetlands, there needs to be grading and possible topsoil, she said.

Dr. Autori asked, “If you create a field of muck with holes in it, is this agricultural cropland or is it a destroyed wetland?”

There was discussion of stump grinding. Mr. Augustadt said that it was not economically feasible.

The Chairman told Mr. Augustadt that his list of reasons for tree removal comes from a homeowner’s perspective, and that the Board is charged with a duty to follow the statutes that they are guided by. She also informed him that if the Board decides to raise this to a Plenary, he will have to provide a lot more information. She cited as reasons for the Board’s concern: (1) the level of disturbance, (2) the amount of wetlands being considered for disturbance, and (3) the fact that this property is part of a much larger wetlands system. The erosion will be significant, she felt. She supported Mr. Katz’ suggestion that a professional needs to be brought in.

Dr. Autori wanted to clarify whether or not the Board had jurisdiction over this. “Is it a farm?” he wanted to know.

The Agent said that the question should not be whether or not it’s a farm, but whether or not it fits the criteria for agricultural use. Wetlands scientists and UConn Cooperative Extension experts were two sources of professional opinion that she suggested to Mr. Augustadt. She said that, if this application were to be considered again, with the additional information required, both the Board and the applicant would probably benefit from an extension of the time needed for decision.

Mr. McChesney thought the applicants should withdraw the application and then come back at their convenience and resubmit.

Mr. Augustadt needed to know, if he resubmitted the application, would the plan still be a plenary level.

The Agent explained that, if he comes back with the same plan, it will almost certainly be raised to a Plenary. If he comes back with a modified plan, based on the advice of professionals, that may not be the case.

The Chairman asked the Augustadts to grant the Board an extension, which they did.

After much discussion of the application, the applicant granted an extension to the Board, to allow discussion to continue on 9/19/06.

2. **#2006-080-SR:** Summary Ruling application to construct driveway in wetlands and upland review area on property located at **11 Old Stagecoach Road** in the RAAA zone. Owner: E. Hunter Harrison. Appl.: Don Longo. *65-day action period ends 11/9/06. Received 9/5/06, walked 9/10/06. For action.*

The Chairman introduced the applicant, Mr. Longo, and detailed the changes that have taken place on the property.

The Agent referenced her staff report. She mentioned that the horse stalls are not in the wetlands, but the driveway in front of them is, and that this is where the wetlands were filled. State statutes have an exemption for a farm road, if it's being used as such. If not, then the Board must approve the filling of the wetlands in front of the horse stalls.

Mr. Katz said that the property in question is registered with the Town as a farm. The state statutes would definitely apply here. He felt that the particular item on the agenda is exempt from the regulatory process. He would move that it be approved, as is.

The Chairman strongly reminded the Board that, "had it come in with an application, and we'd been given an opportunity to review filling in the wetlands to create this gravel drive," that would have been different. But, as it stands, she said the Board had not been given a chance to review it and approve it, and would be approving "something that is already there and was installed without benefit of the application permit process."

Dr. Autori asked the Agent to get clarification on what constitutes a farm road versus filling for a farm road. "Are they one and the same," he asked. The Agent agreed to find out.

The Chairman asked Mr. Longo if he wanted to speak, and he declined.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Gelfman, to approve the application as presented. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0.

3. **11 Old Stagecoach Road.** *Discussion* of previous wetlands permits for pond dredging, driveway crossing wetlands and riding arena. (Permits issued to previous owners, Sam & Libby Edelman.)

The Agent referred to the memo she sent to the Board and to the applicant. She mentioned that she and the Wetlands Inspector, Aimee Pardee, had walked the site and observed the activities going on there, and added that Board members who walked the site on Sunday actually walked further, and noticed additional issues that needed to be raised. Three permits had been issued to the prior owners.

The Agent detailed the many areas of concern to the Board. Work had been done which significantly altered areas of the property, to where they were no longer within the limits of what had been originally approved. Specific areas of concern were: 1) piping of drainage around the riding arena, 2) the pond dredging, 3) the area around the pond, which had been a meadow and was now completely mowed and needed to be restored as a meadow, 4) the stream leading to the pond was now entirely within a pipe leading all the way down to the road near the pond, 5) the driveway crossing the wetlands to get to the derby field had been filled in. All these areas have been extremely altered from what was originally approved, and all without the benefit of permits. Since there is obviously a serious discrepancy between what was approved and what was actually done, the Agent said that it will be up to the Board to make a determination on how to proceed.

