

June 14, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Bedini, Mrs. D. Hill, Mr. LaMuniere, Ms. Purnell

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Picton

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Ms. Coe, Mr. Thomson

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. Ajello, Mrs. J. Hill

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Sabin, Atty. Fisher, Mr. Di Biase, Mr. Neff, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Arturi, Mr. Charles, Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Peck, Mr. Fairbairn, Mr. Rosiello, Mr. Munson, Mrs. Branson

PUBLIC HEARING

Lloyd/149 Whittlesey Road/#IW-06-29/Demolish Existing House, Build New House

Mrs. Hill called the public hearing to order at 6:03 p.m. and seated Members Bedini, Hill, LaMuniere, and Purnell and Alternate Thomson for Mr. Picton. She referred to the list of the twenty documents in the file to date.

Atty. Fisher submitted the green certified mailing receipt cards for the notices he sent to four adjoining property owners and the 6/9/06 letter from Mr. and Mrs. Foley in support of the application.

Mr. Di Biase, architect, submitted "Some Key Design Notes and Data," dated 5/24/06.

Mr. Sabin, landscape architect, reviewed his map, "Site Plan," no date, and the proposed activities. He noted the 2.25 acre property was located at the confluence of the Bantam and Shepaug Rivers and that the only wetlands on it were the rivers themselves. He said there were existing riverside hedgerows consisting of dense forest material varying from 30 to 50 feet in width along half of the Bantam River and most of the Shepaug frontage, but little landscaped areas next to the rivers. He noted the FEMA 100 year flood elevation was 617 feet and that the first floor of the existing house was at 615.558 feet. The proposed construction, he said, would increase the size of the house and elevate it above the 100 year flood level. A 9.7% increase in the building footprint was proposed and a 20.5% increase in the total coverage. He said the house would be rotated to align with the existing pool, bringing the closest part of the house to 46 ft. from the Bantam River and 58 ft. to the Shepaug River. He explained the two terraces proposed on the south and west sides of the house were needed because the house would have to be elevated 3 ft. to get it above the flood level so it would not be possible to step out to ground level. Mrs. Hill asked if the terraces would require foundations. Mr. Di Biase said they would. Mr. Sabin briefly discussed the proposed mitigation plan. The lawn would be taken up in the area between the south side of the house and the Bantam River and converted to a shade garden with natural plants. The same would be done in the area between the existing driveway and the Shepaug. The existing hedgerow would be preserved.

Cultec recharge galleries to handle the runoff from the driveway and house roof would be installed. Mr. Sabin noted the drainage would be dispersed rather than directed to a point discharge to the Shepaug. Concerns had been raised at the last meeting about high ground water, but Mr. Sabin said it was 6 ft. below the surface and the galleries would be only 3.5 to 4.5 ft. down. The mechanicals serving the house would be inside. Atty. Fisher noted the existing mechanicals were in the basement crawl space, but when the house is rebuilt, this space would be lost because the new foundation would have flood vents and the mechanicals would have to be elevated above the 100 year flood level.

Mr. Di Biase briefly reviewed the floor plans and elevations dated 5/24/06 and explained the reasons for the realignment of the house. Mr. Charles asked if a new septic system would be installed. Mr. Di Biase said the existing septic system and well would be used.

Ms. Purnell asked about construction access to the site. Mr. Sabin pointed out the silt fence and limit of disturbance lines on the site plan and said he would pull the limit of disturbance line away from the river banks until it was time to remove the areas of lawn. That would help to keep the construction equipment further from the rivers until the landscaping was done.

Mrs. D. Hill asked why the new house would be larger than the existing house. Mr. Lloyd responded it would have additional living space and had to house the mechanicals.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Atty. Fisher noted there were several letters in support of the application in the file.

Ms. Purnell said she would prefer that another method such as the installation of a small biofilter or sheet flow for the runoff be used to manage the driveway drainage. She feared contamination from oil, grease, antifreeze, etc. would reach the river. Mr. Sabin noted there was a small area that could accommodate a biofilter and said he would look into eliminating the catch basin and utilizing a biofilter instead.

Ms. Purnell noted that although Mr. Sabin had indicated there were no wetlands other than the watercourses on the property, the entire property was in the flood plain and therefore, qualified as wetlands under Ct. law.

