

**Alton Conservation Commission
Minutes of May 11, 2006**

Approved by the Conservation 5-25-06

Members Present: Co-Chair, Justine Gengras; Co-Chair, Earl Bagley; David Lawrence, Roger Burgess, Thomas Hoopes, Gene Young, Alan Sherwood as Selectmen's Representative

Others Present: Jack Szymplenski – Benchmark Engineering, Don Prudhomme, Steve Prudhomme, and Jeremy Dube – Chairman of the Planning Board

Call Meeting to Order:

Co-Chairman J. Gengras called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Approval of Agenda:

Motion made by T. Hoopes and seconded by D. Lawrence to include the written sections. The motion passed with all in favor.

Public Input:

Jeremy Dube – Chairman of the Planning Board – Jeremy showed at the meeting to thank J. Gengras and E. Bagley for attending the last Planning Board meeting and giving input. Jeremy encourages everyone to go to the Planning Board meetings. He also would like to see more participation between the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission.

Approval of Minutes:

Approval of minutes from May 11, 2006 meeting.

D. Lawrence moved to accept the minutes as written, second by T. Hoopes. The motion passed with all in favor.

Presentations/Consultations:

1. Jack Szymplenski – Benchmark Engineering for Timber Ridge Subdivision
Jack gave the Commission a new deed to review with requested revisions.
J. Gengras let Jack know that the Conservation Commission did not see the deed until late March of 2006 and the Selectmen also has to approve the deed.
Jack doesn't know why that was because the Planning Board had the deed since the summer of 2005.

Motion made by J. Gengras to accept the easement deed and seconded by R. Burgess, providing Attorney Sessler reviews and approves. NSTS Development, Timber Ridge Subdivision easement extension subject to approval by Attorney Sessler.

E. Bagley – abstained and J. Gengras, R. Burgess, D. Lawrence, and Gene Young in favor.

T. Hoopes stepped down

Timber Ridge Subdivision. The terrain is steep on the lots and the driveways are long. Timber Ridge is looking to combine 4 single driveways in to 2-shared driveways. A variance is needed for the driveways with less grades and it would be environmentally friendly. The plan is approved for 4 driveways. Timber Ridge is looking for support from the Conservation Commission for the 2-shared driveways on the steep slopes.

A. Sherwood – having shared driveways now might not be an issue but eventually it could be.

Jack – initially the Conservation Commission supported the shared driveways.

J. Gengras – given the steep terrain, I would like to see 2- shared driveways instead of the 4 individual driveways.

Motion made by R. Burgess to support the 2-shared driveways instead of the 4 individual driveways, seconded by D. Lawrence. Motion passed with all in favor.

Standard Dredge and Fill Applications:

1. C&D Interests Map 15 Lots 56, 56-3, & 60 – Construction of a 19-Lot subdivision (continued from 4-27-06 meeting).

Discussion:

T. Hoopes stepped down.

J. Gengras and E. Bagley went to the Planning Board meeting and gave comments as part of the public input. The easement comments were to improve the area and support the protection. The way the plans are drawn there is no way to monitor the property without trespassing on other people's land. NH Soils provided a draft deed and if the project design changes than they might have to go into mitigation and they would also need a waiver length. The road that was moved out of the wetlands impact is now on a steep slope. Conservation's issue is the steep slope not the road length. If the land is transferred to the town it would be transferred as a landlocked parcel.

Can you create a lot with no frontage?

The land could be common land with each owner paying their share of the interest. There is a site walk scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 2006 for this subdivision.

The following are comments for NHDES regarding the Norby Subdivision for the Standard Dredge and Fill submitted.

Re: **NH Wetlands Bureau Standard Permit Application #2006-00868**

Carl Norby & David Reynolds, Tax Map 15, Lots, 56. 56-3 & 60; proposal to fill 7,348 sq ft [with bank impact] for a 21 Lot Subdivision

Dear Ms. Degler,

The Alton Conservation has the following comments on the above referenced wetlands permit application:

5Background:

Project representatives attended two Commission meetings to explain the project and

answer questions.

The project area lies within the Hurd Brook drainage area. This area is recognized as a significant wetlands and wildlife area in Alton's Natural Resource Inventory. The project parcel is part of a large, unfragmented, undeveloped area of forests, streams and wetlands, known locally for its abundant wildlife habitat. It includes a large, significant wetland complex associated with the Hurd Brook drainage as well as many other wetlands of varying sizes. Terrain in the project area is very irregular with moderate to excessively steep slopes.

Project Plans:

You will note Lot numbers on plans submitted with the above application are not consistent between pages 1 & 2, scale 1":100 and the remaining pages, scale: 1":50. The Commission requested and received corrected maps at their May 11 meeting. We have enclosed a 11" x 17"(reduced sized) set of the corrected plans with our comments.

