

Conservation Commission, October 10, 2012

Town of Scituate

Conservation Commission

Town Hall Selectmen's Hearing Room

Meeting Minutes

October 10, 2012

Meeting was called to order 6:16 at p.m.

Members Present: Mr. Snow, Chairman, Mr. Breitenstein, Mr. Harding, Mr. Jones, Mr. Parys, Ms. Scott-Pipes and Mr. Tufts.

Also Present: Jim O'Connell, Agent and Carol Logue, Secretary

Agenda: Motion to amend the agenda to include Emergency Order for Water Dept. Cornet Stetson Road; Drainage swale at Marine Park; Vote required for sprinkler system at 104 Edward Foster Road; CRS Recertification; Lot 2 Glades Road – eliminate premature to discuss, need Executive Session; Addition of Certificate of Compliance for 274 Gannett Road; Phragmites removal; Remove Certificate of Compliance for 57 Surfside Road; Order of Condition for Mullen, 73 Kane Drive if project is closed Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Request for Determination: Levesque, 315 Clapp Road (addition)*
Frank recused himself. Mr. Levesque was present at the hearing. Addition is going on the back toward leaching field. It is approximately 21' x 24'. Ms. Scott-Pipes: Don't see where the wetland line or the buffer lines are. Is the septic tank going in the buffer zone too? Drawing is older, shed in back is not on the plan. Addition is going where deck is now. The driveway is actually asphalt, not gravel. Mr. O'Connell: Suggest without doing a field survey, he is probably out of the 100' buffer, plus it is an altered area. Mr. Snow suggested he file. Motion for a negative 3 determination "The work described in the Request is within the Buffer Zone, as defined in the regulations, but will not alter an Area subject to protection under the Act. Therefore, said work does not require the filing of a Notice of Intent, subject to the following conditions (if any)." Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones.

Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Request for Determination: Condon, 105 Oceanside Drive (addition)*
Kathy Condon was present at the hearing. Project is a small addition, 3 season room 10' x 10' on the back. It will take up some of the existing deck. Mr. O'Connell: the contractor was supposed to bring in a plot plan and an aerial photo. Ms. Condon submitted a plot plan to the members. Half of the building is in flood zone AE elevation 11, but don't know what the finished elevation of the first floor is. Under the local bylaw has to be 1' above base flood, even if half the house is in the flood zone. Stipulate the addition has to be at elevation 12'. Mr. Jones: existing deck to be rebuilt? Car crashed into her house; moving deck to middle of the house. The drawing will have to reflect that. Can continue the hearing and you come back with the information, or we can close and condition that you submit it. Foundation is not shown. Need complete set of plans, elevation of existing home and the type of foundation for the addition. Better to continue and get all the information. Motion to continue to October 22, 2012 Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: McSharry Brothers, Lot 1 218 First Parish Road (new build) (cont.)

Wetlands Hearing: McSharry Brothers, Lot 2 218 First Parish Road (new build) (cont.)

Lenore White, Wetland Strategies and Mike McSharry were present at the hearing. Commission requested consultant look at the isolated wetlands. Applicant paid the review fee and consultant went to site. Took a while to get the report. Frankly the report talked about the ANRAD not being complete, however, the applicant filed two Notice of Intents for a single-family home on each lot; nothing was mentioned about the homes. Really like to move forward with the proposal and the request for a waiver from the bylaws. There is no way to meet the regs. If we conclude these areas in front are jurisdictional, it renders this two-parcel site unbuildable. There are no portions of these lots beyond the buffer zones. Could be an improvement if the waiver was allowed. There are isolated pockets in front, not shown on previous plans or on the state or federal wetland maps. Perc tests were conducted throughout this lot. There are areas of wetland vegetation

and standing water. Front wetlands are not pristine, believe the applicant can offer something better and protect the wetlands and vernal pool out back. Maybe an area could be protected for recreation, or other mitigation for filling the isolated wetlands. Also possibly could offer a CR on a large rear portion of the lots or maybe donate the back area to the town adjacent to existing town-owned land. Open to other suggestions as well. Mr. O'Connell: Ivas's report was very thorough, jurisdictional wetlands that are not delineated. Bottom line, we don't know where the wetlands are; need to delineate first. The reason we hired Ivas Environmental was to check the wetlands in front. Did a series of soil borings and located vegetation. He came to the conclusion that some of the flags were missing. Report was very clear and made suggestions regarding connecting certain flags. Ms. White: First time he didn't have the right plan; second time I was given one-day notice. Would have been happy to meet him on site and show him the area. Not going to deal with out front. The wetland is confirmed out back. Mark McSharry: Is it wetlands or acceptable perc holes? Soils were good enough to do perc tests. Ms. White: didn't look at soils. Would like to move forward to find out if there is anything we can do on these lots. If there is a 100' setback there is absolutely no room for houses. Let's forgo the Ivas report. Do not want to argue every point of the report. Is the Commission willing to consider a waiver? Proposal is to fill the entire front area. Mr. O'Connell: Possibly should have a conference with Ivas Environmental. Ms. Scott-Pipes: no questions, but maybe there are pieces of property that just aren't developable. Mr. Harding: thinks Jim makes sense with his comments. Mr. Breitenstein: when the ANRAD was brought in, why wasn't the isolated wetlands cleared up then? The areas need to be delineated. At that point didn't know what proposals would come forward or if they would proceed. Figured we would wrestle with the front wetlands when they had a proposal. It is a problem now because we don't know where they are. If all the flags had to move, we still would like to pursue the waiver. Mr. Parys: Seems like we have half an ANRAD. Mr. Jones: we've had our own wetlands person out there and if he says these are jurisdictional, we have to go with what he says. If the whole property had been delineated at the same time, we wouldn't have these issues. Mr. Tufts: too much of a question, should be delineated. Ms. White: The same issue has come up now, as would have been faced back then. She

respectively requested to be on site with Ivas. Mr. Snow: that is not the process we want to pursue. Our consultant should go to the site alone, not be on site and debate. Mr. O'Connell: would you be opposed to flagging it according to the Ivas report? Flags requested to connect are in the isolated wetlands. Mr. Snow: approximately 3,000 feet of isolated wetlands. There is no topo on this plan. There are series of depressions that created wetlands. Mr. Breitenstein: no more than 2500 sq. ft. can be destroyed. Under the bylaw they become bordering vegetated wetlands with specific criteria. There are limits to be allowed. All of our bylaws together basically make this area unbuildable. That's why the request for the waiver. Proposing mitigation as stated above, or there may be other things Commission would rather see go forward. Mr. Jones: do you allow somebody an unbuildable lot, if they give another lot? Seems like we have the necessary information. Can discuss the proposition she has offered. We will have to decide the parameters of the CR and the restriction. Ms. Scott-Pipes: The applicant is saying it is unbuildable, will you give a waiver or not. Have to decide first if we will issue a waiver. Mr. O'Connell: Have the applicant lay out a proposal; it is easier if the Commission has something to respond to. Motion to continue to November 5, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Norton, 159R Glades Road (septic repair) (cont.) Greg Morse, Morse Engineering was present at the hearing. Board of Health has approved. Wetlands are salt marsh, delineated by Brad Holmes. 25', 50' and 100' setbacks are shown on plan. Rerouting the plumbing to the side of the house. New pump chamber 43' off the wetland line; only location possible. All lawn and will restore to lawn. Will place a straw waddle at the limit of work and silt fence when cesspool is filled. Mr. Breitenstein: how long is the system expected to last? 25 to 30 years; can rebuild in the same place. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Kent Street Corp./Duval, 25 Mill Wharf Plaza (bulkhead)*

Ken Duval and Attorney Adam Brodsky were present at the hearing.

Abutters notification was submitted. Basic bulkhead repair; Kent St. Corp. previously did temporary repairs. Repairs are straightforward; replace the deadmen anchors and sheet pilings will remain. Does qualify for a limited project for the maintenance and repair of pier structures. Quickly reviewed aerial photos from the 1960s, would not have to strictly comply, but does meet the performance standards. Located in FEMA AE Flood Zone and land subject to coastal storm flowage, no performance standards under the state regs, but there are under the local bylaw. No increase flows, nothing is going to change, just reanchoring the sheet piling. Mr. Jones: taking out the asphalt? Remove and replace with new asphalt. Repair needs to be done quickly. Should take approximately two weeks. Stockpile on parking area. There is an existing Chapter 91 license, which allows for routine maintenance. How deep? 12' or till refusal. Mr. O'Connell: will require erosion control around the stockpiles. Mr. Snow: off of Edward Foster Road, there is one lone concrete dock, anyway to get that removed? When Mr. Duval was recycling, he asked Mark Patterson to see if he would pull it off the reeds. It's been there from a previous owner. It would be cost prohibitive now. Could ask Steve Warner if he is willing to do it. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Marinilli, Hillcrest Road (new build)*
Greg Morse was present at the hearing Abutters notification was submitted. Project is a new single-family home. Wetlands delineated a couple of months ago. The 50' and 100' buffer lines are shown. Foundation is 51-1/2 from the wetland line. House is placed as far away as possible. Septic 64' from wetland, proposing gravel access, utility connection, and no grading to left or right, Proposing storm water mitigation, roof leaders into a series of underground chambers, 10' off the foundation; encroaching into the 50'. Total 530 square feet in the 50' buffer. Proposed two areas of enhancement plantings 600 sq. ft. each in the buffer zone. Much of the buffer consists of invasive plants. Proposing high bush blueberry and native plantings to create a food source; more than 2 : 1 ratio. Drainage report submitted; no new discharges; gently sloping site. Submitted calculations for pre- and post discharge rates for 2, 10, 25 & 100 year storm events. Minimizing impervious surfaces. There is a maintenance and inspection program

for underground systems. DEP had no comments. Board of Health has not approved yet; waiting for soil evaluation logs, which are not submitted. Ms. Scott-Pipes: what invasive species are growing there now? Entire site is in the 100' buffer zone, virgin piece of land. The new plantings at Marine Park have been suffocated by phragmites. Should get something back for intrusion into the 100' buffer. Mr. Harding: agree with Penny. Mr. Breitenstein: why did you choose dry basins? Felt subsurface system was better for this lot. When you take water away, wetland dries up, than native species don't survive. Will that configuration change the normal course of flow to the wetland? Would it be better as a swale or rain garden? Trying to limit disturbance. Analyzed storm water, which drains to the wetland, but only analyzed the area for development. Holding back an insignificant amount. Not in favor of enhancing the buffer zone. Developed this by looking at Hollett Street and Greenfield properties that were approved. Open to suggestions for mitigation. The quality of the buffer is not a strong habitat. Hollett Street site should have been cleared more; the invasives will take over. Need to consider whether it is truly an enhancement. Are they going to survive or are they going to get overrun. Mr. Parys: only disturbance in the back yard is loam and seed? Yes. Mr. Jones: area in yellow planning to loam and seed? Yes and proposing a stone wall along the 50' line on the active side yard. Would clients be against having fencing along the entire area? Mr. O'Connell: going to see more and more of these projects. Highbush blueberries won't survive. Should take a walk with the wetland scientist. Not only should have a fence, but should have buffer zone plantings 4' on center. Have heard repeatedly about invasives. Need explanation of exactly what they are doing. Are we really adding value for habitat? Don't think it will survive on the south side. Excellent habitat as it is. Need site visit with environmental consultant; need to educate ourselves. Schedule a site visit next Monday or Tuesday. Motion to continue to October 22, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Vinchesi, Clapp Road (gravel drive to municipal land)*

