



**TOWN OF WINCHESTER**  
**INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES COMMISSION**  
Town Hall, 338 Main Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – P. Francis Hicks Room, Winsted  
and was streamed live on YouTube:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCT1ffiBjMTBQM5OEXSgKlqg/videos>

**April 20, 2022 – 7:00PM**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Steve Molinelli called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

Roll call was completed by Mr. Molinelli. Present at the meeting in addition to him were: Jeff Lippincott, Leeane Marvin, Jackie Mulvey, and Gary Paganelli.

Russ Davenport, Andrea Krawiecki, Mary Ann Marino, and Kurt Timmeney were absent excused.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MARCH 16, 2022 REGULAR MEETING:**

**MOTION:** Ms. Mulvey, Mr. Paganelli second, to approve the March 16, 2022 regular meeting minutes; unanimously approved.

**4. AGENDA REVIEW.**

Wetlands Agent Michael Stankov requested the agenda be modified to include an additional Show Cause Hearing for 165 West Road for tree clearing over one half acre without a permit.

**5. SHOW CAUSE HEARINGS:**

**A. Owner: Kenneth Pratt and Eleanor Pratt Cease and Desist Order Location: 225 West Wakefield Boulevard Map: 113 Block: 120 Lot: 005AA Violation: Construction of Apparent Drainage Swale in Upland Review Area Without Permits.**

Neither property owners appeared for the hearing. Mr. Stankov reported Mrs. Pratt having stopped by town hall to obtain an application but received no additional communication. Mr. Lippincott recalled Mr. Stankov was going to speak with the engineer that had prepared the plans. Mr. Stankov reported that he had not spoken to the engineer. It was agreed that this application should be considered a violation at this point.

**B. Owner: Camp Wah-nee in the Berkshires, Inc. Cease and Desist Order Location: 132 Wahnee Road Map: 041 Block: 157 Lot: 016 Violation: Dumping of Sand into and around Park Pond.**

No representative of the owner appeared for the hearing. Mr. Stankov indicated that his photographs depict a deposit of sand along the water's edge. He reported having spoken to David Stricker of Camp Wahnee who had denied the deposit of sand, explaining that it is raked into a pile in order to gather the leaves and winter debris from it. Mr. Stankov explained that would be unusual and noted the rivulets. Mr. Stankov questioned whether the commission would expect an application, noting that a new structure had been erected on this property without any permits which will likely be receiving additional violation notices.

The commission discussed the matter of beaches. Mr. Stankov agreed to research the maintenance of the Town's two beaches at Highland Lake and whether additional sand is brought in, whether it is raked, or added material. Ms. Marvin questioned the overall health of Park Pond and whether the sand that will continue to creep out into the pond will cause a significant impact. Mr. Stankov explained that Park Pond is not very developed, noting that Camp Wah-nee is likely the largest contributor to runoff. However, he indicated that he was not aware of any environmental studies. He explained that there are not a lot of roads around the pond. Mr. Stankov opined that Park Pond is not likely under a lot of stress but indicated that if there is stress, it is likely this beach.

**C. Owner: Sandy Drive Three, LLC Cease and Desist Order Location: 240 Perch Rock Trail Map: 113 Block: 105A Lot: 044-47 Violation: Installation of Patio Without Wetlands Approvals.**

No representative of the owner appeared for the hearing. Mr. Stankov reminded the commission that an additional application on this property had been before them at last month's regular meeting as the property owner was seeking a modification for the sidewalk in the lake, at the base of the lakewall. Mr. Stankov noted that deviation from the site plan had not been previously approved and the property owner was seeking a Certificate of Occupancy. After the commission had approved this modification in March, he signed off on the CO, according to Mr. Stankov. About a week after that, there were reports that a great deal of material had been dumped at the site and that there was additional work occurring. Mr. Stankov visited the site, and observed a new patio being installed within 25' of the lake. A portion of it is replacing lawn with a larger portion being located under the existing porch, according to Mr. Stankov.

