



## TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD Inland Wetlands Board

### APPROVED/REVISED MINUTES

February 10, 2022

Members present: Patricia Sesto, chair; Alan Pilch, secretary; Chris Phelps, Tracey Miller, Tim Bishop, David Smith

Members Absent: Susan Baker, Vice chair

Also present: Andrew P. Hally, wetland agent; Aarti Paranjape, office administrator; Steven Trinkaus; P.E. James McManus, Robert R. Jewell, Rebecca Luraschi, James Kelley, Dainius Virbickas; P.E. Kate Throckmorton.

#### **I: Call to order**

Ms. Sesto called the meeting to order at 7:04 P.M.

#### **II: Public Hearing:**

- 1. (Contd.) IW-21-56, 187 Rippowam Road,** Plenary Ruling application to construct a bridge over a stream within the upland review area of the wetlands. *Owner: Nguyen, Vi. Applicant: Steven Trinkaus.*  
<https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/84238>

Mr. Hally read the list of new documents submitted into the record.

Mr. Jewell gave a brief history of the two lots. He said that it's a first division lot and not a subdivision. In 1986 the Planning & Zoning Commission and Wetlands Board had approved the access way. The accessway had least disturbance and approved the dwelling with the septic. The proposed revised accessway provides a prudent and feasible alternative to the previous design and has less impact to the wetlands and watercourse.

Discussion ensued on the allowance of the driveway on the adjoining lot. Mr. Jewell stated Planning and Zoning requires the driveway serving a rear lot be in the accessway. The legality of the accessway on parcel A was discussed and that a variance would be required to use the old wood road. Further, there is a private easement that allows certain parties to use the wood road for access to land farther west. Mr. Jewell was asked to provide a copy of the easement to substantiate its stated conflict with using the wood road for a driveway to serve the subject lot.



## TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD Inland Wetlands Board

Ms. Sesto expressed her observation that one stream crossing should have less wetland and watercourse impact than two crossings. She cited discussion from the last meeting attributing the low level of development in the stream's watershed as a factor in the high quality of the stream. She went on to state the alternative driveway sketch from Mr. Trinkaus submitted pursuant to request was a disingenuous effort. She noted the sketch took a path directly up the slope and failed to consider having the garage in the basement level of the house. She showed a sketch she drew depicting the driveway servicing the house from the basement level.

Mr. Trinkaus stressed that the proposal for the bridge over the stream is environmentally friendly. He added that they will eliminate the proposed work on the existing bridge from the scope of the application. He will revise the plans and place the driveway wholly within its accessway.

Ms. Sesto said that the proper documents should be submitted that the timber bridge is not the alternative. She asked Mr. MacManus if the proposal of two crossing is productive for the functioning of the wetlands especially given the Level A water quality.

Mr. MacManus stated that the proposed crossing will not have the detrimental impact on or off site to the watercourse.

Ms. Miller expressed concerns that records are not clear. She added the cross section is still not detailed enough and has not been labeled as existing and proposed. Her concerns were the disturbance is in very close proximity of the stream bed.

Mr. Trinkaus stated that the U shaped channel is not being disturbed and erosion control measures are just beyond the top of banks. He agreed to note the limit of excavation and limit of disturbance.

Mr. Pilch disagreed with Mr. Trinkaus that disturbance near the banks of the stream would not threaten the stream. He stated that given the hydrology of the soils, the footings should be further away from the top of the banks. He also agreed that the alternative provided using the wood road is disingenuous.

Discussion ensued regarding the stability of a one-foot wide soil wall between the excavation and stream.

Ms. Sesto suggested to look into the prospect of moving the garage in the basement.

The homeowner, Mr. Nguyen said that due to the physical disability of a member of family, it's not feasible to have the garage at the lower level. An elevator would be



## TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD Inland Wetlands Board

required for accessibility. Mrs. Nguyen added that they are advocates of saving environment and will do everything to protect nature. After research they found that the bridge will be environmentally friendly than the earlier approved box culvert.

The applicant agreed to provide a revision showing the bridge footings further away from stream channel.