Greg Morse, Morse Engineering was present at the hearing. Abutters notification as submitted. New access road for a 41-acre parcel, 33

acres of which is upland. Property will become Open Space under the care and custody of Conservation, adjacent to the Appleton Field. Mr. Snow received a notice as an abutter. If anyone would prefer he will recuse himself. He has been involved on figuring how this would work. Members suggested to recuse himself from the vote, but be involved in the discussion. East is the south swamp. This is a limited project, all frontage has wetlands across it. Delineated last December by Paul Shea. Located in NEHSP, but have not heard back with their approval. Very small project in the scheme of things, hope to have approval within a month. Roadway will go along western property line; 12' access with 2' shoulders on either side, for a total of 16', to a parking area for approximately 10 vehicles. Meander it around significant trees, while maintaining stonewalls along property lines, with a wider entrance for 1 parking spot in upland. Access can be restricted at times. The area in yellow is the wetland alteration of 4,300 sq. ft., thought to be the best location, alteration and drainage wise. BVW connected with either side of the roadway by culverts, for drainage as well as wildlife. Replication area is 5,100 sq. ft. in the hatched green location on the plan. As part of submittal detailed planting list is included: 41 trees, 92 shrubs, and native species. Transition between road and replication area will be a wetland seed mix. Replication area will be monitored for 2 years. Gravel roadway will be slightly elevated, from approximately 108' to 110'. Parking area entirely outside the 100' buffer zone. Ms. Scott-Pipes: The property has cart paths through it now. This piece of land connects to the south swamp for protection of the water resource area and animals. Restoration plan sounds excellent. Only concern will be the access for the Appleton field. Intent is to continue the access. A significant portion is within the floodplain and watershed protection district. As part of the NOI there is a written narrative. Mr. Jones: the rectangle that goes down the west side is not included in piece? No. Do we need the 5,100 feet of replication? Do we have to disturb that area? State will require a minimum of 1 to 1 ratio; Bylaw calls for a 2 to 1. Could be reduced to the 4,300 sq. ft., but if the town wanted to hold us to a 2 to 1, we would certainly be open to off site mitigation. One of the considerations when planning this was that hopefully it would be a place to have nature walks, and another example of what the Conservation Commission does. Greg Morse has gone to great lengths with this project and putting the replication area

right next to where people would park would be educational. In negotiating with the Crosbie family, because of increased traffic, they wanted another access for their privacy. They have been phenomenal working with the town. Would like a little leeway for shifting the roadway around trees, or any nice features. Want to have that option to tweak it a little bit. Also wondering if there is any possibility of creating 2 or 3 more parking spots outside the gate and the wetland area, because will probably have to keep the gate closed some. Will check, but still within the 50' and 100' buffer. Mr. O'Connell: from a legal prospective need a vote for a waiver or is it all covered under public proposed limited project. Motion to continue to October 22, 2012 at 7:10 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Mullen, 73 Kane Drive (septic repair)*
Phil Spath, Spath Engineering was present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Septic repair. Wetlands line, 50' and 100' buffer marked. Roughly 2' into the buffer zone, couldn't pull it out because of the best perc being #3. Taking out 5' of material to keep a 4' mound. It is a drip system with a pump chamber. Can't put any material over a drip system. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Perkins, 309 Central Ave. (septic repair)*
Applicant's representative requested a continuance. The abutters' notification was submitted. Motion to continue to October 22, 2012 at 7:20 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Show Cause Hearing: Update: Ayer, 28 Otis Ave. (cutting of vegetation)

Owner cleared wetlands. Sent letter asking them to hire a wetland specialist. They hired Greg Morse, Morse Engineering and Brad Holmes. The homeowner needs to plant a fast growing seed mix and set up a haybale line. Ms. Moshfegh, 26 Gardner Road – no water running toward the marsh. Culvert is gone; concerned about basement and septic. Mr. Snow: our concern is runoff and wetlands, stop all work, make sure they put up some siltation, and plant fast growing

grass. We don't have any other directions to give them right now. Once they have a plan to restore the wetlands, you can have input on that. Mr. O'Connell asked DPW to look to see if it was altered. Should have a response from them soon. Heard from a neighbor that instead of the culvert, a pipe was put in. Need an update for October 22.

