

STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION (SCC)

Minutes for Wednesday March 8, 2006

(Rescheduled from March 2, 2006)

MEMBERS PRESENT at 7:05 PM

Board Members: David Barnicle, Chairman (DB), Donna Grehl (DG), Frank Damiano (FD) and David Mitchell (DM) (7:15 PM)

Kelly Kippenberger, Conservation Agent (KK)

7:06 PM Approval of 2/2/06 Minutes

DB motions to approve the 2/2/06 meeting minutes (minor edits provided by DB and DM). FD seconds the motion, all in favor: 3/0

7:08 PM Discussion

- SCC Members discuss reformatting the minutes and limiting the discussion in the typed minutes. SCC members all agree that the minutes are too long and need to be reformatted. KK provided the SCC members with a “Minute Sample” for review.
- SCC Members discuss using member initials and applicant initials to cut down the length of the minutes. DB states that the “reformatted minutes can be implemented from here on out. The SCC will test it out for a few meetings and determine if it is an improvement.
- DB discusses with other SCC members a database for projects—including the minutes into the project folder. KK suggests including a list of all of the meeting dates in each project folder. FD suggests developing a permit database software. KK discusses the permit software purchased by the Town. DB recommends discussing this at another hearing.

7:25 PM Walk Ins

D. Roberts present from Jalbert Engineering, Inc. and requests to speak to the SCC as a “Walk In” on a couple of topics. KK states that she is unaware of any “Walk In” issues—and she requests to be notified of any Walk Ins.

- 1) Lot 4 for Rom’s Restaurant filing at 209 Main Street (Route 131), DEP 300-673
 - D. Roberts presents the SCC with a proposed revised plan showing a minor change in the garage location and size. He states that the limit of work will not change.
 - SCC Members agree that it is not a significant change and does not need a formal Amendment to the Order, since the limit of work will not change.
 - SCC Members request that D. Roberts submit the revised plan to the office and KK will follow up with an approval letter.
- 2) JMJ Property project (DEP 300-671) at 79 Main Street
 - D. Roberts states that changes have been made to the project through the ZBA process.
 - KK states that she will check the revised plans that were submitted to ZBA and provide the SCC Members with comments and recommendations if an Amendment is needed.
 - SCC members agree

- 3) D. Roberts states that the property owners for 269 Cedar Street Lots 1 through 5 (DEP 300-649 through 300-653) would like to “Walk In” next meeting—3/16/06. SCC members state that a Walk In is only 5 to 10 minutes, any thing longer would be an Appointment. D. Roberts agrees that it will only take 5 minutes and can be a Walk In.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED: DEP 300-688. 33 & 35 Bennets Road—demolition and reconstruction of a single-family house. Jalbert Engineering, Inc. representing J. Dunn

KK opens the Public Hearing at 7:35 PM.

Present: D. Roberts from Jalbert Engineering, Inc.
J. Dunn and R. Dunn, property owners

New Information Submitted: The previous public hearing for this project was on 2/16/06. Revised project plans were submitted 2/22/06 (dated 2/20/06).

Summary by KK: KK summarizes the revised project plans that include the perimeter drain and erosion control modification. The perimeter drain is located approximately 28-feet from Leadmine Lake.

Discussion:

- SCC Members discuss the perimeter drain location. DM questions the amount of excavation
- R. Dunn questions if the perimeter drain will be visible and questions what is rip-rap. D. Roberts states it will be ADS Pipe. Rip-rap alternatives (types of stone) were discussed.
- SCC members discuss that no stock piling is to be on site. D. Roberts states that there is a note on the plan stating that.
- FD makes a motion to approve the project as shown. DM seconds the motion and adds in the Condition that the trench shall not remain open and that no stock piling is to be onsite. DG adds to the motion that the plantings must succeed and possibly be monitored. All in Favor of the modified motion: 4/0.
- Discussion after the vote: D. Roberts questions when the Order will be ready. KK states that she will try to have the permit ready for next meeting, but by law has 21 days to issue. D. Roberts requests to receive the original Order for recording.

Hearing closed and approval Order of Conditions to be issued.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED: DEP 300-683. Construction of a gazebo and walkway at 78 South Shore Drive. Jalbert Engineering representing G. Allard

KK opens the Public Hearing at 7:50 PM.

Present: D. Roberts from Jalbert Engineering, Inc.

