

**CITY OF NORWALK
CONSERVATION COMMISSION/INLAND
WETLAND AGENCY MINUTES
JANUARY 27, 2026**

PRESENT: Steve Klocke, Chair; Elise Allum; Devan Healy; Heather Breslin; Kathryn Knight
(6:03PM)

STAFF: Alexis Cherichetti

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

Lynnelle Jones, 10 Point Road, said that she had sent an email with a summary of the Connecticut Flood Management Act. She had questions about the use of a declaratory ruling for 2 East Rocks Road. She said that the Agency should question the compliance with the Connecticut Flood Management Act. She was concerned about the misuse of public grant funds, as well as the risk of Norwalk losing federal flood insurance and other grants. She thanked them for reviewing the videos in the email she sent. She asked them to consider training for the Coastal Area Management Act and Connecticut Flood Management Act

There was a further discussion about the speaker's purpose. Ms. Jones said she hoped the flood management act be followed. She also appreciated the Agency members help and thoughtful comments. It was suggested that Ms. Jones also reach out to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) since it is responsible for the Coastal Management Act for state granted funded projects.

There were no other members of the public that spoke.

IV. RECEIPT & DISCUSSION

A. #S26-661 – 5 Witch Lane – Elizabeth A.B. Suchy, Esq. – Two (2) lot subdivision adjacent to a wetland and a watercourse

Ms. Cherichetti began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. She reminded them that subdivisions are different from other

applications. Mr. Klocke noted that they were being asked to review the subdivision without seeing a landscape plan and that anything on the application was being shown to represent what could be constructed on the property. Sometime in the future the commission may be asked to review an application of proposed structures.

Atty Liz Suchy, the attorney for the applicant, continued the presentation by introducing the property owners. She explained the property's zoning and size. There is a single-family house on the lot at the moment that the owners live in. There is also a watercourse on the property. For this application the applicant was asking for a subdivision of the lot into two building lots. The Planning & Zoning Commission would also receive an application for the subdivision once this commission acted on the application. The proposed structure on the site plan was not what was being proposed for the property. There could be a separate application at another time.

There was a discussion about the wetlands delineation as well as the lines for the setbacks. Atty Suchy said that they would provide more information on a supplemental plan. There was also a discussion about an application being submitted to the Planning & Zoning Commission which had not been reviewed.

V. DISCUSSION &/OR DECISION

A. #S25-659 – Longshore Avenue – Manresa Osprey LLC – Creation of 'North Forest' park with associated trails, accessway, parking, stormwater management and landscaping in and adjacent to wetlands

Ms. Cherichetti explained that this application would be withdrawn since the wetland map amendment was successful. However, the applicant was waiting for the appeal period to end so that they could formally withdraw. She noted this should happen in the next few days.

B. #S25-660 – 4 Singingwoods Road – William Kenny Associates LLC – Construction of a new single-family residence, with associated grading, stormwater management and landscaping, adjacent to wetlands and a watercourse

Ms. Cherichetti said that this application had been received at a prior meeting and that they had given the applicant feedback to revise the plans. Revised mitigation plans had been submitted.

Len D'Andrea continued the presentation by showing the commissioners a site plan of the property. He gave a brief history of the property including that the current owner bought them as buildable lots. There are five total lots, and some of them already have structures built on them. He said that this would be the last lot that the applicant would be building on that needs a wetland permit. He showed them the area for the septic primary and reserve areas. He then discussed where the new house would be constructed. The water management system would be at the back of the property. He said that they were trying to minimize the grading. There

would also be a patio and a screened porch. He also discussed the trees that would be kept near the septic system, as well as where some trees would be removed. He also mentioned where the vegetative infill areas were. He also discussed the sedimentation and erosion control plan.

Andrew Delach, the land use ecologist for the project, continued the presentation by discussing the revision to the wetland buffer habitat enhancement plan, which included expansion of the buffer area. He noted that some of the trees being saved were in the buffer zone as well as adding more.

There was a discussion about the number of shrubs and trees proposed for installation and removal. There was also a discussion about the distance on the buffer being shown on the plans. There was a concern about the width of the buffer being thin. There was a concern that this was not what they had required from previous applicants. Mr. D'Andrea said that they could increase the buffer to 35 ft. There was a discussion about moving the septic field.

