## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

Committee: Conservation Commission

Date: April 15, 2021

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: Zoom

Commissioners present: Carl Shreder, Tom Howland, Rachel Bancroft, Rebecca Chane,

Chris Candia, and Elisabeth Clark

Staff members present: Steve Przyjemski and Julie Cantara

The meeting was called to order at: 7:03 PM

### Carl Shreder starts the meeting by reading off the following:

This Public Hearing is being conducted in a way that is an attempt to satisfy the Open Meeting Law, and other State Laws pertaining to the Public Hearings of the Town's Public Bodies pursuant to Chapter 53 of the Acts of 2020, as recently amended by Chapter 201 of the Acts of 2020. It is a good faith, best effort to comply with the <u>Executive Order</u> waiving certain provisions of G. L. c. 30A, sec. 20 during the COVID -19 pandemic. Internet based technologies will be used by the Conservation Commission to conduct Public Meetings and Hearings until the Executive Order is rescinded, or the State of Emergency is terminated.

## **HEARINGS**

### **175 Central Street** (GCC# 2021-01) – NOI - (new)

Replace an existing septic system, upgrade and renovate existing building, site work and replacement of drain pipe.

#### **Present:**

Brian Farmer (Applicant) Bob Grasso (Engineer) Brigham Lee (Abutter)

<sup>\*</sup>Carl goes over the project description to open up the hearing.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Carl:** This site has been here before; what has changed?

**Brian:** The issues with the septic have been resolved.

Carl: Do you have a visual?

\*Brian has technical difficulties due to not having a camera on his computer, and is unable to share his screen.

**Carl:** If we don't have a visual, maybe you can give us more of a narrative. You said the issues have been resolved with the septic. The issues before on this case was that it was considered new construction, new septic, and it didn't meet our requirements; it didn't meet the Bylaw.

**Bob:** Carl, can I interrupt for a second? Brian did send in paper copies and pdfs; I'm not sure why he can't put them up. I've been in many Zoom meetings with other Boards that the Agent has put up the pdf on the screen. I'm not sure why Steve is not putting them up.

**Carl:** It's usually the Applicant, the presenter, who will put up what they're presenting.

**Bob:** Well, sometimes there's technical difficulties, which Brian is having right now.

**Carl:** I get it, that's the nature of these electronic meetings.

**Bob:** Can your Agent put up the plans, so Brian can explain it?

**Steve:** We have never done that. I can't speak to other towns, but that's the Engineer's responsibility to lead the meeting.

**Bob:** Steve, why aren't you on video, since you're the Agent?

**Steve:** Is that required, Sir? Can we stick to the topic?

**Brian:** Bob, stay on the topic.

**Bob:** Alright.

**Brian:** Carl, can we just go back? I do have the pdfs, and I guess I could email them. I did email everything to the Conservation Commission through the Town Hall. I guess there is an assumption that each member would have a copy of that. I have pdf files here on my computer now, but I don't know if you can see it, even if I brought it up on my screen.

Carl: No, not currently.

**J. Cantara:** He has to have his video on in order to do that.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Brian:** I just tried.

Carl: Well, why don't you try and pdf them?

**Brian:** Okay.

Carl: Not sure we can get them in real time here.

Steve: Carl, I did send the pdfs to all of the Commissioners. The point is that it's hard to discuss it and look at the specifics based on paper copies in front of us. The public can't see them. Often, the Engineer would have a pointer hovering over something that they're talking about, so they can reference something. Right now, that's not my responsibility, that's their responsibility. At this point, I don't think there's much we can talk about. We can discuss a 3<sup>rd</sup> party review, we can discuss some of the outstanding issues, but I don't see the value to that right now.

**Brian:** I agree, Steve.

\*Bob asks Brian to show the PDF, but Brian continues to have technical difficulties.

