

## **STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

### **Meeting Minutes for Thursday, January 18, 2007**

#### **7:07PM: Open Meeting**

Members present: David Barnicle (DB) Chairman, Donna Grehl (DG), Ed Goodwin (EG), Frank Damiano (FD) and David Mitchell (DM) at 7:12PM

Kelly Kipperberger (KK), Conservation Agent

#### **7:08PM CPA and Zoning Study Committee Updates**

EG states there is nothing to report for CPA Committee except that the committee is looking for parcels for affordable housing.

DG states that for the Zoning Study Committee she is gathering information for. She states that the bio-core map should be brought into consideration for zoning use

#### **7:11 PM: Approval of Meeting Minutes**

FD motions to approve the 12/7/06 minutes as reviewed. DG seconds. KK states that some members gave her spelling errors to incorporate, already done. EG states that he did not review the minutes. All in favor: 3/0/1 EG abstain. (DM enters the meeting at 7:12pm)

#### **7:12 PM: Walk- in Appointments**

##### 1) House Addition at 129 Shore Road

- P. Girouard present for discussion and shows members a sketch of his proposed work and photographs. He states that he wants to square off a small corner of his house--2<sup>nd</sup> floor addition. There is a roof overhang where the addition is to be, so there is no increase in runoff. The corner of the house is about 45-feet from Cedar Lake. He states that the extension will be about 4ft x 12ft and only one footing will be needed.
- FD questions what will be underneath the addition, he believes gravel would be best. P. Girouard states that there is brick now and he would like to keep the brick.
- DB states that a Letter permit should be ok since there is very little excavation and the area is already brick and driveway. Other members agree that a Letter permit would be fine. FD makes a motion for a Letter permit submittal, EG seconds the motion. All in favor: 5/0
- KK states that the Applicant shall submit the photos and sketch with a written letter request to the office. She states that Commission members will do a quick site visit and then write a letter approval.
- FD states that a Building permit will be needed

##### 2) 31 Arnold Road clearing violations

- R. Southall present for discussion
- KK states that SCC members visited the property on 12/10/06 and are concerned with the amount of clearing in the wetland next to the stream that has taken place. KK states that on the site walk, the property owners of 19 Arnold Road came out and told the members that they did not receive a letter (certified mail never picked up). KK states that she re-sent a letter to 19 Arnold Road by regular mail.

- DB tells R. Southall that what has gone on is a problem, it appears that serious clearing has taken place over the years--clearing right up to the edge of the stream. He states that the stream and any wetlands are protected within 200-feet, which includes any type of clearing or excavation
- R. Southall states that he was not aware of any protection laws and that he did clear out the property. He wants to install gravel and build a yard. He admits to removing shrubs, no trees
- DM states there is a 25-foot no touch zone from the stream and wetland. He understands why it is done, but wetland needs to be protected.
- Members recall that the wetland on the north side of the house is a major wetland. DB states that skunk cabbage (obligate wetland species) was found in the wetland. R. Southall agrees that there is a major wetland next door, he says he did not touch it.
- DB states that he is concerned that once gravel and lawn is installed, then pesticides will be added.
- R. Southall states that the Commission should be concerned with the stream and the construction uphill (Highlands). The water in the stream is yellow during heavy rain storm.
- DM states there was not a lot of erosion in the stream channel when he visited the site.
- DB suggests that the Commission should walk up the stream to see where the sediment is coming from
- EG informs R. Southall that the wetlands are protected, and the stream is protected. If he still would like to fill the yard, he needs to get a professional wetland delineation done and then a permit application with the Commission
- R. Southall states that he is now aware. He apologizes and will not cut any more vegetation down. He questions if there are any penalties for what he has done so far. He states that he would like to burn the wood piles. DB states that the Fire Chief, Lenny Senecal needs to be contacted for burning.
- EG states that he would be ok with letting the area re-vegetate naturally. No more removing of vegetation without a permit, no further clearing or further damage. The Commission should send a letter to this effect. Members agree.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED from 12/7/06: DEP 300-727 for Aquatic vegetation herbicide treatment for BIG ALUM LAKE. Lycott Environmental, Inc. representing Town of Sturbridge c/o Big Alum Lake Association

### **DB opens the public hearing at 7:35PM**

**Present:** T. Chase (Lake Association)

### **Discussion:**

- KK states that the commission received the NHESP Letter dated 12/5/06. She has drafted the Order and the Special Conditions are similar to the Cedar Lake Conditions reviewed by the Commission. KK recommends voting to close the hearing and issue the Order.
- DB questions if there are any outstanding concerns from the members. DM states that the only comment is that there needs to be more follow up survey information, he recommends that T. Chase reviews the Special Conditions carefully.
- DG questions where the Lake Association posts the treatment
- T. Chase states that there is a long list of treatment postings, there is a posting on every road that leads to the Lake.

- DG states that the treatment should not be on the weekend since that is when people are swimming and boating. T. Chase states that she thinks L. Lyman does it during the week.
- DM states that there needs to be a pre and post fish kill survey. Also, a more descriptive post application vegetation survey. DM reads over a few Special Conditions to T. Chase.
- T Chase states that no one from the lake association has the past records.
- DB states that the public records are on file in Conservation Commission Office (Dr. Roy has the old records). The Commission needs to make sure all the lakes are being treated the same. DG agrees, the needs to be a track of trends. She questions if the lake association talked about alternative treatment like hand pulls? T. Chase states that Scott Sanderson has done some diving for species identification, but not hand pulling
- DG states that the best alternative is to not have to put chemicals in the lake. The Lake Association should try to do alternatives for weed treatment. DG states that South Pond hired divers to do hand picking of invasive species--it worked well.
- DM goes over the special conditions.
- DG questions if there are any shallow wells on the Lake? T. Chase states maybe one or two. DG states that there should be special recommendations for people with shallow wells. DM states that it really depends on the chemical, and in this case they are using just the standard Reward.
- T. Chase questions the draw down of the Lake. KK states that the order of conditions states that an amendment will need to be filed for draw down. Members discuss the Lake draw downs and setting up meetings with the associations
- FD motions to close the hearing and issue the Order as drafted and discussed. EG seconds the motion. All in favor: 5/0
- Members discuss applying the herbicide during the weekend. DM states that it is highly unlikely that the herbicide will be applied on the weekend, the Commission should not dictate when the herbicide should be applied, the applicator is practicing best management practices.

*Hearing closed and approval Order to be issued.*

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED from 11/16/06: DEP 300-711 for 36/38 Goodrich Road, demolition of an existing house and new house construction. The Center, LLC representing Frederick Gunn

### **DB opens the public hearing at 7:45PM**

**Present:** T. Brown, The Center LLC  
F. Gunn

### **Discussion:**

- KK states that revised plans and additional information was received on 1/16/07 from The Center consultants. Copy of letter in member mailboxes for review. Revised plans include a Landscape Plan and a foundation plan. Her concerns include timing of construction, demolition and stabilization—if work done leisurely then there can be erosion problems. She questions what machines are to be used and also comments that

there are a lot of features to be removed including existing retaining walls, concrete walkways, stone steps. She shows concern for alternating the topography and hydrology of the entire property and the amount of earth work.

- KK question T. Brown if he has been to property. T. Brown answers yes, he has been twice and walked neighboring properties.
- T. Brown states that he has addressed the comments of the 10/13/06 Conservation letter. Starting from the lake up, there are wood structures and decks. Proposed sequence was on original plan submitted by Jalbert Engineering, Inc. but he has now provided a detail for the retaining walls and foundation details. Members discuss the foundation elevation detail. T. Brown states that all foundation walls will be re-enforced concrete and gravity retaining walls will be built by hand.
- T Brown goes over the construction sequence and states that the plan is to remove the trees, put in foundation, remove existing building, remove a portion of the deck, and then do final stabilization. Erosion controls will be installed before anything.
- DG questions what is underneath the deck, rock? F Gunn states broken bits of walls, the area used to be mowed. DG wonders if there is enough soil for plantings.
- KK recommends that the members discuss the construction sequence and stabilization.
- Members agree and review the plan and construction sequencing. KK states that the area will be completely open and excavated.
- FD agrees and states that maybe a bond should be in place
- DB states that his concerns are that there is solid rock that is not known about and erosion controls can not stop soil on rock. He states that there is a lot of earth moving, where will the silt fence go if there is rock. T Brown states he has been to the property twice, there are bedrock outcrops across the street and the site has been completely disturbed in the past. He agrees that he sees a lot of rock but does not believe it is outcrop/bedrock. He states that he has to be hopeful that silt fence and hay bales can be installed.
- DM states with regards to the tight tank, what will be the sequence. T Brown states that the existing tank will need to be pumped and removed. DM questions the retaining wall on southwest corner of the property.
- DM questions the machinery to be used. F Gunn states that the wall closest to the road will be removed by hand. DM states that if ledge is hit, the new walls will need to be pinned.
- KK states that a project located at 48 Goodrich Road hit ledge at 20 inches, shown on the plan.
- DM questions if the removal of the existing house will be done by hand? F Gunn states that he will get a permit to burn portions of the house debris in January and March.
- DM questions the number of trees that have to come down. Discussion of tree removal and first phasing--shed, retaining walls and foundation can be done. T. Brown states that once the foundation is established, then take down house & decks and do plantings. Plantings are natural.
- DG questions if Gunn will be able to walk into the house. F. Gunn answers yes. DG questions the strength of the retaining walls. T Brown states that how the gravity walls work is that the wall is stable by weight of the wall itself. Gravity walls are much more

