

**TOWN OF STURBRIDGE, MA
CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

Thursday, September 3, 2015- approved 10/1/15
Sturbridge Center Office Building, 2nd Floor

Meeting Called to Order: 6:00 pm
Quorum Check: Confirmed
Members Present: Ed Goodwin (EG), Chairman
David Barnicle (DB), Vice Chair
Donna M. Grehl (DG)
Calvin Montigny (CM)
Joseph Kowalski (JK) **Members Absent:** None

Others Present: Glenn Colburn (CG), Conservation Agent
Cindy Sowa Forgit, Conservation Clerk (Substitute)
Applicants and/or Audience Members: Brian Milan, Bob Levite, Ed Hood, Peter Mimeault, Andrew Houle, Elisa Krochmalnyckyij, Mark Farrell, Lenny Jalbert, Scott Morrison, Lynn Ekhart, Louis Fazen, Tim Reardon, Steven Miller, Chris McClure, Barbara A Sullivan, Pat Wondolowski, Clarence Snyder, Chris Barden, Doreen Grout

Committee Updates:

- **CPA – (EG)** Not met since the last meeting.
- **Trails Committee – (DB)** Unable to attend the last meeting, no update.
- **Lakes Advisory Committee – (DG)** Meeting this evening to discuss the boat safety course.

Approval of Minutes: July 16, 2015: Motion: DB 2nd: CM 5-0
July 16, 2015: (Executive Session) Motion: DB 2nd: DG with edit.
August 13, 2015: Motion: DB 2nd: DG 5-0

Walk-ins:

Conservation Restriction progress report by Atty. Robert Levite (BL):

- We are near the end, but still one section for out buildings drawings, sketches what they are for and what stored. Irene will review sketches in relationship for the AUL DEP put on property. She is ready to give final feedback. Irene is looking for scaled drawings from GC.
- One delay was the CR format. The documents need to be reformatted, as Irene needed the paragraphs to match up. It was a 7-hour process, but I have completed it.

Commissioner's comments, questions:

- BL: How do we separate land purchased with CPA money and Town money? EG: ConCom doesn't spend money, CPA would decide that. BL wants ConCom to look at this section for FYI only. If there are any questions, you can call CPA for advice on your questions.
- DB: What type of specifics for buildings, there are no plans at the present time. BL: Irene wants to make sure there is no impact on that site, more specifically, to AUL.
- EG: What about the building on Plimpton property? GC: Not an issue as this CR is complete, signed and recorded. GC: The only buildings are on the Riverland. The buildings are dedicated to trails or restrooms. BL: Irene is concerned that it may be used for DPW equipment or municipal offices. GC: She also wants to tighten up the language. Irene may have a problem with wording but knows our intent. Irene will still do final review. BL spoke with her Monday and she will get back to us with any additional questions. GC: Does she work on all four CR's at once. BL: Yes.
- BL: Does OLT have any additional language? EH: No, we had sent our comments in, our attorney sent to you, Bob. ConCom approved and it was sent to Irene which is the template for the other 3 CR's. EH: The issue is the building envelope. EG: On the Riverland CR we have 2 structures currently on this property, used for trails and maintenance of the trails. BL: I would take what you think you need and provide a general proposed location. Irene needs an idea of what you want to do, including parameters of size and where it should be placed and what you want to do in that contaminated site. She wants to see meets and bounds. GC: Lenny Jalbert is going to do that for us. He is 6 weeks out before he can provide a survey and plan. EG: This delay will cost the Town money. What is the other alternative? GC: All other surveyors are out that far also. BL: I'm not sure you need an exact plan, just idea of where buildings are located, the amount of space for the buildings and an amount of space for parking. I believe that may

be enough for her. GC: If you think that's good enough, I can draw on GIS a map showing the building envelope, footprint for parking etc.

