



Town of Watertown Connecticut

Planning and Zoning, Zoning Board of Appeals,
Conservation Commission/Inland Wetland Agency

Watertown Municipal Center

61 Echo Lake Road
Watertown, CT 06795

Telephone: (860) 945-5266

Fax: (860) 945-4706

Website: www.watertownct.org

CONSERVATION COMMISSION/ INLAND WETLAND AGENCY

Regular Meeting Minutes

February 10, 2022

6:30 PM

Place: Watertown Town Hall, Town Council Chambers
61 Echo Lake Road
Watertown, Connecticut

Call to Order/ Roll Call

Members Present: Craig Palmer
Tom Murphy
George Touponse
Joe Polletta
Ned Dalton
Edward Norton

Members Absent: Scott Tearman
Pierre Moran
Luigi Cavallo, Jr.
Charles Beliveau

Others Present: Moosa Rafey, Wetland Enforcement Officer
Paul Bunevich, Town Engineer
Roseann D'Amelio, Secretary

Edward Norton was seated for Luigi Cavallo, Jr.

Public Hearing

1. Continuation of the public hearing from January 13, 2022 for Application #2021-36 of Bassett Farm, LLC for construction of a single-family home, an accessory dwelling, a common driveway, and onsite septic system on a parcel of land aka Map 10 Block 26 Lot 2A Bassett Road, Watertown, CT.

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 2

Brian Baker with Civill: We're proposing a wetlands crossing in order to access the parcel and that will serve a primary residence a two bedroom primary residence with a garage and two bedroom accessory dwelling further into the site, which is allowed by zoning as part of a special permit. On the accessor dwelling towards the back, the lower level would have horse stalls for three horses. It's not a commercial operation, it's three horses for the property owner. It's the same driveway design and crossing that was approved in 2008 as part of a 3 lot subdivision and the approved a 4x6 culvert. We reviewed that design and decided it was better to up that size to 4x8. So the only difference is that we've increased the culvert width from 6 ft to 8ft to add for additional capacity. It's been reviewed by Paul and I responded to his comments and concerns and you have a clean letter in your file. The driveway we're proposing is 12 wide box culvert with four 15" pipes to help convey water across from one side of the wetlands to the other it crosses the wetlands and splits into two driveways in the back where we'll have one driveway going up. We talked to the fire marshall and added an 8'x20' pull off. In accordance with Paul's recommendation we added a stormwater maintenance plan for all the rain gardens on the site. The infiltration trenches and specifically the cross culvert and the pipes that they be cleaned out and maintained annually so we keep adequate water flow going across the driveway from one side to the other. We added a berm to focus the water from the driveway for the house to make sure that gets in the yard drain which then goes to the rain garden for treatment. Moosa asked us to send in a water handling plan and we'll sandbag around the first 2 culverts and then around the culvert area and allow water to go through the two 15" pipes we just installed, put the culvert in, then sandbag. There will be a pump on site during installation should we get any significant rain and the pump should be able to handle it. You're going to have similar impacts whether you're in the pond a little bit or into the wetlands on the other side

Craig Palmer: If someone is going down the driveway, you're right in the water.

Brian Baker: The edge of the driveway it'd be a 2:1 slope that will grade down into and the pond will be at the bottom of the slope. No matter where you move it unless you put it out fully into the wetlands

Craig Palmer: you should maybe shift it – you're right on the edge of the water

Brian Balker: Whether you're filling in the pond or the wetlands that pond is going to be at the toe of slope on that side of the driveway but you might be able to get a 5 ft shift. WE can stipulate putting a guard rail

Craig Palmer: At least it would give something away from the pond

Moosa Rafey: From the wetland perspective the impact will be the same but if they put a guardrail on the side of the pond that will be helpful. Actually, by using some of the pond area and the slope that they're creating will be a more stable slope. How will you stabilize that 2:1 slope?

