

THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF AVON HELD A VIRTUAL SPECIAL MEETING ON THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2022, AT 6:30 P.M., VIA GO TO MEETING: by web <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/489741261>; or by phone, United States: +1 (571) 317-3116, Access Code: [489741261#](https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/489741261).

Present were Chair Michael Feldman, Vice-chair Michael Sacks, and Commissioners Michael Beauchamp, Robert Breckinridge, Gary Gianini, and CJ Hauss. Also present was Emily Kyle, Planning and Community Development Specialist/Wetlands Agent.

Chair Feldman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. There is a quorum of 6 Commissioners.

I. PENDING APPLICATION:

APPL. #781 – The Silvio Brighenti Family, LLC, Owner and Applicant; request for regulated activities within the 100 foot upland review area: construction of house, driveway, utilities, possible pool and related site work on each of six (6) lots. Locations:

250 Northington Drive, Parcel 4910250;
256 Northington Drive, Parcel 4910256;
274 Northington Drive, Parcel 4910274;
7 Saddle Ridge Drive, Parcel 6210007;
31 Stockbridge Drive, Parcel 6220031; and
49 Stockbridge Drive, Parcel 6220049.

David Whitney, PE, said that after consultation with Eric Davison, Soil Scientist (who cannot be present tonight), D. Whitney made a number of revisions to the plans. He would like to set aside 250 and 256 Northington Drive (the two lots closest to the vernal pool) because he needs E. Davison to be present. Wetlands #3 is in the middle of 49 Stockbridge Drive and 274 Northington Drive. 31 Stockbridge Drive abuts a large area of wetlands (wetlands #1). 7 Saddle Ridge Drive is a completely different watershed than the other five lots. 250 and 256 Northington Drive are the lots that are closest to the vernal pool and in the middle of wetlands #1. He has also outlined the 11.8 acres of remaining woodland habitat for the vernal pool. The total area of conservation easement on 250 Northington Drive is now 40% of the lot because of the proximity of this lot to the vernal pool. He has also added some additional conservation easement area to 256 Northington Drive for a total of about 7,000 square feet or about 15% more of the lot. 31 Stockbridge Drive is moderately flat and slopes down a bit while the rear of the lot rises up and there is quite a bit of ledge. He eliminated the possible pool that he had shown on the back of the property. D. Whitney increased the conservation easement in the back of this lot by 50' because this lot abuts wetlands #1 which is the 7 acre significant wetlands area. He also added a boulder row on the front right-hand corner of the lot where the site disturbance comes closest to the small finger of wetlands. The driveway shows the stormwater runoff going away from the garage and down towards the street. He is cross pitching the driveway to the east where the water will flow across the front yard before it arrives at the wetlands. 7 Saddle Ridge Drive is the westernmost lot of the six and the one that is in the different watershed. This lot has a finger of wetlands, about 760 square feet in the middle of the lot, which is the very end of the

headwater to a much larger wetlands to the west. He has increased the conservation easement area around this area of wetlands and has shown a boulder row on this lot to the rear of the house where the construction activities come closest to the wetlands. The new area of conservation easement on this lot is about 5,000 square feet - 10% more of the lot is now protected by the conservation easement. The driveway runoff will be cross pitched to the southeast and then flow down to the south southwest for a considerable distance before that runoff arrives at the wetlands if it does not soak into the ground first. D. Whitney is asking the IWC to approve these lots based on a feasibility site plan that shows realistically how each lot could be developed but the final detailed plans will probably be somewhat different than the feasibility plans. Typically the procedure in Avon has been when someone wants to build on the lot, E. Kyle will review the proposed detailed site plan and compare it to the feasibility plan. If what is proposed is significantly different from the approved feasibility plan, the homeowner will have to come back to the IWC. D. Whitney added a special note onto the plans to make the process clear to any prospective buyers. He also added a note that prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed erosion and sedimentation control plan, a narrative and a construction sequence, and a detailed site plan all need to be prepared and submitted with the building permit application. He has also shown on the plans the standard sedimentation and erosion control measures including the silt fence at the limit of clearing, the double roll of silt fences and straw wattle at the locations closest to the wetlands, the soil stockpile areas, the driveway apron anti-tracking pads at the driveway entrances, and a note about the disturbed areas to be seeded after final grading. He also added some notes which make it clear to any developer of these lots what needs to be included in the sedimentation and erosion control plan: a pre-construction meeting with Town staff, the limits of clearing to be flagged and inspected by Town staff prior to tree clearing, installation of silt fence and straw wattle that limits disturbance, inspection maintenance, repair of erosion and sedimentation control measures as necessary, anti-tracking pad at the driveway entrance, topsoil stockpile area with silt fence, stabilize and revegetate disturbed areas after construction, and prepare erosion control narrative and a construction sequence.

