A. General Information

1. From: Town of Newbury Conservation Commission

2. This issuance is for (check one):
   a. Order of Conditions
   b. Amended Order of Conditions

3. To: Applicant:

   Walter
   a. First Name
   b. Last Name

   Eriksen
   c. Organization

   Cricket Lane, LLC
   d. Mailing Address

   92 Middlesex Road
   e. City/Town

   Tyngsboro
   f. State

   MA
   g. Zip Code

   01879

4. Property Owner (if different from applicant):

   Byfield Estates LLC
   a. First Name

   c. Organization

   2 Dearborn Way
   d. Mailing Address

   Middleton
   e. City/Town

   MA
   f. State

   01949
   g. Zip Code

5. Project Location:

   55 Pearson Drive
   a. Street Address

   Newbury
   b. City/Town

   R20
   c. Assessors Map/Plat Number

   75
   d. Parcel/Lot Number

   Latitude and Longitude, if known:
   42d45m35.4s
   a. Latitude

   -70d55m46.3s
   b. Longitude
A. General Information (cont.)

6. Property recorded at the Registry of Deeds for (attach additional information if more than one parcel):
   a. County
   b. Certificate Number (if registered land)
   36692
   c. Book
   d. Page
   493
   a. Date Notice of Intent Filed
   b. Date Public Hearing Closed
   c. Date of Issuance
   8. Final Approved Plans and Other Documents (attach additional plan or document references as needed):
      40B Comprehensive Permit The Villages at Cricket Lane Byfield, MA
      a. Plan Title
      Ranger Engineering Group, Inc.
      b. Prepared By
      Benjamin C. Osgood Jr.
      c. Signed and Stamped by
      3/8/2021
      d. Final Revision Date
      Varies
      e. Scale

f. Notice of Intent with all attachments 5/10/2021
   g. Date
f. Additional Plan or Document Title

B. Findings

1. Findings pursuant to the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act:
   Following the review of the above-referenced Notice of Intent and based on the information provided in this application and presented at the public hearing, this Commission finds that the areas in which work is proposed is significant to the following interests of the Wetlands Protection Act (the Act). Check all that apply:
   d. ☐ Private Water Supply  e. ☐ Fisheries  f. ☒ Protection of Wildlife Habitat
   g. ☒ Groundwater Supply  h. ☒ Storm Damage Prevention  i. ☒ Flood Control

2. This Commission hereby finds the project, as proposed, is: (check one of the following boxes)

Approved subject to:

a. ☐ the following conditions which are necessary in accordance with the performance standards set forth in the wetlands regulations. This Commission orders that all work shall be performed in accordance with the Notice of Intent referenced above, the following General Conditions, and any other special conditions attached to this Order. To the extent that the following conditions modify or differ from the plans, specifications, or other proposals submitted with the Notice of Intent, these conditions shall control.
B. Findings (cont.)

Denied because:

b. ☒ the proposed work cannot be conditioned to meet the performance standards set forth in the wetland regulations. Therefore, work on this project may not go forward unless and until a new Notice of Intent is submitted which provides measures which are adequate to protect the interests of the Act, and a final Order of Conditions is issued. A description of the performance standards which the proposed work cannot meet is attached to this Order.

c. ☒ the information submitted by the applicant is not sufficient to describe the site, the work, or the effect of the work on the interests identified in the Wetlands Protection Act. Therefore, work on this project may not go forward unless and until a revised Notice of Intent is submitted which provides sufficient information and includes measures which are adequate to protect the Act’s interests, and a final Order of Conditions is issued. A description of the specific information which is lacking and why it is necessary is attached to this Order as per 310 CMR 10.05(6)(c).

3. ☒ Buffer Zone Impacts: Shortest distance between limit of project disturbance and the wetland resource area specified in 310 CMR 10.02(1)(a) a. linear feet

Inland Resource Area Impacts: Check all that apply below. (For Approvals Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Proposed Alteration</th>
<th>Permitted Alteration</th>
<th>Proposed Replacement</th>
<th>Permitted Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. ☐ Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ☒ Bordering Vegetated Wetland</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. square feet</td>
<td>d. square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ☐ Land Under Waterbodies and Waterways</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. square feet</td>
<td>d. square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ☐ Bordering Land Subject to Flooding</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. square feet</td>
<td>d. square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubic Feet Flood Storage</td>
<td>e. cubic feet</td>
<td>f. cubic feet</td>
<td>g. cubic feet</td>
<td>h. cubic feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ☒ Isolated Land Subject to Flooding</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. cubic feet</td>
<td>d. cubic feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubic Feet Flood Storage</td>
<td>e. cubic feet</td>
<td>f. cubic feet</td>
<td>g. cubic feet</td>
<td>h. cubic feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ☐ Riverfront Area</td>
<td>a. total sq. ft.</td>
<td>b. total sq. ft.</td>
<td>c. square feet</td>
<td>d. square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq ft within 100 ft</td>
<td>c. square feet</td>
<td>d. square feet</td>
<td>e. square feet</td>
<td>f. square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq ft between 100-200 ft</td>
<td>g. square feet</td>
<td>h. square feet</td>
<td>i. square feet</td>
<td>j. square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Findings (cont.)

