

Committee: _____ Conservation Commission _____

Date: _____ January 21, 2016 _____

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 _____

Discussion:

List of Documents and Other Exhibits used at Meeting:

**Conservation Commission
Meeting Minutes
1/21/16**

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

Open Space Update:

Peter Burns, chairman of the Open Space Committee.

Submitted an application to the Community Preservation Committee for Community Preservation Act funds. If the CPC approves it, then we would go before town meeting in the spring to get the funding.

We just completed a draft of the Open Spacing Plan, which we gave to you for review and have now sent on to the Commonwealth for approval. That plan was a 7 year strategy to improve our Open Space and recreational opportunities in the town. Once we have the plan approved we would hire a consultant to link all the conservation lands and things we have in town to make it more accessible to people and more useable. It would be a lot more effective for wildlife, for hiking, biking and horseback riding if we had a network of trails linking these parcels together.

We're also developing a greenway, which establishes a corridor of conservation land between East Main Street and Martel Way. We would like to work with a consultant to help us get some trails in there and a plan moving forward on how to attack this.

Separately there's the bike rail-trail that's being developed that interacts with a lot of our town conservation land too. So it would be good to develop linkages, improving access and awareness to where these parcels are.

So that's what we're doing. We got a quote from an Environmental Consultant for \$29,000. I presented this package to the Community Preservation Committee and they seemed pretty supportive and they didn't ask for any additional information and they thought it was a pretty good plan. Probably in the next few weeks they'll be making decisions on recommendations on how the CPC monies should be distributed to the Selectmen to bring to Town Meeting. Hopefully this will be one of them. I would hope it would be. Open Space is one of the primary focuses of CPA funds. I just wanted to let you folks know what we are doing on that and get your support and answer any questions you might have.

Nick Feitz: Passive versus active recreation.

Peter Burns: I think it's a little bit of everything. That's something we would discuss with a consultant when we have a plan and try to move forward. We would see what we've got and optimize the opportunities for people whether it's passive or active recreation, things that tie in with the rail-trail and some of the other uses we have for the land.

Carl Shreder: Peter, for \$29,000, what would you be expecting the consultant to do? In reality they don't know a lot about Georgetown, so they are going to have to rely on us to provide information about the town.

Peter Burns: We want to have a real collaboration with anyone we hire. Now that we have a plan, due to the limitations on our time and expertise, we would like get someone in here to coordinate it. A consultant could organize hearings to hear what people want to do, both feedback from you folks, the Park and Rec committee and other groups.

Carl Shreder: I agree, given the volunteers and the hours it takes to do this, they are still going to rely on our base knowledge of this town. I'm just trying to figure out where they came up with the 290 hours. They are still going to have to spend a lot of time with Steve and the Open Space Committee and others just to show them where these things are.

Peter Burns: Yes.

Steve Przyjemski: They broke it down on the last page, which I hadn't seen before. I really like that. For example the mapping, Laura had worked on that years and years ago we were really hoping to get a trail map that we could hand out.

Carl Shreder: Over the years we started on that project, but it fell by the wayside.

Peter Burns: It's difficult to ask for quotes when you don't have the money. People are not going to spend a lot of time on it.

Carl Shreder: That's what I'm saying when we hire someone, we need to tighten this up so we get exactly what we want, not just a lot of boiler plate.

Peter Burns: We wouldn't want that to happen. If we do get the money, we can ask for detailed proposals and make sure they have the expertise to deliver what we want.

Andrew Currie: Is it perceived that they will be walking these parcels a lot? Or is it perceived that they will be using the information that's already available on paper?

Peter Burns: I think it would have to include some site walks.

Steve Przyjemski: If you're going to map trails, you will have to have someone walk all the trails with a GPS and put them on a map. I think there's a good amount of fieldwork involved.

Peter Burns: We would ask them for a plan to do the work, not actually a set of maps. (A plan for our plan.) Start with the relatively easy stuff, Lufkin's Brook, the low hanging fruit that we can focus on with just a little bit of effort. Then look at a long term project, like implementing a system of trails or trail maps.

Carl Shreder: There already might be some maps for Lufkin's floating around out there.

Steve Przyjemski: We have some for Lufkin's and obviously Camp Denison is pretty well marked, but not GPS, it's just doodled on a map.

This would be the first phase, if we like it get CPC funds to make a plan, then in subsequent years, fund more activities and get the public involved too.

