

SOUTHINGTON INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY  
 Public Hearing & Regular Meeting  
 Thursday, September 3, 2009  
 7:00 pm - Town Hall Council Chambers  
 75 Main Street, Southington, Connecticut

MINUTES

The Southington Inland Wetlands Agency held a regular meeting on Thursday, September 3, 2009. Chairperson James Theresa Pereyo called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Councilpersons were present, viz:

Jim Sullivan, Bill Barry, Chris Borowy, Ted Cabata, Kevin Conroy and John DeMello

Alternates:

Anne Hulick  
 William Camp

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Joseph DePaolo, Assistant Town Attorney  
 David Lavallee, Assistant Town Planner

A quorum was determined.

THERESA PEREYO, Chair, presiding:

**PUBLIC HEARING**

4. Public Hearing Items:

A. MA #134 - Application of Lovley Development, Inc., seeking to amend the Inland Wetlands Map to reflect the findings of Soil Scientist Dave Lord in association with the development of a 44 lot Open Space Subdivision.

Attorney DePaolo recused himself from this item and left the bench to sit in the audience.

Severino Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates representing the applicant, presented.

The wetlands were delineated by David Lord, soil scientist. The flags were located by transit and certified by Kratzert & Jones as shown on the existing conditions map. (Indicated)

The map amendment application was provided with a report. You visited the site on August 20, 2009. David Lord answered questions in the field. A few days later, the Chairperson, David Lavallee and I and David Lord again visited the site to do additional investigations.

The result of the investigations are reflected on the map. On the easterly side there were additional flags placed a few feet to the west.

David Lord is here to answer any questions you have in addition to what was discussed in the field.

Mr. Bovino had a copy of a 1948 aerial map showing how the property was used in 1948 and it clearly shows that the old tree line was more west of what is currently there and came to the brook.  
(Submitted for the record)

On the easterly side of the property it used to be plowed right to the property line and now we have growth and a wooded area. As you know we are not touching any of the wooded area.

David Lord, professional soil scientist and environmental consultant. My company is Soil Resource Consultants, Meriden, CT.

There is a wetland delineation report which is on file dated July 7, 2009. It concerns the findings of the original on site that was done on June 9<sup>th</sup> of this year. There is a description of the soils found both in the wetland and non wetland area.

Subsequent to the commission taking a site walk, we had the opportunity - the Chair, Mr. Lavallee, Sev and I - to look at the area of the site where the wetlands originally came out a short distance into the field. Flags 113 and 114 were the focus - the area between them. After a number of additional borings we did on that trip, we agreed to move between flags 113 and 114 to show the extent of wetlands further to the west and demarcate with those with Flags 113A, 113B and 113C. From 113C we hooked back into 114 and went back to the tree line. That's the change that's taking place from the original submission.

I'll answer questions.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response

(Those speaking in opposition to the application)

Richard Post, 193 Winding Ridge. I will pass around my comments. I am a professional geologist. I am here solely to help insure that the town be good stewards of what is left of our open space and land. I'm not representing anybody but myself.

The Chair advised at this juncture we are speaking about the wetland map amendment.

The Ass't Planner said this is the amendment to the line based on the soils. There is a change to speak under Item 6 under the regular agenda which would be the inland wetland application for the project and is probably the more appropriate time for you to speak.

Mr. Post agreed he would speak later.

Mr. Sullivan made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Borowy seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

The public hearing portion of the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 o'clock, p.m.

#### REGULAR MEETING

The Chair reseated Attorney DePaolo.

A quorum was determined.

#### 4. Approval of Minutes - Regular Meeting: August 6, 2009

Mr. DeMello made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Mr. Sullivan seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

- Special Meeting: August 20, 2009

Mr. Borowy made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Mr. Cabata seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. DeMello abstaining.

#### 5. Treasurer's Report

Mr. Barry gave the Treasurer's Report to date. Mr. Sullivan made a motion to approve the Treasurer's Report as read. Mr. DeMello seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

#### 6. Reports from Public, Press and Ex-Officio Members regarding items scheduled for action.

Richard Post, 193 Winding Ridge. Submitted his comments for the record. The comments are on file in the Town Planner's Office.

