



# TOWN OF WILMINGTON

## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & CONSERVATION

121 GLEN ROAD, WILMINGTON, MA 01887 [www.wilmingtonma.gov](http://www.wilmingtonma.gov) (978) 658-8238

### CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

August 3, 2022

Donald Pearson called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. after stating the following:

This meeting of the Wilmington Conservation Commission is being conducted via remote participation. **No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted**, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings in real time, via technological means. Members of the public who would like to participate in the meeting via Zoom can do so by clicking on this link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84967099532?pwd=TzI1d3hpdkJaTWV6dGFVQmFTMkRWZz09>

Members of the public who would like to listen to this meeting while in progress may also do so via telephone by dialing 1-646-558-8656 and enter meeting ID 849 6709 9532 then press # and press # again at the next voice prompt. Members of the public attending this meeting virtually will be allowed to make comments if they wish to do so, during the portion of the hearing designated for public comment, by following the steps previously noted then press \*9 on their telephone keypad. This will notify the meeting host that the caller wishes to speak. In the event that despite our best efforts, we are not able to provide for real-time access, we will post a record of this meeting on the Town's website as soon as we are able.

Donald Pearson, Theron Bradley, Vincent Licciardi, Alexander Rittershaus, Melissa Gavegnano, and William Wierzbicki were present. Valerie Gingrich, Director of Planning & Conservation, Cameron Lynch, Conservation Agent, and Erika Speight, Conservation Senior Clerk were also present.

### PUBLIC MEETING – REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF APPLICABILITY – 4 LedgeWood Road – Map 57 Parcel 14

Documents: Request for Determination of Applicability application and materials, received July 18, 2022  
"Plot Plan of Land," received July 18, 2022

Present in Interest: Kristin Hartman-Joshi, Owner & Applicant

K. Hartman-Joshi proposed installing a fence in her backyard within the property lines. The fence would be placed in between the shrubs and boulders, that were already there prior to the purchase of the home, for safety reasons to keep her dogs and children in the yard.

C. Lynch stated that there are no comments. The fence will be placed in the exact location of the demarcation that is already in place.

No comments were made by the Commission.

Upon motion duly made by T. Bradley and seconded by V. Licciardi, it was unanimously

TOWN OF WILMINGTON, MA

2022 SEP - 8 AM 11:02

RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK

RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK  
SEP 7 2022  
TOWN OF WILMINGTON, MA

VOTED: To issue a Negative Three (3) Determination of Applicability for 4 LedgeWood Road – Map 57 Parcel 14

**PUBLIC MEETING – REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF APPLICABILITY – 26 Aldrich Road – Map 33 Parcel 5C**

Documents: Request for Determination of Applicability application and materials, received July 11, 2022  
“As-Built” Plan, dated April 13, 2004  
“Condition of Trees” email from Derek Fleming, received July 19, 2022

Present in Interest: Derek Fleming, Owner & Applicant  
Michelle Hall-Fleming, Owner & Applicant

D. Fleming proposed the removal of three (3) trees on his property. Two (2) tree companies came out to evaluate the trees and both companies determined that the trees did pose a risk to their health and safety. They are large trees that overhang the house and are leaning significantly. One of the tree companies did state that one of the trees could fall down any day. D. Fleming stated he is hoping to remove these trees for safety purposes.

C. Lynch explained that the trees are located behind the demarcation line for the property, with the closest tree roughly 9’ to 10’ from BVWs, according to the plan when the house was built. The only comment is regarding replacement trees. The three (3) trees being taken down will require one (1) replacement tree or bush.

M. Hall-Fleming shared her screen to show pictures of the trees to the Commission. She explained that it is a very wooded area with many trees that will grow and take the space. The first tree displayed was a double tree, with both sides needing to be removed. The tree company explained to both homeowners that if only one part of the double tree was removed, it would act like a lever and the other part would automatically fall. The second tree displayed is also a double tree that is rotted and surrounded by a bunch of vegetation. M. Hall-Fleming displayed another photo to the Commission showing the tree overhanging on the house.

D. Fleming shared a different angle photo of the first double tree, describing it’s almost like a broken pair of scissors and leaning heavily towards the house and starting to split, with the base and middle being rotted. He explained that in all three (3) of the trees, there is significant rot and limbs that have been breaking off and hitting the house or landing directly up against the house. He stated that the trees aren’t healthy, and they both are worried about their safety as well as their young daughter and pets’ safety.

No comments were made by the Commission.

D. Pearson explained that shrubs are an option for replacement, which are more subtle, and may provide many of the same benefits. He stated that C. Lynch can provide a list of the native shrubs and trees.

Upon motion duly made by T. Bradley and seconded by V. Licciardi, it was unanimously

VOTED: To issue a Negative Three (3) Determination of Applicability for 26 Aldrich Road – Map 33 Parcel 5C

**PUBLIC HEARING – NOTICE OF INTENT – 282 Chestnut Street – Map 14 Parcel 5C – DEP File #344-1507**

Documents: Notice of Intent application and materials, received July 19, 2022  
"Notice of Intent Plan," dated June 16, 2022

Present in Interest: Maureen Herald, Norse Environmental Services

M. Herald proposed the construction of a single-family dwelling, porch, deck, driveway, koi pond, shed, providing rooftop infiltration, driveway infiltration, post-and-rail fence, cut and clear trees, plantings, grading, and utilities within the 100-foot buffer zone. The site will be serviced by town water and they're proposing a septic system that will be outside the 100-foot buffer zone. Most of the work is outside the buffer zone, with the closest proposed work being 85-feet away. The plan maintains the 15-foot no disturb and the 25-foot no structure as the Commission likes to see. The new proposed tree line follows along the 25-foot buffer zone and goes beyond that, providing even more of a buffer than the Commission's 15-foot no disturb policy.

C. Lynch stated there are no comments considering most of the project is going to be outside of the buffer zone. Like M. Herald stated, the tree line provides even more of a buffer from the wetlands, and it gets to about 29-feet at its closest point and drifts further away as you go around the yard. The draft Order of Conditions was provided.

M. Herald stated she did review the draft Order of Conditions and had no comments.

No comments were made by the Commission.

No comments were made from the public.