Carl Shreder: I'd like to take it to the next step and put them on the web-site so people can print them out and look at them. So you can see what the features,

acreage, what you can do on it as far as recreation is concerned. It would all be laid out.

Steve Przyjemski: Potentially change the language, not just evaluating, if you can foresee where this is going, you can continue to use that money going forward instead of giving any extra back to the CPC and then having to wait another cycle to ask for additional monies to do the next phase.

Peter Burns: Funds for development and potential implementation.

Steve Przyjemski: This may save you from having to go back to CPC for ~5 years instead of 3. I think it's a great project, I really do.

Steve Przyjemski: No news is good news. State hasn't come back with comments yet on the Open Space Plan. If they pass it in the first round, that would be fantastic!

Peter Burns: There's money available for this types of project, open space component.

Laura Replier: Makes a motion to support the open space application for the community preservation act for this proposal as stated.

Rachel Bancroft: seconds the motion.

Carl Shreder: This needs to be fleshed out a little more, but I think it's a good project and definitely a first step.

Motion passes unanimously.

Meeting Motions / Actions and Summary of Discussions:

Hearings:

175 Central Street (GCC 2014-25; DEP# 161-0797) - NOI
Bob Grasso, Engineering Land Services

We started this NOI a while ago and have made some major changes to the plan and have had more activity fees to both the DEP and the town. We would like to withdraw without prejudice. We filed a new Notice of Intent with the correct fees for the proposed work.

Nick Feitz: I move that we accept the withdrawal of **175 Central Street (GCC 2014-25; DEP# 161-0797) – NOI** without prejudice.

Laura Repplier: Seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

Bob Grasso: Steve has that letter on record from the owner.

175 Central Street (GCC 2016-01; DEP 161-0815) NOI - NEW

Bob Grasso, Engineering Land Services

Green cards given and the newspaper ad

Stan Bigelow, Hydrologic consultant to ELS

Bob Grasso: We have some comments from the DEP which we'll address during the hearing.

Site is located at 175 Central Street which is at the intersection of Brook and Central Street. Existing wood building/garage on site.

William Manuel flagged wetlands, C series #1-16; A series and B series. B1-16 goes through 38 Brook St and into abutting lot.

Paved driveway (2904sq. ft.) exists to the building. The total building area is an "L" shape, 1800sq. ft. structurally safe on the left-side.

The drainage starts with an abutting lot from the upper end, flowing thru a 24" pipe into our property through the wetlands to a 12" ADF pipe which runs under the driveway to a 36" drainpipe which runs underneath Central Street to a large watershed across the street.

390 sq. ft.

The building setback to the wetlands is 31' here (NW) and 36' (NE) here.

Carl Shreder: I'm looking at your plan here and it says, "Existing Two Bedroom", that's a house?

Bob Grasso: No, I'm saying it is an existing wood-framed building. We went through the BOH, it took quite a while for a permit for a system upgrade. The previous use was for a garage.

Carl Shreder: This was never a dwelling.

Bob Grasso: No, this was never a dwelling. It had a special permit granted by the Board of Selectmen and the Board of Appeals. It has been abandoned. So we are going for the permitted use in the zone which is residential use.

Carl Shreder: This to me looks like “new construction”.

Bob Grasso: Continuing, that building had a cesspool on 38 Brook Street and water from 38 Brook Street, and had electrical services off of Brook Street to the building. In 2012 the cesspool failed Title V. In 2014 we did a Title V inspection for the current system that serves 38 Brook Street and it passed. They cross easements.

This was originally one lot. In 1996, the Planning Board signed an ANR plan which broke it into lots into A and B. The Board of Health wanted to eliminate cross easements.

We are proposing when rehabbed, the septic on site would only handle 2 bedroom, deed restriction. Hook into existing leach area that passed Title V for 38 Brook Street, disconnect the cesspool line, put in a new holding tank with a pump chamber, hook it up to a D Box and utilize the existing system that passed Title V.

In the meantime, when we disconnect the D box from 38 Brook Street we have approval from the BOH to replace that system on site for 38 Brook Street. We do have an Order of Conditions for 38 Brook Street for a system upgrade.

That’s the existing conditions right now. We are eliminating easements, the Board of Health wanted that, we accomplished that. We are utilizing a system that passes Title V for the renovation of the building. We are also proposing turning the building so it’s 42’ instead of 31’ and 48’ instead of 36’ from the wetlands, so we’re actually pushing it away from the wetlands. We’re also removing the underlayment of gravel from the western part of the structure. We’re eliminating paving 642 sq ft of pavement, and proposing adding 3 more sq. ft. to make it square, onto the back right corner.

