

**Town of Newbury**  
**Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**Date: June 22, 2021**  
**Location: Zoom Call**

**Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting Dates:** 7/13/21; 8/3/21

**Past Meeting Minutes:** None reviewed.

Present: Chairman Colleran; Brian Gahagan; Dan Streeter; Mary Rimmer; Peter Paicos; Bill Lord;

Meeting opened at 7:01 pm.

**Public Hearings:**

**The Trustees of Reservations (173 Hay St.) DEP# 050-1361** – an NOI for the restoration of up to 30 acres of salt marsh through restoration of hydrology altered by past agricultural practices;

Russell Hopping, the Ecology Program Director at the Trustees of Reservations is presenting. Proposing micro runnels, designed to address some of the water logging (7 of them) happening in areas that the ditch remediation is not going to rectify.

South side of Kent Island part of Wildlife Management Area, past agricultural ditches, mega pools that have been forming, micro-runnel – not able to adjust water log projectory, very shallow, created with a mini excavator in winter months if marsh freezes, if not, boards and the such, to avoid any impact to marsh. Concept try to identify where old creeks used to be and what exists now in terms of vegetation to look for where the old creeks were. Open up micro-runnels, drop water level to stop spread of mega pools, give the vegetation more of a chance to recover. Wildlife management area. R1 – Runnel 1. Don't want the roots of the vegetation to be water logged. These areas dry out in summer, not only open water but bare mud. Thin layer of algae that will build up as water evaporates. Trying to replicate where the creeks used to be, this is being done for the sparrow, marsh resiliency, and the environmental services that come along with that. Clarification – it is all on state wildlife management land, but this in partnership with the state, match for grant for work at Old Town Hill land, received grant for this element of the restoration project. In total there are three sites, this one, the one in Ipswich (132 acres), and Essex (111 acres). This is Phase 2 of the ditch remediation process.

Open for comments: no comments.

Any public comments? None.

Member Rimmer: just for disclosure purposes, Mary is working with the Trustees on this project, so she cannot vote.

NHESP has approved it. Division of Marine & Fisheries has seen everything.

Member Gahagan has made the motion to continue the hearing to 7/13. Member Paicos seconded, Member Rimmer recused – other 3 members in favor.

**Coughlin Shea Builders (7 Larkin Rd.) DEP #050-1360** – An ANRAD to determine if areas within a resource area can be classified as Isolated Land Subject to Flooding;

TJ Melvin with Millennium Engineering representing the applicant; TJ shared and briefly discussed the plan - determine whether the two isolated wetlands were Isolated Land Subject to Flooding, we were also filing to delineate all the resource areas on the property. Two main Isolated wetlands – ran through topo - Can't find any areas that pond greater than 6" and everything drains north to south through the wetlands. It really doesn't pond except a few pockets. The parcel does run along the Parker River, we do have Bank associated with the Parker River, and also a BVW that encapsulates the whole river and along the northern boundary property line. There is a small BVW in that area.

Member Rimmer: It is a large enough site to require a peer review for the wetland boundary.

Chairman Colleran: Do we want to do a group site walk or just have Mary walk it?

Member Rimmer: I'll walk the site with Kara and the applicant's representative. If no issues, take it up at the next meeting, if Kara is comfortable with that.

Agent Campbell: Sounds good to me.

Chairman Colleran: TJ, work that out with Kara and Mary. We will see you back on 7/13.

Member Gahagan made Motion to continue the Hearing until 7/13. Member Streeter seconded, all in favor.

**Steve DeSalvo (16 & 20 Northern Blvd) DEP# 050-1364**- an NOI to nourish the dune in low areas with compatible sand estimated to fill an area 130 ft by 50 ft and 1.5 feet deep to ensure existing dune grass will grow, to plant additional dune grass, and to install sand fencing to encourage dune growth and stability; Applicant requested a continuance to the June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2021 Meeting.

No one present to discuss project; request continuance to next scheduled hearing date. Work schedule for fall time frame.

Member Gahagan made a Motion to continue the Hearing until 7/13. Member Streeter seconded, all in favor.

