



**Bellingham Conservation Commission  
10 Mechanic Street  
Bellingham, Massachusetts 02019**

**Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, January 27, 2021**

***MEETING LOCATION: Remote Participation through Zoom***

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, no in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted at this meeting.

**Present at the Meeting:**

Cliff Matthews, Chairman  
Neal Standley, Vice Chairman  
Michael O'Herron, Member  
Brian Norton, Member  
Shawn Wade, Member  
Noel Lioce, Member  
Arianne Barton, Member

**Other Officials:**

Anne Matthews, Conservation Agent  
Amy Sutherland, Recording Secretary

**Public Hearing: Project Location: Candlelight Lane and Silver Lake Road:**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	7:00 pm
<b><u>Project Description:</u></b>	Drainage Improvements Basin C
<b><u>Application Type:</u></b>	Notice of Intent: DEP File Number ; BWP-271
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Bellingham DPW And South Venter Realty LLC, 120 Quarry Drive Milford, MA 01757
<b><u>Representative:</u></b>	Sean Malone Oak Consulting Group

The Chairman opened the public hearing for Candlelight Land and Silver Lake Road.

Representative Malone presented the plan for site preparation and drainage. A share screen was provided. The site prep was discussed first. The plan shows the existing swales, rip rap and stone check dams that were placed there as a temporary measure during construction. Those areas were highlighted on the plan. There will be one swale parallel to the sidewalk. The reason for this is that during the on-site observation in the field, there was run off coming from site onto the sidewalk and ending up at the intersection of Candlelight and Silverlake Road. This area will be reloaded and hydroseeded. There will be a jute mat put in place. There is also a sedimentation barrier in place. The drainage improvements include a new catch basin at the corner of Candlelight Lane and Silverlake Road. This will be piped to the sediment forebay and into Basin C. The berm separating the forebay from the basin will be lowered by a foot and a half. The basin has been redesigned to be an extended detention basin rather than an infiltration basin as there is less than 2' of separation to groundwater. The groundwater levels were monitored and observed. These do not meet the criteria for being an infiltration basin. There will be a low flow orifice added at the bottom of the outlet structure to allow for the extended detention. The pipe will be reconstructed from the outlet structure to a new drainage structure. The new structure will have (2) 12-inch ductile pipes crossing Silverlake Road. This will allow for the increasing of capacity and will be a significant improvement. Sean also communicated that new plan is being worked on and will be presented at another time. There is a four-inch drop from the catch basin to the forebay. The upper right-hand quadrant of the plan was referenced. This area was factored into the calculations. The schedule of proposed

work was next discussed. The Commission wants to make sure there will be enough topsoil for stabilization. There will be new topsoil put down (4 inches of screened topsoil) then hydroseeded, along with a mat put down. It was suggested to use tackifiers. The area noted is proposed to be done the beginning of May 2021. The Commission noted that there will be a requirement to have progress notes provided and if erosion has occurred then that would need to be addressed immediately. Sean indicated that during the meeting with the ZBA a few weeks ago there was a condition to hire BSC to provide construction oversight as outlined. The Commission asked another question about the vertical profile for the discharge swale to Silverlake and requested that it be placed on the plan. Sean indicated that this was not present and will include this information. The Commission was informed that the swale is in good shape and is stable and is hesitant to propose any work there since they do not want it disturbed. The swale was noted on the plan. Sean indicated that the existing headwall will not be removed since one pipe outlet will remain. There will be the construction of a new headwall right next to the existing headwall. There is a concern about the shortening of the amount of rip rap in this area. During the site walk it was discussed pulling the headwall back to give more time for the dissipation of the outflow of the existing flow. The Commission does not want sedimentation to enter into the no disturb zone. Sean indicated that it could be moved back 20 ft. Consultant Di Pietro responded that when the site was walked, there was a question about the removal of the rip rap at that very location. He also does not think that there will be an increase in peak flow but there will be an increase in water from the roadway. Sean explained that there will be an added check valve on the outlet pipe, so there will not be backflow from the pond into the basin. A question was asked about what would prevent the proprietary structure from functioning with the catch basin which is there since it would be untreated discharge. Sean indicated that the structure would only come into play only during extreme storm events. There was a recommendation to have the Consultant review this. Frank responded that he would like to see what kind of check valve will be in there since if it gets plugged, it will block any water from coming in and out. The double catch basin may not work. Frank would also like to look at the grade change. He does like the idea of the bypass swale. There will be language added to the O & M that the check valve be checked and cleaned on a regular basis. The unit that the applicant is looking at does have a clean out which is attached to it. Sean will provide more information on this. DPW Director Don DiMartino responded that he would like this at the end of the pipe.

