



Town of Beacon Falls  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
Special Meeting Minutes  
April 25, 2024  
C/O Town Clerk  
10 Maple Avenue Beacon Falls, CT 06403  
(Subject to Revision)

**Members Present:** Chairman Michael Rupsis (**MR**), John-Paul Dorais (**JPD**), Vicechair Michael Pratt (**MP**), Marc Bronn (**MB**), Jack Burns (**JB**), William Fredericks (**WF**)

**Members Absent:** Jonathan Conte (**JC**), Steven Orloski (**SO**)

**Others Present:** Community Planner Molly Johnson (**MJ**), Attorney Stephen Bellis (**SB**) and Joe Salemme (**JS**) representing Hopp Brook Estates, Selectman Michael Krenesky (**MK**), Town Attorney Vincent Marino (**VM**), and 8 members of the public.

1. **Call to Order/Pledge to the Flag:**

**MR** called the meeting to order at 7:32 PM.

2. **Read and Approve Minutes from Previous Meetings:**

Motion to accept the 03/21/2024 regular meeting minutes plus both 03/21/2024 Public hearing minutes made by **MP** and Seconded by **JB**. All ayes

3. **Comments from the Public:**

Eric Dolecki (**ED**) 14 Haley Ridge Road: **ED** I know at this point your decisions are probably made with Hawks View Subdivision, at this final time I want to request that you balance the rights that the proposed subdivision landowners have with the hopes, concerns and wishes of the residents on Haley Ridge Road. Thank you – I appreciate you guys.

Eric Klimaszewski (**EK**) 26 Fairfield Place: **EK** Just still voicing my concerns – it's getting worse, nothing has been done – he hit the telephone pole the other day.

**MP** Motioned to rearrange the agenda to accommodate the public. **WF** Seconded. All ayes.

4. **Old Business –**

- a. Chatfield Farms/EG Home LLC: Board reviewed report – no questions or concerns.
- b. Tiverton 1: Discussed under item 5b.
- c. HI Stone: **NP** Their original permit is good until February 2025 so we will revisit it in the Fall of 2024 to get the ball rolling.
- d. Tri-America: No updates. Clerk Email to see where they're at in progression and to make sure all plantings are in the correct place.



Town of Beacon Falls  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
Special Meeting Minutes  
April 25, 2024  
C/O Town Clerk  
10 Maple Avenue Beacon Falls, CT 06403  
(Subject to Revision)

- e. Hawks View Subdivision: **MJ** Reads her Town Planner memo to the board.  
(Attached at the end of the minutes)
- f. Hopp Brook Estates: **VM** One condition must be septic approval. **MR** The septic's have to be approved still. **SB** With DEEP or Naugatuck Valley, it's gone back and forth a few times. **MR** How about the water tower? **MP** That would be a condition. **MR** I thought you were going to have water? We would like to see the tank because there is water up there. The board and fire marshal want to get away from the tanks.

**MJ** Read Town Planner notes to the board regarding the application.  
(Attached at the end of the minutes)

**VM** In regard to Wetlands – this new application needs to go back to wetlands for Stormwater.

- g. Manny's Roofing: **MB** We'll leave this on the agenda.
- h. 20 Fairfield Place: **NP** We have the cease-and-desist letter from the Town Attorney – we just want you (Planning and Zoning Board) to look over it and add any comments if you see it necessary. **VM** I just want to clarify that we loosely refer to this as a "Cease and Desist" but the statute separates this as an "Order to Discontinue" as we are asking him to discontinue the violations of the zoning regulations which is why I reworded and restyled the letter. Otherwise, I laid it out so it's very specific and ready to be issued. **MR** Mail it ASAP please. **MJ** I can't guarantee we will send it tomorrow because we need the ZEO to sign it but we will get it out.

5. **New Applications/New Business:**

- a. 53 Lancaster Dr – Text Change Amendment: Public Hearing set for May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2024, at 7:15 pm.
- b. Release of Original Tiverton Bond: **MP** Motioned to release the original C. Edwards Tiverton Bond for \$176,000. **MB** Seconded. All ayes.

- 6. **POCD Update**: **MJ** For the POCD we are drafting process – one of the main things is we just completed goals and strategies for the plan. Also, regarding the future land use plan we just conducted a town staff review and provided feedback to the consultant. We should have a full draft within the next month and a half. Additionally, we have the final affordable housing plan.