forgiving and the walls move within themselves. Gravity walls maintain their stability overtime.

- DB questions access to the pond during construction. F Gunn states that maybe they will access the property from a boat.
- DG questions if exploratory test holes were done for ledge. Members discuss the construction phasing. DB states that he would like to see more separation of phasing construction. The phasing and stabilization is critical for construction. It needs to be spelt out what is in Phase I, Phase II etc. DM agrees and would like to see bench marks in the construction sequence. F Gunn states that there are only two phases, building the house and removing the house.
- EG states that his concern is that the work is to be done by hand, the time that it is going to take and the time that the site will be open and unstable. He thinks that the plans are a major improvement from what was originally submitted, the planting plan especially. He states that if done by hand, there will need to be a site monitor. He has a great deal of respect for F. Gunn to do the work by hand but with the work that close to the Lake and with the steep slope there definitely needs to be a professional monitor.
- FD agrees that they need either a bond, or a site monitor, something may go wrong and silt may end up in the Lake.
- DM states that he is trying to visualize the sequence, he needs more details. The project is a challenge, they don't know if there is going to be ledge, there is still a lot of unknowns and the engineer will not be involved.
- T Brown states that the Building inspector will be inspecting the footings etc.
- F. Gunn states that the only potential for erosion will be during the backfilling and there will be erosion controls
- DM states that he would feel more comfortable with a timeline for construction. This is not a typical site and the timeline will reduce the uncertainty.
- DG states that she is thrilled that the lot coverage is being decreased but she is very concerned with field changes. She is in favor of an erosion control monitor, especially since they do not know how long it will take for construction. She comments that if there is any type of problem, it will impact the Lake greatly.
- FD states that a site monitor is a good idea but he does not really need a time line.
- EG states that there may be a lot of digging by hand, he is concerned with the execution.
- DB states that the first Phase where the earth work is proposed needs to be more detailed.
- T Brown understands that the Commission needs more details on the construction sequence. He questions if there is any way to close the hearing and approve contingent upon receipt.
- DB answers no, not comfortable doing that.
- DM questions if the members have any problems with the planting plan. DB states no invasive species. Members discuss the foundation drains.
- KK states that the plans are stamped by CT Engineer. T Brown states that he is in the process of getting a temporary license for MA
- DB questions if the Board of Health will approve a tight tank for a year round house. F Gunn states that a tight tank is acceptable. KK states that he will have to go to the board of health for approval, especially since it is new construction.

*Hearing continued to 2/1/07 at 9:00PM pending additional information on the construction sequence. Applicant agrees.*

**PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED from 12/21/06: DEP 300-684 for Demolition and reconstruction of a house and installation of a septic system at 80 & 118 Leadmine Lane. Jalbert Engineering and Rema Ecological Services representing the applicant, G. Pinto

