

**MINUTES**

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**3:30 p.m.**

**September 13, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Steve Miller; Vice Chairman MaryAnn Blanchard;  
Members, Allison Tanner, Barbara McMillan

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Kate Zamarchi, Samantha Collins, Adrienne Harrison

**ALSO PRESENT:** Peter Britz, Environmental Planner/Sustainability Coordinator

.....  
**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. August 9, 2017

The Commission voted to postpone review of the minutes to the October 11, 2017 meeting.

**II. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

A. Maplewood Avenue  
Heritage Hill Condominium Association, owner  
City of Portsmouth, applicant  
Map 219, Lot 40

Ray Pezzullo from the City of Portsmouth, Joe Johnson and Chris Stairs from GPI Consulting Engineers, and Bob White, Landscaping Architect were there to speak to the application. Mr. Pezzullo provided a brief overview of the project, which encompasses the Maplewood corridor and adjacent neighborhoods. The project involves a design of complete streets and significant major utility improvements. The area to focus on today is an important component of the project. The main objective for the project is to separate the combined sewer. It's a requirement from the EPA. Two new outfalls for the new drainage system will be added, which will provide water treatment before discharge. In this case there is opportunity for an additional water quality treatment through a proposed wet pond on the Heritage Hills property. GPI will provide further details around this. Mr. Johnson expanded upon on what Mr. Pezzullo said, stating the primary objective is separation of sewer and storm water. It was noticed that some adjacent neighborhoods could use improvements as well. These improvements will include a new streetscape design. There was a theme repeated through the neighbors to introduce traffic calming efforts along the corridor through lower speeds and bike lanes. The two new outfalls will go into the unnamed pond on the Heritage Hills condo property. The City has obtained an

easement for where the two new outfalls will go. Mr. Stairs provided more details on the proposed pocket pond. The proposed sewer separation will create 10 acres of area runoff that need a place to go. The applicants are proposing to put it in the pond. The proposal is to install a pocket pond on the condo property and the applicants are pursuing an easement. The pond will be dug into the ground water, so it will be deep enough for the required water volume. There will be some vegetation removal to make the pond, but it will be replaced with trees and shrubs. The next outfall would be further down Maplewood at the low point. That will catch the remainder of the drainage that can't get to the pocket pond. This will be treated with a CDS unit. The City has used them successfully in the past. An easement has been obtained to go through private property. The CDS unit will provide separation for debris and grease. The third area where there will be impacts to the buffer is the culvert underneath the Heritage Hill driveway. This culvert would limit any additional impacts. The project will provide a new head wall and a separate culvert next to the existing one with culvert fencing. The property currently has issues with beavers in this area, so the design includes backups to protect against beavers. This is the secondary outfall the primary one is on Market St.

Chairman Miller clarified that the increase in runoff would be due to the separation. Mr. Stairs confirmed that was correct. Chairman Miller questioned how often the swirl separator would be cleaned out. Mr. Stairs responded that the recommended maintenance is four times a year. Chairman Miller noted that the maintenance schedule has to be something that at least meets the recommended schedule for removal, and the volume should be looked at. The improvements are great and the plan is good. The only concern is the maintenance. Mr. Pezzullo responded that the DPW would own the maintenance of this and will be following the manufacturer's recommendations for that. The DPW maintain other systems today. Periodic inspections will also be a requirement.

Ms. McMillan questioned which trees would be cut for the new pocket pond and how big they are now. Mr. White responded that it's a relatively level area on the corner of the driveway into the condo. There are about 20 Norway maples that are six to eight inches and 40 feet or so high. They are the result of the propagation of invasive species. There are a handful of sugar maples on the fringe that would be impacted. They would be replaced with canopy trees on the roadside. The entire pond is seeded. There will be aquatic plants, and wet tolerant species on the side slopes. A traditional wild flower mix will also be planted. Ms. McMillan questioned the maintenance on that. Mr. White responded that the company describes it as maintenance free. It would probably be prudent to get in there with a weed whacker occasionally. This can be recommended to the DPW.