New Information Submitted: Revised project plans were submitted 2/24/06 (dated 2/23/06)

Summary by KK: KK summaries the revised plans that show the flag locations for perennial stream bank and the high water mark for the Lake. KK states that the SCC members conducted a brief site walk on 1/21/06 and the walk was inconclusive. The project proposal is for a gazebo to be constructed on piers and also a walkway proposed from the road to the gazebo and a boardwalk from the gazebo to the water's edge. KK states that she spoke with Mr. Allard and he intends on using the gazebo to possibly store items and enjoy the Lake.

Discussion:

- SCC members discuss the boardwalk and FD questions if the boardwalk is going to be built on piers. D. Roberts describes the boardwalk and states that it will be elevated on poles, which could be removed at any time.
- FD questions if it is a possibility of making the entire walkway like the boardwalk. D. Roberts states that the walkway to the gazebo will be more natural. DM questions if the walkway will consist of woodchips and landscape timbers/railroad ties
- DG questions if there is a need to cut down any major trees. D. Roberts states that the path is marked on the property and it was set to avoid major trees.
- DM states there is no detail of the gazebo and walkway on the plan. DG questions the number of poles planted into the ground for the boardwalk. D. Roberts states that the boardwalk will connect to the dock. FD states the boardwalk will be a benefit, it will control the disturbance in the 25 foot no touch zone.
- DG questions why the property owner cannot use the nearby public ramp for access to the Lake. D. Roberts states that he believes it is a legal easement only permitted by certain users. SCC has a brief discussion of the dock
- KK questions the Board's thoughts on the allowance of work within the 25-foot no touch and the gazebo within the 50-foot no permanent structures. DM states that the walkway will need to not be intrusive, he needs more details of the gazebo and the boardwalk is good—he does not want to deny the property owner access to the Lake and the boardwalk will control the disturbance.
- DG states that she will have to look at the trees to be taken down in the area of the walkways, no major trees shall be taken down to accomplish the project. The disturbance must be minimized. SCC members agree.
- KK states that the entire project is within the buffer zone to the Lake and within the 200-foot Riverfront Area. The distance between the River and walkway is about 40-45 feet. She questions if the roots are to stay for the trees that will be cut for all structures. D. Roberts states that the intent is to minimize the impact and avoid erosion.
- SCC has a brief discussion of permanent structures. DB states that the project must minimize disturbance and he believes the gazebo is a permanent structure. DM states that the area will likely be used, it needs to be protected as much as possible. DG is concerned with the permanent structures and deforesting the area.
- KK states that she would like to see the details of the boardwalk on the plan, details of the poles and base
- DM states he would like to see more details of the gazebo, he doesn't feel the gazebo is necessary, he does agree with allowing access to the water with a boardwalk and path. FD questions if the gazebo will be built by hand. D. Roberts states that it can be built by hand.

FINAL Approved 4/20/06

- SCC Members state that a site walk is needed to review the flag locations. KK states that she can visit the site. DM states that the plans need to be revised to show more detail of the boardwalk and the gazebo.
- DB questions if a stonewall is needed on the bank of the Lake, DG and DM state it is not necessary. DG states that the area is a cove and needs to be protected.

Action Items:

Revised plans to be submitted to include more detail of the structures. KK to conduct a site walk to review flag locations.

Hearing continued April 6, 2006 at 9:10PM pending revised plans.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED: DEP 300-684. Demolition and reconstruction of a house and installation of a septic system at 80 & 118 Leadmine Lane. Jalbert Engineering representing the applicant, G. Pinto.

KK opens the Public Hearing at 8:25pm

Present: D. Roberts, Jalbert Engineering, Inc.
G. Pinto, Applicant

New Information Submitted: SCC Members conducted a site walk 3/7/06. KK wrote a memo with a list of concerns on 3/8/06.

Summary by KK: KK summarizes her concerns observed on the site walk, the amount of wetland disturbance. Permit application was filed as temporary disturbance, but it may be permanent since it will alter forested wetland. The project includes razing the existing house/camp and building a new larger house. The house currently on property is approximately within 25-30 feet of the lake and perennial stream, the new house is proposed further from the resources but still within the 50-foot buffer zone. The septic system will need to be installed—proposed on the adjacent parcel recently purchased. Easement through wetland and Riverfront Area, abutter will not allow easement to be within the private roadway. The perc test was done in 2002, has since expired. KK states that a more detailed restoration plan must be submitted, among other things (see memo dated 3/8/06).

