

Hearing opened 8:00pm, June 20, 2018 for Northstone Builders, 4 Greenville Rd., 3 Single Family Homes, continuation DEP#93-377 Chris Guida for Fieldstone Environmental Consultants and Jim Martin, abutter.

The Commission had requested that a property line alteration that might allow the use of the existing road bed along the side of the property as a driveway be investigated as an alternative to new construction of a driveway within the Riverfront area. The abutter, Mr. Martin, confirmed in the meeting that there was a message left for him by Chris Guida, but there was no content about a possible property line alteration contained in the message. Mr. Guida and Mr. Martin have not had a discussion about any property line alterations between the lots. There have been no written communications nor was there any documentation of proposals. In the alternatives analysis presented by Mr. Guida, the alternative was dismissed as not viable without any engineering designs being shown to back up his statements.

Chris Guida also told us that he had been in discussion with Unitil about a high pressure gas line that is under the old road. His Analysis report only stated that he had contacted Unitil, not that there had been any answers to questions.

Chris refused to make any changes to the plans, insisting that his design is the only viable design for fitting 3 houses onto the property.

Revegetation of slopes will be required. Need to revegetate with plants that don't require mowing and that provide some shade to the wetlands.

Restoration is just removal of asphalt and landscaping the area. The paved area will then become pervious. Need to remove the soils down below contaminants. Need a restoration plan if this is to be called a restoration. Mr. Guida submitted no such plans nor suggested that he would. He eventually said that they would either seed the area with "Conservation mix" or leave the selection of plantings up to the new owner after the home had been built and sold.

Motion was made to close the hearing at 8:47pm. There was no hope of receiving any new materials from the applicant nor reaching any other conclusions than were submitted in his version of an analysis of alternatives for the Riverfront. The analysis included extraneous information about other areas of the project outside the riverfront area. As a result, the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Hearing closed at 8:48.