

CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MAY 21, 2013  
CONFERENCE ROOM L101

These minutes are not verbatim, but represent a summary of major statements and comments. For minutes verbatim, refer to audio tapes on file in the Office of the Town Clerk. Audio tapes are retained for the minimum period required under the retention schedule as provided under Connecticut Law.

Chairman Block called the meeting to order at 7:18 p.m. and noted Commissioners Clark Igielski, Sadil, Shapiro and Zelek were present. Also present were Alternates Krawiec and Paskewich and Chris Greenlaw, Town Engineer.

Chairman Block designated that Alternate Paskewich would vote for Commissioner Ancona.

ITEM III

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of April 16, 2013

Commissioner Clark noted the following corrections:

- A. Page 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph from the bottom, line 2 should read "Bolles (Bowles). We support the difficult task that the Commission had and no matter what happens in the"
- B. Page 4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph from the bottom, line 1 should read "Mr. Gary Bolles (Bowles), 28 Burdon Lane read a prepared statement into the record (listen to audio tape for"
- C. Page 5, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph from the top, line 1 should read "Mr. Greenlaw (Greemlae) noted that a new application has been submitted and is before the Commission"
- D. Page 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph from the top, line 1 should read "Ms. Gail (Carol) Budejko, 55 Isabelle Terrace noted that she supports the Commission's action (on the"
- E. Page 7, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph from the top, line 2 should read "Authorized (Authorize) Agent of the Commission and is replacing Mr. Craig Minor and was seconded by"

Chairman Block noted the following corrections:

- A. Page 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph from the bottom, line 1 should read "Chairman Block said are there any further errors or omissions (omission)? Attorney Boorman no. You need a second"
- B. Page 3, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph from the bottom, line 1 should read "Secretary to be sure of (to) the highest degree of accuracy possible are correct."

Commissioner Igielski noted on Page 3, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph from the top, "Regular Meeting of March (February) 19, 2013"

Alternate Paskewich noted on page 6, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph from the top, lines 2 and 3 should read "on vernal pools. He recently did a video that can be seen on YouTube (YouTtube) on an event that happens only once a year; when the wood frogs and peepers (beepers) come out for their breeding. It can be found under"

Motion made by Commissioner Sadil to accept the minutes as corrected and was seconded by Alternate Paskewich. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention (Shapiro) and the motion was carried.

#### ITEM IV

#### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. John Bachand, 56 Maple Hill Avenue provided to Commission members in a hand out, a list of observations of Cedar Mountain relative to Application 2012-22 (Toll Brothers).

#### ITEM VA

Application 2013-05, 851 Willard Avenue

Mr. Andy Billipp, the operator of the Eddy Farm and the applicant, entered the following remarks into the record:

- A. The history of the Eddy Farm (listen to audio tape for the details of his remarks).
- B. The proposal is to put up two (2) (directory) farm signs. A sign would be located at each entrance into the farm stand on Willard Avenue near an existing water course.
- C. Each sign would be supported by two (2) cedar posts. The holes for each post would be dug with a posthole digger and back filled by shovel utilizing the excavated material.

Commissioner Zelek asked if the signs would be illuminated? Mr. Billipp responded no.

Commissioner Zelek asked if there was a conservation easement on the property? Mr. Greenlaw responded no, but that he would verify it.

Chairman Block noted that it is his interpretation that the previously referenced watercourse is a drainage culvert ditch.

Alternate Paskewich asked how high would the signs be? Mr. Billipp responded three (3) feet by three (3) feet in size and six (6) feet high.

Commissioner Zelek asked if there would any other disturbance? Mr. Billipp responded ConnDOT does maintenance work in the area.

Mr. Greenlaw noted following a review of the map (provided by the applicant), the ditch (referred to by Chairman Block) is a watercourse.

Alternate Krawiec asked if the applicant had considered another location for the signs? Mr. Billipp responded yes. The proposed location provides the best visibility.

Commissioner Zelek noted that the signs would be handmade and that the applicant would be using natural materials and would be in keeping with the environment.

Mr. Billipp noted that it is his intention to open the farm stand in late June and if needed, could the process be expedited to meet that date.

Commissioner Zelek noted that it appears the time frame could be met if there was no requirement for a public hearing.

