

October 8th, 2013



S.B. Church Memorial Town Hall
486 Oxford Road, Oxford, Connecticut 06478-1298
www.Oxford-CT.gov

Oxford Conservation Commission Inland Wetlands Agency

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

The **Regular Meeting** of the Oxford Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency was held in the Main Meeting Room of the S.B. Church Memorial Town Hall on Tuesday, October 8th, 2013.

Meeting was called to order at 7:35 P.M. by Chairman Michael Herde

ATTENDANCE ROLL CALL: Chairman Michael Herde

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Tom Adamski, Bill Richter, Sue Purcella Gibbons, Ethan Stewart
Also present: I.W.E. Officer A. Ferrillo Jr. and Denise Randall Administrative Secretary and
(Allan Young, P.E.- Nafis & Young, Town Engineer)

ABSENT:

None

AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS (NOT FOR PENDING APPLICATIONS)

None

AMENDEMENTS TO AGENDA:

1) Commissioner Adamski to discuss lack of maintenance on the level spreader at Rockhouse Hill.

MOTION made by **Commissioner S. Purcella Gibbons** to discuss lack of maintenance on the level spreader at Rockhouse Hill. **Seconded** by Commissioner B. Richter. **All in favor 5-0.**

NEW BUSINESS:

1) (IW 13-93) Cocchiola Paving - Riverview Subdivision (IW 13-93)

Mike Horbal (registered land surveyor) Seymour, CT. I'm here tonight with Mr. Tony Cocchiola (Lars Realty) and I think it is necessary to review the current revised plans for the 2-lot re-subdivision and the most critical part is that we would like to cross an intermittent watercourse. The last time we applied for this re-subdivision, the Commission had concerns about the stability on, what I would call is section 1. Since that time, I hope that the Commission feels the site is stable enough to go forward to the second section which is the subject of the application. Wetlands has a \$90,000 performance bond in place for the first section and this is the first meeting that we think you will consider the application of section 2 for the crossing of the intermittent watercourse. I will note for the record that we have previously submitted 4 drawings, application and a fee. This \$5570 fee was paid in May of 2013. There was also a \$60.00 State fee submitted. Mr. Cocchiola owns the property showing lot #5 and #6 (pointing out on the map). The subdivision (section 1) I spoke of earlier with the \$90,000 bond is lot #4 and #3 going out to Route 34, close to the Punk-up Road intersection. Mr. Cocchiola has chosen this time to stabilize the slopes but not to build the road or the storm drainage into the road. He continues to monitor erosion control and any erosion on the site and I will say that the site is stable today. I would also note that during the 4 years he has been constructing on the site, I don't believe the town has ever received complaints about erosion. There were complaints about the dust during that time but never any major problems from the construction re-grading on this site. We would like to ask for lots number 5 and 6 and an access way coming off the end of Riverview Road. The lots meet the size requirement of the zoning and we wanted to stay away from an existing right of way he has over East Hill Road, primarily because of the size and condition of East Hill Road and also the small culvert bridge crossing the brook under East Hill Road. We have taken into consideration (Mr. Horbal asked for the Commission to turn to map #2, site and development plan) the location of the houses. All areas have been tested for the septic systems. In order to do this, driveways will have to be built and there will be some grading involved on each of the lots and the driveway crossing. On the driveway crossing, of the intermittent watercourse, we are proposing a 48 inch reinforced concrete pipe with head walls on it and we would rip rap the up stream and down stream portions of the intermittent watercourse. If we are allowed to do this, it will be one of the most stable portions of this watercourse. That is the largest activity we have that involves wetland concerns, I believe. The 3rd sheet of this set of plans is the profiles of the piping plan, storm water and soil and sediment erosion control plan, you see temporary sediment traps, construction entrances and all pretty standard items your Commission is familiar with.

Chairman M. Herde asked Mr. Horbal: You just stated you wanted to avoid the use of East Hill Road, but would you do a lay out as if it did come in there, or is primarily East Hill Road just not suitable for the development?

