

**COVENTRY INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2020**

1. CALL TO ORDER:

By: Penney

Time: 7:02 p.m.

Place: Virtual

2. ROLL CALL:

		PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS:	Martin Briggs		X
	Patricia Laramee	X	
	Lori Mathieu, Chairperson	X	
	Vacant		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. 20-18W – 2880 South Street – Applicant: Titan Construction Enterprises: Owner: Gerard DeCormier; Agent: None. 26’ x 36’ detached garage in the Upland Review Area.**

We received plans but have not had the chance to review. This is postponed. With the additional 90-day period it doesn’t expire until late October.

This application will be on the next meeting agenda.

- B. 20-24W – 105 High Meadow lane – Applicant: Larry and Eileen Hosey; Owner: Same; Agent: None – New house build next to existing property. Existing property to be demolished upon completion of new house.**

Penney stated that the member packets include his August memo and an additional email. Penney received an email today that they may be withdrawing their application; therefore, we are postponing this item.

This application will be on the next meeting agenda.

5. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. 20-29W – Bunker Hill Road – Applicant: Kapelmooney Mahapot; Owner: tbd; Agent: None – New house build on 4.19 acres with wetlands.**

Mahapot, the applicant, was present.

Mahapot has a purchase agreement, contingent of the property being approved as a building lot. The purchase agreement was emailed to Penney during the meeting.

Penney stated the Member's packets include the 20-29W application, Septic Plan Review Approval from Glenn Bagdoian 7-27-2020, a wetland report by New England Environmental Services dated 8-10-2020, a house plans, and a site plan with second sheet for details.

Mathieu pointed out a discrepancy between the agenda, the application, and the wetlands review regarding proposed house size and lot size. Mahapot confirmed that the lot is 4.19 acres and the proposed house is 2,600 square foot.

Penney stated that this property was timber harvest 5-6 years ago; there is an existing gravel driveway installed from the timber harvest that should be removed. There are discrepancies between the proposed house and wetlands review. If we did a walk out basement, there wouldn't need to be that much grading – that would pull back some of that activity from the wetland borders. It would be beneficial for the agency to look what the whole 4.19-acre parcel looks like, instead of just the acre that is being developed.

In response to the discrepancies between the proposed house and the wetlands review, Mahapot stated that John Ianni did the original field delineation and Datum Engineering did the survey work years ago and Ianni is now retired. He tried to contact Ianni with no success, so he contacted Soil Scientist Richard Snarski and produced the report in the member packet.

Mathieu questioned whether this portion of the plot plan is the only developable portion of the lot.

The applicant said without extensive soil testing and based on the Datum survey, yes, but he will reach out to Datum to make sure.

This application will be on the next meeting agenda.

B. 20-31W – 84, 94, 98 Cheney Lane – Applicant: Ted Wrubel/94 Cheney Lane LLC; Owners: Anthony Horelik, 94 Cheney Lane LLC c/o Ted Wrubel, Luxury Lake Life Properties LLC c/o Lonnie Doros; Agent: None - Lake wall repair across 3 neighboring properties

Ted Wrubel, the applicant, was present.

Wrubel stated that he is owner of 94 Cheney lane. All 3 properties have a deteriorating stone wall at the lake edge. They want to make it proper again. Wrubel doesn't know when the walls were built. The walls have collapsed and now they are rubble. He wants to make the properties safer and more aesthetically pleasing. The plan is to remove all the rubble and supplement it with whatever is required to complete project. Nothing will be hauled off site, it will be re-used. The new wall will be in the existing footprint, straightened up.

The 2016 aerial mapping is included in member packets, the three properties are labeled. There will be no work within the lake, construction will be during draw down. There will not be much impact to the lake.

Penney stated that this application is using a similar contractor and similar plan as the Minicucci property adjacent to this application.

Mathieu questioned if once the wall is repaired, will the water touch the bottom of the wall.

Wrubel stated that it would touch but moving it back would affect the large trees on the properties. That is why there are large stones at the bottom of the wall.

Laramee asked if the rocks closer to the water will be removed and if it will be by hand.

Wrubel said yes, they will be removed by hand at lake winter water level. There will not be machines at the water or on its edge.

Penney stated that it may require the contractor laborers to be in the water with waders, so they can load the bucket of the machine. They will not be in there digging with machinery. Penney will visit the site to look at vertical face and to figure conditions of this activity and proceed from there.

This application will be on the next meeting agenda.

C. 20-32W – 77 Edgewater Drive – Applicant: Paul Champagne; Owner: Same; Agent: None – Lake retaining wall and permeable patio. (e)

Paul Champagne, the applicant and owner, was present.

Penney stated that Member packets have the 20-32W application, proposed scope, and a plan. This application involves a segmental block wall. This retaining wall was approved

back in ~1994 to do a segmental wall.

