

Conservation Commission Minutes

3/6/14

Conservation Commission Minutes
3/6/14

In Attendance: Laura Repplier, John Bell, John Lopez, Tom, Nick, Carl Shreder,

Meeting opened at 7:08pm

Discussion:

Turtle Project: George Comisky

501non C project Parker River Water Shed Association

Concerned about the low flow issues with the Parker River. Blanding turtles study. The Blanding Turtle project received 2 grants:

1 grant for 2 nesting areas are protected, near the industrial buildings and Byfield line

1 grant for nest protection and one for head start

Hatchlings into classrooms, grow to juvenile size (size of hand) and then released.

Laura: They've had a lot of success in the south with the Red-bellied scouter.

New change of dept. head at the state. Asked about why we aren't doing this kind of head-starting.

Clearing an area between 10-20K sq. ft. protected areas, some work done within a resource area, may need some guidance with the permitting process.

I'm thinking it may be a fall timeline because of the hoops I need to jump through. The commission holds jurisdiction over that area and we would have to follow your guidelines, we can use the funds through you for matching funds.

John B: 8 months 8gms to 150gms.

John L: What are you asking for?

George: Some support letters.

Some of the money is from you, some from the state and 10K from the Parker River.

1/4-1/2 acre, in Hampshire Woods, there's 120acres out there.

The turtles can travel up to 4 miles. Start in Groveland, and go under power lines, towards Boxford and towards Byfield.

Carl: They need enough sunshine so the eggs can hatch.

Nick: How many turtles are expected to nest out there?

George:

Tom: How do you track them?

George: We tie a bobbin to them and notch the shells to track their nesting habits.

Sometimes we use GPS tracking.

They protect them at West St with a fine mesh screen, and hatch.

John B: Like to make a motion to give the approval of the board to support the grant that George is applying for.

Laura: Seconds.

Motion passes unanimously.

7:23pm **New School:** Minor modification request.

Steve: We issued an Order of Conditions on this site a couple of months back before we discovered the soil was contaminated. Part of the change that is encroaching on the ConCom jurisdiction. We need to determine if it's a minor change that is no big deal and we can vote on here, or if it is a significant change that needs to be filed with the Commission, revision of plans, notify the abutters, advertise in the paper.

Carl Francesca, DRA Architects

Doug Morris, Architect

Dave Conway, Nitsch Engineering

Carl F: As part of the original conditions, the only new work is on the new leaching fields, north of the school. The change is brought about because of the amount of the earth that needs to be moved from the construction site. It is contaminated by arsenic. It is a cost saving measure to keep it on site, rather than to move it off site. It's been ruled by the DEP that it's naturally occurring.

Doug: the stock pile is outside the buffer zone. All the soil gets capped with 18" of clean fill, there's a barrier put everywhere (geotextile fabric) before the clean fill is placed on top of it. Low spot on the site, brought up to be level with the existing fields.

Laura: How much fill? How deep of a pile is going to be there?

Carl: Are you going to be concentrating the arsenic?

Carl F: It's naturally occurring, it's pretty consistent throughout the site.

Lillabeth: A lot of contaminates can be mitigated Mycelium. Let's look into that before we spend millions of dollars...

Carl F: There's two LSPs on the project one of whom is dealing with a very similar situation at another site. He has proposed the same solution and it has been reviewed by DEP.

Legally if they find manmade contaminates, they have to be taken off site, naturally occurring contaminants can be capped on site.

Tom: Have they mapped the whole area?

Carl F: They have found a whole strata from Worcester to Newburyport.

Laura: Will all the playing fields be capped?

Carl F: yes, the whole site will be covered with capped soil, the buildings and the parking lot act as a cap.

Laura: What resource are we looking at? Is it a wetland?

Carl F: It's Penn Brook.

Laura: What's the grade? Is this one of the ones that runs down to the shellfish beds in Ipswich?

Doug: The proposed slope is 2:1, the current is 3:1. Everything gets capped in the end by 18" of clean fill. They have put some mulch up there to cover it temporarily.

Laura: How about some kind of swale before it enters the brook?

Doug: Yes, we're proposing that. I apologize for the lateness of the plan being sent to you, but it was a struggle for us to get the info to you. Regardless of that, the approach right now is simply to maximize the area that we can store this material on site. Before we were outside the buffer zone, we would like to ask the commission if we can move the material inside the buffer zone.

Carl: How many cubic yards would you be pushing into the buffer zone?

Steve: It's a wedge, 100' long and 15' wide just inside the buffer.

Carl: Why can't you pile the soil higher so you don't have to go into the buffer zone?

Carl F: We could do that. We've met with both the building committee and the GAA and other members of the community. We're trying to retain as much usefulness of the playing fields as we can and to get a dimension on here that works as a field, that's why the dimension is there.

Carl: This is not a temporary change, this is a permanent incursion in the buffer. I was not clear on that. I initially thought it was just a temporary moving of soil around the site, but it's permanent.

Carl F: Oh sure, the idea is that all the fields that get capped, all become useful playing fields in the end.

Steve: They haven't finished the grading. Right now they are filling the area until they know exactly how much soil they have.

Carl F: Then they will finally grade the mound. The contractor has given us a survey plan of what is currently out there now. Right now the pile is outside of the 100' buffer. One of the struggles is trying to calculate the ultimate quantities that will be here. We can certainly deal with what's here, but there will be certainly more coming during construction.

Carl: Since we're dealing with a contaminant, a known carcinogen, from my perspective, it certainly behooves the commission to take a little closer look at this.

John L: If we agree that this is a significant change to the order and we elected to have an amended order, could we retain our own LSP?

Steve: Of course. You can always hire a representative. I believe in protecting the wetlands and the kids.

Carl F: Jim Luger is an independent LSP.

John L: My take is that this may or may not be an appropriate solution to the problem. It seems reasonable to me. I remind the Commission that the DEP does not legally recognize a modified order, they recognize an amended order. They do give the commission discretion as far as what defines minor. From what I'm hearing tonight, this isn't minor. I'm not saying this isn't a viable solution, but there's a public process, and I think there should be public input for this as well. So I'm tending towards an amended Order of Conditions, which is the legal way to do it.

If you could find a solution then you wouldn't need to go before us.

Steve: a retention wall might be considered.

Laura: Where there any other options considered?

Carl: Taking off site.

Laura: How much would it cost?

Carl F: \$1 million - for stripping and capping it.

Laura: Did stripping it actually remove the contaminant? Or was it still going to be arsenic bedrock? So stripping it would have no affect anyway, so we're just looking at a contaminated site.

Tom: What if you remove the incursion amount so as not to impact the buffer zone?

Doug: We've looked at a wooded area behind the school to building up the area to put the fill, but we would have to take down all the trees.

Laura: I understand that a lot of this is being driven not by the practicality, nor by the contaminant, but by the playing fields thing and that's not our concern.

Doug: We're trying to give the town the as large an area as we possibly can for playing.

John B: I'd like to make a motion that it is a "Major" change to the Order of Conditions, we would like to see an amended order submitted.

John L: seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

Carl: Let them explain what they are proposing, I haven't had time to digest the info.

Hunting: Discussion regarding hunting on Open Space

Approval of Minutes from 11/14/13, 12/19/13

Hearings:

7:15pm 11 Winter Street (GCC 2014-01) NOI - NEW

Renovation of a natural grass athletic field to include related stone base earthwork, grading, drainage improvements, parking renovations and installation of athletic lighting and an in filled synthetic turf field. Improvements also include fencing, walkways, retaining walls, a bio-retention area, renovated Stormwater outfalls, landscaping, and related amenities.

John Pingree, synthetic turf advisory committee

Synthetic turf Advisory Committee was created by the Board of Selectmen and reappointed by the School Committee to represent them on this project.

John Perry, Gale Associates, Lead Civil Engineer and Project Manager

Bill Seymore, Gale Associates, Director of Civil Engineering

John Pin: We're losing a lot of fields because of the Penn Brook Project. Originally we were looking at the High School field. It's a difficult field, because we don't get to use it very often. There's a drainage issue there. They try to save it, so basically you can only play football on it, so it's only used one time/week. They try to keep all the traffic off of it. Since we have such a shortage of the fields in the town, we really can't afford to keep any traffic off of any field. We already run the grass off of every field in this town. Project conceived in 2006 or 2007, I've been involved since 2009.

We've gone through the whole process, got the funding approved from the town through CPC to the tune of 1.25K, and we've gotten a 500K private donation from the Georgetown Athletic Association to purchase. We have a total of 1.75 thousand dollars to do this project.

Jim Demento, from the CPC, Parks and Rec, 200K will go into the general fund, there is a reduction, but it isn't completely,

John Perry: GMHS currently a natural grass field, most times of the year there's no grass at all. That's the reason for this project. The topsoil gets over compacted and there's sedimentation running off into Penn Brook.

Existing tree line is right at the BVW, plan shows the 50' no disturb, the 100' BVW, the 150' river set back and the 200' riparian buffer zone.

The topography of site sheet flows from east to west orientation. There's really no drainage on site, everything sheet flows into Penn Brook.

Laura: Are you fertilizing the current grass field?

The school is fertilizing, top-dressing, pH adjustments, aeration, over-seeding.

John: You get a lot of phosphorus, from the fertilizers, the grass clippings release phosphorus, as well. (They don't bag the grass clippings.) You also have emissions from the machinery. I think the main issue is the root zone breakdown. There's not a lot of

grass. There's not a lot of erosion control there, because the field a) gets very, very compact because it's overused; and b) because the root zone breaks down, most of that overland flow is very flashy and it does pick up a pretty good sediment burden.

Laura: As I recall, you also water it heavily, is that right?

Bill: It's all on the school. I'm not sure what their watering plan is. They do have an irrigation system there.

Laura: So there's sediment, phosphorus, nitrogen and also water from watering runoff.

Bill: The space is about 120,000 sq. ft. That's managed turf. If you apply 1/2" of water/ week for 16 weeks over that particular area it's about 600,000 gallons of water.

Carl: Technically the entire project is a waiver because it is within the 200' buffer zone.

Laura: My point is we are getting certain benefits back. We are protecting Penn Brook and everything downstream from Penn Brook, and potentially, if we ask for it, will help us with our West Street problems.

Carl: Maybe you could look at as mitigation, there's not much to mitigate on this site. This is already a disturbed site, that's the problem.

John Perry: If you rebuild this as a natural turf field, it can only sustain a total of 200-300 uses/ year, even with organic elements. We have at least double that that's being played on this field. If we rebuild the field even using different, more organic fertilizers or compost teas, in two years it will look like it does now.

John P: Proposed: We propose to reconstruct in place the baseball field and football, multi-purpose field with synthetic turf. We do not intend to encroach any farther into any previously or currently disturbed areas. We do intend to reconstruct vegetation and stabilize it. We do intend to provide some walkways and seating areas along the eastern portion of the site. There will be section athletic lighting 6 in total.

Bill: We're improving the baseball field, we're pulling home plate back so the foul pole distances are improved. The field will all be carpet, none of this is clay. The mound will be a portable mound, so you can have multi-use. The area of managed turf will be less. We will be pulling back from the top of bank area, arguably the most sensitive area. That will no longer be managed turf, and it won't need to be managed turf.

Lillabeth: You said there would be mitigated plants planted, what plants are you planting?

John P: We intend to do erosion control native seed mix, and if the commission would like to we can plant native shrubs as well. We haven't finalized our plan yet. We are renovating a portion of this parking area. I think there's 300sq. ft. of new pavement and the rest of it is being seal coated. The reason is to square up the parking area, currently it's at an angle and makes parking very tight.

Carl: I'm assuming you have a drainage system in it, can you explain it?

John P: This is a typical synthetic turf field: consists of natural grade below, 3/4" crushed stone, 1" finer material, more dense than pea stone, synthetic turf, 20' on center are flat-panel drains.

Tom: What's the expected life span of the turf?

Bill: the setting conditions of the project, it will be 12-14 years before it needs to be replaced.

Carl: What is the turf made of?

Bill: Polypropylene

Laura: Do you need to vacuum it?

Bill: You get a groomer for the field, 4x in the spring 4x in the fall, especially in front of the field.

Lillabeth: What happens to the athlete that skids across this stuff?

Bill: Astroturf was a knitted fibers.

Carl: Have you ever had someone had someone start a fire on this field?

Bill: It will burn with an accelerant, but it's self-limiting. I'm not aware of anything actually burning.

John Pingree: The replacement of the field will be paid for by the GAA.

John Lopez: Can you please explain to me how the drainage system can tie into the river.

Bill: In principal, there is 8-10" of stone under the fields. Given the compaction, most of the runoff is going into Penn Brook.

These field s drain 16" vertically. There's about a 30% drain co-efficient. Really a lot of recharge to the ground water.

Lillabeth: What about the PVC toxicity to humans and to the environment?

Bill: Many institutions have done a lot of research into turf fields.

