

**TOWN OF GRANBY
CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Meeting of May 22, 2012
Aldrich Hall**

Proposed Minutes

Meeting called to order 7:00 pm BS, EC, DW, AF, WL, JH, PK present. Quorum met.

7:00 Building & Board of Health Permits:

107 Carver St, Robert & Laura Os, 32' x 26' addition on NW side of house, checked aerial photos, no wetland resources in vicinity, BS move to approve as presents, EC 2nd, all in favor, CC signed building permit

262 Taylor St., Woody & Katie Geoffroy, proposed 10' x 16' screen room on South side of house, checked aerial photos, no wetland resources in vicinity, BS moved, AF 2nd, all in favor, CC signed building permit

167 Burnett St., propose to extend existing driveway to house with stone, will bring in fill, checked aerial photos, BS moved that CC make site visit, EC 2nd, all in favor, 5:15 pm Tuesday June 5, contact #: 413-313-3757 Shawn Boutet

32 Ferry Hill, Mr. Conway, solar panel installation on hill behind house, checked aerial photos, BS moved to approve, PK 2nd, all in favor, will need to bring in building permit for CC to sign

7:15 Administrative Duties:

1. Commentary:
2. Post next meeting: June 12, 2012 7PM in Aldrich Hall
Approve Minutes: May 8, 2012, BS moved to approve, PK 2nd, all in favor
3. CC Financial accounts update (quarterly). Not available
Bills to Pay ---- *Cathy: Need to buy 2 laser pointers*
Charles Dauchy: \$720 for 9 hrs, January - April 2012, GHA
\$1160.00 for 6 hrs. Jan.- April 2012, 8.5 hrs Oct. – Dec. 2011, Pride-CVS
BS moved to pay, PK 2nd, all in favor
4. Outreach/Education: none
5. Notices (ZBA): none
6. Announcements/News: none
7. Con Com Web site update: none
8. New members for Con Com: none
9. Site Visits scheduled: CVS & GHA on Tues. June 5, 2012

Discussion (Case Files)

Discussion of MGL 44, § 53 Project Review fees:

Comments by Commissioners, discussion point:

Project size: Refers to amount of land area disturbed by earthwork (grading, fill or cut) or size of project proper (acreage) or size of affected watershed (acreage)? Need consistent definition. Complexity of site & project also need to be considered in determining escrow retainer. Single family dwellings generally not subject to fees, main thrust of regulation instead applies to commercial & sub-division projects for technical review of complex projects for benefit of Town.

Appointments/Public Hearings:

Time	GCC#	DEP#	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	Name/Owner/Rep
------	------	------	----------	-------------	----------------

7:30 Amended NOI Grandview.

Construction of stormwater management system & drilling of 5 drinking water wells for proposed 16-lot residential subdivision with portions of the work within the 100-foot buffer zone to BVW. Presentation of plan by Bruce Griffin from NE Environmental, Gregory Henson and Mike Schaefer from Huntley Assoc.

Summary of wetland resources as depicted by Applicant: Large wetland on North end of site, which was delineated previously for original NOI, minor changes made: drainage ditch on E side, question of whether or not it is jurisdictional, intermittent stream, however wetland veg. on perimeter of ditch therefore marked with E series wetland flags, joins with flow of perennial stream (as per USGS map), previous reviews of project did not address riverfront areas, MA series flags mark mean annual high water line of perennial stream, riverfront area discontinuous because of pond

No work proposed within resource area, only issue is approach to buffer zone along ditch, 2 point source discharges to ditch

Examined erosion control plan: detail of location of erosion control barriers & stormwater management system, 2 discharges, subsurface infiltration chambers

Question from BS: have permits been obtained from Board of Health for septic systems?

Answer: Permits will be responsibility of homeowners

CC did quick browse through all the documents associated with the project

BS: question to CC: easy or complicated project? Universal agreement that CC doesn't have time or expertise to review project internally, would like to invoke regulation ch. 44 53G 4.1 & charge peer review fee to retain consultants (wetlands consultant, stormwater consultant) to review proposed project, thereby expediting the application, fee based on size of project? 31 acres will be developed

CC will make site visit(s) once consultants are retained.

Discussion of appropriate fee: \$15,000 seems reasonable to start with, CC retains right to increase fee in future, if needed.

BS moved that \$15,000 be escrowed in 53G account, EC 2nd, all in favor

BS moved that CC continue hearing to next meeting (June 12, 2012 at 7:30 pm) where CC will decide on consultants, discuss project further, PK 2nd, all in favor

Old Business:

8:20 pm: discussion of Girl Scout project at Dufresne, problem: mulch & aggregate put in by pond without wetlands permit, GS also need to get permit from building inspector, CC approval of WPA Form 2 will be contingent on approval by building inspector, condition: double staked straw bales should be installed in continuous semi-circle between work area and pond and maintain through Sept. 3, 2012. *Formal Form 1 RDA hearing to be on 12 June 12 – need to advertise..*

Adjournment:

9:10 pm, PK motion to adjourn, EC 2nd, all in favor