

Conservation Commission Minutes
November 14, 2013

In Attendance: Laura Replier, John Bell, Carl Shreder, Lillabeth Weis, John Lopez

Discussion:

7:06pm Minutes to Approve: 6/27/13, 7/18/13, 8/15/13, 9/26/13

John B: Makes a motion to approve the 4 sets of minutes as read by John

Lillabeth: Seconds the motion.

Minutes are approved as read, unanimously.

John B: Makes a motion to approve the bills as read by Steve

John L: seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Hearings:

7:11pm 61 Warren St (GCC 2013-24; DEP# 161-0772) NOI - NEW

Project proposes the addition of a 24 ft x 24 ft garage and structure attaching to an existing welling. Proposed areas of alterations are currently graveled driveway and residential lawn. Roof drains and dry wells are proposed to captures runoff from the proposed structures as well as from the existing dwelling. Staked hay bales and silt fence are proposed to limit area of work up-gradient of the wetland.

Charlie Ogden, engineer
Mark and Katy Seaver, homeowners

Charlie: Presents green cards.

Property located between Ordway and Jackman on the southeast side of Warren Street adjacent to the Byfield cemetery. There is an existing dwelling, existing gravel driveway, 3 wetland areas surrounding property, wooded swamp delineated by series A, surrounded by BVW; small pond surrounded by BVW area series B on plan; a very small ponded area along Warren Street in front of the cemetery series C on the plan.

From previous work when the dwelling was constructed, no cut zone marked on the property with stone bounds, shown in red on the plan. The project is proposing a 24 ft. x 24 ft. garage and a small section to connect garage and existing dwelling. This is placed on what is currently a gravel driveway. There are a couple sections of gravel driveway that will be turned into vegetative areas, and smaller sections of new gravel just to get alignment in and out of the garage.

Carl: What's the distance to the closest BVW?

Charlie: From the structure we're 51.5' from BVW, from the silt fence and hay bale line we're 45' from the BVW.

Mitigation proposing roof drains for the proposed garage structure and for the existing roof of house as well, which doesn't currently have any recharge. We're asking for an exemption for the setback.

Wetland series B is a certified vernal pool. 100' is the regulation, we're asking for 51.5' setback to the structure.

John: This is also National Heritage area, is it not?

Charlie: Yes, it is. So we've filed with National Heritage.

John L: What is the storm water calculations for the additional structure?

Charlie: The values of the storm water, there's a negative impact for runoff, because we're infiltrating water for both the proposed roof and the existing roof. All the impervious roof area is going to be recharge. Captured runoff in roof drains and moved to subsurface chambers, with 6" of stone under and over them and surrounding, the water will then infiltrate into the ground.

Steve: Right now, there's sheet water flowing off the roof two stories and down a sizable grade into the wetland. Infiltrating is some improvement. The proposed system will capture every drop of water that hits impervious surface and recharge the ground water, as opposed to now where there's splash and runoff. This will work in all but really heavy downpour situations when it will overflow.

There is an old enforcement order from about 2-5 years ago where they went way beyond the "no cut" bounds. No cut stone bounds put into place to prevent encroachment.

John L: You're asking for a waiver for our regulations, plus this is a National Heritage Area, in my opinion, I don't think there is sufficient mitigation proposed.

Charlie: Do you have any suggestions on what we're missing? We're proposing impervious area, so to mitigate that we're proposing recharge into the system, that's the common mitigation.

John L: What about wetland plants?

Charlie: Okay, where are you thinking, near the house?

Carl: My concern is the proximity to the vernal pool, these are some of the resources we are trying to protect. You are proposing to cut the distance by half.

Laura: Isn't it an even trade? With the cars inside the garage you're capturing any oil that would seep into the soil and flow into the wetlands by getting the cars into the garage and off the driveway. I actually think this is quite an improvement for this reason.

Carl: That's assuming you have a clunker car that leaks a lot of oil.

Laura: True. What I'm looking for is that we don't increase the runoff, which would normally happen if we increased the impervious area, but they are capturing it, so it really has the same net effect.

Carl: This whole site was a series of waivers to get approval. It has waiver on top of waiver on top of waiver.

John L: I'm concerned about the endangered species in the area, the blue-spotted salamanders, nesting area for herons, mallards and Canadian geese.

