



**TOWN OF WINCHESTER
INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES COMMISSION**

Held Remotely (Via Zoom)
and was streamed live on YouTube:

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

**January 20, 2021 – 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: Russ Davenport, Christine Hunter, Andrea Krawiecki, Jeff Lippincott, Mary Ann Marino, and Kurt Timmeney as well as staff member Pam Colombie.

Jackie Mulvey was absent excused.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 16, 2020 Regular Meeting and January 6, 2021 Regular Meeting:

MOTION: Ms. Krawiecki, Mr. Davenport second, to approve the December 16, 2020 Minutes; unanimously approved.

MOTION: Ms. Krawiecki, Ms. Hunter second, to approve the January 6, 2021 Minutes; unanimously approved.

4. AGENDA REVIEW:

Mr. Molinelli took an opportunity to acknowledge and praise the efforts of Mr. Davenport who had chaired the meetings over the course of the previous six months.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

A. IWWC#20-32 Applicant/Owner: Mark Mandell and Merrill Mandell Location: 410 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Install 18” Goose Barrier Fence Along Top of Existing Sea Wall; Modify Existing Boat Ramp to Create a 12’x12’ Seating Area with Steps Using Existing Stone.

MOTION: Mr. Molinelli, Mr. Davenport second, to deny Application IWWC#20-32 without prejudice; unanimously approved.

B. IWWC#20-46 Applicant/Owner: Thomas Troy Location: 424 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Repair 130’ of Lake Wall; Replace Dock Concrete Pad; Register 3’x12’ Dock to 10’x10’ Platform, 2 Buoys, and Float.

MOTION: Ms. Hunter, Mr. Molinelli second, to continue Application IWWC#20-46 to the February 17, 2021 regular meeting; unanimously approved.

C. IWWC#20-49 Applicant/Owner: Kevin Winn and Marcia Winn Location: 658 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Repair Lake Wall. Remove Concrete Cap. Remove and Replace Stone as Far Down as Needed. Replace with New Concrete Cap.

Kevin Winn appeared before the Commission regarding this application. He explained that he was seeking to remove as much of the wall as needed, reconstruct the wall, and then cap the top of the wall. Mr. Winn indicated that the length of wall to be repaired is 44’, with it being in two sections: one 5’ section and one 39’ section.

Mr. Winn noted that the stairs would remain as they are. He confirmed that he had active erosion along the wall edge. Mr. Molinelli questioned how much of the lake wall would need to be taken down. Mr. Winn was unsure but estimated that only one foot of wall, from the lakebed up, would remain. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether there would be any excavation into the lakebed or if the work would be from the base up. Mr. Winn confirmed it would not be into the lakebed. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether the wall would be reconstructed to its present height or built higher. Mr. Winn noted that it would be limited to its present height of approximately 4'. He noted that it would be the same height as his neighbors. Mr. Davenport questioned whether there was still time for this repair now that the lake was refilling. Mr. Winn indicated that there was still time to do this work. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether there was any work to be done with the stairs. Mr. Winn indicated that there was not. Staff questioned whether the applicant's dock is removable. Mr. Winn confirmed. Mr. Molinelli reminded Mr. Winn that the dock needs to be ten (10') feet off the littoral boundary. Mr. Winn confirmed that there were no lifts at his property.

Ms. Marino questioned whether Mr. Winn was amenable to a buffer garden along the lake's wall. He noted that he had installed a one (1') foot wide strip of pebbles so that the water could filter through. He indicated that he would be agreeable to doing the same thing along the lake wall.

MOTION: Ms. Krawiecki, Ms. Marino second, to approve Application IWWC#20-49 Applicant/Owner: Kevin Winn and Marcia Winn Location: 658 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Repair Lake Wall. Remove Concrete Cap. Remove and Replace Stone as Far Down as Needed. Replace with New Concrete Cap, 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 January 20, 2021 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. Dock registration to be submitted to the Wetlands Office.

