

# **CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

## **MINUTES (Approved 10/28/15)**

**OCTOBER 14, 2015**

**Present: J. Wiley, Chairman**

**A. Goetz, Vice Chairman  
R. Turner, B. Dyer, K. Watson, E. DiVirgilio (7:05), J. Finnigan**

**Also Present: L. Hershey, Conservation Agent**

Conservation Agent report given to the board

**CONT. PUBLIC HEARING  
LAND DISTURBANCE PERMIT  
BOSTON-PROV. HWY (HOTEL)  
Opened: 7:00**

Mr. Wiley read the advertisement from the Walpole Times into the record for this Public Hearing which has been opened and continued.

Mr. Wiley read an email into the record from the applicant's representative dated October 13, 2015 requesting the hearing be continued until the October 28, 2015 meeting.

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to continue the Public Hearing until October 28, 2015 at 8:00  
Ms. Dyer seconded the motion  
Vote: 6-0-0**

## **MINUTES**

**September 23, 2015**

**Ms. Dyer made the motion to approve the Minutes for September 23, 2015  
Mr. Goetz seconded the motion  
Vote: 5-0-1 (Ms. Watson abstained)**

**ENFORCEMENT ORDER  
1900 MAIN ST.  
DEP# 315-1043**

Mr. Wiley read a letter emailed to the office from Mr. Santos dated 10/8/15. The letter requests an amendment to the Order of Conditions DEP #315-1043 for the removal of the vegetative swale. He stated the original plans were drawn incorrectly and there is no need for a swale. The commission discussed whether this would be considered major or minor. An amendment would require notification of abutters and fees, a minor modification would not. The commission would like Mr. Santos to submit the new site plan provided to the office prior to the next conservation meeting on October 28, 2015. Mr. Santos will be required to let the commission know if he is unable to provide this before that date.

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to approve changes as a Minor Modification to DEP#315-1043 once the site plan has been received**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

A letter will be sent to Mr. Santos directing him of the deadline to get the site plan into the office

#### **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

**GLEN Dr. #2**

**DEP # 315-1044**

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to approve and issue a Certificate of Compliance for 2 Glen Dr.**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

**GRISTMILL LN. #47**

**DEP# 315-1066**

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to approve and issue a Certificate of Compliance for 47 Gristmill Ln.**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

**INDUSTRIAL RD. #33**

**DEP# 315-1012**

Ms. Hershey stated replanting and cleaning up of the area from sedimentation issues has been complete. The applicant submitted an as-built plan he felt was acceptable as the plan of record, although Ms. Hershey told him that typically it is surveyed. The requirements state it needs to be stamped and certified by an Engineer.

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to approve and issue a Certificate of Compliance for 33 Industrial Rd. subject to certification and a stamped engineer plan**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

#### **BOARD COMMENTS**

Zoning Board Appeals – Chandler Ave. #45 – The commission has no comment

Zoning Board of Appeals – Grace Memorial Dr. 310 – The commission has no comments

Zoning Board of Appeals – Common St. #150 – The commission has no comments

Planning Board – Off Norfolk St. (Dynamic Energy Solutions) – The applicant has filed with the conservation commission and will be on the Agenda October 28, 2015

Planning Board – High St. #50-54 – This is a revised plan and the commission has no additional comments since the first request for comments

Planning Board – Modification of Olmsted Estates – The commission discussed that the review of Roscommon Subdivision which is before them tonight may reflect comments regarding the Olmsted plan

Planning Board – Roscommon Subdivision re-file – The board is looking at this filing this evening. Comments will be forwarded to the Planning Board as this plan is under review

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Hershey stated signage has been made up to place on the school property and water treatment area. She and Bob LeBlanc located appropriate areas for them to go.

## **STORMWATER WORKSHOP**

Ms. Hershey stated that after speaking with Town Administrator, Jim Johnson, the stormwater workshop will not take place at the conservation meeting as originally planned, but will be on Tuesday November 10, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. It will be held in the main meeting room, as he felt a Tuesday night more people may be available to attend.

