

Town of Franklin



Conservation Commission

**March 12, 2026  
Meeting Minutes**

*As stated on the agenda, this meeting is available to be attended in person and via the Zoom platform. In an effort to ensure citizen engagement and comply with open meeting law regulations, citizens will be able to dial into the meeting using the provided phone number, or citizens can participate by using the Zoom link provided on the agenda. This meeting will be held in the Town Council Chambers on the Second Floor of the Municipal Building for citizens wishing to attend in person.*

**Commencement**

Chair Mark LePage called the above-captioned meeting to order this date at 7:00 PM as a remote/virtual/in-person meeting. Members in attendance: Mark LePage, Lui Puga, Michael Rein, Roger Trahan, Nicole Chiaramonte, Matthew Stoltz. Absent: Richard Johnson. Also present: Breeka Li Goodlander, Director of Conservation (via Zoom); Tyler Paslaski, Administrative Staff.

*Note: Documents presented to the Conservation Commission are on file.*

**SCHEDULING**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Public Hearing – NOI – Nicholas Drive/Prospect Street Culvert Repair**

Chair LePage said they did not receive any new information; there was a request for continuance.

There was a motion made by Matthew Stoltz to continue the NOI for Nicholas Drive/Prospect Street Culvert Repair to March 26, 2026, at 7:01 PM. The motion was seconded by Michael Rein and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-1 (6-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent). Roll Call Vote: Rein-Yes; Trahan-Yes; Chiaramonte-Yes; Puga-Yes; Stoltz-Yes; LePage-Yes.

**Public Hearing – NOI – Symphony Drive/Tanglewood Estates**

Mr. Bill Buckley of Bay Colony Group representing the applicants Cypress Real Estate Development said they met with the Commission and then received comments back from town staff and peer reviewer BETA. The applicant gave a response to BETA. He summarized the changes made. He said they met with Planning Board and have a few outstanding items and will be reviewing details with town staff. He explained on sheet 7 they significantly expanded the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). He noted it is a 7-acre parcel of land with two lots and are building a private road with a common driveway for the two houses. He said the lots are 3 to 4 acres each which is larger than required by zoning. They will be clearing and doing grading on the side of the hill. He pointed out the area of the buffer zone.

Chair LePage asked about the trees to be removed. He said they like to see a transection of trees 3 in. or more. Ms. Goodlander said they can do one transection and asked that they span all the buffer zones. Mr. Buckley pointed out the area they should look at.

Mr. Buckley explained they are on the side of a hill. He noted bylaws they have to consider including that a driveway over 10 percent grade is not allowed. He said on lot 2 on the right, they set it as a walkout at the grade that is there now. He explained they are trying to not do any activity or the least amount in the buffer zone.

Chair LePage said that makes sense. He asked if the house can be moved back in order to preserve more of the 25 ft. to 50 ft. He said he understands the challenging grading on that lot. Mr. Buckley said they can try to do that. He said he was trying to give a reasonable back yard. He reviewed where he would move the backyard area.

Mr. Buckley said on sheet 7, they significantly expanded the SWPPP and added a lot of narrative in order to guide the contractor as to how we want this built. He said from the Planning Board the concern continues to be that we do not create an issue downhill where there are homes. He said they are working on a more detailed phasing plan. He discussed that they may need to do tree cutting in two phases. He said there were questions about what is going in the back. He said it would be grass, and he discussed some plantings in various places. He noted on sheet 3 of the plan set there is parcel B. It is a 20 ft. wide property that is owned by the town, and it connects to a piece of open space. He said the Planning Board asked them to create the 20 ft. so people could legally pass between the two. He said it is an access parcel to the dedicated open space. He noted why they placed the house where they did.

Chair LePage asked about the orange construction fence on page 7 of the plans. Mr. Buckley said there is silt sock on the east side. He said in areas where they think there will be erosion or sediment, they are putting in silt sock. He said fencing is the limit of clearing. He said they like to see some type of visual barrier for the construction equipment. It gives them a visual barrier to not go beyond there. He said on the plans the dashed line is the limit of clearing, and the silt sock is the heavier line. He said the next time they are before the Commission they will have a more detailed phasing plan.