Upon motion duly made by T. Bradley and seconded by V. Licciardi, it was unanimously

VOTED: To close the Public Hearing for 282 Chestnut Street – Map 14 Parcel 5C – DEP File #344-1507

Upon motion duly made by A. Rittershaus and seconded by T. Bradley, it was unanimously

VOTED: To issue the Order of Conditions for 282 Chestnut Street – Map 14 Parcel 5C – DEP File #344-1507

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – ABBREVIATED NOTICE OF RESOURCE AREA DELINEATION – 800 Salem Street – Map R1 Parcel 24 – DEP File #344-????**

Documents: Response to LEC Peer Review comments, dated June 24, 2022  
"Plans to Accompany," issue date April 20, 2022

Present in Interest: Lawrence Beals, Beals Associates, Inc.  
Matthew Costa, Beals Associates, Inc.  
Brandon Nelson, Owner/Developer  
Richard Kirby, Wetland Scientist, LEC Environmental Consultants, Inc.

L. Beals explained that he wanted to provide a brief update. He met with R. Kirby onsite and reviewed the wetland boundary in the field. They moved about four (4) flags, which were all minor in terms of

movement, as there is a huge slope that comes down to the tallest slope. The most significant one was a channel that was an excavated swale that had been dug into the site, and when observing the soils with R. Kirby, mottling was observed within 12-inches in the grounds surface that qualified for a set of flags. The revised plan was sent to R. Kirby, and L. Beals believes he is comfortable with the revisions and that they accurately represent the changes made in the field. In terms of the wetland boundary, it is finalized, and that aspect of the project is completed. Since the last meeting, additional information was submitted regarding the classification of the resource area next to the property. Is it a river or is it a marsh lies the question. They've submitted information which R. Kirby has reviewed, but has not made a final determination yet. L. Beals stated that they met with the Ipswich River Watershed Association (IRWA) and the Headwater Stream Team (HST) who both have passionate and environmental interests in protecting these resource areas. The purpose in the discussions with both groups are to discuss the resource areas and eventually file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with a design criteria to redevelop this property to protect the adjacent resources. It is a degraded gravel pit with several opportunities to improve this site that complies with environmental standards and regulations and includes additional features to provide an extra degree of environmental protection. Those discussions are ongoing, as they are wide ranging and complicated subjects. A conclusion hasn't been met yet, and L. Beals requested the Commission's consideration on continuing this hearing, which will allow them to give more thought on the redevelopment of the property and hopefully have more productive discussions with HST and IRWA to see if they can reach a conclusion on the resource areas and what other criteria for development there may be. He is optimistic and believes there is a path to hopefully get to a point where they can do a development with respect to the interests of HST and IRWA and protect the environmental resources.

R. Kirby explained that he attended a site visit with L. Beals to review the wetland delineation and start absorbing the information presented regarding the resource areas as they relate to the perennial stream, the marsh within which it seems to be flowing, and the extent of riverfront area correspondent on the site. Modification of a few wetland flags occurred, and he recommended a projection of hydric soils and wetland plants be included in the delineation. He explained that has been done and he is in full concurrence with the BVWs as shown on the plans, however evaluation of the information L. Beals and team submitted with regard to the stream and flowing into the marsh (is it a marsh, is it a pond, is it a stream) it is a unique situation on this site. The end goal is to allow the developer to be able to redevelop the sand and gravel site that is largely degraded riverfront area. R. Kirby thinks it would be great if the Commission could come up with a latitude of acceptance for all parties before final determination on what makes the most sense going forward with this site in regard to the ANRAD.

C. Lynch and V. Gingrich both stated there are no comments.

V. Licciardi explained that there is a lot of wildlife in the area and questioned how it will be dealt with.

L. Beals explained the filing is for an ANRAD right now, and the goal is to determine resource areas. When they proceed with filing an NOI, one suggestion that they received which he believes is an excellent suggestion, is that outside of the area being developed, they should consider some turtle nesting habitats. They are also going to consider putting together a planting plan that adds higher wildlife value plants to the area and native species in the 100-foot more critical wetland areas that provide a food source to wildlife. There was some discussion about the concrete blocks that were placed by previous owners surrounding the site to prevent any further encroachment. L. Beals stated that it may make sense to leave those blocks as they are great turtle barriers, which would provide protection. There was also talk about putting a guardrail around the site with a mesh fence to keep turtles off the site and into their own habitat. He also stated there is a nesting habitat for birds and a beaver colony right in the center currently. L. Beals stated that he believes the wildlife is taking care of themselves presently, however the intent is to incorporate them into an NOI when the time comes.

No comments were made from the public.

Upon motion duly made by T. Bradley and seconded by A. Rittershaus, it was unanimously

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing for 800 Salem Street – Map R1 Parcel 24 – DEP File #344-???? to the September 7, 2022, Conservation Commission meeting

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – NOTICE OF INTENT – 29 Lawrence Street – Map 80 Parcel 76 – DEP File #344-1506**

Documents: No new documents.

Present in Interest: Garrett DeBlois, Owner & Applicant

C. Lynch explained that at the last meeting the project was discussed, however did not have a DEP File number yet. He explained they can review the project again as a refresher if the Commission would like.

D. Pearson asked if there is anything new or if the DEP File number is the only new thing.

C. Lynch stated there is nothing new, just the DEP File number.

No comments were made by the Commission.

C. Lynch explained that the draft Order of Conditions was sent to G. DeBlois.

G. DeBlois explained that he did review the draft Order of Conditions from the previous meeting and is ready to move forward.

Upon motion duly made by A. Rittershaus and seconded by M. Gavegnano, it was unanimously

VOTED: To close the Public Hearing for 29 Lawrence Street – Map 80 Parcel 76 – DEP File #344-1506

Upon motion duly made by A. Rittershaus and seconded by W. Wierzbicki, it was unanimously

VOTED: To issue the Order of Conditions for 29 Lawrence Street – Map 80 Parcel 76 – DEP File #344-1506

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – NOTICE OF INTENT – Cross Street – Map 40 Parcel 11 – DEP File #344-1504**

Documents: Stormwater Analysis & Calculations and Notice of Intent Report, revised July 25, 2022  
"Proposed Permit Site Plans," revised July 25, 2022  
Wildlife Habitat Evaluation, dated June 2022

Present in Interest: Jonathan Main, One Cross LLC, Applicant  
Michael Juliano, Eaglebrook Engineering & Survey, LLC  
Benjamin Minnix, Eaglebrook Engineering & Survey, LLC  
Robert Peterson, Peterson Law

## Maureen Herald, Norse Environmental Services

B. Minnix explained that they were fortunate to have a last-minute meeting on site with D. Pearson, M. Gavegnano, and C. Lynch to review the location of the proposed buildings and retaining wall. B. Minnix shared his screen and gave a brief overview of the project as well as explained what has changed and showed the revised site plans. The property and subject area are a wooded area to the west of Cross Street. Proposing two (2) two-story multi-family buildings, each with eight (8) units, with a parking lot between the two (2) buildings. Two (2) curb cuts for an in and out driveway from Cross Street, across from Yentile Farm Recreation Facility. To review changes to the site plans, a crosswalk from the proposed sidewalk along the front of the building to the existing walkway on the other side of Cross Street has been added. One of the biggest concerns that the Commission discussed last meeting was the location of the retaining wall in relation to where the wetlands are. B. Minnix explained that the proposed wall had been pushed back a few feet which is allowing as much space as possible. It is allowing them to keep the required minimum of thirty-two (32) parking spaces, with two (2) compact spaces, which was requested by the Planning Board to allow as many spaces as possible. At the closest location, they are proposing the retaining wall to be about 5.7-feet from the wetlands, and as you get further away, the retaining wall moves further away to a 15-foot buffer and eventually becomes a 25-foot buffer. Behind proposed building B, there is about a 6.9-foot buffer to the back of the retaining wall.

B. Minnix explained that one of the biggest stormwater change requests was to include in the analysis and stormwater controls, the mitigation for the runoff from Cross Street. Previously proposed, stormwater was being mitigated from the site as required so there was no increase in volume of runoff to the wetlands. Also, they will now be controlling water from Cross Street between Main Street and the entrance to Yentile Farm Recreation Facility. Currently, all the stormwater is cross pitched towards the site and flows to the wetland. They are proposing along the curbed sidewalk, two (2) catch basins in the street which will be owned and maintained by the town. They are still working with the Town Engineer, P. Alunni, to finalize the design for that. Instead of simply discharging to the wetland, they are proposing perforated pipe and stone trenches, to provide an additional recharge for the runoff from Cross Street. Right now, there is no stormwater controls for Cross Street, and everything flows off the pavement and towards the wetland. B. Minnix stated this is an additional improvement just for the street alone. Additionally, on-site, they are proposing four (4) chambers to the infiltration system from the previous submittal and adding stone surface trenches with perforated pipe between the sidewalk and the parking lot and the sidewalk and the buildings, which will capture runoff from the landscaped area to provide additional recharge before it reaches the stormwater system and discharges to the wetland. Also proposing a decreased volume of runoff to the wetland and decreasing the rate at which it reaches the wetland. Above and beyond, B. Minnix explained that they are controlling the stormwater for Cross Street in front of the proposed development.

B. Minnix went on to explain that they are proposing ten (10) upland mitigation trees behind the retaining wall, between the retaining wall and the wetland, and some blueberry bushes, with no heavy construction work in that area.

M. Herald explained that at one of the last meetings, the Conservation Commission discussed providing a wetland replication area as an improvement to the property. As a result, they are proposing some upland mitigation plantings. The site as a whole is about three (3) acres. Most of the site is a wetland, approximately two- and one-half acres, so they are proposing five (5) red maple trees, five (5) red oak trees, one-and-a-half-inch caliper, trees approximately six (6) feet in height, as well as ten (10) high bush blueberries proposed beside building B. Where the trees are proposed, there are black locust trees within that area, which is an invasive plant so it will be overall improving the buffer zone by incorporating the native plantings for this area. M. Herald explained that the high bush blueberries are

high value plants for wildlife and bird species of the area as well. The retaining wall will provide a barrier for any type of amphibians or turtles that are within the wetland so that they don't cross into the site and possibly get hit by vehicles or travel towards Cross Street.

B. Minnix mentioned a wildlife study was conducted.

M. Herald explained that the Commission requested a Wildlife Habitat Study be performed, and she explained that typically that is done when you're performing work in a resource area and you exceed the threshold of disturbance. A Wildlife Habitat Study of the buffer zone was completed, and essentially, they look at the site as a whole and look at the existing topography, the soils, the vegetation that's on the site, and this area is well developed between Main Street, Cross Street, and Lowell Street. She explained that this area also has single-family dwellings around the site as well as commercial properties. In terms of valuable habitat, it would essentially be limited to your typical urban wildlife habitat, like squirrels, chipmunks, skunks, and native bird species throughout this area. That being one of the reasons why they want to enhance the buffer zone as opposed to providing wetland replication because the area has a lot of wetlands already on it. It does provide minimal habitat for urban wildlife. To note, this site isn't located within any priority or estimated habitat as designated by natural heritage, there are no certified or potential vernal pools located on this property and no endangered, threatened, or special concern species as well.

B. Minnix stated it was requested that they provide a photometric plan for building B that was left off the last submission. He explained they added it onto the plans and if you look, it is the same design as building A. Also, they are not admitting light into the wetland, they will all be downward facing fixtures.

R. Peterson added that there was some discussion at the last meeting relative to demarcation where the wetlands area would be, and he had follow up discussions with the Planning and Conservation Department relative to that concept. He wanted to reiterate that once that solid concrete wall is up, and the tree plantings are made beyond that wall, thereafter that will be completely outside the scope of what the developed property will be so it is the petitioner's position that the demarcation relative to where the developed site ends and where the wetlands begin, which would be in the buffer zone, is going to be that wall.

V. Gingrich stated that the plans were received late last week and are still being reviewed. The Engineering Division is still reviewing them in reference to stormwater issues. There are no official comments at this point.

T. Bradley stated after reviewing the plans, that it is very much in conflict with the guidelines of the 50-foot no build for a multi-family dwelling and the 50-foot limit is right through the middle of these buildings, with the 15-foot no disturb being down to 5.9 feet. He explained that normally the Commission would just say "it doesn't fit," and questioned why this is still being considered.

B. Minnix explained that as far as the stormwater controls and improvements to the roadways, it is a vast improvement to the water quality that will be going toward the wetlands. Also, with the development of this intersection coming in the next few years with Mass DOT, controlling the stormwater along the street is going to be much improved with this development. B. Minnix requested it to be considered looking at this project as a benefit to the street.

