

## **MINUTES OF MEETING OF WAREHAM CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**Date of Meeting: May 20, 2015**

### **I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:06 P.M.

### **II. ROLL CALL**

Members Present: John Connolly, Chairman  
Sandy Slavin, Vice Chairman  
Ken Baptiste, Clerk  
Jim Smith  
Joe Leggett  
Donald Rogers  
Elissa Heard, Associate Member  
David Pichette, Agent

Members Absent: Mark Carboni  
Michael Baptiste, Associate Member  
Elizabeth Lydon, Associate Member

### **III. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

### **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **A. NOI – David Hathaway, c/o G.A.F. Engineering, Inc. – SE76-2346**

The public hearing notice was read into the record.

Present before the Commission: Brian Grady, G.A.F. Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Pichette described the project. The property is located at 252 Barker Road. The project involves the construction of a dock in White Island Pond. A 4x40 ft. dock is proposed out into White Island Pond. The dock structure will be an aluminum dock system that is in sections & can be removed seasonally. The sections would sit on the bottom & would not be driven in. It is proposed to drive a quad type vehicle to the dock location. He recommends that motorized vehicles stay at least 30 ft. from the edge of the wetland. A DEP file number has been received. He recommends the issuance of the OOC w/ the standard conditions & that the dock be stored in the off season in an upland area approved by the Commission.

Discussion & questions ensued.

**MOTION: Mr. K. Baptiste moved to continue the public hearing for David Hathaway to June 3, 2015. Ms. Slavin seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**B. NOI – Ronald & Lois Enos, c/o G.A.F. Engineering, Inc.**

The public hearing notice was read into the record.

Mr. Connolly & Mr. K. Baptiste recused themselves from this hearing.

Present before the Commission: Brian Grady, G.A.F. Engineering, Inc.  
Attorney Scott Golden, Attorney for Winship LLC

The public hearing notice was read into the record.

**NOTE:** Mr. Connolly recused himself from this hearing because he is on another Board with Mr. Enos and he is related to Mr. Balzarini. Mr. K. Baptiste recused himself because he is on another Board with Mr. Enos.

Present before the Board: Brian Grady, G.A.F. Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Pichette requested the abutter cards. He was then asked by an audience member if he had the green reply card from Winship, LLC. Mr. Pichette stated he did not have the green card, but had the proof of mailing receipt showing the item was sent to Winship, LLC., P.O. Box 521, Mansfield, MA on May 7, 2015. The same audience member then asked if Mr. Pichette had a green reply card or proof of mailing receipt for Winship in regards to another abutting parcel they own, Mr. Pichette asked if they are the same owner for both properties. The audience member stated yes. Mr. Pichette stated explained if you own both properties you don't need to be sent two different notices. The audience member said there are two different properties, two separate tax bills and two different people. Another audience member stated they never received notice.

Mr. Pichette showed Ms. Slavin the proof of mailing from the Wareham Post Office showing the notice was received by them for mailing (to Winship) and there is a return receipt from Mr. Decas and Deb Decas as abutters to the property. Ms. Slavin stated she cannot take responsibility for the Post Office or for people not picking up their mail at a P.O. box so, she stated she is going to continue the hearing. An audience member asked an (inaudible) question. Ms. Slavin stated she wishes to hear from the Mr. Pichette and the Mr. Grady.

Mr. Pichette described the project. The property is located at 18 Burgess Point Road. The project is being filed under the Town of Wareham Wetlands By-law only as there is already a valid superseding Order of Conditions under the Wetlands Protection Act. The project involves the construction of a pathway within a bordering vegetative wetland and in the buffer zone to a BVW, w/in a coastal flood zone, & on a coastal beach. The 4 ft. wide path approximately 560 ft. in length is proposed to provide access to the beach from Winship Ave. As the path does cross through BVW approximately 1185 sq. ft. of BVW would be altered to complete the path.

