

**CHESHIRE INLAND WETLANDS AND WATERCOURSES COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 2016
TOWN HALL 84 SOUTH MAIN STREET
ROOM 207/209 AT 7:30 P.M.**

Members present: Robert de Jongh, Charles Dimmick, Kerrie Dunne, Earl Kurtz.

Members Absent: Dave Brzozowski, Thom Norback and Will McPhee.

Staff: Suzanne Simone.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman de Jongh called the regular meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was recited by those present.

III. ROLL CALL

Ms. Dunne called the roll.

Members present were Robert de Jongh, Charles Dimmick, Kerrie Dunne, and Earl Kurtz.

IV. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman de Jongh determined there were enough members present for a quorum.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Regular Meeting – March 1, 2016

Motion: To approve the minutes of the March 1, 2016 regular meeting with corrections: Pg. 3 move L31 to L37 “b. 1430 Highland Avenue”; pg. 5 L5 “extension” to “extension is”; pg. 17 L24 “in” to “and”; pg. 19 L8 “are” to “our”; pg. 24 L23 “widen” to “wider”; pg. 26 L9 “corporative” to “cooperative”.

Moved by Ms. Dunne. Seconded by Dr. Dimmick. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Simone reviewed the following communications:

1. **Public Notice Re: Proposed replacement and revision of the Department of the Army Connecticut General Permit.**

This communication was reviewed. Ms. Simone stated that she had the lengthy packet available in the office if any Commission members are interested.

2. **Staff Communication: Fieldstone Court, Clearing and Grubbing Request for Determination #2016-010**

This communication was reviewed. Ms. Simone stated this item was under new business tonight.

3. **Staff Communication: South Main Street, Parking/Drainage, App 2011-010A**

This communication was reviewed. Ms. Simone stated this item was under new business tonight. She said it will just be received tonight; there will be no presentation.

4. **Photos Re: S. Meriden Rd./Academy Rd. Request for Determination 2016-008**

Ms. Simone said that photos were handed out to Commission members relative to the request for determination for unfinished business on South Meriden Road.

VII. INSPECTION REPORTS

1. **Written Inspections**

- a. **Prinz Court**

Ms. Simone said she received a written inspection from Public Works regarding some work that was done on Prinz Court to maintain access to a pond drainage area.

Ms. Simone said if the time comes that they need to get into that area they wanted to make sure no woody growth grew up in that area.

2. Staff Inspections

a. East Johnson Avenue

Ms. Simone said there was a staff inspection of East Johnson Avenue tree clearing. She said that was conducted in preparation for the bridge replacement.

Ms. Simone explained the Natural Diversity Data Base had identified the potential habitat for Long Eared Bats and the cutting is prohibited from April to September so the cutting took at this point in preparation for that project.

VIII. ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

1. Notice of Violation SC 1/07/14
Mr. Nathaniel Florian Permit #2013-015 compliance date: 12/31/15
Woodruff Associates
Unauthorized Activities in the Upland Review Area/Inland Wetlands
108 Blacks Road
Assessor's Map 19, Lots 43 & 44

Chairman de Jongh stated this item has remained on our agenda for continued monitoring. He said he believed there was a meeting scheduled with the property owner later on this upcoming week.

Ms. Simone stated that was correct.

2. Notice of Violation SC 09/15/15
Mr. David Flanagan SC 10/20/15
Unauthorized Activities in an SC 11/05/15
Inland Wetland and Upland Review Area SC 11/17/15
Summit Road
Assessor's Map 32, Lot 5

Chairman de Jongh stated this item is on the agenda for continued monitoring.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Permit Application APP 2016-005
Clearview Farm Preserve, LLC DOR 1/19/16
Cornwall Avenue

Subdivision MAD 3/24/16

Chairman de Jongh stated we had a recommendation from staff for us (the Commission) to consider.

Motion:

That the Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission, having considered the factors pursuant to Section 10 of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations of the Town of Cheshire, Commissioners' knowledge of the area, public hearing testimony, and after review of written information provided by the applicant on this application, finds the following:

1. That the current application is for the subdivision of a 23 acre lot, into a 21 lot subdivision, including the existing house (Cornwall Avenue).
2. That the subject property is bounded by approximately 1,200 linear feet of delineated inland wetlands to the west, sharing the boundary with town owned open space to the west and south.
3. That the proposed road located along the south boundary of the subject parcel borders approximately 140 linear feet of delineated inland wetlands.
4. That an application for the same was submitted on March 3, 2015 and withdrawn on May 19, 2015.
5. That the proposed upland impacts consist of 0.30 acres for the installation of septic system and roadway construction. The direct wetland impacts consist of a direct discharge into a watercourse (North Roaring Brook) from the proposed stormwater basin.
6. That the property is located within the watershed of Willow Brook, a tributary of Lake Whitney, a public water supply reservoir.
7. That the applicant's engineer testified to the Commission on March 1, 2016 that the site will be evaluated by the current CT DEEP NDDB species information.

8. That the site plan contains a “turtle management plan”, which will be reviewed and commented on by CT DEEP NDDB.
9. That the applicant’s engineer stated at the March 1, 2016 meeting that site development will not take place until the CT DEEP NDDB process is completed to the satisfaction of the CT DEEP and a General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities is issued.
10. That the Commission determined the application to be not significant under the context of the regulations.

Based upon the foregoing findings, the Cheshire Inland Wetland and Watercourses Commission conditionally grants CIWWC Permit Application #2016-005, the permit application of CLEARVIEW FARM PRESERVE, LLC as presented on the plans entitled:

“Clearview Farm Preserve
94 Cornwall Avenue, Cheshire, CT
Dated January 12, 2016; Revised January 25, 2016;
Revised February 9, 2016
11 Sheets, Varying Scale.
Sheets SP-1 and SP-2 Revised February 26, 2016
Prepared by Milone and MacBroom, Inc.”.

And

“Lot #13, Supplemental Plantings
Clearview Farm Preserve
Dated February 11, 2016
Prepared by Milone and MacBroom, Inc.”

The permit is granted on the following conditions and stipulations, each of which the Commission finds to be necessary to protect the wetlands and watercourses of the State and the Town of Cheshire:

1. Any lack of compliance with any condition or stipulation of this permit shall constitute a violation of the Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, and an enforcement order shall be both issued and recorded on the Town of Cheshire Land Records.

2. No changes or modifications may be made to the plans as presented without subsequent review and approval the Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission.
3. Prior to any clearing, cutting or any development activities covered in this permit, all recommendations from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP) regarding protective measures for Natural Diversity Database (NDDDB) species shall be forwarded to the Commission and a report submitted by the applicant's soil scientist summarizing any future proposed modifications to be made to this permit grant, so as to be consistent with the recommendations from the NDDDB.
4. Prior to any clearing, grading, or other activities on the site, associated with this permit or the request for a Building Permit for lots #8, #9, #10, #11, #12-#13, the applicant shall accurately stake and/or flag all clearing limits, install erosion controls and permanently mark all non-encroachment lines, as shown on the reference plans above. The applicant shall notify Commission Staff so that Staff may inspect the site to verify all such areas have been properly marked. Staff may also insist on additional markings if field conditions warrant them.
5. Throughout the course of conducting construction activities covered by this permit grant, and per Section 11.2K of the Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring the following:
 - a) That all maintenance and refueling of equipment and vehicles is performed as far as practical from all wetlands and watercourses, at least 100' where possible. All oil, gasoline, and chemicals needed at the site shall be stored in secondary containment to prevent contamination of any wetlands or watercourses from possible leaks.
 - b) That all disturbed areas on the site not directly required for construction activities are temporarily hayed and seeded until the site is permanently stabilized.
6. This permit grant shall expire on March 15, 2021.

Moved by Ms. Dunne. Seconded by Dr. Dimmick. Motion approved unanimously by those Commission members present.

A person from the audience spoke up and said they were expecting Laurie Wilcox to come and make a presentation on Clearview Property – she said she would be here. She said Laurie Wilcox has sort of spearheaded a campaign of residents on Mountain Road; some of those residents have opposition to the Clearview project.

Chairman de Jongh said the issue that we have before this Commission – there was no public hearing and it's too late to call a public clearing at this stage. He said we understand that there are some concerns that have been raised by adjacent or abutting property owners.

Chairman de Jongh said this Commission, based on the presentation made by the applicant and again being guided by the regulations that we have to abide by – we rendered a decision that we felt that based on the presentation – it met our limits of suitability.

Chairman de Jongh said he did know that there is an issue that is before Planning and Zoning relative to a sidewalk – if that requires the filling of a wetland then they will not get their variance and they have to come back before us and it goes through the process again so that kind of modification if it requires the filling of a wetland that was not presented to us at the time we made our judgment that have to come back so they will not be able to go forward with that and they will not be able to get a variance.

Chairman de Jongh explained there is a check and balance that goes into the play of different Commissions. He said like he said there was no public clearing scheduled for this particular item and it's too late to call one based on the time we received the application and the information as to where we are at this point.

Chairman de Jongh said he appreciated letting him know and we are aware of the issues and again if there is a change in presentation or a change in how that site is going to be ultimately developed they have to come back to us.

Chairman de Jongh said he hoped that answers come of the concerns – he said he knew it didn't answer all of the concerns but he hoped it answered some of the concerns.

Dr. Dimmick stated the plans we approved don't show a sidewalk.

2.	Permit Application	APP	2016-007
	Apex Developers, LLC	DOR	2/02/16
	Inverness Court		
	Site Plan – House	MAD	4/07/16

Chairman de Jongh stated there was a draft motion from staff on Inverness Court.

Motion:

That the Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission, having considered the factors pursuant to Section 10 of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations of the Town of Cheshire, Commissioners' knowledge of the area, site visitations, and after review of written information provided by the applicant on this application finds the following:

1. That the current application is for construction of a house on lot 1, Inverness Court subdivision approval #2008-020.
2. That the site plan locates the proposed non-encroachment line at 30 feet from the wetland delineation, in the area of the proposed white pine row. The remainder of the non-encroachment line will follow the 50 foot line, and proposes to be posted with permanent markers and a split rail fence.
3. That the proposed activities will not have a significant adverse effect on adjacent wetlands or watercourses.

Based upon the foregoing findings, the Cheshire Inland Wetland and Watercourses Commission conditionally grants CIWWC Permit Application #2016-007, the permit application of APEX DEVELOPERS, LLC for site plan approval as presented and shown on the plans entitled:

“Proposed Site Plan & Sub-Surface Sewage System Design
Cash Property Subdivision
Lot #1, Inverness Court, Cheshire, CT
Sheet 1; Scale 1”=40’ and Sheet 2 Scale 1”=30’
Dated February 26, 2016
Prepared by Milone and MacBroom, Inc., Cheshire, CT.”

The permit is granted on the following terms, conditions, stipulations and limitations (collectively referred to as the “Conditions”) each of which the Commission finds to be necessary to protect the wetlands and watercourses of the State and the Town of Cheshire:

- 1. Any lack of compliance with any condition or stipulation of this permit shall constitute a violation of the Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, and an enforcement order shall be both issued and recorded on the Town of Cheshire Land Records.**
- 2. No changes or modifications may be made to the plans as presented without subsequent review and approval the Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission.**
- 3. Prior to any clearing, and/or earth work activities, the clearing limits shall be accurately staked and flagged and erosion controls properly installed.**
- 4. Throughout the course of conducting permitted activities, and per Section 11.2K of the Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring the following:**
 - a) That all maintenance and refueling of equipment and vehicles is performed as far as practical from all wetlands and watercourses, at least 100’ if possible. All oil, gasoline, and chemicals needed at the site shall be stored in secondary containment to prevent contamination of any wetlands or watercourses from possible leaks.**
 - b) That all disturbed areas on the site not directly required for construction activities are temporarily hayed and seeded until the site is permanently stabilized.**
- 5. This permit grant shall expire on March 15, 2021.**

Moved by Ms. Dunne. Seconded by Dr. Dimmick. Motion approved unanimously by those Commission members present.

3. **Agricultural Request for Determination** RFD 2016-008
Shawn Stanziale
S. Meriden Rd./Academy Rd.
Construction of Farm, Farm Access & Farm Pond

Chairman de Jongh said there were some pictures that were taken showing the site and there was a field trip by some of the Commission members.

Ms. Dunne said she was on the site visit. She asked if they were going to be attending this evening (the property owner).

Ms. Simone said she thought that Shawn (Stanziale) was going to attend.

Ms. Dunne stated we walked the site – we have two groups of pictures here and she didn't know what to say except it's very wet. She said Dr. Dimmick has been through this area.

Dr. Dimmick said it's a very viable Red Maple Swamp in places.

Dr. Dimmick said the request was to put a long road across this swap just to get to the one piece of dry land in the middle of it.

Ms. Dunne said and that's the walk we took – we took the walk exactly where the driveway would be and it's a long driveway and this photographs were taken – until you come to the drier section which is the pictures with the blue tape.

Dr. Dimmick stated the blue tape shows the wetland boundaries.

Ms. Dunne said that would be the area where the greenhouses would be and the farm which if she understood correctly is not a wetland area.

Dr. Dimmick said except that the perimeter of it goes outside into the wetland boundary.

Chairman de Jongh said so they are asking for the creation of a roadway through a viable wetland to be able to create something that's outside a wetland.

Ms. Dunne stated correct.

Dr. Dimmick said as he explained to him last time the wetland exempt does not allow you to put fill into a wetland without a permit – the farming exemption.

Dr. Dimmick said under the farming exemption – if they wanted to plow it – they are allowed to plow the wetland but they are not allowed to put fill in in – that’s the way the courts have interpreted the way the law reads.

Ms. Dunne explained what the photos showed – some showed where they began the walk and the other packet showed back in the area where the greenhouses would be.

Dr. Dimmick said the places that show where the leaves are dark gray to black those indicate standing water for at least a couple of months out of the year.

Ms. Simone said the soils map from the property owner’s soil scientist does indicate this area is all wetlands so that’s something that’s been documented and they are not trying to dispute.

Dr. Dimmick said there are Tussock grass which is another indication that you water standing.

Ms. Dunne said it was the most difficult walk she’s ever taken since she’s been on the Commission.

Chairman de Jongh said that he thought based on the visual inspection of the property during the site visit and the pictures at least he was inclined to suggest that an applicant is required so we have a lot more details in terms of how they plan going about this. He said he didn’t think in anyway this was de minimis or not requiring any application or further application. He stated that was just his opinion.

Motion: That the Commission having made preliminary examination of the information provided has determined that a wetlands permit is necessary for activity on this property.

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

Dr. Dimmick said he would also convey to who would now be an applicant – that we would want wildlife biological type data because of the extensive potential impact on what seems to be a viable area.

Ms. Dunne said she had a question of procedure – did they request whether or not there would be agricultural exemption and do we need to actually move on that.

Dr. Dimmick said he thought they had done that in making our determination.

Mr. Kurtz said it's been established they can farm in the wetland but as one of the former commissioners of agriculture a man named Gazeck who farmed in a wetland and after the fact when the state discussed it with him they said he could farm in a wetland but you can't build a driveway to get there. He said and this is what they are trying to do – so the right to farm in a wetland area is a right but the problem is in constructing something which means putting a building there in a wetland to get to the field is their problem.

Dr. Dimmick said that's a classic case. He said there are crops that do quite well in a wetland if you choose the right crop.

Ms. Simone said so when she sends notification to the property owner is the Commission comfortable if she specifies that – to say that the creation of the driveway and the fill – the drainage structures and all of that requires a permit but the Commission is not saying that to farm in that area would require a permit – but the access does.

Dr. Dimmick said yes - he said he supposed you could if the driveway was essential to the farming you could drive through there you just aren't allowed to put any fill in it.

Chairman de Jongh said speaking for himself he would just be a little bit concerned if we spelled out what they can and can't do and they may very well go ahead and do that and bypass – he said he would rather work with them and try to get done what they want to have done instead of saying well the law says I can plow it so let me just plow it and then I'll just plow through it – he said he thought they would just be shooting themselves in the foot.

Ms. Simone said okay.

Chairman de Jongh said he'd rather avoid that if we can and just let them know it was the Commission's determination that their activity does require a permit and then these are the things that we need and leave it at that; they can check the meeting record for additional information.

X. NEW BUSINESS

1. Request for Determination RFD 2016-010
Van Hopson, MMI
Lot – 3, Fieldstone Court
Clearing and Grubbing

Matt Ducsay, registered professional engineer of Milone and MacBroom was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Ducsay said Fieldstone Court is located on the northern end of town located on the east side of Route 10 – it's an industrial cul-de-sac.

Mr. Ducsay handed out a copy of the Cheshire GIS map to Commission members.

Dr. Dimmick commented about his recollection of the subject property and the area of the wetland along the road. He talked about the location of the drainage on the north end of the property and the location of a culvert.

Mr. Ducsay stated that was correct the wetland was along the frontage of the lot 4 on the subdivision map of the property.

Mr. Ducsay said this is one of the few lots Fieldstone that hasn't been built upon – he said lot 3 and lot 4 – he said on lot 4 much of it is wetlands – the subject of the request for determination is lot 3.

Mr. Ducsay said the wetlands are pretty much relegated to the front lot in the western boundary of the 6.7 acres size lot.

Mr. Ducsay stated the owner of this lot is Nuzzo Builders who are engaged with Milone and MacBroom preparing a development application towards this piece.

Mr. Ducsay said in an attempt to prepare the piece and keep his guys working during down time the owner would like to do some clearing

on the property understanding that that clearing would be limited to logging the property more or less.

Mr. Ducsay said no stumping is proposed; no grading is proposed; nothing that would have potential erosion associated with it.

Mr. Ducsay said the idea is – in order to have the applicant to keep his workers busy during down time he would like to clear the hatched area (shown on the map) leaving some buffer between the adjoining properties.

Mr. Ducsay said this hatch pattern on the map represents approximately 2.8 acres of land. He said as you can see from the aerial print out the GIS you can see all of it is wooded – there's one access into the property.

Mr. Ducsay showed the location of the existing tree line based upon a survey done a number of years ago for development on this application and since then much of that has grown back in.

Mr. Ducsay said the rear portion of the property is densely wooded; the front portion is pretty much overgrown.

Dr. Dimmick said the orchard (on the site) was abandon about 50 years that used to be there. He said all of those trees are less than 50 years old – they've grown in since they abandoned the orchards.

Dr. Dimmick said he seemed to remember a stone fence somewhere on the property running north south parallel to Route 10.

Chairman de Jongh said on the aerial it looks like there is an entry road or dirt road that leads in and it looks like it was also part of the original plan.

Mr. Ducsay stated that was correct – part of the original plan was the access came in here and the building was located in this vicinity (shown on the map); he said he could tell the Commission that makes a lot of sense; he said in the new application it is going to be the same curb cut so yes there was access that was created on the property in this vicinity as depicted on the aerial and since that time much of it has been overgrown.

Chairman de Jongh said so it exists now.

Mr. Ducsay stated correct.

Mr. Ducsay said the applicant wants to go out and more or less log the property in advance of his development application in an attempt to keep his men working through the down time and that is the purpose we are here.

Dr. Dimmick said he has no problem saying you don't need a permit except we can't control any erosion and make sure erosion controls are in if we don't have a permit. He said other than that with erosion controls it's not going to be a problem.

Chairman de Jongh asked if all of the property was going to be above ground.

Mr. Ducsay said the applicant is well aware that any potential for erosion would trigger the need for an IWWC permit that is why he is not stumping the property at this time.

Dr. Dimmick said he is not stumping – just clear cutting and hauling.

Mr. Ducsay said he is clear cutting, logging, hauling and no grading and no stumping – nothing that could create potential erosion. He said we have made him very clear that that would trigger the need for S&E controls, inspection and potentially a permit as well.

Mr. Ducsay said the intent of this is to keep his men working during down time and no grading is proposed in that area. He said the closest point is this pocket wetland (shown on the map) it's about 75' away from that hatch pattern – if there was a recommendation that that distance should be increased you can clearly see based on the 50' upland review that all the activity proposed for clearing is 150' away from the delineated wetland.

Chairman de Jongh said and the entry way is that existing dirt road – that's how they are going to get in and out of the property.

Mr. Ducsay said that was correct – that's the path of least resistance and that certainly going to be any sort of traffic enters the site and performs the work we are discussing.

Ms. Simone said the road isn't shown on that plan.

Mr. Ducsay said correct – if you look at this plan closely you'll see that the existing tree line is actually shown cut back to here (shown on the map) as one time it was cut back to there as indicated on the aerial it's since grown in. He said there is a bunch of underbrush – the more mature vegetation is all located to the rear of the property here inside the previous existing tree line.

Ms. Simone said and this is based on the 1999 wetland location (the wetland delineation).

Mr. Ducsay stated that was correct.

Mr. Kurtz asked if that is when the development was approved.

Mr. Ducsay said he didn't know if it was 1999 or 2000.

Chairman de Jongh said it was dated October 1999.

Mr. Kurtz asked if it was an approved subdivision.

Ms. Simone said it was an approved subdivision and in 1999 they received a site plan approval for development on the site and they did not execute that and they are here because it's lapsed and now they are asking as opposed to coming in with an application for development – they are asking for a request for determination to clear in a particular area.

Ms. Simone said the Commission just has what's shown here so evaluate that on so there's no erosion controls shown or construction sequence.

Dr. Dimmick asked if we could do our wording requesting determination and determine no permit is necessary as long as there's no grubbing.

Ms. Simone said it would be based on what is requested and what's requested is that is no grubbing it's just going to be cutting.

Mr. Ducsay stated there would be no stumping – no grading.

Ms. Simone asked if Mr. Ducsay could explain clearing limits and if they would be marked in the field before things are cut.

Mr. Ducsay said he would provide the applicant with more or less the points of this hatch pattern if this Commission felt comfortable with the 2.8 acres he described on this hatch pattern (area) so certainly performing that clearing the applicant would be made aware of what's permitted and the limits of this property.

Mr. Ducsay said it's just to make sure he is not clearing on adjacent properties as well not to mention anywhere closer than what's depicted on the plan.

Dr. Dimmick said they could put orange tape around the trees in terms of the limit of cutting – something they could see because otherwise you are out cutting and you just keep on wondering.

Mr. Ducsay said we wouldn't want the applicant to clear on to any adjacent properties nor any closer to the wetlands so we would send out a survey crew to ensure he had adequate clearing limits staked out in the field that are in conformance with the plan we are looking at here.

Ms. Simone said and it wouldn't just be at the corners – there would also be markings along the line.

Mr. Ducsay said yes we would probably do something maybe every 50' to 100' along each line to clear so whatever makes sense to clearly give them an indication of the limit of that clearing.

Mr. Ducsay stated that this Commission will see a development application on this property is the foreseeable three months maybe but very soon there will be an IWWC application being filed as part of the development of this property.

Dr. Dimmick said based on that assurance he was going to make a motion.

Motion: That the Commission has determined that no permit is necessary for this preliminary clearing.

Moved by Dr. Dimmick. Seconded by Mr. Kurtz.

Mr. Kurtz said he said no stumping – there is going to be stumping eventually; you said you were not going to do it but you have to come back to get a permit.

Mr. Ducsay said right – just to be clear – there is going to be no stumping at this time but there will be stumping in subsequent phases of the development of this property – subsequent to obtaining this permit to do so.

Chairman de Jongh said the close proximity that you have to that small pocket down there – you mentioned that maybe every 50' will have orange tape around the trees – he said he would like something a little closer around that area – just again because it's an area closer in proximity even if the wetlands are 75' away.

Dr. Dimmick said the other thing in preparation so you can't say you haven't had time to do it – now is the time in the next couple of months to have Bill Root look at that possible vernal pond for spring amphibians so you will have that data available at the time its best to do it.

Mr. Ducsay said have when the development application is filed.

Ms. Dunne said will be able to get a copy of what you are giving your folks as far as what's being mapped out or is that not an acceptable procedure.

Mr. Ducsay said he didn't know procedurally if it was a problem but we have no problem providing a stake out sketch if Suzanne would like that for file.

Ms. Dunne said it's just because we don't have anything right now – we are just kind of talking about it.

Ms. Simone said the Commission can ask for it but the decision is not pending on that.

Mr. Ducsay said so a survey stake out sketch then of the points we are going to provide the applicant would be sufficient.

Commission members said yes.

Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

2.	Permit Application	APP	2011-010A
	Kensett Square, LLC	DOR	3/15/16
	South Main St./Old Towne Rd.		
	Permit Modification & Permit Extension	MAD	5/19/16

Chairman de Jongh stated there was no presentation on this item tonight.

Chairman de Jongh said it (the application) was recognized we received this application.

Ms. Simone said there was an approval already and this is for a proposed modification; it's currently being reviewed by the engineering department.

Ms. Simone said this item will be on the agenda for a presentation at the next meeting.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 pm by consensus of Commission members present.

Respectfully submitted:

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