



Stephanie Radner, Chair
Nathan Gauthier, Vice Chair
Eliot Foulds, Clerk
Leigh Hafrey, Associate
Nick Garlick, Associate
Bob Holmes, Associate
Erik DeAvila, Associate
Tim Puopolo, Alternate
Elissa Brown, Agent

450 Washington Street
Dedham, MA 02026

Tel: (781) 751-9210
Fax: (781) 751-9109

Website
www.dedham-ma.gov

TOWN OF DEDHAM

CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes of June 17, 2021

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic and given the current prohibitions on gatherings imposed by Governor Baker's March 23, 2020 "Order Assuring Continued Operation of Essential Services in the Commonwealth, Closing Workplaces, and Prohibiting Gatherings of More than 10 People," this public hearing was conducted both in person and virtually, as allowed by Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 "Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §20.

The following Commissioners were present:

Stephanie Radner, Chair
Nathan Gauthier, Vice Chair
Bob Holmes
Leigh Hafrey
Erik DeAvila

The following staff were also present:

Elissa Brown, Agent

The following Commissioners were absent:

Eliot Foulds, Clerk
Nick Garlick
Tim Puopolo, Alternate

The following Applicants and/or Representatives were present:

Regan Andreola, Representative – 214 Lowder Street
Martin Grealish, Applicant – 179 Riverside Drive
Jim Burke, Representative – 179 Riverside Drive
Scott Morrison, Representative – 179 Riverside Drive
Paul Lindholm, Representative – 72 Village Avenue
Gamze Munden, Representative – 32 Orchard Street
John Patillo, Applicant – 2 Jackson Pond Road
Karon Skinner Catrone, Representative – 2 Jackson Pond Road
Giorgio Petruzzello, Applicant – 218 Schoolmaster Lane
Mike Carter, Representative – 218 Schoolmaster Lane
Nancy Kaaz – 62 Abbott Road
Chris McDonnell, Representative – 62 Abbott Road
Brian Timm, Representative – 62 Abbott Road

Commissioner Radner called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm in accordance with the Wetlands Protection Act, M.G.L. Chapter 131, Section 40, the Dedham Wetlands Bylaw, and the Dedham Stormwater Management Bylaw.

1. Continued Applications (Applications Previously Opened to be Discussed Tonight)

1.1 214 Lowder Street – DEP #141-0583/MSMP 2021-01 – Planned Residential Development

Owner: Jack Connors, Wight Pond II Applicant: John Joyce, Old Grove Partners Representative: Regan Andreola, Beals & Thomas

Ms. Andreola confirmed that a waiver was not needed for test pits as originally thought; they were able to complete all necessary test pits. Agent Brown stated she would change that on the draft conditions.

Commissioner Radner also stated the adjacent parcel needed to be added to the NOI for the plantings and berm.

Agent Brown stated Ms. Andreola had supplied comments on the draft permit, almost all of which Agent Brown accepted. Agent Brown had required weekly monitoring by an environmental scientist, but the applicant requested it to be monthly. This request was approved. The applicant requested a waiver for monitoring during frozen ground conditions. Agent Brown did not allow this request because frozen ground conditions change so quickly. Agent Brown also reduced the required planting survival rate from 100% to 80%. Other requests were relatively minor and accepted.

Ms. Andreola confirmed these changes were acceptable, but also noted an issue with the screened in porches. Agent Brown stated that any decks had to be pervious with stone underneath but screened-in porches could be tied into the stormwater management system. Ms. Andreola confirmed that any roofs over decks would collect runoff via gutters and the stormwater management system had sufficient capacity for this added flow.

Commissioner Radner opened the floor to the other commissioners for questions or comments. She received no responses.

Commissioner Radner motioned to issue the Major Stormwater Management Permit as drafted by Agent Brown, with the additions and changes discussed. Commissioner Hafrey seconded. Commissioner DeAvila abstained. Commissioner Gauthier voted “nay.” Commissioners Radner, Hafrey, and Holmes voted “aye.” Motion carried 3-1 with one abstention.