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 3

Brian Baker: the 2:1 will be grass slope and put riprap at the toe of the slope if you get some erosion but it's a small pond

Craig Paler: You say it's a small pond but why would you need four 15" pipes and a 4x8 box culvert -there must be something going there

Brian Baker: It has nothing to do with the size of the pond. That's dictated by the size of the drainage area that comes down so whether there's a pond or not it would be the same amount of flow

Moosa Rafey: I think Brian meant that there's no wave activity that erode the site because of the size of the pond. It's not like a lake that creates waves.

Craig Palmer: Any other questions from the commission?

Joe Polletta: I agree with you, I think we should make it a little wider and shift it to the left about 12 ft

Brian Baker: You give me modifications I think are reasonable I'm happy to do them but 10 ft we're going to get into that steeper section of the watercourse on the low side and on the pond side there's not much for trees there for clearing. After you get to the other side you're getting into the woods so they'll be more tree clearing, more filling of the wetland proper verses the pond from a wetland impact standpoint it honestly doesn't make a difference whichever way you shift it. A 5 ft shift in that driveway would be a modest improvement and not be too worried about getting into that slope down below

Moosa Rafey: Mr. Chairman, I support the idea of the way it's proposed not to make that shift because the impact will be more. It doesn't change anything but what are we going to gain.

Craig Palmer: It's gaining some safety

Moosa Rafey: They're going to put railing.

Brian Baker: That would be wherever we propose it otherwise if you're going to get to a point where you want to fill and not get into the pond at all that things going to be another 20 ft into the woods now you're clearing another 20 ft plus of woods and impacting that wooded wetland. No matter where you are you're going to be 4 ft up.

Moosa Rafey: I'd prefer to protect the wetlands and keep the wetlands but it's up to the commission. The wetland provides some functions that a pond doesn't.

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 4

Brian Baker: There would be less tree clearing required with this than if we would shift it 5 or 10 ft. There are a lot of woods on that south side of the driveway then on the pond side. As far as the crossing and impact goes the only difference is we've added the pull off area, there was no new drainage report there was no new it's the same plan with a slightly different septic and all is well outside the regulated area. As far as the impact goes, the driveway is the same as was previously approved

Moosa Rafey: Mr. Chairman, just for your information, I did get a chance to go through all the new information they submitted today and I'm comfortable they provided all the information we were looking for. They responded to Paul's comments and also the last thing I asked for was a water management plan that they submitted and I agree with that. The only thing I want is to include the water management plan in the final plans for construction. That should be a part of the plan set.

Brian Baker: We would stipulate to rule the construction sequence on the last set that will also include the water management plan and that diagram on the last page.

Moosa Rafey: One other thing, I talked to Bob Smith today and he said he has not approved the septic plans yet. Is there any reason?

Brian Baker: Whenever you have two buildings that go into one septic system, it has to go to the State Health Dept. for approval. We have plenty of room if for some reason they want us to split it into two. He's waiting on state approval

Ned Dalton: Why are there two septic tanks for the barn?

Brian Baker: For the barn in the lower level where the horse stalls are there's a washout area to hose the horses down and they have a washing machine to wash blankets and stuff and to have that outlet from the lower level go to a separate tank so it's more capacity because you've got fur and hair and you want to trap that before it gets down to the fields

Joe Polletta motioned to Close the public hearing for Application 2021-36 and was seconded by Tom Murphy - All in Favor

2. Application #2021-40 of Watertown Plastics, Inc. for construction of a 10,000 Sq. Ft building addition and expansion of a parking lot at 830 Echo Lake Road, Watertown, CT.

Brian Baker, Civill and John Andrews, owner of Watertown Plastics: You walked the site this weekend and what we're proposing to do is where the site is located on the south side of Echo Lake Rd about 650 ft east of the intersection. This is Watertown Plastics and they're looking to expand their footprint. Right now all the drainage goes through the storm drainage system and into the existing detention basin which is now a dry bottom

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 5

basin so it doesn't really provide any water quality treatment per DEEP regulations but it does provide detention for the storm water. They're proposing 100'x100' addition so another 10,000 sf addition to the 30 that they have and we'll have an expansion of the parking area in the back to add some additional parking area for vehicles to turn around. The original proposal was to leave the existing detention basin the way it was and to take the new paved area and add catch basins and oil grid separators and create a new retention basin to handle all the new proposed impervious surface. We've done that and it's designed to meet all the water quality volume and detention for the one year and through the 100 year storm and the expansion would be within the 100 foot regulated area and no activity in the wetlands. We've added a bed of infiltrators below the parking area in the back.