Coastal Resource Area Impacts: Check all that apply below. (For Approvals Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Proposed Alteration</th>
<th>Permitted Alteration</th>
<th>Proposed Replacement</th>
<th>Permitted Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Designated Port Areas</td>
<td>Indicate size under Land Under the Ocean, below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Land Under the Ocean</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. c/y dredged</td>
<td>d. c/y dredged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Barrier Beaches</td>
<td>Indicate size under Coastal Beaches and/or Coastal Dunes below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Coastal Beaches</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. nourishment</td>
<td>d. nourishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Coastal Dunes</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. nourishment</td>
<td>d. nourishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Coastal Banks</td>
<td>a. linear feet</td>
<td>b. linear feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rocky Intertidal Shores</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Salt Marshes</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. square feet</td>
<td>d. square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Land Under Salt Ponds</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. c/y dredged</td>
<td>d. c/y dredged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Land Containing Shellfish</td>
<td>a. square feet</td>
<td>b. square feet</td>
<td>c. square feet</td>
<td>d. square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Fish Runs</td>
<td>Indicate size under Coastal Banks, Inland Bank, Land Under the Ocean, and/or inland Land Under Waterbodies and Waterways, above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage</td>
<td>a. c/y dredged</td>
<td>b. c/y dredged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Riverfront Area</td>
<td>Indicate size under 100 feet, Land Under Waterbodies and Waterways, above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq ft within 100 ft</td>
<td>a. total sq. feet</td>
<td>b. total sq. feet</td>
<td>c. square feet</td>
<td>d. square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq ft between 100-200 ft</td>
<td>g. square feet</td>
<td>h. square feet</td>
<td>i. square feet</td>
<td>j. square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Findings (cont.)

23.  ☐ Restoration/Enhancement *:

   a. square feet of BVW
   b. square feet of salt marsh

24.  ☐ Stream Crossing(s):

   a. number of new stream crossings
   b. number of replacement stream crossings

C. General Conditions Under Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act

The following conditions are only applicable to Approved projects.

1. Failure to comply with all conditions stated herein, and with all related statutes and other regulatory measures, shall be deemed cause to revoke or modify this Order.

2. The Order does not grant any property rights or any exclusive privileges; it does not authorize any injury to private property or invasion of private rights.

3. This Order does not relieve the permittee or any other person of the necessity of complying with all other applicable federal, state, or local statutes, ordinances, bylaws, or regulations.

4. The work authorized hereunder shall be completed within three years from the date of this Order unless either of the following apply:
   a. The work is a maintenance dredging project as provided for in the Act; or
   b. The time for completion has been extended to a specified date more than three years, but less than five years, from the date of issuance. If this Order is intended to be valid for more than three years, the extension date and the special circumstances warranting the extended time period are set forth as a special condition in this Order.
   c. If the work is for a Test Project, this Order of Conditions shall be valid for no more than one year.

5. This Order may be extended by the issuing authority for one or more periods of up to three years each upon application to the issuing authority at least 30 days prior to the expiration date of the Order. An Order of Conditions for a Test Project may be extended for one additional year only upon written application by the applicant, subject to the provisions of 310 CMR 10.05(11)(f).

6. If this Order constitutes an Amended Order of Conditions, this Amended Order of Conditions does not extend the issuance date of the original Final Order of Conditions and the Order will expire on 11/23/2024 unless extended in writing by the Department.

7. Any fill used in connection with this project shall be clean fill. Any fill shall contain no trash, refuse, rubbish, or debris, including but not limited to lumber, bricks, plaster, wire, lath, paper, cardboard, pipe, tires, ashes, refrigerators, motor vehicles, or parts of any of the foregoing.
C. General Conditions Under Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act

8. This Order is not final until all administrative appeal periods from this Order have elapsed, or if such an appeal has been taken, until all proceedings before the Department have been completed.

9. No work shall be undertaken until the Order has become final and then has been recorded in the Registry of Deeds or the Land Court for the district in which the land is located, within the chain of title of the affected property. In the case of recorded land, the Final Order shall also be noted in the Registry’s Grantor Index under the name of the owner of the land upon which the proposed work is to be done. In the case of the registered land, the Final Order shall also be noted on the Land Court Certificate of Title of the owner of the land upon which the proposed work is done. The recording information shall be submitted to the Conservation Commission on the form at the end of this Order, which form must be stamped by the Registry of Deeds, prior to the commencement of work.

10. A sign shall be displayed at the site not less then two square feet or more than three square feet in size bearing the words,

   “Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection” [or, “MassDEP”]

   “File Number 050-1355”

11. Where the Department of Environmental Protection is requested to issue a Superseding Order, the Conservation Commission shall be a party to all agency proceedings and hearings before MassDEP.

12. Upon completion of the work described herein, the applicant shall submit a Request for Certificate of Compliance (WPA Form 8A) to the Conservation Commission.

13. The work shall conform to the plans and special conditions referenced in this order.

14. Any change to the plans identified in Condition #13 above shall require the applicant to inquire of the Conservation Commission in writing whether the change is significant enough to require the filing of a new Notice of Intent.

