

MINUTES

CONSERVATION COMMISSION

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

3:30 p.m.

July 8, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Steve Miller; Vice Chairman MaryAnn Blanchard; Members, Barbara McMillan, Allison Tanner, Kate Zamarchi, and Alternates, Kimberly Meuse, and Adrienne Harrison

MEMBERS ABSENT: Matthew Cardin, Samantha Wright

ALSO PRESENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner/Sustainability Coordinator

.....
Chairman Miller stated that all Committee members would be voting today.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. June 10, 2015

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to approve the minutes with the following amendments.

Page 5, third line “branches” should read “roots”

Page 9, second paragraph “as an abutter” should read “Portsmouth resident looking to purchase one of the 5 new homes”

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Review of Recommendation:
Standard Dredge and Fill Application
99 Bow Street
Martingale, LLC, Owner
Assessor Map 106, Lot 54

Ms. McMillan made a motion to withdraw the application (at the request of the owner).
Ms. Tanner seconded the motion.

The motion to withdraw the application passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

III. STATE WETLANDS BUREAU PERMIT APPLICATIONS

- A. Minimum Impact Expedited Application
Peirce Island
City of Portsmouth, Owner
Assessor Map 208, Lot 1

Duncan Mellor from Tighe and Bond was present to speak to the application. The project plans list Waterfront Engineers as the Project Engineers. However, Waterfront Engineers was recently purchased by Tighe and Bond. The project is the same as it was previously and the same engineers are working on the project, but the ownership is different. The project area is the back channel side of Peirce Island. It is the area referred to as the dog walk area. People and dogs are cutting down from the path to the beach. This has resulted in a loss of vegetation and subsequent erosion. In addition, the effects of trampling on the salt marsh are evident. The worst area is on the path near the bench. People have been cutting down to the beach in this area and it has eroded the bank. Mr. Mellor showed several other areas where the bank is eroding. They are proposing to stabilize just the local areas of erosion caused by people and/or dogs. They are not proposing to stabilize the areas of bank undercut by wave action. They will fit rocks into the eroded areas to stabilize them. They will also install plantings. Stone steps will be added to provide an area for people to go down to the beach. The stone steps will be set into the bank. This has been refined with the building inspector. It was agreed upon that no railing was needed for the steps. They will also be pulling in a section of the timber path in order to create more of a separation from the back channel and allowing a vegetative buffer between the path and the water. Plants such as Virginia Rose will be planted in this area.

Ms. Tanner inquired about how to discourage people from cutting down to the beach by installing a rail, chains or ropes.

Mr. Mellor stated that they opted to move away from the structural type of barrier. They will be installing signage in the area to discourage people from walking on the salt marsh.

Mr. Britz stated that there is cooperation and input from the Peirce Island Committee. This was a Standard Dredge and Fill Application. However, it is now an Expedited Application due to the fact that the rocks being installed (which were going to be below the highest observable tide line) are now above the highest observable tide line.

Ms. Zamarchi stated that she had an issue with the stairs. She wouldn't put them in at all. She wondered whether signage would be enough to discourage people from walking on the marsh.

Mr. Britz stated that without the stairs, erosion would continue.

Ms. Zamarchi stated that education of the public as to why this is being done is important.

Chairman Miller stated that the signs located at Wagon Hill Farm are very well done and a model to be followed.

Ms. Harrison inquired as to whether there was any way to put in low impact temporary fencing to change the behavior of people. She inquired if areas of wave erosion are evident around the stairs and wondered whether the stairs would contribute to the erosion problem.

Mr. Britz stated that once the plantings go in, a construction fence could be left in place for a while to deter people and dogs from cutting across the area. He stated it isn't necessarily the people, but rather the dogs causing an impact. A railing alone wouldn't stop the dogs.

Mr. Mellor stated that the area will probably stabilize over time, but they did not focus on erosion from wave action, only that from people and dogs.

Chairman Miller inquired about a closure time period for the area.

Mr. Mellor stated that total closure time would be 3 (or more) years. As far as the erosion, the stairs would not contribute to the erosion problem. It is the undercutting wave action that is contributing to the erosion problem, but again they are focused on the problem of manmade erosion.

Mr. Britz stated that the time period for closure would be a good amount of time for the plantings to become established.

Ms. McMillan inquired as to whether infiltration steps were considered as opposed to solid stone.

Mr. Mellor stated that the steps are permeable and that water will go through them. There is a crushed gravel base under the steps. Joints between the stones will not be mortared.

