



HULL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

253 Atlantic Avenue, 2nd floor

Hull, MA 02045

Phone: 781-925-8102

Fax: 781-925-8509

TUESDAY, July 9, 2019

Members Present: Paul Paquin, Chair, Sean Bannen, Paul Epstein, Lou Sorgi, Jennifer Stone, Tammy Best
Members Absent: Brendan Kilroe
Staff Present: Chris Krahforst, Conservation Administrator; Sarah Clarren, Conservation Assistant
Minutes: No minutes were ready for review.

7:30 Call to order

P. Paquin, Chair, read aloud the charges of the Conservation Commission.

7:35 119 Bay St., Map 33/Lot 102. (SE35-XXXX) Opening of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Margaret Padden** for work described as **replace crushed stone in off-street parking area with asphalt, replace existing fence with vinyl fence with footings.**

Representatives: Kate Padden (owner)

Abutters/Others: Steve Bergstrom (121 Bay St.)

Documents: "Plan of Land" (annotated) – Fagerstrom – 1/23/1989

"Existing and Proposed Conditions Plan" – Nantasket Survey Engineering – 4/24/2017 (new)

"[pictures, 2] – n.d. (new)

M. Padden provided proof of mailing at the hearing. C. Krahforst stated that the proposed project involves converting a crushed stone parking area into an asphalt parking area. He then said that there is a wooden picket fence which will be replaced with vinyl fencing which will include installing footings. K. Padden stated that the project is in the side yard. A Commissioner asked if the fence is in a flood zone, to which C. Krahforst said no.

S. Bergstrom of 121 Bay St said that he filed a NOI to replace a home and was issued an Order of Conditions after abutters were notified. He stated that in discussion with the Zoning Board of Appeals, he had to amend his Order of Conditions. The Commission questioned Bergstrom's point, to which Bergstrom presented his approved Site Plan which shows a section of the fence on his property. It was noted that although the applicant had submitted a survey, the location of the fence had been annotated at a later date than the survey. The Commission suggested that Bergstrom and Padden discuss the removal of the fence and resolve the issue. S. Bergstrom submitted two pictures into the record. K. Padden submitted a picture for the record. The Commission noted that the hearing must be continued due to the fact that there is no DEP File Number.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 6-0;

It was **voted** to:

Continue the Public Hearing to July 23, 2019 at a time TBD.

7:55 27 Beach Ave., Map 23/Lot 004 (SE35-1474) Continuation of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Athanasios Mitropoulos** for work described as **relocate existing wall to property boundaries.**C.

Krahforst noted that the applicant requested a continuance to the next meeting.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 6-0;

It was **voted** to:

Continue the Public Hearing to July 23, 2019 at a time TBD.

7:55 1131 Nantasket Ave., Map 07/Lot 026 (SE35-1481) Opening of a Public Hearing to **Amend the Order of Conditions** filed by **Peter Dewey** for work described as **construct new 2-story house.**

Representatives: David Ray (Surveyor); Peter Dewey (owner)

Abutters/Others: no one spoke

Documents: "Existing & Proposed Conditions Plan" – Nantasket Survey Engineering – 5/20/19, last rev. 6/25/19

"Foundations Plan" – Paul Bonarrigo – 5/21/2019

D. Ray stated that the Commission granted an Order of Conditions to construct a new 2-story house, but the location of the home needs to be shifted. He stated that the footprint will not change from what was previously approved.

One Special Condition was added as follows:

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 6-0;
It was **voted** to:

Close the Public Hearing and **approve** the Order of Conditions. The Order of Conditions was **signed**.

7:58 1133 Nantasket Ave., Map 07/Lot 025 (SE35-XXXX) Opening of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **John Gilbert** for work described as **demolish house**.

Representatives: John Gilbert

Abutters/Others: no one spoke

Documents: "Plot Plan of Land" – Hoyt Land Surveying – 11/20/2014
"Exist. Foundation" – n.d.