M. Beauchamp had no questions. G. Gianini asked whether the boulder row is installed now or if the next owner would have to install them. D. Whitney replied that this would typically be done early in the construction process of each lot so it would not be done until the lots were sold. The lots are wooded now and it is much easier to move the boulders once the lots are cleared. G. Gianini asked about the reduction of about 12' in the footprints of the proposed houses at 250 and 256 Northington Drive. D. Whitney said that previously the houses and the grading were extended up to the 20 foot existing conservation easement area but now because the houses are shorter, he can add some additional conservation easement area and there will be more yard area between the houses and the boulder rows. He has moved the houses away from the wetlands, eliminated any grading because the houses are at the existing grade in those areas, and provided more room on the side yard for each of these houses.

R. Breckinridge referred to the map showing the overview of the whole area. He noted that every house that is proposed is in the 100 foot upland review area. D. Whitney stated that because the upland review area was increased from 40' to 100', it is impossible to build on these lots without having the homes within the upland review area. R. Breckinridge is not convinced that adding five homes will not have some kind of effect on the whole basin especially the vernal pool. R. Breckinridge would like to see a formal vernal pool survey. Vernal pools can have certain

species in there that are an issue even outside of 100'. He would like E. Davison to address vernal pools more seriously because the wildlife that bases itself in vernal pools can go out hundreds of feet into the upland review areas and depending on the species (wood frogs), some of those can go even further out. R. Breckinridge would like some clarification on E. Davison's comment about this vernal pool being a tier 3 vernal pool. D. Whitney added that a tier 3 was the best with tier 1 being the opposite. The vernal pool in question is classified as a cryptic vernal pool as opposed to a classic vernal pool. E. Davison's report stated "Cryptic vernal pools are depressions or impoundments embedded within larger wetlands and are the most common type of pool in Connecticut and often occur within seasonally flooded portions of red maple dominated forests with wetlands." R. Breckinridge said that he would like a complete assessment of 250 Northington Drive though he thinks that the only way to do that is to wait until spring.