Indoor fields, you need to sanitize the fields on a regular bases. Natural grass fields do harbor pathogens, more so than the synthetic outdoor fields.

They are less abrasive the natural fields.

Is there a filtration system to catch the breakdown of the fields on the way to Penn Brook?

Bill: Passes through filter fabric and then stone, none of the material moves off-site.

John Perry: It drains vertically.

Flat Panel drains are 20' on center run to a perforated pipe, which runs around the field. We have a weir just below the top of the stone base. It slowly dissipates.

Bill: If you can have a 3" rain event, you can get ?

Carl: If we get a 500 year storm event will this float away?

Bill: No, in a 100 year storm, you get equal flood storage capacity in the stone base in the 30% stone voids.

Lillabeth: What is the level of ground water in the spring?

John Pingree: The Penn Brook has never crested the field.

John Lopez: It's a FEMA designated flood plain.

John Perry: The FEMA flood plain is at the edge of the banking of Penn Brook.

We're proposing having a rain garden to catch the entire parking lot and offer some mitigation.

To catch sheet flow from the school and steep 3x3 perforated pipe to carry around to a closed drainage system that we can bring around to the far end of the field. Concrete head wall with a level flow.

Sedimentation and erosion control: Install silt-fence and composting silt socks before any earth moving takes place, stone construction entrance.

Contractor will stockpile outside 100' buffer and they are taking it off site.

Board of Selectmen are meeting on March 10th to decide whether they are going to test for arsenic.

Laura: We would need to know that prior to construction to prevent contamination of the Penn Brook.

Steve: It's really a worker safety issue if there's contaminated.

2 athletic lights would be in the ConCom buffer.

Laura: I am concerned about the lighting and the neighbors.

John L: Dark sky lighting

John Perry: We would need to run electrical

MUSCO light saver green - market lighting steel, 70' high, the higher they are, the better they can keep the light on the field. 50'-100' from the field the net effect of the light will be zero. We have hired a light meter guy, who will do a pre-lighting survey with ambient light, document pre and post lighting.

Laura: Are there any lights up there now?

Public: No. On the upper field there are, but they are temporary.

Lillabeth: Can you use the water you are storing and pump it up to the upper field?

Bill: There isn't much water stored.

Laura: I'd like to make a motion to engage a 3rd party reviewer as Gillian Davies to review this project.

John Bell: second.

John L: Review under state and local, a site visit, review, written report, subsequent review of material to review modified plan.

Laura: Re-motioned

John B: re-seconded.

Motion passes unanimously.

Dave Shay Live on High St: Maintenance manager for the MWRA, I know PVC and such, polyethylene, there's a reason for recycling plastic bottles, they are chemicals, not real grass. It looks like grass, but it could have Cd, PB and good ole Arsenic, the water will get into Penn Brook. It's being filtered out and then send it into Penn Brook. There are natural ways to fertilize and maintain it.

If you don't wash it on a regular basis, you will get staph infections. I'd like to see a well-maintained grass field, we don't maintain our fields well. There's a lot to be studied. I did not know that our town approved 1.2 million dollars for this project.

Jim Demento: CPC, Polyethylene is the second most non-toxic, its leachables are much lower, and it's one of the safest. Make sure whatever you're reading on the web is from 2009 on, to get good information on plastics.

Andrew Audulonni: High Street, I think it's a great plan, but I think it's despicable that you are going to tear up the grass that's there, and put down plastic. It shouldn't even be considered in this field. Somewhere else, possibly, but not there. The drainage from the upper fields is a lot.

David Shay: You're laying down this project, but if you tear up the natural soil, it will take a lot of work to rehabilitate the site.

Lisa Sanborne: We have kids that hang out there all the time now. The kids are going to destroy it. I deal with all the trash. We deal with all public parking on our street.

Dave Shay: Noise pollution, if you build the field they will come. I a lot more people will use the field, we have a loud speaker that we have to deal with all weekend long. I don't need the narration constantly all weekend.

Laura: What's the maintenance agreement?

Bill: Your existing grass field is cut at least once a week, the irrigation is a must.

With our turf a Groomer comes with it, training is done and a manual is left. A lot of high schools incorporating vacuuming

4x/spring, 4x/fall to fluff up the fibers and level the infield. All the pathogens don't like this media, the UV light will kill them, the polyethylene, has a surface area that won't allow pathogens to grab it. Look at Penn State study.

John L: Was there alternatives proposed?

Tom: I'd like one clarification: To what size do the particulates get broken down to?

Tested surface waters, runoff, RICRA8 testing (organics and in-organics metals), testing quarterly - looked at drinking water standards. Metals met non-recordable standards

Carl: Does any commissioner have any questions for the applicants?

John L: I make a motion that this hearing be cont'd to April 17th @ 7:15pm.

Bill: I'll send you the photo-metrics and the lighting plans.

John B: seconded.

Passes unanimously.

5 min recess

9:13pm Rear Lisa Lane, 18 Lisa Lane & 44 Searle Street aka Turning Leaf ((GCC 2013-23; DEP#161-0771) - NOI (cont.)

Roadway construction associated grading and Stormwater management construction for a 24 lot residential subdivision.

Jill Mann, lawyer and representative for Artisan Development

Rich Williams, site design engineer

Jill: The changes to show the open space and the roadway.

Carl: I remember asking for documentation from the Planning Board as far as a single road going in there. I think somebody promised me that. I haven't seen anything.

Jill: Because we really haven't been before them.

Carl: Did you contact them?

Jill: Yes, we talked about it with them, but the last time we had a hearing it was cancelled, they asked us to come back to the next meeting so we can give you that, some evidence that they didn't want to allow an additional length of cul-de-sac extension when we come back before them. That will be coming.

John L: As a point of clarification, did you file this is pursuant to the BSC court date of February 26, 2014 a request section pursuant to section 60.2 for a variance according to our bylaw?

Jill: Yes, It repeats the request to allow for the waiver to allow activity within the 50' no cut as well as activity within the 75' setback. As well as provide an alternative analysis.

John L: So Mr. Chairman, I recommend to save time, you could have send this back to BSC group to verify to the changes per this report have been made, and then have it sent back to us.

Carl: Would you go over the changes?

Rich: Our initial application did not have an open space parcel on the plan. This is the result of the planning board meetings. We carved out a section of open space, showed an access to it with a right of way and parking.

There are 9.2 acres of upland out of 13.5 acres of open space. (5 acres of wetland)

Laura: Where's the access to the upland across the wetland?

Rich: This is just an intermittent stream. You can walk across it, there are paths across it now.

Steve P: How much of it is outside the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction?

Rich: Just a couple of acres outside the 100' buffer zone.

John L: Do you have any alternative analysis that shows the proposed project without any waiver requests?

Rich: We outlined it in our supplemental information package. There are alternatives, there's a no development alternative.

John L: So you submitted plans? I believe the BSC said there were no plans, no alternative analysis. That's a show stopper right there.

Rich: No, we did it, we submitted to BSC, we walked them through it. There was a cul-de sac option, not pursued because the planning board told us we could not extend the length of that end. The "No development option", meaning no further development is to be done on the property.

Carl: Why couldn't you do a loop?

Jill: We cannot have a dead-end that is longer than 800'

Steve: I checked to the Town Planner today and he said that's not the case. As of 2:00pm today the Town Planner said we could go another 600' off this road. I just don't want misinformation to circulate. We just need it in writing.

Jill: Since the request before the ConCom, we haven't been before the Planning Board. It was when we were before the OSRD meeting.

John L: I wonder if we should write a letter from the chair of the Concom to the chair of the Planning Board.

Steve: Courts and lanes are not an option off the end of Lisa Lane?

Rich: You can do a lane off the loop.

Carl: It's got to be in writing from the Planning Board.

Rich: You have to go through the 44 Searle Street piece of land to get back to Searle.

I want to take you through the steps we took. The original orientation the road was entirely on the 44 Searle property. The developer got a waiver from the planning board to move the road as far from the wetland as possible. (This was aided by purchasing an additional property.)

Steve: The closest point of disturbed activity to the wetlands is 43'. The closest point of pavement is 43' because of retaining wall at the back of the sidewalk.

Andy McLaughlin: Lisa Lane: We've been to the Planning Board meetings, there are waivers that have been presented but I don't think any of them have been voted on.

Rich: He's correct. We've asked for a waiver on road width, so the road to be shrunk down and the road be moved as far away from the wetland as possible. We're asking for a section of road way to be one way, so we can shrink the roadway down to get the roadway out of the 50' buffer.

Jill: We haven't been able to talk to the Planning board, but we are hopeful that they can grant that.