**Jared Dombrowski (122A Main St.)** – an RDA for construction of a replacement septic system within 100 feet of wetland resource area. Continued from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting;

Jared Dombrowski is representing himself, along with the Buyer's agent. Septic is being installed near wetlands, designed to go as far away from the wetlands as possible, it's a 15x40 pipe and stone leach field.

Chairman Colleran: Believe the plan was never circulated to the Commission. Drop box submittal? Septic plan itself.

Jared Dombrowski: Initially built as an infiltrator system, but there was an addendum to be a pipe and stone leaching field. It has received BOH approval with the change from infiltrator system to pipe and stone with leaching field. Sharing revised plan. (Question to whether the BOH has approved the septic plan yet). Hay bales to add during construction process so it doesn't infiltrate to the wetlands at all. Existing system is closer to home, wetlands, this is as close to the street as possible away from the wetland. Title 5 did not pass.

Member Streeter asked about erosion control on the area where the old tank is, the protection of the erosion control, need more erosion control. Wrap it around so it includes the area of the tank so any soil disturbance is encompassed by the erosion control barrier.

Member Rimmer: Concrete pad being removed. More than 450' from the wetland edge, seems fairly straight forward as long as the BOH has approved the plan.

Chairman Colleran: A lot of soil disturbance/earth removal – still all the same, do we want to do anything more than erosion control or just let it go.

Member Streeter: Is this an RDA or a Notice of Intent? Normally, something like this would come in as an NOI. What are your thoughts?

Member Rimmer: Typically, it would be an NOI, but considering the time expended, what did Bill Holt say? Comfortable being an RDA, nothing we can really Condition, since it's an improvement.

Chairman Colleran: We can condition a pre-construction meeting, pre-construction line check to check the erosion control. RDA ok. Septic.

Member Rimmer: We can add a few special conditions in the Order, pre-construction meeting, erosion control, post construction report, no COC required, but maybe a report that the site is stable, then take action at that point.

Member Rimmer: Made Motion to issue Negative Determination with Special Conditions, pre-construction site visit with Agent, post-construction report documenting the site is stabilized. Member Paicos seconded, all in favor.

**Justin Leonard (3 Southern Blvd. Plum Island) DEP# 050-13##** - a continued NOI to restore an existing small parking area – Continued from March 9<sup>th</sup> and March 30<sup>th</sup> meetings - still no DEP #. Continued to June 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting;

Chairman Colleran: Instead of waiting on DEP for a file number, would you be ok to be issued an Enforcement Order and get the work done that is stated in the Order? Not recorded on deed. Friendly Enforcement Order. Set terms, get it done, close the Order. Submit a letter to the Commission that you withdraw your submitted Notice of Intent, and then we can move forward with the EO.

Member Rimmer: Made motion to have applicant withdraw the submittal of the Notice of Intent (Justin in agreement) and move forward issuing an Enforcement Order. Member Paicos seconded; all in favor.

**Nathan Gray (21 Cottage Road) DEP# 050-13##** - a continued NOI to remove wood shed, fabric-covered steel frame structure, and located within the wetland resource and restore wetland. In addition, construct a new shed and greenhouse in 100-foot buffer and remodel existing shed located partially within wetlands. Continued to June 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting;

Nathan not present;

Member Rimmer made motion to continue meeting until 7/13. Member Paicos seconded; all in favor.

**David Manty (0 Pine Island Road – Map R30, Lot 5) DEP# 050-1330** – a continued NOI to construct a dock/pier, ramp, and floating dock within salt marsh resource area and ACEC. Continuance requested from applicant's representative to the July 13, 2021 meeting;

Tom Hughes of Hughes Environmental Consulting is representing the applicant. We would like to request a formal continuance to the 7/13 meeting. Discussion with Refuse Manager, going to head out to inspect, and Tom will work with the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife. Discussions continued.

Open to public: no comments.

Member Streeter made motion to continue the meeting until 7/13; Member Lord seconded, all in favor.

**U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service-DEP# 050-1349** – an NOI for Salt Marsh restoration between 3<sup>rd</sup> parking lot and maintenance building, west of Refuge Road, Newbury. Continuance to the June 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting was requested by applicant;

Nancy Pau from US Fish & Wildlife Service representing; DEP was waiting on comments from CVM; provide additional details – how do we know if project was successful, success matrix, and tie it to monitoring. Minor adjustments to NOI, no more concerns from anyone, all agencies, no further concerns with this project.