Town of Beacon Falls  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
Special Meeting Minutes  
April 25, 2024  
C/O Town Clerk  
10 Maple Avenue Beacon Falls, CT 06403  
(Subject to Revision)

7. **Reports:**

- a. Zoning Enforcement Officer: No update
- b. Town Engineer: No update
- c. Town Planner: **MJ** We received an inter-municipal notification from the Town of Oxford regarding an Amendment to the Zoning Regulations for Cannabis Establishments and from the Town of Bethany regarding the discontinuance of Miller Road.

8. **Petitions from Commissioners:** None

9. **Correspondence & Payment of Bills:**

**MP** motioned to pay all bills as presented. **WF** Seconded. All ayes.

10. **Adjournment:** **JC** motioned to adjourn at 8:38 pm, **MP** Seconded. All ayes.

Respectfully submitted,

**Nicole Pastor**

Clerk, Planning & Zoning



**Town of Beacon Falls  
MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Beacon Falls Planning and Zoning Commission  
**From:** Molly Johnson, Beacon Falls Town Planner and Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments Community Planner  
**Date:** April 16, 2024  
**Subject:** Updated Town Planner Review of Hopp Brook  
Affordable Housing Zone to a PROD  
Zone Change and Special Exception/Site Plan  
Applications

As of April 18, 2024, the Planning and Zoning Commission has 37 days remaining to review this application.

- I recommend the commission focus today on a discussion regarding the applications with the knowledge that the May meeting will require the PZC to decisions on these applications. Note that they are two separates but connected applications – a zone change and a special exception.
- You may wish to have our Town Attorney create the proper motions necessary for your final decisions.
- Now that Atty. Marino has clarified that the PROD text amendment does exist in our town regulations, after much deliberation, I have conducted a final review of what we have discussed thus far and connected it to compliance with our existing regulations (Sections 52, 53) and the proposed zone change to PROD.
- Nicole has attached the PROD text amendment language in this month's meeting packet for your reference.
- A key aspect of the PROD comes from Section E.1 which to paraphrase requires any approved site plan of a PROD to meet the PROD standards as well the Site Plan standards of Section 51 and utilize the decision criteria found in Section 52, stating for the Commission that it shall approve an application for a special use permit only if it finds that the proposed development meets the following criteria:
  1. *The proposed development shall be of such location, size and character that, in general, it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the area in which it is proposed and will not be detrimental to the orderly development of adjacent properties.*
  2. *The location and size of proposed uses, the intensity of operations involved in connection with such uses, the site layout, and their relationship to access streets shall be such that vehicular and*

*pedestrian traffic generated by the use or uses, shall not be detrimental to the character of the neighborhood.*

3. *The proposed development will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings or impair the value thereof.*
4. *The proposed uses permit the development of the site without the destruction of valuable natural assets or pollution of lakes, streams, and other water bodies while providing the best possible design of structures and land uses compatible with the shape, size, and topographic and natural character of the site.*
5. *The proposed development will be compatible with the existing and future character of the neighborhood in which the development is to be located. Particular attention shall be paid to the type and density of adjacent residential development, the character and uniqueness of the natural resources of the neighborhood, the character and use of existing highway facilities, and the Plan of Conservation and Development.*
6. *The location and character of buildings shall create a harmonious grouping and shall be compatible with surrounding structures.*
7. *The proposed development shall not create traffic safety hazards or congestion not consistent with the character of the community. Any improvements to public roads necessitated by the proposed development shall be the responsibility of the developer.*
8. *The proposed development shall be of a superior site and architectural design that enhances the surrounding neighborhood environment.*
9. *The public water supply facilities and facilities for the disposal of sanitary waste have sufficient capacity to accommodate the needs of the proposed development.*
10. *The proposed development shall have a positive impact on the overall economy of the community.*
11. *The nature and location of the use and of any building or other structure shall be such that there will be adequate access to it for fire protection purposes.*

Please note that the PROD, which the applicant seeks to change zones to, explicitly states “The Commission may establish the PROD for a particular parcel described in schedule A, which is within the R-1 residential district after an application is submitted and a hearing is held thereon”. The PROD, as it is written, does not address the more recently established and court approved Hopp Brook Village District. Should the Commission approve this zone change, this inconsistency may make the Town vulnerable to an appeal.

An additional significant note is that due to the April 17, 2023 Superior court decision, the existing area is zoned with the “Hopp Brook Village District” overlay zone designation. This overlay zone places significant restrictions on proposed developments to the area.

