

## **STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**Minutes for Thursday, May 12, 2005**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT**

Board Members: D. Barnicle (Chair), F. Damiano, Ed Goodwin, D. Mitchell (7:15 PM)

Associate Members: D. Grehl

K. Doyle for minutes

7:00 PM

### **DISCUSSION OF NEW INFORMATION / WALK INS**

1) Mary Vigeant for 15 Carey Road—Proposed well

- Letter Permit to be submitted to Commission. Include drawing with haybale line and a copy of the Board of Health Permit. One Condition, the well site must be stabilized at the end of each day, remove spoil pile etc.

2) Louis Mountzoures for Allen Homestead for discussion of Erosion Control Monitor (DEP 300-419)

- SCC suggest three Erosion Control Monitors for contact (EcoTech, K. Rabbit, and NEE, Inc.) L. Mountzoures agrees and will keep SCC posted.

3) Steve Morawski for TGP: Vegetative Maintenance off River Road

- S. Morawski informs SCC of the poison ivy treatment specific to one area—unsure of distance to wetland resource areas. SCC approve of treatment. K. Doyle to write a confirmation email to S. Morawski.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

DEP No. 300-657. NOI for Single Family House Construction at 30 Tantasqua Road. Minuteman Engineering representing N. Traux

D. Barnicle opened the public hearing, present were Minuteman Engineering and N. Traux property owner/applicant). D. Grehl recused herself because the project is located adjacent to South Pond and she is the President of the Lake Association. N. Traux submitted appropriate notifications (abutter notification green cards and newspaper advertisement). K. Doyle states that the project is located within Natural Heritage (NH) Estimated Rare and Endangered Species habitat and recommends that the Commission does not act on the project until comments are received from NH.

SCC Comments –

- o K. Doyle questions if the driveway will be paved or gravel
- o D. Mitchell questions where the location of nearby wells since the soil “percs” fast.
- o D. Mitchell questions how the house location was located.

Applicant Comments –

- o Minuteman Eng states that the neighboring wells are located on the plan-far away. Distance to groundwater is about 10-feet, the property is a sand deposit. The well is existing on property.
- o The location of the house is a flat area that is mostly cleared—previously disturbed.
- o The Applicant mentions that a walk way or some sort of access to the Lake is requested

SCC Comments –

- o D. Mitchell states that the walkway cannot be a straight shot to the water, it will have to zig-zag.

Approved 5/26/05

- o D. Barnicle states that a planting plan is required for disturbance within the 25-foot buffer zone.
- o D. Barnicle questions the roof drainage
- o E. Goodwin questions if the dry well is deep.
- o E. Goodwin states that a site walk needs to take place and the hose location should be staked out.

Applicant Comments –

- o Minuteman Eng. states that a zig-zag walk way and planting plan will be fine.
- o A dry well is proposed for the roof runoff, minimal disturbance.
- o The Board of Health approved the well and septic prior to the purchase of the property.
- o N. Traux submits well information to the SCC

Abutter Comments—

No abutters present.

Information to be submitted –

- o Site Walk once property is staked
- o Revised plans with details of the walk way and planting plan, and drainage details

*Hearing continued pending site walk TBA and revised plans. Applicant and representative agrees.*

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

DEP File 300- NOI for Septic Upgrade at 65 Farquhar Road. Greenhill Engineering representing K. Spencer

D. Barnicle opened the public hearing, present was M. Farrell representing the applicant. M. Farrell submits appropriate notifications. K. Doyle goes over project, septic repair located in Riverfront Area—BLSF on property, undetermined.

SCC Comments—

- o K. Doyle questions why the septic cannot be located in front of the garage, out of the Riverfront Area.

Applicant Comments—

- o M. Farrell states that the septic system has failed and now needs to be replaced.
- o Driveway is located in front of garage.

SCC Comments—

- o D. Barnicle questions why the driveway is not shown on the plan.
- o D. Grehl states that septic repair will improve the situation, but questions how the river will be protected.
- o D. Barnicle requests a site walk.

