APPROVED/REVISED MINUTES

January 27, 2022

Members present: Patricia Sesto, chair; Susan Baker, vice chair; Alan Pilch, secretary; Chris Phelps, Tracey Miller, Tim Bishop, David Smith

Also present: Andrew P. Hally, wetland agent; Aarti Paranjape, office administrator; Jon Espeland, Andrew Berkeley, Steven Trinkaus, Steven Sullivan P.E., James McManus, Doug MacMillan, Chris Sullivan SWCD, Kate Throckmorton, Tim Quinn P.E.

I: Call to order

Ms. Sesto called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

II: Public Hearing:

1. (Contd.) IW-21-54, 9 Rita Road, Plenary Ruling application for a construction of single family home within the upland review area of the wetlands. Owner: Candice Germain. Applicant: James Casali.
   https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/83178

   Applicant has requested to continue the public hearing until next meeting.

   Ms. Sesto called for public comment. There was none.

   Ms. Sesto reordered the agenda for public benefit.

2. (Contd.) IW-21-57, 0 Ives Court, Plenary Ruling Application for Drainage, grading and road improvements to Ives Court to meet Town roadway standards within the upland review area of wetlands. Owner: Robert Cioffoletti. Applicant: Michele Micoli; Ar tel Engineering.
   https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/84217

   Ms. Sesto stated the applicant has requested to continue the public hearing until next meeting.

   Ms. Sesto called for public comment. There was none.
3. **(Contd.) IW-21-56, 187 Rippowam Road.** Plenary Ruling application to construct a bridge over a stream within the upland review area of the wetlands. *Owner: Nguyen, Vi. Applicant: Steven Trinkaus.*

https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/84238

Mr. Hally read the list of new documents submitted into the record.

Mr. McManus, certified soil scientist, gave an overview of the environmental assessment. He said the latest soil delineation was done in December 2021. He did a qualitative analysis of macro invertebrates and found species consistent with class A waters supporting the good quality classification. He didn’t find any fish, although DEEP found some fish 350 feet upstream. With the diligent monitoring of the erosion control measures he anticipates no short term or long term impact on the wetlands.

Ms. Sesto inquired about the watercourse quality given the suburban area. Mr. McManus stated the stream’s watershed is better described as rural with not much impervious surface. Of the watershed’s 627 acres, 7% is developed and impervious surfaces total around 0.2%. The water quality was in good shape in the month of July and December.

Mr. Trinkaus added there are large areas of open space and the development pattern mostly consists of large estates. The large majority of the undeveloped land is not permanently protected.

When asked, Mr. McManus stated he had not evaluated the alternatives and their impacts. Ms. Sesto expressed concerns that future development of the watershed will have cumulative impacts on the stream, thus every project needs to minimize its impacts.

Mr. Trinkaus stated the existing crossing is a rotting timber crossing and he proposes a stone abutment on one side and a concrete abutment on the other. The decking will be concrete slabs supported by steel I-beams.

Mr. McManus stated he didn’t see much impact as long as the construction phasing is followed.

Mr. Trinkaus presented the revisions as requested by Board members. He spoke to the alternative of accessing parcel A via the existing crossing. He listed reasons such as driveway slope, large footprint of disturbance, the need to increase the rebuilt bridge width from 12 to 16 feet, suitability of the topography where the new house is proposed to convey why the alternate was dismissed.
Ms. Sesto reiterated that she would like the alternatives shown on the sketch and not just as narrative.

Mr. Pilch proposed an alternative crossing location near the wetlands flag 3 and 23 where the wetland is narrower.

Mr. Trinkaus responded boulders or rock bed could be encountered which would create a hardship to installing the abutments. He said the suggested location was steeper and required a longer span, making it financially not viable. It also increases the size of abutments and is a much more intense crossing. Mr. Pilch disagreed with the applicant.

Mr. Trinkaus shared the plan revisions requested by the Board. The contractors could park along the roadways, and in the existing wood road on Parcel A. Once the proposed bridge is complete, the driveway will be ready up to the dwelling for construction vehicles.