Brian French discussed where the drainage system could go versus where the septic system could be placed, since the septic could be pumped and the drainage could not. He also discussed the soils which had higher restrictive layers in the back as compared to the front. There was a discussion about saving more trees in the upland review area. There was also a discussion about reducing the amount of the site that would be disturbed if all the systems were in one place. Mr. D'Andrea noted that there are health codes about the amount of space between each system. There was also a discussion about the shape of the house. There would be a basement, crawl space and two car garage. Mr. D'Andrea said that the house had already been designed. There was also a discussion about how close the boulders could come to the house. Mr. D'Andrea said the buffer could be expanded at the northside of the property. By moving the buffer they could save a few more trees. There was a discussion about what was being introduced versus what was being saved on the property. There would be seeding with a native mix, as well as plantings of native trees and shrubs.

There was a concern about the house being close to the wetlands. Mr. Delach said he could expand the buffer. Mr. D'Andrea said that as they got closer to the house, the demarcation line could be 8 ft. from the house. There was some further negotiation for saving more trees and the line of demarcation. Mr. D'Andrea noted that the applicant had a buyer so there were deadlines.

At this point, there was a discussion about potentially making a decision on the application. Mr. D'Andrea then left the webinar to make the changes to the site plan.

Mr. Klocke suggested the Agency continue with the agenda items and circle back to this matter upon the return of the applicant's engineer.

VI. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Conservation Commission

January 27, 2026
Page 3 of 5

A. January 13, 2026 meeting minutes

Ms. Healy made note of a correction. She noted she had abstained, but the minutes reflected a 'no' vote.

*** **MS. HEALY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 13 MEETING, AS AMENDED.**

*** **MS. ALLUM SECONDED THE MOTION.**

*** **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VII. CONSERVATION INITIATIVES

Ms. Knight reported she is on the Sustainability and Resilience Task Force, working on the energy portion. She asked the commissioners if they had any examples of towns working on this as well. She also said that they were looking at Ann Arbor, Michigan as a model. She asked the commissioners if they had any ideas, case studies from other towns for these energy topics. She also asked if they had any ideas for the other groups on the task force.

Ms. Healy said that she had been to the League of Conservation Voters event and could send contacts that she had met from the day. There was a discussion about community solar. Ms. Healy explained that there are plug-in solar panels, "porch solar panels."

Mr. Klocke returned to the pending permit application.

VIII. DISCUSSION &/OR DECISION

#S25-660 – 4 Singingwoods Road – William Kenny Associates LLC – Construction of a new single-family residence, with associated grading, stormwater management and landscaping, adjacent to wetlands and a watercourse

At 7:07 pm Mr. D'Andrea returned to the meeting and showed the commissioners the changes he had made to the proposed site plans. Mr. Klocke said that these revisions were not quite ready. Ms. Knight did not want this to set precedent for other applicants. Ms. Healy did not think they should accept these changes at this time.

Mr. Klocke determined it would be best to make a decision at the next meeting, after revised site plans had been submitted and Ms. Cherichetti had prepared a draft resolution with conditions.

IX. BOND RELEASE/REDUCTION REQUESTS

A. #S25-654 – 26 Devils Garden Road - Shaak– Reduction of bond held for corrective action restoration of a wetland

Ms. Cherichetti explained the corrective action activities. She said that the work had been completed and shared pictures of it. She showed them the pictures of the demarcation wall. There was discussion regarding the undersized boulders. Ms. Cherichetti noted the tree and shrubs were planted by the area was not seeded yet and the owner is waiting until the spring for optimal germination. The applicant is seeking a reduction of the bond that is being held.

There was a discussion about the size of the boulders which the commissioners did not think were big enough. They also did not want to set precedence with small boulders. There was a discussion about building a wall on it so it would not be easily movable.

There was a discussion about the plantings being done in December which is outside of the growing season.

Ms. Cherichetti said that the greenhouse/shed had been removed, and the hot tub had been relocated. Shrubs have been planted. There was also a discussion on how to make the wall taller.

***** MS. KNIGHT MADE A MOTION TO DENY THE REDUCTION OF THE BOND AS REQUESTED.**

***** MR. KLOCKE SECONDED THE MOTION.**

***** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

X. REPORTS

A. Commission Chair

There was no report from Mr. Klocke.

B. Senior Environmental Officer

There was no report from Ms. Cherichetti.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

***** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Diana Palmentiero