J. Gilbert stated that the intention is to rebuild the structure, but at this point in time, the proposed plan involves demolishing the burned home. He noted that the project will need to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. He then noted that he has contracted with D. Ray to survey the property and will also have an environmental survey done to delineate the wetlands.

He noted that there is a substantial amount of home that needs to come down and a tractor trailer may need to be used, but it would reside on the front of the lawn, to which the Commission agreed that would be acceptable, but it should not go in the back of the house, close to the wetland.

One Special Condition to be included as follows: no heavy equipment in the back of the house. The Commission noted that they were unable to close the hearing as no DEP File Number has been issued.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 6-0;
It was **voted** to:

Continue the Public Hearing to July 23, 2019 at a time TBD.

8:05 38 Clifton Ave., Map 31/Lot 002 (SE35-1496) Continuation of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Frederick Shaw** for work described as **restore and replace a seawall that was damaged during the Jan-March 2018 storm**.

Representatives: Frederick Shaw (applicant); Brendan Sullivan (Representative)

Abutters/Others: Debbie Joyce and Roger Bearde (40 Clifton Ave);

Documents: "Site to Accompany NOI – 38 Clifton Avenue" – Cavanaro Consulting – 6/11/2019

B. Sullivan said that since the last hearing, a file number has been issued and that they have submitted a construction sequence. B. Sullivan said that the intention is to construct a wall that is 6-8" deeper than the rubble and mortar wall (what was there before). A Commissioner noted that the wall as constructed is approximately 6' high now and questioned if it went deeper than what the representative is saying, to which B. Sullivan said that it doesn't go deeper; the crushed stone is the base of the wall.

A Commissioner said that the new wall is significantly larger than what was there before and what was permitted; the Commission permitted a wall that was the same as what was there before. The way the wall was constructed will likely cause erosion. A Commissioner said that further information has been submitted showing that the original wall was much smaller than what was constructed. B. Sullivan said that the east side of the original wall had been obliterated during a storm while the westerly side was more intact. Another Commissioner said that an abutting property wanted to re-construct a stronger wall than the original wall and the Commission didn't allow it. The Commissioner then stated that the wall that the applicant constructed is substantially larger than the pre-existing wall and added that the wall that was installed isn't at all like the wall that was pre-existing. The Commissioner added that the Commission allowed the pre-existing wall to be replaced, in-kind and that the wall that was constructed may exacerbate erosion.

C. Krahforst said that he received an email from the previous owner describing the pre-existing wall, which the pre-existing owner constructed. This email was read aloud for the record. B. Sullivan stated that the information was just hearsay. C. Krahforst stated that there is actually no permit for the pre-existing walls in the files. He added that in speaking to an abutter, the abutter relayed that the wall did not extend 3-4' into the ground and it was built on top of rock gravel. A Commissioner stated that administrative boards are allowed to use hearsay, if it is reliable and relevant. C. Krahforst stated that the file contains pictures of the wall before it was 'reconstructed' and what is currently onsite (what the applicant's are requesting a permit for). B. Sullivan presented pictures of the pre-existing wall and an abutting wall. He stated that what was permitted was a stone and mortar wall, but during a site visit with the Conservation Administrator, the contractor received the ok from the Administrator to pour a concrete wall

instead. C. Krahforst stated that for consistency purposes, the neighbor to the right requested to pour concrete on top of the wall instead of putting cinderblocks in (what the pre-existing wall was) , to which the Commission permitted. C. Krahforst stated that in the spirit of consistency, when the contractor requested to do the same thing that the neighbor did with a permit from the Commission, Krahforst agreed that a concrete pour would be consistent with the Commission's decision, but that the wall would need to be faced with a stone and mortar to provide the same rough texture to help dissipate wave energy. He then stated that this in no way meant that he granted permission to excavate and install a 6' wall that is 4 and some odd feet deep in the ground. Krahforst stated that what he approved onsite was based on what the Commission recently granted to a neighboring property to the project area.