The applicant will make the recommended changes and asked for a continuation.

**On a motion made by Neal Standley, seconded by Shawn Wade, the Conservation Commission voted by roll call to continue the hearing for Candlelight Lane and Silver Lake Road to February 10, 2021 at 7:10 pm.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Arianne Barton	aye
Noel Lioce	aye

**Continued Public Hearing: Project Location: 9 Lovers Lane (Lot 81):**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	7:30 pm
<b><u>Project Description:</u></b>	SFD, Grading, Utilities, Bioretention Area
<b><u>Application Type:</u></b>	Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-891; BWP-261
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	South Center Realty LLC 120 Quarry Drive Milford, MA 01757
<b><u>Representative:</u></b>	John Frederico Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. PO Box 235 Milford, MA 01757

The Chairman opened the continued hearing for 9 Lovers Lane (Lot 81).

The applicant representative Mr. Frederico was present along with the applicants construction manager to discuss the technical construction side of what is done in the field with these types of walls. Mr. Frederico provided information about the filter fabric wrapping around the backside of the versa lock wall as well as the boulder wall. He did speak with the manager from Wellington after the site visit and was informed that all boulder walls which they contrast greater than 3 ft. in height would have filter fabric located behind it. There will also be crushed stone and mortared joints. There will be drains

installed along the wall. There was a question about material seeping through at the joints in between where the block wall and boulder wall will be meeting. Mr. Frederico did speak with Versa Lock about this. There were some photos he shared where they have used the joint method in various parts of New England with things such as ledge or other different materials. There could also be mortaring between the block wall and boulder wall. The share screen was provided. The detail was provided by Versa lock. If there are any small gaps in between, those would be able to be mortared. The Commission continues to be concerned with the construction of the wall mortaring and back filling creating movement. There was a question about the design being by Elizabeth Mainini from Guerriere and Halnon, and if she has had experience designing walls such as this. Mr. Frederico responded that the boulder wall has been used in various applications. Fafard contractor Alex responded that he has constructed about 8 of these walls. He mentioned that there was a concern that there might be a disturbing of the open space on the face of the wall but he clarified that these are constructed with the geotextile fabric which is like a blanket and this work is from behind the wall. The material behind the wall needs to be excavated. The structural fill material will be coming in with lifts. Most of the disturbance will be on the lot where the house is and not on the open space. There will also be a base of crushed stone. It was communicated by the Commission that the concern is for the proximity of the foundation to the block wall being 10 ft. and the interception of the boulder wall and the pressure on the wall as a result of backfilling. The Commission is concerned about the viability of this lot over a long period of time. The contractor communicated that in the past when these were constructed, the engineer stamps the drawing and signs off at the end of the construction. He is also called to inspect at specific time during the process of it being built. There was a question about who the site supervisor will be. The wall would be constructed first, then the foundation would be poured. Versa Lock does provide services to be on site during construction. The supervising structural engineer would be from Versa Lock. This will also need to be submitted to the Building Inspector. It was explained that these sorts of walls do protrude out from the face of the wall. Consultant Di Pietro commented on the underdrain. There will be a pipe that runs parallel to the face of the wall. This needs to be included as a detail. A question was asked if the person who is doing the inspection provides a certification that this was built according to the plan and standards. Consultant DiPietro wanted clarity on the scheduling of the building up of the wall. The wall would need to be dug down to 280 and slab would be 292. There would be compacting in the 10-foot gap between the two that goes towards the road. The Commission would like a side profile of this area due to the amount of fill. The Consultant would like to see a profile of the wall from the street.

The new superintendent from Fafard was present during the zoom meeting and was just observing.

The Chairman indicted that the applicant would like to continue the hearing to later in the meeting.

**On a motion made by Michael O'Herron, seconded by Brian Norton, the Conservation Commission voted by roll call to continue the hearing to 9:30 pm later in the evening.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Noel Lioce	aye
Arianne Barton	aye

**Public Hearing: Project Location: 11 Lovers Lane (Lot 82 A):**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	7:00 pm
<b><u>Project Description:</u></b>	SFD, Grading, Utilities, Bioretention Area
<b><u>Application Type:</u></b>	Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-906; BWP-2279
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	South Center Realty LLC 120 Quarry Drive Milford, MA 01757
<b><u>Representative:</u></b>	John Frederico Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. PO Box 235 Milford, MA 01757

The Chairman opened the hearing for 11 Lovers Lane (Lot 82A).

The Engineer representative Mr. Frederico from Guerriere & Halnon was present. A screen share was provided. The Notice of Intent is for a single-family dwelling. It was explained that since the last meeting the applicant was able to lessen the grade. The infiltration units were pushed below the wall so that there would be no issues with water seeping through or putting pressure on the backside.

The Commission has no further comments regarding this site. It was recommended to close the hearing and issue the Order of Conditions.

**On a motion made by Neal Standley, seconded by Michael O'Herron, the Commission voted by Roll Call vote to close the hearing and issue the Order of Conditions.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Noel Lioce	aye
Arianne Barton	aye

**Public Hearing: Project Location: 13 Lovers Lane (Lot 83A):**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	7:45 pm
<b><u>Project Description:</u></b>	SFD, Grading, Utilities, Bioretention Area
<b><u>Application Type:</u></b>	Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-906; BWP-2279
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	South Center Realty LLC 120 Quarry Drive Milford, MA 01757
<b><u>Representative:</u></b>	John Frederico Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. PO Box 235 Milford, MA 01757

The Chairman opened the hearing for 13 Lovers Lane (Lot 83A).

Representative Frederico communicated that Lot 83A was one of the lots that was visited on the site walk. There were no changes proposed. There is very limited impact to the 100 ft. buffer zone which was observed during the site inspection. The Commission had no suggestions or changes.

There was a recommendation to close and issue the Order of Conditions for 13 Lovers Lane (Lot 83A).

**On a motion made by Brian Norton, seconded by Noel Lioce, the Commission voted by Roll Call to close the hearing for 13 Lovers Lane and issue the Order of Conditions.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Noel Lioce	aye
Arianne Barton	aye

**Public Hearing: Project Location: 16 Lovers Lane (Lot 86):**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	7:45 pm
<b><u>Project Description:</u></b>	SFD, Site Work, Bioretention Area
<b><u>Application Type:</u></b>	Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-909; BWP-281
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	South Center Realty LLC 120 Quarry Drive

**Representative:**

Milford, MA 01757  
John Frederico  
Guerriere & Halnon, Inc.  
PO Box 235  
Milford, MA 01757

The applicant provided a share screen. The 100 ft. wetland buffer was noted on the plan. It was communicated that the only buffer impact is at the front of the house. This is a very small impact. The Commission had no further questions of comments. There was a recommendation to close and issue the Order of Conditions for 13 Lovers Lane.

**On a motion made by Michael O'Herron, seconded by Neal Standley, the Commission voted by Roll Call to close the hearing for 13 Lovers Lane and issue the Order of Conditions.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Noel Lioce	aye
Arianne Barton	aye

The Commission next moved to discuss 14 Lovers Lane (Lot 87).

**Public Hearing: Project Location: 14 Lovers Lane (Lot 87):**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	7:45 pm
<b><u>Project Description:</u></b>	SFD, Site Work, Bioretention Area
<b><u>Application Type:</u></b>	Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-908; BWP-282
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	South Center Realty LLC 120 Quarry Drive Milford, MA 01757
<b><u>Representative:</u></b>	John Frederico Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. PO Box 235 Milford, MA 01757

The Chairman opened the hearing for Lot 87.

The Engineer John Frederico from Guerriere & Halnon was present. It was explained that this lot is for a single-family dwelling which will only have a little grading. A foundation drain is proposed. The Engineer will make sure this is not being discharged directly into the system. There are two infiltration chambers for roof recharge. A note will be added on the plan about a post and rail fence with badges. The Commission had no further questions about Lot 87. There was recommendation to close the hearing for 13 Lovers Lane and issue the Order of Conditions.