The Chairman asked Mr. Longo to clarify whether or not he was the contractor for the prior owners as well as for the current owners; and if he was a licensed contractor in the State of Connecticut; and if, in fact, he was aware of what was involved with filling in a wetland and installing catch basins, drying it out to the point that an irrigation system had to be installed. To all these questions, he answered, “Yes.”

Dr. Gelfman said that what the Agent described is an area that has been “substantially altered,” and he thinks that it should be restored - back to what it originally was - a wet meadow with a stream running through it, naturalized with check dams and rocks and plantings. He also took issue with the area around the derby field and how it has been altered.

Ms. Willis said, “I agree with Nelson. It should be restored.” She also mentioned that there had been overland flow that drained to the brook, and it was caught by the plunge pool, with no impact on the pond that had been dredged.

Mr. Katz initiated discussion about the particulars surrounding these changes, stating that what he thinks has to happen is that the Board gets back to what the original permits allowed.

The Chairman said that the stipulations, which the Agent referred to as “the permit conditions,” were at the table. A mitigation plan had been prepared by Kate Throckmorton of Environmental Land Solutions, which addressed the entire site as opposed to just parts of it. She suggested “a master restoration plan.” Ms. Willis said she thought that would be a great idea.

The Chairman and Dr. Gelfman tried to clarify the specific areas needing to be restored. The Agent and Mr. Katz talked about the derby field and the “daylighting of the pipes.” The Agent said that the goal is “to restore the function of the wetland.” She added that it wasn’t necessary to be rigid about adhering to the original plans – that the original plan for the derby field might still be modified.

The Chairman added that what used to be a wet meadow needs to be restored to a wet meadow, and the stream that is now piped needs to be restored to an open stream with check dams and banks.

Kate Throckmorton of Environmental Land Solutions cited the plan that was submitted, and looked forward to addressing the “inconsistencies.”

The Chairman addressed Mr. Longo, stressing that the property is exceptional, and that the Board expects the contractor to honor the stipulations set forth in the permitting process, and that she expects the job to get done as it's approved.

Prior permits and additional work done without permits were discussed by the Board with Don Longo, contractor for the property owner, and Kate Throckmorton, the owner's consultant. After much discussion of the issues, it was decided by consensus of the Board that the property owner should submit a master mitigation plan prepared by the consultant, to restore wetlands and wetland functions to the property. When the mitigation/restoration plan is complete, it should be submitted to the Board for review and approval.

4. **#2006-085-SR:** Summary Ruling application for excavation, filling and grading and installation of retaining walls in upland review areas on property located at **25 Lookout Point** in the RAA zone. Owner: Andrew B. Wile. Auth. Agent/Appl.: Nicholas M. Johnson. *65-day action period ends 11/9/06. Received 9/5/06, walked 9/10/06. For action.*

The Chairman introduced Mr. Wile and Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson explained the proposal to install two retaining walls. They would reduce the existing slope of the lawns going down to the lake, helping to eliminate storm water runoff and the erosion of the shore. A natural boulder retaining wall along the shoreline would address the degradation of the shore by creating immediate erosion control. The mortar and stone wall further up the slope would allow for slight terracing to eliminate that runoff. The walls would also serve to reestablish the turf and planting areas. Only organic topsoil would be used, with no use of fertilizers and pesticides. There was also the hope that these walls would help to control the Canada goose infiltration onto the property. Also the existing dock would be replaced with a floating dock. There was also a plan to greatly increase the buffer plantings, and to preserve the habitat of a family of swans.

There was some discussion as to whether or not the walls will prevent the geese from accessing the property. Dr. Gelfman was particularly interested in this, as he is dealing with the same problem.

Ms. Willis expressed concern about the boulder wall changing the function of the shoreline. She said it has fill going right up to it, and also changes the view from across the way. She would prefer that the leveling stop at the first retaining wall and

that more plantings be used to create a deterrent. She brought up the letter from Carroll Brewster of the Conservation Commission, which seemed to back up her views.

