

**Town of Auburn  
Conservation Commission  
June 8, 2021**

**Members present:** Jeff Porter-Chairman. Peg Donovan, Vice Chair. Richard Burnham, Member. Mark Ampuja, Alternate Member. Minutes recorded by Denise Royce.

**Absent:** Diana Heaton & Ed Fehrenbach, Members. Stephanie Hanson, Alternate Member.

**Also Present:** Eric Mitchell, Brad Remillard, John Langill, David Gilmore & Jason Ashby.

Mr. Porter called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and moved into summarizing the meeting preamble to everyone present.

**MEETING PREAMBLE DURING COVID-19 EMERGENCY**

Good Evening, as Chairman of the Conservation Commission, I am declaring that an emergency exists and I am invoking the provisions of RSA 91-A:2, III (b). Federal, state, and local officials have determined that any public gathering of people may pose a substantial risk to our community in its continuing efforts to combat the spread of COVID-19 and is reinforced by Emergency Order #16 issued by the Governor on March 23<sup>rd</sup>. In concurring with their determination, I also find that this meeting is imperative to the continued operation of Town government and services, which are vital to public safety and confidence during this emergency.

Governor Sununu issued Emergency Order #12 on March 23<sup>rd</sup> which provides local government boards the ability to conduct business using technology to hold remote meetings and not provide a public place of meeting but provide for the public's ability to listen to the meeting. As such, this meeting will be conducted without a quorum of this body physically present in the same location.

At this time, I also welcome members of the public accessing this meeting remotely. Even though this meeting is being conducted in a unique manner under unusual circumstances,

the usual rules of conduct and decorum apply. Any person found to be disrupting this meeting will be asked to cease the disruption. Should the disruptive behavior continue thereafter, that person will be removed from this meeting.

Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote as required by RSA 91-A:2, III (e).

Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member is called, please state your name, and also please state whether you are physically attending the meeting or are remotely attending the meeting. If you are remotely in attendance, is there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to-Know law (RSA 91-A:2, III (c)).

Mr. Porter moved on to a roll call of Conservation Commission members and alternate members. Mrs. Donovan, Vice Chair was present, Mr. Burnham, Member was present. Mr. Ampuja, Alternate member was present and Mr. Porter, Chairman of the Conservation Commission was present.

Mr. Porter asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes for April 6, 2021. No one made a motion as they believed they did not receive the minutes and therefore could not make a motion at this time.

Mr. Porter moved right into the first discussion tonight for Ms. Silva which property is located on Chester Turnpike and turned the meeting over to Mr. Mitchell.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

**Eric Mitchell**

**On Behalf of Geraldine Silva, Trustee**

**Chester Turnpike, Tax Map 11, Lots 15-1 & 15-2**

**Zoned Rural**

**Discuss Potential Two (2) Lot Subdivision (Wetland Buffer)**

Mr. Mitchell began the presentation by saying that, he was representing Mrs. Silva who was the owner of the property and Cherry Hill Homes who has a portion of the property under agreement. The site is made up of two (2) existing lots which is Tax Map 11, Lot 15-1 which has the property owners house on it that has a total of approximately 14 acres.

The other lot next door which is vacant is Tax Map 11, Lot 15-2 which is also approximately 14 acres in size. The total frontage for both properties is around 1,500 feet. What they are proposing to do is to subdivide two (2) additional lots in addition to the two (2) that are there currently. Mr. Mitchell went on to say that the existing lot would consist of approximately 13 acres, one will be 3 acres, one will be 7.5 acres in size and the last one would be approximately 4 acres. What they first need to do is a lot line adjustment between lots 15-1 and 15-2 whereby one acre in the front will be taken from the house lot and added to the 14-acre vacant lot. The reason they are before the Conservation Commission is that they have applied for a Variance to reduce the setback between the wetland and the buildable area on Lot #15-2 which shows a 75-foot setback from the wetlands. So, what they are proposing to do is have a 75-foot setback from the rear which would give them enough room to build a house on Lot #15-2. Mr. Mitchell stated that, basically the land goes up in the back and then down again so nothing would be going into the wetlands, and they can also put some chip berms in another area.

