MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Committee: Conservation Commission

Date: March 17, 2022

Time: 7:00 PM Location: Zoom

Commissioners present: Carl Shreder, Rachel Bancroft, Rebecca Chane, Chris Candia,

Elisabeth (Liz) Clark, Tom Howland, and Laura Repplier

Staff members present: Steve Przyjemski (Agent) and Julie Cantara (Admin)

The meeting was called to order at: 7:04 PM

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

This Public Meeting 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. It is a good faith, best effort to comply with the new law, Chapter 22 of the Acts of 2022, signed into law on February 15, 2022, which includes an extension until July 15, 2022, of the remote meeting provisions of the Governor's March 12, 2020, Executive Order suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law. Internet based technologies will be used by the Conservation Commission to conduct Public Meetings and Hearings until the Executive Order and its extension provisions are rescinded or terminated.

HEARINGS

• <u>93 Tenney Street</u> (GCC# 2022-02; DEP# 161-0915) – NOI – (new)

Construction of a commercial building with appurtenances within jurisdictional wetlands resource areas and/or associated buffer zones and local setback zones.

• <u>47 West Street</u> (DEP# 161-0889) – State NOI – (cont.)

Construction of a 16-unit senior housing development.

• 175 Central Street (DEP# 161-0908; GCC# 2021-01) – NOI – (cont.)

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

• 35 Charles Street (GCC# 2022-01) – NOI – (new)

Raze an existing single-family dwelling foundation and septic, and construct a new single-family dwelling, septic, & associated appurtenances.

BUSINESS / DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1. Items not reasonably anticipated by the chair 48 hours in advance of the meeting.
- 2. Approve Meeting Minutes from the January 20, 2022 and February 17, 2022 meetings.
- 3. COC request for 75 West Street (Marshall Well Replacement); DEP# 161-0867.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

HEARING: 93 Tenney Street

93 Tenney Street (GCC# 2022-02; DEP# 161-0915) – NOI – (new)

Construction of a commercial building with appurtenances within jurisdictional wetlands resource areas and/or associated buffer zones and local setback zones.

Present:

David Cowell (Wetland Scientist from Hancock Associates) Robert DiBenedetto (Hancock Associates)

Carl: It being on or after 7:00, I'm going to open a new Notice of Intent for 93 Tenney Street. That is

GCC# 2022-02, and that's the construction of a commercial building with appurtenances within jurisdictional wetlands resource areas and/or associated buffer zones and local setback zones. If I could have the applicant and/or consultant, and if you could identify yourself for the record,

please.

David: Hi Carl, and members of the Commission; for the public record my name is David Cowell, and

I'm a Senior Wetland Scientist for Hancock Associates here tonight, on behalf of the applicant. First, administrative business. I understand the DEP issued a file number without comments, and I believe one of my colleagues dropped off the abutter notification green slips, prior to the

hearing. So, I think that this is a valid hearing.

Carl: Yes, I just want to verify. I think I got an email from Julie that those were received.

Julie: That's correct, yes.

David: Alright, wonderful. First of all, I'm filling in for the civil engineering project manager, and the

Wetland Scientist, Devon Morse, who couldn't be here tonight - so I'm standing in. They briefed me on the project, and I'm qualified to present it. Do I have the ability to share my

screen? I'm going to try to pull up the site plan.

Carl: You should.

David: Alright, let's give it a go. Let me know if you can see my screen.

Carl: I can.

David: Alright, here's the site plan. You should be looking at a plan with some colored, concentric

circles on it.

Carl: Correct.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

David:

We filed a Notice of Intent and request to permit a multi-use, commercial industrial use building, with 8 units on it. I'll zoom in a little bit to show you. This is a very narrow lot – let's start with the wetland resource areas. It's bordering vegetated wetland that was field delineated. There's some to the South of the lot, and there's some to the West of the lot; the red line is the local 50-foot setback, the yellow line is the local 75-foot setback, and the green is the 100-foot buffer zone. As you can see, we are able to site the majority of the work outside of the buffer zone, towards the front of the lot here. We've developed this with a minimum number of parking places to reduce our footprint to the maximum extent practicable. This doesn't have town sewer; we do have a septic system. Can you guys see my icon when I move that around, my mouse?

Carl:

Yes.