Charlie: I don't think where we're proposing work in a suitable nesting area, it's already a gravel driveway. The property gently slopes towards the wetlands from the property line. There's a large stone wall that is a drainage divide, with **each side sloping away from the wall?** On the side that is

heading towards the vernal pool is tall grass and trees, the perimeter where the line is, is tall, native and wetland grasses and sweet pepper bush.

Carl: Is there any room in the plan to move the garage further away from the vernal pool?

Charlie: There isn't really. There's a septic system that just clips the 100' buffer and a reserve area.

Steve: Zoning won't allow them to get closer than 20' from the stone wall.

Charlie: It would be problematic to put the garage on the other side. Placing it closer would make it difficult to turn out, unless we turned out towards the wetland. We would also lose the area for the recharge, unless that goes on the wetland side.

Laura: John, would you be happier if we restored the understory.

John: I think if they are asking for a waiver and this is a National Heritage area. I think there's plenty of room for a robust mitigation plan.

Charlie: If we move it back 10' we would have a problem with the turning out of the garage and we would have to put the catch basin somewhere else.

Steve: Have we heard from National Heritage?

Charlie: No.

Carl: I would suggest you explore some additional mitigation. This site is 75% wetland, I can't change that, that's the way it is.

Steve: I think the naturalization is well underway, but it's coming in slow do to the dense canopy of pine trees. The sedges and grasses and sweet pepper bushes are already there. What are you enhancing?

Laura: We will have to wait for National Heritage anyway. Low grasses would capture more silty runoff from the driveway than more woody shrubs would.

John L: It would go through succession, so you're talking about early succession, and I'm proposing a mix of early and secondary succession.

John B: It's a 50' no disturb area, so we shouldn't be disturbing anything.

Steve: You can enhance it, but it is already naturalized. What are you really enhancing? Adding a little bit more variety and diversity?

John L: Since this is such a rich foraging habitat for birds, increase the foraging habitat. Give us something.

Steve: This has been growing in for quite a while.

John L: What's the fertilizer restriction on the site?

Steve: We can go back and look at the Order of Conditions, but the boiler plate is no, chemical fertilizers.

John L: The bar has to be very, very, very high, in my opinion, before we grant a waiver in a National Heritage area. Mitigation in the form of native plantings, is a suggestion nothing more, nothing less.

Carl: I would suggest that the applicant contact Steve and see if there were some improvements that we could make.

Laura: I would rather there is no lawn on the other side of the Do Not Disturb boundary. We could ask them to restore the wetlands.

Katy and Mark: Yes would be happy to learn about wetland plantings.

John L: This is just a thought, I like to see some habitat restoration. I always like to see a planting plan with a 3 year monitoring plan area with an 80% survival rate.

Carl: The entire house is in the buffer zone except for the corner of the septic.

John L: For the record I need to disclose that I am an abutter to 61 Warren St and a skater on this pond, with no financial interests.

Carl: Any abutters to comment?

No abutters.

Laura: Could we work out how much area we are balancing how much area we are converting from the driveway to the structure and how much area you are mitigating by taking it back to the natural habitat?

Carl: I would ask that we convert anything that is long grass to appropriate habitat.

Laura: I would also ask for "no mowing" during certain times of the year, when the critters in the vernal pools, leave as they are drying up.

John L: We have to consolidate all our recommendations in a motion. We're asking for a draft mitigation plan, convert previous mowed "no cut" area back to wetlands habitat, request native non-hybridized species, woody and grassy, take a look at the sq. footage of mitigated area compared to the sq. footage of the new impervious areas. We need to hear from National Heritage.

Charlie: Runoff calculations: straight, typical SES calculations (volume/sq. ft.). Do you want me to use Cornell?

Steve: That's the direction we are moving in, it's not in our regulations yet.

Carl: If you have the data that would be helpful.

Charlie: Yep, I can show that.

John B: I'd like to make a motion to continue to Dec 17, 2013 @ 7:25pm.

John L: Seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

7: 45pm off Long Hill Road (GCC 2013-21) RDA NEW

Harvest Forest Products on land classified under MGL Chapter 61 Productive Woodlands.

Gary Goldrup New England Forestry Consultants, MA licensed since 1992, working for Mr. Tompkins since 1996.

Property under Chap 61. By law, Mr. Tompkins has to have an approved forest management plan. We harvested the subject area in 1997-98. Any forest cutting must have a Chapter 132 cutting plan which is submitted to the state forester for approval.

We are proposing to harvest the area we harvested 15 years ago following the approved Chapter 61 management plan, to improve the health and productivity of Mr. Tompkins timber resources and extracting forest products.