15. The Agent or members of the Conservation Commission and the Department of Environmental Protection shall have the right to enter and inspect the area subject to this Order at reasonable hours to evaluate compliance with the conditions stated in this Order, and may require the submittal of any data deemed necessary by the Conservation Commission or Department for that evaluation.

16. This Order of Conditions shall apply to any successor in interest or successor in control of the property subject to this Order and to any contractor or other person performing work conditioned by this Order.
C. General Conditions Under Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (cont.)

17. Prior to the start of work, and if the project involves work adjacent to a Bordering Vegetated Wetland, the boundary of the wetland in the vicinity of the proposed work area shall be marked by wooden stakes or flagging. Once in place, the wetland boundary markers shall be maintained until a Certificate of Compliance has been issued by the Conservation Commission.

18. All sedimentation barriers shall be maintained in good repair until all disturbed areas have been fully stabilized with vegetation or other means. At no time shall sediments be deposited in a wetland or water body. During construction, the applicant or his/her designee shall inspect the erosion controls on a daily basis and shall remove accumulated sediments as needed. The applicant shall immediately control any erosion problems that occur at the site and shall also immediately notify the Conservation Commission, which reserves the right to require additional erosion and/or damage prevention controls it may deem necessary. Sedimentation barriers shall serve as the limit of work unless another limit of work line has been approved by this Order.

19. The work associated with this Order (the “Project”)
   (1) ☒ is subject to the Massachusetts Stormwater Standards
   (2) ☐ is NOT subject to the Massachusetts Stormwater Standards

If the work is subject to the Stormwater Standards, then the project is subject to the following conditions:

a) All work, including site preparation, land disturbance, construction and redevelopment, shall be implemented in accordance with the construction period pollution prevention and erosion and sedimentation control plan and, if applicable, the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit as required by Stormwater Condition 8. Construction period erosion, sedimentation and pollution control measures and best management practices (BMPs) shall remain in place until the site is fully stabilized.

b) No stormwater runoff may be discharged to the post-construction stormwater BMPs unless and until a Registered Professional Engineer provides a Certification that:
   i. all construction period BMPs have been removed or will be removed by a date certain specified in the Certification. For any construction period BMPs intended to be converted to post construction operation for stormwater attenuation, recharge, and/or treatment, the conversion is allowed by the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook BMP specifications and that BMP has been properly cleaned or prepared for post construction operation, including removal of all construction period sediment trapped in inlet and outlet control structures;
   ii. as-built final construction BMP plans are included, signed and stamped by a Registered Professional Engineer, certifying the site is fully stabilized;
   iii. any illicit discharges to the stormwater management system have been removed, as per the requirements of Stormwater Standard 10;
iv. all post-construction stormwater BMPs are installed in accordance with the plans (including all planting plans) approved by the issuing authority, and have been inspected to ensure that they are not damaged and that they are in proper working condition;

v. any vegetation associated with post-construction BMPs is suitably established to withstand erosion.

c) The landowner is responsible for BMP maintenance until the issuing authority is notified that another party has legally assumed responsibility for BMP maintenance. Prior to requesting a Certificate of Compliance, or Partial Certificate of Compliance, the responsible party (defined in General Condition 18(e)) shall execute and submit to the issuing authority an Operation and Maintenance Compliance Statement ("O&M Statement") for the Stormwater BMPs identifying the party responsible for implementing the stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan ("O&M Plan") and certifying the following:

i.) the O&M Plan is complete and will be implemented upon receipt of the Certificate of Compliance, and

ii.) the future responsible parties shall be notified in writing of their ongoing legal responsibility to operate and maintain the stormwater management BMPs and implement the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

d) Post-construction pollution prevention and source control shall be implemented in accordance with the long-term pollution prevention plan section of the approved Stormwater Report and, if applicable, the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Multi-Sector General Permit.

e) Unless and until another party accepts responsibility, the landowner, or owner of any drainage easement, assumes responsibility for maintaining each BMP. To overcome this presumption, the landowner of the property must submit to the issuing authority a legally binding agreement of record, acceptable to the issuing authority, evidencing that another entity has accepted responsibility for maintaining the BMP, and that the proposed responsible party shall be treated as a permittee for purposes of implementing the requirements of Conditions 18(f) through 18(k) with respect to that BMP. Any failure of the proposed responsible party to implement the requirements of Conditions 18(f) through 18(k) with respect to that BMP shall be a violation of the Order of Conditions or Certificate of Compliance. In the case of stormwater BMPs that are serving more than one lot, the legally binding agreement shall also identify the lots that will be served by the stormwater BMPs. A plan and easement deed that grants the responsible party access to perform the required operation and maintenance must be submitted along with the legally binding agreement.

f) The responsible party shall operate and maintain all stormwater BMPs in accordance with the design plans, the O&M Plan, and the requirements of the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook.
C. General Conditions Under Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (cont.)

   g) The responsible party shall:
      1. Maintain an operation and maintenance log for the last three (3) consecutive calendar years of inspections, repairs, maintenance and/or replacement of the stormwater management system or any part thereof, and disposal (for disposal the log shall indicate the type of material and the disposal location);
      2. Make the maintenance log available to MassDEP and the Conservation Commission ("Commission") upon request; and
      3. Allow members and agents of the MassDEP and the Commission to enter and inspect the site to evaluate and ensure that the responsible party is in compliance with the requirements for each BMP established in the O&M Plan approved by the issuing authority.

