

Auburn Conservation Commission

October 6, 2015

Auburn Town Hall

Members present: J. Porter Porter (chair), Diana Heaton Heaton, Ed Fehrenbach, Peg Donovan, Alan Villeneuve, (arrived @8:00 p.m.)

Others present: Kathy Doyle, Mathew and Julie Demers, Norma Picard, John Roy, Mickey Rohlf, Randy Donkers, Tim Ferwerda

Meeting called at 7:01 p.m.

1. Kathy Doyle Tanglewood Drive, Shed encroachment

Ms. Doyle explained she would like to build a large shed within the drainage easement. She wants to go on other side of line, from her perspective; this is the least invasive space to put the shed on her small lot. The area is covered with trees so she thinks the shed will not be an eye sore and will not be seen. There will be a 12x15 sq. ft. foundation for the 10x14 sq. ft. building, the plan meets the requirements for the state of NH, it will be placed twenty feet from where easement starts, so is only going over the border a little.

J. Porter how much encroaching into the buffer?

K. Doyle: about 16'

D. Heaton: what is you planned use for the shed?

K. Doyle: storage, lawn mower, snow mobile etc.

J. Porter: no chemicals?

K. Doyle: other than gas for the machines, no

D. Heaton: we would request that you be extra careful of your chemicals/gasoline being stored

J. Porter: this is a level two wetland; I don't see much of an issue

P. Donovan: how far down are you going, will you need to create disturbance outside the parameters of the foundation

K. Doyle: probably not, this is the driest spot in the yard and I have been waiting to put loam on the area between the drainage easement and the house. The whole space has been cleared from the construction and I have been waiting to clean it up, plant some trees.

There was discussion about placement, acreage etc. K. Doyle said she has a patio over-hang which also limits her placement options.

J. Porter: Well I certainly do not have a problem with this

P. Donovan: No

2. 589 Bunker Hill, driveway permit, wetland disturbance

Randy Donckers presented for the property owners, showed a plan and a wetland permit

Proposing to create a new lot. Engineer says this is the only spot to place the driveway because of wetland. 35' across from the garage, disturb 2100' of wetland to cross the wetland with a driveway. Says it is the only area to place it

J. Porter: beyond the actual construction how much will you disturb?

R. Donkers: about 110' east of road about 55' across wetlands

J. Porter: what will the drainage for crossing will be?

R. Donkers: 18' culvert pipe

P. Donovan: is this new lot inside the other?

E. Fehrenbach: it is being cut out of the existing lot

R. Donkers: the entire lot about 17.5 acres, this lot will be 2.2 acres

P. Donovan: within the property is there no other place to carve out a lot?

R. Donkers: not with the frontage, there is not enough South of the house to create another lot, we would still have to cross a wetland

E. Fehrenbach: there is an easement around the other side, would it be cheaper and easier

R. Donkers: we felt that would be an awkward placement

E. Fehrenbach: you are going through a level 1 wetland as well

D. Heaton: we are looking at the impact on the level 1 and since they flow from one to the other, we look at it as the impact to level 1

J. Porter: it is 2100' impact to a level 1

P. Donovan: it appears to be standing water; it is not a vernal pool is it?

T. Ferwerda: no, not a vernal pool, a forested wetland with standing water

D. Heaton and E. Fehrenbach both asked what types of species were found there, were referred to the packet of information handed out.

E. Fehrenbach: we try to come up with the best option to see if a wetland crossing can be avoided.

D. Heaton: the man-made pond referenced is not the same wetland affected by the crossing?

T. Ferwerda: No

J. Porter: how much fill will be needed to cover this?

R. Donkers: about three feet

E. Fehrenbach: driveway looks as though it drains down to the wetland

R. Donkers: drainage will be across the driveway to the south to prevent erosion

P. Donovan: would there be less impact if went onto the other side of lot?

R. Donkers: spoke to the way in which water flows and answered no, because the water does get deeper on the north side of the lot

J. Porter: what is the width being cleared?

Mathew Demers: we would like to keep a level of privacy by keeping it narrow, no more than needed

R. Donkers: the upstream end of the wetland is just north of the garage

J. Porter: I would want you to make sure there are no more encroachments into the setbacks on either side, and keep area as natural as possible after the work.

J. Porter asked if any of the members were concerned. No one was

J. Porter: no additional comments, plans are what they are

E. Fehrenbach: suggested returning the topsoil that they would remove, if possible

D. Heaton: I am really uncomfortable with the amount of impact to that wetland, the 2100 sq. ft. is the size of a house, the going in and out will do a lot of damage to that wetland that can not be got back. I understand though that you are backed into a corner and do not have other options.

Julie Demers: what if we went around and came the other way for the construction

D. Heaton: any minimization to the impact that will occur is the best

J. Porter: we understand that this is a hardship, your plans are well thought out, and we are just looking to minimize disturbance. Nothing we can do to prevent the impact that will occur, the plans you put forth are as good as they are going to get

R. Donkers asked J. Porter to sign the expedite state of NH wetland form which he did

3. Old Business

a. Minutes of September meeting

Motion to accept minutes of last meeting: D. Heaton second: E. Fehrenbach

b. Pending easements

Motion to go into closed session: P. Donovan second: E.
Fehrenbach

Enter closed session at – 7:43 p.m.

Motion to come out: D. Heaton second: P. Donovan

Come out of closed session at 7:51 p.m.

Move to seal minutes: D. Heaton second: E. Fehrenbach

Minutes sealed

4. New business

a. Amherst Conservation

P. Donovan was talking to Amherst land trust; found they hold all the easements in Amherst. Commission members then discussed the feasibility of this being a process Auburn might like to adapt.

J. Porter: how does that factor into conservation commission

P. Donovan: they would not hold the easement

J. Porter: so it is a separate government entity

E. Fehrenbach: Phil Auger explained to him that he felt this was not the best idea for a town, as situations can get political and there can be a group of people that gang up on others to get their way. Situation such as this occurred with an easement in Derry.

D. Heaton: it could be problematic when dealing with the town entity that ebbs and flows with what the priorities are

P. Donovan: Amherst people felt there would be a vested interested if the town people held the easements

E. Fehrenbach: if the town holds the easement and has an issue then the town needs to hire a lawyer to pursue, outside entity hold the easement, they hire a person to deal with it

D. Heaton: possibility of relationships within the town having an effect on the way the easement is honored

Discussion of the pros and cons of this possibility ensued.

b. Martel lot on Dearborn

Not doing a cluster, wiped out all the level one setbacks

c. Calls about Lover Lane destruction

J. Porter called Bill and the Enforcement Officer

Discussion about following ordinances

Alan entered at 8:10

Motion to adjourn: D. Heaton second: P. Donovan

Meeting ends at 8:20 p.m.