Joel Carmichael, 228 Monarch Drive. I have been out in that field many times and the reality is is that field has a lot of standing water. My concern and I am here today to ask the builder and

to ask this commission, at some point more than likely there'll be a house and that backyard will but up against my side yard.

My concern is that the standing water and any kind of runoff water from the roof, et cetera, I would like to insure that the property would be pitched in a certain way so that water would not come into my backyard.

My backyard is pretty much moist throughout the year. I am concerned that if houses are built and pitched to come down into my property, I would like to have some type of buffer or have it pitched some other way so it would stay away from my property.

As it stands right now my basement is dry. I'd like to keep it that way.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. Post said a thought would be to help him over here with an earthen berm or something that would not allow runoff into the immediate area. Plant a few more trees to put a buffer between the two neighborhoods. It might look nice, too.

Discussion.

7. Items from the public hearing:

A. MA #134 - Application of Lovley Development, Inc., seeking to amend the Inland Wetlands Map to reflect the findings of Soil Scientist Dave Lord in association with the development of a 44 lot Open Space Subdivision.

Attorney DePaolo recused himself and left the bench to sit in the audience.

In response to a query by Mr. Conroy, the stream location was pointed out nothing it was 100' or more inside the tree line.

Mr. Borowy asked if anyone could tell when the land was actively farmed. Just not growing grass for hay, but farmed. More than ten years, I would guess. Mr. Bovino said since 1969, when he came to town, it's been like that.

Mr. Cabata made a motion to approve MA #124. Mr. Conroy seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 to 1 with an abstention by Mr. Barry.

8. Inland Wetland/Floodplain Filling Applications:

A. Information/Action - IW #1162/FF #217, application of Dean Michanczyk seeking to demolish a building, add to a building, and reconstruct a parking lot within 100' of the Qunniapiac River. Property located at 120 W. Main Street

The Chair reseated Attorney DePaolo.

Attorney Bryan Meccariello, 142 North Main Street, representing the applicant. Tonight we have Rich Mehan from Mehan & Gooden who was at the site walk as well as Jim Sakonchick from Kratzert, Jones.

Jim Sakonchick, professional engineer with Kratzert, Jones & Associates, representing the applicant. I would like tonight to describe our proposed construction and why we feel we are able to build what we propose in a floodplain as well as install incidental things like lights in the parking lot and other improvements in the floodplain.

(Passed around a packet of information for the Commissioners and the record to follow along with his presentation.) Packet on file in the Town Planner's office.

After explanation, he submitted into the record the table and the cross sections which are important because they identify Sections U & T as appropriate sections just south of West Main Street.

In conclusion, we believe that we are able to show that our activities here are not going to have any kind of detrimental effect on the river to handle floods.

Thank you.

Richard Mehan, Mehan & Gooden Engineers & Surveyors in Manchester, CT. We prepared this plan in conjunction with Torres Engineering.

Walked through an overview of the entire site. Identified the boundaries of the property.

The parcel is 2.04 acres. The floodway line was pointed out. The floodway contains about 1.03 acres of land. Most of the land in the floodway will be somehow worked. Work will occur in most of that area except for a 15' buffer which will run along the side of the river. There will be some work in that buffer as per a request at the site walk. Mr. Lavallee suggested that we might plant some barberries and some other species of shrub in that area to stabilize it. That has been done.

In response to suggestions made by this commission and the staff, we've made numerous revisions to the plans. He submitted several sets of plans showing the revisions and explaining the revisions which were in response to suggestions by this commission and town staff.

(End of Tape #1, Side A)

(Beginning of Tape #1, Side B)

Mr. Mehan continued explaining the floodway line.

On Sheet 2 we did add the floodplain line to the southwest of the floodway itself. It also shows the piers sitting underneath the proposed addition to the restaurant and building.

Sheet 3 added the flood elevations. Explained that represents the general flow line of a potential flood within the floodway. That was in response to town staff comments.

The bunker foundation was discussed. In response to a suggestion by the Town Engineer, we have elected to cut a small groove into that concrete bunker to allow conveyance of the floodway. Explained.

We also redid the calculations for the cuts and fills for the entire site and it also ended up in some slight regarding. The site is lower and the bunker will be cut to allow conveyance of the flood at that point.