   h) All sediment or other contaminants removed from stormwater BMPs shall be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

   i) Illicit discharges to the stormwater management system as defined in 310 CMR 10.04 are prohibited.

   j) The stormwater management system approved in the Order of Conditions shall not be changed without the prior written approval of the issuing authority.

   k) Areas designated as qualifying pervious areas for the purpose of the Low Impact Site Design Credit (as defined in the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook, Volume 3, Chapter 1, Low Impact Development Site Design Credits) shall not be altered without the prior written approval of the issuing authority.

   l) Access for maintenance, repair, and/or replacement of BMPs shall not be withheld. Any fencing constructed around stormwater BMPs shall include access gates and shall be at least six inches above grade to allow for wildlife passage.

Special Conditions (if you need more space for additional conditions, please attach a text document):

   See Attachment "A"

20. For Test Projects subject to 310 CMR 10.05(11), the applicant shall also implement the monitoring plan and the restoration plan submitted with the Notice of Intent. If the conservation commission or Department determines that the Test Project threatens the public health, safety or the environment, the applicant shall implement the removal plan submitted with the Notice of Intent or modify the project as directed by the conservation commission or the Department.
D. Findings Under Municipal Wetlands Bylaw or Ordinance

1. Is a municipal wetlands bylaw or ordinance applicable?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No

2. The ___________________________ hereby finds (check one that applies):
   
   a. ☐ that the proposed work cannot be conditioned to meet the standards set forth in a municipal ordinance or bylaw, specifically:

   1. Municipal Ordinance or Bylaw
   2. Citation

   Therefore, work on this project may not go forward unless and until a revised Notice of Intent is submitted which provides measures which are adequate to meet these standards, and a final Order of Conditions is issued.

   b. ☐ that the following additional conditions are necessary to comply with a municipal ordinance or bylaw:

   1. Municipal Ordinance or Bylaw
   2. Citation

3. The Commission orders that all work shall be performed in accordance with the following conditions and with the Notice of Intent referenced above. To the extent that the following conditions modify or differ from the plans, specifications, or other proposals submitted with the Notice of Intent, the conditions shall control. The special conditions relating to municipal ordinance or bylaw are as follows (if you need more space for additional conditions, attach a text document):
Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection
Bureau of Resource Protection - Wetlands
WPA Form 5 – Order of Conditions
Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act M.G.L. c. 131, §40

E. Signatures

This Order is valid for three years, unless otherwise specified as a special condition pursuant to General Conditions #4, from the date of issuance.

Please indicate the number of members who will sign this form. This Order must be signed by a majority of the Conservation Commission.

The Order must be mailed by certified mail (return receipt requested) or hand delivered to the applicant. A copy also must be mailed or hand delivered at the same time to the appropriate Department of Environmental Protection Regional Office, if not filing electronically, and the property owner, if different from applicant.

[Signatures]

Benjamin O'Sullivan
Printed Name

Daniel Streeter
Printed Name

Brian Collier
Printed Name

[Handwritten dates and text]

☑ by hand delivery on
11/23/2021

☐ by certified mail, return receipt requested, on

[Date]
F. Appeals

The applicant, the owner, any person aggrieved by this Order, any owner of land abutting the land subject to this Order, or any ten residents of the city or town in which such land is located, are hereby notified of their right to request the appropriate MassDEP Regional Office to issue a Superseding Order of Conditions. The request must be made by certified mail or hand delivery to the Department, with the appropriate filing fee and a completed Request for Departmental Action Fee Transmittal Form, as provided in 310 CMR 10.03(7) within ten business days from the date of issuance of this Order. A copy of the request shall at the same time be sent by certified mail or hand delivery to the Conservation Commission and to the applicant, if he/she is not the appellant.

Any appellant seeking to appeal the Department’s Superseding Order associated with this appeal will be required to demonstrate prior participation in the review of this project. Previous participation in the permit proceeding means the submission of written information to the Conservation Commission prior to the close of the public hearing, requesting a Superseding Order, or providing written information to the Department prior to issuance of a Superseding Order.

The request shall state clearly and concisely the objections to the Order which is being appealed and how the Order does not contribute to the protection of the interests identified in the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (M.G.L. c. 131, § 40), and is inconsistent with the wetlands regulations (310 CMR 10.00). To the extent that the Order is based on a municipal ordinance or bylaw, and not on the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act or regulations, the Department has no appellate jurisdiction.
G. Recording Information

Prior to commencement of work, this Order of Conditions must be recorded in the Registry of Deeds or the Land Court for the district in which the land is located, within the chain of title of the affected property. In the case of recorded land, the Final Order shall also be noted in the Registry’s Grantor Index under the name of the owner of the land subject to the Order. In the case of registered land, this Order shall also be noted on the Land Court Certificate of Title of the owner of the land subject to the Order of Conditions. The recording information on this page shall be submitted to the Conservation Commission listed below.

Town of Newbury
Conservation Commission

Detach on dotted line, have stamped by the Registry of Deeds and submit to the Conservation Commission.

