

THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF AVON HELD A VIRTUAL REGULAR MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2023, AT 7:00 P.M., VIA ZOOM: by web <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84306122276>; or by phone, United States: [+1 \(646\) 558-8656](tel:+16465588656), Meeting ID: [843 0612 2276](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84306122276).

Present were Chair Michael Feldman, Vice Chair Michael Sacks, and Commissioners Michael Beauchamp, Robert Breckinridge, Gary Gianini, Carol Hauss, and Kevin Tobin. Also present was Emily Kyle, Planning and Community Development Specialist/Wetlands Agent and Attorney Kari Olson of Murtha, Cullina LLP, attorney for the Town of Avon.

Chair Feldman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. There is a quorum of 7 Commissioners.

I. ENFORCEMENT HEARING:

Amco Development, LLC, 28 Richard Street (Assessor's Map #013, Lot #3710028); removal of trees/saplings within the 100 foot upland review area.

E. Kyle issued a Cease and Desist for 28 Richard Street. The new owner of this property recently contacted the Planning & Zoning Office regarding development of this site. The GIS map showed wetlands soils on this lot so E. Kyle requested a wetlands delineation prior to any development. That was done, however our office did not receive this map or information prior to tree clearing taking place. Andrew Morse, a principal of the owner, was contacted to stop the tree clearing because some trees were within the 100 foot upland review area. The building permit process was put on hold and E. Kyle requested that the surveyor flag the upland review area. She determined that several trees including three mature trees and several smaller trees were removed in the upland review area. After meeting with A. Morse and Town officials, she then requested that any tree clearing stop and the stumps remain in place. She issued a Cease and Desist Order on February 27, 2023. Chair Feldman asked if the tree clearing should have required an IWC permit. E. Kyle said that it should have required at least an Authorized Agent Approval (the site is flat and the trees are minor) but once enforcement is triggered, it must be heard by the IWC. Chair Feldman asked if the owner needs IWC approval to build the house. E. Kyle said that the proposed house and all other improvements are outside of the upland review area except the tree clearing. She said that the IWC could require a retroactive application to cover the work that was done and anything that needs to be done to remediate this. There will not be a lot of site work necessary to build on this lot.

Jim McManus, a certified professional soil scientist at JJM Consulting Services in Newtown, CT, was hired on behalf of Amco Development, LLC. He found no wetlands on 28 Richard Street when he reviewed the site in late summer, 2022. He also looked at 22 Richard Street and showed the wetland boundary on a map though there was no upland review area staked in the field. A. Morse then cut trees in the upland review area by mistake. J. McManus said that most of the trees cut were small or in poor health though there were two large oak trees cut that were about 85-90' from edge of the wetlands. He said that the cutting of these trees did not have a significant or adverse impact on the wetlands. A. Morse will plant five additional, mature trees (maybe a couple of red or black oaks and also sugar maples) spread out where the larger trees

were cut down to help mitigate the mistake even though there was no impact. A. Morse said that the largest tree cut down (24" diameter) was 5' from the furthest edge of the upland review area and the second largest tree cut down (13" diameter) was 2' from that edge. It was a mistake having to do with the measurements from the stake. A. Morse said the trees had been cut before he received any notice from the Town. E. Kyle said there was a tentative warning issued.

R. Breckinridge and Vice Chair Sacks had no questions. G. Gianini asked whether the proposed trees are similar to what is on the property currently. J. McManus said that the larger trees that were cut down were oaks and they would plant three oaks and two sugar maples (also currently in the area). G. Gianini asked how large the new trees would be and J. McManus said 2-3" diameter. G. Gianini asked about monitoring the trees to see that they are still alive in the future. J. McManus said that there is still plenty of tree cover in this area – it was not clear cut. M. Beauchamp asked if the stumps would be removed. A. Morse said that it was suggested to him to grind the stumps down before planting the new trees. C. Hauss and K. Tobin had no questions. Chair Feldman asked how many trees were removed in total. J. McManus said 12 in total and 2-3 of substantial size (which were just inside the furthest edge of the upland review area boundary) and the others were small. A. Morse said 6 of the 12 trees were completely rotted. Chair Feldman asked E. Kyle if the mitigation plan looked acceptable to her. She said she is comfortable with the planting of the proposed new trees and the IWC could require an Authorized Agent Approval instead of a full application. She would require a plan that identifies where the trees would be located and this would be attached to the application for a building permit.