Ms. McMillan inquired about the size of the steps.

Mr. Mellor stated that they have a 15" tread with a 6.7" riser (to match the slope).

Ms. McMillan inquired about what will be on either side of the steps.

Mr. Mellor stated riprap stones with a gravel base will be on either side of the steps.

Ms. McMillan inquired if Mr. Mellor was confident that erosion will not occur on either side of the steps.

Mr. Mellor stated that erosion could progress further down the bank beyond the limits of what they are doing.

Ms. Harrison inquired if plants could be located where riprap is proposed.

Mr. Mellor stated that it is a steep slope. However, plants could be installed at the base.

Ms. McMillan inquired about meeting with the Peirce Island Committee.

Mr. Britz stated that a site walk for the Conservation Commission to be followed with a dialogue with the Peirce Island Committee would be helpful.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Miller asked for a motion. Ms. Tanner made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. McMillan

Chairman Miller called for discussion.

Ms. McMillan asked about including a stipulation around plants replacing the riprap.

Mr. Britz stated that the permit can be adjusted to accomplish this.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Miller called for the vote. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

B. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
Peirce Island Waste Water Treatment Facility
City of Portsmouth, Owner
Assessor Map 208, Lot 1

Jeff Clifford from Altus Engineering was present to speak to the application. Terry Desmarais City of Portsmouth Engineer, Eric Meserve and John Pierce from AECOM, and Adele Fiorillo from Normandeau Associates were also present to speak to the application. There are 2 Dredge and Fill Applications before the Conservation Commission this evening.

Mr. Desmarais provided an overview of the project. This project is an upgrade of the existing Peirce Island Treatment Facility. The plant was built in 1964 and has been upgraded several times. The level of treatment is primary; the lowest level of treatment available. In 1972, the Clean Water Act was passed and requires a second level of treatment. From 1985-2007, the facility operated with a waiver to allowing primary treatment only. In 2007, the facility was issued a permit for secondary treatment. They could not upgrade so entered into a Consent Decree with the EPA. Currently, the design is 75% complete. What is currently proposed is one level higher than secondary treatment.

There have been numerous iterations of a Site Plan. He showed the existing and proposed facilities on a map. The project in its current form could go on for 3 or more years.

During that time, there will be construction fencing in place for public safety and the treatment plant will be closed. There are 2 areas for year round staging; one at the dog park and one adjacent to the treatment plant itself. These areas would be used for construction trailers, equipment storage, and anything for which the contractor would need extra staging.

Ms. Tanner inquired about why fencing is needed all the way down Marcy Street

Mr. Desmarais stated that it is up to Marcy Street, but not down the street, and it is for public safety. He stated that people would still be able to use Four-tree Island.

Mr. Meserve described facets of the project (erosion mitigation, landscaping, stormwater treatment). He stated that another facet of the project is equipment replacement and rehabilitation for the existing treatment plant, much of which is 30-50 years old. All buildings are being designed to match the existing masonry or concrete exterior, and flat roof. There are 3 revetment areas and that is the reason for the second permit application. He went on to describe the revetment areas in detail using the maps and plans.

Mr. Clifford presented the plan for stormwater management for the site in terms of what is most appropriate. There are site constraints. The site has 2 drain outfalls. It is 3.7 acres within the fence (everything is staying within the fence for this project). One outfall is undersized and will be replaced. There is a spill prevention plan. There is not a lot of room on site for a raingarden, but they have located one on site. The roof runoff will go to a level spreader and will flow over a vegetated area. Silt barriers and silt fences will be installed. The contractor will hire a third party to implement the plan and provide weekly reports as well as reports for large events. There will be 2 temporary construction access points for scrubbing tires as vehicles leave the site.

The reason for permits is that the site has 100' tidal buffer zone. Some areas will have temporary impacts and some will have permanent impacts. There is also work that will be done below the HOTL and that is the reason for the second permit.

Adele Fiorillo with Normandeau Associates spoke to the environmental findings/impacts for the project. The project site is surrounded by tidal waters. They delineated the highest observable tide line (defined as the limit of the tide, or where salt tolerant vegetation ends). They also delineated fresh water wetlands, of which there were two small pockets. Ms. Fiorillo showed the location of these wetlands using aerial photography. She stated that she will refer to the two applications as the "Facility Application" and the "Revetment Application." The applicant does not need a Shoreland Zoning permit, but they do need to meet Shoreland Performance Standards. They have done so in the Facility Application. She demonstrated, using the plans, where there will be temporary as well as permanent impacts. They requested data from the Natural Heritage Program on rare and endangered species. The program asked them to survey for Saltmarsh Elder, a shrub. They found 4 populations. The Natural Heritage Program determined that the project will not have an impact on that species. She described impacts to resources. Title buffer zone impacts are primarily from staging. There will be 1,430s.f. of impact for

temporary staging activities. This will be restored back to current use when the project has been completed. Permanent impacts total 34,515s.f. Wetland (scrub/shrub) impacts total 1,030s.f. The recommendation for this area is to stabilize it at the end of the construction period. There is 1,040s.f. of tidal water impact associated with the revetments.