Member Rimmer made the motion to approve the NOI as proposed and issue an Order of Conditions on the restoration. Member Streeter seconded. All in favor.

**Town of Newbury - Orchard St. Cart Creek Crossing Restoration – DEP# 050-1356** - an NOI to replace the culvert underneath Orchard St. at Cart Creek on a Public Way. Continued from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting;

Anyone from Town or representatives? No one present.

Norse Environmental – we had written to the Commission to continue this to the next meeting – still waiting on MEPA comments and just received DEP comments, draft up response letter and supply to the Commission on next meeting 7/13.

Member Streeter made Motion to continue Hearing to 7/13. Member Lord seconded, all in favor.

**Dale Myers and Alliance Newbury 1, LLC (75 Boston Rd.) DEP# 050-1339**- A request to reopen public comments on the project for installing solar panels at the current landfill site in Newbury, as the issues with DEP have been resolved with this project. Continued from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting;

Dale Myers present, asked Maureen Herald with Norse Environmental to summarize - Commission may recall last May, solar panels on Newbury LF. Substantial time after submittal and hearing closure, DEP submitted comments late; responded to DEP concerns, RF itself wasn't flagged in field, flagged Bank and MHW, number of concerns related to SWM, number of comments addressed, Weston and Sampson letter dated April 9<sup>th</sup> addressing all concerns re stormwater and essentially that was it. Sent in revised package to Commission, DEP, received an email from DEP that they are satisfied with the comments, discussed with Bill Holt about possibly re-opening the hearing, re-advertised, re-notified abutters.

Member Rimmer: I wasn't a member, not familiar, sounds like everyone is satisfied, all set.

Re-open the Hearing, re-close it. Open for public comment:

Public comments from the general public? Nothing.

Commission discussion: Not voting to issue anything, still have to vote to issue an OOC. Vote to close and issue OOC. Drafted, but never issued. Approve an order with a different plan, different plan date, redrafted, resigned, amend the existing or fresh – fresh – never issued, don't have to amend – new Order.

Member Rimmer made a motion to close the hearing and issue an Order of Conditions. Member Lord seconded the motion. Approved by all. Stipulation that other drafted Conditions carry over to new Order. Standard conditions only.

**Cricket Lane, LLC (55 Pearson Dr.) DEP# 050-1355** - an NOI to construct 24 single-family homes with 800 feet of roadway, common septic system, water lines, sewer lines, and stormwater management system. Roadway includes limited crossing wetland filling and replacement with work in the buffer zone. Continued from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting;

Member Rimmer abstained:

The site visit got rained out, no site walk by Commission;

Ben Osgood, Engineer, present representing the Applicant; Walter Erickson, Owner, with Norse Environmental – the rainout of the site walk understood, received correspondence sent in by Patrick Garner – hired by a group of Pearson Road abutters (Mellissa Goldner, Peter Frangos; Daniel Linden, Brad Smith). Respond to letter, has Commission read it? Give you initial overview of letter. Initial overview –

The project went through the zoning process, the Town hired a consultant to review this according to the WPA outside of Conservation, but a thorough review by the Zoning Board before it went to Conservation. Wanted to make sure project addressed all issues.

Letter submitted last week, been through review, Town hired LEC Environmental, Ann Marton, to do that review, very thorough, review extended back to previous applicant on same project since it started in 2016.

Project got withdrawn from Zoning Board due to issues with the previous applicant, so we resubmitted it under a new applicant, Walter Erickson, review continued with new applicant, three review letters from LEC with a lot of information in them, raises LEC's comments re WPA and how we didn't comply, three letters to us, back to them, with changes.

Joe Swerka was hired to review civil engineering/stormwater management issues, review letter received, comments given.

Rigorous review by town-hired peer reviewers – Commission – please read and understand what was submitted – please review 94 pages –

Next meeting can definitely take questions on those review items. Have gone through rigorous review, and feel the revised plans address all the issues raised.

