

Brittany Spurlock

From: palazzolo thepatentsource.com [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2026 8:48 PM
To: Cstaff
Subject: Fwd: OBJECTION TO CRMC ASSENT APPLICATION 2025-10-075 (25 ATLANTIC AVENUE, WESTERLY, RI)
Attachments: OBJECTION TO CRMC ASSENT APPLICATION 2025-10-075 (25 ATLANTIC AVENUE, WESTERLY, RI).pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Categories: Britt

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "palazzolo thepatentsource.com" [REDACTED]
> To: "Cstaff1@crmc.ri.gov" <Cstaff1@crmc.ri.gov>, "palazzolo thepatentsource.com"

[REDACTED]

> Date: 02/13/2026 8:44 PM EST

> Subject: OBJECTION TO CRMC ASSENT APPLICATION 2025-10-075 (25 ATLANTIC AVENUE, WESTERLY, RI)

>
>
> Please see attached my objection to assent application 2025-10-075. I request a hearing. Thank you.

>
> Anthony Palazzolo Jr.

OBJECTION TO CRMC ASSENT APPLICATION 2025-10-075 (25 ATLANTIC AVENUE, WESTERLY, RI)

I object to approval of the shoreline hardening proposed in CRMC assent application 2025-10-075 (as well as the shoreline hardening proposed in CRMC maintenance assent application M2024-10-047). However, I would support applicant's proposed shoreline hardening if the applicant grants a permanent pedestrian public right of way over the six foot strip of land on the western boundary of the subject property (the one labeled "6' easement and private right of way" in applicant's mapping). I request an oral hearing to address my objection.

I accept that structural shoreline hardening has long existed on the subject property (per CRMC assent 1993-03-062) and that it is grandfathered even though CRMC now prohibits new shoreline hardening because such hardening increases beach-facing erosion, flanking (or erosion at the ends of the features), removal of sediment for longshore transport, and reduced biodiversity. See TAKINGS CONSIDERATIONS FOR RHODE ISLAND'S STRUCTURAL SHORELINE HARDENING PROHIBITION IN TYPE 1 WATERS *Marine Affairs Institute at Roger Williams University School of Law and the Rhode Island Sea Grant Legal Program*, January 2026. Beach-facing erosion is particularly concerning here because dry-foot lateral access along the shore is already blocked at some high tides. In my opinion, this problem will gradually worsen until dry-foot lateral access may become blocked at all tides. Similarly, in my opinion, some amount of flanking erosion has occurred on nearby property and will continue to occur without change to the present revetment; this will gradually deprive east/west neighbors and the public from some amount of beachfront. Note that the Town-designated Maplewood Avenue right of way is only a few doors east of the subject property. Nonetheless, the applicant is grandfathered.

However, in seeking to harden the revetment on the subject property, applicant is also proposing to accelerate the aforementioned beach-front and flanking erosion. The larger the stones, the harder the shoreline. In my opinion, this will hasten the date by which dry-foot lateral access in front of the subject property will become impossible. In my opinion, this will also hasten the date by which there will be no beach in front of neighboring properties, thereby eliminating wrackline-plus-10 dry sand where the public may sun bathe, picnic, etc. Similarly, this will also hasten shortening of the Maplewood Avenue Town-designated right of way, further eliminating public dry sand where the public may sun bathe, picnic, etc. Thus, permitting any hardening of applicant's revetment will create negative externalities over and above those that already exist and I object to it. That is, unless the applicant ameliorates the additional burden applicant's proposed hardening will impose on blameless others. Fortunately for the applicant, there is a way to do exactly that at no cost or burden: the applicant can dedicate a permanent six-foot pedestrian public right of way (hereinafter a "restorative PROW") along the western boundary of the subject property where there already is a private right of way (see yellow highlighting in applicant's mapping immediately below).



