



MEETING NOTICE POSTING & AGENDA

TOWN OF HULL

Pursuant to MGL Chapter 30A, § 18-25 all Meeting Notices must be filed and time stamped in the Town Clerk's Office and posted at least **48 hours prior to the meeting** (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Holidays). Please be mindful of the Town Clerk's business hours of operation and make the necessary arrangements to ensure this Notice is received and stamped in by the Town Clerk's Office and posted by at least **30 minutes** prior to the close of business on the day of filing.

TOWN CLERK'S STAMP

Board or Committee	Conservation Commission
Date & Time of Meeting	TUESDAY, July 26, 2022 at 7:30 P.M.
Meeting Remote Location	Remote Call-in meeting with Zoom: https://zoom.us/j/94028488110?pwd=cjJjN3JSWE9xTmhFeFNqcHVFNUZnUT09 Meeting ID: 940 2848 8110 Passcode: 596250 Or Dial: +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592
Requested By:	Chris Krahforst, Director

This meeting is being held remotely by telephone as an alternate means of public access pursuant to an Order issued by the Governor of Massachusetts dated March 12, 2020 Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law. You are hereby advised that this meeting and all telephone communications during this meeting may be recorded by the Town of Hull in accordance with the Open Meeting Law.

Members Present: Paul Paquin (PP), Chair, Tammy Best (TB), Katherine Jacintho (KJ), Sam Campbell (SC), Lou Sorgi (LS)

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Chris Krahforst (CK), Conservation Administrator, Renee Kiley, Conservation Clerk

Staff Absent: none

Minutes:

Consideration of Minutes of 7/12/2022. **Motion by LS to approve the minutes with typos to be addressed and as amended, 2nd by LS 2nd by SC Roll call: Jacintho-aye, Paquin-aye, LS-aye, SC, TB-aye**

AGENDA

7:30 Call to order

Review of Agenda, Meeting Procedure, and approved permit guidance
Minutes

7:36 KJ arrived.

7:36 Abandoned RR Bed adjacent to Harborview Rd. Maps 03 & 57/Lot 009(SE35-1698) Continuation of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Town of Hull for work described as perform a pipeline assessment along the Harborview Road coastal beach because of a slope failure along the embankment & install associated underground structures with manholes at the surface. Notification: proof provided. Resource Areas: Coastal Beach (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat), Buffer to Coastal Bank (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat). Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: VE 16/20/21, LIMWA, possible c.91 jurisdiction. Site visits done: 7/10, 7/11, & 7/24.

Representatives: John Struzziery

Abutters/Others: Tim Grobleski

Documents: Revised proposed plans, file plot plan of 1150 Nantasket Ave,
Struzziery presents the above project. Provides requested map showing overall project area and the two test pit sites at the Ocean Ave site and the Duck Lane site. Proposes to move test pit locations (150' further N or W) after consultation with contractor as doable. Proposes to use and repurpose crushed stone from nearby manhole project and possibly new clean gravel, to level access to proposed pit near Duck Lane. Commissioner asks if surveyed plan of adjacent private property (1150 Nantasket Ave) is available as the owner of said is concerned about activities that

may encroach their property. (Conservation record signed plan is shown.) Grobleski raises concerns about heavy machinery on the beach and also states that a portion of an existing access path crosses their property. Grobleski also recalls the recent nearby large coastal bank failure and is concerned this project may promote a similar failure. Commissioner reminds all that there is no work proposed near that said coastal bank failure. Struzziery provides some recent history regarding the sewer main placement on the coastal beach. This said recent coastal bank failure may have locally impacted this sewer main. Proposes to leave access material on the beach after completion of project. CK: Material will add to the beach volume and natural beach elevations will adjust with wave energy.