1.2 179 Riverside Drive – DEP #141-0585; MSMP 2021-02 – New SFD on Undeveloped Lot

Applicant: Martin Grealish, Phoenix Holdings Representative: Jim Burke, DeCelle-Burke-Sala
Request: Issue OOC/MSMP

Mr. Grealish presented details about the proposed project and how he and his contracted engineer have sought to design a home with a small footprint that is comparable to other homes along the river in this area. He stated that he is hoping to improve the site during construction by removing invasive species as well as potentially improving existing stormwater infrastructure on site. Agent Brown stated that DPW Director Joe Flanagan had viewed the site and reported that he did not note infrastructure issues in dire need of correction.

Mr. Grealish also discussed previous concerns about the deck, stating that the deck is the secondary egress from the house and therefore it cannot be removed from the plans. He also stated that the

house footprint was as small as it could functionally be. Further, he stated he does not believe removing the deck or shrinking the house footprint further will result in a lessened impact on the resource area.

Mr. Burke presented the engineering design of the proposed plans. He stated the plans include room for on-site parking, as off-street parking is already prevalent in the neighborhood. He stated he had seen a large amount of erosion and debris deposition associated with the nearby storm drain outfall. Mr. Burke stated that, with a strict application of the buffer area rules, this lot is unbuildable, but he felt this design represented a reasonable compromise to allow the project to move forward.

Scott Morrison, a contracted wetland scientist for the proposed project, reviewed his findings after examining the site. He stated the habitat value is mostly as a corridor for wildlife movement. The only wildlife habitat he found on site was a woodchuck burrow. He also stated he had noted several invasive species on the site. He assembled a landscape plan that included removal of the invasive species and installation of native plants. He also stated that positioning of the house as shown in the plan maintains the noted wildlife corridor.

Commissioner DeAvila asked if invasive species would be removed mechanically or chemically treated. Mr. Morrison stated most could be done mechanically, but some areas, particularly the knotweed, would need herbicide treatment. Commissioner DeAvila also asked what trees would be removed. Mr. Burke indicated that two deciduous trees, one 12" and the other 18" in diameter would be removed.

Commissioner Radner asked if the 2-tiered deck affected these trees. Mr. Burke stated that removing the 2nd tier of the deck from the plan might allow the 18" tree to remain.

Commissioner Radner cited previous conversations about whether there used to be a structure on this site and whether this project would be considered re-development. She stated she checked with the Assessor's Office and found no permits on record. Therefore, the existence of potential remnants is irrelevant because even if there was something on the site, it was never permitted.

Discussion ensued about the history of the lot. Mr. Morrison noted that, since the lot was created so long ago, it was subject to a grandfather clause in the Wetlands Protection Act, allowing development of up to 5000 ft². Commissioner Radner stated that the land had changed hands since the effective date of the Act, so she wasn't sure if the grandfather clause was still applicable. Mr. Morrison stated it was still applicable as long as the parcels weren't re-subdivided.

Commissioner DeAvila asked if the 2nd tier of the deck was pervious. Mr. Burke stated that it was currently just a wood deck, but a gutter system could be installed if that was preferable. He stated flow from any gutter system could be routed to the infiltration system. Commissioner DeAvila also asked about runoff from the driveway. Mr. Burke stated it was asphalt and would be directed to the infiltration system along with the roof runoff. He mentioned that pervious pavement could be explored if the commission preferred.

Commissioner Holmes asked how much of the undisturbed buffer area would be directly affected. Mr. Burke stated there was 4,429 ft² of 100' buffer on the site and they are proposing to disturb 3,600 ft² of that area.

For stormwater infrastructure improvements, Mr. Burke suggested they could consider improving the inlet that feeds the nearby outfall in a number of ways to help remove trash and debris. Mr. Grealish noted erosion in photographs that is caused by the outfall pipe.

Commissioner Hafrey asked for clarification on the invasive species removal and whether it would be completed in one activity. Mr. Morrison stated the initial activities would involve removal and creation of shade to prevent re-emergence, but also said that on-going management would be needed as in most cases of invasive species removal.

Commissioner DeAvila asked how soil would be stockpiled during construction given that the site is so steep. Mr. Burke stated that erosion and sediment controls would be placed first and then the excavated earth would be constantly pulled up the hill.

Commissioner Radner cited another project that needed strict conditions to prohibit parking and construction vehicles blocking the road and suggested something similar might be needed with this proposed project.