Chairman Colleran: Kara, did we receive the material?

Agent Campbell: Yes, it was placed in drop box.

One important point of letter from Patrick Garner. His letter states there are two vernal pools on the property - north east corner – certified vernal pool, borders/overlaps our property and Martin Burns Property, pretty large vernal pool – certified. There is a purported second vernal pool located within the A series isolated wetlands. We tried three times to certify the vernal pool, NHESP Jacob Colbell denied the application each time, insufficient evidence, lack of hydrology for the species life span. Walter and I witnessed it last week, it was dry. Jacob mentioned that the fact that it was dry in beginning of June, time period isn't there for the species to develop.

Standing disagreement over vernal pools - paper trail.

Ben Osgood – on June 8<sup>th</sup>, Patrick Garner stated our application abutters filed for vernal pool, stated that it was pending, but, it was denied in March. That information was not shared with the applicant. If it was denied in March, why pending till in June?

Important fact to review the information.

Chairman Colleran: Kara, anything?

Agent Campbell: No, recommend site visit before next meeting.

Chairman Colleran: Commission, anybody want to chime in?

Member Gahagan: why wasn't Conservation informed of Ann Marton's analysis, not informed, don't feel it was applicable to the process due to the lack of Conservation's input.

Member Streeter: Nothing

Member Lord: Good so far

Member Paicos: looking forward to rescheduled site walk.

Chairman Colleran: stand w/Ben's comments – do all the wetlands they want (Zoning) – Conservation is Conservation - start from scratch and work our way through.

Member Streeter: issue with vernal pool certification – evidence tad poles and metamorphys – that the pool could produce wood frogs, but the photos were deemed not good enough – in

contact with NHESP because it seems the threshold that the vernal pool is being held to seems high as compared to other most certifications in the state, number of folks involved trying to figure this out.

Site Visit – calendar now or through Kara later? Preferences? Thursday the 1<sup>st</sup> at 5:30 pm.

Member Streeter made the Motion to continue the Hearing to 7/13 at 7:00 pm. Member Lord seconded, all in favor (except Rimmer – abstained).

**Marybeth and Larry Abbott (69 Southern Blvd.) DEP# 050-1358** - an NOI to replace a single-family home with a new single-family home on pilings, with associated site work. Continued from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting;

**Marybeth and Larry Abbott (71 Southern Blvd.) DEP# 050-1359**– an NOI to replace a single-family home with a new single-family home on pilings, with associated site work. Continued from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting;

Tom Hughes of Hughes Environmental is present representing the applicants. 69 Southern Blvd – just got comments posted from DEP – pretty straightforward – share screen.

Assessor line and property line not accurate – proposing to remove structure, and put it more in line with lawn area, property line cuts through house at 71. Proposing to remove structure at 69 Southern and build a structure back more in line with zoning setbacks in the lawn area. Slight part of property in the VE-16 zone but the remaining area of the property is actually mapped out of the flood zone in the X-zone. There is a large area of pavement that extends all the way over in front of the building at 71, encroachment from several buildings. Remove building, pavement, fill with clean comparable sand, new drive constructed with shell as shown on plan. DEP Comments twofold – dune vegetation shows up on aerial photographs, show where we are putting 10 cubic yards of sand. Best guess of how much it will take, just to match grade, described that in narrative. Fill void to match grade. Vegetation is pretty detailed on plan, full accounting of vegetative impacts, and re-planting.

We start with 5,129 sq. ft. of vegetation, end up with 5,269 sq. ft.. We are proposing to plant dune grass 1' on center. If anyone wanted to drive by or ask questions, I'd be happy to attempt to address them.

Member Lord: Good with this. No questions.

Member Streeter: Only real question, there is an area of locust trees – will wait for 71 discussion.

Member Rimmer: elevation plan that shows the height of the building above grade? You have 2.4' to bottom of structure – standard. I have been to the site, the house is pretty much in



disrepair. House being raised, improvement. Are you satisfied that the plan addresses DEP comments on vegetation?

Tom Hughes: This plan provides a lot more detail. Maybe they are misinterpreting the vegetation, removing the paving and building, plantings, standard any area disturbed during vegetation would be replanted.

