MINUTES
May 18, 2020

In attendance: Vice Chairman Elliot Benton, Secretary Stephan Skoufalos, Joseph Rogers, Bill Galvin (7:15 pm), Norma Kerlin, Jay Schondorf, Peter Linderoth, Klaus Jander (7:50 pm)

Also, in attendance: Director Patricia Sesto, Senior Wetlands Analyst Robert Claudi, Wetland Compliance Officer Doreen Carrol Andrews, Assistant Compliance Officer Jennifer Urena, Anthony D'Andrea and Brian French, D'Andrea Surveying & Engineering, P.C.; Larry Liebman and Peter Finkbeiner, S.E. Minor & Co.; William Kenny, William Kenny Associates LLC; Thomas Heagney, Heagney, Lennon & Slane; Bret Holzwarth, Redniss & Mead, Tom Ahneman, Ahneman & Kirby; Joe Pajonas, Joe Pajonas Studio, LLC; Alan Small, Bryan Muller, Sound View Engineering

Agency Session

1. Call to Order
   Vice Chairman Elliot Benton called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

2. Seating of alternates
   In the absence of Brian Harris, Peter Linderoth was seated.

3. Review and approval of draft minutes of April 27, 2020 meeting.
   The vote on the April 2020 minutes was deferred to June.

4. Director’s Report

   Director Sesto provided the Agency with an update on the reopening of Town Hall and the workings of the agency staff. Staff will report to Town Hall on May 27th. The staff schedule will reflect the directives of the State for reopening offices. The office will retain access to electronic contact with staff via the wetlands@greenwichct.org address. Public will be allowed into Town Hall by appointment only. Staff will be in the office about 50% of the time to assist in reducing density and maintaining social distancing. Working remotely has gone very well and the office has been nearly fully functional.
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5. **Other business**

   None

---

**Public Hearings**

1. #2019-153 – 42 Dublin Hill Drive – Rocco V. D’Andrea, Inc. for LMB Dublin Hill, LLC for construction of single family residence, driveway with wetland crossing, pool, septic system, and drainage within and adjacent to wetlands. Tax #08-2590 (90-day extension 8/4/2020) Robert Clausi

   Robert Clausi read the additional information into the record and reviewed his staff report. The applicant has not met agency’s requests for alternative configurations and placement of the house. The on-site wetlands are part of a larger system that extends on to the Stanwich School property. A 2007 report notes a vernal pool exists but is considered to be lower in value. Concerns remain over the loss of 50% of the upland review area between the two wetland areas. Balance between the size of the house and outdoor play space has not been met and the agency is often faced with the eventual homeowners coming back and applying for a permit to create yard.

   Bill Galvin joined the meeting.

   The driveway is now shown on the adjoining parcel and avoids crossing the wetland. The realignment also requires the drainage basin built for the adjoining 5-lot subdivision be reconfigured. DPW has yet to review this change. The habitat enhancement plan is not comparable to the extent of mature trees loss. With the submission of the revised plans, it is not clear if the existing pipe on the west side of the parcel is still proposed for removal. This is discouraged due to slope stability concerns. The status of the previously proposed easement and gazebo are likewise uncertain.

   Mr. Clausi reminded the agency this public hearing must close by August 4th.

   Anthony D’Andrea, D’Andrea Surveying & Engineering, P.C., addressed the agency. Mr. D’Andrea reviewed the planning associated with the realigned driveway and enlarged drainage basin; changes he expects will be approved by DPW. He noted the location of the drive will be accommodated via a lot line change. The enlarged basin will collect runoff as planned with the subdivision and additionally take the runoff from approximately ½ of the driveway. He concluded this alternative is in the best interest of the wetland as the direct impact has been eliminated. He expressed hope he would receive the support of the agency for this alternative.

   In response to other questions raised by Mr. Clausi, Mr. D’Andrea stated he would look into sliding the house to the southeast. The patios associated with the residence provide the outdoor space in lieu of yard.

   The leaching area is located in the best area. The house is proposed as a seven-bedroom dwelling and the septic is designed for eight bedrooms. This design does not add much more in the way of size and...
Mr. D’Andrea expressed his preference for a larger-than-needed system for a cushion and to avoid failures due to parties, etc. He stated he is not inclined to reduce its size.