Ms. McMillan clarified that the applicant will be doing the work from land for the revetments.

Eric Meserve stated that this was correct.

Ms. Fiorillo stated that there would be very few permanent impacts because they've designed and planned so as to avoid this. They looked at the wildlife value for the plantings. They are planting shrubs good for song, shore and marsh birds. There are a lot of invasives on site including honeysuckle, barberry, bittersweet, garlic mustard, etc. They will have an invasive species management plan. Eradication would be optimistic while control of invasives is more realistic. This is a repair project, but they do need to mitigate for permanent tidal buffer zone impact (totaling 7,505s.f.).

Vice Chairman Blanchard asked about stockpiling earth in staging areas and what would be done to mitigate runoff.

Mr. Clifford stated that if the excavated earth is going to be there for a while, it will be seeded. A barrier could also be put at the bottom. Alternatively, it could be covered.

Mr. Desmarais stated that given the limited area of staging, a contractor won't be storing anything for too long.

Ms. Meuse inquired about the 100-year storm.

Eric Meserve stated that most of this work will be conducted well above the 100-year storm line. The lowest grade at the plant is 15; most of it is at 20-30.

Ms. McMillan inquired about work on the entrance roadway other than paving.

Mr. Clifford stated that they will be doing underground work, replacing the water main and adding new electric service. There will be no curbing added.

Ms. McMillan inquired about the revetment plan, and whether the applicant would be adding vegetation.

Mr. Clifford stated that it is only riprap.

Ms. Fiorillo offered that that landscape architect is proposing Virginia Creeper to cover the riprap area.

Ms. McMillan inquired about the staging of construction materials and whether the entire site will be open at the same time.

Mr. Clifford stated that they have to keep the plants running simultaneously so they won't be able to work on all buildings at once. They will be moving from building to building.

Ms. Tanner wondered about the plan for handling invasives.

Ms. Fiorillo stated that they had to commit to a certain time frame with NH DES. The invasives plan has to be submitted by September 1, 2015. The applicant plans to request a work session with the Conservation Commission before September.

Vice Chairman Blanchard stated that it would be helpful to have it on the August Conservation Commission agenda.

Ms. Fiorillo stated that there would be a project specific invasive species management plan.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Miller asked for a motion. Vice Chairman Blanchard made a motion to recommend approval of the facilities application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tanner.

Chairman Miller called for discussion.

Ms. McMillan inquired about restoring the wetland area. She would like to add a stipulation for replanting the staging area with a wetland mix designed to deter invasives, and include a monitoring component.

Mr. Britz stated that this will be covered between the contractor and the City. There is a one-year warranty period. The applicant must go back after one year to ensure that the plantings have taken hold.

Vice Chairman Blanchard felt that it would be best that this be included by the Commission.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Miller called for the vote. The motion to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

- C. Minimum Impact Expedited Application
Peirce Island Waste Water Treatment Facility Revetment
City of Portsmouth, Owner
Assessor Map 208, Lot 1

Revetment was discussed with the Standard Dredge and Fill facilities application in Item B.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Miller asked for a motion. Vice Chairman Blanchard made a motion to recommend approval of the Revetment Application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. McMillan.

Chairman Miller called for discussion.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Miller called for the vote. The motion to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

D. Minimum Impact Expedited Application
248 New Castle Avenue
Richard and Janice Henderson, Owners
Assessor Map 207, Lot 73

Steve Riker with Ambit Engineering was present to speak to the application. Richard Henderson, owner, was also present. The owners would like to make site improvements. There is a proposed porch and steps on the side of the building and a 2-story addition. There is an existing entryway on the back. They are proposing to move it slightly. There is a proposed 24' X 24' garage. There is a walkway and driveway. There is a proposed drip edge around the garage.

Chairman Miller inquired about 3 tree clumps that will be removed. Mr. Henderson confirmed that they would remove them.