Agent Brown suggested the applicants prepare a construction phasing plan to be discussed at the next meeting to illustrate their plans to address these issues.

Commissioner Radner identified the proposed deck as an area for compromise, suggesting that the 2 tiers may be excessive and creating unnecessary impact. Commissioner DeAvila requested clarification on the positions of the deck. Mr. Burke stated the upper deck is a walkout from the basement, while the lower deck is about 6' below that.

Commissioner Radner asked for further questions from commissioners. She received no responses.

Commissioner Radner opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Agent Brown read a question from a virtual attendee requesting clarification on the grandfather clause referenced by Mr. Morrison. Agent Brown stated that the grandfather clause does not specifically allow a deck, but allows a house, driveway, and septic (if sewer is not available). She further stated that there is no grandfather clause in the Town By-Law. Mr. Morrison stated he thought there was a similar provision in the By-Law. Agent Brown responded that she would check to confirm or deny it.

Sharon LaRose, 159 Riverside Drive, asked for clarification about an existing public access right-of-way and asked how far the project encroached upon that. Mr. Burke stated that the project will not encroach onto the right-of-way.

Agent Brown read a question from a virtual attendee asking if this was a buildable lot. Commissioner Radner responded that, according to the Assessor's Office, this is a buildable lot, but that only means that the lot meets the Assessor's definition of "buildable." Mr. Grealish suggested that the purpose of this hearing was to determine whether the lot was buildable or not.

Agent Brown asked if infiltration rate testing would be included in test pits. Mr. Burke confirmed and stated a deep sump would be used for the driveway.

Agent Brown stated no more virtual attendees were signaling they had questions or comments.

Commissioner Radner stated she wanted to look further in the grandfathering provisions to better understand them in the context of this project, as well as the provisions of the Town By-Law.

Agent Brown also suggested the applicant consider a lighting plan due to the proximity of the project to the water.

Commissioner Radner recommended that applicant review the process for a waiver for the Town By-Law and think about the conditions and alternatives they would like to put forth when requesting it.

Commissioner Radner motioned to continue this item to the next meeting to gather more information, including a lighting plan and a construction staging plan. Commissioner Gauthier seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

1.3 72 Village Avenue – MSMP 2021-13 – Renovation of Existing SFD, garage, and deck

Applicant: David Flynn Representative: Paul Lindholm Request: Issue MSMP

Mr. Lindholm gave an overview of the project. He stated the stormwater management devices had been resized so they will receive a 2" of runoff from the entire house. He also stated 2 trees were removed, but they are adding a number of trees and shrubs to the site.

Commissioner Radner opened the floor to the public for comments. She received no responses.

Mr. Lindholm asked if the surety bond could be reduced since this was only an addition instead of a single-family home construction. Agent Brown stated that the bond program had been effective in having applicants complete the entire process, but that an applicant was also more likely to complete the process if they were living at the site, which is the case in this project. Commissioner Radner suggested the bond be reduced to from \$5,000 to \$3,000 for this project.

Commissioner Radner motioned to close the public hearing on this item. Commissioner Hafrey seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

Commissioner Radner motioned issue the MSMP with the bond reduced from \$5,000 to \$3,000. Commissioner Hafrey seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

1.4 32 Orchard Street – MSMP 2021-09 – New Pool Deck and Re-grading

Applicant: Antoine Chehwan Representative: Gamze Munden, Munden Eng. Request: Issue MSMP

Ms. Munden stated she had submitted a revised construction spec. The owner decided not to pursue pavers around the pool area as they cannot find contractors to complete the work this season. Since the pavers will not be placed, Ms. Munden has removed the stormwater infiltration system from the plans, but Ms. Munden stated that the owners are aware that they will need the Commission's approval to place the pavers in the future.

Commissioner Radner asked for clarification that this was a partial "after-the-fact" application, as the pool has already been installed. Ms. Munden confirmed that the project began as a pool installation permitted by the building department, but the contractor also levelled the back yard, resulting in over 2,000 ft² of disturbance.

Commissioner Gauthier asked for clarification on how subsequent work in later years might be permitted. Agent Brown stated that the Building Department's standard that if related work is done

within 5 years, then it should be part of the initial permit. Conservation has adopted the same stance, so any related work within 5 years will require modification of the permit.

Commissioner Radner opened the floor to the public for comments. She received no response.

Agent Brown stated she had drafted a MSMP for this project and shared it with Ms. Munden. Ms. Munden stated she had not reviewed it. Agent Brown stated the drafted permit had no special conditions. Commissioner Radner gave Ms. Munden a choice of either the Commission issuing the permit as drafted or continuing this item to the next meeting to give her time to review it. Ms. Munden stated her preference to have the permit issued at this meeting.

Commissioner Radner motioned to close the public meeting for this item and issue the Major Stormwater Management Permit as drafted by Agent Brown. Commissioner DeAvila seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

2. New Applications

2.1 2 Jackson Pond Road – RDA 2021-09 – Invasive Species Management and Paving

Applicant: John Patillo Representative: Karon Skinner Catrone Request: Issue Neg. DoA

Ms. Catrone stated the applicant is requesting a Negative Determination of Applicability to re-pave the existing driveway and remove invasive bittersweet from the property. The driveway will retain the same dimensions. A compost sock would be installed along the wetland-side of the driveway. Bittersweet plants are growing throughout the yard on the wetland side and the applicant would like to remove them. The work will be completed by a professional who specializes in invasive removal and there will be no removal of native vegetation.

Commissioner Radner noted some burning bush that had been growing along the driveway. Ms. Catrone confirmed this and stated that it could be removed, as well, if the commission wished.

Agent Brown noted there was smilax in the yard as well, which can often be confused with bittersweet. She recommended the applicant be aware of this and not remove the smilax.

Ms. Catrone stated the bittersweet is proposed to be removed by hand, but herbicide was also proposed in the management plan. This activity would be "cutting and dabbing" done by a licensed professional applicator.

Mr. Patillo stated that he's aware that management of the invasives will require continuing maintenance and he's committed to this task.

Commissioner DeAvila stated his concern with digging out the burning bush plants because they didn't know how many there were near the wetland. Ms. Catrone stated her recollection was the burning bush was on the corner and the opposite side of the driveway.

Agent Brown noted that the driveway is partially gravel and the gravel portions seem to match up with the property lines. She asked for clarification on this item. Mr. Patillo stated that much of the driveway is an easement across his neighbor's lot. He stated it was paved at one time, but in lieu of repaving it, a past owner simply covered it with gravel.

Agent Brown stated a letter from the neighbor confirming their approval of this work would be appropriate. Mr. Patillo stated the easement was recorded, but he could obtain a letter, as well.

Commissioner Radner asked if the driveway would be resurfaced or if the existing pavement would be removed. Mr. Patillo stated the existing asphalt would be removed. Agent Brown stated erosion and sediment controls would be necessary and should be added to the plan.

Commissioner Radner motioned to continue this item to the next public meeting, requesting a letter from the neighbor, revised plans showing erosion and sediment controls, and a draft Negative Determination of Applicability be prepared and submitted. Commissioner Hafrey seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

2.2 210 Schoolmaster Lane – MSMP 2021-14 – Driveway Relocation

Applicant: Supreme Development, Giorgio Petruzzello Representative: Mike Carter, GCG Request: Issue MSMP

Mr. Carter stated the applicant is requesting a waiver for stormwater regulations for a driveway relocation. An existing driveway serves a house at the back of the parcel (Lot 5). This driveway currently runs across Lot 6 and needs to be moved. When the stormwater permit was issued for the property on Lot 6, they knew the driveway would have to be removed and did not request credit for removing the driveway because they knew the impervious area would just be moved to another location wholly within Lot 5. It is irregular shaped to minimize tree removal (only one tree will need to be removed) and existing ledge. The overall impervious area is not changing – the original driveway measures 2,324 ft² and the new one will measure 2,323 ft². They have proposed to install a stone infiltration trench along the driveway. The road will be built as though it's permanent but is thought of as temporary as this parcel will likely be developed in the future. Mr. Carter stated they are requesting a waiver because they are not creating additional impervious area, the inclusion of stormwater management will require the removal of trees and/or blasting of ledge, and this may be a temporary driveway that will eventually be removed if the parcel is developed.