With regards to the house design, this is an architecturally designed house that fits the character of the neighborhood and Greenwich as a whole. He stated this is the design his client wants for the site. It is fully designed and there is an aversion to revising or reducing it.

The pipe removal previously proposed for mitigation is no longer part of the plan. Likewise, the easement on the land north of the northern wetland offered at the prior meeting has been withdrawn from consideration; as has the gazebo.

Peter Linderoth questioned the prudence of proposing a level spreader on a 36% slope in contrast to the State recommendation. Mr. D’Andrea stated he is not concerned with the slope adjacent to the level spreader. To ensure the spreader does not develop points of concentrated discharge, a metal beam is integrated into the weir.

Norma Kerlin asked if the revised driveway plan reduces the extent of disturbance between the northern and southern wetland, where the house is sited. It was confirmed there is no appreciable change and some 75% of the area between the wetlands is used for the development envelope.

Patricia Sesto raised several questions. She asked Mr. D’Andrea about is assertion that the leaching system should be oversized to avoid failures due to parties and has it been his experience this is an issue. Mr. D’Andrea stated the older methodologies could be prone to this. He continued to say, regardless, he will not be presenting a 7-bedroom system. Ms. Sesto countered by suggesting a 4-bedroom system to reduce the footprint for the leaching field and perhaps allowing it to move south east, away from the wetland. Mr. D’Andrea replied the leaching field is in the best location.

Ms. Sesto followed up on the past request to provide alternate footprints for the agency and challenged his contention the agency should consider community character in their deliberations. She stated Section 10.3 of the regulations provides the agency with a clear directive that they shall not approve an application if the record does not establish the preferred alternative is the most feasible and prudent with regards to wetland and watercourse protection. She advised it is her assessment the record, as it stands, does not meet this burden.

Ms. Sesto identified Mr. D’Andrea’s statement to withdraw the easement on the north end of the site as being in conflict with the benefits of the protection cited by William Kenny. Mr. D’Andrea confirmed no easement is being offered.

Elliot Benton asked about the expectations of the outdoor play space as there is no level yard included and pursued alternatives to the large footprint of the house and leaching field. He urged the applicant to submit a materially smaller footprint for both. Mr. D’Andrea identified the level area associated with the leaching fields behind the garage as suitable play area. Given the way the State Health Code uses bedroom count as one of the parameters for sizing the leaching field, dropping the size to a 7-bedroom system would not amount to much of a change. A 4-bedroom system was suggested, to which Mr. D’Andrea responded he will not present a 4-bedroom system. Mr. Benton redirected the response back to his point; the need to substantively reduce the size of the house, regardless of the bedroom count.
William Kenny of William Kenny Associates LLC addressed the agency. He stated the proposal includes only 10% impervious coverage. Science has consistently demonstrated watersheds are not impacted with impervious levels under 11-12%.

Mr. Benton called for comments from the public.

Francia Alvarez, Greenwich Tree Conservancy, stated concern regarding the extent of trees of significant size being cut. Mature trees are important for stormwater management and with the flooding issues in the Strickland Brook and Mianus River watersheds, in which this parcel is located, she urged the agency to work to minimize this impact. Ms. Alvarez noted the application documents do not provide information regarding the area of canopy to be lost. She further stated the depiction of surveyed trees varies from one plan to the next, making it impossible to draw out this information.

The development envelope covers ½ of the parcel and an alternative with a smaller area of impact is warranted. Likewise, the easement previously proposed is important to protect the areas outside of the impacted area. A detailed inventory of the trees and which are to be cut is also needed to determine the extent of impacts from cut trees. Mature trees have values that cannot be replicated by planting an equivalent basal area of smaller trees. Older trees are superior at stormwater retention and provide a distinct ecosystem.

Cheryl Dunson, Greenwich Tree Conservancy, reiterated the need to preserve mature trees as a means to control damaging drainage and flooding. She noted there has been $20M spent to protect the Mianus River watershed, and individual parcels must do their part.

With no further questions, the public hearing was continued to the agency’s next regularly scheduled meeting.

