Sturbridge Conservation Commission
Minutes of
Thursday, April 5, 2018
Center Office Building

Mr. Goodwin called the meeting of the Conservation Commission to order at 6:00 PM.

Quorum check – confirmed.

Present:

Edward Goodwin, chair
Steven Chidester, vice-chair
David Barnicle

Absent:

Steve Halterman
Paul Zapun

Also Present:

Rebecca Gendreau, Conservation Agent
Rebekah DeCourcey, Planning Department Administrative Assistant
Jammin Jablanski, Tree Removal
Leonard Jalbert, Jalbert Engineering
Peter Vogliazzo, Applicant
Fernando Santos, Abutter
Mark Farrell, Green Hill Engineering
Moira McGrath
Frank Biechieri, Bertin Engineering
Andrew Listen, for Heal Inc.
Michael & Leanne Mazeilla, Tree Removal
Jamie Suprenant, Dobson project
Al Dobson, Applicant
Glenn Krevosky, Smith project

<u>Committee Updates:</u>

- CPA: meeting is next week
- Trails: Mr. Barnicle received an email from Brandon Goodwin, chair of the Trail Committee. The Trails Committee will require assistance preparing a Notice of Intent (and/or other similar documents) for the creation of 15 miles of mountain biking trails through the Plimpton Property. The trails will be mostly single track. They would like the project to be completed for late August for an event. Ms. Gendreau stated that they would work on the NOI but we will need to coordinate with NHESP around potentially protected areas; a site visit will be needed. Mr. Barnicle would like to have this on the agenda for the next meeting.
- Lakes Advisory Committee: none

- Open Space Committee: The Public Forum for the Open Space and Recreation Plan is going to be held on Wednesday, April 11th at 6:30pm at the Publick House. Refreshments will be served.

Request for Certificate of Compliance:

- 336 The Tail: This project dates back to 2010, when work was done on the driveway. The property is under sale agreement and it was discovered that the project never finalized the Certificate of Compliance. Ms. Gendreau did a site visit and observed no problems. Bertin Engineering has been working on the site, and a NOI has been submitted. The project will be on the next agenda. The Committee signed the Certificate of Compliance. DEP File #300-830.
- 1 Evergreen Lane: also known as Lot 10 of the Sanctuary Subdivision. Only a small portion of the lot was in the buffer zone. Ms. Gendreau did a site visit and observed no problems. The Committee signed the partial Certificate of Compliance. DEP File # 300-470.
- 68 Goodrich Road: the septic and septic pipe work has been completed. Ms. Gendreau did a site visit and observed no problems. The Committee signed the Certificate of Compliance. DEP File # 300-810.

Discussion:

The Conservation Commission (Con Com) performed a site visit at Rapscallion Brewery regarding the field where he first disc golf tee is located. The ConCom had asked to have the trailer moved away from the edge of the wetland. The ConCom discussed his proposal to move the trailer, tent, gravel and tee hole. The Committee discussed water runoff in the area and has no issues with the moving of the gravel. Ms. Gendreau will inform Mr. Daniel he can proceed with the project.

Letter Permit – Tree Removal:

Location: 110 Westwood Drive. One tree.

Vote: 3 – 0

Discussion: Tree has been losing limbs, is located over 100 ft from lake, applicant discussed planting a flowering shrub to replace the dying oak.

Public Hearing. Notice of Intent – DEP File #300-1008. Peter O. Vogliazzo is proposing a 8' x 10' addition onto a single family home. The property is located at 300 Clarke Road Extension.

Materials presented at meeting:

- A Certified list of Abutters and certificates of mailing
- A Decision filed by the Zoning Board of Appeals approving the proposed addition

Leonard Jalbert presented on behalf of the client. For clarity reasons, Mr. Jalbert stated that he felt the applicant should file a Notice of Intent rather than a Determination. The project site is over 50' from the lake. The existing square footage of the house is only 584. The proposed 8' x 10' addition would be 96 sq. ft., bringing the total to 680 sq. ft., which is under the minimum 750 sq. ft. required by Zoning Bylaws. There is a drip strip proposed to catch the water coming off the new addition as well as the existing roof. Construction will be done on two supporting piers, not a foundation.