To:

Town of Newbury
Conservation Commission

Please be advised that the Order of Conditions for the Project at:

55 Pearson Drive
Project Location
050-1355
MassDEP File Number

Has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds of:

Essex South
County

Book
Page

for: Property Owner

and has been noted in the chain of title of the affected property in:

Book
Page

In accordance with the Order of Conditions issued on:

November 23, 2021
Date

If recorded land, the instrument number identifying this transaction is:

Instrument Number

If registered land, the document number identifying this transaction is:

Document Number

Signature of Applicant
Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection  
Bureau of Resource Protection - Wetlands  

Request for Departmental Action Fee  
Transmittal Form  

Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act M.G.L. c. 131, §40  

A. Request Information  

1. Location of Project  
   55 Pearson Drive  
   a. Street Address  
   Newbury, MA 01922  
   b. City/Town, Zip  
   c. Check number  
   d. Fee amount  

Important:  
When filling out forms on the computer, use only the tab key to move your cursor - do not use the return key.  

2. Person or party making request (if appropriate, name the citizen group's representative):  
   Name  
   Mailing Address  
   City/Town  
   State  
   Zip Code  
   Phone Number  
   Fax Number (if applicable)  

3. Applicant (as shown on Determination of Applicability (Form 2), Order of Resource Area Delineation (Form 4B), Order of Conditions (Form 5), Restoration Order of Conditions (Form 5A), or Notice of Non-Significance (Form 6)):  
   Name  
   Mailing Address  
   City/Town  
   State  
   Zip Code  
   Phone Number  
   Fax Number (if applicable)  

4. DEP File Number:  

B. Instructions  

1. When the Departmental action request is for (check one):  
   □ Superseding Order of Conditions – Fee: $120.00 (single family house projects) or $245 (all other projects)  
   □ Superseding Determination of Applicability – Fee: $120  
   □ Superseding Order of Resource Area Delineation – Fee: $120
B. Instructions (cont.)

Send this form and check or money order, payable to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to:

Department of Environmental Protection
Box 4062
Boston, MA 02211

2. On a separate sheet attached to this form, state clearly and concisely the objections to the
   Determination or Order which is being appealed. To the extent that the Determination or Order is
   based on a municipal bylaw, and not on the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act or regulations,
   the Department has no appellate jurisdiction.

3. Send a copy of this form and a copy of the check or money order with the Request for a
   Superseding Determination or Order by certified mail or hand delivery to the appropriate DEP
   Regional Office (see https://www.mass.gov/service-details/massdep-regional-offices-by-community).

4. A copy of the request shall at the same time be sent by certified mail or hand delivery to the
   Conservation Commission and to the applicant, if he/she is not the appellant.
Under the Order of Conditions ("the Order", or "OOC") issued under [MassDEP File Number 050-1355], the Newbury Conservation Commission ("the Commission" or "NCC") hereby finds that the information submitted by the Applicant is not sufficient to describe the site, the work, or the effect of the work on the interests identified in the Wetlands Protection Act. Additionally, the proposed work cannot be conditioned to meet the performance standards set forth in the wetland regulations. Therefore, work on this project may not go forward unless a revised Notice of Intent is submitted which provides sufficient information and includes measures which are adequate to protect the Act’s interests, and a final Order of Conditions is issued. Descriptions of the performance standards which the proposed work cannot meet, as well as the specific information which is lacking and why it is necessary, are outlined in this Attachment.

I. Referenced Documents & Plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WPA Form 3: Notice of Intent with all attachments</th>
<th>Prepared For:</th>
<th>Prepared By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>Walter Eriksen</td>
<td>Benjamin C. Osgood Jr., PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket Lane, LLC</td>
<td>Ranger Engineering Group, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92 Middlesex Rd</td>
<td>13 Branch St, Suite 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyngsboro, MA 01879</td>
<td>Methuen, MA 01844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Plans (30 Sheets)</th>
<th>Entitled:</th>
<th>Prepared By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40B Comprehensive Permit</td>
<td>The Villages at Cricket Lane</td>
<td>Benjamin C. Osgood Jr., PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byfield, MA</td>
<td>Ranger Engineering Group, Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last revision date: March 8, 2021</td>
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II. **Supplemental Documents & Materials:**

The Commission’s decision considered the following documents and materials in addition to those listed in the preceding section:

1. ZBA Peer Review Memorandums from Ann Marton, submitted by Benjamin C. Osgood Jr (Ranger Engineering Group, Inc) on June 21, 2021
2. Email correspondence from Jacob Kubel with the Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (NHESP), forwarded/received August 14, 2019
3. Email correspondence from Jacob Kubel with the NHESP, sent to Applicant and representatives July 10, 2021
4. Email correspondence from Jacob Kubel with the NHESP, received August 25, 2021
5. Response to the Certified Vernal Pool Analysis from Patrick Garner, submitted by Benjamin C. Osgood Jr (Ranger Engineering Group, Inc) on November 2, 2021 at 12:46 PM
7. Title V Form 11 – Soil Suitability Assessment for On-site Sewage Disposal, submitted by Benjamin C. Osgood Jr (Ranger Engineering Group, Inc) on November 2, 2021 at 12:47 PM

