

**COVENTRY INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2020**

1. CALL TO ORDER:

By: Mathieu

Time: 7:07 p.m.

Place: Virtual

2. ROLL CALL:

		PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS:	Martin Briggs	X	
	Patricia Laramee		X
	Lori Mathieu, Chairperson	X	
	Sam Norman, Treasurer	X	
	Thomas Woolf, Vice Chairman	X	
ALTERNATE MEMBERS:	Suzanne Choate	X	
	Mike Powers	X	
STAFF:	Todd Penney, Town Engineer/Wetlands Agent	X	
STAFF:	Mindy Gosselin, Wetlands Agent Assistant	X	

3. AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS (2-minute time limit):

No one wished to speak.

4. OLD BUSINESS:

A. 20-07W – 1600 Boston Turnpike: Applicant: Garret Homes, LLC; Owner: Coventry Investments LLC; Agent: BL Companies – 7500 SF Retail Building with Associated Parking, Lighting, landscaping, storm water management, and utilities within the 75-Foot Upland Review Area.

Penney reported he performed a review on the storm water management report and the wetlands report from the previous plans. His comments were provided to the applicant on May 19, 2020. A new set of plans have been received. Penney has some final comments.

Robin Messier Pearson, attorney for the applicant, Eric Davison, Soil Scientist, and Matthew Bruton, Engineer from BL Companies, were present.

Bruton began the presentation by indicating the septic system testing has been completed and the system location is shown on the plans to the right of the building, under the parking area. It is H₂O loaded so vehicles can drive over it. The well is on the other side of the building gaining the 75' separation requirement. The infiltration system is shown at the front of the septic system; there is to be a rain garden at the rear of the building. The plan has been partially reviewed by the Health District. If anything changes in sizing or moving the building the plan would have to go back to the Health District. The plan was approved with a possible retail building in mind. The infiltration system is at the front with connection to the State system on Route 44. Based on the soil testing the groundwater is close to the bottom of the subsurface drainage system. Therefore, it would need to be wrapped with a permeable liner to preserve groundwater from coming up into the system. This is a solid piece of material draped over the system during excavation. The point of the liner is to keep groundwater from flooding the system. Bruton believes the lifespan of the liner is for the life of the pavement, at least. Typically, 30+ years, but he will follow up on that question. At the rear of the building the plan is trying to match the water flow and incorporate green aspects. The roof leaders are now shown to discharge into the rain garden. The test pits back here indicate the separation to groundwater is greater. The rain garden was sized to receive 3" of water per hour. A photometric lighting plan was added for the safety and security of patrons and employees. No light spillage over the property lines. The Soil Scientist recommended limiting the number of lights facing the wetlands. Davison stated this plan complies with what he is looking for to reduce light spillage to the vernal pool. The landscaping plan added more landscaping between the building and the wetlands to the west. Nothing goes past the rock wall that is on the edge of the existing wetlands. This area is proposed to not be mowed. A buffer was added near the front to keep snow plows from plowing towards the wetlands. Staff provided a narrative of the litter and trash control plan from Cumberland Farms. This requires employees to check the bulk trash bins and the parking lot so that litter is not blowing into the wetlands. There are no outside garbage bins for consumers being proposed. Employees will be responsible for interior and exterior litter control.

Penney stated the Members have his review memo from May 19, 2020. What Penney heard this evening answered his last follow up comment – that is, regarding the impermeable liner and the soil permeability for the rain garden. The follow up comment asking if the roof leaders can drain into the swale first to get some overland flow before draining into the rain garden. Bruton indicated that is not possible. The litter plan mimics what was approved for Cumberland Farms.

Mathieu commented the IWA does not want to have litter fly-aways with the wetlands ending up being the garbage area. Is the trash area at the back? Bruton replied the lidded dumpsters will be inside a gated enclosure at the rear; trash will be picked up by a weekly service. There is no roof over the dumpsters. The enclosure is a 6' chain link fence with privacy slats.

Woolf commented he thinks the plan is pretty well done. With the trash control that is going to depend on the lease and how they police the area. Bruton stated this is intended to be a retail user in a smaller size building. The litter and trash maintenance plan will be passed onto the end user so they know their obligation.

Briggs feels the plan is appropriate from the previous discussions. Norman had nothing to add. Choate appreciated the attention that was made to the previous comments. Powers was impressed with the detail in the response to the comments; he had no negative comments. This is well thought out. Mathieu added the plan has come a long way. The IWA appreciates the work made for the protection to the wetlands with the tree line and rain garden added. And the plan to maintain the sanitary condition of the wetlands.