2. #2020-010 – 306 Round Hill Road - S.E. Minor & Co., Inc. and Eric Brower, AICP for Christopher Pollack for maintenance of dam, dry hydrant, and installation of restoration plantings within wetland and watercourse. Tax #10-1018 (65 day extension 6/3/20) BC

Robert Clausi read the list of documents into the record and reviewed his staff report. He stated this is a serious violation, with the river and its banks having been dammed, diverted, cleared, graded, and a dry hydrant installed. Plans and a biological analysis were too recently submitted for a proper review by Mr. Clausi or DPW. The applicant maintains the desire to keep the dam and facilitate fish passage via a fish ladder. The plans include the intent to dredge the area behind the dam and use the spoils to fill in the diversion channel. The landscape plan speaks to stone revetments placed below the river scour line, but no details are provided.

At least one dry hydrant is part of the proposal. More information is needed to properly understand what is being proposed and who from the town has been consulted, i.e. Fire Department, DPW.

The planting plan is appropriate, with a plan that will create a floral community similar to what was removed. The applicant is also seeking a map revision for the floodway from FEMA.
Larry Liebman, S.E. Minor & Co., represented the applicant. He provided additional details to Mr. Clausi’s project description. There is a 12” low-flow culvert as part of the dam and culvert allows for fish passage already.

William Kenny, William Kenny Associates LLC, spoke to the landscaping plan. The east side of the river will be naturalized to fix the clearing, with the trees being located to restore shade to the river. On the west side, existing lawn down to the water’s edge will be replaced with beneficial plantings of meadow and trees.

Ms. Sesto asked Peter Finkbeiner, S.E. Minor & Co., about the suitability of the dredge material to backfill the diversion channel and at what size storm will the river overtop and flow over the repaired area. Mr. Finkbeiner indicated his work on the project was not at a point to answer these questions.

Elliot Benton questioned Mr. Liebman on the fish ladder and why this was deemed the most feasible and prudent alternative. Why is dam removal not the best choice. Larry Liebman responded the dam has been in place since the 1940’s. The dam has leaks and more recently it breached. His client is looking to keep the dam that has been repaired.

Ms. Sesto countered with the argument that had the owner sought a permit before doing the work, the agency may have determined leaving the breach or dam removal were the better alternatives. There is a statewide effort to remove dams, an effort she has worked on directly with Trout Unlimited. Following discussion, Ms. Sesto was directed to ask counsel if it is within the agency's ability to order the dam be removed.

Mr. Liebman requested the agency approve a 90-day extension as afforded by executive order.

Elliot Benton made a motion to extend the period of time to conduct a public hearing by 90 days, seconded by Norma Kerlin, and carried 7-0-0.

3. #2020-013 – 8 Hickory Drive – Sound View Engineers & Land Surveyors, LLC for Yury Sofman for construction of a single family residence, driveway, drainage, and relocation of a watercourse. Tax #09-2473/s (65 day extension 6/3/20) BC

Robert Clausi read the list of new documents into the record, indicating this list applies to both 2020-013 and 2020-014. The revised plans no longer include the two options of either piping a section of the watercourse or relocating it. Two alternatives were also submitted; one depicting a three-lot subdivision and the other depicting the house on 8 Hickory Drive to align with the front of the existing house. The footprint of the house is 1,700 s.f. and the deck is 1,200 s.f. The deck is shown over what is now scruffy lawn and dilapidated patio. Eight Hickory Drive is proposed to have a 750 s.f. lawn to the east side of the watercourse in a wooded area. The lawn would be roughly 10 feet from the watercourse, which introduces concerns with non-point source pollution.

The erosion and sedimentation control plan does not reflect the revised proposal, leaving several areas open to the watercourse. The construction sequence needs to be updated. Additionally, the stream channel is eroded, and the applicant has not instituted stream channel protection as called for in the Town’s stormwater manual.
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A 180-foot section of stream corridor is being enhanced with plantings. However, the buffer is narrow in places, being as little as 10 feet. The narrow buffer is of special concern adjacent to the proposed lawn.

For 0 Hickory Drive, there is no wetland or watercourse on the site, but the proposed house and its retaining wall are 16 feet and 9 feet from the watercourse, respectively. This site plan likewise does not have updated E&S plans or construction sequence.

In the alternative labeled “B,” the house on 0 Hickory shows a smaller footprint to allow access for the theoretical third lot to the rear. While Mr. Claudi did not support the third lot, he stated the reduced footprint of the 0 Hickory Drive house provided a more reasonable separating distance to the watercourse of 26 feet. This would accommodate planting between the house and watercourse.

Lastly, the location of the level spreader will impact two mature trees. This feature should be relocated to avoid the loss.

