

**Town of Auburn  
Conservation Commission  
June 2, 2015**

Meeting called at 7:06 p.m.

**Members Present:** J. Porter Porter (chair), Peg Donovan, Ed Fehrenbach, Alan Villeneuve, Stephanie Hanson (arrived @ 7:18)

**Others Present:** Doreen Remillard, Rick Burnham, Matt Olsen, Glenn Bickford, Jocelyn and Dana Carlucci Roscoe Blaisdell, Mickey Rolfe, Jerney Lougee

Chair Porter took a moment to introduce the members of the Commission before starting with the business at hand

**1. Request to build a deck within the wetland buffer (Matt Olsen, 44 Westminster Lane)**

Mr. Olsen would like to build a 24' x 20' low lying deck that would have the back right corner encroaching into the wetland buffer zone. Mr. Olsen met with building inspector C. Cote who said he should file for a conditional use permit with the Planning Board and contact the Conservation Commission to discuss the proposal. The deck would be in the grass area of their yard, 25' beyond furthest point is lawn.

E. Fehrenbach asked how far into the buffer Mr. Olsen already mows on a regular basis? He asked if the area was already being used. M. Olsen answered they mow about 25' beyond where the deck would end, and yes they are using the area now.

P. Donovan questioned the rational for going into the buffer. M. Olsen replied they have a 16' brick patio off house presently and they would like a little step up deck onto the space beyond

J. Porter, looking at the plan asked if the circle drawn was intended to be a pool. M. Olsen said it was intended to be, he had gotten a permit for it but then his leach field started failing so for now it is on hold. J. Porter asked about the discharge for the pool. M. Olsen said it was intended to be a salt water pool

A. Villeneuve noted that where pool water is back flushed is always a question, adding, he had been to this house, and the land does slope down beyond the deck area, where as the rest is sort of flat until you get to the wetland, it is all lawn up to the edge of what would be slope, and there is probably still 100' from open water. J. Porter then asked what type of capture mechanism he was planning to use as dumping salt water will do some damage to lawn and wetland. M. Olsen replied that he was: not sure, he was kind of new to the pool idea.

***A. Villeneuve: motion to support application for 44 Westminster Lane as presented E. Fehrenbach: second  
All in favor, motion passes***

## **2. Paradis cleanup within wetland – no show**

## **3. Glenn Bickford 378 Wilsons Crossing**

Mr. Bickford talked about how his plan was to restore the wetland area along the side of his property, he was planning to clean out the wetland, and he has already removed trees and burned brush, now he would like to grade the area. J. Porter asked if G. Bickford had any plans available pertaining to how he expected to proceed, reminding Mr. Bickford that the Commission had concerns about stump removal within the wetland area. G. Bickford replied that he had stopped removing stumps, he had cleared brush, and now the creek is now draining as it should.

J. Porte noted that the Commission was looking for more formal plans about silt fencing and restoration, which should also be sent to Carrie. He added the need for a site walk – decided upon Monday June 8 at 6:00. Mr. Bickford will have his plan drawn by this time and will share it with the Commission.

## **4. Jocelyn and Dana Carlucci Gravel Pit (Roscoe Blasdell presenting for them)**

The Carluccis intend to reopen an old gravel pit on property they own on Silver Hill road. Mr. Blasdell presented a plan of what they hoped to do. He said the area will cover 127,000 sq. ft., a little more than ¼ acre, they also intend to restore and create another area of 3,000 sq ft. The pit depth will be about 16' deep and they plan to come as close as 25' to level 1 wetland. The idea is to make a detention pond at the front of the area in order for water to flow towards the pond and settle and then leach away from the detention pond. E. Fehrenbach wondered if the 16' depth would be lower than or come out of the cut. R. Blasdell answered, the highest point is at the face at 16', but at water level it'll be 2', there is an average of about 8'. We will create a face near the property line. This is the most we would do if conditions are not good, such as a high water table or the soil is rockier, the best material is in the existing pit right now, however I have not done any test pits yet.