Below are specific comments from my review, in no particular order, which include the relevant Town regulation, and whether that element is in compliance with that regulation.

Compliance	Comment	Regulation Relevance	Topic
No	<p><u>Aquarion Water service commitment that was submitted at the public hearing as Exhibit 5 expired on October 24, 2023</u></p> <p>Applicant will need to get an updated review and service commitment from Aquarion.</p> <p>Note that in this expired service commitment, Aquarion was unable to provide the fire hydrant demand requested and explained that “system</p>	<p>PROD – D.10 “Private or public water and sewer service shall be provided to any development proposed under this regulation.”</p> <p>Sec. 52.6.9 “Public water supply facilities and</p>	Water service access

	<p>improvements, including installation of a new water tank, are required to provide fire flow to the proposed development”.</p> <p>Town Engineer (TE) was also concerned with how the proposed water tower would function.</p> <p>The applicant submitted Exhibit 10, the conceptual design criteria shared by Carlos Vizcarrondo of Aquarion Water Company from November 2020 who stated “These are obviously <b>subject to change</b> as we get into real design but, should be adequate for a conceptual estimate”. <u>More details must be submitted.</u></p>	<p>facilities for the disposal of sanitary waste have sufficient capacity to accommodate the needs of the proposed development”</p>	
<b>No</b>	<p>TE comments: “The sanitary pipes/system is a bit difficult to understand without seeing how it actually ties into each septic unit. Pipes to dead-end manholes are shown, with no outlet pipes.”</p> <p><u>“The lack of septic design is obviously concerning. Given the amount of units and flow they will generate, in my opinion that should be fully designed and approved before either commission grants approval since its significant to the outcome of the project.</u> They show 7 Mantis Septic systems that accommodate 16 units each. Theres 96 units total, not 112.”</p> <p>From IWWC Letter “Specific concerns of the IWWC include, but are not limited to, the design for the septic system and reserve areas...”</p> <p>At the public hearing, the Applicant included Exhibit 15, a letter from their Project Engineer stating that in 2018 test holes were completed for the 7 individual septic systems and that they were reviewed by Laurel Shaw at Naugatuck Valley Health District. The site investigation report was also included.</p>	<p>PROD – D.10 “Private or public water and sewer service shall be provided to any development proposed under this regulation.”</p> <p>Sec. 51.3.5 <b>“The proposed method of sanitary sewerage shall be indicated and shall be in accordance with applicable standards of the Director of Health of the Town, the CT State Health Dept. and the DEEP.</b></p> <p>Sec. 52.6.9 “Public water supply facilities and facilities for the disposal of sanitary waste have sufficient capacity to accommodate the needs of the proposed development”</p>	Septic Systems
<b>Yes</b>	<p>The site plan indicates compliance to specific building standards set out in the PROD – building height of max 35 ft., building setbacks, a landscape plan, floor plans – Exhibit #8, etc.</p>	<p>PROD – D. 1, D. 2, D. 4, D. 6.</p>	Building structures/setbacks
<b>Yes</b>	<p>A traffic impact study was submitted as Exhibit #9. It was completed in May 2020 by Kermit Hua of</p>	<p>PROD – D. 5 “A Written Traffic report may be</p>	Traffic

	<p>KWH Enterprise for the previously submitted design of 108 houses. It found that the development will produce “limited traffic impact”.</p>	<p>submitted by a qualified professional engineer, if required by the Commission.”</p> <p>Section 51.3.4 Drives, Parking and Circulation: “special attention shall be given to location and number of access points to avoid undue hazards to traffic and undue traffic congestion...”</p> <p>Sec. 52.6.7 “shall not create traffic safety hazards or congestion...”</p>	
<b>No</b>	<p>In his review, TE noted <u>“no storm drainage computations provided”</u> as well as many <u>additional notes on storm drainage according to the plan. See notes: While stormwater is review by the IWWC, it is critical to know that the applicant has not yet received approval regarding stormwater.</u></p> <p>The property is adjacent to a Superfund site which is currently undergoing long-term remediation. The adjacent parcel has a DEEP Environmental Land-Use Restriction, which discusses monitoring wells and that no action shall be taken (on the parcel) that is reasonable likely to...<u>“create a risk of migration of pollutants or a potential hazard to human health or the environment”</u>. I recommend any approval is contingent upon review by the proper DEEP and EPA authorities that nearby development (which is occurring within 100 ft of the parcel) will not create any risks to human health or the environment.</p> <p>Additionally, from the March 20 IWWC letter - “The Inland Wetland and Watercourses Commission still retains jurisdiction over Stormwater Management and Sediment and Erosion Controls. A detailed request from the applicant will need to be submitted for revisions of the existing permits, but that request should not be submitted to the IWWC until after the applicant goes through the Planning and Zoning process with</p>	<p>PROD D. 7 - <b>“A written engineering report addressing storm drainage using BMPs and flooding for a 25 year storm as well as soil erosion &amp; sediment control”</b></p> <p>Sec 51.3.6 – “waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or the public storm drainage system”</p>	Drainage & Stormwater