## **ENFORCEMENT ORDERS**

### **SOUTH ST. #120**

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to vacate the Enforcement order for 120 South St.**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

### **INDUSTRIAL RD. #33**

**DEP# 315-1012**

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to vacate the Enforcement Order for 33 Industrial Rd.**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

## **CONTINUED PUBLIC MEETING**

### **REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF APPLICABILITY**

#### **WASHINGTON ST. #112**

**Opened: 7:00**

Mr. Wiley read the advertisement from the Walpole Times. This meeting has been opened but the representatives have requested continuances until this evening.

Mr. Wiley read board comments into the record.

Mr. Dan Garson, of Woodard and Curran was present representing Hollingsworth and Vose Company.

Mr. Garson stated that he emailed a minor change to the original Request for Determination. The original plan was to install a new stair and entrance which would include a stairway to the second floor. Instead the existing entrance at ground level will be renovated and the Mill will be entered from there. The basement stairway will be enclosed as originally proposed. Mr. Garson stated the footprint of activity will be reduced and minimal. Mr. Garson presented photographs in the Request for Determination. They are

requesting a Negative Determination for this proposal as there is minimal work and it has no effect to the resource area. Mr. Garson stated that H&V has always operated the mill in a responsible way.

Ms. Hershey stated that based on the request and plan, she feels it is minor in nature and recommends a negative Determination.

Mr. Turner asked if a new machine was going in and discussed concerns the mechanism may impair the environment

Mr. Garson stated a new one is going in at the same location as the one it is replacing and there are no real changes.

Mr. Goetz stated his only concern is during the construction period, materials need to be removed and brought to the right place. He stated scrap materials should not be dumped into the river

Mr. Garson stated that full erosion controls will be in place including silt socks. Hollingsworth and Vose will supervise the contractors to avoid problems. He stated all material will be in enclosed dumpsters and disposed of properly. Mr. Garson anticipates the project being much faster now that the second floor is not involved.

Mr. Wiley asked for questions or comments from the audience

Mr. John Mustonen, 7 Bullard St. discussed he is involved in the Willett Pond Charitable Protective Association. He discussed concerns that the need to draw down Willett Pond to supplement river flow may happen and also the abutters concern of adverse effect to wildlife

Mr. Ian Cooke of the Neponset River Watershed Association said although he has no objections to this particular application, he is concerned with future implications for future water use. He discussed he has had constructive dialog with H&V and hopes it will be ongoing regarding his concerns. He discussed the WPA regulations and Walpole Bylaw.

Mr. Wiley stated that as far as activity for this particular application the comments are not applicable

Mr. Jim Ward, Attorney representing H&V discussed water withdrawal in rebuttal to Mr. Cooke's concerns

Mr. Wiley stated the comments regarding water withdrawal is a different issue and not the application before us tonight.

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to close the Public Meeting**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

**Closed: 7:53**

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to issue a Negative 2 Determination**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion.**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

**PUBLIC HEARING  
NOTICE OF INTENT  
PINE ST. #164 (BROOKSIDE VILLAGE)  
DEP# 315-1093**

**Opened: 7:56**

Mr. Wiley read the advertisement from the Walpole Times. Certificates of mailing were given

Mr. Wiley read board comments into the record as well as DEP comments

Mr. Rob Truax, GLM engineering was present representing the applicant. Plans were submitted entitled "Notice of Intent for Brookside Village 164 Pine St. Walpole, MA 02081" dated September 2, 2015

The proposal is to develop the parcel into a thirty (30) unit Age Qualified Condominium Village. Mr. Truax gave the background of this 11+ acre property which was acquired in 1999. The applicant then purchased an existing house at 164 Pine with the intention of creating access for the development without being in the riverfront area. Mr. Truax gave an overview of the plan and stated he completed a site walk with Ms. Hershey and Joyce Hastings of GLM who delineated the wetlands. Mr. Truax stated portions of the work are located within 100 ft. of a wetland resource area. He stated everything slopes from Pine St. and to the wetlands.