Motion to issue to an Order of Conditions with the special conditions that any damage done to the Duck Lane dune will be repaired and revegetated, no cutting into the existing dune area, any rock & gravel sand e that is brought in will stay there, any damage along the way (e.g. vegetation) will be repaired by LS, 2nd by SC. Roll Call: KJ-aye, PP-aye, LS-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye,

7:59 189 & 193 Nantasket Ave. & 0 George Washington Blvd., Map 37, Lots 002-004 (SE35-1614) Continuation of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Nantasket Dune Holdings, LLC** for work described as demolish existing building and construct five-story building, after-the fact clearing of 0 George Washington Blvd., and construction of a parking lot; demolish golf course and construct parking lot. *The scope of work the Notice of Intent has been amended to only include: construction of a parking lot.* **Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune**(storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 10'/X'** (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). Site visit done: many times.
Representatives: Adam Brodsky, Chris Reale, Karlis Skulte, John Chessia (peer-reviewer)
Abutters/Others: Sandra Seagull, Horizons; Cheryl Parks, Sunset Place
Documents: None
Brodsky represents the above project: Revised plans submitted to the Commission and shares peer-review report and states that the applicant has satisfied issues raised in said report. Commissioner asks if the peer reviewer is available to speak on this matter. Chessia (peer reviewer) states his presence. Chessia provides background investigation details: test pits evaluated at high tide. Observed some saline water in some of the holes. Salt marsh sediment material found in test pits in in the central project area. The original proposed point for stormwater to be tied into (a line from the pool to the manhole and catch basin) assumed an outlet into the bay. That pipe didn't connect to this site. There was another catch basin with a drain near the jog in the property line (NE area, Existing Conditions Plan) which the plan (C101) (shown on screen) shows near TPCEST3 a catch basin and a pipe going out from there. During testing, as the tide came in, the water rose in the catch basin. There is a PVC pipe and couplings that connect to the pipe leading out to the bay. The applicant needs to find where that pipe discharges. Chessia states trying to find the discharge point, but could not and was not able to determine what the other pipe (in the catch basin) is. Chessia states the receiving water is a critical area (of environmental concern, ACEC).The discharge is to a shellfish harvesting area and part of an ACEC where there are higher wetland standards. (Chessia reviews the performance standards relevant to the proposed project.) Standard 1: untreated stormwater, the water they are discharging will be treated, they need to know where the outlet is. Standard 2 is peak discharge rates: They have not asked for a (coastal) waiver at this time. The discharge (volume) isn't going to make any difference to the water quality of the bay. Suggests the applicant may want to make some adjustment that are included in the peer-review report. CK: Because this is coastal area, this standard considers the receiving waters as an unlimited reservoir for discharge. The waiver for this standard is allowed in the regulations (310 CMR 10) and can be an option for the Commission to consider. They may waive adherence (to Std. 2) but note that this project proposes discharges into an ACEC. Chessia: All proposed drainage ties into this pipe. Depending on how much water is added to the pipe, the pipe might not have enough capacity. All catch basins are at lowest grade points and the most common impact from a (heavy) rain event would be puddling at the catch basins. It wouldn't add to anymore flooding to abutters or any other property. The flooding would be contained to the parking lot. Std. 3: recharge to ground water. You are required to recharge a certain amount of ground water for the impervious area. They far exceed that standard. The next standard is removal of TSS (total suspended solids) and sediment: The original plan had bio-retention basins which are essentially filtering systems, but bio-retention systems need to be relatively deep (2-3 feet of soil and stone). They don't have that type of depth to work with here, and a shallow basin with plantings would be hard to maintain. So they changed to catch basins that go into a propriety system (for pre-treatment) and then into an infiltration system, and they added larger sediment catch basins. In a critical area, they have to require TARP BMPs (Best Management Practices) as backup systems.(TARP is a testing facility for these BMPs that a group of states have agreed to follow which meet certain pre-treatment water quality standards for stormwater runoff.) They need a backup for more than one area of the project. The propriety system has to meet the pretreatment performance. I'm not sure it would meet the standards for land use with a higher pollutant load, which would be above 1000 vehicle trips a day. If this is the case, the stormwater design would have to protect from oil and grease drippings. They're proposing proprietary swirl chambers. These type of sites usually call for an oil grid separator and to provide data on the capacities of oil/gas/floatables in the proprietary units. The details on the underground systems should be added to. This project would be a partial redevelopment and they can comply with the standards. This site is in a low lying area. They propose a limited erosion and sediment control plan. They will need to file a SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan) and file with EPA. The Commission can defer to the EPA on the SWPPP. However, the Commission may want to look at the

