

**Town of Auburn
Conservation Commission
May 5, 2015**

Members: Jeff Porter (chair), Ed Fehrenbach, Diana Heaton, Peg Donovan (entered @ 7:17p.m.)

Non-Members: Eric Mitchell, Rob Starace, Leonard and Elaine Willet, Sue and Rocky Baglio, Rick Burnham, Mickey Rolfe

Sue & Rocky Baglio – 52 Wilson's Crossing Road

Want to put up a garage (26' x 26'), need 125' only have 100'

Setback issue because septic is only 10' from where end of garage would be – if measure from the rock wall, not road. Carrie has plot plan, Ed asked that they have it available

J. Porter noted that the Commission should do a site walk, they discussed a day and time, decided for Tuesday May 12, at 6:30 p.m. – D. Smiley will email them as a reminder

77 Pingree Hill (Eric Mitchell, Rob Starace)

Strategic Contracting Company, Planning board accepted the plan, need Con Com to look at is as there are wetland encroachments, planning wanted them to increase pavement from 22' to 24' this plan reflects that, also had a question on the berm.

Lots 13 & 14, cannot do anything in buffer, no buildings, no tree clearing and cutting or mowing inside buffer supposed to be put in the deed as well. Notes should reflect this as well as on lot 6 berm through plantings. They are planning on putting up posts to reflect the restrictions.

J. Porter asked if these are the berms on the east bound side. Would like to see the poles that show no cut zones.

E.Mitchell answered, yes, we can show on the plan and new owners can be told by builder about the buffer but consecutive owners may not note it so this is to make sure they know, vinyl fence post, sign one every fifty feet. Signs will be the same on lots 7 & 8.

J. Porter asked what changes have occurred to accommodate the new 24' design.

E. Mitchell replied, not much, no further in the back towards wet, of either lot, may be more crowded towards road. J. Porter then asked what do he needed from Conservation, noting that he would send a note to the planning board that we've looked at the plans.

E. Fehrenbach asked about storm water. E. Mitchell spoke to the plans they have available.

Lovers Lane (Eric Mitchell) JMJ properties

E. Mitchell noted that they did appeal the ZBA denial and that is why present tonight, to show changes. Detention pond was not outside of the 125' buffer, if moved it onto the lot would be more doable, he felt while it would be good to be out of buffer, they did not want to lose a lot. Wildlife corridor study has been done that he handed out. Their biologist determined that because of the slope configuration the detention pond will act as a berm. Smaller mammals will be more confined, larger will go wherever, and that one spot would not be any worse than another.

J. Porter stated that he wished to renew his objection to putting the pond closer to a level one wetland and that he felt losing one lot to follow town regulations compared to the number of lots planned was not a hardship, but does send a message that we will honor our regulations about staying out of level 1 wetlands, so he renewed his objection.

P Donovan stated that she agreed with J. Porter.

E. Fehrenbach mentioned that the plan presented last time and had pulled everything out of the wetland and the Commission supported that.

E. Mitchell responded that it was his job to show other options, and they felt this is additional information about the pond following the ridge

J. Porter predicted the scientists E. Mitchell hires will go against STANTEC, our position is that we do not want to continually encroach into a level one wetland when there is another option and with this plan, there can be other options.

D. Heaton said she presumed this report would go to STANTEC, E. Mitchell answered that he didn't know, the report went to zoning, and STANTEC works from planning.

D. Heaton noted that the summary of the wildlife report mentions impact to the vernal pool in both options, which concerns her.

J. Porter wondered what the impact to vernal pool would be with pond two, asking if there is a particular reason why the outflow is directed towards the vernal pool.

E. Mitchell answered that the outflow goes through a ditch and a berm and then towards the level 2 wetland.

D. Heaton asked if that distance maintains a 75' setback to which E. Mitchell answered, no it is more like 50', we would need a conditional use permit for this.

D. Heaton asked for confirmation that they plan to go into the buffer of the level 1 wetland with the vernal pool and the buffer of the level 2 wetland, to which E. Mitchell answered, yes.

D. Heaton asked what other options there are.

E. Mitchell said they have land on the other side, but say it is not feasible because of the elevations, on other side would need to blast to make a hole to go in, we have looked at putting two smaller ponds in elsewhere.

D. Heaton mentioned they had proposed an option, of other placement

E. Mitchell answered that they do not want to do that because that would mean losing a lot and while they could do that, they don't want to.

Elaine Willet – got confused about vernal pool with #2 basin, as group do you still feel the detention ponds are placed well

J. Porter replied the Commission is caught between a rock and a hard place, they feel it is hard to support an encroachment into a buffer of a level 1 wetland/vernal pool when the developer has other options, namely use a house lot instead. I question the method of the impact from E. Mitchell's wetland scientist, and I would like developers to pay attention to what our variances say and not have the constant variances.

D. Heaton asked a question about the vernal pool impact noting that basin 2 still has some problems to be dealt with. J. Porter added they are looking to make it more challenging to go into the buffers, there by strengthening the regulations.

Motion to go into nonpublic session – D. Heaton Second – P. Donovan

Nonpublic session begins at 7:44 p.m.

D.H. Move to come out of nonpublic P.D. second

Motion to close minutes - E. Fehrenbach Second – P. Donovan

Closed minutes at 8:00 p.m.

New Business

Discussions about easement holding

J. Porter had a conversation with someone from Eversource with information about programs they offer, he asked the Commission to consider some times that would work to have him come in and discuss

Approve Minutes of April Meeting

E. Fehrenbach- motion to approve minutes of April meeting as written D. Heaton –second

All in favor, motion passes

P. Donovan – motion to adjourn E. Fehrenbach -second

Adjourn 8:08 p.m.