- EG in summary, we have 2 areas. We need to provide the specific area, the intended use of the building, the intention of the space and the intended parking area and get to Irene as soon as possible. DB: I'm not sure why we have to tell what intend to do with property. It's really to make sure it won't go against how CPA money will be used.
- BL: The Champeaux Rd parking area (0.6 ac) and the other parcel (70.6 ac). They are separate parcels now. The small parcel was going to be parking to get to Long Pond, for which it's already being used. The issue is that it was not purchased with CPA money. I think you should leave it as a separate parcel for the following reasons:
 - If you do additional work (water, the beaver dam and the old dam back there) you will have folks coming in to work, thus they will want to park near there. I think it's better as a town owned parcel since it's not in a CPA set up.
 - I'm concerned about the possibility of eminent domain in this area. You don't want that parcel to be together.
 - EG: We want to see this as one complete parcel. The parking area is a maintenance area and it was bought specifically to attach to the Long Pond land. It was in the initial package that you were provided. BL: I will go back and check that out. GC: We bought the middle parcel with CPA, then put it all together in CR. BL: Town Council made a title error which I fixed. GC: But the land was purchased with CPA funds. BL: This is just my legal suggestion. GC: What is Irene's timeline in completion? BL: You just need to get her the building envelope. GC: I will get to her via email tomorrow. EH: So the process will be, comments are going from Irene to BL, then BL makes edits, BL then records at the registry of deeds. BL: Yes. DB: I suggest GC, to call Irene in a few days to make sure that was received and no further info is required of us. GC: Indeed. Does she still use her state email? BL: Yes.

Public Hearings:

6:15 Request for Determination of Applicability, 39 Draper Woods Rd, Brian Milam, in-ground pool in the buffer zone.

Brian Milam, present.

Agent briefing: revised plan presented. ConCom did site visit, saw lines on ground. All work is within existing yard. GC: Where is extra fill going? BM: It will be used to level the rest of the yard as it currently slopes. Any excess will be taking off site. JK: What will happen with the large double trunk oak tree? We are recommending that you consider taking that one down due to safety. DG: Lawn will be seeded? BM: Yes and landscaped. The pool will be constructed in the fall, sit over the winter. In spring the rest of work including the patio, fence and landscaping will be completed. DB: Where is the filter going? BM: Near house by 16' line. DB: Please send a copy of the plan that shows this and the plantings. BM: I will have a 7' buffer between the fence and brush

Motion: To close the Public Hearing: DB 2nd: CM Vote: 5:0

Motion: To approve the RDA at 39 Draper Woods, based on the discussed plan and a forthcoming plantings plan. To issue a positive determination #5 for work subject to review by the Town Bylaw. To issue a negative #3 for work within the Buffer Zone; without altering the resource area: DB 2nd: CM Discussion: None Vote: 5:0

6:30 Request for Determination of Applicability, 76 South Shore Drive, Peter Mimeault, lakebed restoration project, South Pond. Peter Mineault, present.

Scope: to remove 15 cubic yards of gravel like material that has moved in front of my shoreline that wasn't there 2-3 yrs. ago. Work is in the resource area.

Backstory: In July, we discussed this project to restore the lakebed and to proceed with RDA. Jalbert Engineering provided a delineation. I have since added more detailed calculations in the application and what I can do, to help the cove. Below are my concerns and proposal to fix the current issue: I am concerned that this may be a repeat request every year or so for many to follow. I am trying to avoid this. DG: I feel it's a repeated project. CM: If 15 yards deposited over the last 3 yrs., it will happen again. No abutters are present this evening. No abutters have called the Agent or inquired about this project.

(PM) My Proposal would be to do the following:

- Size of Project: a 9'x 50' strip into the lake. The cubic yardage is calculated from my property #76 to my abutter at #78.
- Timing of Work: All work would be from the low water mark. One side is 3'-4' deep (left side), on the right side of property, you can walk out about 25' and only be in 18" of water.
- Neighbors/Abutters: I'm trying to work with neighbors but they haven't done much at this time. I want to start soon as it continues to move in front of my property.