Chairman Colleran: do you want to keep this open and move on to 71? Let's close them together.

71 Southern: Two lots, merged for zoning purposes. Large area of lawn, turnaround driveway, areas of and, some woody vegetation, one black locust, area dominated by black locust and debris piles. We are out of the flood plain, show areas that will be re-vegetated.

Minimum 2' height – DEP sees the stand of locust and thinks it's dune vegetation in aerial photo – nothing worse than an invasive tree – certainly is some dune vegetation, in the end – the table – we go from 9,296 sq ft of vegetation to 10,837, and we get rid of all the black locusts. Again, we're just talking about American Beach Grass 1' on center. If the Commission wanted to add the Condition that we add some woody vegetation in there and specify a number we would be willing to accept that as a Condition. Until the black locusts are gone, it would be a lot easier to handle it as beach grass.

Member Lord: all looks good, fine with it.

Member Streeter: Locust area – with that type of existing vegetation, I am wondering how successful dune grass will be if the soil is more organic than sand, maybe some other plants would be more suitable – just curious.

Tom Hughes: With the locust gone, dune grass will do well with some organic stuff, grows well in dune environment because it out competes others that don't grow well. We are ok with a suggestion of woody vegetation, but my concern was when you remove black locust even with the removal of the stumps and everything you get root sprouting, and even with herbicide you get re-sprouts. If we keep it clear of woody vegetation that might mask it. It's easier for them to make sure that we eradicate the black locust before doing anything else. I didn't stick my auger in the ground. It's an area that does have debris piles that have probably composted a little bit to, so there may be a little more organics back in there. I am open to something other than dune grass back there.

Member Rimmer: I'm wrestling with that too, structural diversity, would like to have more diverse planting plan to provide more shrub or tree cover. Tom, do you know if the black locust is idiopathic, in is it going to prevent other stuff from growing? Include bayberry or something that would compete with it.

Tom Hughes: can you give me type and number so I can add it to the plan? I'm guessing there is about 6 good size locusts and smaller ones, 12 removed? Twelve from CZM's list, reference the dune section of the plant list. Black cherry, or red cedar would be good.

Tom Hughes: bayberry – blueberry would do well if there is any shade and organic soils. Just give us a Condition for twelve woody plants in addition to other planting, then approved by Agent, would that be acceptable?

Member Rimmer: Where you put them it is a resource, we wouldn't want them to be just foundation plantings, all around the house, within the broader dune area.

Member Paicos: What is the size of structure? Square footage?

Tom Hughes: Let me check the zoning table, we have been through zoning – I don't have lot coverage – I can give you the area, not the floor area. So the existing building is 1031, and proposed building, steps, spiral and overhang 1718.

Chairman Colleran: Less worried with after plantings, more with plan of action to get rid of locusts – chip? Burn? Cutting, ripping out?

Tom Hughes: plan is currently to cut and remove the stumps. Remove everything from site. If we end up with difficulty doing that, we are not in an aquatic resource area so actually, unless the Commission objected, I would suggest that even Roundup would be suitable to either paint any broken or cut roots or paint any stumps that remain. If we don't treat it, you are going to get sprouting everywhere, where ever any roots remain. If the Commission didn't object, we would apply roundup to any remnants that remain, but we want to get out as much as we can to prevent re-sprouting.

Chairman Colleran: If I may ask, where are you taking the locusts to? I don't want to see them re-sprouting somewhere else.

Tom Hughes: The people removing the trees would dispose of them, the locust once removed don't really re-sprout, and the wood is in high demand for posts. They may chip it, they may cut it to usable lengths. It isn't like knotweed where you put it down somewhere and it re-sprouts. The only issue is if you don't get the roots out they will just grow back.

Chairman Colleran: concerned about pulling out and the fruit that is left behind.

Tom Hughes: By the time the decision is made, and the appeal period is over, the trees are just flowering, we can bag up any fruit trimmings and make sure we rake all that up. However, there is going to be some seed in the soil probably for years to come, and this will be an ongoing maintenance thing and what we can do is provide you with a report that the site is free from black locusts at the time we come in for a COC.