**On a motion made by Michael O'Herron, seconded by Brian Norton, the Commission voted by Roll Call to close the hearing for 13 Lovers Lane and issue the Order of Conditions.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Noel Lioce	aye
Arianne Barton	aye

**Continued Public Hearing: Project Location: 6 North Main Street, Mill Street, Common Street:**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	7:15 pm
-----------------------------	---------

**Project Description:**

Construction of a new access road, improvements to existing roadways, construction of stormwater management facilities, utility improvements including pump station

**Application Type:**

Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-900; BWP-N/A

**Applicant:**

Denis Fraine  
Town of Bellingham  
10 Mechanic Street  
Bellingham, MA 02019

**Representative:**

Mark Allen  
Allen Engineering & Associates Inc.  
One Charles Road, Suite 2  
Hopedale, MA 01747

The Chairman opened the continued hearing for 6 North Street for the Notice of Intent for the proposal to construct a new access roadway, improvements including a pump station located within the 100-foot buffer zone to bordering vegetated wetlands including proposed alteration of 150 sq. ft of bordering vegetated wetlands. Member Arianne Barton recused herself from discussion. At the last meeting, the Commission wanted clarity on the extent of the catchment area on South Main Street. The Engineer provided an update. The site was revisited and there was reevaluation of the wetland replication area along where the sidewalk is going to be. It was mentioned to the applicant that there will be re-evaluation of the culvert system which goes underneath Mill Street. The property owner at the end of Mill St. did express concern about the routine maintenance of the leaf litter that forms in this area. There will be mitigation of the ponding which occurs outside his front door. There will be work at the pump station to add some sort of infiltration trench or deep sump hooded catch basins. The applicant will not be submitting a final set of plans until further feedback is provided by the commission. In regard to the extent of the catchment area, there has been about 2.5 acres of sub catchment area that can be treated in the basin from South Main Street. The hydrology analysis shows this. The sub catchment area will be added to the revised plan set. This will benefit the town is MS4 compliance requirements. The Chairman next discussed the site visit and in particular the drainage structure from Mill Street. It was found to be in a degraded condition. The Chairman would like the applicant's wetland person to do an evaluation to determine if there is a benefit to cleaning this out or to leave as a functioning wetland. The applicant has agreed to do this evaluation. The Chairman would also like the applicant to do a relocation of the stormwater management basin to the south. There is a large area behind Walgreens, and this would reduce the proximity to a BVW and would have a gentling of the side slopes. The Commission suspects that there will be a contribution to groundwater from the proposed basin. If this basin were slid more to the south, there would be a longer and greater amount of resource area to accommodate the groundwater contribution and could be enlarged to catch the other two sub catchment areas for the MS4. The applicant replied that the team did look into this area prior to this current design and the area is steeper in slope than the current area. It is also higher in elevation. It is less effective in that area than what is proposed. The applicant communicated that a basin could be added. The Chairman continues to want clarity that the option he proposed would not be a better option than running the drainage down Common Street. The applicant responded that he is certain that the basin on the bottom will not be able to be eliminated. The discussion next focused on the replication area. The team did go to the site and found that the area was slightly elevated, so the Engineer slid the replication area away from the area of slope. There was a concern noted that this area would be an area where invasive plants could take over. The last item discussed was the back-slope grading of the lower basin. The applicant has asked the Planning Board to reduce the slope of the fill from 3 to 1 to 2 to 1. The Chairman asked if there could be a clay barrier in the basin walls. The Commission is not satisfied with the 2 to 1 slope and having a detention basin without a lot of extra freeboard. The Consultant will put together some technical comments regarding the waiver. Consultant Di Pietro noted that there is a steep slope, and this will be looked at, but he does not think that a clay barrier is necessary but could help with seepage through the wall. The applicant has voluntarily agreed to honor the 25-foot no disturb zone. This project does have to meet the phosphorus removal requirements in the drainage basin area for the Charles River.

The Chairman asked for a motion to continue the hearing.

**On a motion made by Neal Standley, and seconded by Brian Norton, the Conservation Commission voted to continue the hearing to February 10, 2021 at 7:30 pm.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye

Noel Lioce, Member

aye

**Continued Public Hearing: Project Location: Mechanic Street & Mill Street:****Hearing time:** 8:45 pm**Project Description:** Roadway, Utilities. Stormwater Management for Residential Subdivision – Red Mill on the Charles**Application Type:** Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-910; BWP-268**Applicant:** Kevin Lobisser  
Snowflake, LLC  
One Charlesview Road Suite 1  
Hopedale, MA 01747**Representative:** Mark Allen  
Allen Engineering & Associates Inc.  
One Charles Road, Suite 2  
Hopedale, MA 01747

The Chairman opened the continuation hearing for Red Mill on the Charles.

Member Barton recused herself from hearing.

The Chairman wanted to first discuss the waivers. The applicant has met with the Planning Board on the Planning Board waivers. The Conservation Commission waivers will affect the design of the stormwater management system. The first waiver is the free board to the 100-year storm. The intent is to provide an extra layer of security in the case of a large storm event. The applicant noted that this is waiver #3 in the packet Section 247, Section 33, Section 3 where a minimum 1" freeboard from 100-year ponding elevation within basins and the emergency overflow spillway. The overflow spillway elevation for this basin is at 247.00. The 100-year flood elevation within the basin is at 247.04 which is just 1' above the required freeboard per this regulation. The basins are being designed to accommodate some catchment areas that are basically impervious. The applicant further contends that they are providing adequate recharge and are replenishing the waters, streams, and rivers as they are today. The basins will hold all of runoff from the 25-year storm event and will not increase runoff from the 25-year design storm. The drainage analysis does not show an increase in the 25-year design storm but did not consider frozen ground conditions which they believe "would only artificially inflate the peak construction peak flow rates and thus unnecessarily expand the limits of tree clearing for much larger basins." The applicant communicated that he has photos from various other projects and could show the reasoning for the waiver request. These were recently approved projects in town based on the regulations. The Consultant communicated that the Commission needs to go back to the regulations and decide if this is reasonable or not. The applicant communicated that the two waiver requests would reduce the rate even more. The applicant would like to match or just slightly decrease the peak flows and peak volumes. The Chairman asked the Commission if they think it is necessary to provide the extra layer of protection with a one-foot free board over the 100-year storm event in the anticipation of future events. The Commission discussed the waivers and it was noted that they do not know how that gravelly soil is actually going to perk. The applicant communicated that they have encountered no ledge in these basins and test pits have been done. The report does indicate gravelly soil. The applicant has communicated that they have more than enough land to make this project work but without the waiver, the basins will be more costly, larger and will take down more trees. This is an 80-acre site with 40 acres being open space. The town will own these basins which are on separate parcels. The Chairman noted to ask the applicant to create a model on the what the different in size this would be. The Commission communicated that if these are undersized, they will be the towns responsibility in the future. A compromise was to design the basins to the 25-year storm frozen ground condition but not the one foot of freeboard above the 100-year condition. Board of Selectmen member Dan Spencer communicated that it appears that the applicant is giving the town a 99% guarantee of compliance and what the Commission is looking for is 100% and he does not believe this could ever happen. (his audio was comprised, and the call was disconnected). The Chairman next asked the applicant to lay out in the field the riparian zone. A site inspection will be completed to evaluate the existing conditions and determine which area will be granted redevelopment status. The applicant communicated that this was done, and photographs were part of the response submittal. The applicant indicated that the flags are there, and he does not see the need to stake it in the field. The applicant communicated that in the response letter, the team compared and contrasted those to all of the other predisturbed areas on site. Next discussed were the habitat evaluation which the Commission wanted completed. The Commission would like the applicant and their representative to be present when the evaluations are being done. This will allow the Commission to possibly grant redevelopment status when the onsite evaluation is done. Jeff Duragio was present and was contracted to do those evaluations, but this time of the year is not conducive to do these studies for the habitat due to the existing snow cover. Consultant Matt Burne noted that there is evidence of the recovery of the

riverfront area overtime from 1970 to 1995 and continued recovery between 1995 and 2020. The question is if there is an area of redevelopment today. There has been a demonstration that there is recovery over a 25-year periods and there is a need to see what today qualifies as having no topsoil. The applicant indicated that a conservative approach was taken. The Commission clearly stated that a field evaluation must occur. Town Administrator Fraine was present during the zoom call and relayed a comment from Board of Selectmen Spencer indicating that the Commission is getting 99% assurance of compliance and the Commission wants 100% and he thinks this is an unreasonable expectation and causes undue delay. It was further expressed that the Board of Selectmen have signed a development agreement with the developer. The developer is doing a lot for the town including the Mill Street drainage, along with drainage coming off of Rt. 126. They are also making a substantial payment as part of the development agreement which will be going to the schools. The Board of Selectmen and Town Administrator are in support of the project and believe it will work well for the town. The Chairman explained that the State Regulations are clear that the Commission has the right to either grant or not grant degradation status. The determination will determine if the project needs a redesign. The applicant asks the Commission to look at table 1 page 10 to see all the progress made.