Carl Shreder: That doesn’t meet our set-back.

Nick Feitz: Will you be digging a basement?

Bob Grasso: No it will be a slab only.

We're removing the 12" ADS pipe which is choking the flow from the watershed to address the flooding issue. We're replacing it with a 36"W x 30" H box culvert.

Carl Shreder: What do the calculations show as far as the increase in flow and where the water will go downstream? We can't push our problem on someone else either.

Bob Grasso: Exactly. We'll address the nitty gritty later on. We're taking whatever is in the wetland out of the wetland, because we're installing the box culvert, we're eliminating 5' of pipe on each side of the culvert, the box culvert will be in the uplands. The inverts will stay the same, just a bigger opening to let more volume through. Proposing fence line limit of work line, silt sock during construction for limit of work. After that we're proposing a permanent fence to show no more development on the property line to the south and along the limit of work on the north side.

Removing portions of pavement, putting water quality grass channel on the end of the driveway to treat any runoff from driveway into the wetlands, and also adding plantings on the upward side of each swale, red maple and paper birch - 8 total, 6 total - sweet pepper bush and high- bush blueberry.

Adding roof drains into infiltrations unit to enhance the property to recharge the ground water. Gateway to Georgetown, so driving into Georgetown it looks nice to improve the property and enhance the surrounding property.

Carl Shreder: My issue was that it was never an occupied residence.

Bob Grasso: It had a use from the zoning board and the Selectmen.

Carl Shreder: From the Selectmen? What's their legal role? Explain that to me.

John Connelly, Atty: This site has a strange history, bought by Tolman in 1960. In 1963 I believe, he got a special permit to operate a garage there, which is what he did with it. He got a variance in 1970s from the ZBA. Planning Board signed it in the 1996, they really didn't have any choice but to sign the plan because it was a valid 81P Plan, so they signed it. 81P plans don't establish anything in terms of zoning, not even the legality of the lot. This property has been zoned single residence since the 70s, probably since '63.

Carl Shreder: We're looking at from it is a new construction or an existing residence?

John Connelly, atty: There's a 2012 study that described the use, with the bathroom and the cesspool serviced the bathroom and the runoff from garage floor and washing cars, etc.

Carl Shreder: You bring up a good point, you have a garage there with floor drains, have you done any contamination studies?

Bob Grasso: Yes, we've done a 21E site assessment. 1995 no-contaminants found in mooring well.

Nick Feitz: Has anything been done recently?

Bob Grasso: There has been no use since then.

Andrew Currie: Is it currently one story?

Bob Grasso: Yes, it's currently 1 story, it's zoned for a 2 bedroom dwelling, which is the permitted use without any special permits or variances in that zone. It blends in with the neighborhood.

Carl Shreder: It seems to me it was used more recently.

Bob Grasso: Yes, it was used by a landscaper to park their vehicles.

Stanton Bigelow, consultant to ELS on hydrologic issues
I did a hydrologic analysis on the areas that are tributaries to the existing 12" culvert under the driveway and also to the 36" culvert under Central Street.

Large drainage area north and west of the site on the other side of Brook Street and the other side of an old, abandoned railroad. Approximately 182 acres.

I did an analysis of the runoff from that area with maximum 5, 25 and 100 yr. storm, without considering ponding within the area is about 150 cu feet/second. Very large 23 acre storage pond and the bottom of that area, that has a 12" pipe which restricts the outlet of the ponding area to 7.5 or 8 cu ft. /second.

That flow comes through an existing 24" ADS pipe under Brook Street which flows into a small ponding area on site. The existing 12" pipe is supposed to carry water out to a main channel and directed into a state culvert. 32 acre, doesn't quite reduce the

flow, ponding area south/west of the site reduces the flow from 30 cu ft./second to 10 cu ft./sec.

There's another 12 cu ft./ sec and about 8 cu ft./sec from the other direction (east). So that's about 20'/second total.

Carl Shreder: We would want to show 200' off property. It helps us hydrologically to know what would connect.

Laura Replier: This side over here there are houses all around that area, so we need to know how that runoff will affect those houses too.