Chairman Colleran: Yes, I agree, but we also want to make sure that we are not creating a headache for someone else. Whatever the offsite choices are for disposal, it would be good to have some receipts showing that we aren't creating any more trouble for anyone else either by taking seeds offsite and driving them around or throwing any ripped-up roots just over in the trash pile.

Tom Hughes: We can make sure that any material that leaves the site that is viable, if it has seed, that it will be disposed of appropriately, and documented that it left the site unviable, either chipped or chip any branches if it has seed and just take the wood away. The wood isn't viable, just the seed.

Why don't we just document the Condition at the time of removal, we will make sure any viable portions of the plant are chipped or otherwise disposed of and we will document in a manner that renders it nonviable.

Member Rimmer: We can issue special conditions that deal with invasives management, we don't have to work out specifics tonight – separate – close the hearing, vote, then draft the special conditions on invasive species management.

Tom Hughes – I will work with the Team on an approach that will include the use of herbicide, ok with Roundup since it's not an aquatic setting?

Chairman Colleran: Rodeo is better.

Tom Hughes: I may just go with Triclopyr.

Open meeting to public: any public comments? None.

Member Rimmer: Made a motion to continue both 69 and 71 Southern Boulevard for invasive species management plans by the next meeting (7/13). Member Paicos seconded. All in favor.

**David Daly (22 16<sup>th</sup> St.) DEP#- 050-1357** – an NOI to construct a new single-family home on pilings, with associated site work. Continued from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting;

Agent Campbell mentioned that she received emails from the abutters that they cannot access the Zoom meeting, so they feel the hearing should be continued until next month so they can make comment.

Tom Hughes of Hughes Environmental Consulting is representing the applicant. All the abutters were properly notified. Only one abutter showed up at the last meeting, actually in favor of the project. We did stake out the site right after our last hearing; we reviewed our plans and submitted an update right after the hearing added a couple things - showing the condensers that would be hung on the side of the building, the propane tank detail was added, and DEP

comments were just posted today, and in response to that, I will go over what we did. We emailed in an update that added two notes. One is that there was no note that the driveway was going to be clamshell or gravel so we added that note. Also, we made a note to be clear that the area where we are bringing the grade to 10 is being done with clean compatible sand. Those are both things that are in our narrative, but we just made it explicit on the plan. The other thing is that what DEP said on this was that driveway couldn't be paved, it had to be clamshell or compatible material which we've now labeled on the plan but that wasn't our narrative and the other thing was they asked us to explain how the fill and the Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage will not cause flood waters to be displaced or reflected onto adjacent properties in public or private ways. What I want to point out is that what we're doing is taking Elevation 10 and we are just adding clean sand to make a relatively flat area around the house so that we can have the parking underneath. This is common, done on almost every project the Commission sees, and what we are talking about is literally filling 6" to 1' at the highest point. We are not filling; we are leveling off this area. We are not doing a fill that would have any effect on flood waters in any way. This is also 8 to 13 outside the limit of moderate wave action so any water during a flood slowly rolls in here; any sand is going to help to disperse any energy but it's not going to reflect it anywhere and it shouldn't have any effect on the way a flood behaves in a coastal situation like this. Did the Commission conduct a site visit?

Member Streeter: I did drive by the site, it looks like other than the remnants of the existing driveway or parking area, the area looks well vegetated.

Tom Hughes: It is, but there are some areas with existing disturbances, 2090, and proposed would be 2065, so we are reducing the disturbed areas now. What that means is that they are out there in that vegetated area. There are areas of sand and it's got chunks of pavement in it and there are a couple of other areas. We are not proposing to touch this encroachment that comes over from a neighbor but what we are doing in this gravel area – not performing dune function.

Member Streeter: When I look at the plan, it isn't clear to me where the replanting activity is going to occur. There is no line on the plan where you are going to replant – fill area. Just trying to make sense of the plan, it looked vegetated before, but the after seems empty.

Tom Hughes: Area of existing disturbance to be revegetated – arrows on plan showing that – any work beyond the limit of work is done by hand, and we have timber disturbance, edge disturbance, all shown on plan.