- Cause: I believe that when the Town unclogged the culvert, silt came into the lake. Measurements were taken and recorded as I wanted my riparian rights documented. Photos show brown water/sediment. Hay bales and tarps are still there. I hired PLS to come back and show that 2 yrs. after this work was done there, there is an additional 2-3" deposited. The report shows it was gullied out and material keeps moving. This is a 2 yr. issue and will continue to happen. I want to clean this up once, since this culvert is to remain open. It now affects my use of the water. I now have a 1' of water vs. 3' of water I used to have. I feel by proposing to remove the sediment, and if the storm water management plan by Bertin was incorporated, it would help this issue. It starts at the upland side, about 2-3 house above me and down around the corner 2-3 houses below me. If this design was put in play, it would be a great plan. If the hole isn't catching water, it should be fixed. I'm trying to help fix hole and discuss an NOI which is in the ROW. I'm willing to create the NOI for the ROW if I know whose property the ROW is on. I met with Town Administrator, Greg Morse and GC, of which we came up with a good plan. Allard has bobcats that can help do the work, but ConCom won't agree to this plan until the hole is fixed. I would remove sediment by hand, dry it out and put in trailer and haul away (15 yds appx). That will return that 9' strip back to where it was originally. My boats are bottoming out now.

Agent Briefing: I'm unclear as to what you're restoring. This appears to be more a dredging project for access to dock, not restoring ecological environment. Streams naturally move stuff. How can we separate what came from the road and what is a natural occurrence. Although we can repair the road, we can't stop the streams activity. I feel that currents will stir up and you will be back again. Work in a resource area is not typically covered under an RDA. I feel this is large project and could be completed with an OOC to restore the wetlands. We are improving boat access. I'm not opposed to removing the sediment that came from road. I believe to solve this issue we must first address the erosion on road. PM: The stream is 65' away from my water front. GC: If you do ecological restoration project, then look up stream. When the beaver dam was released the sediment moved down further. I feel it's a neighborhood issue to resolve sediment off road. PM: spoke with neighbor and they are in favor of it. ConCom has the road under control and you did your job with storm water management since town stepped in.

Commission comments, questions:

- JK: The applicant makes good argument. I have no issue if he wants to remove 15 yards by hand, no issue since small defined amount. I feel there is no impact on the ecology of lake
- CM: Who will oversee project? PM: I will.
- EG: With the removal project at 96 Allen a year ago, the board wanted a scientist on board. PM: Can we make that a condition on the OOC? EG: We should be removing the damage created, but not just in front of PM's house. We should hit the neighbors affected.
- DG: Since I have lived there for over 25 yrs., the cove has been impacted by road and can attest to that fact that it's not just beavers. If you want to restore it, there is pickerel weed that is needed. That is restoration. Dredging is not a restoration project. PM: I pay a lot in taxes for a property that I want returned back to the way it was 3 yrs. ago.
- DB: Work is in the resource area. We are concerned that if this is a dredging project that it could set a dangerous precedent moving forward.
- EG: I feel it can be an RDA. This lake is defined by the road. If we are going to alter the lake, we need to correct the problem. Process I see: 1) RDA, 2) create a plan for road and conduct a site visit before the next meeting.

Requested a continuation to the next meeting. Request granted: 5-0. Site visit on 9/15 at 5pm.

6:45 Notice of Intent DEP #300-tbd, 146 Lane Eight, Louis Fazen & Lynn Eckhert. Removal and construction of a SFH and detached garage in the buffer zone with associated landscaping. (Cont. from 8/13) Mark Farrell, Green Hill Engineering, present.

MF Update: Natural Heritage responded with a determination that the work will not impact a state-listed species. Plan has incorporated changes from the last meeting. We have double staked the straw wattles and eliminated the silt fence. The drip edge will continue all around the house. Owners decided to move proposed house back further from water, which will be just outside the 100 BZ. JK/ CM: no comments. DG: Drainage from the house and the garage, any concerns? MF I can put drip strip on garage. DG: any ledge? MF: No, I haven't seen ledge issues in these areas.

Motion: To close the Public Hearing: DB 2nd: DG. Vote: 5:0

Motion: To issue an OOC under MA WPA and Town Bylaw. To approve the plan with modification of drip strip around garage edge: DB 2nd: DG Discussion: none Vote: 5:0

7:00 Notice of Intent DEP #300-929, 70 Paradise Lane. Timothy and Donna Reardon. Raze and Rebuild of SFH with shoreline alterations; (Cont. from 8/13) Tim Reardon, Owner, Scott Morrison, EcoTec and Lenny Jalbert, Jalbert Engineering, present.

SM Update: Revised plan presented to remove rubble and material along shoreline, proposing to install steps to provide access and installing dry stack stone walls, and additional grading to minimize run off. The birch clumps and red maple will now remain. Previously held a site visit with ConCom and discussed looking into the abutting property to possibly remove the concrete pad and add additional restoration. This plan is forthcoming. A turbidity curtain will be utilized. Work will be done during draw down, starting at shore and working back to the street. Installing erosion barriers and a well etc.

Agent Briefing: I'm very pleased with shore line work. The proposed filling in that man-made area is a great benefit to the lake. Once permission is obtained from the abutter to remove the old concrete slabs, it must be added to the scope of work, and return to ConCom. Perhaps by amending the OOC. My only concern is that we are still within the 50'. ConCom wants overhanging vegetation along the wall and the crevices in the stone wall for habitat.

Commissions comments, questions:

- JK: The maple tree near the old boat house has some roots exposed. Although it's not in great condition it can survive if the project is oriented around saving the tree. Possibly treat beforehand or no impact near the tree at all. With a proposed slight grade change, I don't foresee it as an issue.
- EG: Are we ok with position of the house and proximity to wetland. All commissioners agreed. EG: I'm concerned with filling the area of the steps. GC/DG: We are losing a flood storage area. Who in favor of filling? JK/CM/DB: yes DG/EG: no. Vote carries.
- DG: Are you building up the retaining wall? Will critters be able to get around? SM: The wall is next to the driveway and house. It is 3 ½ feet high, the driveway is paved. DG: Any run off? SM: Yes, it will be redirected, to go down the driveway, down to the road and into swale that goes into a culvert which crosses back under the road. DG: What is the plan for planting? SM: Plantings are along the shore line. They will be shrubs, no more trees since we have existing trees. The existing growth will remain.
- DB: Any improvements to underground piping system? SM: No. DB: timing? TR: Based on obtaining permits.

Audience comments, questions:

Steve Miller, abutter on the lower side. I'm very happy with the cleanup. I'm concerned with the drainage problem that floods our lawn and want to insure this work won't produce more water drainage. LJ: This grades from the shed and the house. The culvert is on your property Mr. Miller. The slope is in the direction of the wetland and won't change the flow pattern that currently exists. SM: Will it increase? LJ: No, it will decrease. The run off from house will be put into a leaching pit.

Motion: To close the Public Hearing: DB 2nd: CM Vote 5:0

Motion: To issue an OOC under MA WPA and Town Bylaw, so to include items discussed: DB 2nd: CM Discussion: none. Vote 5:0

7:15 Notice of Intent DEP #300-908, 69 Route 84, (DPW fields), Parks & Recreation. Construction of recreational fields in Riverfront Area and Flood Zone A. (cont. from 8/21/14)

Agent Briefing: No update on Turtle Study. Requested continuation to October 1st. Request granted.

7:30 Notice of Intent DEP #300-933, 66 Mt Dan Road. Jeff Buchanan; Drainage and landscape improvements in the buffer zone. Scott Morrison, EcoTec, Chris McLure, McLure Engineering, Jeff Buchanan, Owner, present.

