

Town of Warren Inland Wetlands & Conservation Commission
Special Meeting – Minutes
Wednesday, September 9, 2015 - 7:00PM
Warren Town Hall – 50 Cemetery Road

PRESENT: Chairman Keith Jewell, Nancy Binns, Nora Hulton; Alternates Tom Caldwell and Darin Willenbrock; Stacey Sefcik, Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer.
EXCUSED: Cindy Shook
ABSENT: Dawn Blocker

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DESIGNATION OF ALTERNATES.

Chairman Keith Jewell called the regular meeting to order at 7:03 pm. The proceedings were recorded digitally, and copies are available in the Land Use Office. Alternate Darin Willenbrock was seated for Dawn Blocker, and Alternate Tom Caldwell was seated for Cindy Shook.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Richard & Josephine Kaicher, 33 Arrow Point Road – AFTER-THE-FACT Replacement of Concrete Boat Launch and Reclamation & Placement of Sand at Shoreline, & Replacement of Drainage Piping Outletting into Lake Waramaug.

Mr. Jewell re-opened the public hearing. He asked whether the applicant was willing to grant the Commission, if needed, the additional 51 days to make its decision because the Commission felt it still needed additional information. Mr. Manasse, attorney for the applicant, requested discussion before making a decision whether or not to grant the Commission additional time.

Mr. Jewell assented. Ms. Sefcik interjected that there had been a site walk July 30 at which she, Mr. Caldwell, and Chairman Jewell were present. Chairman Jewell suggested that what was observed during that walk be presented, noting, too, that the Commission had received a plan from the applicant's engineer. He stated that the site walk, taken shortly after torrential rain, showed that water from the neighboring property was draining properly; however the Committee members on the walk ran into a number of additional pipes about which they had not had any knowledge. Some erosion was seen about the railroad tie wall and around the new boat launch; photos taken by Ms. Sefcik which documented the erosion were offered. Chairman Jewell restated that the Committee felt that it needed more information and some additional remedies before the After-the-Fact Permit could be granted.

Russell Posthauer, PE, addressed the Commission and explained the plans submitted. He said that the first aspect was cleaning out the drainage pipe along the property line, which he alleged was damaged by the neighbor. Mr. Posthauer stated that the Kaichers were willing to put sod down to stabilize the area once the work was completed. Regarding the boat launch area, Mr. Posthauer stated that two potential issues were identified. The first was the potential for erosion at the outlet of the pipe. He recommended a small, stone swale at the outlet of the pipe. There was also some erosion at the corner of the grate, which he recommended filling and seeding in order to get the water to go into the grate.

Regarding the drainage pipes seen onsite, he stated that the pipe seen in the wood pile was just a piece of pipe; it did not drain anything or lead anywhere. Mr. Jewell stated that members of the Commission had seen dripping water coming out of that pipe. Mr. Posthauer stated that they had removed the pipe and visualized both ends of it. Mr. Posthauer stated that there were two pipes outletting directly into the lake, a 6-inch pipe and a 4-inch pipe. He said that 6-inch pipe definitely carried water from the roof and the yard drains around the gazebo; he surmised that the footing drain for the house was also connected to that pipe. Mr. Posthauer said that they did not observe water coming out of the 4-inch pipe, so he was surmising that it was the outlet of the French drain along the property line. The 4-inch pipe was the one that outletted into the air above the sand area; he was recommending this pipe be reset to match the grade of the 6-inch pipe so it discharged onto rocks instead. Mr. Posthauer

stated that, if the Commission felt the applicant needed to reset the retaining wall, they would be willing to do so; however, this was not reflected on the plans.