M. Beauchamp made a Motion to sustain the Cease and Desist Order and allow the property owner to submit an Authorized Agent application to retroactively approve the cutting, approve a mitigation plan including the planting of new trees, and require annual inspections of the trees' health. Vice Chair Sacks seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

II. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING: Chair Feldman and G. Gianini left the meeting as they recused themselves from this Application.

PENDING APPLICATION:

APPL. #785 – 100 Nod Way, LLC, Owner and Applicant; request for regulated activities within the 100 foot upland review area: construction of thirteen (13) single-family houses and eight (8) buildings containing forty-two (42) townhouse common interest units, driveways, utilities, and related site work. Location: 100 Nod Road, Parcel 3290100 (the "Property").

Rachael Burstein of Tyche Planning & Policy Group set forth the procedure of the meeting and public comments. E. Kyle read the Legal Notice of Continuation of Public Hearing.

Acting Chair Sacks read the same statement that he read at the start of the Public Hearing at the January 9, 2023 IWC Special Meeting.

Attorney Timothy Hollister of Hinckley Allen spoke on behalf of the Applicant. Also present for the Applicant are P. Anthony Giorgio, a principal of the Applicant, Guy Hesketh and David Ziaks, both Professional Engineers of F.A. Hesketh & Associates, Inc., William Kenny, Soil

Scientist, Wetlands Scientist and Landscape Architect, of William Kenny Associates, and Attorney Christian Mines of Hinckley Allen.

The Application was filed with the IWC on November 15, 2022 and there was an extensive presentation with public comments at an IWC Special Meeting on January 9, 2023. T. Hollister responded to the public comments from the Special Meeting in writing. G. Hesketh had reviewed the existing storm water system created by the Town on the 9.3 acre parcel between Nod Road to the west, Nod Way to the east, and Hunter's Run residential development to the east of Nod Way. There are two watercourses – one on the south end of the Property which runs to an open channel and one on the north end of the Property that runs underground. There is a ditch and a berm on the golf course to the west across Nod Road and there is 1,300' from the Property to the Farmington River providing an ample separation hydrologically. The January 9, 2023 presentation highlighted that there is no intended disturbance to any wetland or watercourse and there is no impact on any function of a wetland or watercourse. The only work being done is temporary and in a non-wetland upland review area. The wetland delineation on the site done by W. Kenny and earlier by Robert Russo was confirmed by a third-party reviewer, the North Central Conservation District (the "NCCD"). T. Hollister had reviewed alternatives that could have had an adverse impact on the wetland or watercourse but they rejected those for the current plan which avoids all such impacts. Therefore the requirement of the Applicant to show no feasible and prudent alternatives is satisfied. There has been no contrary expert report or evidence submitted that shows an impact to a wetland or watercourse. He believes the Application qualifies for approval. T. Hollister referred to several photographs submitted by residents that showed storm water overtopping Nod Road and Nod Way. He said that the flooding shown has been confined to one or two days with extreme storms over the last few years and the water was a result of clogging of the culvert that goes under Nod Road. The culvert has not been maintained but that is fixable by cleaning out the leaves and other debris. The drainage easement in favor of Hunter's Run to cross the property will then return to its normal condition with proper maintenance and the flooding will not occur. At the January 9, 2023 Special Meeting there were questions about climate change and the reliability of rainwater data. G. Hesketh had testified that the most recent NOAA data available on rainfall is already built into the model so the Applicant has factored in changes resulting from climate change. They have used the most recent data for engineering calculations and cannot guess at future data. Even in an extreme storm, the Property will not flood. If there are extreme storms that flood Nod Road, that is an existing condition that property owners there need to address. The issue of density is not in the purview of the IWC but the proposal here of 6 units per acre with a combination of single-family homes and townhomes is considered by professional planners to be middle housing - low to medium density housing and not high density. The development will not impact the Farmington River or its habitat as there is a golf course and 1,300' between the Property and the River. There was a resident question about green space and he said the green spaces include landscaping, vegetated detention basins, and lawns so it is not the case that the Property will be almost entirely paved. To summarize, the Applicant believes they have prepared a plan that complies with the Town's wetlands regulations, incorporates best practices for engineering and environmental protection, will not adversely impact a wetlands or watercourses, and therefore warrants IWC approval.