C. Hauss is concerned with the overall impact of all this development in this area. The disturbance has been cut back but there is still going to be a lot of clearing at 250 Northington Drive near the vernal pool. Vice Chair Sacks said that the map shows the wetland ends at Stockbridge Drive but he believes that is not correct and this wetland connects to another wetland. He said the Town GIS map shows the wetland continues all the way down the mountain so this is a source of water from the mountain, down into the valley below, and this entire area functions to serve water that goes below. He would like to know how much water flows from the mountain through the wetlands and below because he believes the large wetland on the top of the mountain is enormously important. He would like to know the importance of keeping the nutrients in that water and the flow and the functions of the wetlands because it connects into others. After visiting the site, he believes the elevations shown are not accurate on the map given to the IWC. D. Whitney said the site drops down from the road, it is relatively flat where the house is shown, and then it rises very steeply and is rocky as you go west. Vice Chair Sacks said that this wetland area consists of an important canopy of trees with water accumulating in this area so he thinks that the IWC needs to be concerned with more than the vernal pool because this wetlands is very large and well functioning. Also, the wetland on 7 Saddle Ridge Drive connects and forms an important function of flowing down into a waterway – it is a headwater and it is important to protect the waters that flows into the headwater. He also questioned if there is a headwater located on Stockbridge Drive. He would also like to know about the wetlands on 49 Stockbridge Drive and 274 Northington Drive which are not in a highly functioning wetland area but he questions where the water flow goes. Wetlands #3 is a low functioning area but it is at the top of the mountain in a basin with the water purified by the trees, roots and leaves. He would like to know if the water is refreshing the aquifer beneath it. D. Whitney said that wetlands #3 has no outlet. Vice Chair Sacks said he is asking about the water that penetrates through the wetland – does it go down into the aquifer and therefore serve to refresh the aquifer. D. Whitney referred to E. Davison's report on the functions and values and for wetlands #3 which is an isolated area of wetlands in the middle of these two lots, he said the primary function (actually the only function) of this wetland is groundwater recharge/discharge. He said they are not disturbing or impeding that function – the wetland will remain and continue to do what it does. Vice Chair Sacks is concerned because there is a complete change of the water flow in that wetland when you have construction and remove trees, and in the upland review area because it is a buffer to the wetlands flow of water which would have been purified going through this area of trees and shade. It is not credible to him that this area would not be changed. He would also like to know why the boulder row is only in certain locations. D. Whitney said that he did not put

boulder rows on these two lots because he did not consider this wetland to be as valuable based on E. Davison's report. Vice Chair Sacks is concerned that owners could decide to expand their lawn into a conservation area. He believes that the IWC needs to look at the total area including the removal of large trees, the functions they have, and the transformation of the flow of water through filtering systems.

M. Beauchamp visited the site and is concerned that 250 and 256 Northington Drive are near the wetlands. Chair Feldman asked E. Kyle about any changes to her Staff Report and she replied that the original soil survey report from E. Davison plus the revisions addressed the loose ends that she pointed out in her original report. She thought that E. Davison's original depiction of the different wetlands functions was explanatory for her in understanding which lots were more feasible than others. Referring to the overall map, Chair Feldman asked D. Whitney about the dark green line and D. Whitney replied that was the remaining wooded wildlife habitat around the vernal pool. Before the Bridgewater subdivision, there was a much larger undisturbed area around the vernal pool. Now there are 13.5 acres (outlined in dark green) of remaining wildlife habitat around the vernal pool. The existing undeveloped land around the vernal pool will be reduced to 11.8 acres if the three lots are developed in the manner shown in the plans. The dark green line shows the remaining 11.8 acres of critical terrestrial habitat around the vernal pool. He stopped 750' from the vernal pool because it was his understanding that based on an Army Corps of Engineers report that the critical terrestrial habitat was all the area within 750' of a vernal pool. Chair Feldman asked about the stormwater infiltration system which is proposed for 250 and 256 Northington Drive. D. Whitney explained that it was because those lots were closest to the vernal pool. Chair Feldman asked what maintenance was required for those systems. D. Whitney replied that there are sumps in the yard drains that collect gross particles and have to be cleaned out on an annual basis. The infiltration system functions like a big septic system for stormwater runoff. Sometimes he puts in hydrodynamic Vortec separators which would be equivalent to a septic tank which is a way to stop hydrocarbons and gross particles from getting into the system but he did not think that was warranted for the short driveways and the small amount of watershed to these systems. The systems are not final designs – they are concept based at this point just to show that the developer would commit to requiring an infiltration system on those two lots. Chair Feldman asked if a condition should be included requiring ongoing, permanent maintenance of those systems. D. Whitney agreed. Chair Feldman's concern is that a number of conditions are permanent in nature and they survive the sale to future buyers. D. Whitney said that there would be language in the deeds to the properties because the conservation restrictions are an encumbrance on the property and that can be where the maintenance requirements are articulated. Also, the notes are on the plans. E. Kyle said that she is reviewing the site plans that are approved and ultimately would receive a building permit application and would review that to make sure it matches with what was approved by the IWC. The conservation restriction would be filed on the Land Records and would always show up when a title search was done prior to a property transfer. E. Kyle reiterated that the deed would reference the conservation restriction associated with the property and the deed would have a reference to the map in the land records.