Joe Polletta: Where do the roof leaders go?

Brian Baker: They will end up in the existing pond

Craig Palmer: Anyone have any questions?

Joe Polletta motioned to close the public hearing for Application #2021-40 and was seconded by Tom Murphy - All in Favor

3. Application #2021-41 of Echo Asset, LLC for construction of a 12,800 Sq. Ft industrial building and associated infrastructure including driveway, water and sewer lines and onsite drainage system at 0 Echo Lake Road, Watertown, CT.

Sev Bovino, Kratzer Jones and Assoc representing the applicant. The property is 33.8 acres and 5.9 acres of wetlands which they're in the center of the property associated with a brook that runs through the property. There are 8.9 acres of upland review area that impact the property. The building is 12,800 sf and located on the easterly side of the property about 700 ft in from Echo Lake Rd. The proposal is to disturb 415 sf of wetlands and it's due to a utility crossing, sewer and water. Catch basins with sumps, large bioretention areas with 4 bays by the driveways, stone filter berms and rip rap plunge pools on each discharge point. We revised plans and responded to staff comments in writing and emailed them to Paul & Moosa. During the site walk the commission requested an oil water separator and we revised the plans to show it and will be located at the last catch basin before the detention area which is catch basin #16 at this location

Craig Palmer: Any questions from the commission?

Joe Polletta motioned to close the public hearing for Application #2021-41 and was seconded by George Touponse - All in Favor

Regular Meeting

Public Participation

Tom Murphy motioned to add Election of Officers to Item 3 under New Business and was Seconded by: Joe Polletta - All in Favor

Action on Minutes

Joe Polletta motioned to Approve Regular Meeting Minutes of January 13, 2022 and was seconded by Tom Murphy - All in Favor

Pending Applications

1. Application #2021-36 of Bassett Farm, LLC for construction of a single-family home, an accessory dwelling, a common driveway, and onsite septic system on a parcel of land aka Map 10 Block 26 Lot 2A Bassett Road, Watertown, CT.

Moosa Rafey: Mr. Chairman, I drafted a motion for you if you want to review it. Feel free to make any changes

Tom Murphy: Is this going to be standard to get draft motions now? Because we went through this before.

Moosa Rafey: It depends on the application. There are a few points I wanted to make sure were in the motion

Joe Polletta motioned to Approve Application #2021-36 of Bassett Farm, LLC for construction of a single-family home, an accessory dwelling, a common driveway, and onsite septic system on a parcel of land aka Map 10 Block 26 Lot 2A Bassett Road, Watertown, CT subject to conditions and was seconded by Ned Dalton - All in Favor

Commissioner Joe Polletta recused himself prior to discussion of Application #2021-39

2. Application #2021-39 of Giuseppe Polletta for filling regulated areas for construction of single-family homes on Lot 11 and Lot 12 and relocation of an existing conservation easement at Lake View Estates Subdivision, Lake View Drive, Watertown.

David Lord, Soil Scientist & Environmental consultant, we had an opportunity on Saturday at the site walk to look at the proposal, which is the construction of a large boulder wall along the section of lots 11 & 12, and backfilling behind it to create a 2:1 slope going up to a level rear yard area to provide both of these proposed single family homes the availability of a reasonable backyard. It's about 30 ft off the rear wall to the top of the slope. The boulders will be at

