

The Brockton Conservation held a meeting in the GAR Room, City Hall, Brockton on Thursday, February 10, 2011 at 7:00 PM. Members present: Chairperson Stephanie Danielson, Scott Ford, James Bosco, Greg Enos and Timothy Reilly. Also present were secretary Pamela Gurley and Marta Nover, Nover-Armstrong Associates (NAA).

1. Notice of Intent

Property: 225 Liberty Street  
Applicant: USPS  
Representative: LEC Environmental

Mark Manganello, LEC  
Walter Watson

Mr. Manganello apologized for the late filing of material and said that all the additions were made per the discussion at the last meeting. Mr. Watson said that they added a hydrocarbon skirt to the catch basin hoods and cleaning of this is in the OM plan and will be continuous. He said that the OM plan was updated and sent in with the revised plans. He said the erosion control location was added to plan; crushed stone was added to hold it in place and protect it. He said that the work should only take a couple of weeks. Ms. Danielson said that the construction pavement needs additional protection.

A motion was properly made (Reilly), seconded (Ford) and unanimously passed to close the hearing.

A motion was properly made (Ford), seconded (Reilly) and unanimously passed to issue a standard order of conditions contingent upon review and approval of the revised plans and OM plan and the agreement that the applicant will make any final changes that NAA requires.

2. Notice of Intent

Address: Plot 94-1 Summer Street  
Applicant: Bay State Gas Co.  
Representative: AECOM Technology  
(Should not have appeared on this agenda – re-scheduled for February 24, 2011)

3. Request for Determination

Address: 678 East Street  
Applicant: Robert Carroll  
Representative: Pilling Engineering

Todd Pilling, Pilling Engineering  
Attorney Michael O'Shaughnessey

The secretary advised that Commission that no review check had been submitted.

Mr. Pilling said that the property is the old Knight of Columbus building. He said they are proposing to tear the building down, clear the vegetation approximately 20' from the building and also to remove the pavement.

Ms. Danielson asked why the vegetation needs to be removed and Mr. Pilling said that the vegetation has grown up around the building.

Mr. Pilling said that their initial plan was for a subdivision but the application was recently denied by the Planning Board.

Ms. Danielson said that the Commission has a 25' no touch to the wetlands and wondered why they did not file a NOI (for the removal of asphalt). Mr. Pilling said that they intend to remove the building and plant grass and allow it to re-vegetate. Ms. Danielson asked if the Planning Board plan showed work within the buffer and Mr. Pilling said no.

Mr. Ford said he would like to have seen a NOI filed. He asked about the time frame for the work and Mr., Pilling said it would take about two weeks to do the work. Mr. Ford asked where the asphalt and building debris will be stored. He said those are the details that would be included in a full NOI. He said it would also would be helpful to know what reuse is. He said that a determination is supposed to be quick and easy (work proposed) and this looks like the work proposed is significant.

Attorney O'Shaughnessey asked if anyone had been out to the site and Ms. Danielson said yes.

Mr. Bosco said that he attended the Planning Board meeting. He said there is stockpiling of material on the site and that a neighbor noticed that material is being delivered to the rear of the building. He said that the neighbors are concerned about flooding.

Mr. Pilling said that the bricks (stockpiled material) are in E. Bridgewater. He said the Conservation Commission and Planning Board went out to the property and material is stockpiled outside the 100' bz. Mr. Bosco said that Attorney. Mr. Pilling said that removal of the impervious area will help the neighbors flooding issues. Ms. Danielson said they need to see more detail. Mr. Pilling said that it is a commonly accepted point that grass is more impervious that asphalt.

Mr. Reilly asked if there was a safety concern...was there a danger of fire...is there any contaminants inside the building. Mr. Pilling said that the building is a safety concern and fire would be a problem. Mr. Reilly said he would like to see a plan of what the development would be to which Mr. Pilling said that right now their plan is just demolish the building. He said they would need to file with the Commission to reuse the property.

Mr. Ford asked if there was a basement or was the building on a slab. Mr. Pilling said that the slab and portion of the building with the bowling ally is coming out and remainder will be used for stockpiling.

Opposition:

Jinni Jepson – 578 Plain St., said they never had a water problem until the Peterson Ave. subdivision was built. She said the neighbors pleaded with the Commission not to approve the project. He said the contractor for that project also told them it would be designed so that it would not impact them....she said they are very concerned about water problems.

Attorney O'Shaughnessey asked if the Commission would allow the clearing under the RDA and not the demolition of the building. Ms. Danielson said that she would not be so

inclined to do that. Mr. Ford said everything has a repercussion and he is not comfortable with not having the remaining information.

A motion was properly made (Reilly), seconded (Bosco) and unanimously passed to close the hearing.

A motion was properly made (Ford), seconded (Reilly) and unanimously passed to issue a positive one determination.

**Other Business**

There was no other business for discussion.