

**MINUTES  
CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

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

**3:30 P.M.**

**June 16, 2021**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Barbara McMillan; Vice Chair Samantha Collins; Members Allison Tanner, Jessica Blasko, Andrew Samonas and Thaddeus Jankowski

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

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

.....  
**I. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS (OLD BUSINESS)**

1. 1 Raynes Avenue, 31 Raynes Avenue, & 203 Maplewood Avenue, One Raynes Ave, LLC, 31 Raynes Ave, LLC, & 203 Maplewood Ave, LLC, Owners Assessor Map 123, Lots 10, 12, 13, 14

Eben Tormey, Patrick Crimmins, and Olivia Stasin spoke to the petition. Mr. Tormey briefly reviewed the project and said they would address the Commission's comments from the May meeting as follows:

1. The greenway trail alternative was presented, with the trail completely out of the 25-ft buffer, with the exception of the connection to the pier and the kayak launch that has been implemented into our plans.
2. Additional plantings between the path and the North Mill Pond have been added and additional details will be provided.
3. Snow storage on site is eliminated and the updated Operations and Maintenance manual will state that all snow will be removed from the site and disposed of legally.
4. Remove salt or snowmelt chemicals from the buffer and do not store them within the 10-ft buffer, which will be done and updated in the O&M plan.
5. Include preliminary drawings for what is proposed for the in-kind reconstruction of the pier. The intent is for the pier, ramp, and storage to be an amenity for public use and benefit and will be part of the community space if the City Council and the Planning Board feel it's something they'd like to see included in this section of the greenway. If they feel that public access to the pier and kayak are not appropriate at this location, we will remove this scope from our work and eliminate the access to them.

Mr. Crimmins said the greenway trail has been revised to be outside of the 25-ft vegetative buffer, with the exception of the connection into the kayak ramp and pier. The adjacent trail has

an easement on it currently being coordinated between the abutter and the city that will allow for the location. The park on the side of the abutter's property parcel will connect to that location.

Mr. Crimmins said they were seeking a recommendation from the Commission as to whether the public pier and kayak ramp should be included in the project scope. At this time, he said the design intent was to replace the pier in kind and as part of the latest package.

He said the Operations and Maintenance Plan was previously included in the drainage analysis but has been separated into a stand-alone document as part of the latest submission package. He said the intent of the plan is to implement the frequent routine maintenance schedule to maintain a high quality of stormwater runoff on the site and how to properly maintain stormwater best management practices, which is particularly important to this project given the significant quality improvements the project will implement over the existing condition.

To recap, he said the existing condition of the property does not provide stormwater treatment now. The proposed development will be implementing the new best practices that will significantly improve water quality that is being discharged off the North Mill Pond, not only from this site but also from the surrounding streets. For the runoff generated by the new building and surface parking, stormwater treatment will be provided. Underground retention systems that have been incorporated into the design to address temperature of runoff of the surface parking area. For the runoff generated by the trail itself, a porous asphalt design has been incorporated and will provide treatment for the runoff infiltration. The path will be lined and underdrained, as infiltration stormwater is not permitted on the site. In addition to the onsite treatment, the project will result in improvements to the existing municipal drainage system that is currently discharging to the NMP by the culvert that runs through the site. As part of the project, the applicant will grant an easement to the benefit of the city for this culvert to allow for permanent access and maintenance. The applicant will replace the aging culvert within the project's development area and the easement will allow the city to replace the downstream portion of the culvert and head wall in the community greenway space. In addition to the culvert reconstruction and easement, the project has incorporated a stormwater treatment system to improve quality of stormwater runoff where none is currently provided for runoff from the abutting neighborhood's roadways and parking areas. Part of the stormwater design is to reemphasize the significant improvements to water quality this project will have for the North Mill Pond. To ensure these improvements continue to maintain high quality treatment, it's important that the O&M plan be implemented. Tied to the plan will be how the property addresses snow and salt management for the site. The O&M plan has been updated to address the Commission's feedback and we've included references to snow management that have been updated to indicate that the property manager will be responsible for timely snow removal from all private sidewalks, driveways, and parking areas. We have also updated the notes to indicate that all snow removal will be hauled offsite and legally disposed of. Notes were also added to Section 1.7 of the O&M plan stating that the salt storage is not permitted within the 100-ft buffer.

Ms. Stasin addressed the updated landscape design plan. She said the planting design is divided into vegetative areas, and the feedback from the Commission was to focus on adding more plantings between the mean high water line and the trail. She said they took the isolated planting beds hugging the path and created an organic swooping nature to allow for a larger square

footage of plantings. The plans will include maples, oaks, dogwood shrubs. The current lawn and invasive plant and asphalt site will be transformed to provide for and shelter for wildlife. The plantings have been coordinated with the North Mill Pond Community Park One to have a unified restoration approach along the pond and enhance the shoreline's health and beauty. She said there would be no change in the parking buffer's horizontal and vertical layer, but they will no longer store the snow within the buffer area. She said if the path did not connect to the pier and kayak ramp, the design will stand on its own to perform all the seed programs it wants to do for the community. She said they would maintain the red fescue grasses, She noted that the current site doesn't have the proper tools to mitigate some of the current and future climatic conditions, and erode shoreline is not welcoming or usable.

Mr. Tormey said that, in addition to the request for the CUP, they were requesting a decision from the Commission on the pier and kayak launch, which was an option they were presenting as an additional public amenity beyond the community space requirement.

Mr. Samonas asked what the alternative was if the pier and kayak launch were not incorporated into the scope of work. Mr. Crimmins said there would be no public access to it and no connection from the path. He said the lot would retain ownership but it wouldn't be used, and appropriate means would be provided to keep people off it for safety reasons. Chair McMillan clarified that the applicant would not change either of those at all and not return at a later date to do anything to it. Mr. Crimmins agreed, noting that they provided a conceptual design and the intent was to replace in kind, but they wanted to know if it should be incorporated into the project. Afterwards they would have to return for approval for the pier as part of the State process. Otherwise, they would not pursue any other permitting for it.

Vice-Chair Collins asked whether the snow storage waiting to be collected would be on pavement in a pile and then brought off. Mr. Crimmins agreed and said it wouldn't go into anything else besides pavement while it was waiting. She asked if the new ribbon plantings along the water will be mulch or just left alone. Ms. Stasin said there would be mulch and spacing for the first two years, and then the plants would be healthy enough to stand on their own. Vice-Chair Collins said the Commission would want that area to be naturally filled in as possible, with as little maintenance as needed.

Mr. Jankowski said he was concerned about using de-icing and pre-treatment materials on the parking lot prior to snow because it was impervious surface and would flow into the 50-ft buffer and beyond. He noted that the long-term O&M plan talked about salt usage, evaluation, and monitoring. He asked how much material would be used. Mr. Crimmins said they would abide by what the ordinance stated pertaining to within the buffer and not use chlorides, but the public sidewalks might be treated for salt. Mr. Jankowski asked if there was a soil management plan. Mr. Tormey said they would develop the soil plan once they had their cut and fill plans established. The soils would be tested and handled appropriately on site and off site.

Mr. Samonas asked for clarification of the landscape plan that showed the right hand side having planting beds and vehicular unit pavers. He asked if it would be a mixture of plantings or entirely pavers. Ms. Stasin said there were plantings adjacent to the building's edge, where the access for the fire truck was, so they had to keep it open for planting beds. She said the planting bed along

the wall was where the fire trucks turn, so that was what they were limited to. She said it would be a good spot to have a flexible plaza, given that they couldn't do more plantings.

Vice-Chair Collins asked that clause about salt and de-icing not being used in the 100-ft wetland buffer should be in Section 1.7, page 1-5 of the applicant's O&M plan.

Chair McMillan questioned Section 1.3, page 1-2 of the O&M plan, where it stated 'the landscaping islands will be maintained and mulched as required each spring'. She noted that the applicant said eventually they wouldn't need to be mulched, and she asked if there were other instructions for people doing the landscaping afterwards for the maintenance. Ms. Stasin said that area would probably have mulch as well. She said the intent was just for the first few years, and then they would have to assess how the plant condition is doing.

Chair McMillan questioned Section 1.3, the jellyfish filter system, where it stated 'inspect the vault for sediment build-up static water once annually.' She said according to jellyfish recommendations for maintenance, it should be maintained more often than annually. Mr. Crimmins said if they had a large rainfall event that exceeded 2-1/2 inches, the property manager would inspect the jellyfish. Chair McMillan said it stated that a minimum of quarterly inspections during the first year of operation should be done to assess the sediment and floatable pollutants accumulation and ensure proper functioning of the system. Mr. Crimmins said he could add more detail relative to the frequency during the first year.

Chair McMillan questioned the statement in Section 1.6 on porous asphalt, page 1-4 'Monitor periodically to ensure the pavement surface drains effectively after storms', noting that there was not 'if not' clause. She said she had seen these fail and recommended adding 'if not, then it shall be replaced. She asked if salt would be stored on site. Mr. Tormey said it would be limited to small quantities, like the sidewalks, and would be in bags in the maintenance room. Chair McMillan said it was stated in the manual on page 1-5 that the salt storage areas would be covered so it won't drain into a wetland, but it does more damage if it drains to the soils, plantings, or any vegetation.

Chair McMillan questioned the street sweeping on page 2-3, 'After storm events, the management team will be responsible for having the street swept to recapture unmelted de-icing materials when practical'. She said that was awesome but didn't see it earlier on when the applicant talked about sweeping in the plan. Mr. Crimmins said he would add it. Mr. Jankowski asked if any testing was done of the soil in the area where the pier was proposed, and Mr. Crimmins said no.

Chair McMillan asked how far the lighting would go out. Mr. Tormey explained they were all dark-sky complaint fixtures and were directional, so they threw light from the pole down toward the parking lot.

The pier and kayak ramp were discussed. Chair McMillan said the boat ramp looked great but she worried about the pier being just a solid impervious surface. She suggested that the applicant be creative and use vegetation of some sort so it wouldn't be just a flat surface, and no lighting.

There was no public comment.

Vice-Chair Collins moved to recommend approval for the CUP, with the following **stipulations**:

1. Relating to the porous asphalt maintenance requirements, monitor periodically to ensure the pavement surface drains effectively after storms, and if not look into replacing the porous pavement.
2. The clause 'no salt and de-icing material shall be used in the 100-ft buffer' shall be added to the Operations and Maintenance Plan, probably in Section 1.7.
3. Add instructions for the two-plus year time span on eliminating mulching and maintenance to allow for natural growth and esthetics on some of the planted islands.
4. Add frequency of inspection of the jellyfish.
5. Store salt indoors.
6. Add the clause 'sweeping of de-icing material after storm events' to the general sweeping section in the Operations and Maintenance Plan.
7. Restore the pier to something vegetative and porous and investigate it in that stage.

Ms. Tanner seconded the motion.

Mr. Samonas referred to the planting notes and remarked that there was a mixed height parking buffer and it seemed like the trees were substantial. He suggested that they be maintained for more than one planting season because the maturity life span of those types of plants are longer than some of the other low-lying shrubs and someone should ensure that they come to fruition. Ms. Stasin said they would take a look at the trees but said they normally maintained the trees and shrubs for a year or two.

Ms. Blasko said she appreciated the applicant's efforts to address the Commission's concerns about water quality and habitat, but she still struggled with approving the application because it felt like a very dense project and she thought there was another viable alternative. She said she wasn't sure if Number 2 of the Commission's articles was fully met. Considering how the property is now used, she said there were a lot of water quality issues, but as far as people and foot traffic on that site, what was proposed will be a significant shift for what's happening there now. If the project moved forward, she suggested that the Commission draft a letter to state that they support the State and will continue to monitor the site since it's contaminated but she wanted to advocate and see what happened and also make sure that as construction moved forward, the State would monitor and ensure that the North Mill Pond was being looked at. Mr. Jankowski agreed and said he was also concerned that it was a really contaminated site. He said he was interested in how much contamination was closer to the water and where it was going. He said the buildings were massive and a great displacement of the lot and that the Commission needed to know more about the property.

Chair McMillan asked Mr. Samonas if the conditions he mentioned should be added to the letter. Mr. Samonas said if the property was managed properly, then it should be a given, but if it wasn't, then maybe it should be included. He noted that the applicant provided substantial feedback that was accurate. Chair McMillan said she was uncomfortable with the project due to the intensity of the property, even though the applicant made an efforts to offset some of the

impacts in the buffer. She said the impacts to the buffer and pond were big, with so much impervious area there.

The motion **failed** by a vote of 3-3, with Mr. Jankowski, Mr. Samonas, and Ms. Blasko voting in opposition.

(Note: A motion fails if it's a tie).

## II. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. 3 Curriers Cove  
Chase B. Bailey & Kathryn E. Soave-Bailey, Owners  
Assessor Map, 204 Lot 12

The applicants Chase and Kit Bailey spoke to the application. Mr. Bailey said he got a building permit in February 2018 to remove the pool and replace the existing pool house, but no action was taken so they were re-applying. He reviewed the site plan and said the project was the same as the previous one.

Mr. Jankowski said it was a fine plan and commented that many people who had property above a wetland or body of water agreed to maintain their property organically and follow basic standards for organic land management. He said he could get the applicant a manual.

Ms. Bailey said everything she used was organic and that they didn't believe in grass and left the land wild. She said they had indigenous plants, never used pesticides, and had not put any pavement down. She said they kept everything natural and maintained it.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Blasko moved to recommend approval of the Wetland Conditional Use Permit Application to the Planning Board, seconded by Vice-Chair Collins.

The motion **passed** unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

2. 0 Patricia Drive  
Fritz Family Revocable Living Trust, Edgar H. Fritz Trustee, Owner  
Assessor Map, 283, Lot 11

James Gove of Gove Environmental Services spoke to the application. He said had plans to do a reduction of the road and also put in some plants and a stormwater treatment basin. He thought he did a good thing but then got comments from DES, which culminated in a site walk. DES said any permanent impacts would have to be mitigated through the ARM fund and the proposed treatment basin would have to be monitored for five years to determine that it was really removing and treating. Mr. Gove said he asked DES what they wanted him to do, and they said not to do anything in the prime wetland. They said it could be repaved if it was temporary. Mr. Gove told DES that he wanted to take some of the pavement out and put in vegetation, but DES

said it was a permanent impact and couldn't be done unless the applicant paid into the ARM fund. Mr. Gove said he was baffled because he thought it was a good thing to reduce the impervious in the 100-ft buffer. He said he still wanted to be able to treat runoff from the road, so he submitted a revised plan for the media filter system and told the DES that he would put in the existing catch basins, and DES issued him a permit for work in the prime wetlands. Mr. Gove said he appreciated Mr. Britz's comments. He said the existing catch basins were getting the existing runoff from the road and that he could put in a berm on the bottom to make it more efficient for them to into the catch basins.

Mr. Britz noted that in his memo, he didn't say catch basins couldn't be used to treat the stormwater but that there was a way to design it. In the last plan, he said those catch basins were replacing just the old ones put in with the original road and those were bypass areas that went into the stormwater treatment, so those basins were going to be used just to move stormwater through the system and not treat it because it was coming from the hillside and didn't need treatment. Now that it was known where the water was coming from, there wasn't a good drainage plan and no curbing shown, so it wasn't clear. He said the plan needed more detail on the catch basin so that the Commission could review it. He said that was why he had recommended postponing it. Mr. Gove agreed but thought it was worthwhile to explain how they got into this bind and had to come back with a different plan.

Chair McMillan asked about maintenance. Mr. Gove said they can have the entire maintenance schedule put onto the plans. Ms. Tanner said the Commission needed to understand what volume of water the catch basins would receive. Mr. Gove said it got sized but didn't get on the plan, and the critical element was getting information on the plan. Mr. Samonas said a lot of homeowners came before the Commission with simple plans but didn't know how to maintain it or they unknowingly did things that infringed on the plans, so he said it would be helpful to make future homeowners aware of those things.

Mr. Gove said the plans included marking of the prime wetland boundary, and he would better clarify how people would know where they should go on.

Ms. Tanner moved to **postpone** the Wetland Conditional Use Permit Application to the July 14, 2021 meeting, seconded by Mr. Jankowski.

The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

3. 3400 Lafayette Road  
Ricci Construction Company, Inc., Owner  
Assessor Map 297, Lot 11

Ms. Tanner said there was important information missing from the package, like the wetlands functions and values, and suggested postponing the application, seeing that it was next to a mitigation site for the Portsmouth hospital. The applicant Joe Coronati said they could answer a lot of those questions and supply additional information later on. He introduced his project team and reviewed the application. He said it was a vacant parcel that had one use on the site, a logging chipping operation. He said the site used to be zoned industrial and the city rezoned it as the Gateway District, along with abutting parcels, so the city didn't want to see industrial on it

and allowed a lot of residential development of varying densities. He said the site consisted of the NRP zone and 15-1/2 acres of G1 zone land. He said they initially proposed 248 townhouses on the property but TAC recommended breaking up the site and having fewer buildings, so they now had only 50 units and more greenspace and added a turnaround. He said some of the changes the city requested let them add park space, so they had a grassy area with benches for outdoor active recreation. He said they also moved the dog park and had a trail network behind the units that linked up with the other trails.

He discussed the key items from Mr. Britz's staff memo.

**Item 1.** The land is sized and scaled to the development adjacent to what it intended to be, a highly functioning wetland system and is not an appropriate portion of the stormwater treatment that's within the wetland buffer.

Mr. Coronati said they disagreed with that because there was quite a large impact in the wetland buffer today consisting of 40,000 square feet of area utilized by the logging company, a gravel roadway, woodchips, no pavement, heavy equipment back and forth, stacks of lumber and trees, fuel service, and some small storage buildings. He said they were restoring the entire buffer that's currently impacted and everything will be vegetated, and they will provide a complete planting plan. He said the only impacts for the site are temporary. They have one drainage that's a vegetative swale and will be grassed over once it's built. He said there was some impact around Buildings 19 and 20 that would get drained into a bio-retention pond. They also have a temporary impact from a proposed sewer line connecting to the existing sewer main on the property and were in discussions with DPW about it as to whether it would be the final sewer location. He said they might not even need that buffer impact and all those areas will be revegetated and 40,000 square feet of the buffer will be revegetated. He said they had to have outfalls for the stormwater but didn't have a pipe, so it would just be a revegetated swale through there. He said all the stormwater treatment ponds are outside of the buffer, and they have a bio-retention pond and a detention system under a cul-de-sac for stormwater treatment, as well as a wet pond design out of the buffer, so there are three different stormwater ponds for treatment and any water flowing into those outfalls will already have been treated.

Ms. Tanner asked what the volume of water going into each bio-retention system or the vegetated swales was, since they'll dump into that wetland. Mr. Coronati said the drainage report had to be reviewed by DPW and the AOT but that it was all submitted with their application. Ms. Tanner asked how the water to each of these places would be directed. Mr. Coronati said they had a few variations. The whole road was curbed and the water sheet flows to the riprap. He explained where the stormwater would go by pointing out various catch basins. He said the area also took the impervious surface between twelve units and it went into a wetpond.

Mr. Samonas said it would be wet if there was significant runoff of snowmelt. Mr. Coronati said everything there was below grade and there's a focal point that's a primary treatment center, and he explained how it would work. Mr. Samonas said those had been sensitive areas in the past. Mr. Coronati said the entire cul-de-sac was curved, so there wouldn't be any vehicles entering that area and no reason to have damage from plows inside the grass area. Mr. Samonas said 110 residents were expected based on average occupancy, so it seemed like the area could get some

high traffic. Mr. Coronati said all the lawn areas will be maintained by the condo association, but there would be another area for outside recreation where the dog park would be moved, and it would be out of the wetland buffer.

Ms. Tanner asked why there were so many parking spaces. Mr. Coronati said each townhouse had two garages and a driveway, so four cars could be parked per unit. He said they counted two per unit in the garage and then the visitor spaces. Mr. Jankowski asked what the parking requirement was per unit. Mr. Coronati said it was 1.4 cars, but it was hard to have 1.4 garages per unit and no driveway.

**Item 2.** They appeared to have maximized the residential development of the site.

Mr. Coronati said the density is really 248 units, and they have 50 units. They have a lot of wetlands on site but are not over-intensifying the use within the 50 units because they're allowed to have 250 units per zoning. He said they also have an existing 28-acre conservation easement on the property and were proposing a 10.3 acre conservation easement. He said the plans he handed out were easier to see and that the limit of the existing easement goes all the way out and comes up toward the backs of some units. He said a piece of land of 10.3 acres was not a conversation easement but that they planned to put into conservation. He said the land abuts up to Coach Road and that they would put all that land into conservation as well as propose a trail from Coach Road into the site to link up with their trail system and the sewer easement trail that would be accessible by the public.

Vice-Chair Collins asked if that area was wet. Mr. Coronati said there were wetlands throughout most of it but there were uplands, too, especially by the sewer easement land.

Mr. Coronati said the city had requirements for open space and building coverage, and they were far below those requirements. He said they were not over-intensifying or maximizing the site. The city required 20 percent open space, and they had 84 percent. He said they were just using the G1 zone in their calculation and not the NRP zone. He said the building coverage is 50 percent maximum and they're at 5.6 percent within the G1 zone. He said the total conservation with existing and proposed is 88 percent of the property, or 38 acres.

Ms. Tanner how much impervious surface was being added. Mr. Coronati said three percent of the land, or 61,000 square feet of pavement. With the buildings, there would be a total disturbance of 4.8 acres. Ms. Tanner asked for clarification on the three percent of the land. He said they were just including the G1 land in those numbers. He said the total conservation on the site was 33 acres out of the 44, so about 88 percent of the site would be in conservation if they put the 10.3 acres in.

**Item 3:** While the stormwater from the site will be treated, it's not clear how this treated water and new volume water will impact the functioning wetland mitigation which was created to offset wetland impacts in a different part of the city.

Mr. Coronati said they had people from JZA who could comment on the functions, values, and the quality of the existing wetland mitigation site. He said all the stormwater that ends up in that

location will be treated prior to entering it, and there was currently untreated water going into it today from the logging operation. He said they didn't see noticeable signs of concern with the wetland mitigation but they would add 40,000 square feet of vegetation in that area where they're currently operating, so there will be much more buffer than there is today and water will be treated before releasing into any of the wetlands on site.

Chair McMillan suggested waiting until the next meeting to discuss it further.

**Item 4.** The area proposed for development is currently being used as a wood processing area, therefore a portion of the natural vegetation impacted with the introduction of 50 housing units will require the removal of all the natural vegetation outside the buffer and some of the vegetation in the buffer, at least as a temporary impact.

Mr. Coronati said a lot of that was true. He said there were areas they were not impacting, some of which were in the conservation easement and some areas behind some units. They would keep a wooded buffer along Lafayette Road and between the project and the Weatherstone Condominiums and would meet open space requirements with that layout.

**Item 5.** While the applicant has kept all the proposed housing and roadways out of the wetland buffer, the proposed impacts to the wetland buffer for stormwater treatment are not the least impacting alternative, and the runoff from the development, while proposed for treatment, will still have long-term impacts to the adjacent wetland system.

Mr. Coronati said he didn't know what impacts would be anticipated, but the only impacts they'd have is clean stormwater entering those areas. He said all the ponds are out of the buffer, and the vegetative swale is not much of an impact; getting the development out of the buffer and having the buildings up against the edge of the buffer will keep the pavement even further away. He said the pavement at the closest might be 140 feet, and everything will drain away from the wetland, so he didn't see any long-term impacts or detrimental impacts from clean stormwater entering the area.

**Comment 6.** The applicant is proposing temporary impacts in the wetland buffer but is not clear how these will be restored when the project is complete.

Mr. Coronati said they will provide more detailed landscaping plans that show not only how the wetland buffer will be planted but that also show the outfalls planted as well.

Ms. Tanner said referred to the notes.

**Note:** Landowners are responsible for complying with all applicable local, State, and Federal wetland regulations, including permitting required under these regulations.

Ms. Tanner asked if there should be a deed restriction so that people understand the importance of the wetland buffer. She noted that the buffer would have to be marked.

**Note:** Each unit is to have trash cans picked up by a private trash hauler.

Mr. Coronati said the condo association would handle all maintenance. He said everyone will keep their trash cans in their garage and put them out once a week for trash pickup, but it would all be private handled at no cost to the city.

**Note:** Snow is to be trucked offsite when designated snow storage areas are full.

Ms. Tanner said there should be explicit information and suggested Green SnowPro. She said it should include that there should be someone who understands how to handle snow, salt, sand or whatever else was in the wetland area and that there be a maintenance plan for the filter and so on for that area. Mr. Coronati said they could add the note about the Green SnowPro and it could be included in the condo documents. He said there would be an O&M manual for the stormwater that's already provided to the city as part of their drainage report and as also part of their AOT that would be included in the condo documents.

Ms. Blasko said it seemed like the Commission's packet was incomplete, and said having details like the O&M manual was important. She noted that there would be 100+ people living on the edge of the wetland and their impact could be very significant, so the Commission needed a better idea of what the condo documents say and whether they address their concerns about how the wetland would be taken care of and what would be allowed in that buffer. She said she'd want to know more about the trail – what it looks like, where it's going, what it's made of -- because it would be within the buffer. Mr. Coronati said they would provide a detail for it and a copy for the condo documents.

Mr. Samonas said the efficacy of the long swale would be directly impacted by the residents and it was important that they be made aware of that because if that was where the treated runoff would go, it had to be maintained so that it's clean and treated throughout the process. He asked Mr. Coronati to elaborate on the proposed organic filter berm, noting that it sat pretty close to the property line and what appeared to be back decks. Mr. Coronati said the term filter berm was a fancy name for a pile of stump grindings and would be used instead of a silt fence because it was better suited for the location. He said the filter berm ground up stumps into natural, organic material that was unsightly but temporary. Mr. Samonas asked if there was a grading to it. Mr. Coronati said there wasn't. Mr. Samonas asked if it would be sloping or flat afterwards. Mr. Coronati said the grading was pretty flat behind the units, but the decks were raised and the tenants would be able to walk out. He said there was nothing behind them but lawn or stone and it was out of the buffer, and the plantings and trail would be beyond the filter berm.

Ms. Tanner asked about plans regarding guttering. Mr. Coronati said there were sandy soils, so there were stone drip edges and no gutters on the backs of all the units. Mr. Jankowski said it was an environmentally sensitive area and hoped the condo association adopted some organic land management practices. He said they could get the applicant information from the Northeast Organic Farmers Association (NOFA). He said the Commission didn't want to see toxics or pesticides in that area. Mr. Coronati said they would look into it.

Ms. Blasko asked about the wetland on the adjacent property. Mr. Coronati said that wetland was only 4,522 square feet and didn't have a wetland buffer to it and was entirely off site. Ms. Blasko asked if porous pavement was considered for the parking and driveway areas. Mr. Coronati said

it was a challenge to get the construction equipment in and out while building units and protecting the porous pavement. He said they did consider it but nixed the idea because they felt they had the space to do all the stormwater treatment without needing to do porous pavement.

Chair McMillan asked why the applicant indicated that it was clean stormwater. Mr. Coronati explained that the stormwater goes into the treatment ponds and systems before discharging into the outfalls and everything is treated before it gets to a swale. Chair McMillan asked about the sodium chloride. Mr. Coronati said he felt that the Green SnowPro and the reduction of salt was the main goal in that system and that they would use whatever was recommended. Chair McMillan noted that Mr. Coronati said the filter berm would be removed. She said it didn't always get removed, and she wanted to ensure that it was in the notes. Mr. Coronati said they would add it. He assumed that there would be an inspection. Mr. Britz said the city had a person who did it, and it was easier if it was on the plan.

Chair McMillan said she was concerned about the trail going into the mitigation area for the hospital, noting that the impact would be substantial if people were always walking out there. She said the dog park would also be impactful, especially if the dogs were leashed or not. She said she'd like to see the trail out of the buffer, except for perhaps a small viewing section swooping it. Mr. Coronati said they would do what the city wanted but would need certain amounts of amenities for the public. He said a lot of the trail was in the area that was already cleared and that the trail was an amenity for the residents and public. He said there were ways to handle it, like signage or outdoor doggie bag dispensers, and it would be good to have people out there to see the wildlife and the conservation.

Chair McMillan suggested a site visit. Vice-Chair Collins asked that the 100-ft buffer line be made very visible on all the plans. Chair McMillan asked the applicant to add the vegetation maintenance plan to the overall planting plan.

Vice-Chair Collins said there would be a fair amount of people living in the development and the trail would probably get more use than desired in that sensitive area. She said she didn't think the trail was in a good spot because of the amount of use it would get.

Mr. Samonas asked where the trail would originate from. Mr. Coronati said they proposed a trail at Coach Road. He said the existing sewer easement had a maintenance road that was mostly grass, and the easement went up to Nathaniel Drive. Mr. Samonas said he needed the trail to really be a public amenity, so if it did have great access from Nathaniel Drive, it should be highlighted. He said it should be made aware that the trail would be a longer spanning trail but that it would be maintained in a way that the public knows it could be very sensitive. Mr. Coronati asked what the hope was for Coach Road. He said the trail could head in a different way into the site so that it didn't seem like the public was walking into a development. Vice-Chair Collins said it just needed to be well thought out and have more details.

At this point, it was moved, seconded, and passed to continue the meeting beyond 5:30. Vice-Chair Collins said she wanted to see a robust buffer restoration plan to bring the buffer back to what it could be.

Ms. Tanner moved to **postpone** the Wetland Conditional Use Permit Application to the July 14, 2021 meeting, seconded by Vice-Chair Collins. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 6-0.

Mr. Britz said he would look into some dates for the site walk and inform the Commission and applicant.

### **III. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Britz said a different conference room might be needed for the July 14 meeting.

Ms. Tanner commented that the 3400 Lafayette Road application should have been a work session. Mr. Britz said the applicant should be able to show that they're not impacting the intention for the mitigation. He said the stormwater over the long term was a good point. Ms. Tanner asked whether the super-intensive development should be allowed on the fringes of the wetland, and it was further discussed. Mr. Britz said it was a challenging site and there wasn't a lot on information presented for the Commission to review.

### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
Acting Secretary for the Conservation Commission