SWPPP submission. CK: There is also a new Hull Land Disturbance permit (required by MS4 stormwater Regulation and local stormwater regulations.) required through a new town "Stormwater Authority" that will need to review projects of this size. Chessia: The local agency will be more effective than the EPA. The O&M plan should be its own document. The last standard regards illicit discharges; what is the pipe (in the catch basin near TP-CEC3) and is it an illicit discharge? Commissioner: Who owns the pipes? Chessia: I would assume that pipe was put in when Paragon Park was built. I think that occurred after the railroad was removed. If you had a pipe on your property can you use it? Brodsky: I agree that you would have the right to continue to discharge to it. The mystery pipe has no easements on record. The origin of this pipe could be off our property. We need to investigate. Commissioner: Would DCR have some info? Brodsky: I do not know. Skulte: We looked at the research; it was part of the right of way. There were some modifications. We reached out to DPW & Sewer. We received all the drainage record cards which show no infrastructure coming into 0 GW Blvd., just historic discharges, not how or when they were installed. Commissioner: With the proposed system, is the stormwater to be clean enough to discharge into the ACEC? Chessia: Yes, with the proposed catch basins, propriety swirl chamber, and then into an infiltration system- it would meet the DEP requirement (for water quality). I don't know what the local bylaw may say. An ACEC designation typically doesn't change the requirement for the treatment; those discharges are allowed. The Commission would need the TARP data States have used for studied systems that have certain (pollutant) removal credit. All the purposed BMPs are allowed in the critical area. The engineer (Skulte) for the applicant presents responses to the peer-review. Skulte: We don't disagree with anything presented. There were some comments (in the report) about adding an isolator row, adding filter fabric, - we would be happy to add those back in. The other minor changes and typos are noted will be addressed. Some of this was omitted in the 2nd plan version. We will address the stormwater O&M plan for use in the future. As far as the Erosion/Sediment control plan and filing of a SWPPP with EPA, we fully intend to do that. We don't think that this will change the design of the system. We need to investigate the outfall. There is some evidence that the catch basin is connected to the bay, as high salt water level was observed in the test pit and it rose and fell with the tide. We are confident that the system will work. Commissioner: After a regular rain event there might be a puddling. Is there any concern bigger ocean storm or more intensive rainfall events would result in flooding beyond the property? Chessia: If there is a coastal storm it will be flooded. The property is in the flood zone. One of my comments was they might want to put a check valve in the pipes coming from the catch basin toward the infiltration system. In a minor coastal storm, you don't want the salt water coming into the system and clogging them. If you have a big coastal storm it will flood and it will be the same if they did nothing to it. Commissioner: Does DCR connect into the existing system? CK states DCR storm drain layout for Nantasket Beach Reservation is available on-line and will share URL information with applicant. Commissioner: Would the system as proposed when completed add to flooding in the area? Will it cause more flooding during a normal heavy rainstorm if had never been built? Is the flooding in the general area to be worse during a coastal storm from the proposed system compared to the area as is? Is this area (including abutting properties) better or worse in normal heavy rain? Chessia states what is proposed would not increase in runoff or stormwater volume from rainfall events. Overwash to the area from a coastal storm and subsequent flooding would not be redirected to abutters by this proposed project. Commissioner: A concern exists with the parking behind. Would this project increased flooding to the parking lot belonging to the adjacent Condominiums? Is there a drain pipe from the (Condominium) parking lot to this property? Chessia states not seeing it, and that the parking lot is draining in its own way. Commissioner: Is it possible their parking lot is draining into this parking lot (0 GW Blvd)? Chessia: There is a 4-6 inch pipe, but it does come from the other direction. It's pointing toward the other parking lot but not large enough to be a regular drain pipe. Commissioner: Where does that other stuff drain to? If you have a drainage pipe already existing on the property can you just use it? Commissioner states the following key issues remain: finding the origin of the pipe in the drainage basin near TPCEST3, the location of the discharge to the ACEC, and assurance that this project will not negatively affect (w/respect to the water quality, erosion or scouring) the bay. CK: Points out that this area is a soft shell clam harvesting area and possibly a human consumption concern as well as important habitat. The existing drainage probably predates the WPA. Sandra Seagull, from Horizons Condominiums, expresses concern about possible pollutants impacts to the clam beds and seeks more understanding about longevity of proposed protective measures. What is the plan if this property is sold? Who is going to maintain this? Brodsky points to the required O&M plan and could be captured as a condition of the order. It would be the responsibility of the property owner to follow the O&M Plan and to abide by the Order of Conditions and be the responsibility of the property owner. Seagull: The property is not completely paved. Paving will raise the flood level higher. We get more severe storms and nor'easters, more damage and flooding. Commissioner: The applicant is required to keep the (stormwater drainage) on their property. If storm surge to the area occurs it will flood everything. I don't know if they are proposing to raise the land. Skulte states the design minimizes the use of any fill. The goal is to match existing grade. The stormwater drainage system was designed to account for rainfall from a 2 year storm event and a 10 and 25 year rainfall events. We will not increase the runoff from the property or propose to increase elevation. Commissioner: The question is, notwithstanding a coastal storm event, once this project is complete, the catch basins are in, the drainage is in, and we figured out what the pipe is, is this area going to drain better? Is it going to cause more flooding? Chessia: There is one aspect that will be bettered by this project: the water will be treated. The rainfall is designed to stay within the site and not make it spread any further. Cheryl Parks, Sunset Place: Is a physical and privacy separation proposed (to the neighboring property)? Skulte proposes to re-establish a portion of the fencing and points to a landscape plan with a plant set detailed. A chain link fence of which the bottom will be 3 feet open to allow flood water to flow through and a privacy component above that is proposed. Commissioner asks if this hearing may be continued. Brodsky: Karlis, how much time is needed? Skulte: We propose to do CCTV investigation or dye testing; 2 weeks to 1 month. Commissioner notes that the Commission is seeking more than just