III. **Public Hearing History:**

The public hearing/meeting history for this project is as follows and includes only the dates of meetings where discussion on this project was held. This list does not include the dates of the three meetings at which the hearing was opened and immediately continued with no discussion:

1. June 1, 2021 (first public hearing)
2. June 22, 2021
3. August 3, 2021
4. September 7, 2021
5. November 2, 2021 (close of public hearing)
6. November 12, 2021 (Commission meeting to hold vote to issue Denial OOC, this meeting was publicly accessible but was closed to public comment)

IV. **Introduction:**

This OOC addresses a Notice of Intent (NOI) filed with the Commission for proposed work located at 55 Pearson Drive, Newbury, MA. The work proposed is to construct twenty-four (24) single-family homes with 800 feet of roadway, a common septic system, water and sewer lines, and a stormwater management system. The roadway includes limited wetland crossing, filling, and replacement with work in the Buffer Zone. The land is currently vacant and covers approximately 15.08(+/-) acres. The proposed project has been approved as a Chapter 40B development by the Town of Newbury
Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and was issued a Comprehensive Permit Decision on March 18, 2021.

The following wetland areas are identified in the approved plans for the Order of Resource Delineation (ORAD) issued by the Commission on August 29, 2019:
- Isolated Wetland with Vernal Pool and Isolated Land Subject to Flooding within its boundary (‘A series wetland’)
- Isolated Wetland (non-jurisdictional) (‘B series wetland’)
- Bordering Vegetated Wetland (‘C series wetland’)
- Bordering Vegetated Wetland with Intermittent Stream (‘D’ & ‘E series wetland’)
- NHESP Certified Vernal Pool (‘VP series wetland’)

The Applicant engaged the professional services of Ranger Engineering Group, Inc to prepare the NOI, project site plans, and supporting narrative. The Applicant engaged the services of Norse Environmental Services, Inc for a wetland restoration report. The Applicant was also represented by Attorney Douglas C. Deschenes with Finneran and Nicholson, P.C.. The Town of Newbury engaged Ann Marton with LEC Environmental Consultants, Inc for wetland science peer review services during both the ZBA process and the Conservation Commission hearing process. During the ZBA process, Ms. Marton issued the Applicant an extensive review of the project plans which resulted in revisions that were ultimately accepted and approved in the Comprehensive Permit.

The Applicant and their representatives repeatedly referred back to the ZBA peer review and Comprehensive Permit stating they believed it addressed any concerns the Commission could have had. During the August 3 hearing Attorney Deschenes noted that the ZBA was “acting as the Conservation Commission” during their review process, and that Ms. Marton’s ZBA peer review resulted in plan revisions that address Conservation concerns. Similar statements were made by the Applicant and their representatives in the September 7 hearing as well. The Conservation Commission, however, is the permit granting authority under M.G.L. c. 40B sections 21 through 23 for the purposes of applying the WPA. The Zoning Board of Appeals did not determine nor claim to issue an Order of Conditions under the Act. The Applicant specifically requested that the public hearing for this project be closed at the November 2, 2021 meeting.

Over the course of the Conservation Commission hearing process, a number of concerns were noted and expressed by the Commission. Throughout the process, the Commission attempted numerous times to gain clarification on these concerns from the Applicant, either by requesting additional information or by requesting the Applicant to reconfigure the project. Notwithstanding said requests, the Applicant did not provide sufficient information upon which the Commission could properly approve an Order of Conditions that would address the performance standards and interests of the Act. Specifically, the Commission has determined:
1. Work within the 100’ Buffer Zone to the ‘D’ and ‘VP’ series wetlands:
   a. The proposed septic system falls at 102’ away from the CVP, with the primary absorption area closest to the Buffer Zone line. The septic system also falls partially inside the 100’ Buffer to the BVW. Grading for the system is entirely within the 100’ Buffer to the BVW and the CVP. The Applicant refused to consider reconfiguring the system to provide additional protections and further limit the impacts of the Buffer Zone work to the resource areas. The Applicant stated they refused to reconfigure the system as requested by the Commission in the September 7 hearing, and this refusal was reaffirmed during the November 2 hearing.
      i. The Commission would like to note that, while possible Title V violations were initially part of the denial discussed in the November 12 meeting, we have since received new feedback from Claire Golden with Mass DEP stating that associated grading is not considered part of the septic system. The septic system itself is in fact fully compliant with the WPA regulations. For this reason, the Commission would rescind Title V issues from the reasons for denial.
   b. There is a retaining wall as well as drainage swales, both proposed for the purpose of conveying stormwater, located within 100’ of the CVP. During the November 2 hearing the Commission discussed the stormwater standard (MA Stormwater Handbook, vol. 1 ch. 1 Stormwater Standards, Table CA 2; Standard 6) that disallows stormwater structures and stormwater BMPs within 100’ of a CVP, and in an attempt to deter the concerns of the Commission, Attorney Deschenes was noted on the record as stating, “Shame on us for calling it a swale. All it is, is that backyard is slightly graded so that the water flows in the correct direction, it’s not a channelized swale.” However, the area in question was referred to by the Applicant and their representatives throughout the hearing process, and is a proposed depression constructed to convey stormwater. Members of the Commission voiced concerns of the impact of stormwater management BMPs in the Buffer zone during every hearing except that on June 22. The Applicant failed to address same.