Penney echoes the Members sentiments. The plan has addressed the IWAs concerns. As previously stated this is an already established site as residential with a minor commercial aspect. The plan has mitigated the development impacts. Mathieu commented the maintenance of the areas the IWA protects is important. It should be clear that the maintenance plan is followed in the future.

Choate was seated for Laramee.

Motion: I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application 20-07W – 1600 Boston Turnpike.

With the following conditions:

- The Wetlands Scientist for the applicant shall submit a monthly inspection report during construction that indicates the elements regarding protection of the wetlands are being adhered to.
- All permits shall be obtained prior to the start of construction.
- A pre-construction meeting is organized by the applicant with the Inland Wetlands Agent.
- The storm water management plan must be met and adhered to.

By: Norman

Seconded: Woolf

Voting:

For: Briggs, Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

B. 20-09W – 1657 Boston Turnpike – Applicant: Venkat Gogu; Owner: 1657 Boston Turnpike, LLC; - Replacement of the Fuel Tanks within the 75-Foot Upland Review Area.

Penney commented this property is located at the intersection of Main Street, Boston Turnpike and Grant Hill Road. The activity is on the edge of the upland review area. The IWA asked at the previous meeting why the tanks are being replaced. Penney has email communication with Sean Hanahan, agent for the applicant, who indicated the tank replacement is a regulatory replacement at the life span of the tanks at 30-years. Comments also indicated the five new tanks, to replace the existing three, will be moved to be completely outside of the upland review area. Penney had some questions about the shoring.

Sean Hanahan stated one of the existing three tanks is within the 75' review area. The new tanks will be kept out of the upland review area. The vertical steel shoring keeps the excavation as small as possible and provides a safety measure during construction. Twenty-

foot-tall sheets of steel are driven into the excavation area until the top of the sheets are at grade. The existing tanks will be removed, the new ones installed and backfilled, the shoring is removed, and the asphalt is patched.

Mathieu noted there will be some disturbance in the upland review area for the removal of the old tank and repair of the parking lot to restore it to the existing condition. Any questions or concerns from other IWA members have been addressed. Norman pointed out the IWA appreciates the applicant is moving the tanks away from the wetlands and to listening to the concerns stated at the previous meeting. Penney's comments have been addressed.

Motion: I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application 20-09W – 1657 Boston Turnpike.

With the following condition:

- A pre-construction meeting is organized by the applicant with the Inland Wetlands Agent.

By: Choate

Seconded: Norman

Voting:

For: Briggs, Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

C. 20-10W – 51 Woodland Road – Applicant: Walter Borst; Owner: Walter & Ruth Borst; Agent: None - Demo/Rebuild Single Family Residence in 150-Foot Upland Review Area.

Penney met with Kim Fletcher, agent for the owners. The revised plans based on that meeting were received. Penney is comfortable with the application. Walter Borst was present.

Kim Fletcher outlined the changes made to the plan based on her meeting with Penney. Because a groundwater seep was noticed the infiltrators from under the deck to near the existing shed. Moving the infiltrators to the east there would be less collection of groundwater into the tanks. Overflow of the tanks were addressed by adding a pop-up cap that would allow excess water to flow out of the infiltrators. The grading was changed near the retaining wall. Penney requested an erosion control blanket be used. The four-foot walkway behind the house will be edged with stone for storm water management. Parking on the east side will remain a grass area. Stairs were added to show the access points to the home. Penney recommended a small retaining wall on the north side of the shed to protect the structure. Rebuilding of the stone retaining wall and stone steps will take place when the lake level is down. This is not planned for at this time, but Penney suggested adding it as part of this application for the future. Penney asked the ENS plan show a haybale silt fence downgradient of the well. The owner may need to get temporary rights for ENS controls from the neighboring property owner. The sequencing of construction comments are to be added. The garage was removed from the comments as no garage is being added.

Penney stated the revised plan set has addressed his concerns of the proposed activity. The

current structure was a modest home and the proposed home is also modest. Impervious surface area goes from 12% to 14%. This is the only location to place the house. The plan keeps the existing deck line. This is a reasonable plan. Fletcher has done a good job of siting a house on this property. One outstanding issue is in regards to Shonty Lane with this being a tight lot having concern about the construction vehicles spilling off the property. Mr. Borst will pursue this possibility with the neighbor to the east. Borst has spoken to all of the neighbors; they feel this is a positive plan for the property. Borst also contacted the owners who happen to be in Sweden about the dumpster being on his right-of-way and reiterated the well will be located there as well.