**Bob:** Why do you request pdfs if you can't pull it up?

**Rachel:** So that we have them for our records.

**Bob:** Ok.

**Carl:** We're just trying to look at it for the meeting.

**Bob:** Other towns that I've dealt with; if clients have technical difficulties dealing with Zoom, because this is all new to everybody, the Agent usually just pops it up and then Brian will talk about it. Ok, obviously Georgetown doesn't do that.

**Brian:** I'm still having issues...

Carl: Let's do it again. Mr. Farmer, if you could give us a little more narrative. Again, there's a little history with this site, and we won't be able to look at it at the moment. Give us a narrative, and then I'll ask my Agent to also give us a history with this site.

**Brian:** It seemed like the septic was the primary, so we re-designed a septic system so that the leaching field would be outside of the 100-foot wetland setback. On top of that, this design has some of the most advanced septic design and is considered an alternative system design. It's a Fuji in a drip dispersion; the drip dispersion is a pressurized tubing, and it meets groundwater discharge limits. I'll leave it at that point on the septic. I don't want to change the footprint of the building, so it's an upgrade and renovation of the existing building. It has a common foundation, but it's two different buildings.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Carl:** I think one of our sticking points last case, was that we consider this a new septic. I understand that the DEP already has an open case on this, and they can't have two open cases on the same project.

**Brian:** My Counsel couldn't make it tonight and he apologizes; he has another meeting at the exact same time. Ideally once the Commission approves this plan, we'll send a letter to withdraw that Superseding Order of Conditions request. It seems that's the easiest way. But yes, there is a file number. You are correct, Carl; the DEP doesn't want two file numbers, or Notice of Intent numbers for one property. The two projects are very similar from DEP's point of view.

**Carl:** Steve, can you give us a little more background on this case for the newer Commissioners?

**Steve:** Sounds good. Just to let you know; the DEP hasn't officially given us a new DEP number. They don't give two DEP numbers for the same project. They have an appeal; in order to move forward with a new project, the Applicant needs to withdraw that appeal, and then the DEP will issue a DEP number. At this point, the DEP will not be issuing a second number until the first one is withdrawn.

**Rebecca:** So, why are we moving forward with this right now?

Carl: We really can't.

**Steve:** We can discuss things. We just can't close it; we can't vote on the project.

**Bob:** Steve, can I ask you a question?

**Steve:** Bob, would you mind if I finished what I was saying?

**Bob:** Absolutely.

Carl: Ok, one person at a time, and then I'll let everyone speak as necessary.

Steve: The Chair asked me to give an overview on where this project stands. The DEP will not issue another number until the appeal is pulled back. So, that's not an accurate statement. Again, it doesn't matter for what we need to do, it's just that we can't give a decision until that DEP number is issued. This original project was always a conversion of a garage into a house. In roughly 1998, the previous owner got a denial for converting the garage into a house. At the time, they didn't appeal the decision.

**Brian:** Steve, that's new information.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Steve:** In 2016, the Commission again denied pretty much the exact same project. It went through the Court process; the Commission won that case, and there's been an ongoing appeal with the DEP. The current plan is different in certain ways, but a lot of the issues that the Commission had originally are still there; septic system components in the 100-foot buffer, the culvert issues were never resolved, and there are flooding issues. It's really hard to make decisions. This could go out to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party review, but it's going to come back with almost the exact same concerns that were not resolved before. It's a very challenging project to hash through because the issues are pretty obvious, and nothing has changed. The existing leaching system - the Board of Health has notes on their plans that they haven't done soils yet. It hasn't been approved by the Board of Health. The Commission doesn't approve projects for septic systems without the Board of Health approving it first. Again, the first time this was denied in 2016 was the first time ever that this structure was shown as a house versus a garage. As recently as a couple months ago, the Applicant submitted a building permit with the Building Inspector to rehab the structure, and they called it a garage. That's really the crutch of the problem; that this is a garage being converted into a house, and it's considered new construction under the original denial in 1998, and the denial in 2016. The Board of Health and all other departments are considering this new construction, and that's the hard part to get past.

Carl: That's one of the (inaudible) of the issues here.

