

**Town of Auburn  
Conservation Commission  
November 4, 2014**

**Members present:** Chuck joy, Jeff Porter, Alan Villeneuve, Peg Donovan

**Others present:** Mickey Rolfe, Walter Milne, Sue Milne Haydock, B. Jensen, Eric Mitchell

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m.

**546 Londonderry Turnpike – Driveway Redesign (E. Mitchell)**

Minor conditional use permit will be before the planning board at the 11/19/14 meeting

Would like to send an expedited minimal impact to the State

Involves two properties, one a 5 acre house lot surrounded by a 132 acre lot. Driveway about a 20% grade propose a 10% grade to get to desired spot but need to extend length. Level 3 wetland less than 5,000 square feet will need filled. Road onto by- pass 28, so for safety reasons trying to decrease grade, 2100 square feet of wetland needs filled. If sign expedited will go to town w/in 30 days, if don't sign, goes to State for comment are providing an easement on property next door which is the same family.

D. Heaton arrives at 7:13

A. Villeneuve asks was the wetland created by drainage across the street.

E. Mitchell, responds, not sure if caused by it, but maintained by a culvert, is on a slope, does pop up from nowhere and disappear to nowhere.

A. Villeneuve asks if there is a proposal to do anything about water that comes from the culvert.

E. Mitchell not at the moment. Right now does not cut a channel just comes out of the pipe and spreads out

P. Donovan, asks he speaks to the removal of the loam and clay this plan references

E. Mitchell, yes anything unsuitable needs to come out

P. Donovan will you do anything to alleviate drainage?

E. Mitchell nothing needs to be done about it, for most part this will be a high ramp that comes around the house, it will be higher than the road

J. Porter this is for improvement to the existing house?

B. Jensen was originally a three season home which is why they built it the way they did, went to Florida and closed the house up, safety only reason to do this

A. Villeneuve what about other ways of travel

E. Mitchell looked at other ways they required a lot more fill

B. Jensen there is an historical wall that was part of Folsom's tavern wanted to avoid that and this plan allows us to

A. Villeneuve I believe there are shared driveways across the street will there be any impact to those?

B. Jensen that is further south across from the culvert

A. Villeneuve isn't there a proposed new driveway

W. Milne, not at this point

A. Villeneuve I am just concerned about what created this, any water that comes out, will now go there, assuming this goes downhill don't see any grading wetland is not on flat ground, where will this water go and where does it reenter the wetland, what are you doing with all that water?

E. Mitchell about a thirty foot drop, 90' at start of wetland and 120' at bottom. Goes out into the field or hits the total slope until it gets back into the wetland

A. Villeneuve all stuff coming off road now is pushed around the circle, more than likely creating a bigger area, should something be done with that drainage because it is all dumping water on someone else's property all parties are talking now but may not be in the future

E. Mitchell comes underneath the road then pops backup by putting this in, will divert around the driveway but it will flow back into the wetland as it does now. Could look at doing an armament at the end of road to avoid erosion.

D. Heaton I think you actually will increase run-off

E. Mitchell but we are directing the runoff I feel the amount of water that is changed is not significant enough to require being engineered for.

A. Villeneuve no objection to what is being proposed other than you are proposing to put more water from one property onto another person's and that should be recognized.

J. Porter you will see that water spread and go out, how much impact will you see in that new area and what is the impact for the abutters

E. Mitchell haven't calculated because feel is minimal have both parties here so they can agree

J. Porter can't they work with existing driveway and avoid wetland

E. Mitchell tried that, did but very steep, and have the wall for the tavern

B. Jensen, this wasn't necessarily the desired but it's a seasonal wetland and just to the right of the culvert is what looks to be an old channel water is finding its own path to the lake. If it wasn't for the grade being 20% we would just repaved it and be done with it. Putting a bit of a landing pad so can actually stop before get to the end of the driveway

E. Mitchell do have a sight distance so can safely sit before heading out, so can also more safely turn in from the road

J. Porter – motion to improve plans as presented

P. Donovan – second

C. Joy asked if there was any further discussion

A. Villeneuve just want to make sure you realize that the other property can see some impact from this

C. Joy – all in favor

Aye from all, motion passes

A. Villeneuve - Motion for C. Joy (chairman) to sign the expedited permit

J. Porter – second

Aye from all, motion passes

C. Joy signed

E. Mitchell this is for a conditional use permit, did you see it? Ask that your approval for the plan be given to the planning board, because they will be acting on your recommendation.

