



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

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

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

**November 4, 2020 – 7:00PM
Special Meeting Minutes**

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Secretary Russ Davenport called the meeting to order at 7:05PM.

2. ROLL CALL:

Roll call was completed by Mr. Davenport. Present at the meeting in addition to Mr. Davenport were: Christine Hunter, Andrea Krawiecki, Steve Molinelli(7:10PM), Jackie Mulvey, and Kurt Timmeney as well as staff member Pam Colombie.

Mary Ann Marino and Ric Nalette were absent excused.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 21, 2020 Regular Meeting:

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Krawiecki second, to approve the October 21, 2020 Minutes; Motion passed unanimously with Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter, Ms. Krawiecki, Ms. Mulvey, and Mr. Timmeney voting in favor.

4. AGENDA REVIEW:

The consensus of the Commission was that discussion would likely not begin on an application after 10:00PM.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

**A. IWWC#20-45 Applicant: Brian Dwyer Owner: Jeffrey R. Smith and Rhonda J. Tobin
Location: 226 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Excavate 30” Behind 50’ of Lake Wall and Install Twenty-Four (24”) Inches of Stone and Backfill Remainder with Topsoil; Reinstall Sod.**

Brian Dwyer appeared before the Commission regarding this application. He explained that the scope of the project did not include any type of wall repair and that it was limited to excavating behind the wall and removing the soil in order to backfill with crushed stone on top of some filter fabric. Mr. Dwyer explained that this work would prevent sink holes from forming. Photographs of the existing conditions were reviewed with Mr. Dwyer explaining that all the work would be done by hand. He explained that this project will help prevent sediment from getting into the lake through the weep holes. Ms. Mulvey questioned whether the material will be taken off the site. Mr. Dwyer confirmed, noting that there would be no storage of materials on the property. Ms. Krawiecki questioned whether the six to seven yards of material removed would be replaced with the same volume of crushed stone. Mr. Dwyer confirmed.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Mulvey second, to approve Application IWWC#20-45 Applicant: Brian Dwyer Owner: Jeffrey R. Smith and Rhonda J. Tobin Location: 226 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Excavate 30” Behind 50’ of Lake Wall and Install Twenty-Four (24”) Inches of Stone and Backfill Remainder with Topsoil; Reinstall Sod and 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 November 4, 2020 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;

unanimously approved.

**B. IWWC#20-46 Applicant/Owner: Thomas Troy Location: 431 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: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter second, to continue Application IWWC#20-46 to the November 18, 2020 regular meeting; unanimously approved.

**C. IWWC#20-47 Applicant/Owner: Ken Albino Location: 376 East Wakefield Boulevard
Proposal: Modification of Approved Application IWWC#20-17, Including Dock
Rehabilitation/Registration/Minor Site Revisions.**

Maria Miele, accompanied by Professional Engineer Rob Colabella, appeared before the Commission on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Colabella reminded the Commission that the site had been reviewed by them recently. He explained that his clients were seeking to make some modifications to that approved site plan. He reported the proposed modifications would function to decrease the amount of activity on the site. Mr. Colabella noted that the proposal included converting the crushed gravel area in the front of the home with a pervious paver system. Additionally, the deck and walkway would be changed. The steps leading from the patio to the yard towards the lake will be shortened, too, according to Mr. Colabella. The widths of the paver

walkways on the southerly side of the property were also shown to be shortened from the previously approved plan. Mr. Colabella reported the impervious surface coverage would be reduced from 35.4% to 32.4%.

Mr. Colabella reviewed the dock proposal. He noted that the proposed size would be 38.5' x 8' with the distance to the nearest property line being 15.4'. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the dock was a floating dock. Ms. Miele indicated the dock to be a permanent dock. She noted that the part that is permanent is on a pier and that no work would be done on that. Ms. Miele indicated that the only work that is necessary on the dock is the replacement of the decking. Additionally, she noted that the dock is shorter than 38.5'.

