

Londonderry Conservation Commission Tuesday, March 28, 2006 Minutes Page 1 of 1

Present: Deb Lievens; Mike Speltz, Ken Henault; Paul Nickerson and Mark Oswald, Town Council Liaison

Call to order

<u>Drainage structures in the buffer</u>- Andre Garron and Tim Thompson of Planning and Economic Development and John Trottier of the Public Works Department were all present to discuss with the LCC the ongoing issue of drainage structures being allowed in the Conservation Overlay District buffer. The LCC has repeatedly asked that rather than using the buffer for drainage structures because there is nowhere else on the lot to put them, that parking or the building footprint be reduced instead. As buildable lots with enough dry area become more and more scarce in town, the potential for the buffer to be infringed upon is greater and greater. In the past year, LCC members have mentioned several times that as long as treatment occurs outside of the buffer, it would be acceptable for the treated water to flow across the buffer and into the wetland.

The discussion began around Conditional Use Permits being granted for swales, drainage ways, grass waterways and associated maintenance. J. Trottier presented findings from the Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control handbook, published by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services and the Rockingham County Conservation District. The majority of the dialogue centered around the placements of swales in or out of the buffer but questions regarding turf, mowed grasses and dense vegetation were also debated.

The three key points decided upon were as follows (T. Thompson will provide a more detailed version for the LCC's review):

- 1. Swales are drainage and therefore allowed by CUP in the COD buffers, but only if absolutely necessary (i.e. no meaningful alternatives remain with the site plan);
- 2. Treatment swales need to be monitored according to Best Management Practices to exclude woody vegetation;
- 3. Given the threat that swales pose to wetlands, applicants MUST demonstrate there are no feasible alternatives per Section 2.6.3.4 of the COD.

<u>AlCuMet CUP</u>- Jeff Lewis returned with redesigned plans for AlCuMet's site plan for an addition. He reviewed the buffer impact. As he did not have the correct CUP request form, he will submit this later on. The LCC voted to recommend approval of the CUP plan as presented with impact reduced from +/- 6000sf to 3100sf.

DRC's (2)1. AlCuMet Lot Line Adjustment, 14-13 & 13-4
No Comments

2. Town of Londonderry Fire Stations, 6-57 and 17-51 & 52 No Comments

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Oswald Acting Secretary