R. Peterson explained when considering a multi-family dwelling relative to a 15-foot and 25-foot buffer, there has been some leniency when it comes to a residential multi-family development in that factor. He believes it was stated in the discussion at the previous meeting.

V. Gingrich stated she did comment on that at the last hearing. Like 168 Lowell Street, those town houses don't quite meet the 50-foot off set, she believes it to be somewhere between the 25-foot to 50-foot setback. What they ended up doing there was increasing the no disturb zone, making it greater than the typical 15-foot no disturb and that was approved with those structures inside the 50-feet, but outside the 25-feet, and they found a way to add another benefit because of that difference. The typical policy that the Commission likes to see is these types of structures outside the 50-feet.

T. Bradley stated that it is fair to comment that he is not convinced that the Commission should vote to approve this. He agrees with V. Gingrich that time to time, the Commission may be okay with a foot or two inside the no disturb zone with good reason when there is some compensating work done elsewhere, but this is so much contrary to the guidelines that he's struggling with thinking he'll vote to approve.

V. Licciardi stated he has no comments.

W. Wierzbicki explained that he is interested in hearing about the site visit conducted and how that went. He agrees with T. Bradley that it is right in the middle of the guidelines, and he noticed roof drains on the back side of the plans and questioned if they were draining to the wetlands or going back into the drainage system.

B. Minnix explained that all impervious area on site drain to the infiltration system, so the roof drains are from down spouts like your typical residential style gutters and downspouts, those all drain to the infiltration system. B. Minnix explained that the site visit went well, and they were able to pre-stake the locations of the buildings and the wall at the closest point. They were able to review where the fence would be and the corners of the wall in relation to the wetland.

W. Wierzbicki questioned how wet it was during the site visit.

B. Minnix explained there wasn't any water. He explained that there were some black leaves and some residue approximately another 20-feet beyond the line, 20-30 feet in some places. They did look at the pipe as well and there were no signs of water flowing through, with the area being dry.

W. Wierzbicki explained that when the town gets heavy rainfall, the whole area floods including the road on both sides.

B. Minnix explained that currently everything flows across, but because at the edge of the road there is some buildup of sand, it does flow along the street on the edge of the pavement and then trickles across the woodland to the wetland, which would be mitigated with two (2) catch basins.

R. Peterson added to B. Minnix's point relating to stormwater management on the site. He stated that they are not required to capture and take care of that runoff, but through the discussions with the Town Engineer and what he would like to see relative to the future development of the area, specifically the Butters Row redevelopment, there was some concern as to what's going to happen to that runoff if the existing conditions are left in place. He continued by saying that the Town Engineer asked them to investigate this as if it was a viable option for the site and Eaglebrook Engineering, through B. Minnix, was able to design the secondary stormwater management facility to allow for all the stormwater to be pre-captured from the street, treated in a stormwater system and then appropriately handled back into the wetlands. Relating to the area of flooding it would be our position, at least for this development, proposed with the stormwater management protocols they're hoping to implement, it would aid the area rather than augment any existing conditions which would result in flooding.



B. Minnix reviewed what Mass DOT is planning to do and explained they will be creating a signalized intersection between Cross Street and Main Street and proposing to meet their curbing and sidewalk. Instead, they are proposing two (2) catch basins to treat that runoff and provide additional recharge. Before it was being treated with a swale, stone riprap, and a vegetated swale, but instead breaking it up into two (2) areas.

M. Gavegnano stated she has no comments.

A. Rittershaus stated he would like to hear D. Pearson's input of how the site visit went. Also, he shares the same concerns as T. Bradley on the current layout of the plans. He thinks it is too intense of use on the property where its currently situated.

D. Pearson explained that everything was well identified in the site visit, in fact he suspects that if it would be possible, the Commissioners that couldn't make it today should go out and look at some other time. Perhaps C. Lynch could gather a few people who would be willing to make a visit between now and the September meeting. He continued by saying intuitively, if all the buildings that are going to be developed here are going to be at the grade of the road, when you're on site it slopes downward so it's almost like putting bricks in a bathtub, you've sort of displaced the ability to store water if the ground basically couldn't absorb it. One (1) question he had is since it is being built up to the street grade, is there really a capacity to store water if you've got a whole lot of it. He understands that they are proposing to handle it better and that it'll be better water when it gets to the wetlands, but basically there is a volume that's been stolen away from the site that no longer is able to hold water in case of a real inundation.

B. Minnix explained that in the largest portion of the stormwater system, there are two (2) rows of twenty (20) chambers per row, with stone surrounding the chambers. These chambers are the larger chambers, which is about 3.5-feet from bottom to stone, with two (2) rows of twenty (20) chambers each. He explained that this system along with the stone trenches that are along front of the sidewalk allows us to mitigate the volume and the rate in which the water flows off the property including a 100-year storm. They are not saying they're storing the 100-year storm; they're saying they are controlling the rate at which it leaves the property. If we get an 8-inch or 9-inch storm event, predevelopment or post development, you're getting the same volume of water, its 8-inch or 9- inches over the whole area. For the impervious surfaces, he explained they'll be collecting that water and even in some of the pervious areas they'll still collect the water and recharge the ground so whether it goes across the woodland or goes into the ground, most of it will still reach the wetlands through the ground or over the surface. He stated what they're doing is controlling the rate at which it reaches that area. That is all designed as part of their calculations and even in the stormwater report, which P. Alunni, the Town Engineer, is reviewing and they've gone through already. B. Minnix explained that in the previous submission they were meeting the requirements, now they are doing even more to control that flow. He continued by saying now the street runoff is going to be improved as well, which is beyond the scope of what is being proposed. He stated improvement to the street and our property are two separate pieces.

D. Pearson stated that you get to the point where you're close to the wetlands. A lot of the shade in the places where you're proposing the buildings will be eliminated. As you get really close to the wetlands, are we losing too much of the canopy in that vicinity.

B. Minnix explained that this was noticed after the site plans were submitted, but he did put in an existing tree that will not be taken out, which is approximately 36-inches in diameter, behind the retaining wall. That will remain to provide some shade. Also, they are proposing additional trees around the development. At the front, there is another tree that they believe they can save that's at the back of the sidewalk. Those two (2) trees are the biggest in his opinion, that are worth saving compared to

some of the black locust that were discussed before across the site. There's also another big shade tree located on the back side of the proposal that can be saved. Other than that, there really aren't large trees that provide a high value of shade. There are a couple across the front, but those will be replaced as far as plantings in the front of the property.