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 7

heights between 2 & 4 ft on the lot. The 2 ft is on lot 11 & the 4 ft on lot 12 and the proposed grading doesn't extend all the way across the rear section of lot 11 but the boulder wall will because that will run along the proposed change in the conservation easement area. A Geotech wrap will go around the stone generally 2-3" minus clean stones no fines will be covered on both sides with Geotech fabric to allow the underground water through the soil moving towards the low lying area on the site to pass through the boulder wall safely without bringing fines with it to undermine the slope and allow for proper drainage and no erosion or sedimentation issues. I've also proposed the use of a low maintenance no mow seed mix for the surface of the proposed 2:1 slope above the wall. This seed mixture is self sustaining and doesn't require any fertilizer and we are also going to propose a change in the conservation easement which exists on the property now and encompasses a portion of lot 13, 12, 11 & 10 in its present condition and in some places it comes all the way out to the road. For lot 10 we are going to the Town Council to change that so all rear area to the east of the boulder wall and in a straight line over across the rear section of lot 10, this entire area would become a part of the conservation easement area. A significantly large portion of lot 10 which was not incorporated into the previous conservation easement will be with the relocation of that boundary

Ned Dalton: What types of soils will be used behind this wall?

David Lord: It's going to be a free draining gravelly fine sandy loam. The Geotech fabric is specifically selected for its resistance to clogging

Moosa Rafey: They got a copy of your letter but I haven't gotten any responses yet from the engineer

David Lord: We'll check to be sure he received it and is working on it.

Moosa Rafey: David, what's the scale of this? How high is it?

David Lord: Between 2 & 4 ft. This is just a detail that shows the relationship that the lowest stone boulder would be set below existing grade generally half the size of the boulder set below the existing grade and you stack up to the appropriate height.

Moosa Rafey: The boulders will just be sitting on top of each other?

David Lord: yes. They're set on top of one another with an offset into the slope.

Moosa Rafey: Do you think the pressure from the fill doesn't push them to fall?

David Lord: We're attempting to work on the hydrostatic pressure with the filling behind it with the clean stone to act as a drain but that's a question for the engineer

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 8

Paul Bunevich: Dave, it looks like this typical section details in metric. I see about half the height for the width of the wall and the envelope but says 1.2 meters

David Lord: The document I handed out tonight is an attempt to give you a general idea. There were some questions and discussion while we were on the site on Saturday how it was going to be done. I wanted the commission to see the stones, the envelope with the clean stone behind it and the grade off of that and it's going to be set below existing grade. That's going to be spelled out by the engineer.

Craig Palmer: We'll need to see something, like a map

Paul Bunevich: Is the geotextile and stone going to wrap around and what's the end treatment of the wall with the geo textile and the stone going to be

David Lord: Any place there's a wall or seepage there will be a Geotech and it'll tie in with the existing slope. Again, that's a question you should ask the engineer.

Moosa Rafey: Mr. Chairman, if you want to table this application you'll need an extension of time from Mr. Polletta.

Craig Palmer: I think there should be some type of fence or some type of barrier so if they have kids they won't go down

George Touponse: What was the original plan to develop these lots?

Moosa Rafey: I think the toe of the slope was approximately 50ft from the edge of the wetlands

George Touponse: How was that going to be engineered? It mathematically doesn't work

Moosa Rafey: Now there will be 10-12 ft from the wetlands.

George Touponse: I understand that but where I'm going is this proposal looks like it should've been part of the original proposal. How did the grading work before he put some houses in here?

Moosa Rafey: That's a good question for the Planning and Zoning Commission that approved these lots.

George Touponse: I don't believe we should just dish it off on Planning & Zoning. We, as a wetland commission would have had to review that

Moosa Rafey: The wetland commission approved those lots with the limit of disturbance to be approximately 40 ft from the wetlands.

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 9

George Touponse: I understand that, but me looking at these plans, what he's proposing now is the bare minimum of what could've been approved before. If you draw a 2:1 slope up, you'd have no backyard and it doesn't appear you can even build a house. I think this proposal is a correction to a problem that was never initially addressed

Moosa Rafey: I don't see a problem but it should be done correctly to make sure it works.