Stan Bigelow: I did use a software system with CAD system to evaluate the culverts. The state culvert will handle the flow and flood to a depth at 2' well without surcharging behind the inlet of the pipe. (Currently a 36" pipe)

The existing 24" ADS pipe under Brook Street handles the flow and floods to a depth of 1.5', there's no surcharge of this inlet as well. The peak flow of 8 cu ft/sec immediately raises the pond level behind the pipe, flooding the driveway and Central Street. By replacing the 12" culvert to a 36"W x 30"H Box culvert, we would be able to flow the 8 cu.ft. flow to a depth of 1.5'. The state culvert controls the level in the pond area and the area up stream. The two flows converging on the culvert cause a "still flow", which is an attenuation of the stream into the pond area. Because we're proposing to maintain the box culvert at the same invert elevations, there wouldn't be any change in the stream centerline topography. The topography upstream is lower than the culvert so even if there is a no flow situation at the culvert, there would still be ponding up stream.

Carl Shreder: How much additional impervious surface would this be adding to the area?

Stan Bigelow: We would actually be reducing impervious surface because we would be taking away, a pretty good portion of the paving.

Bob Grasso: The site is going to a residential use as opposed to commercial area, we're reducing the impervious area to 2 parking spots on the left and 2 parking spaces in front, that's it, 4 parking spots for a 2 bedroom house.

Reducing the existing pipe of 40' by 5' on each end. The flows coming in from the larger areas, they are established, they wouldn't have as high a peak and wouldn't flow over the road. There would be a continuous pond in the area of the 36" box culvert, even with "no-flow" going through the culvert.

Carl Shreder: The question is in our regulations, “Is it an area subjected to flooding?” I know it’s not a FEMA issue, if the 12” pipe wasn’t there, it would flood anyway.

Stan Bigelow: It’s a very isolated flooding situation that’s caused by someone put in a 12” ADS pipe in there, where it should have been a much larger pass through to allow the flow to go through without creating the immediate back water. If you remove that 12” pipe under the driveway, you would immediately remove the back water situation which is occurring.

Steve Przyjemski: A question, you referenced gravel as impervious per our regulations, what section was that?

Bob Grasso: On Heather Road when I proposed...

Carl Shreder: Compacted gravel?

Bob Grasso: Well that is impervious.

Steve Przyjemski: That’s not per regulations that was due to a discussion at a previous meeting.

Carl Shreder: We would consider compacted gravel to be impervious.

Bob Grasso: Well it would be compacted with the cars on it.

Carl Shreder: It doesn’t spell it out.

Steve Przyjemski: I don’t consider the Heather Road project with a deck over gravel the same situation as in this case. I would caution the Commission on making a direct comparison.

Bob Grasso: I stand corrected, but it is a compacted undersurface which no water would penetrate.

Carl Shreder: If the 12” pipe wasn’t there, it would flood even worse, correct?

Stan Bigelow: Yes, I think it would. It’s an ADS pipe, so it was put in fairly recently. They have only been around for about 15 years at the most. There may

have been a situation where there wasn't a culvert...someone put a 12" pipe in and didn't really evaluate what the requirement was.

Carl Shreder: Apparently without a permit. So what I'm saying is that this area may meet our requirements as far as "an area subject to flooding". If there weren't culverts there, the area would flood. What we're doing by engineering is directing the water away, to keep it from flooding, but naturally, it would flood.

Bob Grasso: Your town flood maps don't show this as an area.

Carl: Whether the maps show it or not, it is a natural low point and there is water that flows into it from a number of different sources.

Andrew Currie: They (FEMA) stopped the mapping 1000' downstream.

Steve Przyjemski: They measured points and extrapolated, but it's not accurate.

Bob Grasso: When you consider "areas subject to flooding", what years do you look at to make that call?

Carl Shreder: We don't do it that way, we would look at volume. What I'm getting at is that we look at it as part of the whole wetland mix.

Laura Replier: Before they put the 12" pipe in, I'm assuming the water would have just flowed freely across there.

Andrew Currie: For a 100 year storm, at the 36" state culvert, how high do the head waters go with the existing conditions? How high would they be with the 36" box culvert?

Stan Bigelow: The Central Street culvert, isn't filled at peak conditions for the 100 year storm. The flooding from the existing 12" culvert flows over Central Street.

Andrew Currie: The 24" Brook Street culvert, isn't flowing over the road.

Carl Shreder: Do you provide us with a list of waivers that you're requesting for this?

Bob Grasso: We're actually making the existing conditions better.

Steve Przyjemski: Whether it's an improvement or not, if it's in the jurisdiction like the 75' "no build" buffer, it's still a waiver.

Bob Grasso: I can include that in the plan.