**D. Owner: Gary V. Ferrarotti and Ruth Ferrarotti Location: 165 West Road Violation: Tree Clearing.**

Gary Ferrarotti and Ruth Ferrarotti appeared before the commission regarding this matter. Mr. Stankov provided photographs to the commission of a 2019 aerial image of the two-acre site which included a large pine area. Mr. Ferrarotti noted that the area had not been previously developed and there were large pines that had died and got hung up in other trees. He indicated that some of them could have reached his house and that some of them could also reach the power lines on the road. He noted that he was unaware that a permit was necessary. He explained that he would like to use the spot as an orchard with apple, pear, and peach trees. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether all of the planned clearing was complete. Mr. Ferrarotti confirmed but for a few saplings. He noted that he intends to clean up the site and finish the grading.

Mr. Lippincott questioned whether there was any chance for erosion. Mr. Stankov reported that there was silt fence installed along West Road and that the stumps were still in the ground. He explained that in this zone, with over a half-acre of clearing, this commission needs to review a sediment and soil erosion plan. Mr. Lippincott questioned whether there were intentions to pull the stumps. Mr. Ferrarotti noted the stumps were already pulled.

Mr. Molinelli questioned whether Mr. Stankov was okay with an agent determination. Mr. Stankov suggested that this commission review an application and if they were comfortable with its contents, they could then refer it to him for an agent determination.

**6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. IWWC#22-05 Applicant/Owner: Paul Marino Location: 680 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Remove Existing Accessory Building; Addition to Existing Home with Garage and Bonus Room; Realign Driveway Utilizing Permeable Pavers; Remove and Rebuild Retaining Walls, Entrance Walk, and Stairs.**

Paul Marino, accompanied by Laura Nash, in person, and Professional Engineer Mike Sherman, via his laptop as Mr. Sherman FaceTimed for the meeting, appeared before the commission regarding this application. Staff confirmed that the legal ad was published the requisite two times, April 6, 2022 and April 13, 2022, in the Republican American. Additionally, it was noted that certificate(s) of mail had been received providing evidence that the abutting neighbors had received notice of this hearing.

Mr. Marino reported several revisions having been completed since the last meeting following a visit by Department of Public Works Director Jim Rollins' visit to the site. He explained that the west side of the planned grassy berm at the corner of Lake Drive and East Wakefield Boulevard has been increased from an elevation of 906.2' to 908'. Mr. Rollins had opined that by doing so, it would direct more water from down past the driveway into the catch basin. He noted the 200 yards of hill across the street that results in the storm water flowing down the boulevard after every rainstorm.

Mr. Marino noted the copies of a communication that were available to the commission from his neighbor to his west, Wayne Warren, the owner of the property most likely to be affected. The email indicated that Mr. Warren was in favor of the revision, according to Mr. Marino.

Mr. Molinelli questioned whether during a very heavy storm, water might run towards the neighbor's garage. Mr. Marino noted the lip at the roadway, and opined that the plan will stop a lot of the runoff. He reported that he had spoken with that neighbor who had indicated no problem with the design. Mr. Stankov noted that he had visited the site and noted that the Town will be adding improvements to the stormwater at the lake soon.

Mr. Marino distributed copies of a memorandum from Mr. Rollins, dated April 14, 2022, to this commission regarding the driveway permit.

Mr. Marino noted that the basement door and well located on the west side of the property have been eliminated from the plan. Additionally, he indicated a maintenance plan had been added for the pervious paver system.

Noting that the purpose of pervious paver systems was to retain the water, Mr. Paganelli questioned the underdrain that was included with the design and whether the water would flow directly out of the area into the lake. Mr. Marino then FaceTimed into the meeting Professional Engineer Mike Sherman. Mr. Paganelli questioned whether the drainpipe should be raised to a higher elevation. Mr. Lippincott agreed. Mr. Sherman explained that the purpose of the drainpipe was for the very large storms when there is more than an inch of rainfall. He noted that water will infiltrate on the minor 2% slope. Mr. Paganelli questioned whether it might make sense to install that pipe with the holes up, to give four inches of water sitting at the bottom of the 4" of stones. Mr. Sherman agreed that this could be done.

Mr. Sherman assured the commission that there will be no net increase in runoff between pre- and post-construction, noting that the design reduces the amount of water that flows onto the subject property by putting in a proper driveway apron. He explained that the grading that will occur by the road is the equivalent of installing a curb at the road.

Mr. Paganelli questioned what conditions will be with ice flow over the permeable pavers. Mr. Sherman opined that the ice will be reduced, explaining that ice only occurs when there is melt water and that the water will filter through. Mr. Paganelli noted that the applicant will need to be diligent in checking the joints between the blocks.

The hearing was open to the public. No comment was received.

**MOTION:** Mr. Lippincott, Mr. Paganelli second, to close the public hearing; unanimously approved.

## **7. OLD BUSINESS:**

**A. IWWC#21-47 Applicant/Owner: Neil A. McGuinness Location: 512 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Add New Dock on Easement; Add Extension to Existing Dock; Add Float.**

It was reported that the applicant had communicated his intention to withdraw his application.

**B. IWWC#22-01 (Modification of IWWC#20-56) Applicant/Owner: David Paigo Location: 656 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Break Up of Rocks in Front of Seawall; Relocate 8'x36.5 Cantilever Dock and Boatlift; Reposition Shed.**

It was reported that the applicant had requested a continuance of this application.

**C. IWWC#22-05 Applicant/Owner: Paul Marino Location: 680 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Remove Existing Accessory Building; Addition to Existing Home with Garage and Bonus Room;**

**Realign Driveway Utilizing Permeable Pavers; Remove and Rebuild Retaining Walls, Entrance Walk, and Stairs.**

**MOTION:** Mr. Lippincott, Ms. Mulvey second, to approve Application IWWC#22-05 Applicant/Owner: Paul Marino Location: 680 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Remove Existing Accessory Building; Addition to Existing Home with Garage and Bonus Room; Realign Driveway Utilizing Permeable Pavers; Remove and Rebuild Retaining Walls, Entrance Walk, and Stairs, subject to the following standard conditions (1-12) and additional conditions:

1. The permittee shall notify the Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer immediately upon the commencement of work and upon its completion.
2. If the authorized activity is not completed within five years from the issuance date of April 20, 2022, said activity shall cease and, if not previously revoked or specifically renewed or extended, this permit shall be null and void. Any request to renew or extend the expiration date of a permit should be filed in accordance with the Inland Wetlands Regulations of the Town of Winchester. Expired permits may not be renewed and the Inland Wetlands Commission may require a new application for regulated activities.
3. All work and all regulated activities conducted pursuant to this authorization shall be consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit. A copy of the permit and plans shall be on site at all times. Any structures, excavation, fill, obstructions, encroachments, or regulated activities not specifically identified and authorized herein shall constitute a violation of this permit and may result in its modification, suspension or revocation.
4. This authorization is not transferable without the written consent of the Inland Wetlands Commission.
5. In evaluating this application, the Inland Wetlands Commission has relied on information provided by the applicant. If such information is subsequently proved to be false, incomplete, or misleading, this permit may be modified, suspended, or revoked and the permittee may be subject to any other remedies or penalties provided by law.
6. The permittee shall employ the best management practices, consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit, to control storm water discharges and to prevent erosion and sedimentation and to otherwise prevent pollution of wetlands or watercourses. Permittee will provide a copy of approved plans to contractor which shall stay on site and be available for review or inspection during the duration of work. For information and technical assistance, contact the Wetlands Enforcement Officer. The permittee shall immediately inform the Commission of any problems involving the wetlands or watercourses that have developed in the course of, or that are caused by, the authorized work.
7. No equipment or material including without limitation, fill construction materials, or debris, shall be deposited, placed or stored in any wetland or watercourse on or off site unless specifically authorized by this permit.
8. This permit is subject to and does not derogate any rights or powers of the Town of Winchester, conveys no property rights or exclusive privileges, and is subject to all public and private rights to all applicable federal, state and local laws. In conducting and maintaining any activities authorized herein, the permittee may not cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the inland wetlands and watercourses of Winchester.
9. If the activity authorized by the inland wetlands permit also involves activity or a project that requires zoning of subdivision approval, special permit, variance, or special exception, no work pursuant to the wetlands permit may begin until such approval is obtained.
10. The permittee shall maintain sediment and erosion controls at the site in such operable conditions as to prevent the pollution of wetlands and watercourses. Said controls are to be inspected by the permittee for deficiencies at least once per week and immediately after rains. The permittee shall correct any such deficiencies within 24 hours of said deficiency being found. The permittee shall maintain such control measures until all areas of disturbed soils at the site are stabilized.
11. The permittee, contractor and/or owner shall conduct all operations at the site in full compliance with this permit, to the extent provided by law, may be held liable for any violations of the terms and conditions of this permit and are responsible for any violation they may have created.
12. Wetland flagging to stay in place during the construction process. Missing flags to be replaced upon the Wetland Agent's request if required for inspection or enforcement.
13. Pipe to be raised, as discussed, out of the permeable pavers, higher in the bed of stone, with the holes facing up.