The public hearing was continued to February 24, 2022.

2. **(Contd.) IW-21-57, 0 Ives Court**, Summary Ruling Application for Drainage, grading and road improvements to Ives Court to meet Town roadway standards within the upland review area of wetlands. *Owner: Robert Cioffoletti. Applicant: Michele Micoli; Artel Engineering.*

<https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/84217>

Mr. Hally read the list of new documents into the record.

Mr. Virbickas presented the updates requested by the Board at the last meeting. The new plans show the watercourse, limit of upland review area and the north arrow. A few of the existing discharge points, which were discharging into the wetlands, were eliminated. The discharge pipes are shortened and now they discharge into stilling pools before overflowing into the wetlands and brook.

The grading of road shoulder has been pulled back by 20 feet using a 1:1.5 slope and water bars were added at 50 foot intervals

Ms. Throckmorton presented the mitigation plan. After contacting CT DEEP's Natural Diversity Data Base, it was confirmed that eastern box turtles were present in the vicinity. There are five direct discharges and the road is in poor conditions.

The following best management practices are proposed:

- Provide a detailed sequence of construction.
- Eliminate direct discharges as possible, and where the discharges couldn't be eliminated stilling pools are proposed. This reduces the sediment runoff into the watercourse and wetlands.
- Relocate stockpile away from the wetlands.
- Protection plan for the eastern box turtle as per recommendation of DEEP.
- Riprap or erosion control blankets will be used to stabilize the steep slopes.
- Hand removal of sediment at the cul de sac.
- Replanting per the planting plans.



## TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD Inland Wetlands Board

The new plunge pools are proposed at the cul de sac area, all disturbed area will be replanted and stabilized. Includes street trees on the south side and provides good cover.

On the western side, two discharges have been eliminated and after re piping will discharge into the basin which will be replanted with understory and herbaceous plants and will be seeded.

Ms. Miller requested again to check with the Housatonic Valley Association to check if the applicant qualifies for a grant to replace existing culverts with fish friendly ones. She stated the site has perched culverts and having a grant for replacement will be beneficial to the project.

Mr. Virbickas spoke to questions about the plunge pools, stating the construction of the plunge pools do not involve much filling or excavation, silt fence is proposed, and straw bales will be used to fortify the erosion controls. The plunge pool in the western end could hold some water. He agreed to look into the stabilization on the slopes using erosion control blankets in consideration of the velocity.

Ms. Sesto expressed concerns that the shaded area will be inhibitive for the vegetation to thrive and pollutants like hydrocarbons, sediments discharging to the wetlands and stream from the road runoff will be detrimental. She added plunge pools are good to control velocity flow and would not be as effective to capture these soluble pollutants. Ms. Sesto suggested pursuing swirl separators and LID practices, including vegetative swales.

Mr. Virbickas responded the lack of shoulder width limits their LID options, but he would look into swirl separators. He also addressed the concern of the neighbor, stating there is no change to the volume of water leaving the site and the downstream pond should continue to have same amount of water.

The public hearing was continued to February 24, 2022. The applicant will grant extension.

**Ms. Sesto motioned to add an item to Agenda, IW-21-51, 9 Rita Rd. Mr. Bishop seconded. Motion carried 6-0-0.**



## TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD Inland Wetlands Board

- 3) IW-21-54, 9 Rita Road, Plenary Ruling application for a construction of single family home within the upland review area of the wetlands. *Owner: Candice Germain. Applicant: James Casali.*

Ms. Sesto asked for public comments. There were none.

The applicant has granted an extension and asked to continue the public hearing to March 24, 2022.

### III: Applications for Discussion:

1. **(Contd.) IW-21-58, 66 Keeler Drive**, Summary Ruling application for corrective action for potential violation, to fill the area adjacent to stream and pond within the upland review area of the wetlands. *Owner: Alexandre Suter. Applicant: Mike Mazzucco.* <https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/84841>

Applicant requested to continue the discussion until next meeting.