Mr. Truax showed the units on the plan and discussed the proposal to tie the site into town sewer. He discussed there will be leaching galleys constructed to support the 100 yr. storm for the proposed buildings as well as a recharge system. Mr. Truax stated five of the thirty units have walkout basements and a pipe system will be put in along the back of the units to a drainage basin as shown on the plan. Mr. Truax stated the proposed development will disturb 28,000 square ft. of riverfront. There will be no work proposed within the 100 ft. buffer of the homes, as most impacts are to the riverfront area. Mr. Truax discussed grading, and how there will be a gentle slope from building to building across the site. He is proposing a retaining wall behind some of the homes where needed. The drainage basin has no outlet and is a recharge basin; no pipe leaves the basin. Mr. Truax stated TSS removal standards have been met with deep sumps and stormceptor for street runoff. The soil testing show good soils with no issues with groundwater and a good site to get rid of runoff

Ms. Hershey stated she completed the site walk with Ms. Hastings and Mr. Truax and had no issues with the wetland flags. She stated this application is a review within the riverfront area, and although the applicant has done a great job of taking work outside the riverfront, the Riverfront Act does call for no work there unless there is no practicable alternative. Ms. Hershey stated the applicant needs to prove that with their alternative analysis. The conservation agent report will be included in these minutes. Ms. Hershey stated she would like to see the basin moved out of the 100 ft. buffer. Relocating the basin will allow for longer travel time and be beneficial prior to infiltration and discharge to the river. Ms. Hershey stated a wildlife habitat evaluation should be completed, and basically that more work needs to be done. She stated that DEP also is asking for more information as well

Ms. Watson stated the scale seems huge for such a small area; she has concerns for the wildlife in the area as well

Mr. Finnigan made the statement that the applicant has the right to overcome presumption that the riverfront area is significant to the interest of the Wetlands Protection Act

Ms. Hershey stated the applicant has the right to do this but the application was filed under the presumption that the riverfront area is significant

Mr. Truax will get back to the commission on this

Mr. Truax stated they can probably do some work to pull the basin out of the 100 ft. buffer, but there was a natural bowl there and it seemed like the best area to have it.

Mr. Finnigan questioned if the applicant is going to overcome presumption, why are they presenting tonight

Mr. Turner stated his concerns of protecting the brook and making sure there is no negative impact. He discussed the water running under Route One, through the forest and into the wells and that this area has been one for wildlife habitat for several years.

Ms. Dyer stated it is the commission's job to uphold laws and bylaw. If the applicant knew alternatives were required why would they bother to come tonight? She stated why not put in a few luxury homes instead of several.

Mr. Truax stated luxury homes are not allowed as it is highway business zoned

Mr. Goetz stated he has not seen worksheets on stormwater specs. He asked about recharge in the riverfront area. The front of the units, open space area or basin could be utilized. He asked about the sewer line and why it couldn't go through the house lot since only part of it is being used. Mr. Goetz stated he feels this project is an example of greed and that thirty houses are not necessary. The whole riverfront area doesn't need to be taken over

Mr. Wiley asked if there would be an easement for the proposed sewer line

Mr. Truax stated it is owned by the association so it's private. He is not proposing an access road

Mr. Wiley stated the existing site stores a lot of water that goes to the riverfront. How will this be maintained so the same amount of water will drain back to the stream?

Mr. Truax stated the basin recharges back into the ground as well as roof runoff.

Mr. Wiley asked for questions or comments from the audience

Maura Therrin, 116 Pine St. —asked about the sewer line and is the pump station set up for thirty additional houses.

Mr. Truax stated the station is capable of this increase in houses and as it is an age qualified development most homes will not have four bedrooms which is accounted for in that calculation

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to continue the Public Hearing until December 9, 2015 at 7:00**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**



**PUBLIC HEARING  
NOTICE OF INTENT  
ROSCOMMON SUBDIVISION  
DEP# 315-1094**

**Opened: 8:50**

Mr. Wiley read the advertisement from the Walpole Times. Certificates of mailing were received

Mr. Wiley read board comments into the record. He also read a letter from DEP into the record

Plans were submitted entitled "Roscommon Open Space Residential Development Walpole MA" dated 9/9/15. A packet was sent to the commission dated 10/7/15 with supplemental information on the proposal by Lucas Environmental, LLC.

Mr. John Glossa and Tom Liddy, Lucas Environmental was present. Owners, Michael Viano and Sean McEntee were present.

Mr. Liddy gave a general overview of the proposal for the construction of a thirty (30)-lot Open Space Residential Development located between Fisher and North St. They will access the OSRD by constructing a new roadway and sewer line which ties into an existing manhole located on Walden Dr. They would like to provide access to the 30-lot Open Space development through Emerald Way. If approved they would need to amend the Order of Conditions for Olmsted Estates Subdivision to extend the subdivision roadway from Fisher St.

Mr. Liddy discussed existing conditions of the site and the wetland resource areas and stated they have an approved Order of Resource Area Delineation. Mr. Liddy stated there are a number of constraints on the property including isolated wetlands and a vernal pool.

Mr. Liddy stated the Army Corp of Engineers has reviewed and issued approval.

Mr. Liddy discussed the plans and wetland impacts. Mr. Liddy stated a wetland crossing would need to be constructed on Emerald Way and the other wetland crossing for a private driveway. Mr. Liddy discussed the proposal to use an open sided box culvert for the crossings which will keep the stream channel intact. He stated this is consistent with the standards and what the State requires. Mr. Liddy stated the total wetland fill is 10,000

Mr. Liddy stated this is a limited project and feels they have met all of the standards. The proposed 24ft wide roadway is the minimal length and width acceptable to the Planning Board. He stated there is no alternative means of access from a public way to an upland area so a wetland crossing is unavoidable. Two replication areas of BVW are proposed as mitigation for the wetland impact of 16,000 sq. ft. Mr. Liddy stated the proposed roadways are designed so they do not restrict the flow of water, so stream crossing standards are met. He discussed taking input from the Army Corp. of Engineers. They felt that the proximity of the vernal pool and large wetland system should remain intact so the roadway was relocated to the south and is now 100 ft. from the wetlands. Houses were also eliminated near that area. Mr. Liddy discussed the wildlife in the area and their access to the vernal pool was taken into consideration. Mr. Liddy discussed house lots and their locations to the wetlands; some of which have restrictions to prevent encroachment to sensitive areas.

Mr. Glossa went into drainage detail. He stated they made a low impact design as best they could. They tried to make a country drainage design but the DPW was adamant they wanted catch basins and a more

traditional design. EPA is pushing away from that as they want to spread drainage out for runoff time to go through natural vegetation and soak through the soil where the water becomes cleansed of suspended solids. Mr. Glossa showed on the plans where catchment areas and catch basins are located and how the water is cleaned prior to discharge through the outlet structures. He stated the systems will be maintained by the Homeowner Association and the Town will maintain the catch basins located in the street.

Ms. Hershey stated the proposal as Open Space is a thoughtful plan that will protect the buffer as well as upland. She stated this is filed as a limited project under the Wetland Protection Act and some of the requirements have been discussed. Ms. Hershey stated realignment and relocation were not discussed as an alternative. Her agent report will be attached to the minutes. Ms. Hershey stated significant impact is being requested and all alternatives need to be looked at. An informal discussion with the Planning Board is not enough; it needs to be in writing with regards to the issue of where the roadway is going to go. Ms. Hershey stated the design of the basin shows grading but the basin is not consistent with vernal pool habitat. Ms. Hershey stated she would recommend to the board a peer review of this Notice of Intent for the limited project status. She would like the Planning Board to have the same reviewer to keep it consistent.

Mr. Glossa stated they would embrace this idea and agree one reviewer is best

Ms. Watson stated she agrees more information is needed and would like the peer review

Mr. DiVirgilio agrees as well and would like to see an alternative to lessen impact on the roadway. He would like more information on the replication area.

Mr. Finnigan asked if the 401 and 404 permit were not needed would the design change

Mr. Liddy stated they knew the Army Corp review would be more stringent with increased jurisdiction so they went to them first for input

Mr. Turner stated as far as drainage he has concerns about erosion and suspended solids

Mr. Glossa stated that the deep sumps and catch basins meet standards to remove solids. If more is needed the peer reviewer can decide.

Ms. Dyer asked about the driveway that was mentioned as part of the project and wants to see it on the plan. She stated that some of the lots have extra restrictions and should be on the plan as well.