Ms. Tanner noted that it's not just a matter of the debris created from cutting down plants there is concern around what's going to blow into the pond as well. Mr. White responded that there will inspections performed. Ms. Tanner questioned how the site for the pond was determined. Mr. Stairs responded that it was really the only location that worked.

Ms. McMillan questioned if the project included putting in sidewalks and bike lanes. Mr. Johnson confirmed they would be added all along the north side of Maplewood Ave. Ms. McMillan questioned if there was discussion about not curbing that whole area and adding a swale around there instead. Mr. Stairs responded that the roadway will be going downhill and a

pipe will be running against grade to get to the drainage. That's why curbing and a closed drainage system would work to get water to the drain location. Ms. McMillan clarified that meant there was no opportunity to filter there. Mr. White responded that a lot of private properties would prevent that. Mr. Stairs added that there is a lot of grade C soil so it's not ideal for infiltration.

Chairman Miller questioned if the street was curbed currently. Mr. Stairs responded that it is on the north side. Chairman Miller asked for clarification on where the low point was and if it was curbed currently. Mr. Stairs responded that it is curbed on the north side and it's all sloped toward the roadway. Chairman Miller noted the road is a little bit of a turtle trap because they get stuck at the low point in the road. They travel back and forth between because there are ponds on both sides of the road. Mr. Stairs responded that there are driveways at the low point that can be an escape. Mr. Pezzullo added that they are modifying the profile to flatten out the hill a little bit, so hopefully the traffic calming efforts will help provide safety for all. Chairman Miller commented that it's important to have traffic calming features.

Ms. McMillan questioned if there was a plan for preventing invasive species from getting into the area during or post construction. Mr. White responded that the invasive plants right now are loosestrife and cat tails in the large pond. In terms of the detention pond he was not sure what the DPW does. Mr. Pezzullo responded that the DPW wasn't anticipating going into the pond with the scope of this project. Ms. McMillan questioned how the invasive plants would be treated during construction. Mr. White responded that all of the invasive plants that are there today will be removed from the site. The trees and stumps will also be removed.

Vice Chairman Maryann Blanchard motioned to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented, seconded by Ms. Tanner. There was no additional discussion. The motion passed unanimously in a (4-0) vote.

Ms. McMillan noted that the complete streets seemed like a good opportunity for open drainage. It was probably discussed, but would have been helpful to include in the plans. Mr. White responded that it was in the first review, but then the soil conditions were discovered and would have prevented it from working. If there were appropriate soils then it would have been a different discussion.

- B. 150 Spaulding Turnpike  
James A. Mulvey Living Trust, owner  
Robert J. Bossie Revocable Trust, owner  
Map 236, Lots 34, 35, & 36

Attorney Bernie Pelech and Paul Connolly spoke on behalf of the application. This proposal involves the property at 150 Spaulding. Presently there is a ticket resale outlet and a pet food outlet with two residential/retail units behind. Those buildings would be demolished. This has been through the ZBA and the project has received variances to construct a parking lot to house cars for the Coast Cadillac dealership. The front building will remain and be a used truck dealership. The proposal is to install pervious areas where the vehicles will be parked and proper drainage into the wetland area. The Nissan dealership abuts this property and has been granted a

CUP for a similar effort. Paul Connolly from Civil Works noted that the existing ticket resale and pet food store in the front third of the parcel adjacent to the Spaulding would remain as is. All of the pavement and the two buildings behind would be removed. Approximately 2500 square feet of land will be impacted in the buffer area. Some of the pavement, garden and lawn area will be impacted. Mr. Connolly showed in the plans where the standard pavement driveway that would surround the pervious storage area and nine parking spaces would go. The plans also showed where they would be adding landscaping. In an earlier meeting with Mr. Britz it was suggested that they take away the lawn area as much as possible in the back of the property and replace it with more vegetation. They are willing to take this suggestion and would replace the lawn with conservation seed mix. The rest of the proposed lawn area is somewhat important to keep as lawn to keep it looking tidy and manicured from the street for potential customers. In the buffer area today there is approximately 2600 square feet and the proposal would be 1700 square feet of vegetation. This small reduction is to add five or so pervious area parking spaces. The project will only increase the impervious area by 60 more square feet. As proposed this plan will include pervious pavement and will allow runoff to filter through the ground and into a catch basin and then out into the paved area. There will be no sand or salt used in the pervious area.

