

**CITY OF NORWALK
MEETING OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION/INLAND
WETLAND AGENCY MINUTES
JULY 22, 2025**

PRESENT: Steve Klocke, Chair; Cheryl Brown; Paul Vinett; Heather Breslin; Kathryn Knight

STAFF: Alexis Cherichetti

OTHERS: Atty Liz Suchy; Brian Carey; Andy Soumelidis

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

There were no applications to be received.

V. DISCUSSION &/OR DECISION

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

Ms. Cherichetti noted that the application is still incomplete because they are waiting for payment of the application fee. It would need to be paid before the commission's August 26th meeting as that is the deadline for them to make a decision. This matter was tabled.

B. #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 said that the application had been received at a previous meeting. The commission also received an extension of time from the applicant so the public hearing would be held on October 18. The applicant requested that this matter be tabled.

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

This item was tabled as the application was incomplete.

D. #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 they had received the application at the previous meeting. The applicant has been working on the commission's comments from that meeting.

Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation with a brief overview of the project. She said that the site plans and storm water management plan had been sent to the Department of Public Works (DPW) but they had not received any comments yet. She said that Brian Carey and Andy Soumelidis would present to them and that they would determine that no public hearing is necessary. She noted that one of the standards was for the commission to receive a petition from 25 residents requesting a public hearing. It was her understanding that they had not.

Brian Carey, one of the engineers on the project, began the presentation and said that they had submitted a full environmental memo. He showed them the aerial view of the property as well as the current site plan. Most of the property fell in the upland review area. The site is fully developed with a commercial building and a single family residential house. There will be 2 separate residences which will be townhouses. He gave a brief overview of the proposed drainage system. He said they would address questions from the previous meeting. They had submitted the plans to the city's engineer and met the water quality management standards. They also submitted an operation and maintenance plan. He also discussed the grading on the property. He noted that the property is about 100% impervious, but the landscaping plan would address this. Snow storage areas were designated on the site plan. There was an alternative analysis for the highest and best use of the property.

Mr. Carey did not believe there would be a need for a public hearing since there had been no public interest in the project and there was no significant impact to adjacent wetland resources. He said they were interested in moving the project forward by seeking the other necessary city approvals. He believed the project met the standards of the inland wetland's agency as well as the zoning regulations. There would be no work done in the wetlands. They would try to use green infrastructure on the site to manage the water quality.

There was a discussion about additional photos of the current site. Ms. Cherichetti did not have any. Andy Soumelidis showed them the location with Google maps while Mr. Carey discussed the type of tree in the area.

There was a discussion about the larger trees at the back of the property and the impact. The paving would be on the property line.

Eric Rains, the landscape architect, continued the presentation with a discussion of the retaining wall that was to be replaced. Mr. Klocke requested that the applicant add more information about what was currently on the property. There was a discussion about what were the offsite wetlands which were delineated on the existing conditions site plan.

There was a discussion about organizing a site visit to see the existing conditions. Ms. Cherichetti said that staff could meet any of the commissioners that would like to see it. Mr. Rains said that he could meet them as well.

There was a discussion about adding the conditions of the adjoining property which included invasive vegetation. At this point, Mr. Soumelidis showed them pictures of the current property. There was a discussion as to whether this project would be improving the site as opposed to the current conditions. There was also a discussion about attempting to ask the adjacent property owner for permission to be on their property. There was also a discussion about having more detail for the proposed retaining wall. There was a discussion about the location of the temporary stockpile. There was also a discussion about the material of the grass pavers. There was a discussion about whether a soil sampling on the property had been done. Mr. Carey said it had not. There was also a discussion about the wetlands delineation since there were concerns about wetlands being under the lawn without testing the soil. There was a discussion about the offsite property and what they had received from a survey that was completed on that property. Mr. Carey said that from the resources available there was nothing to suggest that there were wetlands on the property

At this point, Mr. Klocke summarized what the commission would expect to see at the applicant's next presentation. There was a discussion as to whether there should be a public hearing held on this application. It was determined that a public hearing was not warranted. Ms. Knight asked if she could go see the site and Ms. Cherichetti asked her to email to set up a time to do so.

VI. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

A. July 8, 2025 meeting minutes

***** MS. BROWN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 8, 2025 MEETING.**

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

Conservation Commission

July 22, 2025
Page 3 of 4

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

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

***** NO ONE ABSTAINED.**

VII. CONSERVATION INITIATIVES

There was nothing to report.

VIII. REPORTS

A. Commission Chair

Mr. Klocke announced that it was Ms. Brown's last meeting. She thanked everyone and said she valued the experience. Ms. Cherichetti said she would advise at the next meeting about how to replace her since she was the Vice Chair.

Ms. Knight said that she had recently added solar panels to the roof of her home and was already exporting power back to the grid.

B. Senior Environmental Officer

Ms. Cherichetti said that she had nothing to report.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

***** MR. KLOCKE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN.**

***** MS. BRESLIN SECONDED THE MOTION.**

***** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:51 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero