

**Town of Scituate
Conservation Commission
Selectmen's Hearing Room
Meeting Minutes
July 19, 2017**

Meeting was called to order at 6:18 p.m.

Members Present: Mr. Snow, Ms. Caisse, Mr. Harding, Mr. Parys, and Ms. Scott-Pipes.

Also Present: Patrick Gallivan, Agent, Amy Walkey, Agent and Carol Logue, Secretary

Agenda: Motion to accept the amended agenda to discuss meeting dates Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Snow introduced Amy Walkey: New Conservation Agent & Natural Resource Officer. Commission is happy you decided to come to Scituate and work with the Commission and we look forward to it. Ms. Walkey stated she is happy to be here.

Informal: Dobie, Osprey Nest in Humarock

Mr. Dobie was present. Looking to put up an Osprey nest across from 128 Central Ave., about 60' off the street, in a gravel area, not in the marsh. Mr. Gallivan: we wanted to make sure there was no interference from Audobon, Natural Heritage, or North & South River Watershed. Have received from them all and they were good with it. Just wanted members of public and Commission members to be able to make comments. Ms. Scott-Pipes: as long as the other agencies are happy, could we give a Minor Activity Permit (MAP)? Yes. Mr. Harding loves seeing the Osprey and is thrilled. Mr. Dobie questioned if there was a form to fill out or a fee. Mr. Snow explained the MAP at a cost of \$35, but could we waive that fee since it is a good environmental project? The Commission agreed to waive the fee. Arranged it so it wouldn't fall on anyone's property. Mr. Snow: frustrating to go to all the other boards; unfortunate so many entities. Thanked him. There are a lot of osprey and twice they tried to build a nest twice in a telephone pole. How tall is the pole? 32' feet, it has to be higher than anything else around.

Informal: Atlantic / Barratt (fence)

Mr. Gallivan: There is a request to continue the discussion until the next meeting, but we still have it on the agenda. The owner has been asked to file, planning to, but is not ready yet. Fence was built within a dune that wasn't part of the permit. Notified property owner to take it down or file; still up; also an issue to assess the beach; and needs to be on property line. Think the biggest issue might be to prove it is on the property; we could vote to either allow it or not. If it's not on his property, he doesn't have the right to put it there. We also have something to be read into the record and it will be part of the file. Mr. Snow: is there anything to look at, any kind of a plan? Just some photos. Mr. Harding: understanding is that it is part of the street and that's part of the conjecture and at one time Keith allowed a different fence to be on part of his property. Mr. Dobie was present and showed pictures of a fence from 17 years ago; been on both properties; it has been up and down and at one point it was part of an Order from this board to be put back up. You can see that if there is no fence, the dune is not protected. Ms. Scott-Pipes: how wide is the pathway? About 4'; wide enough for a carriage or a beach cart. Ms. Caisse stated it is 35" wide. Mr. Dobie: property owners each own to the middle of the street. Mr. Gallivan: whether there had been fence in the past or not, once it got knocked down it should have been included in the Notice of Intent and shown how the fence was going on the property line. Not contesting that, but apparently there is one neighbor that wants it down. Trying to keep cars out, had trouble in the past when the fence was down; people getting stuck and causing trouble. Mr. Dobie stated he was in North Carolina when it was put up. It wasn't put up exactly to his liking, should have been zigged zagged. Fence needs to be there and it should be about the width it is. Rights of way is a legal matter between neighbors. Mr. Parys has a problem with someone putting up structures not on their own property; if it is their property they are free to file. We have no drawings to know where the fence is. Mr. Snow: this is an informal discussion. First we are trying to get a picture of what we are discussing and what the issues are. Because we are expecting a filing, we don't need to spend a lot of time without more information. Ms. Scott-Pipes: no expert, but believe it needs to be at least 4' wide for handicapped access; you need to check on that. Mr. Snow: it may be something to do with public access. Mr. Parys: have nothing to say about access issues, but if they want to put a fence on their property they have to apply and they are welcome to do that. Ms. Caisse: has to be on their property. Mr. Snow: there has to be a compelling reason to work in a resource area; has to be a benefit. Mr. Gallivan: they could amend the Order of Conditions, file a Request for Determination, or we could issue a violation of an Open Order of Conditions. There is an Order for the dune out front. Ms. Caisse: part of the pilot program we approved. John Stanton: 130 Central Ave.: it is his access to the beach. Has a photo of what has been constructed by both parties. Have all sorts of pictures down through the years. Called for a fence along the lot line. Close to Atlantic Drive is where the dune is protected. Two people can't pass together, especially with beach chairs. Mr. Snow: if we don't get a filing, we can issue an Enforcement Order (EO); it is a restrictive path. Mr. Parys: have no problem in setting a time line. We put it in the lap of the offender. Remove or file within 30 days. E-mail needs to be sent to applicant to file by the 16th. Mr. Snow: we can see there was work done that appears to go beyond the Orders. Either a show cause hearing, an EO to remove what was not permitted, Amend the Orders or file a new Notice of Intent. Give them a deadline to file by the next meeting. Ms. Caisse: start with two weeks and if they are going to file we can extend. Ms. Walkey: notify us of your intension; tell us what you are going to do; if we don't hear anything, it is an automatic violation. Ms. Scott-Pipes: something has to be filed before August 16, otherwise it might be six months before they file. This has been going on for a year. Mr. Snow: we need to deal with the resource area.

Request for Determination: Donnelly, 140 Jericho Road (asphalt drive from street to front stairs & plantings) (cont.)

Christine Donnelly was present at the hearing. Mr. Gallivan: Commission had asked about past projects. There were no decisions regarding pervious or impervious. Zoning allowed the porch and they went to Building from Zoning. Measured distance from coastal beach and it is beyond 50' in an AE flood zone. There was a three home filing for bank restoration and beach stabilization,

that was done, plantings completed and they all have Certificates. Ms. Scott-Pipes: where's the coastal bank? It is 50' from the beach at the edge of the harbor; it is extremely altered. Mr. Harding: she has done everything we asked; prefer she didn't asphalt, but no reason she can't. Mr. Parys: really developed and it is in the shadow of the house; not going to change coastal flow. Ms. Caisse: we shouldn't be letting people pave. Mr. Gallivan: velocity zone is different from an AE zone. If you keep 50' off the buffer, think we've allowed things in the past. There was some offer of plantings, but should be more beach grass/roga. Mr. Snow: back and forth on some of these projects. Holding firm if it is on a barrier beach, unless people have a strong issue. In this case the houses around have paved driveways. Driveway is 25' x 36' x 6' and in the middle 22' x 6'; 25' at the street. 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)." A planting plan shall be submitted to the Conservation Commission before work begins. Mr. Harding. Second Mr. Parys. Motion passed by a 3 to 2 vote. Need that information before it is started.

Request for Determination: Murphy, 76 Lighthouse Road (remove concrete slab & steps/replace with seawall cement and reinforce as necessary)*

Request for Determination: Marram, 78 Lighthouse Road (remove concrete slab & steps/replace with seawall cement and reinforce as necessary)*

Read both notices together for 76 & 78 Lighthouse. Michael Bonomi, Mary Ann Murphy, 76 Lighthouse and Walter Morse, 78 Lighthouse were present at the hearing. Pictures were submitted to the Commission. Replacing same exact footprint; same dimensions; photos in the file. Ms. Scott-Pipes: as long as same footprint. Just make sure concrete doesn't fall into the harbor. We will dispose of correctly. 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. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Bonomi: 159 Turner Road. There is a 3' x 3' chunk of missing seawall on the property side of the seawall. Mr. Gallivan: DPW won't repair, it is a private seawall. Have the owner call and we can see if it can be a Minor Activity Permit.

Request for Determination: Madan, 75 Kent Street (install permeable paver driveway)*

Sue Madan was present at the hearing. Mr. Gallivan: Enlarging a dirt and gravel driveway, about 15' from the wetland. Mr. Harding: at the Coastal Advisory Meeting last night a group of 8th graders did a whole set of projects of how we could handle various coastal activities and remedies and one of the projects was about permeable pavement and the good and the bad of it. Really encouraging to see creative ideas from the 8th graders; remedies from all over the world. 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. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Town of Scituate/DPW, 430 Chief Justice Cushing Hwy. (reservoir) (cont.)

Tom Cook from Tetra Tech was present at the hearing. Getting very close to finishing the MEPA process. Executive Office asked for a two week extension for comments from Fisheries; extended to July 11, expecting certification to be issued this Friday and public notice on Monday. We will know what is coming in for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Nothing unexpected from Corp of Engineers, EPA, or DEP's different boards; primarily impacts on the vegetation and analysis of the drinking water. Suggest continue hearing to the next meeting to get the formal letters in hand and go over with Pat and Amy before the next meeting. We will want to know what MEPA's and EIR are looking for. Can't approve the project with over 5,000 sq. ft of disturbance. Ms. Walkey: need additional information before we can deny. Once ConCom denies, then we appeal to DEP, they deny and then we request a variance. EIR will probably will take a year to conduct. MEPA's report is the last thing needed? Yes, we will know exactly what everyone is requiring. Judi Aronson, 19 Cudworth: do you know about the other project to flush the well through Tack Factory Pond? That might have some kind of play in what you are trying to do at the reservoir. Mr. Gallivan: there are two other ones; one is to change the manganese in the water and drilling next to the current well to run a pipe through the wetlands. Commission voted, but had to check with DEP; sent to the regional director; under an emergency, they might have a recommendation. Mr. Snow: DPW has proposed to add water to Tack Factory Pond Reservoir. Mr. Cook: DEP has requested a permeable update; will be addressed in the next phase of the design; will impact the analysis. Motion to continue the hearing to August 2, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Bard, 8 Holmes Street (construct & maintain a ramp, pier, canoe & kayak rack, ramp & float)*

Kevin McGuire and Phillip Bard were present at the hearing. Abutters' notification was submitted. Pier is about 50' long and 4' wide; two 25'x12' canoe and kayak rack; 3' x 24' ramp; adjustable float 10' x 16'. Float is located just beyond the mean low water line. Proposing 6 x 6 posts, driven from land; difficult to get a piece of equipment under the bridge. Top of plan shows detail of pier. If we can't get cribbing out there, will use adjustable float shoes 2-1/2' above the water. Pier stops 20' to 22' before the mean low water line. Shore end of float would sit along the water line. Had discussions with harbormaster; looked at it a couple of times; as long as boat traffic wasn't impeded he was comfortable. Ms. Caisse: will be elevated 2-1/2' above the bottom. Probably be 1-1/2'. Seasonal float; taken out in the winter; no piles out in the river. Ms. Scott-Pipes: where are you going to store it. One location is South River Yacht Yard. Can't be stored on the marsh. Filed with Corps at the same time. We have to get through ConCom before Chapter 91. Got the letter from Marine Fisheries. There will be 1" between decking, elevated 4' above the marsh, but in this instance there isn't any marsh. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Burke, 50 Surfside Road (new build)*

Paul Mirabito was present at the hearing. Abutters' notification was submitted. Existing lot west side of Surfside Road. 41,700 sq. ft., borders Musquashicut Pond. Three years ago filed an ANRAD; ORAD has been extended for another three years. Proposing a single family home, garage and open deck. Resource areas BVW, barrier beach, land subject to coastal storm

flowage, AE flood zone, elevation 14'. House would be wood driven piles; 1st floor 2' above base flood at 16'; sewer betterment on the property; water, and natural gas. Lawn area will remain. Driveway will be a clam shell; gravel parking. A strip of *rosa rugosa* will be planted along the edge of the wetland, to protect against intrusion. House 31' off the street. Proposed work is between the 50' and 100' buffer, no work in the 50'. No state performance standards for land subject to coastal storm flowage, but it does meet the bylaw. Does not increase flood water; flat site at elevation 7', slopes to 5'; no poured concrete foundation; and pervious driveway. Receive the DEP file number; no comments. Ms. Scott-Pipes: recently closed two similar projects on Surfside, lawn went all the way down to the wetlands; asked for plantings at the 50' buffer; would also like to see these plantings at the 50'. The Commission agreed. Mr. Gallivan: is the roof drainage captured in the infiltration trench? Yes. Is there a width or number of plants to be put along the buffer? Is there a planting plan? No and no foundation plan at this point. There is an existing lawn area, but could compromise and bring plantings to the 5' contour. Mr. Parys: good compromise. Discussed mitigation for work in the 100' buffer; have a right to ask. Mr. Gallivan: think it is fair because work is being done in a resource area. Mr. Mirabito: the reason quoted performance standards we meet every one of them and not changing grades. Wasn't planning on going any further with the *rosa rugosa*. Mr. Snow: agree with Penny, would like to be consistent. Follow the 5' contour to the corner of the parking lot. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Parys. Motion passed by unanimous vote. Zoning reviews floodplain protection district. New construction cannot take place within the floodplain protection district. This is outside the floodplain protection district. Commission approved 0 Foam Road, ultimately the Zoning Board denied the project. Mr. Mirabito: believed that was in the floodplain protection district.

Enforcement Order: Norton, 23 Sunset Road / McLean Drive

Frank Snow recused himself. The agent can issue the Enforcement Order (EO), but bring to the Commission to ratify. Fill had been put on the site and at one point the isolated wetland and the BVW were connected; asking them to remove the fill. To do that, they need to file a Notice of Intent (NOI). Ms. Scott-Pipes: nothing will go forward with the new filing until this issue is taken care of and a NOI is filed to see how they will remove the fill and a time frame. Referenced 4 lots, but seems to be under 1 ownership. Reluctant to any new information without the property owner here. We will continue this filing, but will not discuss until the violation is taken care of. Gabe Crocker, RPE, representing Jim & Mary Bristol, Susan Maze and Atty. Robert Kruse, representing the abutters. When EO is issued, what is the time line for the NOI? As soon as possible. If we don't get a fast response, we will issue a date. Mr. Gallivan: we have no date at this time, but we can put one on there. Can always modify it if you need to. We did say at the July 19th meeting we will determine a date. File by August 2. Order specific to the illegal fill within McLean Drive and didn't see a mention of the illegal water main and utilities that were installed underneath. Shouldn't we disconnect the private illegal water main? This is the opportunity to do it right. We focused on the wetland connection, but good idea; should run that by legal counsel. Ms. Scott-Pipes: is that water for the fire hydrant? Should talk to DPW and town counsel. Don't think it is turned on, not part of the public water system. We need to make sure. They could also put the hydrant on the public road. Need to address the resource areas. But the resource areas haven't been settled so is this the time, is that part of the NOI being required now, it should be? Mr. Parys: EO isn't usually a delineation of resource areas. Mr. Gallivan: the area where they have filled and where they work will be done is where the wetland might have been and is will be the important part, but the other issue is the whole larger parcel. We've asked why they have included the large parcel, we want to get away from the farm fill. Mr. Parys: needs to be specific as to what is going to be remedied. Mr. Crocker: Sebitia's report said the whole 4.79 was BVW. Mr. Harding: you made some very good points and we need to look at the EO anyway and check with legal counsel.. Atty. Kruse: just using Mr. Grays report as to what we think should be in the EO. Mr. Crocker: also still another fill area not associated with this one; brings us further investigation. Shouldn't it be in the areas identified, or do you keep it separate and issue a separate EO for that section? Step by step – get the fill removed, get the delineations finalized.

Show Cause Hearing: Kamman, 31 Candlewood Drive (working in wetlands)

Jerry and Marjorie Kamman were present. Mr. Snow: this is a Show Cause Hearing for work done in a wetland area at the edge of your field; have some pictures. Looks like the work went into the wetland and possibly onto town property. There is a huge pile of rocks stockpiled. Mr. Kamman: was trying to get a big rock that kept rolling off the pile. Appeared that when you tried to retrieve it, you got into the wetlands; didn't have anything to measure with to determine where the work was in relationship to your property. We worked a long time to resolve the issues. There is also debris from adjacent neighbors in there. Mr. Harding: we have had enough dealings, call and tell us what you want to do. He apologized. Ms. Scott-Pipes: who's property? Town's? Not your property. Mr. Snow doesn't believe it was town's. Looked at the assessor's map and it is difficult to determine, but the town property is fairly close, but can't say for sure. Mr. Kamman: would like to put in a line of electric fence for coyotes and deer; goal is to put a poly fence around the back of the rock pile to access the rocks. The large trees haven't been touched. Ms. Caisse: there is a lot of disruption behind those rocks, after everything the Commission has been through, trees uprooted, brush taken out, trees scared, in quite a large area; vegetation plowed down and moved. Have many pictures of the destruction. By digging, you uprooted trees. Don't think it was a form of destruction? You had no right to disturb that area. Mr. Snow: there was a preexisting wetland line, that wetland would have to get remarked to know where the violation took place; also don't know where the property line is. At Maple Street a person cleared to a stone wall, but it was not the property line. They admitted they didn't know; we had them survey it and worked with them to restore it. If the damage is on town property, that would mean something in addition. Definitely work took place within the wetland resource area. The rock is over the wetland line; will need to be surveyed. Mr. Gallivan: agree with Penny, Richard & Lisa. The Commission went more than half way to compromise with you; then find a whole new area disturbed. We have 100' of jurisdiction, 50' no disturb; need property line surveyed and wetland flagged. We have been through this before. Didn't take any plantings out.. Goal is to have a 7-1/2' fabric fence. We are talking about disturbance now. Would I be able to put netting in? Asking for consideration to protect the orchard; that's the permanent way. Need a permanent edge staked. Mr. Parys: can't take equipment into the wetlands. Mr. Snow: we need to determine what was damaged. Someone has to take a look at and decide what it would take to restore. If on town property that needs to be addressed also. Have to look at a number of things and find out where the property line actually is. Robert Comfort, 147 Tilden Road: concerned with the damage to the trees and wetland that appears to be town owned directly behind my property. Valued asset; will reduce the property value. Some of the trees have turned brown; lack of enforcement will increase the slope. The dead spoken of are the grape vines. Based on a map, anything beyond the orchard is town owned. Mr. Snow: can see where the pear trees are supposed to end. Cleared right to property line. If restoration or fines are required, we need to know where the lines are. Sean Halligan, 36 Eva's Lane: the bobcat runs at all hours of the night; can look at the police report; also called state Environmental Protection Agency. Mr. Kamman: never been out there at 9:30 at night; it was daylight when the police came. Mr.