Commissioner Radner stated that the Commission would view this as a permanent driveway because, according to current plans, it may be at least a few years before the parcel is developed, if ever. She stated that while there wasn't a change in impervious area, there is a significant amount of area that will be disturbed and the amount of additional area that would be disturbed to install stormwater management features would be relatively minor. Because of this, she stated she's inclined to reject the waiver request.

Commissioner Gauthier stated that this work clearly exceeded the permit thresholds and therefore a Major Stormwater Management Permit was required. Further, he felt that a waiver could be requested for parts of a Major Stormwater Management Permit, but he was not in favor of granting a waiver from the entire process. Commissioner Radner agreed.

Commissioner Radner clarified that this was an "after-the-fact" application.

Mr. Petruzzello stated that installing stormwater management features would require blasting due to ledge. Agent Brown suggested placing the management features below the road. Mr. Petruzzello stated the bedrock is very shallow in this location and all foundations in this area had required blasting and fill.

Commissioner Radner expressed concern that a waiver would set a troublesome precedent for future applications.

Commissioner Gauthier stated that if they wanted to file a waiver for a particular requirement, they have to define what they are proposing, perform necessary calculations, show why they can't do what's required, and show how they are coming as close as possible to compliance. Commissioner Gauthier made an example of the stone trench on the plans. Currently, the trench extends along one side of the driveway. He asked why it couldn't be to both sides to double the amount of infiltration.

Mr. Carter did some approximations and figured that adding a trench on the other side would allow for approximately 400 ft³ of infiltration, which would be more than the required amount of 375 ft³. However, he stated that the trenches may not catch all of the water directed their way because of the slope in the area. He stated that to meet the regulations they would have to do flat infiltration basins.

Commissioner Radner asked that the applicant provide a proposal with calculations that the Commission can use to make a decision.

Mr. Petruzzello stated that the calculated requirement is 375 ft³ of infiltration and they have proposed 200 ft³ and he strongly requested a determination. Commissioner Radner reiterated the need to have this written in an application. Commissioner Gauthier agreed with the need for a formal waiver request.

Commissioner Radner asked, and Agent Brown confirmed, that the requirements and instructions for Major Stormwater Management Permits are available. Commissioner Radner then asked if all necessary items had been submitted for this project. Agent Brown stated they had not. Commissioner Radner again reiterated the need to have all submissions to the Commission before a decision could be made.

Commissioner Radner moved to continue this item to the next meeting on 7/1 with remaining supporting materials required to be submitted by 6/22. Commissioner Hafrey seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

2.3 62 Abbott Road – MSMP 2021-15 – New Patio and Pool

Applicant: Nancy Kaaz Representative: Chris McDonnell, RJ O'Connell Request: Issue MSMP

Mr. McDonnell stated the applicant desires to install a pool, but while reviewing permitting requirements, the representatives discovered an open permit from 2016 for removal of a side driveway, expansion of a driveway to the front of the property, installation of a garage, and construction of an addition to the home.

Mr. McDonnell displayed the approval from the previous permit. He stated the stormwater management features included some rain gardens and a small infiltration system in the rear of the yard. He stated that the scope of the project expanded beyond what was permitted to include a patio to the rear of the property. He is uncertain if the rain gardens were installed as proposed but stated that they are not currently functioning if they were installed. Mr. McDonnell stated that, to the best of their knowledge, the small infiltration system was installed as proposed.

Agent Brown clarified that the plan Mr. McDonnell was displaying and discussing was not from the original application but was a modification after substantial changes were made to the approved driveway during construction. Mr. McDonnell confirmed this was correct.

Mr. McDonnell then reviewed a drawing showing existing conditions as well as installations that are proposed as part of this new application. The project will include expansion of the existing patio and installation of a pool. A detention basin is proposed to the rear of the property that will collect roof drainage from approximately half of the residence (the hash marked area in the plans). The roof runoff from the rest of the residence currently drains to the existing infiltration system. He stated that drainage analysis shows this will cause a 20% reduction in runoff rate and volume during a 2-year storm and a reduction of runoff rate for 10-, 25-, and 100-year storms when compared to the original existing conditions outlined during the permitting process for the earlier project.

Mr. Timm added that the detention basin will be capturing runoff from the areas that were intended to flow to the rain gardens that were included in the earlier project and reiterated that this work will result in a reduction of rate and volume of runoff from the site compared to conditions that existed before the earlier project.

Commissioner Radner expressed confusion with the grading plan as shown on the drawings, as it doesn't show the grade of the patio and pool area. Mr. Timm stated retaining walls are depicted on the site plan that are difficult to see on the color rendering.

Agent Brown asked if an existing gravel driveway to the rear of the property will be regraded and replanted. Mr. Timm stated that will remain as-is and they counted it as "grass" during drainage calculations.

Commissioner Gauthier asked if requirements related to all components of both projects (the pool and patio but also the addition and driveway) would be satisfied with this project, as though all of the work was completed as part of the same project. Mr. Timm stated they had focused mainly on the pool and new patio and believes the proposed design meets all requirements. However, he stated he is not familiar with regulations regarding additions and can't be sure the measures proposed in these plans would satisfy requirements of the addition if it were proposed today. Agent Brown stated the gravel driveway was also not permitted and added at some point, and therefore should be included.

Commissioner Gauthier stated that any un-permitted work or permitted work that wasn't completed needs to be included in this project. Mr. Timm stated that the existing conditions from the previous design were used as the baseline to prepare these plans.

Commissioner Gauthier noted the plans show the patio will cover part of the infiltration chamber. He asked if some sort of access will be included. Mr. Timm stated there is an inspection port at this location. A note on the plans informs the construction contractor to notify the design engineer if any part of the infiltration chamber is encountered. If that happens, they intend to shift the chamber away from the construction, keeping the same design parameters.

Commissioner Gauthier asked about a planting plan for the detention basin. Agent Brown stated one was required. Mr. Timm agreed to provide a planting plan.

Commissioner Holmes asked for a better representation or side view of the detention basin. Mr. Timm stated that could be prepared.

Agent Brown stated a construction management plan was also needed showing how construction vehicles will be managed.

Commissioner Gauthier asked for clarification on the installation date of the gravel road. Agent Brown stated it was installed sometime after 2017 based on aerial photography. Commissioner Gauthier asked if trees were removed for the driveway. Mr. Timm stated he did not believe any trees were removed in the process because it followed the path of the asphalt driveway that was proposed to be removed in the earlier project. Mr. Timm also stated a substantial number of trees had been planted along the perimeter of the parcel.

Commissioner DeAvila asked if any trees would be removed as a result of the newly proposed project. Mr. Timm stated no trees would be removed and some might be added because of this project. He said shrubs may be removed.

Commissioner Radner asked if the commissioners had any further questions. She received no responses.

Commissioner Radner opened the floor to the public for questions and comments.

Judy House of 555 East Street stated that East Street drains water to Jersey Street and she has already noted issues with water on Jersey Street. She is concerned the gravel driveway, which may be a street, will intercept water from the new installations, drain it to East Street, and exacerbate the issues she's already seeing. She also stated she was concerned the detention basin would allow mosquitos to breed. Agent Brown stated she had checked with the Building and Engineering Departments and confirmed the gravel area is a driveway and not a street.

Commissioner DeAvila asked what prevents overflow from the basin from being discharged to the driveway. Mr. Timm stated nothing was in place to prevent that, but that their analysis showed that it will not overflow in the 100-year storm. He stated they could modify the design to capture more surface runoff from the gravel driveway if needed. Agent Brown asked for calculations showing the basin will drain within 72 hours, which prevents mosquitos. Mr. Timm stated he would make sure they were in the HydroCad report.

Commissioner Gauthier asked for clarification on the pre and post conditions. Mr. Timm stated the runoff volume would be reduced by over 1,000 ft³ during all analyzed storms. Agent Brown asked what the freeboard was for the 100-year storm. Mr. Timm replied that the basin had about 1' of freeboard over the 100-year storm.

Commissioner Gauthier asked if a test pit had been dug where the detention basin is planned. Mr. Timm stated a test pit had previously been dug elsewhere on the property. They applied the findings from that pit to the design of the basin. He believes a test pit would likely find a better draining soil that what has been modeled in the calculations.