C. Hauss said she has seen the Nod Road flooding and there is a lot of surface water on the Property. She is still concerned that there will be a lot of impervious surfaces. She recognizes that the current storm water management system is clogged but there is also water coming down from the mountain. When the Town worked on this system in 1997 the issue was not taken care of. She is also concerned with the box turtles and if this Application goes forward, she would want a condition regarding the protection of the turtles. She has not heard from a wildlife expert and is worried that there will be building where the turtles nest. The species is under special concern - one of their biggest threats is getting hit by a vehicle so if their habitat is disturbed, they may be crossing Nod Road more than before. The turtles have a role in the wetlands. G. Hesketh said that he observed that the culvert on the south side of the parcel that conveys runoff from the area to the east was 2/3rds full of sediment and debris. He thinks there has been an ongoing maintenance issue with that culvert and in his professional opinion, that was the reason why it could not convey the runoff that came across Nod Road during a flood. The culvert did not have the capacity but doing routine maintenance in the channel and removing any of the debris and brush that builds up will restore the design capacity of that culvert. C. Hauss asked how can we know that will not be a continuing problem. G. Hesketh said that the southern culvert will not receive any runoff from this project – this flow simply runs through the parcel. He believes that the Town of Avon is responsible for the maintenance of the culvert and if it was routinely maintained, it would help remediate existing flooding issues occurring along that watercourse. That maintenance should include yearly inspections. The culvert on the north side of the Property which will have a nominal amount of flow from the project also has debris in it. It also has a 90 degree turn which probably contains brush and impedes the flow through it. He suggests that the Town's Department of Public Works ("DPW") inspect and clean the culverts so the design flow is restored and there would be significantly less chance of water overflowing. The storm water system on the Property has design parameters that include taking runoff that comes from east of Nod Way and traversing it through the Property in a pipe designed for a 100 year flow capacity. The management system is also designed to capture and treat 100% of the DEEP recommended Storm Water Quality Volume using water quality basins. His analysis shows that even though there is an increase in impervious area, the Property will have a flow less than the existing conditions. He used Best Practices and the storm water management system is designed to mitigate any increase in runoff generated on the site. The Owner has no control over water coming up from the Property. W. Kenny had proposed a box turtle management plan which includes sweeping through the Property to ensure there are no turtles within the development area. If any are found they will be removed from the area and perimeter fencing will be installed and monitored regularly to be sure they do not make their way back into the development area during construction. There is the potential that the turtle community could be diminished in size but based on their limited use of the wetland areas it is his professional opinion that any change in that population would not adversely affect the wetlands. The turtles typically use the wetlands primarily in summer on very hot days to moderate their body temperature. C. Hauss asked if their food sources live in the wetlands. W. Kenny said yes but the amount of turtles and their food found here is minimal. It is his professional opinion that the effect on the turtles will not have an adverse impact on the physical conditions of the wetlands. C. Hauss said that the number of turtles are unknown and they are currently dormant. W. Kenny said that he did a seasonally appropriate inspection of the Property and he did not observe any in summer. T. Hollister said that the turtles are not the protected resource.

M. Beauchamp had no questions. R. Breckinridge wanted to confirm that the project itself will have no effect on the flooding at the north and south culvert areas. G. Hesketh observed that the flooding is only on the northern and southern watercourses and this proposal will have no impact to either of those areas because all the storm water on the site is being managed onsite and discharged to a separate culvert across Nod Road. R. Breckinridge asked E. Kyle about future recommendations to the Town. She will check with DPW regarding a maintenance schedule for cleaning out the culverts. It was probably low priority because there is no current development on the Property. R. Breckinridge asked if this project would affect access to the pipe system running along the north side of the Property. G. Hesketh said the storm drainage system is within the Town's right of way but each of the changes in direction of the pipe includes a manhole so it is readily accessible. There will be no impact to that at all and with grading there will possibly be more accessibility. K. Tobin asked if DPW was not responsible for cleaning the culverts then who would it be. E. Kyle said that if it was not DPW it would be the owner of the parcel. If the Application moved forward, she would suggest that a maintenance plan be a condition of approval.

