

STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION Meeting Minutes for Thursday, December 21, 2006

7:08PM: Open Meeting

Members present: David Barnicle (DB) Chairman, Donna Grehl (DG), Ed Goodwin (EG), David Mitchell (DM) at 7:15PM and Frank Damiano (FD) at 7:22PM
Kelly Kippenberger (KK), Conservation Agent

CPA and Zoning Study Committee Updates

EG states that the CPA Committee is currently looking into the possibility if Lake Associations can get funding from CPA for maintenance. He also states that the Committee is looking into parcels of land for habitat of humanity

DG states that the Zoning Study Committee is finalizing proposed zone changes: commercial, industrial, and in-law apartments. She states that none of the changes will affect the Conservation Commission, it is zoning changes like changing the building size within industrial zone.

7:13PM Other Business

DB requests an update to 118 Clarke Road, Howerton and Rizey. KK states that she sent out a reminder letter on 12/20/06 to the property owners that the 75-day deadline for information is 1/9/07. She states that the Commission is seeking information on DEP 300-314, the Order of Conditions for the construction of the driveway. (DM enters the meeting at 7:15PM)

7:17PM Sign Permits

DB questions if all members have had a chance to review the Order of Conditions for Stoneleigh Woods. EG states that he would like a condition stating that the project cannot start until the Town accepts Chase Road. Members discuss Chase Road. DB decides to table the discussion and signing the Order until after all public hearings. (FD enters the meeting at 7:22PM)

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 11/2/06: DEP 300-714 for 120 Lane 10, proposed house demolition and construction of a new house. Green Hill Engineering, Inc, representing Vizards

DB opens the public hearing at 7:33PM

Present: M. Farrell, Green Hill Engineering
D. Vizard

Discussion:

- KK states revised plans submitted 12/20/06 that includes two notes on the plan: stone to be installed around house for roof run off and construction access to be mulched and planted once house is built. KK states that the notes lack detail and she recommends that the members discuss any outstanding concerns
- Members discuss the driveway slope. EG states that there is a town requirement of 12% slope for driveways. Members are concerned with a driveway to the house. KK states that the parking and garage is located on Lane 10, not near the house

- D.Vizard states that there is an erosion problem near the neighbor's house. M.Farrell agrees and states that the project includes infiltrating the water running down Lane 10.
- FD questions the construction details provided, why does the construction access need to be 10-foot wide. M. Farrell states that there is an existing path. FD requests clarification of the cross section of the construction access, he prefers that the grade of the access road stays the same in order to not have any erosion.
- D.Vizard states that he needs to create a construction access to the house. He states that there are portions of the access road closest to Lane 10 that is steeper than where the access road will be. DM states that he is concerned with the access road after construction
- EG states that he thought the Commission asked for more details on the construction access. KK states that the Commission would like to see restoration details of the access road. It appears that the members are concerned with after construction and the potential for erosion.
- DM questions how the 9 inches of gravel will that be removed.
- M. Farrell states that he thinks paving the driveway would be better, able to control the water. Members disagree.
- FD questions where the evergreens will be planted and how many. D. Vizard states that he would like to maintain a path
- EG recalls that members discussed low impact construction, like using rubber-tired vehicles. D. Vizard states that he too would like as much little impact as possible. He has already spoken to contractors and told them that he wants as little impact as possible. M. Farrell states that only a limited amount of trees to be removed.
- DM states that a drivable path shall not be left, it should not be an extension of Lane 10. DG questions if bollards should be installed to block access
- DB questions if the board would like to see more details on the restoration. FD states that he is not in favor of the project, but that there should be more details on the restoration.
- KK states that the garage is up top, there should be only foot access to the house
- DVizard states that everyone on Lane 10 has a driveway. KK states that not everyone has the steep slope. The garage and parking area was put on top of the steep slope for a reason.
- DVizard questions why would he want to be responsible for cars driving down the steep driveway.
- M. Farrell questions if the will of the board is to band all vehicle access to the house. He states that from the beginning he thought it would be better to pave the driveway and shed the water off to the side. FD states that paving the driveway would increase the velocity of the water and cause major erosion problems. MFarrell states that the board is being unreasonable
- DB questions M.Farrell if he thinks the best way to protect the Lake is to pave the driveway to control the runoff. M.Farrell answers yes.
- DG states that currently there isn't an erosion problem on the path, why should the commission help create potential problems. As soon as the trees are removed, there will be erosion problems. The construction access should be returned to the way it is now.
- FD states that he completely disagrees about paving the driveway, pitching the driveway would not help.
- D.Vizard states that trap rock is need for the construction vehicles. There is an erosion problem just past the driveway. M.Farrell states that hard pact gravel will be used for the vehicles.
- KK states that there is an Order of Conditions to put the septic line where the construction access is going to be. She states that the Commission was very concerned about the erosion potential for just the septic line. Members discuss the septic system project. M.Farrell states that the project will minimize disturbance.