Carl Shreder: And also the 200' off site, you need to include that. I still wrestle where this is a new or existing structure.

Bob Grasso: Did that structure before you broke the lot off have a cesspool? Did it have a water service? Its own utilities going to it? Did it have a town approved use? Did it have a Selectmen and Zoning Board approved use? A variance? Is it new? It has to meet the regulations. It is an upgrade?

Steve Przyjemski: I think septic-wise, it wasn't there, there's an existing leaching system and a cesspool. That cesspool only showed up on paper in 2013. I think if you go back and look at the history...if it's new it has to meet the regulations, if it's not, then you have to allow them to upgrade. Until you decide whether it's new or an upgrade, you can't move forward on a ruling.

Nick Feitz: How much of the existing structure is going to remain?

Bob Grasso: Everything, it's just going up. Just going to upgrade the structure, and turn it. We're going to improve the walls, just make it structurally sound, so we can add the second floor.

Nick Feitz: It will be the same footprint? It is the same building? You're not going to raze the building?

Bob Grasso: No, we're going to turn it away from the wetlands. Nope, we're just going to upgrade it, add some 2'x4's and 2'x6's.

Carl Shreder: If we went on a site walk right now, could you actually show me where the bathroom was in there?

Bob Grasso: Yeah, actually it was on the outside. It was enclosed, there was a sewer pipe that goes right down through here. It was a bathroom for the employees of the garage.

BOH has cleaned off all the easements from each property and approved it with 2 bedroom deed restrictions.

Steve Przyjemski: The packet I sent around, pre-1996 this was a residential house, on the plan you can see: leaching field, garage and shed (this was prior to the splitting of

the lot into two parcels). In 1996 an ANR plan was endorsed by the Planning Board, all they look at is area of site and road frontage, and this lot had that. No connectivity and no cesspool shown. The Assessor's vision sheet shows accessory land with an improvement, not a residential structure, a garage or shed, something to that effect, with use. Please note the price, \$75,000, lots in town were going for \$150,000 - \$175,000, so this was either a really, really good deal, or there was some question about its buildable value. On the back of that is a picture of the structure from the Assessor's card.

Rachel Bancroft: That shed isn't connected to the garage.

Steve Przyjemski: The next page is the 38 Brook Street approval in 2013 before the Conservation Commission. Show's the "existing commercial structure on slab", and the existing septic system "to be abandoned". They referenced the plan for the 38 Brook Street property, but we never actually saw it. The Commission approved that "L-shaped" on the left upper corner and required as it was within that 100' buffer, so they are abandoning one, to build another for the Brook Street address. 2013 was the first time the cesspool was shown on a plan, was on the 38 Brook Street approval. They are proposing to sever the line to the existing septic system. They already replaced it with one on the Brook Street property, now they are showing it existing. You can't get rid of one septic system and build two. I know there's an easement, and that's to use it, and that's more of a legal question. I'm not a lawyer, I'm recommending this go to Town Council, I believe this is new construction, by review of the setback laws, which it needs to meet. This is a 100' setback. If it is determined to be new construction...

(Bob hands Steve the Title IV for the cesspool.) - I'll have to review this.

Based on my review, it brings up a lot of questions and I would like to get Town Council involved. They created their own hardship by subdividing this property, they need to ask for more waivers. Until the question of "new construction" gets answered, I don't think they should be moving forward on any approvals. I think a 3rd party review. Is the dry well just a drain for the garage? This is an important question to answer.

John Connelly, atty: The septic system exists legally at 175 Central Street. My question is the septic system is your regulations, when I went to the BOH, it had been there for 2 1/2 years. The problem that prevailed there was that the BOH wanted to do the zoning case, the conservation case, they held the whole thing up trying to do everyone else's job. That property is zoned for residential use. Your bylaw says what uses are legal in that zone. The use that was there was not legal, but it was specially allowed. My question to you is: "Let's assume that lot was vacant, except for the

leaching field that had been servicing Brook Street. Now, let's assume, my guy goes in, and wants to build a house. Its new construction for the building, but not the septic system, the septic system exists. There's nothing in your regulations that says the existing septic system to be protected has to be servicing a structure on the location where that septic system exists, it doesn't say that.

Carl Shreder: It's also our interpretation.

John C: My client has right when he makes this filing, the law is pretty clear, the law at the time of the filing is what controls the bylaw. Take a look at the regs.