13. Project to include hay bales or silt fence to prevent erosion during construction.

14. Applicant to install stone along wall edge.

15. Cash erosion and sedimentation bond totaling \$750 to be submitted to the Inland Wetlands Office prior to the commencement of work;

unanimously approved.

D. IWWC#20-58 Applicant/Owner: Shawn Stanziale Location: 504 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Renovate Cottage and Detached Garage to Add Second Floor Living; Relocate Driveway.

No business discussed.

E. IWWC#20-62 Applicant/Owner: Sherwood Dawson Location: 538 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Construct Single Family Residence.

Professional Engineer George Cotter appeared before the Commission regarding this application. He noted that there had been a permit for this proposal issued before but explained that it had expired in 2019. Mr. Cotter noted that his client would like to construct retaining walls on the site to support the grade, explaining that there is a change in grade of eight feet from the road down to the water. He reported the lot area as 2250 square feet, indicating it as 30'x50'. Mr. Cotter noted that a driveway area was being proposed across the street to provide parking for this property.

Mr. Cotter explained the parcel had 50' along West Wakefield Boulevard with 30' along the lake. He noted the house would be 22'4"x24' with an 8'x24' deck. Mr. Cotter reported a raingarden had been proposed between the home and the lake to capture the runoff from the roof leaders. He noted that the retaining walls are part of the design because of the steep slope. Mr. Cotter indicated the wall on the northerly side of the property will have stairs leading from the upper area near the road down to the area near the lake. He explained that both the lower areas and upper areas will be grass. He noted that the stairs into the lake and the dock exist now.

Mr. Molinelli questioned the location of the well. Mr. Cotter explained that the well will be located across the road near the parking area. He indicated that approval had been granted from the Torrington Area Health District in this regard. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether the two parcels were one property. It was noted that they were two properties. Staff noted the footing drains and rain leaders were not reflected on the plans.

Mr. Cotter indicated that the sandy area on the lakeside had been previously approved. With regards to the raingarden, Mr. Cotter indicated that there would be no increase in runoff between pre- and post- development. He explained that the raingarden would include a sand area underneath it to include a pipe through the wall to collect rainwater and then to dissipate through ground and back into the lake. Mr. Cotter indicated that his revisions would include elevations for the tops and bottoms of both walls.

Mr. Davenport questioned the riprap swale to the north of the proposed parking area. Mr. Cotter noted that the plans for the parking area include riprap around the edge of the pipe in that area which will pick up this parcel's driveway's runoff and be directed towards the stormwater system. Mr. Molinelli questioned how the runoff from the hill behind the parking area will be addressed. Mr. Cotter indicated that the runoff from the hill will be picked up by the storm drainage in the street. Mr. Davenport noted that the plans should show the driveway being pitched towards the swale so that a prospective contractor would understand. Mr. Cotter noted the plans would be modified to include enough detail so that it is understood that the water will be directed towards the swale. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether the stormwater will enter the catch basin and will lead into pipes that lead to the lake. Mr. Cotter confirmed that there are catch basins along West Wakefield Boulevard that eventually go into the lake.

The consensus of the Commission was to refer the proposal to an independent engineer after receiving the revised plans from Mr. Cotter. Staff indicated that the lot proposed for parking would need to be researched in order to make a determination as to how and when it was created and whether subdivision approval was necessary. Mr. Cotter indicated that he would provide calculations on the new runoff on the proposed parking area to the Town's existing storm drain and what is being discharged off that slope currently. Staff requested updated zoning tables on the parcels.

MOTION: Ms. Hunter, Mr. Davenport second, to accept Application IWWC#20-62 Applicant/Owner: Sherwood Dawson Location: 538 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Construct Single Family Residence, finding the proposed activity to be in the public interest, to schedule a public hearing for the February 17, 2021 regular meeting;

Motion approved with Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter, Ms. Krawiecki, Mr. Lippincott, Ms. Marino, Mr. Molinelli voting in favor while Mr. Timmeney was opposed.