David:

Okay good, that helps. This is the septic system that's located outside of the 100-foot buffer zone, up at the front of the lot, and that's pursuant to your local Board of Health Regulations. Elements within the 100-foot buffer zone – you can see that there's a small element here towards the back; we have been able to maintain the 75-foot setback for building, but in order to construct the site we do have some tapered grading occurring. We're able to maintain the grading outside of the 50-foot setback, but this is just some grading that's necessary for stormwater drainage and stabilization. Once that's graded, the plan here would be to seed it and loam it, and return it to a vegetated, impervious surface area. We did want to point out that...and I'm going to zoom way in here; this is stormwater drainage here, this line that says *D*; the attempt there would be to provide stormwater drainage - that this would just be trenched, the drain pipe would be set in there and back-filled to existing grade, and again, loamed and seeded and vegetated. There is one man-hole cover that's at the 75-foot line, and we really don't have the ability to vacate that, so if we needed to request any variance from your local Bylaw, it would be for a single man-hole that really falls right on the 75-foot outer peripheral margins of that zone.

Carl:

Are these just the standard catch basins, or do they have any kind of a collection point if there would be a spill or anything like that? I'm assuming these are industrial condos, or I'm not exactly sure what they are.

David:

They said their idea is they would have bay doors, but it would essentially be office space or something, so I don't anticipate any heavy industrial use, to give it a greater risk of fuel or pollutant leaks over your conventional commercial office space buildings. My stormwater engineer called me a few minutes ago and said he was running late – he's going to try to join the hearing with us, if we're still on. But the stormwater was designed in accordance with all stormwater management standards. What I believe is that each of the catch basins are your conventional stormceptor chaps that have oil/gas separators, which is the first line of treatment in (inaudible) solids and oil/gas separators. That's it; hopefully Rob DeBenidetto will be able to join us – he was the one that designed the grading plan, the stormwater systems, and the wastewater treatment systems. My background is in ecology, wetland science and wetland permitting, so if you do have technical engineering questions, he would be more suited.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Carl: Are there any drains coming off the roof? The actual building itself; are they being infiltrated in,

or is that just going to run off onto the pavement?

David: That is an outstanding question, and I don't know the answer. I don't know if this is outfitted

with conventional downspouts and gutters that would discharge to the surface, or if it's been

outfitted with drywells that would receive roof run-off and infiltrate that.

Carl: I'm assuming that the all the parking and the building is all impervious surface the way it's

designed; is there any green islands or anything like that in there? It doesn't look like it.

David: No, it really is tight in terms of getting the minimum amount of parking that's required under the

zoning and building ordinance. But it's really impossible because each of these units have sort of a bay door on these units, and just for cars to pull out of these parking spots, and turn around and pull out of the lot, there's not really any opportunity to put green islands or anything in there.

By surface area I think it's 2,800 square feet of impervious surface area, all of which was modeled to be collected and treated with our stormwater best management practices and

infrastructure.

Carl: Has the Board of Health approved the septic on this yet?

David: That's a great question again that I don't know the answer to. I would defer to my engineer, if he

was able to join us.

Carl: Do any Commissioners have any questions?

*No one comes forward with any questions.

Carl: Steve, if you want to give us your view of the sites, and I'm assuming you've been out there. I

think this did come before us as an ORAD a few years ago.

Steve: Correct. So, just a couple of like housekeeping spots. As you look at this plan to the left, I think

they could really use some erosion control along that orange line. It's not really clear where the limit of work is. You show grading in that direction, and it's not in the 50-foot, we agree - but there's also some need for some erosion protection, so we don't have erosion flowing into the wetland, and it creates a better limit of work. That erosion control should really circle around the

entire disturbed area.

David: That's an easy one, Steve. Yes, I agree with you. I didn't review this plan prior to submittal,

otherwise I would've covered that. It looks like they have either a silt fence or hay bales on the back side of the property, but if you can follow my cursor, I would take this and follow the limit of grading out to the lower 75 (foot), and I'd set that in here. I agree with you; there should be standard best management practices for erosion and sediment control throughout all construction processes, including maintaining a perimeter sediment controls between the limits of work and

downgrading in wetlands. So that's an easy fix.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Carl: Another point I wanted to bring up was, you got a dumpster area in the back; was that planned to be an enclosed dumpster? It's fairly close to the resource area, and depending on what industrial

use, there could be run-off from that into the resource area.

David: Let me ask about that. I know it should be on concrete slab, and there's a fence around it, but I don't know if they have something like secondary containment; like if they have a berm around

it, such that if anything fell out of there it wouldn't...