(FYI [http://auburnnh.us/forms\\_regulations/regulations/Zoning\\_Ordinance.pdf](http://auburnnh.us/forms_regulations/regulations/Zoning_Ordinance.pdf))

J. Porter confirmed that they were looking to be working just 20' off the existing property line. R. Blasdell responded that, yes, neighbor has allowed us to come within 20' of the property line. J. Porter asked were they not concerned about erosion with a 2:1 slope at the property line. To which R. Blasdell responded, "if all the things I am proposing on this plan are done, there shouldn't be any erosion. This should guide them to do the excavating properly. This is a short project, around 100' x 300' it should not take more than a year to remove the material and then clean up the area."

J. Porter asked what the long term plan was are they planning to take all the top soil then the sand. R. Blasdell said we plan to stock pile the top soil and then when we are done, grade it the pit and return 5" of top soil to let it regrow, adding that scrubby land is beneficial to wildlife, and so what they leave behind should be a good area for wildlife. E. Fehrenbach asked if they planned to clear the whole. R. Blasdell said the land was not ready to be logged in the back. P. Donovan confirmed that they are clearing the knob. R. Blasdell answered yes.

A. Villeneuve injected that this plan is much more helpful than what had been presented before and asked that Mr. Blasdel talk about the precautions they would take while working along the level 1 wetland. R. Blasdel answered, we are creating a hole so the water will need to go uphill with silt fence at the detention pond we will remove trees then start trenching working their way towards the hill.

A. Villeneuve mentioned that he found the detention pond confusing, as it appears you drive into the lot through the detention pond, and wondered if it would be left on site when they were done. R. Blasdel responded that actually the pond may need to be bigger, rather than let the water run off the property they would want it to stop somewhere, maybe 30' x 40', not a huge area, just a way to settle any silts and whatever. A. Villeneuve said he was expecting the detention pond was a part of construction, not restoration. He noted that the dirt road into the pit was edged by wetland and wondered what protection they had planned for the wetland along the road. R. Blasdel said they would put up silt fence. J. Porter asked if they thought the culvert at the front of the dirt road would support the trucks moving in and bringing stuff out. R. Blasdel said he thought it will be able to handle it.

A. Villeneuve asked if the expectation is to stock pile on the property there where that would be done. R. Blasdel pointed out a flat, disturbed area on the drawing, adding there will be plenty of stock pile areas, there should be more soil than will be needed if adding 5" back at the end. J. Porter was skeptical about how much topsoil there was, noting that when the Conservation Commission walked the area, there was only sand and water.

S. Hanson noted that on the plan, everything seemed to be stocked within the erosion control area, and wondered if they would be stabilizing them after so many days. R. Blasdel said again, it is not going to be a long project, and the dirt will all be treated before it goes off. A. Villeneuve said the Commission would expect them to seed their pile to protect it from moving around because, actually they do not know how long the project will take to complete.

A. Villeneuve also wondered if the reclamation plan was in the notes because he did not understand how it is going to be done exactly what happens to the land when you are done excavating. R. Blasdel, replied, just the usual, we will be using best management practices. J. Porter said he would hope to see the actual plan for reclamation, noting that because of the closeness to the wetland, fertilization is not within the context of what you will be able to do here. A. Villeneuve added that they would want more than just grass in the restoration of the buffer, they should include bushes as well, the plan should say we are putting this many of x, y, and z, and they will be placed like so in these areas. R. Blasdel said well that depends upon what you want, to which A. Villeneuve replied we are not in a position to tell you what to do. R. Blasdel answered, well we are not planting any trees.

S. Hanson asked what is out there now, wondering if there are any invasive plants, mentioning the possibility that the detention pond could become a vernal pool and they should be aware of that for their future plans will the land. R. Blasdel said not that I saw???

