

Committee: _____ Conservation Commission _____

Date: _____ December 10, 2015 _____

Time: _____ 7:00pm _____

Location: _____ 3rd Floor Town Hall _____

Members & Staff present: __Nick Feitz, Rae Ann Baldwin, Laura Repplier, Carl Shreder, Susan Flint & Steve Przyjemski, Rachel Bancroft, Andrew Currie

Members not present: _____ Lillabeth Weis _____

The meeting was called to order at: _____ 7:05pm _____

Meeting Motions / Actions and Summary of Discussions:

Hearings:

Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes 12/10/15

Commissioners here: Laura Repplier, Nick Feitz, Andrew Currie, Carl Shreder, Rae Ann Baldwin, Rachel Bancroft, Steve Przyjemski, Susan Flint-Vincent

Meeting opens at 7:05pm

160 Jewett Street (GCC 2015-14; DEP #161-0812) NOI - cont. Subsurface Sewage Disposal System Upgrade within buffer zone of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland.

Jim Scanlan, engineer representing the applicant

Jim Scanlan: At the last hearing the hearing was closed, looking for the Order of Conditions to be voted on.

Carl Shreder: Everything was provided, all we have to do is vote. No Comment from the DEP, but a number was issued. Does anyone have any comments?

Nick Feitz: You've received the BOH certificate?

Jim Scanlan: It has been approved by the Board of Health, yes.

Nick Feitz: I make a motion to accept the NOI for 160 Jewett St (GCC 2015-14; DEP #161-0812).

Rae Ann Baldwin: Seconds the motion

Andrew Currie abstains and Carl abstains.

Motion carries with two abstentions.

Rae Ann Baldwin: Makes a motion to close the NOI for 160 Jewett St (GCC 2015-14; DEP #161-0812).

Rachel Bancroft: Seconds the motion to close.

Motion passes unanimously.

24 Summer Street (GCC 2015-15; DEP# 161- 0813) NOI - NEW

Repair filed septic system. Additions and repairs to an existing single family home including the addition of a driveway. Restoration and removal of fill in a resource area. The proposed work will be in the restored area, in the buffer zone and in the riverfront area.

Chris Conway, owner

John B. Paulson, Engineer, presents green cards.

Carl Shreder: Just to refresh the commission, this started out as an enforcement order.

Nick Feitz: As I recall at the last meeting we were going to do Phase I in the fall, and Phase II, which was the septic system in the springtime.

Chris Conway: I think the last we left it, was that we were ready to present the septic design, as part of that discussion, you wanted to capture the discussions we'd had to date on the area that had been infilled.

Carl Shreder: Correct me if I'm wrong, some other activity has occurred on site.

Chris Conway: No, we were supposed to meet a several months ago, but due to time constraints and availability of my engineer, we weren't able to present. We've been idle the past two months waiting to present this design, which has the septic design and the redelineation of the area as well as the presentation of the overall construction we are proposing. Nothing has occurred, it's still exactly the same as it was several months ago.

Steve Przyjemski: Nothing on the ground has happened because the commission has not approved anything.

Rachel Bancroft: In addition to the remediation there's now construction?

Chris Conway: The whole reason for the septic system was because we were planning on doing an addition. The first step was to get our septic system inspected and it failed, so we were presenting the new septic system for the new construction.

Rachel Bancroft: What would the timeframe be?

Chris Conway: The remediation would be done in the spring as soon as possible, then the septic system would be done in the springtime. The actual construction would begin in the summer of 2016.

Carl Shreder: So you're asking for quite a few waivers, so why don't you walk us through your plan here, what you're actually proposing.

John B. Paulson: Steve had asked me to break down the remediation with the existing conditions.

At Steve's request, we put a siltation barrier out there to hold that area until everything was approved.

Here's the flood plain with the 50', 75' 100' buffers. Show the 100' river front and the 200' river front buffers. The whole lot is within the 200' riverfront. (2nd sheet) The hatched area is the area that needs to be replicated back to what it was. I had taken elevations out there prior so I know exactly what had changed elevation-wise and so-forth.