The final interpretation is made by a judge. There's nothing here that would damage the town. There's no reason to be cooperative, conciliatory, or anything else and then have somebody go ballistic on you.

The 81 P plan didn't create any legal rights, it didn't create any zoning, didn't alter any land use.

Steve Przyjemski: Have a 3rd party review all the documentation.

Bob Grasso: This is site improvement, not new construction. I don't feel a third party is necessary.

John Connelly, atty: I can give you what I have: 1963 special permit, by the Board of Appeals, notice of it; 1972 letter from the Selectmen; application and grant of a permit for a septic system, variance for the site, the same plan Steve gave you. Those are the things that happened from zoning perspective that I think are important. I'm happy to provide you with multiple copies of these if you want, I'll submit a copy of the package right now. I can e-mail them to you as well, if you would like.

Carl Shreder: When I'm talking about a "Third Party", I'm not talking about a legal review of the whole case, I'm talking about the site conditions. It's got a unique history to this site, and is a unique property. I think my commissioners would like to see the site.

Steve Przyjemski: I'm recommending a legal review as well, I think both are very important in this case, one boots on the ground, and one legal review of the information and documentation of this case.

Carl Shreder: BSC can look at the history, the resource, the storm water, the existing conditions and give us a read, an interpretation of our regulations in a third party. This is unique, the BOH has approved it.

Andrew Currie: In re: to the renovation, the state building code has a lot of items that address the amount of modification of a building, it gets to a point in the worth of the building, where you're spending so much money, it really gets looked at as new construction and it has to meet everything by the code.

Carl Shreder: You're no longer grandfathered as far as building.

Steve Przyjemski: I talked to the building inspector today and reviewed just this plan, he wanted to talk with you. He believed it wasn't a typical project, and it should go to ZBA for clarification.

Abutters to 175 Central St.

Judith Cunningham 21 Brook Street: I've been in my home for almost 40 years. We've had at least 5-100 year storms. Personally and visually the idea of a "single family home", sounds lovely, where I am on Brook Street. Brook Street goes on both sides of Central Street. Will there be more water going into the wetland area that side of Brook Street? If there is, they are going to be in trouble, they already have collapses, and it has to be closed off and on.

If it's abandoned for 15 years, we've watched it collapse in on itself, I can't imagine much of the walls that are there will be able to be reused. Between the water that's been there, the wind and the sun...

Carl Shreder: We can ask the owners, if abutters can go on the site walk. It is really up to them. Our regulations require them to look 200' off property, because what they do here could affect somebody else. No one is allowed to cause harm to someone else by their activities.

Steve Przyjemski: Flooding issues is important to make sure...whenever you change a pipe like that you have to be very careful. I think the Commission should make sure the information we are hearing is correct. To your point, there's already flooding down there, and additional water will make it worst. Trust but verify, when we hire someone to review this they should look at that also.

Laura Replier: Will BSC be able to do those storm water calculations to see the effect that it will have on this site, across Central Street?

Steve Przyjemski: They don't actually do the calculations in the review, they review what was done to make sure it makes sense.

Laura Replier: I have the same concern Mrs. Cunningham does about these all people who sit on that wetland there where all that extra water is potentially routed over to that side of the road.

Steve Przyjemski: The review would look at that. It looks at the entire picture and tries to evaluate it.

Stan Bigelow: With respect to the extra water, the larger pipe under the driveway is only to attenuate the peak flow through the natural channel. What you get now at peak flow is sheet flow over the roadway can be greater in a short period of time than what you would get if you kept the water in the channel. As far as additional water, we would be able to reduce the impervious area within the site. We're not altering any of hydrologic characteristics of the site.

Carl Shreder: We want it to be clear that we don't want to allow any extra water to go across Central Street.

John Connelly, atty: To deal with the non-board members, the only concern is liability. If there are non-board members who are reasonably from around the area and want to go on the site walk, I have no problem with that, if they want to sign a release before they go on the property.

Laura Replier: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to engage the services of BSC to conduct a third party review of 175 Central Street to evaluate the resources, storm water and the changes of the hydrology and look at the filing based on our regulations, and having a review by town council for any associated with this.

Rachel Bancroft: Seconds the motion.

Carl Shreder: In your revised site plan you need to give us a list of waivers, include the 200' off site. If you cannot get permission to flag, include letters from abutters denying permission.

Laura Replier: Makes a motion to do a site walk At 175 Central Street on Saturday, May 7, 2016 @ 9:00 am.

Rachel Bancroft: seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Carl Shreder: Per the atty comments, if abutters would like to attend, they would have to sign a hold harmless waiver. I'm assuming you could draft something for them to sign? (Addressing the attorney)

John Connelly, atty: Sure I can.

Laura Replier: Makes a motion to continue 175 Central Street (GCC 2016-01; DEP# 161-0815) to May 12 at 7pm.

Nick Feitz: Seconds the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

540 North Street (GCC 2016-02; DEP# 161-0816) - NOI - NEW

Bob Grasso, Engineering Land Services

I have the abutter mailings and the advertisement. DEP#, they reviewed it with no comments.

71650 sq. ft. 2009 upgrade septic, currently 2 bedrooms, designed for 4 bedrooms. When you add a bedroom you have to add a reserve and upgrade the septic system.

Wetland series A13-A32 from a previous filing, existing 24" corrugated metal pipe under roadway, flows into a perennial stream, called Dalton Brook. 200' river setback. Old delineation from 2009, company is no longer in business. Serviced by gravel driveway and town water. Existing tree line.

He wants to add a bedroom, straight off the back of the house 18', come forward 22' and go right back to the house. It will be a crawl space underneath, not a full foundation. Proposed adding 445 sq. ft. total, 142 sq. ft. within the 75' to ask for a waiver.

Steve Przyjemski: How far from a septic tank can you have a structure of this type?

Bob Grasso: On a slab you can go right up to it, foundation, 10'. We could go right up to it, but it's not a good idea because you have foundation walls right there, and it's not good to go up to a foundation wall. This is an all grass area, it's been mowed

since the 1950s. No trees in the area, no grade changes. Tie into the existing gutter system that are dumping right onto the lawn. Put in 5 monuments denoting the 75' and 50', one at the corner, 50' and 75' buffer. Trying to keep what's there now, he's cutting what is there now.

Carl Shreder: Is this National Heritage area?

Bob Grasso: It is further north. The property is out of flood zone, out of riverfront, out of National Heritage area.

Steve Przyjemski: If he moved the room over 10', you're still in the resource area, but you're as good as you can get. You'd lose a window either way. This plan doesn't show any mitigation, just defining what it is now and prevent future encroachment, which I like. Right now Stormwater isn't infiltrated. So look at alternative design, maybe modifying it a bit and some mitigation.

Bob Grasso: I did some quick calculations I would need four units for the addition, for the rest of the house I would need twelve infiltration units. Total roof area 445 sq. ft., 1530 sq. ft. for the rest of the house.

Steve Przyjemski: You're supposed to reduce the scope of work, but if not mitigate. Maybe some clarification of why this can't be done.

Carl Shreder: I like the stone bounds, to keep the lawns from growing. Does the commission want mitigation, infiltrators? Anything else?

Laura Replier: It's a very small footprint within the 75', and I don't see much sheet flow.

Steve Przyjemski: So, just infiltrate the runoff on the new structure, four units. If you submit what we agree upon, you don't have to come to the next meeting, as long as your new plans meet what the commission agreed upon tonight.

Carl Shreder: As a timeline, when are you looking to do this? Spring?

Homeowner: yes

No Abutters.

Laura Replier: Just to be clear, we want the new structure to be infiltrated and we want to keep the conservation bounds.

Nick Feitz: Mr. Chairman I would like to make a motion to continue 540 North Street (GCC 2016-02; DEP# 161-0816) - NOI - NEW to February 11th @ 7:15pm.

Rachel Bancroft: Seconds the motion.

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

Carl Shreder: I understand the applicant is asking for a continuance.

Steve: Correct.

Nick Feitz: Makes a motion to continue 24 Summer Street (GCC 2015-15; DEP#161-0813) to February 11th at 7:30pm.

Rachel Bancroft: Seconds the motion

Motion carries unanimously.

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

Carl Shreder: We also have a request for a continuance for this as well.

Nick Feitz: Makes a motion to continue 2 Partridge Place (GCC 2015-16; DEP#161-0814) to February 11, 2016 at 7:35pm.

Laura Replier: Seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Steve Przyjemski: Memorandum of Understanding of Parcel F - I will send this Memorandum of Understanding around for your approval. Clarifying what the land can be used for as far as recreational purposes. The current agreement says things like: walking, hiking, biking, horseback riding, and passive recreation. Under the care and custody of the Conservation Commission. This was signed by the Planning Board to support it, hopefully the Commission will sign it tonight, we will authorize Carl sign on behalf of the Commission, then it goes to Park and Rec and then the Selectmen and then the Town can get the deed registered.