Ms. Gendreau stated she had no anticipated concerns with this project.
The Committee had no concerns with this project.

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to close the Public Hearing.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to approve the Notice of Intent DEP File #300-1008 as submitted, subject to the Orders of Conditions to be provided by the Conservation Agent.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Public Hearing. Notice of Intent – DEP File #300-1011. Louis and Lynn Eckhert Fazen are proposing the repair of a septic system in the buffer zone. The project is located at 18 Tantasqua Shore Drive.

Materials presented at meeting:

- A Certified list of Abutters and certificates of mailing

Mark Farrell of Green Hill Engineering presented on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Farrell stated the current septic and leach field are not up to today's standards. He has sited the proposed septic location working around the proximity of three additional wells abutting the property. The tank will be within the 100' buffer. The leach field will be partially in the buffer. Mr. Farrell stated he put a portion of the leach field under the driveway, the portion to be reinforced with appropriate strength piping. This was to minimize the impact on the existing natural resources. He will work around the largest trees in the location, but may have to remove 1 or 2. He will need to remove some smaller bunches of trees.

Ms. Gendreau stated she noted the erosion controls (EC) would be in place, may look to include additional EC all the way around the project site. She had no other major concerns with the project. Clarification on amount of trees to be removed/ roots impacted.

The Committee had the following questions, comments, and concerns:

- Mr. Barnicle discussed the impact of moving the leach field. Could it be possible to put more of it under the driveway to reduce tree removal? Mr. Farrell stated during the drafting of the plans he worked with the placement and he strongly felt that current location was as equal distant to all the wells as possible. He could go back to the drawing board and double check his placement calculations.
- Mr. Chidester asked Mr. Farrell to clarify which trees will be removed. Mr. Farrell did so and stated he will try to only remove one of the two closest trees, but that might not be possible.

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to close the Public Hearing.
2nd: Mr. Goodwin
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to approve the Notice of Intent DEP File # 300-1011, pending discussion of alternatives to the leach field placement with the Conservation Agent.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Public Hearing. Notice of Intent – DEP File #300-1012. Ellen Shaughnessy is proposing the installation of a new well and waterline in the buffer zone. The property is located at 52 South Shore Drive.

Materials presented at meeting:

- A Certified list of Abutters and certificates of mailing

Mike Farrell of Green Hill Engineering presented on behalf of the applicant. This house was built in the late 1950's and has had only one owner. The new well and waterline are located within the buffer zone. The existing well is a point driven and it has become perpetually clogged, unproductive, and it is time to replace the entire well. The new well location was chosen due to three other leach fields in the vicinity. Mr. Farrell stated that with the age of the house, the owner will most likely be replacing the leach field in the near future and he wanted to keep this in mind when siting the new well.

The Committee had the following questions, comments, and concerns:

- Can the existing well be re-drilled? Mr. Farrell stated that getting the large machine down to area of the well would mean not only more removing trees, but damaging the root systems of the remaining trees. He did not recommend this. The Commission agreed.
- Mr. Farrell pointed out the numerous ECs be proposed after construction to mitigate soil runoff.
- The Committee brought up the possibility of bringing the water line in a different route. Instead of going through the trees and causing root damage, the Committee

discussed with Mr. Farrell about following the walkway from the driveway to the house instead. Mr. Farrell was supportive of this change.

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to close the Public Hearing.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to approve the Notice of Intent DEP File # 300-1012, pending submission of a plan showing the waterline rerouted to follow the existing walkway, with the Conservation Agent.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None

Request for Minor Changes to Orders of Conditions

Heal Inc. previously obtained approval for the site plan proposed at 660 Main Street for a Medical Marijuana Dispensary. Due to higher than predicted construction costs, the project has been reworked. Main changes include reduction of the number of parking spots, and overall reduction in impervious surfaces. Only a portion of the site is within the buffer. All of the drainage remains the same, even with the reduction in impervious surface, so there will be more than adequate drainage on site.

The Board has the following questions, comments, and concerns:

- The Board went over the location of the existing wetlands and extent of the buffer. Proposed changes are at extent of buffer zone (BZ)/ outside of BZ.
- Mr. Barnicle stated that he remembered specific concerns brought up with the fire chief regarding this project. He stated that he recalled the additional pavement was because the fire trucks needed it for access.
- Ms. DeCourcey was at the Planning Board meeting on March 27th where the Planning Board approved a Waiver of Site Plan Review for a minor modification of a site plan for Heal Inc. She clarified that Heal Inc. has met with the new fire chief, Chief Grasso, a number of times to go over site design. Chief Grasso had different recommendations than the previous fire chief. Heal Inc. successfully worked in the new requests and all of this has been document with the Planning Department.

Motion: Made by Mr. Chidester to approve the minor changes to the site plan for Heal Inc. at 660 Main Street.
2nd: Mr. Barnicle
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Discussion:

Ms. Gendreau stated that she had issued a letter to 551 Leadmine as requested by the Con Com. The owner previously applied to remove the trailer, etc. The owner did stop by the office and reported that he is working on the removal and is working on the asbestos inspection.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to approve the minutes of October 5th, 2017 as amended.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to approve the minutes of March 15th, 2018.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to approve the minutes of March 1st, 2018.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to approve the minutes of February 22nd, 2018.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Public Hearing. Notice of Intent – DEP File #300-1010. OFS Fitel, LLC. Is proposing the replacement of existing retaining walls within the buffer zone. The property is located at 50 Hall Road.

Leonard Jalbert of Jalbert Engineering represented the applicant. This project involves replacing existing retaining walls at the OFS facility off Hall Road. The area enclosed by the retaining walls holds storage tanks for various liquids used in manufacturing. The wall ranges from 6" in height to roughly 5'. The project proposes removing the existing wall and replacing it entirely with Versalock. There has been a partial wall already replaced in this manner.

Almost the entire site is surrounded by pervious paving, so the threat of run off is minimal. The only disturbance will be removing the wall, placing 6" of stone behind the wall, then replacing the wall. There is a fence at the top of the existing retaining wall. The project proposal does not include any of the land beyond this fence; all work will be done inside the fence and paved area. Mr. Jalbert was recommending hay bales or waddles instead of a silt

fence. He did not feel the more protective measures would be necessary with this project. The existing catch basins in the paved area will be protected with silt socks.

The Committee had the following questions, comments, and concerns:

- Are the tanks being replaced? No, only the walls.
- Ms. Gendreau stated that if equipment does end up being needed to be up on the backside of the wall behind the fence, the wattles should be sufficient for erosion control and serve as limit of work. Can develop plan for EC for segmented work.
- Regarding the removal of material from the site: as material is dismantled from the wall, a small loader will load it into trucks that will immediately bring it off site. There will not be any excess material stockpiled. Only material to be reused will be stockpiled.
- The Committee discussed that on their site visit the wall was literally crumbling into pieces. As a huge safety risk, it needs to be replaced.
- The Committee discussed if the wattles would be needed on the other side of the fence. If the project is really only proposed within that fenced area, then they shouldn't even be needed for erosion protection.

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to close the Public Hearing.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

Motion: Made by Mr. Barnicle to approve the Notice of Intent DEP File # 300-1010, as submitted in the plan without the need for the silt barriers.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: The Conversation Agent will put into the Orders of Conditions that if the project does go beyond the fence for any reason, they will then need to put the erosion controls into place.

Public Hearing. Notice of Intent – DEP File #300-1009. Mark Smith and Barbara Veale-Smith are proposing construction of a screened-in porch over an existing deck within the buffer zone.

Glenn Krevosky from EBT Environmental Consultants Inc. represented the applicant. The current owners have owned the home for roughly a year and a half. The home was rebuilt in 1995, and a Certificate of Compliance was issued from 1998. There are no other records of permits issued, particularly noting the deck. A photo in records from 2006 shows the existing deck, which is not the same as the deck that appears in the 1995 plans.

Ms. Gendreau wanted to clarify the project details: a large existing deck on a second floor would be converted into a screened in porch – a roof and three walls. There would be no new soil disturbance or stock piling of material. It is within the no new structure buffer.

The Committee had the following questions, comments, and concerns:

- The Board was surprised this project was ever approved being so close to the water, but the project also was a long time ago and before the Sturbridge Wetlands Bylaw.
- Could the run off from the proposed roof be worked into the site better? Some of the runoff from the site now goes directly into the lake. A long term solution to this problem would be nice to see.
- The site has little vegetation on it, instead consists of crushed stone. Unclear when the crushed stone was added to the site. Mr. Krevosky stated the property owner thought this would be a positive point with the Commission. The Commission would like to see more infiltration on site, could use rain gardens and the addition of planting material in general.
- This project is so close to the water's end, even with the fact the house already exists, the Commission would like to see sketches of the building design with the proposed roofline and proposed infiltration.
- The Commission noted also on the site there appears to be an issued with runoff at the boat ramp, and Mr. Krevosky stated this was a known point of concern with the owner and they would look into this.
- Upon the site visit, the Commission also noted some other areas where drainage control needed attention.

The Commission asked Mr. Krevosky if they would like a continuation to the next meeting, April 19th. Mr. Krevosky will look at and develop options for infiltration, bring in a building design including roofline, to also address the field drain issue and the roof runoff.

Motion: Made by Mr. Goodwin to close the Public Hearing and continue at the meeting on April 19th.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

<u>Letter Permit – Tree Removal:</u>

Location: 19 Old Hamilton Road Extension. Four trees. Michael & Leanne Mazeika brought photographs of the four dying White Pine trees in their yard. They have gotten various quotes to take the trees down, and due to the poor condition if they wait much longer the trees will be too brittle to climb and the cost to remove will increase drastically.

Vote: 3 – 0

Discussion: The ConCom discussed the health and decline of the trees with applicant. The applicant was reminded that they are not allowed to remove the roots or stumps to maintain the stability of the lake shore. The applicant will replant with shrubs, most likely blueberries.

Sturbridge Conservation Commission
Minutes of
Thursday, April 5, 2018
Center Office Building

Old Business:

DEP File # 300-970. Modification to site plan for the property at 22 Cedar Lake Drive. Frank Biechieri from Bertin Engineering spoke on behalf of the client, Al Dobson. Engineering changes were made to the project upon commencing construction. The original plan included repairing the existing retaining walls and working them into the new site design. After work began, the field stone and mortar walls were found to be in such disrepair they needed to be replaced. The new walls were slightly different than the original, mainly for aesthetic reasons. These changes were noticed when the As-Built was submitted.

Jamie Suprenaunt, builder for 22 Cedar Lake Drive, explained to the board that upon building the set of stairs on the corner of the house, he encountered tree roots. At that point Mr. Suprenaunt changed the layout of the stairs to work around the tree roots utilizing area of previous house foundation. The Commission has expressed concern with saving some specific trees on the site. This project began when Glenn Colburn was the Conservation Agent.

Ms. Gendreau stated she had no concerns with the minor modification to the plan, involving the change of the retaining wall going from straight to a curved line, nor with the change in the layout of the stairs.

Motion: Made by Mr. Goodwin to accept the As-Built plan.
2nd: Mr. Chidester
Discussion: None
Vote: 3 – 0

New Business

- ✓ The Commission asked Ms. Gendreau to contact KP Law regarding the proposed changes Bylaws so the project can be finalized.
- ✓ The Commission would like to reinvigorate the potential for having associate members on the Commission.

On a motion made by Mr. Chidester, seconded by Mr. Barnicle, and voted 3 - 0, the meeting adjourned at 8:42 PM.