Steve Przyjemski: To clarify, previously we were told no wetlands were impacted, it was just buffer encroachment. When I first saw this it looks like they are restoring wetlands that are perfectly fine, but the reality is the wetlands have already been filled in, so this plan is to bring them back to their original state.

The other part of the initial project that was approved by the Board of Health we would replace the existing septic tank with a new septic tank in a new location, and put a new septic system in where the driveway is now.

The leaching field is outside the 100' buffer and the tanks are within the 100' buffer.

Steve Przyjemski: Are they in failure now?

John B. Paulson: It is in failure. I dug them up and one tank is under 1' of water now. The other is not.

It's a 3 bedroom design and it's going to stay that way. Current footprint is 865 sq. ft. They want to go up one story. The house was built in a couple of separate phases.

Chris Conway: The front of the house was built in 1804, the second addition, that we want to remove, and go up to a second story, I believe was built in the 1920s. The foundation is failing on that portion of the house.

John B. Paulson: They want to take the footprint and go up to the second story and square off the box here. Because of their growing family they would like to put a family room in with a garage underneath. Proposed as part of that is the paved driveway. Much of this is going to require waivers so, instead of asking for specific waivers we would ask for waivers on whatever the approved plan is.

Carl Shreder: We expect the applicant to provide a list of waivers. We shouldn't have to be the ones to identify the waivers.

John B. Paulson: We are proposing a pervious back patio and walkway, but an impervious bituminous driveway.

Chris Conway: But it doesn't have to be.

John B. Paulson: We have a shed that's over the lot line, which we're proposing to move back up near the end of the driveway. We're putting infiltrators in the back of the house to handle the roof runoff. Stone trench along the driveway between the driveway and the wetlands to handle the runoff from the driveway, and infiltrate it.

Carl Shreder: How big is the shed? Is it on footings?

John: It's just an existing 10' x 12' shed on cinder blocks.

Andrew Currie: The original addition was a little different from this, it was smaller, 16 x 16' and the driveway was drawn in.

Chris Conway: Talking to John about a month ago, we've wanted to have some kind of structure off the side of the home, thinking it would be a family room, and taking

that into consideration we've always wanted to incorporate a garage into the building.

Carl Shreder: Why couldn't you orientate the garage doors perpendicular with the street and shorten the driveway?

John B. Paulson: There is a driveway there now, but the grading won't make it as a garage under if you're putting a family room in at the first floor level. If was simply a garage, you could put it here.

Chris Conway: It's at the start of the hill. You'd have to drop the street about 4'-4.5' down in about a 10' - 12' run. It would be a pretty steep decline into the garage itself.

John B. Paulson: We're changing almost none of the grade this way. I tried to make the driveway here, but there wasn't a good turn around area.

Carl Shreder: I'm trying to bring some of the impact out of the resource area, not put it in. It's not a great house lot for development. When it was built in the 1800s, they weren't worried about that.

Chris Conway: We're sort of locked as far as what we can do, by moving the septic to the driveway side, it doesn't leave a lot of options except for going to the other side of the home, which is the riverside. Unfortunately that's just the way the lot is.

It's a very small home, just over 1000'. We have three children, the family room would increase the size of the home to about 1500'. We would like to keep the kids in the school system, we like the town.

Rachel Bancroft: Is there a step into the home?

John B. Paulson: It's already a 3 step difference. The garage floor is at 94', so the family room is 102' at the floor level.

Chris Conway: It's probably about a 2' difference, if we would shift the driveway to the front it would be a 4' difference.

Carl Shreder: You could slide the entire garage back towards the patio, and change the grade towards the driveway in the front, correct? Change the slope.

Chris Conway: I don't know what the minimum set backs are off the lot line, 10' or 15'? It might be an option, but that's another discussion about setbacks. I don't know

how much difference it would make. There's a utility pole to the right of the proposed driveway, that cannot be relocated, that would fall into the center of the driveway.

I don't know if there's any height restrictions for the addition, if we have the garage at street grade and then put a second story on top of that, we're now getting really tall. It would probably require 5'-6' of stairs to get up into the family room.