Thomas Heagney reviewed the changes and characterized them as being significant. On 8 Hickory Drive, the house is now placed at the front yard setback of 18.5 feet. The deck was previously proposed out over the watercourse and is now adjacent to it. The proposal to alter the watercourse have been eliminated. The concerns expressed by neighbors have mostly centered on the volume of water that passes through these lots. The volume is a function of road runoff and an examination by the project engineer, Bryan Muller, confirmed the watercourse receives runoff from several streets. DPW has reviewed the plan and found the stormwater management report to be acceptable.

The alternative that shows a third lot would have not additional regulated activities over what is being proposed, with the exception of the third driveway. The subject parcels are oversized and could support an additional lot and meet the open space requirement of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Heagney concluded by referring to William Kenny’s conclusion that the proposal has no impact and they are reviewing the staff report and will respond.

Bryan Muller provided additional information regarding the level spreader. He will more closely examine the elevations to see if it can be moved west, cautioning the basement elevation will limit this. He also stated the spreader could be hand dug to protect the trees. These two trees and others will be scrutinized for preservation. The E&S control plan will be revised. The stream channel protection standards do not apply to the subject project because the water is coming from off-site sources. The post development standard for stormwater generated on-site has been met.

Elliot Benton asked William Kenny if the conversion of forest to lawn, 10 feet from a watercourse would threaten the watercourse. Mr. Kenny responded the area is scruffy lawn and the flow path is more important than the actual distance from the lawn to watercourse. The flow path from the lawn runs parallel to the watercourse and the soil type is highly permeable. Runoff from the lawn is not expected to reach the watercourse for most storms.

Mr. Benton called for public comment. There was none.
Bill Galvin made a motion to extend the review period for the public hearing by 90 days per executive order, seconded by Norma Kerlin, and carried 7-0-0.

The public hearing was continued to June 22, 2020.

4. **#2020-014 – Hickory Drive** - Sound View Engineers & Land Surveyors, LLC for Yury Sofman for construction of a single family residence, driveway, and drainage 15 feet from wetlands. Tax #09-2472/s (65 day extension 6/3/20) Robert Claudi

See narrative in 2020-013.

**Consent Approval**

1. **#2020-047 – 34 Concord Street** - Sergio Biagioni and Debbie Palmer for Construction of garage additions and residential additions with associated site improvements 10 feet from wetlands. Tax #09-2843/s (first 65 days 7/1/20) BC

2. **#2020-052 – 11 Round Hill Club Road** – Joseph F. Risoli, P.E. for Caliza 11, LLC for construction of tennis court, pool house, spa, and terrace 29 feet from wetlands. Tax #10-1401 (first 65 days 7/1/20) BC

Stephan Skoufalos made motion to approve the applications listed for consent approval, seconded by Peter Linderoth, and carried 7-0-0.

**Pending Applications**

1. **#2020-008 – 12 Hillcrest Lane** – Ahneman Kirby, LLC for Derron and Marion Slonecker for modification of a driveway 15 feet from wetlands. Tax #12-1532 (90 day extension 6/30/20) DCA

Doreen Carrol Andrews reviewed the proposal and the changes recently submitted. The report written by Scott Marucci, senior engineer, Greenwich DPW, was read. Mr. Marucci concurs with the applicant, stating using the current driveway is not recommended and prefers the applicant’s proposal, as it meets sight line and grade requirements. Ms. Carroll-Andrews recommends the planting plan be enhanced to cover an area 30’ X 90’ and a boulder demarcation be incorporated.

Tom Ahneman, Ahneman & Kirby, spoke on behalf of the applicant. He indicated this is a complicated project, with a variety of considerations and requirements to mesh. He described how the preferred alternative meets the Town’s standards, provides enhancements for the watercourse, and handles the drainage.

Diane Devore continued to explain the constraints. Accommodating Planning and Zoning grade plane regulations and emergency vehicle access also drove the design. Further, with the planting plan, the site will be vastly improved over current conditions.
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Elliot Benton made a motion to approve option 3 with the conditions as proposed by staff, seconded by Jay Schondorf and carried, 7-0-0.

2. #2020-021 – 27 Pecksland Road – Sound View Engineers & Land Surveyors, LLC for Benjamin Welsh for construction of a pool, patio, and retaining walls 20 feet from wetlands. Tax #10-3659 (90 day extension 7/28/20) BC

Robert Clausi reviewed the changes to the plan since the last meeting. The extent of yard has been reduced and the placement of retaining walls has been pulled closer to the home. Additionally, the planting plan has been enhanced. Mr. Clausi noted the retaining walls are helpful for future enforcement.