D. Pearson stated the last thing in question is that one end of the pipe is visible, but the other end of the pipe hasn't been identified. It goes under the road and sort of goes off somewhere. He asked if someone could clarify where that pipe goes and what its purpose is and whether it's still doing anything.

B. Minnix explained that is about a 36-inch corrugated metal pipe, he's assuming 1930's to 1950's was when it was installed. He reviewed some old plans from the Registry that show this pipe going across the road, with an easement for the town to access it. It led to a wetland and drainage ditch that extended beyond the property. That area has since been filled with a subdivision, at least three (3) to four (4) houses in a row. That pipe reportedly goes to a manhole; however, the location is unknown. They haven't witnessed any flooding and at the site visit, it was dry. The Town Engineer may have more information, but B. Minnix hasn't found any more information on plans that he has found.

D. Pearson stated he wonders if it may be beneficial for Engineering to consider plugging it up if there is no known cause as to what it does.

B. Minnix explained that the problem with plugging it is that any runoff that comes off surrounding properties and comes from Main Street to the wetlands, now has nowhere to go. Which could lead to possible rising water levels.

D. Pearson asked if we even know what that pipe does.

B. Minnix explained that we know that it is connected to the wetlands, we just don't know exactly the flow path in which it gets there. Looking at some of the vegetation from driving around, the drainage ditch looked like it went behind Yentile Farm Recreational Facility and is connected to the wetland back there. The plans showing the drainage on Lowell Street, do not show a tie in with that pipe, so he does believe it is somewhere connected to the pipe that leads to the ditch.

D. Pearson stated there is no real way of hiding the fact that the development is stressing the Commission's policy on structures and no disturb. He explained he wants to hear the strongest case for what it is providing in terms of improved stormwater handling, and if it is adding to the residential stock in town and if it has value in that way to get around the fact that it really challenges our policy so much. He added that Engineering will be looking at the plans as well so there will be a chance to talk about it again.

R. Peterson reiterated that this site went through innovations relative to what they foresaw, specifically sixteen (16) units which was down considerably. There was an iteration of this site with thirty (30) units, an iteration of this site with twenty-four (24) units, an iteration of this site with one (1) building to the left, associated parking to the right, and some sort of townhouse condo development which didn't work because of curb cuts. When the applicant approached R. Peterson's office, he explained that he is ready and willing and able to work with the town. Prior, they had five (5) or six (6) prefilling meetings before they got to where they are now. They are at a point now where they are comfortable with what would be the responsible development for this site. He stated that he can't sit here and tell you this is not a tough site because it is a very tough site and what is proposed on this site is what they saw as the best way out as far as what else could go there. They are doing the best they can as far as stormwater recharge relative to the site in the existing conditions. R. Peterson stated that P. Alunni insisted they capture the runoff from Cross Street onto the property to hopefully alleviate any sort of flooding or water

concerns down the road that currently exist, but might be exacerbated when they open the road and they see what's coming over from Butters Row. That water is going to have to go somewhere and at least with this development it will be taking a good step to make sure they're not making an issue relative to where that water goes through the pitch of the road and addressing that in the immediate future. He would say in regard to the last point relative to housing stock, there is some multi-family housing going up around town, however he sees that this specific location, when it was rezoned at town meeting, had the overwhelming support to be rezoned to support a residential development as that is what he believes fits best at this exact and precise location. He continued by saying you could fit some sort of commercial development there as it sits, but again the responsible development here is going to be for residential dwellings and again sixteen (16) units isn't perfect for any developer as you all know the more units they could get, the better it is for them. After months and months of discussions, the sixteen (16) unit multi-family dwelling is something the developer is comfortable with, and he wanted to relay that to the Commission.

D. Pearson explained that personally speaking its sort of like if you looked at it in the sense of a little village right across from a nice recreation area, but its busy streets on both sides and a limited selection of businesses one might walk to, to shop or eat, it's still a place where you live and drive somewhere else, so he is struggling with how it fits in some ways. He stated it's really hearing the story that makes the Commission feel comfortable that the rules are going to bent so seriously, but there's sort of a benefit to the town and a minimal effect on the wetland and the neighbors going forward.

R. Peterson stated he agrees, however as a lifelong resident of Wilmington, he hopes there are more developments like this in the area. He is hopeful that we can get some meaningful, great developments here and one way to entice businesses and commercial space that everyone seems to want is going to be increasing housing stock, so projects like this would lend credence to rooftops or households in the restaurant industry to get some thriving businesses in and around Wilmington which he believes should be the end game for all the developments.

D. Pearson stated its sort of like if you build it, they will come, like a field of dreams kind of thing. It's not an organically planned thing, it's like a we're going to do this, and we expect some follow along benefits, if we get a chance to kick that around that's good. He stated we look forward to continuing this to the next meeting.

Upon motion duly made by A. Rittershaus and seconded by M. Gavegnano, it was unanimously

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing for Cross Street – Map 40 Parcel 11 – DEP File #344-1504 to the September 7, 2022, Conservation Commission meeting

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – NOTICE OF INTENT – Marion Street, Eagleview Subdivision – Map 5 Parcels 2J, 3, 3A, 3C, 3D, 3E – DEP File #344-1494**

Documents: Continuance email from Kristen Costa, dated August 2, 2022

Present in Interest: None.

C. Lynch stated the applicant requested to continue.

Upon motion duly made by A. Rittershaus and seconded by M. Gavegnano, it was unanimously

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing for Marion Street, Eagleview Subdivision – Map 5 Parcels 2J, 3, 3A, 3C, 3D, 3E – DEP File #344-1494 to the September 7, 2022

## Conservation Commission meeting

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – NOTICE OF INTENT – 30 Upton Drive – Map R1 Parcel 18H –  
DEP File #344-1500**

Documents: Planning & Conservation Peer Review Response Letter, dated June 21, 2022  
Engineering Response Letter, dated June 21, 2022  
"Plans to Accompany," dated January 5, 2022

Present in Interest: Devin Howe, Project Engineer, Beals Associates  
Stephen Albano, Owner & Applicant

D. Howe explained that all the documentation has been sent to the town relative to the latest letters. The Planning Board issued the stormwater management permit, the site plan review permit, and the groundwater protection district permit. P. Alunni reviewed the stormwater management and the engineering of their design and is all set with it. D. Howe stated he did receive a draft Order of Conditions from C. Lynch for the Commission to vote on. There are two (2) conditions that he would like to review. Condition #23 reads that the Commission reserves the right to impose additional conditions on this project to mitigate any actual or potential impacts resulting from the work here in permitted. D. Howe explained that typically seen with other towns if the situation arises during construction, they'd reach out to either the applicant, the engineer, or the construction management company to address any issues that arise. In a case that an issue is not resolved or fixed, the town does have mechanisms to address issues such as Enforcement Orders and at that time the Commission could add additional conditions within the Enforcement Order. He stated that they don't feel its proper to have an open-ended condition such as this one that leaves the door open for other conditions to be added to this permit.