SM Update: Notice of Intent to address drainage problem and landscaping in the buffer zone. We are proposing the following:

- A paved driveway. Drainage from the drive will sheet flow and move across the lawn.
- We will reconstruct a walkway to the house, add stairs and additional plantings. Proposing walk way on the side and back of the house with 5 small retaining walls. We will remove the existing block walls, and use drystone walls instead with plantings.
- Add a new deck and a 3 season porch below. The wood deck is on grade with the existing area of lawn.
- We will replace the rubber mats at the shore fronts
- We will remove steps and install stone steps stairs, a small patio of stones, with wide areas in between with plantings.
- CMclure engineered the numbers provided. The drainage features include a pea stone channel and the neighbor's driveway.
- Planting plan shows a lot plantings along house and walk way. Water flow will be away from house. The trees are existing, which will be filled in with shrubs. DB: There are about 30 large trees from edge of water to corner of house.

Agent Briefing: There is history with this property. The previous owner pulled a tree removal permit. 7 trees were granted removal. During our recent site visit, within the 25' buffer zone, there is a violation due to more than 7 trees were removed by the prior owner. This lot has had a lot of disturbance in the 25' buffer zone that wasn't supposed to happen. At our Site visited, there are water erosion issues. I thought this was a restoration, not an expansion project. There is nothing proposed to replace

the hemlocks. JB: I'm spending over \$100K for this plan. GC: I would call it a restoration with a 1:2 replacement as I thought we were getting a planting plan for trees. SM: There are a significant number of plantings on this plan that should satisfy the replication. JB: We took down a dead tree, it wasn't an oak.

Commissioner's comments, questions:

- JK: Can you incorporate a plan with 10% or 50' whichever is less? SM: The shoreline on this property is 180'. JK: You are allowed to clear 18' of that. So a highly wooded buffer, is what I would like to incorporate as the 18' into lake. JK: You still can't put a structure within 25'. I like the plantings and rocks to make look amenable.
- CM: How many woody plants are in buffer strip planting? SM: 35 appx. on the shore line. JM: Now the shore is grass, and bare, I want to add plantings and stone.
- DG: The deck is pervious. With no new build within the 50' which you have now, it will be impervious. JM: What if there was no 3 season porch added and you just have a deck instead? EG: Maybe a trex deck (now pervious) where the current deck is and without extending.
- EG: I like the 18' option. I understand that you need something better to walk on under porch, but I can't see 3 season as we fought this battle a few years ago with the previous owner. My issues; no structure in 25' and just plantings and some stones is good idea.
- DB: I'm concerned with the plan since there was to be no cutting of trees, shrubs in the front of house as this was the last house lot on this lake to be developed. ConCom fought it with previous owner, so not to cut down trees to have a view of lake, therefore a deck was approved, to provide the view they wanted. Your wetland calculations seem to be off as behind this property is the hill which weeps. Anytime there is a lot of water on this hill, there is a lot of water on this property. CMcLure: I ran hydraulic studies that have shown due to topography that this weep will benefit the property. DB: I'm concern that paved driveway won't help with the "weep". CMcLure: the 1800 sf driveway won't be affected. SM: In summary, a deck, no 3 season porch, 10% shoreline and 25' BZ may be disturbed, move the stones and all must be on plan.

Request a continuation to the next meeting on 9/17 time: TBD. Request Granted.

New business

Hamilton Rod & Gun Club (HRG) requesting permission to use Plimpton Forest for event. Ed Hood (EH) - Opacum Land Trust, Clarence Snyder (CS) – Hamilton Rod & Gun are present.