At this time, Mr. Mitchell moved on to talk about the common driveway which is shown on Lot #15-2-1 which crosses an existing culvert over the wetlands and proceed up and then it would split with a driveway going left to Lot #15-2-2 and a driveway going right for Lot #15-2-1. Mr. Mitchell explained that they did have a discussion with the Planning Board last week and that most of the comments that were given was that the Board was not in favor of common driveways and that the regulations state that they are prohibited but that they would be asking for a waiver. The reason that they would be asking for a waiver was to have only one wetland crossing where there is an existing culvert now and noted that they would have to obtain a dredge and fill permit to make it a little wider. This would mean that they would only have to cross the wetland once. Basically, the consensus from the Board members that were there was that they were not really in favor of doing common driveways. Mr. Mitchell went on to talk about possibly putting in another culvert crossing so that they could have two driveways, but it would mean that they would have to cross the wetlands twice. Mr. Mitchell did not believe that would require a Variance from the ZBA as it would only be crossing the wetland once and then going up to the uplands to where the homes would be built in both cases. To summarize, they would have Lot #15-2 which would be approximately 3 acres and looking for relief of the 125-foot setback down to 75-feet with a Variance. The common driveway they have there, the Commission can discuss that but the Planning Board was not in favor of it so they would look to probably not have a common driveway. In terms of the level of the wetlands they have prepared this to be 125-foot setback but have not done a wetland study of which they will probably go out to do. Mr. Mitchell indicated that, it was very possible that it could be a Level Two wetland but because they had to go before the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Adjustment, they wanted to seek relief for the 75-feet but there is a possibility that it will be shown to be a Level Two wetland, but they are not definitely sure. They are here to obtain input from the Conservation Commission before they go to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Porter thanked Mr. Mitchell for his presentation and pointed out to the Board members that, this area was surrounded by the area where the Conservation Commission put in a Conservation Easement with the Sanborn's and commented on the sensitivity of this area and how vital it is to keep it as pristine as possible. With that being said, Mr. Porter pointed out that, this would not be something that he would be in favor of. Mr. Porter believed that they should consider possibly getting two (2) new lots but not three (3) lots.

Mrs. Donovan commented that, she was not a supporter of common driveways as well and asked Mr. Mitchell where he would propose two (2) driveways as opposed to the shared driveway. Mr. Mitchell explained to the Board members where the two (2) driveways would be located by directing them to look at the plan where the driveway for the 4-acre lot would cross over the existing culvert where it is now and then going up and that Lot #15-2-2 would cross would be to the right of that where the wetland narrows down. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the driveways. Mr. Mitchell did inform the Board that, the wetlands were not mapped for the house lot.

Mr. Porter asked Mr. Burnham if he had any comments. Mr. Burnham asked if they had a placement for the proposed homes yet and wondered by the lots had jiggered lines. Mr. Mitchell commented that, it was because the lot line had to be perpendicular to the road for the first 100 feet and then bends off to obtain more room. Mr. Mitchell also added that, where the common driveway is located, the lot line goes back some 200 feet because they were proposing the common driveway in that location. Basically, they wanted to keep the acreage with the current house lot which is Ms. Silva's house. Mr. Burnham also commented that he was not in favor of common driveways as well.

Mr. Porter asked Mr. Mitchell what he was looking for and if it was just for the driveway or was it for the setback as well. Mr. Mitchell stated that it would be the input on both of those because they are seeking a Variance because they are on the agenda for the ZBA so they would need the Conservation Commission input to give to the ZBA. One would be relief from the 125-foot setback to 75-feet for the 3-acre lot and the other would be where the access for the common driveway is. Mr. Mitchell indicated that, obviously if the common driveway is something that they are not in favor of then they would potentially go to the ZBA for relief for the setback on the 3-acre lot. Mr. Porter believed that the 3-acre lot should be something that should be removed and lot to obtain 2 new lots as opposed to 3 new lots and believed that this should be something that he would need to talk over with the landowner. Basically, Mr. Porter was not in favor of the 3-acre lot and trying to shoehorn a third lot in there was not something that he was in favor of especially after what they have done to preserve the conservation land in the back. Mr. Porter also reiterated that, he was not in favor of shared driveways and in terms of the 3-acre lot that he would like to see that lot removed and therefore was not in favor of the reduction in that area either. Mr. Mitchell wanted to make one comment which was, if the 3-acre lot was gone that they would have to do two (2) wetland crossings in order to build in the back of those lots where the uplands were located unless there was relief down in front

where the 3-acre lot is where the lot line goes away. Mr. Porter again pointed out that, this area was still very sensitive to the work that has been done to preserve this land.

At this time, Mr. Porter turned to Mrs. Donovan for comment. Mrs. Donovan commented that, if they didn't have the three (3) lots there that they wouldn't have to go for the Variance. If they just had two (2) lots they would avoid more disturbance.