Request: re: 513 First Parish Road (add an additional catch basin)
Greg Morse, Morse Engineering was present at the hearing. Flooding problem in front of 513. Repair or replacement of the catch basin was mitigation for the work within the 50' buffer. After investigation by the applicant it was not necessary to repair the catch basin, because it was working. Would like to put a new catch basin nearer 513. DPW is going to close any work on roads sometime in November. Mr. O'Connell supports the project because it is in an appropriate place. They need a decision. Amending order would take too long. Allow an Emergency Order and then come back for the amended order. Should they be doing this as part of the storm water management plan? It is an approved plan and the appeal period is over, might have missed that opportunity. Mr. Breitenstein: Before the house was built there wasn't a flooding problem; it was a known discharge point. If it had been such a big deal, the town would have put a catch basin there. The project exasperated the problem; it is project created; the road is scouring. Trying to expedite the process. We can request additional mitigation when amended. Mr. Bjorklund: There was no disturbance in the 50' buffer zone. There was a proposal for 4 times the mitigation, but the Commission preferred to see the catch basin fixed - all the water on site is being handled. The applicant is trying to correct a town problem. Nobody did anything wrong. It is just a better thing to do. Putting street water on their property. Did go there on a rainy day in hindsight, we should have known that this could have occurred when the area was cleared; much better for the site and better for the town. Motion to give an Emergency Certification for the catch basin at 513 First Parish Road Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Snow: received a proposal from Conway School; going before CPC and asking for funding. Basically outlines what was discussed and what they are proposing, hopefully get CPC to fund. This is not a full

proposal, will be after we meet with the graduate students. A little concerned that it is not conclusive. Need to lock in time for the students.

Order of Conditions: Mullen, 73 Kane Drive (septic)

Motion to condition the project Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Parys.

Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Signs: Motion to pay for the "Spit" signs out of the Conservation Fund

Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Parys. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

159 Summer Street – asking for CofC – \$1,400.00 provided to ensure the mitigation gets done. Request to be used for offsite mitigation. Mr. O'Connell reviewed restoration plan. It is a well-designed mitigation plan. Owner and engineer are here. Need to decide about issuing the Certificate of Compliance. Mr. Jones: personally why anything has to be done. Mr. Mirabito: there was the original replication and a 2nd. Wetland crossing for the driveway. Replication was required for the crossing for the driveway. When you drive into the site, there is a small gravel knoll, fairly high, with large trees right in the middle of the proposed replication area. Would have to take down large trees, excavate the soil and bring hydric soils in. Would be doing more harm, stumps would have to be removed and a large area would have to be opened up to bring in the equipment. Makes more sense for off-site mitigation. Mr. Breitenstein: what about native species on the front lawn, row of bushes all along the front. Ms. Scott-Pipes: At least \$500 for each tree removal. Get an estimate on how much it would cost for the replication today. Motion for an additional \$10,000. Mr. Bjorklund: just did a replication of a whole buffer zone area, brought in machinery, put in 90 shrubs and a # of trees. Motion for \$7,500 for the mitigation not done Ms. Scott-Pipes. \$1,400 still in the account. Motion for \$7500 - \$1400 = \$6100 Mr. Jones. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Agents Report: 134 Humarock Beach Road – new pile supported house. Built well for storm damaged prevention. In the Order of Conditions catwalk was supposed to be removable. It was built as sturdy as the house, galvanized caps, with 6 commercial piers under.

Applicant wants to forgo the removable catwalk. Wants to put skirts around the entire house. Not in the plan, not even proposed. If it were a sandy barrier beach, would not recommend, but pretty much all cobble. Only thing that might happen, some of the slats will be destroyed and fly around. In terms of the resource area, believe there is no impact.