A Commissioner said that what is troubling is that the Commission doesn't have proof how far the original wall went into the ground and that an engineer is saying that it was deeper. Another Commissioner stated that through Commissioners' observations from visiting the site and from information from abutters and the previous owner that the pre-existing wall was not as deep as what the engineer is saying. A Commissioner said that it is in close proximity to a soft solution which now may face erosion.

A Commissioner said that the original Order of Conditions was for the replace and repair of a wall. A Commissioner said when the abutting wall was removed and not replaced, it exposed part of this wall; therefore the Commission was able to look at the base of the wall and it's easy to determine that the wall was much less than what was constructed. What has been constructed is more of a concrete poured seawall that will erode the beach. A Commissioner then noted that the wall as constructed goes right next to the abutting property which does not have a hard coastal engineering structure; usually in these situations the Commission requires a 10' buffer (gap) in-between such properties to reduce end effect. Krahforst noted that vegetation is also important.

D. Joyce of 40 Clifton Ave said that she has lived next door to the site for 22 years and that the pre-existing wall was only ornamental and wasn't deep. She submitted a picture of the pre-existing wall. She noted that she was not able to replace a wall on her property that had been removed. She expressed concern over potential flooding and erosion from the wall at 38 Clifton, as constructed. She said that she isn't saying that her neighbor shouldn't have a wall, it just should have been constructed correctly.

B. Sullivan said that he received approval to construct the wall as constructed from the Conservation Administrator, to which the Commission said the Order of Conditions rules. A Commissioner noted that it was the Commissions' belief that the previous wall was ornamental, shallow, small; what was constructed is not what was permitted and could not be allowed as it will impact resource areas. The Commissioner added that the Commission saw the end broken off at the neighbors property and that the pictures that have been submitted speak volumes; what has been constructed is not close to what was permitted. The Commission said that they follow the interests of the Act and protect the resource areas; the way the wall has been constructed will scour the coastline and negatively impact the wetland.

A Commissioner said there is no evidence how far down the original wall was before removing it, to which B. Sullivan said that the contractor had dimensions of the material that was excavated which was 22 cubic yards, which is 6' high, 2' high, 50' long. A Commissioner noted that it appears that everyone tried to do what was right and that there was miscommunication, however, the wall as constructed will adversely impact the abutter as well as resource areas. The Commissioner suggested that the wall be redesigned and cut back to allow for a buffer between the abutting property.

B. Sullivan said that the wall is 2' off the property line and questioned if they could cut back 4' at a 45 degree angle (equates to 6' off property line at the top and the bottom would be below grade within 2-3' of the wall; the wall would be 4-5' off the property line), to which a Commissioner said that in the past a 10' buffer has been conditioned. A Commissioner stated that they would need a revised plan of any changes. Another Commissioner stated that as designed, erosion would cause negative impacts, so the wall should be removed. Another Commissioner agreed and added that it violates the Act.

R. Bearde of 40 Clifton Ave suggested armoring the corner, to which a Commissioner said that would exacerbate erosion. A Commissioner suggested continuing the hearing to allow a plan to be developed that would 1) design vegetated area that protects the dune in front of the wall and 2) show a revised plan protecting the area.

A Commissioner asked if the granite steps are being replaced to which B. Sullivan said they would be and would be flush with the top of the wall.

- L. Sorgi **motioned** that the Commission requests the applicant request a continuance to: 1) Design vegetated area that protects the dune in front of the wall and 2) submit a revised plan protecting the area, including a vegetated berm to alleviate damage

A Commissioner said that they don't know if they'd agree to a revised plan, to which B. Sullivan said that he does not want to engineer a plan that would be denied.

The motion was not seconded; **the motion failed.**

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 5-0-1 (Sorgi abstained);

It was **voted** to:

Close the Public Hearing and **Deny** the Order of Conditions. The Order of Conditions was **signed**.