Mathieu asked Penney to expand on his comment that this is the only location for the house to be situated. Couldn't the house be moved to the north? Penney explained the slope is about 2 to 1. This will be present a difficult construction project. The retaining wall will be more than what is currently there. If the structure was move further north the retaining wall would be 6' – 8' high and be cost prohibited. In addition, more of the slope would be exposed during the construction. Mathieu commented placing the new structure over the existing footprint creates less disruption of the property. Mathieu added paying attention to the ENS controls during construction is important. She initially had concerns about the amount of lot coverage. Mathieu feels it is good to keep the focus on the construction to the area that is currently disturbed.

Norman agrees with Penney this is a reasonable project as long as ENS is kept in place. Briggs stated he appreciates the observation of the groundwater seep and the plan to deal with that; the existing structure is in disrepair. Woolf asked if Shonty Lane is a legitimate road or a private way? Borst stated in 1952 right of egress was conferred to all of the properties on it. Staff added this is a private road. Woodland Road became a town road as part of the sewer project. Choate thanked the applicant for addressing the concerns; Mathieu seconds that sentiment.

Mathieu asked Penney to explain the groundwater seep. Penney stated during the site visit he observed the seep on the westerly side facing the lake. This is a water table issue that has been happening for a long time. Dewatering measures may be needed when the foundation hole is excavated to keep the cellar hole from filling with water. The suggestion is to move the infiltrators up to the easterly side where there are better soils. Shonty Lane will be improved along the edge of the lake while being mindful of the water body during construction. The owner intends to build the wall behind the house this year and build the house next spring into fall.

Motion: I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application 20-10W – 51 Woodland Road.

With the following condition:

- A pre-construction meeting is organized by the applicant with the Inland Wetlands Agent.

Discussion: Walter Borst indicated the current house will not be torn down until we are ready to begin rebuilding.

By: Norman

Seconded: Choate

Voting:

For: Briggs, Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

**D. 20-12W – 285 Woodland Road – Applicant & Owner: Thomas Archambault;
Agent: Towne Engineering – Re-establishing Single-Family Dwelling with Detached
Garage and activities associated with their construction in 150-Foot Upland Review
Area.**

Tom Archambault was present. Choate recused herself. Mathieu seated Powers for this application.

Penney noted the IWA packet includes the revised plan and his memo of May 21, 2020. The IWA received the application on April 22, 2020 to construct a lake front home where a house was previously demolished. A variance was granted by the ZBA in 2017 for a new house and garage. The lot coverage went from 11.7% to just under 15%. The structure will be 20' wide x 50' long. The garage is 23' x 23'. There is an intermittent watercourse to the north of the property. Penney had some lengthy comment about the proximity to the wetlands and the amount of activity.

Tom Archambault stated the lot coverage increase was because the proposed deck is covered; it is a porch, not a living space. Grading has been revised. The underground utilities have been shifted away from the watercourse. The wall has been moved. The yard drain was changed to a manhole for future maintenance. No turnout on the driveway is proposed. Sand will be reused. Approximately 75% of the proposal has been changed.

Penney made a site visit in early May. He is concerned about the northwesterly corner where the sewer line runs and where the wetland complex comes down. The infiltrators would be inundated with ground water so the activity was moved away from that area. Penney requested the underground utilities be shifted; the sanitary sewer remains along the same border. Mr. Maynard did not address the sewer location. The fill amount has been reduced for the front of the house. The sidewalk was requested to be moved to the south side. There is a significant amount of overflow from the well. Scour was observed as reddish brown from iron in the groundwater. The sand area gets soft and inundated. A new well location would help to alleviate that. The existing driveway is greater than 16% in some locations; there will not be a turnout. The IWA is not trying to restrict the development of the parcel; a house and garage were there. This is a modest application but it is increasing the coverage. The comments were about possibly moving the activities away from the wetlands. Penney mentioned the sewer line was not moved. The plan addresses the infiltrators better for improving storm water quality. This is a very narrow and steep lot. Very little grading is needed. If the applicant has a floor plan that he is committed to he should make that presentation to the IWA. The original house was 750 sq. feet. The proposed plan is for 1,000 sq. feet. This is an increase but remains in the limits. The previous structure was razed because it was dilapidated. In development planning Penney is trying to keep activity away from the wetlands.