Mr. Porter asked Mr. Ampuja for comment. Mr. Ampuja stated that, he agreed with Mr. Porter with regard to the common driveway as he was not in favor of that as well. Mr. Ampuja also mentioned the Conservation Easement on the abutting property and all the work that the Conservation Commission would have a hard time approving the reduction in the wetland buffer from 125-feet down to 75-feet.

In conclusion, Mr. Porter asked Mr. Mitchell if this would be something that he would like to discuss with Ms. Silva. Mr. Mitchell did not know if Ms. Silva had called in and didn't know if she had any comments. Ms. Silva did not call in to this meeting. Mr. Mitchell further indicated that, he would need to speak with Mr. Langill of Cherry Hill Homes as they were obviously getting input from the Commission, and they were going to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to seek a Variance in a couple of weeks. Mr. Porter stated that, if they planned to move forward with this plan, then there will be a vote and the notes will go forward but if he would like to postpone going to the ZBA for a month and discuss the plan ideas that you're hearing and rework the plan and come back before the Conservation Commission may work as well. Mr. Mitchell deferred the question to Mr. Langill of Cherry Hill Homes to respond to that as he is the one that has the property under agreement. Mr. Langill stated that, the only reason they proposed the common driveway was because they wanted to minimize the impact to the wetlands. Mr. Langill commented that, it was more desirable to have two (2) individual driveways and they don't want to give up the third lot. Mr. Porter pointed out that, if they don't have the support from ZBA then they don't have a buildable lot. Mr. Langill was not sure. Mr. Porter reiterated possibly going for two (2) lots instead of three (3). Mr. Langill did not want to make a decision without first speaking with Mr. Mitchell and his partner and then decide how to go forward.

Mr. Porter believed that it was better to Table this and have the discussion and wait to go to ZBA. A brief discussion ensued, and, in the end, Mr. Langill believed the best way to go about this would be to first sit down with Mr. Mitchell and his partner. Mr. Langill pointed out that, if you walk out to where Lot #3 would be that it was a beautiful lot and if we have to push it out another month, he'd rather push it out another month and do it right. Mr. Mitchell asked if the Commission would not be meeting during the month of July. Mr. Porter commented that, if this was going to be pushed out another month then something could be done but the plan was not to meet in July but would be willing to work with Mr. Mitchell to hold a meeting in July. Ms. Royce informed Mr. Porter that the ZBA does not meet in July so it would be August 24<sup>th</sup> for the next ZBA Hearing. The decision

was to meet at the beginning of August in time for the ZBA Hearing at the end of August. Mr. Mitchell stated that the minutes would be available for the ZBA and for them to review to make a decision. Mr. Porter indicated that there was nothing to vote on so the meeting minutes would be informational. Mr. Mitchell asked Mr. Langill if he would be willing to wait until August to meet with the ZBA. Mr. Langill said yes if it would please the Board that he would be willing to postpone the ZBA.

At this time, Mr. Porter indicated that they would Table this until August at which time, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Langill will rework the plan. Mr. Mitchell asked the Chairman if it would be possible to meet back with the Commission in July and then again in August. Mr. Porter believed that it would be a possibility but if ZBA is not going to meet in July then there was no sense meeting before the first week in August but would leave it open.

Mr. Porter thanked Mr. Mitchell and moved on to the next discussion on the agenda which would include Mr. Mitchell presenting on behalf of 269 Rockingham Road, LLC.

**Eric Mitchell**  
**On Behalf of Alan Villeneuve**  
**269 Rockingham Road, LLC**  
**269 Rockingham Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 40**  
**Zoned Commercial Two**  
**Discuss Retaining Wall and Holding Tank Within Wetland Buffer**

Mr. Mitchell began by saying that, this property was located on 269 Rockingham Road, and it is a site that was before the Board previously. Mr. Mitchell stated that, the site is under construction and that the outside was pretty much all finished, and they are working on the inside. They are seeking ZBA approval for relief from the wetland setback as it was determined to be a Level Two wetland. Mr. Mitchell pointed out what has transpired since this plan was approved is that the piece of property to the east that was owned by NHDOT that a lot line adjustment has been done whereby a portion of the property went to 269 Rockingham Road and the other portion went to Wellington BROS LTD. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that more land has been added to the property. Mr. Mitchell went on to say that a retaining wall has been added which is four (4) to six (6) feet tall so the area between the building and the retaining wall is all flat. What the proposal is, is that they are going before the Zoning Board of Adjustment to ask for relief from the wetland setback to keep the retaining wall where it is, and they are also proposing a 3,000-gallon holding tank for the floor drain coming out of the building. With that said, Mr. Mitchell indicated that they needed comments from the Conservation Commission to move forward.