Jay Schondorf, Norma Kerlin, and Bill Galvin were identified as having been to the site.

Joe Pajonas, Joe Pajonas Studio, LLC, addressed the agency, stating the revisions were made in response to what he understood the agency’s directives were.

Discussion ensued regarding the plans and exhibits. Mr. Pajonas confirmed the plan prepared by SoundView Engineering, dated May 14, 2020 is the plan he is seeking approval for. He added he has no objections to the recommendations of staff.

Bill Galvin made a motion to approve the May 14, 2020 plan as proposed with the conditions set forth by staff, seconded by Stephan Skoufalos and carried, 7-0-0.

3. #2020-025 – 70 Lower Cross Road – Redniss & Mead, Inc. for SBP Lower Cross, LLC for construction of single family residence, driveway, guest house, pool, pool house, patio, septic system, and drainage within and adjacent to wetlands. Tax # 11-1842 (90 day extension 7/28/20) Robert Clausi

Robert Clausi recapped the previous issues and how they have been addressed to his satisfaction.

Bret Holzwarth, Redniss and Mead, confirmed he was in agreement with Mr. Clausi’s recommendations.

Bill Galvin made a motion to approve WWA 2020-025 with the conditions proposed by staff, seconded by Joseph Rogers, and carried, 7-0-0.

**New Applications for Review**

1. #2020-048 – 33 John Street – S.E. Minor & Co., Inc. for Greenwich Runaway LLC for correction of unauthorized deer fence and shed within wetlands. Tax #10-1673 (first 65 days 7/1/20) JU

Jennifer Urena reviewed the nature of the violation, stating it is a combination of unfulfilled permit conditions and new, unpermitted work. Plantings associated with a past permit were not found and need to be replaced. The new work, consisting of an extension of a deer fence and construction of a shed in a wetland, is proposed to be corrected and mitigated. There is no negative impact to wetlands.
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from the fence extension. The shed will be relocated outside of the wetland and the area replanted. Ms. Urena’s report included conditions for the order to fix new and old violations.

Larry Liebman, S.E. Minor & Co., concurred with Ms. Urena’s recommendations.

Bill Galvin made a motion to issue an order to correct violations at 33 John Street as proposed by staff, seconded by Joseph Rogers, and carried 7-0-0.

2. #2020-051 – 40 Locust Road – Sound View Engineers & Land Surveyors, LLC for Sanle Zhang and Yangping Li for construction of horse shed within wetlands. Tax #10-1594 (first 65 days 7/1/20) BC

Robert Claudi described the situation where the applicant has a shed on a neighboring property he wishes to remove. The run-in shed would be reconstructed on the subject property and in a wetland. Mr. Claudi indicated the run-in shed is covered by section 4.2.a of the Inland Wetland and Watercourses Regulations as an as-of-right agricultural use. He is recommending the agency issue a letter acknowledging this permitted use.

Stephan Skoufalogos made a motion to issue a letter confirming the demolition and reconstruction of a run-in shed is a permitted use pursuant to section 4.2.a of the IWWA regulations, seconded by Joseph Rogers and carried, 7-0-0.

3. #2020-053 – 510 Valley Road – Rocco V. D’Andrea, Inc. for Scott and Kristen Studwell for pool, patio, and drainage, and fence in and adjacent to wetlands. Tax #08-2320/s (first 65 days 7/1/20) BC

Robert Claudi described the project to construct a pool and patio and install a safety fence through the wetlands. Comments by DPW have yet to be addressed. The wetland associated with the on-site pond is not shown on the site plan and if approved, should be shown on the pool as-built plan.

Mr. Claudi questioned the justification to run the pool fence along the periphery of the property and through the wetlands. Building code does not allow for the agency’s typical 6-inch gap along the bottom to facilitate wildlife movement. He recommends the fence be relocated closer to the pool and out of the wetland.

An area south of the pond was found to have been recently cleared of shrubs and scrub. The agent for the applicant told Mr. Claudi the work was done in response to a fallen tree. Mr. Claudi is recommending a planting plan for the area be submitted and the agency delay taking action on this application.