R. Breckinridge asked if this Application must be considered as one for all the properties or could the lots be split up and approved separately. E. Kyle replied that the IWC would handle this with separate motions giving reasons for all decisions. Chair Feldman inquired the

Commissioners about next steps. R. Breckinridge believes the soil scientist needs to answer the question about the headwater regarding where the water flows. D. Whitney looked at one of the original overall plans for Bridgewater Estates from 2004 and the water goes through a culvert at 31 Stockbridge Drive then continues to flow down a relatively narrow channel to another wetlands area closer to Lovely Street. He could provide an overall offsite drainage map. He could add some topography from the Town GIS map to show where the water goes. R. Breckinridge asked if E. Davison ever addressed this as being the headwater region for that water running downstream. D. Whitney does not believe that he did. Chair Feldman clarified that headwaters, drainage, and a culvert bring the water downstream and asked if there are any watercourses in this area that have not been identified. D. Whitney does not believe so, but Chair Feldman said that a culvert suggests there is some watercourse or stream that is leading to it. D. Whitney said that the runoff from the wetlands has been channelized and directed to that culvert whether it is a perennial or annual stream. The construction of Stockbridge Drive to some degree has created a dam where the water flows downhill until it reaches that location and goes through the culvert. G. Gianini has concerns about 31 Stockbridge Drive and the water flowing into the Roaring Brook watershed. He feels that there are trees and a large slope near the stream and he is concerned about the disturbance from constructing a house there. Chair Feldman asked if the IWC needed more information from the soil scientist before voting. Vice Chair Sacks is concerned about 7 Saddle Ridge Drive and whether E. Davison identifies that as a headwater. Vice Chair Sacks thinks there is a basin with water flowing down and if you eliminate all the trees and put in a lawn with fertilizer and chemicals, you will completely change the hydrology of the area and that will have an important impact on a headland area. Chair Feldman asked about time limits to act on this Application. E. Kyle answered that the IWC will run out of statutory time on August 11 and this Board does not meet in August. The Applicant can grant or consent to an extension for up to 65 days which is October 15. In order to continue this Application until September, the Applicant has to tell the IWC how much time they would like to grant and then the IWC would make a motion to accept their grant. D. Whitney said that they want to continue this Application and J. Brighenti said that he would extend the time frame until September 7, the day after the next regularly scheduled IWC meeting.

Vice Chair Sacks made a Motion to Continue Application #781 until September 7. R. Breckinridge seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

II. NEW APPLICATION:

APPL. #783 – Town of Avon, Applicant, and Avon Old Farms School, Incorporated, Owner; request for regulated activities within the 100 foot upland review area: construction of roadway modifications including realignment and repair with related site work to address safety issues. Locations: 355, 500 and 575 Old Farms Road, and 28 Scoville Road. Parcels 3360355, 3360500, 3360575 and 3880028.

Larry Baril, Engineer for the Town of Avon, began and introduced Consultant Shawn Bearce from Fuss & O'Neill. There are three projects that are part of this overall project scheme and the one presented in this Application is called the North/South section. The first project (now finished) is the Old Farms bridge over the Farmington River and the related work on Route 10. There have been hundreds of different alignments that have been considered over the course of