2. **IW-22-2, 22 Whitlock Lane**, Summary Ruling application for construction of pool, retaining wall and a rain garden within the upland review of wetlands. *Owner: Nnennaya&ChikezieDuke. Applicant: RebeccaLuraschi.* <https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/85641>

Ms. Luraschi gave an overview of application. The proposed pool is a fiber glass inground pool. The location of the pool is driven by wetlands, zoning setbacks, and leaching fields setbacks. The pool is 52 feet away from the wetlands. There are mature trees between the pool and the wetlands and no trees are proposed to be removed. The coping of the pool is 1-foot-wide and surrounded by pervious artificial turf. Access will be around the back of the house from the end of the driveway. The crane will be placed on the driveway which will lift and place the pool in the exact location. There is minimal excavation beyond the footprint of the pool. The mud tracking mats will be used to avoid soil disturbance.

Ms. Luraschi stated there is no drawn down involved with this pool and the filtration system is closed to avoid backwash.

**Mr. Bishop motioned to approve the Summary Ruling application with the board's standard and applicable regular special conditions, Mr. Smith seconded. The motion carried 6-0-0.**

**The publication date is February 17 and effective date is February 18, 2022.**



## TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD Inland Wetlands Board

- 3. IW-22-3, 10 Black Pine Ridge,** Summary Ruling application for construction of pool within the upland review area of the wetlands. *Owner: Jorge Restrepo. Applicant: Sara Demici.*

<https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/83911>

Mr. James Kelley gave an overview of the pool project. The 20x40 inground pool is 82 feet away from wetland boundary. The erosion measures are established around the pool to reduce sediment runoff. There is no backwashing. Gizzmo tool is used for overflow and hence no runoff of water from the pool will affect the wetlands. No fill will be brought in or removed. Planting plan includes herbaceous plants in between pool and the upland review area. Minimum grading is involved as that part of the property is relatively flat. Driveway will be used for accessing the construction vehicles. The 800 sq. ft. patio includes impervious pervious blue stone pavers.

Mr. Pilch suggested to use pervious pavers for patio.

The board questioned if there is demarcation of limit of lawn and what limit of lawn was approved previously.

Discussion ensued regarding the limit of lawn and buffer planting between the lawn and wetlands.

Mr. Kelley agreed to update the information at the next meeting.

The discussion is continued to February 24, 2022.

### **IV: Applications for Receipt:**

- 1. IW-22-5, 7 Canterbury Lane,** Summary Ruling application for construction of patios and retaining walls and addition to dwelling within the upland review area of wetlands. *Owner: Gregory & Danuta Veillette. Applicant: Gerry Panico. For receipt and scheduling a sitewalk and discussion.*

<https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/85863>

**Mr. Pilch motioned to receive the above application, Ms. Miller seconded.  
Motion carried 6-0-0.**

Site walk is scheduled for February 20, 2022 and discussion on February 24, 2022.



## TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD Inland Wetlands Board

### V: Administrative Approvals:

**1. IW-22-4, 118 Sleepy Hollow Road,** Administrative approval for repair of the existing old deck within the upland review area. *Owner/ Applicant: Jon Jonas.*

<https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/85807>

Mr. Hally gave an overview of the administrative application where the homeowner proposes to repair the existing deck and expansion of deck by 256 square feet. The existing deck is 20-30 feet away from the edge of wetlands. The six concrete piers will be used for support. There is no decline in pervious surface. Roof runoff drains onto the existing lawn.

**Mr. Phelps motioned to approve the administrative application with general and special conditions. Mr. Bishop seconded. Motion carried 6-0-0.**

### VII: Approval of Minutes:

- **Inland Wetlands Meeting: January 25, 2022**  
**Mr. Pilch motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Ms. Sesto seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0.**
- **Sitewalk Meeting: February 06, 2022**  
**Mr. Bishop motioned to approve the minutes. Ms. Sesto seconded. Motion carried 4-0-2. Ms. Sesto and Mr. Bishop abstained.**

### VIII. Adjourn

Hearing no further business, Ms. Sesto adjourned the meeting at 9:07 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

Aarti Paranjape  
Recording Secretary