We are harvesting to the edge of the wetlands. We are proposing one wetland crossing with poles and mulch leading up to it. All the timber will be skidded to a wood landing in Rowley. Rowley will also be harvested as part of this project. The cutting plan has been approved the State Forester and all the land has been walked by Brent Basiler of the Rowley Conservation Commission.

Selective cutting 1/3 of the overstory volume. It's an improvement to the understory. Timber harvesting is to diversify age classes, species types on private land owners and through selection harvesting we're trying to create a matrix of different age classes so that you have perpetual growth and can harvest over a sustained amount of time. The harvest we did 15 years ago has generated a sufficient amount of regeneration which we are trying to now release from the overstory that is covering it. So we're just trying to promote the continued growth of the regeneration that we have established. A sustained yield.

Laura: What is the impact on a wetland? I'm quite surprised actually that you're going right up to the edge of the wetland.

Gary: In Forestry we're allowed to cut in a wetland. Under Chapter #132 cutting practices, (not talking about towns with bylaws), under normal situations if we chose to harvest in a wetland we could take up to 50% of that basal area.

Laura: But you're not proposing cutting in the wetland in this instance, you're cutting up to the edge of the wetland.

John L: Steve can you confirm with the DEP on that regarding Chapter# 132? There's increased runoff when the trees are cut down.

Gary: We put in water bars (soil berm), on the approaches to crossings, we'll put down natural wood fibers, mulch and tops (of trees) to slow down the flow of water.

John L: There IS increased run-off when you remove the trees.

Laura: Are you proposing to do this in the winter, when the ground is frozen?

Gary: Dry or frozen.

Laura: I think there would be a lot less damage to the environment if the ground was frozen.

Gary: Loggers have to work all year round. Harvesting in the summer there's more transpiration, harvesting in the winter there's more run-off, because there's less transpiration, so there is some debate on how much overland flow of water you're going to have in either situation.

Carl: Is this National heritage area?

Steve: No.

Laura: What is the impact on the wetland?

Gary: As a Forester, I will say it's a good impact, even if you're cutting in a wetland. You're diversifying age classes, trying to remove low quality trees that maybe preventing regeneration. A lot of time you'll get windfall from stands that have been over mature and a lot of blow down, so that's a preventative measure by harvesting trying to create age classes within a the buffer or the wetland itself.

Laura: When do you plan on harvesting?

Gary: When it's dry or frozen.

Laura: That's There's more transpiration in the summer.

Gary: The state forester has to come out and approve the plan and does a site walk and closes out the harvest when it's complete, including the ...

Gary: 10 years ago there was an article in the paper that talked about how well managed Mr. Thompson's property was being managed.

Most towns with bylaws defer to the agricultural practices, to reduce the tax burden on farmers to act as an incentive. It adds time and money, the cost keeps going up and up. 100 cords of firewood, \$1000. I would hope you would consider on an agricultural restrictions.

10 years ago, Mr. Tompkins was willing to do an educational workshop on good forestry practices.

The trees that pine, oak, maple, birch, are all properly marked. As a licensed forester I delineated the wetland myself. You filed under the local, and the abutter notification went out.

John L: My concern is the legal issues surrounding it. Let's contact DEP and ask them if they needed a NOI.

Steve: I think it's discretionary, it's a buffer encroachment, not a DEP issue. I think we should focus on the local bylaws, not the state regulations.

John: I want to make sure we uphold the act and the bylaw.

Gary: Timing is very important. My suggestion is if you could work closely with Laura Dooley. She could educate you.

I would rather you be completely happy with the project. I would be more comfortable walking the area with you. I would like you to give the project over to the State Forester to oversee it.

Site walk 11/23/13 @ 9:00pm. Meeting at Bruce's house in Rowley. 74 Long Hill Road in Rowley.

No abutter comments.

John B: I'd like to make a motion to continue RDA to 12/19 @ 7:35pm.

8:21 274 East Main Street (GCC 2013-20; DEP#161-0770) ANRAD

Mike Ciulla, applicant

Steve: Had our 3rd party go out w/ Mr. Seekamp and make some minor modifications. 7/15/13 original plan, 10/12/13 revised plan, 2 sheets

John L: Has our agent confirmed that all the changes have been made subjected to the peer review?

Steve: Yes.

Carl: Have you done any work out there now?

Mike: We've done a lot of clean up. We demoed an old house, up on the hill.

Steve: I'd like to set a limit of work.

