

Town of Rockland
CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday January 12, 2021
7:00 PM



Attendance:

Douglas Golemme, Chair
Ronald Brunelle
Lorraine Pratt
Charlene Judge
Virginia Hoffman

Also in attendance:

Caitlin Nover from Beta Group
Henry Nover from Nover Engineers

Meeting come to order at 7:00p

Motion to postpone the review of December 15th minutes was made by Lorraine and seconded by Charlene; due to copies not being clear.

Projects/Hearings:

Off Dyer St (Parcel 83) – NOI (two filings)

Applicant requested continuance to next hearing to February 9, 2021

0 Pond St - NOI

Applicant requested continuance to next hearing to February 9, 2021

28 Bishop Lane – NOI

Motion to open the hearing for 28 Bishop Lane was made
Brad Holmes from ECR representing the applicant for a NOI submittal to the Rockland
Conservation Commission.

Proposed project is a new commercial storage building. The site contains cell tower and
pavement. All proposed work is within buffer zone and river front area
Project does comply with river front controls.

The existing site and proposed change plans were reviewed with the commission.

Shawn Hardy also spoke to Commissioners regarding the proposed project.

Proposal to take storage containers and consolidate into one storage building with 9 parking
spaces. Increase in impervious area which requires a Storm water review. This review has been
started and a recommendation was made to dig a test pit. That recommendation was
performed and it was discovered ground water was at a different level. Which required a
change to proposed plans.

CNover Beta Group –

Received confirmation that Town of Hanover abutters were notified. Filing fees and peer
review fees have been received by the Town Hall.

Original June 2020 comment letter from items were addressed with the revised plans.

Administratively all the comments have been addressed.

Riverfront area comment – they have submitted an analysis which quantified the requirements
of regulation. Some mitigation would be required with restoration of a 2 to 1 ratio. The
disturbed area is 310 ft. which they would need to replicate 620 ft. proposed on the plan is 750
ft.

MA DEP comments – stating a special condition in the order any future alteration within
mitigation area is prohibited.

Not addressed – silt sock in sink catch basins need to be installed which will need to be a special
condition.

A de-watering plan will need to be submitted to commission prior to the start of this activities
during construction. This will be added as a special condition.

HNover –

Subsurface changes were too close to ground water levels have been addressed.

All comments from the January 5th letter has been addressed and the plans meet the standards. In compliance with the Storm water Standards and satisfy requirements of existing conditions.

No further questions from the board

Motion to close the hearing was made by Lorraine and seconded by Virginia.

Motion to issue the OOC with special order conditions for 28 Bishop Lane was made by Lorraine and seconded Charlene.

0 Hingham St – NOI

Motion to open the hearing for 0 Hingham St was made by Virginia and seconded by Lorraine.

Kevin Grady presented the proposed project on the vacant lot next to Dunkin Donuts on Hingham St. It is under agreement for Primrose School which has been designed in the same area of work as prior application under R&R diner. Keeping in line with the no disturb areas.

The portion in the buffer zone is portion of building, playground and parking lot. The storm water plan was also reviewed with the commission.

A LOMA by FEMA was done on this site. There are some areas that were reviewed with the commission approx. 6 cubic yards of fill in the flood zone proposed.

The 25ft no disturb zone has not been met. There is an area approx. around flag 7 will be temporary disturbed during the construction of this project.

CNover –

The project has the same limited of work as the previously approved project. Slight difference on NE corner of the site was reviewed. The SW area of the corner does exceed to the boundary of the work. However less buffer zone impact with new proposed project.

From Beta Group perspective the project, outside of storm water, does meet the recommendations. The prior project had special conditions that would be issued to this site.

HNover –

DEP comments on the wetland comments on this property that speaks to prior alteration that restored. This was the same comment under the prior filing with the commission.

The review of the Storm water plan with the commission. There were some changes made to this filing that were different than the prior approved by the commission.

The storage and infiltration of the water was reviewed and recommendation have been made. The turf being used in the playground needs to be reviewed and analysis provided on the plan.

Board questions:

LPratt – is there a snow removal plan with this filing?

Response: The proposed storage area was reviewed with the commission.

DGolemme –

When the last project was approved we had a recommendation of a 25ft no disturb zone. However, now the commission has a bylaw. With this filing the 25 ft no disturb zone area is temporary during construction but will be restored. This is only temporary disturbance which is a small area. And once the project is complete the area will be within the 25 ft no disturb. The board has determined that this disturbance will be allowed due to it being temporary during construction and restored per the plans.

Motion to continue this hearing to February 9th was made by L.Pratt and seconded by V.Hoffman.

Motion to approve secretary payroll was made by L.Pratt and seconded by V.Hoffman

Meeting adjourned at 8:37pm