Town of Greenwich
Conservation Commission

Meeting called to order at 7:03 pm by Rutherford

Meeting called to order at 7:03 pm by Rutherford

Seating of Alternates: di Bonaventura was seated for Henrey and after 7:08 pm for Baker

Review and approve minutes of January 6, 2022 meeting

Motion was made by Silberberg and seconded by Walworth to approve the minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

Review of Correspondence - no correspondence.
5) Chairman’s Report – no report

6) Referral Applications

a) 1141 King Street, 1141 King Street LLC, Conservation Cluster Development, Tom Heagney, Agent

Heagney stated the project went to the IWWA for the second time and its first P&Z Commission meeting. The feedback received is to what this commission expressed, with more open space is being requested. The revised plans address this request designating 60% of the land to be encumbered by a conservation easement. In addition, the revised plan satisfies the CC requests by including more native plants, a more robust demarcation line, replacing arborvitaes along the wetland buffer with native trees, reducing grading associated with the road, having the boundary of the open space adjusted west of the dwellings, moving the tennis court and the shed closer to the road, and relocating a swimming pool. The relocation of the pool at unit 5 and the tennis court allows for the wider wetland buffer but places these accessory structures within the 100-foot property line setback. Heagney conveyed P&Z may be open to allow for the narrower setbacks on a case by case basis. It is within their purview to vary their regulations.

Brower explained the 100-foot setback for accessory structures for the cluster development within the Conservation Zone was meant to avoid multifamily appearance.

di Bonaventura stated the value of property line setbacks should not be limited to ensuring bulky buildings were not too close to other properties. Keeping uses back from property lines also reduced pressure on wildlife and other natural resources that comes from human activity. She spoke to potential designs to achieve compliance via smaller unit footprints and fewer accessory structures.

Discussion ensued, concluding the adjacent parcels for this development would not be impacted by accessory structures being less than 100 feet from the property line. Subsequent requests for reductions should be evaluated based on use of structures and not just visual impacts.

Heagney explained the limit of lawn/conservation easement will consist of Belgium blocks enhanced with boulders and plantings to clearly mark the edge of the mowed areas.

Reagan reviewed the details of the revised planting plan. He pointed out a mature elm tree on Lot#3 and additional three trees will now be preserved due to the recent plan revisions. The number of proposed trees increased from 125 to 223. More native trees, including along the road, were added to the plan. All sections of the existing
stone walls not conflicting with the site development will be preserved. A common driveway for units four and five was not pursued as it would not result in more stonewall be saved.

Sesto stated the area in the northeast section of the property was recently cleared and the maps still show the area being wooded. A plan to manage the area to prevent invasive species from reestablishing is warranted. Rutherford requested more trees to be planted within the affected area.

Canavan agreed to expand the meadow management plan to include the entire open space.

Sesto recommended the staff draft a memo to P&Z which will be reviewed by the CC members at a special meeting called later this month. Heagney committed the team will address the additional comments risen by the CC members before the is drafted.

di Bonavenura left at 8:12 after recusing herself from the next application

b) 602 Indian Field Road, Mead Point LLC, Site Development, Tom Heagney, Agent

Heagney described the existing site conditions and the proposed development. He pointed out the swimming pool is the only feature located within the flood zone. CT DEEP had no comments for the project.

Matthews, certified arborist, reviewed the tree assessment. The forested area is dominated by variety of oaks, sassafras, and birches.

Cavazos described the proposed planting plan pointing out its habitat value. She stated the plan will support habitat diversity and expand the healthy food web. As proposed, 121 trees will be removed from the area to accommodate the development. Invasive species will be eradicated and replaced with native species. The proposed plant material will also increase the site’s resiliency and quality.

Sesto asked if the bird assessment for the site was conducted, noting the Greenwich shoreline supports breeding pairs of bald eagles and ospreys.

Cavazos responded no assessment was done and/or reflected in the plant choices. William Kenny Associates LLC will be submitting this assessment.

Moch stated a section of the property was designated as an open space during the subdivision process approved by ZBA. The declaration of restrictions approved by ZBA allows for paving of the existing dirt road and an installation of a gazebo. These allowances contradict conventional open space language routinely adopted by P&Z. Moch expressed concern the construction envelope may be expanded over the open space and the paving done during the site development.
Heagney responded P&Z will not allow the construction vehicle access to this area during the site development phase.