8:44 Town-owned layout of Beach Ave. opposite 131-145 Beach Ave., Map 21/Lot NA (SE35-1485)

Continuation of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by the **Town of Hull** for work described as **proposed coastal dune restoration.**

Representatives: Jim Lampke (Town Counsel); Leslie Fields (Woods Hole Group)

Abutters/Others: Sarah Kiernan (141 Beach Ave); Arjan Kraan (143 Beach Ave); Robert Galvin (Attorney of Kiernans and McIntosh's); Stan Humphries (consultant to abutters); Amy Lemkin (81 Coburn St); Judi Hass (145 Beach Ave); Rhoda Kanet (170 Samoset Ave)

Documents: "Re: Notice of Intent: Proposed Coastal Dune Restoration for the Town of Hull – ECR – 7/2/19
"FW: WHG Beach Ave. Dune Project" – email thread between Krahforst and Humphries– 7/8/19
"FW: WHG Beach Ave. Dune Project" – email thread between Krahforst and Hoenig
"Re: NOI: Response to ECR Comments on Suggested Alternative" – WHG – 7/9/19
"Re: Alternative Dune Restoration Proposal; 131-145 Beach Avenue, Hull" – CZM – 7/8/19

L. Fields of the Woods Hole Group (WHG) said that the Town of Hull agreed to a continuance from the last hearing, per a request by an abutter, to allow the abutter and their representatives to respond to the Town's proposal. She said the plan has not changed since the last hearing.

R. Galvin, attorney, said that he represents the Kiernan's and McIntosh's. He then said that he yields the floor to Stan Humphries. S. Humphries stated that he submitted a letter last week showing an alternative plan. He suggested that the Commission focus on the value of flood control and focus on preventing overwash and stated that because the locus is an altered area, it could be treated differently than establishing a natural dune. He stated that he has a problem with establishing a natural dune, as it will migrate landward. He suggested that sand fill coir envelopes be considered as an alternate. He said that with multiple layers of coir there would be less chance of sand leaching out. He stated that the graphic that was included in his letter is a vertical exaggeration and added that the sand cover on the seaward and landward side could be vegetated. S. Humphries stated that the envelopes themselves should act as a stop-measure of flooding and added that his proposed alternative would have a 7-10 year lifespan, but within that timeframe, root systems should be established. S. Humphries suggested that the real advantage in the suggested alternative is in the short-term. He added that the suggested alternative would involve a further seaward footprint. He stated that he won't get into the cost of the alternative. He added that Piping Plover habitat is seaward of the concrete wall, but habitat will be impacted by both the Town's proposal and his alternative. S. Humphries stated that he did receive WHG's response to the alternative proposal and CZM's letter that afternoon, but has not had a chance to respond.

A Commissioner questioned the goal of the suggested alternative and if the goal involved preserving parking. S. Humphries stated that ownership is still disputed. A Commissioner noted that applicants can request a permit to do any work, which the Commission reviews. Another Commissioner noted that the suggested alternative encroaches further into plover habitat than the Town's Notice of Intent and added that the cost of the proposed alternative is excessive and would require significant maintenance. It was suggested that if the coir logs aren't established quickly, the coir envelopes will be destroyed. The Commissioner stated that the suggested alternative is not better than the one the Town (the applicant) provided. S. Humphries said that the coir envelopes don't break until their lifespan is up and added that UV rays impact that. A Commissioner asked if it is further seaward that the Town's proposal, to which S. Humphries said it is.