Mr. Jewell commented that, in his observation of the boat launch area during the site walk, the water was missing the grate and eroding the area to the side of the boat launch. Mr. Posthauer explained that this was the area he was proposing to fill, topsoil, and seed. Mr. Jewell reiterated his belief that an updated plan was necessary in order to reflect the repairs to the retaining wall; he also expressed the belief that perhaps some sort of plantings would be needed in order to minimize water entering the beach area and causing erosion. Mr. Posthauer asked for Mr. Jewell to identify areas of erosion, and Mr. Jewell referred him to pictures taken on the site walk which demonstrated rills in the sand from the wooden retaining wall leading down into the water. Mr. Posthauer stated that he could understand the Commission's request; however, he stated that he believed grass was the most stable thing to have in this area. He said that if they were to repair the wall, the quickest thing to do would be to re-establish grass. Mr. Jewell asked for Ms. Hulton's input, given her background in horticulture. Ms. Hulton noted that she had not been on the site walk and was not sure what the topography was of the area in question. Ms. Sefcik pointed out that this was part of the reason for Mr. Jewell's request for more information, since the survey was not to the level of an A-2, nor did it have topographic information on it. Mr. Posthauer stated that everything was located by survey and tied into the boundary data that they were able to find. Ms. Sefcik noted that several notations on the plans made it appear less than certain where things were located, such as "Drainage pipe connections are not visible in the field and cannot be depicted hereon" and "4" PVC outlet for gravel swale/underdrain (as per owner)". Mr. Posthauer stated that he could positively state that the roof and yard drains outletted through the 6-inch pipe into the lake. He said that they could determine more definitively where the pipes originated but it would require ripping up the whole yard, which he did not think the Commission would want. Ms. Sefcik stated that she believed topographic information was required.

Ms. Sefcik explained that it appeared that the drainage along the property line had been constructed without any permits, more than 5 cubic yards of sand had been deposited at the shoreline without any permits, and both the original and replacement boat launch had been constructed without any permits. While the Commission was still deliberating and had not yet rendered a decision, it would be within the Commission's purview to consider requiring all of these things to be removed. However, the Commission had requested additional information in order to determine what would be the best approach for resolving this situation going forward.

Mr. Jewell explained that he was not clear on what was causing the issues with the water coming down onto and eroding the sand at the beach area. Mr. Posthauer stated that it was due to water coming through the existing retaining wall. Ms. Sefcik asked whether it would be correct to assume that having a sandy beach area at the shoreline with more than the permitted 5 cubic yards of sand could be part of the issue. Mr. Posthauer stated that this was wrong, because instead of sand, soil would then be there eroding. Mr. Jewell and Ms. Sefcik then asked if that would be the case with stone or a more natural beachfront. Mr. Posthauer stated that, over time, soil would erode and front would move rocks at the shoreline. He said he could speak with his clients, but his recommendation would be grass for stabilization. He said it would slow the water down and provide some filtration. Mr. Posthauer said that they could repair the wall and potentially put some plantings behind the wall if that is what the Commission wanted.

Mr. Caldwell questioned why the inverts to the pipes were not demonstrated on the plans. Mr. Posthauer stated that they would have to dig up the pipes in order to verify exactly where everything was located. Mr. Posthauer said that they tested by dumping water through the roof drains; it seemed logical to assume that the footing drains were also connected. Referencing the gravel swale along the property line, Mr. Posthauer said that it helped treat

water coming off the driveway. Mr. Caldwell noted that it was in disrepair. Mr. Posthauer said that it was in disrepair because it was flooded with mud by the neighbor.

Mr. Caldwell noted that there is a trench drain in front of a concrete apron for which a new splash pad has been designed. He questioned whether a drain could be installed behind the replacement retaining wall. Mr. Posthauer said that he did not know what a drain would accomplish; he believed a new wall with some sand behind it would allow the water to infiltrate a little better. He said that they might be able to get a little negative pitch behind it. Ms. Hulton, reiterating that she had not been to the site, stated that while native plantings would be great, she felt grass was good. (15:53)

Ms. Sefcik raised the issue of the water coming from the driveway into the lake. Mr. Posthauer asserted that the only water going to the lake was roof water. Ms. Sefcik responded that regardless of where the water is coming from, it cannot be outletted directly into Lake Waramaug without treatment. Mr. Jewell concurred, stating that the Lake Waramaug Taskforce does not favor drains going directly into the lake.

Ms. Sefcik explained that while Mr. Posthauer has prepared a plan for what he believes will correct the problem, it is within the Commission's purview to hire an independent engineer to review the plans. Ms. Hulton asked who was to pay for an engineer's review. Ms. Sefcik explained that the fee was paid for by the applicant.

At this time Mr. Willenbrock stated for the record that he had a previous business relationship with Mr. Manasse, but that everyone in town probably knows him. Mr. Willenbrock felt that his relationship with Mr. Manasse would have no bearing on his ability to be impartial on this matter.

Mr. Jewell again suggested requesting a continuance in order to allow for the changes discussed to be made part of the plans, and to allow for an independent review by the Town's engineering consultant.