Mr. Greenlaw noted that the Commission has 65 days to make a decision (on the application).

Chairman Block noted that the Commission could make a decision tonight under old business.

Commissioner Igielski noted that Chairman Block's remark was outside of the standard practice (of the Commission).

There was a general discussion among Commission members relative to the applicant's request to consider expediting the application (listen to audio tape for details of the remarks).

Mr. Greenlaw noted that a public hearing can be called by the Commission if it determines that the application would result in a significant impact, if a public hearing would be in the public interest or if the public submits a petition with the required number of qualified signatures and within the time limits outlined in the Regulations.

Mr. Greenlaw reviewed the definition of significant activity as outlined in the Regulations (listen to audio tape for the details of his remarks).

Commissioner Block noted that the sign posts would be located close to the watercourse.

Chairman Block asked if the Commission called for a public hearing tonight, would there be adequate time to process it (public hearing requirements for legal notices)? Mr. Greenlaw responded yes.

Mr. Greenlaw noted that it might be a good idea to make copies of the definition of significant impact for Commission members.

Commission went into recess at 8:00 p.m.

Commission came out of recess at 8:10 p.m.

Chairman noted that by calling a public hearing now would save at least a month.

Commissioner Zelek noted that he sees no significant impact (emanating from the application).

It was the consensus of Commission members to carry the item over to the June meeting.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski to inter change ITEM VB and ITEM VC and was seconded by Commissioner Zelek. There was no discussion. Vote was 7 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

#### ITEM VC

Application 2013-07A, 129 Main Street

Mr. Michael Zarotney, the applicant referring a plan noted the Town wetland line is shown on the left side of the plan and the wetland boundary limits found in the field by the soil scientist is shown on the right side of the plan. He is asking for a map amendment to reflect the actual field conditions.

Commissioner Zelek noted that he was confused by the lines shown on the plan.

Mr. Zarotney noted the location of the Town Map line shown on the plan is in the street. A soil scientist was retained and he/she located the actual wetland boundary limits in the field and are shown on the right side of the plan.

Commissioner Zelek noted that the soil scientist line takes the area where the structure would be built as shown on the plan out of the wetland.

Mr. Zarotney responded yes and noted that the upland review would not be impacted by the structure.

Chairman Block noted that the proposed house would be built on a mound.

Mr. Zarotney noted that the application is for a map amendment (location of a wetland boundary limit determined by a soil scientist in the field). The question asked (by Chairman Block) should be addressed under the next application.

Mr. Alan Bongiovanni noted that he is a registered land surveyor in the State of Connecticut, and a client of the applicant and noted that he has been asked by the applicant to assist him in the presentation of the applications.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that the Town Map wetland boundary line encompasses the entire piece of property; whereas, we are looking to remove the southern portion of the property per the findings of the soil scientist in the field.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that it is Mr. Zarotney hopes that a public hearing would be held next month and the soil scientist would be present.

Commissioner Sadil asked for a further explanation of the two (2) wetland boundary line? Mr. Bongiovanni responded the Town Map was developed using Soil Conservation Service maps and aerial photography to develop a map as an indicator of the location of wetlands; whereas, the soil scientist goes out into the field and locates the actual wetland boundary limits.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski that under Section 15.7 of the Town of Newington Inland Wetland and Watercourses Regulations that a public hearing be held on Application 2013-07A, 129 Main Street for a proposed map amendment to define wetland boundary limits on June 18, 2013 at 7: 00 p.m. in Conference Room L101, Town Hall and was seconded by Commissioner Zelek. There was no discussion. Vote was 7 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VB

Application 2013-06, 129 Main Street

Mr. Greenlaw noted that it might be a good idea for the applicant to introduce the application to get an over view of the proposal to include an explanation of the various lines shown on the plan together with possible impacts associated with the application. The discussion could raise some questions that could be addressed next month.