F. IWWC#20-66 Applicant/Owner: James Brandolini and Lynn Brandolini Location: 272 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Add Mooring Ball and Jetski Lift and Boatlift.

James Brandolini appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Brandolini noted that he had 234' of water frontage. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether the jetski lift was a single lift or double lift. Mr. Brandolini noted that it would likely be only a single lift. Mr. Molinelli verified that Mr. Brandolini understood the jetski lift could not be used for a boat. Mr. Brandolini confirmed. He noted that the mooring would likely be located approximately 50' from ledge. It was noted that this was different than what was located on the site plan. Mr. Brandolini noted that the dock is 26'x8' where it extends from the 8'x10' platform along the lake's edge.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Marino second, to approve Application IWWC#20-66 Applicant/Owner: James Brandolini and Lynn Brandolini Location: 272 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Add Mooring Ball and Single Jetski Lift and Boatlift, finding the proposed activity as not significant, and to approve it subject to the standard (1-12) conditions; unanimously approved.

G. IWWC#20-67 Applicant: Dino Corp., Nancy Frink, and Lee Morsey Owner: Dino Corp. and Nancy Frink Location: 88 Hubbard Street Proposal: Timber Harvest.

Lee Morsey appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Morsey noted that the timber was ready to be harvested. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether the harvesting would occur in or near wetlands. Mr. Morsey indicated that it would not as there are no designated wetlands. Mr. Morsey confirmed that the work was a selective harvest of approximately fifteen acres. He noted that the existing skid roads from the previous harvest will be utilized.

The Commission understood this activity to be an as-of right activity.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

Application IWWC#21-01 was reviewed ahead of Application IWWC#20-73.

A. IWWC#21-01 (Modification of IWWC#17-08, #19-07, & #19-35) Applicant: Karen Tiernan Owner: John Tiernan and Karen Tiernan Location: 61 East Lake Street Proposal: Flatten Rock at End of Dock.

Karen Tiernan appeared before the Commission regarding this application. It was noted that the proposal included the top of the rock to be removed with hand tools through the feather wedge technique. Ms. Marino questioned whether the water level was up at this spot. Ms. Tiernan noted that they do not live at this location, so she was unsure. Mr. Davenport opined the work could probably be done in an hour.

When reviewing the site plan, Mr. Molinelli questioned the size of the existing dock. Ms. Tiernan was unsure of the size of the dock but was confident that it was shorter than 40'. Mr. Molinelli questioned the distance of the rock off the dock. Ms. Tiernan explained that it was right at the end of the dock. Mr. Davenport explained that during the recent approvals of this type of work, the Commission has been requesting some type of protection for the lakebed but as the water was rising in this case, he did not deem it necessary.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter econd, to approve Application IWWC#21-01 (Modification of IWWC#17-08, #19-07, & #19-35) Applicant: Karen Tiernan Owner: John Tiernan and Karen Tiernan Location: 61 East Lake Street Proposal: Flatten Rock at End of Dock subject to the standard (1-12) conditions;

Motion approved with Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter, Ms. Krawiecki, Mr. Lippincott, Mr. Molinelli, and Mr. Timmeney voting in favor while Ms. Marino was opposed.

B. IWWC#20-73 Applicant/Owner: Patrick Hussey Location: 752 Lake Drive Proposal: Dock, Repair Steel, Replace Wood Decking.

Patrick Hussey appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Hussey explained that his proposal included replacing the steel under the dock and replacement of the decking. He noted that the three beams will go out a maximum length of 30' and explained that it would sit on the existing pier. Mr. Hussey indicated the width of the dock as 7'. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the work would be done in the water. Mr. Hussey explained he had to wait until the water freezes over and his contractors can stand on the ice. Mr. Molinelli questioned the manpower that would be necessary to get the steel beams to the location. Mr. Hussey noted it will take five of six guys. Mr. Davenport questioned how the steel beams will be fastened to the shore. Mr. Hussey noted that the beams go in four or five feet under the deck and explained the beams get fastened to bolts underneath.