John L: I really think it's crucial that the Planning Board and the Concom coordinate their efforts to a much greater extent. So the selection of one consultant who reviews it for both the Planning and the Conservation Commissions perspective so it's comprehensive.

Donna Dunkin 46 Searle Street: What is your one way and where would it go?

Rich: There are two different options where it would be one-way, and the rest of the roadway would be two-way.

Carl: If the Planning Board did grant you a waiver for the length of road, what would I be looking at if I had a plan?

Rich: A two cul-de-sac plan, with other roads coming off there and there. And not for lack of trying on our part, we've had multiple meetings both private and public where we've had that discussion.

Carl: I'd like to see for our records a "no waiver" plan that includes something like that.

John: I'd like to see a plan that requires no waivers. There certainly is precedent here, going through the report, where the commission has denied similar projects for similar level of non-compliant impact.

Jill: The impacts are far different from this project. Martel way, the impacts are far greater than this project. The impact with the 0-50' buffer is 4000 sq. ft. on a lot that only had 66,000 sq. ft. of upland. Of that upland 120'x60' was the only one that was non-jurisdictional and that was for the septic, and that is what was denied. The entire road was in the wetland. It was proposed to have parking, outdoor storage, graveled areas within the 50' buffer, setbacks as close as 34' in the no-cut buffer, there's a lot of activity on this site that is just not present.

In addition to that the Parish Road was to have activity within the 100' riparian buffer. It was actually rejected to the Wetland Protection Act as well, because it didn't even qualify under the wetland protection act or the own individual bylaw. That project was again of tremendous impact on the surroundings, those that are not in our project and would not be comparable. That also included building up to 2' within the wetland. We are trying to push out beyond the no-cut, no-disturb. We are no closer than 43' from the BVW.

John L: I appreciate your efforts and look forward to seeing a plan that would not require any waivers.

Jill: We'll show it to you, but it has to be approvable.

Steve: How many houses can you get by right now?

Rich: Zero, there's not enough frontage on Lisa Lane.

Jill: There is no yield plan. A by right plan means No waivers from any board. It's zero, if you don't come through and make a connection, if you come through and make a connection, then you can put the road in. Let's talk just Planning, You come through and you make a connection, planning alone, we can do it. That's "by right" according to the Planning Board, but not by you. For Conservation purposes, you don't have any sort of regulation that would prohibit us from extending off a right of way, so by you we could come in and "by right" we could put in those little cul-de-sacs, but not by with them, so we need to balance those two regulations.

Steve: What would a reasonable plan look like? If it's reasonable to extend the road 400', what would that look like? We have examples in town, almost an identical situation, Stone Row is one of them, where there is 40 acres, and they came in with 40 houses and a wetland crossing. If you go and look right now, there's 3 house lots at the end of the street. When they started, their yield plan was zero. I don't believe that the answer is either zero or 20+ houses, I think there is someplace in between. We ask for alternative designs, reduction of scope of work, should have evidence that we can visibly look at like site plans that we can and understand what is going on.

Kevin Duncan 46 Searle Street: How many waivers have you asked the Planning Board?

Rich: 11

John Lopez: How many waivers are you asking us for?

Jill: 2, we aren't able to move the roadway.

Steve: We can also look at their responses to our 3rd party review. We can look at their response to the waivers.

Rich: I think we're looking for a little direction. If we get out of the 50', but still in the 75' are we getting close or wasting our time?

Jill: The only structure that are located within the 75' is that portion of roadway.

Steve: you're not looking for waivers for the houses, just the roadway. When I brought up how much non-jurisdictional space is being donated, they are using almost every square inch of land that they can use. It's really pushing the boundaries, to maximize as much as they

can, which is what you do for a new development. They are also pushing it down around the roadway also.

I would not recommend accepting the proposed land to be donated as open space, personally. Speaking from land I manage in town, its wetland, its buffer, they can't use it anyways. It doesn't have the value we look for, it has no value for public good. The whole point of this is, "Why are we granting public waivers?" This is just my opinion.

John L: It would be taken off the tax rolls.

Rich: I think there's some value, it's adjacent to other town land, and would provide a connection. Where the town is trying to acquire a greenway in this area, I think there is a benefit.

Carl: I'd like to see the results of narrowing the road down and making it one way.

John B: Because you're building the road, that gives you the frontage that you need to build off that cul-de-sac?

Jill and Rich: Yes.

Laura: I would like to see some sort of communication from the Planning Board, about a discussion about extending that roadway. What would the yield plan be? What would the Planning Board entertain as to the length of that road?

