

Wakefield Conservation Commission
Meeting minutes for January 2, 2006

Members present.:

Nancy Spencer-Smith
Anne Bartley
Marsha Lavalley-Huntoon
Dennis Miller
Peter Kasprzyk
Stan Lombara

The meeting began with a review of applications and correspondence; there were no new applications to be reviewed.

Kevin O'Connor 69/29 File # 2006-02991: proposed project is to replace an existing retaining wall and a perched beach. The Conservation Commission found that the application was missing information regarding- materials to be used, the degree of the slope, the height of the existing wall, the effectiveness of 8" front wall, information on soil erosion on either side of the beach. The Commission also had questions regarding the existing retaining wall. On Nov. 30, 2006 applicant received a notice of invalid permit by notification from NHDES. On Dec 29, 2006, *N. Spencer-Smith* received a revised sketch depicting a wall replacement. Correspondence also informed that the perched beach had been declared abandoned by NHDES, and therefore just the retaining wall would be replaced.

John Boucher 195/42 File # 2006-03025 Minimum Impact Expedited Application: Proposed project is to repair an existing rock retaining wall. The area is approx. 126' along the shoreline. A site visit from NHDES was requested by the Conservation Commission. On Dec 27, 2006 applicant received a request for more information from NHDES. Proposed project does not qualify as a Minimum Impact Expedited Application; therefore, it would be reviewed as a Standard Application. A standard application requires an additional impact fee. A stamped surveyed plan showing all details and plans drawn to scale top-view showing all existing and proposed structures on the frontage is also needed. These plans shall include all permanent dock support size, type, and locations. All structures shall be measured from fixed points along the shoreline to verify structure locations in relation to property lines. The normal high water mark shall be clearly labeled and identified on the plans.

Plans need to be revised to show the proposed retaining wall is completely behind the high water mark elevation. Evidence that the shoreline east of the 14ft x19.8ft dock cannot be effectively stabilized by riprap is also requested.

McLaughlin Real Estate LLC 179/118 File # 2006-02495: proposed dock does not meet the rules for a "Minimum Seasonal Dock Notification" and needs to be reclassified. The reasons for this determination are that the property has less than the required 75ft of shoreline frontage. The project does not meet the 20ft setback from abutting properties. Because the proposed dock does not qualify for the notification, no work may begin until a Wetlands Permit has been issued and posted on site. Any new structures that have been installed must be removed.

Lise McNaughton (representative to applicant) 53/20 File #2006-00460 55 Cese Way East Wakefield: NHDES requests photographs of the existing conditions of the additional work area. Plans need to consist of cross sections and overhead plans of the existing and proposed conditions. No additional work may be conducted beyond the scope of the approved plans without permits or an amendment to the current permit.

William & Joan Oatis 52/15 File # 2006-02661: NHDES requests more information to clarify and complete this application.

- 1) A construction sequence and details that describe what actions will be taken to control siltation, erosion, and turbidity during construction.
- 2) Proposals for riprap and/or retaining walls adjacent to great ponds [or waterbodies where the state holds fee simple ownership], must include stamped, surveyed plans locating the proposed riprap relative to the normal high water line and property lines. Stamped surveyed plans shall accurately portray the existing natural contours of the shoreline frontage. The reclamation of land shall not be permitted.
- 3) The applicant must demonstrate a need for a retaining wall lakeward of the normal high water mark elevation, beyond the extent of the proposed perched beach by explaining why riprap controls will not adequately stabilize

Wakefield Conservation Commission
Meeting minutes for January 2, 2006

the existing shoreline behind and under the existing docks. Retaining walls shall not be constructed to reclaim lost frontage due to erosion: therefore, plans must be revised accordingly.

- 4) The proposed lake access step, lakeward of the normal high water mark elevation should be removed from the plans. The front beach retaining wall should be completely behind the normal high water mark elevation so that the natural shoreline is left undisturbed
- 5) Plans should include details on how beach sand will be contained to the proposed square footage. Beach sand shall be completely enclosed by retaining walls to prevent erosion and sand from entering the lake.
- 6) Revision of plans to show that geo-textile fabric or other siltation control fabric to line the beach, and line the landward side of the retaining wall and riprap to prevent further erosion.
- 7) A submission of plans that indicate the volume of sand to be used (in cubic yards) and the footprint, with dimensions, of the area where it will be placed is needed. NHDES will not permit the placement of sand below the normal high water line.
- 8) A cross-section diagram of the proposed beach, which shows existing and proposed grades, the height and width of the retaining walls, methods for diversion of surface runoff and the location of the steps to the water relative to the normal high water line.
- 9) The submitted application is also missing the average shoreline frontage. This is defined as the average of the lengths of the actual natural navigable shoreline frontage and the straight-line distance drawn from property line to property line as measured at the normal high water line.
- 10) Information about the existing dock being seasonal or permanent is also requested.

Parker Vander Hoof 126/15 File # 2006-03000 Minimum Impact Expedited Application: Proposed project is to replace concrete structures under a boat dock, with a wetland impact area of 250sq ft. Shoreline impact is expected to be 15 linear ft. Applicant received Notification of an incomplete expedited application. Plans with dimensions of all dock support and support locations must be submitted. The plans must show the structures relative to fixed points on the shoreline and show distances from the structures to property lines.

Kenneth Laurion 156/ 19 & 20: Review of correspondence from the Assessing Technician of Wakefield. Applicant has been notified that Intent to cut form and a Notification of Forest Management or a Timber Harvest Activities Having Minimum Wetlands Impact form, are needed by the Town of Wakefield.

Educational forums and Seminars:

NH Land Conservation Coalition Meeting- Thursday January 25, 2007 9am-12pm. Topics shall include;

- A) ***Open Space Development-*** How does a good land conservation plan designate areas for protection using a science-based method? How does open space development protect natural resources?
- B) ***Panel discussion-*** Can open space development ordinances be written to better protect conservation resources? How can the land trust community influence the planning process? What can land trusts do to help target critical areas for protection?
- C) ***Agricultural Commissions-*** What are they and how can you start them in your town?
- D) ***New Hampshire State Funding for Land Conservation***
- E) ***NH Wetland Mitigation In-Lieu-Fee Program.***

N. Spencer-Smith & Anne Bartley agreed to attend.

Motion to Adjourn @6:30pm.

Thank you to N. Spencer-Smith and the rest of the Commission for acting as secretary in my absence.