

INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

JULY 14, 2025 – 6:30PM (VIA ZOOM)

- 1 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm.
- 2
- 3 2. Roll Call & Seating of Alternates. Present: Vivian Garfein, Sally Spillane, Russ Conklin, John
- 4 Landon, John Harney, Maria Grace, Tracy Brown (Alternate), Abby Conroy (Land Use Director),
- 5 Miles Todaro (Land Use Tech Specialist) and Georgia Petry (Recording Secretary). Absent: Larry
- 6 Burcroff. T. Brown was appointed Voting Alternate for L. Burcroff.
- 7
- 8 3. **Approval of Agenda. So Moved** by S. Spillane, seconded by J. Landon and unanimously
- 9 **Approved.**
- 10
- 11 4. **Minutes of June 23, 2025.** V. Garfein asked for 2 corrections, as follows: Line 63 to read "...the
- 12 regulations do not say...." And Line 94 to read "...this is the last meeting that...." A **Motion to**
- 13 **Approve the Minutes of June 23, as Amended**, was made by J. Landon, seconded by M. Grace
- 14 and unanimously **Approved.**
- 15
- 16 5. Minutes of July 10, 2025 (site visit) – pending
- 17
- 18 6. Public Comment – None
- 19
- 20 7. #2025-IW-058 / 235 Belgo Road LLC / 235 Belgo Road / Renovation of Existing Barn to be Used
- 21 as a Single-Family Residence / Map 9 / Lot 9 / DOR: 06/09/2025
- 22 Cristianne Ortiz introduced their Engineer, Keith Bodwell, to describe the plans, including the
- 23 wetlands delineations. R. Conklin asked about the septic plan; Mr. Bodwell responded that he
- 24 was not sure about the TAHD approval yet. R. Conklin asked about any road work and the top
- 25 soil stockpile for the septic and siding; Mr. Bodwell responded that it would be in a flat area
- 26 outside of the URA. A **Motion to Approve Application #2025-IW-058, Subject to Standard**
- 27 **Conditions**, was made by J. Harney, seconded by J. Landon, **With All in Favor.**
- 28
- 29 8. #2025-IW-059 / Alexandra & Nicholas Brandfon / 70 Belgo Road / Septic System Replacement /
- 30 Map 6 / Lot 52 / DOR: 06/23/2025
- 31 V. Garfein commented that the site visit went well. J. Landon commented that it was well
- 32 planned out and is OK with it. A. Conroy noted that the vegetated buffer is good. A **Motion to**
- 33 **Approve #2025-IW-059, Conditioned on TAHD Approval**, was made by J. Landon, seconded by
- 34 S. Spillane, **With All in Favor.**

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75

9. #2025-IW-060 / Sharri & Richard Posen / 225+227 Undermountain Road / Dredging Silt and Removing Invasives from a 0.25 Acre Pond / Map 19 / Lot 06 / DOR: 06/23/2025
M. Todaro spoke with the applicants who asked for the Application to be **Tabled**; they still need some documents.

10. #IWWC-25-63 / Randall Allen (John Holden) / 396 Salmon Kill Road / 850sqft Addition to Existing Residence, Construction of a New Accessory Structure, and Associated Site Work / Map 08 / Lot 03 / DOR: 07/14/2025
The new online application was reviewed by A. Conroy; it had been recommended that they provide a site development/engineering plan. M. Todaro had not received anything about the septic system yet; A. Conroy indicated that the information will need to be provided. V. Garfein asked about the location of the outbuilding. John Holden, Architect, described the plan to expand the house and make it a long-term use. A. Conroy asked about the TAHD status; Mr. Holden answered that this plan expansion had not been approved yet. V. Garfein commented that she wants it on file with a B-100A. V. Garfein added that they need more information for completeness; the site visit will wait until they have more details. A. Conroy pointed out that the Town Engineer will need a detailed site plan also. Application received; no action was taken.