2. Protection of the ‘A’ series wetland and the Vernal Pool within its boundary:
   a. There is impact from work in proximity to the Vernal Pool and its impact on the functionality of the resource as well as the associated wildlife habitat within and surrounding this sensitive area. The Commission expressed concerns over the proximity of work and structures to the Vernal Pool. The Applicant did not revise the plans to address these issues.
   b. The Applicant’s plans included discrepancies between the ORAD, which shows delineation for a Vernal Pool, and the site plans submitted with the NOI, which failed to identify the Vernal Pool. The Board peer review agent noted the discrepancies as did members of the Commission. The Commission and its peer review agent requested the Applicant to treat
the area as sensitive habitat, providing a Buffer Zone and protections around it, and the Applicant has refused to do so.

3. Buffer Zone work:
   a. In multiple locations, proposed tree clearing and grading, and associated permanent modifications and impacts of same, run flush with the wetland delineations. Notable locations include the Western portion of the ‘D’ series wetland, the entire northern half of the ‘A’ series wetland containing the Vernal Pool, and along most of the ‘C’ series wetland borders. Additionally, significant amounts of cutting will be conducted within the 100’ Buffer Zone to the CVP. This is linked to the deficiencies outlined in Section IV(2)(a) and (b).
   b. Grading in the Buffer Zone of the ‘C’ series wetland extending right up to the wetland line was also noted as a significant concern, with requests to set a limit of work farther away from the edge of the wetland delineation, the Applicant refused to make these adjustments. This is linked to the deficiencies outlined in Section IV(1)(a) and (2)(a).

4. Insufficient information, refusal to redesign any part of the project to protect the interests of the Act, refusal to answer questions, provision of insufficient answers, insufficient time for review:
   a. There are discrepancies between the ORAD plans (showing a Vernal Pool in the ‘A’ series wetland) and the site plans submitted with the NOI (did not show the delineated Vernal Pool). This is linked to the deficiencies outlined in Section IV(2)(b).
   b. The Applicant and their representatives refused to redesign, reconfigure, or shrink the project in order to provide adequate protections to wetland resources and wildlife habitats.
      i. September 7 – request made to reconfigure septic system (Section IV(1)(a)), Applicant refused
      ii. September 7 – request for additional information about wetland replication, Applicant resubmitted copies of the wetland replication sheets from the site plans and a letter issued by Norse Environmental Services, Inc, all of which the Commission already had
      iii. September 7 – request to have no work in the 100’ Buffer Zone to the CVP in order to protect sensitive habitat, Applicant refused to redesign the project
      iv. November 2 – request for the Applicant to consider shrinking the footprint of the project in order to mitigate issues and concerns voiced by the Commission, Applicant refused to redesign the project
      v. November 2 – request to reconfigure the project to resolve issues of stormwater management in the 100’ Buffer Zone to the CVP, Applicant refused to reconfigure the project
c. The Applicant failed to provide additional hydrology data at the request of the NHESP during attempts to certify the Vernal Pool in the 'A' series wetland. When requested multiple times by the Commission to provide that information, the Applicant repeatedly refused to do so. Requests from NHESP for more data are noted in three sets of email correspondence (Section II(2), (3), and (4)).

d. The Applicant submitted three documents (Section II(5), (6), and (7)) to the Commission for review on November 2, 2021, all approximately six hours prior to the start time of the hearing (7:00PM EDT), thus not allowing for sufficient time for the Commission members to review the documents.

e. The Applicant elected to have the Commission close the public hearing for this project during the hearing on November 2. The Commission urged the Applicant to allow for a continuance so they may review recently submitted documents and to address outstanding concerns. The Applicant refused to do so, leaving many concerns unaddressed.

V. Findings:

1. There are discrepancies between the approved plans associated with the ORAD issued on August 29, 2019 (DEP File Number 050-1295) and the site plans submitted with the Notice of Intent (NOI).
   a. On sheet 1 of 2 of the approved ORAD plans, delineation is shown for an "Isolated Wetland with a Vernal Pool and Isolated Land Subject to Flooding within its Boundary" on the southern edge of the property ('A series' wetland area). The plans submitted with the NOI identify the same area as "Isolated Wetland with an Isolated Land Subject to Flooding within its Boundary" on all sheets where the 'A series' wetland is identified and labeled (Sheets 3, 5, 13, and 25).
   b. For the reasons listed above, the Commission finds that the NOI as submitted is factually incomplete, and as such the project cannot be conditioned to meet the performance standards and interests set forth in the WPA.