Mr. Manasse announced that he had a few additional points to make and ventured that in the 1991 letter, a copy of which he had in his possession, the Commission had approved a plan to prepare a dock area. He opined that nothing in the permit specified how the dock would be constructed, and he questioned how a dock area could be built without constructing a dock. Mr. Manasse stated that the area was not built up surreptitiously and that Martin Connor, the then Zoning Enforcement Officer, was there at the site reviewing what was being done. Mr. Manasse acknowledge that today's regulations may be different; however, at the time and as far as is known the dock was done under this permit. Ms. Sefcik said that no one was questioning the dock onsite; the issue was the boat launch.

Mr. Posthauer stated that his goal tonight was to leave knowing exactly what he had to do. Pointing to the site map, Mr. Posthauer said it was not known exactly how the pipe gets from the lake to the house, but that it was assumed it comes from the northern side of the property. He offered that the pipe might be located using wire snaked into the pipe and a metal detector, but he was loathe to dig up the whole pipe because it would create significant and unnecessary disturbance of the area. One solution to the problem Mr. Posthauer suggested was letting some of the water pass through stone to slow it down, or to install a twelve-inch gallery with stone under it.

Mr. Manasse stated that the Kaichers would like to market their house, but if the additional 51 days of continuance time were used, this work being discussed would not likely get done this year, which was not in anyone's interest. He stated that the areas in the wall that allow seepage have to be repaired, but an elaborate plan was not required for this. Mr. Manasse said that he thought that the Commission had enough information to approve the application tonight.

Mr. Jewell responded by saying that although the Commission was asking for 51 days, all 51 days might not be necessary. He explained that he wanted additional information on the plan prior to voting on this matter; for example, the issue of the wall and whether grass or sod to be planted, and what exactly was being done regarding treatment of water through the drainage pipe. He said that the Commission needs need the location and work documented on the plan, and he did not feel the Commission had sufficient information to vote at this meeting. Commission members then discussed possible plantings onsite and their location and the need for information regarding the retaining wall on the plans. Ms. Sefcik stated that there was also the issue regarding the drainage pipes outletting directly into the lake and water quality.

Mr. Posthauer said that installing raingardens would require a great deal of disturbance throughout the yard. He suggested that they could perhaps find the 6-inch pipe behind the house and perhaps install an underground gallery. Ms. Sefcik said that the issue was treatment of water prior to entering the lake and the Commission was not stating definitively it had to be done one way or the other. Mr. Jewell questioned what the Lake Waramaug Taskforce preferred, and he asked if they had weighed in on this matter. Ms. Sefcik stated that while nothing had been submitted in writing, she had spoken with a representative of the Taskforce who had expressed concern about drainage pipes outletting into the lake without any treatment of the water first. Ms. Binns questioned whether there were any other alternatives. Mr. Posthauer said that there were, but that nothing would be 100%; water flows downhill. He said that he would prefer to put in a plastic gallery surrounded by stones for the 6-inch pipe than try to put in raingardens throughout the yard and cause a great deal of disturbance. Mr. Posthauer said that he is not expecting to find great soil onsite, but the plastic gallery would help somewhat. He said that he could not get the 6-inch pipe to daylight before it hit the lake.

Mr. Caldwell discussed the possible use of galleries with Mr. Posthauer and the Commission. He declared for the record that he has worked in the field of excavation and he knew Mr. Posthauer from that work. Mr. Caldwell noted that the Commission did not know the condition of the soil and acknowledged that they did not know that this would fully achieve what the Commission was hoping it would. Mr. Posthauer said that they could potentially run a wire through pipe in an effort to find where it went. He suggested a 12-inch gallery with 6 inches of stone underneath. Mr. Caldwell stated that the first step would be verifying whether the soil was suitable for such a method. Mr. Posthauer stated that this could be verified when digging a hole to locate the 6-inch pipe; the best benefit that could be gotten would be that the water temperature would cool.

Ms. Sefcik questioned whether the Commission was interested in having engineering review of this application, as there was a timing element to such a request. Mr. Manasse questioned whether it would be beneficial for Mr. Posthauer to put together a plan based on what was discussed and then bring back to the Commission for their review, or was the Commission locked in on having the plan reviewed independently. Ms. Sefcik noted that a letter was in the file authorizing a continuance through September 24th. Mr. Posthauer stated that he would do some topographic survey to see if it would be possible to install a swale behind the retaining wall leading to the French drain; he did not think it would be possible, but he would check. Mr. Jewell then questioned about the status of verifying the 6-inch pipe. Mr. Posthauer said that he did not want to do that and leave a big hole open without knowing for sure what was going to be approved from there. Mr. Jewell stated that he wanted to know what the Lake Authority's opinion was on this matter. The Commission then discussed the issue of having an independent engineer review the plans.