11. #IWWC-25-64 / Jonathan Bender & Julia Glade (Invasive Plant Solutions – Christian Allyn) / 49 Canterbury Lane Request for Jurisdictional Ruling for Invasive Plant Management / Map 40 / Lot 16 / DOR: 07/14/2025
The application came through as Regulated Activity; A. Conroy noted that they want to apply for Jurisdictional Ruling, for maintenance of a residential property. Christian Allyn referred to a CT Association of Conservation and Wetlands meeting last October and attended by Attorney Janet Brooks. Mr. Allyn described Attorney Brooks’ recommendation that this type of terrestrial invasive plant management work should be ruled as a Jurisdictional Ruling under Section 4.2.a. Mr. Allyn described the reason for that as being that invasive plant management does not disturb the native or endemic character of the land. V. Garfein expressed concern about the large area for proposed removal, without having more information. J. Landon asked how close to the lake the area is they would be working on; Mr. Allyn described the closest areas and the details of plans for removal. IWWC members had questions, including: the method of removal; when the spraying would occur; the equipment to be used; if the property was dry or wet; the herbicide to be used; the stages of the project; if there would be planting after the project. S. Spillane commented that this is a multi-year project and asked Mr. Allyn if he thought it was all going to happen; Mr. Allyn answered yes, the owners plan on it and have other plans as well. J. Harney asked if there should be a site visit. V. Garfein asked A. Conroy about the Jurisdictional Ruling matter. A. Conroy explained that this application applied for maintenance of a residential property, not under conservation of soil, vegetation, and other specifics. S. Spillane wanted to know that the buffer along the lake would be substantial and if it could be expanded. V. Garfein pointed out that a Jurisdictional Ruling could not have conditions; A. Conroy agreed. Mr. Allyn

76 commented that he would be willing to provide updates and to make a recommendation to
77 expand the buffer. J. Landon commented that it would be great if more people were willing to
78 take on such a huge project like this. V. Garfein asked if there was consensus on a Jurisdictional
79 Ruling; S. Spillane and J. Landon were comfortable with that. M. Grace asked if it is just for this
80 exact project and nothing else, because she did not want to set a precedent for others with
81 similar projects, but not the same level of detail. R. Conklin had another question for Mr. Allyn
82 about exposed vegetation from invasive plants removal; Mr. Allyn responded that a lot of native
83 and invasive plants would come back, but without a lot of soil disturbance to allow for native
84 recovery. V. Garfein suggested another option: to accept and schedule a site visit, then decide
85 on a Jurisdictional Ruling; A. Conroy agreed. J. Harney wants a site visit to understand the
86 project and educate the IWWC. M. Grace asked if there was the possibility of doing stump
87 treatments by hand, instead of doing a spray; Mr. Allyn responded that the cost component and
88 the amount of herbicide and labor required was weighed against spraying versus spot
89 treatment. T. Brown commented that photos are missing from the application; there was
90 further discussion. V. Garfein asked about the site visit; in addition to J. Harney, R. Conklin and
91 S. Spillane want to do that. M. Todaro will send out dates for a site visit; the application was
92 received, with no action taken.

93
94 12. Discussion of Activities Eligible for Agent Determination

95 The definition of risk management was added by A. Conroy, examples were left out. R. Conklin
96 commented about changing the wording in the title to “Agents Approvals for...” And other
97 members offered suggestions. S. Spillane commented that the size of the project matters,
98 regarding Agent Determination; V. Garfein agreed. The changes will be made available online
99 for the next meeting. A. Conroy reviewed the tri-fold color form for Regulated Activities,
100 Permitted Activities and Agent Determinations. S. Spillane commented that it is too easy to
101 make Agent Determinations, those should be just possibilities; A. Conroy agreed to look at the
102 language. R. Conklin commented that one of the qualifying factors was the duration of the
103 activity; A. Conroy commented that it might be better for an IWWC Jurisdictional Ruling than
104 leaving it up to Agent Determination, if a long duration project. V. Garfein commented on the
105 benefits of site visits.

106
107 13. Discussion of Online Permit Applications

108 V. Garfein commented on her application and added suggestions for the process; others also
109 commented that it just needs to be figured out.

110
111 **Adjournment. So Moved** by S. Spillane, seconded by R. Conklin and unanimously **Approved.**

112 The meeting adjourned at 7:43pm.