**Steve:** Correct.

**Brian:** Carl, there were several mis-statements there. The Board of Health approved the septic system. When we talk new construction, there's different...

**Carl:** When are you saying they approved it?

Brian: They approved the septic design...not this particular septic design. Currently there's no Health Agent in the Town of Georgetown. They reviewed already once, one septic design. All of the soil tests have been done, I just want to say that. That part was not an accurate statement. There are plans before the Board of Health as we speak. It was signed off on by the two innovative technology companies, and it's in front of the Board of Health right now. Steve's correct that that hasn't been voted in, but in 2014 the Board of Health approved the septic design for the property; that septic design has been changed. This is the first time I'm hearing of a 1998 denial. I don't even know what that is referencing. Is that a statement that the Conservation Commission had a public hearing for a Notice of Intent in 1998? That's brand-new information. As far as flooding goes; it was a culvert that was under size, and something happened. I don't know about a house denial; that's a Zoning issue.

Carl: We would consider what you're doing as new construction, and it doesn't meet the Bylaw and Regulations because some of the components are within the 100 feet. That's one of the issues as well.

**Brian:** It's hard to have a conversation if we're just talking about Conservation Commission issues. I understand the normal process would come to the Commission with all the other approvals that are required normally, right? Is that a true and accurate statement I just made, Carl? The normal process?

### Memorial Town Hall ♦ One Library Street ♦ Georgetown, MA 01833

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Carl:** The normal process is: if it's within the jurisdiction, part of it is an approval by the Commission; but it also has a Board of Health approval, too. It's normal for any kind of construction like this that's within a resource area. Yes, you have to go to both Boards.

**Brian:** I understand that, and certainly the Building Department would be part of a house or a dwelling, because that would be an alteration or that type of thing, but...

**Carl:** We consider this new construction. I don't consider it a repair.

**Brian:** My understanding was; because we couldn't agree, that everything went with the increase. It all came down to the septic system and increase of flow into the resource area. Is that a true and accurate statement of how it all played out? Because no increase in the number of bedrooms as it related to the septic system.

**Carl:** What bedrooms? It was a garage; it is a garage. When were there bedrooms?

**Brian:** I'm staying focused on the septic. The previous proposal that was before the Commission appeared to show five bedrooms septic, leaching in the resource area, and that was my problem to overcome. Now you have before you a current plan with no increases in bedrooms in the resource area as it relates to the septic system.

**Rebecca:** So, it's staying a garage?

**Brian:** It's still a garage now as we speak.

**Rebecca:** And it's staying a garage?

**Brian:** Well, I would like to make it a house.

Carl: You can't say it's a garage, get a septic, and then all of a sudden say it's a house.

**Brian:** Under the Title V Inspection Report that was performed; that used to be a 2-bay garage and an office in there. When you calculate it out, it's like a five...

**Carl:** The fact is that in the last year or so, it's actually increased in size. It used to be smaller before, but it's actually increased twice in the last couple years.

**Brian:** What has increased?

**Carl:** The garage.

**Brian:** That's not a true statement.

**Carl:** I can show you photographic evidence of it.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Brian:** The foundation footprint on the property hasn't changed at all because some things broke down, fell down, or needed to be maintained. That's not an accurate statement.

**Carl:** I can show you pictures of that five years ago, and it's smaller than it is now.

**Rebecca:** So, how many bedrooms septic are you proposing now?

**Brian:** Two bedrooms is the answer.

**Rebecca:** You're going from a garage to a two-bedroom?

**Brian:** Two-bedrooms septic design, yes.

**Rebecca:** You're going to tear that down and build a two-bedroom house on it?

**Brian:** Yes, just convert the retrofit that it structures there, to a two-bedroom ranch.

**Carl:** Have any of the flooding issues been addressed?

Brian: The good thing about the Superseding Order of Conditions request, is that we never really got into the details in 2016. DEP put a lot of effort into reviewing the culvert and the new stream crossing guidelines; which the culvert design does conform with that part of the pipe replacement, which is what we called it in the Notice of Intent. The final design is what you see. We've got a 24" culvert, and another 24" culvert that should flow through a 36" culvert, onto the street (Route 97); and part of the flow goes to a 12" culvert. It's overtopping; they don't really call it flooding. So, the water backs up on the North side, and then it would cross across the driveway and flow into the 36" culvert. It would balance the flow. There's no increase in flow.