Mr. Horbal replied: We like the idea to access off of our proposed Riverview Road because of the type of homes that Mr. Cocchiola will eventually offer, as opposed to some of the homes on East Hill Road. In addition to that, if you look at the size and condition of East Hill Road, including

the first 200 feet including the culvert, we prefer not to use it. It is narrow and not in good condition and we have even submitted reports on the condition of this road.

Chairman M. Herde asked: If you come in from that side, does it drastically change the layout of the homes?

Mr. Horbal replied: Not the homes at all.

Chairman M. Herde asked: How about the grading?

Mr. Horbal replied: It would change the location of some property lines, obviously, but we still need the room in between the homes and still end up putting lot #6 close to the lower level of the site, otherwise it will cause us more grading.

Chairman M. Herde suggested putting the home in the upper area in the vicinity of where the septic is proposed. Does that change the grading a lot up there?

Mr. Horbal replied: It would essentially flip this over. If it was in that location, it would shorten the driveway for lot #5 but would make the driveway longer for lot #6.

Chairman M. Herde stated: We have had extensive public hearings on this project in the past and does anyone on the Commission feel we should go to public hearing due to public interest and/or potential significant activity here with the intermittent watercourse? Do we need to do this in the applicant's favor or the Town's favor so that someone in the area doesn't feel left out?

Commissioner T. Adamski stated: I think potentially we have public interest, as we have had in the past.

Chairman M. Herde agreed and stated: There are a lot of grade changes in the vicinity and we do have a section of the intermittent watercourse which is going to be completely altered and there is a whole swale coming in which will change the flow.

Commissioner B. Richter stated: I would say we should go to public hearing due to the previous public interest and the plan is different from the previous public hearing.

Chairman M. Herde agreed

Commissioner T. Adamski stated: And with the impact, you have a swale now going into that watercourse, correct?

Chairman M. Herde stated: Right.

Mr. Horbal asked which swale Commissioner Adamski was talking about (pointing to the plan)

Commissioner T. Adamski asked Mr. Horbal: So potentially you don't think your dumping more water into the intermittent watercourse?

Mr. Horbal replied: I don't think we are dumping more; we are dumping it in a different place which will end up in Five-Mile Brook.

Chairman M. Herde stated: We do have one letter from a concerned citizen in that area and his name is Mr. Richard Kopf at 581 Roosevelt Drive, Oxford and he request that the Commission conduct a public hearing due to public interests. His letter also states that many others in this neighborhood agree.

MOTION made by **Commission T. Adamski** to go to public hearing on Cocchiola Paving - Riverview Subdivision (IW 13-93) due to both significant public interest and potential significant impact. The public hearing to be held on November 12, 2013 (Tuesday) before our regular meeting at 6:30 in the main meeting room 1 and 2 at 486 Oxford Rd., Oxford Town Hall. **Seconded** by Commissioner B. Richter. **All in favor 5-0.**

2) (IW 13-97) 3 Echo Valley Rd. Tom Haynes- Oxford Town Center

Kyle Bogardus stated his name and: (Langdon Engineering & Environmental Services) Professional Engineer and Certified Erosion and Sediment Control and I'm here on behalf of the Applicant with me is Michael Klein (Environmental Scientist) and I will walk you through an overall view of the site and where it is today and Mr. Klein will talk about the wetlands and we will go through our phasing approach. Mr. Bogardus stated for those of you not familiar with the site, it's located on Route 67 and showed an aerial photo of this existing Quarry and pointed out the materials yard, post office and Echo Valley Road. It's about 30 acres in total with 4 wetlands pockets and low lying areas as a result of quarry activity there is standing water. There is a man-made sediment pond built to handle storm water management and erosion control during the quarry operations. Mr. Bogardus pointed out the associated regulated areas. Existing grades, generally speaking, are about 20 to 40 feet higher then the lower area down below. There are lots of existing piles of materials as the quarry operation stopped in the variant stages of processing the larger material into smaller material that will be utilized. I will now let Michael Klein talk about the wetlands and then I will walk you through the proposed operation.