Several wetland replication areas totaling 1201 square feet are proposed. The intent is to be able to run golf type vehicles over this path to access the beach. The applicant does not propose any surface for the path or any elevated structure to accommodate the golf carts. Root systems of the plants would not be removed as part of the path construction. The plan shows a turning area in the existing mowed field area at the coastal end of the path. The applicant is requesting a waiver to do work in the 30 foot No Activity Zone based on the recently amended Wetland By-law. The Amendment states that the Commission shall waive or reduce the No Activity Zone to the extent necessary to provide reasonable shoreline access to disabled individuals. Mr. Pichette recommends the Commission decide as to whether the waiver information submitted qualifies for the waiver exemption. If they believe it does, then he recommends the issuance of an Order of Conditions under the By-law only with the standard conditions and the added conditions for replication areas, that the path remains only 4 ft. wide, that any root material not be removed from the path area to be cleared, and the only motorized vehicles to be used on the path are golf cart type vehicles.

Ms. Slavin questioned time of year limitations to accessing the path. The original order had a condition of "no vehicle traffic between November and March" and she would like this to remain as one of the conditions. Mr. Pichette concurred.

One of the ConCom members stated he has not seen this proposal, has not seen anything staked out, and has not been near it so he would like the hearing postponed to the next meeting. Ms. Slavin explained this is the same location that was dealt with in 2012. She explained this is the same plan that was discussed in 2012. When Ms. Slavin asked for confirmation of this, Mr. Pichette stated it is not the same plan. He stated it has been modified and approved through D.E.P. hearings with their superseding order. Ms. Slavin asked Mr. Pichette to explain the differences in the plans. Mr. Pichette explained the replication area is included and the path is four feet. Ms. Slavin said the Commission approved the changes as well and wanted to know if the boundary of the land is the same, Mr. Pichette said it is the same. Ms. Slavin asked if the location of the path within the boundary is the same and Mr. Pichette stated it is in the same general area. Ms. Slavin asked the Concom member if he was ok with the explanation & the ConCom member replied "yes".

Ms. Slavin asked the public in attendance if they wished to speak for or against the project.

Present before the Commission: Attorney Stockholding, Winship, LLC

Attorney Stockholding stated he submitted a letter today to Mr. Pichette, a copy of which each Concom member has in their packet. The said letter outlines the issue re: the Notice of Hearing of the Wetland Protection Act as well the Town's local By-Law Section 53 which requires a publication of the hearing or the Notice of Intent hearing 5 days prior to the actual hearing. The Notice of Hearing (for this application) was published last week in *Wareham Week* providing only four business days. There is a Supreme Judicial Court precedent which states the day of the

hearing **does not** count as a day for notice which means Thursday, Friday, Monday and Tuesday are the only days that count. He stated thus, insufficient notice removes this application from the jurisdiction of the ConCom. He stated the letter specifically states and recommends they believe the proper procedure would have been to close the hearing and republish it in accordance with Act and the By-laws & to reconvene in two weeks. He stated because the closing and re-publication did not happen, it appears to him that there is an opinion of the Town that the ConCom is complying and he & his client plan to dispute this as stated in the letter.

Attorney Stockholding stated the second issue Winship, LLC has is they did not receive a formal letter by mail of the hearing and they do not dispute the Town having proof of mailing said letter. He disputes that the letter was received as required. He explained the issue with not receiving the letter is there has not been sufficient time to prepare for the hearing having only learned of it recently & there has not been an opportunity to fully evaluate the changes that have been made. He has been able to quickly go through the application, but he has not been able to have an engineer do a thorough review of it. He would like the hearing to be continued to give he & his client the full opportunity to review all the submitted materials.

Attorney Stockholding stated a third issue is Winship, LLC believes there is a change from the previous sixteen provisions. He explained the maintenance plan calls for mowing and maintenance, but the application of herbicides needs an NOI to be filed with DEP because it is additional work not previously approved by DEP in the Superseding Order dated March 2013. He stated the work will alter the area subject to protection under the Wetland Protection Act.

Attorney Stockholding state a fourth issue is the plan does not fully incorporate the requirements set forth in the G.A.F. Engineering, Inc. letter dated May 25, 2012. He stated his position is the filing is administratively incomplete because the plan does not reflect the changes previously sought, approved and required as part of the application.

Atty. Stockholding has multiple issues with the handicapped waiver from the No Activity Zone. He does not feel the applicant has demonstrated their eligibility under the handicapped waiver By-law. The By-law required the property owner whose family members are disabled under the Americans with Disability Act \_\_\_\_\_. He stated the issue is the owner of the property is a Realty Trust. The Trust is a legal entity and cannot have family members. He does not believe the Commission can make a finding that a Trust can have family members that are disabled according to the ADA , making for an ineligible applicant. The ADA has stringent standards to qualify. He does not believe having a Massachusetts RMV placard qualifies an individual as ADA disabled because the qualifying standards are different. A letter from an assisted living facility does not qualify a person as disabled under ADA standards.