Finally, Mr. Colabella explained that the previous approval had included adding a vegetative garden along the lake wall's edge. He noted that the area behind the wall currently is pea stone but that his clients had noted a weep hole system behind the wall. His client had observed them as being permanent and had questioned whether a request could be made to eliminate that garden and extend the grass to the back of the wall, keeping the height of the grass to about six inches below the back of the wall. Mr. Closson explained that there is a concrete slab buried approximately twelve inches from the top of the wall with grates every six to eight feet that function as entry ports for the weep holes that funnel the waters out. Mr. Colabella noted that the planned rain garden would remain.

In discussing the approval of this application, the consensus of the Commission was that the revision date of 11/04/2020 should be added to the final drawing. Mr. Colabella agreed to remove the vegetative garden from the plans and update the length of the dock to reflect what Ms. Miele had indicated.

MOTION: Mr. Molinelli, Ms. Hunter second, to approve Application IWWC#20-47 Applicant/Owner: Ken Albino Location: 376 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Modification of Approved Application IWWC#20-17, Including Dock Rehabilitation/Registration/Minor Site Revisions as revised at the November 4, 2020 regular meeting; unanimously approved.

D. IWWC#20-48 Applicant: Brian Dwyer Owner: Gunjan Prakash and Daniel P. Roeser Location: 546 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Repair the Stone Foundation Wall on the North Side of the House; Foundation Repair around Utility Room; Clean and Point Eastern Retaining Wall; Clean and Point Southern Border Wall; Backfill Northern Lake Wall and Install Sod and Dwarf Arborvitae Border Reset 2 Bluestone Steps at Lake Entry.

Brian Dwyer appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Dwyer shared photographs of the existing conditions of the site from a couple weeks ago. He noted that most of the work is limited to repointing, repairs to the foundation, and the resetting of the two steps at the lake entry. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the work would involve a structural repair. Mr. Dwyer confirmed that a few rocks may need to be reset but the work should not take more than two to three days. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the house had to be jacked up and supported. Mr. Dwyer indicated that it did not, and that most of the foundation is sound. Mr. Molinelli questioned the length of wall that needed the work. Mr. Dwyer explained that it was a twelve-foot section from the chimney out towards the lake. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether there was water against the foundation as of the date of this meeting. Mr. Dwyer noted that the water has receded so that it is away from the wall/work area. Ms. Krawiecki questioned what was involved with the cleaning of the wall. Mr. Dwyer explained it was minor repair to the retaining walls. In reviewing the documents, Mr. Davenport questioned whether a patio was being expanded. Mr. Dwyer noted that approval for that had been received in 2004 and confirmed it had already been done but that those drawings were from the most recent approval the Town had on file. Mr. Davenport questioned the arborvitae. Mr. Dwyer explained that his clients were planning to create a natural vegetative border between their property and the right-of-way of the neighbors. He noted that it would likely be work undertaken by a landscaper. The debris from the chipped-out mortar would be hauled away at once, according to Mr. Dwyer.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Molinelli second, to approve Application IWWC#20-48 Applicant: Brian Dwyer Owner: Gunjan Prakash and Daniel P. Roeser Location: 546 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Repair the

Stone Foundation Wall on the North Side of the House; Foundation Repair around Utility Room; Clean and Point Eastern Retaining Wall; Clean and Point Southern Border Wall; Backfill Northern Lake Wall and Install Sod and Dwarf Arborvitae Border Reset 2 Bluestone Steps at Lake Entry, subject to the standard 1-12 conditions; unanimously approved.

E. 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.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter second, to continue Application IWWC#20-46 to the November 18, 2020 regular meeting; unanimously approved.

F. IWWC#20-50 Applicant/Owner: Normand Laliberte, Jr. Location: 416 West Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Building Retaining Walls, Replace Deck Section with Aluminum Dock and Add Stone for Improved Erosion Control.