Acting Chair Sacks asked if any of the water from the flooding was reaching the Farmington River. G. Hesketh was unsure though he had looked at a map to see the route the flooding would take. Acting Chair Sacks said the watercourse on the Property extends to the Farmington River and G. Hesketh agreed that could be a path the flooding takes. Vice Chair Sacks asked about flooding which could run into the pond on the golf course. G. Hesketh said that discharge from the Property enters a drainage ditch on the side of Nod Road and from there is conveyed to the pond on the golf course but there is not a direct channel to flow to the Farmington River. If the pond is overtaxed, he thinks most of the water would enter the groundwater and continue to flow to the west. Acting Chair Sacks said that currently the Farmington River would be endangered by the flooding and there is a direct hydrologic connection between the Property and the River. G. Hesketh said that the flooding with the southern watercourse has no impact from the development – it happens regardless of what development would take place. Acting Chair Sacks is concerned that if the proposed system does not work, then the Farmington River would get flow from the Property. G. Hesketh said that the proposed storm water management practices implemented would result in a net reduction in peak flow from the site, a reduction in volume of flow from the site, and provide for a cleansing through captured treatment of the water quality volume. He said there would be a net decrease of flow to the Farmington River. Acting Chair Sacks said that currently there was an issue with flooding because of the clogging of the culvert but we need to be also concerned with an increase in storms. He asked if there was an error in the data used in the past for water flow and if we were getting an increase in precipitation. G. Hesketh said that 30-40 years ago hydrologic analysis used published DOT data that listed rainfall intensities for 2, 5, 10, 15, 25, 50 and 100 year storms. The current NOAA data is not significantly different than the prior data for a 100 year storm and in some cases, it is less, but the more frequent storm events have a higher range of intensity. When you do drainage design, you pick a statistical range because you do not want to overdesign. He recommends proper maintenance and believes that will eliminate 90% of any issues. Acting Chair Sacks asked if the design takes into consideration recent findings of more storms. G. Hesketh said the NOAA data is updated constantly – they have monitoring stations all over CT, they look at those on a real time basis, and they include statistical analysis. Acting Chair Sacks looked at the NOAA website and found that data is actually updated infrequently because of the expense and effort and it

could be 10 years old. G. Hesketh said the drainage plan provides for a reduction of flow so if there is a 10% margin, it will be provided for. Acting Chair Sacks said the system appears designed properly but he wonders if the data is accurate. He emphasized the need to maintain the system and read from the post-construction storm drain maintenance system information provided in the Application and asked how the IWC would know that the maintenance items were being done once construction was completed. T. Hollister said that legally the Applicant was entitled to a presumption that they would follow the plan approved by the IWC. The Town will require the Applicant to follow the requirements of approval or there could be consequences – this is typical of any development. Acting Chair Sacks is concerned about three things – whether the precipitation that is planned for is realistic based on changes seen in recent years, whether all items will work for the system to function properly, and the IWC is relying on expert testimony without an outside unbiased assessment. He feels that for a complex project like this the IWC should have an outside opinion. Acting Chair Sacks referred to the Town Engineer's written comment that he is not a wetlands expert and could not say whether this project has an adverse impact on wetlands. The NCCD report did not address future water flow rates on the Property and recommended following up with the Town Engineer who said the system was designed by a professional engineer to current standards. T. Hollister responded to the comment about flooding and said that it will be alleviated by maintenance of the culvert by the responsible party. This Property is in a separate watershed from the Farmington River and will not contribute to the flooding problem – it will actually improve the water flow off-site by cleaning out some of the contaminants. He said that there has been no evidence that the Farmington River will be polluted or evidence that any water contains pollutants. The NCCD confirmed W. Kenny's wetlands delineation and T. Hollister does not think that this Application (which was submitted several months ago) is complex and does not need a third party opinion.