the last 50 years for these combined projects. The first project widened the road, added a turning lane, built a new bridge, and reconstructed Old Farms Road – now there is better floodway management. Significant archeological find field work was completed in April, 2019. The bridge was open to traffic in December, 2019. The East/West section of the project goes from the terminus of the project (the bridge) all the way down Old Farms Road onto Thompson Road to the M.H. Rhodes facility, which is the facility the Town owns near the rail trail. The North/South section runs from the intersection of Thompson Road and Old Farms Road north outside of the existing alignment and then joins back onto Old Farms Road. Old Farms Road reconstruction has been under consideration since the late 1960s. Every Plan of Conservation Development update since 1969 discusses Old Farms Road and its significance from a traveling perspective as a way to get across the Farmington River other than the major crossings such as Route 4 in Farmington, Route 44 in Avon, and further north in Simsbury. Hundreds of design concepts and at least three environmental studies have happened since then to come up with the best design that minimizes environmental impacts, provides safe traffic for traveling motorists, and more recently takes into account pedestrians, bicyclists, and non-motorist transportation. There is only one abutter to the project which is the Owner, Avon Old Farms School. The Owner is a partner in this project and will benefit from the project but the primary benefit that the Town has been working toward is for the traveling public - motorists and residents. The North/South section will have a new design alignment and the East/West section will stay within its current corridor but the curves will be softened to make it safer for travel. The purpose and need as stated to the Federal Highway, Army Corps and the Connecticut DOT is to maintain the rural character of the corridor while improving roadway safety by eliminating non-standard curves and intersection geometries, improve sightlines, construct industry standard roadway structures that minimize future maintenance and yet provide an excellent return on investment, improve pedestrian cyclist safety, minimize environmental impacts, and provide important linkage from the Greenway trail to Fisher Meadows. Both the North/South and the East/West sections contain dedicated, separate bike trails and will connect the Greenway Trail system through to the Fisher Meadows complex, which is the Town's most significant recreational facility. The North/South section goes from Thompson Road through Scoville Road which curves around through the north, then goes east and reconnects back at Old Farms Road. There were many considerations given to where this alignment is. The Owner is a partner in this project and the Town made some concessions that were beneficial to both parties - one concession to the Owner was to push the road out of the existing alignment giving the Owner the ability to do more campus consolidation. The road was kept outside of the 100 foot wetlands upland review area where it was possible to do so. The cost differential to build outside of the current alignment v. staying with the existing alignment is negligible but by building outside of the existing alignment, it allows the Town to keep the road open during large portions of the construction project as opposed to either closing the road or impacting traffic through that area during all the construction activity. There are some key benefiting components to pushing the road outside of the alignment. The intersection at Scoville Road is designed to be a roundabout. There are many reasons to do that – the primary reason is because it is the most safe and efficient way to move traffic through the intersection. There are a large number of accidents at that intersection. The alignment is designed this way because it provides a safe, through motion which slows traffic down and maintains the rural character of the area. It also provides safe pedestrian movement through the intersection, both on bikes and walking. The intersection at Thompson Road is currently designed to be a three-way stop. The sightline from Thompson Road is poor and is the site of numerous accidents. A three-way stop

will provide safer traffic motion and also provide an opportunity for pedestrians to cross the road such as the students that have school activities both at Beaver Pond and Nimrod Cabin - we needed an intersection that was going to stop the traffic. The design intent for the North/South section includes minimizing direct and indirect impacts to wetlands while using LID techniques for the sake of stormwater management. The Town completed a rigorous Connecticut EPA process in 2020 that was mandated by the DEEP that included significant environmental and archeological review. The Town received the Planning and Zoning Section 8-24 referral approval last week. The project should get through 100% design in October, be ready to bid in late 2022, and construction will begin in 2023. The construction for this phase, estimated to be \$4.3M, is completely funded through two grant projects - LOTCIP and a Community Connectivity Grant. There are significant contingencies because the economy and construction processes are less predictable than they had been in the past. The plan is to begin the design of the East/West section in the Fall of 2022. That project also includes a dedicated paved bike/pedestrian trail adjacent to the roadway from the Greenway Trail down to Fisher Meadows. The East/West section will go from the Greenway Trail on the west side along Thompson Road through the intersection with Old Farms Road and then continue to the terminus point where the bridge project stops which is just west of Tillotson Road. The intent is to keep the road in the existing corridor but replace the two culverts that are currently there which are very narrow and the scene of numerous accidents, and soften the road curves to make them more standard for the roadway design speed. L. Baril expects to return to the IWC in about a year for approval for this project which will require more permitting than Inland Wetlands. Inland Wetlands is the only permit, other than DEEP, for construction on the North/South project and the wetlands impact is fairly insignificant here. The East/West project, because of the proximity of wetlands and the fact that we have to cross the brook twice – trying to minimize the wetlands impacts both direct and indirect – will be difficult to do without more significant impact and will require an Army Corps of Engineers permit.