Sheet 4 is the landscaping plan. We added within the buffer area some bayberry and other species of shrub as well as in the back of the property, the basin to which the snow drainage is going to flow at the south end of the property, we're including some plantings in that basin.

The packet I handed tonight to Mr. Lavallee includes a list of revisions to all the plans.

He explained lastly the cut and fill the calculations. In order to accomplish what we want to do with the restaurant and the construction of a parking lot and the like, it's necessary for us to place some improvements in the floodway itself. What it consists of:

- 9 piers that are sitting in the shadow of conveyance,
- 3 light poles on the islands in the parking area,
- a little small bit of curbed area that will be inside the floodway itself.

All of those in total add to 9.23 cy of material sitting in the floodplain. However, through site grading, elimination of a foundation that's sitting on the back of this restaurant now, through girding of the entire site and the cutting of this whole in the foundation, we have a total of 296.70 cy that'll be taken out of the property for a net gain of 287.55 cy of additional storage in this and that's not including about 50 yds of material that was taken out by the applicant in this area right to the east of the pellet building when he did the improvements on that building.

Also, the two fences were discussed. And, they were not included in these calculations even though they do present quite a substantial

obstruction to the conveyance. They're going to be gone and we did not include them in the calculations.

Any questions?

Mr. Barry asked: Has there been any tests for pollution down there?

Attorney Meccariello stated not on this property. On the property to the rear, 100 Main Street, the old Plantsville Forge, that site Dean can speak to.

Dean Michanczyk said that site, the back property at 100 West Main, when we took ownership had a Phase III environmental study done on there and we are continuing with Diversified Environmental Services. There's no pcb on that property. It was a slight amount of oils. No other pollutants. All that is on file.

My property was clean when I purchased that in 1996. We had a policy on all of that and there is record.

Mr. Barry verified there is a record of this policy being clean. Mr. Michanczyk responded: Yes. Mr. Barry asked if the town had that. Mr. Lavallee said it has not been submitted.

Mr. Barry pointed out it is an excavation adjacent to a river. It's important when you are right next to the river and the history of the property was industrial, it leads me to believe that we need to follow up on that. That's my only concern. If you have that from 1996, that'd be great.

Extensive discussion.

Mr. Barry questioned: If we go in there and start digging the soil up is it just going to cause another issue up there? That's all I want. Information on it that it's clean.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy asked if there had been any soil borings done on the site and is there any evidence that the existing soil is native or is it fill? The Chair said the commission asked for that on the site walk. Attorney Meccariello responded: Not for this particular piece of property.

Discussion.

The Chair asked for a better feel for what the applicant is doing maybe during construction, is there going to be dewatering?

Mr. Conroy said if it is native soil, the risk of it being hazardous is very small. Any kind of urban fill presents a greater risk.

Discussion.

Structural soil borings for the addition were discussed.

Mr. Michanczyk talked about the building being the old YMCA which was built in the mid-1800's. All that has been there for a long time. There's been nothing else on that property since then.

Attorney Meccariello explained the time frame the applicant is under.

Mr. Barry said: My question was, has there been any tests done for pollution and you're talking about a time frame. I think it's pretty important to test to see if there's pollution. The Chair agreed there should have been some kind of soil investigation.

Extensive discussion.

Mr. Conroy discussed different tests that might be submitted as satisfactory evidence. He did state that based on the history of the property he did not have any real concerns about that. But if others did, it could be stipulated the tests could be done and submitted at a later date.

Discussion.

The Chair suggested a stipulation that it be a requirement that the material excavated gets tested.

Discussion.

Discussion of a Phase I, what it entails, and would that be acceptable to be submitted prior to construction beginning.

Mr. Barry again brought up the property might be polluted if the property adjacent is polluted and it's a high water table. A couple of borings on the site is not difficult.

Discussion.

Jim Sakonchick described for the record what activities he underwent as part of his design of the footings for the building. Extensive explanation.

Mr. Barry said he would like to have borings done with reports it's pristine. He's agreeable to the stipulation they test when they begin. I warn you that once they start the excavator, it's not shutting down until it's done.

Mr. Sullivan agreed with doing the tests during the construction process.

Mr. Conroy made a motion to approve IW 1162 with stipulations. Mr. Cabata seconded.

Stipulations:

(1) Trees to be removed along the edge of pavement shall be subject to approval by the IW Agent.