Field inspection:

The Commission inspected the project area May 8, 2006 with project wetland scientists, Cindy Balcius and Tracy Tarr and the project engineer. The inspection was limited to areas of direct wetlands impact. The centerline for the proposed project access road is not staked, hence we did not walk the route of the proposed access road.

Observations:

1. The wetlands we observed appear to be accurately delineated in the field and accurately represented on the project plans.
2. The site has very irregular terrain with moderate to excessively steep slopes and diverse wetlands. Exposed soils in perk tests suggest that site soils are sandy and range from sand with rocks to areas with 100% loose sand, like beach sand.
3. We saw game trails and numerous signs of moose while walking the site.
 - The substandard silt fence on the south side the current access road entrance off Old Wolfeboro Road, along the north side of a wetland [Lot #3] should be replaced and properly installed.

Wetlands:

There are many wetlands in the project area, widely distributed and of varying sizes and types. The project attempts to minimize avoid wetlands impacts by proposing a long access road which runs south and east through the parcel. The "trade off" is that excessively steep-sloped areas are impacted to achieve this end. The road proposal is dependent on receiving a waiver for road length from the Alton Planning Board. The Planning Board is considering the request, but the waiver has not yet been granted.

- Can this project can be implemented without significant degradation of some of

the wetland areas beyond proposed impacts, particularly considering the steep slopes scattered about within the project area and construction impacts located in very close proximity to wetlands? [See Plans and locations where direct wetlands impacts occur or where road/driveway cuts are very close to wetlands.]

Changes in site hydrology

The project road and lot driveways will require an enormous amount of land alternation and dissection of steep slopes. This will significantly change hydrology on parts of the site. The access road changes site hydrology, dissects small drainage basins and invades excessively steep-sloped areas.

Proposed driveways also invade steep slopes to access desirable building locations. Each driveway cut creates a “channel” for water to flow down to the access road.

- How will runoff from proposed sloping driveways be handled?
- The Commission recommends that specific driveway locations and impacts be considered in assessing site hydrology.

Erosion control

Site soils viewed in perk tests are rocky sand to very loose “beach” sand. With all the steep slopes, erosion control and site stabilization during construction are a big issue, particularly those areas in proximity to wetlands and stream drainages.

The project Wetlands Application item 3.3.2 Minimization states: “The project proposes to incorporate 2:1 side slopes where feasible to minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible.”

- Are 2:1 slopes practical, given the erosion-prone sandy soils at this site?
- The Commission recommends no clear-cutting or stump removal on steep slopes except where absolutely necessary to help prevent slope erosion.

Water quality

The Stormwater Drainage report (p. 14) says: “The presence of wetlands and steep slopes also reduce the ability to provide traditional treatment basins, swales and underground storage.”

- The application does not address winter snow melt and salt-laden runoff from the access road and sloping driveways during periods when the ground is frozen. The treatment swales will not maintain water quality if runoff occurs when the ground is frozen. Degraded runoff is a common occurrence throughout the winter and early spring.
- The Commission recommends that measures be required to prevent degraded stormwater from the road and driveways entering the project area streams and wetlands.

Aesthetic interests of the general public

- Will the striking view from Rt. 28 across the large wetland to unbroken forest

beyond be substantially marred by the visibility of houses constructed in the proposed project?

- Can "no cut" areas be established in appropriate locations to screen the houses and protect the view on Rt. 28?

The proposed conservation easement

The landowner proposes a voluntary conservation easement on the Hurd Brook wetlands complex. At this time, project wetlands impacts are less than 10,000 sq. ft, and NH Wetlands Bureau does not require wetlands mitigation.

- The Commission agrees that the proposed easement is an environmentally significant area and should be protected and preserved as open space.

The easement proposal, as currently drawn, has a problem which needs to be resolved. Access to it will be blocked on all sides by private property. We learned at the Planning Board meeting that it is current "attached for Planning purposes to Lot 6." This creates a problem for any entity who holds the easement, as it cannot be accessed or monitored without trespassing through private property.

- Should this project change and the easement considered for mitigation, the Commission recommends resolution of the access issue prior to execution of any easement deed.

Thank you for permitting us to comment on this application.

Justine Gengras, Co-Chairman

cc: Carl Norby
Cindy Balcius, NH Soils Consultants

No action taken by the Commission. T. Hoopes rejoined the meeting.