D. Pearson explained that for 36 & 38 Upton Drive, his belief is that the Order of Conditions probably had the same conditions word for word, and it was a Beal's Associates project as well, so he doesn't know why the conditions for this one would be in question.

D. Howe stated that he is correct, and after it was flagged today, they went through 36 & 38 Upton Drive, and he explained he can't speak for the thought process on that. It was his office; however, he was not personally involved in the final decisions with the town for those. As far as what the concern is tonight for 30 Upton Drive that is what he can speak to today. The other condition is #45 stating no rock salt (sodium chloride) shall be used on paved surfaces within 100-feet of wetland resource areas and any arrangement for snow removal shall so stipulate. He asked that as part of this condition they be allowed to de-ice, when necessary, for public safety. He asked for understanding that there really is no way to manage salt chemicals and de-icing other than what's shown on the salt management plan. He would like to leave the door open if it be necessary to ensure the public's safety that they would be allowed to add de-icing chemicals within 100-feet of the resource area.

D. Pearson asked C. Lynch and V. Gingrich if that means rock salt specifically, because for 36 & 38 Upton Drive there was talk of using a brine solution for de-icing and the use of sand and they had a robust sort of operations planned. D. Pearson questioned if by rock salt we meant sodium chloride and solid form.

V. Gingrich explained that this is a standard condition that is put in all orders and there are alternatives to sodium chloride that could be used, so that could be used specifically for rock salt. As far as Condition #23, that is a condition that was included from the beginning of time in the Town's orders.

D. Pearson asked if the prohibition of rock salt within 100-feet of the intermittent stream handcuffs the property manager from keeping the roadway safe around the building.

D. Howe explained that there are other ways to manage the de-icing however as he stated prior, they want to try and leave that door open. If it's the Commission's wish to not allow rock salt, at the end of the day it's the Commission's decision to vote on.

D. Pearson stated that these conversations were had with 36 & 38 Upton Drive about sodium beginning to show up in ground water at higher and higher concentrations, so he believes they were looking for ways to control winter driving hazards using minimal sodium and minimal chemistry and rely on something more like sand. He explained that the concerns are noted, but if they kept the Order of Conditions the same, how would he feel.

D. Howe stated that it is the Commission's decision. He stated that the first condition he noted, he doesn't believe its proper to leave a condition such as that open. He continued by saying this arose in other towns and they removed the condition. Again, he understands it is up to the Commission.

D. Pearson asked V. Gingrich if she's known projects that impose additional conditions in progress. He doesn't recall any himself.

V. Gingrich stated if there is something that happens during construction like dewatering, there are certain things that we would want to require of them through a dewatering process that has to be approved by us anyway. We've never gone and added text to an order, more so working through issues that arise in the field.

D. Pearson stated he has been on the Conservation Commission for a long time and doesn't remember seeing any conditions amended to add conditions. As V. Gingrich stated, it's much more like negotiating what was said or maybe at the most an Enforcement Order that states the change. He hopes that sets D. Howe's mind at ease.

D. Howe explained that he understands that the Commission wouldn't use it in any way that would be unfair, however in their opinion having this condition, it could be misinterpreted later down the road by a different Commission, and they might not know the same intent that was intended tonight.

D. Pearson polled the Commissioners, and all agreed that the Order of Conditions are standard and should stand as is.

D. Pearson stated now that it was brought to attention, it is something the Commission can ponder on for future orders.

D. Howe understood and stated it brings back the policy that they understood for intermittent stream versus the bordering vegetated wetlands not having a retaining wall in the 50-foot no build zone. He just wants to make sure that he understands, and future Commissions understand what the intent is tonight. He stated they are happy to go with the Commission's decision.

No comments were made from the public.

Upon motion duly made by A. Rittershaus and seconded by W. Wierzbicki, it was unanimously

VOTED: To close the Public Hearing for 30 Upton Drive – Map R1 Parcel 18H – DEP File #344-1500 to the September 7, 2022, Conservation Commission meeting

Upon motion duly made by A. Rittershaus and seconded by W. Wierzbicki, it was unanimously

VOTED: To issue the Order of Conditions for 30 Upton Drive – Map R1 Parcel 18H – DEP File #344-1500

**REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE – 14 Michael Drive – Map 5 Parcel 8 – DEP File #344-1415**

Documents: Request for Certificate of Compliance received July 21, 2022  
“As Built Plan of Land,” dated May 23, 2022  
Letter from Edward J. Farrell, P.L.S dated June 10, 2022

C. Lynch stated it is slightly different than what was approved. The pool is in a slightly different location and the shed and cabana are slightly smaller, but it doesn't get closer to the wetlands.

Upon motion duly made by T. Bradley and seconded by V. Licciardi, it was unanimously

VOTED: To issue the Certificate of Compliance for 14 Michael Drive – Map 5 Parcel 8 – DEP File #344-1415

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION**

**151 Federal Street – Map 61 Parcel 7D**

V. Gingrich explained that the office received a call about some tree clearing on Federal Street. She did a site visit and spoke to Mr. Kelley and saw that there were several trees cut down within the buffer zone. V. Gingrich and Mr. Kelley discussed having the wetlands delineated and having the distance from the trees to the wetlands placed on a plan and provided for the Commission.

Mr. Kelley explained that he moved to Wilmington in 2018 and is rather new to the area, which isn't an excuse, however, he did not seek out the process for tree removal on his property. The trees he had taken down posed a safety risk to himself and his family. These trees taken down were of concern and he apologized for not consulting with the Commission prior to the removal of trees. He explained that they were asked to bring in a wetland scientist which was completed.