Attorney Stockholder stated the Commission does not have the criteria needed to decide if the applicant is or isn't a handicapped waiver applicant. He feels a revised form with opinions is

needed from Town Counsel as to what findings need to be made prior to a disability waiver being handled. For this reason, he would like to see the hearing continued to give the Commission time to seek advice from Town Counsel in determining standards to enable the Commission to decide if someone is a qualifying applicant.

Attorney Stockholder stated Winship, LLC has a general disagreement with the legality and the constitutionality over this handicapped waiver exemption. Attorney Stockholder stated he & his client are requesting the hearing to be continued to give them time to review all submitted items and for the Commission to address the issues brought forth in the letter submitted to Mr. Pichette and the Commission.

One of the ConCom members stated he would like to know if there are any medical documents pertaining to the disability of the applicant. Ms. Slavin stated there are none at this time, but Town Counsel is working to address this issue.

Mr. Leggett stated he would like to have a continuance in light of all the information brought forward.

Present before the Commission: Peter Balzarini, 18 Burgess Point Realty Trust

Mr. Balzarini stated he is a member of the owning trust, 18 Burgess Point Realty Trust. He stated that Attorney Stockholding brought up many points he (Mr. Balzarini) feels are off track from what the hearing is for. He stated the issue before the Commission is to see if the members of the Trust are in compliance with the newly enacted Town Bylaw. He feels all other information about the changes in the plan are irrelevant. The Trust has a Superseding Order of Conditions presented by the DOE and given back to the Trust.

It was explained that the original plan was passed, Winship, LLC appealed to the DEP and DOE and a hearing was held. DOE visited the property and issued the Superseding Order of Conditions. Winship, LLC, appealed it further to DEP judicial and a full scale DEP hearing was held. The DEP adjudicated in favor of the Trust for the Superseding Order of Conditions. The Trust has not requested any changes in the order, for example no pesticides. The Trust just wants to go by the plan approved by the DEP with the Superseding Order of Conditions. Winship, LLC further appealed to Superior Court on the grounds the Commission granted an exemption under the Wetlands Protection Bylaw that should not have been done because the Trust did not meet any of the requirements for the exception the way the Bylaw was written. It was then suggested the Trust could possibly alter the Bylaw by having an amendment added to the Bylaw at Town Meeting.

It was further explained that at the October 2014 Town Meeting an amendment, drawn up by the Board of Selectmen and Town Counsel, was presented to Town Meeting and overwhelmingly

passed. The people of Wareham decided there were exceptions to the Wetlands Bylaw 30-foot no work zone to build a shed, driveway or pier, but there is no exception to walk across the land or to allow for handicapped individuals to walk across the land or for handicapped individual to walk across the land. All the Bylaw states is to allow for people who have a handicap to cross the wetland and in this case, to get to the beach.

Mr. Balzarini sees the other matters being brought up this evening as an attempt to slow down the process. He stated this issue has been going on for over three years, court hearing after court hearing, road block after road block, and this letter is just more of it. There is always innuendo; a threat if they are not satisfied there will be a type of law suit as a result. He feels there has been enough of this. He explained that all the Trust wants is permission to build their path based on newly passed Bylaw. In the Commissioner packets they have information about members of the Trust who are handicapped. There is nothing in the Bylaw saying there has to be ADA requirements, just in accordance with the ADA requirements. It means patterned after the ADA requirements. The Trust believes they have met the requirements. They have information from the Trust re: an elderly mother with a handicapped placard and another mother who lives in assisted living leaving no question, there are members of the Trust who are handicapped.