Mr. Alan Bongiovanni, a registered land surveyor in the State of Connecticut and representing the applicant, entered the following remarks into the record:

- A. The subject property contains 2.7 acres and is bounded by (North) Main Street on the east, Piper Brook on the northwest and existing housing on the west and south.
- B. The lot was created some 30 years ago.
- C. The property is subject to a 100 foot wide Helco easement, a DEEP Stream Channel Encroachment Line easement and a sanitary sewer easement.
- D. The lot was created (cut) from property at 137 (North) Main Street with a driveway access easement from (North) Main Street.
- E. Referring to the plan, he noted that the construction of a portion of the driveway and installation of utilities are the only regulated activities on the property. All other activities would be outside of the regulated area.

Commissioner Zelek asked for an explanation of the channel encroachment lines? Mr. Bongiovanni responded that the DEP (now DEEP) years ago established channel encroachment lines following the completion a major (federal) flood control project by the SCS (Soil Conservation Service) to control future activity within the project limits. He noted that any proposed activity in this area would need DEP (now DEEP) approval.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that the Town has no control over these lines.

There was an exchange of remarks between Mr. Mr. Bongiovanni and Mr. Greenlaw on the function of channel encroachment lines (listen to audio tape for the details of the remarks).

Commissioner Zelek noted that the property looked familiar to him. Did another person recently come before the Commission on this property? Mr. Greenlaw responded yes. He noted that the property to the south, known as Adrian Brown, was issued a permit to remove trees and brush off of the property (listen to audio tape for the details of his remarks).

Commissioner Zelek asked if the owner of this property and the property noted under the previously noted permit is one and the same? There was a general discussion on the question (listen to audio tape for details of the discussion).

Chairman Block recommended that the Commission request that Ms. Adrian Brown appear at the next Commission meeting.

Mr. Zarotney was asked if he owned the property? He responded that he has entered into a contract for the property.

Chairman Block asked when was the contract entered into? Mr. Zarotney responded that he could not recall; maybe one to two (2) months ago.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski to table the application over to the June meeting and was seconded by Commissioner Sadil. There was no discussion. Vote was 7 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VI A

Application 2013-03

Mr. Alan Bongiovanni, a licensed land surveyor in the State of Connecticut and representing the applicant entered the following remarks into the record:

The proposal is to relocate an existing sign within a regulated area on Commerce Court with a (new) sign within a regulated area on Fenn Road.

The sign would be located two (2) feet from the street line on Fenn Road and would be placed in the upland review area about 28 feet from the wetland boundary line. All work would be done in the upland review area.

The property is 4.225 acres in size. The front of the property outlined in tan on the plan is a conservation easement that was granted to the Town by the developers of that property somewhere around 2000-2001 and is recorded in the Town land records in Volume 1481, Page 261.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that two (2) actions would be required by the Commission as noted below:

- A. The first action would be as the Conservation Commission where permission is being sought to install the new sign within a conservation easement that had been previously granted to the Town.
- B. The second action would be as the Inland Wetland and Watercourses Agency to conduct a regulated activity within a regulated upland review area.

Mr. Bongiovanni entered the following remarks into the record relative to the first action:

- A. He noted that when the property was encumbered by the easement, he (Mr. Bongiovanni) believed that the land owner could come back with an application at a later date to the Commission. To support this conclusion, he (Mr. Bongiovanni) referred to language in the conservation easement which states that certain activities, including the installation of a sign, are prohibited unless expressed consent is granted by the Town (listen to audio tape for the full details of his remarks).

- B. The request is being made to install a sign that would have a base of two (2) sonotubes, two (2) feet in diameter placed seven (7) into the feet into the ground. The holes would be dug using a mechanical posthole digger. A concrete base would be placed over the tubes.
- C. The reason why the applicant is making the request is from a business perspective; namely, its clients are having a hard time finding the property. The applicant has tried to work with the Town to solve the problem, but to no avail.
- D. The dark area shaded on the reference plan is actually a 150 foot Helco right of way for transmission lines. The ground growth is cut on an annual basis.

Commissioner Zelek noted that he has visited the area and the growth has not been cut to the ground. He observed the area and found it to be an area of mature growth. He suggested that the Commission members make a site walk.

Mr. Bongiovani passed out several photographs that were prepared from the Town's GIS department. He proceeded to explain the photographs from a designated location (listen to audio tape for the details of his remarks). He noted there was a triple four (4) inch apple tree that would be cut down.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that he was advised by CL&P staff that the area is maintained on a regular basis.