- D.Vizard states that the best surface would be trap rock with natural hemlock mulch over the top. After the house is complete, he will install the mulch for a walking path and utility vehicle access. DG states that leaving a 10-ft wide swath of gravel is too wide.
- M. Farrell states that after the driveway is installed, there will be monitoring during construction. If there is a problem, they will come back before the Commission to address it. He is absolutely confident that there will not be an erosion problem. He states that the biggest potential for erosion may be the roof runoff from the house.
- D.Vizard states that he needs a safe construction egress. DM questions what will happen after construction is done. He questions what is utility access. D.Vizard states a John Deer utility vehicle.
- D.Vizard states that the path tree to tree is about 11-feet wide. When lumber is brought in, the trees will come down to ensure safe delivery.
- DB states that he would be more acceptable to the project if more details were submitted for the restoration of the drive
- EG states that he wants to find a way to build the house, he would allow temporary access. He thinks that utility access is reasonable but he would like the area to be restored after construction
- KK states that the Commission needs to be careful about having Conditions that can be enforceable. She states that the conditions need to relate to the Lake and the potential for erosion in the lake.
- DB asks the members what objection do they have to the current plan. DM states detail number nine is lacking information. KK states a restoration sequence is missing.
- FD states that his issues go beyond the driveway. EG states that he agrees with DM.
- FD questions if a compacted gravel driveway will have an erosion problem.
- KK states that the soils are sandy, there is a high potential for erosion
- DB states that emergency vehicles would park on top of the slope on Lane 10. He believes that a personal utility access will not cause erosion if restored properly
- EG states that maybe a bond should be put in place.
- M.Farrell states that he can come back with a more detailed restoration plan.
- FD questions other members if the commission will allow the gravel.
- DM states that he needs a safe construction egress. He would like to see a 6-foot path gravel to be left, curved (within existing path) with vegetation. DG agrees, seems to be reasonable.
- KK need planting details, species, size and number
- EG states that a bond on the property would be good. DB states that he doesn't think a bond is needed.
- D. Vizard agrees to a continuance for additional information--restoration details.
- DB states that revised plans need to be submitted at least 3 days before the meeting

Hearing continued to 1/4/07 at 8:40PM pending revised plans.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 11/2/06: DEP 300-684 for 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 reads the request to continue the hearing to 1/18/07 at 8:00pm. Members agree with the continuance request. KK states that mitigation plan was received 12/19/06 and circulated to the members. Members should review the mitigation prior to next hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

RDA CONTINUED from 11/16/06: SCC 06-15 for 165 Charlton Road, wetland and stream determination. Alton Engineering representing Bill Babineau

DB opens the public hearing at 8:25PM

Present: A. Stone, Alton Stone Engineering
B. Babineau

Discussion:

- KK states that the wetland area was re-flagged with 7 new flags. KK and DB reviewed the new wetland flags on 11/29/06 and agreed that flag C7 needs to be moved 10-15 feet to the west. (review of photos). The new wetland flags have not been formally surveyed, but a sketch has been provided. The Commission will need a surveyed plan. At a previous hearing, the SCC voted to reclassify the stream to intermittent, the only outstanding issues are approving the delineation.
- A. Stone states that he is in agreement with moving Flag C7. Jalbert Engineering will do the plans.
- A. Stone states that his recollection is that from Flag C5 to the west the ditch is not a resource. He was under the impression that the area from C5 and C6 to the east the ditch is an intermittent stream--to the west it would be just a ditch.
- DB states that he is concerned that the ditch is a resource area according to the bylaw. A Stone questions that the bylaw does not have any differences in classifying a stream from the Act. DB states that the ditch is picking up overland flow and water during periods of rain.
- DB requests that KK reads the bylaw. KK reads section of 1.1 of the local bylaw that the Commission protects "areas that are inundated with water"
- DM questions the water source of the ditch. DB states there is ground water inundation, ditch had water (and iron) when last at the property
- KK states that the real question here is if the ditch has buffer zones for protection
- A. Stone states that the ditch is not a pristine resource, it is a drainage ditch
- FD questions what the soils were like in the ditch. A. Stone states he could not find hydric soils in the ditch
- DM states that when he visited the property, he saw it just as a ditch. EG states there is no source for the water in the ditch. It is horizontal seepage.
- DB states that there are no real habitat features. KK states what is interesting is that there were beaver dams in the ditch. KK asks B. Babineau to show on plan where the beaver dams were removed. (dams closer to wetland)
- A Stone states that when a NOI is filed there will be a stormwater management plan