Good Evening, my name is Michael Klein I'm a biologist and soil scientist with an office in West Hartford and we marked the wetland boundaries last month. There are 2 small wetland pockets in the Northeastern corner of the site that represent areas that were functioning as temporary sediment traps based on the grade around those areas when the quarry operations stopped. There were low lying, veins migrating into that area from rainfall runoff, from the time the quarry has been suspended and they now support wetland vegetation and have a perched water table and the material underneath is obviously highly compacted or rock. They technically qualify as regulated and really have no function other than to act as a collection point for local drainage in a totally confined depression and have no influence in any other area of the site. The largest wetland area on the site is known as wetland 3 which is the sediment pond and has a permanent pool of standing water and a fringe of vegetation around the edges. It's man-made and functioning as a sedimentation pond and has a water quality renovation function. The wetland that is along the property line, in the South east corner near Echo Valley Road is part of a large wetland system that comes down from the north and has a semi-perennial stream that flows through it and it terminates at the entrance road to the store and I'm told it

picks up in the street drainage. There is a small ponded area on the east side of the driveway entrance. It's actually a regionally diverse wetland system and has open water and marsh habitat and vegetation around the edges with a stream through it. If it were not for its relationship to a pretty well developed area and pretty small size it would be a pretty nice wetland. As it is now, it seems to be doing pretty fine on its own in that location but is somewhat diminished in significance by the landscaped characteristics in the surrounding area. The report describes these areas of the sediment pond is about 10,000 square feet, so it gives you an idea that these 2 are less than 1000 sq ft. each. We did a functions and values assessment which was included in our report and we identified the principal function of these wetlands #1 and #2 is sediment and retention but not providing a significant level. For wetland #3 principal functions is sediment and retention and because of the fact that is treating the quarry water runoff can be considered significant but can also be accomplished at any other location with a suitable volume. I believe this is it on wetland resources and I can take any questions if the Commission has them.

Mr. Bogardus stated: What we are planning to do and we have broken out into some phases of the operations and it's about 160,000 cubic yards of materials that are on the site either in stock piles or materials and about 400,000 more material will be excavated. The vast majority will be placed in this low lying area to create a developmental pad across this phase 1 area. There will be some export associated with this development, we are thinking about 50,000 cubic yards and we have been working with Nafis and Young to break that out into the phases to get a better understanding of when and the duration of that kind of work.

Mr. Bogardus then pointed out where the work would be placed into the low lying area. The phase 1 and phase 2 areas were done for 2 reasons, one is to maintain the post office and the store then the bins and tents will come down and start placing fills and lifts to start to bring it up. Also, maintain the existing sediment pond in the initial phase. The proposed sediment pond will replace that function in this area (pointing out on the map) with the store re-locating, it is important and we are being cognizant of that in maintaining the existing pond. Phase 3 area is again similar to phase 1 in that there is a lot of stock piled material, not as much excavation down in that area. It will more tiered fill being placed across this area. The phases, as you would expect will overlap, its not just a linear type project happening throughout but there are some key delineation points with the storm movement, the existing pond being removed and the new pond being installed. This is kind of a summary of the activities associated with this project, are there any questions?

Allan Young (Town Engineer, Nafis & Young) asked: I should point out; the existing pond will not be filled in until the new pond is constructed to replace it. So even though it is in phase 2, it will be constructed first before the balance of the filling happens on the existing pond.

Mr. Bogardus replied: The new pond is in phase 2, so we are envisioning to start bringing it up in lifts, maintaining this pond in the function it does today and we won't remove that pond, until this pond (pointing to map) is fully established. That timing is critical and we recognize that and spoke to Nafis & Young about it.

Mr. Bogardus continued and stated: What I will do now is go through our B, M, P's and soil and erosion control measures and storm water management for the site.