2. Regarding concerns for stormwater BMPs:
   a. Under the WPA Regulations (310 CMR 10.00), stormwater BMPs include basins, discharge outlets, swales, rain gardens, filters, or other stormwater treatment practice or measure either alone or in combination including without limitation any overflow pipe, conduit, weir control structure that: a) is not naturally occurring; b) is not designed as a wetland replication area; and c) has been designed, constructed, and installed for the purpose of conveying, collecting, storing, discharging, recharging, or treating stormwater (310 CMR 10.04).
   b. According to the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook and Stormwater Standards, stormwater BMPs must be set back 100' from a CVP, and proponents must perform a habitat evaluation and demonstrate that the
stormwater BMPs meet the performance standard of having no adverse impact on the habitat functions of a CVP (MA Stormwater Handbook, vol. 1 ch. 1 Stormwater Standards, Table CA 2: Standard 6).

c. For the reasons listed above, the stormwater BMPs listed in Section IV(1)(b) of this Attachment are not in compliance with the Stormwater Standards, and do not protect the interests or meet the performance standards of the WPA.

3. Regarding protection of the ‘A’ series wetland area and the Vernal Pool within its boundary:

a. This Vernal Pool is significant to the protection of wildlife habitat pursuant to 310 CMR 10.57(1)(b). Under 310 CMR 10.57(2)(b)(4) the portions of an ILSF area which shall be presumed to be vernal pool habitat are those determined under procedures established in 310 CMR 10.57(2)(a)(5), which states that resources areas presumed to be vernal pool habitat are those certified by MA DFW. However, such presumption is rebuttable and may be overcome upon a clear showing to the contrary. In this case, the “clear showing to the contrary” lies in the ORAD issued to the Applicant delineating the Vernal Pool within the ‘A’ series wetland.

b. Pursuant to 310 CMR 10.52, it is the responsibility of the person proposing work to design and complete his project in conformance with performance standards, and it is the responsibility of the issuing authority to impose such conditions on a proposed project as to ensure that the project is designed and completed in such a manner consistent with these standards. In the case of this project, however, the Applicant repeatedly refused to redesign any part of the project in order to meet performance standards and allow the Commission to appropriately condition the work.

c. The Applicant failed to provide information to overcome the burden of proof rebutting the presumption that the altered land surrounding the ‘A’ series wetland is significant to the interests specified in 310 CMR 10.57(1)(a) and (b), pursuant to 310 CMR 10.57(3).

d. For the reasons above, the Commission believes that the ‘A’ series wetland and the Vernal Pool within its boundary should be protected and provided an adequate Buffer Zone in order to protect the interests of the Act. The Commission finds that the project as proposed does not protect the interests of the Act and cannot be conditioned to do so.

4. Regarding work within the Buffer Zone:

a. Pursuant to 310 CMR 10.03(1)(a), any person who files a NOI to perform any work within the Buffer Zone has the burden of demonstrating to the issuing authority that the area is not significant to the protection of any interests identified in the Act, or that proposed work within the Buffer Zone will contribute to the protection of the interests identified in the Act. The Applicant has failed to satisfy this burden to the Commission.
b. Pursuant to 310 CMR 10.53(1), for work in the Buffer Zone subject to review by the issuing authority shall impose conditions to protect the interests of the Act identified for the adjacent resource area. The potential for adverse impacts to resource areas from work in the Buffer Zone may increase with the extent of the work and the proximity to the resource area. Conditions may include limitations on the scope and location of work in the Buffer Zone as necessary to avoid alteration of resource areas. The issuing authority may require a clear limit of work and the preservation of natural vegetation adjacent to the resource area to protect the interests of the Act. In the case of this project, however, the Applicant repeatedly refused to redesign any part of the project in order to protect the interests of the Act and allow the Commission to appropriately condition work within the Buffer Zone.

c. For the reasons above, the Commission finds that the Applicant has failed to satisfy its burden of proof and provided insufficient information, and as such this project cannot be conditioned to meet the performance standards and protect the interests of the Act.

5. Regarding insufficient information and refusal to provide sufficient information
   a. The Applicant failed to provide additional data for the Vernal Pool within the ‘A’ series wetland at the request of the Commission and the NHESP. Additionally, the Commission made requests to the Applicant to redesign the project to meet the performance standards and the interests set forth in the Act. The Applicant refused to redesign the project as requested by the Commission, and they failed to satisfy the burden of proof that the project as proposed is designed in such a way that it meets the performance standards and interests set forth in the Act.
   b. The Applicant provided new documents to the Commission with insufficient time allowed for review of these documents, and then elected to have the Commission close the public hearing for this project.
   c. For the reasons listed above, as well as those in Findings 3(c) and 4(b), the Commission finds that insufficient information was provided to satisfy the burden of proof that the project as designed meets the performance standards and the interests set forth in the Act, and therefore cannot approve the project as proposed.

VI. Conclusion:

Based on the preceding information and findings, the Newbury Conservation Commission denies this project as proposed pursuant to the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (M.G.L. Chapter 131 Section 40) and the associated regulations (310 CMR 10.00). After careful consideration of the information provided, current site conditions, and the proposed project, the Commission finds that it is unable to condition an approval to adequately protect the wetland resources and interests of the WPA. The Applicant’s refusal to provide additional information requested by the
Commission and the NHESP, or to allow sufficient time for review of information that was submitted, on the significant matters discussed in this Attachment makes it impossible for the Commission to conclude that all WPA performance standards will be met, the interests of the Act will be protected, and that the Applicant has satisfied its burden of proof of the same.

**VII. Severability:**

The invalidity of any provision of this Order of Conditions shall not invalidate any other provision thereof.