This option is probably the one that would flow the best with the existing structure.

John B. Paulson: No matter which way the driveway comes in we have to hold the garage at 94' or higher to keep out of the flood zone. If we put it higher, that's higher the family room goes, every foot is two steps.

Chris Conway: We're not set on a paved driveway, we're just looking for access into the garage, so if it had to be stone, or some sort of pervious driveway...

Carl Shreder: I'm looking for some options, that's a little less impactful into the resource area. This entire project, everything you're asking for is a waiver, everything.

Chris Conway: We don't have a lot of options just because of the nature of the yard and the footprint. We're just looking to convert the grassy area to a stone dust driveway to get us into the structure itself. It's more about getting the home to a reasonable square footage.

Rae Ann Baldwin: Where does the roofline impact on the existing structure?

Chris Conway: Just a shade lower than the existing structure. There would be a 2-step up into the family room. The family room is open concept, with cathedral ceilings, so the roofline could be adjustable I guess. The new share footage would be a little over 2000 sq. ft. The foundation on the back half is crumbling.

Rae Ann Baldwin: It looks like a rock foundation.

Chris Conway: It is.

Andrew Currie: If you made the garage 95' and graded it down to the west.

John B. Paulson: I'd have to have the garage at 95' to be able to grade. Where you're at the 104', you'd have to come up 5 or 6 steps.

Laura Replier: How far would a stairway of that dimension protrude into the room?

John B. Paulson: 63”

Laura Replier: So about 5’. The garage is a square, so if it’s a 2 bay garage this way, it can be a 2 bay garage this way. So if you raised it up to the level of the street, you can use it as a garage coming in straight from the street.

Chris Conway: I think it would have to be a little bit wider just because the stone wall coming off the front of the home is 22’. The stone wall return is 6’
Why not access the family room up the 7 steps from here? (The front corner of the family room.)

I’m concerned about how large that driveway is, and where it is, I’m concerned about digging that large a hole within the 50’. I’m feeling like the garage needs to be at ground level even if that entails steps to get to the family room, it would reduce the impact, hugely.

Steve Przyjemski: Even that scenario, would require massive waivers.

Carl Shreder: It’s a challenging lot to double the size of the house, in close proximity to resources.

Nick Feitz: If you were to take the leach field and have it run parallel to the street, then you could have the family room over where the driveway is there now.

Steve Przyjemski: I was going to suggest outside the box thinking.

Rachel Bancroft: If you move the patio round the side where the driveway is there now, there’s an old stone wall and lilacs, so that could move.

John B. Paulson: It makes it a more intimate part of the house, more private, rather than right on the street.

Rachel Bancroft: I’m trying to get it away from the resource area.

John B. Paulson: The patio is pervious also. It’s already disturbed area.

Chris Conway: Is the patio the concern? Or the structure?

Steve Przyjemski: All the activities are.

Carl Shreder: I would be more concerned about the structure and the driveway. The patio is pervious, which is a little better.

Chris Conway: If the driveway was pervious, would that make it better?

Carl Shreder: A little better, I just ask that you take another look at the design to see if you could make it less impactful.

John B. Paulson: We were not expecting you to say “Yes” tonight, there’s no DEP # yet.

Steve Przyjemski: The website is down, they are not adding any new information.

Carl Shreder: I’d like the commissioners to comment, and see what you can come back with for alternative plans.

Steve Przyjemski: Technically its 50’ no disturb, and 75’ no build. I think this is a reduction of scope of work, something may have to get dropped off. For example to me, the driveway isn’t even on the table, commissions have denied projects further away than that. We can discuss it, the commission makes the final decision. From a precedence standpoint, I can show you two lawsuits, showing that you’re breaking precedence, and you’re really stepping on very dangerous territory. We need more reduction of scope of work than alternative design. You can do both, but if this gets approved you will have other applicants come in screaming because their projects were denied last year.

Rachel Bancroft: I would love to see the small permeable driveway, and have it pull straight in to the garage. I know that as a designer, it makes you be creative and makes things 10x better inside.

Andrew Currie: From a practical standpoint is that a dry stone wall?