Mathieu stated she is hearing concerns from Penney that activity should be moved away from

the wetlands. Norman asked if the new house is proposed in the location of the previous house. Penney reported the ZBA variance was to shift the proposed house to the middle of the lot. The existing house was at the edge of the wetlands. The applicant is not altering the wetlands as they have already been disturbed. Woolf asked why the garage couldn't go back toward the road? Penney commented the location as it is was approved with the ZBA variance. The garage is immediately adjacent to the wetlands. The new garage is at the terminus of the existing property. If it were moved up gradient it gets nearer and steeper. This is an improvement to where it was previously to which Penney agrees.

Norman suggested tabling this matter and find out about the possibility of moving the sewer. Mathieu and Woolf agreed. Powers would like to know the opinion of moving the sewer line or living with it as is.

Archambault indicated the layout of the house was made using the location of the sewer line. As it is the plan was changed by 75% with trying to meet all of the comments. Moving the sewer line could mean a total redesign of the house. Penney asked if the line could be moved closer to the house. Could it be at a 45 degree and moved further away from the wetlands – is a question for the applicant's engineer. Mr. Archambault does not know the answer to that but it was capped and never connected because the property was in such blight. The applicant stated if that is what the IWA wants that is what we will do.

Mathieu asked Powers for this input. Powers stated it is a very narrow lot with much activity going on with a very steep slope going right into the lake. There are lot coverage concerns, the steepness, the wetlands. It seems to be pushing to the overuse of the property, pushing it beyond what we would normally be okay with. Briggs echoed concerns that have been voiced. Concerns from Penney has been addressed. Briggs does not have an idea on how to improve things. Mathieu does not know how to fix this; it does seem to be an overuse. She has no thoughts on the best way to minimize impact to the wetlands.

Woolf asked about the two lots. Archambault indicated there are two side-by-side and owned with his brother. Woolf feels this is an overuse of a small lot. The applicant indicated the property is in better condition than previously when a squatter was living in the dilapidated house. It is a drastic improvement and the neighborhood will be improved with the proposed plan.

Norman stated he sympathizes and emphasizing with the applicant. Mr. Archambault is trying to improve the quality of a lot near a wetlands. The 2' – 3' move suggested by Penney and the concerns of the IWA make seem like nickel and dime changes in an attempt to keep the lot from being built on. Norman continued that is not the case, we are trying to be a wetlands friendly as possible while accomplishing the applicant's goal. Moving the sewer line a bit closer to the house would have less impact on the wetlands. The IWA doesn't begrudge you the right to build a building. Norman suggests finding out from his engineer what the impact would be to moving the sewer line.

Penney added the IWA could have a special meeting to discuss the feasibility of shifting the sewer line away from the wetlands. The IWA has 65 days to render a decision; we are currently in the first month. Archambault is a commissioner of the Columbia IWA so he understands the statutory timeline.

Mathieu stated the comments are in the record to give direction to the applicant. The proposed plan is an overuse of the property. What was there was smaller because the lot could not sustain all of the activity.

Powers would like to know what moving the sewer line versus leaving it where it is does. He does not have a good concept in his mind as to what disruptions there might be in moving the line. Is there greater or less benefit? Powers struggles with the same a previously stated – the former building was probably a summer cottage and was small because it was for someone to use on the weekends.

Penney added aside from the sewer line with regards to the ZBA variance without input from the IWA is a logistical matter. Penney reiterated this is a modest construction albeit more than what it was. Mitigation is suggested with infiltrators. There is a lack of roof leaders. The property was saturated beyond compare when he was there in the spring. Can a rain garden be put on the other side? If on the south side, the garden would be in conflict with the boat ramp. Penney is not sure we have gotten good answers to some questions. We are trying to minimize the activity on the north side.

Mathieu is concerned about the development of the applicant. She proposed to the applicant that another round of review is needed with the applicant and the engineer to take another look. Penney will review any changes and provide comment. Mathieu is willing to have a special meeting. Penney suggested given what the applicant is hearing the IWA give him additional time to address the concerns being stated. There is some nebulousness of overbuilding on the site to force a plan change. A variance for the lot coverage would not be required. Any changes to the proposed plan would require that ZBA consider those for the variance. Penney suggested additional narrative about the plan be brought to the IWA by the applicant.