A site inspection was scheduled for Tuesday, June 20, 2006 at 5:00 p.m.

Mrs. D. Hill noted the \$250 public hearing fee was due.

It was noted the application had been referred to Land Tech.

MOTION: To continue the public hearing to consider Application #IW-06-29 submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd to demolish the existing house and construct a new house at 149 Whittlesey Road to the site inspection of that property at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 20, 2006 and then to continue it to 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 28, 2006 in the Land Use Meeting Room, Bryan Memorial Town Hall, Washington Depot, Ct. By Mrs. Hill, seconded by Ms. Purnell, and passed 5-0.

At 6:50 p.m. Mrs. Hill continued the hearing per the above motion.

This public hearing was recorded on tape. The tape is on file in the Land Use Office, Bryan Memorial Town Hall, Washington Depot, Ct.

Ms. Coe arrived at this point.

REGULAR MEETING

Mrs. D. Hill called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and seated Members Bedini, Hill, LaMuniere, and Purnell and Alternate Thomson for Mr. Picton.

Consideration of the Minutes

The 5/24/06 Regular Meeting minutes were accepted as amended.

Bottom of Page 5: Add: the time and date of the public hearing, Wed., June 14, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.

MOTION: To accept the 5/24/06 Regular Meeting minutes as corrected. By Mrs. Hill, seconded by Mr. Bedini, and passed 4-0-1. Mr. Thomson abstained because he had not been present.

MOTION: To accept the 5/31/06 Zelman-Defendorf site inspection minutes as submitted. By Mr. LaMuniere, seconded by Mrs. Hill, and passed 5-0.

MOTION: To add the following site inspection minutes to the agenda: 1) Colville-5/31/06 and 2) Adams-6/13/06. By Mrs. Hill, seconded by Mr. Bedini, and passed 5-0.

MOTION: To accept the 5/31/06 Colville site inspection minutes as submitted. By Mrs. Hill, seconded by Mr. Bedini, and passed 5-0

MOTION: To accept the 6/13/06 Adams site inspection minutes as written. By Mr. LaMuniere, seconded by Mrs. Hill, and passed 5-0.

Pending Applications

Potter/220 Old Litchfield Road/#IW-06-32/Site Development: It was noted the Commission was waiting for a revised site development map. The map, "Site Analysis Plan," by Mr. Alex, revised to 3/27/06 and a second map with a limit of disturbance line drawn in by Mr. Potter were reviewed. Ms. Purnell said the hand drawn map did not appear to be to scale and noted the limit of disturbance was shown within 50 ft. of wetlands flags #27 and #33 (when measured it was more accurately 40 ft.), 75 ft. from #6, and 120 ft. from #39. She noted she had asked for information regarding whether there were wetlands on the property to the south. Mr. Ajello said there did not appear to be. Ms. Purnell noted the Commission had requested the soils report and sketch map and asked if they had been submitted. Mr. Ajello said they had not. Ms. Purnell thought it was unlikely that the Commission would have permitted clearing so close to the west side of the wetlands, noted the Site Analysis Plan had not been followed, and suggested some restoration be required. Mrs. Hill noted at the last meeting Mr. Ajello advised the Commission that additional percs would be done on higher ground and a new septic location chosen, but that this was not indicated on the current map. It was noted the 65 days in which to act on the application would be over prior to the next meeting.

MOTION: To deny without prejudice Application #IW-06-14 submitted by John and Tim Potter for site development at 220 Old Litchfield Road because the information submitted to date is incomplete unless a signed request for an extension is submitted no later than 6/16/06. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mr. Bedini, and passed 5-0.