**Rebecca:** Mr. Chairman, if we were to look at this; wouldn't we look at new buildings, stormwater management, septic...the whole entire plan altogether? Why are we only looking at adjusting the septic? If you're building a new building, you'd need stormwater management and all that.

**Carl:** What he has in front of us is only a septic.

**Brian:** There's a septic proposal in front of...there is an upgrade of the existing culvert pipe, or replacing of the pipe, rehabbing the existing buildings, and no footprint expansion. And yes, some site work. Some fencing.

Carl: When you say renovate existing buildings, are you actually talking about, *I'm going to build a two-bedroom house?* Because that's a little bit of a stretch.

**Brian:** No. You can see it's a normal flow for a two-bedroom ranch. We've got to comply with Zoning, that's how I look at it.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Carl:** I call changing a garage into a house a little bit of a stretch of just a renovation.

**Brian:** The existing toilet plan and system is there. There was plumbing and electrical...

**Carl:** There's already water to the site?

**Brian:** Yeah, there was shared water coming across from my neighbor's property.

Carl: You can show me where the pipe is?

**Brian:** Yeah, if you need to go down there, I can show you on Wednesday.

**Rebecca:** Was this project denied previously because it was considered a new building?

Carl: It was denied because it was considered new construction, and didn't meet the requirements in conformance with the 100 feet of the resource area.

**Rebecca:** What has changed now? It's still a new building.

**Carl:** This is what I initially mentioned.

**Rebecca:** I don't understand what's changed.

**Brian:** Seeing as I spent thousands of dollars to try to get people on record to specifically what the issue is - the Commission took the position that they didn't want to see, on the septic point, the increase of the number of bedrooms in the resource area, but it was all based on the septic system; at least that was the Town Counsel. I was basically told when you looked at the cases, and I agree; we showed five bedrooms in the resource area, the leaching field, and that's how the town normally regulates the bedrooms. This design overcomes that without touching my neighbor's leaching field that's on 175 Central Street, so we're trying to reduce the number of bedrooms because that would be an increase, which gets to a new construction.

**Rebecca:** There are no bedrooms there now, so even one bedroom is an increase.

**Rachel:** Exactly what I was thinking.

**Brian:** Not the proposal in front of you as it relates to the septic design.

**Rachel:** But it's the new construction, which means it has to meet certain standards.

**Rebecca:** Right, Rachel; which is stormwater, septic, drains, wetlands.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

Rachel: Exactly, and right now there's photographic evidence that new things that have been added. Some are not connected, some are. It's a bunch of small little things that would have to be connected that were not there originally. The original garage was a garage, and then there was a small addition put on, which wasn't even permitted, that I think was supposed to replicate where the toilet might have been. Best guess is what we were told. Now, there are a bunch of new things, but all of those things put together are still all new construction, and you have to put them all together to create the building that you want it to be; because right now it's a garage. You've said it's a garage. You want it to be a two-bedroom house, but it does not have two bedrooms or a bathroom right now; it doesn't even have a half bathroom or a powder room, so I'm really having a hard time trying to understand how this is not an allover new proposition. If you were to go by the original garage that was there, before the tiny addition that's supposed to simulate where the bathroom might have been; that is not a floor plan for a two-bedroom. That's not a two-bedroom ranch, that's a garage. To connect all of the buildings that are there now - one being a shed, one being new, and then one being the existing garage that was there, that didn't have a toilet and no bedrooms; it would be new construction, because you'd have to do a new foundation, which is a completely new building.

