

**CITY OF NORWALK
MEETING OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION/INLAND
WETLAND AGENCY MINUTES
JULY 8, 2025**

PRESENT: Steve Klocke, Chair; Cheryl Brown; Paul Vinett; Ed Holowinko; Heather Breslin; Kathryn Knight (after roll call)

STAFF: Alexis Cherichetti

OTHERS: Atty Liz Suchy; Andy Soumelidis; Eric Rains; Atty Frank Murphy; Lynn Shaak; Jen Horvath

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Klocke called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held on Zoom.com with all participants calling in, separately.

II. ROLL CALL

Ms. Cherichetti called the roll.

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No one spoke on this item.

IV. RECEIPT & DISCUSSION

A. #S25-658 – 38 Lois Street & 1 Bishop Street – 38 Lois, LLC & One Bishop, LLC – Demolition of existing and construction of two (2) multi-family buildings with twelve (12) total units with associated site work and stormwater management adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Ms. Cherichetti said that she had not prepared a staff report but gave a brief overview of the property. The current structures would be demolished and replaced with two multi-family structures.

Attorney Suchy began the presentation with a description of the property which was a half-acre in size. She then introduced the project team. There would be a total of 12 new residential units on the site. She explained the activities in the upland review area. There would not be any activity in the watercourse. She said that they did not need a public hearing because this was already a developed site, and they are proposing changes which would not have a significant adverse impact on it.

Conservation Commission

July 8, 2025
Page 1 of 6

Andy Soumelidis, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation by showing the Agency the current site plan. He noted that two lots would be merged. He explained the current conditions on both lots, one of which has a commercial building on it. The wetlands are to the north which gets piped through this property. On the other lot there is a single-family residence. He then showed them the proposed site plan which included a building on one lot as well as a building with 4 townhomes on the other lot. He then discussed the proposed curb cuts, as well as the parking. He also explained the proposed drainage system as well as what happened to water currently. He briefly discussed what would happen on the site during construction. Mr. Soumelidis said that they did not flag offsite wetlands and only flagged what was on their property.

Eric Rains, the landscape architect on the project, continued the presentation by showing them the proposed landscape plans. They would be using permeable pavers on the site. He also discussed the amenity area, as well as the tree line along Bishop Street. He discussed the planting plan. He described the difference between the current plantings and the proposed plan. One thing he noted was that it was more diverse, which was an improvement. He also described other parts of the landscape plan including the placement of the gravel and the hedge fence system.

There was a discussion about the reinforced lawn area, part of which would be made with a synthetic material. There was a request for some pictures of the current conditions of the wetlands area. There was also a discussion about snow removal vs. storage of it on the site. Mr. Rains said snow would probably have to be removed. The Agency also reviewed the aerial photo of the site. Ms. Cherichetti gave a brief overview of the current watercourse and its flow.

There was a discussion as to whether the stormwater management plan had been submitted to the Department of Public Works (DPW). Attorney Suchy said that it would be once they submitted an application to the Planning & Zoning Department. Ms. Cherichetti requested that they submit the plans in advance of filing the application with P&Z. Mr. Soumelidis said that they had been in talks with Transportation, Mobility and Parking (TMP) but would speak with DPW as well.

There was a discussion about the mitigation of the synthetic materials that would be used. Ms. Cherichetti noted that this was a significant regulated activity which would require a public hearing but did not think it was ready to be scheduled. The applicant would have to come back to the commission at their next meeting. Atty Suchy asked that there be a discussion at the next meeting as to whether this was a significant regulated activity.

At this point, Ms. Cherichetti noted that Mr. Soumelidis had requested that another item on the agenda could be moved up since he was away.

*** MR. KLOCKE MADE A MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA.

*** MR. VINETT SECONDED THE MOTION.

*** STEVE KLOCKE; CHERYL BROWN; PAUL VINETT; KATHRYN KNIGHT;
HEATHER BRESLIN; ED HOLOWINKO APPROVED.

*** NO ONE OPPOSED THE MOTION.

*** NO ONE ABSTAINED.

V. DISCUSSION &/OR DECISION

A. #S05-223B – 215 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Drive – LandTech –Modification to alter site development plan in and adjacent to a wetland

Ms. Cherichetti noted that they had seen the application previously and gave a brief overview. She said that there was a draft resolution. She explained that the resolution included most of what was in the 2005 permit and had language for a swirl separator as well as the fact that there were no buildings on the property.

Mr. Soumelidis said that a temporary trailer would be removed from the site. He explained how the swirl separator would treat the water before it would go into the wetlands. There would also be some additional plantings.

Ms. Cherichetti said that a new bond would have to be posted by the new owner. She also explained how there would be a wetlands scientist on the property while the work is being done to assess it.

*** MR. KLOCKE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE DRAFT RESOLUTION DATED
JULY 7, 2025 FOR #S05-223B AS WRITTEN.