operation of law on the 10th anniversary of vehicular use. *Burke-Tarr Co. v. Ferland Corp.*, 724 A.2d 1014, 1020 (RI 1999)? Don't Rhode Island's road abandonment statute (R.I. Gen. Laws § 24-6-1 *et seq*) and/or *O'Reilly v. Town of Glocester*, 621 A. 2d 697, 703 (1993) prevent abandonment of rights of way that are still in active use? Isn't that right of way acknowledged in Westerly's 2020-2040 Comprehensive Plan and in Westerly's 2018 and 2019 Harbor Management Plans? Wasn't the Westerly Town Charter amended in 2024 to prohibit the Town Council from conveying or abandoning any of its interests in rights of way to the shore? And, doesn't all of that guarantee public access from Atlantic Avenue to East Beach in Watch Hill even without the proposed restorative PROW?" In a word: HELL NO!!!!!! Not in Westerly where every grain of sand in Watch Hill has been under siege for decades and where the words feckless and venal don't even begin to capture the sloven ineptitude, brazen corruption, crippling dysfunction, breath-taking ignorance, and oligarch pandering/servility/sycophancy of the Dunning-Kruger effect specimens sometimes called the Westerly Town Council.

This is certainly true with respect to Atlantic Avenue (West) because Westerly Town Manager, Shawn Lacey, gratuitously stated (at a recent meeting with Ben Weber and Nancy Letendre) that Atlantic Avenue (West) "*isn't* a right of way" and then (apropos of nothing) flatly announced at a subsequent Town Council meeting that that Town-designated right of way "*isn't really* a right of way".

These comments must be understood in light of the fact that, earlier, Westerly Town Solicitor, Bill Conley, was tasked with penning an opinion regarding Light House Road so that the Town Council could then begin negotiations with the federal government to acquire the Watch Hill Light House. Conley gave that opinion to the Town Council three days **AFTER** the federal government had already conveyed the entire property to a private party. The Public's Radio coverage of that fiasco was one for the history books. Nonetheless, the Town Council was so pleased with Conley's work, they re-upped his contract without a bidding process and gave him a substantial raise.

And, before that, Town Manager Lacey announced *sua sponte* that "the Town is not taking the position that Fort Road is a public right of way" despite the fact that the Town Council adopted Fort Road as a public right of way by resolution in 2008. Even after the Town spent almost \$300,000 defending the Fort Road right of way in litigation, Shawn Lacey recently confirmed that he stands by everything he said.

But even before that Town Council President, Ed Morrone, warned a fellow councilor not to advocate for CRMC designation of Everett Avenue (on East Beach) as a State right of way because it was privately owned by abutter David Roth and he would retaliate by closing it. David Roth was later arrested for spray painting over the Town right of way sign and Everett Avenue was designated a State right of way by the CRMC after Ed Morrone resigned in disgrace.

And before that, Watch Hill interests told Westerly that the forty-foot wide Manatuck Avenue (also on East Beach) has been a private foot-path (no vehicles or even horses) four feet wide since 1916 so the ever-supine Town of Westerly stopped plowing it (after decades of doing so) and placed it on Westerly's 2025 list of private roads. Nonetheless, the CRMC and Westerly still list Manatuck Avenue as a State-designated public right of way. Westerly also prohibits parking there (as it has since 1959) and maintains water utilities there as it has done for many decades. And, various Manatuck Avenue homeowners have expressly indicated that they have frontage on **public** road Manatuck Avenue (not a private four-foot foot-path) when filing plat maps and for construction permits, CRMC assents, etc.



And before that, a prior Town Manager, Mark Rooney, so badly bungled an attempt to erase the Fort Road right of way from the Harbor Management Plan that Watch Hill Fire District attorney Gerald Petros (successfully) opposed his effort. See Westerly Town Council meeting January 25, 2021.

But even before that, Watch Hill interests declared Town-designated (since 1940) right of way "Niantic Avenue" to be private so the Town Council, idiotic lemmings that they are, summarily removed it from their Comprehensive Plan and Harbor Management Plan. They did this even though the Town Council agrees they can't abandon a right of way without a formal abandonment proceeding (which never occurred) and Westerly still prohibits parking there. And, the current Council President, Chris Duhamel (a devout Town-designated rights of way denier), says he's waiting for the CRMC to decide who owns the right of way. He's going to be waiting a long time. Do you know why?

Still before that, Town Council President, Ed Morrone, lead a successful effort to strip Watch Hill Harbor of its federal guarantee of public mooring access. Morrone began receiving payments totaling \$30,000 from the Watch Hill Fire District for "consulting services" the same week a federal law decommissioning the Harbor took effect. He resigned from the Town Council soon after that became public knowledge.