Carl: Normally you're looking for covers. Dumpsters themselves will have covers, but they actually have roll-up covers that slide over them, so the rainwater doesn't just wash through them and

then flows out into the wetlands.

David: I'm nearly certain without knowing definitively, that they would have a covered dumpster. Again, that's something that you could put in as a condition in the Order of Conditions to say the

dumpster must be a covered dumpster, or something to that affect. That's reasonable.

Carl: On the other side, I've worked enough with projects in an industry to know that that's a pretty

standard requirement these days, so you don't have oils and other materials, or heavy rain just

getting washed out and everywhere you don't want them to be.

David: Agreed, it's very rational.

Steve: The next thing is, given the work is right on the 50-foot, maybe some no-cut stone bounds just to

> prevent encroachment in the future. Especially given that it's kind of a commercial site; you know, landscapers throw material down slope, and things happen, so I think a clear fence or

delineation of not encroaching would be helpful for prevention of future encroachment.

David: Agreement, Steve; another condition that I see frequently on sites. We could either do stone

monuments, or some people use like phenol markers. We could monument the 50-foot no-

disturb with any language that the Commission wants on there.

Carl: Typically, they use concrete or granite, up to the applicant's choice, just because they last a long

time. We've had people want to put fence posts in, and after 20 years they disappear. We want

these in perpetuity.

David: That's right. I'll be happy to talk to my plan about that condition as well.

Carl: Do you have a point where, from a snow management standpoint, do you have a location here

> that you would basically compile the snow? Because obviously we don't like the idea of the contractor coming in and just dumping it into the wetlands. If no one's telling them not to do

that, that's typically what they're going to do.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

David:

Yes. That's a valid question too, especially when I look at this site. I envision what a snow contractor would come in to plow, would push all the snow right into the buffer zones on either side of this. That is a question that I don't know from the top of my head; again, I would ask my engineer to consider that – a snow management system. Because just looking at the plan, I'm seeing the same thing you are; that a contractor would come in and plow, and in normal circumstances would plow either right to the back of the lot – which is the wetland, resource area, or again, to this side of the lot here. I believe the property bound on the…I don't know if that's the East side, but the East side by the way the plan is oriented is commercial office space, and to the side – so they don't have room on that side to do it.

Carl: Right.

David: They may be able to push snow over the septic system; that may be a lay out, but I would have to

ask my engineer.

Carl: Okay.

Robert: Hello, this is Robert DiBenedetto, I'm with Hancock.

David: Oh Robert, your ears must've been burning. This is Robert, our Civil Engineer. We had a

couple questions. Robert, right now what we're talking about is snow management. Do we have

an identified snow stockpile location?

Robert: It was the original intent to have snow management down in the bottom left corner near the

dumpster, and at the ends of each of them. However, if there's going to be a restriction or regulation against that, then I believe we can have snow management up front; either on the front right corner, or along the front in the grassy area, or somewhat on top of the primary system. The majority of that section is going to be under pavement anyway, so it will be protected, so having a little snow on top of that is okay – we just have to be sure that wherever we are putting the snow, it's not going to interfere with any potential trees, so the primary system does make it

an ideal spot, because you're not going to have large shrubs on that anyway.

David: Traffic circulation; I see that this is the curb cut right here, so this is the site access, where my

cursor is.

Robert: That's correct. That's the ingress and the egress for the site.

David: Can they come on and make a right turn, and come around? Is this full circle, or?

Carl: Is it a big horseshoe around the building, or?

Robert: It does not go around the bottom...

David: Not the back.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Robert:

Not the back side of the building. They would turn right, turn left to get access to the parking stalls. There's enough of a turning radius around the building, because we provide 24 feet, plus 5 feet for each of the entrances, so there's enough room to make a turn. Just so I'm clear, are we allowed to stack up snow between the 75 and 100-foot buffer zone? My understanding is that the owner is going to be owning both of these properties, so I'm curious if there's a chance to store snow to the left of the dumpster pad. Even if it spilled onto the neighboring property, he also owns that, so it wouldn't be an issue in terms of storage.

Carl:

I'd like to keep it as far away as we can within reason. Obviously because of salt and other materials in that collected snow, it ends up ultimately draining into the resource area. Steve, correct me if I'm wrong; I don't think it specifies a specific foot setback for snow.

Steve:

That's correct, Carl.