Member Rimmer: This is a different lot, a lot more dune function, hard to envision areas of existing disturbance. Stretch to call them areas of disturbance. Glitch in open meeting, potential people that want to comment, definitely recommend continuing Hearing to allow that to occur, there needs to be some response to DEP comments in writing to LSCSF – there is stuff that is washed over the dune, but those patches change week to week, storm to storm, doesn't seem like human intervention, not necessarily an area of disturbance, just unvegetated. Some encroachment from the neighboring property – have those encroachments been approved? It

certainly would benefit your project if you could count on that as restoration area. We need to keep meeting opened for more info and public input.

Tom Hughes: If the Commission wants plan updates, we can certainly accommodate that.

Member Paicos: public input should be heard. Very appreciative of David's efforts and intentions to keep the footprint small.

Chairman Colleran: I second everyone else's ideas. Tom did you put a document together how this project interacts with the bylaw? Erosion rate?

Tom Hughes: Yes, narrative includes all of that. No erosion data for this section, not considered a Coastal Bank, erosion data is on the beach on the ocean side. VE and AO zones and not the AE – new development is allowed in the AE Zone – this is all included in the NOI.

Chairman Colleran: Thank you – I missed it – I will review it. Let's continue this and let Kara catch up, talk to Mary and Dan. Keep it open, continue.

Public Comment: Any abutters, members of the public? No one present, no public comment.

Member Streeter made the Motion to continue the meeting until 7/13 with approval of the applicant. Member Rimmer seconded (Chairman Colleran, Members Paicos and Gahagan in favor; Member Lord, not in favor).

Commission discussion on Zoom meetings vs. in-person meetings:

Member Rimmer: virtual;

Member Paicos: Planning Board discussion earlier today – Boards that are appointed, follow direction of Select Board – for Boards that are elected, they can make their own independent decision.

Member Streeter: Would prefer the camera and screen sharing, shared electronic plans vs. poster boards, etc.

Matt Cooper, Town IT/Media Manager: Screen in main meeting room - Town Hall is capable of lap top taking the meeting – drop box is completely separate – no reason why the screen sharing couldn't be used at the hearings. Technology is still available.

Member Streeter: Is Library room going to have the same capability?

Matt Cooper: I will see what I can do.

**Commission Discussion:**

**Certificates of Compliance:**

Request for COC for Martha Taylor – continued to 7/13

Request for COC – Craig Gould - 65 Plum Island T/P DEP File#: 050-1343 – construction of shed; Agent Campbell went by, shed is constructed per OOC – trees were planted and shrubs along perimeter – looks ok – all healthy – approved – issue COC.

Questions? None

Member Rimmer made Motion to grant COC. Member Lord seconded. All in favor.

**Extension Permits:** GDA Request for Extension of OOC for Science Bldg. project. –  
GDA Request for Extension of OOC for Boardwalk project.

Agent Campbell: not too familiar – representative?

Norse Environmental present to discuss project – both of these projects have not been started yet, process of collecting necessary funds, put on hold this past year. Gearing up, prospective funding, hoping to complete the projects soon. Requesting 3 years on the extension of each.

Member Rimmer not around for beginning of project.

Chairman Colleran: nothing new – if we did deny it – may have different discussion on dock – dock over trail – floating dock – new dock policy – slightly different conversation.

Member Streeter: Think we should issue the extensions to both.

Member Streeter made Motion to grant the extensions to both OOCs for an additional 3-year term. Member Paicos seconded. All in favor.

**Emergency Certificates:** None

**Re-Issuance:** None

**Other Business:** Great Marsh Partnership Project – UNH Team – asked for letters of support to help with funding applications – would like to see us put support letter together.

Floor open discussion –

Member Rimmer: compression runnels? (Yes). I'd be ok with a letter of support.

Chairman Colleran: I believe it's a good idea.

Member Streeter made a motion to draft support letter; Member Paicos seconded. All in favor.

Member Lord made Motion to close the meeting; Member Streeter seconded the motion. All in favor - meeting ended at 9:38 pm.

**REMINDER:** *The listing of matters is as those reasonably anticipated by the Chair, which may be discussed at the meeting. Not all items listed may in fact be discussed and other items not listed may also be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.*