Mathieu is asking the applicant and his engineer to get together to review Penny's concerns. As for the overuse of the property perhaps reduce the building down to the size of the previous building. This is a very narrow lot on a steep grade with high groundwater. How can that be handled when on the lake front? The extensive use of the narrow slip of land is of concern.

Penney asked the applicant to address the comments that have been heard that are measures for wetlands protection. This may be a good opportunity for the applicant to walk through the comments from the Town Engineer. Archambault is upset that this is being put off and being suggested to decrease a house plan that he has worked on for a number of years. He feels his engineer has addressed the concerns. This plan will greatly improve the neighborhood.

Mathieu replied the statutes require the IWA to oversee the protection of wetlands. The Agency is willing to work with you and your engineer to address the comments heard tonight. Move the activity away from the wetlands. The ZBA granted a variance but that is not part of the IWA's consideration. We must consider the statutes and the laws. Is the applicant not willing to sit down and give it two more weeks? Mathieu feels this is a fair way to move forward as a pathway toward approval. Norman asked if it is feasible to move the sewer line? Archambault replied he does not know if the sewer line can be moved. The building was laid out the way shown per the location of the sewer line; it fits with the floor

plan. Norman would like clarification from the applicant's engineer. This is Norman's sticking point.

Mathieu reiterated we have to look at protecting the wetlands. The ZBA's decision does not mean that we are stuck with this design. The concerns are the narrowness of the lot, the use of the lot, the steepness of the lot, and the presence of a lot of groundwater. The IWA has concerns and would like the applicant and his engineer to sit down and talk through these concerns. The IWA is offering to hold a special meeting. Archambault asked what his alternative is?

Penney suggested we table this item. Although not the most favorable avenue for Archambault, the IWA is within its regulatory allotment to do so. Mathieu replied that is a consideration, but that delays the process. Penney stated that is not the IWA's concern. The plan needs to be looked at some more. Tabling this until the next regular meeting or entertaining a special meeting is within the purview of the IWA.

Mathieu would agree to table this matter. Norman abstains. Briggs and Woolf agreed to table this item. Powers thinks the IWA has enough questions nagging the members that have to be answered.

Mathieu asked the applicant to think this plan through with his engineer and Penney based on the concerns heard this evening. The IWA is more than willing to hold a special meeting.

This application is being tabled.

5. NEW BUSINESS:

A. 20-13W – 190 Avery Shores – Applicant: Anthony Skut; Owner: Same; Agent: None. Re-establishing Single Family Dwelling and activities associated with its construction in the Upland Review Area.

Staff commented all of the applications under New Business are to be accepted and moved onto next month's agenda. Brief comments on each one can be made this evening. The application calling for the installation of permeable pavers has merit in giving authority to the Inland Wetlands Agent for approval.

Application 20-13W - Anthony Skut was present. Penney stated the IWA has the proposed site plan. The run-down house has been demolished. This lot is not immediately adjacent to the lake. There are wetlands across the street within 75'. Because the new house will have a full foundation the application does not qualify as minimal impact.

Skut added there is an intermittent watercourse at the front of the property. The house does not impact the wetlands. Storm water will be managed with rain gardens to mitigate lot coverage. The lot coverage remains as it was because he acquired more property.

The IWA accepts the application. Norman does not abut the property, but he can see it. Should he recuse himself? Mathieu stated you do not have to recuse due to a visual of the property but it will never be a bad thing to step back in such a case.

B. 20-18W – 2880 South Street – Applicant: Titan Construction Enterprises; Owner: Gerard DeCormier; Agent: None. 26' x 36' detached garage in the Upland Review Area.

Penney stated this is another application with a full foundation rendering it unqualified as minimal impact under the new criteria set by the IWA. The foundation will be 40' from the wetlands. A soil scientist delineated the wetlands. Penney has not had a chance to do his review of the plan.

Shane Stinson was present. This property has a house but not a garage. The driveway is on the right side of the house and continues past the structure. This would be the natural place to locate the detached garage.

The IWA accepted the application. Penney will review the plan and be in touch with the applicant to relay his comments.

C. 20-19W – 199 Standish Road – Applicant: Creative Exteriors, LLC; Owner: Dawn Love; Agent: Creative Exteriors, LLC. Installation of Permeable Paver Patio at Lakeside of Coventry Lake.