Normand Laliberte, Jr. appeared before the commission regarding this application. He reminded the Commission that they had been provided with a 1983 survey that showed where the land used to be, in that it was halfway under the cottage with the other half of the cottage resting on piers out over the lake. The October 26, 2020 survey provided with the application includes the 1983 land line, he explained. Mr. Laliberte reviewed photographs that had also been submitted as part of his application packages. He emphasized the erosion that has occurred over the last couple of decades. Mr. Laliberte reported his engineer having visited the site who recommended rip rap being installed under the cottage to slow the waves and to also locate boulders in the lake in front of the cottage. He noted that a machine would need to be in the lakebed to accomplish this but would only need to be there for a couple of hours. Alternatively, a berm would need to be created along the water side.

Additionally, Mr. Laliberte explained that the proposal also includes construction of lake walls on both the northerly side of the parcel and the southerly side. He noted that he would like to continue the neighbor sea walls. He indicated that he would also like to install retaining walls for additional parking near the road. Additionally, Mr. Laliberte explained that the proposal included the removal of the wooden stairs off the house and rebuild them from stone. The dock running along the home would be converted to aluminum dock system with legs with a 6'x10' floating section at the end of that system. The length of dock from the steps would be 30', according to Mr. Laliberte. Mr. Davenport questioned whether this work was planned for this year during the deep drawdown. Mr. Laliberte confirmed, explaining the lake walls would be but that the upper retaining walls need not be done during the drawdown.

Reviewing the photographs with red lines depicting the proposed location of the new lake wall, Mr. Laliberte noted that some of the rocks will be relocated to under the cottage. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the majority of the work will be done in the lakebed. Mr. Laliberte confirmed noting that a heavy machine will be used to move the rocks over in front of the cottage in lake and men will move them underneath the cottage.

Mr. Davenport questioned whether material will be brought onto the site or taken off the site. Mr. Laliberte indicated material will need to be brought on to the site so as to be able to build the walls. He noted that no soil will be brought in. Mr. Davenport noted the absence of erosion controls on the plans. He questioned whether there was a contractor retained yet. Mr. Laliberte reported having a mason for the wall and an excavator contractor for the boulder work. Ms. Mulvey opined measurements are needed for the plans so that the Commission can determine what walls are going where and objected to equipment in the lakebed. Mr. Davenport requested more details with the plans including proposed elevations and more details on the scope of the project. Mr. Molinelli noted that it may be a good idea to have the proposed locations of the walls be staked out. He questioned whether a couple commissioners and staff could meet with the applicant to locate the proposed area. Staff cautioned, explaining that the surveyor should complete that task and be sure to keep the wall on the property of the applicant so as to avoid encroachment out into the lake.

In discussing whether the proposed activity was significant, Mr. Molinelli suggested the applicant meet with an engineer to better narrate where and how the work will be done, the scope of the proposal, a construction sequence, and what will be done with the material on the site. Mr. Davenport agreed, noting that the Commission would like a better idea of exactly where the walls will be.

MOTION: Mr. Molinelli, Mr. Davenport second, to accept Application IWWC#20-50, deeming the activity to be not-significant, and to continue the matter to the November 18, 2020 regular meeting, pending more information from the homeowner; unanimously approved.

G. IWWC#20-51 Applicant/Owner: Joseph Gomes Location: 214 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Replace Lake Wall.

Joseph Gomes appeared before the Commission regarding this application. He explained that he was unaware of the condition of his wall until the lake water was drawn down. Mr. Gomes noted that the property has a lot of sink holes, with one side of his yard completely gone. Reviewing the submitted drawing, Mr. Davenport questioned whether the proposal included a new deck and gazebo. Mr. Gomes indicated that it did not, explaining that it was merely an old drawing he used. Mr. Davenport questioned the scope of the project. Mr. Gomes confirmed that he was seeking to replace the entire lake wall. He noted that large rocks were washing completely out into the lake. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the deep drawdown was necessary for this work. Mr. Gomes noted that the work could not be completed during a normal drawdown. He explained that the wall will be replaced with a block wall and shared the manufacturer specifications. It was noted that the entire length of lake wall, all 95' of it, will be replaced with an engineered product. Mr. Gomes confirmed that the height of the wall will remain consistent. Mr. Davenport questioned the plans for the current concrete steps leading into the water. Mr. Gomes indicated that those would remain for access and be moved only temporarily, 3' out into the lakebed while the wall is constructed.