Ned Colket of 36 Gatewood asked about runoff of salt in the winter – he believes it will be substantial and asked if there was a study done about the salt impact on the Farmington River. G. Hesketh said there was no study done, their operations would include a minimal use of salt on the site, and any runoff from the on-site paved areas would go into the water quality basins and the majority would be infiltrated into the ground. N. Colket asked about what happens when the Applicant is no longer responsible for the Property. T. Hollister said there would be a homeowners association which would have a clear set of responsibilities including everything that is on the plans such as maintenance responsibilities. The Town's wetlands staff would oversee these responsibilities. This is typical of other common interest communities (such as Hunter's Run) which would hire a contractor to perform work like this. Hugh Sinclair of 191 Nod Road said that a potential buyer would be nervous given the items that must happen to alleviate flooding. He asked if there were still oil tanks still in the ground that would impact the ground water. T. Hollister said there were no oil tanks on the Property but H. Sinclair said there was a long history of houses on the Property before records were kept. T. Hollister said he believed a Phase I environmental report was done and would accept a condition of approval that if there are any oil tanks on the Property, they would be properly remediated. Laura Corning of 146 Nod Way has witnessed flooding multiple times every year and you can currently see the evidence of the most recent flooding in the culvert. Also, the pipe in the culvert looks smaller than the pipes that come in from Hunter's Run so there may need to be a larger pipe. Harry Captain of 2 Clearbrook said that Hunter's Run consists of 273 acres with 266 condominium units so there is at least 1 acre of property for each condominium unit. Over 20 years Hunter's

Run has experienced some water problems with water coming down the side of the mountain however, in the last 5 years there have been more problems with an increase in rain including water intruding into some units and water topping curbing which had to be rerouted under a road. Water on the road freezes and creates a hazard. He is concerned with that water and any pollutants in it now flowing through the new development on its way to the Farmington River. T. Hollister said that the Property is in a different system and will not contribute to the Hunter's Run runoff and will actually improve the situation for water flowing west. Amy Petras is the Executive Director of the Farmington River Watershed Association. She asked if the storm water system was designed using the 2004 Storm Water Quality Manual or the new draft proposed Storm Water Quality Manual that DEEP has asked for public comment on. G. Hesketh said that he used the 2004 Storm Water Quality Manual and those concepts in his design for storm water management. A. Petras asked if he was aware that DEEP was working to update that Manual and G. Hesketh said he was. A. Petras asked if it would be prudent to use the new guidelines as the project will be ongoing when the guidelines are updated. G. Hesketh said he used the current, published standards recommended as Best Practices and he cannot speculate on what may happen in the future. T. Hollister said that a key question regarding the proposed Manual is whether it will remain a guideline as opposed to a regulation enforced by inland wetlands commissions. A. Petras said that it is prudent to her to look at the difference between a 2004 Storm Water Quality Manual and one currently proposed on the DEEP website as a draft. T. Hollister said it was a draft, a long way from finalization, and while he is aware of the effort and the ideas, the DEEP has not come to any conclusions so he would not know what to follow.

T. Hollister said that the IWC should consider whether there is expert evidence in the record of an adverse impact on the function of a wetlands or watercourse as a result of this development. Expert evidence coming from qualified professionals should be separated from speculation. The record shows that there will be no adverse impact on a wetland or watercourse.

M. Beauchamp made a Motion to Close the Public Hearing for Application #785. R. Breckinridge seconded. The Motion passed unanimously. K. Olson said that the IWC could deliberate but was not obliged to make a decision tonight. E. Kyle said that an extension would not be necessary but if a matter is continued, there should be a reason why. K. Olson added that the IWC has 65 days to render a decision.

M. Beauchamp made a Motion to Approve Application #785. R. Breckinridge seconded. He asked about the number of Commissioners needed to pass a motion and a discussion including E. Kyle and K. Olson ensued. E. Kyle listed conditions of approval which include 1) the final plans submitted to the Planning & Zoning Commission (the "PZC") must be revised to reflect the requested modifications by the Town Engineering Department, 2) the final plans submitted to the PZC (the next step for an approval) must be revised to reflect the requested modifications by NCCD in its report dated January 5, 2023, 3) as recommended by the Town Engineer, a series of two as-built surveys for the storm water management system shall be submitted to the Planning Office and reviewed by staff showing volumes and piping prior to the issuance of any building permits to insure compliance and again after construction is completed to insure that volumes have not been altered by silt resulting from construction, and 4) perimeter silt fencing for the purpose of turtle protection including the entranceway to and from the work area shall be inspected by Town staff prior to the commencement of any earth moving construction activities,

and staff will regularly inspect for compliance for the Turtle Management Plan. E. Kyle asked Acting Chair Sacks about adding a condition regarding culvert maintenance which would require that a culvert maintenance plan for the central culvert would be provided to Town staff with annual reporting from the homeowners association for this community which is required for other projects in Town. Acting Chair Sacks asked about Town inspection and maintenance of culverts and is concerned that DPW is not maintaining culverts now. E. Kyle said that she can confirm with DPW that these culverts become a higher priority.