Penney reported the property owner called wanting to do a permeable paver patio adjacent to the stone wall that is adjacent to the lake so an application was submitted. The IWA has remanded approval to the Inland Wetlands Agent for similar projects in the past. The plan calls for a buffer between the wall and the patio.

Tim Tomko, Creative Exteriors, was present. The plan is proposing an ~500 sq. foot permeable paver patio. There will be a sloping grade to the lake. A secondary wall is proposed ~7' back from the existing wall. This provides a buffer and a leveling off of the sloping grade. The wall is 32" high. The sitting wall will be 18" high.

Mathieu feels this can be remanded to the Agent. The plan is consistent with applications previously given to the Inland Wetlands Agent. The adjacency to the lake is the sensitivity in such projects. Penney reported he worked with Tomko previously on the rebuilding of a stone all at 24 West Lakeshore Drive.

Motion: I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency remand application 20-19W – 199 Standish Road to the Inland Wetlands Agent.

By: Woolf

Seconded: Choate

Voting:

For: Briggs, Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

D. 20-20W – 55 Edgewater Drive – Applicant/owners: Gary and Jean Costello; Agent: Peter Panciera. Tear down and rebuild new single-family home in Upland Review Area of Coventry Lake.

Penney stated he has not reviewed the plan. At the previous meeting there was discussion about the lot coverage.

Peter Panciera and Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates, were present. Bushnell stated because of the previous discussion he looked at some different scenarios. One was to raise the house 5' – 6' and included needing to bring in fill; that plan is not prudent or feasible. Therefore, more storm water mitigation measures were added. More exploring of the soils between the house and the lake is required.

Panciera stated time is of the essence for his project. The application was accepted by the IWA; the statutory timeline begins now.

E. 20-21W – 10 Avery Shores – Applicant: Joseph Guardino; Owners: Joseph and Elaine Guardino; Agent: Andrew Bushnell. Tear down existing house and construct new house and associated grading.

Penney reminded the IWA this property was discussed last month. The conceptual plan had signification lot coverages. Penney has not reviewed the site plan.

Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates, commented on the plan. The proposed garage floor was raised to create a driveway of 5% or less in slope. The parking area around the garage at the street was changed to a permeable surface, not gravel. Gravel gets compacted so it becomes impermeable. The concrete galleys of the old septic system will remain since the level of the house is being raised. The cisterns will be used for irrigation. Storm water can flow into the galleys and allow water the infiltrate into the ground. These address concerns the IWA had regarding the lot coverage issues. These changes will keep the lot coverage at 18.8% as it is currently. The existing garage will remain and a second garage added.

Mr. Guardino stated changes were made based on comments from the IWA at the previous meeting. This plan should conform and get us to where we need to be.

The application was accepted by the IWA.

F. 20-22W – 1022 Grant Hill Road Subdivision – Applicant: Mark Wheaton; Owner: Same; Agent: Same. Three lot subdivision with upland review area activity.

Mark Wheaton was present along with Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates. Bushnell indicated this is a 28.87-acre parcel near the Tolland town line. Two lots of four acres each are proposed on Grant Hill Road; the other lot will be a rear one. The wetlands were shown on the plan; these are the headwaters complex for Liberty Croft. A is a conservation easement is proposed. With significant wetlands these were the best spots for the protection of the wetlands. There is well in excess of 20%. The soils are acceptable for the septic system. There is to be no activity in the wetlands. All activity is confined to the upland review area.

Choate asked for a report from John Ianni on the significance of the wetlands and the impact to the complex with the driveway being so close.

Penney stated this application is being received by the IWA. The subdivision will require a public hearing from PZC. Penney does not feel a public hearing is needed from the IWA. The Agency has 35 days to make a determination if a public hearing is needed. This is a conservative development with no actual wetlands impact. Bushnell added the plan was changed from having here front lots to two front lots and one rear lot. The driveway for the back lot is the best location for it per Penney. Penney has to do his review and provide comments to the applicant. The property was cut out of 1022 Grant Hill Road and surrounds it.

6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

This section was tabled.

A. April 15, 2020

B. April 22, 2020

7. CORRESPONDENCE:

None

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion: I move to adjourn at 10:23 p.m.

By: Choate

Seconded: Woolf

Voting:

For: Briggs, Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

Respectfully Submitted,

Yvonne B. Filip

Yvonne B. Filip, IWA Clerk

PLEASE NOTE: The minutes are not official until approved by the Inland Wetland Agency at the next Agency meeting. Please see the next Agency meeting minutes for approval or changes to these minutes.