Adams/57 West Shore Road/#IW-06-15/Retaining Wall, Path, Stairs, Plantings: No one was present to represent the applicant. The map, "Beach Renewal Project," shown on a survey by Mr. Cheney, dated July 2004 was studied. Ms. Purnell reviewed her findings from her recent site inspection, noting the existing wall along West Shore Road was not a true retaining wall and that the proposed wall along the beach would not likely be approved. She made the following observations; 1) the area proposed for planting was all sand, 2) she did not see any erosion on site, 3) runoff from the Adams driveway runs through the site, 4) the now wooden stairways are proposed to be reconstructed with stone and anchored with pins into the existing wall, and 5) she had discussed with Ms. Dzenutis the possibility of installing a barrier of large rocks instead of the proposed lower wall. She also noted another 20 inch wide wall was indicated on the map, but not mentioned in the narrative so it was not clear whether it was proposed or not. Mr. Bedini noted the Commission had a record of denying walls by the lake. It was the consensus that a concise narrative was needed and the map had to reflect all the work that was proposed. Mr. Bedini said it was not clear from the plans submitted how the proposed bluestone walkway would be held in place.

MOTION: To deny without prejudice Application #IW-06-15 submitted by Mr. Adams for a retaining wall, path, stairs, and plantings at 57 West Shore Road due to the lack of concise information unless a written request for an extension is submitted no later than 6/16/06, and if a request for an extension is received, the Commission expects a new plan that shows clearly and concisely what is proposed. By Mr. Bedini, seconded by Mr. LaMuniere, and passed 5-0.

Washington Club, Inc./8 Golf Course Road/#IW-06-24ATF/Utility Trench: Ms. Purnell recused herself and Alternate Coe was seated. Mr. Sabin, landscape architect, and Mr. Arturi, Club vice president, were present. Mr. Sabin presented a simple mitigation plan to stabilize the trenched area, the disturbed steep slope, and the disturbed section of the sandy upland and to clean out the one section of

wetlands where sedimentation had occurred. He submitted the 6/14/06 letter with attached map regarding the utility line encroachment and stabilization. He proposed to 1) clean out the sediment in the wetlands by hand to expose the leaf litter, 2) seed the disturbed area with New England wetland seed mix, 3) seed the areas not already germinating naturally in the disturbed corridor with the New England wetland seed mix, and 4) stabilize the disturbed slopes by taking out the stumps and debris, regrading the banks so they are stable, mixing in organics 4" to 6" down, seeding with annual rye and New England upland restoration mix, and mulching with straw. He noted the seed would not be mulched in the wetlands, that natural species would ultimately supercede the annual rye, and that the silt fence would have to be maintained until the WEO OK'd its removal. It was the consensus the proposed mitigation was appropriate.

MOTION: To approve Application #IW-06-24ATF submitted by The Washington Club, Inc. for a utility trench at 8 Golf Course Road per the 6/14/06 plan by Mr. Sabin. By Mr. Bedini, seconded by Mr. LaMuniere, and passed 5-0.

Ms. Coe was seated for Ms. Purnell who had recused herself because she is an adjoining property owner and a member of the Washington Club.

Ms. Purnell was reseated.

Cohen/62 Calhoun Street/#IW-06-27/Pave Driveway, Repair Culvert: Mr. Munson, contractor, Mr. Neff, engineer, and Mr. Rosiello, landscape designer, were present. The map, "Driveway Drainage Improvement Plan," by Mr. Neff, dated 5/22/06 was reviewed. Mr. Rosiello submitted the 5/19/06 letter from the Fire Dept. regarding the reconfiguration of the driveway to facilitate access by emergency vehicles. The change requested by the Fire Dept. was approximately 77 ft. from the wetlands and would result in a decrease of 300 sq. ft. of coverage. Ms. Purnell asked if the four culverts shown on the plan were existing. Mr. Rosiello said they were and Mr. Neff added that in one location a new pipe would be added adjacent to the existing pipe. Installation of the bridge was briefly discussed. Mr. Rosiello said it would be done during low water flow. He also noted that all of the required erosion control measures had been installed and more would be added when the driveway work began. It was the consensus the erosion control plan was satisfactory.

MOTION: To approve Application #IW-06-27 submitted by Mr. Cohen to pave the driveway and repair the culvert at 62 Calhoun Street per the 5/22/06 "Driveway Drainage Improvement Plan" by Mr. Neff and the supplemental 5/19/06 request from the Washington Fire Department with attached 5/23/06 drawing showing a circle driveway at the house. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mrs. Hill, and passed 5-0.

Lloyd/149 Whittlesey Road/#IW-06-29/Demolish Existing House, Build New House: The public hearing was continued to the 6/20/06 site inspection and then to Wednesday, June 28, 2006 at 6:30 p.m.

Coville/14 Wheaton Road/#IW-06-30/Excavation, Clearing, Install Septic, Rebuild House: Mr. Neff, engineer, and Mr. Coville were present. The map, "Proposed Site Plan," by Mr. Neff revised to 6/3/06 was reviewed and Mr. Neff noted it had been revised according to the discussion that had taken place at the site inspection on 5/31/06 by adding a double row of silt fence on the south side of the work area. The area to the south of the barrier was to be left undisturbed and the embankment below the septic system would be planted to stabilize the steep bank. There was a lengthy discussion about whether a buffer should be planted along the edge of the top of the bank. Mr. Neff said Mr. Picton had thought this area would revegetate naturally and Mr. Coville preferred not to block his view of the stream, but Mr. LaMuniere thought the buffer would provide added protection for the wetlands by stabilizing the ground and holding some of the increased runoff caused by the cutting of the trees on site. Finally it was agreed that the mowed lawn would be kept at least 3 ft. back from the top of the slope and that this buffer would contain native herbaceous plants.

MOTION: To approve Application #IW-06-30 submitted by Mr. Colville for excavation, clearing, installation of a septic system, and reconstruction of the house at 14 Wheaton Road per Mr. Neff's plan revised to 6/3/06 subject to the condition that the area within 3 to 5 feet of the inner most silt fence from the iron pin at the NW corner of the house along the brook to where the property line makes a ninety degree turn to the east shall not be mowed, but shall be allowed to grow herbaceous plants. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mr. Bedini, and passed 5-0.

Zelman-Defendorf/16 Tompkins Hill Road/#IW-06-31/Site Development: Mr. Wolfe, engineer, submitted a copy of the 6/1/05 soils report by Mr. Temple, which found only 713 sq. ft. of wetlands in the SE corner of the property. A copy of the sketch map had not been submitted as requested. The map, "Plan Showing Proposed Improvements," by Mr. Wolfe, revised to 6/14/06 was reviewed. Mr. Wolfe noted the revisions included 1) the elimination of a pipe to the curtain drain, 2) the addition of the location of the septic system, and 3) the addition of one yard drain in the NE corner of the property, just beyond the 100 ft. regulated area. He proposed that the yard drain discharge just upgrade of the wetlands area, which would absorb what it could, with the balance overflowing over a drainage easement to the catch basin off site. Ms. Purnell asked if the amount of runoff had been calculated, if it would increase the size of the wetlands, and if the wetlands area had the capacity to handle it. Mr. Wolfe did not think the flow from the yard drain would affect the wetlands. Mr. Peck, contractor, explained the proposed drainage work was to eliminate the ponding of runoff near the house. Mr. Charles, adjoining property owner, claimed the main water problem was due to the high groundwater table and asked why a rain garden was not proposed. Mr. Wolfe explained a rain garden was not feasible due to the topography of the site. Mr. Bedini noted the road runoff also contributes to the drainage problems on the property since the road tilts towards it and there are no curbs to direct the flow down the hill. He suggested the Town be urged to make the necessary road improvements. Mr. Peck asked if a lip could be installed on the driveway apron to prevent the road runoff from flowing down the driveway. Ms. Purnell asked if that would then affect the downhill Saunders property. Mr. Bedini thought a curb could direct the road runoff to the existing catch basin. Ms. Purnell was concerned because the catch basin empties into a nearby stream and directing road runoff into it would also increase the amount of contaminants flowing into it. Mr. Wolfe said a rain garden would treat the runoff before it entered the culvert, but Ms. Purnell noted rain gardens are usually separate entities, not the wetlands themselves, and recommended the garden not be situated in the wetlands or a watercourse. Mr. Ajello did not think there was any other option and asked why the applicant had abandoned the idea of a piped overflow from a rain garden. Mr. Wolfe said he had eliminated this idea based on the comments by commissioners made at the site inspection. Mrs. Hill noted plans for a rain garden were not yet included in the file. Ms. Purnell and Mr. Ajello pointed out that some of the drainage problems were due to unauthorized activities by the applicants such as the construction of the patio and expansion of the driveway. Ms. Purnell thought the septic area might be flooding due to the patio work. She also suggested that a swale be installed along the upper side of the driveway in lieu of the rain garden. Mr. Peck said this would not be possible due to the ledge in this area. Mr. Peck asked about the possibility of excavating a pond in the area adjacent to the wetlands or the owners installing Belgium blocks if the Town did not install a curb. Mrs. Hill said the Commission would not comment until the curb had been discussed with the Town Highway Dept. Mr. Bedini noted there were five sources of water problems on this small property: 1) runoff from uphill, 2) roof runoff, 3) groundwater, 4) road runoff, and 5) runoff entering from the rear of the lot and so thought a professional review was merited. Partial solutions and piecemeal approval of the application were discussed. Mr. Charles complained the Commission was considering solutions without knowing the exact source of the problems or what the impacts would be on adjoining properties. The patio construction was discussed in more detail and Mr. Peck noted the propane tank would be relocated, a generator and underground conduit installed. Mr. Ajello noted information still required included: 1) assessment of the patio construction and its impact