Mr. Bogardus pointed out a few areas on the map and stated: What we try to do is manage storm water throughout the construction process and we have done that through temporary diversion berms and temporary swales, so that we can move these and adjust as needed. The perimeter BMP's, silt fences, all those things we be installed initially, but I would envision that diversion berms and swales would be shifted around as we excavate a larger area. If there is 20 feet of grade change, we are going to bring it down, we are not going to put a diversion swale in right away in that area, we might put in a pipe and those things will be active during this construction process. This is pretty typical of any construction project. We are envisioning diversion berms, pipe slopes, not sure if you have seen this similar on highway excavation. We have concerns about soil erosion; we have a berm at the top of the 2 to 1 slope, to cleft through a pipe, go down to the swales, slope drain down to the sediment trap. A comment that came up was regarding reverse benching which will be every 15 feet on that slope, 2 to 1 slope up from the edge and we reverse bench, flat area and will sheet flow down towards the bottom. There will be a double row of silt fence, it will be silt fence, hay bales, then silt fence and add another silt fence directly around the wetlands to prevent any migration of soils to the site in this direction. The 7th basin has been sized per the D.E.E.P. requirements and also we have done storm water calculations for conveyance of the various storms and it has the capacity needed for the area that will drain to it. (Pointing to area on map) This side of the site is a little more challenging from a topography prospective and explained the area where most of the fill is going and he will be able to get gravity flow to go down to the sediment pond and hopefully to the storm drain system.

Mr. Bogardus pointed to an area that would sheet flow towards Rte 67. What we're proposing is a sediment pond and diversion berms as needed to make that barrier so we don't have it sheet flow out onto Rte. 67. We will manage the runoff in this area and we were talking about other ways to accomplish this would be to make depressions throughout the initial phase of construction to keep it managed on site. This is a very large piece of property and we can make storm water temporary basins throughout the process as needed to really manage the storm water runoff and erosion. Also a double silt fence along Rte 67 and utilizing the existing paved access driveway to the quarry, it's all stabilized construction entrances. Initially we had them at 50 feet and we increased it to 100 feet, per discussion with the town engineer. We wanted a little more tracking distance before the vehicles leave the site. The grading is pretty gentle and you can see it on this map. In general, this would be a flat area with a 4% grade across from Route 67 back to the top of our banks. Any questions on erosion control measures?

Chairman M. Herde stated and asked: Using the existing driveway, there has been a lot of water coming off of there onto Route 67, I'm just wondering with the increase of truck traffic, picking back up again and with the amount of dirt that is on that driveway, washing down and eventually going into the river. How are you addressing the driveway specifically, are you adding in a drainage system around the driveway, or curbing or catch basins going into that area?

Mr. Bogardus replied: We are not adding structural catch basins and pipe. There is an existing catch basin in the island, (pointing to map) down here. No sheet flow from this area gets to that catch basin that would only take out the driveway, not the developed area. What we plan to do is make depressions in this location (pointing to map). If you went out to look right now, there is a low lying area and I think that has prevented some washing out over the years, which in the past was a previous concern. We have recognized it is a major component. We will do everything we need to do to prevent any erosion and storm water runoff for this site.

Chairman M. Herde stated: This has been a sore spot and was missed in the original engineering and in all honesty, this should have just been shut down instead of letting it continue when it failed.

Mr. Tom Haynes (the applicant) agreed: The maintenance on that basin and that pipe was not what it should have been. When the pipe got filled up it should have been cleaned and it is now and that is why we don't have issues on that driveway anymore. Also the maintenance up top should have been managed differently and this is like what we are talking about doing now. We want to keep the sheet flow off of that driveway versus the grading filled up taking place while we are in there.

Chairman M. Herde asked: Where does that catch basin go to, where is it piped, is it all the way down to the river?

Mr. Tom Haynes replied: Down on the side, I think there is a manhole and it pipes down and ties into the storm system on Route 67.

Chairman M. Herde asked: How is the water being cleaned that is on that driveway that goes straight into the river?

Mr. Bogardus replied: The intention is to manage that runoff, not to get to that driveway. Manage it on site with low lying depressions such as these (pointing to map).

Chairman M. Herde stated and asked: With the rain water and dirt coming off the trucks and has no choice then to either go into Route 67 or into that catch basin. After you have collected the dirt and the rain water that's on that driveway, how will it be cleaned?

Mr. Bogardus replied: Yes, it is challenging in that section. We will do inlet protection with silt sack in the catch basin and hay bales. It has to be maintained, and has to be an active process to keep that runoff controlled and clean. Our intention and the goal we try to achieve is to not allow sheet flow from the quarry operation, and to increase the anti tracking pad to 100 feet. Any trucks leaving the site have to go down 100 feet of tracking pad.

Chairman M. Herde stated: I want to just say it will be an area of concern. If it doesn't work, you will be in a real pinch because it will be when everything is underway and this time we will not look the other way.

Mr. Haynes replied: And this is understood. Over the years we have learned more about soil and erosion control measures and we are well aware that driveway is going to be heavily monitored and we understand what we need to do.

Chairman M. Herde stated: Ok, and we will be monitoring from where it comes out on the other end.

I.W.E. Officer A. Ferrillo asked: Does that barrier wall come down immediately, in between Route 67 and the Quarry?

Mr. Haynes replied: I believe the goal is to work from the back to the front. To take the high area down and just keep going with the fill and working our way toward the front which would mean taking down that barrier wall last and again so that everything is managed on the site.

Chairman M. Herde asked: How much of this is common fill versus rock?

Mr. Haynes replied: Its all rock.

Chairman M. Herde asked: Along the eastern side, where the green lines are in the back, is that a temporary berm?

Mr. Bogardus replied: The green lines on this map, represent the silt fence and hay bales, the arrows represent where there are diversion swales and diversion slopes. At the toe of that slope, we will have a depression before you go up to the silt fence; it will capture it from the slope and go down.

Chairman M. Herde added: Yes and there will be check dams all the way. My concern is when you have a mile of silt fence all running in one direction, it ends up increasing velocity along it and sooner or later there is a hole in the silt fence, which can never be perfect, and no silt fences has made to hold back 20 acres of water that is moving.

Mr. Bogardus replied: I don't think there is any issue with having check dams along those intervals to help manage velocities.

Chairman M. Herde stated: In certain situations, I think that silt fences are their own worst problem. When you have 400 feet of fence, when you only need 100 and all you did was concentrate more water.

Chairman M. Herde asked if anyone had any comments or questions.

Mr. Haynes stated: This is really a part of the intended site plan and we are kind of following through. The overall approach from 15 years ago is pretty much where it was headed except that we revised this site plan to leave more material on site then what was originally approved before. Our goal is keep more on the site because we really have a development plan for this and we have been able to balance the site and to take about 50,000 cubic yards off site.

Mr. Allan Young (Town Engineer) where we stand, we have been closely working with Kyle Bogardus and all comments are being addressed. The final comment and one that I have already mentioned was the sheet flow coming onto Route 67 which neither Commission was favorable with and this is the first time I have see the plan tonight. I have some revised plans for that. They have done everything I have asked.

Chairman M. Herde asked: My question is if this site goes half way through or whatever happens, is it, at any point, will it be at a stable position where it can stop indefinitely?

Mr. Allan Young replied: As long as the front excavation is going to be last, that provides some protection to Route 67. The rest of it is basically rock. The rock may change slightly. The new pond

will act like the old pond, but in a different location. I think basically if the project were to stop after phase 1, it would be ok.

Chairman M. Herde asked: In the long run, if it was sitting for many years, are these ponds going to be maintained? If you have all this open rock sitting and eventually all those little fissures stop taking on water in between the rock and you have a system, does this system take care of itself or will you need maintenance if its sitting over a long period of time?

Allan Young replied: It might need maintenance, if it's over a long period of time for sure. What you're getting is very high run off, because it's all rock. But not a lot of material to silt it up, if all of the sudden it stops for 10 years, then yes, your probably going to have to do maintenance. But the good part of it is its basically rock and therefore not too much maintenance needed.

Chairman M. Herde asked: Is there any point in this Commission, aside from Zoning, should we be bonding erosion control so that they definitely get to a point where they can stay stable for a period of time?

Allan Young replied: Well that is up to the Commission. Certainly, if you had that and then you were going to restore the site, or try and do some restoration on the site, if it reaches that point, that is really up to the Commission, I have seen it done before.

Chairman M. Herde agreed: Yes, it's more for the erosion controls to protect the wetlands and if the project stops at a certain point prior to completion.

