

**CITY OF NORWALK  
CONSERVATION COMMISSION/INLAND WETLAND AGENCY  
FEBRUARY 27, 2024**

**PRESENT:** Steve Klocke, Chair; Cheryl Brown; Ed Holowinko; Kathryn Knight (arrived after roll call); Heather Breslin (left the meeting at 7:50pm)

**STAFF:** Alexis Cherichetti

**OTHERS:** Les Carter; Andy Soumelidis; Mike Pasquarella; Elizabeth Suchy; Akiva Kobre, William O'Connor

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Klocke called the meeting to order at 6:02 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 COMMENT**

There were no members of the public who spoke at this time.

**IV. RECEIPT & DISCUSSION**

**a) #S24-633 – 189 Perry Avenue – Carter – Corrective Action installation of drainage and expansion of driveway adjacent to a watercourse**

Ms. Cherichetti began the presentation with an overview of the corrective action. She then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. She explained what the notice of violation cited.

Les Carter, the property owner, said he was an environmentalist and avid fisherman. He had purchased the house because of the waterfall. He addressed the extra gravel by stating that there had been a mud pit in the area before he added it. He said that with the new drainage he has had no problems at the end of the driveway. He had submitted a statement about the work done but some of the pipes had been damaged. He discussed a dry well which he cleaned out.

There was a discussion about the orangeburg pipe and whether it was on the map. Ms. Cherichetti said she had not received a map. Mr. Carter said that he had pictures of the work

Conservation Commission

February 27, 2024

Page 1 of 6

that had been done, which he emailed to Ms. Cherichetti during the meeting. She reminded Mr. Carter that they would need the map.

Ms. Cherichetti showed the commissioners photos as well. Mr. Carter asked if they could have another discussion after this meeting to discuss this application further. He said he would fix this situation.

**b) #S24-634 – 10 Norden Place – Norwalk Center LLC – Three lot subdivision of land containing a wetland and a watercourse**

Ms. Cherichetti oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map.

Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation by introducing the project team. She then described the subdivision to the commissioners. She noted that a portion of the property is in the wetlands. There was no construction proposed. She noted that the subdivision application would be before the Planning & Zoning Commission in March.

There was a discussion about the lot lines for the three lots where there is only one lot now. Ms. Cherichetti explained that the applicant must come before the commission when wetlands are on a property being subdivided. She showed them the proposed lots. The commissioners then discussed their role in this application. Only one of the proposed lots has wetlands on it. The applicant would return to the commission at their next meeting.

**c) #S24-635 – 280 Main Avenue – Main Norwalk LLC – Construction of commercial retail buildings and associated parking adjacent to a watercourse**

Ms. Cherichetti oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map.

Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation by introducing the project team. She then discussed the application materials that were filed. She showed them the site plan of the current site. She then discussed the proposed project on the site.

Matthew Bruton, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation by showing them current pictures of the site, as well as discussed the existing conditions of the piping system and watercourse. He then discussed the drainage plan and said there would be an increase in the impervious area. They would need a stormwater management plan as well. He discussed the landscaping plan.

Atty Suchy reminded the commissioners that in 2013, under a prior application, a significant activity application was approved. The public hearing was deemed not necessary.

There was a discussion about the parking bays and the gradient levels. There was also a discussion about the retaining wall. There was a discussion about the watercourse in a flooding situation. They are not changing it from what exists today.

There was a discussion about the landscaping and planting plan. Ms. Brown asked for native species plantings. There was also a discussion about the charging stations in multiple places on the property and where the charging stations would be. There was also a discussion about a buffer as well as the plowing plan. There was also a discussion about the upland review area and a buffer.

There was a discussion about what the commissioners would like to review before the public hearing. Atty Suchy reminded the commissioners as to what would trigger the commissioners to hold a public hearing. There was a discussion about whether there had been a public hearing for the original application in 2013. Ms. Cherichetti said that the commissioners should determine how they wanted to handle the public hearing. She also noted that Planning & Zoning would be holding a public hearing on this application as well. There was a lengthy discussion amongst the commissioners as to whether there should be a public hearing and if the proposal would have a significant impact on the property.