Mr. Riker spoke to impacts. There will be 1,944s.f. of permanent impact and 1,412s.f of temporary impact.

Chairman Miller confirmed the pre and post-construction impervious area numbers.

Ms. Tanner inquired about the gravel driveway.

Mr. Riker stated that the gravel driveway is being removed and it will be lawn.

Ms. Tanner inquired if the applicant really wanted that much area to mow.

Chairman Miller inquired about additional plantings in the front; something that will reclaim the soil.

Mr. Riker stated that there are some small plantings in front of the house. The plan that the Conservation Commission has does not show some of the plantings. The owners would be open to additional plantings.

Chairman Miller stated that more information is helpful and that they like to see what the plantings will be. The Commission is looking for changes in impervious flow and improvements to water quality. The site is across from the marsh, so keeping the flow away from the marsh is desirable.

Ms. Zamarchi inquired about further details for the drip edge.

Mr. Riker described the drip edge. It is a subsurface storage area for water that would drip off the roof if gutters are not there.

Ms. McMillan asked if the drip edge was just around the house or around the garage too.

Mr. Riker stated that the drip edge is just around the garage. There is some gravel around the house now, but it isn't a true engineered drip edge.

Ms. McMillan stated that this may be a good site for a raingarden.

Ms. Tanner stated that slowing the flow of the water should be considered.

Chairman Miller stated that gutters provide the opportunity to direct water to the raingarden.

Mr. Riker stated that gutters could be added.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Miller asked for a motion. Ms. Tanner made a motion to recommend approval of the expedited application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented with the stipulation as noted below. The motion was seconded by Ms. Zamarchi.

Chairman Miller called for discussion.

Ms. McMillan stated that if there are going to be gutters, then a raingarden would be helpful. It depends on where the gutters and downspouts are though.

Mr. Riker pointed out on the drawings where there are several locations to put a raingarden.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Miller called for the vote. The motion to recommend approval of the Revetment application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented with the stipulation as noted passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Stipulation:

1) The applicant shall install a raingarden (to be sized appropriately to handle runoff) and manage the flow from the roof of the house and the addition.

Ms. McMillan left at this point in the meeting.

III. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

- A. 1163 Sagamore Avenue
Chinburg Builders, Owner
Assessor Map 224, Lot 17
(This item was postponed at the June 10, 2015 meeting)

Colin Dinsmore with Ambit Engineering was present to speak to the application. Steve Riker with Ambit Engineering was also present. Presently, the Loyal Order of Moose Lodge occupies the site. It is a 7,300s.f building with a large parking lot. Proposed is a 10-unit residential building with a new driveway and a stormwater drainage system. The parking lot will be removed. There is currently no stormwater treatment or detention system. Runoff flows (untreated) into Sagamore Creek. The stormwater system will consist of a micropool extended detention pond on the east side of the driveway and 2 raingardens on the west side of the driveway. All stormwater will be treated and discharged into the impact area/100' wetland buffer. NH DES has regulations that with proximity to a steep slope, there shall be no infiltration. They are not anticipating infiltration on the site. There is a wetland across Sagamore Avenue. The project proposes a public sewer main that will be extended with the project and that will be within the 100' wetland buffer. On May 29th 2015, a CUP was submitted depicting 9,682s.f of disturbance. The applicant met with TAC shortly thereafter. TAC provided comments and the applicant subsequently revised their CUP. TAC had concerns about the 3 outfall locations. The recommendation was to reduce that to 2 outfall locations. The applicant has done so. The previous outfalls extended onto City property. The applicant revised that and most of the outfall will now be on site. Mr. Dinsmore showed on the drawings where there would still be outfall on City property. On June 30th, 2015, there was a follow-up at the TAC meeting. TAC recommended extending the riprap swale up to the edge of the wetland. The applicant anticipates they will have to submit another revised CUP application once they finalize the design for the outfall. They are here today to get comments/input for the design from the Commission. There is a stipulation from TAC that a new drainage outfall will need to be approved by DPW. There will be 409s.f. of impact on City property (this has been reduced from 649s.f.). The applicant submitted a revised CUP application on June 25th, 2015.

Chairman Miller inquired about the need for a CUP.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that there are two impacts; one for the sewer main extension and one associated with construction of the site and the stormwater system. He stated that there will only be temporary impacts associated with installing the stormwater outfall. There will be no impervious area in the 100' buffer. The current parking lot (within the 100' buffer) will be removed.

Chairman Miller inquired about the reduction in impervious surface.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that the reduction in impervious surface (as outlined in the application letter in the last paragraph, section 5) on site is 4,406s.f.; 985s.f. of which is within the 100' buffer.