- The MOE event is on Sept 20th. We have a good venue and want to extend the loop of the trail onto Plimpton property. This extension on Plimpton would go by the old stone wall and loop back. DG: Will someone pick up garbage? CS: Yes. DB: What about erosion from the bike traffic? CS: This is only one event, no erosion... We are only using plastic flags as the only marking. We usually have about 600 people, of that, 200 would be the bikers over the 8 hour day. DG: In case of rain? CS: We would have to back off. EH: Since you are following existing trails, OLT will support it. **5:0 vote.**
- CS: In spring we hold our annual archery event. Do we need to notify ConCom/OLT within 45 days to have agreement so we could proceed? Is this the protocol? ConCom & OLT: Yes. Saturday into Sunday event is usually the 1st weekend in June. CS: Can they use an ATV to place targets on property and remove the following day? EH: ATV use is prohibited except for trail maintenance. However, OLT will approve, only as long as there is no impact, and just for those events. CS: There are 15 targets on Plimpton, 20 between the 3rd & 4th pond, and 15 at the biker areas; 50 total. GC: Perhaps using cart roads when possible will help with reducing impact.
- CS: Insurance. HRG supplied the insurance carrier and listed the town to be included as they have done with John Plimpton in the past.
- CS: Green Certification. Forest plans mirrored what Hamilton did. An audit will be this year on Oct 20-22. If you are interested in this program, paperwork must be submitted by Oct 1st. I would suggest to do for all parcels with an active forestry plan. This program will give you access to grants.
- CS: Posting of Safety Zones. Work parties once a month to help with posting signs they did that for John Plimpton.
- CS: Beaver control will have the Town continue the program which is about \$300-\$700 appx. We need the water flow for the fishing.
- CS: Mapping of trails. HRG will work with GC using the active GPS site to connect the trails and delineate on a map. Will have volunteer help with the paths between the shared properties.

Enforcement:

- **29 Main Street, Brian Eisold. EBT Environmental to present restoration plan.** (cont. to next meeting) Jalbert didn't complete plan due to current workload, but should have soon.
- **45 Seneca Ln, Craig Moran. Restoration/replanting plan. (cont. to next meeting)** GC has not heard from Mr. Moran. He owes ConCom a planting plan. GC will produce an Enforcement Order for signature.
- **8 Birch Street, Gerry Paquin. Work in the buffer zone without permits. Demolition plan to be presented to ConCom.** Barbara Sullivan, abutter was present. She is requesting a 6 foot stockade style fence, properly re-installed, all the way to water and to be installed 6" off ground. GC will have Enforcement Order ready for Commissioners to sign. Before the fence is installed, we need Mr. Paquin to remove the deck and file for putting in a fence. Need an RDA.
- **9 Holland Road, Gerry Paquin. Work in the Riverfront Resource Area without permits.** Excavator on site. Unprotected storm drain. Excavator was on site. Used to be vegetated area. Many areas are now cleared, of which many lead to the river. Excavator did stop work upon request and was removed from the site recently. No permits were filed, no erosion controls were installed. GC had Mr. Paquin install filter fabric and straw bales. According to Mr. Paquin he was cleaning up the area as there is a committee that will be inspecting the mill. They are looking into rehabilitating some old abandoned mills in the area. Enforcement Order to be sent. Date for response and plan will be 10 calendar days. Work completed by Oct 1st.
- **Outdoor World. Dumping of sand into the lake.** A private camper, took 2 dump truck loads of sand and dumped at the shoreline in front of their camper (appx. 12'-15' x 20'). Work is in the resource area, land underwater, bank, and at shoreline. The Camper received permission from the manager. Manager is aware that they must take all sand out and restore it. GC will also provide an SOP for any work that will occur within a 200' BZ so they will know the next time as they are a repeat offender. Enforcement Order will be sent out.

Request for Certificate of Compliance:

3 Cherry Brook Circle, DEP #300-837, SFH, Patrick McGlone Owner is looking for a COC. ConCom has held off due to disturbance in the riverfront area. Mr. McGlone was required to show revegetation. The trees planted all died. He also planted mountain laurel and the grass is knee high. Area looks to be re-vegetated. ConCom required an as-built plan, which we have now. Certificate of Compliance is being issued.

Minor Amendments to Orders of Conditions:

Request for Minor Change to Order of Conditions; 30 Goodrich Road; DEP #300-919. Installation of a drilled well and addition to existing structure. Mark Farrell, Owner, present.

At a previous meeting, a tight tank was requested. Also reconstruct a portion of the building and the stairs. An OOC was issued for this work. Since then, ZBA approved and Farrell got a permit to expand out another 3 ½' to expand bathroom. Tonight, requesting amending the OOC for the well and addition. The BOH wants a well. Will require a tree be removed to get the well rig into this location. It is an 8-10" oak that is currently leaning. **Agent Briefing:** The expansion is further from the lake and a well is needed. Its proposed location is good. With the loss of 1 tree, I don't feel there is an impact. Questions: None.

Motion: to amend the current OOC on 30 Goodrich Road, DEP#300-919 to include a 3 1/2' extension and to approve a well in the said location along with the necessary arborist work to allow for access; No replacement trees are being requested: DB , 2nd: DG, Discussion: None Vote: 5:0

Request for Minor Change to Order of Conditions:

453 Main Street; DEP #300-846. Modifications to landscaping plan and construction details. Chris Barton, Graves Engineering, present.

Documents Submitted: Abutters notification

CB: A major change in the plan occurred. Proposing to remove the 2nd floor 3 season patio and replace with the 1st floor patio. Also to revise the walk way and landscaping. No changes to the limit of work. There is no increased impervious area.

Agent Briefing: the work limit hasn't changed as stated in the previous OOC. Shared parking is with abutters. There is no increased drainage.

Motion: to accept the amended plan as proposed: EG 2nd: DG Vote 5:0

Correspondence:

- Baseline document report for Plimpton CR was completed by Peter Westover. Excellent quality work. He followed property lines documenting the condition of the property, turned around in a week. Did a great job. Trust for Public Lands is creating a sign. Commissioners reviewed and signed.
- Spot treatment of Cedar Lake took place yesterday

Letter Permits:

9 Cedar Pond Road, Susan Starr & Doreen Grout, requesting removal of 6 trees within 100 ft buffer zone. Waiting for arborist report. Doreen Grout, owner present.

Agent Briefing: An arborist report was submitted by a CT lic. Arborist. Felt there is high risk due to the lean and dead trees (Hemlock). Suggested to remove all 6 trees; and grind to stump an additional large oak tree. Site visit: Commissioners felt some were in decline. DGrout: One on the hillside did come down and put hole in roof, which we had to replace that roof.

Motion: To approve the cutting: 2nd JK; DB DG: Any plantings? DGrout: Most of the trees are in back and 2 are on the side. DB: It would be hard to find a location for any new trees. JK: I feel the owner met the requirements and therefore ok with her proceeding to remove. CM/DG/DB: no comments. Vote: 4:1 (EG)

Forest Cutting Plans:

Gay Road and Cedar Street: Michael Steuer. 27 acres on 71 Gay Rd, Brookfield, 12 acres are in Sturbridge. GC: You must go through Brookfield to get to the Sturbridge property. The landing will be in Brookfield. The majority of work will occur in Brookfield. ConCom recommends BOS to approve.

Orders of Conditions:

21 Bennetts Road, David Zonia
57 Bennetts Road, Danny Minchoff, drilled well
53 Breakneck Road, Allen Levanchy, replacement septic

Certificate of Compliance:

DEP#300-370: 16 Tantasqua Shore Drive, , the 1st was issued in 1997 for a small addition onto the house. It appears built to plan. Signatures received.

DEP#300-870: 16 Tantasqua Shore Drive : issued recently for a replacement septic. It is now stabilized. Signatures received.

DEP#300-837: 3 Cherry Brook Circle: replanting is stabilized. Signatures received.

Meeting Adjourned: 10:05 pm Motion to Adjourn the Public Meeting and to proceed into Executive Session for approval of minutes of 7/16 Exec Session: DB 2nd: CM Vote: 5:0

Next Meeting: Thursday, September 17, 2015 at 6:00 pm

A copy of tonight's meeting can be found on our Town's website or is available upon request via the Audio Department: 508.347.7267

The items listed, which may be discussed at the meeting, are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair.~ Not all items listed may in fact be discussed and other items not listed may also be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.~ For those items that will be discussed, the Conservation Commission will address its questions and concerns with a proponent before allowing the public to weigh in on the topic being discussed with the proponent.~ For public discussion of non-agenda items, such discussion will be handled during the Walk-in period or as allowed by the Chair.