**Brian:** There were two things that...there's not going to be any new foundation, because the foundations are good and there's a slab there. The bump out that used to be there that's collapsed in the past; there is definitely a toilet flange there that you can see with your own eyes. There used to be a toilet there, and that came out with the Board of Health hearings. So yes, I do want to alter the buildings from the previous auto repair businesses, garages, there were two bays – yeah, I want to make it...

Carl: It was two bays? That's news to me.

**Brian:** That's what the environmental report that I previously submitted, the 2180, that was done way before I got involved called it; a 2-bay business.

**Rachel:** Carl, I have a picture. Can I show that?

**Carl:** If you're able to.

\*Rachel shows a photograph on camera, and makes sure that everyone can see it clearly.

**Rachel:** That is the garage (on the photograph).

**Brian:** That's two buildings on the right of the flag.

**Rachel:** Yes, and it's not attached.

**Brian:** If you zoom in low to the left, you'll see the slab where the toilet flange is; or you can look at the plans that were submitted.

<sup>\*</sup>Rachel keeps the photograph on the screen.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Rachel:** This was the original. The two parts are not connected.

**Rachel:** Then this picture here; this is what I'm talking about. This little one right here (Rachel points to a small building/addition to the left of the garage), is what was put on...

**Brian:** That previously existed, and like I just said; somehow it had fallen down, and I had to clean up the property when I first purchased it, and there was debris there.

**Rachel:** To my recollection, when there were questions about that, there was no building permit for that.

**Rebecca:** Rachel, how about the new building to the right?

**Rachel:** So, now we have this. We went from the original one-door garage, to now having this. I don't understand how going from this - it's not two bays, it's one door with an entry door and then a...

**Brian:** Can I speak on that? It was always two windows, two bays, and there was garage door debris. There was plenty of photographic evidence that we took when we cleaned up that area to repair that building.

**Rachel:** Can you show me on this original; explain to me where the two bays are?

**Brian:** The white building and the black building. The one that has the tarp over it; it was waiting for a repair permit because we were going through the Conservation Commission process - the final process we assumed. A building permit was issued to turn that black building into a white one.

**Rachel:** Ok, but the tiny little bump out at what was supposed to be the toilet; there was no permit for that

**Brian:** No, it was rectified through the repair permit process.

**Rachel:** No, this one; this right here (pointing to a small white addition). This wasn't standing at all. This was not in existence, so this is new without a permit.

**Carl:** It's been there for quite a few years now.

**Brian:** I know you say it was never in existence, but that's not a true and accurate statement. The foundation was there; I was trying to clean the property up when I purchased it, but I got to a point where Steve didn't want me doing anymore cleanup.

<sup>\*</sup>Rachel shares another photograph on the screen.

<sup>\*</sup>Rachel shares the newest photograph again.

<sup>\*</sup>Rachel shows the newest photograph.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Rachel:** Carl; if I go into the woods and find a foundation, can I call it a pre-existing structure?

**Carl:** I wouldn't think so.

**Rachel:** Okay, that's all I'm asking.

**Rebecca:** I have another question. Mr. Grasso; the foundation is under the original bay garage -what is under the building to the right? Is there a foundation under that?

**Bob:** You're asking if there's a foundation to the right?

**Rebecca:** Yes.

**Bob:** There's a slab.

**Rebecca:** The new building you just rehabbed.

**Bob:** I didn't do a building, but there is an existing concrete foundation to the right.

**Rebecca:** On both the bay garage and that new structure?

**Bob:** As Brian stated, there was a bump out to the left of the building which had a sewer flange, which went to a cesspool, which was part of the garage at the time. There was water service from 38 Brook Street, into the garage. It had water service, it had septic, which there's a cesspool.

**Rachel:** My recollection was; there was a debate as to whether it was a cesspool or not, or if it was just a pit. There was great debate on whether or not it was or wasn't, and what it was shown as and what it wasn't shown as.

**Carl:** How do we know it wasn't a sink or a drywell versus what you say is a toilet or septic system?

**Bob:** The garage existed. It had a bump out to the left, a flange with a spurt, and a bathroom that went to a cesspool, which was located on the plan; shown on the previous plans/main plans.