The wall product was discussed with Mr. Gomes reporting the blocks as 18" tall, 24" deep and 4' in length. Mr. Davenport questioned how the work area will be accessed. Mr. Gomes explained that the work area will be accessed by going down the side of his property. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the debris will be brought up to dump trucks parked on the road. Mr. Gomes confirmed. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the existing wall is demolished by pulling it out with an excavator. Mr. Gomes confirmed. He clarified the length of the wall, explaining that the property is 75' wide but the indentation where the steps are, account for the additional footage. Mr. Davenport questioned whether there would be additional material to be deposited on the backside of the new wall. Mr. Gomes confirmed, explaining that there will be material brought in for drainage and to follow the manufacturer's specifications. He noted that it would be stone and filter fabric. Mr. Davenport questioned the slope on the site. Mr. Gomes indicated that it was not very steep.

Mr. Davenport questioned whether there ought to be additional silt fence installed along the property line. Mr. Molinelli indicated that there ought to be silt fence out in the lakebed.

Mr. Molinelli questioned whether there were any planned modifications to the dock. Mr. Gomes indicated that there were no planned changes. Mr. Molinelli observed that the dock appeared to be currently in the littoral boundary. Mr. Davenport questioned how the dock is supported currently. Mr. Gomes explained that it sits on a pier. Mr. Timmeney questioned whether a vegetative buffer will be added along the lake wall. Mr. Gomes agreed to add one.

Mr. Gomes confirmed that there will be stockpiling on site.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter second, to accept and approve Application IWWC#20-51 Applicant/Owner: Joseph Gomes Location: 214 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Replace Lake Wall, subject to the standard 1-12 conditions and the following additional condition:
13. Cash erosion and sedimentation bond totaling \$1500 to be submitted to the Inland Wetlands Office prior to the commencement of work

14. A vegetative buffer to be added in front of the wall; unanimously approved.

The Commission recessed at 9:35PM and reconvened at 9:41PM.

H. IWWC#20-52 Applicant/Owner: Gary Meyer Location: 83 East Lake Street Proposal: Raze and Reconstruct Existing Cottage, Remove, and Replace Existing Gravel Parking Area with Permeable Pavers; Install Rain Garden.

Gary Meyer, accompanied by Professional Engineer Rob Colabella, appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Colabella noted that his clients intended to demolish the existing cottage and rebuild a new one after having received variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Additionally, Mr. Colabella explained the proposal included replacing the existing gravel parking area with pervious pavers and the installation of a raingarden. He explained that the work with the home and pavers are outside of the regulated area. Mr. Colabella confirmed that there would be no grade changes with the site. He noted the two sheds that will be removed as part of this project.

Mr. Colabella indicated that no site dewatering is expected. He noted that there is very little excavation expected for the construction of the home. Mr. Molinelli questioned the width of the property. Mr. Meyer noted the property was only 35' wide. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the property had any docks currently. Mr. Colabella confirmed, but noted that there was no proposed work beyond the removal of the shed. Mr. Molinelli questioned how access will be obtained. Mr. Colabella pointed out the right-of-way areas. He confirmed that the material excavated will be removed immediately and not stockpiled on site. He noted the location for lumber will be kept on site.

Mr. Colabella confirmed that there would be no increase in stormwater runoff between pre and post construction. He noted that extra volume has been added to the rain garden to be sure that there is not.

Mr. Molinelli questioned when the project would be started. Mr. Meyer noted the demolition would be right away with new construction beginning in the spring. Staff questioned the proposed location of the dumpster during demolition. Mr. Meyer indicated that it would be located on the current gravel parking area, between the home and the lake.