K. Olson confirmed that a vote of a majority of Commissioners present can approve an application. M. Beauchamp made a revised Motion to Approve Application #785 with the standards conditions typically used and the conditions set forth by E. Kyle above. R. Breckinridge seconded. He is uncomfortable with this project in general but believes that the Applicant has met the standards and guidelines of the Town's IWW Regulations. He is concerned with flooding but has been told by an expert witness that flooding is not related to this project and is due to a lack of maintenance of the culvert. He is also concerned with the box turtles but has been told that the Applicant will follow protocol and Best Practices recommended by the State. He is concerned about wildlife in general but understands that an application cannot be denied for this reason unless the wetlands themselves are affected by the development. R. Breckinridge voted in favor of the Motion. M. Beauchamp voted for the Motion because the Applicant has met all the conditions for Avon's IWW Regulations, and the project now has to go to PZC for their approval. Also, the Property is not virgin land – it has been cultivated and modified many times in the past. C. Hauss said there has been much public input and she does not want to ignore clear evidence that the Property has flooding issues, she is not convinced that the box turtles will not be affected (there was no evidence from a conservationist), she is not convinced that the flooding will not continue, and the IWC heard from an expert, A. Petras, who has concerns about the impact of this project on the Farmington River. C. Hauss voted against the Motion. Acting Chair Sacks said that he is concerned that the expert evidence is based on precipitation data that is not current and does not take into consideration the recent reports by government agencies that the northeast will have higher precipitation and more storms. He is also concerned if the storm water management system does not work. Lastly, he is concerned that an outside expert has not reviewed this Application. He would like more information on many issues including whether a reduction of turtles will affect the wetlands. Acting Chair Sacks voted again the Motion. R. Breckinridge wants the Commissioners to understand that the IWC cannot make a vote on speculation. For example, a turtle expert said that he did not see turtles in the summer when these turtles are typically present, therefore it is pure speculation that there are turtles on the Property. Also, an expert witness said the current flooding is a result of the lack of culvert maintenance. To deny this Application due to flooding would be inaccurate. The Application can only be denied because of a direct impact and the issues being talked about here are hypothetical, indirect effects. The IWC's function is to determine the effects on the wetlands themselves. C. Hauss is concerned that there is no consideration for climate change. R. Breckinridge asked how that would affect wetlands - and the wetlands here are actually outside the Property. We cannot speculate about climate change and must use current facts. E. Kyle quoted Section 10.6 of Avon's IWW Regulations that "the agency shall not deny or condition in an application for a regulated activity in an area outside wetlands or watercourses on the basis of an impact or effect on an animal or aquatic life unless such activity will likely impact or affect the physical characteristics of such wetlands or watercourses." She said there is case law on this

topic including a case that said that wood frogs can play a role in the physical characteristics of a wetland, watercourse or a vernal pool. But there is no such data with regard to box turtles and absent expert testimony that the turtles play a physical role in the wetlands, the IWC cannot make a decision based on that. K. Tobin agreed that there were many valid points raised but he did not hear anything that allowed him to deny the application so he voted to approve the Motion. The Motion passed 3-2.

III. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC (unrelated to any Application): None.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Staff and Commissioner Comments (unrelated to any application): R. Breckinridge asked about getting a vernal pool expert for another application. E. Kyle said she would address that separately with him as this was an Execution Session topic.

B. Approval of Minutes: December 6, 2022 – Regular Meeting
January 3, 2023 – Regular Meeting

K. Olson said that Minutes can be posted and then amended if necessary. The IWC did not vote on the Minutes.

V. NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: April 4, 2023

Acting Chair Sacks made a Motion to Adjourn. R. Breckinridge seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

Janet Stokesbury
Clerk, Inland Wetlands Commission
Town of Avon Department of Planning and Community Development