Ms. Krawiecki shared her request for a survey depicting the location of the dock. Mr. Hussey noted the dock is existing. Mr. Davenport shared photographs he took during his recent site visit. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the decking was getting replaced. Mr. Hussey indicated that he was unsure. Mr. Davenport noted the 4"x4" posts and questioned whether they were being replaced. Mr. Davenport requested more detail for the next meeting regarding the scope of the project. Mr. Hussey explained that the new dock is going in five feet towards the existing deck and will be welded to the existing bolts that are there. He noted that the dock will be anchored with six-inch wedge bolts on top of the pillar and finished with decking. Mr. Lippincott questioned whether the existing deck will be removed for the work. Mr. Hussey noted that they will not and that the beams would just slide under.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter second to accept Application IWWC#20-73 Applicant/Owner: Patrick Hussey Location: 752 Lake Drive Proposal: Dock, Repair Steel, Replace Wood Decking, finding the proposed activity as not significant;
unanimously approved.

C. IWWC#21-02 Applicant: Christopher Chinnock Owner: Christopher Chinnock and Linda Chinnock Location: 242 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Repair Lake Wall.

Christopher Chinnock appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Chinnock reported that there is a drainage pipe running from the street through his lot that leads into the lake. He explained that it appeared the pipe was unmaintained, and that erosion was observed. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether Mr. Chinnock intended to replace the entire wall of this lot. Mr. Chinnock confirmed. It was noted that he intends to change the wall to an engineered block wall.

Mr. Chinnock explained that after observing the drainage pipe in October, noting at the time that it was filled with sand, he had contacted Department of Public Works Director Jim Rollins. Mr. Chinnock opined that the pipe was disconnected on the land side of the wall. Mr. Chinnock reported that DPW will coordinate with his contractor for after the wall is ripped apart as part of the lake wall replacement, DPW will come in and reset the pipe prior to the wall being built. Staff noted the finished conditions of the lake wall on the neighboring parcel at 240 Perch Rock Trail including the wide concrete base protruding into the lake. The consensus of the commission was that this base would not be acceptable.

Mr. Davenport questioned whether a deep drawdown was necessary for this wall replacement. He noted that the water has already begun to rise and queried whether there was adequate time to do such a project. Mr. Chinnock noted that a manufactured wall would sit on gravel or riprap foundation. Mr. Molinelli indicated that a dewatering plan will need to be included on a site plan. Mr. Molinelli suggested the plans may have to be reviewed by an independent engineer. He advised Mr. Chinnock to include a comprehensive plan with additional details for the next meeting if there was hope to have this work done this year. Ms. Krawiecki questioned the plan for the debris removal. Ms. Marino questioned the proximity of the rising water to the location of the proposed wall replacement. Mr. Chinnock remarked the water was two to three feet from the wall during his last visit. Mr. Davenport suggested a more complete site plan including an updated survey along with a construction sequence including details on what equipment would be utilized, the location of the stockpile, details on the backfill behind the retaining wall, and the location and type of erosion controls to be employed. Mr. Molinelli noted that a detail on a dewatering plan should also be included with the site plan. Mr. Davenport questioned what role the Town would play in this project. Staff reported that DPW may be agreeable to the repair to the pipe but would likely want the easement located on a plan.

Mr. Chinnock confirmed that the lakewall work would be confined to 242 Perch Rock Trail with none extending over to the wall in front of 244 Perch Rock Trail.

MOTION: Mr. Molinelli, Mr. Davenport, Mr. second, to accept Application IWWC#21-02 Applicant: Christopher Chinnock Owner: Christopher Chinnock and Linda Chinnock Location: 242 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Replace Lake Wall, finding the proposed activity as not significant; unanimously approved.

The Commission recessed at 9:20PM and reconvened at 9:26PM.