The Chairman asked for a motion to continue the hearing.

**On a motion made by Brian Norton seconded by Shawn Wade, the Conservation Commission voted by roll call vote to continue the hearing to February 10, 2021 at 8:00 pm.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Noel Lioce, Member	aye

**Continued Public Hearing: Project Location: 11 Stone Street:**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	9:15 pm
<b><u>Project Description:</u></b>	Septic System Repair
<b><u>Application Type:</u></b>	Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-; BWP-287
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Edward and Wendy Jones 65 South Street Franklin, MA 02038
<b><u>Representative:</u></b>	Karon Skinner Catron 63 Gilbert Drive Stoughton, MA 02072 Hopedale, MA 01747

The Chairman opened the hearing for 11 Stone Street. This application is for a septic system repair. The applicant is Edward and Wendy Jones. The applicant representative is Karon Skinner Catron, but Paul DeSimone spoke on behalf of the plan. The plan was shown on screen share. The Chairman and the Conservation Agent inspected the site. The wetland was verified and accurate. The applicant is proposing a new 1,500-gallon tank. The applicant couldn't do a perk test since the water was pouring into the perk hole, therefore the soils needed to be sent out for testing. There is a high-water table. There was debris observed during the site visit. The Commission was informed that the new owner will be cleaning this up. There will be language in the Order of Conditions indicating there needs to be clean-up on site. Any pumping on the site would need to be to the front yard. The water will be pumped to the left of the house outside of the buffer zone. There was a suggestion to have a filter bag at the dewatering outlet. The applicant will be waiting until June or July when the water table is at its lowest to install the system. The Board of Health has approved this plan. There will be staked straw bales for erosion and an entrenched silt fence.

**On a motion made by Brian Norton seconded by Michael O'Herron, the Conservation Commission voted by roll call vote to close and issue the Order of Conditions for 11 Stone Street.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye



Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Noel Lioce, Member	aye
Arianne Barton	aye

**Continued Public Hearing: Project Location: 9 Lovers Lane (Lot 81):**

<b><u>Hearing time:</u></b>	7:30 pm
<b><u>Project Description:</u></b>	SFD, Grading, Utilities, Bioretention Area
<b><u>Application Type:</u></b>	Notice of Intent: DEP File Number 105-891; BWP-261
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	South Center Realty LLC 120 Quarry Drive Milford, MA 01757
<b><u>Representative:</u></b>	John Frederico Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. PO Box 235 Milford, MA 01757

The Chairman reopened the continued hearing for 9 Lovers Lane (Lot 81).

The Commission continues to have concerns relative to viability of lot. The Commission would like a profile of the front and back of the lot along with the north to south to understand all of the elevations. The applicant has agreed to put this together. The applicant expressed that this could be a condition within the Order of Conditions. The Consultant asked if the applicant could supply a cross section from where the Conservation Commission property, through the wall and to where the foundation is going to be and then across to the lot. It may help visualizing where the separations are and how close those may be. The applicant is willing to do this. The Commission was clear that there is to be no disturbance in the open space area. The Conservation Agent recommends that the applicant be allowed to provide more information for the Commission to make their determination on if this is a viable lot especially with a stamped plan for the wall.

On a motion made by Neal Standley seconded by Michael O'Herron, the Conservation Commission voted by roll call vote to continue the hearing to February 24, 2021 at 7:00 pm.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Neal Standley, Vice Chairman	aye
Michael O'Herron, Member	aye
Brian Norton, Member	aye
Shawn M. Wade, Member	aye
Noel Lioce, Member	aye
Arianne Barton	aye

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

**ADJOURN:**

On a motion made by Michael O'Herron, seconded by Brian Norton, the Conservation Commission voted to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 pm.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland  
Recording Secretary

Minutes Approved on: February 24, 2021 Amy Sutherland  
(Date) (Prepared by Amy Sutherland)