16. Cash erosion and sedimentation bond totaling \$2000 to be submitted to the Inland Wetlands Office prior to the commencement of work;

*unanimously approved.*

**D. IWWC#22-06 Applicant/Owner: Brian Bouthiller Location: 212 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: 3'x16' Walkway to East of Boatlift.**

It was reported that the applicant had requested a continuance.

**MOTION:** Mr. Lippincott, Mr. Paganelli second, to continue Application IWWC#22-06 Applicant/Owner: Brian Bouthiller Location: 212 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: 3'x16' Walkway to East of Boatlift; unanimously approved.

**8. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. IWWC#22-07 Applicant/Owner: James Lawson Location: 106 Sucker Brook Road Proposal: Install/Repair Existing Septic System.**

James Lawson appeared before the commission regarding this application. Mr. Lawson explained that he had just purchased this home last year which had a contingency that the septic system be replaced. He noted that there had been modifications to the system that had been done without permits. A soil scientist had later been retained who had flagged the wetlands and provided that information to the professional engineer who redesigned the system around those wetlands.

Mr. Lawson noted the system will be a raised system. He indicated that he will cut a couple, notably three, trees, confirming that they are not in the wetlands. Mr. Molinelli questioned when this work was planned. Mr. Lawson indicated that he would like to get started in a couple of weeks. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether there was currently any backup into the house. Mr. Lawson indicated that there was not.

Mr. Paganelli questioned the amount of fill that was necessary for the system. Mr. Lawson was unsure. Mr. Paganelli noted that there was no tracking pad included for the project. Mr. Paganelli questioned the plans for the old system. Mr. Lawson reported the old tank would be crushed and buried. He noted that he would like to fill the gully off to the side of the home. It was agreed that the commission would refer the application for an agent determination.

**MOTION:** Mr. Molinelli, Mr. Paganelli second, to accept Application IWWC#22-07 Applicant/Owner: James Lawson Location: 106 Sucker Brook Road Proposal: Install/Repair Existing Septic System; unanimously approved.

**MOTION:** Mr. Molinelli, Mr. Paganelli second, to refer Application IWWC#22-07 Applicant/Owner: James Lawson Location: 106 Sucker Brook Road Proposal: Install/Repair Existing Septic System for an agent approval subject to the conditions that the amount of fill that is to be brought on site be recorded, the placement of a stone antitracking pad along the south side of the house be located on a plan, and a record of where all of the material from the abandoned septic system is going and be included on the plan if to be located on the north side of the house; unanimously approved.

**B. IWWC#22-08 Applicant: James McTigue Owner: Steven Heffer and Heena Sultan Location: 212 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Reconstruct Residence and Decking; New Walks and Retaining Walls.**

Licensed Land Surveyor James McTigue of Arthur Howland and Associates appeared before the commission. He distributed a pamphlet outlining the history of the cottage, noting it was originally constructed in 1923, later remodeled in 2004, followed by a demolition/rebuild of it along with the addition of a second floor in 2009.

Mr. McTigue reported a structural engineer had been retained to review the foundation, finding the steel beams had rusted through and that the concrete piers were failing to do their job properly. He noted that the structural engineer had recommended that the entire structure be torn down in order to start anew with new footings, etc.

Mr. McTigue noted that the photographs reveal that there are currently three piers holding up the lakeside of the cottage with the other side of the cottage sitting on the shore.

Mr. McTigue reported a first-floor addition was being proposed to bring it out to the same points of the lower level, explaining that there was an existing foundation at 5.8' to the property line. Mr. McTigue noted that there were three existing sheds in this area and that area would now include the mechanicals, an area to bring in the water line, the sewer line, and a place to enclose their trash cans. He indicated that the proposal included a generator on that side and another condenser. Mr. McTigue noted the semi-open fence along the front boundary line along with a retaining wall on the other side of that. He explained the plans include dropping the grade down 3' beyond that wall with another retaining wall at the edge of the lake. Mr. McTigue noted that retaining wall will be no higher than 3' either.

An 8" oak tree and a 6" pine tree will be taken down, according to Mr. McTigue. He explained those will be replaced with three river birch trees in one area, another three river birch trees on the other side, and two flowering trees on either side of the walkway. Finally, he noted that his clients would like to add a set of steps for access down to the lake.

Currently, the existing house has roof leaders that drain down to the lake. As part of the plan, Mr. McTigue, reported the proposal includes to capture the roof water and put it into the ground, designed for a 100-year storm. He explained that will allow for water attenuation, to cool the water before it enters back into the lake. The structural engineers have planned for three feet of wall on both sides as part of the foundation, according to Mr. McTigue. He explained that currently there was about 12' of foundation between the three piers and that the proposal included 12' of foundation with two piers, noting that there would be the same amount of concrete exposure at the water line. The plan includes a turbidity wall to protect during construction and to wrap the site with silt fence. He noted that the area was such a tight site and that there would not be much moving of material, reporting that there was a little bit of cuts and fills. The zoning regulations require the return portions of the retaining walls to maintain two feet unless there is permission from the neighbors, according to Mr. McTigue. He indicated that permission is being sought from the neighbors as the plans do call for the returns to be at the property lines. Additionally, Mr. McTigue reported a text amendment was before the Town to allow development on a 25% slope via the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. McTigue noted that the plans included a sediment and soil erosion plan, explaining that 30 cubic yards of fill will need to be brought in for the area between the two retaining walls. He reviewed the floor plans for the proposed structure. He noted the height of the building will not be changed.

Mr. Lippincott questioned the depth of the water at this location. Mr. McTigue noted that it was estimated to be about 8'-9'. He confirmed that his clients will utilize coffer dams to do all of the construction for all of the walls. He indicated that his clients were looking to get started immediately following receipt of all the approvals. Mr. Lippincott questioned whether there was any information on the lakebed in this area and whether any excavation would be necessary. Mr. McTigue noted that the contractor will need to go down 3½' below the lakebed floor to get proper footing but might be less if ledge is encountered. They can pin to ledge if they hit it but will not know until they open it up, according to Mr. McTigue. Mr. Molinelli advised Mr. McTigue that machinery is not allowed on the lakebed. Mr. McTigue confirmed that no machinery will be on the lakebed. Mr. Molinelli questioned how the site will be excavated without machinery in the lakebed. Mr. McTigue explained that would be covered through *Means & Methods* and offered to seek more information from the contractor. Mr. Paganelli suggested that their plan might be to reach with a long arm. Mr. McTigue confirmed that there might be some temporary blockages in the Town's right-of-way (the road), noting that the site is very small. He noted that the driveway across the street, on his client's other parcel, could be utilized during construction for temporary storage.

Ms. Mulvey questioned the bottom space of the dwelling, referred to as the wet room. Mr. McTigue explained that the basement area is essentially for utilities and kayak storage. The flooring will be like decking that will

allow the water to flow through, according to Mr. McTigue. Ms. Mulvey questioned what the space was used for currently. Mr. McTigue noted that this is what the space is currently used as. Mr. McTigue indicated that he would seek a report from the structural engineer.

Mr. Molinelli questioned the size of the house. Mr. McTigue noted that it was basically 20'x22'. He noted that the current piers are 4'x4' and the proposed piers will be 6'x6', but reminded the commission that there will not be a center pier.

Mr. Molinelli advised Mr. McTigue that the commission generally does not like to grant approvals with conditions but instead prefers to act on finished plans. It was noted that this commission would seek consultation with an independent engineer and that the applicant should forward electronically any plan revision as soon as possible.

**MOTION:** Mr. Molinelli, Ms. Marvin second, to accept Application IWWC#22-08 Applicant: James McTigue Owner: Steven Heffer and Heena Sultan Location: 212 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Reconstruct Residence and Decking; New Walks and Retaining Walls, and finding the proposed activity as significant, to schedule a public hearing for the June 15, 2022 regular meeting; unanimously approved.