Issued Emergency Certificate for Cornet Stetson – one of the town's wells is closed down because of ecoli problems. Water Department wants to put another pipe in the embankment on the side of the road. Need to put a circular pipe to allow the groundwater to have longer contact before it hits the well. Have to put out to bid probably be done next week. Motion to ratify the Emergency Order Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Atty. Nagle requested Mr. O'Connell to issue an Enforcement Order for 30 Inner Harbor Road on Peggotty Beach. Mr. O'Connell thinks it is a relatively minor issue. Three property owners in front of four properties built an artificial dune. Gave exclusive access over the dune to the beach. Mazzola's are elderly, initially he was not allowed to build any access over the dune. Gibbs noticed he is going over the dune. Mr. O'Connell showed pictures to the Commission. If you look closely you can just make out a small footpath. This is town-owned property. Suggests contacting Mr. Mazzola and asking him to file and come in with some type of walkway over the dune, removable for the winter, unless they come to the ComCom under their own initiative. Others don't have footpaths, they have wooden walkways. Mr. Jones: There are roll out mats that would be the cheapest way to go. Another side to the equation is the dune is 2' higher at Mazzola's. His house is on open piles. Sand bulldozed from the road is supposed to go back on the dune, but isn't. There was supposed to be a small narrow parking area. The sand is 6' to 7' high, Gibbs is not necessarily in compliance. Issue an Enforcement Order or encourage him to file? No Enforcement Order.

Mr. O'Connell made site visits for Certificate of Compliance to the following addresses and found them to be in compliance: 9 Hawthorne, 57 Surfside Road, 6 Gannett Pasture Lane, 159 Summer Street

68-964 (aka: 151 Summer); 134 Humarock Beach Road.

Agents Report:

147 Hollett Street – John Zimmer went to site, it appears that they are not mowing in the 50' buffer. Did soil tests.

Haven't gotten around to writing a thank you letter to the Associate members.

Appleton Field: Read the license – It states: #36. The Licensee, at its own expense, agrees to indemnify, defend and save the Town of Scituate, Scituate Conservation Commission, and all of their past, present and future officials, members, officers, agents, employees, representatives, assigns, successors, servants, and designees, harmless from and against any and all actions, demands, omissions, suits, damages, liabilities, losses, costs, expenses, causes of action, and claims, both at law and in equity, brought by any third person on account of, or incident to, arising from or on account of any negligent act or failure of Licensee or his agents or representatives in connection with the Licensee's use of the Property and related activities.

274 Gannett Road: A receipt in the file that shows he bought salt tolerant vegetation, but he planted grass. It may not last, but it is performing its function. If it dies in the future, we will send an Enforcement Order and make him replant. They did regrade and reseed quickly.

Seawall repair work – Maintenance on 2nd and 3rd Cliff. They want to know if they need to file. Will have to clear a temporary roadway; they did a very nice job previously. If we get something in writing showing the maintenance and where and when they are going to do it, that should be sufficient.

Seems to be an increase in requests for Certificate of Compliances. On some projects grass hasn't even started growing. Requesting before the 2-year growing season. If seeding with grass and it is coming up and growing and looks healthy, don't believe have to wait the 2 years..

Adding MP to the DEP Database to remind to check the wetland mitigation.

Think there should be some procedure when changes are made to the website.

Sprinkler System - 104 Edward Foster Road: satellite system, if it going to rain it won't turn on. Orders stated no sprinkler system. Homeowners are going to see about digging a well. Willing to remove in 2 years. Yes, in 2 years take it out. Mr. O'Connell: Important - is there a performance standard for a dune that would prohibit a sprinkler system? Water conservation issue years ago; protect water quality. Mr. Tufts: so inconsistent. For example: because someone builds a catwalk strong, it doesn't have to be removable. Ms. Scott-Pipes: Majority rules, but tired of people of doing what they want to do. I think the catwalk should come out.

Phragmites removal: do you want a filing for 4 to 6 phragmites cut at 24 Alden Road? Upland and wetland plant. Have them come in with a proposal? Mr. Jones: could you answer them by saying you want a scientific approach to eliminating the phragmites? The idea of just cutting it down doesn't make sense. They want to dig it up. This is a major problem, come up with a real scientific approach. Ms. Scott-Pipes: a couple of years ago the whole area was mowed down.

Swale as you enter Marine Park – designed, but not maintained, out of the silt grew some beach grass that they want to clean out, it was designed for drainage.

CRS through great effort Scituate has recertification for another year for a 10% reduction in flood insurance premiums. There are 18 categories that have to be completed. Need information from DPW, the Planning Dept. and Building for elevation certification, to name a few. Had to make up a flyer and send out 500 flyers to repetitive loss properties in the floodplain. All they need are two claims over \$1,000 to be considered repetitive loss. Expense on the town.