C. Krahforst said that the WHG reviewed the abutters' proposal and determined that it would not be as reliable as the Town's proposal. L. Fields (WHG) said that having anything seaward of the existing dune toe is that it's not at equilibrium with the dune-beach system and said that there is a reason there isn't a dune where the alternative is proposed. A Commissioner asked if coir envelopes would enhance the Town's proposal, to which L. Fields said that having coir rolls further landward would work, but they would need to remain covered and would require more

maintenance than what is proposed. She added that the way the alternative design is designed will be incredibly difficult to maintain and suggested that it would need to be replaced in part or in whole in 3-5 years. L. Fields then added that in terms of supplying sand to the beach, once the sand is in coir rolls there will be less sand migration to the beach. She then estimated that the suggested alternative would involve encroaching/taking of 10,000sq ft of habitat for rare species and would likely not meet the performance standards for that. She stated that the Town's current proposal does also involve habitat, but it is significantly less than the abutters' proposal and has been reviewed and approved by Natural Heritage.

C. Krahforst read CZM's letter aloud for the record. L. Fields then added 2 things to CZM's letter including 1) the alternative proposal is not permissible because it doesn't meet performance standards for habitat and 2) the costs provided are vastly under what they will be and we estimate it to be at least 3 times higher.

R. Galvin, attorney, said that there is some conflict with CZM's letter and what WHG has said; WHG said that coirs would be more robust. The Commission responded by stating that the coirs would encroach on habitat and would require significant maintenance. R. Galvin, attorney, questioned if the sand placed in the area under an Emergency Order could be considered a take. He then stated that the sand was supposed to be removed and that there is a court hearing coming up on 7/22 which will address the question of eminent domain and the property rights. Since 1934, clients have been parking there and therefore we have it by adverse possession. R. Galvin, attorney, then stated that his clients submitted a NOI to conduct maintenance work to remove sand in the area that had been placed by the Town and the Town withdrew their signature from the NOI. The Commission stated that Town Counsel has reviewed the matter and that the Town owns the land. It was added that the plan includes a survey, showing Town ownership. C. Krahforst then noted that the town had the resource areas on site reviewed and experts have stated that the area is a primary dune and removing sand impacts the resource area. He added that protection of the dune is independent from ownership. R. Galvin, attorney, responded by stating that the whole stretch of land, houses and all, if not maintained would return to dune and beach. A Commissioner then responded by stating the area in question is acting as a dune. The Commission then restated the resource areas on site.

A. Kraan said that we are the one house that in the area that has a dune in front of the parking area. He asked how many flood claims are behind the area, to which S. Clarren stated that information is listed in the NOI. A. Kraan then alleged that the sand that the Town placed in the area impacted the Piping Plovers. He stated that he is for a dune, but prefers the coirs. C. Krahforst reiterated that the NOI does include information on Repetitive Loss Properties, but that it doesn't fully represent the amount of flood claims. A. Kraan said that to this date, he hasn't met anyone who has submitted a claim.

Judi Haas of 145 Beach Avenue said that the dune in front of her property extends further seaward than what WHG is saying is feasible.

R. Kanet of 170 Samoset Ave said that she has had losses due to flooding but has no flood insurance, so it wouldn't show up on the data. She then stated that someone filmed a river running down Manomet Avenue during the past winter when the dunes were breached. She stated that as Chair of the Beach Management Committee (BMC), the BMC has continuously worked on the dune, which renourishes itself. She questioned why the Town would consider installing coir envelopes when the dune works and stabilizes itself. She added that in the past, the BMC has looked at alternatives and determine that coirs are not effective when there are high velocity waves and that they are cost prohibitive. She then restated that CZM and WHG have questioned its feasibility in the area suggested.

Judi Haas of 145 Beach Avenue said that the video R. Kanet mentioned was shot from Coburn Street and the water didn't come from the parking areas; she added that she is pro-dune.