Chris Conway: No, it’s mortared.

Andrew Currie: Some of the money you were going to spend on the proposed driveway you could put towards modifying the wall so you could get decent access into the garage.

John B. Paulson: One of the critical lines is the 50'. We need some real direction tonight because if we can't do anything in the 75' than this goes away.

Carl Shreder: I'm factoring in that there is an existing home there. If there was nothing on this lot and you wanted to build a new home, we wouldn't even be having this conversation.

Steve Przyjemski: The second rectangle in the back is underutilized, the footprint is going to get bigger and have a second story, so you're basically doubling your useable space. From a regulatory standpoint, from the garage down, it's really, really gray to me as far as the regulations and allowing something like that. The commission can work to grant waivers to make it a more functional, better property.

Laura Replier: Why can't you extend the family room out to the 50' and lose the garage? You're in a really sensitive area, way within the 200' river front.

How close is the edge of the proposed driveway to the resource area?

John B. Paulson: 20' - 25' at the closest point.

Steve Przyjemski: I have a list of things that need to be addressed. They really need to show what the waivers are. The distance to the activities and disturbed areas, so it is clear. So the commission can vote on each waiver. I'd like to see a slightly better planting plan. Shrubs and trees are put into stabilize then add seed mix. It's a lot of impervious area. I don't know how much storm water is flowing into the river and is it being treated before it goes into the river, so the calculations would be good to see.

Chris Conway: Taking into consideration the cost of all this, the engineering that goes into all of this the driveway is never going to happen because it's breaking all kinds of precedences (sic), rather than going down the road, I'm wondering if it would be more realistic, if the commission is willing to listen to putting the family room off the side of the home, to ixnay the garage. It's a box structure, it would only be going down to put a foundation. It doesn't have to be 22' x 22', but just the way the buffer zone cuts if there was a way we could encroach slightly to make it more aesthetically pleasing to look at as opposed to an angled, obtuse structure coming off the house.

Steve Przyjemski: What if you pulled it towards Summer Street and line it up with the front of the house, you'd be pulling it out of the 50' buffer zone?

Carl Shreder: With the CAD programs architects can slide the box around and you can see what would work. We're trying to be sensitive to your needs and follow the rules and regulations too, to lower the impact on the environment. We're trying to balance those two, and also be mindful of the precedence it sets.

Steve Przyjemski: Once you build in the 50' you set a horrible precedence, also pushing the patio out of the 50' would be relatively easy to do.

Chris Conway: It's a non-conforming lot to begin with, anything we do will have to go before the ZBA.

Steve Przyjemski: Before you even design it you should get a read from the building inspector so you know what's allowed where.

John B. Paulson: If what we're proposing is not more non-conforming, it would be a finding, not a variance.

Carl Shreder: It sounds like the commission is saying, they would like to move the activity outside of the 50', "see what you can do." That would be a big step in the right direction. We're not going to solve it tonight. I think we need to give the applicants clear guidance on what to look at, and we're going to have to continue.

Abutters?

(No one says anything.)

Chris Conway: Is it okay to propose a structure right up to the 50'?

Steve Przyjemski: Play with it and see what can be done. 50' is better than 20'.

John B. Paulson: If they are allowed an addition, there is no alternative other than that side of the property no matter what the size of the addition is and it's going to be between 50' - 75' buffer.

Chris Conway: I'll have some informal discussions with the Building Inspector and the ZBA before we meet again.

Carl Shreder: It will save you some money, you won't go down a path that you can't do anyway. Make sure that you stress to the architect where these lines are that we're concerned about, so they don't propose a building across those lines.

Nick Feitz: I'd like the restoration project to be finalized by the spring.

Rachel Bancroft: I'd love to see a planting plan.

Rae Ann Baldwin: Makes a motion to continue the 24 Summer Street (GCC 2015-15; DEP# 161-0813) NOI hearing until, January 21, 2016 @ 7:00pm.

Rachel Bancroft: Seconds the motion to continue.

Motion carries unanimously.