Brower asked if P&Z reviewed the restrictions.

Heagney responded the subdivision was denied by P&Z. Once it was filed with ZBA, P&Z lost their jurisdiction. The pavement will be regulated under Coastal Area Management and it would require a permit.

Rutherford commented not all trees were shown on the survey. He was concerned the plan misrepresents the existing trees and consequently the trees proposed to be removed. No details for the large tree installations are provided. It is unknown how they will be brought to the site and planted without damaging the existing root system of mature trees. Rutherford also raised concerns about the extent of grading, ledge removal, tree protection, rock processing at the site, and the impact of the extensive network of drainage pipes will have on existing tree root systems. He felt more soil testing should be done to better understand the depth to the bedrock.

Sesto stated the tree clearing below house and the swimming pool appears solely to be proposed for views. This aspect of the clearing should be scaled back, with an emphasis of retaining clusters of trees for structural stability.

Dickinson read the letter received from Sarah Sportman, State Archeologist.

Saunders, archeologist, described all archeological findings including work of archeologist Ernie Wiegand, who conducted Phase I, II, and III archeological assessments. It is a significant site offering unique data for the period of 1000-700 BCE. She made a case for the importance of the site preservation by limiting soil disturbance in archeologically sensitive areas. A preservation layer could be applied to secure the area for the future when improved technology could yield more information. She recommended bringing Ernest Wiegand back at the time of tree removal and site excavation when new areas are open, and more access is possible. The area of the proposed septic system was marked as an archeologically sensitive area.

Staff was directed to draft comments based on the revised plans and the ecological site evaluation report. The comments will be reviewed and approved at the special CC meeting.

7) Fisheries/Wildlife:
   Staff provided written report to the members on the following topic:
   a) Fish Ladder – Coccaro

8) Ongoing projects:
   Staff provided written report to the members on the following topics:
a) Pollinator Pathway – Moch

b) Greenwich Flood Watchers – Coccaro

9) Education/Outreach

a) “Could EV Charging Station Profit Your Business” zoom workshop host by Cos Cob Library and organized by the CC, Sustainability Committee and Greenwich Chamber of Commerce on February 16, 2022 at 2:00 pm. – Moch

b) “Landscape practices for Healthy Yards” a series of three educational webinars for landscape professionals on March 1st, property owners on March 9th and in Spanish on March 16th organized by CC and PP with GLT and Quiet Yards, hosted by the Cos Cob Library.

c) Earth Month – Coccaro provided an overview

10) Committee and Liaison Reports

a) Open Space Committee
   Sesto reported the plan was drafted. The copy of the draft will be distributed to the subcommittee members the next day. She was pleased with all the hard work of the participants and contributions to the plan.

b) Sustainability Committee
   Sesto reported First Selectman attended the last meeting. She noted co-chairperson and selectperson, Janet Stone McGuigan has become quite engaged in the committee. Further, she requested a meeting with CC staff to familiarize herself with our work.
   • Transportation and Air Quality subcommittee: a written report was forwarded to the CC members by Moch.

c) GRAB:
   Dickinson stated due to snow storm the food scrap collection was canceled. Moch provided a written report about Waste Free Greenwich initiatives.

d) Parks and Rec Board:
   Baker previously provided a written report to the CC members.

e) Harbor Management Commission:
   Baker previously provided a written report to the CC members.

f) Leaf Blower Committee:
Henry stated Quiet Yards Greenwich prepared and distributed survey to the property owners. 99% of the participants supported some level of restriction on the gas-powered leaf blower equipment. She will share the copy of the survey with the CC members via email.

11) Old Business

a) CTDOT Corridor Study grant:  
Sesto reported Norwalk was awarded the grant.

b) Coastal Resiliency Report:  
Sesto stated the report went $11,000 over the budget. Subsequently an additional $15,000 was requested from BET to ensure all costs are covered. After BET approval, the request will move to RTM. Sesto explained the additional cost will cover for unexpected revisions, delays, more in depth participation of DPW, and changes to the public outreach program.

A motion was made by Silberberg and seconded by Brower to approve the request for additional funding. The motion carried 7-0-0.

12) New Business: n/a

13) Adjourn: motion was made by Silberberg and seconded by Henry to adjourn at 9:46pm. The motion carried.

Next meeting is March 3, 2022