Mr. Britz inquired about an existing conditions plan for the parking lot.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that he does not have this, but it should be in the plans.

Ms. Tanner inquired about why the outfall is on City property at all.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that the intent is to provide a stabilized channel for the stormwater from the outfall to the wetland. He described 2 options:

- 1) Moving the outfall back onto City property at the toe of the slope to minimize disturbance of the existing slope and add the riprap channel from the outfall to the edge of the wetland (this is the applicant's preference).
- 2) Keep the outfall on project property and keep the same angle of discharge. Shorten the riprap channel in order to keep it out of 100' tidal wetland zone.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that there could be a combination of the two options and the applicant is willing to change option 1 so that it doesn't fall onto City property at all.

Ms. Tanner wondered why the drainage on the property cannot be handled in any other way.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that they must provide stormwater treatment and detention. They could have the discharge point on the site, but then it immediately flows offsite as it does today.

Vice Chairman Blanchard inquired if there was an actual culvert and what the dimension of that culvert was.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that there is a culvert and it is a 24" pipe.

Vice Chairman Blanchard stated that the runoff will have salt in it (from plowing).

Mr. Dinsmore stated that the stormwater treatment system treats the water.

Vice Chairman Blanchard stated that this project represents a significant change in use.

Vice Chairman Blanchard asked if the structures front Sagamore Creek.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that there is a portion of City property at the edge of the project. The creek is on the other side of City property.

Mr. Britz clarified that the applicant is looking for comments/input today from the Commission. He stated that the City property is the complicating factor and that this is why the applicant had to postpone their request to the Planning Board. In order to do the drainage, the applicant is looking for permission to cross City property to allow drainage of the property. They are present today to get feedback from the Commission on different designs. But they are still working on permission to cross City property. He also wonders why the site is so constrained that it won't allow discharge to be entirely on the applicant's property. He recommends a site walk to better understand what the applicant is proposing and to get a visual for the drainage.

Chairman Miller and Vice Chairman Blanchard supported the idea of a site walk.

Vice Chairman Blanchard stated that this application is an intensification of the use of the site.

Chairman Miller stated that he doesn't know how to help the applicant until he sees the site. In addition, he would like to see something in place so that when people buy the units, there will be no dumping of things such as grass clippings, or expansion of a property towards the water. Owners may not understand the resource issues involved and may want to expand their area/unit. Future issues such as this need to be prevented from happening.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that the project will pursue condos. Each unit will have a plot to plant a garden, etc.

Mr. Britz stated that only one shared common area is allowed. Otherwise, it is considered a subdivision.

Mr. Dinsmore stated that things of this nature would be handled by the condominium association.

Mr. Riker spoke to the concern of Chairman Miller and stated that there are only a few units (4, 5 and 6) close to the wetland.

There was discussion by the Commission around their perspective that more units were close to the wetland.

Ms. Harrison stated that one deck actually extends out over the wetland buffer.

After discussion, the Commission decided on July 29th, 2015 at 3:30pm as a tentative date for a site visit. The group will meet in the parking lot at the site.

Ms. Tanner stated that the site is being very heavily developed. This is very different from what it is currently, even though there is a building and a large parking lot.

Vice Chairman Blanchard stated that the volume of the flow off the site will be very different than what it is now. The daily activity pattern will also be very different.

Mr. Britz stated that a drainage study has been completed and is available. A summary of this may be helpful to the Commission.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Miller asked for a motion. Ms. Tanner made a motion to postpone consideration of the application to the August 12th, 2015 Conservation Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Blanchard.

Chairman Miller called for discussion.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Miller called for the vote. The motion to postpone consideration of the application passed by a (6-0) unanimous vote.

- B. 217 Walker Bungalow Road
217 Walker Bungalow LLC, Owner
Assessor Map 202, Lot 12

David Witham was present to speak to the application. He and his wife own the property at 217 Walker Bungalow Road. He described site improvements they would like to make. He stated that their property is a .25 acre lot and the majority of the lot is within the 100' buffer zone. There is a portion within the 250' Shoreland Protection Zone. He handed out an existing conditions map. The major improvement to the lot they would like to make is the septic system. The existing tank is in poor condition and is antiquated. It is 65 years old and is within 20' of the wetland. There was one elderly person occupying the residence and the demand on the system was low. Now his family resides there and the burden on the system is heavier. Surveying has been conducted and it was thought that the property boundary was the stone wall in the back, but the line is much closer to the house, so in effect, the family has lost much of what they thought was their back yard. There is an existing 5' hole in the ground. It is clay so it contains most of the waste. They are proposing a new septic outside of the wetland buffer zone by Advanced Onsite Solutions. It will be a state-of-the-art system producing a much cleaner effluent. He has technical information for waste output if the Commission is interested in seeing it.