David Lord: The existing grades are shown for both properties and the proposed hill slopes are shown

George Touponse: What I'm saying is there wasn't room to build a house before those grades were developed

Ned Dalton: The grades that are existing were not existing prior to disturbance so if you did a 2:1 slope from 40 ft away from the wetlands, you'd be up at the street and there would be no room for a building lot

George Touponse: I don't see an alternate feasible way to build these houses in here that have been approved to be built without completing the proposal basically as it is being shown to us. The other option is to build a 20ft high concrete wall in the back of these yards but that's not safe. I would prefer to see a 2:1 slope

Moosa Rafey: I think those plans were reviewed by the town engineer at that time, the Planning & Zoning & wetlands commissions.

Tom Murphy motioned that the Commission accepted a 35 day time extension for Application #2021-39 of Giuseppe Polletta for filling regulated areas for construction of single-family homes on Lot 11 and Lot 12 and relocation of an existing conservation easement at Lake View Estates Subdivision, Lake View Drive, Watertown and was seconded by Ned Dalton - All in Favor

Tom Murphy motioned to table Application #2021-39 of Giuseppe Polletta for filling regulated areas for construction of single-family homes on Lot 11 and Lot 12 and relocation of an existing conservation easement at Lake View Estates Subdivision, Lake View Drive, Watertown and was seconded by Ned Dalton

All in Favor	Tom Murphy	Opposed	Abstention
	Ned Dalton		George Touponse
	Joe Polletta		
	Edward Norton		
	Craig Palmer		

Commissioner Joe Polletta rejoined the meeting after voting was completed

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 10

3. Application #2021-40 of Watertown Plastics, Inc. for construction of a 10,000 Sq. Ft building addition and expansion of a parking lot at 830 Echo Lake Road, Watertown, CT.

Tom Murphy motioned to Approve Application #2021-40 of Watertown Plastics, Inc. for construction of a 10,000 Sq. Ft building addition and expansion of a parking lot at 830 Echo Lake Road, Watertown, CT subject to conditions and was seconded by George Touponse - All in Favor

4. Application #2021-41 of Echo Asset, LLC for construction of a 12,800 Sq. Ft industrial building and associated infrastructure including driveway, water and sewer lines and onsite drainage system at 0 Echo Lake Road, Watertown, CT.

George Touponse: Do we have a draft motion for this?

Moosa Rafey: No, I didn't get a chance to do it because I got the information at 5:00 this afternoon.

George Touponse motioned to approve Application #2021-41 of Echo Asset, LLC for construction of a 12,800 Sq. Ft industrial building and associated infrastructure including driveway, water and sewer lines and onsite drainage system at 0 Echo Lake Road, Watertown, CT subject to standard conditions and was seconded by Joe Polletta
All in Favor

New Applications

None

Old Business

1. Discussion on the construction of Watertown Dog Park at 0 Main Street, Watertown.

Paul Bunevich, Town Engineer, here regarding the construction of the dog park. I apologize on the field walk on Saturday I forgot the plans and were not a part of the packet because they were previously issued to the commission and I didn't bring them with me. I have the old approved plan with me and the revisions.

Joe Millette, Assistant Town Engineer. What was proposed here was very minimal work to be done. When we got out there were a lot of things that were not originally on the plans we found. As we were coming through with the bioswale we were finding large pieces of concrete and other things. Same thing happened with the water line. When we were extending the final part of the water line, there were large pieces of concrete so as we were moving that we had to bring in additional fill to fill in for the water line. The

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 11

bioswale has a mixture of soil, sand and leaf compost. As we came down to where Dollar General is, we found the grade was not as proposed. At that point we decided we were going to put in a rain garden behind Dollar General where they dumped the roof leaders and parking lot right into this site. That was the basic reason for some of the changes. All the material that was on site stayed on site. We just brought in clean fill to cover the water main and to build the bioswale.

Craig Palmer: You said Dollar General gutters & everything went out the back?

Joe Millette: They came to the parking lot & then down the side of the access road & straight into where the dog park is being built.

Craig Palmer: I think I was on the commission then and we approved them to go through the front with infiltrators into a rain garden. You said the slope behind there isn't correct either?

