TOWN OF HULL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes January 10, 2023

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

(KJ)

Members Absent: none

Staff Present: Chris Krahforst (CK), Conservation Director, Ian MacDonald (IM), Conservation Administrator, Renee

Kiley (RK), Conservation Clerk

Staff Absent: none

6:30

1. Call to Order

a. Review of Agenda, Overview of Hearings Procedure

b. Approval of Draft Minutes – December 27, 2022. Motion to approve minutes as ammended by LS, 2nd by SC. Roll call: KJ-aye, LS-aye, PP-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye.

2. Notices of Intent

a. 25 Bay Street. Map 34/Lot 008 (SE35-1735) Continuation of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Lorraine Shaughnessy for work described as: Repair seawall. Abutter Notification: proof provided. Resource Areas: Costal Bank (vertical buffer bank protected by a coastal engineered structure/seawall), 100-foot buffer zone to Salt Marsh & Coastal Bank, Barrier Beach storm damage prevention, flood control, wildlife habitat); Coastal Dune (storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: FEMA AE 10' (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control).

Representatives: Brad Holmes, Jed Hanlon

Abutters/Others: none

Documents: Proposed Site Plan, Photo from NOI submission.

Hanlon represents the above project. There is an existing concrete seawall that is severely damaged, but is currently structurally sound. Hanlon further described the overall repair needed and identified areas that would be selectively demolished. Proposes to drill and insert epoxy coated rebar, place forms along the wall face and fill with concrete and cure in place. Photo from NOI shown

6:47 Technical difficulty; meeting resumes

Commission: Is there a current Chapter 91 license for this property? Hanlon indicates not, but will obtain as needed. CK: The Commission can vote based on what resources are being impacted and how, and also include a condition that the applicant receive a Chapter 91 license if needed or correspondence from DEP stating that a c.91 license is not needed. The wall appears to be a concrete wall all the way around. There may have been a brick wall there before (as indicated by the disrepair photos). The repair work should be conditioned to be tidal dependent. On the ocean side, there is sea grass and a little washout area. Would the Commission propose stone use with weep holes so water can pass through? Google Earth photo shown. The Commission discussed the wall and fill behind, the adjacent east and west sides property. On the east side there is land, an existing structure, and no seawall. There is a wall on the west side. Commission: During storms with extreme high water, this entire wall is under water. What kind of equipment will need to be on the tidelands? Hanlon: I can't speak for the contractor but I think that on the upland side, the lot side, an air compressor with hoses and chipping guns would be used. These would be hand carried to do the

demolition work. For the form work, including rebar would be hand carried. No heavy equipment is anticipated, no excavators or pile driving is being proposed. Concrete would be pumped into place from the upland area. Commission noted the NOI narrative seemed to be lacking in describing the means and methods, and sedimentation controls for the project. The Commission asked about project duration and timing. Hanlon estimates 2-3 weeks and plenty of intertidal period in which to work 6-8 hrs. per day. The Commission asked if fill would be brought in and Hanlon stated that no fill is proposed. The Commission asked for more clarification on the methods to be used and decided that there needed to be a better narrative provided and asked if the applicant would continue this hearing so that a new more detail narrative be provided and the Commission wanted to do another site visit and also to better understand the existing conditions, included the adjacent property lots.

Motion to continue by LS, 2nd by SC Roll Call. TB-aye, SC=aye, KJ-aye, LS-aye, PP-aye.

b. 102 Edgewater Road. Map 30/Lot 053 (SE35-1741) Opening of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Michael & Cheryl Woolf for work described as: Install 640 square foot asphalt driveway & privacy fence 6" off the ground. Abutter 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. Site visits done: 12/27.

Representatives: Michael & Cheryl Woolf

Abutters/Others: none

Documents: Proposed site plan

The Commission reviewed the project and conducted an additional site visit prior to better understand the neighboring properties and the extent of impervious surfaces in the area and how they might add to the Town's stormwater drainage system of the area. The Commission determined that the runoff from this property isn't going to be an impact and that the proposed driveway should be gently sloped towards the road.

Motion to by LS, with the special condition that the driveway be pitched gently toward the street, 2nd by SC. Roll call: SC-aye, KJ-aye, LS-aye, PP-aye, TB-aye.

c. 259 Kingsley Road. Map 22/Lot 142 (SE35-1742) Opening of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Jeffery Asmar for work described as: Install deck, footings, and concrete pad. Abutter Notification: proof not 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. Site visits done: 1/09/2023.

CK: No evidence of proof of mailing was provided. The Commission did not open this hearing for that reason.

3. Requests for Certificates of Compliance

4. Continued & New Business

5. Violations & Compliance

18 Bay view Street: Fill was brought in off of Ocean Ave, private way. Applicant came to the commission with an RDA and was given a positive determination. Fill, crushed stone was brought in and the work was done. The commission was also is unsure on who owns the property. It is also under c.91. Commission: It looks like the driveway was expanded. CK: We did visit the property and saw the delivery. There is a draft letter of no compliance. CK: It is a private way and thus is appropriate for the owner to sign the NOI. The commission did permit the project (Note by CK: The Commission denied the project in 2000; DEP issued a SOC in 2001). Commission: Can you please pull the previous approved plans.

7:34 Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by LS, 2nd by SC. Roll call: LS-aye, PP-aye, TB-aye, SC-aye, KJ-aye.