the illicit pipe (investigation). To be included are: TARP documentation for the Stormceptor BMPs, an isolation row to be added or refuted. A NPDES SWPPP Plan, check valves in discharge pipes, a separate O&M Plan, fiber cloth material added to certain BMPs as raised by Chessia. Commissioner: Do we need to discuss this tonight, or can you send these to the Administrator prior to an issuance of an OOC? Brodsky: We would provide all that prior to the issuance of an OOC. With respect to the SWPPP, it is usually obtained by the contractor, and it can be reviewed by the Commission or by the Stormwater Authority.

Motion to continue until Aug 16 by LS 2nd by SC. LS-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye, KJ-aye

- 8:56 25 T St., Map 13/Lot 015 (SE35-1693) Opening** of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Frank Luisi** for work described as **extend front porch/deck remaining entire length of house. Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune**(storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AO (Depth=2')**(storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Site visits done: 7/24.**
Representatives: Frank Luisi
Abutters/Others: None
Documents: Proposed Plan
Luisi: No changes to project. Demolishing porch and extending the deck the remaining length of the house: 12 ft. x 7 ft.

Motion to issue Order of Conditions by LS 2nd by SC TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye, KJ-aye, LS-aye

- 9:01 18 Manomet Ave Map 13/Lot 015 (SE35-1703) Opening** of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Marjorie MacLeod** for work described as **restore ~ 15 ft² portion of existing wall. Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune**(storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 10'**, (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Site visits done: 7/24**
Representatives: Marjorie MacLeod, Richard Henderson
Abutters/Others: Ian Adams (attorney representing abutter)
Documents: Proposed plan, photos