And before that, the Weekapaug Sand Trail had been a public road maintained at great expense by the Town of Westerly from 1931 to 1997 at which time Town Solicitor, Stephen Hartford, unexpectedly announced that the Town had never formally accepted the road. Sickenly, the Town surrendered that road just three days later without any road-abandonment procedures whatsoever. The Town Council then promoted Hartford to Town Manager. He eventually resigned in disgrace amidst a sexual harassment lawsuit that just kept on giving.

In light of the foregoing, I respectfully submit that those *really* paying attention know that, when it comes to public rights of way in Westerly, the future is uncertain and the end is *always* near. The Town-designated right of way Atlantic Avenue (West) is here today. If some Watch Hill interest or other suddenly turns up with a Rube Goldberg contraption and some carnival music, it might be gone tomorrow. Thus, a restorative PROW would not be redundant. It would be a win for the applicant. It would be a win for the public.

Note that, if the applicant is unsuccessful with this application, it may consider a Special Exception application in which the restorative PROW discussed herein provides the requisite public benefit for such an application.

Digitally signed,

/Anthony Palazzolo Jr./

This email and any attached documents are solely for use by the RI CRMC in connection with a matter of public concern in Westerly, RI. Although I am licensed to practice law in California and Connecticut, I am not licensed to practice law in the State of Rhode Island; nothing herein should be construed to imply otherwise. I have no clients in Rhode Island. I represent no one with any interest in this matter and I am not receiving any financial benefit of any kind related to this matter. I opine solely for myself as a would-be user of the shoreline who is merely exercising his petition and free speech rights under the U.S. and Rhode Island Constitutions.



From: Ben Weber [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2026 9:04 PM
To: Cstaff
Cc: Jeff Willis; Anthony DeSisto
Subject: Objection to Application: RE. 25 Atlantic Avenue; Westerly, RI.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear CRMC,

I would like to hereby submit into the record my written objection to the request for a variance to CRMC regulations for structural shoreline hardening in Type 1 waters at 25 Atlantic Ave, Westerly, RI, plat 175, lot 17.

In reviewing the plans which now constitute a new wall application for CRMC approval, after rightfully deemed a significantly larger scope than just a minor repair, and as a Westerly resident who enjoys lateral access to the shoreline, I am very concerned that the changes in the plan pose a more significant threat to public access in front of this property. This specific property and revetment is set significantly closer to the ocean than neighboring property. Lateral access is already unavailable for much of the tidal cycle and any additional erosion and/or blockade will further reduce the ability to transverse the shoreline and access.

I must remind the CRMC of it's duty to uphold it's mission and fail to see how allowing this would honor it in any way shape or form. Dennis W. Nixon, member of the shoreline study commission, wrote in the EVOLUTION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RIGHTS TO RHODE ISLAND'S SHORE "In 1971, the Rhode Island General Assembly introduced a more significant factor limiting riparian interests in the shore, with the creation of the Coastal Resources Management Council (CRMC)...The traditional common law riparian rights to fill in and wharf out recently have been eroded by actions of the General Assembly, the CRMC, and the 1986 Rhode Island Constitutional Convention...In all other respects, the common law law rights have evolved into privileges which **public trustees** at the state and federal level may or may not choose to grant, based on the impact which the proposed development would have on the public's use and enjoyment of the shore and adjacent waters..." [Suffolk University Law Review vol.XXIV. R.I Survey, 1990. Number 2. page 314]. Despite being contrary to CRMC's goals If the Council does opt to grant this variance, I strongly urge CRMC to stipulate an alternative public access route be added for the loss. For example, there is a 6 foot wide easement and private public access ROW detailed on the map on the westernmost boundary of this property. I'm not a lawyer so I don't know the exact language needed, but I think establishing this as a public ROW to the shore would help guarantee public access nearby.

Thank you for your consideration. I will look forward to further notifications about this petition and any possible public hearing.

Sincerely,
Benjamin Weber
[REDACTED]

Sincerely,

Brittany Spurlock

From: Chris Dodge <cdodge@savebay.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2026 5:26 PM
To: Cstaff
Subject: Save The Bay Comments 2025-10-075
Attachments: STB Comments - 2025-10-075.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good evening,

Save The Bay is pleased to offer the attached comment letter as it pertains to CRMC file number 2025-10-075. Thank you for your inclusion of this letter into the file.

~~~~~  
Fair Winds and Following Seas!  
Chris

Chris Dodge (he/him/his)  
Narragansett Baykeeper  
@NarraBaykeeper

**T:** (401) 272-3540 x116 [desk]  
**T:** (401) 206-0328 [field]  
**E:** [cdodge@savebay.org](mailto:cdodge@savebay.org)





**THE BAY CENTER**  
100 Save The Bay Drive  
Providence, R.I. 02905  
phone: 401-272-3540

**SOUTH COUNTY OFFICE**  
8 Broad Street  
Westerly, R.I. 02891  
phone: 401-315-2709

**HAMILTON FAMILY AQUARIUM**  
23 America's Cup Ave, First Floor  
Newport, R.I. 02840  
phone: 401-324-6020

---

*Sent via electronic mail to: cstaff1@crmc.ri.gov*

February 12, 2026

Jeffrey Willis, Executive Director  
Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council  
Stedman Government Center  
4808 Tower Hill Road  
Wakefield, RI 02879

*RE: Application 2025-10-075 (Chrones Family Rev. Trust % James Chrones)*

Dear Director Willis:

Save The Bay, on behalf of our members and supporters, is writing to offer the following comments pertaining to the Coastal Resources Management Council's (CRMC) public notice File No. 2025-10-075, "to reconstruct a revetment on a barrier and adjacent to Type 1 waters by exchanging existing stone with 350-400 tons of larger armor stones, up to 7.2 foot in diameter, within the footprint of the existing revetment (detailed in Assent 1993-03-062)" at 25 Atlantic Ave. in Westerly, RI. In CRMC's own words, "the work exceeds [the] scope of maintenance and therefore is considered a new wall adjacent to Type 1 water (Conservation Area) on an Undeveloped Barrier Beach. New shoreline protection facilities are prohibited abutting Type 1 waters and on undeveloped barrier beaches per RICRMP Section 1.3.1.G.3.(a)." Save The Bay respectfully objects to this application.

Save The Bay would first like to acknowledge that in no way should this application be reviewed as a Category B application, as the work proposed is explicitly prohibited by CRMC's own rules. Project eligibility for review under Category B requirements is determined by Rule 1.1.6 (F) and further identified by Table 1: Water Type Matrices found in 650-RICR-20-00-1.1.5. Within Table 1, structural shoreline shoreline protection on undeveloped barriers in Type 1 water is listed as prohibited. Therefore, this application should not be reviewed under the standards for a Category B application, since such review is precluded by CRMC rules. Notwithstanding that, Save The Bay is left stating our objections and citing the regulations based on the portions of the CRMC Red Book pertaining to Category B Applications for shoreline protection structures in Type 1 waters, despite our contention that this application for new structural shoreline protection in Type 1 waters should not have progressed this far to be in front of you as a Category B in the first place. Those objections are as follows:

1. CRMC's rules prohibit shoreline protection facilities along Type 1 waters and on undeveloped barrier beaches.

The property in question is located along Type 1 waters and the dominant coastal feature of this coastline is further defined by CRMC regulations as an undeveloped barrier beach (650-RICR-20-00-01 1.2.2 (B)(3)), both of which expressly prohibit the construction of structural shoreline protection facilities. CRMC rules prohibit "the construction of new structures other than access ways, walkover structures, and beach facilities in setback areas" and "alterations to beaches adjacent to Type 1 and Type 2 waters." 650-RICR-20-00-1.2.2 (A)(2)(a) and (c). Additionally, "[a]lterations to undeveloped barriers are prohibited except where the primary purpose of the project is protection, maintenance, restoration or improvement of the feature as a natural habitat for native plants and wildlife." 650-RICR-20-00-1.2.2 (B)(1)(d). The prohibition of structural protection on Undeveloped Barrier Beaches is further simplified in the aforementioned Table 1 of 650-RICR-20-00-1.1.5. Although there is already a pre-existing structural shoreline protection facility at this site, the scope of the work would be appropriately considered a new facility and not viewed as maintenance by the Coastal Resources Management Program, which is expressly prohibited by the aforementioned regulations.

2. A portion of the proposed shoreline protection facility does not protect a structure integral to the primary structure on the property.

In addition to this proposed project being prohibited in Type 1 waters, CRMC regulations also prohibit the use of hybrid or structural shoreline protection to protect undeveloped land or structures not integral to the primary structure. 650-RICR-20-00-1.3.1 (G)(3)(b). The primary structure on the property, located on Plat-Lot 175-17 consisting of approximately 0.57 acres,<sup>1</sup> is currently fronted and flanked by coastal armoring, including pre-existing armoring on the western side which separates it from two other empty lots. However, Plat-Lot 175-18 consisting of 0.13 acres and 175-19 consisting of 0.28 acres<sup>1</sup> to the west of the residence, which are owned by the applicant and are a part of this proposed project design, are not listed as separate lots in the public notice of this application, remain empty, and are utilized as only parking, and are referenced as such in the CRMC permit database for a prior maintenance certification file # 2007-05-115. The new stone revetment is proposed to mirror the existing revetment, intending to continue to protect and keep separate lots 175-18 and 175-19, a total of 0.41 acres or approximately 42% of the total 0.98 acre parcel area, with no structure being protected. Because of this, the shoreline protection facility, as proposed, should be prohibited from being constructed at this site.

3. A shoreline protection facility as proposed would impair lateral public access to the shore.

Notwithstanding the above mentioned CRMP regulations expressly prohibiting the construction of a new stone revetment in Type 1 waters, the plans, as engineered, for this new shoreline protection facility extend seaward of the Mean High Water (MHW) mark. By extending into tidal waters, this shoreline protection facility will be one of the only structures preventing unimpaired lateral access along approximately five miles of uninterrupted coastal beach, one of the longest such stretches on Rhode Island's coast. Approval of the proposed structure, which will, without question, impair the public's lateral access to this coastal beach, conflicts with CRMC's goal "[t]o preserve the qualities of, and public access to those beaches which are an important recreational resource (adjacent to Type 1 and 2 waters)." 650-RICR-20-00-1.2.2 (A)(1)(a)(1). Additionally, "[a]ll persons applying for a Category B Assent are required to:..." "[d]emonstrate that the alteration will not unreasonably interfere with, impair, or significantly impact existing public access to, or use of, tidal waters and/or the shore," (650-RICR-20-00-1.3.1(A)(1)(f)) which the applicant has not done.

---

<sup>1</sup> Town of Westerly - GIS and Real Property Information [<https://westerly.mapxpress.net/portal.asp>], accessed February 11, 2026.

4. Persistent and repetitive maintenance of the structure at the site has already surpassed the intent and policies of CRMC Regulations.

Despite the aforementioned prohibitions on structural shoreline protection facilities in the Type 1 waters adjacent to this project site, and on undeveloped barrier beaches of any water type, the permit history on this site indicates that a "new" revetment was permitted in 1993. Even if a structure of some kind pre-existed the passage of the state's coastal management program, approval of a new structure on this site was inconsistent with CRMC rules applicable in 1993, and is still inconsistent with those same rules today. In the 33 years since that time, owners of this property have been granted a total of seven maintenance certifications, including as recently as May of 2025 (File # 2024-10-047). The frequency of maintenance certifications to upkeep this structure has already resulted in fortification of what might've been a pre-existing structure far beyond CRMC's policies that allow for maintenance. CRMC defines "maintenance" as "reconstructing or repairing to *previously approved conditions and dimensions* [of] a damaged or deteriorated structure or facility". . . and "includes only those activities that *do not significantly alter the assented design, purpose and size* of the structure." 650-RICR-20-00-1.1.2 (83)(emphasis added). Aerial imagery shows the steady increase in the size of the structure over the years, and any further increase beyond the clearly articulated standards of what constitutes maintenance should not be permitted on this site.<sup>2</sup>

Save The Bay appreciates the opportunity to comment on this application and urges the Council to prohibit the installation of a new shoreline protection facility on this site for the reasons outlined above.

Sincerely,



Capt. Chris Dodge  
Narragansett Baykeeper - Save The Bay  
100 Save the Bay Dr.  
Providence, RI 02905  
(401) 272-3540 x116  
[cdodge@savebay.org](mailto:cdodge@savebay.org)



---

<sup>2</sup> RIDEM Environmental Resource Map  
[\[https://ridemgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=87e104c8adb449eb9f905e5f18020de5\]](https://ridemgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=87e104c8adb449eb9f905e5f18020de5), accessed February 11, 2026.

## **Brittany Spurlock**

---

**From:** ellen kane [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 13, 2026 2:44 PM  
**To:** Cstaff  
**Subject:** addendum to my letter regarding 2025-10-075

**Categories:** Britt

Dear CRMC,

Please add to your consideration of my previous letter opposing 2025-10-075, my request for an oral hearing on the matter.

Thanks very much.

Sincerely,

Ellen Kane  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

## Brittany Spurlock

---

**From:** ellen kane [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 12, 2026 4:30 PM  
**To:** Cstaff  
**Subject:** Re: 2025-10-075 Application

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear CRMC,

I would like to register my objection to this request for a variance to CRMC regulations for structural shoreline hardening in Type 1 waters at 25 Atlantic Ave, Westerly, RI, plat 175, lot 17.

In reviewing the plans, which now constitute a new wall application after CRMC approval for a more limited repair, and as a Westerly resident who enjoys lateral access to the shoreline, I am very concerned that the changes in the plan pose a more significant threat to public access in front of this property. The Marine Affairs Institute and RI Legal Sea Grant Legal Program published a paper last month addressing this issue, noting the common "exacerbated erosion in front of and adjacent to (such hardened) features". Such erosion, both in front and flanking erosion, commonly obstructs lateral access.

This specific property and revetment is set significantly closer to the ocean than neighboring property. Lateral access is already unavailable for much of the tidal cycle and additional erosion will further reduce access.

In the event that CRMC does see grant this variance, I strongly urge CRMC to stipulate an added public benefit for the loss. There is a 6 foot wide easement and private public access ROW detailed on the map on the westernmost boundary of this property. I'm not a lawyer so I don't know the exact language, but I think establishing this as a public ROW to the shore would help guarantee public access nearby.

Thank you for your consideration. I will look forward to further notifications about this petition and any possible public hearing.

Sincerely,

Ellen Kane

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

## Brittany Spurlock

---

**From:** Joy Cordio <JCordio@SouthCountyRI.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 11, 2026 5:19 PM  
**To:** Cstaff  
**Subject:** File Number: 2025-10-075 Request form Hearing  
**Attachments:** File Number 2025-10-075.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** Britt

Please see attached objection to File Number: 2025-10-075.

Thanks,  
Joy

*Joy Cordio*  
*Digital Marketing Specialist*

South County Tourism Council  
4160 Old Post Road  
Charlestown, RI 02813  
800.548.4662 401.789.4422  
401.789.4437 fax  
[www.southcountyri.com](http://www.southcountyri.com)



Joy Cordio



February 11, 2026

Jeffrey Willis, Executive Director  
Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council  
Stedman Government Center  
4808 Tower Hill Road  
Wakefield, RI 02879

**RE: Application 2025-10-075 Chrones Family Rev. Trust**

Dear Director Willis,

I write to protest Public Notice 2025-10-075, and to request a hearing on this matter. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct a revetment on a barrier and adjacent to Type 1 waters by exchanging existing stone with 350-400 tons of larger armor stones, up to 7.2 foot in diameter, within the footprint of the existing revetment (detailed in Assent 1993-03-062).

Given what they are proposing - bringing in much larger boulders/rocks - this has to be treated as a **NEW** build - however, **new shoreline protection structures are not allowed in type 1 waters**. Additionally, the west side of the wall is not protecting a structure, and should have never been allowed in the first place.

**CRMC's rules prohibit shoreline protection facilities along Type 1 waters.**

CRMC rules prohibit "the construction of new structures other than access ways, walkover structures, and beach facilities in setback areas" and "alterations to beaches adjacent to Type 1 and Type 2 waters. 650-RICR-20-00-01 §§ 1.2.2 (A)(2)(a) and (c). The dominant coastal features of the stretch of Atlantic Beach between Weekapaug Breachway to the east and Watch Hill Lighthouse to the west, is a coastal beach with dune, and is further defined by CRMC regulations as a developed barrier beach. 650-RICR-20-00-01§ 1.2.2 (B)(3).

Thank you for your attention to this matter

Sincerely,

Joy Cordio

Attention: CRME

Re: File 2025-10-075

Chronos Family Rev Trust

Date 2-10-26

I write to voice my objection to the revetment that is being proposed for 25 Atlantic Ave. Such structures cause erosion to adjacent beach and in front of the revetment. It also impacts wildlife and most likely will prevent passage along the shore. This type of waters requires careful protection; please do not approve the request.

Respectfully,

Caroline Contrata

Caroline Contrata