**Carl:** I've never seen those plans.

**Bob:** From day one it shows a cesspool. From when this project started, it shows a cesspool connected to that garage. It also shows a water service connecting from 38 Brook Street to the garage. It had water, it had sewer, and it had its own electric connection from Brook Street, from an overhead wire to the garage. So; it had electric, water and sewer.

**Rebecca:** But wasn't this property subdivided such that this might have just been a runoff that runs off the main house?

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Bob:** Yes, there was a Form A which was signed by the Planning Board. It had an A&R process, which had frontage area and it had its own service, but unfortunately the septic was on another lot. Brian is trying to rectify that issue by saying 'ok, we're going to put the septic outside of the 100-foot buffer zone', which he's presenting tonight with an alternative type pre-treatment system. That system flows out of the dwelling/garage up to a drip dispersion system, which is outside the 100-foot buffer. The only thing that's inside the 100-foot buffer would be the septic tank and the pre-treatment tank.

**Carl:** No, you need to get that outside of the 100-foot.

**Bob:** Well, that's not going to happen.

Carl: That's what I'm telling you needs to happen. What I'm suggesting right now is that you withdraw the existing case with DEP; and if you'd like, we'll schedule a 3<sup>rd</sup> party review of this.

**Brian:** That sounds great, Carl. Anytime anyone wants to come to the site and see the flange and repaired building, I'm certainly open to that.

**Carl:** I think some of the same issues exist that existed in 2016, unfortunately.

**Brian:** I think the septic issue is resolved. We're not constructing new buildings.

**Rebecca:** Carl; have we ever permitted a septic tank to be put within the 100-foot, within wetlands?

Carl: No.

**Brian:** Excuse me, but the Town of Georgetown has approved many leaching fields within 100 feet of the setbacks.

**Steve:** That's true for repairs.

**Carl:** Repairs and replacements.

**Steve:** Before the Board of Health Agent left, she did receive this plan, and on it she wrote these notes: "This is not an existing dwelling; this is new construction. No soil in proposed area + don't agree with the H2O table. No reserve area. No waivers allowed on new construction. Was existing detached garage that was subdivided from the existing house located at 38 Brook Street. Additional review is required. Noted above is a summary of some of the main issues".

Steve: This has not been approved by the Board of Health, and per my comment at the beginning of the meeting, the soils have not been verified. The plan itself says "verify soil conditions before installation", so they have not done the soil testing to say that this system will work. I think we need to wait for the Board of Health to approve the project. I honestly don't recommend going into a 3<sup>rd</sup> party review because I don't think it's fair to the Applicant. If we spend the Applicant's money on a review to come up with the same issues we did before,

Memorial Town Hall ♦ One Library Street ♦ Georgetown, MA 01833

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

and the Board of Health doesn't approve it, then we're wasting the Applicant's money and I don't think that's fair. My recommendations are to continue this until the Board of Health has approved the project.

**Carl:** That's one option. Maybe the correct venue is to wait for more from the Board of Health before we take the next steps.

**Steve:** We often don't approve the basic septic system replacement until after the Board of Health has approved it.

Carl: That's pretty typical.

Steve: This property has a huge history, and really nothing has changed. The leaching system is out of the 100-foot buffer, but all the components are in the 100-foot buffer. From a regulatory standpoint, nothing has changed. If that's the case, I don't see the point in spending the Applicant's money on a review. If the Board of Health agrees with their argument and the soil science is verified, I think then the Commission can look at their Regulations and their thoughts on it; but at this point we're going over stuff that's been argued over and over again.

**Carl:** Let me ask Mr. Farmer; when are you on for the next hearing with the Board of Health on this?

**Brian:** I should be on the next hearing. The soils have been verified, and I won't get into that. I don't know their schedule, but there's probably a new Health Agent coming to town, I don't know. It's the COVID-19 reality. I don't know their schedule, Carl.