In discussing whether a public hearing was warranted, the Town's GIS was pulled up and reviewed so that the density of the area could be reviewed.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter second, to accept the application finding the proposed activity as not significant and to approve Application IWWC#20-52 Applicant/Owner: Gary Meyer Location: 83 East Lake Street Proposal: Raze and Reconstruct Existing Cottage, Remove, and Replace Existing Gravel Parking Area with Permeable Pavers; Install Rain Garden subject to the standard 1-12 conditions and the following additional condition:

13. Cash erosion and sedimentation bond totaling \$1500 to be submitted to the Inland Wetlands Office prior to the commencement of work; unanimously approved.

I. IWWC#20-53 Applicant: Matthew Closson Owner: Gerald Crispino and Robin Crispino Location: 851 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Construct New Single-Family Home as per Plot Plan and Drawings.

Matthew Closson, accompanied by Professional Engineer Mike Sherman, appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Sherman noted the location of the regulated area, explaining that it was 105 square feet. He noted that there would be 65 square feet of fill brought on the site in order to meet the driveway ordinance. Mr. Sherman indicated the footing drains and roof leaders would be connecting to the Town's catch basin in East Wakefield Boulevard. He reported the Department of Public Works was okay with that proposal. Mr. Sherman noted the gutters would be screened in order to keep the leaves out so that they won't enter the storm drain. As such, Mr. Sherman explained that no outlet protection was needed. Mr.

Molinelli questioned whether the storm drain discharges into the lake. Mr. Sherman confirmed, although he indicated that he had not looked at the outlet of the storm drain but was assuming that the drain discharges into a channel that leads down into the lake. Mr. Sherman addressed the storm water runoff, noting the back side of the parcel is the highest point with the rain water flowing down, which will hit the new driveway and flow behind the wall before eventually making its way down to the road. He noted that the driveway will have retaining walls due to the steep bank. He noted that the runoff will increase due to the driveway. In his visit to the site with the applicant, Mr. Sherman shared his observation that there were no signs of concentrated flow coming down off the site. Mr. Sherman reported the runoff will not increase on to the property of neighbors but would increase on to the road. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether that storm water would go into the same catch basin that the roof leaders and footing drains would be connected to. Mr. Sherman confirmed. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether there would be any treatment to the water. Mr. Sherman confirmed that there would not be, indicating that it would be overland flow. Staff questioned whether anything could be added to the proposed development so that the site captures the runoff. Mr. Sherman agreed, suggesting that drywells could be added as the elevations are high enough. He noted that test pits would need to be dug to determine where the ground water was so that water could infiltrate. Staff questioned whether DPW Director Jim Rollins had been consulted regarding the driveway retaining walls. Mr. Sherman indicated that they were going to consult with him after having gained approval from this board.

With regards to avoiding an encroachment on the neighboring property during construction of the driveway, Mr. Closson indicated that he did not foresee needing a temporary construction easement despite the distance between the wall and the abutting parcel being only four feet. Mr. Sherman explained that because the wall will be an engineered product, the blocks are just dropped and there is no need to excavate much behind them. He estimated the necessary excavation behind the wall to only be two feet and could be done without disturbing the pins or neighbor's property. Ms. Mulvey questioned the purpose of the retaining walls. Mr. Sherman explained that they are part of the proposal in order to maintain the 4% grade off the center line of the road.

Mr. Davenport questioned whether the roof leaders might be discharged in a manner other than being tied to the catch basin. Mr. Sherman noted that a rain garden may be added. Mr. Molinelli questioned the function of the town's catch basin. Mr. Closson noted that the subject basin has a curb and does have a sump in it. He reported that he believed it runs across the road to another catch basin that also appeared to have a sump in it which then presumably discharges into the lake.