Joe Millette: No. It's steeper. I don't know where some of that fill came from because it looks like it was dumped there. We found broken concrete, rebar

George Touponse: That would make sense since that was where the old Lorraine Gardens used to be

Joe Millette: Besides that, once we put (inaudible)...the trees that were supposed to be saved are too big now to dig up and try to plant so we cut them down and we'll be putting additional deciduous and pine trees in the back. We kept all the native trees that were on the property. So with the modifications that we ended up doing, myself, I attempted to appease the commission and we didn't have time to get some approvals to get this set up

Craig Palmer: We went on the site walk and now there's a pond there by the brook.

Joe Millette: There could be a little sedimentation because we didn't have time to finish

Craig Palmer: Why don't you put some kind of retention pond or rain garden? There's a huge amount of water and a depression area.

Joe Millette: I don't see a problem with that

Craig Palmer: There should be some type of retention. You can see what the rest of the people are going through in Turkey Brook. The town sets a poor example. You should be ahead of the rest not behind.

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 12

Paul Bunevich: We can certainly slope it so it can be mowed easily 4:1 or even 6:1

Craig Palmer: How much material was brought in

Joe Millette: The material brought in was for the bioswale and that was material we were supposed to bring in. Any material taken out was just laid on the site, about 330 cubic yards.

Ned Dalton: The fence is not the fence that was proposed. It was supposed to be a breakaway fence.

Moosa Rafey: Mr. Chairman, just to make easy for them to follow, you just want them to propose a rain garden or a detention pond where the water is standing now and bring it back for modification of the existing permit and draw a plan and bring it to the next meeting. Joe, you're new to this commission and it always happens. There are situations that people cannot follow the plans that was approved but they come back to the commission for a modification. In this case you just did it on your own and that's why the commission is not happy about it. In the future, if this happens again, you can come back to the commission to modify that permit. I was under a lot of pressure with this on why I didn't stop it, but I didn't know. The permit says that whenever you want to start the project, within 3 days before that you have to notify me. I was not notified and I didn't know what was going on. In the future, please keep that in mind to do so.

Craig Palmer: It was the second violation on that permit

Moosa Rafey: There was a notice of violation that I issued to Roy Cavanaugh

Joe Millette: There was nothing against commission, I was doing what I felt at the time was best in the town's interest and the public's interest for safety to get it in. As far as the fence I don't recall a special design on that fence.

Moosa Rafey: We'll look at the original permit and see what we can do to fix it

2. Notice of Violation issued to the owner of 30 Jericho Road, Watertown.
3. Discussion on Application Review Process by the Agency

Tom Murphy motioned to Table Items 1-3 under Old Business and was seconded by Joe Polletta
All in Favor

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 13

New Business

1. Request for extension of expiration date of Permit #1012 for a two-lot subdivision and construction of 25 residential units at 741 Echo Lake Road, Watertown, CT.

Tom Murphy: It indicates that wetlands permits and subdivision have a period of 14 years plus a possibility of an additional 5. Are we going for an automatic 19 on this ??

Moosa Rafey: Yes, that is what the state wants. This is basically for the last 5 year extension. The permit was issued to Lovely Development.

George Touponse: He was the one that filed the application

Moosa Rafey: He submitted the application and got the permits

Tom Murhpy motioned to approved a 5 year extension for Permit #1012 for a two-lot subdivision and construction of 25 residential units at 741 Echo Lake Road, Watertown, CT and was seconded by Joe Polletta - All in Favor

2. Request for extension of expiration date of Permit #567 for construction of a driveway to access two existing building lot at 0 Highmeadow Road and 0 Thomaston Road, Watertown, CT.