**Carl:** You don't have a hearing date, or anything of that nature?

**Brian:** Right. They haven't set one. It's been in front of them for about a month now; the revised plans. The two technology owners, Fuji and Drip Dispersion, have signed off on the design; that it conforms with their license. That's Title V of the State Environmental Code. It's always been getting the leaching field at least outside the 100-foot setback. There will be no increase in the bedrooms associated with the wastewater flow. I'll leave it there, Carl.

**Rebecca:** I just want to clarify; I did hear one of you say that the original septic was on the original divided property, but this property never had a septic.

**Brian:** That's not 100% accurate. You've got a cesspool on the lot, and now you've got the leaching field servicing the existing house on the other lot.

**Rebecca:** They subdivided, and what was left on your property was only a leaching field, and not a septic design system?

**Brian:** I may have misunderstood what you said.

### Memorial Town Hall ♦ One Library Street ♦ Georgetown, MA 01833

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Rebecca:** When the original property was subdivided, the piece that we're talking about now had a remaining leaching field with no septic system on the property; is that correct?

**Brian:** When you say septic; it's a cesspool. It was a cesspool servicing the building, that's all I'm saying. So, I guess I'm saying no. There was a cesspool servicing that building, or building complex, or whatever you want to call what we're talking about. There was a cesspool that was there, I believe for the workers that were repairing cars, and maybe some customers or something like that in the office. So, I think the history is pretty clear on that. As I put in the report, I jetted it out. We can go through that phase too; it exists. Under Title V they call it two non-conforming septic systems. Ideally, back in 1996, they should've put the septic systems on each lot separately. That's what should've happened on the property. It technically wasn't a subdivision. I know there are two lots, but I think it was under 81L that it wasn't considered a subdivision.

**Carl:** If the Commission is okay with this, I think the next step would be to hear back from where the Board of Health is on this. Then, if Mr. Farmer wants to withdraw his existing appeal to DEP and look at a 3<sup>rd</sup> party, if it goes to that point, and move it forward in that venue.

**Rebecca:** Also, if there's going to be a new house there with the two homes, it's well within our wetlands. We want to see the entire design; the landscaping design, the stormwater, the whole septic, the whole engineering plans all at once - correct?

**Carl:** Yes, but some of the same issues exist that existed in 2016, as far as the components within the 100 feet, that is a concern. If it was a repair; yes, we certainly allow repairs to be within that. New construction is the problem.

**Brian:** The DEP, under Title V, considers it a repair of the septic system.

**Carl:** I want to hear back from the Board of Health on this one.

**Brian:** I agree, Carl. It's a great way to proceed.

**Carl:** Do any Commissioners have any further comments at this point? Or, if there's anyone from the public that would like to comment on this project, you may speak if you identify yourself for the record, please.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

#### **Brigham Lee: 38 Brook Street**

Brian's been great. He's come to talk to me about what he wants to do. He talked about the cesspool and leaching fields, and the plans he submitted. From what I see on the plans, from his point, everything will be fine.

Brigham asks for clarification of flooding.

Memorial Town Hall ♦ One Library Street ♦ Georgetown, MA 01833

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

Carl stated that historically, like with a 100-year storm, the front of the property to the left of the garage, has had significant flooding. As in approximately a foot of water. It's notorious for flooding.

Brigham asked about the culvert that was mentioned, because he didn't hear how it was going to get resolved.

Brian stated that there's a 3ft x 4ft wide box culvert with nothing on bottom. When everything comes down from the pond on the North side, the water backs up in the resource area, and it comes across his driveway. Brian states that it's more like overtopping that looks like flooding. He stated that it won't do that anymore; that it's neutral and there's no increase in flow.

Brigham asks if it'll just continue to do what it did before, or if he's adding a pipe. Brian responded that it's a pipe replacement, and that's what it's called on the Notice of Intent. It's making it a bigger pipe system so that won't happen again. The water won't come up and over the driveway.