Bryan French, D’Andrea Surveying & Engineering, P.C., was in receipt of Mr. Claudi’s comments and will address them. He did question if the stonewall at the property periphery was already an impediment for some animals, such that adding the pool fence would be inconsequential.

After a brief discussion, the agency directed Mr. French to return with options for the pool fence.
Violations

1. Cease & Correct Order #2020-003, 0 Round Hill Road for unauthorized clearing of trees and other vegetation. Tax ID# 10-3203. DCA

Doreen Carrol Andrews read the documents into the record and described the clearing violation. The area is believed to have been covered in vines, shrubs, and trees. Shady Tree Landscaping was the contractor involved and was issued a stop work order.

Tom Heagney, Heagney, Lennon, & Slane, addressed the agency, stating his client is working on a corrective action application.

Elliot Benton made a motion to maintain the order, seconded by Bill Galvin and carried, 7-0-0.

Applications to Be Received

1. #2020-055 – 94 Pecksland Road - S.E. Minor for James Gould to correct violation for removal of foundation walls and site grading adjacent to wetland. Tax #10-1660. (first 65 days 7/1/20)

2. #2020-056 – 23 Shannon Lane - J. Bond Septic Service for Billie Degruchy for new septic system 50 feet from wetlands. Tax #08A-1300. (first 65 days 7/1/20)

3. #2020-057 – 35 Copper Beech Road - Murphy Brothers Landscaping LLC for Ryan & Alison Willingham for replacing septic system and remove/rebuild front porch 3 feet from wetlands. Tax #11-2549. (first 65 days 7/1/20)

4. #2020-058 – 30 Old Stone Bridge Road – Murphy Brothers Landscaping LLC for Rowley Douglas for 100% septic reserve area 60 feet from wetlands. Tax #08A-1530. (first 65 days 7/1/20)

5. #2020-059 – 80 Glenville Road – Environmental Land Solutions, LLC for Jude & Mary Kate Donato for new deck and modification of existing patio 35 feet from wetlands. Tax #07-1323. (first 65 days 7/1/20)

Elliot Benton made a motion to receive the listed applications, seconded by Peter Linderoth and carried, 7-0-0.

Agent Approval Permits

1. #2020-054 – 41 Doubling Road - Rocco V.D’Andrea for Andrew & Grace Schoelkopf for addition, driveway modifications, patio and 100% septic reserve area 45 feet from wetlands. Tax #11-3012.

No comments.
Other Business

1. #2017-154 – 82 Buckfield Lane – MTM Construction Group for Michael Grunberg for installation of a wooden fence in wetlands. Tax #10-1741 DCA

Doreen Carrol Andrews described the situation at 82 Buckfield and a decision by staff to determine a repositioning and lengthening of a fence was a “field change” associated with an existing permit. The neighbor, Alan Small, contends the work exceeds the permit for which this was issued, and staff was in error. He is requesting the permit be revoked and he was denied his due process to comment on the plan. Ms. Carroll-Andrews noted the approved plans stated the fence posts would not be installed with concrete and it is alleged they were. Affirmation from the agency that the reconfiguration of the fence was appropriately deemed a field change is sought.

Norma Kerlin, Jay Schondorf, and Bill Galvin were identified as having been to the site.

Bill Galvin described the change as consequential. The approved 4 sections of fence were pivoted to follow the property line out to the pond, requiring 12 additional sections of fence. This blocks the neighbor’s view of the pond.

Ms. Sesto described the criteria she and her staff use in making field change determinations. If the change is narrow in scope and is a revision of what was already approved, it is generally considered a field change. In this case, fencing had been approved in a wetland and the revision was effectually the same as was approved. Neighbor’s views and aesthetics are not considered as that is outside the scope of the regulations.

Alan Small of 86 Buckfield addressed the agency. He described the various impacts associated with pressure treated wood, noting CT DEEP directs individuals to minimize the number of pilings used for docks due to contaminants that leach from them. Mr. Small contends the permit was obtained by false representations. It was supposed to be a picket fence, no footings, and in a different location.

Discussion ensued regarding the purpose of the fence as approved, what was not proposed, how the proposal comports with the permitted fence, appropriate criteria for the agency to consider, what constitutes a field change, and other matters.

It was concluded that staff would revisit the site to ascertain compliance with the permit and its intended purpose. The information will be brought back to the agency at the next meeting.

Adjourn

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Patricia Sesto
Director
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