Ms. Tanner questioned what was being done in front of the building for drainage. Mr. Connolly responded that everything in the front would remain as is.

Ms. Tanner questioned where the snow storage would be. Mr. Connolly responded that it's addressed in the plans. It will be stored in a specific area on the property and trucked off site if there is overflow.

Ms. Tanner questioned if anything could be done to enhance infiltration in the area. Mr. Pelech responded that the plan is a little deceiving because part of it is state property and it goes out into the Spaulding. Mr. Connolly added that the plans showed the only small piece that they own and that is a sloped area. Ms. Tanner questioned how drainage off the roof would happen. Mr. Connolly responded there are two downspouts in the back that go into the catch basin.

Chairman Miller commented that trees on the side were a good addition as well as doing something on the back lawn. Mr. Pelech noted that they would like to add more trees, but this is in an electric area that prevents anything with height. Mr. Connolly added that it has to be kept clear for Eversource. There are many trees on the other side, so the neighborhoods are already pretty shielded. Chairman Miller questioned if shrubs could be added in the front. Mr. Connolly responded that there is a decent slope there, so it may not make sense to plant anything with mulching because it could just get washed away.

Ms. Tanner noted that essentially nothing would be done to the front. It will just remain. Mr. Connolly confirmed that everything in the front would be untouched. The only exception would be the addition trees and shrubs in front and one side of the building. Ms. Tanner clarified that the front building would not be changed at all. Mr. Connolly responded that maybe the paint would change, but nothing structural will change.

Ms. McMillan wanted to clarify that the drainage from the building in the front has two downspouts that go into two different locations but both end up in the catch basin. Mr. Connolly

responded that both are located on the back and all indicators show that line goes over to the catch basin. Then it empties to the existing culvert at Port City Nissan. They have a deeded right of way over that the portion into their property. Ms. McMillan commented on the landscaping to the left of the building with the trees. Is there an opportunity to direct one of the downspouts that way? Mr. Connolly responded that if there were an opportunity to, then it would have been seized. The intent is to not have runoff on the pavement, because it could create an ice concern. Ms. McMillan commented that the downspout could be directed into the trees and the overflow could be directed into the catch basin. Mr. Britz clarified that a rain garden could be put in and overflow would go into the pipe like it does today. It just wouldn't go right into the pipe. Mr. Connolly responded that there is a sewage and water pipe right there coming into the building. They would stop short of a promise to do that, but will certainly look to see if it's possible. Mr. Pelech commented some of the trees from the plan would have to be eliminated if a rain garden was installed. Mr. Connolly added that they are struggling to meet the tree requirements already.

Ms. McMillan questioned what the maintenance of the conservation seed mix in the back would be. Mr. Connolly responded that it would be mowed once a year and maybe more often one-mower width near the edge more often to keep it tidy.

Vice Chairman Miller questioned if the Commission should stipulate that a conservation mix be used. Mr. Connolly agreed with that stipulation.

Mr. Britz noted that if the applicants changed the plan before the Planning Board, then it can be incorporated. It wouldn't have to be added as a stipulation.

Vice Chairman Blanchard motioned to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. McMillan with the following stipulations:

1. To substitute a conservation seed mix to be mowed annually for the lawn at the rear of the property.
2. To investigate the feasibility of the installation of a small rain garden or other similar treatment technology to treat the storm water coming off the roof of the building on the property.

The motion passed unanimously in a (4-0) vote.

Chairman Miller noted that the applicants should be sure that the contractor for the pervious pavement should really know what they are doing. If it is installed wrong then it can really change the pavement. Mr. Connolly responded that the pavers have been doing this for 10 years now and they have it down.

C. 325 Little Harbor Road  
Anthony DiLorenzo, owner  
Map 205, Lot 2

Corey Colwell and Chris Gagnon with MSC Engineers spoke to the application. This application is for a CUP and State Wetland Permit for Belle Island, also known as Lady Isle. The grounds currently contain one residential house, a caretaker cottage, three guest cottages and a horse barn with a horse paddock. The majority of the island is in the buffer zone. The properties that are beyond the buffer require a shoreline permit. This project will replace the residential building. Remove the caretaker house, and the three guest cottages. The carriage house will be renovated mostly with interior changes. A patio will be added on the back. A saltwater pool and pool house will be installed as well as a tennis court. The septic system will be removed and a new one will be installed further away from the shore. The driveway will be pervious pavement. Repairs will be made to the retaining wall. This proposal includes plans to install a significant amount of landscaping. The high point of the island is an elevation of 36 and low point is elevation of 4. Sheet C1 shows all of the significant trees that have been located and are shown on the property. The owner wants to save as many trees as possible. Sheet C2 shows a wetland and shore land impact map. The green area shows all the land in the 100-foot tidal zone. Then the yellow area shows everything out of the buffer but in the shoreland zone. The impact of each improvement has been quantified. The first table is an impervious table. There is currently 45000 square feet or 9.2% of impervious area. After this project that will go down to 6.72% impervious area. This is mostly due to the fact that four structures will be removed and the driveway will be replaced with a permeable driveway. The dark green hatch area on the map shows the unaltered area of the Island. 72,000 square feet of the island will be left in an unaltered state. The construction sequence is also outlined in this plan. Each improvement has an impact associated with it and that has been quantified in a table. Sheet C3 is the site layout plan. It shows the proposed structures and driveways as well as the buildings to be removed. It also maps which significant trees will be removed. The project will only require the removal of seven trees. The driveway location will change to go away from the house a little further. This new driveway location is designed to save all trees but one. Sheet C4 is the utility plan. Improvements specify a new septic, new well and the new utility lines to the new building. The sewer lines will run to the septic then to a pump chamber and finally into a new leech field that will be constructed. The current leech field is 20 feet from the river. The new one will be 100 feet from the river and it will be larger. A new generator is proposed to be installed behind the shed. This will provide back up power to the island. This is the last property on the electrical run. New water, electric and sewer will be put in for each of the new buildings. Sheet C5 shows the grading and drainage. Today there is very little treatment to the runoff. This project will introduce 1,300 square feet of a rain garden. It will be located between the dwelling and river as well as the pool and river. The silt sock will all be replaced and placed entirely around the buildings. The last few sheets are details for the contractor to ensure erosion control is maintained throughout the project and after. Drip line trenches will be added around each building. This will allow for roof runoff to infiltrate into the ground. The last sheet is the landscaping plan done by Matthew Cunningham. All plants are native trees or shrubs and the plan calls for the removal of all invasive plants. Any removed lawn will be replaced with landscaping. A plant schedule is also provided. In summary the project will make significant improvements to the property. The retaining wall will prevent tidal erosion and the stone path will allow for more storm water infiltration prior to reaching the river.

Ms. Tanner wondered why the driveway was moved. Mr. Colwell responded that right now it's located very close to the home. The landscape designer felt that space between the home and

driveway was necessary to give the home more of a front yard. Ms. Tanner asked if this property would be occupied year round. Mr. Colwell confirmed that it would be.

Vice Chairman Blanchard commented that she was familiar with the property because it was before the commission in 2014. Is the ownership different now? Mr. Colwell responded that it is under different ownership.

Ms. McMillan noted that the site walk was helpful. In the plans it looks like a formal pathway will be installed for the pathway down to the dock? Mr. Colwell responded that was correct. It will be stone steps to help prevent erosion. Ms. McMillan recommended that infiltration steps be installed along there to allow for more infiltration. Mr. Colwell clarified that could be a granite step with crushed stone below. Ms. McMillan confirmed that was correct, and assumed that they would not be able to do something similar to the pathway because of tree roots. Mr. Colwell confirmed that was correct.

Ms. McMillan questioned if the new shed was part of this permit application. Mr. Colwell confirmed that the 16 by 24 foot shed was part of this permit. The proposed shed is much bigger than the old shed. Ms. McMillan noted that the shed is in the 50-foot buffer and questioned what the requirements are for that. Mr. Colwell responded that the state requirements for accessory structures allow footage based on the shoreline, so a shed of this size is allowed. Ms. McMillan questioned what the shed would be used for. Property owner Anthony DiLorenzo responded that it would be used to store things that will support the dock and boat.

Ms. McMillan questioned how much the wall would be raised by. Mr. Colwell responded that it would be about a foot. Ms. McMillan questioned if there were limitations on how much the wall can be raised by? Mr. Colwell responded that he was not aware of any. Ms. McMillan questioned if the wall would be filled in behind to raise the land. Mr. Colwell responded that the intent is to do a fill with crushed stone. Another fill could be brought in if needed, but the intent is to only put crushed stone. The grading is shown on sheet 5 and it outlines how it should work. The fill will be elevated on the landside of the wall so that storm water can flow down from the site toward the wall and filter down through the crushed stone. Ms. McMillan commented that pathway should not be along the wall. There is an opportunity to have pathways down to the wall, but to put it all the way around the wall is a lot of area. At the site walk it was talked about moving it back and having the buffer along the wall. The cross section on C7 makes it look like nothing would be gained if it's just going to go in the stone and seep out. Putting plantings along the wall and a path 25 feet back would provide so much more filtration. Mr. Colwell noted the only drawback to a path would make it easier to have more runoff. The crushed stone would provide more filtration.

Chairman Miller clarified that it's crushed stone not stone dust. Mr. Colwell confirmed that was correct.

Ms. McMillan expressed concern about the fertilizer. Mr. Gagnon responded that it's outlined on the landscape plan.

Chairman Miller questioned if the shoreline protection act covered fertilizer. Ms. McMillan confirmed that it did and she saw the note in the plan. It's addressed here. There is concern about the shed a little bit. If it could be smaller that would be awesome.

Mr. Colwell addressed the path. It's important because the owners walk that multiple times a day. The concern is if nothing is done, then it will create a problem. Adding crushed stone will help keep it maintained. The preference is to have the path where it's shown. If saltwater comes over the wall then it will go through the stone and back out but if the plantings were there then erosion and salt could impact them. Ms. McMillan responded that it depends on the plantings and feels the opposite because roots of the plants should be maintained.

Chairman Miller noted the back and forth about the path at the site walk. The eastern shoreline seemed like it was the harshest area. It was barren with nothing growing there. Not sure if the land would get more treatment right against the wall or if it was moved back. This area will probably remain the most difficult area to maintain in the future too. The wall is already there all the way around, so already there is no opportunity for saltmarsh migration. If the wall weren't there, then the commission would want to see some more creative ideas around the shore. However, the wall is there and that's the reality.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned what the highest point of the island was. Mr. Colwell responded that the highest elevation is 36 feet on the west side and the area that is being talked about now is an elevation of 4 feet.

Mr. Britz questioned how wide the planting was. Mr. Colwell responded that it would be 24 feet wide. Mr. Britz clarified that 5 feet would be path and then 24 feet would be plants. Mr. Colwell confirmed that was correct. Mr. Britz commented that the area on the plans with boat ramp shows a wall and path, but would there really be a wall there or not? Mr. Colwell noted that Mr. Britz was correct. A wall would not be put in there. Mr. Britz noted that it shouldn't show as a wall there in the plans. Mr. Colwell commented that the path is intended to be there. Mr. Britz commented that the path might not be held in where there is no wall. Mr. DiLorenzo suggested that maybe a piece of granite could be installed to retain it. Mr. Colwell commented that the wall could just be removed in that spot instead. Mr. Britz pointed out a discrepancy in the notes on the plan. Mr. Colwell confirmed that would be updated.