Resident Katie Lombardi stated that, as she understood it, the gutters on the original part of the house are draining to the existing infiltration system. She asked if the proposed patio would change that. Mr. Timm confirmed that the gutters would still drain to the infiltration system. Ms. Lombardi asked for a clarification on the drainage arrows on the patio on the site plan. Mr. Timm clarified that they show drainage of surface runoff from the patio. Ms. Lombardi stated there is a storm drain near the plan's

top right. She asked if overflow from the basin would cause erosion issues on the path to that drain. Mr. Timm stated that the basin is designed to infiltrate and should not overflow if constructed properly. He stated that if it did overflow, it should not cause erosion. He said an overflow should indicate that the basin is not working as designed and the residents should then repair it.

Agent Brown asked if there was a spec on the substrate of the basin. Mr. Timm stated he would include that in the planting plan.

After review, Agent Brown stated she did not have the expertise for a complete review of the project and would like a peer reviewer to consider the design. Commissioner Radner asked Agent Brown for an estimate of funds required for a peer reviewer. Agent Brown estimated \$2,200 and said she could request quotes. Commissioner Radner asked if this would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Timm asked if the Town Engineering Department could review it. Agent Brown stated they would not. Ms. Kaaz stated funding a peer review was acceptable.

Commissioner Radner made a motion to request \$2,200 from the applicant for a peer review and to direct Agent Brown to request quotes for the work. Commissioner DeAvila seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Timm requested a timeline for the peer review. Agent Brown stated she would request quotes as soon as she received the funds.

Commissioner Radner made a motion to continue this item the July 15th meeting. Commissioner DeAvila seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

3. Agent's Report

Agent Brown stated interviews had been held for an Assistant Conservation Agent and they would be pursuing an applicant for hire.

3.1 Discussion of Request to Waive Engineering Fees – Schoolmaster Lane Lot 7

Mr. Carter stated that the same protocol has been followed for all lots he has prepared in the area. He requested that a peer review not be required for this lot since it is very similar to past submissions and because of his history of successful applications for this subdivision.

Commissioner Radner stated the request for a peer reviewer was made partially because they were concerned about the steep drop off and encroachment of the chambers. She stated that a discussion had occurred during the site visit about changing the orientation of the infiltrators and that Mr. Carter seemed amendable to that change.

Agent Brown stated her request for a peer review was because it was different from past submissions. She stated there were emergency overflow swales and a dry well in the front. Thus, it wasn't comparable enough to past submissions for comparison.

Commissioner Gauthier asked if elongating the infiltration system would remove the need for overflow swales. Mr. Carter stated that he thought that might work.

Mr. Carter showed plans for another lot where an overflow swale was included. He stated he will move the infiltration system further from the slope and elongate it. If he can remove the overflow swale because of these changes, he will.

Commissioner Radner suggested requesting the applicant to provide narratives about the aspects that Agent Brown is not familiar with. Commissioner Radner asked Mr. Carter to describe the purpose of the dry well.

Mr. Carter stated the infiltration systems are also basically dry wells. He cited previous plans where plastic infiltration systems were used but said that on the new plan a precast dry well was selected due to site conditions. Agent Brown stated no connections to the dry well were shown and asked what it was collecting. Mr. Carter stated it is collecting surface flow from the area.

Agent Brown and Commissioner Radner expressed difficulty understanding Mr. Carter due to technical issues. Agent Brown suggested Mr. Carter set up a meeting to discuss the details of the plan in person. Mr. Petruzzello took over the explanation and stated that the grate for the drywell is lower than the road and the top of the house, so it is catching water from the grassed area and walkway at the front of the house.

Commissioner DeAvila asked for confirmation that this was a precast fixture. Mr. Petruzzello confirmed.

Commissioner Radner asked if Mr. Carter would be willing to meet with Agent Brown to go over the plans in more detail. If Agent Brown is comfortable with the explanation, they can avoid the need for a peer review. Mr. Carter and Agent Brown agreed.

Agent Brown asked the commissioners if they desired hard copies of all documents for future meetings. No one expressed a need. She asked anyone who wanted hard copies of documents for future meetings to let her know.

Agent Brown suggested that future meetings may need to be virtual instead of hybrid to avoid the audio issues experienced during this meeting. The commissioners agreed that the next meeting would be held virtually.

Commissioner Gauthier motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Hafrey seconded. All attending commissioners voted "aye." Motion carried 5-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 pm.