*** MS. BRESLIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

*** STEVE KLOCKE; CHERYL BROWN; PAUL VINETT; KATHRYN KNIGHT;
HEATHER BRESLIN; ED HOLOWINKO APPROVED.

*** NO ONE OPPOSED THE MOTION.

*** NO ONE ABSTAINED.

B.#S25-654 - 26 Devil's Garden Road - Shaak - Corrective Action restoration of disturbed wetland and after-the-fact construction of structures adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Ms. Cherichetti explained that the Agency had reviewed the application at multiple previous meetings. The applicant had made revisions as per the Agency's comments, as well as the Zoning Department. She then showed them the revised site plan and explained the changes.

Attorney Frank Murphy continued the presentation by explaining how the hot tub would be moved since it was within the setback line. He noted that it had been approved by the Zoning Enforcement Officer. Since the potting shed was encroaching on the neighbor's property it would be removed and replaced with a raised bed garden. He also asked for a waiver or reduction of the bond, since he believed it was excessive. Ms. Cherichetti reviewed how the bond was calculated. There was a discussion with Lynn Shaak about the work to be done. She said she would be doing it herself.

There was a discussion about the plan which included having a lawn on the wetlands and the only demarcation would be with boulders. There was concern that anything put onto the lawn would go into the wetlands. There was a discussion about having plantings near the boulders which would act as better filtration. Atty Murphy noted that the lawn area had been there for a long time, possibly back to 1934 when the house was constructed. He said that their soil scientist had no issue with the lawn. He did not think that Ms. Shaak should be required to remove the lawn.

Ms. Knight said she was not requesting them to remove the lawn, but had concerns about the runoff from it. She would like to see better filtration for the runoff from the lawn. Atty Murphy said that the area was mostly flat and not prone to runoff.

There was a discussion about modifications to the resolution. They discussed moving some of the plantings to behind the boulders for better filtration. Ms. Cherichetti made suggestions as to which could be moved. Atty Murphy suggested adding them to the edge of the lawn.

*** **MR. KLOCKE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE DRAFT RESOLUTION DATED JULY 7, 2025 FOR #S25-654 AS AMENDED.**

*** **MR. VINETT SECONDED THE MOTION.**

*** **STEVE KLOCKE; CHERYL BROWN; PAUL VINETT; KATHRYN KNIGHT; HEATHER BRESLIN; ED HOLOWINKO APPROVED.**

*** **NO ONE OPPOSED THE MOTION.**

*** **NO ONE ABSTAINED.**

C. #S25-655 – 12 Riverwalk Lane – Rowley – Corrective Action restoration of disturbed wetland and designated buffer adjacent to a wetland and watercourse

Ms. Cherichetti said that this item would be tabled as Ms. Rowley was completing her application. She said that she would follow up again with her in August as the Agency has a deadline to render a decision.

D.#S25-656 – 23 Glenwood Avenue – Moch – Construction of an eight-unit multi-family residence with associated parking area and stormwater drainage adjacent to a wetland and a watercourse

Ms. Cherichetti explained that the applicant had requested that this item be tabled as they were still working on their revisions.

E.#S25-657 – 19 Park Street – Somma – Corrective Action activities in response to Enforcement Order #V25-1081

Ms. Cherichetti explained that the application is part of the resolution directives of a Cease and Desist Order. She noted that this item would be tabled but that she had met with the owner to discuss the scope of the application.

VI. DETERMINATION OF PERMIT NEED

A. 70 Witch Lane – Proposed shed adjacent to wetlands and watercourse

Ms. Cherichetti explained what the owner was proposing to install on the property. She noted that sometimes it is unclear whether the permit should be issued administratively or with the review by the Agency. Since she could not answer many of the questions that were raised by the Agency at the June 10th meeting, she invited the property owner to attend the meeting at the request of the Agency.

Jen Horvath explained the size of the shed and its use. She said that there was a footbridge that they would use to get to the shed. The Agency were shown a photo of the footbridge. There was a discussion about how the shed would be built. Everything would be carried to the proposed site. There was a discussion about the foundation, as well as how far the shed would be from the wetlands. There was a discussion about having a surveyor stake out where the shed should be built.

There was then a discussion as to whether this was a minor regulated activity. The Agency decided that it was.

VII. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

A. June 10, 2025 meeting minutes

***** MR. VINETT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 10, 2025 MEETING.**

***** MS. KNIGHT SECONDED THE MOTION.**

***** STEVE KLOCKE; CHERYL BROWN; PAUL VINETT; ED HOLOWINKO; KATHRYN KNIGHT APPROVED.**

***** NO ONE OPPOSED THE MOTION.**

***** HEATHER BRESLIN ABSTAINED.**

VIII. CONSERVATION INITIATIVES

Ms. Cherichetti said that there was nothing to report.

Mr. Klocke asked whether recent federal legislation would affect any funding to Norwalk but Ms. Cherichetti said that at this time, it had not.

There was a discussion about the astroturf at Broad River which the Common Council had voted against.

IX. REPORTS

A. Commission Chair

Mr. Klocke did not have anything to report.

B. Senior Environmental Officer

Ms. Cherichetti said that the city had issued email addresses for the Agency members. She would send out information that would require that they come into the office so that the city's IT Department could set them up for them.

Ms. Breslin suggested that everyone download the Merlin Bird app.

X. ADJOURNMENT

*** **MR. KLOCKE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN.**
*** **MS. BRESLIN SECONDED THE MOTION.**
*** **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero