

CHESHIRE INLAND WETLANDS AND WATERCOURSES COMMISSION
Tuesday, June 2, 2020 at 7:30 p.m.

Public access at
https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC4_xey3QjJmwe57R_6K4Dw
available on Channel 14 and on demand at www.cheshirect.org.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kurtz called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was recited.

III. ROLL CALL

Ms. Dunne called the roll.

Members present were Chairman Earl Kurtz, Dr. Charles Dimmick, Dave Brzozowski, Kerrie Dunne, Will McPhee and Thom Norback (at 7:37 pm).

Staff member present: Suzanne Simone.

IV. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

There were enough members present for a quorum.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Regular Meeting – May 19, 2020

Chairman Kurtz called for a motion to approve the minutes from the May 19, 2020 regular meeting with corrections as noted: pg. 6 L44-45 should read “Mr. Waz of the Meriden Water Department (on a) previous (nearby application.”

Moved by Ms. Dunne. Seconded by Mr. Brzozowski. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Simone reviewed the following communications:

1. Letter of Support Request by RWA Re: Acquisition of property at 257 Fenn Road

Ms. Simone explained the Regional Water Authority is preparing an application for an open space grant which the town will be submitting to receive money in order to buy the property to keep as passive recreation-open space.

Ms. Simone reminded the Commission that this property was subject of a development approval for a subdivision and there were other actions on this site – a cease and desist order which is still standing on this parcel; no development has moved forward after the initial clearing was done.

The letter from Regional Water Authority is asking if the Commission would write a letter to the State of Connecticut supporting the town purchasing the property.

Dr. Dimmick suggested having staff draft a letter and he and the chairman go over the draft and approve to send out on behalf of the Commission.

Chairman Kurtz asked if this was something Commission members were in favor of; he asked if anyone had any ideas or specific suggestions that should be mentioned or specially left out.

Dr. Dimmick the property is already adjacent to property under the land trust or owned by the town and there are a number of reasons why it should be left as open space because its near the river and that is land we want to protect.

Ms. Simone informed Commission members this property abuts 200 acres owned by the Town of Cheshire which is the De Dominicis property and in conjunction with the town purchasing this property the land trust is seeking a grant through the Audubon Society and Army Corp or Engineers; this property would be owned by the town but would have conservation restrictions from the Army Corp of Engineers as well as the State of Connecticut if the grant is approved, as well as Regional Water Authority who is also chipping in (to purchase the land).

Ms. Simone agreed to draft a letter with Dr. Dimmick in support of the purchase.

- 2. Request for Determination #2020-010 Re: 1540 Notch Road - Above Ground Pool and Deck**
- 3. Staff Communication w/attachments Re: IWWC 2020-002, Jarvis Street, Site Plan – House**
- 4. Staff Communication w/attachments Re: IWWC 2020-008, Coleman Road - Site Plan**

5. Engineering Comments Re: IWWC Application 2020-009, Lamp Realty, LLC, Hazel Drive – Site Plan
6. Staff Communication w/attachments Re: IWWC 2020-009, Lamp Realty
7. Request for Determination #2020-011 Re: 569 Cornwall Avenue - Construction of wood landing and stairs

Mr. Norback and others waiting joined the meeting at 7:37 pm.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Permit Application
Timothy McMurray
Jarvis Street
Site Plan – House | APP 2020-002
DOR 1/07/20
SW 1/16/20 |
| | MAD 4/07/20 |

Timothy McMurray was present.

Mr. McMurray explained there was a site visit and it was recommended he go back and have the soils map redone which he did; he provided copies of that map.

Ms. Simone confirmed they have those copies. She asked about where the wetland flags were located on the site plan but the map makes reference to a 2002 delineation that was done; she asked if they went out into the field and field located the delineation of wetlands; and if the wetlands were currently flagged.

Mr. McMurray stated they did and the (wetlands) are flagged and staked as well.

Dr. Dimmick questioned the contours and that there may be a mislabeling of the contours at the 140-contour mark.

Dr. Dimmick and Mr. Norback commented about the contours and tried to figure out what was being represented.

Dr. Dimmick stated the final plan would have to be corrected (no reflect what the correct contours are).

Chairman Kurtz asked if they thought a public hearing was needed on this or to have the engineer explain these drawings and contour lines.

Mr. Norback said it sounds like the contour lines need to be corrected but said the 140 contour works with the garage; but clarification is needed.

Dr. Dimmick said it looks like there's an extra 140 contour line; he said the problem is they have seen other sights like this that look okay on paper but in the field they run into problems; he is not opposed to what is taking place he just wants to be sure there's protection and inspection on this going in.

Ms. Dunne asked if there was a conservation easement established.

Ms. Simone said in looking at the land records, she did not find any conservation easement that was created and recorded on the land records – it was mentioned in the 2002 approval and was a stipulation of that approval but since that site was not developed she believed there was no reason to institute that easement; as noted in her staff report – what is the value of having a conservation easement on private property such as this where the area is self-regulating and limits what can be done in that area; from the staff perspective she did not believe having a conservation easement on private property would not gain any further protections of that wetland area and may be more responsibility on the town.

Dr. Dimmick asked about the gabion barrier shown on the plan; and that they are good barriers if left to themselves and form a nice vegetative barrier; but that the plan shows other information for a silt barrier and not details about the gabion barrier so these details need to be corrected.

Ms. Dunne said in the staff report it noted that it would be good to know how much of the regulated area would be disturbed and did they have that information.

Ms. Simone said that information was not seen on the site plan; and that information would be helpful.

Chairman Kurtz commented that the applicant need to provide additional information and come back at the next meeting.

Ms. Dunne asked if they also needed an environmental assessment also.

Ms. Simone reviewed the timeline for action to be taken on this application; and stated there is only 30 days left; unless the applicant provides approval for the remaining days and extend the time 30 more days.

Mr. Norback said they need the detailed information and the Commission cannot just consider the timing.

Mr. McMurray granted the extra time to July 7th to get additional work done on the plan and would get answers to the questions (asked by the Commission).

Ms. Simone said the plan should also show the location of the non-encroachment markers and the markers can be purchased in the wetland office.

Ms. Simone agreed to work with Mr. McMurray on what should be shown on the plans.

This item was carried over to the next meeting.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

1. Request for Determination RFD 2020-010
John and Beth D'Addona
1540 Notch Road
Pool & Deck Extension

John D'Addona was present.

Ms. Simone stated this was a request for determination; in her staff report she noted this house was constructed before the inlands and watercourse regulations were adopted so there was no requirement for a non-encroachment area on the property.

The map of the property was reviewed showing the soils map, upland review area, and house and location of above ground pool and deck area extension.

Mr. D'Addona addressed the Commission explained he wanted to install a 28' round pool directly behind his house, in an established lawn area.

Mr. McPhee asked after the pool is installed how much grass area there would be before the wooded area.

Mr. D'Addona said it goes towards the waterline and it will be about 22' to 28'.

Dr. Dimmick asked if he knew how far the proposed pool was from the actual wetland line.

Mr. D’Addona said he was not exactly sure; the pool location would be between the house and the playscape.

Dr. Dimmick asked if it would be entirely within the grassed area.

Mr. D’Addona stated yes.

Mr. McPhee said as long as it falls within the grassed area he did not problem with it.

Motion: That the proposed activities are not significant in terms of wetland environment and therefore would not require a permit under the Commission’s regulations.

Moved by Dr. Dimmick. Seconded by Mr. McPhee. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

Ms. Simone informed Mr. D’Addona he would need to fill out a zoning permit; she would be able to indicate a wetlands permit was not needed.

Mr. D’Addona said he already applied, and they were waiting on the wetland decision.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 2. Permit Application | APP | 2020-008 |
| Bartosz & Catherine Grala | DOR | 5/19/20 |
| Coleman Road | | |
| Site Plan | MAD | 7/23/20 |

Dennis McMorro from Berkshire Engineering & Surveying LLC was present.

The plans were reviewed by Commission members.

Mr. McMorro explained the Gralas purchased lot 1B which was a two lot re-subdivision of lot 1 on Coleman Road; lot 1B is a 3.89 acres parcel; he showed the location of the driveway on the north side of the house at a 10% grade down to the garage – this was done to the curve on Coleman Road; there’s a 14’ fill slope down to the driveway to the edge of the wetlands; there’s stabilization fabric and details added to the plan.

Mr. McMorro said the applicant is looking to construct a house – the goal of this new plan is to get a little bit of a back yard; the driveway is proposed at about 300’ to the south of the property and is a much flatter driveway at a slope of 2% versus the 10% - they trade off is its twice as long as the other proposed driveway – 140’

versus 300' but meets the site line criteria, there's only an 8' high fill going to the wetlands instead of a 14' high fill slope.

Mr. McMorrow reviewed the presentation plan – highlighting the original approved non-encroachment line from the original plan and now shows the area where they have additional non-encroachment; they are not cutting trees for any of this – the additional impact is 2400 SF – they couldn't lower the house anymore because they'd have to lower the driveway and would then have to have a cut below the septic system – they balanced a lot of different factors and the net result is they do have a little bit of a back yard for possibly a future pool location behind the house for a family area to enjoy with their children.

Mr. Morrow said they've added a rock slope - rip rap details and filter fabric and will toe in at the base of the slope the stone as shown on the detail; the rip rap slope will be a good erosion control on that 1:1 slope in that area.

Dr. Dimmick asked about the rip rap, its size and how it would be installed as well as the filter fabric installation.

Mr. McMorrow confirmed it was modified rip rap and the size was graded up to a 12" stone – and would be placed with an excavator from the top; he explained how the filter fabric would be installed.

Dr. Dimmick said it looked good and an overall improvement from the first plan.

Mr. Norback said he had no problem with it.

Ms. Simone asked about the back area – and the grading for the 1:1 slope and stabilization.

Mr. McMorrow said once that slope is formed – they will install the fabric and seed and both the 2:1 and 1:1 slope will both be stabilized permanently and not waiting until the end of the project.

Ms. Simone asked about the non-encroachment markers dissecting the driveway – based on what was approved previously; clarification on their location was needed.

Mr. McMorrow explained those we actually approved as part of the subdivision and they went out and staked them and he thought they might have already been put up – they would have to be taken down and moved to the new location shown.

Ms. Dunne asked if they approve this were they also approving the pool location.

Ms. Simone said they are showing it and they are establishing the non-encroachment line is shown at the toe of the slope and technically touches within the upland area – that’s why they are showing it so yes the permit for the dwelling would also cover the pool.

Mr. Morrow said on the original site plan the deck with 30’ from the wetlands and the corner of the house was 41’; and on this plan they are farther away – the deck is 41’ and the corner of the garage is 46’ – so farther away from the wetlands.

Commission members were in agreement that staff should prepare a draft motion for the next meeting.

- | | | |
|---|------------|-----------------|
| 3. Permit Application | APP | 2020-009 |
| Lamp Realty, LLC | DOR | 5/19/20 |
| Hazel Drive | | |
| Site Plan – 114 Units in 2 Residential Buildings | MAD | 7/23/20 |

Attorney Joe Williams, land use attorney with Shipman and Goodwin, Ryan McEvoy, PE from Milone and MacBroom and the owners representative Tony Nazzarado were present.

Ms. Simone explained the application is for two residential building totaling 114 units; there is already a development on the site and the plan calls for that to be demolished and rebuilt in the same general area.

Attorney Williams addressed the Commission and gave a brief overview of the proposal which he believes will improve the environmental aspects of the site; there are two aging and dilapidated convalescent buildings and a large overgrown parking area with no storm water treatment measures in place today which they will be replace with two new apartment buildings, a parking area, an extensive planting plan and state of the art storm water management plan – the plan pulls a portion of the existing buildings out of the upland review area and pulls some of the existing asphalt paving out of the upland review area; an install storm water quality

basins which are intended and will greatly improve the storm water discharging from the site into Larson's Pond.

Attorney Williams explained there are no direct impacts on their plan to wetlands and watercourses – it's a large property – 22 acres of beautiful property and a sizable pond and watercourse and wetlands that are undisturbed and will remain undisturbed; they are redeveloping a portion of the property that has already been heavily disturbed in the past by the development and operation of the convalescent home.

Attorney Williams said they believe the proposal will greatly improve the environmental and wetlands condition over the existing situation and will not create an adverse situation for the wetlands and watercourses and so they will ask that you (Commission) approve the permit and find that there is no significant activity.

Mr. McEvoy addressed the Commission.

Mr. McEvoy reviewed the property location with frontages on Hazel Drive, and Lakeview Avenue and Larson Avenue on the opposite side of the pond and towards the ramp of I-84; the property has a very irregular shape.

The plans were displayed for Commissioner review.

Mr. McEvoy showed on the plans and the location of the watercourse and wetland system that drains towards Larson's Pond; there are some wetland fingers on the eastern portion of the site and disturbed areas associated with leaching septic systems – the application is not focused on that part of the property – all of the proposed activities are focused on the west side of the property.

Mr. McEvoy spoke about the previous use of the existing buildings and fairly large parking areas and filled areas; there is a large drainage area on Hazel Drive just to the right of the relic of the old buildings and a swale that leads directly into the wetlands; to the north are the remnants of a leaching field.

Mr. McEvoy noted the site was served by septic systems until 1993 when it was converted to public sewers.

Mr. McEvoy explained the property does have some significant grades in some areas and slopes range from moderate to steep with the highest elevation along Hazel Drive down to the pond; the parking areas and buildings and all imperious areas generally drain directly to the wetlands absent any storm water management system or water quality enhancements – they sheet flow into the wetland and

at some places are as close as 15' to 20' from the wetland associated with the pond.

Mr. McEvoy said this property was subject of a site plan in 2005 that was approved by this Commission that included improvements and wetland delineation; as part of this permit application they have upgraded the delineation done by Matt Sandford, updated from Bill Roots delineation, showing where the wetlands are and are in the same location.

Mr. McEvoy said the site plan proposes a multi-family residential development – two apartment buildings each with 57 units and construction new parking and access for these buildings off of Hazel Drive.

Mr. McEvoy said they will be demolishing the asphalt parking areas that are in close proximity to the wetlands and moving them further away and also improving the vegetative buffer to the wetlands; the plan shows the activities within the upland review area and there are very few areas of proposed pavement that fall within the upland review area; one significant improvement is the installation of stormwater quality and management features on the site – all drainage (from building and parking) will be captured in a catch basin system and conveyed to two stormwater management basins – shown on the plans – the basins will detain and hold back the first inch of runoff – the basins will have forebays and will have a CDS unit which is a proprietary swirl basin unit to help trap sediments and floatables prior to discharge from the basin; the discharge is then routed through a level spreader.

Mr. McEvoy said also important to note they are improving the water quality coming off of the town road with the introduction of a sediment chamber to pick up coarse sediments coming off the town road and discharging the town drainage into its own separate level spreader discharge which will provide the same level velocity reduction as opposed to a point discharge; all three discharges will be slowing the velocity and spread out to reduce erosion and each basin will incorporate water quality volume and designed in accordance to the 2014 water quality manual and will have primary treatment and they are introducing vegetation, and a stone dust path to separate the parking lots and wetlands themselves.

Mr. McEvoy said they feel by reducing the footprint of the impervious surface from the upland review area and introducing stormwater management features that do not exist today and providing for water quality treatments for discharges - this will ultimately enhance the water quality leaving the site.

Mr. McEvoy stated they have a detailed sediment and erosion control plan with three locations of sediment traps; he reviewed the process the sediment traps functions; there will be silt fence and haybales and (based on recent comments from the town engineer) orange construction fencing.

Mr. McEvoy said they recently had test pits to determine the soil conditions; he reviewed the information regarding the test pits and ground water levels that determined what basins to install; seeding mixture was selected to accommodate the moist and dry areas; storm water storage and detention will also be provided.

Mr. McEvoy said he believed that the improvements they are making will ultimately going to protect the resources which is the pond and the wetlands.

Dr. Dimmick said he knew they were now connected to town sewer; he asked if there was town water.

Mr. McEvoy replied that there is Regional Water Authority public water; they connected to sanitary sewers in the 1990s because of significant septic issues in the 1980s; the buildings are going to be served with public water and sewer and feasibility approval was received from WPCA for connection to the sewer and they have a letter that public water is available for the project.

Dr. Dimmick asked if the existing water wells on the property - have they been properly abandoned and seals.

Mr. McEvoy said he was not familiar with the abandonment procedure for those wells or where they are located on the properties.

Dr. Dimmick had some knowledge of the well locations and when they were installed in the 80s.

Dr. Dimmick asked about the regarding and if they have erosion controls in place.

Mr. McEvoy reviewed the plan showing the improvements and removals appropriate – silt fence and haybales around the entire perimeter of activity; and include three temporary sedimentation traps identified on the plans; the functions were reviewed; the sedimentation basins will have to be maintained and cleaned when sediment reaches a foot deep; additional details are provided.

Mr. McPhee asked what the end use of the proposed building were.

Mr. McEvoy stated its going to be apartments.

Ms. Simone said she did check the natural diversity database and this area does not register any known species on the database so there is not need for natural diversity database measures here.

It was noted, they still have 44,320 SF of disturbance of in the upland review areas and Mr. McEvoy explained that consists of installation of the storm water basins primarily and there will be some parking areas within it – 80% of the activity within the upland review area will be for the storm water basins.

Commission members discussed whether or not the proposed activity would require a public hearing; based on its size and public interest and disturbance of the upland review area.

Ms. Simone shared information regarding publishing the public hearing notice in local mainstream media and newspapers – due to Covid-19 the posting of the public hearing could be on the town website in time for the June 16, 2020 meeting; the Commission could post in the *Cheshire Herald* and on the town website.

Motion: To declare the proposed activity significant based on public interest 9.1 c of the regulations; so, a public hearing would be held, and the Commission members agreed to post the notice of public hearing for June 16, 2020 on the town website and in the *Cheshire Herald*.

Moved by Dr. Dimmick. Seconded by Mr. McPhee. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

4. Request for Determination RFD 2020-011
Ed Barnett
569 Cornwall Avenue
Construct Landing and Stairs

Attorney Anthony Fazzone was present on behalf of the applicant, Ed Barnett.

Ms. Simone stated Mr. Barnett was trying to get into the meeting but was unable to.

Ms. Simone noted in her staff report she indicated that this is a request for determination born out of the submission of an as-built survey that was provided in support of staff signing the certificate of occupancy; the as-built originally identified a deck; she went out to the site and saw that there are sliding doors and now is being labeled as a wood landing and some stairs and because that is a deviation from the approval form the Wetlands Commission she is

not able to sign off on this; there was discussion with Mr. Barnett about this and subsequently Attorney Fazzone is now submitting a request for determination to see if a permit is needed for a change to the original permit.

Ms. Simone put up the map showing the original site plan and as built.

Chairman Kurtz noted they did have provisions to handle this – with a permit after the fact and they can decide if one is required.

Ms. Simone explained Mr. Barnett was in the meeting waiting room and it showed he joined the meeting.

Ms. Simone reviewed the site plan approved February 5, 2019, showing the house and upland review area; and the as built provided on May 27, 2020 shows the upland review area that there is change to the plan.

Mr. Norback commented on what was shown on the original plan and that more detail was shown on the as built.

Ms. Simone said what they are looking at on the screen is the approved plan.

Mr. Norback said he thought the approved site plan seems to have a rectangular box and the house seems to be a different space.

Attorney Fazzone said he thought that was correct; and the box is bigger than the ultimate footprint for the house; he thought the rear line to the box pretty much corresponds with the location in the as built.

Mr. Norback said in his opinion it looks like the landing and the stairs are more or less within the footprint of the approved plan; he thought the change fits within the box that they approved.

Commission members reviewed the site plan and as built details.

Dr. Dimmick said it's within 5-6 square feet but it looks like it's close enough.

Ms. Dunne said in the minutes did not we require they come back for that (a change).

Mr. Norback said if he recalled Mr. Barnett was out of town and his father in law came in and it looked like the permit was not going to be granted and a commission member suggested they nix the deck

on the plan to assure that the proposal for the proposed plan would go through. – he vaguely remembered he suggested that.

Ms. Simone said that in the discourse that happened they had already received their approval from the Commission then they submitted a zoning permit and on that permit it showed the deck; staff was not able to sign the zoning permit because it was different then the approved plan that then was brought up in the proceedings of the cease and desist order that was issued for the site and that's when Mr. Siniscalco could not submit the zoning permit showing the deck unless he was to modify the plans and the minutes indicate he was going to modify the plans.

Attorney Fazzone said he thought it should be pointed out – that he believed the deck that was shown was 10' by 10' and he gets that number because in the assessors records the house is assessed on the basis that the house has a 10' by 10' deck – so he thought he was told the original as built survey was labeled a 6' by 4' sloop was labeled as a deck.

Ms. Simone said that was correct.

Attorney Fazzone talked about the history of this application; he is submitting to the Commission that this be viewed without the history in mind and that its extremely minimal in terms of the amount of disturbance. He said he filed the request for determination as the only way that he saw to hopefully the Commission's decision at this meeting.

Attorney Fazzone explained the house is sold and they plan to close within the next week or so – but obviously it can't close or be sold without a certificate of occupancy – they only way he could get a certificate of occupancy without a sloop and stairs would have been to somehow board up that sliding door. He showed two photos of the footings under the stairs - there is maybe 7' to 10' of disturbance.

Mr. Norback said in his opinion this structure is within the area to have the footprint of the house – even though it is an appendage on this house and not heated place; he thought it was within the footprint and should be approved.

Ms. Dunne asked if they were able to approve an application for something that is totally contradictory to what we said at the May 7, 2020 (per the minutes); when both Chairman de Jongh and Dr. Dimmick both said an application was needed for this; she didn't know if they could do the opposite of what they said could be done regardless of it being minimal and contrary to what they have done in the past.

Commission members discussed next steps and that the deck needed a rail as did the step; a few thought the activity was minimal.

Chairman Kurtz said the only thing that's not minimal is that he was told he needed and he knows he needed a permit – he knows the regulations and he didn't get a permit but we (the Commission) have a procedure that we allow a permit after the fact and all it needs is to be applied for – if he thought he could go ahead without getting a permit and sell the house he (Barnett) wasn't thinking – he has an attorney that can advise him and now he needs a permit after the fact.

Commission members discussed the procedure to follow regarding the determination; and to determine if the activity is within the approved area and if staff has the authority to sign off on the CO when something like this has come up in the past and looks different from the approval then staff is not authorized administratively to make the decision to say it's within the realm if it's not shown on the approval – a request for determination is required from the Commission as to whether it does or doesn't need a permit.

Mr. McPhee said if the deck falls within the approved permit they can go ahead but if they are outside of that footprint then they have further discussion.

Ms. Simone has the ability to make a determination as to whether or not a permit is needed, and it does not have to fall within that same footprint of what was approved.

Attorney Fazzone addressed Ms. Dunne's and Mr. Kurtz's concern about an application being necessary and that the applicant knew about that – he said that was a 10' by 10' deck and if this was a 10' by 10' deck then this would be outside the footprint that was originally approved and would need the application; but the fact that it's within that area or that it's de minimus in terms of what the disturbance in the upland review area is and also the fact it's at the far edge of the upland review area nearly 50' away from the wetland.

Dr. Dimmick said it's 44' away from the wetlands.

Mr. McPhee said in his opinion this is de minimus.

Motion: That based on the information provided that the applicant's changes are de minimus and a permit is not required.

Moved by Mr. McPhee. Seconded by Mr. Brzozowski.

Chairman Kurtz said he thought they needed to know who was voting yea or nay and if that was understood.

Ms. Simone called down the list: Chairman Kurtz – no; Vice-chair Dimmick – nay; Secretary Kerrie Dunne – no; Dave Brzozowski – in favor; Will McPhee – no; Thom Norback – (I- yes).

Ms. Simone stated the vote was 3 to 3 so the motion fails.

Dr. Dimmick said they need to acquire a permit after the fact.

Ms. Simone said by failing she can not sign off on the certificate of occupancy; she spoke about the next steps and the time frame of filing an application for a permit after the fact and the possibility of the application being submitted tonight and approved at the next meeting.

There was discussion about how they could proceed with the application submission; the 14 days waiting permit is needed for an application or application modification.

Ms. Simone said she would need to check with the town attorney to see if the emailed application for modification as submitted could be accepted.

Ms. Simone said that Mr. Barnett was trying to speak at the meeting, but the audio was not available.

Attorney Fazzone provided via email request for a permit application for modification of the application for 569 Cornwall Avenue on June 2, 2020.

Ms. Simone said that the Commission is not able to waive the application fee; and the permit after the fact fees need to be assessed and she would check with the town attorney.

Attorney Fazzone said he received an email from Mr. Barnett that this detail would cause him to lose the buyer of this house. He stated that the application is for 569 Cornwall Avenue and that the record reflect that.

Ms. Simone agreed to contact the town attorney and get information out to the Commission on this.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 pm by consensus of Commission members present.

**CHESHIRE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
VIDEO TELECONFERENCE**

JUNE 2, 2020

Respectfully submitted:

**Carla Mills
Recording Secretary
Cheshire Inland Wetland and Watercourse Commission**