Mr. Porter believed that they have seen this before and had comments about it. Mr. Porter began by saying that, from the original design and the construction has been done and there have already been Variances with the design and believed the use of the building



has changed considerably and also the retaining wall that was created was in an area that already was talked about and agreed to, and the plans were not followed. Mr. Mitchell explained that the only thing that was not on the plan that was constructed is the retaining wall. The holding tank has not been installed yet. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the retaining wall and holding tank. Mr. Mitchell talked about putting in a provision that it would be maintained on a regular basis would be fine with them.

Mrs. Donovan asked if the person building the building would be owning the building or would they be leasing it out. Mr. Mitchell was unsure if the building would be rented or sold. Mr. Mitchell explained that, originally it was for someone with a hobby to go in there and work on their vehicle and to wash their vehicles so anything would go right into the holding tank and not go into the septic system and not go into the existing ground. This was originally approved for automotive repair and restoration but not like a VIP. A discussion ensued with regard to the number of vehicles that can be washed to reach 3,000 gallons. Mr. Mitchell did not know that answer and pointed out that, this was not meant to be a car wash either. Mr. Mitchell also indicated that, this would be discussed before the Zoning Board of Adjustment as well.

Mr. Poltak asked if the Board had any comments. Mr. Burnham asked Mr. Mitchell if he was looking for the Conservation Commission's approval to add the retaining wall and 3,000 gallon holding tank. Mr. Porter stated that, they are basically voting on something that already exists. Mr. Porter informed Mr. Mitchell that the owner of 269 Rockingham Road needs to understand that the tank needs to be completely sealed and serviced regularly and in terms of the retaining wall, it's there and we are not looking to have him remove it but it is interesting that we went through this process once and the plans were agreed to and then things were done that were different than the plan so now you have to come back before the Board again for ZBA relief. Mr. Porter did not believe they had any other option but to accept the plans as they are and support the reduction in the buffer.

Mr. Porter asked if there were any other comments and began with Mrs. Donovan. Mrs. Donovan had nothing else to add. Mr. Burnham agreed with Mr. Porter and agreed that they were looking for permission to do something that is already done and added that it was difficult to say no, and it should be a no support. Mr. Porter stated that he would be at the ZBA Hearing and would leave it up to the Board members on how they want to word this but believed that an affirmed vote of no support because it has already been done. If these plans had come before us as it sits right now, would it be acceptable. Mr. Burnham would listen in on a vote of non-support.

At this time, Mr. Porter moved to a vote in the reduction of the buffers for the retaining wall and holding tank. Mr. Porter explained that a yes to support and a no would be to not support the changes.

**Mr. Burnham voted to not support the reduction in the wetland buffer for the retaining wall and 3,000 gallon holding tank, Mrs. Donovan seconded the vote, Mr. Burnham voted No to not support the plan, Mr. Porter voted No to not support the plan, and Mrs. Donovan voted Yes to support the plan. A vote was taken, and the Conservation Commission was not in support of this plan by a vote of 2 not in favor and 1 in favor. The vote did not pass.**

Mr. Porter explained that the Conservation Commission was not in favor of the plans but believed if the plans had come before the Board initially that they would have had support but the way this was done was unacceptable. Mr. Porter went on to say that they would be just supporting the fact that people are doing things that were not on a plan. Mr. Porter asked Mr. Ampuja to weigh in on this. Mr. Ampuja also agreed with what Mr. Porter was saying and would also be a non-supporter of this plan. In the end, Mr. Porter explained that they had a Yes vote and two (2) No votes. Mr. Mitchell understood the vote and thanked the Commission for their time.

**Jason & Jenna Ashby  
332 Chester Turnpike, Tax Map 11, Lot 8-4  
Zoned Residential Two  
Discuss Wetland Buffer**

Mr. Ashby basically started out with, what they are proposing to do is build a garage because they garage that is currently on the house was really not useable. It's a single door and you can't put two (2) cars in there and that the master bedroom takes a portion of the garage. Mr. Ashby went on to say that basically they use it to house their gym equipment, so their vehicles have remained outside. Mr. Ashby explained that he has since purchased a tractor and has a big pickup truck and his wife's car. They have a tent structure that basically has blown off a few times and that he had to go chase it. Mr. Ashby just wants to know what would be possible on this property for a garage. Mr. Ashby explained the plan shows an old seasonal wetland area on the drawing and cuts into any useable area on the property. They can't put anything on the left side of the house because their septic system is there. He would like to build it longer as it would be wide to keep it away from the wetlands. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the wetlands. Mr. Porter commented that, it would be pitched away from the house and therefore they would be looking for ways to contain the water runoff and capture it. Discussion ensued with regard to runoff. Mr. Porter's biggest concern was the size of the building and what he would be storing in there and how he would be containing the fluids.