The planting is proposed along the north and south sides of the crossing. The driveway is graded to pitch stormwater away on either side. A low three to four feet tall boulder wall is proposed at each side of the headwall to limit grading. Mr. Trinkaus conveyed his observation that there are no catch basins on the Rippowam Road, and stormwater dissipates off into the shoulders or flows to West Mountain Rd.

Mr. Trinkaus described changes at the crossing. The footings will be back filled. The filter socks will stay in place for the entire construction period. Tree protection has been added. A report was sent to CT DEEP’s NDDB and the applicant is waiting to hear from them. The stormwater system meets the Ridgefield requirements.

Mr. Trinkaus dismissed the suggestion of reducing the driveway from 12 to 10 feet, citing people’s discomfort with ten-foot driveways. The visitor parking will be eliminated to reduce disturbance in the upland review area.

Ms. Miller asked if a cross section of the bridge had been submitted as previously requested. She noted the detail in the driveway cross section was not sufficiently detailed and it was difficult to understand the dimensions of the edge of the stream and the abutments at the northern southern end along with the location of plantings. Mr. Trinkaus agreed to submit a cross section with the exact dimension.

Discussion ensued, and Ms. Sesto recited the following revisions to be submitted before the next meeting:

a. Detailed cross section of the abutments with dimensions.
b. Alternatives as discussed in narrative will be submitted in sketch form.
c. A revised plan showing the elimination of the visitor parking.

Ms. Sesto called for public comment. There was none.

The public hearing is continued to February 10, 2022.

III: Applications for Discussion:

1. (Contd.) IW-21-58, 66 Keeler Drive, Summary Ruling application for corrective action for potential violation, to fill the area adjacent to stream and pond within the upland review area of the wetlands. Owner: Alexandre Suter. Applicant: Mike Mazzucco. https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/84841

Applicant requested to continue the discussion until next meeting.


Ms. Sesto stated the sitewalk didn’t alleviate her concerns with regards to rain garden being in woodlands area adjacent to the wetland. Mr. Sullivan responded they are now proposing permeable pavers with 15 inch gravel reservoir for the patio, which will eliminate the need of rain garden. The runoff from pavers can be pitched towards the grass area and can infiltrate from there. Mr. Berkeley confirmed there will be no tree removal.

Ms. Sesto stated a special condition:
A. Site plan to be revised showing permeable pavers with 15 inch deep gravel reservoir and removal of rain garden.

Mr. Bishop motioned to approve the Summary Ruling application with the board’s standard and applicable regular special conditions, and the additional special condition stated by Ms. Sesto. Ms. Miller seconded. The motion carried 7-0-0.

The publication date is February 03, 2022, with effective date of February 04, 2022.
3. **(Contd.) IW-21-60, 276 Old Sib Road**, Summary Ruling application for reconstructing the existing garage with the addition above, within the upland review area. *Owner: Bobby Grenier. Applicant: Doug MacMillan.*

https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/84416

Mr. MacMillan gave a brief description of project. The existing garage will be demolished, and the new garage will be two feet wider. All the construction vehicles will be parked on the driveway and a double row of silt fence will be installed along the limit of the work zone. The three pvc pipes discharging roof runoff will be redirected to a gravel pad in the yard. The driveway drain will discharge to this pad as well.

Mr. Pilch suggested a riparian buffer atop the opposite streambank between the wetland flag #25 and # 27. He suggested removing the lawn and creating a separation from the lawn and watercourse. The vegetative buffer should consist of shrubs in a five-foot deep planting strip. Mr. Macmillan agreed to do the updates as proposed by Mr. Pilch.

Ms. Sesto stated possible special conditions:

- a. Planting to be provided between the wetland flags # 25 and # 27.
- b. Planting to be completed within the six months of issuing certificate of occupancy.
- c. Bond to be posted for 2 years.

**Ms. Baker motioned to approve the Summary ruling application with standard and applicable special conditions, and the additional conditions stated by Ms. Sesto. Mr. Bishop seconded. The motion carried 7-0-0.**

The publication date is February 03, 2022, with effective date of February 04, 2022.