J. Porter said that he goes back to original stance of the Commission, this is very close to a level 1 wetland which is a concern, although the plans help to clarify their intent, he felt the space should be extended and he was concerned with the proposed impact into a level 1 wetland. E. Fehrenbach said he didn't think the water drains out as explained

and he didn't think there was enough loam out there, that they would need to bring some to reclaim the area. R. Blasdell answered that all disturbed area will be re-loamed

A. Villeneuve said he thought the project could be done, but he didn't have a lot of confidence in the plan the Commission had been shown, it bothered him there was no reclamation plan, the detention pond, drive into the site, through wet then get to a wet area. He wondered where the limit of the disturbance was. Adding, the site was not that wide to be able to do a whole lot of things. A. Villeneuve mentioned he was concerned about access, that the road was created by bisecting water. He agreed with E. Fehrenbach, that they will need to truck loam in and his understanding of the plan of attack will need clarified, adding it would be helpful to say "this is how we are going to go about this project", going 25' to a wetland is not something the Commission does lightly. R. Blasdell said that what he presented to the Commission that night, was not the finished plan. J. Porter said this gives us something to chew on, adding the impact to a level 1 wetland is a really big deal.

R. Blasdell said once we get a variance then we will do the test pits, so at the moment we don't know what disturbance will be, because we don't know how much material we can remove. J. Porter asked what their schedule was. R. Blasdell we hope to get the variance, then do the test pits, then go to the planning board.

A. Villeneuve said the next reiteration of this we are shown, should have a well-defined level of disturbance. J. Porter included that they need defined steps to reclamation as well. S. Hanson said she would like noted the type of seed and what is in the mix, also wondered if they needed to fill out a SWIPP , and also asked that they identify where their vehicle storage and refueling areas will be. R. Blasdell said he thought he could avoid the SWIPP because the pit is under 2 acres. A. Villeneuve said if he came back with just grass as reclamation, it will not be okay. J. Porter said hydraulic leakage is a concern, also questioned the need for the detention pond, that it does not seem to fit the plan. R. Blasdell said it was just a dip to stop the flow, not a big construction project.

A. Villeneuve gave Mr. Blasdell some advice about where to begin the excavation, he suggested an area as far from the wetland as possible. E. Fehrenbach asked if there was some reason why he would rather not start as far away from the wetland as possible. R. Blasdell said it does not make a difference to him where they begin.

S. Hanson wondered who checks the silt fencing. There was some discussion about that

***A. Villeneuve - motion that we support the idea that was presented P. Donovan – second***

***All in favor, motion passes***

## **5. Approve minutes of last meeting**

***P. Donovan - motion to approve minutes of May meeting E. Fehrenbach- second  
Two approved, A. Villeneuve abstains because was not present at the meeting.***

## **6. Nonpublic Session**

***A. Villeneuve - motion to go into nonpublic session E. Fehrenbach – second  
All in favor, motion passes***

Enter nonpublic at 8:01 p.m.  
Leave nonpublic at 8:28 p.m.

## **7. New business**

### **A. Update on Lover's Lane project detention pond**

J. Porter mentioned that the motion for a rehearing about the detention pond on the Lover's Lane project JMJ properties was denied. At the same time they were applying for a variance for the same property using what they felt was new information. That was tabled. Counsel was engaged to see if that is possible because the issue had been presented, denied, appealed and denied so not sure if can proceed or how. P. Donovan asked right now is it STANTEC and JMJ property discussing it? J. Porter said no STANTEC does not need to be involved. S. Hanson mentioned that there is no regulation that says you are allowed to develop every square inch of your property. A. Villeneuve added that a cluster should be a tradeoff, you are given concessions and you conserve some significant part of the natural landscape. J. Porter said his stance was that this is not truly a hardship. P. Donovan added it is the cost of doing business.

### **B. Discussion with potential alternates**

Talked with Doreen Remillard and Rick Burnham about the possibility of becoming alternates, what it entails and requires

***A. Villeneuve: motion to adjourn   E Fehrenbach: second  
meeting closes at 8:55 p.m.***