Carl:

The goal is, if there's a better place to put it, I obviously don't want to see it stacked right next to a resource area, if I can; that's why we look at best management practices here.

Robert:

I think the ideal location would be along the front side where there's enough space, given the setback, to have some green area there – on the top left corner, where the primary system is, and then moving towards the right. Like you mentioned, we want to make sure to be able to get in and out, and not have any viewing blocks. But, Tenney Street is also further away from the property line, so there shouldn't be any issues in terms of turning into the facility from Tenney Street. They wouldn't be allowed to put snow outside of the property line, in that respect, so they should be ok in terms of site distance.

Steve:

So, the snow storage – the snow coming from the exact opposite side of the building, is going to go up, take a hard left, and then get pushed? I think you have to re-evaluate this snow removal. So, where your cursor is, down to the right...

David:

Down here?

Steve:

Yes, down there. The snow there is going to get pushed up and then hard left; I just don't think that's feasible. You're going to need a few different locations for snow removal, I think.

David:

I was thinking the same thing as Steve, because any plow operator that enters this site...it's impossible to drive over 2 feet of snow to get to the back and turn around, and then push the snow upward and back.

Carl:

Unless you have a really big, powerful truck.

Robert:

Maybe the alternative is to adjust or shift one or two of these parking stalls, and provide a snow storage area on the pavement in the bottom right corner, where we're at a point where it would be allowed to drain to catch basin # 2, so it stays on the pavement and gets captured in that respect. So, the final 2 stalls could be converted into a snow storage area there, so we ensure that it's not going down the hill.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Carl:

That might be a possibility. The other question I had asked a few minutes ago was about the dumpster coverage; was the plan to actually have a covered dumpster? From a stormwater standpoint – again, this is an industrial facility, and I'm just concerned from a stormwater perspective that materials or heavy rain, someone just puts something in the dumpster, and it comes right out the bottom and down the slope.

Robert:

I understand. The intent is to have the cape cod berm around the dumpster, as it goes towards the building.

David:

A CCB.

Carl:

You can also specify the dumpsters that have the plastic covers, too.

David:

Yeah, just lids.

Carl:

Right.

David:

That's reasonable. I would say if that's something that they want to put in the conditions, that's a reasonable request.

Robert:

Additionally, the grading on that dumpster is going to be pitched towards Tenney Street, so any stormwater underneath will be pitched towards the nearest catch basin, and not towards the wetland. If there is potential run-off, it should be going towards the parking lot instead.

Carl:

Is this going to have some sort of a fuel storage tank, or a heating oil tank? Above ground or below ground tank?

Robert:

I don't believe so. I'm not 100% certain because I know that they're going to be looking for tenants, but I've not been told that that would be the case for this.

Steve:

Carl asked earlier if the Board of Health has approved the septic system.

Robert:

Have they approved it? Sorry, I don't have that answer. I know that we supplied one set of plans that would be submitted to all the various departments; I'm not sure if they've had a chance to review or approve it.

Carl:

I guess you would know because they'd have to have a hearing on it, and would've voted to approve it.

Steve:

You need to actually file with the Board of Health, not just submit. We're required to submit copies of this to all departments, but that's different than filing with the Board of Health and getting an approval. They never give an approval based on a plan copy from the Commission.

Robert:

In that case, I know that our first step was to go through the Conservation Commission. So, the answer is no.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Carl: Understood. Steve, if you could just go over the bounds again for the engineer.

Steve: Before you joined us, we would prefer to see the erosion control encompass the entire limit of

work. It kind of stops short.

David: We'll wrap it around from here along the downgradient contour, and then back up the East side

of this. Anywhere in between the limit of work and down gradient resource area.

Robert: What kind of erosion control would you like on the upgradient portions? Specifically on the

bottom left side. In terms of the locations of the limit of work and what erosion control you want to see, currently we're showing the silt sock around the property lines for Tenney Street and the abutting parcel to the right; and then along the 50-foot no-cut, no-disturb zone. However, on the left side, that area's upgradient of the site – so any stormwater should be flowing into the site and

not out of there; do you still want to see the silt sock...

David: Is there a rise and fall in elevation between the wetland and our property?

Robert: Yes, there is. If you look at the contour on the bottom left, you'll see it's labeled 120, and then

you'll see our proposed contour; then from there it goes down to 118, 116, 114. So, there is a cut

into the existing hill on that property, to create a swale as it goes around.