Mr. Brewster read his letter, which stated that “armoring of a lake front is detrimental to the environmental function of the lake.” The Commission suggested leveling the lawn to the first retaining wall and amending the soil to allow the grass to grow, eliminating the runoff of sand into the lake. They also suggested a buffer of plantings of at least 18” in height to provide an equal or more effective buffer.

Mr. Katz questioned the Conservation Commission's use of the word “armoring.” He said the water will go right through a natural boulder wall. He found that acceptable, and thought the Wetlands Board would be going too far by preventing the owners from enhancing their property in this way.

Dr. Autori said there would be no interference with the flow of water with the boulder wall, but there will be serious habitat disruption. He, therefore, is opposed to the building of that wall.

Dr. Gelfman said it depends on what goes on between the first and second wall. Fill and quick grass would create more of a problem. He suggested that a lower wall with a more natural slope, and the planting of shrubs and high grasses would create a better barrier to the geese.

The Agent said that the Wetlands Inspector spent much time with the landscape architect. She mentioned that the plan involved only 1/3 of the shoreline owned by the Wiles; “It is not their entire property.” The rest of the land would be left in its natural state. The wall, being no higher than 30', was seen as an improvement by the Inspector.

Mr. Wile spoke briefly in favor of this plan, showing a great sensitivity and respect for the ecology and wildlife on his property. Mr. Katz expressed his respect for the Conservation Commission, and Mr. Fossi stipulated that the wall should not exceed 30” in height.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to draft a Resolution of Approval for the application. The motion to draft the approval passed by a vote of 4-2-2, with Dr. Autuori and Mrs. Willis opposed, and Mr. Slavin and Mr. McChesney abstained.

5. **#2006-088-SR:** Summary Ruling application for drainage pipe extension, and wetlands mitigation and grading for property located at **31 Overlook Drive** in the RAA zone. Owner: Robert A. Grasso. Appl./Auth. Agent: Craig A. Studer. *65-day action period ends 11/9/06. Received 9/5/06, walked 9/10/06. For action.*

The Agent discussed the plan, detailing areas of major concern to the Board: the removal of the invasive vegetation in the area adjacent to the pond, and the adding of

an additional 20' to the drainage pipe that runs from Overlook Dr., goes underground through the property, and daylights on the property. The applicant wishes to add 20' to the pipe, bringing it closer to the wetlands. The Agent suggested a modification to the plan; specifically, a plunge pool could be substituted for the splash pad to deal with the sediment accumulating at the outlet of the pipe. The Chairman wanted to know the applicant's reason for submitting the plan, and the Agent explained that the pipe was currently too close to the driveway and the edge of the yard. Discussion continued related to the location of the pipe and how far to extend it, and also the need to maintain access to clean out the plunge pond. The Chairman and the Board felt the drain should be extended approximately 12.'

Mr. Brewster read a letter from the Conservation Commission:

"We would recommend not extending the road drainage pipe into the wetland, which would also bring it nearer the stream and pond." Of great concern to the Commission was the direct discharge of the sediment from the road, including gas and oil, which would degrade the wetland and create more algae growth. The Commission suggested stones and plantings. They felt the swale could be enhanced with check dams and/or a plunge pool. The outlet could be configured as a level spreader, allowing for "pollutant attenuation by plants and a diffuse discharge into the wetland".

Mr. Fossi said that it appears that 12' will allow enough room to clean out the plunge pool. The Chairman asked for a distance, and 10' from the existing culvert was decided upon by the Board.

Mr. Fossi motioned to draft a Resolution of Approval for the application, as presented, with the stipulation that the pipe extension extend no more than 10' from the existing culvert, and a plunge pool be added at the end of the culvert. Mr. Katz seconded the motion with a proviso that native plants surrounding the pond not be removed. The motion to draft the approval passed by a vote of 7-0-1, with Mr. McChesney abstained.

NEW ITEMS

Walk Dates schedule, distributed 9/5/06, *for discussion/ approval*.

By consensus, the Board agreed to combine the discussion with the same item on the Planning and Zoning Commission agenda. The results of the discussion can be found in the Planning and Zoning Commission minutes for this date.