Vice Chairman Blanchard inquired if the system had a double tank.

Mr. Witham stated that it does have a double chamber, a septic chamber and a settling chamber.

Mr. Witham stated that other improvements include that the garage will be removed and turned into storage. They are proposing a pervious driveway system. It is currently impervious. The existing shed (within the buffer zone) will be removed and a new one will be placed outside the buffer zone. In total, the area of impervious surface currently is

4,393s.f. This will be reduced by over a 1,000s.f to 3,325s.f. They will cut back the overhangs to 18” and they will move the deck back within the property line. They have received state approval for the new septic system.

Ms. Tanner inquired about gutters.

Mr. Whitman stated that there will be no gutters.

Ms. Tanner inquired if there was a reason that they are moving the driveway closer to the wetland.

Mr. Witham stated that the way they designed it helps the traffic flow into and out of the house.

Ms. Tanner inquired about the size of the lot.

Mr. Witham stated that it is .25 acres, but part of it is on the street and property ownership on Walker Bungalow tends to go to the middle of the street.

Vice Chairman Blanchard inquired as to whether the owner will need to cut trees.

Mr. Witham stated that he does need to cut some oak trees. It may look like he does not need to do this, but the roots can interfere with structures.

Ms. Tanner inquired about plantings.

Mr. Witham stated that they are going to install plantings, but that he cannot speak much to that right now as his wife is the green thumb in the family.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Miller asked for a motion. Vice Chairman Blanchard made a motion to recommend approval of the application as presented to the Planning Board. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tanner.

Chairman Miller called for discussion.

Ms. Tanner stated that she would like to see something around the house like a drip edge to absorb the runoff.

Mr. Witham stated that he would be comfortable with installing a drip edge if the Commission would like to make that a condition.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Miller called for the vote. The motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented, with the stipulation as noted below, passed by a (6-0) unanimous vote.

Stipulation:

1) The owner shall install a drip edge around the perimeter of the house.

- C. 241 Walker Bungalow Road
Denise A. Croteau Revocable Trust, Owner
Assessor Map 202, Lot 13

Steve Riker, Ambit Engineering was present to speak to the application. Jeff Croteau, owner of 241 Walker Bungalow was also present. The project is for construction of an addition onto the house. The owner apologized and stated that there was a miscommunication in March, 2015 between the original design and what was approved by the Commission. The applicant is back with an amendment to do a couple of extra things. Those things include the addition of a 97s.f deck connecting to a deck that already exists. The addition has a full basement and the owner proposes a walk-out door on the side. There will be a temporary impact area (from grading) associated with this. There is also a proposed window seat (31s.f.). There is a 290s.f. buffer planting area. There is also a 76s.f. buffer planting area. The window and the deck were inadvertently left off the original plans. The only thing that has really changed is that the inside passage went through 3 doors previously. He felt that this was too much like a trap and worried for the safety of his children. Adding a basement walk out is safer than going through 3 doors in order to exit the building.

Chairman Miller clarified the dimensions of the additions: 79s.f. deck, 12s.f. landing, and the 31s.f. window seat.

Mr. Croteau confirmed those additions and dimensions.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Miller asked for a motion. Ms. Harrison made a motion to recommend approval of the application as presented to the Planning Board. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Blanchard.

Chairman Miller called for discussion.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Miller called for the vote. The motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented passed by a (6-0) unanimous vote.

V. CITY COUNCIL REFERRAL

- A. Decristofaro Land Donation

Mr. Britz stated that this property is at the southern part of city on the Rye line. It has upland and wetland. The property has no street frontage and is valued at \$3,900.00, but has frontage on the railroad. There is quite a bit of adjacent conservation land. The City

Council must accept an offer when a donation of land is extended. The Council refers it to the Planning Board, who in turn refers it to the Conservation Commission. The Planning Board recommends acceptance of this parcel.

Ms. Tanner made a motion to accept the donation of the Decristofaro land. Vice Chairman Blanchard seconded the motion. The motion to accept the donation passed by a (6-0) unanimous vote.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 6:06 pm, it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,
Toni McLellan
Conservation Commission Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Conservation Commission meeting on August 12, 2015.