Mr. Glossa stated all will be on the revised plans

Mr. Liddy stated most are out of the 100 ft. buffer

Mr. Glossa stated the only places work is being proposed in the 25ft buffer is at two crossings

Mr. Wiley asked if there was any other way to get access to lot 30. He stated it could be accessed from Kilronan and doesn't see why there is need for a crossing

Mr. Liddy stated there is no way other than a crossing. In deciding the crossing locations the wetland reason was to maintain continuity in that area and it was a compromise to be away from the vernal pool and not as close to neighbors. Mr. Liddy also stated if the timing works out they would bring the water and gas to the driveway area.



Mr. Wiley asked for questions from the audience

Ms. Hershey stated that in the event the commission chose to have a peer review of the site, she has reached out to Beals and Thomas and they are able to do this in a few weeks.

Mr. Viano and Mr. McEntee were amenable to a peer review

**Ms. Watson made the motion to continue the Public hearing until November 12, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.**

**Mr. DiVirgilio seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

**Mr. Goetz made the motion to accept a peer review for the Roscommon Subdivision**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

**Mr. DiVirgilio made the motion to adjourn**

**Ms. Dyer seconded the motion**

**Vote: 7-0-0**

**Closed: 10:15**



**Town of Walpole  
Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

**Conservation Agents Report  
Landis Hershey**

**10-14-2015**

**1.0 MEETINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**1.1 Bos-Prov Hywy Land Disturbance Permit**

The Applicant is requesting a continuance to 10/28 in order to provide the Commission with the requested information.

**1.2 Hollingsworth and Vose -112 Washington Street**

There has been some modification to the project since the original filing. There project as proposed is within previously altered river front area and does not present additional impact to the river. Recommend negative 2.

**1.3 Pine Street, 164 Brookside Village NOI DEP #315-1093**

The Applicant proposes an alteration of

100-200 feet: 28,329s.f. (9.9 %) for development and 10,073s.f. for drainage basin.

100-200 et: 5,869 s.f for drainage basin and 2,865 s.f temporary for sewer line.

*1) The Applicant needs to submit additional information on the alternative analysis requirements 10.58(4).* The applicant shall prove by a preponderance of the evidence that there is no practicable, and substantially equivalent economic alternatives to the proposed project with less adverse effects on the interests of the Act. The alternative analysis should include reduction of the scale of the activity.

The current alternative analysis does not take into consideration any design alternatives which would reduce the scale of the project. The Applicant needs to provide to the Commission an alternative analysis which includes the least impact to the riverfront area. The analysis should include whether such option(s) are reasonable or cost prohibitive to the owner; use best available technology and engineering design to minimize adverse impacts; proposed use alternatives from the perspective of site location, site configuration and scope of project; and logistics such as legal and site constraints.

*2) The Applicant needs to show that there is "no practicable alternative" to locating the stormwater basin within the 100-foot undisturbed vegetation.*

*10.58 4d: No Significant Adverse Impact-* Commission may allow alteration within 200 foot Riverfront area of 10% or 5,000 s.f. whichever is larger, provided: 1.(a) at a minimum 100-foot wide area of undisturbed vegetation- The site does have 100-feet undisturbed vegetation except

for the drainage basin. Stormwater management structures may be located within the 100 feet however only if "there is no practicable alternative".

**Reasons to move the basin:** 1) the Applicant has not shown that there are **no practicable alternative** locations for the stormwater structure; 2) Locating the stormwater structures further away from the river allows for a longer travel time for cooling of stormwater prior to infiltration and discharging to the river; 3) The area proposed for the stormwater basin is a bowl which had been altered at some point however I believe that it would be better suited for the applicant to provide some mitigation plantings there and locate the stormwater basin outside the 100-foot riverfront area; and 4) Locating the basin within the 100-foot riverfront area may pose an obstacle to wildlife habitat functions.

3) *The Commission should require a wildlife habitat evaluation under section 10.60 if the Applicant's design exceeds 5,000 s.f of riverfront alteration. 10.58(4)(d)1c.* – If the Applicant is proposing to alter undeveloped river front area exceeding 5,000 s.f the Commission may require a wildlife habitat evaluation study under section 10.60.