Allan Young added: A lot of this erosion control is temporary erosion control as the process evolves. Its not permanent erosion control and maybe I'm wrong but I am under the impression that permanent erosion controls will be coming later with the site development plan.

Chairman M. Herde added: Yes, this is semi –permanent erosion controls. We have seen it in a few different projects where things got stalled and/or changed ownership or whatever along the way. So if you had a bond in place until the site got where it was a very stable site, it could stay for 10 years and then we could release that bond.

Mr. Haynes added: And yes, this is one those sites that got stalled.

Chairman M. Herde stated: Yes, and we have been dealing with you for years and we know that you will come through.

Mr. Haynes replied: We have no problem providing a bond, and if that is what the Commission feels you need for comfort, we are ok with it. We have no reason to go in without a project. We don't want to move the store but we are doing this because we have an overall plan. If this plan were to not happen for some reason, we will come in and let you know.

Commissioner T. Adamski asked: So basically this whole thing comes in as a package, phase 1, phase 3 and phase 2. If for some reason phase 3 can't happen, and I'm not implying anything, phase 1 would not happen, nothing would happen, right?

Mr. Haynes replied: Right. We are calling it a phase because the Town is asking for a phase. The entire site is one site and maybe that site off to the left would not be developed right away but we have a tenant shopping center and a parking lot that's going to go all in and our goal is to do that right away.

Chairman M. Herde stated he would like all Commission members to visit the site to get re-familiarized. We will then see the applicant at the next meeting on October 22, 2013.

OLD BUSINESS:

1.) (IW 13-47) Garden Homes, Hurley Road.

A September 9, 2013 public hearing was held and will be continued on October 17th, 2013, 7 pm at Oxford Town Hall.

2.) (IW-11-92) Botti/Riggs Street & Autumn Ridge Map: 33 Block: 10 Lot: 82- 3 lot subdivision Beth Acres

I.W.E. Officer A. Ferrillo stated: This previous subdivision was approved by the Commission and Mr. Horbal and the applicant proposing a lot line revision.

Mr. Horbal stated: Present with me is Mr. Brian Botti (applicant) here is a check for \$60.00 and here are the proposed plans for this subdivision known as Beth Acres that has been around for some time now. Most recently this Commission re-approved this subdivision in the past year for Mr. Botti. We had some problems with Planning and Zoning regarding the original subdivision is void because the requirements of setting a couple of items were not completed and has caused us to change the lot lines on the lot to make 3 road front lots, all of which are served by driveways coming off Autumn Ridge Road. Lot #2 and #3 are using the same driveway as we had originally proposed. There is no additional construction required for this lot lay out, other than we may have to move the telephone pole located on lot #3. We still propose to pull out the pipe crossing on Riggs Street Brook and doing the rip rap that we had already talked about and your Commission has it approved wanted it done asap.

Commissioner T. Adamski asked: This was already approved, right?

I.W.E. Officer A. Ferrillo replied: Yes, there is no additional impact.

Mr. Horbal agreed: Yes, there is no additional impact, were not getting closer to the wetlands, and we are not grading any more. Our grading near the outside of the brook is basically done there. There are no new easements required and we move the lot lines around to satisfy Zonings current requirements. We had to do that to get 175 foot square in each of the lots in the dry contiguous areas.

October 8th, 2013

MOTION made **Commissioner B. Richter** to approve the lot line revision for **(IW-11-92)** Botti/Riggs Street & Autumn Ridge Map: 33 Block: 10 Lot: 82- 3 lot subdivision Beth Acres. No impact to the wetlands. Commissioner T. Adamski **seconded**. All in favor 5-0.

NEW APPLICATIONS REQUIRING OCCIWA APPROVAL (ACCEPTANCE)
None

OTHER BUSINESS:

ACCEPTANCE OF APPROVAL MINUTES & CORRECTIONS TO MINUTES (IFANY):

MOTION made by **Commissioner T. Adamski** to approve the regular meeting minutes for September 24th, 2013. **Seconded** by **Commissioner S. Purcella Gibbons**. All in Favor 5-0

ENFORCEMENT OFFICER:

I.W.E. Officer A. Ferrillo stated: A complaint was called in about a sea wall that was built on the Housatonic River without a permit and Commissioner Adamski and myself took some photos of a sea wall. Photos were then shown. Investigation continues.