Discussion:

- DB states that the wetland disturbance is permanent and the NOI application should be changed. The area of wetland to be impacted has a rocky terrain with large boulders and large trees. If the rocks are removed, the tree root systems will be destroyed. If it is temporary disturbance, then the rocks will have to be mapped out and replaced same with the large trees, so this project cannot be a temporary disturbance, it is permanent disturbance. FD, DG and DB agree that the disturbance is permanent.
- DM questions why the clearing swath is 15-feet wide. D. Roberts states that the width will allow a small back-hoe to dig the trench. A back-hoe is needed due to the depth of the trench.
- FD states that he personally does not think a tight tank is an alternative. D. Roberts states that a tight tank is really not an option, it is not preferred by DEP.
- KK questions if ledge is in the area and blasting is needed. DB states that the area is glacier till. KK states that more information is needed for the restoration and she questions if the septic system will be accessed for maintenance over the pipe through the wetland. D. Roberts points

out the access cart path that is already exists (on LeFleche property). G. Pinto was granted the cart path for easement to the septic system.

- D. Roberts states that two 2-inch pressure lines will be installed.
- DM states that an inventory of the altered area must be done, a detailed approach.
- G. Pinto states that he will get a wetland specialist involved.
- DG questions the enlargement of the house size. G. Pinto states that it is proposed to be about 6-foot wider. He also states that the foundation will be on a elevated slab with porous material.
- SCC Members agree that a wetland specialist needs to get involved and comment on KK's memo.

Action Items:

G. Pinto to contract a wetland specialist to review project and respond to SCC concerns relative to wetland disturbance and restoration.

Hearing continued May 4, 2006 at 8:20pm pending additional information.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED: DEP 300-686. Septic System repair at 299 Cedar Street. Jalbert Engineering representing property owners, A. and P. Koziol

KK opens the Public Hearing at 9:07pm

Present: D. Roberts and L. Jalbert from Jalbert Engineering, Inc.

New Information Submitted: KK conducted a site walk on 2/28/06.

Summary by KK: KK shows the SCC Members photographs of the property. She states that the property is approximately 3 acres in size and that the area north of the house seemed like an alternative location for the septic system (further from the wetland) but was informed that the area has ledge and would not perc. The location of the proposed septic system is the only location. She has no problems with the project, just wants to make sure the erosion controls are monitored during construction.

Discussion:

- L. Jalbert states that the current system is in the front of the house because of the ledge. DM questions the well location on the abutting lot. D. Roberts states that the septic system is not near any wells, the Board of Health will review that.
- D. Roberts states that the new septic system cannot be in the foot print of the failed system.
- KK points out the distance between the grading and the wetland, and also the tree removal to occur where the system will be. DG suggests some type of plantings at the base of the slope. DB is concerned with the grades up against the 25-foot no touch zone.
- FD questions if there is anything else besides grass that can be planted. D. Roberts states that no plantings on the system itself, but plantings can be off the system. DG suggests high-bush blueberry shrubs at the 25-foot no touch buffer zone adjacent to the system. L. Jalbert states that is fine with him. FD makes a motion to approve the project with the addition of some high-bush blueberry plantings as discussed. DG seconds the motion, all in favor: 4/0.

Hearing closed. Approval Order of Conditions to be issued pending receipt of revised plans showing the plantings.

*******At 9:22 PM, L. Jalbert requests to “flip-flop” the meeting times for the 127 & 135 Main Street meeting (scheduled for 8:30 PM) and the 12 Wallace Road meeting (scheduled 8:45 PM) since the Applicant is present for the 12 Wallace Road meeting. No abutters present for either meeting. SCC Members agree to the time revision. *******

PUBLIC HEARING

RDA's CONTINUED: SCC 05-43 and SCC 06-01 through 06-5. Lots 1 through 6 at 12 Wallace Road, Proposed and Existing Single-Family Houses. Jalbert Engineering, Inc representing T. Reardon Builders, Inc

KK opens the Public Hearing at 9:22pm

Present: D. Roberts and L. Jalbert from Jalbert Engineering, Inc.
T. Reardon, T. Reardon Builders, Inc.

New Information Submitted: SCC members visited the properties on 2/4/06. KK informed Jalbert Engineering of SCC concerns through e-mail (Lot 6 issues). Revised plans for Lots 5 and 6 submitted on 3/2/06 (dated 2/28/06) with current conditions added.