	<p>respect to the Text Amendment, Zone Change, and updated plan that the Planning and Zoning Commission has reviewed and acted upon.</p> <p>Specific concerns of the IWWC include, but are not limited to, the design for the septic system and reserve areas, how stormwater will be properly accommodated throughout the revised layout of the development, detailed sediment and erosion controls reflecting the revised layout, a construction schedule that includes the completion of the stormwater detention facilities in each phase prior to issuance of building permits within that phase.” For example - Impervious coverage is beyond our current standards.</p>		
<b>No</b>	<p>The March 20<sup>th</sup> IWWC letter explains that the proposal as is, will not have a direct impact on wetlands and watercourses, which complies with these regulations.</p> <p>The existing site plan includes significant excavation, clearing of trees, and other changes to the topography and natural site features.</p> <p>TE’s letter states “There’s not contour labels and the overall grading leaves a lot to be desired for. I know each individual lot will required a site plan with grading, but it seems it could be a bit more gradual and thought-out for these plans. There are steeper sections, such as the end of Road #3, that will require erosion control.”</p>	<p><b>PROD - Sec. D.3 “If reasonably prudent and feasible, proposal shall make reasonable attempts to adapt to existing topography and natural site features”</b></p> <p>Sec. 51.3.2 and Sec. 51.3.3 “the landscape shall be preserved in its natural state insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal, and any</p> <p>Sec. 52.6.4 – “without the destruction of valuable natural assets...while providing the best possible design...compatible with the shape, size and topographic and natural character of the site”</p>	Topography/Natural Features
<b>Yes</b>	<p>The site plan proposes 40 acres to be deeded to the Town as open space. If approved, the commission should determine a timeline of this transfer as a condition of approval and appropriate discussion with Conservation Commission.</p>	<p>PROD B.3.I. “In determining the appropriateness of a PROD Zone, the Commission shall consider...the ability to</p>	Open Space



		preserve a large tract of open space"	
<b>No</b>	<p>Fees: Zone Change: \$1,000 fee for Zone Change has been paid. There is an additional fee for map amendment that has not been paid yet to the Town.</p> <p><b>Special Exception: Remaining fees have not yet been paid for a Special Exception.</b></p>	<p>PROD Section C.1.i. and C.1.iv. : i. "application fee for zone change and <b>map amendment</b>"</p> <p>iv. <b>"application fee for special exception"</b></p>	Fees
<b>N/A – due to PROD</b>	If approving of the PROD - general road regulations do not apply, so the majority of Paul's comments about the roads cannot be enforced. However – see details on related concerns about emergency access.	PROD D.10 "The roads shall be privately owned and the regulations of public roads shall not apply to them"	Roads
<b>No</b>	<p>Considerations regarding emergency access and maneuvering are critical.</p> <p>TE states that "maneuvering an emergency vehicle through these streets will be next to impossible."</p> <p>TE "Has it been confirmed that emergency vehicles have access from the Superfund site to the gravel emergency vehicle access path they show on the plans? Which also seems to lack radius, and is practically joining a residence's driveway. Seems like there could be a better option."</p> <p><u>At the public hearing, the applicant submitted Exhibit 11 titled "Fire Marshall – emails", the included information was a documentation of an email communication between Manny Silva and Fire Marshall DeGeorge in 2020. However, a statement from Fire Marshal DeGeorge stating that the proposal meets Fire Safety standards was not included.</u></p> <p><u>TE has not reviewed the Site Plan in terms of setting a Performance Bond.</u></p>	<p>PROD D.8 <b>"A statement from both the town Fire Marshall Fire Chief that the proposal meets Fire Safety Standards and a statement from the Town Engineer as to the adequacy of the drainage and site line distances for ingress and egress."</b></p> <p>Sec. 52.6.11 "The nature and location of the use and of any building or other structure shall be such that there is adequate access to it for fire projection purposes" (seems to be a typo and should be "protection")</p> <p>Emergency Services</p> <p>Sec. 51.5 Performance Bond: <b>Before approval by the "Commission", the applicant shall post a performance bond in the form and amount satisfactory to the "Commission", as surety</b></p>	
<b>No</b>			