Steve: I think we'd prefer to see it almost as a limit of work; just so the equipment knows where to stop.

Robert: Sure, we can provide a limit of work line to go around that portion; but in terms of a physical

constraint – are you looking for a construction fence along that side?

Steve: I think that would be ideal. The other one, because of the steepness and the closeness to the 50-

foot – I think you just spec out a silt sock; if you could put a silt fence along with that, kind of

double protection, I think that would be ideal.

David: Okay, that's easy. We can do that.

Carl: The other question I had brought up was roof drains. Are they being infiltrated, or directly

discharging onto the pavement, or what was the plan?

Robert: I believe the intent was to have a roof drain system to go directly into the infiltration basin.

There will be something that's either tied internally through the building and pops out on one spot on the right side, or it could potentially wrap around. Because we have such a great difference between the left and right sides of the buildings, there's no concern about the pitch as

it gets around to the other side.

Steve: But that's not shown on the plan at this point. Where's the storage? That's on the next version,

or?

Robert: The storage – you mean the capacity?

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Steve: Yes.

David: No, where the infiltration chambers...

Robert: Oh, you want to see the detail or the plan view?

Steve: No, on the plan.

Robert: I can go back. Zoom into the right side of the building (David zooms in). So, there's a hatched

area on the right side of the building...

David: This hatch type here; the boxed hatch type right here?

Robert: I apologize, I'll be right back.

David: Alright, right here; Brentwood Storm tank, 820 chambers. So, the call out here is for the storm

tank, the Brentwood chambers; is that this dotted hatch type?

Robert: Yes.

David: This surface area under which those chambers would be put sub-surface, and then back-filled

and paved?

Robert: That's correct. So, this entire system would be under the parking lot; we're going to connect all

of the catch basins and drain manhole systems to this system here. We provided some elevations, specifically the groundwater elevation of 102, you'll see that in the call out, where the Brentwood Storm tank chambers are. The bottom chamber is 2-feet above that, at 104; the top of the chamber is 106, and then you have the minimum grade of 108 above that. With the void

ratio that's supplied by the manufacturer, we have a certain volume, and there's also an infiltration rate, based on our soil testing that we did in the area. This was run through our HydroCAD modeling, to allow us to analyze for the various storm events, up to the 100-year. Through our modeling system, we used an analysis point at the bottom right of the development; what would happen with all of the water coming to that spot, and we made sure that we balanced it pre to post, or met or exceeded those peak flows. That's the proposed structure. There is an outlet-controlled structure at the bottom right, which we'll use a weir, and have a 2" orifice that

will be plugged to allow for maintenance in the future, if need be, and it has to be drained. Then,

there's a flared end section to allow it to come out during the larger storm events.

Steve: Obviously there has to be some revisions to these sheets; can we also get a sheet of the entire

property? We don't mind zooming in on this, but typically we look at the entire property, and

this kind of cuts off. I think it would be good for the Commission to see the big picture also.

Robert: Oh, you want to see 91 Tenney in addition to this?

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Steve: Correct. You have part of your activity going onto it; typically, we look at the entire property,

not just a section of the property. Since you're capturing part of the 2nd parcel, I think it's fair to show the entire parcel on this plan. Or, at least one sheet showing it, because it might be too

complicated to be on one sheet.

Robert: I think we can do that. I mean, if an additional sheet just shows even at a smaller scale with the

entire property is, but this one would be the one with the details?

Steve: Correct, thank you.

Carl: Steve, I'm assuming this is not a National Heritage area.

Steve: I don't believe so.

David: No. Before we do wetland delineations, we screen for everything from Natural Heritage area,

endangered species, certified vernal pools, potential vernal pools, outstanding resource waters, areas of environmental concern, service water protection zones, well-head protection zones, cold water fisheries, FEMA mapped 100-year floodplain; so, there's no other known constraints on

the lot aside from wetland.

Carl: I just ask because it's better to have that discussion now, than sometime later.

David: That's right.

Robert: Dave, did we already talk about the construction entrance?

David: No, we didn't. Do you want to guide us on the construction entrance?

Robert: Just a note for that; that the construction entrance is currently being shown on the left side there,

but we are going to be moving that to the main entrance – the proposed entrance of the site. That is done to minimize the disturbance happening in that wetland on 91 Tenney. So, that will move

over to the main entrance.

David: Obviously we need to do a couple of plan revisions for submittal prior to the next hearing, and

that's one thing that we can take this off, right?

Robert: And just move it over to the right.

David: The construction entrance will be where the permitted entrance will be.

Robert: Yep.

David: Okay, good. Thanks for calling it out.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Carl: Any other comments from Commissioners? I'm not sure anyone from the public is there, but I

want to open it up to public comment, if there's anyone out there that would like to make a

comment.

Steve: When are you guys planning on applying with the Planning Board?

David: Rob, do you know that, or is that a Deb Colbert question?

Robert: I think that's a Deb Colbert question.

David: Deb was on vacation this week, she'll be back next week, and she is the project manager that

may be privy to this information – in terms of Planning.

Carl: I'm assuming you've given copies to the Fire Department, and all of the other departments, too,

correct?

David: I think so. Rob, you weren't involved in the submittal of this, so I presume that Deb did that.

That turning radiuses are up to fire code for fire apparatus, and all that stuff.

Steve: Carl, that was partially why I was asking that question about when they're going to the Planning

Board. Typically, we don't notify the Fire Department and the Police Department; that's the

Planning Board approval process.

Carl: Right, but usually we get the feedback at some point along the way.

Steve: Correct. We also don't typically approve a project until the Board of Health has approved it.

That's why I brought that up earlier, just to give them a heads up. Again, revisions to a plan are great, but I think that there are some bigger items that we make sure we discuss; there's no

stormwater calculations in any of the submitted information.

David: There's a stormwater report – did you guys get the stormwater report?

Steve: I don't have it in my packet in front of me.

Julie: Steve, can I? I'm sorry; it was in the zip file that people couldn't open, so that was my fault. I

apologize. I did receive an electronic copy and I put it in a zip file, but the Commission couldn't

open it.

Steve: Typically, we get a hard copy, and I didn't see a hard copy in the packet that we received. I

think that's why I was asking, because a lot of the questions being asked tonight are stormwater. Right now, we're being told the stormwater's good, but we need to do a 3rd party review on that, and typically that's done by the Planning Board. If they're not going to the Planning Board, then

we really can't close this project out until that gets done; we can do that review, but typically the

Planning Board does it.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Carl: Yes, I mean it doesn't sound like it's ready to be closed out tonight anyway. There are too many

unknowns; you've got the septic that hasn't been filed, and the Planning issues. This is

information that we need to know, to move this forward.

David: That's right.

Carl: I don't see anything that's insurmountable, we just need to take some more steps to bring it to

fruition.

David: This is exactly how I envisioned this hearing to go. I didn't come in tonight expecting this to be

a one and done hearing; I expected to present the project and its elements, and get feedback and comments from the Commission members, so that we can circle the wagons prior to the next hearing, and respond to questions/comments and uncertainties ahead of our next hearing.

Carl: As I started to open it up to anyone from the public; if there's anyone out there from the public

who would like to make a comment, if you can identify yourself for the record, you may speak.

*No one comes forward.

Carl: Not hearing anyone. Okay. Anymore comments from Commissioners? At this point, I think it

probably makes sense to look at a continuation date.

David: Yup, we just want to make sure that we have all of your...it sounds like we have a good running

punch list right here...

Carl: Yes, and I would also suggest that before the next hearing, if you're not sure, you can certainly

contact the Agent – feel free to do that before the hearing, so we make the best use of time.

David: Absolutely, we'll do that. I imagine that Steve, you're the Agent for the Town? You're

probably working more closely with Devon Morse, who's out of our Danvers office; I'm located in Marlboro, so she normally handles all of our North Shore communities. She's good, she just wasn't available tonight. Following this hearing, what I'll do is brief Deb Colbert, who's the civil engineering project manager, and Devon on these list items. As soon as Deb returns next week, I can get answers from her in terms of where permits stand with other municipal entities; the Board of Health, the Planning Board, etc., the Fire Department. We can get answers to that, and I will express that the Commission is reluctant to close a public hearing until we have a definitive plan that we know isn't going to be subject to change by other regulations – that the Fire Department doesn't have a change to our width, and anything else that'll result in significant revisions to this. We want to have that same level of certainty as you guys do. We don't want to

have to come back and file for an Amended Order of Conditions or site changes.

Carl: Alright. I'll entertain a motion to continue 93 Tenney Street. Steve, do we have a date?

Steve: Is a month too soon? Do we want to go out two months, given the other, bigger stuff?