**\*\*\* MR. KLOCKE MADE A MOTION THAT THE COSERVATION COMMISSION HAS DETERMINED THAT THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY IS NOT LIKELY TO HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE WETLANDS AND WATERCOURSES ON THE PROPERTY.**

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

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

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

**\*\*\* NO ONE ABSTAINED.**

Ms. Cherichetti said that there could be a public hearing if there is a petition signed by at least 25 people who are over the age of 25 in the next 14 days, requesting a public hearing..

There was a discussion about how to change the application for the next meeting.

**d) #S24-636 – 70 Cranbury Road – LandTech – Three lot subdivision of land containing wetlands and watercourses**

Ms. Cherichetti oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. She noted that a little bit of the property is in Westport. She then described the three lot subdivision.

Andy Soumelidis, the engineer on the project, began the presentation with a discussion of the current property. He showed them a pond and the wetlands. He then discussed the

proposed three lot subdivision. He discussed the floodplain. He then explained the utilities including sewer, water and gas. He explained that the individual house plans would have to come before the commission at a later date.

Ms. Cherichetti explained what the commissioners were asked to review for this subdivision application. She also explained that there had been a prior application and noted what would be part of the subdivision permit. There were currently two buildings on the property. There was also a discussion about the shared driveways. Mr. Soumelidis said that the owner had a crew clean up the site. Ms. Cherichetti showed them pictures of the site in recent years. Mr. Soumelidis showed them the planting plan including what would be removed and what would remain. He said that they would address Ms. Cherichetti's comments as well as anything from the commission. There was a discussion about the setbacks as well as the location of the proposed homes within the wetlands.

## **V. DISCUSSION &/OR DECISION**

### **a) #S23-631 – 207 West Rocks Road – O'Connor – Corrective Action landscaping in and adjacent to a wetland and a watercourse**

Ms. Cherichetti said that the application had been received at the previous meeting and reviewed the comments from that meeting.

William O'Connor began the presentation by discussing the upland review area and the changes. He also discussed the plantings which would be delineated in the area. He discussed the planting plan. Ms. Cherichetti thought the scale was off on the proposed map. There was a discussion about the silt fence.

There was a discussion about placing the plants in the wetlands into the buffer. There was also a discussion about the types of plants and the size of rocks.

Mr. Klocke asked for a draft resolution for the next meeting and made suggestions as to what to include. Mr. O'Connor said that he would not be in the country on March 12 which Mr. Klocke said would be fine as long as he worked with Ms. Cherichetti if she needed help.

### **b) #S24-632 – 35 Weatherbell Drive – Pasquarella – Corrective Action filling and grading in and adjacent to a wetland and a watercourse**

Ms. Cherichetti said that the application had been received at the previous meeting and reviewed the comments from that meeting.

Mike Pasquarella began the presentation and said that they could not find a site survey. He had contacted the town clerk to see if there had been one since the time the property had

been developed. He has a surveyor on hold to get one. Ms. Cherichetti said that once they had a survey they would have to go back to the soil scientist.

There was a discussion about the plantings that the commissioners would like to see on the property. Mr. Klocke said that they would have to address it later. Ms. Cherichetti then discussed deadlines.

## **VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

### **a) February 13, 2024 meeting minutes**

**\*\*\* MR. KLOCKE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 13, 2024.**

**\*\*\* MR. HOLOWINKO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\*\* STEVE KLOCKE; ED HOLOWINKO APPROVED.**

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

**\*\*\* KATHRYN KNIGHT; CHERYL BROWN ABSTAINED.**

## **VII. CONSERVATION INITIATIVES**

Ms. Cherichetti discussed amending the regulations to extend the upland review area to 100 feet. She said they could send out the proposed regulations for review and then hold a public hearing. Mr. Klocke asked that she re-send the commissioners the proposed regulations.

Ms. Cherichetti said that there is a Connecticut House Bill, which would be holding a public hearing the next day, that she wanted to make them aware of. She explained the bill to them and what was being considered including training for commissioners.

## **VIII. COMMENTS OF STAFF**

### **a) Report of the Senior Environmental Officer**

There was no report from Ms. Cherichetti.

## **IX. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS**

### **a) Report of the Commission Chair**

There was no report from Mr. Klocke.

## **X. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Meeting adjourned at 8:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero