

**MINUTES  
CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
SCHOOL DEPARTMENT CONFERENCE ROOM**

**3:30 P.M.**

**MAY 14, 2014**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Vice Chairman Mary Ann Blanchard; Members Allison Tanner, Barbara McMillan, Elissa Hill Stone, Peter Vandermark, Shelley Saunders, Alternate Kimberly Meuse

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Chairman Steve Miller

**ALSO PRESENT:** Peter Britz, Environmental Planner

\*\*\*\*\*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. November 13, 2013
2. December 11, 2013
3. April 9, 2014

Ms. Tanner made a motion to approve the November 13, 2013 minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stone. The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) vote.

Ms. Tanner made a motion to approve the December 11, 2013 minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stone. The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) vote.

Ms. Saunders made a motion to postpone approval of the April 9, 2014 minutes to the June 11, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) vote.

**II. STATE WETLANDS BUREAU PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

- A. Standard Dredge and Fill Application  
529 New Castle Avenue  
William Marconi Revocable Trust et al  
Assessor Map 205, Lots 4 & 5

Mr. Eric Weinrieb of Altus Engineering representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. He stated that the Marconi family had owned the north side of Shapleigh Island since the 1950's, using the fishing pier as a lobster company income, and there were three

parcels under their ownership. They received Planning Board approval for a lot line adjustment for various uses on different parcels. They also applied for a variance for lot coverage because they were slightly over the lot coverage. Mr. Marconi wished to sell one home, continue his lobster business, and downsize his own home, which would be demolished and reconstructed in the same footprint. He also wanted to construct a pervious deck within the 50-foot primary setback of the small expansion as well as a new driveway. The slight expansion of the footprint would be outside the 50-foot setback. There would be 1,400 square feet of temporary impact for the utilities and a permanent impact of 3,390 square feet for the construction of the home.

Ms. McMillan arrived at this point in the meeting.

Ms. Stone asked if they would remove the cesspool. Mr. Weinrieb agreed that they would and said that he met with the building designer about the new draft map having a flood elevation of 9' and 13' across the river. Mr. Britz suggested that they build above the elevation.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stone.

The motion passed (6-0) with Ms. McMillan abstaining.

### III. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

1. Off Spinney Road and Middle Road  
 Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Ky Anderson Revocable Trust, owners  
 Spinney Road Land Holdings, LLC Applicant  
 Assessor Map 16, Lots 5 & 24  
*(This item was postponed at the April 9, 2014 meeting to the May 14, 2014 meeting.)*

Mr. Britz stated that the applicant requested to postpone.

Ms. Tanner moved to postpone the Conditional Use Permit application to the June, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stone.

The motion passed by unanimous (7-0) vote.

2. 209 Gosport Road  
 Christine V. Crockett Revocable Trust, owner  
 Assessor Map 224, Lot 10-12  
*(This item was postponed at the April 9, 2014 meeting to the May 14, 2014 meeting.)*

Mr. Britz updated the Commission on the current status of the application. He stated that the owner wanted to site a house, and the Commission had recommended denial of the first state permit application due to impacts to the buffer. The second application showed the impacts on the tidal wetland buffer and the freshwater buffer in the Tucker's Cove subdivision. The Commission had recommended that it be postponed, but the issue was whether or not it had

correctly gone before the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board because of an existing settlement agreement pertaining to how the subdivision lots would be handled. The lots were grandfathered to be single family lots, so the Legal Department interpreted it that a home could be built on each of the lots in the subdivision based on the approved plan. The applicant's lot was one of those lots. When the Tucker's Cove settlement agreement occurred, the Wetland Ordinance hadn't been adopted at the time. The settlement agreement stated that certain properties would be automatically granted Conditional Use Approval to build houses where shown on the subject lots. Other lots needed a minimum of 25 feet if they had adjacent wetland.

At the time of the Ordinance, the size of jurisdictional wetlands was ½ acre. The lot had a wetland that was less than a ½ acre in size. Currently wetlands were regulated with lots of a ¼ acre, or 10,000 square feet. The Legal Department determined that because the settlement was in place at the time, the wetland wasn't jurisdictional and the house could be placed in the buffer of the wetland in front of the property and even in the wetland itself. However, the tidal wetland used to be regulated as a dimensional standard in the Ordinance before it shifted to the section of the ordinance that covers inland wetlands. The jurisdiction for the tidal wetland went to the Board of Adjustment (BOA), so people would need to go to them if they were in the 100-foot setback. In summary, they were allowed to build a house but had to get a variance for the 100-foot buffer, so the application had been withdrawn and the next step was for the applicant to go to the BOA.

Vice-Chair Blanchard asked if the application would go back to the Commission at all. Mr. Britz stated that it would not come back for the construction of the home on that lot. Future additions to this property would be regulated under the existing Ordinance, however.

3. 165 Middle Road  
Christine and Craig Hodgson, owners  
Assessor Plan 168, Lot 17

Mr. Eric Weinrieb of Altus Engineering representing the owners and the owner Mr. Craig Hodgson were present to speak to the application. Mr. Weinrieb stated that the Hodgsons purchased some extra land from the Sanderson subdivision. They had a small lot, and the house was built in the early 1920's when setbacks were not an issue. They had no garage and a small driveway that was 275 square feet with room for one car. When the Sanderson development was done, a functions and values assessment was done that identified the entire wetland, and Mr. Mark West of West Environmental had verified that it was accurate. They were proposing a two-car garage with a small area in-between to break up the mass and provide space so that the driveway did not go up against the house. They had few options for alternatives because the existing house did not meet the front setback. The minimum size of a standard garage was 26' x 26', and their garage would have two bays and would not be excessive. There was no other place to cite the garage on the property. They could not move it forward because it would be up against the front setback. It would be 32.9 feet away from the wetland at the closest point, and they had no other options but to expand within the buffer. They would naturalize within the 50-foot buffer by letting the ground cover spread.

Mr. Weinreib stated that the City had made improvements in 2012 to Middle Road by rebuilding sidewalks and reconstructing the drainage structure that was entirely in the buffer, yet had received no Conditional User Permit. Their project would impact less by having stone drip edges and by naturalizing with forsythia, which would have a low impact on the buffer. He said that it wasn't much different from his previous project in the Woodlands, which was 12' from the wetland, and even though it was in an area of concern, it was not a sensitive watershed because it naturally discharged back into the City drainage.

Ms. Tanner asked how many trees would be cut down and was told none. She asked if the proposed driveway would be pervious. Mr. Weinreib stated that it was shown as conventional pavement, but they could do a pervious driveway if requested. Ms. Tanner stated that the applicant was adding a lot of impervious material. Mr. Weinreib said he would agree to a stipulation. Ms. Stone referred to the Woodlands project and said there was a rain garden that received the roof water. Mr. Weinreib stated that they had not taken any runoff from the roof because it was too close, so they planted some blueberries. Ms. Stone asked if they could do something similar with the new project instead of forsythia which did not naturalize. Mr. Weinreib replied that they could do additional plantings to take up some of the nutrients, but the soil wasn't compatible with a rain garden, so he suggested blueberries.

Vice-Chair Blanchard referred to Mr. Britz's memo which addressed the need for a more robust planting plan, and she asked if Mr. Weinreib had come up with anything definite. Mr. Weinreib stated that he had not talked about it with the homeowner, but if they did a pervious pavement, they could do some enhancements. Ms. McMillan asked how much fill would be used. Mr. Weinreib stated that there was some elevation change, and they had discussed the options of building a retaining wall by the garage or making it all structural with a basement underneath. Ms. McMillan asked where the stairs would go, and Mr. Weinreib replied that they would come out of the basement and go up to the existing deck.

Vice-Chair Blanchard asked if there would be a roof runoff modification on the existing house, and Mr. Weinreib stated that they would not put one out back, but the front had a downspout that discharged to the lawn, which they would extend to the end of the house to treat the runoff. Mr. Britz asked if they were going to extend the drainage from the street. Mr. Weinreib stated that the City would do it. They further discussed the subdivision approval process and the fact that the City had no easement at the time.

Ms. McMillan asked if there was a stream in back of the property. Mr. Weinreib stated that there was not. On a previous application for a single family residence, they discovered that they did not need to provide a functions and values assessment report and had simply used the City wetland map. Vice-Chair Blanchard requested a more defined impervious surface map and a planting plan to balance and offset the impact of the new impervious surface, which she believed was significant compared to the size of the house and the fact that it was in the wetland buffer. Mr. Weinreib stated that they would make the driveway pervious and add more landscaping improvements. Vice-Chair Blanchard asked if they could reduce the impervious surface aside from the driveway. Mr. Weinreib stated that they were removing the driveway on one side. Ms. Saunders thought that the removal of the old driveway and the pervious new driveway would offset the buffer, especially with a more robust planting plan.

Ms. Saunders moved to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) That a pervious driveway is installed.
- 2) That a more robust planting plan is integrated into the project.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed (6-1) with Mr. Vandermark opposed.

4. 147 Walker Bungalow Road  
Roxanne S. Tooker Revocable Trust of 2008, owner  
Assessor Plan 205, Lot 5

Ms. Susan Faretra of Faretra Septic Design Company representing the owner was present to speak to the application. She stated that the house was for sale, and during the inspection it was discovered that the existing septic system was failing. The wetland in the back had poorly drained soil. She showed where the 100-foot buffer came up to. The property was small, with a lot of ledge, and the existing system had a leach field that was also failing. She designed an aerobic pretreatment system that included a stone and pipe leach field. The treatment tank was larger than the original tank and the leach field was the same size or larger than the existing leach field. The State allowed a small leach field, and in their case, the wastewater was treated inside the tank rather than in the soil and then disposed of in the leach field. Because the leach field was higher than the original one, they had to add a small pump chamber to lift it, which would be a temporary impact into the buffer. The permanent impact was the area where the leach field was graded. It would go from lawn to lawn, with no trees cut and no other construction other than removing the tank. They would reseed the lawn. It would be a total impact of 1,321 square feet, but only 403 square feet would be a permanent impact.

Vice-Chair Blanchard asked if it was the maximum size the house could take. Mr. Faretra agreed. She stated that, with the Clean Solution system, the sizes, tanks and fields were per the number of bedrooms and the type of soils. As the number of beds went up, the size of the leach field also went up. The minimum size for the property would have been 75 square feet, but she had provided 91 square feet to add a little bit of buffer.

Ms. Tanner asked how far the leach field was from the wetland. Ms. Faretra stated that it was 63-1/2 feet, with the temporary impact being about 45 feet. Vice-Chair Blanchard asked how old the house was. Ms. Faretra said it was built in 1957. She submitted it to the State to review for approval, but there had been a minor adjustment with the number of bedrooms that the State would approve, which had come into effect back in 1967. She explained the subdivision review approval process and stated that the house was built to all the requirements. The house originally had two bedrooms, but at some point turned into a three-bedroom home, after the State requirements. The State would only approve it as a two-bedroom home, which was what they were seeking approval for. The leach field and tank had not changed. Vice-Chair Blanchard stated that she had no problem approving it but when the sale went forward, the buyers had to understand that it was approved for two bedrooms. Ms. Faretra assured her that they would. The plan would go on record with the State.

Ms. Stone asked if the plan got filed with the Registry, and Ms. Faretra told her no. Ms. McMillan asked what the difference in maintenance would be. Ms. Faretra stated that there was a maintenance contract signed by the owner and then passed down to subsequent owners that had to be looked at every two years. She explained how the system worked and said the septic needed to be pumped regularly. Ms. McMillan asked what would happen if it failed. Ms. Faretra said that it could fail if it wasn't maintained regularly. Vice-Chair Blanchard asked what the average life span of the traditional leach field was. Ms. Faretra told her it was up to 50 years.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. McMillan.

The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

5. 200 Spaulding Turnpike  
New England Marine & Industrial, Inc., owner  
Subaru of New England, Inc. applicant  
Assessor Plan 237, Lot 56

Vice-Chair Blanchard and Ms. McMillan recused themselves, and the meeting was turned over to Ms. Tanner. Ms. Tanner moved to nominate Ms. Saunders as temporary chairperson for the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vandermark. The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) vote.

Mr. John Lorden of MSC Engineers and Land Surveyors, Environmental Scientist Mr. Jim Gove, Legal Counsel Attorneys Timothy Phoenix and Mr. John Kucinivich and an associate of Subaru New England were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Lorden stated that the existing lot was 21 acres. New England Fishing Gear had the southern part of the lot, and the northern part was vacant. There were two zones, one of which was the General Business Zone with approximately of 150 square feet and the back lot was 300 square feet. It was a difficult lot, due to the wetlands, buffers and sloping topography. They would subdivide the property, and New England Fishing Gear would remain on the southern nine acres, while 12 acres would be for the Subaru dealership. The proposed building was 30,050 square feet and the footprint itself was 19,150 square feet. The lot was currently vacant. There was no other option without disturbing the wetlands or buffers. They had managed to stay outside of the wetlands completely, but they would disrupt the wetland buffer.

Originally, parking was going to be in the Residential Zone and part of the building and parking in the actual wetlands, but they had pulled it all back. They were proposing access from Echo Avenue with an access easement through the New England Fishing Gear property. They would increase the shared 19-foot wide driveway to 25 feet wide and provide 66 parking spaces. The pavement would be porous, and the grading termination along the site would be the sewer line. The entry way and parking would be standard pavement, but everything else would be porous for the storm water runoff. The runoff from the building would be collected and put in the reservoir section of the porous pavement, which would protect the wetlands.

Mr. Gove stated that the wetlands were divided up into four areas. The area was an active upland wildlife travel corridor, with rabbits, deer and coyotes. The vegetation came up thick, much less so in the woodland area adjacent to the highway. The functional assessment that was done found that the upper area had the wildlife habitat, and because of its size, it provided some storm water management from runoff that came from residential areas to the north and east. The stream habitat was a wetland that didn't trap water and had no real function. Another area had a limited function of controlling runoff. Wetland 1 was the most valuable wetland. Their analysis showed that wildlife would still move back and forth.

Ms. Tanner asked how many feet of impervious surface there were. Mr. Lorden stated that it was usually a 5-1 ratio, and they were closer to 3-1. Ms. Tanner asked how many trees would be cut down. Mr. Lorden stated that all the trees on their property would be removed. Mr. Vandermark asked Mr. Lorden to explain the reservoir. Mr. Lorden stated there were different levels of filtration that went into a reservoir with a depth of crushed stone. Ms. Stone noted that when the Commission went on the site walk, they had scared off a few ducks, avoided coyote scat, and noticed a foxhole. She thought that Wetland 1 was diverse with plants, as compared to what was shown in the photos. She thought more information was necessary.

Mr. Britz stated that the Ordinance allowed for the Planning Director to authorize independent studies, which he felt should be done on a project of that size. He had sent a letter to RCCD letting them know he would be asking them and the applicant to sign a three party agreement with the City. If the Commission wanted to add any studies to it, it was the appropriate time to discuss it. He felt it was important to get a second opinion on the work done by Mr. Gove. Ms. Tanner thought that hydrology would be an important study.

**Ms. Saunders opened up the public speaking session.**

Mr. Joe Caldarola of 170 Dennett Street stated that he was a developer and had helped build a subdivision in Durham where porous pavement like the applicant's had been designed and directed to an outflow on the upland side of the buffer. The overflow was not treated and had to be managed by the buffer. The applicant had a situation where the entire buffer was being developed and the overflow was being directed into the wetland, and he asked that the Commission insist on a third-party consultant. A car dealer required most of the buffer, and other commercial uses would require less of it, and that was the balance that had to be met.

Mr. Kucinivich addressed Mr. Caldarola's issue and stated that they had hired someone to design the pervious pavement. Their ratio was good because the site would house a dealership with the ability to have more pervious pavement because it would not have a high use of storing cars on it. It would allow a lesser chance of overflow into wetlands because it was over-designed by the nature of its use. Car dealerships were the perfect users of pervious pavement because of new cars that were sealed and would not contaminate like older cars with oil leaks.

Mr. David Palumbo of 181 Echo Avenue stated that his property was 130 feet from the proposed road and he saw a lot of deer and rabbit when he walked his dog. He was concerned about the

trees because they acted as a buffer for not only traffic noise but also traffic pollution from the turnpike. He pleaded with the Commission to get a second opinion about the wetlands. Ms. Kate Mallen of 140 Woodlawn Circle stated that she had lived there for 45 years. She brought up the negative impact on the wetlands and the tree clear cutting and said she had read the Subaru website, where it was noted that their corporate responsibility policy was that “they employed environmental practices and considerations that helped protect the environment, and they were committed to being a leader in environmental initiatives and would continue to reduce their own footprint. Being green wasn’t a trend, it was who they were and what they stood for.” She felt it was a conflict of what the applicant purported to be and what they wanted to do.

Mr. Kucinivich stated that all of the large trees were getting cut, but he had confirmed with the City Attorney that they had the right to cut down 2/3 of the trees because they were not in the buffer zone and they were less than 50% of the trees in the limited cut area, so they were not dealing with 100 trees. They had also provided an arborist report stating that the trees were at the end of their life cycle and were dangerous because they could fall over. He referred to the Conditional Use Permit Ordinance stating that the alteration of the natural vegetative state of managed woodland would occur only to the extent necessary to achieve construction goals. The trees were not native species so they could not be considered under a Conditional Use Permit. They looked at other uses for the site, but the strip was so narrow and access so limited that any development of the site would involve the tree cutting. They would suggest extensive planting and screening towards the neighbors houses and their backyards because any screening toward the building wouldn’t be effective due to the topography. A solid building would screen more noise and pollution from the highway than dying trees. The arborist had recommended that the trees be taken down and not simply culled.

Mr. Bruce Osborne of 2 Echo Avenue was concerned about what would happen with snow removal if there were parking for 300 cars. As far as new cars being on the lot and not doing harm to the pervious pavement, he asked about the people who would purchase cars and leave their old cars with leaking oil and antifreeze for resale.

Ms. Cathy Cosgrove of 174 Echo Avenue supported Mr. Britz’s recommendation for additional studies because she challenged the conclusion that the development would not have an impact. She referred to Criteria #3 under the Zoning Ordinance that stated there would be no adverse impact to the wetland functional values of the site and adjoining properties.

Ms. Lenore Weiss Bronson of 28 Woodbury Avenue stated that she used to be on the Trees and Greenery Committee and people had concerns about trees on property. She did not recall anyone from the neighborhood stating that the trees were a danger, and she had also walked in the area and hadn’t noticed dying trees. She was also concerned about Hodgson Brook, which could be affected by the disturbance to the wetlands. At a previous neighborhood meeting with Subaru, someone had asked if the project would be beneficial to the neighborhood, and Subaru had admitted that it would not be. She felt that the land did not have to be developed.

Ms. Saunders asked Mr. Kucinivich if the tree plantings were in the site plan. He said they were not but were still being finalized. He disagreed that the project was not beneficial and stated that



Subaru was environmentally conscious. He noted that the site lines from the houses looked onto high tension wires, and that kind of view was one of the greatest factors in suppressing residential values.

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street was concerned about the Planning Board meeting the following night when the applicant would file for a Conditional Use Permit. He assumed that the Conservation Board and Mr. Britz would notify the Planning Board that they were seeking more testing because it would make it easier for the Planning Board if they knew there were ongoing studies and that they should wait for the recommendations. Mr. Britz responded that in a case like the applicant's, if the Conservation Commission recommended postponing, the Planning Board would usually postpone as well.

Mr. Kucinivich stated that they planned to go to the Planning Board or at least make an introductory presentation. If the Planning Board wanted additional information that the Conservation Commission had not requested, they applicant wanted to get it all done at once and keep the process moving.

Ms. Saunders closed the public comment session.

Mr. Britz noted that he had not seen the porous pavement in the plan. Mr. Loring agreed that it was not in the packet. It was in the set of plans for site review and had been in the design all along. Ms. Saunders told him that it would have been important for the Board to review.

Ms. Tanner moved to postpone the application to the June 11, 2014 meeting for the following reasons:

- 1) That a report of an independent arborist be provided to review the report provided by the applicant.
- 2) That a drainage analysis be conducted which will look into what will happen to the overflow of storm water from the site looking specifically at the impacts to Hodgson Brook.
- 3) That an independent wetland scientist be provided to assess the site.

Mr. Britz asked about a drainage study and whether they would need a hydrologist. Ms. Tanner thought that a drainage analysis and independent study would be fine to determine what would happen to the overflow on the site and its effect on Hodgson Brook.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Stone. The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) vote.

#### **IV. WORK SESSION**

##### **1. Wholey Way**

The owner Mr. Hank Brandt was present to speak to the application. The proposed lot was on the corner lot on Echo Avenue and Wholey Way. About five years before, he and his wife had applied to the Planning Board for a lot line adjustment to create a buildable lot. It was approved in 2011, but the Wetland Ordinance had changed while they were going through the process and

required a buffer for the wetland. A buffer would consume the entire buildable area on the lot. Because they made the application prior to the Ordinance change, they felt they should not be bound by it. However, since the approval came after the Ordinance change, the Planning Board felt that they should be bound by it. They thought a Conditional Use Permit to build within the buffer area would resolve the issue. The buildable area was very tight and bordered its sides by site line setbacks, the wetland, and a cemetery, the latter of which had 25 feet of a no-construction buffer to it.

Vice-Chair Blanchard didn't see the wetlands line and asked if the house would be out of the wetland buffer. Mr. Brandt stated that it would be built right up to the edge of the wetland itself, not the buffer. Vice-Chair Blanchard asked if he had considered reconfiguring the footprint. Mr. Brandt said there was not much configuring to be done because it was a rectangular footprint. Vice-Chair Blanchard asked what the building's depth was, and Mr. Brandt replied 28'x40'.

To find an equitable tradeoff, Mr. Brandt said he was considering revamping the cul-de-sac turnaround, which was 100 feet in diameter and enormous. The water drained down Wholey Way into a catch basin and then into the wetland area. He wanted to eliminate some of it by placing a green island in the center of it to replace a portion of the asphalt. If he left a 20-foot passageway around the perimeter, the green island could be 60 feet in diameter and would provide a 3,000 square-foot increase in green space. With the 1,000 square feet of building footprint, they would create three times the amount of green space as the building would take up.

Ms. Tanner noted that a City road was 24 feet wide, not 20 feet. Mr. Brandt stated that he had not talked to the City about the road, but if the cul-de-sac went one way only and were a single lane, it could be narrower. The City owned the street, but he was proposing to pay for the alteration. Ms. McMillan asked if there were catch basins in the cul-de-sac. Mr. Brandt replied that there were not, but everything went from the top of the cul-de-sac down to the catch basins. One of the Commissioners asked if it could be a bioretention center instead of a green area or an engineered rain garden. Mr. Britz said it would get some flow but not much.

Vice-Chair Blanchard asked if there were any catch basins in the Wholey Way development. Mr. Brandt replied that there were two. Vice-Chair Blanchard asked how much of the structure was in the buffer, and Mr. Brandt told her it was 100%. Ms. Saunders asked if trees would have to be removed. Mr. Brandt replied that the only trees removed would be for the building. Ms. Tanner asked if he could get a variance for the cemetery setback. Mr. Brandt replied that it was a State RSA and not a Municipal regulation, so he did not think he could.

Ms. Tanner stated that he would be completely in the buffer, and it might be a positive thing to get more impervious area and remove the center of the paved surface and create a treatment area, even a green island. However, she thought the basement could change the hydrology. Mr. Brandt talked about equitability and said their application had been submitted prior to the change to the wetland Ordinance, so he and his wife were trying to find a way to make it work. He was offering 3,000 square feet of impervious surface as a tradeoff for 1,000 square feet of impact.

Ms. Saunders asked if he had considered building a house with no basement. Mr. Brandt stated that it was a topography issue and they would not have to do much excavation. It would be a daylight basement and not below the wetland elevation.

Mr. Vandermark asked if the neighbors would buy into the cul-de-sac. Mr. Brandt didn't know for sure and commented that some people thought Wholey Way as an on-ramp to Spaulding Turnpike because it was so big. Mr. Britz suggested checking what the engineering costs would be because it might not be worth it.

## **V. NEW BUSINESS**

Vice-Chairman Blanchard stated that she met with Mr. Britz to discuss a tentative work session for the Commission in terms on ongoing work and continuing responsibilities. She asked the Commissioners to let Mr. Britz know their ideas for an agenda.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

At 5:45 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
Acting Conservation Commission Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Conservation Commission meeting on August 13, 2014.