Mr. Ashby added that, he has 385 feet of frontage but did not have anything to work with due to the wetland buffer. Mr. Ashby basically stated that, he would really like to put his tractor and truck and really everything inside and under cover as opposed to leaving it outside. Mr. Ashby also commented that, he wanted to do this one time and not have to



keep adding on to it later. Mr. Ashby stated that, if he had done a little more research and looked into this further that he probably would not have bought the property but is hopeful that he will be able to put up a garage at some point. Mr. Ashby also pointed out to the Board that, if he's leaving everything outside that it would be leaking onto the ground and if it's in a garage that it would be contained inside the garage. Mr. Ashby also stated to the Board that he has an automotive shop and understands how to contain the fluids and is very cognizant of that and talked about the cleanliness of having everything contained and that he services vehicle for a living. Mr. Ashby also talked about the fact that his truck does not fit through a standard door and that he would like to keep his tractor for a very long time. Mr. Ashby stated that, he does not plan on leaving and would be here until his kids are basically out of college. Mr. Ashby was just trying to get an idea of if he could get any sort of approval for any structure on this piece of property next to his house.

Mr. Porter responded that, no matter what size structure you put on there that he will have to do a substantial amount of work with regard to water containment to prevent any runoff into the wetland which may require gutters or some sort of catch basin just to capture that to keep it away from the wetlands. A brief discussion ensued with regard to setbacks and possibly seeking relief from the setback.

Mr. Porter asked Mrs. Donovan for comments. Mrs. Donovan asked about property line. Mr. Ashby explained that he had 385 feet of frontage and added that, the plan was a shrunk down view of the actual lot, and his house is set more to the left and that he wasn't even close to where his property line would be to the right-hand side. A brief discussion ensued with regard to well, septic and garage location. Mrs. Donovan believed there would be a lot of disturbance going on and did not know if it was a Level One wetland or what as it indicates that it is a seasonal wet.

Mr. Porter asked if it would have a slab or would he be doing a basement. Mr. Ashby stated that, he reached out to a couple of people who do foundations and the way the property drops off that he would end up doing a basement and then have pressure casted piers at the driveway level. The upper floor would be level with the driveway and the property drops off to the right side of the driveway so it would basically have a basement foundation on it. Mrs. Donovan believed he would have to put in some kind of drainage down there and asked what the steepness would be. Mr. Porter believed he would be into the buffer and whether it's seasonal or not, he would be looking at a high-water table issues and if it's not a slab and he is looking to have a basement it probably wouldn't work as he would have water issues. Mr. Porter believed he was well beyond a buffer impact and would be looking at a wetlands impact which will be a state issue and would not support. Mr. Porter asked about tying it into the existing building itself. Mr. Ashby believed a stand-alone structure would be better than modifying the house. Discussion ensued with regard to the wetlands and the challenges and impact to the wetlands. Mr. Ashby asked that, even if he were to shrink it down to a 40 by 30 that still doesn't

necessarily get him out of really anything. Mr. Porter agreed and said it didn't matter because he was still going to have a fair amount of buffer impact and the same amount of work. Mr. Porter was concerned with the amount of disturbance that would occur.

With that said, Mr. Porter talked about the next step being formalizing the designs and getting the grading put up and any containment information and look at what Variances he may need. Mr. Ashby indicated that, he would like to move forward with putting up a structure and understood that it would require a good amount of work and he would like to do this one time as opposed to adding on later. Mr. Porter indicated that, he would definitely want to get an engineer to put the engineering plans together and look for any Variances that he may need and any type of waivers and slopes and mitigating controls for the house. After all that, Mr. Porter stated that, they would have another meeting and then vote on the plans. Mr. Ashby thanked the Board members for their time and input and commented that he would get all this information and would come back before the Board in August. Mr. Porter also thanked Mr. Ashby for his presentation and the discussion ended at 8:31pm.