Applicant Comments—

- o M. Farrell states that the driveway was not located during the survey, too far from control point.
- o Erosion controls will be installed for protection. The property is disturbed near the river (volleyball court etc.)

Abutter Comments—

No abutters present.

*Hearing continued until 5/26/05 pending a site walk on or around 5/14/05. Applicant representative agrees.*

Approved 5/26/05

**PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED DEP No. 300-654. House Addition at 310 The Trail. Jalbert Engineering, Inc. representing J. & M. Ricci. (Pending revised plans)

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, present was L. Jalbert representing the applicant. L. Jalbert submits revised plans to the SCC at the hearing.

Applicant Comments—

- o L. Jalbert states that he revised the plan to eliminate one driveway. 540 cubic yards of material still to be removed due to the location of the house addition.

SCC Comments—

- o F. Damiano states that there is not difference in the project. SCC was under the impression that by removing one side of the driveway, the amount of material to be removed would lessen.
- o D. Mitchell questions why the additional grading needs to be done on the side slope.
- o D. Barnicle questions how higher the addition needs to be in order to eliminate some earth removal.

Applicant Comments—

- o L. Jalbert states that the grading is required for drainage of the site.
- o L. Jalbert states that the applicant wants to match the finish floors, so raising the garage is not an option.

SCC Comments—

- o E. Goodwin states that because it is so close to the Lake and there are so many Lake side homes with erosion problems etc, he recommends that the project is redesigned to not remove so much material.
- o D. Grehl questions what will happen with all of the big rocks and trees.
- o F. Damiano states that the project can be done without removing the hill side.

Applicant Comments—

- o L. Jalbert states that rocks and trees will be removed and replaced with grass.
- o L. Jalbert requests that the SCC takes in account the turning radius for a car to enter the driveway.

SCC Comments—

- o D. Mitchell states that last hearing it was stated that a reduction in the amount of material to be removed was to be designed and now the plan shows that the same amount of material will be removed.
- o D. Barnicle is concerned with the slope and stability.
- o F. Damiano states that there must be a way to do the project without removing 540 cubic yards of material. He is looking for minimal impact.

Abutter Comments-

No abutters present.

Information to be submitted—

See above. Revised project plans with alternative designs.

*Hearing continued until 5/26/05 at 8:30 PM. Applicant representative agree.*

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Approved 5/26/05

Multiple NOIs CONTINUED DEP Nos. 300-649 through 300-653. Five Single Family houses at 269 Cedar Street (Lots 1-5). Applicant: M. Valandre and/or T. Reardon Builders, Inc. Rep: Jalbert Eng. and EcoTec (Request for Continuance: 5/26/05 8:10 PM)

Due to the requested continuance, the following topics were tabled:

- 1) CPA Update by E. Goodwin
- 2) Approval of 3/31/05, 4/14/05 and 4/28/05 Hearing minutes. K. Doyle received written comments for the 4/28/05 minutes by D. Mitchell and D. Barnicle—comments to be incorporated. All in favor of approving minutes with recommendations: 4/0 approved.
- 3) SCC representation for Zoning Committee.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

RDA CONTINUED SCC No. 05-05. Green Hill Engineering for M. Clayton & M. Carbonneau. Single Family House construction at 17 South Road.

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, present was M. Farrell from Green Hill Engineering representing the applicant. SCC conducted a site walk on 4/30/05—no concerns as a result of the site walk.

SCC Comments—

- o K. Doyle requests if any special conditions are necessary.
- o D. Barnicle makes a motion to issue a negative determination with no special conditions. The project will not impact the wetland resource areas and a NOI is not required. Frank seconds the motion. D. Mitchell abstains (not on site walk). All in favor: 3/0 approved.

Abutter Comments-

No abutters present.