M. Schweisberg explained that he visited the site yesterday morning to assess the property. What he found were six (6) trees that were recently cut, with several others that were cut a long time ago. All six (6) trees were Eastern White pines. One (1) of the trees had three (3) to six (6) inches in diameter at rest height. One (1) tree at six (6) to twelve (12) inches and two (2) at twelve (12) to eighteen (18) inches. They all are on the edge of the lawn and not very far into the existing forest area. All the trees were in the buffer zone. M. Schweisberg stated that he did not delineate the wetlands as he wasn't retained to do so at this point and wasn't sure the Commission would want that after hearing the status today. He explained six (6) trees were cut at varying diameters. M. Schweisberg estimated the heights were roughly in the sixty (60) to eighty (80) foot high range being the tallest. Some of the smaller trees were roughly fifteen (15) to thirty (30) feet and maybe another being in the twenty (20) to forty (40) foot range. The ground was intact, the understory, which is mostly sweet pepper bush and red maple, with a variety of others all intact with no other disturbances. The only disturbance were the six (6) trees as mentioned.

D. Pearson asked if he had an indication of any of the trees being in the wetlands without doing the delineation.

M. Schweisberg stated that they all were along the existing lawn area or farther back on the property in some previously disturbed areas which are quite old. The nearest tree was roughly forty (40) to fifty (50) feet from the edge of the wetland.

V. Gingrich stated that she could say she agreed that the trees were not in the wetlands and that they were sort of just off the edge of the yard. She stated that distance wise she was not so sure of, but they may have been a little closer, however certainly not in the fifteen (15) foot no disturb. V. Gingrich stated the goal for tonight is figuring out what Mr. Kelley should do as far as filing or a friendly Enforcement Order and what the Commission would want to be included in that filing.

D. Pearson asked if this would've been handled as an Administrative Tree Removal request if the trees had not been cut down.

V. Gingrich answered by saying depending on the health of the trees potentially, but it is hard to say not seeing them prior to being cut down. She believes an Administrative Tree Removal request is a lower limit of trees, and six (6) trees would exceed that which would require a filing.

D. Pearson asked what the number of replacements would be, given those circumstances.

C. Lynch stated that it is one (1) replacement for every two (2) trees over 24-inches in diameter and one (1) replacement for every three (3) trees less than 24-inches in diameter.

V. Gingrich stated it would be two (2) replacement trees and/or bushes.

D. Pearson proposed in terms of talking it out, an Enforcement Order that would require Mr. Kelley to plant two (2) replacement trees or shrubs in an area that C. Lynch is comfortable with and if that's the best way to go about this.

C. Lynch stated that would be more straight forward than a filing and can be discussed among the Commission.

D. Pearson stated that it seems on target and is simpler than the filing in his opinion.

Mr. Kelley asked if there would be guidelines on what is expected of him regarding the replacements.

D. Pearson explained that Mr. Kelley would have native species to pick from as well as C. Lynch's advice as to where the replacement plantings may have the best impact. There will be a timeframe in which it will need to be completed by.

D. Pearson stated two (2) replacement trees and/or shrubs of native species be planted by mid October.

Upon motion duly made by A. Rittershaus and seconded by M. Gavegnano, it was unanimously

VOTED: To issue the Enforcement Order for 151 Federal Street – Map 61 Parcel 7D

**ADMINISTRATIVE TREE OR SHRUB REMOVAL****128 Glen Road – Map 55 Parcel 1**

V. Gingrich explained that she did a site visit at 128 Glen Road while the Conservation Agent was on vacation. She explained that if you're heading towards Main Street, the parcel is located on the left side, right before Lubber's Brook. They were two (2) large trees that both had large holes in them and were compromised. V. Gingrich spoke to the homeowner about one (1) replacement tree or shrub, in which the homeowner agreed.

**22 Allenhurst Way – Map 49 Parcel 149**

C. Lynch stated that there were four (4) trees needed to be removed. Three (3) of the trees at the back of the property were rotted and very close to the house and wetlands. The tree in the front of the property by the driveway was rotted as well.

**ENFORCEMENT ORDER****702 Sandy Lane – Map 106 Parcel 124**

C. Lynch stated that he talked with the homeowner and was sent via email what they have so far. The restoration plan is ready to go, they are just putting it onto an actual plan and they should be ready to submit for the September 7, 2022, Conservation Commission meeting.

D. Pearson mentioned that there was some discussion about delineating where the border of their property is and where Conservation land is. He asked if that will be included.

C. Lynch stated it was talked about, but left open ended to see what they come up with, whether they decide to put in a fence or larger boulders in place of the rock wall that's there currently, but only one foot tall, which doesn't have much impact when stopping someone from going back there.

D. Pearson asked if the rock wall checks with the property boundary.

C. Lynch confirmed that it does follow all the property boundaries.

**55A & 65 Chestnut Street – Map 16 Parcels 2A & 1A**

C. Lynch explained he and V. Gingrich met on site with Maureen from Norse Environmental Services. He explained that she found a wetland about 60-feet away from the disturbance and now they will be coming up with a restoration plan for the area, what plantings will be placed, and will remove all the debris from the upland so that the restoration plantings can grow properly. He explained it should be ready by the September 7, 2022, Conservation Commission meeting.

**4 Wilton Drive – Map 21 Parcel 3M**

T. Broman explained that he has been trying to get a wetland scientist, however the ones he contacted are twelve (12) to sixteen (16) weeks out. He contacted eight (8) different places, and Hancock Associates are the only one that got back to him. He has been playing phone tag with a woman named Devlin to schedule a time for her to come and do a wetland survey. He explained he is just waiting to hear back to schedule a time for somebody to come out to his property and delineate the wetlands.



## DISCUSSION

### 12 Buckingham Street – Map 9 Parcel 62

C. Lynch explained that last week the office received a call about some work that had been going on down by the wetlands. When he went out to do a site visit, there was gravel, dirt piles, it looked like the ground had been chewed up a bit. At the time, he was thinking it would be a Notice of Violation, however circling back to why it was listed tonight as a discussion to gather the Commission's thoughts. C. Lynch looked up the maps on Google Earth street view and saw that it was previously a driveway area used for parking, but had not been approved by an RDA or any type of filing in order to get installed in the first place, which is why they chose to do a discussion rather than a Notice of Violation right away. He stated the work is maintaining the area in the back and replacing the parking storage area. The question would be does the Commission want him to file an after the fact for the original construction of the parking area or if the replacement of it is okay.