D. IWWC#21-03 (Modification of IWWC#20-54) Applicant/Owner: Michael Goncalves and Desiree Goncalves Location: 522 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Add Footings for New Entrance as Part of Remodel and Addition.

Michael Goncalves appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Goncalves explained that the planned work included remodeling the home by adding a second floor and to reconfigure the entrance stairway. He explained that the 3'x7' overhang will be removed and the stairs leading into the home would be shifted. Mr. Goncalves noted the plans would again include an overhang, but it would be shortened and widened. Additionally, he explained the stone sidewalk would be replaced with a pervious walkway.

Mr. Molinelli questioned whether any footings would be necessary for the new entrance. Mr. Goncalves confirmed, explaining that the retaining wall in that area would be modified, too. In reviewing the photographs, Mr. Goncalves confirmed that the proposed walkway would be the same size or smaller than the current

walkway. Mr. Goncalves indicated the walkway will be limited to an area from the driveway to the front door, explaining that the area leading to the stairs to the lake will be grass.

MOTION: Mr. Lippincott, Ms. Krawiecki second, to approve Application IWWC#21-03 (Modification of IWWC#20-54) Applicant/Owner: Michael Goncalves and Desiree Goncalves Location: 522 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Add 3 Footings for New Entrance as Part of Remodel; and Replace Impervious Pavers with Pervious Pavers, as per the site plan, subject to the standard (1-12) conditions; *unanimously approved*.

E. IWWC#21-04 Applicant/Owner: James Kloczko Location: 100 New Hartford Road Proposal: Landscape and Construction Yard – Mini-mix Concrete.

James Kloczko appeared before the Commission regarding this application. It was noted that the site plan submitted was being updated by the applicant's engineer.

Staff explained that this site was formerly Kentucky Fried Chicken and that the applicant was contacted after it was discovered that he had begun business operations without having gained the proper approvals from this commission and the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Kloczko explained that the material which will be stored outside at this location is washed sand and stone. It was noted that the development on this parcel has wetlands surrounding it and that they should be re-flagged and located on an updated site plan. Additionally, it was noted that any planned development, including outdoor storage, should be included on an updated site plan.

Mr. Davenport questioned the location of the sand bin currently, noting his concern with its proximity to the storm drain. He noted the drain was just above a stream. Mr. Kloczko confirmed, noting that a silt sock had been installed to prevent infiltration into the drain. He noted that there would be no cleaning of the trucks as there is no leftover concrete with a mini-mix type rather than ready-mix. He explained that he had done the walkways up at the spillways at Highland Lake and was able to rinse his trucks out at the old pin company right down the street. Mr. Davenport requested a maintenance plan of the catch basins be included with his updated site plan.

Noting that there was not enough information to consider the application as complete, the consensus was to continue the matter to the next regular meeting pending the updated engineered site plan. It was noted that the engineered plans will be reviewed by an independence engineering firm.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Krawiecki second, to continue Application IWWC#21-04; *unanimously approved*.

F. IWWC#21-05 Applicant/Owner: David Preusse and Kristen Preusse Location: 215 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Replace Waterfront Decking and Rails; Rebuild Retaining Wall to Prevent Erosion of Lake Deposits; and Fencing.

David Preusse, accompanied by his contractor Joel Jarvis, appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Preusse reviewed photographs he had submitted since the last meeting. He noted that they included an aerial view of the site, conditions of the former deck at the site, and trees that have been removed. Mr. Preusse noted that as they had removed the bank holding the stumps and the area under what he described as a former shed, he and his contractor discovered old lumber and railroad ties that had been buried. As such, it increased the amount of their excavation, according to Mr. Preusse. He reported his contractor had advised the need to stabilize the area beneath a new retaining wall thus their dig went deeper and deeper. Mr. Preusse explained that the work stopped after receipt of a *Cease and Desist Order*. He noted that he had been advised by town staff to consult with an engineer about the proposed work. Mr. Preusse explained that he had Borghessi Engineering to the site who had suggested the use of concrete blocks or a poured concrete wall including rebar within it.