2 Partridge Place (GCC 2015-16; DEP# 161-0814) NOI NEW

John B. Paulson, engineer

Matt Kramer, resident

Replace existing deck with 3 season porch. Replace a pea stone patio with pervious paver patio. Add roof infiltration and a stone trench at the driveway. All work within a buffer zone. Wetlands flagged in 2013'. I did the original subdivision design plans, the wetlands now are almost identical to where it was then. Fairly obvious wetlands, 2' drop. Revised plan shows the 50', 75' and 100' buffers. Added variance request.

Put in typical stone trench 43' long, 2' W, 2' Deep, allowing some rainfall to infiltrate, acts as a buffer for the wetlands. Trying to stop normal storms not 50 and 100 year storms. Proposing relocating existing shed from off the property to on the property, but within the 50' buffer so we don't have to take down any trees. The original plan was recorded in 1993.

John B. Paulson: Proposing to take down existing deck and putting in a 3 season porch that opens onto a deck, this is on piers, there's no foundation, and comes down onto a pervious stone patio. Mosquitos and things like that are why we're proposing to put a screened porch but still having some deck. We're proposing infiltrators for the new 3 season roof and incorporating the gutters for the back 1/2 of the house roof. They are designed to handle 1 1/2" of rain, which we don't usually get, if more it will back flow onto the lawn.

Steve Przyjemski: Where's the septic system?

John B. Paulson: over to the left of the house, as you're looking at it. Patio is sited out the back of the house now.

Steve Przyjemski: Is that shed on town conservation land?

Carl Shreder: Regardless of this hearing, that shed needs to go, that's not acceptable.

John B. Paulson: Yes, it's been there for many years, but yes, that's why we're proposing to move it.

Without doing inside reconstruction of moving doors etc., that's where it needs to go, because that's the current exit from the house.

Carl Shreder: Where is the closest work to the resource area?

John B. Paulson: 10' from the resource area is the trench.

Carl Shreder: That's pretty close.

John B. Paulson: But the trench is a benefit to the town to protect the wetlands. We don't need to put that in for what we're doing, we're not touching the driveway, and it's not affecting the drainage from anything else. It is a benefit to add some infiltration capacity before pavement goes off into the wetlands.

Laura Replier: This is up onto of a hill, you go up Pillsbury behind the school.

John B. Paulson: It's definitely a structure, but it's on piers, with stone underneath.

Laura Replier: But it's capturing the water. How much bigger is the screened in porch than the deck?

Rae Ann Baldwin: 4' per side, you're going from 12' x 12' to 16' x 16'.

Rachel Bancroft: If you wrapped the deck around the house you would still have a lovely view of the woods.

John B. Paulson: The deck would still be within the 75'.

Rachel Bancroft: It would be smaller.

Steve Przyjemski: As with the other one, it's a reduction of work. This might not be ideal, but you can get it almost completely outside of the 75' buffer.

Carl Shreder: Sounds like the commissioners would like you to look into alternative design plans.

Matt Kramer: We were trying to stay within the original deck size because the septic system and leaching field are off to the side of the house. The gas line comes in from this direction...

Storm water fixes would be welcome, it's a major issue.

The septic system is outside the 75'

Nick Feitz: Makes a motion to continue 2 Partridge Place to January 21, 2016 at 7:30pm.

Rachel Bancroft: seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

175 Central Street (GCC 2014-25; DEP#161-0797) NOI - cont.
Septic system replacement and repair of existing building.

Carl Shreder: no new information, no applicant. We have lost quorum, so they need to withdraw without prejudice or be denied due to lack of information and lack of quorum.

Steve Przyjemski: Many Engineers that have looked at it, the applicant maintains there is an existing septic system, but the engineers say, "No, there is no system."

Rae Ann Baldwin: Makes a motion to continue 175 Central Street to January 21st at 7:10pm.

Rachel Bancroft: Seconds the motion.

Carl Shreder: We need to make it clear to them, that we can't carry this into perpetuity.

Steve Przyjemski: I made this clear to them today.

Laura Replier: This is a bit of a lynch pin for another project. So we need to be careful about denying it, I'm not sure what effect this might have.