2. Anthony DeFrancesco Map 53 Lot 3-2 – Repair an existing 50' shoreline wall, docking structure and tie-off pilings in-kind, as discussed per an on-site pre-application meeting with Ms. Darlene Forst of NHDES on August 30, 2001 with A. Folsom

Discussion:

The project appears to meet NH Wetlands Bureau rules. Send standard letter of no objection with the comment that the wall should be an angled riprap wall as opposed to a vertical wall.

Motion made by T. Hoopes to send standard letter of no objection to NH Wetlands Bureau with comments, seconded by E. Bagley. The motion passed with all in favor.

Notification of Routine Roadway and Railway Maintenance Activities

None at this time

Permit By Notification

1. Dwain Perillo Map 10 Lot 5-6 – Install a culvert for a driveway crossing for a home site. Impact area is 1330 square feet.

Discussion:

J. Gengras did a site inspection on 5-9-06 and acknowledged that there was steep slope and that the project is located on a curve. She also noted that there is a seasonal stream on the property not run-off. There will have to be a lot of fill brought in to bring the driveway up to road level. The applicant plans on using an 18” corrugated culvert. T. Varney said that the proposed driveway location is the location on the approved subdivision plan for the lot.

Motion made by R. Burgess to direct Co-Chair to sign application, seconded by E. Bagley. The motion passed with all in favor.

Minimum Impact Expedited

1. Gary Bahre Map 21 Lot 5-3 – See File

Discussion:

T. Tarr mentioned that Mr. Bahre has a beach replenishment permit from the state, but would rather go this route to protect the beach longer. He plans on putting a filter fabric between the sand and stones. They will be burying it to help keep stability of the perched beach and to prevent erosion. The Commission discussed the project and found that it appeared to meet NH Wetlands Bureau rules.

Motion by J. Gengras to direct a Co-Chair to sign application, seconded by R. Burgess. The motion passed with all in favor.

Commissioner Reports:

1. D. Lawrence: NSTS Development Easement Review.

Timber Ridge Development needs to be notified that because the easement was signed, that the Selectmen and the Conservation Commission need to sign. Before the deed is signed the deed contents requires a review for accuracy with the accompanying plan and the deed language approved by the Town Attorney. D. Lawrence reported that review of the draft easement deed showed there were a number of errors in the draft and a dimension missing from the plans. A request was made for the secretary to schedule a meeting for D. Lawrence to discuss the discrepancies with Jack Szymplenski of Benchmark Engineering.

2. J. Gengras – FYI – There is a situation impacting the new Zoning Regulations, which require buffers for wetlands over 10,000 sq. ft. in size. Someone is looking for a Planning Board waiver not to have to map the large wetlands on the back part of a proposed lot, because they are not planning on developing the back part of the lot. The question is whether the Planning Board can grant this waiver, as all of the wetlands need to be delineated to determine if the wetlands are large enough to require a buffer.

Also, all parts of the wetlands need to be shown in order to show the required buffers for the wetlands on project plans.

3. A. Sherwood – Gilman’s Corner Road and Drew Hill Road to access Gilman Pond.

A. Sherwood reported that the Selectmen discussed the Commission’s request to add a culvert to the Gilman’s Corner Road access to Gilman Pond. The Selectmen agreed for the work to be done as long as the Conservation Commission is willing to purchase the gravel and culvert(s) needed. Also, the Road Agent asked if the Commission wanted a culvert installed at the Pond access on Drew Hill Road.

The Conservation Commission agreed, but doesn’t feel that there needs to be a culvert at the Drew Hill Road. T. Hoopes mentioned that he would build a berm at the Drew Hill Road access to Gilman Pond to stop vehicles from crossing the beaver activity area. The Conservation Commission would also like to erect signs on the property which say “No access to Gilman Pond after dusk/dark”, and “daylight use only”.

The Commission also discussed the need for a sign for the Coffin Brook Conservation Easement. T. Hoopes said that he understood that the sign would be provided by the Hannaford project.

Other Business:

1. 2006 Tree Steward and Earth Team Natural Resource Volunteer Program

No action taken by the Commission

2. Margaret Brown Trust Map 43 Lot 16 – Permit Approval

No action taken by the Commission

3. Michael Thompson Map 75 Lot 77 – Permit Approval

No action taken by the Commission

4. Chestnut Cove LLC Map 15 Lot 15 – Name Change Permit Approval

No action taken by the Commission

5. Ralph & Lois Jury Map 35 Lot 33 – Grant to Right Petition Approval

No action taken by the Commission

6. West Alton Marina Map 17 Lot 29 – Denial of Amendment to Standard Dredge & Fill Permit Application

No action taken by the Commission

Adjournment:

Motion made by R. Burgess and seconded by J. Gengras to adjourn at 9:15pm. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Fortin
Secretary to the Conservation Commission