A. Lemkin of 81 Coburn St said that she lives behind 131 Beach Avenue and has lived on the property 18 years. She said that her main concern of the area is public safety. She stated that there are a significant number of homes in this neighborhood that are seasonal and the owners don't witness these storms. She said that she's also concerned about a financial issue and potential burden to the town because if there is a storm of significance, which are occurring more frequently, and there are no dunes, the areas behind the gap will be impacted. She then added that parking should not be protected; per Google, 131 Beach Avenue has 100' of frontage on Coburn St, 133 Beach Ave has a two car garage and a 70' driveway, the Firmans have an easement and they have parking on Manomet Ave, 137 Beach Ave has a 2 car garage and a 70' driveway, 139 Beach Ave has a three car garage and 70' of frontage, 141 Beach Avenue has a 12 car parking lot on Manomet and 55' of frontage and 143 Beach Avenue has a four car garage and 60' of frontage. She stated that the abutters have enough parking and that safety and protection should be the top concern. She added that the area isn't being parked on during the winter—cars are moved to

Coburn and elsewhere. A. Lemkin said the safety of the community needs to come first and added that the area is clearly a dune.

L. Fields said that the Town proposal includes a cutthrough for a walkway. J. Lampke, Town Counsel, said that after the last hearing, further clarification should be given; not all openings are bad and that openings that aren't designed and aren't permitted are not good for the dune system. He stated that dune openings are filled in with sand in the winter. He said that the proposal includes an opening, which could be constructed and maintained. He added that if down the road, the Town sees issues with the opening, it could be addressed. He stated that the Town is not trying to keep people off the beach, but is trying to keep the beach off of the people. A Commissioner said that some storms, depending on how the storm hits, affects the dune system. A Commissioner suggested that the dune onsite is immature dune area and is therefore more vulnerable and that the Commission may consider holding off on allowing a path or walkover until the dune has been L. Fields said that if Commission is concerned about the effect of a path will have, a walkover could be postponed until vegetation on the dune is established. R. Kanet of 170 Samoset Ave suggested waiting a year to install an opening and said that the proposed path is 48" wide, but most paths are only 36".

A. Kraan said that the path at Coburn is poorly designed. A. Kraan then asked if the Commission has issued a permit for a walkover path, to which the Commission said it has.

R. Galvin, attorney, asked what the cost estimate for the Town project is, to which L. Fields said that it will be approximately \$40/yard and it is approximately 1200 cubic yards, which equates to just under \$50,000. She said that this total doesn't include the grass. She said that maintenance costs will depend on storm impacts, which are hard to assess. A. Kraan asked if the plan has a proposed maintenance plan, to which the Commission said the Beach Management Plan includes dune maintenance. A. Kraan asked what the sand source would be, to which L. Fields said that sand analysis has been done, so at the time of construction, sediment analysis would be done on available sand sources and the most compatible one would be selected. C. Krahforst said that when they get this information, another public meeting would be held.

A. Kraan asked what the level of confidence that if the coir logs are not used if the dune will still be there if we get a storm like what we had last March, to which C. Krahforst said that the WHG did modeling showing different storms and the design providing the most coverage and longevity was selected. A. Kraan asked what happens if the sand ends up on Beach Avenue, to which J. Lampke, Town Counsel, said that clean sand is collected by the DPW to be reused on the dune to nourish as needed. B. Hass of 145 Beach Avenue asked if the sand ends up on their property, if the town is liable for the sand and its removal, to which the Commission said no.

R. Galvin, attorney, asked for an opportunity to respond to the letters. J. Lampke, Town Counsel, said that the Town would like to move forward with the original Town proposal.

A. Kraan said that he's tried to come to a solution with the Town on this issue and alleged that the Town has been disingenuous, to which the Commission strongly disagreed. L. Fields of WHG added that she and the Town met with abutters back in February who had alleged that they had a proposal, but it wasn't until last week that the Town received any alternative or form of a plan, in writing; there had been plenty of time to submit information. C. Krahforst said that this information was put online and mailings were sent out.