4. **IW-21-62, 799 North Salem Road**, Summary Ruling application for corrective action for potential violation, to restore the planting within the upland review areas of the wetlands. *Owner: Peter Morritz. Applicant: Chris Sullivan, SWCD.*

https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/85126

Mr. Sullivan, South West Conservation District, described the subject area as a disturbed horse pasture. The owner doesn’t use the pasture and the area was overgrown with invasive vegetation. The proposal is to plant native species which will be food for habitat and also the pollinator site and remove the invasive plants. The whole proposal will be a huge improvement over existing conditions.
Ms. Sesto acknowledged the efforts by SWCD to help the homeowner to improve the area.

Following questions, Mr. Sullivan agreed to add deer protection and noted the chosen plants should thrive even without supplemental irrigation.

Ms. Sesto suggested following conditions along with standard conditions:
   a. Deer protection be added to the plan.
   b. Planting to be fully implemented by May 15, 2022

Ms. Sesto motioned to issue an order for the corrective action with applicable normal conditions and the previously referenced conditions. Mr. Bishop seconded. The motion carried unanimously 7-0-0.

Publication date is February 03, 2022 and effective date is February 04, 2022.

5. IW-22-1, 20 Ridgebury Road, Summary Ruling application for construction of detached garage and associated work of revised driveway within the upland review area of the wetlands. Owner: Peter Soos. Applicant: Kate Throckmorton.

Ms. Throckmorton provided an overview of the proposal to construct a garage. The wetlands are 50 feet away from the structure and a rock wall demarcates the boundary of lawn in this area. The driveway will be reconfigured, pervious pavers are proposed near the dwelling with a gravel reservoir; in all there will be a net reduction in impervious surface. The area behind the garage will be planted with the herbaceous plants so there will also be net reduction in lawn

Mr. Quinn licensed engineer gave an overview of the drainage report, stating the drainage plan meets the town’s stormwater requirements. It will avoid any point discharges. The drainage plan includes six Cultec units sized for the water quality flow for one inch of rain, treating ninety percent of all rain events. The impervious surface is decreased by five hundred square feet.

Mr. Pilch corrected the town’s design rain event is for 1.5 inch of rain as opposed to one inch as designed. Mr. Quin agreed to make the necessary changes to capture the first 1.5 inches of rain.

Ms. Sesto suggested the following additional conditions of approval:
   a. Resize the stormwater management system for 1.5 inch of the rain event instead of 1inch.
   b. Planting to be completed within the six months of issuing CO.
Mr. Pilch motioned to approve the Summary ruling application with standard conditions, applicable special conditions, and the additional special conditions stated by Ms. Sesto. Mr. Smith seconded. The motion carried 7-0-0.

The publication date is February 03, 2022, with effective date of February 04, 2022.

IV: Applications for Receipt:

1. **IW-22-2, 22 Whitlock Lane**, Summary Ruling application for construction of pool, retaining wall and a rain garden within the upland review of wetlands. Owner: Nnennaya & Chikezie Duke. Applicant: Rebecca Luraschi
   
   https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/85641

   
   https://ridgefieldct.viewpointcloud.com/records/83911

Ms. Sesto motioned to receive the above two applications, Ms. Miller seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0.

Site walk is scheduled for February 06, 2022 and discussion on February 10, 2022.

V: Administrative Approvals:

None

VI: Status of Corrective Action Application-Completion of work

1. **148 Ledges Road**.

   Mr. Hally informed the Board that staff, Mr. Pilch, and Ms. Miller met Mr. Lohan at his property and came to conclusion that eight more *carex* will be added to the revised planting plan.

   Mr. Pilch said the planting was already established along the stream on top of bank and the additional herbaceous planting amends at the discharge point along the driveway.
Ms. Miller agreed that the existing planting was not included in Mr. Lohan’s initial planting plan, and additional planting compliments the revised planting.

VII: Approval of Minutes:

- **Inland Wetlands Meeting:** January 13, 2022
  Ms. Baker motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Mr. Phelps seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0.

- **Sitewalk Meeting:** January 23, 2022
  Ms. Sesto motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Pilch seconded. Ms. Miller and Mr. Phelps abstained. Motion carried 5-0-2.

VIII. Adjourn

Hearing no further business, Ms. Sesto adjourned the meeting at 8:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

Aarti Paranjape
Recording Secretary