Carl Shreder: It may be a lynch pin, but it's irrelevant, we have to look at each hearing separately.

Steve Przyjemski: We can't legally vote on it, it is what it is.

Carl Shreder: They have two options: 1) They can withdraw without prejudice; 2) We can deny it.

Nick Feitz: Makes a motion to accept minutes for the November 12, 2015 meeting as written.

Laura Replier: Seconds the motion.

Andrew Currie and Carl Abstain due to not being there.

Motion passes unanimously.

Laura Replier: Makes a motion to reappoint Robert Gorton, and John LoCicero to the Camp Denison Committee.

Rachel Bancroft: Seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

Rachel Bancroft: Makes a motion to pay the bills as read by Steve.

Rae Ann Baldwin: Seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

Steve Przyjemski: Talks about budget protocol. It was great that everyone attend the Parcel F discussion with the Selectmen.

I'm getting together with the heads of the different commissions to go over some conditions and work out specific language of this agreement about what can have access would be used for in the future.

Carl Shreder: I was looking at some older land use policies we had, and they were much more restrictive than we would probably need for that particular parcel, we need to bring that up to speed.

Whatever gets put forward the commissioners will see it as a draft.

Laura Replier: At one point, Jim DiMento said they wanted emergency access just enough for an ATV to get thru.

Steve Przyjemski: We're leaving that open as a possibility for emergency access for health and safety at the moment.

Carl Shreder: We've never accepted Conservation land, into an area that doesn't have public access from a public street or trail. It's done, we've already been clarified.

Steve Przyjemski: I've already drafted a document, and that's in there already.

Laura Replier: It cannot be developed, it's a lot of wetland with a 3:1 slope. It already has the easement access they were requesting. Everything they want is already covered or impossible.

Carl Shreder: We just need to clarify the passive use. We just need to agree to agree on what we want to use it for. I think anything passive would be acceptable, as long as it's passive recreation. We don't have any huge restrictions we want to put on it.

Laura Replier: What would we consider snowmobiles?

Carl Shreder: Active recreation. The state requires you have a license to ride it even in your own yard. They have no place they can ride them.

Laura Replier: They do a lot less damage than the ATVs, just on observations.

Carl Shreder: The Georgetown/Rowley forest was the last area in Eastern Massachusetts you could legally ride ATVs, so they came from all over and did a lot of damage to the forest. So the state caused the problem in that sense, and then they closed it.

Laura Replier: What would snowmobiles be considered in our forest?

Carl Shreder: Active, they fall under chapter 90B. Massachusetts have some of the most stringent laws in the country. They are required to have a license to ride one even in your own yard. You also have to get the permission of your neighbors to ride in your own yard.

Andrew Currie: What do you do if you have a 4'W path crossing a wetland? Do you do anything to stabilize it?

Steve Przyjemski: The commission can file a NOI to upgrade wetland crossings. I can see a boardwalk in for walking, but if it comes to the point where we need to get emergency vehicles back there, we can make a sturdier boardwalk that can handle an ATV, but that would be under park improvements.

Carl Shreder: When is that joint meeting to set to take place?

Steve Przyjemski: A week from today. Howard, the town planner; Rob Hoover, Planning Board chair; Jim Dimento, chair of Park and Rec; and myself, Carl is on the list, but I don't know if he can make it, it's at an awkward time, 3:00pm. I did send Carl a draft, if you ask me, it's pretty straight forward. We already have a policy about what can and cannot be done on ConCom land, and this is another piece of ConCom land. The only difference is a potential access for an ATV.

Laura Replier: Do we need to amend the regulations for horses?

Carl Shreder: Lufkin's Brook has its own rules. There's no hunting, by deed. Hunting is considered passive recreation and is allowed in other parcels, but not Lufkin's Brook.

Laura Replier: We should also be considering asking the CPC for funds for projects. I think Lufkin's Brook should be near the top of the list, funding to control the invasives, it's almost impassible.