Summary by KK: KK summarizes her concerns with Lot 6: erosion controls not installed (at time of the site walk), entire back yard was not seeded—potential for major erosion, an open trench exists, and a natural swale was filled in between the lots. KK states that each lot has a RDA filing, 3 houses are existing so 3 RDA submittals are “After the Fact”

- T. Reardon submits photos to the SCC showing the current site conditions. He states that as soon as KK sent the email with the list of concerns from the site walk, the issues were corrected. Erosion controls were installed on Lot 6. D. Roberts states that the open trench has been backfilled and rip-rap has been added to the perimeter drain outlet (Lot 6).
- DM states that the wetland flag locations are fine.
- DB questions the filled in swale (Lot 5). T. Reardon states that he believes there was a foundation that caved in and pitches towards Wallace Road (SCC Members and T. Reardon review the site plan). The piles of dirt were installed to block the properties from trespassing. DB states that it is a violation to fill in the swale.
- SCC Members decide to review each Lot separately. SCC decide to start with Lot 5 since the swale is on Lot 5

Discussion of Lot 5:

- D. Roberts states that filling the swale will not affect the drainage. There is an existing pile of debris there.
- DB states there is a problem with this project, there is no basis of knowing what was there prior to development.
- T. Reardon states that about 8 linear feet of the swale was crossed in the middle. SCC Members review the topography shown on the plan in the area of the swale, and discuss if filling in the remain portion of the swale that is altered with impact the area.
- D. Roberts states that it appears that filling in the swale will not impact the hydrology of the area.

FINAL Approved 4/20/06

- DM states that he does not have a problem with filling in the swale, it appears to not have a purpose. DG makes the observation that the swale is out of the 200-foot buffer zone and therefore out of SCC jurisdiction.
- SCC Members discuss the erosion controls. DM makes a motion to issue a Negative Determination with basic erosion control conditions for Lot 5 and DG seconds the motion. All in favor: 4/0

Negative determination to be issued for Lot 5

Discussion of Lot 4

- DM states that the 6-inch perimeter drain should also have the rip-rap installation.
- DB questions if mitigation is proposed for the work that took place within the 200-foot buffer zone without SCC approval. DM states that the SCC would have allowed the house to be built either way.
- T. Reardon states that the lot has already been hydro-seeded and is stable. Rip-rap can be installed at the outlet, no problem. He also states that there is a gentle break between a flat area of the lot and the existing vegetation.
- DB and DG both agree that some type of plantings need to be installed to mitigate for the work done in jurisdiction without a permit. T. Reardon agrees and requests if the vegetation can be determined by the property owners. SCC members agree.
- DG questions if bollards should be installed. No other SCC members comment.
- DM makes a motion to issue a Negative Determination, but the plans are to be revised to include an area of vegetation to be determined and rip-rap at the outlet. FD seconds the motion, all in favor: 4/0.

Action Items:

Revised plans are to be submitted showing the rip-rap at the outlet and an area of plantings to be determined.

Negative Determination to be issued pending receipt of revised plans.

Discussion of Lot 6

- SCC Members review the observed violations and what has been done to correct the issues (erosion controls installed, trench backfilled, rip-rap added, stone wall added at toe of slope)). SCC members satisfied with the progress of Lot 6.
- KK states that the back yard needs to be hydro-seeded as soon as possible and suggests Maple Tree plantings to mitigate for the work in the 200-foot buffer zone. DG agrees with KK's suggestions. FD makes a motion to issue a Negative Determination with conditions to hydro-seed and plant Maple Trees in the back yard. DM seconds the motion, all in favor: 4/0.

Negative Determination to be issued with conditions of hydro-seeding and plantings.

Discussion of Lot 3

- DM states that he would like to see the rip-rap added to the perimeter drain outlet. T. Reardon agrees and states that the lot has a defined wood line.

FINAL Approved 4/20/06

- DM makes a motion to issue a Negative Determination with revised plans showing the rip-rap detail, FD seconds the motion. All in favor: 4/0.

Action Items:

Revised plans are to be submitted showing the rip-rap at the outlet

Negative Determination to be issued pending revised plans.

Discussion of Lot 2

- SCC members state that they have no issues with Lot 2.
- DM makes a motion to issue a Negative Determination, FD seconds the motion. All in favor: 4/0

Negative Determination to be issued.

Discussion of Lot 1

- SCC members state that they have no issues with Lot 1.
- DM states that there is a stone wall located on property and thinks it needs to be shown on the plan. DB agrees.
- KK questions the clearing limit for Lot 1. D. Roberts states that the clearing limit may need to be adjusted.
- DM makes a motion to issue a Negative Determination, FD seconds the motion. All in favor: 4/0

Action Items:

Revised plans to be submitted showing the clearing limits and the stone wall on property.

Negative Determination to be issued pending revised plans.

12 Wallace Road Hearing closed, Negative Determinations to be issued for Lots 1 through 6.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED: DEP 300-668. 127 and 135 Main Street, Proposed Commercial Building and Parking. Jalbert Engineering representing Maple Hill Realty LLC

KK opens the Public Hearing at 10:12pm

Present: D. Roberts, Jalbert Engineering, Inc.
L. Jalbert, Jalbert Engineering, Inc

Summary by KK: No new information has been submitted. KK states that the project includes a discrepancy in the wetland delineation. When SCC Members visited the property in October 2005, they noted an area of the property that appeared to be wetland that was not flagged and requested that KK visit the property. In November 2005, KK visited the property with the wetland specialist and agreed that there was a questionable area and requested additional field data to be submitted. Since that time, no information has been submitted. KK states that because if the wetland issue, the project has been on

“hold” and the SCC has not reviewed the actual work proposed. KK reviews the project plans with the SCC Members.

- D. Roberts states that he apologizes for the delay in the project review but would like to present the SCC with a possible plan.
- L. Jalbert shows a revised plan to the SCC Members and states that the questionable wetland area is approximately 1,400 square feet in size. Without changing the design of the project, some grading will need to occur in the questionable wetland area but an approximate 3,000 square foot vegetated replication area is proposed.
- KK states that the questionable wetland area is not the greatest, healthiest, wetland. She believes that the replication area could be a definite plus for the area, especially if it increases the wetland area and brings in better vegetation for the habitat. The replication area is large to accommodate working the in 25 and 50-foot buffer zones.
- The board discusses the replication area and reviews the plan.
- SCC members agree that the replication area may be a good thing.
- DM states that hydrology and soil are crucial for the success of the replication area.
- D. Roberts states that they wish to move the project along, it has been under review for awhile.
- DM states he feels this application is appropriate at least some of the wetland will be altered by grading, but most will stay the same.
- DB states he would like to continue the hearing to allow KK to review the plan.
- DM agrees, he would like KK to review the plan and make sure the wetland hydrology and wetland soils are achievable for the success of the replication area.

Hearing continued April 20, 2006 at 8:00PM.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Discussion of Forestry Grant

KK opens the discussion at 10:30 PM

Present: J. Theroux, Forester
T. Chamberland, Tree Warden

KK Summary: KK found three parcels of land that were owned by the SCC and have decent acreage, 1 parcel off Stallion Hill Road, 1 off Finley Road and 1 off Leadmine Lane. KK researched the Assessor’s information, the aerial map and the topography for each parcels and provided the Forester with the information. The Forester was to review the 3 parcels and select one to develop a Forest Management Plan. All of this work was included in the Grant proposal.

- T. Chamberland introduces J. Theroux to the SCC and states that letters of interest have been mailed out to certain foresters, most people did not respond due to busy schedules. J. Theroux was selected to be the forester working on behalf of the SCC for the Grant.
- J. Theroux states that he will review each parcel with the SCC one at a time. He walked each parcel and took brief notes. Parcel 1 located at 197 Leadmine Lane was logged about 15-20 years ago. He sees this being a problem because the logging was heavy and no good trees were left to sell. There is good timber growing in the 6-8 inch range. Out of the 3 parcels, this parcel is the least attractive to work with. It does have great access, but only good for converting it to parking lot.

- With regards to the 197 Leadmine Lane parcel, DB states that this parcel would be good access to the 800 acres that surrounds the property (trail system)
- J. Theroux states that the 127A Stallion Road parcel was also logged about 15-20 years ago but was not hit as hard as the Leadmine parcel. The access to the parcel is not great and the topography consists of valleys and wetlands. Hemlock is dominant on the property.
- T. Chamberland states that access could be achieved through the OSV parcel, there is a power line near the Town water tanks—could speak with Mass Electric to bring in trucks through the power line for access..
- J. Theroux states that the Finley Road Parcel is the best parcel for the development of a management plan. There is good access, high quality oaks are present—diversity of chestnut oak and scarlet oak. There are wetlands on the property, but there is potential for a parking facility. There are some good areas of example pioneer plant species and there is no evidence of prior cutting. There is an underground gas line that transects the property, a pad would have to be put over the pipe for trucks. The only downfall, the property is the smallest of the three.
- SCC Members agree that the best parcel may be the Finley parcel. T. Chamberland states that the Grant was to develop a plan for a 100 to 150 acre parcel, but that number was determined prior to researching what was available. J. Theroux suggests developing a plan for the Finley piece and then maybe include a portion of another piece. SCC Members agree that may be a good idea.
- DB states that he likes the Finley parcel, the parcel may be able to provide people with good examples of a Mature Forest verses an area with Pioneer Species.
- SCC Members discuss the parcels
- DB makes a motion to allow the Forester to develop a Forest management plan on the Finley parcel and possibly include a portion of a second parcel (Stallion Hill Road). DB also requests that the Forester provide the SCC with a list of good foresting books to be purchased for the Library through the Grant monies. DM seconds the motion, all in favor: 4/0.
- KK states that a site walk should be scheduled. DB states that the SCC will decide a site walk at the 4/4/06 hearing, the walk should be in April. J. Theroux agrees and wants to be notified of the site walk. In the meantime, he will start the management plan.

T. Chamberland informs the SCC Members that Biodiversity Day is June 13, 2006 and Earth Day is April 22, 2006—if SCC Members are interested in participating. Also, June 6, 2006 is National Trail Day, there will be a presentation at the Westville Dam to promote trails in the area. DB thanks T. Chamberland for the information.

11:05 PM OTHER BUSINESS

- 1) 98 Paradise Road Enforcement Order (DEP 300-617)
 - M. Deterando (applicant) present for discussion.
 - KK states that the concrete step installation is complete and shows the SCC recent photographs (2/28/06). M. Deterando provided the SCC with dimensions of the original stairs, the disturbed areas and the new stairs (shows SCC Members).
 - DB states he needs to know the amount of sand that was deposited into the Lake, the depth of the sand. DM states that the sand must be taken out by hand.
 - M. Deterando states that he understands but has an issue with the height of the new stairs—there may be a safety issue. SCC Members state that there should be no issue and still need to know about the amount of sand in the Lake.
 - KK states that hay should be spread on the exposed soil areas for stabilization. DG states that she is concerned with silt entering the Lake and requests that a silt fence is installed.

FINAL Approved 4/20/06

- SCC Members discuss the disturbed area near the Lake and the planting plan. M. Deterando agrees that the planting plan shall include the disturbed area and that he will submit a revised planting plan to be done by a Landscaper.
- KK states that the SCC should release the Enforcement Order under the following conditions: Silt Fence is installed, stock pile of debris is removed, the area shall be stabilized with hay, and that a planting plan is submitted. SCC Members agree and DB makes a motion to release the EO with the Conditions. FD seconds the motion, all in favor: 4/0. KK to follow up with a release letter.

2) Lake Vegetation Maintenance

- DM briefly mentions to the other SCC Members the status of the Lake Maintenance NOI requirements. Task Force meetings are complete and public hearing on the requirements in April. The requirements are to be emailed to the SCC members for review prior to the hearing.

DM leaves meeting at 11:30pm.

3) Discussion of 52 Mt Dan Road Letter Permit SCC 06-07

- KK shows the SCC Members the revised sketch with the well located outside of the 50-foot buffer zone. SCC Members satisfied with the revisions. DB makes a motion to approve the well installation with a letter permit, but specify that the Board of Health may need to approve of the change. DG seconds the motion, all in favor: 3/0.

4) Discussion of 170 Cedar Street Letter Permit SCC 06-08

- Postponed until next meeting 3/16/06

5) Discussion of 78 Fairview Park Road

- SCC Members state that KK should write a letter to Judson Building Co. with a list of observed errors (wrong flared end and the need of rip-rap). DB states that the entire project has been one mistake after another, unacceptable.

6) Discussion of 13 Library Lane South correspondence received

- KK states that the property owner also wrote a letter to J. Malloy.

7) Discussion of Volunteers

- DB mentions to other SCC Members the possibility of having volunteers do site walks and Cert of Compliances. SCC Members move to discuss this idea at another hearing.

Meeting Adjourned 12:02PM