Commissioner Zelek noted that the (apple) tree is proposed to be removed. Do you have a list from a botanist on the species to be removed? Mr. Bongiovanni responded no and does not believe there is a need or necessity to provide the information.

There was an exchange between Commissioner Zelek and Mr. Bongiovanni on the right of the Commission to request such information (listen to audio tape for details of the exchange). Note: Commissioner Zelek expressed a concern on the possibility the tree might be one of an endangered species.

Mr. Bongiovanni asked if it is the practice of the Commission through the Chair (Chairman Block) that every applicant that comes before this Commission would have to engage expensive professionals at the whim of Commissioners? Chairman Block responded that a Commissioner has the right to ask a question and that the applicant has the right to answer it or not. The Commission would act with or in the absence of the information.

There was a brief exchange between Chairman Block and Mr. Bongiovanni on the question (listen to audio tape for the details of the exchange).

Chairman Block noted that the Town has place the responsibility if the sign is to be installed to the Conservation Commission. The Commission can agree to or deny the request. One

Commissioner has asked for additional information (listen to audio tape for the details of his remarks).

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that a Connecticut botanist would supply a report to the request.

Mr. Bongiovanni presented an enlarged photograph of the sign for the Omar Company that was previously approved by the Conservation Commission. Referring to the sign which he noted was 18 feet by 18 feet in size and 16 feet to 18 feet in height. He also noted they (Omar Company) were afforded the ability besides clearing the area for the sign to incorporate a large landscaped area (as shown in the photograph). He also noted that it is his intention to enter the Omar Company file into the record at next month's meeting.

Commissioner Zelek interrupted Mr. Bongiovanni and noted that the approval (Omar Company application) was done by a different Commission in a different period of time. We are now in a different situation today, where we have little open space and very few parcels with scenic valid. The previous action is not relevant to today's environment. He noted that this is like the "Slip and Slide" (listen to the audio tape for the full description of the "Slip and Slide").

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that he is here providing evidence on why his client feels that he is entitled to place a business sign as a good corporate citizen of the Town. He (the client) pays his taxes and is entitled to the same enjoyment as other businesses. The way you just characterized it, I think it is an insult to the applicant and do not think was appropriate as a citizen. I am embarrassed by your comment.

Alternate Paskewich asked if there was anything in the regulations that states what kind of vegetation that can be cut? Chairman Block responded it is not the question of what is being cut. The question in his opinion that is being raised by the applicant is when the owner (Omar Company) of the property to the south of Commerce Court was granted approval for a sign, did they get approval to maintain the affected area as a lawn? We do not have that information in hand.

Mr. Greenlaw noted that all Commissioners should have a copy of the conservation easement to read. He also noted that all conservation easements are not under the jurisdiction of the Conservation Commission. Some are under the Town Planning and Zoning Commission (listen to audio tape for the full details of his remarks).

Commissioner Zelek said that he wanted to apologize to the applicant. He did not mean to be insulting; he was trying to be humorous. It was not the best selection of words.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that the apology was accepted.

Commissioner Clark noted that she does not intrepid the last paragraph of the easement as the applicant indicated. The applicant implies in his earlier statement that approval would be granted.

Mr. Bongiovanni responded that it was not his intention to imply that approval would be granted. He noted that he stated "it was anticipated that there is the potential on these properties, such as this one, that there may be a need for some sort of development that would have to be regulated by the Town through its Commission" (listen to audio tape for the remainder of his remarks).

Commissioner Zelek noted that the applicant made reference that the conservation easement contains boiler plate language. He noted that the easement was site specific.

There was a discussion on the history of the property from the original subdivision of land owned by Fenn Manufacturing to the application before the Commission today (10 years later) and is summarized below:

- A. The parcel of land to the south of Commerce Court was initially purchased from Fenn Manufacturing and subdivided for development and included a conservation easement. The parcel of land to the north of Commerce Court was retained by Fenn Manufacturing.
- B. Later, the parcel of land north of Commerce Court was subdivided into two (2) land parcels. The parcel abutting Fenn Road was developed by Progressive Insurance with a conservation easement over a portion of the property.
- C. Mr. Bongiovanni following the above discussion proceeded to provide the history of the development of the land parcel south of Commerce Court. He noted that a (directory) sign for the property out on Fenn Road was not part of the original approval. The sign was approved later under similar circumstances when customers were unable to find the businesses located within the development (listen to audio tape for the full details of his remarks).