The Commission reviewed the Town's GIS aerial view of the site. Mr. Sherman noted the pine trees that will need to be cleared for the development of the site. Mr. Davenport shared his preference that the rain leaders be discharged into a rain garden and that the applicant and his engineer meet with Mr. Rollins to discuss tying the footing drains into the catch basin and the proposed driveway.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Mr. Molinelli second, to accept Application IWWC#20-53 Applicant: Matthew Closson Owner: Gerald Crispino and Robin Crispino Location: 851 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Construct New Single-Family Home as per Plot Plan and Drawings finding the proposed activity as not significant, conditioned upon the applicant meeting with Jim Rollins to discuss the drainage with the catch basins; unanimously approved.

J. IWWC#20-54 Applicant: Michael A. Goncalves Owner: Raymond J. Fugere Revocable Trust 3/4/99 Location: 522 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Replace Existing Seawall.

Michael Goncalves appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Closson noted that he would be assisting the applicant with the proposal, noting the transfer of the property to the current owner had been completed earlier that day. He reviewed an A2 survey noting that the proposal included replacement of lake wall covering a 60' width as well as walls part of a 30' inlet. Mr. Closson noted that the area depicted on the drawing as Unity Beach would not be part of the project. Mr. Closson explained that the new wall would be a ReadyRoc system. He noted that excavation would be necessary to install 12" of crushed stone before the

first layer of wall. Mr. Closson noted that the wall is 45" exposed, which is exactly what is there currently. He confirmed that there were no grade changes proposed. Access to the site would be gained through the right-of-way, which is owned by the applicant, according to Mr. Closson. He noted that there would be no stockpiling of material on site.

Mr. Davenport questioned the current dock. Mr. Closson noted that it is an old wooden dock but that Mr. Goncalves may be proposing a relocation of the system. Mr. Davenport questioned whether it was a floating dock. Mr. Goncalves explained that it was attached to the wall on one side. He noted that he does intend to replace it but was not currently part of this proposal. Mr. Davenport questioned whether a deep drawdown was necessary for this work. Mr. Closson estimated the water depth in this area as 3½'.

Discussion ensued regarding the dock with the consensus of the commission being that the dock and its location ought to be considered at this juncture. Mr. Goncalves reported that he was unsure what the current town files had regarding the location of the dock.

Mr. Goncalves noted that he had pondered shortening the interior walls of the inlet.

Discussion unfolded about the historical practice of the Commission in calculating the amount of lake frontage in terms of whether it is measured in terms of the width of the property or whether each jog and edge is measured to calculate frontage numbers. Mr. Molinelli explained that it is the distance parallel to the width and that historically, each jog of walls has not been included in the amount of lake frontage. The commission concurred.

Mr. Closson noted that while Unity Beach and the associated right-of-way belonged to the applicant, it was considered a separate parcel.

Mr. Closson agreed to have the littoral boundaries reflected on the plan and to include in the scope of work confirmation that there will be no temporary stockpiling.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Mr. Molinelli second, to accept Application IWWC#20-54 Applicant: Michael A. Goncalves Owner: Raymond J. Fugere Revocable Trust 3/4/99 Location: 522 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Replace Existing Seawall, with the conditions as discussed that the contractor provide littoral boundaries on a new set of plans, finding the proposed activity as not significant; unanimously approved.

K. IWWC#20-55 Applicant: Matthew Closson Owner: Geoffrey Todd Gervasini Location: 628 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Construct New Block Sewall.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter second, to continue Application IWWC#20-46 to the November 18, 2020 regular meeting; unanimously approved.

L. IWWC#20-56 Applicant: Matthew Closson Owner: David Paigo Trust Location: 656 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Install New Cantilever Dock; Install Swim Area; Repoint Wall as Necessary; Install New Shed.

MOTION: Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter second, to continue Application IWWC#20-46 to the November 18, 2020 regular meeting; unanimously approved.

6. ADJOURN:

MOTION: Ms. Hunter, Mr. Davenport second, to adjourn at 10:55PM; unanimously approved.

**Respectfully submitted,
Pamela A. Colombie
Recording Clerk**