D. Pearson questioned if the gravel was being replaced and what's happening there now. He asked if it's going back to lawn.

C. Lynch believes it is being replaced by new gravel from what he observed.

D. McCue was having trouble with the audio on his laptop. He called in via telephone to the Zoom meeting and explained the situation. He stated that the area in the back that was disturbed, he came before the Commission about ten (10) years ago about opening that area up for installation of an ice-skating rink. Somebody in the neighborhood thought it was encroachment into wetlands, so they contacted the Conservation Department. Winifred, the Conservation Agent at the time, went on site and determined that the rink could be in the buffer zone. D. McCue filed an RDA with the Commission. When he came before the Commission, he received approval to remove three (3) trees and approval to use it as a skating rink. At this point, the disturbance was from working on a rock wall behind his pool area. He had material that he was bringing back to the stone wall area, and he was cutting through that area where the rink is. There was no intentions of reconstructing the existing, it was just a mode of access for him to get back and forth to the stone wall.

D. Pearson clarified that his intent isn't to change the surface and that it'll remain what it was, but what's in question is if the rock wall is within 100-feet of the wetlands.

D. McCue stated that the rock wall is not within 100-feet of the wetlands, his way of access to the rock wall is by cutting through that buffer zone area. The work being performed is not considered buffer zone area.

D. Pearson stated that if he's performing work on the rock wall and it measures less than 100-feet to the wetlands, a filing is required to obtain approval.

D. McCue explained that the gravel driveway he's using to get through to the rock wall, is in the buffer zone. The actual work on the stone wall and around it is not within the 100-feet.

C. Lynch confirmed that the rock wall is not in the buffer zone and that this is more geared towards the access, torn up area closer to the boundary.

D. McCue stated there is no disturbance to anything in that area from what he is doing.

D. Pearson stated that if the area that he's maintaining for the rink is being maintained annually, and if that's in the 100-foot buffer zone, we would ask what precautions are being taken to keep any of the material that's being put on the rink from eroding and going elsewhere. If there's an area within the buffer zone that is being maintained, more than just raking leaves, he believes it would be reasonable that he checks with the Commission.

D. McCue stated that in the fall everything dies off there. He has a tarp that he puts down underneath the liner, with boards that go around the rink, and the water fills up and gets dumped back to the ground. He has gone in front of the board at least ten (10) years ago and they were okay with the release being back into the ground. There were no special conditions needing to be adhered to.

D. Pearson stated if it is as simple as a tarp going up and down, it sounds harmless, but if it's being regraded or re-graveled or releveled, that is something of concern.

D. McCue stated that it has been the same for the last ten (10) years and has not changed.

C. Lynch explained that the question is whether the Commission thinks that D. McCue should file an after the fact for installing that parking area that doesn't have to do with the RDA that was filed for the rink and the trees. C. Lynch shared his screen to show the Google Earth Street view of the gravel area.

D. Pearson stated that if he received permission to install the rink, but there is an additional gravel area that was put in at the same time that wasn't included in the request, it would require separate filing.

D. McCue provided a back story and said back in the 1990's when Medford Ave was created, the town allowed the developer to put a drainage easement through town property that dumps out back about 30-feet beyond his property. When he moved into this property in 1996, that whole area was not wet and there was drainage which was only a year or two old and it wasn't a wet area. Over the years, it has developed. He has had that gravel area in place for a long time, prior to the installation of the rink. He explained that the Conservation area encroached onto his property and that he lost land due to the drainage area being installed in the 90's. Ten (10) years ago, when Winifred came out and walked the site, he is confused because if it was an issue then, why wasn't it brought up until now.

D. Pearson asked if it showed a gravel area on the RDA plans.

C. Lynch stated it didn't and that it was all just description.

D. McCue stated that the gravel area is probably 16-feet deep by 20-feet roughly, and he uses it to park his utility trailer.

C. Lynch explained the overall question for the Commission is if they think a filing would have been required for this installation and if so, do they think an after the fact should be required now or if the maintenance and replacement of the gravel on top is okay since it's been there for a while.

W. Wierzbicki stated if it is just maintenance, he is okay with it.

T. Bradley questioned if the gravel was mentioned in the description.

C. Lynch stated it was not, it only mentioned the temporary rink and the three (3) trees to be removed.

T. Bradley is okay with leaving the gravel area as is if somebody already approved it a few years back.

V. Licciardi agreed with maintaining it every now and then is okay.

M. Gavegnano stated that it seems to just be maintenance and she is okay with it.

A. Rittershaus stated that if it is just maintenance and not intense, it should be fine.

C. Lynch stated that the language in the RDA was vague and handwritten, not being very complete and would be a stretch to include that the gravel area was included, being six (6) to eight (8) feet away from the rink.

D. Pearson stated if it's been that way for a while, then he is okay with leaving it the way it is. He stated we don't have something that captures the existing condition today to know if something changes in the future. He asked if it be possible to obtain a sketch from the homeowner that shows that area with reasonable dimensions and shows where the rock wall is and what the extent of the gravel is.

D. McCue stated that he has an "as-built" plan that he can draw on and file it with the Conservation Department.

#### **MINUTES – June 1, 2022**

D. Pearson pointed out a missing word on page four (4) and required revision for the Ipswich River Watershed Association (IRWA).

Upon motion duly made by M. Gavegnano and seconded by V. Licciardi,

D. Pearson, V. Licciardi, A. Rittershaus, and M. Gavegnano voted 4-0 to accept the minutes for the June 1, 2022, Conservation Commission meeting as amended. T. Bradley and W. Wierzbicki abstained.

#### **MINUTES – July 6, 2022**

Upon motion duly made by T. Bradley and seconded by M. Gavegnano,

D. Pearson, T. Bradley, V. Licciardi, M. Gavegnano, and W. Wierzbicki voted 5-0 to accept the minutes for the July 6, 2022, Conservation Commission meeting. A. Rittershaus abstained.

#### **NEXT MEETING – September 7, 2022**

#### **ADJOURN**

There being no additional business to come before the Conservation Commission, A. Rittershaus motioned and T. Bradley seconded, it was

VOTED: By D. Pearson, T. Bradley, V. Licciardi, A. Rittershaus, M. Gavegnano, and W. Wierzbicki to adjourn the meeting at 9:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Erika Speight  
Senior Clerk