Brigham asked Brian if it would be under the driveway, or if he was putting it in a different direction. Brian stated that it would be under the driveway. Brian said that originally, there was probably a stream going through there that was restricted. He thinks there was a pipe in there around the 1980's. Brain states that there's one 24" pipe flowing into a 12" pipe, and it's trying to get through a 36" pipe.

Brigham said that he wasn't aware that there was a pipe on that side, underneath the driveway to the other side, so he needs to re-think it over.

Carl stated that as we look at pipes, we have to ensure that it doesn't flood other people's property.

Brian said that it seems sensible to him to put the proper culvert size in there.

\*Carl asks if there are any other abutter comments. No one comes forward.

#### \*\*\*END OF PUBLIC COMMENTS\*\*\*

**Carl:** If there are no more comments, we can look at continuing this; I have a May date, a June date, and a July date.

**Brian:** Can we wait for the Board of Health?

**Carl:** We have to continue it, otherwise we would have to close it.

**Brian:** June makes sense to me, if that makes sense to everybody else.

**Steve:** Seven-thirty.

**Rachel:** To continue, you have to contact Steve or Julie and keep open communication.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

**Rebecca:** Makes a motion to continue the hearing to June 17, 2021 at 7:30 PM.

**Tom:** Seconds motion.

#### ROLL CALL

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Rebecca Chane	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Elisabeth Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries.

### **<u>21 Tenney Street</u>** (DEP# 161-0903; GCC# 2020-17) NOI – (new)

Convert a deck to a 3-seasons room.

#### **Present:**

Jason Grzesik (Applicant)

Jason states that there's an existing deck that's 27 x 13 feet, that he would like to convert to a 3-seasons room, with a roof and open sides.

Carl asks if gutters will be installed, and Jason responded that he'd be happy to do whatever needs to be done. Carl states that it's not a requirement.

Rachel asked for plans, but Jason was having technical difficulties because he was using his cellphone for the meeting.

Carl asks Steve if he has any comments.

Steve states that the existing area is lawn underneath a deck, and that the DEP has signed off on it. He also spoke to Jason regarding guttering and drywalling, but he didn't say it was required. Steve feels that it's a reasonable project, and recommends approving it – the gutters would just be a bonus.

\*Carl opens it up to abutters, but none come forward.

**Rebecca:** Makes a motion to approve the project, but not accepting the wetland line.

**Tom:** Seconds motion.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

ROLL	CALL
NULL	CALL

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Rebecca Chane	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Elisabeth Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries.

**Rachel:** Makes a motion to close the hearing.

**Chris:** Seconds motion.

#### **ROLL CALL**

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Rebecca Chane	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Elisabeth Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries.

### **BUSINESS**

## COC REQUEST: EAST MAIN STREET STATE PARK (DEP# 161-0783; GCC# 2014-09)

Steve recommends that the Commission approves the COC request.

**Chris:** Makes a motion to approve the COC request for the East Main Street State Park.

**Tom:** Seconds motion.

#### **ROLL CALL**

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Elisabeth Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**Rachel:** Makes a motion to approve the meeting minutes from March 18, 2021.

**Tom:** Seconds motion.

**ROLL CALL** 

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Elisabeth Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries, and the minutes are approved.

### **CLOSING THE MEETING**

**Tom:** Makes a motion to close the meeting.

**Rachel:** Seconds motion.

**ROLL CALL** 

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Elisabeth Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries, and the meeting is closed.

The Meeting was adjourned at 8:13 PM. Documents and other exhibits used at the meeting will be available for review at the Conservation Office.

#### \*\*\*\*END OF MEETING MINUTES\*\*\*\*

See the following section for approval information.

## MEETING MINUTES April 15, 2021

This section is for approving the meeting minutes		
Minutes for the Conservation Commission meeting held on April 15, 2021 were approved by a virtual roll call vote on May 20, 2021. The Chairman will sign the Meeting Minutes when in-person meetings resume.	 [	
Respectfully submitted,		
Chairman: (Signature)		