In response to questions, Mr. Buckley said to look at sheet 2.1 for existing conditions, and he noted the paths through the lots. He talked about the positioning of the house on the east side. He said he can push it forward, but the grade off the road is steep, so they will have to grade the house. So, they were trying not to touch the backyard grades and leave it what it is today. Chair LePage said maybe they want to put together a maintenance plan for the backyard and some of the plantings. Mr. Buckley said what they show on sheet 4, on the backyard, they said any activity in the buffer zone, they are having a specific seed mix, the original Jonathan Green Black Beauty seed mix, which is a mix to use on lakes. It does not require a lot of water or maintenance or fertilizer. It is a hardy mix and requires minimal maintenance. Outside of the buffer zone it is regular mix. Mr. Buckley explained where the walkout basement would be and reviewed the proposed rear of the house would be a walkout. He noted there is no buyer yet. He confirmed that he was asked by Mr. Trahan to keep the house out of the 100 ft. buffer. Mr. Buckley said they can move the house. In response to questions, Mr. Buckley talked about plants other than arborvitae, but the purpose is for screening. The Planning Board had asked for a screen to be planted. Ms. Goodlander said any viburnum would be fine, but it loses its leaves in the winter. She suggested a red cedar or holly. She suggested a dogwood, but it loses its leaves in winter.

Chair LePage talked about a maintenance plan for the backyard. Mr. Buckley said enforcement is always an issue. Ms. Goodlander said it is not typical to do an O&M plan for a residential property for a lawn. She said for the concerns about seeding or for any native plantings that would happen prior to certificate of compliance, there is the regulatory compliance for 75 percent coverage when it comes to seeds, and the seedlings have to be successful otherwise there is cause to not grant a certificate of compliance. Mr. Trahan asked about a concrete wetland marker in the ground. Mr. Buckley explained they typically put in concrete bounds and indicated the note they put on them. Chair LePage said that sounds like a good idea. Ms. Goodlander said she has 3 in. signs in her office and those can be put on the posts.

Chair LePage reviewed when information needs to be provided in order to get it in for the next meeting.

There was a motion made by Nicole Chiaramonte to continue the NOI for Symphony Drive/Tanglewood Estates to March 26, 2026, at 7:02 PM. The motion was seconded by Matthew Stoltz and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-1 (6-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent). Roll Call Vote: Rein-Yes; Trahan-Yes; Chiaramonte-Yes; Puga-Yes; Stoltz-Yes; LePage-Yes.

**Public Hearing – NOI – 670 King Street**

Mr. Michael Davis said he knows the Commission put in the provisions for the cement not going in the hole for the swimming pool. That is fine with him. Chair LePage said they are still looking for a Department of Environmental Protection number for the project.

Mr. Russell Waldron (via Zoom) on behalf of the applicant confirmed they are still waiting on a file number. He explained the DEP seems to be having a delay, and he will continue trying to get some information.

Chair LePage explained they need to wait for the DEP number. He reviewed that typically the Commission resolves all outstanding items, puts together the conditions, and votes at the next meeting. He said they need to know the fill material. Mr. Davis said stone aggregate. Chair LePage said that should be in the plans or the Commission can condition that. Ms. Goodlander said they can prepare it for the next meeting and hopefully they will receive the DEP number. Chair LePage explained he thinks they would be putting the Commission in harm's way if they vote before they receive a DEP number. He said they hopefully will be in a better position in two weeks.

There was a motion made by Roger Trahan to continue the NOI for 670 King Street to March 26, 2026, at 7:03 PM. The motion was seconded by Michael Rein and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-1 (6-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent). Roll Call Vote: Rein-Yes; Trahan-Yes; Chiaramonte-Yes; Puga-Yes; Stoltz-Yes; LePage-Yes.

**Public Hearing – NOI – Lewis Street**

Mr. Stephen Balcewicz of Land Planning, Inc. (via Zoom) on behalf of the applicant and property owner, Lewis Street Realty, stated there were concerns about the wetland delineation at the last meeting. After the meeting, a site visit was conducted and the delineation was amended and additional transects were taken. As a result, the plans have been updated for existing conditions and site plans. Buffer zone impacts and buffer zone areas have also been amended on the site plan. He shared his screen and reviewed the changes. He noted the wetland flags that had concerns. He noted the previous flag locations and that wetland flags 901 and 902 were added. They have moved the delineation a little closer to the property. He said they provided the field data sheets.