A member of the Commission then asked Mr. Pichette if the Commission has more information about the handicapped members of the Trust other than the letter dated May 20<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Pichette stated the Trust did submit certain information as part of the NOI. He feels the Commission's role is to determine if the Trust members are eligible for the waiver. He does not feel at this point they can make the decision. Ms. Slavin questioned if the NOI could be handed out to members of the Commission. Mr. Balzarini questioned why they don't have the information. Mr. Slavin told Mr. Balzarini the NOI is not normally handed out to Commission members. Mr. Pichette stated he has the information. He explained it is not that the information was not provided, it is a question of whether or not the information meets the standards of the Bylaw. A question was asked if the information provided meets the standards of the State and RMV, what standards are they going to set? Ms. Slavin told Mr. Balzarini she does not know yet. They are waiting for Town Counsel to tell them exactly (based on the data provided) what is deemed handicapped under the Town Bylaw. It was stated this is the first time the Commissioners have questioned this Bylaw. It is new to the Commission and they are trying to tread cautiously. The Bylaw speaks about specific members of the family (mothers are mentioned, but mother-in-laws are not). The Commission is trying to understand based on the new Bylaw whether or not the data presented to the Commission meets the criteria. Mr. Balzarini stated he thought all of this information would have been looked at prior to the meeting. He stated the information was submitted with the original application. He stated now at this hearing, he is being told now they have to look at it. Ms. Slavin stated this is the first time they are seeing the information. Mr. Balzarini does not know how the procedure works, but he stated it seems the information has been there to look at and now they have to wait more and more. He hopes the Commission senses his frustration in the length of time it has taken to make any progress with this project. It

has been adjudicated, it has been sent through DEP, it has been sent through the courts, and they are back again because they don't know what the Bylaw says, even though it was passed in October 2014.

Mr. Pichette concurred the Bylaw was passed in October 2014 and formalized in February 2015. He explained the Bylaw was approved by the Massachusetts General Court in February 2015. He said no-one is questioning the approval of the Bylaw, but this is the first project using this Bylaw and even before it was approved, some of the discussion Ms. Slavin had was this very issue (what determines the level of disability in order to meet the Bylaw?). Mr. Balzarani asked if the Massachusetts RMV determines someone is handicapped and gives them a placard to park closer to the store, how would the Commission's standard for this be any different? He stated the Bylaw language says as defined by the American with Disability Act. Not knowing exactly what that means, the Commissioners need Counsel to help them through this particular hearing and project.

Mr. Pichette asked Mr. Balzarini about the issue of herbicide mentioned earlier and Mr. Balzarini reiterated nothing has ever been mentioned about herbicide use and he does not know where the idea came from.

A representative of Winship, LLC. appeared before the Commission thanking the Commission for confirming the wording for the ADA section of the Bylaw.

The representative of Winship, LLC stated the question about herbicides comes from Page 2 of the general information and general project description. It has been on the application, it is there today, and it was in there before. He stated this is the reason Winship, LLC's counsel brought this up. It is part of their NOI application. If the applicant is not aware of it, they must not have looked at their own application. The end of the application states "wiping of mowed area with herbicide seasonally".

Mr. Balzarini stated he did not know it was in there. Mr. Pichette told Mr. Balzarini if the statement about herbicides is incorrect then it needs to be corrected on the application to remove the herbicide issue.

The representative of Winship, LLC then questioned the process by which the change got into the Bylaw. Ms. Slavin said this question is outside of the realm. The representative questioned the Bylaw as it existed on the day the application was submitted. He stated it did not have the approved Attorney General's Bylaw included. Ms. Slavin stated the NOI was dated May 7, 2015 and it was a State approved Bylaw in February. When it was received back from the State, it was incorporated into the Bylaw. The representative stated he went to the Clerk's office the day before the hearing. The Town Clerk indicated a mistake had been made. The second sentence of the proposal, when it was approved by the Attorney General's office, was not included in the old Bylaw when they updated the Bylaw. The Town Clerk is in the process of updating the Bylaw again. So at the time of the application, the Bylaw was incorrect. Ms. Slavin asked if it was the

printed or on-line version that was incorrect. The representative stated he made a formal request to the Clerk's office for the document. Ms. Slavin said the Clerk may have an older document. Mr. Pichette said what was approved by the Attorney General is the Bylaw. If there is a typo as to what the Town put in their revision it does not negate the Bylaw as approved. The representative stated if the correct information was not in the Bylaw at the time of the application, it is not the Bylaw. Ms. Slavin asked the representative if they had spoken to the Town Clerk. The representative stated he spoke to the Clerk on Tuesday of this week and she was 'literally' making the changes after he spoke with her. Ms. Slavin asked if the paper copy the representative received from the Clerk included the updated Bylaw from Fall Town Meeting. The representative stated it included half of it. He stated it did not include all of it. He stated it included the "shall waive" sentence, but not the sentence describing what family members are included.