**DB opens the public hearing at 8:45PM**

**Present:** G. Logan and S. Gawya from REMA Ecological  
G. Pinto

**Discussion:**

- KK states that since the last meeting, members were to review the Streamside mitigation plan submitted 12/19/06. She received comments from one member, which I forwarded to the Applicant. On 1/16/07 the office received supplemental information that was forwarded to the members for review. KK states that she would like to remind the members that the project includes: razing a seasonal house and building a new house (larger and within the 50-foot buffer zone). The new septic system will be installed across Leadmine Lane, with the sewer lines going through a wetland and Riverfront Area. To minimize impacts, there is a wetland restoration/mitigation plan in place and to compensate for the new house in the 50-foot buffer zone, there is the stream mitigation.
- KK states that it is important that the documents are carried through the permit, construction and completion. There will need to be monitoring done by professionals
- DG states that she hopes the restoration will be an improvement to the wetland. Mitigation for the house is good. FD states that the environmental work was very creative.
- DB comments that the Commission is impressed with the work. He questions the planting of willows (*Salix* spp.) along the stream. G. Logan states that the root system will stabilize the bank, the willow species will not need a lot of water all the time. Discussion of root systems damaging the culverts. G. Logan states that he does not think it will be an issue.
- KK states that she has new house foundation questions. G. Pinto states that it will be an elevated slab, heat in the slab--tubing and piping. The soil is all clay.
- KK questions the stockpiling of soil. G. Pinto states it will be in front of the house in the erosion controls.
- KK questions the construction sequence. G. Pinto states that the leach field construction and piping done first, then house. KK questions if that can be a condition and G Pinto agrees.
- DG questions the tree clearing and then asks how much bigger is the house. G. Pinto states the new house is about 8 feet wider. DG states that she cannot believe the Commission would allow a bigger house in the 50-foot buffer zone
- FD makes a motion to close the hearing and approve the project with all the submitted documents. DM seconds the motion. Discussion: EG states that the house could be the same size as the existing house. He is not in favor of a bigger house in the 50-foot buffer.

FD states that the mitigation qualifies the extra house in the buffer zone. All in favor: 4/1 EG opposed.

- Discussion of house in the buffer zone. EG states that the house is in the 50-foot buffer to the Lake and river.
- KK states that the Order of Conditions will have very specific conditions that pertain to the restoration, monitoring and mitigation. G. Pinto questions if he can review the draft Order. Discussion of applicant reviewing the draft. EG states that the Commission has never done that before. Members disagree, applicants have been able to review draft Orders and in some cases, have helped writing the Orders for Commission to review (Cedar Street project).
- DB states he has no problem allowing the Applicant to review the Draft Order once the Commission has reviewed it. KK states that if the Applicant has questions, he would have to ask the Commission. EG states that he would have to do it through an appeal.
- Members agree that the Applicant can review the draft Order.
- KK requests consent to issue the Order in more than 21 days. G. Pinto questions the process of the issuance. KK explains the 21 day issuance, the appeal process and permit recording. G. Pinto gives consent to issue in more than 21 days if needed.

*Hearing closed. Approved Order to be issued.*

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED from 1/4/07: DEP 300-724 for Septic system repair/upgrade and stormwater reroute at 31 Bennetts Road. Jalbert Engineering, Inc. representing J. Dulka

9:13PM: Requested continuance, KK reads continuance request received 1/18/07. L. Jalbert from Jalbert Engineering present. DB questions the Board of Health process. L. Jalbert states that they are undecided, that is why he wants a continuance. EG states that he would like written approval from the Board of Health before having any more hearings. L. Jalbert agrees.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED from 12/21/06: DEP 300-728 for 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 9:15PM**

**Present:** L. Jalbert, Jalbert Engineering, Inc.

### **Discussion:**

- KK states that at the last hearing, the members voted to allow the installation of the well to be done as an Emergency. She does not believe it was done. Revised plans were submitted 1/17/07 that include restoring the stairs that were removed, installing the well and enclosing the foundation. Other excavation needed that is not clear on the plan includes the waterline to the house from the well. KK questions what will be the level of disturbance for the removal of sonatubes and adds that the restoration includes loam and seed.