		conditioned on the carrying out of the above conditions and any other safeguards imposed, and providing that in case of default, the surety shall promptly take any and all steps necessary to comply with said conditions.	
<b>No</b>	There are 7 proposed homes that are approximately 100 ft from the bordering Beacon Height Inc. Superfund Site which is a contaminated site currently undergoing long-term remediation efforts. Given that the Hopp Brook parcel would become a residential area, I do not believe 100 feet is an adequate buffer zone to the Superfund Site and would create potential risks to children and public health due to relatively close access to a hazardous location.	Sec. 51.3.9 – “Adequate natural screening and buffer zones shall be provided to substantially insulate the proposed use, buildings and other structures...”	Effect on Residential Areas
<b>No/Yes</b>	<p>In 2016, a proposed change to Plan of Conservation and Development was approved by the PZC for land later identified by the below Schedule A to change to the land designation to a Suburban neighborhood, with available sewer service.</p> <p>The revised POCD contains key aspects that are related to this application –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storm drainage concerns on steep topography (p. 67) – Connected to storm drainage concerns in this application.</li> <li>• Recommendation “The residential densities of all areas outside the core area should be limited to a maximum of 0.5 to 1.0 dwelling units per acre.” P. 81 – connected to the density concerns of this application.</li> <li>• “Recognize the need to provide affordable housing to residents of Beacon Falls, who cannot afford the current high costs of housing, in a way consistent with the character of the community.” P. 32 – As this application is proposing to move away from the Hopp Brook Village District</li> </ul>	<p>Plan of Conservation &amp; Development</p> <p>Sec. 51.6.1 – “it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the area in which it is proposed to be situated and will not be detrimental to the orderly development of adjacent properties.</p> <p>Sec 52.6.10 – “shall have a positive impact on the overall economy”</p> <p>Sec 52.6.5 – <b>“Particular attention shall be paid to...the Plan of Conservation and Development”</b></p>	POCD

	<p>affordable housing zone, it is acting counter to discussions of affordable housing in the POCD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>See “Natural Resource Constraints map on p. 17. This parcel is defined as severely constrained – meaning it has a “Slope &gt;25%, or hardpan, shallow or rocky soils and slope 15 to 25 %, or 500-year floodplain)</u></li></ul>		
--	--	--	--



**Town of Beacon Falls  
MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Beacon Falls Planning and Zoning Commission  
**From:** Molly Johnson, Beacon Falls Town Planner and Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments Community Planner  
**Date:** April 16, 2024  
**Subject:** Updated Town Planner Review of Hawks Views Re-subdivision Application

- As of April 18<sup>th</sup>, the PZC has 37 days remaining to review this application. I recommend the commission focus today on a discussion regarding the application with the knowledge that the May meeting will require the PZC to decisions on these applications.
- You may wish to have our Town Attorney create the proper motions necessary for your final decision.
- Please see the below comments from my review, in no particular order, which include the relevant Town regulation, and whether the piece of the application is in compliance with that regulation.

Compliance	Comment	Regulation Relevance	Topic
To be determined by PZC	<p>Atty. Marino has explained that it is up to the PZC to determine <u>whether or not they want to enforce the water hook-up requirement. This is due to specific language in Subdivision Regulation 4.12</u></p> <p>The Fire Marshall has sent a letter stating that <u>"After review of the correct plans and retrieving the flow report from Aquarion water company that was dated February 2015 the Fire Marshals Office is requesting that public water is supplied to this subdivision for reasons reviewed and possible future expansion due to open land."</u> Please review the letter for more details.</p> <p>At the public hearing, the applicant's legal counsel presented a counter view and explained that water hook-up would be cost prohibitive to the applicant. The attorney also discussed a specific example of bottom lots on Burton Road that were not required to hook up to</p>	<b>Subdivision Regulations 4.12</b>	Water supply