(2) No standing fuel tanks used for refueling shall be allowed within the floodplain or floodway during construction, but there is room on site for them.

(3) All appropriate approvals from the municipality shall be obtained prior to construction.

(4) Phase I within the project limits shall be performed and the results shall be submitted to the commission prior to any earth disturbing activities.

(5) Inspection of disturbed soil within the project limits shall be performed by a qualified individual such as a LSP and certification stating no hazardous materials are present shall be submitted to the commission.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Mr. Conroy made a motion to send a positive recommendation on FF 217 with the stipulations noted above. Mr. Sullivan seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Information/Action - IW 1163, application of Lovley Development, Inc., seeking to fill .05 acres of wetlands and upland review area for a 44 lot open space subdivision. Property located at 703 W. Center Street.

Attorney DePaolo has recused himself and left the bench to sit in the audience.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones and Associates, representing the applicant presented.

This is for an open space subdivision which was approved by the planning and zoning on Tuesday, September 1<sup>st</sup> as an open space subdivision.

The first proposal involved 44 lots and 2,296 sf of wetlands filling. After the site walk we took into your concerns and we did a revised plan which is the second proposal. This proposal eliminated Lot 13 which is on the southwest corner, adjusted the detention area slightly and we adjusted some of the home locations to stay away from the buffer, the 55' or so that we talked about in the field. Even if we felt lot 13 was probably viable and would be attractive to buyers, we removed it from the layout. In addition, the house on lot 27, to the north of the wetland, was relocated to allow more buffer to the wetlands. This revision allowed us to eliminate the wetlands filling altogether.

The commission had concerns with the lots on the easterly edge of the property --- see layout number 3 (Lots 389 to 42).

(End of Tape #1, Side B)

(Beginning of Tape #2, Side A)

Boulders and trees have been proposed along the buffer area in back of these homes.

Orange construction fence will be installed prior to the initiation of the construction.

Notes on the plan for a job meeting prior to starting construction to inspect all erosion controls to be sure they're in place.

The drainage system is directed into two detention areas. One to the northeast and one to the southwest. Runoff is discharged into rip rap plunge pools with stone check dams inside the detention area and grass swales through the detention area until it gets to the outfall control structure. There is additional plunge pool and swale.

Discharge points are outside the wetlands.

Planting plans were prepared by David Lord and provided.

This layout reduces impervious area because we eliminated over 300' of roadway.

Reduces the number of lots to 42.

Provides 28.9 acres of open space out of which 7.3 acres is upland area.

Explained.

All the houses east and west of the site are designed to have walk out basements to eliminate the impact of creating a backyard.

Wetlands markers will be installed along the wetlands border to prevent encroachment in addition to the boulders and trees.

Discussion of the floodplain elevation being around 182, 180. All basements are a minimum of 186.

Explained the walk out basement.

In summary: We eliminated two lots, reduced impervious area and addressed all staff comments in writing. We believe we addressed the commission's concern which was distances to the wetlands, provide a good buffer in the back of the homes.

At the edge of the wood line, there is a natural low area before it goes into the wood line like a little berm.

Explained.

Discussion of the location of the boulders in response to a comment by the Chair. The boulders are about 30' from the back.

ZIRO has been achieved.

Andrew Quirk is here to discuss the drainage. Explained the changing of the basin with the elimination of Lot 13 in response to a query by Mr. Lavallee.

Discussion of reducing the basin in the northeast corner because of the reduction in impervious area (about 10%). All the reduction of impervious area was in that watershed.

Andrew Quirk added they did submit the stormwater treatment train that details the detention basin and the stormwater management report. We are achieving ZIRO.

I'll answer questions.

Mr. Barry commented as Mr. Post said earlier, this laughable in the sense of what open space. There is not a quarter acre of usable open space. But the open space which is on the west side there, do we have any idea of how this development will affect that wetlands and its natural ability to protect the wildlife and the aquatic vertebrates and fish that are in the river there? The river is extremely pristine at that point and it was destroyed while you built Monarch.

I believe this is a continuance of that destruction of the wetlands and I think this is going to affect that whole watercourse, the whole corridor that comes down the mountain. What kind of study has been done as to what will happen with the increased pollutions? The people are going to use fertilizer, poisons. I think this development is so massive in such a sensitive area; I can't support it the way it looks. The density needs to be reduced. I think there is a better alternative.