Three Special Conditions were added as follows:

- 1) The location and design of any pedestrian accessway is to be deferred until after the Conservation Commission or its designee determines adequate establishment of the proposed vegetated dune and subsequent public hearing review by the Commission.
- 2) The source of sand material for dune restoration must be approved by the Commission and requires a public hearing before the Commission prior to its use in dune restoration.
- 3) Conditions required by Mass Fish & Wildlife, Natural Heritage Program (referred below as the "Division"), shall be as follows:
 - a. Work associated with dune restoration shall not be conducted during the period **April 1 – August 31**.
 - b. The applicant has the responsibility of protecting breeding Piping Plovers and state-listed species of terns that may be on this section of beach. Therefore, the applicant must allow regular monitoring for the presence of Piping Plovers and terns by a qualified shorebird monitor, as determined by the Division, during the period April 1 – August 31 and shall allow any nests, scrapes, or unfledged chicks to be protected with symbolic fencing (warning signs and twine fencing).
 - c. Authorization by the Division is valid for 5 years from the date of issuance of this Order of Conditions and limited to the project described therein.

d. If the need to renew, extend, or amend this Order of Conditions arises, the applicant shall contact the Division for written response regarding the impacts to the Resource Area Habitat of state-listed wildlife.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 6-0;
It was **voted** to:

Close the Public Hearing and **Approve** the Order of Conditions, based on the original, Town of Hull's Notice of Intent. The Order of Conditions was **signed**.

Murphy asked why the accessway would not be installed, to which the Commission said that it may once the dune has been established; the Commission added that the accessway likely wouldn't be used in the winter.

R. Galvin, attorney, asked if the Order of Conditions was being issued under the WPA or the Bylaw, to which the Commission said WPA.

10:14 Hull Shore Drive Extension. Map 27/Lot 061 Opening of a Public Hearing on the Request for Determination of Applicability filed by Hull Redevelopment Authority to repair existing concrete stair access to Nantasket Beach.

S. Clarren stated that a representative of the project verbally requested a continuance to the next meeting.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 6-0;
It was **voted** to:

Continue the Public Hearing to July 23, 2019 at a time TBD.

Certificates of Compliances

36 Cadish Avenue (SE35-1400): Diane and Michael Cohen were present. Krahforst said that he received an as-built and it doesn't appear that elevations are that different from what was approved. He read aloud two letters submitted by trustees of the property. A. Perry said three additional small drywells were installed in addition to mitigate for runoff. K. Nolan stated that she met with the DPW who checked out pictures and said that he thought it was a road issue. The Commission determined that the water onsite may not be because of the permitted building. – P. Epstein **Motion**, S. Bannen **2nd**, **vote 6-0**; CoC issued.

10 Dighton: C. Krahforst noted that the Department received an email from the owner who is currently trying to find an As-Built Plan. No action.

Cobble Pilot: – P. Epstein **Motion**, S. Bannen **2nd**, **vote 6-0**; CoC issued.

RR Bed (Se3-1431): – P. Epstein **Motion**, S. Bannen **2nd**, **vote 6-0**; CoC issued.

Continued and New Business

Permitting Inquiries: 12 Q St deck extension- Emily and John Mercer were present. The Commission determined that the deck is approximately the same size as what was permitted and therefore no further permitting is necessary. 14 Brewster – paver apron. The Commission determined that a paver apron should go through the permitting process and an RDA should be filed.

SE35-1495: S. Clarren noted that the polymer injection permit request (SE35-1495) had been continued to 7/9, but it did not make the agenda. – P. Epstein **Motion**, S. Bannen **2nd**, **vote 6-0**; Continue SE35-1495 to the next meeting.

New Business: A Commissioner expressed concern about enforcement issues. Upon a motion by Epstein, **2nd** by S. Bannen and a vote 6-0, the Commission voted to have P. Paquin draft a letter on behalf of the Commission to the Police Department to request assistance in investigating unpermitted activities. Commission requests police to assist in enforcement.

- 11:05** Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein and **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 6-0;
It was **voted** to: Adjourn

Other people in attendance: Carol Britton Meyer, Hull Times; Susan Green (71 B St)

Please note that other people may have been in attendance; a sign-in sheet was passed around, but only one sheet was returned at the end of the meeting.