S. Bearce began by showing a graphic of the overall plan and introducing Michael Soares, a wetland scientist from Fuss & O'Neill. The realignment of Old Farms Road starts at the intersection of Thompson Road and heads north on unimproved land, heads through the roundabout at the intersection of Scoville Road and the present, existing Old Farms Road, and then heads north of the roundabout where you have the further realigned portion of Old Farms Road. The current right of way will be turned over to the Owner as part of this project. Highlights of the project other than the roundabout are: the existing roadway for Old Farms Road is 20-22' wide and the realigned portion of Old Farms Road will be widened to 26' from 20-22' currently and will have 11 foot travel lanes with 2 foot shoulders. The standards from the Connecticut DOT for this classification of roads is that the roadway has to have a minimum travel lane of 11-12' with 4-8 foot shoulders but considering the nature of the roadway itself and with an eye on minimizing impacts in the review areas, the shoulders have been kept to 2'. Part of the benefit here is a 10 foot wide shared use path along the north side of the realigned Old Farms Road. The bike path will start at the Thompson Road intersection, head north, and make the left hand turn west along Scoville Road. Chair Feldman asked if the pedestrian/bike trail will be part of the roadway or separate from the roadway. S. Bearce said there will be a five foot buffer from the edge of the road and front edge of the paved trail so there will be a grass strip in between. He continued that the plan is to have an open drainage system with roadside swales along the north and the south portions of the area to the north of the roundabout. There will also

be roadside swales along the east and west side and those will discharge into wetland disturbance area 3 that is right at the project limit. For the area south of the roundabout, due to the bike trail on the west side, there are roadside swales capturing any roadway pavement drainage on the east side of Old Farms Road. That swale discharges down towards the Thompson Road and Old Farms Road intersection. Wetlands disturbance area 1 is at the intersection of Old Farms Road and Thompson Road. The plan shows the actual wetland disturbance area, the impact to the upland review area, and the portion of the pavement that would be removed at this intersection. Currently at this intersection is an existing 24" RCP that conveys flow from the wetland area on the east side of Old Farms Road, crossing under Old Farms Road to the other side. That existing pipe will be replaced by a 6 x 6 foot precast concrete box culvert. The reason for the increase in size is the contributing drainage area for this drainage point is very significant, over 100 acres, so the existing pipe is undersized. The bottom 2' of the box culvert will be lined with natural stream bed material, a portion of which would be from excavations in the vicinity of the work here. If any supplemental material was needed it would be imported from off site. As far as any temporary impacts, sedimentation control systems will vary between a silt fence and a hay bale system. Any catch basins installed or existing in the area would be protected with silt sacks. As far as permanent restoration, there will be wetland grass establishment which is very similar to turf establishment that is there today.