	water service when they were built. Town staff did further review and found that there was more information to be shared regarding this example. We found that when these homes on Burton Road were originally built, water access was not there. However, when water was brought in, the houses were hooked up to water. We believe this was a discrepancy in the attorney's example that should be clarified.		
<b>Yes</b>	On 2/14/24 the IWWC approved <b>with conditions</b> the Inland Wetlands Application A-2023-377 and Stormwater Management Application SW-2023-336: for the Hawks View Subdivision.	Subdivision Regulations 2.3.9	Inland Wetlands & Stormwater
<b>Yes</b>	The applicant provided Open Space to the Town in the first phase of the subdivision. The applicant has agreed to continue to work with the Town to be in compliance with the Open Space designations in the Town's regulations. It is important as the development continues to ensure that the minimum of 10% of open space or fee in lieu of is maintained.	Subdivision Regulations 4.19 "where open space regulation and disposition is deemed appropriate such land shall consist of no less than 10% of the tract to be subdivided.	Open Space
<b>To be determined by PZC</b>	There are continued concerns over whether the cul-de-sac will ever be extended. One question is whether the applicant would be able to ever extend due to the AT&T fiber optic line. This concern was not addressed at the public hearing. Of additional concern are the steep slopes located at the end of the proposed cul-de-sac.  <u>The current length of the cul-de-sac is not in compliance with regulations, if it is to be a dead-end street.</u>	Subdivision Regulations 4.4.10 – "no permanent dead end street shall be planned except when...conditions make it impractical or undesirable to extend it" – "... <b>no permanent dead end street shall exceed 1000 feet in length</b> "	Cul-de-sac/Dead End
<b>Yes/No</b>	A portion of the development is located on Slopes greater than 25%, the POCD explicitly explains that the " <u>steep topography is an important component of the rural character of the town</u> ". This plan mostly accommodates the slopes, however the end of the cul-de-sac is located next to these slopes and, if it is to be extended would be contingent on impacting the slopes.  <u>Additionally a few of the proposed lots would be on prime farmland soils.</u> In the Natural Resource constraints map, the parcel is shown to have "Moderate - (Well drained soils with slope 15 - 25% or hardpan, shallow or rocky soils with <15% slopes) Severe - (Slope >25%, or hardpan, shallow or rocky soils and slope 15 to 25 %, or 500-year floodplain)	Subdivision Regulations 4.1.3 <b>"subdivisions shall be planned and designed in general conformity with any Plan of Conservation and Development, adopted by the Commission..."</b>	POCD

	<p>Open space aspects of this application, supports goals within the POCD.</p> <p>In terms of housing goals, this affects multiple goals. The applicant has demonstrated willingness to design with neighborhood in mind, by working with a neighboring resident to adjust the design. Other neighbors still have concerns about the effect on their neighborhood, but we recognize the prior cul-de-sac was designed to be extended which was a subject of concern to the residents at the public hearing.</p>		
<b>Yes – via conditions.</b>	<p>Noting that the POCD details the parcel as having environmental constraints of “Moderate - (Well drained soils with slope 15 - 25% or hardpan, shallow or rocky soils with &lt;15% slopes) and Severe - (Slope &gt;25%, or hardpan, shallow or rocky soils and slope 15 to 25 %, or 500-year floodplain) categorization. The PZC should must consider the application with this in mind.</p> <p>The Town Engineer reviewed these considerations during the IWWC approval process and design requirements are included in the conditions of approval. These take into account considerations for the downslope neighbor and soil and erosion controls including efforts to restore vegetative cover.</p>	Subdivision regulations 4.2 – “Land which the Commission finds unsuitable for subdivision of development...shall not be subdivided unless adequate methods are formulated by the applicant and approved by the Commission, upon recommendation of the Town Engineer...”	Character of Land
<b>Yes</b>	The Town Engineer stated “The pavement section is the same that was approved for Tiverton, so it is acceptable. The revised road ordinances that have not been approved yet, will required 4” of pavement in the future.”	Subdivision Regulations 4.4	Streets
To be determined by PZC	This is to be considered based on the Commission’s decision regarding the public water supply. Additionally, the Commission may require certification from the WPCA of the applicant’s right to tie into the sewer lines.	Subdivision Regulations 2.3.6 “When the subdivision is not to be served by sanitary sewers and/or public water supply, the applicant shall present a statement from the Health Dept. approving the subdivision for private sewage disposal and/or water supply systems. In areas deemed appropriate and economically	Sewer System and Water Supply

		<p>feasible, the Commission may require written certification of the applicant's right to tie into public sewer lines, as provided in Sec. 4.11."</p> <p>Sec. 4.11</p>	
--	--	--	--