on the drainage and runoff, 2) input from the Town regarding the road runoff, 3) a planting plan for the west side of the driveway, 4) the addition to the plans of an overflow pipe in the wetlands, and 5) a planting plan for the enhancement of the plants in the wetland area. It was the consensus that the plans should be referred to a consulting engineer for review. Mr. Wolfe offered to post a bond instead so the Commission would be assured the planting would be completed to its satisfaction, but the Commission thought the review was necessary. Mr. Wolfe will revise the plans before they are referred to Land Tech.

Enforcement

Calhoun Street Trust/62 Calhoun Street/Unauthorized Construction: The map, "Site Plan," by Mr. Neff, revised to 6/13/06 was reviewed. Mr. Neff noted he had added a limit of disturbance line as had been requested at the last meeting. Mr. Rosiello noted there would be no massive planting behind the guest house; it would be a mowed lawn area, and the area east of the pool behind the spruces would also be mown as it always had. Mrs. Hill asked if the Commission was satisfied with the map as submitted. Ms. Purnell said she would have to research the guest house permit because it appeared according to how the map was drawn that 50 to 100 feet of wetlands near the guest house could be landscaped. Mr. Rosiello and Mr. Neff explained the limit of disturbance line had not included this area because the irrigation system had been installed there and it had always been mowed. They said that differed, though, from a regular landscaped area. Mr. Rosiello stated the purpose of this discussion was for the Commission to determine whether the unauthorized walls could remain and two additional dry stacked walls to protect the wetlands could be applied for. Mr. Ajello noted as proposed, an access to the pool and garden area would remain, but Ms. Purnell said, in effect, it would create a roadway. Mr. Ajello thought it made sense to continue to use the existing access and to construct a barrier to check to landscaping "creep" towards the wetlands. Mr. Rosiello was anxious to know whether this would be acceptable to the Commission so that he could complete the required mitigation plan, which would change if it was thought the walls were a good idea. Mrs. Hill thought Mr. Picton should review the map. Ms. Purnell noted she was angry about the current proposal and the disturbance to the property, which consisted of 50% wetlands and watercourses, and offered to recuse herself. She said all four separate upland areas had been altered. Mr. Rosiello thought once the mitigation plan was implemented, it would be a gain for the wetlands. It was suggested the commissioners should inspect the site again on their own prior to the next meeting. Mrs. Hill advised Mr. Rosiello he could generate an overlay map with the changes to the mitigation plan.

New Applications

Potter/253 Old Litchfield Road/#IW-06-32/2 Lot Subdivision: Mr. Fairbairn represented the applicants. He noted the site development plan was not ready yet, but presented the map, "Site Analysis Plan," by Mr. Alex, dated March 2006. Mr. Fairbairn stated the property totaled 6.94 acres and two lots consisting of 2.55 and 3.59 acres were proposed. The wetlands had been flagged. The proposed house site was out of the regulated area, but the driveway off Shearer Road was proposed within 100 feet of wetlands. He explained an alternate driveway location would be off Rt.109, but as proposed it would help maintain the rural character as viewed when entering Washington from Morris. A site inspection will not be scheduled until the site development plan is submitted.