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that in recent years Big Sky has come back to the Commission on two (2) occasions for building expansions within the conservation easement. The last appearance was in the past 12 months and construction is under way as we talk and includes the altering of the ground within the conservation easement to accomplish the new construction.

Commissioner Zelek noted he was on the Commission at that time and the approval had no impact on the scenic value and no destruction of wildlife. In his opinion, there was no impact.

Chairman Block noted that solar power was being proposed to light the sign? Would it be possible to put in a timer to limit the hours of operation? Mr. Bongiovanni responded that he would look into it.

Commissioner Zelek asked what is the environmental impact of having that type of light (emanating) near the wetland and also what type of species would be impacted? Chairman

Block noted that he wanted to advise the applicant that this has been a concern of this Commission. He also noted that the question before the Commission is what is the impact of this sign on the area, namely the upland review area.

There was a discussion between Chairman Block and Commissioner Zelek on the need to have an assessment done on the impact of the lighting on the regulated area and the removal of the tree.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted the desire of the Commission to have expert testimony and a report. He thinks that in many respects, that for many applications it would be the proper thing to do. In this case, we are looking to trim shrubs and remove a tree that has grown wild with some kind flowers and fruit so that a sign could be installed. The activity would occur in an upland review area located within a Helco easement where they have the right to mow nearly to the ground and cut what is required on a regular basis. The utilities traverse across the property which is being characterized improperly as a scenic natural habitat. There is nothing natural about it.

Alternate Paskewich interrupted Mr. Bongiovanni and said that he disagrees. The tree is significant to bird life if it is an apple tree.

Ms. Krawiec noted that since we cannot control what CL&P does, it does not mean that we cannot speak to what we can control.

Commissioner Clark noted that she sees the south side of Commerce Court as a sterile lawn area with ugly conical bushes; whereas, the north side of Commerce Court is seen as an attractive natural area.

Commissioner Zelek noted that he supports saving the tree.

Commissioner Sadil noted that Big Sky added supplemental plantings (under its last application). Maybe the applicant should look into providing a mitigation plan as a possibility? There was a discussion among Commission members about this possible option (listen to audio tape for the details of the discussion).

Commissioner Igielski noted that he did not receive any information on the sign in the agenda package.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that he would make sure that all Commission members would receive the information.

Recording Secretary Peter Arbur asked the Chair for the record that the Commission would be requiring the applicant to submit an environmental assessment report? Chairman Block responded yes. There was a discussion among Commission members on the content of the report (listen to audio tape for the details of the discussion).

Alternate Paskewich recommended that the Commission conduct a site walk of the area.

Chairman Block noted that if the entire Commission makes the walk, it would be considered to be a meeting of the Commission. Minutes would have to be taken and the public would be able to speak. It was his recommendation that Commission members visit the site on an individual basis prior to next month's meeting.

Mr. Greenlaw noted the applicant by signing the application gives Commission members the right to walk the property.

Mr. Greenlaw asked if all activity would occur within the upland review area? Mr. Bongiovanni responded yes.

Mr. Greenlaw noted the Commission is now 35 days into the decision making period. Therefore, the Commission at next month's would have to take the following actions:

- A. As the Conservation Commission make a decision on the installation of a sign within the conservation easement.
- B. As the Conservation Commission make a decision if the activity would warrant a public hearing.
- C. As the Inland Wetland Commission make a determination if the activities would have a significant impact on the regulated area.

Commissioner Igielski noted that the Commission has 65 days to render a decision unless a public hearing is called which would open a new window. In addition, the applicant or Commission can make a request for a time extension per the Regulations.

Chairman Block noted that the conservation easement is a private document and therefore is not bound by the Inland Wetland and Watercourses Regulations. Therefore, in his opinion, there would be no time limit to make a decision. You can ask the Town Attorney for an opinion. He (Chairman Block) finds this matter to be a very complex decision.

Chairman Block made an extensive statement as to the dilemma before the Commission in processing this application. A number of points were made by him (listen to audio tape for the details of his comments).