Chairman M. Herde replied Ok and asked about 138 Coppermine Road and asked I.W.E. Officer to go down and check on that project.

COMPLAINT/CONCERN:

APPLICATIONS NOT REQUIRING OCCIWA APPROVAL:

4/20/2013	Jacki Halpern	56 Jackson Cove Rd.	Interior alteration - no ext of foot.
4/29/2013	Edwards Realty	16 Edwards Drive	Cottage Biz
5/6/2013	Richard Hoepfner	9 Owl Ridge Rd.	CO for enclosed sunroom
5/7/2013	Chris Kelly	505 Traditions	Bathroom remodel

October 8th, 2013

		Court	
5/13/2013	Larry Sims	621 Championship Dr.	partial finish bsmt for closet
5/14/2013	Pheonix Propane	268 Oxford Road	CO for Office
5/20/2013	Gary Hylinski	71 Oxford Road	Remodel for Velvet Hair
		549 Putting Green	Salon
5/21/2013	David Giovanetti	In	Bathroom in bsmt.
6/5/2013	Ed Cirella	575 inverness ct	Bsmt. Remodel

MATTERS OF VIOLATIONS/LITIGATIONS:

1. Michael Ligi -501 Roosevelt (Town Engineers report dated 9-12-2011)
Commission requested the Enforcement Officer to contact Mr. Ligi regarding the current status of the wall constructed without a permit. Mr. Ligi is currently filing reports with all departments under court order. Matter is being reviewed by the State's Attorney.
2. Notice of Violation Cease & Desist--- Ms. V. Tkacz-(10 Park Rd.)
Certified Letter sent on 7/5/12 by I/W and Letter sent by P&Z on 10/1/12. Letter received.
Engineer F. D'Amico engaged by owner to prepare site plan. Site plan received and sent to town engineer for review. Mr. D'Amico brought in the revised map on 8/13/13 and within the next few weeks the Commission will be walking the property with the new revised map.
3. Notice of Violation Cease & Desist ---Mr. Frank H. & Robert Samuelson (Under the Rock Park) on Roosevelt Drive
4. Notice of Cease & Restore -- (88 Perkins Rd) Debris and garbage on property.

REPORTS ON SEMINARS, INSPECTIONS, and OTHER MEETINGS SCHEDULED OR ATTENDED NEWSPAPER ITEMS & P & Z MINUTES:

OTHER ITEMS OF CONCERN:

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN & OTHER COMMISSION MEMBERS OTHER:

- 1) Oxford Oak, LLC 360 Oxford Road (Lot 39) (Stabilization of site).
- 2) Open Space Inventory Map. Completed by New England Geosystems

October 8th, 2013

- 3) **NOV WR SW 06 007 (Issued 4/10/06) CT DEP Meadow Brook Estates, Great Hill Road** (Remove Sediment from Pond & Stream) (Letter dated 9/27/06) (Memo dated 8/4/06). Work completed, staff to monitor site for 1 year.
- 4) Town of Oxford Catch Basins (Silt Removal).
- 5) Storm Drain Marker Program (Phase II).

MATTERS OF CONSERVATION:

Commissioner T. Adamski wanted to talk about the level spreader at the High School and the current lack of maintenance with trees growing in the forebay. He explained that we should take out the older stone and put in new rip rap in the forebay.

I.W.E. Officer A. Ferrillo stated: I spoke with John Barlow (facility manager at High School) and visited the site with him. He stated he will remove the trees currently growing in the forebay but stated he does not have sufficient funding available at this time.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION made by **Commissioner B. Richter** to adjourn at 9:32 p.m.
Seconded by **Commissioner T. Adamski**. All in Favor 5-0.

Respectfully Submitted,



Denise Randall
Administrative OCCIWA Secretary

13 OCT 17 AM 11:20
TOWN OF OXFORD, CT
TOWN CLERK
Denise Randall