Steve Przyjemski: The two things that are before the CPC now are tweaking the accounting for controlling the invasives in the two ponds, and the Camp Denison roadway improvements, that Drew's done a lot of work with. Historically the Open Space Committee hasn't interacted or asked the Commission, so I think it's a really great discussion. We can definitely brainstorm it now, but what I would suggest on top of that is to e-mail any comments to me and I will forward them on to the Open Space Committee.

Steve Przyjemski: I think that's a great idea, we really need to start thinking ahead. I'm talking in general, CPC has a meeting Thursday, it may be closed this year for public requests, but for municipal requests, I think we still have some time, it's really up to the chair. There are also other monies out there for access issues...

Carl Shreder: There are other monies out there for access to Open Space, Community Gardens, upkeep and such.

Steve Przyjemski: It would be great if the Open Space Committee could give the Commission some direction prioritizing. I'll get you a list of all the existing Open Space money as far as what categories they fit into. We can continue all of these discussions. I'll itemize all the money we have, there's probably \$15K - \$20K.

Carl Shreder: At one point we started a trail map system, a project to map all of our trails.

Laura Replier: I had it all priced out with the guy who had done the GPS mapping for BTA Bolt, but we need the GPS mapping done. I've been trying to convince children who need community service hours to go and do the GPS mapping.

Steve Przyjemski: I'll send out an e-mail: Open Space - future visions, projects, where the commission would like it to go, parcels of interest.

I went to a Chapter 61 workshop last week. The aspects of Chapter 61, farms, forestry, the town has first right of refusal, if the Chapter 61 comes out of use. This isn't something that you can be reactive about, you have to have a plan. I'm working on a proposal for who, what, when, and where if a Chapter 61 proposal were to come out of use. There's actually 2 parcels that actively meet the criteria of coming out of use, Town Hall was never notified. No one in Town Hall knew what the criteria were to look for, the procedure to follow nor the policies, so I'm working on a policy for notification to who and what boards get involved. 121 days from start to finish to be able to match the price a developer is willing to pay. Right now, it would take us a long time to figure out what it was. I've been talking to almost all of them already.

Carl Shreder: CPC is too slow for this kind of stuff, it's an annual cycle, they can't respond fast enough.

Steve Przyjemski: We can give away our first right of refusal to Greenbelt, they can buy it and sell it back to the town.

Carl Shreder: We did a similar thing with Greenbelt.

Steve Przyjemski: They didn't purchase, but they facilitated, and they are great facilitators.

Carl Shreder: The other option we should look at is a Conservation Land Trust.

Laura Replier: We've had it in the Open Space Plan for years, and have never organized that.

Steve Przyjemski: That's a great idea, prioritize, have the Open Space Committee come up with a list of "Parcels of Interest", I have a list of 20 I'm interested in.

Laura Replier: Speaking of the barn, what happened?

Steve Przyjemski: It's been down for months. Nothing was salvaged. I did a lot of leg work to save it, but it was just demolished. Things fell through last minute.

Laura Replier: That's awful! Is there any mechanism for protecting historic buildings on private property? I thought there was a protection of demolishing of buildings on private property?

Steve Przyjemski: There's a demolition delay bylaw. Hoping that the person will facilitate saving it to reduce that delay.

Laura Replier: But that's only 6 months of protection, and it's not even really protection, just a delay! Is there any way to actually get protection?

Carl Shreder: Only if it gets of the State's list of historic buildings, then you have the state involved in that.

Steve Przyjemski: Commissioners give me any ideas or suggestions before the meeting.

Rae Ann Baldwin: Makes a motion to close the meeting.

Laura Replier: Seconds the motion to close the meeting.

Motion passes unanimously.

Meeting closed at: 9:02pm

Discussion:

List of Documents and Other Exhibits used at Meeting:

Documents and Other Exhibits used at meeting will be available for review at: ___the Conservation Office_____

(Office)

Meeting was adjourned at: _____ 9:02pm_____

Next meeting:

Date: _____ January 21, 2016 _____

Time: _____ 7:00pm _____
Place: _____ 3rd Floor Meeting Room _____

Respectfully submitted,
Chairman: _____
(Signature)

Minutes approved by Committee on: __ January 21, 2016 __
(Date)