Mr. Jewell then opened the floor to public comment. Michael Guadagno, 31 Arrow Point Road addressed the Commission. He questioned if the age of the French drain along the property

line was known. Ms. Sefcik stated that her understanding from Mrs. Kaicher was that it had been installed at the request of a previous neighbor. Mrs. Kaicher concurred that it was put in at the time the house was built. Mr. Guadagno noted that was approximately 20 years ago; he asked what it would look like since the current drain did not look very nice. Mr. Posthauer stated that he had to speak with his client as to how it would be finished; the wood had been there for a long time. Mr. Guadagno stated that there were four pipes on the Kaichers' property that he knew of; he said that two of them were not functioning and asked whether they would be removed. Mr. Posthauer stated that a pipe near the north side of the wood pile was not connected to anything. Mr. Guadagno stated that was one of the four he was aware of, and he asked whether it had been removed. Mr. Posthauer stated that they did not remove it; he stated that they believed that pipe was on Mr. Guadagno's property. Mr. Guadagno stated that the survey he had done stated that that area was not on his property. Mr. Posthauer stated that they had determined there was a problem with the survey in that area, but that he could not answer the question directly. Mr. Guadagno then asked if it were correct to state that the pipe did not come from Mr. Guadagno's property. Mr. Posthauer stated that he could not answer the question, but the pipe was sitting on the ground.

Mr. Guadagno stated that the two pipes that did work extended quite far out from the shoreline and were very unsightly. He said that he did not want to get involved in whether the pipe should be located there, as that was the Commission's decision. However, he was concerned with its appearance. He questioned whether the proposal would be another pipe sticking four feet out over the water or whether it would somehow be changed so that it looked better than it did now.

Mr. Guadagno then asked when the French drain along the property line was built. Mr. Jewell stated that it appear that the drain was built when the house was built in 1991. Ms. Sefcik stated that they did not know for sure when it was built as there was no wetlands-related permit issued pertaining to the house. He said that he just wanted to have an idea what the end result was going to look like. Mr. Posthauer stated that their plans called for having the 4-inch pipe brought down to grade. Mr. Caldwell questioned whether that would be with fittings open. Mr. Posthauer said that he was suggesting gray pipe as that provided UV protection. He said that, if the Commission preferred, they could create a riprap swale from the top of the hill, but he felt that was more disturbance. Mr. Posthauer stated that his goal was to fit the pipe to follow the grade so as to negate the need for digging. The Commission verified that it was rocks and not ledge in the area where the pipe outlets at the back side of the wood pile. Mr. Caldwell asked if there was a way to lodge additional stones around the outlet, and Mr. Posthauer responded affirmatively. Mr. Guadagno responded positively to this suggestion. Mr. Posthauer said that they could cut the pipe back and see if they could instead put stones in the area.

Mr. Guadagno then stated that the pipe that was located underneath the wood pile was not his pipe; if it was not doing anything, then he believed it should be removed.

The Commission discussed the need for this information to be detailed on the plans. Mr. Jewell reiterated his belief that the plan should be reviewed by the Commission's engineer. Ms. Binns expressed concern regarding the expense to the homeowner. Ms. Sefcik explained the process for obtaining the review. She noted that the applicant's engineer had put forward many suggestions; if the Commission was uncertain whether one method might be better than another to address the situation onsite, then that would be a reason to hire an engineer to review the plans and comment.

Mr. Caldwell said that he felt that if the plans brought back to the June 24th meeting covered everything discussed at the meeting, he did not believe engineering review was necessary. If at that time they were not complete, he would consider engineering review. Ms. Binns and Ms. Hulton agreed.

Mr. Posthauer asked for clarification as to whether or not he should dig to locate the 6-inch pipe. Mr. Caldwell suggested putting a cross-section on the plan for the gallery work Mr. Posthauer was proposing; exact location could be determined later and reflected on an as-built.

MOTION Ms. Binns, second Ms. Hulton, to continue the public hearing in the matter of **Richard & Josephine Kaicher, 33 Arrow Point Road – AFTER-THE-FACT Replacement of Concrete Boat Launch and Reclamation & Placement of Sand at Shoreline, & Replacement of Drainage Piping Outletting into Lake Waramaug** to the September 24, 2015 regular meeting; unanimously approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. July 23, 2015 regular meeting.