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

David:

Steve, if I may; on behalf of the applicant, I always prefer to be continued to the next hearing, and see where we're at, rather than paint ourselves into a corner by kicking it out two months. If we are able to make progress and headway to close in a month, I'd prefer that. If we aren't there, we can always call and ask for a continuance.

Carl:

Please do keep us informed, because sometimes applicants just leave us hanging, and we don't know what they want to do.

David:

Yeah, I hate doing that. I serve on a Conservation Commission, I have for the last 8 years, and I know how these things go. As professional consultants, we really try to be on top of these things and not leave the Commission hanging with uncertainties where you're emailing us the day of the hearing, asking me if I'm going to show up tonight.

Steve:

So, April 21st at 7:00.

David:

Thank you.

Carl:

I will entertain a motion, if someone would like to make one.

Laura:

So moved.

Tom:

Second, Howland.

Carl:

We have a motion and it's been seconded to continue the Notice of Intent for 93 Tenney Street, to April 21st at 7:00 PM. All in favor, roll call vote:

ROLL CALL

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Rebecca Chane	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Liz Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Laura Repplier	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

HEARING: 47 WEST STREET

47 West Street (DEP# 161-0889) – State NOI – (cont.)

Construction of a 16-unit senior housing development.

Carl: It being on or after 7:05, I'm going to re-open up a Notice of Intent for 47 West Street. That's

the construction of a 16-unit senior housing development. I believe we've been requested to

continue this project. Steve, do we have the date April 21st?

Steve: Correct, at 7:10.

Carl: 7:10; I'll entertain a motion to continue 47 West Street.

Rachel: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to continue 47 West Street to April 21, 2022 at 7:10

PM.

Chris: Seconds motion.

Carl: We have a motion, and it's been seconded to continue 47 West Street, to April 21st at 7:10 PM.

All in favor, roll call vote:

ROLL CALL

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Rebecca Chane	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Liz Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Laura Repplier	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

HEARING: 175 CENTRAL STREET

175 Central Street (DEP# 161-0908; GCC# 2021-01) – NOI – (cont.)

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

Carl: It being on or after 7:10, I'm going to re-open 175 Central Street; DEP# 161-0908. That's to

replace an existing septic system, upgrade and renovate existing building, site work, and replacement of drain pipe. I think we've been requested, and are continuing this as well.

Steve: Correct.

Carl: Alright. April 21st again?

Steve: 7:15, please.

Carl: I'll entertain a motion to continue 175 Central Street.

Rachel: So moved, Bancroft. **Tom:** Second, Howland.

Carl: We have a motion and it's been seconded, to continue the Notice of Intent for 175 Central Street

to April 21, 2022 at 7:15 PM. Is there any further discussion? All in favor, roll call vote:

ROLL CALL

Rachel Bancroft	AYE
Rebecca Chane	AYE
Chris Candia	AYE
Liz Clark	AYE
Tom Howland	AYE
Laura Repplier	AYE
Carl Shreder	AYE

Motion carries.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

HEARING: 35 CHARLES STREET

35 Charles Street (GCC# 2022-01) – NOI – (new)

Raze an existing single-family dwelling foundation and septic, and construct a new single-family dwelling, septic, and associated appurtenances.

Present:

Fred Peterson (Applicant)

Cheryl Kelly (abutter at 40 Charles Street)

Carl: It being on or after 7:15, I'm going to re-open a Notice of Intent for 35 Charles Street; GCC#

2022-01. That's to raze an existing single-family dwelling foundation and septic, and construct a new single-family dwelling, septic, and associated appurtenances. If we could have the applicant

and/or consultant, and if you could identify yourself for the record, please.

Fred: Fred Peterson, applicant.

Carl: Very good. I think we were just waiting on the DEP#, is that correct, Steve?

Steve: A couple of modifications to the plans; no-cut stone bounds, and a modification to the limit of

work – all of which have been done and submitted. The new plan date is February 28th, so I

think everything is all set.

Carl: Did you say February 28th?

Steve: Yes.

Carl: Okay, so that's the stamped date of the plan. Alright. Any other questions from

Commissioners? I think we pretty much brought this to a close last time.

*No one comes forward.

Carl: Is there anyone from the public that would like to make a comment on 35 Charles Street?

*No one comes forward.

Carl: Not hearing anyone. I would entertain a motion for 35 Charles Street, relating to the plan on

February 28th. Would someone like to make a motion?

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Cheryl: I'm sorry - Cheryl Kelly, I'm directly opposite the 35 Charles Street. I just want to say thank

you, and I'm looking forward to having Fred build his house and his family moving into the

neighborhood, and all the other neighbors are waiting to welcome him.

Fred: Thank you.

Carl: Thank you. Okay, very good. Any other comments?

END OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Carl: Okay. Again, I'm looking for a motion from the Commission.

Rachel: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to approve 35 Charles Street, with a plan date stamped

February 28th.

Tom: Howland, second.

Carl: We have a motion and it's been seconded, to approve the Notice of Intent for 35 Charles Street,

with a plan dated 2/28/2022. Is there any further discussion? All in favor, roll call vote:

ROLL CALL

Rachel Bancroft
Rebecca Chane
AYE
Chris Candia
AYE

Liz Clark ABSTAINED

Tom Howland AYE
Laura Repplier AYE
Carl Shreder AYE

Motion carries with one abstention.

Carl: I'll entertain a motion to close the Notice of Intent for 35 Charles Street.

Rebecca: So moved. **Rachel:** Seconds motion.

^{*}No one comes forward.

GEORGETOWN CONSERVATION COMMISSION

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

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Carl: We have a motion and it's been seconded to close the NOI for 35 Charles Street. All in favor,

roll call vote:

ROLL CALL

Rachel Bancroft
Rebecca Chane
AYE
Chris Candia
AYE
AYE

Liz Clark ABSTAINED

Tom Howland AYE
Laura Repplier AYE
Carl Shreder AYE

Motion carries with one abstention.

BUSINESS: Meeting Minutes

Carl: And, I think we have some meeting minutes to approve, and a Certificate of Compliance. We

had some meeting minutes for January 20th and February 17th. Does anyone have any comments

on them? If not, if you'd like to make a motion.

Laura: Mr. Chairman, I just have to let you know that I need to leave the meeting, but I know you still

have quorum. It's Laura.

Carl: Okay, so noted. Alright, would someone like to make a motion regarding our meeting minutes

for January and February?

Rachel: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to approve the meeting minutes for both January and

February of 2022.

Rebecca: Second.

Carl: There's a motion and it's been seconded to approve the meeting minutes from January 20th and

February 17, 2022. Is there any further discussion? All in favor, roll call vote:

ROLL CALL

Rachel Bancroft
Rebecca Chane
AYE
Chris Candia
AYE
AYE

Liz Clark ABSTAINED

Tom Howland AYE
Carl Shreder AYE

Motion carries with one abstention.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

BUSINESS: Certificate of Compliance for 75 West Street

Carl: I believe we have a Certificate of Compliance for 75 West Street. This was the Marshall Well;

the dam issue. I guess we need a motion for that as well.

Rebecca: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion to approve the COC for 75 West Street.

Tom: Howland, second.

Carl: We have a motion and it's been seconded to approve the COC for 75 West Street. Is there any

further discussion? All in favor, roll call vote:

ROLL CALL

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

Motion carries.

Carl: Steve, do we have any other business at this point?

Steve: That's it, sir.

Carl: Wow, that's pretty good.

Steve: I just want to thank Julie for getting those minutes out. She got two sets of minutes out in about

a week and a half, which is pretty awesome. As always, high quality. Thank you, Julie.

Carl: That's very good indeed.

MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 17, 2022

Okay, if there's nothing else to discuss I'd entertain a motion to close.

CIC	CIN				
CLU	ווכנ	IG II	ᇽᇎᅜ	1EETI	NG

Carl:

Chris: Tom:	So moved. Second, Howland.		
Carl:	We have a motion and it's been seconded to close the March 17 th meeting of the Georgetown Conservation. All in favor, roll call vote:		
	R	OLL CALL	
	Rachel Bancroft Rebecca Chane Chris Candia Liz Clark Tom Howland	AYE AYE AYE AYE AYE	
	Carl Shreder	AYE	
	Motion carries	and the meeting is closed.	
	the Conservation Office. ****END OF M	nts and other exhibits used at the meeting will be available for IEETING MINUTES**** pproving the meeting minutes	
		g held on March 17, 2022 were approved by a virtual roll call e Meeting Minutes when in-person meetings resume.	
Respectful	lly submitted,		
Chairman:	(signature)		
	P	age 21 of 21	