C. Hauss had no questions. R. Breckinridge asked what kind of water flow there is this time of year through the pipe under the road. S. Bearce said much of the water in that 100 acre area is percolating into the existing wetlands and just recharging and discharging itself so possibly the water does not make it down here. However, with the drainage analysis, you have to account for that whole area and when you do, the current 24" pipe capacity is not adequate. R. Breckinridge said that depending on the time of year when the construction is going to be done, there is the potential of water flow coming down into that area and he asked how it would be handled. S. Bearce said there are likely certain periods of the year when this gets more flow so typically bridge work will be done between June and September. L. Baril said if it was not raining at the site, you would see a trickle at most. He reiterated that we are going from a very small pipe to a much larger box culvert even though from his experience, that area does not flood. The only incident near that structure in 15 years was last year when we had the 2-3 large rain events that happened back to back and the issue was not the culvert – it was the outlet of the culvert that failed. On the east side of the road, there is currently some rip rap near that section because the road edge started to fail and public works had to come in and shore it up. He does support putting the box culvert in because: 1. He thinks it will provide a better pathway for wildlife to be able to travel through the culvert from one part of the wetland system to another. 2. The storm systems that we have seen in the last 10 years have definitely changed – both the intensity of storms and storms happening in closer proximity to each other. He thinks we have an opportunity to prevent a problem from happening. R. Breckinridge asked how long it takes to put the culvert in and how would they stop the flow. S. Bearce said they would utilize the existing pipe and maintain that while the box culvert is installed.

G. Gianini and Vice Chair Sacks had no questions. M. Beauchamp thinks this project benefits the vast majority of Town residents. He had no questions. Chair Feldman wondered how much discretion the IWC has with the Town as the Applicant. S. Bearce spoke about the next two wetland areas which are not as impactful as this site. Wetlands disturbance area #2 is near

Scoville Road where similar to Old Farms Road and Thompson Road, there is an existing draining crossing with an existing pipe that is a 24 x 30" stonewalled culvert. It is being replaced with a 36" RCP. Like the previous area, there is an existing drainage crossing conveying water from one wetland under the road to the other side. Similar to the other site, any areas disturbed as part of the final restoration will be restored with wetland grass establishment. Temporary impacts are limited to sedimentation, control fence, and hay bale system. This site is not as challenging as the other site. S. Bearce said the third wetlands site is at the north end of the project limit where the realigned Old Farms Road comes into the existing portion and there is a drainage crossing very similar to the others. It does not convey a wetland from one side to the other however it captures roadside drainage and discharges. There is no direct or permanent impact to this wetland though there will be temporary impacts for silt fence and sedimentation control. This portion of Old Farms Road has roadside swales on both sides and they both discharge at the same point. There is no permanent impact here and very minimal disturbance along the end of the pond for sedimentation control.

C. Hauss made a Motion to Approve Application #783. M. Beauchamp seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

III. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 3, 2022 – Regular Meeting

R. Breckinridge made a Motion to Approve the May 3, 2022 meeting minutes. Vice Chair Sacks seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

V. NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: September 6, 2022

E. Kyle stated that she revised the Checklist for an IWC application. Now the impact assessment and the delineation report are required for every application unless not required by staff which would be unusual. Vice Chair Sacks feels that the Checklist is confusing and E. Kyle talked about possible changes to correct this. The act of construction is typically the greatest impact to the wetlands so we would always be concerned about that though we would not always need an item such as drainage calculations – they are common for commercial projects but very rare for residential projects. Vice Chair Sacks stated some possible changes to the Checklist and E. Kyle stated that she would revise it so all the September applications (and beyond) will follow this Checklist.

Vice Chair Sacks asked if the IWC would get an update on 425 Waterville Road. E. Kyle said that she would give a status update at the September or October IWC meeting. In the event that no action towards remediation occurs, she will advise the IWC on possible next steps.

Vice Chair Sacks asked about getting an independent wetland scientist to possibly make an assessment of a property. He believes that we need to build that into the Town regulations. E. Kyle said that she understands that to be a major project and some proposed changes, such as citations and fee schedules, would have to go to the Town Council. It could be a long process and a regulation change would require a public hearing.

Vice Chair Sacks made a Motion to Adjourn. G. Gianini seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

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