John L: And the Stormwater.

Lynn Grosslein 16 Lisa Lane: The environmental impact study, what was done?

Carl S: That's the 3rd party peer review, yes it was done.

Rich: I've worked on other projects in town that have done wetland filling, Caribou Court, Pillsbury Pond, Little's Hill (multiple wetland fillings), all were examples of wetland filling, that was all under the bylaw. What is the commissioners' opinion?

Carl: Some of those may have preceded the regulations too. We do grant waivers, but they need to be justified.

Jill: We're working within the confines of the regulations and we're seeking to minimize the impacts. We will ensure the protection of the wetlands.

Letter from Mrs. LaPlaca, please put in record.

Concerned about Turning Leaf water runoff impacting her property and other neighboring properties.

Laura: I think she's being completely reasonable to be worried about this, she's not an alarmist.

Carl: Any project cannot have any impact

Donna Duncan 46 Searle Street: The Numeroff property is uphill of ours and ours floods all the time.

Gary Stead 48 Searle: I'm downhill of Donna, and I am even worse off than she is.

Lynn Grosslein: I didn't know the easement of land going to the town. The developer proposed something to the planning board. I want to make sure that the proposal goes to Tolman and Olson properties.

Rich: We do show an easement access across the wetland.

Steve: The town would never accept an easement.

John L: We want to have the final plan decided upon by the planning board to be reviewed by BSC.

Steve: If we could get everything 2 weeks before the meeting that would be helpful for us to review properly.

John L: I make a motion to continue **Rear Lisa Lane 18 Lisa Lane & 44 Searle Street aka Turning Leaf (GCC 2013-23; DEP# 161-0771)** to 4/17/14 @ 7:45pm.

Lillabeth: seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

10:08pm 186 East Main Street (GCC 2012-01; DEP#161-0736)

New soccer field, Skate Board Park and dog park off East Main Street

The applicant has withdrawn without prejudice.
They hired a new engineer and will come back and resubmit.

John B: I make a motion to allow the withdrawal **186 East Main Street (GCC 2012-01; DEP#161-0736)**

Laura: seconds the motion.

Carl abstains.

Motion passes.

10:11pm Tidds Junkyard (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.

Tidds 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 structure, portions of which are proposed within the Buffer Zone to BVW.

Steve: I'm working with them to clean up the last few things, but they need to show up to the meetings.

John B: I would like to make a motion to continue **Tidd's Junkyards (GCC2007-11; DEP#161-0666) to 4/17/14 at 7:30 & Tidd's Junkyard (GCC 2007-12; DEP#161-0661) to 4/17/14 at 7:35pm**

John L: seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously

10:15pm 175 Central Street (GCC 2013-10; DEP#161-0763)

Replacement of an existing septic system, upgrade and renovation of existing building.

Steve: This project is still before the BOH

John B: Makes a motion to continue to May 15, 2014 @ 7:45pm

Laura: Seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

10:17 64-74 East Main Street (GCC 2013-15; DEP# 161-0766)

Parking lot improvements, storm water management improvements, septic system improvements and Riverfront Area restoration activities.

Developers have a P&S to the house next door to spread out a bit. They had to go to Historic commission. Looks like they are going to be denied from the Zoning Board.

John B: I'd like to make a motion to continue to 4/17/14 at 8pm.

John L: Seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

Discussion Items:

Partial Paving of road at Camp Denison: CPC said there was no money to pave Camp Denison, so the project has been scrapped.

Hunting: There's been a problem up at Little's Hill. Right now they cannot hunt on Town Owners land.

Population control for managing deer.

Tom: You would have to come up with a policy and manage it.

Carl: It would be hard to manage, chapter 131 chapter 5C, you cannot legally harass hunters.

Steve: We have had people blocking in hunters cars until the police got there.

Luftkin's Brook you cannot hunt on.

Carl: The problem that when you have a mixed-use site,

Laura: I think the best thing we can do is control the deer population.

John B: I think we need to talk about safety.

Workshop in the Woods:

John B: I would like to make a motion to authorize the contract for the chairman to sign. I appoint Carl to sign the Workshop in the Woods.

John L: seconds the motion.

Carl: I abstain.

Motion passes.

Lillabeth makes a motion to pay the bills.

Laura: seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

Laura: Makes a motion to close.

Lillabeth: seconds.

Meeting closes at 10:47pm