Discussion.

Mr. Bovino pointed out they are preserving 28.9 acres of open space, 7.3 of those acres are upland areas and the remaining acres is valuable for the wildlife.

Discussion.

Mr. Bovino pointed out the benefits of wetlands. And, all safeguards for best management practice are in this design. We are donating 68 percent of the property instead of developing it. The corridor is remaining intact here.

David Lord is here to discuss concerns and describe his planting plan for the detention area.

David Lord stated in response to a question by the Chair, they have not received the report from the National Diversity Database. When we get the notification we will submit it to the wetland office.

I did real close measurement of where the shaded area runs and it runs right along the eastern side of our property --- too close to call.

Explained.

Mr. Lord gave a brief description of the wetlands. The primary focus of impact to the wetlands system needs to be on these five houses on the western side. The entire development is not of concern to this wetland edge as much as the runoff goes through stormwater management systems. It's the rear yard areas of the five lots that are the main concern.

Extensive discussion.

Mr. Barry said he felt there was a way to adjust some of the lots and remove some of the houses as they will impact the wetlands.

Extensive discussion.

Mr. Lord reviewed the soils in the area and whether or not they are classified as wetlands.

Extensive discussion.

Soil boring results did not indicate any restrictive layers. Explained.

Shallow irrigation cultural swales were noted and discussed as being able to intercept the flow and allow it to soak into the ground.

I do not see conditions on this site based on vegetation, based on soils, based on the proposed development and the setback and the rear yards and the fact that we're talking about five houses that this is going to cause ----

Mr. Barry interrupted noting that on the other side, it is even closer to the Eight Mile River. Mr. Lord noted there are higher protective measures on that side than there are on the side.

Extensive discussion.

I don't see any basis for significant measurable impact to the wetlands systems. There's too many in place mechanisms: soils, vegetation, runoff, topography, grade, which provide levels of protection to this wetland system and stream channel from the runoff.

The northeast corner of the site was discussed as having a similar condition gradewise.

Discussion.

The farm road was discussed as being another level of protection. Explained.

We have significant natural existing mechanisms for the protection of the wetland system. And, the rear yards closest to the wetland are relatively small. I don't see the level of threat to the eastern wetland from the development along this side. It's not of a magnitude and generation of potential impact that it is going to significantly or measurably impact the wetland systems.

Discussion.

I'll answer any questions you might have.

Mr. Conroy thanked the applicant for the revisions. He clarified for the record, from Mr. Post's comments, the project is currently outside the FEMA floodplain and the base elevations are roughly 8' above the elevation. Mr. Bovino said this is an area that was not determined by FEMA. Available information is the elevation is around 180 to 182 and the lowest floor basement elevation is 186.

Mr. Conroy noted the plans have been revised to show a minimum 30' rear yard area prior to the establishment of the physical barrier: shrubs and boulders. That area provides a minimum of 25' as a buffer to the actual wetland.

Discussion.

As to the buffer itself, I know it's not our typical site. This is a wet meadow type of wetland. As shown, we're showing a line of boulders and shrubs at that line that we discussed. Behind it is an area of hayfield and grass meadow before we reach the tree line. Any concern of that space being utilized for storage of lawn clippings, sheds, et cetera? Any benefit to requesting more of a vegetative barrier?

Mr. Lavallee said that comment was offered to the developer and he agrees that it could use some plantings within there.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said he would like to see something that's going to grow wild in that area. On the west and east side from the boulders back.

Discussion.

No earth excavation permit required. It's under 10,000 cy. The fill will be appropriate because we don't want to pollute our property, noted Mr. Bovino. A site assessment will be performed and provided to the Planning Department before the approval of the PZC, added Mr. Bovino.

7.3 acres of upland land provided as open space was pointed out by Mr. Bovino.

We have very specific jurisdiction and authority, noted Mr. Conroy, and specific guidelines that we need to adhere to.