Carl: Are any of those areas in the wetlands? What kinds of debris?

Mike: No. Must have been 30 trailers with trash just left everywhere in the woods.

John L: I'd like to make a motion to approve an order of resource delineation pursuant to the ANRAD plan dated 7/15/13 revised 10/12/13, sheet 2 of 2.

David Knorr: I was just concerned about the area where it flooded.

Steve: It's not a wetlands, there are no other wetland plants.

John B: Makes a motion to close **274 East Main Street (GCC 2013-20; DEP#161-0770) ANRAD.**

John L: Seconds the motion to close.

Motion closes.

Rail Trail (GCC 2013-16) RDA cont.

Jeff Wade: Chairman of Recreation Path Committee.

I'd like to thank the board and especially Laura who helped us out walking the trail and getting you the information that you requested.

Gave out the agreement with Nat'l Grid allowing the Recreation Path Committee to cut vegetation and to use the trail, and at some later date if we want to regrade, put in bridges, or put another type of surface down, we need to come back for approval with both you and them.

There's an agreement that says that we have come before you.

The trail is 4.2 miles overall. The trail goes from the border of Boxford through Georgetown. Camp Den. is right at the border, there's a pH zone. On sheet 8 of 29 NHESP area, we are planning on stopping the trail before that area. Camp Den, across Nelson St, behind Nunan's and CVS, through center, past Bob's Auto, up to Mill St. North of Mill St, there are NHESP sites (Section 14 sheet 19), the plan stays away from NHESP sites.

Steve will go out with us. We want to go out with a string mower and small mower and hand pruners. We would get volunteers from the community and ourselves. We would flag 10 zone (s).

Jeff: We have insurance as the town for the trail. Required for Nat'l Grid, and statues for the state.

The maintenance program is a little bit less. 6' mowed, path. The time of zone mowing would be dependent upon the time of year and growing season. State requires a 10' path and a 3' buffer zone on either zone. National Grid wants that as well. We want to keep the 6' zone for safety so no one will run into a tree, and it will keep the ticks at bay.

2' zone. The BVW is a blue line.

Off of Nelson St. the trail is all grasses, pretty clear all the way out. Grasses cut to 6" or to 1'. As far as invasive species, we plan on cutting invasives, and leaving them by the side of the trail for the small animal habitat.

Steve: As we walk the line we can talk about what we are going to do with what species when.

John B: You'll do the main clearing and then figure out when to do the maintenance.

Jeff: We still need to understand when we need to be careful of the turtles. We're close to the ground and hands on, so this shouldn't be a problem.

Steve: There's no soil disturbance.

Jeff: There's no work in the Nat'l Heritage sites. We're hoping we can link this project to the new school project, so there will be a crossing onto Elm and the back road into Penn Brook. We procured 3.5 million dollars to build the trail from Andover Street up through Byfield Center to do a full project.

Laura: There's so many public benefits from this. It abuts up to the Little's Hill Conservation Area and Camp Denison situation. We may get many more people out to enjoy our conservation areas and keep them safe from ticks and cars.

Jeff: You have my word, "We aren't going to go out and pave a highway to somewhere."

Nicole Carlisle: 14 Pond Street Mill St to Thurlow, will that not be cleared. I think everything you have, I came here to bring awareness, to protect the 100s of species that hatch out of that specific site. I know species of turtles and milkweeds, etc.

Laura: I'd like to make a motion to give a negative determination for the RDA with the following conditions: The Recreational Path Committee will work with the Agent to develop an operations and maintenance plan, cutting area not to exceed the specifications on plan, work with agent invasive species plan to be developed with the agent, including cutting times and no work in NHESP areas times and before starting cutting a walk thru with the agent and draft to be submitted to Steve.

Jeff: What we've found in other towns that the more people who use the trail, the less ATVs are there.

John B: Seconds the motion to give a negative determination to: **Rail Trail (GCC 2013-16) RDA.**

John L: Abstains.

Motion carries.

John B: Makes a motion to close **Rail Trail (GCC 2013-16) RDA.**

John L: seconds.

Unanimously carries.

Short break 9:08pm

9:12pm 118 Jewett St. (GCC 2013-18; DEP#161-0768) ANRAD
Wetland delineation

Patrick Seekamp, Seekamp engineering
Jim Tolman, property owner

Met with Gillian Davies (our 3rd party review) in her letter dated 10/23/13 she substantially agreed with changes made in the field and shown on the revised plan we submitted to them. We've made those changes and revised the vernal pool 100' buffer zone, changes to the A series of flags: RA11 and RA12 have been relocated. All of these changes have been thoroughly reviewed in the field with Gillian.

Mr. Tolman: the intent is that it is a commercial zone

Carl: Are there any abutters' comments?

James Rogers: 117 Jewett St: Did the line become bigger or smaller?

Patrick: That flag moved up slope 11', expanding the wetland. The vernal pool arc was made larger slightly as did the buffer zone for the wetlands.

James: Thank you for your explanation.

Patrick: You are welcome.

John L: I'd like to make a motion that an ORAD be issued for DEP# 161-0768 pursuant to the BSC 3rd party peer review by Gillian Davies dated 10/23/13, and a plan titled "Topographic Plan in Georgetown, MA" showing vernal pool and wetland flags dated 7/23/13, rev. 10/16/13

John B: seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

John B: Motion to close **118 Jewett St. (GCC 2013-18; DEP#161-0768) ANRAD**

Lillabeth seconds.

Motion passes unanimously.

9:19pm 212 West Main Street (GCC 2013-22; DEP#161-0773) NOI - NEW
Tree Removal.

David Andrews and Deborah, homeowners.

DEP has not issued a number yet, MESP but sent me a letter and cc'd you on it saying....

Steve: National heritage has some comments.

David: They requested photos of 3 of the trees, but they are outside of the 100' buffer to the water. They wanted to know if they were in the woods or on the lawn. Property near the channel that connects Rock Pond, to the Parker River, before the culvert on West Main Street the left after Giordano's Restaurant.

Lillabeth: How many trees are you proposing to remove?

David: It's 16 trees.

All the trees that we're interested in taking down surround the house, while we're on the water, it's not to open up views to the water. We've had a lot of damage to the house. All the large pines.

Carl: We have to make a determination, our town by-law says that we have to notify all the abutters around the pond on a project on a pond, because it could potentially affect view, etc. So we would have to give this gentleman a waiver that allows him to not have to do that, just allow a conventional notification of abutters.

Steve: In this case, none of the work being done would be visible from the pond.

John B: I'd like to make a motion to waive the 300' notice instead of all the abutters around the pond due to the size and scope of the project.

Laura: seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

I've put photos of each tree and why each one we would request the tree to be taken down.

John L: Could this be alleviated by some pruning?

David: Yes, we had \$2500 pruning done a couple of years ago, but we've still had a lot of damage done to our roof.

John L: Do you understand the impact of taking out the trees? Aside from the habitat and all that stuff, these trees hold soil in place, so potentially removing these trees could increase erosion. Also these trees are a form of storm water management. In heavy rain events, each tree can take up 1000 gallons up each.

David: I understand. Steve Nunan helped me develop a landscape design to mitigate the removal of trees. It includes putting in 30 native trees and shrubs, within the 50' buffer to give back all that land that's along the water. I'm hoping that will eliminate that issue of water runoff.

Steve: One of my concerns is that if you put those trees that close to the resource is that they may become a problem later when they are larger. What I would suggest is putting some larger trees towards Rock Pond.

David: I would be willing to put some larger trees, we're just concerned about them near the house. The property has been in our family for 4 generations. The house was built by my grandfather in 1963, owned by my Dad and my wife and I bought it 16 years ago.

Deborah: Some of the larger trees have nothing to brace them, in the event that they do fall, and we're worried about them coming down.

David: #7 is about a foot from the house.

David: We'd like to stump grind some of them below grade.

Steve: I've been out to the property. Most of the trees make sense to me to cut down. Some of them are unhealthy, and some are leaning over the house. The only ones I'm not fully on board with are the cluster of three trees. They are 200' away from the house, not a safety issue to the house.

Laura: Why did you want to take them down?

David: They are just extremely, extremely tall. I have a photo of them.

David: They are 3 pine trees that are really huge.

Steve: They aren't a danger to the house, so if you agree they need to come down, they need a better reason. They are all alone in the lawn, about 30' from the tree line.

Laura: I would say for a bunch of reason, including flooding mitigation, I would say to leave the 3 pine trees. (#1, 2 &3)

Steve: #12 and #13, saplings now, not a danger to the house right now, but they will be.