Tom Murphy motioned to approved a 5 year extension for Permit #567 for construction of a driveway to access two existing building lots at 0 Highmeadow Road and 0 Thomaston Road, Watertown, CT and was seconded by Joe Polletta - All in Favor

3. Election of Officers

A. Chairperson

Text of Motion: Tom Murphy nominated Craig Palmer as Chairperson

Motion Made by: Tom Murphy

Seconded by: Joe Polletta

There were no other nominations

All in Favor

B. Vice Chairperson

Text of Motion: Craig Palmer nominated Tom Murphy as Vice Chairperson

Motion Made by: Joe Polletta

Seconded by: Ned Dalton

There were no other nominations - All in Favor

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 14

C. Secretary

Text of Motion: Joe Polletta nominated Ned Dalton as Secretary
Motion Made by: Joe Polletta
Seconded by: Tom Murphy
There were no other nominations
All in Favor

Communications and Bills

1. Re-appointment Letter for Mr. Thomas Murphy
2. Re-appointment Letter for Mr. Giuseppe Polletta
3. Re-appointment Letter for Mr. Charles Beliveau

Tom Murphy motioned to Accept and File Items 1-3 under Communications and Bills and was seconded by Joe Polletta - All in Favor

Reports from Officers and Committees

1. Chairman's Report

Craig Palmer: I see tonight there were 2 different and I don't know how much to do with wetlands and there was a question on Echo Lake Rd that states about the grade and now we're down at this Dollar General and they said the grade wasn't right as to how it was before. Moosa, who goes to check that?

Moosa Rafey: For commercial properties I think it's the Town Engineer and Mark Massoud and for residential properties normally I do.

Paul Bunevich: There may not always be a planting or erosion bond but I don't know. It varies from site to site.

Tom Murphy motioned to table and was seconded by George Touponse - All in Favor

2. Report from Wetland Regulations Review Subcommittee

Tom Murphy: We are still waiting to hear back from the town attorney regarding the proposals so no report and motion to table and was seconded by George Touponse – All in Favor

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 15

Report from Staff:

Moosa Rafey: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any reports but Mr. Touponse raised a good question tonight on how those lots like on Lake View were approved if there was not enough back yard. When you review plans for subdivisions, I'm sure the developers want to have as many lots as they can fit. I think from now on you should be careful. When you approve a lot make sure they can build that house and there's a reasonable back yard.

Tom Murphy: How do we do that if we don't have authority to do that

Moosa Rafey: That's the problem, we only have jurisdiction over the regulated area and if they're outside the regulated area, there's nothing we can do. Then the Planning and Zoning Commission can look at that because they approved the subdivision. Why should a lot be approved if you cannot build a house with a reasonable backyard.

George Touponse: The last subdivision I worked out everything was laid out. The wetlands and planning & zoning

Paul Bunevich: The site development plan should show all that.

Moosa Rafey: My recommendation is that we should talk about it because George made a good point. When developers come here they have a piece of land and they have the right to develop it. They are trying to follow your regulations and you have limited jurisdiction. It's only on wetlands water courses and upland review area. I think from now on we should pay more attention and if something doesn't work, it shouldn't be approved.

George Touponse: When they design the septic system, they have to stick to those grades or start the process again if something comes up on site that's different and they have to put in an as built before they get a co.

Craig Palmer: Anyone from the public wishing to speak?

Katherine Camara, 31 Cottage Place: I want to thank you, as I always do that you do the job that you're supposed to do, I appreciate your meetings and to do what you're supposed to and follow the regulations because as I've been seeing around town when people do things that are not allowed there can be some tragic consequences so it's good to monitor what's going on. I caught some of the dog park discussion and it sounded to me like it was that Dollar General has some drainage that was going onto the property and they were supposed to have a rain garden and I know it's not your job but it makes me wonder things are getting approved by planning and zoning and people build their proposed building and does anybody ever go back and see what they've

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2022
Page 16

done? I agree that something needs to be done and I'd like to comment on the approval of lots, it's questionable as far as wetlands, I'm sorry, but what happened with Trolane Rd, Mr. Touponse's property and you're talking about what probably shouldn't've happened there. I would have to agree that something needs to be done so something like that doesn't happen again.

Ned Dalton: The rain garden that was proposed for Dollar General is there and I think they didn't put all of the water that was supposed to be there.

Paul Bunevich: When someone submits an as-built we go out and check it and check the plans that were approved and we're supposed to see if there's any discrepancies and I don't know what happened. It was before my time so I can't comment

Tom Murphy motioned to adjourn and was seconded by Joe Polletta - All in Favor