#### 1.4 Roscommon Subdivision North Street

This project is filed as a *limited project 10.53(3)(e)* proposing wetland alterations to construct a new roadway, driveway and utilities to access an upland portion of land. Under section 10.53(3) the Commission may exercise their **discretion** to approve the limited project by considering the following: 1) *magnitude of the alteration and the significance of the project site to the interests of the Act*, 2) *the availability of reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity, the extent to which adverse impacts are minimized, and* 3) *mitigation measures, including replication or restoration, are provided to contribute to the interests of the Act.*

1) *Prior to reviewing other components of the project such as stormwater management, the Commission should first determine if the Applicant has met the performance standards 10.53(3) for the limited project.*

- a. Under 10.53(3)e the Applicant must discuss "reasonable alternatives". The Applicant should document that there are no alternatives including realignment, relocation and/or engineering practices which would have less adverse impact on the wetland resource areas for both access routes (North Street and Fisher Street).

This should include but not limited to, why Emerald Way can't be relocated to the south where the wetlands are narrower and if all possible engineering best management practices have been considered to minimize wetland impacts at the North Street alternative access.

- b. The Applicant should provide to the Commission a letter from the Planning Board with a ruling regarding the minimum length and width of the roadway and that a request for waivers was made, denied or would not minimize the adverse impacts to the wetlands as recommended in DEP Policy 88-2. An informal conversation between the Applicant and the Planning board is insufficient documentation.

- 2) In consideration of the OSRD layout, I would recommend that the Commission request that the Planning Board instruct the Applicant not to design stormwater detention structures within the buffer zone of the wetland located in Open Space #5 and 6. The earlier comments and intent of including this area as part of the Open Space Plan was to provide unaltered land between the development and the wetland and vernal pool. The design as shown with grading, a berm, and the location of a stormwater structure within this area does not meet that intent.

I would also consider that the Commission extend the minimum 25-foot no alteration area to a greater distance with recommendation from the peer reviewer.

**Administrative issues:**

- 1) I recommend that the NOI go out to peer review for the stormwater management system, the limited project review, and proposed mitigation review.
- 2) Filing fee should include driveway crossing for a single family lot cat. 2f as well as the roadway crossing cat. 4a.
- 3) The submitted NOI is not the most recent copy (4/22/2015) and the date has been copied off. The NOI should be re-submitted on the 4/22/2015 form.
- 4) The NOI was filed for work associated with the Roscommons subdivision. Another NOI was submitted and an OOC issued for work associated with Olmsted subdivision. Part of the crossing is on the Olmsted Subdivision property but it is my understanding that the wetlands alteration is all filed under the Roscommons NOI. The Water Quality application states that there are no wetland impacts on the Olmsted subdivision. Please clarify this.

**2.0 General Business**

**2.1 Conservation Land**

5 No motorized vehicles signs and 3 Environmentally Sensitive, Passive Recreation Only, No Motorized Vehicle signs were made and I located the areas with Bob LeBlanc they should be in or going in soon.

- 2.2 Stormwater Partnership workshop** is scheduled for Tuesday 11/10 at 6 pm in the Main Meeting room. This was the time Jim Johnson thought we could get the most department heads and other interested parties. The workshop will be led by NepRWA. So we will have the regular schedule on 10/28.

**3.0 CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

- 3.1 Glen Drive, 2 DEP #315-1044 – ok issue

- 3.2 Industrial Road, 33 DEP #315-1012

As-built is not surveyed As-built but rather plan updated certified by engineer.  
Issue with continuing conditions if final plan is ok

- 3.2 Gristmill, 47, DEP 315-1066

Ok- issue

#### **4.0 BOARD COMMENT**

**Planning Board – Olmsted Estates modification**

Comment should include that the Commission will be reviewing the possible alternatives to the proposed wetland alteration for the extension of Emerald way. The Applicant must show that there is no reasonable alternative with less impact including relocation of the roadway.

**Planning Board – Roscommon Subdivision refile**

See my notes above regarding the Open Space

This is a refile because they did not notify abutters the first time

**Planning Board – High Meadows subdivision**

The Commission is currently reviewing

This is a refile because they did not notify abutters the first time

**ZBA – Common street, 150 - No jurisdiction**

**Grace Memorial Dr 10 – No jurisdiction**

**Chandler Ave. 45 – No jurisdiction**