- L. Jalbert said that the owner still removed the dirt around the trees per the Commission's request.
- L. Jalbert states that he would like to keep the existing deck in front of house (lake) and replace the front access with a small deck landing and stairs. The sonatubes will be removed, so it will not be expanded as originally wanted.
- DB questions how do the Commission know if the deck was ever there.
- L. Jalbert submits records from the Assessor office, the property field card that states the deck was there. The deck on the field card is public record. He also adds that they did a mortgage survey in 2003 and the deck was there. (Mortgage survey dated 6/4/03)
- EG states that he still has no idea that the decks were there, whatever was there was removed prior to the Commission seeing it. L. Jalbert states that the mortgage plan and the assessor information clearly shows that the decks were there.
- DB states that at a previous hearing, it was indicated that some sonatubes are underground not shown on the plan.
- L. Jalbert states that all sonatubes will be removed with chains and a small back hoe.
- Members discuss removing the sonatubes. DB states that if the Building Inspector wants the sonatubes removed, then the Commission cannot override.
- L. Jalbert states that they will need to saw cut the slab to accommodate the foundation footings
- EG states that all soil should be hauled off site.
- L. Jalbert states that the well will be installed and a 4-foot deep trench to the house. DB comments that when digging the trench, it may be close to water table.
- L. Jalbert goes over the areas that are to be restored, back area near the driveway to be mulched for the winter and seeded in the spring.
- L. Jalbert states that the new deck will be about 5x7. DG questions if the old well will be abandoned. L. Jalbert states yes, abandoned in place.
- L. Jalbert recaps the work to be done, remove sonatubes, enclose the foundation, replace the 5x7 deck, install the well and trench, and restore the areas with mulch, loam and seed.
- EG states that there is a ground cable that may need to be trenched. The Commission needs to know about it, it should be on the plan
- KK states that the outstanding items on the plan includes a note on the removal of sonatubes, the trench for the well and the electric wire to be buried
- DM states that the Commission needs the revised plan in order to vote.
- FD requests a detail of the sonatube footing for the 5x7 deck.

*Hearing continued to 2/1/06 at 7:20PM pending revised plans.*

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

NOI CONTINUED from 12/21/06: DEP 300-720 for proposed 5-Lot Subdivision at 12 & 30 Farquhar Road. Bertin Engineering Associates, Inc. representing The Spaho Corp. (Continued new project discussion from 12/21/06 hearing. The public discussion on 1/4/07 was review of the previous project DEP 300-583 on property).

### **DB opens the public hearing at 9:50PM**

**Present:** H. Blakeley, Bertin Engineering



## Discussion:

- KK states that she submitted a review memo on 1/9/07 to all members. Since then, a response was submitted on 1/18/07 and in boxes for review. Revised plans were submitted on 1/18/07 and KK recommends a presentation of the revised plans.
- DB states that he did look at the site, but focused on the drainage area.
- KK states that her memo focused on the wetland across the street and the mitigation for the drainage area
- H. Blakeley states that the wetland across the street is not connected to another resource, it is a small area that picks runoff
- DB states that the project design will put the water in the drainage system to be cleaned and discharged to the wetland.
- H. Blakeley agrees and states that there will be a stone channel then the water will go through a stormceptor (in cul-de-sac) and then in detention basin.
- KK states that Greg Morse has required a paved access to detention basin. HBlakeley states that it is required because it is a 12% slope. The access is for maintenance and it will be 10-ft wide. Only a small section is in the 200-ft buffer. H. Blakeley states that Parcel C (drainage) must have a direct access off the roadway not driveway.
- H. Blakeley states that the project now includes slope stabilization with plantings and North American Green mat that is part of best management practices. The mat is made up of straw and coconut fibers, it lasts about 18-months and it is degradable material.
- DG questions if the property owners will be able to mow the slope H Blakeley states no, some trees and ferns will be planted and stone walls to be installed. The slope will be too steep to mow.
- KK states that the property does have some steep slopes, there is a slope provision in the bylaw
- EG questions the status of the open space parcel. H.Blakeley states that the owner would like to donate it to the Town and she sent a letter to all Boards, there has also been negotiations with the Nitmunk (Escape Estates) and Opacum Land Trusts
- Blakely states that per the recommendation of the agent, they are adding some mitigation and stone areas added for habitat at the swale and detention basin outlet. She would like to recommend stone in the 25-ft buffer to spread it out a bit.
- DB questions if pre and post construction drainage calculations were done. None of the water at the present time goes to the wetland towards the south. H. Blakely states that the drainage report did take into consideration the topography
- KK questions if test pits were done in the detention basin location to determine the level of ground water. H.Blakeley states yes.
- M. Blanchard (abutter) questions when the open space letter was sent. KK answers that the letter is dated 12/20/06 but the Commission received it on 1/4/07
- DB requests to break apart the project for a thorough review
- KK recommends going through the project plans, starting with existing conditions. KK states that the wetlands were originally flagged by WET Inc and reviewed by BSC Group a few years ago during the condo project process. The wetland flags have been refreshed

and she did review the delineation. The property exists as a mature forest with large pine trees and acidic soils. There are steep slopes and some valleys.

- H. Blakeley states that the project has more fill than cut.
- DB questions habitat migration and if the project will be a barrier. KK answers that each species has their own migration patterns and distances. She does not believe that habitat migration will be impacted. Major impact includes large walls, major tree clearing and denuding of a forest, large parking lots and impervious areas.
- DB states that the bio-core needs to be protected. H Blakeley states that the applicant has full intention of leaving the 13 acres for open space. Natural Heritage is requiring it too.
- KK questions if there are any alternatives for the lot locations, size etc. H. Blakeley states that the lots need to be a certain size for the R factor and frontage. H. Blakeley admits that some creative engineering went into the lot lines. She states that the lots meet all planning aspects.
- Brief discussion of roadway elevations.
- Members discuss the conservation easements to be in addition to the open space. H. Blakeley states that a stone wall will delineate the restriction. The Restriction is to be drafted, including the purpose.
- EG proposes to the Commission that a letter is sent to Jim Malloy stating that the Conservation Commission is interested in the land. Members agree.
- DB states that the hearing should be continued. Next meeting they will pick up where they left off in reviewing the project plans. H. Blakeley agrees.
- KK states what is left to discuss are the mitigation, the drainage details and house lots.

*Hearing Continued 2/15/07 at 7:45pm.*

## **10:38 PM OTHER BUSINESS**

### 1) Discussion of 58 Main Street: DEP 300-713

- H. Blakeley present for discussion
- KK states that a Memo was sent to the members 1/10/07 regarding catch basin in stream. DG recalls visiting the property and she states that it is like nothing she has even seen. KK shows the members photos.
- H. Blakeley states that the catch basin is not a right elevation and needs to be raised at least 6-inches. H.Blakeley states that the contractor put it in at the elevation of the parking lot and did not take in consideration that it would need to be raised.
- HBlakeley states that they plan on raising the catch basin, seal the opening near the stream and it will function ok.
- DB questions if the approved plan would have worked. H.Blakeley states not exactly, elevations are somewhat off than what was originally taken for measurments.
- DB comments that the property owner must be very frustrated.
- H.Blakeley states that the catch basin is acting as a retaining wall.
- FD states that it appears that the corrective work is an extension of the field change.
- DB states that an amendment should be filed. Members discuss the amendment. DM questions what exactly has changed and that he doesn't think an Amendment is needed.

KK states the changes so far have been the location of the catch basin, the removal of the retaining wall, the perimeter drain in the rear of the parking lot that resulted in more excavation than what was originally proposed. The purpose of the Amendment would be to issue a new Order that reflects the right plans and what was done on property.

- H.Blakely states that she sees the changes as minor field changes
- DB questions if others think it is a major change to the project? KK states yes, EG states yes. DM can understand why the changes were done, but he thinks there should be an amended plan. DB states that he too believes there needs to be an amendment. The property had major flooding and there needs to be accurate plans recorded. Members agree that a formal amendment to the Order must be submitted.
- DB states that the plans should be a larger scale. DG reminds H. Blakeley that additional stabilization needs to be done at the inlet.

## 2) Town Report and Re-organization

- DB requests that members get any town report recommendation changes to KK soon. The reports are due 2/15/07
- DB states that the Commission must vote a chair every year. EG motions to elect DB as Chair and DM as Vice Chair. DG seconds, all in favor: 4/0 (DB abstains)
- Discussion of Board complaints tabled.

## 3) Discussion of DEP 300-314: 120 & 118 Clarke Road

- KK states that the Commission received a letter from C. Rzy via email on 1/16/07
- DM states that no new information was brought to the table in the letter.
- Members discuss what to do next. KK states that their options are to require a request for a certificate of compliance or wait out the appeal.
- Members decide to do nothing at this time.

## 4) Discussion of Site Visits: 18 Stoney Brook Drive (DEP 300-725), 10 Gifford Road (DEP 300-515)

- KK states she visited 18 Stoney Brook on 1/9/07 and the bridge was complete. There may be potential erosion issues, she shows members the photos.
- KK met with K. Rabbitt at 10 Gifford Road on 1/9/07. She is ok with removing the house from the east side, shows members the photos. Consensus of the Board is ok too. KK to write letter approving the removal of the house from the property and not from the road.

## 5) Discussion of Leadmine Lane Land—LaFleche

- KK states that an ANR Plan dated 12/15/06 shows 11 acres to be donated to Town
- Members agree that it would be a good piece to own.
- Consensus to write a letter to Jim Malloy that the Commission would like the LaFleche land.

**Meeting adjourned 11:25PM**