14, 15 and 16 outside of the 100' buffer zone. #15 is right over the garage. National Heritage asked for more information. The majority of the project appears exempt from the MESA review, however it is unclear if the removal of trees #14, 15 & 16 will be exempt. Could you please provide site photos of these trees? We're mostly interested in the condition of the area where the trees are growing, the lawn, brush, wood chips, etc. They are out of the 100' buffer zone, but they are extremely large and this one, #15, is right over the top of the garage and is of great concern to us.

Lillabeth: What about #16?

David: It is a concern to us, just because it's an extremely large tree.

Carl: It's outside the 100' buffer zone.

Laura: It's not in our jurisdiction.

Steve: I asked him to put those on just to get a feel for the property.

Carl: We've had troubles with tree companies before, cutting more trees, so they need to be clearly marked.

David: I've marked all the trees with an orange marker.

John L: Looking at the property, I see a brook, labelled to the north of the property. Is this perennial?

Steve: Yes.

John L: So why isn't this not a riverfront, and show a 200' buffer.

Carl: You can't look at this as an aesthetics issue, only a safety issue.

John L: Is this a flood zone?

Deborah: No, this is not a flood zone.

Steve: The bank is pretty steep up to their house. The applicant can modify the plan to show the river and show the 200' buffer. In my mind it doesn't change the discussion and the facts of the case. It's not accurately depicted on the plan, I didn't pick up on that either. Maybe you could add more taller trees to the back, behind or in-line with the pine trees, so you don't reduce the lawn area any further. I agree that the shrubs you have proposed don't make up for the number and size of the trees you are taking down.

Abutters? No

Laura: I'd like to make a motion to continue **212 West Main Street (GCC 2013-22) NOI** to 12/19/13 @ 7:45pm.

John B: Seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

9:47pm Rear Lisa Lane, 18 Lisa Lane, 44 Searle Street, aka Turning Leaf (GCC 2013-23; DEP#161-0771) NOI - NEW

Roadway construction, associated grading and storm water management construction for a 24 lot residential subdivision.

Jill Mann, representative of Artisan Developments, LLC

Rich Williams, Williams and Spragues, site design engineer

Miriam and Brimmer? Associates, wetland scientists, who delineated wetland line.

Steve: Someone approached me before the meeting, and pointed out that the abutter notification was only 100', our regulations require 300'. The proper number of people have not been notified. I would recommend opening and continuing the hearing after proper notification. I wouldn't recommend you discuss anything, because then you may run into a quorum issue later.

John L: I make a motion the NOI hearing **Rear Lisa Lane, 18 Lisa Lane, 44 Searle Street, aka Turning Leaf (GCC 2013-23; DEP#161-0771) NOI** be continued to 12/19 @ 8 pm pending proper abutter notification.

Laura: seconded the motion

Motion passes unanimously.

9:54pm Tidd's Junkyards (GCC 2007-11; DEP#161-0666) NOI (cont.)

Complete site remediation under Chapter 21E followed by construction of a 16-unit senior housing development with associated grading, roadway, septic system, utilities and storm water management structures with portions of the project being within 100' of Bordering Vegetated Wetlands.

9:46pm Tidd's Junkyard (GCC 2007-12; DEP#161-0661) NOI (cont.)

Revision on plan to construct a 16-unit senior housing development, with associated grading, roadway, septic system, utilities and storm water management structures, portions of which are proposed within the Buffer Zone to BVW.

Carl: I would like a punch list of what still needs to be done.

Steve: They say it's clean. Jim is going to do a list of all that needs to get done, do a site inspection and will sign off.

Steve: Their LSP, seems to be able to get this moving. I will encourage them to withdraw without prejudice. And they can reapply

Laura: I'd like to make a motion to continue Tidd's **Junkyards (GCC 2007-11; DEP#161-0666) NOI and Tidd's Junkyard (GCC 2007-12; DEP#161-0661) NOI** to 1/17/13 7:20pm & 7:25pm respectively.

John B: seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

10:11pm 64-74 East Main Street (GCC 2013-15; DEP# 161-0766) NOI (cont.)

Parking lot improvements, storm water management improvements, septic system improvements and River front area restoration activities.

3rd party review

Laura: Has that gone in front of the planning board?

Steve: It's in front of the zoning board. I don't think it's been in front of the planning board.

John B: makes motion to continue **64-74 East Main Street (GCC 2013-15; DEP# 161-0766) NOI** to 1/16 @ 7:30pm.

John B motion to accept the bills as read

Laura seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

John B motion to close the meeting.

Laura seconds the motion.

Motion unanimously carries.

Meeting closed at 10:28pm.