Mr. Porter moved on to Mr. David Gilmore for his presentation.

**David Gilmore**  
**69 Hook Road, Tax Map 13, Lot 44**  
**Zoned Residential One**  
**Discuss Wetland Buffer**

Mr. Gilmore began by explaining the drawings that were presented to the Board members earlier today. Mr. Gilmore stated that, he was before the Board tonight looking for approval to construct a garage. At this time, the Board members reviewed the package that was before them tonight. Mr. Gilmore talked about the wetland buffer that was an issue and that the septic was on the left and basically the location that he is proposing was the only best place to put it on the property. Mr. Gilmore pointed out the well location and explained the property in depth. Mr. Gilmore directed the Board to the plan where the house and garden was located basically on the high ground but everything else you can see by the topography. Mr. Gilmore talked about the garage proposal and that they would be digging down for the garage with a room above that would match the existing house. Mr. Gilmore indicated that, after speaking with the builder that was the easiest spot to place the garage instead of digging up the front yard and putting a huge retaining wall up.

Mr. Porter commented that, from the last discussion and pointed out that where he was proposing to place the garage was actually not in the buffer but in fact in the wetland itself. Mr. Porter went on to say that, basically Mr. Gilmore would be looking for a Variance for relief to be 100 feet into the buffer and to be 23 feet from the wetland. Mr. Porter believed

that was a Level One wetland and believed he was right on the wetland and that his engineer would have to do some creative stuff with regard to containment and roof water is captured to keep it away from the buffer area. Mr. Porter also talked about behind the house and whatever he was going to do with that space would have to be revegetated with plantings of native species and there should not be any area of lawn in that space. Mr. Porter understood that there were not a lot of good options for placement and thought there was something about putting it away from the house and noted that the septic system was there with the leach field and tank as that area was out of the buffer. Mr. Gilmore commented that, their desire is to have a garage attached and believed that was the only place they could do that. Discussion ensued with regard to the driveway location and having it as an additional parking area. Mr. Porter was unsure if he could have two (2) driveways, but he would have to double check with Mrs. Rouleau-Cote, Building Inspector for the Town of Auburn. Mr. Gilmore will check with the Building Inspector on whether or not you could have two (2) driveways as she has seen these and never said anything about having two (2) driveways.

Mrs. Donovan stated that, she would have a hard time approving a garage being built on the other side and that he has his work cut out for him. Discussion ensued with regard to what was behind and what was to the side where the proposed garage would be going. Mr. Gilmore stated that, Hook Brook was behind there. Mrs. Donovan believed that they would need to go out there and see the property.

Mr. Porter asked Mr. Gilmore if he had Variances in with the ZBA. Mr. Gilmore said no. Mr. Porter suggested that Mr. Gilmore speak with his engineer and get in touch with the Building Inspector as to the driveways and that they will have to have a lot of input with his engineer in order to obtain their support. Mr. Porter stated that, they are happy to work with him on this project. Mr. Porter suggested that they keep this discussion open and believed there was significant work that needed to be done. Mr. Gilmore understood and just wanted to recap what the Board is looking for which was for him to speak with his engineer and the main points would be containment, runoff from roofs and revegetating the area and doing a berm or some sort of containment method in that area. Mr. Porter said yes and that he was looking for another driveway cut and what does that entail and what needs to be done with the existing one. With that said, Mr. Gilmore understood what was being asked and thanked the Board members for their time and the discussion ended.

Mr. Porter asked Ms. Royce if she had the meeting minutes from the last meeting. Ms. Royce informed the Board that we did not meet in May, so the last meeting minutes were from April 6, 2021. The Board now recalled the meeting minutes and were ready to vote on the minutes at this time.

## **MINUTES**

**Mr. Burnham moved to approve the minutes of April 6, 2021 as written. Mrs. Donovan seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken as follows: Mrs. Donovan voted yea, Mr. Burnham voted yea, Mr. Ampuja voted yea and, Mr. Porter voted yea. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.**

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Porter asked if anyone had any new business. None were noted. With that said, Mr. Porter asked for a motion to adjourn.

## **ADJOURN**

**Mr. Burnham moved to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Donovan seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken as follows: Mrs. Donovan voted yea, Mr. Burnham voted yea, Mr. Ampuja voted yea and, Mr. Porter voted yea. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously, and the meeting stood adjourned at 9:01pm.**

**The Conservation Commission will not be meeting in the month of July. The next meeting is currently scheduled for Tuesday, August 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road unless otherwise noted.**