**C. IWWC#22-09 Applicant: M.E. Carroll & Sons Owner: Beth Ballantine Location: 380 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Remove 1000-Gallon Underground Tank; Bury 500 lb Propane Tank.**

Jarrold Carroll appeared before the commission regarding this application. He explained that the oil tank to be removed was located on the side of the house and that his clients were seeking to bury their propane tank down and over due to underground utilities, in the area of a current flower bed. Mr. Carroll estimated the work to take two days when factoring in the necessary inspections. He estimated that the disturbance to the ground would be in a 3'x13' area. Mr. Carroll noted that matting would be used where they mobilize equipment and that those would be retrieved after the work was completed. A 10" sediment log would be used, according to Mr. Carroll.

**MOTION:** Mr. Lippincott, Ms. Marvin second, to accept and refer Application IWWC#22-09 Applicant: M.E. Carroll & Sons Owner: Beth Ballantine Location: 380 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Remove 1000-Gallon Underground Tank; Bury 500 lb Propane Tank for an agent determination; unanimously approved.

**9. AGENT ACTIONS:**

**A. Determinations.**

Mr. Stankov noted that there had been no wetlands determinations.

**B. Warnings/Violations.**

**i. Parcel opposite 215 West Wakefield Boulevard (Preusse)**

Mr. Stankov reported that there has been no activity on this.

**ii. North Main Street (18.1 acre parcel located behind 493 North Main Street)**

Mr. Stankov reported that the property owner was trying to put in electric service at this location and that he would, accompanied by the Police Department, be inspecting this property on Monday, April 25<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Stankov noted that there appeared to be six pylons comprise of trees that had been rid of their bark. He confirmed that the property owner has contracted local Land Surveyor Peter Keefe.

**iii. 308 East Wakefield Boulevard**

Mr. Stankov reported that the property owner is still in discussions with Lenard Engineering to determine whether there was anything to be done at this site but after receiving the price, the owner may just be ripping everything out. Because the parcel is so small, it would be nearly impossible to get the impervious surface coverage down to below 20%, according to Mr. Stankov. He noted that Lenard Engineering had quoted the property owner a price for the engineering and the owner was unsure that he could afford to pay it.

**vi. 713 East Wakefield Boulevard**

Mr. Stankov reported that he had confirmation that the property owner had paid Mr. Keefe a retainer to complete the survey. Mr. Lippincott questioned whether the property owner had been issued a citation. Mr. Stankov indicated that they had not as three days before he was going to send it, Mr. Keefe had phoned him and reported the update.

**v. West Wakefield Boulevard (Connole)**

Mr. Stankov reported he was certain that the survey was completed but was unsure why no application had been submitted. He indicated that fines would be issued if no application was received for the May meeting.

**vi. 225 West Wakefield Boulevard**

Mr. Stankov reminded the commission that the property owner had picked up an application but that no other communication was received.

**vii. 182 Shore Drive**

Mr. Stankov reported that he had not heard from the property owner.

**10. COMMUNICATIONS AND BILLS:**

Mr. Stankov reported that there was a lot of erosion into the two wetlands crossings at the solar farm on Platt Hill Road. He noted that he was able to get the contractor to clean those out. He indicated that he may need to send them a Cease and Desist if the issues at the solar farm do not get resolved.

Mr. Molinelli noted that he is seeing a lot of construction activity around the lake. He requested that this commission be kept updated with inspections. Mr. Lippincott questioned whether Mr. Stankov was of the opinion that everything that is getting done on the lake has been permitted. Mr. Stankov reported that there was a car parking issue, a complete replacement of an existing dock that should have received a permit prior to getting started, and a driveway and a deck rebuild.

**11. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**A. Report from Department of Public Works Liaisons – Russ Davenport and Jeff Lippincott.**

No business discussed.

**B. Report from Highland Lake Watershed Association Liaisons – Jackie Mulvey and Mary Ann Marino.**

No business discussed.

**11. ADJOURN:**

**MOTION:** Ms. Mulvey, Mr. Davenport second, to adjourn at 8:31PM; unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pamela A. Colombie  
Recording Clerk