*Hearing closed and a Negative Determination is to be issued. Applicant representative agrees.*

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED DEP No. 300-637. Green Hill Engineering for J. MacCauley. Single Family House construction at 113 Breakneck Road.

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, present was M. Farrell from Green Hill Engineering representing the applicant. SCC conducted a site walk on 4/30/05—no concerns as a result of the site walk.

SCC Comments—

- o K. Doyle states that the tax form is incomplete and the permit cannot be released until taxes are paid.
- o K. Doyle requests that hay bales are installed at the limit of the septic system work to protect the rear wetland.
- o D. Barnicle makes a motion to issue an Order of Conditions approving the project with a Special condition for erosion controls. Frank seconds the motion. D. Mitchell abstains (not on site walk). All in favor: 3/0 approved.

Abutter Comments-

No abutters present.

Approved 5/26/05

*Hearing closed and an Order of Conditions is to be issued. A new plan with the hay bale location is to be submitted. Applicant representative agrees.*

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED DEP No. 300-656. Green Hill Engineering for the Faugno's. Single Family House Addition at 37 Tantasqua Shore Drive.

D. Barnicle re-opened the public hearing, present was M. Farrell from Green Hill Engineering representing the applicant. D. Grehl recused herself because the project is located adjacent to South Pond. SCC conducted a site walk on 4/30/05.

SCC Comments—

- o K. Doyle confirms correspondence from Natural Heritage states that the project will not impact the rare wildlife habitat.
- o D. Barnicle states that he has a problem with where the driveway is to be located, too close to the wetlands.
- o K. Doyle questions if the drive will be gravel

Applicant Comments-

- o M. Farrell states that there is an existing driveway and the driveway will just be relocated.
- o A gravel drive may rut and sediment will enter the roadway and then the wetland.

SCC Comments—

- o D. Mitchell states he doesn't have a problem with the project.
- o D. Barnicle questions if the driveway can be straightened out and pulled away from the wetland.
- o D. Barnicle questions the drainage of the addition.

Applicant Comments-

- o M. Farrell states that the turn around can be eliminated.
- o M. Farrell states that the soil is highly permeable and that gutters can be installed.

SCC Comments—

- o D. Barnicle makes a motion to issue an Order of Conditions approving the project upon receiving revised plans. D. Mitchell seconds the motion. E. Goodwin abstains (not on site walk). All in favor: 3/0 approved.

Abutter Comments-

No abutters present.

*Hearing closed and an Order of Conditions is to be issued. Revised plans to be submitted showing the driveway turnaround eliminated. Applicant representative agrees.*

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Tabled and included:

1) Appointment: Alfred Trifone and Dan Flynn for 37 So. Shore Drive Enforcement Order

- As Built Plans submitted to SCC. House located closer to wetlands than originally proposed. SCC very upset with the house location.
- Discussion of violations to the Order of Conditions—nothing in writing submitted.
- Planting Plan previously submitted unacceptable because old house location is shown.
- Replication area is to be incorporated into design
- Septic system area is to be seeded immediately (only work to be happening on site)

Approved 5/26/05

- A full request to Amend the Order of Conditions is to be submitted to the SCC
- Full Amendment request to be submitted by May 19. Discussion on May 26 hearing if work can commence inside the house. Hearing for the Amendment on June 9.

2) Appiontment: Barbara Wessell for 35 and 37 Breakneck Road

- B. Wessell discussed abutting property tree clearing activities.
- SCC to visit property.

3) Discussion of 446 Main Street Beaver Removal

- Beaver removal is not the problem, culverts blocked.
- K. Doyle to set up meeting onsite with Critter Control

4) Discussion of Clark Road Extension

- Italian American club to come to the SCC for approval of beach restoration.
- K. Doyle and D. Barnicle to draft letter to Board of Selectman in regards to multiple problems with dirt roadways near Lakes in town (erosion entering lakes).

5) Signing of Order of Conditions

6) Signing of Certificates of Compliances

Motion to close hearing, 11:50 PM, approved by unanimous vote.