Henderson represents above project. Project proposes to replicate original wall and which was part of an adverse possession matter. The applicant is now the current owner. Proposes to use the same material in the same place. (Photos shown and the proposed plan.) MacLeod (owner) states that they have come complete with everything needed. Commissioner: What was the wall made of? MacLeod: Concrete. Commissioner: Are there some pictures showing the original (wall)? Photos shown. Commissioner: Is this a flow zone? Would the wall erode anything around it during an overwash event? Adams states that they represent the abutting property owners at 27 Beach Ave. and introduces a public comment letter (received just prior to public meeting and to the file). Adams recounts earlier permit received by 27 Beach Ave. where the Commission issued an Order of Conditions to remove the portion of wall (the nature of which is this proposed project) to minimize redirecting water into client's house (at 27 Beach Ave). Henderson states to have never seen this letter. Commissioner: Although (a portion of) the wall was taken down, it probably should be allowed to be put back up and should resemble (original wall photo shown) when completed and before a Certificate of Compliance is requested.

Motion by LS to issue an Order of Conditions 2nd by SC, SC-aye, PP-aye, KJ-aye, LS-aye, TB-aye

- 9:13 47 F St., Map 13/Lot 015 (SE35-1713) Opening** of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Brian Hernon** for work described as **add 5' to existing side porch and build 16'x12' deck in rear of home. Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Coastal Beach**(storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat), **Buffer to Coastal Bank** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat). **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 10. Site visits done: 7/24.**
Representatives:
Abutters/Others: None
Documents: Proposed plan
CK: Applicant is out of the country and may be having difficulty in attending tonight's meeting. Commissioners note project plan is not to scale and doesn't appear to match the site plan.

Motion to continue to August 16th by LS, 2nd by SC. Roll Call: PP-aye, KJ-aye LS-aye TB-aye, SC-aye

- 9:20 24 Warren St., Map 23/Lot 130 (SE35-1701) Opening** of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Gary & Xiao Hong Melville** for work described as **install rear patio. Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Coastal Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat), **Buffer to Coastal Bank** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat). **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 12. Site visits done: 7/24.**
Representatives: None

Abutters/Others: None

Documents: None

No one is present to represent the project. Commissioner notes submitted drawing is homemade but clear and the edge abuts the street. CK notes that this project may not have needed a NOI or an RDA; they are replacing asphalt and making that area more permeable. Commissioner: Is the garage being removed? CK states no work on the application is proposed for the garage area.

Motion by LS to issue a special condition that the permeable paver by permeable in perpetuity and no stone dust be used. And the Order of Conditions does not affect the garage. KJ-aye, LS-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye

Recess until 9:32

9:32 23 Warfield Ave., Map 24/Lot 068 (SE35-1695) Opening of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Henry Dunn** for work described as **proposed 2-Story House, Deck, & Permeable Driveway**. **Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune** (storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 10'**, (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Site visits done: 7/24.**