BOARD WALKS

There were no new walks scheduled.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASE/REDUCTION

- **#2005-105-SR-SP: 901 Ethan Allen Highway**, request for release/reduction of performance bond (letter of credit) posted in the amount of \$563,535.00 for wetlands activities and site improvements approved under PZC special permit.

In a memo, the IWA recommends release of bond covering wetlands work. The bond was posted in combination with the bond for the Special Permit.

By consensus, the Board decided to combine discussion on this item with the same item listed on the Planning and Zoning Commission schedule. Action on the item can be found in the Planning and Zoning Commission minutes of this date.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Chairman pointed out the following correspondence:

- Memo from Wetlands Inspector Aimee Pardee, re Old Sib Road Subdivision (Sturges).
- Summer 2006 newsletter of the CLF (Connecticut Federation of Lakes)
- Fall/Winter newsletter of the Norwalk River Watershed Association

MINUTES

For approval: There were no minutes for approval.

For distribution: September 5, 2006

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

September 12, 2006

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

Absent: Patrick Walsh

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Director of Planning
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

A public hearing was held prior to the meeting.

At 9:45 p.m. p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2006-074-SP:** Special Permit Application under Sec. 312.0 required by Sec. 417.0.B. to remodel and expand existing structure and convert it back to commercial use for first floor office or retail use and general office use on the second and third floors for property located at **27 Catoonah Street** in the CBD zone. Owner: 27 Catoonah Street Associates, LLC. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. Received 7/28/06, walk scheduled for 9/10/06, public hearing commenced 9/12/06.65 day action period ends 11/16/06.For action.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to draft a Resolution of Approval for the application. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0. The draft will be subject to a final vote by the Commission, when it is prepared.

#2006-079-REV: Revision to Special Permit under Section 312.0.E as required by Sec. 410.0 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for underground utilities required for construction of Building 10 and structure for two emergency generators and an electrical substation on property located at **900 Ridgebury Road/Shadow Lake Road** in the CDD zone. Owner: Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Appl.: Wayne Jenson. 65-day action period ends 11/9/06. Received 9/5/06, walked 9/10/06. For discussion/action.

Gary Randall, Project Manager from Boehringer Ingelheim, introduced himself, as well as Lee Schofer, the Consulting Engineer, and Greg Cox, the Construction Manager from AZ Corporation. Mr. Randall said that this project paves the way for the building of Bldg. #10, and that the two projects are linked.

Mr. Schofer explained that Bldg. #10 will house research & development and office space, and will adjoin buildings #7 & #6. The main access to the building will be from an existing parking lot. He explained that the main reason for the first part of the project is to relocate utilities to make room for the new building. In addition, some utilities need to be brought over from the power plant for heating and cooling and power. Also, there is a timing issue related to the electric generator which serves buildings #6 & #7. That generator must be relocated and up and running before an extensive amount of work in the area can be done.

Mr. Randall stressed that all utilities will be underground.

Mr. Schofer described in detail the specifics of the plan, explaining that the generators will sit in a walled-in enclosure, sunken into the ground as deep as 12' in some areas, screening them from Shadow Lake Road. He stated that Boehringer's plan has taken into consideration the acoustic requirements of the Town of Ridgefield for 55 dba during the day. Their calculations assume both generators running at the same time. He also said that they would consider running the generators, if asked, to lessen the demand on Connecticut Light & Power in the case of power failures in the area. That would happen only if permitted and total less than 300 hours per year, and would still fall below the 55 dba permitted. Additionally, high temperature hot water and chilled water will be extended from this project to be available to the new building when needed.

Dr. Autori referred to Mr. Schofer's discussion of providing emergency assistance to CL&P, asking if they were speaking about contributing to the CL&P power grid.

Mr. Randall explained, "Not directly. It would lessen our load." Mr. Schofer agreed, saying that it would reduce Boehringer's demand.

Dr. Autori asked if they could do better acoustically than just meeting the 55 dba.

This prompted continuing discussion and some disagreement. The Chairman and Mr. Katz voiced their satisfaction that Boehringer was trying to comply with standards and to reduce any noise created. Dr. Autori was not satisfied that simply meeting the dba standard would suffice. Mr. Randall said they were making efforts to "attenuate noise radiating off of the engines and also some of the noise of the radiator fans." He described the acoustic control around each generator, saying that it was a very large enclosure, heavy gauge material, and a sandwich panel. Also, there would be sound blocks lining that structure. "To get it any better than that, you'd have to go to an enclosure around the whole thing," he said.