In response to questions, Mr. Balcewicz flipped back and forth between the old wetland delineation and the new set of plans to see the changes. Chair LePage asked if it was possible to curve the driveway to get it out of the buffer. Mr. Balcewicz said it would be a possibility, but noted the DPW would like the driveway to be 90 degrees to the extension of the road. Chair LePage said he understood. He asked about a transection of trees. Mr. Balcewicz asked if that could possibly be conditioned and possibly a staking of the tree line. He said there is no real area to reduce the tree clearing. Chair LePage said a staking would be good and doing a transect of trees 3 in. or more. Mr. Balcewicz asked for the radius area for the transect. Ms. Goodlander said 15 ft. and making sure it goes through all of the buffer zones, not parallel to them. Chair LePage said he liked the blueberry bush adds. Mr. Balcewicz asked for elaboration on the transect area. Ms. Goodlander explained. In response to questions, Mr. Balcewicz reviewed the proposed blueberry bushes and their location. Ms. Goodlander said she has a few seed mixes she could recommend.

Chair LePage suggested looking at conditions for the next meeting. Mr. Balcewicz said regarding altering these plans, they are a complete set. He said he would like to submit a supplement worksheet plan with a

letter reporting the transects and the findings. Ms. Goodlander said she thinks that is fine. Chair LePage agreed.

Chair LePage said they could look at writing up conditions for the next meeting. Ms. Goodlander confirmed she was comfortable with that. Mr. Balcewicz confirmed the Commission can approve the project and vote on the conditions at the same meeting.

There was a motion made by Michael Rein to continue the NOI for Lewis Street to March 26, 2026, at 7:04 PM. The motion was seconded by Mark LePage and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-1 (6-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent). Roll Call Vote: Rein-Yes; Trahan-Yes; Chiamonte-Yes; Puga-Yes; Stoltz-Yes; LePage-Yes.

### **Public Hearing – NOI – 47 Patridge Street**

Mr. Rick Goodreau of United Consultants (via Zoom) said the Goddard Consulting staff sent over a continuance request this afternoon. He said they received comments from DEP but are still waiting review comments from BETA. He said the revisions were made to accommodate comments received from the Planning Board's review consultant. He said those items were addressed, and the Planning Board was satisfied, and they are waiting for them to move further along with the Commission before making their final decision.

There was a motion made by Lui Puga to continue the NOI for 47 Patridge Street to March 26, 2026, at 7:05 PM. The motion was seconded by Matthew Stoltz and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-1 (6-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent). Roll Call Vote: Rein-Yes; Trahan-Yes; Chiamonte-Yes; Puga-Yes; Stoltz-Yes; LePage-Yes.

### **GENERAL BUSINESS**

**Friendly 40B Local Initiative Program (LIP): None.**

### **Minor Buffer Zone Activities: 5 Oak Tree Lane**

Homeowner Jaclyn Leslie (via Zoom) said the Commission approved her pool installation at the end of 2024. She said she wanted to do the fence after the pool was fully installed around June 2025. That is where it became unclear as to what fencing was approved, so they reached out to the Commission. They are requesting approval of installation of the fence further out than where the pool is located on the property, but not disturbing wetlands; it is outside of the buffer zone and minimal soil disturbance.

Chair LePage noted the photograph which was shown on the screen; he said it was GIS. He asked about the fence along the property line. He said the fence would be deep into the buffer based on the GIS. He asked if instead of on the property line could the fence shoot out from the northwest corner of the driveway and back off the property line a little bit to get it out of the buffer zone. Ms. Leslie confirmed to bring it in a little closer toward the house. She said she thinks they can do that. She said where they are proposing the fence is in a disturbed area. There is a swing set that does not show on the plans.

Chair LePage said 0 ft. to 25 ft. is a no disturb buffer zone. He said the further they can pull it away, the better. He explained it would adhere to the bylaws if they could swing that. Ms. Leslie confirmed as close to the patio as possible. Chair LePage said they could verbally condition that.

Mr. Rein said he is not clear. Chair LePage explained the driveway squares off at the end of the driveway. Ms. Leslie explained the location of the driveway and the proposed fence as shown on the photograph and said she could pull the fence in closer to the deck. She explained the location of the walkway and deck. Chair LePage explained they would like the fence line to ride along the walkway from where it hits the northern corner of the driveway, follows the contour of the walkway to where it curves almost due north, then heads to the back of the lot from there. Discussion commenced on the location of the walkway, pool, driveway, and proposed fence. Ms. Leslie said she understands they want her to stay out of the buffer zone. Chair LePage

reviewed the location again for the proposed fence. He said they are trying to balance being reasonable and protecting the wetlands. Ms. Goodlander said she has not been out to the site. She shared her screen and measured on the GIS map. Chair LePage said they could say 10 ft. from the property line. Ms. Leslie said yes.

There was a motion made by Matthew Stoltz to approve the minor buffer zone activity for 5 Oak Tree Lane, with the condition that the fence line on the southwest boundary be a minimum of 10 ft. away from the boundary line. The motion was seconded by Roger Trahan and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-1 (6-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent). Roll Call Vote: Rein-Yes; Trahan-Yes; Chiaramonte-Yes; Puga-Yes; Stoltz-Yes; LePage-Yes.

**Request for Determination of Applicability: None.**

**Permit Modifications/Extensions: None.**

**Certificates of Compliance: None.**

**Violations/Enforcement: 8 Bogastow Brook Lane**

Chair LePage said this is from last fall, and it has to be renewed. He said he needs to follow up with Adam from Lola's Landscaping; however, this needs to be extended.

There was a motion made by Nicole Chiaramonte to extend the enforcement order for 8 Bogastow Brook Lane, for 90 days. The motion was seconded by Michael Rein and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-1 (6-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent). Roll Call Vote: Rein-Yes; Trahan-Yes; Chiaramonte-Yes; Puga-Yes; Stoltz-Yes; LePage-Yes.

**Minutes: February 26, 2026**

There was a motion made by Roger Trahan to approve the meeting minutes for February 26, 2026. The motion was seconded by Mark LePage and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-1 (6-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent). Roll Call Vote: Rein-Yes; Trahan-Yes; Chiaramonte-Yes; Puga-Yes; Stoltz-Yes; LePage-Yes.

### **Discussion**

Chair LePage noted Earth Day. He said they were talking about having some seedlings to hand out. Ms. Goodlander was going to look into that. For about 80 seedlings it would cost approximately \$1,000. He suggested giving Ms. Goodlander administrative approval to make the purchase. He discussed the quantity and said if they are not all taken, they can bring them to the farmers' market. Ms. Goodlander requested approval to buy the tubes for the bee boxes as well. Chair LePage and other members said yes. Chair LePage confirmed seedlings, bee boxes, and a walk at Riverbend. He asked Ms. Goodlander if someone from DCR would help with the walk. Ms. Goodlander said the consulting forester Tom Ashton offered to do a forestry demo on the forest stewardship plan they have on Riverbend. She asked if the Commission would be amenable to felling some younger trees to open up the canopy to increase stratification and species diversity and enrichment. She said it is in the forest stewardship plan. She said that is active forestry. Commission members informally agreed. She said she will report back on the purchases and the demo. Chair LePage said Mr. Johnson has the table. Ms. Goodlander confirmed the table runner. She said she is not certain of materials that may be in the office. Chair LePage confirmed the event is April 18 from 10 AM to 2 PM. Discussion commenced on the time of the walk. Chair LePage suggested seeing what time works for Mr. Ashton.

Ms. Chiaramonte discussed the project she was proposing. She said at this time she does not think it is a good idea because of the water chestnut in the ponds. She said it is an expense to make the floating mat project, and she would not like to see them destroyed due to the growing vines. Chair LePage suggested there

are some wetlands surrounding DelCarte and maybe some interpretive signage explaining the flora and fauna.

Ms. Goodlander noted a flyer is needed for Earth Day. Mr. Puga said he would make the flyer. He noted dog waste at DelCarte and Dacey Field and said we can do better and it is etiquette and environmentally it is impactful. He would like to bring awareness to this. Ms. Chiramonte discussed a sign being posted at DelCarte regarding the need to clean up after your pets. Mr. Trahan noted the same situation at the SNETT.

**Executive Session: None.**

There was a motion made by Michael Rein to adjourn the meeting. No second made. There was a voice vote aye.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi  
Recording Secretary

*--Conservation Commission approved minutes at March 26, 2026 meeting*