Representatives: Henry Dunn, David Ray

Abutters/Others: Dean Cibotti 35 Warfield

Documents: Proposed Plan, file photos

Ray is present to represent this project, proposes to add a pool, and proposes a brand new home on a FEMA compliant foundation with flood vents. Commissioner: Is the pool mentioned in the application? CK notes the application doesn't include the pool. Ray notes that the pool is mentioned in the narrative and but agrees to remove from consideration. Ray explains the new house project to have 4 feet of freeboard, a deck on one side, and a permeable paver driveway in the front except for the 3 foot bituminous concrete apron as required by DPW. Proposes to create a grass parking area to have a corrugated plastic matrix with grass plantings added to the voids. Commissioner: Have these matrices worked anywhere else in town? Ray: We used them at Channel St (22 Channel St.) and they appear to have stayed there well. Cibotti, abutter, asked about abutter notification? Commissioner: Because the public wasn't notified of the pool, the pool is not included as part of this project. Cibotti asks about zoning bylaw 3.1- the bylaw shall be enforced by the Building Commissioner. No building shall be built or altered and no use of building or land shall be changed without a permit. Has there been a permit (building) issued? Commissioner: Building permits are independent (from this hearing). Ray states that no building permit has been issued. Cibotti asks if they can I share my screen? Commissioner states that if it pertains to zoning (it is not part of the consideration here). CK: We have to share with the public what is in the files, so no screen sharing is permitted. Cibotti states that some modular house components were put on the property (Photos in file shown.) which seems premature. Cibotti reports that near 35 Warfield Ave a drain gets flooded with just 0.5-0.6 inches of rain and he has a concern from a conservation stand point. The town has been ineffective in finding a remedy to this problem. This project will bring more water into the area. CK notes the elevations shown on the plans are less than 11 ft elevation. Note this project is in an AE 11 Zone and thus is a relatively low-lying area. Trying to drain an area that is a low lying, even draining precipitation, can be difficult since stormwater infiltration may be exacerbated by sea level rise, saturated soils, and probably shallow groundwater tables. Ray states that when the project is completed percolation into the ground (on site) will improve. The driveway will have a 2 foot gravel basin and permeable pavers, Together that will work as a giant drywell. We will add drywells (for roof runoff) as well. Cibotti remained concerned that "the original premises here is convenience, safety, health, welfare and about a lot of things on this document that we're not contemplating when they decided to make the lot sizes smaller. That was the wisdom of whatever board it was." Commissioner clarifies that (lot size change) was a citizens petition eventually approved at town meeting. Cibotti: You spoke about flood control and storm drainage in your opening statement. Commissioner states that a standard condition exists stating if the construction of the property increases flooding to the neighbor's property, then the home owner with make appropriate remediation measures.

Motion to issue order of condition with the special condition that the pool is not part of the permit, that the permeable pavers stay permeable in perpetuity, that no stone dust be used, that gutters and dry wells be installed 2nd by TB. LS-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye, KJ-aye

9:57 33 Warfield Ave., Map 24/Lot 069 (SE35-1696) Opening of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Tony Rossetti** for work described as **proposed 3-Story House, Deck, Porch, & Permeable Driveway**. **Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune** (storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 10'**, (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Site visits done: 7/24.**

Representatives: Tony Rossetti David Ray

Abutters/Others: Dean Cibotti 35 Warfield Ave

Documents: None, Flood Maps, Proposed Plan, File photos

Ray represents project: Proposing to build a new house on a FEMA compliant foundation with 4' of freeboard, a permeable pavers driveway with a 3 foot buffer strip, small deck, and, if required, drywells (for roof runoff).

Commissioner notes that flooding here appears to be a neighborhood area problem. Cibotti accuses Commission as

“bought and paid for”, to which members of the public and of the Commission voice strong objection. Commissioner instructs Cibotti of the appeal process through DEP and to contact the administrator for more information about that process. Commissioner: Is Dean (Cibotti) asking us to address the flooding on the road or a flooding issue on the property? Commissioner: It's on the road. CK: The solution to drainage in these areas is probably not through infiltration as the soils get (quickly) saturated when there are rain events because of possibly a relatively shallow groundwater table. Commissioner: Does the water flow from the properties to the neighbor's lot or does it just rise up everywhere? CK: It seems to be neighborhood wide. Commissioner: Adding permeable pavers and the dry wells will help the keep stormwater on the property. Cibotti: This lot pitches toward 35 (Warfield). Commissioner: We've conditioned other properties such that there can't be any flow directed towards any other property because of the project. There exists one low spot where the stormwater may pond. Another Commissioner: We haven't checked with DPW. Cibotti asks if Mr. Ray is a qualified engineer for (assessing) flooding (impacts). Commissioner: I think that (Mr. Cibotti) is speaking as an abutter now. As an abutter he is concerned that there is going to be increased flooding to his property. This property may potentially experience increase flooding during a rain event because of this project. We might want to ask the applicant for some evidence that that would not be the case. This may warrant further inquiry for a couple of weeks. Commissioner: Does anyone agree? Commissioner: I think that Ray stated that the owner would be open to adding dry wells. The dry wells and the permeable driveway would be significant to the control of runoff. There is also a lot of room between this structure and the property line (in question). Commissioner: This is a single family home in a neighborhood that does flood. Commissioner: (In the past,) when an abutter expressed runoff concerns, we have required drains in driveways and swales to keep it on the property. Commissioner: Not when all of us didn't perceive that there would be a problem. Commissioner: The low point is going to remain the same and be managed for runoff far more efficiently then is current.