Moving to Mr. Conroy's own comments:

On the comment by Mr. Carmichael, just reviewing the grading plan, it appears that the grades shown on Lots 38, 37 and potentially some of the grading from Lot 36, there will be runoff crossing from those parcels across Mr. Carmichael's property. Is it possible to provide a berm so it is directed towards the back of Lot 35 and across Lot 34? Mr. Bovino said a swale can be provided at the edge of the property. We do not intend to have runoff go on the neighbors' property.

Discussion.

Water flow on Lot 34 was discussed.

(End of Tape #2, Side A)

(Beginning of Tape #2, Side B)

Mr. Borowy commented he is in favor of the application. He was very impressed with the applicant and the cooperation of his people to extend themselves and consider what we've been asking for.

Mr. Barry made a motion to table until we get the report from the National Diversity Database Report.

Discussion of possible stipulations

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion to table. Motion failed 1 to 6 on a roll call vote with the Chair, Mr. Borowy, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Cabata, Mr. DeMello and Mr. Conroy opposed.

Mr. Borowy made a motion to approve IW 1163 as presented with the comprehensive conditions and stipulations offered by the Assistant Town Planner. Mr. Conroy seconded.

Stipulations:

(1) Reduce the size of the northwest basin to create a greater setback from the forested wetland.

(2) Response from the DEP Natural Diversity Database shall be submitted to the commission and all pertinent suggestions shall be implemented and any changes resulting from such suggestions shall be subject to review by the agency or its agent.

(3) All fill brought into the site shall be certified to be free from contaminants from the appropriate professional.

(4) Slopes within the stormwater quality basin shall be shaped, matted and seeded prior to home construction in each phase.

(5) No zoning permit shall be issued until satisfactory inspections are made.

(6) Shrubs shall be provided behind the boulders to enhance the upland review area on each side of development subject to approval by the IW Agent.

(7) Lot 34 shall be reduced to the minimum required lot size to protect the wetland within the current lot lines.

(8) A Phase I done on the property shall be submitted to the commission.

Motion passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Barry opposed.

Attorney DePaolo reseated for the remainder of the meeting.

## 9. Communications

A. Reports from Public, Press and Ex-Officio members regarding items other than those scheduled for action.

Richard Post, just to respond. The intent of open space is actually environmental and open space in wetlands is still a viable use. However, the main intent of our regulation was to minimize what is developed. So the concept would be if you have open space in a subdivision and that space could be built on, that's a legitimate reason. What that does is, you then don't build as many homes and that left is open. That's the intent of the regulation.

I agree with you on the viability of the habitat in that area, but this is still being used for the high profitability of a developer because most of that property could not be developed.

Extensive discussion.

There are times when you have to look at the big picture and step beyond what has been acceptable in the past because the status quo does not work.

Extensive discussion.

What's in the past is done and it's forward thinking.  
Discussion.

The thoughts by Mr. Bovino about the wetlands trapping contaminants is very true. But that's kind of counter to what he stated at near the wetlands is also the habitat. Because you form a

habitat and then you pollute that habitat, then you lose the habitat. The Best Practice is to eliminate the pollutant source before it gets into the sensitive environment and the sensitive environment would start at the wetlands boundary.

Discussion.

10. Conservation Issues/ Unfinished Business / Miscellaneous

- 5 year extension request of David Bucholz, West Pines Section 2-IW #1026.

Mr. Lavallee explained the history of the application and the location.

Mr. Conroy wanted to look at it again.

Mr. Borowy made a motion to table. Mr. DeMello seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Lavallee said they have received revised plans for the development that was over excavated - the adjacent parcel. That earth excavation plan includes remediation for what was over excavated. They need PZC approval for it.

Discussion.

- Mr. Conroy commented on the open space. If all we're getting is wetlands for open space, it wouldn't be much of a benefit to the town. The open space provided here is more than zero. This is the closest thing I've seen to an open space development that I've actually seen, he concluded. What is it we're actually getting on some of the open space subdivisions? This one, I think, we're getting something as opposed to the nothing that we usually get.

Extensive discussion.

- Mr. Sullivan brought up one more item. The Poriello Farm on Meriden Avenue. I understand they are calling the bond. Any wetlands concerns there?

Mr. Lavallee responded the bond they called will cover the finishing of the basin. We monitored that real close. We would like to see it stable with a more acceptable grass than what is there. It's just weeds now. They will finish the roadway.

Mr. Barry made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Conroy seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 o'clock, p.m.)