MOTION Ms. Binns, second Mr. Willenbrock, to approve the minutes of the July 23, 2015 regular meeting as written; unanimously approved.

B. July 30, 2015 special site walk meeting.

MOTION Ms. Binns, second Mr. Willenbrock, to approve the minutes of the July 30, 2015 special site walk meeting as written; unanimously approved.

4. PENDING APPLICATIONS:

A. Richard & Josephine Kaicher, 33 Arrow Point Road – AFTER-THE-FACT Replacement of Concrete Boat Launch and Reclamation & Placement of Sand at Shoreline, & Replacement of Drainage Piping Outletting into Lake Waramaug .

This matter was tabled to the September 24, 2015 regular meeting.

5. NEW APPLICATIONS:

A. Arthur Howland & Associates, PC for Sam Gold, LLC, 108 North Shore Road – Demolish and Reconstruct Single Family Dwelling with Associated Drainage Improvements and Modifications to Septic System and Parking Area.

Mr. Szymanski explained that the property was 4 acres and currently had an existing garage and home. They proposed to demolish the existing structures and reconstruct a new house that was located a minimum of 50 feet away from the shoreline; currently a good amount of the home was located within the shoreline setback area. The driveway would be reconfigured with two forks to the garage and the front of the house and parts of the septic system would be repaired. Mr. Szymanski said that the only work within 50 feet of the wetlands would be a small portion of the wetlands, a pump chamber and tank for the septic system, and stormwater management efforts.

Roof runoff from the south side would be routed through a series of underground infiltration units, which would overflow into a raingarden and from there, in the event of extremely large storm events, into the lake. Three additional raingardens are also proposed so as to drain the driveways and other portions of the house. Proposed plantings for the raingardens were located on the lower-left corner of the plans. Staked haybales were proposed around the limits of the construction area. Topsoil would be stockpiled adjacent to the existing driveway approximately 75 feet from the lake and would be surrounded with two rows of silt fence. Mr. Szymanski said that the site was very flat, and there was not high risk of erosion, particularly given the control measures proposed.

Mr. Szymanski offered to stake out the location of the septic system, driveway, corners of the house, and raingardens, and Ms. Sefcik accepted. Ms. Sefcik explained that the application

had been submitted to Inland Wetlands first; however, since the August 27th meeting had been cancelled due to lack of quorum, the Planning & Zoning Commission had seen the application first and scheduled a public hearing for November 10th. Additionally, the activities were taking place within the flood plain overlay zone, so a flood plain permit was also required. While the proposed house was located further back from the shoreline than the existing house, it was still located within the shoreline setback area and as such required a special exception permit. The IWC now had to determine the significance of the activities proposed; if the application was determined to be significant, a public hearing would be required. Because of the scope of work and its close proximity to the shoreline, Ms. Sefcik explained that the Commission could determine that this was significant. She noted that P&Z had requested engineering review of the application due to its complexity; the IWC might wish to consider having the application reviewed from the Inland Wetlands perspective as well.

Mr. Jewell stated that he believed the application appeared significant. Mr. Szymanski stated that there were no proposed changes to the grades planned. The leaching system would be kept as is; only a forced line would be installed. Mr. Jewell questioned whether any trees and natural features would be removed. Mr. Szymanski said that some rhododendrons might be removed, but that was it. He said that, as the application was already being reviewed for P&Z, he had no objections to that requirement.

MOTION Ms. Binns, second Mr. Willenbrock, to determine the application in the matter of **Arthur Howland & Associates, PC for Sam Gold, LLC, 108 North Shore Road – Demolish and Reconstruct Single Family Dwelling with Associated Drainage Improvements and Modifications to Septic System and Parking Area** to be a significant activity and to schedule a public hearing for the October 22, 2015 regular meeting and to request professional review of the application by the Town’s engineering consultant; unanimously approved.

B. Arthur Howland & Associates, PC for DH Partners, 8 North Shore Road – Installation of Dock at Shoreline.

Paul Szymanski, PE of Arthur Howland & Associates addressed the Commission regarding this matter. Mr. Szymanski explained that a great deal of sediment from Sucker Brook enters Lake Waramaug and spreads out to the east and west, including the area near his clients dock. He reminded the Commission that they had issued a permit for the property owner to have sediment dredged from the inlet around his dock area; this work had been completed this past summer. Despite this effort, the area was still too shallow for the property owner’s boat and he wanted to get permission to install a new floating dock at the end of his peninsula. The current dock would be removed and the steel bars anchoring it to the shoreline would be cut flush with the rocks.