- KK states that she is fine with calling the ditch out on the plans. It is there for a reason, some sort of hydrology and should be maintained as such. She does not consider it a resource, but the hydrology should be maintained.
- DM makes a motion to close the hearing and issue a Positive determination reclassifying the stream, labeling the ditch as ditch and getting revised survey plans that relocate Flag C7 as described by KK. FD seconds the motion. All in favor: 5/0
- KK requests consent from the 21 day deadline, no knowing when the revised plans will be submitted. A.Stone agrees.

Hearing closed. Positive Determination to be issued pending final plans.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 11/16/06. DEP 300-723 for proposed house addition at 32 Hamilton Road. Heritage Design Group representing L. Conley

DB opens the public hearing at 8:38PM

Present: A. Gaudette, Heritage Design Group

Discussion:

- KK states that SCC members visited the property on 11/18/06 and had questions regarding the stone swale. Revised plans submitted 11/27/06 including turfstone pavers for the driveway and stone swale to be at the existing shed. No vegetation is going to be removed and the Commission would be granting a waiver from the 25 foot and 50 foot buffer zones.
- DB states that he is concerned with the runoff and that where the stone swale is not shown is a good location. DB states that the majority of the property is grass and hard packed clay
- AGaudette states that the pavers will help infiltrate the runoff. DG states that there cannot be any erosion problems coming off the driveway--it is close to the wetland.
- FD questions the need for the dry well. A.Gaudette states that the dry well is for the garage runoff
- DG questions if the driveway is to be level. A.Gaudette states that it will be stable and flat. Originally the paved driveway was to be pitched to the swale, but the pavers will help infiltrate and it does not need to be pitched.
- DG questions how much disturbance to the west of driveway. A.Gaudette states that the erosion control line is the limit of work
- DB comments that the land is very flat, hay bales would be fine and there is no need for silt fence
- KK questions if any woody vegetation to be removed. A.Gaudette states no. There are some grasses and herbaceous plants to be removed near the driveway, but nothing major.
- FD states that the new plan is an improvement and motions to approve the revised plan as presented. DM seconds. KK states that the Commission would be granting a waiver to the 25 and 50-foot buffer zones. She states that the justification would be that the disturbance is minimized by not removing any woody vegetation--the work is in an area of lawn and dirt driveway, also the stormwater runoff situation will be improved. Members agree
- Vote: 5/0 approved

Hearing Closed. Approval Order of Conditions to be issued with special conditions.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI for DEP 300-728: Excavation activities including foundation work at 16 & 18 Cedar Lake Drive. The property owner started work without obtaining proper permits and an Enforcement Order was issued. Jalbert Engineering Inc. representing E. Evensen

DB opens the public hearing at 8:55PM

Present: L. Jalbert, Jalbert Engineering
E. Evensen
Abutters

Information submitted: KK receives the certified receipts and newspaper advertisement to open the hearing

Discussion:

- KK states that this is the first hearing on the project and this is an after the fact filing due to work without a permit and Enforcement Action. Natural Heritage letter dated 12/19/06 states that the Conservation Commission shall be satisfied with the erosion control measures and that they are maintained. Natural Heritage comments do not include removing and replacing the cove wall, something the property owner was seeking approval for in the 10/25/06 letter. My recommendation is to go through the 10/25/06 letter and Narrative written by Jalbert Engineering to determine what has occurred since the cease and desist and what the property owner is seeking approval for.
- DG states that when she visited the property there is dirt around the trees and the trees will die
- L. Jalbert agrees that they should go over the 10/25/06 letter item by item. Number 1: stone steps removed. L. Jalbert states that he did a mortgage survey about 15 years ago and the steps were there.
- Number 2: dig out the crawl space. E. Evensen states that about a quarter of the basement was a crawl space. L. Jalbert states that the westerly side of house will be a crawl space.
- Number 3: L. Jalbert states that the slab was put under the house in violation--no permits, no inspections. He states that the Building Inspector wants footings to be installed to meet state code. The foundation will then be enclosed, the footings are L-shaped. The state code is a minimum of 10-in deep for the footings. L. Jalbert sketches the footings for the Commission. About 30-linear feet needed on the westerly side, and 17 feet on south side.
- Number 4: remove old oil tank, install new tank. E. Evensen states that Tasse did the work last Friday--they got the proper permits to put in the tank. The oil tank is inside the house. E. Evensen states that he called Jalbert office and they said it could get done. DB questions if E. Evensen has seen the permit. DB states that the property owner is responsible for getting all permits. DB states that he is very concerned that work was done even though there is a cease and desist. DM states that construction should be ceased.
- KK states that Conservation Enforcement Order is for work that could impact the wetland or the buffer zone, not work in the house.
- E. Evensen states that the water line is not installed properly (second part of Number 4). This has not been done
- Number 5: DB questions if it will be the same size of previous structure. L. Jalbert states no. DM states that he needs to know the previous deck square footage and the proposed square footage. L. Jalbert states that the previous structure was 90 sq ft., the proposed is 320 sq ft. L. Jalbert states that 4 sonatubes were installed prior to the Enforcement Order (plans only show

2). He states that the Building Inspector wants the sonatubes removed because he does not know the depth.

- Number 6: Not part of the NOI.
- Number 7: no longer proposed
- Number 8: replace and expand. Previously 45 sq ft, proposed 180 sq ft
- Number 9: install artesian well, KK states that they need a board of health permit.
- FD confirms that the property has town sewer but not town water.
- L.Jalbert states that the house next door just got an Emergency permit for a new well. A shared well is on property and it has run dry.
- Number 10: interior work
- DG questions what is proposed for the driveway. E.Evensen states that he is going to leave the gravel.
- L.Jalbert states that they are seeking Conservation approval for the well tonight. E.Evensen states that the draw down of the lake made the water level go down. It has been a dry season so the water level is very low.
- EG questions the sonatube location. E.Evensen states that the sonatubes were installed as deep as they could, about 3 feet.
- EG states that for now, the property needs to be hay baled correctly and the fill around the trees need to be removed
- Members discuss proof for what was existing prior to the work. L.Jalbert states he can get the Mortgage survey.
- EG questions when the rear deck was put in E.Evensen states about 6 years ago with a permit from Mark Lev. KK states that the Conservation Commission has no permits on file.
- DM states that he is not in favor of deck that close to the water.
- Discussion of removing the sonatubes.
- DB states that the Commission should take up the issue of the well.
- E.Evensen states that he already spoke with Board of Health--no water. L.Jalbert states that the Board of Health needs a consensus for the well from the Commission since there is a cease & desist.
- DB states that no stock piling from the well is to be left on the site. FD states that maybe the well can be installed once the property is cleaned up. DM states that the ground is not frozen, good opportunity for the well
- E.Evensen states that he has cleaned up 99% of the property. Would like someone to see what is to be cleaned up.
- KK questions where is the trench from the well to the house.
- FD states that the soil near the trees is not good. Members discuss the clean up of site.
- DG questions the catch basin on property--outlet is to the Lake. DG states that E.Evensen needs to maintain the catch basin.
- E. Gilmore (abutter) states that the Town plows the road and maintains the catch basin. Cedar Lake Drive is not a private road.
- DM states that he will be willing to allow the well if removal of the material by hand around the tree is done and more hay bales are installed
- DB states that he walked around the perimeter of the property and surprisingly there has been no erosion into the cove

- G. Chesna (abutter) states that the Commission should: make sure hay bales fit proper requirements so that sediment does not get into the cove. Well should be allowed if there is no water.
- E. Gilmore: came in today to get the emergency permit for the well, confirms that E.Evensen needs water. Complaint about the draw down being too much.
- DG states that the Commission is trying to control the draw down. DM states that the Association will now need a permit for draw down. There should be a well survey.
- E. Gilmore questions if the Town can take control of the dam.
- DG questions if Cedar Lake is exceptionally low this year? Abutters answer Yes.
- S. Gilmore complains that the Lake Association controls the draw down.
- FD motions to allow the installation of the well, pending removal of the soil by hand near the trees and extra hay bales are added. EG seconds. All in favor: 5/0
- KK states that the property owner still has to go to the Board of health for a well permit.
- FD states that additional information needs to be submitted showing the exact footprint of all structures. Members state that removal of the sonatubes must be clearly shown.

Hearing continued to 1/18/07 pending additional information. Well allowed to be installed through a letter permit.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI Amendment for DEP 300-720. Proposed 5-Lot Subdivision at 12 & 30 Farquhar Road. Bertin Engineering Associates, Inc. representing The Spaho Corp.

DB opens the public hearing at 10:00PM

Present: H. Blakeley, Bertin Engineering
Abutters

Information submitted: KK receives the certified receipts and newspaper advertisement to open the hearing

Discussion:

- KK states this is the first hearing on the project: 5 Lot subdivision with cul-de-sac & detention basin proposed off Farquhar Road (previously Lot 1 in the Rom single family house). A portion of the project includes an Open Space parcel of approximately 13 acres. The subject parcel has a permitting history, currently the SCC has a valid Order of Conditions for a condo project (DEP 300-583) and a single family house at 12 Farquhar (DEP 300-672). Natural Heritage has commented on the project and stated that if parcel B is permanently protected, then impacts to the wetlands and habitat will be prevented. KK recommends a formal presentation on the project this evening.
- H.Blakeley gives an overview of the project: First 3 lots, smaller in size and 2 large estate lots. Lots 2 & 3 have matting with erosion controls on the step slopes. .
- DM questions if the estate lots are out of 200-foot buffer. DB requests clarification as to what is in the 100-ft buffer.
- DG questions what is land like now. H.Blakeley states that it is heavily wooded and steep. DG questions how much fill. H.Blakeley states that a lot of fill is needed but does not know the exact calculations. EG questions what is the objective of the fill. H.Blakeley states to maintain

the slope of the cul-de-sac, to create surface area. DM states that he would like total amount of fill per individual lots.

- DB states that the driveways prevent the movement of wildlife. KK states that a parking lot was previously proposed which would be more of a barrier.
- H.Blakeley states that the TSS removal is achieved.
- FD questions if in general is this project less of an impact than what was originally approved.
- DM states that he needs to see the lay of the land. DM comments that project alternatives include changing the locations of the houses.
- EG questions if there are approved perc tests for each lot. H.Blakeley states yes.
- FD questions the importance to build 5 houses instead of 4. H.Blakeley states that 5 houses is financially feasible to the applicant, the project has been reduced from 21 condo units.
- FD states that if Lot 2 is eliminated, the impact would be a lot less. KK states that the grading on Lot 2 is a concern, not the fact that there are 5 houses
- EG questions the location of the 13-acre parcel for open space. He states that through the permitting process of the parcel over the years, the open space parcel has decreased in size.
- H.Blakeley states that Natural Heritage is requiring Parcel B to be protected as open space. DB states that the open space parcel is very important, it provides access to the River.
- C. Blanchard (abutter) states that during the recent planning board hearings there has been discussion of the open space. Access to the open space parcel has been removed from the project that was once part of the condo project. KK recalls that the open space access was also the emergency access to the condo project. DB states that the open space parcel had access and parking spaces for the public. It was a very good thing for the project. DM states that the plan now shows no parking access.
- C. Blanchard states that if the land were given to Opacum, it would be private. DM comments that the land needs to be protected whether there is parking or not.
- DB states that the centerline of the roadway, septic and house locations shall be staked out for a site visit.
- H. Sarty (abutter) states that according to the planning board, there is a permit for all private septic systems, but as soon as town sewer is available, the houses must connect--it is a condition of the board of health. H. Sarty questions if a private septic system is good or not.
- H.Blakeley states that Title V Regulations require if a septic system fails, the property must connect to town sewer if available. EG questions how the septic lines would be looped. H.Blakely states that town water service is going in, no private wells. She also states that the sewer would not be looped, a trunk line would go in.
- FD answers the abutter's question and states that private septic systems are not necessarily bad for wetlands, there is a ground water recharge.
- C. Blanchard states that one of his concerns is that the individual homeowners may cut trees and extend their yards. The condo project included a conservation restriction of the wetland buffer zone. He states that 500 to 600 foot long driveways are ridiculous. He advises the Commission to pull out the old plan and revisit the condo project. There was a lot of work put into the condo project and he believes it is a better project. The 5-lot subdivision is not as conservation friendly as the condo project design.
- KK questions what the acreage of disturbance with the condo project was.
- DB states that the condo project was complex and it was a creative design. KK states that even though the Conservation Commission has an approval for the condo project (Order of Conditions issued December 2004) it doesn't mean the project is approved by the Town--there is no zoning approval