Mathieu asked it was starting to fall over.

The applicant said yes, it is becoming a safety hazard. They are entertaining two bids, one with natural stone and one with segmental blocks. The current wall is failing from within. Intent to replace the wall the runs the whole property ~112 feet. The water comes up to the wall in the spring but come June it is not up to the wall.

Mathieu asked when the pictures where taken.

Applicant says within the last week and explained the viewpoints of the pictures and the bulge in the wall. Replacing the existing height ~4 ft. and existing location of stairway. Last page is conceptual; when the wall is being done they may put in a permeable patio ~500 square feet.

Penney stated that he will do a site visit. Right now, the water is 3-5 feet away from the wall, during winter drawdown it will be more. The addition of the patio reduces the area for lawn fertilizer.

This application will be on the next meeting agenda.

D. 20-33W – 143 Woodland Road – Applicant: Outback Landscaping LLC; Owner: Bruce Johnson; Agent: None – Lake retaining wall and permeable patio. (e)

Bob Ballock from Outback LLC, the applicant, was present.

Penney stated that the member packet includes the 20-33W application and supporting documents. The plan is to remove a wooden deck and relocate the rocks in front of it to the lawn portion. The land that is under the wooden deck and rocks will be restored to a beach/lawn area. A permeable patio will be constructed further from the lake.

Laramee asked when they would be doing construction.

Ballock stated that the rock removal would be by hand and most work would be above the hedgerow. There are boulders in the photos that may be ledge, if so, a jackhammer will be used to achieve ideal depth for permeable pavers.

Penney stated that there will be many phases, and once a permit is issued, they will start.

Ballock said that 75% of the rocks removed from the existing stone wall will be reused. The existing retaining wall under the deck will stay.

Penney suggested that one of the wetland agents could be out there during the wall deconstruction, to supervise turbidity.

This application will be on the next meeting agenda.

E. E. 14-07W (MOD.) – 145 Edgewater Drive – Applicant: James and Edyta Rotundo; Owner: Same; Agent: None – Install domestic well versus water service. (e)

Richard Rotundo, the applicant’s builder was present.

Mathieu recused herself, therefore we do not have quorum. Penney proposed a special meeting because the property needs water, details to come. He also brought up that there may be un-permitted activity on the property’s lake edge that will need to be discussed.

Richard stated Andrew Bushnell is the engineer on this application, and Bushnell is reaching out to a landscape architect.

There is a question of the legality of the water company denying the applicant water. Mike Ruef, the Coventry sewer technician, has the copy of the letter from the water company.

This application was tabled.

F. F. 20-35W – 5 Avery Shores – Applicant: William Guinan; Owner: Janet Grace; Agent: None – New single-family home in Upland Review Area.

The application did not have anyone present.

Penney shared the information for the application, which included a site plan from 2006.

Penney stated that this property was approved by wetlands in 2004. There was a modification to the permit in 2006, the wetlands agency approved a single-family home and issued a permit (06-13W). That permit expired and the house was not built. The applicant in 2020 is looking to do the same exact thing and get a re-issued permit.

Penney stated that it is the same proposal from 2006 and it does require the loss of wetlands; the driveway crosses it.

This application will be on the next meeting agenda.

6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

A. July 22, 2020

Motion: I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve the minutes of the July 22, 2020 meeting.

By: Woolf

Seconded: Laramie

Correction on page 2 of 9: the fourth paragraph and other locations, the spelling of “Michael Deets” is incorrect. The correct spelling is “Michael Dietz”.

Voting:
For: Woolf, Mathieu, Laramée
Against: None
Abstain: None

7. CORRESPONDENCE:

A. None

8. DISCUSSION:

A. 50 John Hand Drive – Invasive plants on abutting property in wetlands

Nancy Marcus was present.

Penney stated that Marcus came to the agency in 2017, to demo two houses and combine two lots to build a new single family home. At that time, the eradication of invasive plants was discussed, but ultimately removed from the permit.

Japanese knotweed, stilt grass, and bamboo are present on her property. The knotweed is very aggressive. Marcus has been trying to smother the knotweed with tarps since June but it is still growing. Marcus is working with Save-A-Tree to find solutions to this invasive problem. They are thinking of cutting the weeds, applying herbicide, and continuing to smother them.

The owner of the abutting property gave her permission to work on the property to attempt to control the invasive.

Penney posed the question, is cutting the weeds and spraying them with herbicide an as of right? If they were to excavate that area, then it would need a permit.

Mathieu stated that concurred with Penney's assessment. The tarping is as of right activity.

Penney stated there is an as of right form to be filled out and put in the file. He will provide contacts at UConn that could be of help.

Woolf and Laramée agree.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

Laramée adjourned the meeting at 9:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mindy Gosselin
Coventry Wetland Agent Assistant

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.