Ms. Tanner motioned to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented, seconded by Vice Chairman Blanchard. The motion passed in a (3-1) vote. Ms. McMillan voted against the application.

Ms. Tanner noted that the idea of planting near the wall would be good, but rest of the plan makes up for that feature.

Vice Chairman Blanchard commented that the elimination of buildings and the addition landscaping would be very beneficial. There are so many improvements with this project especially with water quality. The preservation of trees is great as well. There a lot of things the commission likes to see in the plans.



Ms. McMillan noted that she still had a problem with the wall. The whole island is in the buffer. The shed is in the 50-foot buffer and the commission wouldn't normally approve this. For that reason she can't support it.

Ms. Tanner agreed with Ms. McMillan, but noted that so much has been done to the property it makes up for it.

Vic Chairman Blanchard commented that this is such a significant improvement from when this was here three years ago. There is no clear answer on the wall if it's a trodden path with an existing structure. Vice Chairman Blanchard noted that she approved this, but had reservations of the shed. There is so much improvement that it outweighs the reservation. All of the landscaping in the plan is very much appreciated.

Chairman Miller questioned if there would be treatment under the shed to prevent erosion. Mr. Colwell responded that the thought was to put crushed stone underneath.

- D. Ocean Road to Greenland Road  
Eversource Energy, owner  
Map 258, Lots 1, 34, 35, 36 & 54; Map 282, Lots 2 & 5

Tracy Tarr from GZA Environmental and Kurt Nelson from Eversource spoke the application. They have already received a CUP for the bulk of the project, but realized that two additional structures need replacement. They are close to what was already approved for work areas, so they are able to overlap temporary work pads. One pole needed emergency work and received approval from DES to replace that one. It's been added to the mitigation fee and required a wetland statement.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned where the vehicles would go? Ms. Tarr responded that the vehicles don't park on the mats overnight, so they would park on the uplands. This project timeline is early October into December, so it would be a short timeline.

Ms. McMillan motioned to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed unanimously in a (4-0) vote.

### **III. STATE WETLAND PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

1. Minimum Impact Expedited Application  
Maplewood Avenue  
Heritage Hill Condominium Association, owner  
City of Portsmouth, applicant  
Map 219, Lot 40

This application is related to the construction of the head wall.

Vice Chairman Blanchard motioned to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetland Bureau as presented, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed unanimously in a (4-0) vote.

2. Standard Dredge and Fill Application  
325 Little Harbor Road  
Anthony DiLorenzo, owner  
Map 205, Lot 2

Ms. McMillan commented that she would vote to approve the wetland permit, and wondered if a note could be added to ensure research is done about the pathway to determine what is best for it. Chairman Miller noted that if it's going to erode, then rock is better than soil.

Ms. Tanner motioned to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetland Bureau as presented, seconded by Vice Chairman Blanchard. The motion passed unanimously in a (4-0) vote.

3. Standard Dredge and Fill Application  
600 Market Street  
Portsmouth Submarine Memorial Association, owner  
Assessor Map 209, Lot 87

Cheryl Coviello and Ken Harig, President of the Board, spoke to the application. This application is for a standard dredge and fill it will include re-grading and adding drainage in the wetland area. The background on this is in 2015 the dry basin for the submarine was reconstructed. A temporary waterway was connected to the Piscataqua River. This wetland area is in an already highly altered area. There were no signs of wetland impact in that area until submarine way was built. It was supposed to be a temporary road, but now is permanent. There is a lot of high water now. The bedrock is sloping to the east. In the spring of 2017 there was heavy snow melt then rain and everything flooded then it all re-froze to ice.

Vice Chairman Blanchard clarified that the pictures shown in the application are where the issue is. Ms. Coviello confirmed that was correct. The invert is higher than the basin wall. The proposal is to do some minor re-grading to promote flow to a catch basin to drain.

Chairman Miller asked where it would drain? Ms. Coviello responded it would drain to Cutts Cove.

Vice Chairman Blanchard commented that the submarine was just cleaned and repaired and two years later they have to do it again.

Ms. McMillan noted that the outlet was originally abandoned what does the outlet to Cutts Cove look like today. Mr. Harig responded that it's just an open pipe. Ms. Coviello commented that there is not any stone at the outfall. Ms. McMillan asked if they had any idea of the level of outfall. Ms. Coviello responded that they have worked with John Chagnon, and they are not expecting a high level.

Chairman Miller noted that it looks like a pipe runs and joins in the parking lot. Ms. Coviello responded that the pipe goes right beside it. Chairman Miller commented that some erosion control might be needed there. Then it won't degrade existing issues in Cutts Cove. Ms. Coviello noted that it's pretty vegetated down there already. Chairman Miller commented that if it is, then it's probably better to keep it vegetated.

Ms. Tanner noted that there is a large median between the sign and the marked entrance. It's just a sign on one side, so now there's a median to mark Albacore Park is there. Mr. Harig responded that they have been told they are limited to one sign. Ms. Tanner noted that even one additional directive would be nice.

Vice Chairman Blanchard motioned to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetland Bureau as presented, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed unanimously in a (4-0) vote.

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

##### **A. Public Undeveloped Lands Assessment (PULA) update**

Mr. Britz gave an update. Mark West looked at recently acquired property. The Greenland/Rye line property has quite a bit of upland there with mountain biking trails and big cedar trees. Mr. Britz will add information to PULA. The island has a trail that people use today. Ms. Tanner questioned if the dredging was for a new dock and berm? Mr. Britz responded that was correct, people can walk out today with boots, however, mostly kayaks are used. Chairman Miller noted there was an impressive bench and fire pit on the island. It would be beneficial to ensure people aren't burning all the wood on the island. Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned what the name of the island was. Mr. Britz responded that there are a lot of informal names, but not sure what the official one is. The City also recently acquired 150 Greenleaf where the sewer line goes through a subdivided sewer/wetland property. Mr. West highlighted connection across the creek removing the crossing at the culvert. Chairman Miller noted that it was nice to see all three of the properties. Ms. Tanner noted that it was nice to see perineal stream documented. Chairman Miller requested that someone make a motion to show support of City's decision for acquiring these properties. Ms. Tanner commented that she thought Banfield Road was being included in this effort. Chairman Miller noted that can be included in the future.

Ms. Tanner moved to commend the City Council for acquiring three new parcels of land and to include a letter highlighting the functions of the acquired land, seconded by Vice Chairman Blanchard. The motion passed unanimously in a (4-0) vote.

##### **B. Stewardship Update**

Mr. Britz provided the update. There was a meeting on stewardship to see how volunteers would work. This can be talked about in another meeting. The hope is to give volunteer training this spring with manuals and forms.

C. Set date for presentation on the NHCRHC Report, confirm invite list and venue

Chairman Miller noted that the commission talked about a presentation in a past meeting. There has not been much progress made on this since then. A date should be set and the Commission should figure out whom to invite.

Vice Chairman Blanchard commented that this should be held in the City Council Chambers.

Chairman Miller noted that at this point the presentation probably wouldn't happen until November.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned how long the presentation would be.

Chairman Miller noted that the report is all recommendations, so the thought is to select 2-3 that are the most important and highlight what's been done. Chairman Miller hopes to coordinate the presentation with Natalie Morrison.

Vice Chairman Miller noted the format should be to present then open to questions.

Mr. Britz questioned if this was a presentation to City Council or an invite to everyone?

Vice Chairman Blanchard responded that anyone should be invited.

Mr. Britz noted that November could be tight with elections happening.

Chairman Miller responded he would work with Mr. Britz to see what's available then communicate a date. It may not be until January.

Ms. Tanner asked if Ms. Collins and Ms. Harrison had submitted their applications, and if there was a status on alternates.

Mr. Britz confirmed that they still need alternates.

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

At 6:15 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Frey, Conservation Commission Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Conservation Commission meeting on October 11, 2017.