

**Salisbury Conservation Commission**  
**March 5, 2014**  
**Colchester Auditorium, Town Hall**  
**5 Beach Road**  
**Salisbury, MA 01952**  
**7:00 P.M.**

**COMMISSIONER MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Sheila Albertelli (SA), Sally Laffely (SL), Matt Carignan (MC), Joanne Perreault (JP) and Andria Nemoda (AN)

**COMMISSIONER MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Michelle Rowden, Conservation Agent and Lori Robertson, Secretary

S. Albertelli opened the meeting at 7:15 pm under the Wetlands Protection Act & Open Meeting Law and informed the public that the meeting is being recorded.

**MINUTES:**

**February 19, 2014**

**JP** motions to continue the minutes from 2/19/14 until the 3/19/14 meeting. **SL** seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. **Motion Passed.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS at 7:15 p.m.**

**NOI: Seth and Belinda Traub, 438 North End Blvd.:** Mr. Bill Manuel (BM) of Wetlands and Land Management addressed the board on behalf of the applicant. The applicant would like to rebuild the house and put the house on piles. We are raising the house up to the highest V zone elevation. One of the clarifications that DEP was looking for that there would be no footings and that is true. We are going to remove all the solid features to the existing home. They wanted a narrative that explains how the piles will be going in. We provided that. DEP questioned whether fill would be brought in. There will be no fill brought to this property. DEP questioned where the primary dune was located. The primary frontal dune will either be seaward of the home or inclusive of the barrier beach. It doesn't matter in this case because we are on pilings. We had shown on a previous plan a 10'x10' utility chase. DEP would like to see 4'x4'. The new change on the plan is a new 4'x4' utility chase.

**SL** questioned if there were 12 piles? **BM** stated I haven't counted them.  
No abutters present.

**MC** motions to approve the NOI for 438 North End Blvd. **JP** seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. **Motion Passed.**

**RDA: Christine Frary, 5 Samantha Way:** Ms. Christine Frary (CF) addressed the board. I am looking to put a single story addition off the side of the house 18'x22'. We did have Hancock Engineering flag the wetland. At the closet point the driveway is 70' away from the wetland. **SA** asked about erosion control. Mr. John Morrity, builder (JM) addressed the board. As far as erosion control I assume haybales or silt sock. **SA** asked for salt hay. **JM** stated sure. **MR** asked what kind of foundation will it be. **JM** stated a full foundation.

**JP** motioned to issue a negative determination for 5 Samantha Way. **MC** seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. **Motion Passed.**

**NOI: Jay Davis, 12 Wyman Greely Street:** Mr. Matt Steinel of Millennium Engineering addressed the board. The applicant proposes to build a single family home on piles. We had West Environmental flag the wetlands. The applicant proposes to extend the existing right of way with approximately 60-80' of gravel. We are proposing silt fence. **SL** stated the town is saying that they don't want to maintain the roadway. **MS** stated it's the same as Coulson Pratt. The DPW Director came in and gave me fair warning that they wouldn't be taking over the roadway. The owner would be required to plow and take care of it. **MC** asked if Wyman Greely was a public way? **MS** stated yes for a certain distance. For I believe 316'. DEP has not issued a number yet. **SA** asked if the site was walked before the winter. **MS** stated just in November. **SA** stated I would feel more comfortable if Mary Rimmer reviewed the line.

Abutter, Mr. Jay Davis (JD) of 8 Wyman Greely Street addressed the board. The water is 3' deep inside my fence

where you are proposing to build. Since Caulson Pratt was built the water levels have risen. At certain high tides or full moons it is getting extremely wet. If you walk that property in May, under my house there will be 2' of flat water. Between the Andrews home and my home there are trees they are proposing to cut down. We need those trees there to drink the water. There is so much water that the trees are drowning. If they cut the trees down, fill in gravel, all the water will have to go somewhere. I spoke with Karen Andrews from the Army Corp of Engineers who said it is not happening. I also spoke with Phil Dieptro at the wetland program at the DEP. He said keep me informed. Dave Kadel of the Army Corp of Engineers has been monitoring this area for a long time. I built my house 14 years ago and the water level has risen 9". Where is this 600' of water going to go? I'm not concerned about my view, I am concerned if this is allowed my yard will be a lake and who will pay me.

**MS** stated water levels are rising everywhere. The trees maybe dying because the influx of salt water. There will be tree removal. I haven't run calculations like the abutter of the 600' of water. I don't see it being cubic feet of water. The pilings themselves are "I" beams. They don't take up much space. **MC** asked how many trees are you proposing on removing. **MS** stated we haven't counted them. **MC** asked if the houses on the street were on pilings. **MS** stated I am not sure, (abutters-the last two are on pilings). **SA** stated I think we need to have a peer review. **MC** stated I think also a site visit will be helpful. **AN** stated I think we should look into what the abutter wrote in his letter about September 1998. **JD** stated the deal was I was the last buildable lot on that street. **AN** stated I don't know if we need a wetland scientist. He has come before the commission stating that things were said at a Conservation meeting in 1998. I would like to look into it more. Who will incur the cost of the wetland scientist? **MR** stated the applicant. **AN** stated if a previous commission said this lot was unbuildable is this something we can over-rule. **MS** stated I went to my boss and asked him about this. He said just because a prior commission said that didn't believe anything beyond this lot is buildable doesn't handcuff this commission from moving forward. If we can prove that it meets the wetland protection act. **JD** asked why did I have to combine lot 8 and 10 and make it one. Under my conditions I had to put 75% of specs on 8 because 10 was to wet.

**JP** motions to continue 12 Wyman Greely Street to the March 19, 2014 conservation meeting for the following: 1. DEP number. 2. Opportunity for the peer review/Mary Rimmer. 3. Additional information to be researched regarding past Conservation meetings. 4. Site walk by commission members. **SL** seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. **Motion Passed.**

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

- **SL** stepped down.

- **Request for Certificate of Compliance, 6 11<sup>th</sup> Street:** **AN** and **MR** went on the site walk. Both agreed everything was in compliance.

**AN** motioned to grant the Certificate of Compliance f or 6 11<sup>th</sup> Street. **MC** seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. **Motion Passed.**

#### **ENFORCEMENT ORDERS:**

-  
20 Dock Lane-no action  
Salisbury Woods-no action  
2 Broadway-no action  
16 Hayes Street-no action  
4 Fanaras Drive-no action  
178 North End Blvd.-no action  
44 Lafayette Road-no action

#### **COMMISSIONERS COMMENT:**

**AN** asked if anyone went to the training. **MR** stated she did attend. I went to a workshop on coastal, non-structural erosion control. Really more information for people who live on the water without many waves. I also went to a training on culvert replacement.

#### **ADJOURNMENT:**

- **SL** motioned to adjourn at 8:20 p.m. **JP** seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. **Motion Passed.**