Additionally, Mr. Preusse explained that he would like to build a retaining wall along West Wakefield Boulevard.

Mr. Preusse noted that the survey had recently been completed and depicted his docks, explaining that they comply with the requirements of the Dock and Mooring Ordinance.

Mr. Davenport questioned whether the applicant intended to pour a concrete wall. Mr. Preusse confirmed, noting that the new wall was shown in the color orange on the concept drawing. Mr. Jarvis explained that should there not be adequate time to complete a poured wall, they would like to install a concrete block wall instead. Mr. Lippincott questioned the height of the wall. Mr. Jarvis indicated the proposed wall would be six (6') feet, with only four (4') feet above the lake bottom.

It was noted that what had been provided by Borghesi did not address the base upon which a wall would be constructed. Mr. Jarvis indicated that process would be installed and compacted. Mr. Lippincott questioned whether stable ground had been reached. Mr. Preusse indicated that the root system still had to be cleaned out. Mr. Davenport questioned what would be used for backfill to the wall. Mr. Jarvis indicated 3/8" stone would be used. Mr. Davenport questioned whether there was any planned drainage for the wall. He noted that the detail from Borghesi did not appear to include any. Mr. Davenport questioned whether it was a single pour. Mr. Jarvis noted that there would be two pours: one for the footing and another for the walls. Mr. Jarvis noted that the rebar will be installed and will come from footings. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether the plans had been reviewed by an independent engineer. Staff noted that there had not been. It was also noted that there would be backfill necessary on both sides of the walls in some areas. Mr. Jarvis noted that there had been excavation behind where the water formerly was.

It was noted that there was another retaining wall proposed by the wall. Mr. Davenport noted that a new set of stairs was proposed for in front of the lower retaining wall. Mr. Jarvis noted that those steps would be constructed of wood.

The Commission discussed whether riprap should be installed in the area until the proposal can be refined. It was agreed that what has been submitted so far by the applicant would be forwarded for an independent review. Mr. Preusse indicated the independent engineer could consult his engineer, Allan Borghesi.

MOTION: Ms. Hunter, Mr. Timmeney second, to accept Application IWWC#21-05 Applicant/Owner: David Preusse and Kristen Preusse Location: 215 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Replace Waterfront Decking and Rails; Rebuild Retaining Wall to Prevent Erosion of Lake Deposits; and Fencing, finding the proposed activity as not significant; unanimously approved.

8. AGENT ACTIONS.

A. Determinations.

B. Warnings/Violations.

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

The property had been discussed and reviewed through the application submitted.

9. COMMUNICATIONS AND BILLS.

Staff reported the Land Use Seminar sponsored by the Connecticut Bar Association scheduled via ZOOM for the first Saturday in March. It was noted that the Town includes a budget allocation for training and will cover the registration fees for any commissioner interested in attending. A request was made to confirm by February 1st.

10. OTHER BUSINESS.

A. Discussion on Catch Basin Maintenance Schedule.

Mr. Molinelli suggested that a commissioner be appointed as a liaison to the Department of Public Works to regularly consult with Mr. Rollins regarding road treatments and eventually a catch basin maintenance schedule. Additionally, Mr. Molinelli suggested that another individual function as a liaison to the Highland Lake Watershed Association.

B. 838 East Wakefield Boulevard – Clarification Sought.

The commission reviewed the approved permit along with the 2018 Minutes for the meeting that the proposal was discussed. It was noted that there had been a condition that “*verification by a licensed land surveyor to the Inland Wetlands Office that the iron pins have not been altered after completion of the project*”. An email provided by Licensed Land Surveyor John DiCara indicated that the property had never had iron pins initially. It was noted that it would be appropriate for the Wetlands Office to return the bond to the applicant.

11. ADJOURN:

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Krawiecki second, to adjourn at 10:50PM; unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

**Pamela A. Colombie
Recording Clerk**