Another gentleman for Winship, LLC spoke up and said this issue is addressed in Section 6 of the letter and there is a Exhibit 3 which is a copy of the Bylaw in the Clerk's office. Ms. Slavin acknowledge the section and exhibit. The representative asked if the applicant was going to amend the application maintenance section and Ms. Slavin stated she does not know, but they will look at it and they will ask. Mr. Pichette said it sounded as though 'yes' they will be correcting the page.

Another gentleman stood up to bring something to the Commission's attention. The gentleman stated the last time they were there 2 ½ years ago, some gentleman's son had a bee sting and they were going under the ADA. Now they have a plaque and the speaker and his wife have a plaque for a handicapped person who can't walk. When they come back next time they will bring all the ADA information, but since they weren't notified they are going to hire someone to come and explain to the Town what the ADA does and what is required. The applicant has a 91-year old mother they want to use for the plaque & the speaker and his wife are both 75. The plans have nothing to do with the ADA.

Present before the Commission: Fred Fuller, part of the 18 Burgess Point Trust. He stated it was his son who had the bee sting. In 2010, he was bit by a mosquito and got EEE. He stated his son does not live in the house any more. He lives in a group home. He has severe brain damage. Ms. Slavin told Mr. Fuller the document they have tells them exactly who is handicapped in the family and asked if Mr. Fuller's son was included. Mr. Fuller said he did not include his son because he will not parade his son around. Ms. Slavin said they cannot consider him as an issue for this waiver because he is not listed as handicapped. Mr. Fuller asked if the Commission wanted him to bring his son in and Ms. Slavin said no. Mr. Fuller stated this is just more delay action by Winship, LLC. Ms. Slavin stated this is an attempt to identify who the handicapped person is & who is looking for a waiver.

**MOTION: Mr. Leggett moved to continue the public hearing for Ronald & Lois Enos to June 3, 2015. Mr. Rogers seconded.**



**VOTE: Unanimous (4-0-0)**

**MOTION: A motion was made & seconded to have Mr. Pichette reach out to Town Counsel & have Town Counsel review the NOI & the letter from Winship, LLC's attorney re: issues brought up this evening.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (4-0-0)**

Mr. Connolly & Mr. K. Baptiste returned to the table.

**V. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. Amended NOI – James & Julie Cronan, c/o JC Engineering, Inc. – SE76-2277**

Present before the Commisison: Brad Bertollo, JC Engineering, Inc.  
James & Julie Cronan

Mr. Pichette described the project. The property is located at 27 Broad Marsh Avenue in the Swifts Beach area. The project involves the construction of two small additions, a bulkhead, & grading work in the buffer zone to a coastal bank, salt marsh, & w/in a coastal flood zone. A 3x21 ft. addition is proposed on the water side of the house. This would be 35 ft. from the existing seawall. An area currently used as a walkout in this area is proposed to be filled in to level out the back yard. Grading is shown on plan. The backyard area is currently all lawn right up to the seawall. Haybales are proposed between the limit of work & the seawall. Also proposed is a 4x16 ft. addition on the front or street side of the house & a 5x6 ft. bulkhead to access the basement also on the front of the house. A DEP file number has been received for the project. He recommends the issuance of the OOC w/ standard conditions.

**MOTION: Ms. Slavin moved to close the public hearing for James & Julie Cronan. Mr. K. Baptiste seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**MOTION: Ms. Slavin moved to grant an Order of Conditions w/ standard conditions for James & Julie Cronan. Mr. K. Baptiste seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**B. NOI – Pine Grove Estates, LLC (9 Jordan Road) c/o JC Engineering, Inc. – SE76-2277**

Present before the Commission: Brad Bertollo, JC Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Pichette described the project. The property is located at 9 Jordan Road. The project involves the construction of a single family dwelling in the buffer zone to a BVW. A 30x40 ft. dwelling w/ attached 24x24 garage is proposed. The limit of work for the project is 50 ft. from the edge of the wetland. The dwelling would be 77 ft. from the edge of the wetland. The well,

grading work & a propane tank would also be w/in the buffer zone. The driveway & septic system would be outside the buffer zone. Haybales & silt fence will be placed between the work & the resource area as shown on the plan. A DEP file number has been received. He recommends the issuance of an OOC w/ standard conditions.