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that the size of the sign south of Commerce Court is about 18 feet in height; whereas, the sign under discussion would be 11 feet in height. The size of the sign under discussion would be eight (8) feet long by two (2) feet seven (7) inches in height. He noted that some of the placards (individual signs) on the other sign are higher than our sign.

There was a general discussion among Commission members to the comparison in size of the two (2) signs. It was agreed that Commission members might go into the field and review the (Omar Company) other sign (listen to audio for the details of the discussion).

Mr. Greenlaw asked the applicant if the environmental assessment report could include a possible mitigation plan? Mr. Bongiovanni responded that he would check with his client.

Commissioner Zelek noted that the application has been provided to the Commission in a piecemeal manner. The manner in which the information is being submitted together with the lost month (applicant not available last month) has resulted in a smaller window to review the application.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that the applicant is here for two (2) things to be addressed and are summarized below:

- A. Will the (Conservation) Commission on behalf of the Town grant the right to perform some work related to the installation of a sign in the conservation easement? There is no check list, no maximum or minimum requirements etc.
- B. For the second, we have submitted an application, site plan with the wetland delineation and other supporting documentation.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that the Commission is asking for other things tonight. He noted that the he has never been asked for an environmental assessment report for pushing back some brush and cutting down a tree located along the side of the road. Some of the information being requested is out of the ordinary. He will advise his client of the request.

Mr. Greenlaw noted that the Commission could ask for an extension of time.

Mr. Bongiovanni noted that all he can do is ask his client if he would be willing to fund the study. He also asked if there were any standards or guide lines relative to the light issue. There was an exchange between Mr. Bongiovanni and Commission members when he asked to what standards or guidelines he must address if the report is done (listen to audio tape for the details of the exchange).

Motion made by Commissioner Clark to carry the item over to the June meeting and was seconded by Commissioner Sadil. There was no discussion. Vote was 7 yes and 0 no and the motion was carried.

#### ITEM VI B

##### New Initiative-Vernal Pools

Commissioner Zelek noted that he made contact with a member of the CERT Team. They provided me with some additional information. They also advised me to contact the

Connecticut Association of Conservation Commissions. They are going to discuss aspects of vernal pools at their next meeting and will get back to me.

#### ITEM VII

#### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON- AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. John Bachand, 56 Maple Hill Avenue asked the following questions:

- A. Is there anything the Commission can report to the public on the Toll Brothers court case? Chairman Block responded the court case has been initiated and we will find out when the dates come up.
- B. Can the Town Engineer turn my remarks over to the Town Attorney? Chairman Block responded it is past the time for submitting information related to the case.

#### ITEM VIII

#### COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS

#### Agent Approval-Application 2013-04A

Mr. Greenlaw noted that acting as the Duly Authorized Agent, he issued a permit to install a pool in the upland review area. There was a minimum amount of excavation related to the installation.

#### Internal rules and Procedures

There was a discussion on the possible change of language to Section 7 (Duly Authorizes Agent) and the section where the location of Commission meetings are held. At the conclusion of the discussion it was decided to carry the item over to the June meeting.

#### L.I.D. (Low Impact Development) Initiative

Mr. Greenlaw noted that DEEP has made \$100,000 grant to the town under the subject program and was broken down as follows:

- A. \$50,000 to revise the TP&Z Commission and the Inland Wetland and Watercourses Regulations to incorporate and implement low impact development techniques into future developments.
- B. \$50,000 for a demonstration project to showcase the incorporation of low impact development techniques specified/outlined in the revised TP&Z Commission and Inland Wetland and Watercourses Regulations.

Motion made by Commissioner Sadil to adjourn the meeting at 10:25 p.m. and was seconded by Commissioner Clark. There was no discussion. Vote was 7 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

Sincerely;

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Peter M. Arburr", written in black ink on a white background.

Peter M. Arburr  
Recording Secretary

Commission members  
Tanya Lane, Town Clerk  
John Salamone, Town Manager  
Town Planner  
Councilor Myra Cohen  
Councilor David Nagel  
Chairperson, Town Planning and Zoning Commission  
Peter M. Boorman, Town Attorney  
Chris Greenlaw, Town Engineer  
Lucy Robbins Wells Library (2)