Mr. Szymanski stated that the applicant had met with both adjoining property owners regarding the proposed dock location. He explained that one of the challenges for selecting a location was that the water level around the peninsula is extremely shallow. Therefore, in order to accommodate a full-size boat, the dock would have to extend out past the fifty foot limit imposed by the Zoning Regulations. Because of the underwater topography, the applicant was also going to be requesting a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to permit a dock of this length.

With regard to the Inland Wetlands application, the applicant wished to construct a new floating dock and abutment. Ms. Sefcik explained that, since a floating dock was proposed, the Commission’s review pertained more to the connection of the dock at the shoreline.

Mr. Szymanski noted that Tom McGowan of the Lake Waramaug Taskforce had written a letter in support of the application. Ms. Sefcik confirmed this, and stated that the letter was present in the file. Mr. Jewell asked how long the existing dock was; Mr. Szymanski said that it was approximately 30 feet long and 5 feet wide. The proposed dock, while longer, was in fact narrower than what currently exists. Mr. Szymanski explained that currently the water

level was only 18 inches deep sixty feet out from the end of the peninsula. He informed the Commission that his crew surveyed the entire perimeter of the peninsula and prepared a map of the underwater topography. Mr. Willenbrock questioned whether this was the case every year, or just this year, noting that the water level is unusually low this year. Mr. Jewell questioned whether the sediment coming in from Sucker Brook would simply fill in this proposed area as well. Mr. Szymanski explained that there was a significant drop off of the lake bottom where the dock was proposed. He stated that he had spoken with the Resident Trooper the patrols the lake about the plan and obtained his approval; it was felt this would actually serve as a warning to boaters that this area was shallow.

Mr. Szymanski stated that the plans would be revised in order to show the existing dock to be removed.

MOTION Ms. Binns, second Mr. Willenbrock, to receive and accept the application in the matter of **Arthur Howland & Associates, PC for DH Partners, 8 North Shore Road – Installation of Dock at Shoreline**; unanimously approved.

C. Chris Pierzga for Brian Zipp, 80 North Shore Road – Repair of Retaining Wall and Walkway at Shoreline.

Chris Pierzga addressed the Commission on behalf of the property owner. Mr. Pierzga explained that the retaining wall at the shoreline had suffered ice damage the previous winter. The wall had been built 8 years ago, and the ice had pushed the wall in and heaved it up in one location. They wished to install some rip rap in front of that section of the wall in this location, which had been done previously in another location. Additionally, he wanted to re-lay stones on the walkway at the top. He explained that they were not cemented, but were just in a sand mix. He would dig down a foot and re-lay the stones in the same location so they were flat. Lastly, he wanted to repair a hole in the hole in the wall which had been mortared previously.

Ms. Sefcik explained that the applicant had obtained a permit for virtually identical work in 2006 but it had very recently expired. Looking at the pictures submitted with the application, Mr. Caldwell questioned how recently they had been taken. Mr. Pierzga said they were taken approximately 3 weeks ago. Mr. Caldwell questioned whether the water level had receded since then beyond the footing area. Mr. Pierzga responded affirmatively.

The Commission verified that this could be acted on at the September 24th meeting. It was discussed that the work should be done at a dry time of year while the water level was down.

MOTION Ms. Binns, second Ms. Hulton, to receive and accept the application in the matter of **Chris Pierzga for Brian Zipp, 80 North Shore Road – Repair of Retaining Wall and Walkway at Shoreline**; unanimously approved.

6. INLAND WETLANDS ENFORCEMENT OFFICER’S REPORT:

The Commission briefly reviewed Ms. Sefcik’s report for the previous month. Mr. Jewell informed the Commission that a new alternate member would be starting at the September 24th meeting.

7. CORRESPONDENCE:

The Commission reviewed notification from the Town of Washington regarding maintenance work being performed by the Lake Waramaug Taskforce within 500 feet of the Town line on Arrow Point Road. They also reviewed notification from the Town of Kent regarding an application to replace an existing metal culvert along Carter Road. Traffic may be diverted onto Warren roads while the work is being completed.

8. Discussion of Beach Maintenance Best Management Practices Guidelines:

Mr. Jewell requested that commission members review the document for the next regular meeting on September 24th.

MOTION Ms. Binns, second Ms. Hulton, to adjourn the meeting at 8:30PM; unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

**Stacey M. Sefcik
Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer**