

STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes for Thursday, January 20, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT

Board Members: D. Barnicle, D. Mitchell, J. Hoffman

Potential Associate Members: D. Grehl, C. Barnhart

K. Doyle for minutes

7:00 PM

CPA UPDATE

- o No update, E. Goodwin not present

DISCUSSION OF NEW INFORMATION / WALK INS

- o Discussion of The Preserve (DEP File No. 300-471). C. MacGregor present for discussion of violations as indicated in monitoring reports. C. MacGregor submitted to SCC a letter dated 1/20/05 discussing ways to correct all erosion control issues on site as mentioned in monitoring reports. SCC accepted letter and requested that C. MacGregor continues to work with A.Allen of Eco Tech, Inc. in stabilizing site. No fines were assessed at this time; however any other violations noted and ignored will be finable offenses.
- o Discussion of 209 Charlton Road—The Point. L. Jalbert and B. Williams present for discussion. B. Williams stated that he submitted to SCC a copy of the statement from the hydro-engineer (Lyons Whitten) outlining his services as requested from the SCC. L. Jalbert stated that hydro-engineer will conduct “perc” tests to determine the sub-surface hydrology of the property. D. Mitchell not convinced that the method proposed will help in understanding the nature of the flow beneath the property. The method proposed will not determine where the water is coming from, where it is going and where it travels. This is crucial when designing a culvert to channel the water under the property. D. Mitchell requests that the hydro-engineer attends a meeting to discuss this and make sure everyone is on the same page. B. Williams agrees to have Lyons Whitten attend next SCC meeting. K. Doyle to follow up with B. Williams.
- o K. Scoble (resident on South Paradise Lane) present to discuss water quality of Big Alum Lake. K. Scoble stated that her lake frontage is now “mucky” and believes it is due to the sewer installation. K. Scoble mentions that she had correspondence with J. Malloy and project representative at TRC but feels the SCC needs to get involved if possible. K. Scoble to submit additional information to K. Doyle. Site visit required after snow melt.

PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearings opened at 7:35 PM

NOI—101 Cricket Drive. Jalbert for E. Paquette, construction of a SFH and associated work. DEP File No. 300-646

D. Barnicle opened the public hearing, present was L. Jalbert representing applicant and an abutter, R. Rehkamp.

L. Jalbert handed in green cards from abutter notification and tear sheet from public advertisement.

Applicant Comments –

- o L. Jalbert discusses the project and went over the project plan. Portion of house and associated site work to be located within 100-foot buffer zone to BVW. No work within 50-feet of the BVW. House will be connected to town sewer and installation of a private well is proposed. A rip-rap wall is proposed in rear of house due to significant slope.

SCC Comments –

- o D. Mitchell asks why well and not Town water?
- o D. Barnicle states that he prefers private well/private sewer OR town water/town sewer. Simply because a well takes from the water table of Sturbridge and gets re-routed to the Southbridge system.
- o D. Mitchell states that there are problems on Cricket Drive due to significant slopes etc. D. Mitchell questions where the sheet flow from the driveway will be directed, is the drive pitched away from wetland?

Applicant Comments –

- o L. Jalbert explains that the Town will not allow a water connection at this location of Cricket Drive. There is not enough water pressure at this end of the cul-de-sac.
- o R. Rehkamp states that Sturbridge DPW stated that a wider pipe would need to be installed in Cricket Drive to provide the proposed residence with town water.

SCC Comments –

- o D. Barnicle asks about the rip-rap to be installed. Will a storm drain be installed in driveway? The driveway should be pitched to a storm drain to collect the water due to the significant slope of the rear of the property.
- o D. Mitchell also suggests roof drains to recharge the runoff from the roof.
- o D. Mitchell questions the need for a swale on the east side of the house location, abutting Cricket Drive. What water is directed to the rip-rap swale?
- o D. Barnicle states that the slopes along Cricket Drive are significant. The SCC has to be very cautious due to other projects that did not turn out so well along Cricket Drive.
- o D. Grehl questions if it is a wooded lot. Concerned with the potential of major runoff with the clearing of vegetation.

Applicant Comments –

- o L. Jalbert explains the purpose of the rip-rap and mentions that it is a typical rip-rap design as noted on the plans.
- o L. Jalbert does not recommend roof drains. No need for them.
- o L. Jalbert explains the swale on the east side of property, it is already existing, he believes it was installed as part of Cricket Drive.
- o L. Jalbert states that the property is wooded, there are large trees on property now.

SCC Comments –

- o K. Doyle questions the resource areas present on property, perennial stream is associated with the BVW. K. Doyle points out that a portion of the grading is within Riverfront Area, which was not stated in the Notice of Intent filing.
- o K. Doyle states that if there is work within the Riverfront Area, then the NOI needs to show that. Also, there are additional filing fees associated with being in Riverfront Area.
- o K. Doyle mentions that the applicant did not pay the local \$50 Standard NOI fee.
- o K. Doyle questions the frontage of the lot per zoning regulations.
- o K. Doyle asks when the BVW was flagged?

Applicant Comments –

- o L. Jalbert states that there is grading within the Riverfront Area.
- o Not aware of the local filing fee, never had to pay the local fee, but will start.
- o There frontage is ok, the house is actually located on two lots owned by the same owner. (property boundary detail included on plans)

Approved 2/3/05

- o L. Jalbert states that the BVW was flagged 1-2 months ago.

SCC Comments –

- o D. Mitchell recommends that the SCC conducts a site visit. He recommends that on the site visit, the SCC starts at wetland flag 1 to check out the perennial stream etc.
- o D. Barnicle motions to conduct a site walk at 8:00AM on Saturday 1/29/05.
- o D. Mitchell asks if the driveway and house location could be staked for the site walk.
- o D. Grehi questions what level of tree cover will be left on property.
- o D. Barnicle motions to continue public hearing until Thursday 2/3/05 at 7:20PM.

Abutter Concerns –

- o No concerns from R. Rehkamp. He was just interested in seeing what was going to be constructed on property.

Applicant Comments –

- o L. Jalbert agrees to staking the property prior to site walk and agrees to a continuance of the hearing.

Information to be submitted –

Revised plan with drainage details, Riverfront Area to be assessed. See above for details.

PUBLIC HEARING

ANRAD Continued—23 Hall Road, 24 acre delineation. Waterman Design Associates, Inc. for Robert Straus.
DEP File # 300-640

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, present was B. Waterman representing applicant/property owner.

Applicant Comments –

- o B. Waterman discussed the information that was submitted to the SCC prior to the hearing, which included StreamStats, drought information and a revised plan showing all current wetland delineation flags.
- o B. Waterman discusses the status of the perennial stream on property. He states that he believes it is intermittent due to the information submitted to the SCC in accordance to the regulations. He states that all evidence that the stream is intermittent has been submitted to the SCC.

SCC Comments –

- o D. Mitchell states that he needs to be convinced with his own eyes that the stream is not perennial. He would like to see the soil survey information for the property.
- o J. Hoffman submits the historic topography quadrangle maps for the property, stream is shown as perennial. D. Barnicle states that he would like to visit the site and check out the stream. He asks K. Doyle for comments on the stream.
- o K. Doyle states that there is evidence that the stream is intermittent, however it was flowing so well at the site walk. K. Doyle wonders what would make the stream status go from perennial to intermittent, whether that is new development up stream cutting off the water supply or maybe beaver activity somewhere up stream etc.
- o D. Barnicle and D. Mitchell state that a site walk is necessary for Saturday 1/29/05.

Applicant Responses-

Approved 2/3/05

- o B. Waterman is concerned with continuing the hearing process but agrees to a site walk and continuing the hearing until 2/3/05

Abutter Concerns –

- o No abutters present

Information to be Submitted-

- o Soil Survey information

Continuation-

- o Project continued 2/3/05 at 7:40PM pending the site walk on 1/29/05

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED – Green Hill Engineering for K. Strum for existing single family home garage and driveway addition at 118 Arnold Road. DEP File # 300-644.

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, no one was present for Applicant.

- o SCC review revised project plans submitted 1/12/05.
- o D. Mitchell motions to approve the project as shown on 1/12/05 plans.
- o J. Hoffman seconds the motion.
- o All in favor: 3, All opposed: none
- o 3/0 approve project as presented. Issue Order of Conditions.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED – Green Hill Engineering for DeRose for construction of single family house, septic and driveway at 117 McGilpin Road. DEP File # 300-645.

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, no one was present for Applicant.

- o SCC review revised project plans submitted 1/12/05.
- o K. Doyle questions why erosion controls on are within the 50-ft. buffer zone.
- o D. Mitchell motions to approve the project as shown on 1/12/05 plans, minor modification needed to locate erosion controls out of 50-ft buffer zone.
- o J. Hoffman seconds the motion.
- o All in favor: 3, All opposed: none
- o 3/0 approve project as presented. Minor modification to be made, revised plans to be submitted prior to signing of the Order of Conditions. Issue Order of Conditions pending receipt of revised plans.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED – Para Land Surveying and Engineering for Alfred Davis for single family home construction and related at 265 Holland Road. DEP File # 300-643

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, present were R. Para and A. Davis.

Applicant Comments –

- o R. Para requests a continuance so that the applicant can go forward with the ZBA variance. R. Para requests confirmation that the SCC will support the request for a ZBA variance. R. Para goes over project plan with new prospective Associate SCC members.

SCC Comments –

- o D. Barnicle states that the SCC will correspond with the ZBA stating that the SCC recommends utilizing the 25-ft right-of-way off Holland Rd as an alternative to impacting wetlands and the stream.
- o D. Barnicle questions that drainage of the property, how does the property drain.
- o D. Barnicle states that the applicant needs to supply the SCC with two things; an indication of when the ZBA variance will be submitted and what type of assistance does the applicant need from the SCC.
- o K. Doyle mentions that the applicant needs to think about it: does he wants to request a “shared driveway” or can the 25-foot right-of-way can be treated as a roadway.

Applicant Comments –

- o R. Para stated that the property drains via the brook. Also, the property owner across the right-of-way from the subject property had a previous filing to the SCC. DEP No. 300-621. R. Para requests a copy of the project plans filed under this filing.
- o R. Para agrees to continue the public hearing, pending the ZBA process. R. Para suggests the next hearing be 3/17/05.

Abutter Concerns –

- o No abutters present

Continuation-

- o Project continued until 3/17/05 at 7:20PM

Information to be Submitted-

- o Correspondence with the ZBA regarding the request for a variance to utilize the 25-foot right-of-way

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED – Jalbert Engineering for Steve’s Collision. DEP # 300-576

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, present were L. Jalbert and S. Brunnele

Applicant Comments –

- o L. Jalbert stated that since the last hearing on 1/6/04, new plans have been submitted to the SCC. The new plans include two catch basins, the location of the pipes, revisions to the berm location and the location of the roll-off dumpster.

Approved 2/3/05

- o L. Jalbert and S. Brunnele stated that a large pipe on property was installed a long time ago to drain the wetland was blocked, that is why the two other nearby pipes were flowing. The larger pipe is now cleaned and no longer blocked.

SCC Comments –

- o D. Barnicle questions why the two newer pipes are still there, should they be removed. How long are the two pipes?
- o D. Mitchell questions why the pipes are even present, the pipes look new. He states that there is no reason to remove the pipes.

Applicant Comments –

- o S. Brunnele states that he has been on the property for 11 years and no activity has taken place in the location of the pipes. He knows nothing about the pipes.
- o L. Jalbert states that the pipes look to be about 16 feet long.

SCC Comments –

- o D. Barnicle questions the location of the roll-off dumpster.
- o D. Mitchell states that it looks like the roll-off is to be located on a slope. D. Mitchell states that the roll-off should be contained within the berm.
- o D. Mitchell questions the size of the berm, would like to see a detail of the berm

Applicant Comments –

- o L. Jalbert states that the roll-off location is to be paved—the roll-off will be on pavement.
- o L. Jalbert states that he can extend the berm to contain the roll-off.
- o L. Jalbert states that the berm is to be a typical Cape-cod berm. He can provide a detail of a Cape-cod berm on the plans. Also, the roll-off is to be emptied as required.

SCC Comments –

- o D. Barnicle states that the project is ready for approval, as long as the requested revisions are shown on the plan.
- o D. Barnicle makes a motion to close the hearing and issue an Order of Conditions upon receipt of revised plans. D. Mitchell seconds the motion.
- o 3/0 approve project as presented. Minor modifications to be made, revised plans to be submitted prior to signing of the Order of Conditions. Issue Order of Conditions pending receipt of revised plans.

OLD BUSINESS

Tabled.

Old Business included:

- o Update of 446 Main Street
- o Update of Windgate Project at 450 Main Street
- o Update of Mashapaug ANRAD DEP File No. 300-635

NEW BUSINESS

Tabled.

New Business included:

- o F. Damiano (not present) and D. Grehl interested in becoming Associate members
- o Discussion of Certificate of Compliance Requests (Mill Yard Market Place and Mass Highway)

Approved 2/3/05

- o Discussion of The Preserve, K. Doyle to write a follow up letter to C. MacGregor

OTHER BUSINESS

Tabled

LETTER PERMITS

- o None at this time

ORDER OF CONDITIONS

Tabled.

- o Sign Farquhar Road Order of Conditions DEP File No. 300-583
- o Sign Fiske Hill Order of Conditions—Denial DEP File No. 300-642

CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE

None at this time.

Motion to close, 11:20 PM, approved by unanimous vote.