Motion to issue Order of Conditions with special conditions that the applicant will add gutters, down spouts, and drywells, and no stone dust be used, pavers permeable in perpetuity, and grade stays the same by TB 2nd by PP. TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye, KJ-aye LS-no

10:24 143 Nantasket Rd., Map 30/Lot 049. (SE35-1697) Opening of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Jack Mitchell for work described as **proposed 2-Story House, Deck, Porch, & Permeable Driveway Notification**: proof provided. **Resource Areas: Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune** (storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 10'**, (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Site visits done: 7/24.**

Representatives: Jack Mitchell, David Ray

Abutters/Others: None

Documents: Proposed plan

Ray presents above project: proposes to remove an existing house, fill in the basement, elevate with foundation flood vents such that it is FEMA compliant, add a porch on the front, deck in the back, and proposing a bituminous concrete driveway pitched towards a large drywell. This property is a north facing site and difficult to get full melt off the driveway (during winter). A 4 foot long French drain is proposed which will extend down several feet and be filled with gravel. Mitchell asks: The garage is at or above elevation 10. Do I need flood vents? Commissioner: It is required as per building code. CK: It is in the FEMA flood zone and it needs to be flood compliant. You could ask for a Letter of Map Amendment if you think this is out of the floodplain. Commissioner asks if the area past the drywell is grass. Ray: There is about 10 feet of grass past the dry well.

Motion to issue Order of Conditions with a special condition that the drywell be maintained and stay functional in perpetuity. The applicant will need to demonstrate to the Commission that it works correctly by LS 2nd by SC. SC-aye, KJ-aye, PP-aye, LS-aye, TB-aye

Certificate of Compliance Requests

1072 Nantasket Ave (SE35-1336) Project is a fence with chicken wire and rocks to fill the gap between fence and the ground. CK noted that water appears to be able to move freely underneath the fence. The fence was designed to not connect directly to the ground and meets the intent of the Commission. Commissioner noted discoloration line (on the fence shown in the photo) as a salt water line. CK states the discoloration is the result of flower boxes which have been removed.

Motion to issue a certificate of compliance by LS 2nd SC PP-aye, KJ-aye, LS-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye

133A Manomet Ave (SE35-1447) Two additions proposed in the front. The plan of record also shows paver patio which were permitted under a separate permit.

Motion to issue a certificate of compliance by LS 2nd SC, KJ-aye, LS-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye

44 Clifton Ave (SE35-1580)

Motion to issue a certificate of compliance by LS 2nd SC. LS-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye, KJ-aye

Pedestrian Path adjacent to 133 Beach Ave (SE35-1521)

Motion to issue a certificate of compliance by LS 2nd SC, TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye, KJ-aye, LS-aye

93 Manomet Ave (SE35-1674)

Motion to issue a certificate of compliance by LS 2nd SC, SC-aye, PP-aye, KJ-aye, LS-aye, TB-aye

Continued and New Business

CK: There is knotweed in the primary dune. We did get a contractor to assess the situation. They are proposing to do chemical control in September when the plovers season. Would the Commission like a RDA? This project does not propose to alter the resource. Commissioner: I would like to see what they are doing. Another Commissioner: Did the contractor think that it was surprising that the knotweed was growing in sand? CK: No I don't think so. This is for 1 application of chemical control to be applied in the fall. There may need to be another application next year. The procedure is to cut the plant at its base, removed the plant material use an injection method to apply the herbicide.

Conflict of interest forms. Please download and sign

Violations and Compliance issues- none.

10:46 Motion to adjourn by LS 2nd by SC KJ-aye, LS-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye, PP-aye