Minutes: July 30, 2012, August 13, 2012, August 27, 2012

Motion to approve the minutes of July 30, 2012 Ms. Scott-Pipes.

Second Mr. Tufts. Motion passed by unanimous vote.
Motion to approve the minutes of August 13, 2012 Ms. Scott-Pipes.
Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.
Motion to approve the minutes of August 27, 2012 Ms. Scott-Pipes.
Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

CORRESPONDENCE

September 18, 2012 – October 10, 2012

1. Recording of OofC for 68-2426 – 3 Milton Street (in file)
2. Recording of OofC for 68-2402 - Lot 2 Edward Foster Road (in file)
3. Recording of CofC for 68-2345 – 159 Summer Street (in file)
4. Zoning Board re: Request Flood Plain Special Permit for 145R Glades Road
5. Nationalgrid re: 399 First Parish Road – Circuit Switcher Replacement Project - all work outside buffer zone except portion for staging and area for temporary equipment staging and materials storage during construction
6. Recording of CofC for 68-2209 –154 Turner Road – 102 Scituate Ave. has not been built under same DEP # (in file)
7. Notification to abutters notice re: Marinilli, Hillcrest Road - Storm water Management Bylaw & Wetlands hearing (in file)
8. Notification to abutters notice re: Duval, 25 Mill Wharf Plaza – repair bulkhead (in file)
9. Planning Board Agenda for September 27, 2012
10. Tibbetts Engineering to Army Corps of Engineers re: Scituate Marine Park (in file)
11. The Trustees of Reservations requesting membership
12. Request for CofC for 68-964 – 159 Summer Street (in file)
13. Request for CofC for 68-1214 – 9 Hawthorne Street (in file)
14. Request for CofC for 68-2410 – 274 Gannett Road (in file)
15. Etrusco requesting to use “crush run”, price difference approx. \$6,000.00 from pavers (OK’d per Frank Snow) (in file)
16. Request for Extension for 68-1958 – 238 Central – dock permit expires December. Understanding Permit Extension Act extends for 4 years. If not request at least a 2-year extension (in file)
17. DEP re: 68-1754 – Inspection & on-site visit for CofC – Massey, 134 Humarock Beach (in file)
18. DEP File #68-2433 – Marinilli, Hillcrest Road (in file)

19. The Beacon
20. Request for CofC 68-2348 – 30 Indian Trail – as-built, request, no check (in file)
21. Coastal Services magazine
22. Recording for CofC 68-676 & 68-891 149 Thomas Clapp Road (in file)
23. Recording of OofC for 68-2429 – DiGregorio, 100 Greenfield Lane (in file)
24. Murphy, Hesse . . . re: Fairbanks Trust v Scituate ConCom – Opposition to the Plaintiffs’ Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings and the Defendants’ Cross-Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings and Memo of Law in Support. (in file)
25. Storm water magazine
26. Insurance Services Office – Annual 2012 FEMA NFIP/CRS Recertification – Receipt of completed 2012 NFIP/CRS Recertification for Scituate. This completes the recertification process for 2012 & community remains in good standing.
27. Request for CofC for 68-1430 – 130 Central Avenue – request, engineer’s verification, as-builts, and \$100 (in file)
28. Request for CofC for 68-2019 – 6 Lighthouse Road – request, engineer’s verification, as-builts, and \$100 (in file)
29. Recording for CofC 68-2403 – 6 Gannett Pasture Lane (in file)
30. DEP File # 68-2434 – Mullen, 73 Kane Drive (in file)
31. Request to continue Ayer, 28 Otis Avenue to the next hearing. Morse Engineering has been retained to review recent wetland violation. October 3 walked the site with owner and Brad Holmes, observed areas of disturbance (in file)
32. Planning Board Agenda for October 11, 2012
33. WSP – SELLS – flying services for mapping requirements
34. RiverWatch Newsletter

Meeting adjourned 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Logue, Secretary