**MOTION: Ms. Slavin moved to close the public hearing for Pine Grove Estates (9 Jordan Road). Mr. K. Baptiste seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**MOTION: Ms. Slavin moved to grant an Order of Conditions w/ standard conditions & the added condition that low nitrogen fertilizer be used for Pine Grove Estates (9 Jordan Road). Mr. K. Baptiste seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**C. NOI – Pine Grove Estates, LLC (9 Jonathan Lane) – c/o JC Engineering, Inc. – SE76-2339**

Present before the Commission: Brad Bertollo, JC Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Pichette described the project. The property is located at 9 Jonathan Lane. The project involves the construction of a single family dwelling in the buffer zone to BVW. A 30x40 ft. dwelling w/ attached 24x24 ft. garage is proposed. The limit of work for the project is 50 ft. from the dge of the wetland. The dwelling would be 77 ft. from the edge of the wetland. The well, grading work & a propane tank would also be w/in the buffer zone. The driveway & septic system would be outside the buffer zone. Haybales & silt fence will be placed between the work & the resource area as shown on the plan. A DEP file number has been received. He recommends the issuance of an OOC w/ standard conditions.

**MOTION: Mr. K. Baptiste moved to close the public hearing for Pine Grove Estates, LLC (9 Jonathan Lane). Mr. Rogers seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**MOTION: Mr. K. Baptiste moved to grant an Order of Conditions w/ standard conditions & the added condition that low nitrogen fertilizer be used for Pine Grove Estates, LLC (9 Jonathan Lane). Mr. Rogers seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**D. NOI – Pine Grove Estates, LLC (10 Jonathan Lane, c/o JC Engineering, Inc. – SE76-2338**

Present before the Commission: Brad Bertollo, JC Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Pichette described the project. The property is located at 9 Jordan Road. The project involves the construction of a single family dwelling in the buffer zone to BVW. A 30x38 ft. dwelling w/ attached 26x26 ft. garage is proposed. The limit of work for the project is 50 ft. from the edge of the wetland. The dwelling would be 71 ft. from the edge of the wetland. The well, grading work would also be w/in the buffer zone. The driveway & septic system would be outside the buffer zone. Haybales & silt fence will be placed between the work & the resource area as shown on the plan. A DEP file number has been received. He recommends the issuance of the OOC w/ the standard conditions.

**MOTION: Mr. K. Baptiste moved to close the public hearing for Pine Grove Estates (10 Jonathan Lane). Mr. Rogers seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous ( 6-0-0)**

**MOTION: Mr. K. Baptiste moved to grant an Order of Conditions w/ standard conditions & the added condition that low nitrogen fertilizer be used for Pine Grove Estates (10 Jonathan Lane). Mr. Rogers seconded**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**VI. EXTENSION REQUESTS**

**VII. ENFORCEMENT ORDERS**

**VIII. CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE**

**IX. ANY OTHER BUSINESS/DISCUSSION**

**A. Discussion: Municipal Maintenance – Cottage Street, Parkwood Drive**

Mr. Pichette discussed the emergency repairs needed at Cottage Street & Parkwood Drive by Municipal Maintenance.

**MOTION: Mr. K. Baptiste moved to approve the emergency repairs at Cottage Street by Municipal Maintenance. Ms. Slavin seconded.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**MOTION: Mr. K. Baptiste moved to approve the emergency repairs at Parkwood Drive by Municipal Maintenance.**

**VOTE: Unanimous (6-0-0)**

**B. Discussion: Draft No Activity Zone Handicapped Waiver.**

C. Discussion: Conservation Restriction/Stewardship

D. Discussion: Bills

E. Discussion: Wetland Bylaw.

X. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION:** Ms. Slavin moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 P.M. Mr. K. Baptiste seconded.

**VOTE:** Unanimous (6-0-0)

Date signed: 7/15/15

Attest:

*John Connolly*  
John Connolly, Chairman  
*Kenneth Baptiste*  
WAREHAM CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Date copy sent to Town Clerk: 7/21/15