Steep Rock Association/147 Sabbaday Lane/#IW-06-33/Replace Bridge: Ms. Branson circulated photos of the old bridge and abutments in the Shepaug River in Hidden Valley, noting the replacement bridge would be in the same location and as identical as possible to the original bridge. The proposed fiberglass bridge was 4 feet wide with a wooden cap on the railing. The reasons fiberglass was chosen were detailed in her 6/8/06 letter to the Commission. She noted construction specifications had not been finalized, but said she thought only one abutment would be put in so there would be less chance for debris getting caught by the bridge. Mr. LaMunier asked how the bridge would be anchored. Ms.

Branson was not sure, but said previously there had been a cement block drilled into a shelf in the ledge. Mr. LaMuniere noted the right bank had washed out and asked how the steep side would be accessed. Ms. Branson said it would be accessed the same way as had been done for the first bridge. She noted once a contractor was hired Steep Rock would rely on him to provide the construction and installation details. Questions to be answered included: 1) How would the bridge be anchored on the far side, near side and middle (on the boulder)? 2) What is the construction sequence? 3) What equipment will be used? 4) How will the equipment access the site? 5) Will the bridge arrive in one piece or will it be assembled on site? 6) Will a crane be used? If so, will it reach both sides of the river from one location? Where will it be located?

Enforcement

Taylor/11 Sunset Lane/Unauthorized Excavation: Mr. Ajello reported he had sent Mr. Taylor another letter on 6/5/06. Mr. Taylor was present and said he would not agree to the Commission's restoration proposal. It was explained to Mr. Taylor that the Commission did not expect his entire yard to be restored to one third lawn, one third natural growth, and one third wetlands buffer vegetation, but only the pond perimeter. He still did not agree to the proposal and said his wife was working on a planting plan with a professional planting person. Ms. Purnell advised him that the Commission consistently discouraged people from clearing and planting lawn down to the pond edge because plants are filters that help the health of the pond. Mr. Taylor said he would consult with his wife and bring in a proposal to the 6/28 meeting. A site inspection was scheduled for Tuesday, June 20, 2006 at 4:30 p.m.

Peck/10 Slaughterhouse Road/Unauthorized Excavation, Tree Removal: Mr. Bedini read the 6/13/06 letter from Mr. Peck in response to the latest letter he received from Mr. Ajello. In spite of the arguments raised in this letter, it was the consensus of the Commission that Mr. Peck had caused a great disturbance to his property, he had previously agreed to have the wetlands mapped as a first step to solving the problem, and the Commission would still require that he conduct the soil testing he previously agreed to. Mr. Ajello will send another letter and ask Mr. Peck to advise the Commission when he expects to submit the required information.

Moore/25 Litchfield Turnpike/Unauthorized Filling, Clear Cutting: Mr. Ajello reported that Mr. Moore said he would not pay the citation. A second notice will be sent and Mr. Moore will have 10 days to respond to the hearing officer if he still plans not to pay.

Shepaug Realty/East Shore Road/Unauthorized Parking Area, Shoreline Work, Dock: The Commission read Mr. Ajello's 6/14/06 enforcement report and studied the DOT photos, which compared the site as it was in 2004 vs. 2005. It was evident the parking area had been constructed in that time period. Mr. Ajello informed the Commission he would begin the enforcement process by sending a notice of violation. He said DOT officials would take separate enforcement action with the possible involvement of the state Attorney General.

Carter/292 Walker Brook Road (141 Shinar Mt. Rd.)#IW-04-V8/Repair of Retaining Wall: Ms. Purnell said she had a letter ready for Mr. Picton to sign and that when he had done so she would leave it with Mrs. J. Hill to send to the property owner.

Collins/323 West Shore Road/Unauthorized Clear Cutting, Soil Disturbance: Mr. Ajello reported that Mr. Collins has hired an engineer to work on a drainage plan and that no further work had been done on site.

Mrs. Hill noted a nominating committee to find candidates for the Commission offices would be chosen at the next meeting. Election of Officers will take place at the July 26th meeting.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting. By Ms. Purnell.

Mrs. Hill adjourned the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill

Land Use Coordinator