Laura Replier: Makes a motion to agree to the Memorandum of Understanding giving Parcel F into the care of the Conservation Commission and to authorize Carl to sign on behalf of the board.

Rachel Bancroft: Seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Steve Przyjemski: The town is adopting a bylaw that the Conservation Commission has to enforce. The Planning Board is petitioning the Selectmen to put more stringent Cornell numbers for storm water calculations.

Carl Shreder: I think it would be prudent to send the differences between the Cornell numbers and what we use currently around to catch everyone up to speed.

Steve Przyjemski: Clarifying and creating a policy for tree cutting. Town DPW and the Tree warden cut down trees all the time.

Carl Shreder: That procedure needs to clarify who will get notified, timelines and how.

Steve Przyjemski: Every two weeks Peter and I drive around town and look at culverts and trees and I advise him on what needs to do and whether he needs to come in front of the commission. It's worked great up until now.

Carl Shreder: I think you need to flesh it out, I think it needs to be specified. There should be a bullet list so people can look at it and decide, "Do I need to call?" (The Conservation Agent) Dying and diseased trees, can be habitat.

Rachel Bancroft: They were 80' from Penn Brook and also wetlands on the other side of the street, multiple layers of buffers...

Carl Shreder: Is a procedure enough? Or do we need trained individuals?

Steve Przyjemski: I think something in writing. I dabble in everything, but I'm not an arborist, and in the middle of winter, I don't know how to tell if the tree is diseased enough that it's going to fall down tomorrow. To Carl's point, I think arborists that work for a tree company are more inclined to say a tree will fall sooner than later just to get the job.

Steve Przyjemski: I think we need a statement in writing and creating a policy. You've given me very clear directions before: dead, dying or about to fall down. My issue is making an assessment in the middle of winter on the health of a tree.

Carl Shreder: If you can't make a judgement, we should at least have a discussion, unless it's a matter of public safety, then it should come down.

Steve Przyjemski: Maybe we wait until spring and see what leafs out and maybe we just do a major pruning...

Rachel Bancroft: I would not mind being certified or trained as an arborist.

Steve Przyjemski: If you want to look into that, it's a skill the commission could use and we could probably pay for that.

Carl Shreder: I would like to know what the qualifications are.

Andrew Currie: Is it just town labor doing this? Or do they have contractors doing it?

Steve Przyjemski: They hire, I believe Mayer Tree. This was probably a 200' crane. We do this all the time, but there's usually more discussion. In this case I wasn't aware of these trees coming down. Peter said the arborist said the trees need to come down. Maybe we can ask that a written request explaining why these trees need to come down be submitted for our approval and we can sign off on them. I'll work with Peter to come up with a good policy, he's going to have to be comfortable with this, I think he will follow our guidelines and ask if he has questions, he's a good guy.

Steve Przyjemski: Rachel is working on a tree bylaw. Historic trees, etc. Any tree may come into play.

Rachel Bancroft: Makes a motion to accept the minutes from 12/10/15 with the amendment via Laura's suggestion: to clarify that Bob Gorton and Jack LoCicero were being reappointed to the Camp Denison Committee.

Nick Feitz: seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Rachel Bancroft: Makes a motion to accept the bills as read.

Nick Feitz: Seconds the motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Steve Przyjemski: Since Bob Morehouse has passed away there has been some reorganization at Camp Denison, Jim Lacey is the Chairman. I asked him to come in at the next meeting to give an overview of the reorganization and a financial summary and where they see themselves going.

I was wondering if the Commission would authorize use of Conservation funds to bring in a big rock and put a plaque for Bob Morehouse on it recognizing his huge contributions to the Camp, the Open Space Committee and the town. He was enormously involved in both acquiring and restoring the camp.

Carl Shreder: I think if we put a plaque for Bob down near the flagpole that would be appropriate.

Steve Przyjemski: Thank you.

CoC for 172 East Main Street

CoC for 33 Elm Street

Nick Feitz: Makes a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Laura Replier: Seconds the motion.

Meeting closed at 9:50pm.

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

(Office)

Meeting was adjourned at: _____ 9:50pm_____

Next meeting:

Date: _____ February 11, 2016 _____

Time: _____ 7:00pm _____

Place: _____ Basement Meeting Room _____

Respectfully submitted,

Chairman: _____

(Signature)

Minutes approved by Committee on: __ March 10, 2016__

(Date)