- H. Blakeley states that there is only so much you can do on the property, the project meets the regulations. The wetland crossing is no longer and more trees are protected, there is a tree clearing limit on the landscaping plan. DB states that the wetland crossing was to be a bridge that would completely span the wetland.
- EG states that the development is located further from the pristine wetland than the original project. DM comments that the Commission must judge the new project on its own merits, but pulling the old plans out for a review is a good idea.
- H.Blakeley states that there could be room to do conservation easements behind the houses.
- L.Sarty (abutter) states that the property abuts major wetlands, Hobbs Brook and the Quinebaug. There are animal species that use the uplands next to the wetlands and rivers and the project destroys the upland.
- KK requests to know the percentage of upland verses wetland of the open space piece.
- L.Sarty questions what if construction starts and the lots won't sell.
- C. Blanchard states that it may be worthwhile to pull out the old drawings and see what the difference is from the previous project.
- FD questions if it is possible to reduce the size of lots 4 and 5. H.Blakeley states that there is no reason to reduce the lot size, the lots meet R Factor, have the right area and the right frontage.
- KK questions if there is going to be a homeowners association? H.Blakeley answers that it is a potential
- DB states that the property should be staked out for the site walk. DM states that he would like to know the amount of fill to be brought in
- DB states that he would like to pull out the old plans and look at the project that was previously approved. He states that he really thinks it is a good idea, especially for the new members to see. Members discuss when to review the old project. Members decide to review the old project for informational purposes only at the next meeting 1/4/07 at 9:00PM. DB states that the discussion of the new project will be continued.
- H.Blakely questions if the members can make a determination on the open space parcel, if the Commission would accept the parcel. Members state that they cannot make a determination at this time.

Hearing Continued to 1/18/07 at 9:00PM pending additional information and a site walk

11:05 PM OTHER BUSINESS (As Time Allows):

1) Stoneleigh Woods Order of Conditions

- Members reconvene discussion of the Order of Conditions drafted for review. Members discuss adding the condition that work cannot start until Chase Road is approved by the Town. The condition reads that work will not start until Chase Road is substantially complete, property is stable and drainage system is functioning properly.
- Some members believe that not allowing work to start until Chase Road is accepted is not a Conservation Commission related condition. EG states that not allowing the project to start until Chase Road is accepted would protect the wetlands.
- KK reads from the Zoning Board of Appeals Special Permit.
- EG motions that a condition should be added that work on Stoneleigh Woods cannot start until the Town accepts Chase Road. No second to the motion.

- DB states that the Order is fine as written and will sign the permit. Other members sign the permit for issuance.
- 2) Discuss Shepard Parcel
- Members discuss the environmental issues with converting the land to development.
 - DM states that the Commission would be setting a precedent.
 - DB states that he has a problem with the request being from a private organization and not the Town
 - Consensus of the Board is to not move forward with discussion of converting the parcel to ball fields. The Board supports T. Chamberland's efforts but think other parcels are available. KK mentions that there has been a committee formed to evaluate land for playing fields for the Town.

3) Discuss Route 20 FCP

KK & DB visited on 12/14/06 and have no real issues. KK to write letter to Board of Selectman discussing what was mentioned on the site walk with the forester.

4) Discuss 19, 29 & 31 Arnold Road stream violations

- SCC visited on 12/10/06 and witnessed the violations. DB states that 31 Arnold Road had major clearing in the wetland. He requests that the property owner get a second letter to come in and talk to the Commission
- DB states that Cliff Curboy the property owner was there at 19 Arnold Road. He said that he did not receive a letter. KK states that the certified mail was not claimed. She will re-send the letter regular mail. DB states that the DPW should be notified, the only access to the barn is by crossing the stream. DB states that the DPW should know about the culvert replacement, there needs to be some additional work done--there needs to be armoring of the culvert crossing--erosion could happen.

5) 468 Leadmine Road: Certificate of Compliance

- DB states that members reviewed the pine plantings on 12/10/06. He states that the plantings may not last, it appears that the plantings were very small. DM states that at least the owner tried to comply. FD motions to issue the Certificate of Compliance. DM seconds. All in favor: 4/1 (DG opposed).

6) Letter Permit for 60 So Shore Drive—addition of beach sand

- DG states that clean sand will be added by hand, bucket by bucket. DM questions where the sand will be added. DG states on the first tier up from the water. FD motions to allow the sand to be added by hand. DM second. All in favor: 4/0 (DG abstained)

Meeting Adjourn 11:54 PM