



Town of Burlington  
29 Center Street  
Burlington, MA 01803

Phone 781-270-1655  
Fax 781-238-4690

*Burlington Conservation Commission*

---

**MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 10, 2010  
BURLINGTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
APPROVED DECEMBER 9, 2010**

Members Present: Gretchen Carey, Larry Cohen, Indra Deb, Gail Lima,  
Kerry Melanson, Ann McNamara

Members Absent: Nedim Celik

Also Present: John Keeley, Conservation Administrator  
Ellen Longo, Principal Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 7:00PM by L. Cohen.

**1. Citizens' Time**

Gregory Smith, who resides at 36 College Road, was present. G. Smith said he had a letter from Congressman John Tierney's office regarding flood mitigation for Burlington. He mentioned that certain areas of Burlington flood all the time especially off of Wilmington road. G. Smith then commented he received a call saying work will start tomorrow on Wildwood Park.

G. Smith said there is an area between 26 and 27 College Road that is wet but does not meet the criteria for a wetland. L. Cohen said he would like a copy of the letter from John Tierney's office.

**2. Minutes – October 28, 2010**

**A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 28, 2010 WAS MADE BY G. CAREY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY I. DEB AND APPROVED 5-0-1 (A. MCNAMARA ABSTAINED).**

**3. Request for Determination of Applicability**

**8 Sorelle Place – Aldo Gallinelli  
New residential construction**

Aldo Gallinelli was present. A. Gallinelli stated he has built four homes previously and this will be number five. A. Gallinelli said this property abuts the town of Lexington so he filed an application with them also. J. Keeley stated there is a wetland to the south of the proposed house which is actually in Lexington. There is an existing wall between the proposed construction location and a pond and construction will be at a distance of greater than 50 feet. A. Gallinelli said he will put erosion controls beyond the wall. J. Keeley asked where the driveway will be located and A. Gallinelli said there will be a common driveway most of which is not in Burlington. J. Keeley reviewed the draft negative determination. A. Gallinelli commented he installed the silt fence beyond where it is necessary. No one was present in the audience for this project.

**Conservation Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2010 Minutes**

**A MOTION TO ISSUE A NEGATIVE DETERMINATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT AT 8 SORELLE PLACE WAS MADE BY G. LIMA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY A. MCNAMARA AND APPROVED 6-0-0.**

**4. Notice of Intent**

**1 Pinevale Avenue – Rich Iovino / NIKLEA LLC  
New residential construction  
DEP File # 122-465**

See below.

**5. Notice of Intent**

**3 Pinevale Avenue – Rich Iovino / NIKLEA LLC  
New residential construction  
DEP File # 122-466**

L. Cohen suggested doing agenda items #4 and #5 (1 & 3 Pinevale Avenue) at the same time.

Steven Erickson of Norse Environmental Services, Inc. was present and gave a brief description of the proposed work. He said there is an existing house which will be razed and the lot will be converted into two house lots upon which two single-family homes will be constructed.

J. Keeley explained the resource areas which consist of bordering vegetated wetlands associated with the start of Sandy Brook. J. Keeley stated the wetland continues to the southwest, and the applicant will need to extend the erosion controls accordingly. J. Keeley also reminded the applicant that they will have to go before the planning department for an ANR. J. Keeley stated that the lot which was filed as 0 Pinevale Avenue will be known as 3 Pinevale Avenue per the Building Department. The existing house mailing address will be 1 Pinevale Avenue.

J. Keeley recommended that the commission require a stamped detailed plan for the retaining wall and have the Building Department inspect it as well. He also stated that the plan does not clearly depict the contours near the proposed retaining wall. Additionally, the plans don't show details about driveway runoff. S. Erickson stated that they will probably put some sort of grate at front of driveway.

I. Deb commented that calculations for the drywell were needed and asked what material would be used for the wall. S. Erickson stated the wall will be built on a base of crushed stone. S. Erickson stated he will provide a engineered stamped plan with details of the retaining wall. I. Deb also asked about the location of the drywell, and expressed concern over having enough clearance above the water table. S. Erickson stated that the drywell will ultimately be 2 ft. above existing ground level.

G. Lima asked if the wetland line on the left will affect the 20 ft no disturb area and S. Erickson said it is well over 20 ft. from the property line. G. Lima asked about the retaining wall behind lot #1 and also asked about the configuration of drywells on both sites. S. Erickson stated he was not sure why there were two drywells proposed on one lot and just one proposed on the other, but he will find out. G. Lima also stated that the Commission will need detailed information on the fill being used as well as an estimate of the amount of fill to be used.

**Conservation Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2010 Minutes**

A. McNamara asked about the age of the existing house and of the existing fencing at the site. K. Melanson asked about the stormwater calculations and proposed drywells. L. Cohen asked about the depicted wetland flags and S. Erickson explained that some flags depicted on the plan could be soil depth flags and not wetland flags. S. Erickson also explained the delineation and that there is a breakout point along the hill. L. Cohen asked about the soils in that particular area and J. Keeley stated that soils near wetland flag # 9 were clearly upland soils. L. Cohen also questioned possible drainage issues near the proposed wall. S. Erickson stated that the engineer usually puts stone near the wall to handle drainage. I. Deb reminded the applicant that detailed information regarding the wall and its installation is needed.

L. Cohen expressed concern over the location of the proposed infiltrators in relation to the proposed wall. S. Erickson stated they could provide 20 ft. between the two. L. Cohen also stated that the Commission needs specifications on the fill used and the locations of stockpiling need to be indicated on the plan as well. Additionally, the applicant shall provide the Commission with the proposed construction sequence.

L. Cohen stated that the Commission needs written confirmation that no machinery will be entering into the wetlands. L. Cohen also stated that driveway runoff should be handled separately from rooftop runoff and S. Erickson stated that they will be separate. L. Cohen also stated that as the wall is 10 ft. high, some type of barrier is needed. S. Erickson replied that building codes requires this.

Ann Donahue, an abutter who resides at 5 Church Lane, was present and had concerns about the trees and structures in the area. She said she is worried about losing the privacy she now has in her yard. She asked what will happen with the trees once the shed and garage are removed. S. Erickson said any trees on the property line will stay. A. Donahue said she sometimes gets water in her back yard during heavy rains. S. Erickson asked for her name and telephone number and said he will have the builder get in touch with her about planting buffers and trees. A. Donahue also had question about the silt fence and S. Erickson explained it to her and further stated the fence will stay until everything is re-vegetated. A. McNamara asked her if some of the trees are rotting and she said some are and some are not.

Tara Kosinski, who resides at 6 Pinevale Avenue, said she had concerns with the project. T. Kosinski said she lives across the street from 3 Pinevale Avenue and is concerned with potential runoff into the street since she recently installed a two car garage and new driveway. S. Erickson stated that no runoff will go to the street, any runoff will run in same direction it does now. T. Kosinski said there is no storm drain at her end of the street. J. Keeley commented the planning board won't have any say over this. She had concerns with the existing red maples and asked if there was any plan to preserve them. S. Erickson said if the trees are in the right of way they would be preserved, but if the trees are on the Pinevale property, then he is not sure. T. Kosinski said the street light at the end of their road is not working. A. McNamara told her to get the pole number and the address and the call the Engineering department.

G. Lima had a question regarding 3 Pinevale. She asked if the property line goes to the stonewall and also asked if work will be done between the property line and the hay bale line. S. Erickson said no work will be done in that area. L. Cohen said sometimes the Commission requires a double hay bale and asked if this is necessary by wetland flag #7, 8 and 9. J. Keeley agreed that it would be a good idea.

L. Cohen reviewed the major outstanding issues:

**Conservation Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2010 Minutes**

- Need comments on extending wetland line and confirming soils
- Driveway drainage design (separate from roof drywells)
- Check street drainage
- Detail on wall and its drainage. Clarification of contours next to wall in sloped area, with documentation stamped by engineer
- Documentation for drywells and review placement of drywells.
- Verification of location of maple trees out front (in right-of-way or on lot?)

J. Keeley said he is not sure if there is any fill on Lot #1. L. Cohen stated we need verification that the soil is suitable. L. Cohen stated he wants an explanation of construction of the wall and does not want any heavy equipment in the wetlands. J. Keeley stated he wants a second drywell on #1 and an estimate of quantity of fill brought in. J. Keeley said the erosion control line is to be brought to the street on lot 3 and the double hay bale line should be shown on the plan.

Item continued until the December 9, 2010 Conservation Commission meeting.

**6. Continued Public Hearing – Notice of Intent  
90 Middlesex Turnpike – Dave & Buster’s Inc.  
DEP File # 122-464**

The applicants have requested that this hearing be continued to the December 9, 2010 Conservation Commission meeting.

**7. Informal Discussion  
217 Middlesex Turnpike  
Drainage Improvements**

Eugene Sullivan, the project Engineer and Scott Buonopane, the potential tenant were present. E. Sullivan said the building is an existing two story office building, 10K sq. ft. per floor. The building is approximately 30 years old. E. Sullivan stated the potential tenant is looking to occupy half of the first floor with a carpet business and looking to construct an outdoor driving ramp at the rear of the building. They are also proposing to enlarge the existing loading dock which is located near Vine Brook. E. Sullivan stated they are also proposing to improve drainage in the parking area, creating a new berm along edge of parking area and eliminating some existing paved area to create a vegetated swale. The applicants will file a Notice of Intent in the future. J. Keeley said the work for this project is similar to the work which was done at the building next door. J. Keeley stated that the water currently sheet flows from the parking lot into Vine Brook and that the proposed project will be a great improvement as to what is there now.

I. Deb expressed concerns with the proposed loading dock. E. Sullivan stated they are removing the dock and will install a ramp in its place. In total, impervious surface at the rear of the building will be reduced.

G. Carey stated she would like to see a gravel area on the back side like what was done at the adjacent property.

G. Lima commented she would like the dumpster moved closer to the building, secured, and enclosed in some way. G. Lima said she does not want parking spaces in the dock area. G. Lima would like signs put up for no salt and no snow storage. K. Melanson commented the parking lines by the brook look longer than regular ones and maybe could be pulled back a bit. A. McNamara stated when members of the commission visited the site, they thought the parking spaces at the rear of the property were very close to the water. E. Sullivan stated they will take a look at it. E. Sullivan said the parking spaces at the rear are mostly for zoning purposes. The entrances to the building are located at the front and side of the building where most of the parking is. E.

**Conservation Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2010 Minutes**

Sullivan stated he plans to file a Notice of Intent for the December 9, 2010 Conservation Commission meeting.

**8. Planning Board Comments**

There were no planning board comments.

**9. Administration**

**a. Upcoming Meeting Schedule**

December 9, 2010 – I. Deb may be absent from this meeting.

January 13, 2011 – K. Melanson be absent from this meeting.

**b. Other:**

**A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING WAS MADE BY I. DEB AT 8:15 PM. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY G. CAREY AND APPROVED 6-0-0.**

Minutes respectfully submitted by,

Ellen F. Longo, Principal Clerk  
Conservation Department