C. Joy if it wasn't in the mail, I did not see it, but they will read the minutes

### **Emory Property – Lover's Lane extension - E. Mitchell**

E. Mitchell we asked for special exceptions from planning board at last meeting, wondered if Conservation Commission had any additional comments relative to the changes. We squeezed the size of one lot down to avoid the buffer. E. Mitchell then spoke about a variance from the zoning board in regards to the buffers, saying the Planning board doesn't want lot lines in the buffers so makes for some very small lots. Don't believe can reduce the 125' buffer without a variance.

A. Villeneuve replied, as we explained before, we do these things lot by lot after we have walked the property, which we did. I have concerns about the connectivity of the open spaces – (pointed to some spots on the plan that would create problems) I also object to some of the lots, they have issues but I am not a planning board member.

C. Joy said the Fish and Game ask for 300' feet of connectivity for a wildlife corridor.

E. Mitchell option is to the go to the zoning board for a variance

J. Porter answered, we have talked in the past about the encroachment into the wetland. I suggest reorienting the plan to fit around the wetland, that is more agreeable than trying to get variances, I don't know if this is a possibility, but each one of these lots has impacts into the wetland. Perhaps if you make the lots more horizontal you would have less impact, although you may lose a lot, but in the spirit of trying to make things as good as they can, follow our ordinances, not having to always request variances, preserving the wetlands etc. reorienting the plan to fit around the wetland is the best fit.

C. Joy added that the setback and minimums are in the ordinances and they have been there so just because they are being enforced does not create an issue

A. Villeneuve included that the way we can best enforce the ordinances we have is to have that line be that line and that means lot lines are not in the wetland and buffers are adhered to and that may not be what the developer wants.

E. Mitchell spoke about his client wanting to get the project approved

A. Villeneuve we talked about this parent tract of land and taking off things on road because they have a certain value and then the rest will be a cluster, therefore this does not meet the criteria of a cluster to me because this cluster is very visible and as you drive out that road, you see the houses which does not meet the criteria, a cluster is supposed to be hidden away.

E. Mitchell having the grid lots in front to hide what is going on the back

D. Heaton but you are doing this by going into the wetlands, the front three are not in your open space cluster, so they do not apply, you still see houses

E. Mitchell correct

A. Villeneuve (spoke about a particular lot and a 50' buffer to the adjoining property) I think should switch some lot to two to open up the area and get them out of the buffer.

Commission members looked at the plan C. Joy noted a particular lot he felt would be a problem because of the impact to the wetlands

D. Heaton I agree when looking at these lots, particularly the smaller ones where everyone is within the buffer every one of those is a visit or two to the commission, I just don't see these as livable lots, and they are problems waiting to happen, maybe need to consider decreasing the number of lots.

Much discussion ensued

E. Mitchell said he was not asking for approval tonight but rather direction to take, to help us come up with something

Discussed the plans again.

J. Porter I still think that re-orienting the lots is the best idea. I think when looking at the contours and you have your grass area encroaching into the level one wetlands, you should look at getting your grass out of that area because it is impact right onto the level one

P. Donovan, said I agree, decreasing the number of lots is the best solution

E. Mitchell we may need to make smaller houses to give them a backyard

J. Porter, it's the fact of a back yard in the level one, you then have all the pesticides, herbicides, pools, sheds, play yards, etc. and they encroach upon the level one wetland.

D. Heaton I don't see how you do this without fewer lots

E. Mitchell make smaller houses

D. Heaton But you are still using the land for a yard in a level one wetland area.

E. Mitchell in area where drain right to the wetland is an issue and the areas that drain across the roads etc. are another issue. Thanked the Commission for their ideas and left.

## **5 Calef Road – Garage in wetland area (Bastek)**

No show

***A. Villeneuve - Motion to go into non-public @ 8:08 p.m.***

***D. Heaton - Second***

***Aye from all, motion passes***

***Go into nonpublic***

***A. Villeneuve - Motion to come out of non-public @ 8:20 p.m.***

***D. Heaton - Second***

***Aye from all, motion passes***

***Come out of nonpublic***

**Minutes of last meeting**

***J. Porter – motion to approve minutes of October 2014 meeting***

***P. Donovan – second***

***Aye from all, motion passes***

***A. Villeneuve - Motion to adjourn***

***J. Porter - Second***

***Aye from all, motion passes, meeting adjourn at 8:30 p.m.***