The Planner stressed that these were emergency generators that would not be running constantly, and asked how often they would be tested. She clarified that the kilowatts were 700, not 750. She reported that the Fire Marshall, David Lathrop, had approved the plan.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to approve the application according to the plans and specifications submitted. The motion passed, 7-1-0, with Dr. Autuori voting against.

NEW ITEMS

3. Walk Dates schedule, distributed 9/5/06, for discussion/ approval.

Mr. Katz made a motion to adopt the proposed site walk schedule for 2007, as prepared by Commissioner Willis. The motion was seconded by Mr. Slavin, and passed by a vote of 8-0.

4. **#2006-092-REF:** Section 8-24 referral for 25-year lease, Ridgefield Theater Barn lease, **Halpin Lane**. Owner: Town of Ridgefield. For discussion/action.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to issue a favorable report to the Board of Selectman for renewal of the 25-year lease for the Ridgefield Theater Barn located on Halpin Lane. The motion passed, 8-0.

5. **#2006-093-REV:** Revision to Special Permit under Section 312.0.E. to allow construction of two trash enclosures located at **94 Danbury Road** in the B-3 zone. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. Owners: Ninety Four Commerce, LLC. 65-day action period ends 11/16/06. For receipt and schedule walk.

The Planner explained that they are not changing the dumpster which had been approved on the Ridgefield Bank property. They are asking for decorative enclosures for the dumpsters that are now sitting between this property and the adjacent property to the west, on Danbury Road.

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve, as presented, the proposal for decorative fencing for trash enclosures at the rear of the site on 94 Danbury Road. The motion passed, 8-0.

6. **Chairman's Report:** Chamber of Commerce meetings; Economic Development Commission; Open Space Ordinance.

The Chairman briefly discussed the three items with the Commission, and there were no actions taken. She reported that the Chamber of Commerce was invited to send a subcommittee to the next Planning and Zoning meeting in order to discuss the signage issue. She mentioned that the Chamber had come up with the idea of putting directional kiosks within municipal parking lots. She reported the Economic

Development Commission is looking for a way to deal with the Town as a whole, but their immediate focus is on Schlumberger, who is about to start the process of moving. The Town wants to work together with the company so that Ridgefield doesn't lose that commercial base. She also reported on the Turner Hill open space encroachment issue discussed at the Board of Selectman's meeting. She said a quote of \$11,000 was gotten to have a survey done to determine the property line, in order to determine where, if at all, there can be a buffer zone.

COMMISSION WALKS

There were no new site walks scheduled.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASE/REDUCTION

- **#2005-105-SR-SP: 901 Ethan Allen Highway**, request for release/reduction of performance bond (letter of credit) posted in the amount of \$563,535.00 for wetlands activities and site improvements approved under PZC special permit*. PD recommends partial release.

As noted in the Inland Wetlands Board minutes for this date, the actions of the Board and the Commission were taken concurrently on this item. In a memo, the Planner recommended release of the portion of the bond covering wetlands work, and a reduction to **\$180,000** for the remaining work covered by the Special Permit.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to reduce the bond as recommended by the Planner. The motion passed, 8-0.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Chairman pointed out the following correspondence:

- A letter from realtor Tim Dent regarding the need to change the DPD zone on Danbury Road, north of Copps Hill Plaza.
- A letter from Warren Arthur, expressing interest in membership on the AAC.
- A letter from the Conservation Commission regarding the Special Meeting scheduled for September 18, 2006.
- A memo from the Planner regarding traffic control on the Toll Brothers site at 638 Danbury Road.

MINUTES

For Approval: There were no minutes for approval.

For distribution: September 5, 2006

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
AQUIFER PROTECTION AGENCY

September 12, 2006

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

Absent: Patrick Walsh

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Director of Planning

A public hearing was held prior to the meeting.

At 10:21 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

There were no pending items.

NEW ITEMS

There were no new items.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Dr. Autuori motioned to approve the minutes of June 13, 2006, seconded by Mr. Katz.
The motion passed, 8-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary