



## INLAND WETLANDS & CONSERVATION COMMISSION

50 Cemetery Road Warren, Connecticut 06754

860 868 7881 x 117

Lower Level Meeting Room, Town Hall

Regular Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 27, 2021 – 7:00 pm

### ***1. Call to Order, Seating of Members, and Designation of Alternates***

**PRESENT** were Mr. Chairman John Favreau, Ms. Shook vice chairperson, Ms. Holton, Ms. Hodza, Ms. Binns and Ms. Tanner were present. Ms. Tanner was seated for Mr. Caldwell as an alternate. **ABSENT** were Thomas Caldwell and Alternate Darin Willenbrock. Mr. Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

### ***2. Consideration of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting – April 22, 2021***

Ms. Holton made a MOTION to APPROVE the minutes as presented, Ms. Tanner SECONDED the motion. A vote was held; all were in favor with the exception of Ms. Shook who abstained due to lack of presence at the meet. The Motion CARRIED, the minutes were approved as presented.

### ***3. Additions to the Agenda (Includes applications received by the Land Use Office by May 26 at 4:00 pm, 2/3 vote required)***

The commission received IWC application 21-05-03 26 D. North Shore Road, assessors map 43 Lot 7. Lloyd Holt, general manager of the Washington Club, removal of fence and proposed re-landscaping between Holt beach and the Warren town beach. Date of receipt 5-27-2021. Ms. Shook made a motion to add the received proposal to the agenda, Ms. Binns SECONDED the motion, a vote was held; all were in favor. The MOTION CARRIED, the item was added to the agenda.

### ***4. Pending Applications***

***IWA# 21-02-02 / 39 Arrow Point Road, Assessor's Map 41, Lot 4 / Paul Szymanski, P.E., on behalf of the Gally Family Irrevocable Real Estate Trust of 100 Newbury Court, Concord, MA / Proposed construction of a single family dwelling, detached garage, driveway, septic system, landscaping and related appurtenances. (Date of Receipt by Inland Wetlands Commission 2/25/2020; Plans revised on 3/24/2021).***

Mr. Szymanski, P.E. on behalf of the Gally Family was present and presented to the commission that the proposal has not changed for 60 days; and was last updated March 24, 2021. Mr. Chairman asked if the application should be further discussed or if a motion should be made to have it be brought to a public hearing. Ms. Hodza stated it was up to the commission. Mr. Chairman stated that given the level of disruption in the proposed area, the placement of the lake as well as additional correspondence received, and the high level of interest from the general public, Mr. Chairman asked the commission to consider having a public hearing. Ms. Hodza added that the correspondence received was dated this afternoon. Mr. Szymanski stated he would like the opportunity to comment on the letter received. Mr. Szymanski stated that after submission on February 4th of the application, revisions were requested and made for the March meeting. At the last meeting an extension was requested and Mr. Szymanski complied, Mr. Szymanski stated that Mr. Hayden and he had met at the site and requested Mr. Hayden share any concerns at that time and he reported he had none. Mr. Szymanski stated that he was extremely disappointed in the receiving of the letter from the task force this afternoon as he has worked to comply with the Lake Waramaug Task Force and after 112 days the commission feels

there is potential for significant impact but not received any statements from the commission during February, March and April's meetings. Mr. Szymanski stated it was unfair to his clients/applicants and to himself to receive correspondence as such. Mr. Szymanski stated that the proposal had 3 levels of sedimentation and erosion controls, silt fence, staked hay bales, and coir wattles. All of the roof runoff is fully infiltrated for the 100 year storm effect, the patio fully infiltrates the runoff and a stone infiltration trench is proposed around as well. A planted buffer with supplemental planting plan is also proposed with a small lawn area. Mr. Szymanski read the correspondence letter received for the record. Mr. Szymanski stated that the commission may request a public hearing if they receive concerned correspondence from 25 people or more, or if the commission believes that the proposal would have a significant impact on the wetlands/resource. Mr. Szymanski stated that the word is "significant" not an impact, but a "significant" impact and that he request the commission be specific in how they believe there will be significant impact. Mr. Szymanski stated that Mr. Hayden's letter does not give specific examples or explanations of impact. Ms. Hodza stated that she did receive the bond that was asked for, however they also requested a title block for the planting plan and it has not yet been received, and also requested information regarding what is allowed in the radius, as well as a prudent and feasible alternative, for example, shifting the septic fields north. Mr. Szymanski stated that the first two requests were through planning and zoning and that the request for prudent and feasible alternative analysis is done when a public hearing is called; a public hearing is called for a 25 person petition or a significant impact. At that point, they would look at a prudent and feasible alternative if there were an adverse impact on the resource; Mr. Szymanski stated that he did not believe there was an adverse impact based on the data submitted. In this case Mr. Szymanski stated his professional opinion was that there was no impact to the resource, as there are buffers to the resource, fully infiltrating all the runoff within several hundred feet, maintained the majority of the forested area within 50 feet of the lake with the exception of one tree, and provided supplemental plantings. Mr. Szymanski stated that due to this there is no other option which would cause any fewer disturbances, for example moving the house 50 ft., they would still be utilizing all the same methods. Mr. Szymanski stated that he dimensioned having 17ft of lawn about 100ft wide, Mr. Szymanski asked the commission to look at the existing homes nearby. Ms. Hodza asked what the buffer zone was in the first plan submitted, Mr. Szymanski stated the first plan had significantly more lawn, which technically could be considered an alternative, but in order to achieve from a planning and zoning perspective, the lawn area was decreased. Ms. Hodza stated because the buffer for zoning was more for a special exception to build that close to the lake. Mr. Szymanski agreed. Ms. Shook asked how many houses in the surrounding area are further than 50 feet back. Mr. Szymanski stated that there are houses that are near the road, and lawn to the water's edge that's fully fertilized houses with roof runoff that isn't treated in any way, with patios with discharge right towards it. Mr. Szymanski stated it was necessary to look at the big picture. Mr. Szymanski stated that a house that's further away with an acre of lawn to the lakes edge that would be completely adverse from an impact perspective. Ms. Shook asked if this house would be closer than any other around it. Mr. Szymanski stated he was unsure. Mr. Szymanski stated that Mr. Gary Johnsons is a similar distance away and was approved 3 to 4 years ago by the commission with a series of rain gardens. Mr. Szymanski stated that when you are within 50-100 ft. of the lake the planning and zoning commission requires a special exception with a public hearing process and maintain 50% of the area within 100ft of the lake in a vegetative state. If you chose to go closer to the lake the commission requires extra protections. Ms. Shook stated Mr. Szymanski has done that. Mr. Szymanski stated that was correct he had a 50% buffer. Ms. Holton asked Mr. Chairman if a petition was received. Mr. Chairman stated there had not been a petition received. Mr. Szymanski stated that he believed Mr. Hayden's letter was the only

correspondence of concern received. Ms. Hodza stated that verbal comments have been shared, such as Mr. Connor who sent emails regarding concern which she believed were read into the record. Mr. Szymanski stated he did not believe that was true. Ms. Hodza stated she had received an email from Mr. Connor regarding concern of the impact to the wetlands however it was sent to her prior/in reference to a planning and zoning meeting even though it was applicable to the inland wetland commission. Mr. Chairman read Mr. Connors letter into the record. Ms. Hodza stated that she had pulled up an aerial view of the location. Mr. Szymanski discussed another property (10 North Shore Rd) and the efforts made via sedimentation and erosion control plans as well as supplemental buffer zones developed as compared to the current property being discussed. Ms. Shook stated she felt that a public hearing was unnecessary. Ms. Holton stated that if there had not been a petition, even in setting the property back further it would add more lawn/fertilizer. Ms. Hodza stated she had received a phone call regarding a concerned citizen who asked about the possibility of having a public hearing based on a petition. Ms. Hodza stated that because of the additional rules put in place due to covid19, even though the time that passed for the commission to set a public hearing, that the application was started during the executive order and therefore there would be an additional 90 days and then if that person wanted to put together a 25 person commission that person would still have time to do so. Ms. Binns stated that there is significance in that this phone call was made and no petition was created. Mr. Chairman stated that the response was untimely; especially Mr. Hayden's who part of the process was and on the zoom calls, and that Mr. Szymanski's statements were very well taken. Mr. Chairman stated there has been opportunity for the public to send correspondence and provide feedback. Ms. Hodza stated that it seems that the commission felt a public hearing may not be sent, and given that the commission has the duty to fully vet the application tonight and act in the public's best interest and according to the regulations. Ms. Hodza reminded the commission they need not make a decision tonight. Ms. Holton asked if there were any other concerns unaddressed from the last meeting. Mr. Chairman stated that the question that came up last meeting was prudent and feasible alternatives which was somewhat discussed. Mr. Chairman stated the patio was porous pavers with no roof. Mr. Szymanski stated that was correct and there was a stone infiltration trench surrounding it. Mr. Chairman asked the distance from the lake of the actual house. Mr. Szymanski stated it was 76-77ft at the closest point. Mr. Szymanski also reminded the commission he had volunteered to give the commission reports on a weekly basis and on a storm greater than a quarter inch in size. Ms. Holton stated that she was surprised the task force was just weighing in on the last meeting considering the project was proposed in February. Ms. Hodza shared that Mr. Hayden did experience some rather serious side effects from the covid19 vaccine and that may have been what caused delay in the task forces response. Ms. Holton asked what the timeline would be if someone presented a petition. Mr. Chairman stated that if a petition had been received the public hearing would have been set for next month. Ms. Tanner stated it seemed the proposal has taken a lot of precautions. Ms. Holton stated that she had expected to hear from concerned residents within the past month but was surprised to not have received any further correspondence. Ms. Shook made a MOTION to proceed forward and approve the application, Ms. Binns SECONDED the motion. Mr. Chairman asked if there was further discussion prior to a vote, Ms. Hodza stated the commission could set the bond based on Mr. Szymanski's estimate or higher if they felt necessary. Ms. Hodza stated that Mr. Szymanski offered to make further conditions, namely timely inspections on a schedule determined by the commission. Mr. Szymanski reminded the commission that he had offered once per week inspections and reports after a storm of a quarter inch or greater. Ms. Hodza asked if the applicants had a construction manager. Mr. Szymanski stated that was to be determined. Mr. Chairman asked if those reports would be throughout the construction. Mr.

Szymanski answered yes, until it was fully stabilized. Mr. Chairman asked if the house had been designed based on the proposed footprint. Ms. Hodza stated she had received schematic design however there was no architect's name and she was not happy with what was presented. Mr. Chairman asked if it was the same size. Mr. Szymanski stated it was the same size. Ms. Hodza stated that there are differences in the shape and a screened porch, however it is smaller, but not what is proposed. Mr. Chairman asked if it was within the confines of what is delineated in the footprint. Ms. Hodza stated that was correct. Mr. Chairman asked how much it reduced the impermeable surface as presented. Mr. Szymanski stated about 10%. Mr. Chairman asked if it was a smaller footprint than what was presented. Ms. Hodza stated that the motion on the floor now was to approve the application without conditions, and asked if conditions should be applied. Ms. Shook withdrew her former motion and made a new MOTION to approve the application with the following stipulations, a bond of 13,500, a weekly report is provided and/or a report is provided after any event of a quarter inch or more of rain throughout the process until the site is stabilized. Ms. Holton SECONDED the motion, Ms. Hodza asked if the commission felt that 13,500 were acceptable. Mr. Chairman asked Mr. Szymanski if the bond covered all three erosion controlled/ disturbed areas. Mr. Szymanski stated that it covered all three as well as hydro seeding the entire disturbed area. A brief discussion was held on how to know if the amount was enough, Mr. Chairman stated that he felt it may not be enough. Mr. Szymanski stated they took into consideration every square foot. Mr. Chairman stated they should raise it to 15,000. Ms. Shook amended her motion to move the bond to 15,000 as opposed to 13,500 with the other conditions remaining. Ms. Binns SECONDED the motion. A vote was held, all were in favor, the MOTION CARRIED. The application was APPROVED.

***IWA# 21-04-01 / 27 Cornwall Road, Map 50 Lot 15 / Riga Construction for Renaud Charrin / Dig trench along length of driveway, bury power lines within the regulated area. (Date of Receipt by Inland Wetlands Commission 4/22/21) c. IWA #21-04-02 / 11 Cornwall Road, Map 50 Lot 18 / Richard Rosiello for Vanderbilt Partners LLC, 55 Hudson Yards, New York, New York / Landscaping with stone walls, steps, and sitting area in the regulated area. (Date of Receipt by Inland Wetlands Commission 4/22/21)***

Ms. Hodza stated that the applicant's contractor, Roger Headman called and asked if it was necessary to attend the meeting and she stated that he did not have to be present for the application to be decided upon however if there were any questions it would be helpful for someone to be there to answer anything that comes up. Mr. Chairman reminded the commission of some details of the application and asked if there was further discussion or questions. Ms. Holton made a MOTION to APPROVE, Ms. Binns SECONDED the motion; a vote was held. All were in favor, the MOTION CARRIED. The application was APPROVED.

***IWA #21-04-02 / 11 Cornwall Road, Map 50 Lot 18 / Richard Rosiello for Vanderbilt Partners LLC, 55 Hudson Yards, New York, New York / Landscaping with stone walls, steps, and sitting area in the regulated area. (Date of Receipt by Inland Wetlands Commission 4/22/21)***

Mr. Rosiello, representing the applicant; introduced himself and introduced the proposal by providing some of the details of the application. Ms. Hodza stated she had completed a site walk and was familiar with the site and Mr. Chairman also walked the site. Mr. Rosiello stated there was a silt fence along the perimeter and also proposed some areas may also require hay bales. Mr. Chairman asked if it was delineated in the plan, Mr. Rosiello confirmed. Ms. Hodza stated that her only concern was pea stone. Mr. Rosiello stated that there was no pea stone, the areas would be seeded and slopes would be slated with no mow fescue, level with the fire pit would be sod. Mr. Rosiello stated there were two different seed mixes that would be used, and

they were native. Ms. Shook asked if the no mow fescue was native, Mr. Rosiello stated that it was. A discussion was held on no mow fescue. Ms. Shook made a MOTION to APPROVE the application, Ms. Holton SECONDED the motion; a vote was held. All were in favor, the MOTION CARRIED. The Application was APPROVED.

## **5. New Applications**

- a. *IWA #21-05-01 / 44 Arrow Point Road, Assessor's Map 41, Lot 9 / Jehv Gold for Claire S. Gold / Construction of a screened porch, partially within the regulated area. (Date of Receipt by Land Use Officer 5/11/2021, Date of Receipt by IWC 5/27/2021)* Mr. Gold was present on behalf of his mother Mrs. Claire Gold. Mr. Gold explained the proposed screened in porch stating that it would be attached to the house and that the corner closest to the lake is between 95 and 105 feet to the lake depending on the time of year. Mr. Gold stated that the only excavation will be the moving of two shrubs, the porch will be above ground as well as the rafters supporting it. There will be three cement footings placed into the ground to meet code. Mr. Gold stated that the roof of the porch will continue the roofline of the house and there exists drainage off the roof which will catch the water from the screened in porch. The porch will not have plumbing, only an electric outlet. Ms. Shook asked for clarity on the roofline, a discussion was held in reference to the diagrams presented in regards to the drainage from the roofline. A discussion was held regarding the different footings that can be used. Ms. Shook asked if the door would remain going into the house, Mr. Gold stated that it would. Ms. Shook asked if the drain would come in front of the door, Mr. Gold stated there would be a cheat wall. Mr. Chairman asked what it would add to the impermeable surface of the property percentagewise. Ms. Hodza stated she did not ask Mr. Gold to do that. Mr. Chairman stated they would need that calculation. Ms. Hodza told the applicant he would need to calculate the total impermeable surface on the property and determine a percentage. Ms. Hodza stated that wetlands does not regulate the amount of impervious surface, it just factors into drainage and runoff. Mr. Chairman stated it is a good indication of what mitigation is being done for runoff, especially around the lake. Ms. Hodza agreed, however stated that the application does not require it to be calculated. Mr. Chairman stated the commission prefers to have it. A discussion was held on the percentage allowed of impervious surface. Mr. Gold stated to keep grass from growing into screened in porch he was planning to put down a sheet of plastic covered with gravel. Ms. Hodza stated that the site is very level and well away from the lake and the chances of an adverse effect on the lake is very minimal however the regulations state that 100ft is the minimum distance before needing to present to the commission. Ms. Shook made a MOTION to RECEIVE and ACCEPT the application and that we have requested additional information, Ms. Tanner SECONDED the motion; a vote was held.
- b. *IWA #21-05-02 / 28 Reed Road, Assessor's Map 17 Lot 43 / Demetrio Meduri for Star Meduri of 167 Town Hill Rd / Construct Driveway within the regulated area. (Date of Receipt by Land Use Officer 5/24/2021, Date of Receipt by IWC 5/27/2021)*

Mr. Meduri, representing the applicant Ms. Star Meduri was present. Mr. Meduri stated that he was in the process of building a home on the property via access through an easement of a neighbor's driveway. Ms. Hodza stated that the proposed driveway would be in the upland review area, and verified that Mr. Michael Alex composed the drawing. Ms. Hodza stated that the site has a slight slope. Mr. Meduri stated that it was a slight incline and noted there was a small stream that goes into the pond 60-70ft away and therefore assumed he would need to put

up a silt fence. Ms. Hodza asked what the surface would be, Mr. Meduri stated that he would do gravel and that he would need to pave the apron. Ms. Tanner asked where the pond was, Mr. Meduri stated it was on the property next door. Ms. Hodza stated that the wetlands are marked, and he was referring to a stream beyond the property. Mr. Meduri described the access point he was utilizing, however the neighbor blocked access and described the route of the stream. Mr. Chairman verified where the edge of the wetlands existed on the maps, as it would be necessary for each part of the driveway it would be necessary to know the distance between the edge of the driveway and the edge of the wetlands. Ms. Hodza stated that Mr. Meduri needed to have Mr. Alex indicate the distances more clearly at each marker. Mr. Chairman asked that there also be indications of erosion control methods. Mr. Meduri stated that there wouldn't be runoff as the slope goes toward the road, Ms. Hodza confirmed. Ms. Hodza stated that the building site is all open field, and therefore there would be little disturbance with regard to the removal of any vegetation. Ms. Shook asked to verify the driveway materials. Mr. Meduri explained the topsoil would be removed and gravel applied. Mr. Chairman asked where they would stockpile; Mr. Meduri stated he could put it by the barn, to keep it from the wetlands. Ms. Holton asked if it was going to be removed or utilized in the property, Mr. Meduri stated due to the ledge he may not be able to get a full basement on the site and therefore he would utilize the stockpile to slope away from the house. Mr. Meduri pointed out the location of the septic as well. Ms. Hodza reiterated that the commission was requesting the location of the stockpile, the distance from the wetlands markers to the driveway and to draw in the erosion control fence. Ms. Hodza stated this information would be required prior to the June 24th meeting. Ms. Shook made a MOTION to RECEIVE and ACCEPT the application, Ms. Binns SECONDED the MOTION. A vote was held, all were in favor; the MOTION CARRIED. The application was RECEIVED and ACCEPTED.

***c. IWA #21-05-03/26 D. North Shore Road/ assessors map 43 Lot 7/ Boyd Holt, general manager of the Washington Club, removal of fence and proposed re-landscaping between Holt beach and the Warren town beach. (Date of receipt 5-27-2021.)***

Mr. Holt, general manager of the Washington Club was present and introduced the proposal. Mr. Holt stated that in the wetland area members had planted non-native species and bark mulched it for many years. Mr. Holt's proposal is to remove all the non-native plants as well as the fence and replant with all native species in order to end up with a privacy screen that is all native. Mr. Chairman asked what plants were existing there. Ms. Hodza stated that she had visited the site with Mr. Holt as well as Mr. Don Murphy, parks and rec director, stated that there is a stream that runs between the two properties and the description of the overplanting and abuse of location was well described. Ms. Hodza stated that the fence that is currently there must come down. Ms. Hodza stated that her only concern is the birch tree. Mr. Holt stated that the center is actually dead, with 5 growths coming out of it, 3 of which are dead. Mr. Holt stated that the plan is to replace it with a native river birch. Mr. Chairman asked what the plan was for the removal as well as the mitigation plan for the disruption washing into the lake. Mr. Holt stated that he would put it out to bid to whatever landscaper would do the best job. Mr. Chairman stated that it was the responsibility of the commission to mitigate the potential disruption, impact or runoff to the lake so therefore how the plantings would be dug up, where sediment and erosion control such as silt fencing would be located. Mr. Chairman stated that the plantings make sense, it's the activity and process is a concern to the commission. Ms. Hodza stated that the landscape architect would know how to show an additional map showing the protections of the lake during the work and indicate which method would be utilized and how the trees would be removed, how long they may stay on the site, be chipped, etc. Mr. Holt

stated that due to the season, they would start after Labor Day and that the entire process is proposed to be about 3 days of work. Ms. Shook asked how they would be dug up. Mr. Holt stated that they would remove plantings and the tree in any way the commission requested. Mr. Chairman stated that it may be beneficial to discuss with one or two landscape architects how they would best go about doing it because it would be necessary to know if it would be backhoes or hand dug. Mr. Holt stated he believed there were at least four trees that would not be able to be removed by hand. Ms. Shook asked where the intermittent watercourse was located. Mr. Chairman stated it basically follows the line of the fence. Mr. Chairman explained that without adequate protection controls, a heavy downpour going through the intermittent waterway it would carry sediment into the lake. Ms. Hodza stated that she would send an email of what conditional information and the concerns of the commission between now and the next meeting. A discussion was held on finding a landscaper and if an engineer was necessary. Ms. Binns made a MOTION to RECEIVE and ACCEPT the application, Ms. Holton SECONDED the motion. A vote was held, all were in favor; the MOTION CARRIED. The application was RECEIVED and ACCEPTED.

**6. *Other Business Proper a. Discussion of DEEP's Natural Diversity Data Base for State Listed Species Review and possible incorporation into application procedures.***

Ms. Hodza stated that this program performs reviews of state listed species. Ms. Hodza stated that some towns require that any work being done within the circles of critical habitats or hatch marks, there would be an additional application to the DEEP. Ms. Hodza stated that it is a quick application that she would do for the applicant and the turnaround is rapid in response from DEEP in regards to if there is impact to the species within the area. Ms. Hodza stated that it may be something the commission wanted to look at as some of the surrounding towns are participating in the process. Mr. Chairman asked what the species were, Ms. Hodza stated that she was not aware but it would be information that could be obtained. Mr. Chairman pointed out a location and stated that native brown trout are within that protected area. Mr. Chairman stated that in regards to erosion control within that area as it applies to work being done on the roadways; it had taken 2 years in negotiations with DEEP to approve the paving of the 341 roadway. Mr. Chairman asked if it was an onerous addition to request applicants to engage in the process of approval from DEEP. Ms. Hodza stated that the inland wetlands regulations are onerous for an applicant as they are, however the purpose is that things are difficult because things are important. Mr. Chairman asked if it creates a further burden on Ms. Hodza as land enforcement. Ms. Hodza stated she would not have brought it to the commission if that was so, and that it was up to the commission to add this as part of their review process. Ms. Binns asked why it would be onerous to add the additional application, Mr. Chairman stated that the concern was that the DEEP has already allocated the locations of concern and therefore they may deny an application due to the protected area even in the event IWC may approve. Mr. Chairman stated that if they don't comply with the DEEP request, they may receive correspondence of concern of disturbance of the wildlife. Ms. Binns stated that was different than locations determined by DEEP as critical habitat. Ms. Shook gave an example of what concerns the DEEP might have in regards to critical habitats as they relate to specific applications. Mr. Chairman stated that if they were not to comply, it may open them up for potential liability in not recognizing it as were not requiring it. Ms. Shook said especially along the lake at arrow point. Mr. Chairman stated that it also would give them more flexibility in if something is disturbing the environment or not, with the DEEP behind them. A discussion was held amongst the members in reference to the maps provided and which areas are considered protected critical habitats. Mr. Chairman asked that it be determined if Kent, Washington, Goshen and other surrounding towns were participating. Ms. Hodza stated that in her previous

experience, no applications were denied. A discussion was held regarding insecticide and its effect on the lake and wildlife.

**7. *Inland Wetlands Officer's Report (April 26 – May 26, 2021)***

Ms. Hodza stated she had an update on applicant David Diwik. Ms. Hodza read a letter from the applicant for the record. Ms. Hodza reminded the commission that when a zoning permit is issued, there is an expiration of 5 years and therefore the commission can add a time frame for issuing of approval of permits with a minimum of 2 years.

Ms. Hodza stated that she sent out a 2.5 page letter in regard to violation at 89 North Shore rd. A homeowner drained his pond directly into Lake Waramaug. The resident responded to the first notice and Ms. Hodza spoke on the phone to the resident. Mr. Hayden was also informed. Ms. Hodza visited the site and the entire 8,000 square foot pond was dry. During discussion with the resident he reported that he did not realize it was not legal and that the reason he did so was to rake out the leaves.

**8. *Communications Received***

None.

**9. *Public Comment***

None.

**10. *Adjournment***

Ms. Shook made a MOTION to ADJOURN. Ms. Holton SECONDED the motion, a vote was held. All were in favor, the MOTION CARRIED. Mr. Chairman called the meeting to a close at 9:01 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Melissa Woodward  
Recording Secretary  
Dated: 6/3/2021