Snow: our jurisdiction doesn't go into the time of day. Large old growth trees that are severely damaged. If discovered to be town land, we'd be talking to town counsel. Seventeen years this has been going on; thought we'd come to a solution; we are frustrated as well. Mr. Gallivan: what we did on Maple Street is the applicant hired a surveyor and a wetland person. Legal counsel and police have been notified. No excuse to take it as lightly as last time. Mr. Snow: town do it or Mr. Kamman? Mr. Gallivan: why should the town pay for it? Brad Holmes and two others have been out there. The surveyor would have plotted the wetland line; will give Mr. Kamman the name. You will need to contact the surveyor and wetland person. Want to know when the surveyor is coming; call and whoever has time should go out.

Order of Resource Area Delineation: Sheerin, Lit 1 – 90 Ann Vinal Road (resource delineation) (ORAD)

Motion to accept the wetland delineation Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Order of Conditions: Tondorf/Rivershed, 17 New Driftway (grease trap)

Motion to condition the project Ms. Scott-Pipes. Mr. Snow's agenda says Board of Health and Sewer Department is reviewing. We've close the hearing. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Minutes: April 5, 2017 and April 26, 2017

Motion to accept the minutes of April 5, 2017 and April 26, 2017 Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Compliance:

Allman, 3 Jawl – not issuing.

Coastal Advisory Commission: Did not have a quorum, so did not have a formal meeting. Ms. Caisse: the next meeting is for the Coastal Coalition at the South Humarock Civic Association. Report from the 8th Graders were good: one about permeable pavement; they found a removable wall in Denmark, and something else in Tokoyo; they did remarkable research.

Green Connection on Stockbridge Road: Letters have to go out to Green Connection and three others. Should notify the property as well. Pat went out and they haven't done anything and it has been a month.

Sonoco Station: he contacted us; seems willing to cooperate. Old file in archives have to find. Might show what the existing trees were.

Update DPW Determination, main from Well 17A to Tack Factory Road: DEP may not get back to us.

Meeting Times: resolve an issue regarding the schedule for Wednesdays. Have a couple of applications for a new member, hopefully the Selectmen will appoint someone, because Bill is still out of state for FEMA. Paul's schedule is good till the end of the summer. So the thought is to move to Monday nights rather than Wednesdays. Ms. Walkey: Board of Health also meets on Mondays at 6:00 p.m., and there are holidays involved, but maybe if we work with them we can coordinate better. A tentative schedule has been made up. Mr. Harding: If there are a couple different nights we just have to be very clear and make sure it is advertised well. Mr. Snow: it definitely is easier when we can say first and third Wednesdays.

CORRESPONDENCE

June 28, 2017 – July 19, 2017

1. MACC Dues \$552.00 + \$60 for staff
2. Recording of Extension Permit for OofC 68-2525 – Davidson, 34 Bailey's Causeway Bk 48574 pg 231 (in file)
3. Recording of CoC for 68-2606 – O'Neill Construction / Robert O'Neill, 138 Stockbridge Road Bk 48603 pg 321 (in file)
4. Planning Board – Accessory Dwelling Unit Special Permit – 10 Marshfield Ave. – hearing July 27, 2017. Applicant Richard Torsney for 3 accessory dwellings above a business.
5. DEP File #68-2669 – Rivershed – 17 New Driftway (in file)
6. Request to continue Sunset Road to August (in file)
7. Letter from Building to Mr. Valdez re: 164 Turner Road that was substantially demolished without proper permits.
8. Request continuance for Seaside at Scituate, Hatherly & Tilden Roads to July 13th. (in file)
9. Reservoir Dam Water Storage & Fish Passage Improvement Project: ENF has been submitted to MEPA (in file)
10. Planning Board Agenda for July 13, 2017 – meeting in conjunction with Conservation - Toll Bros.
11. Conservation Commission Agenda for July 13, 2017 - meeting in conjunction with Planning - Toll Bros. with a BOH Memo attached (in file)
12. BOH Agenda for July 10, 2017
13. Zoning re: GRANTED 77 Rebecca Road – elevate and reconstruct (they told us it was renovation) (in file)
14. Zoning re: GRANTED 140 Jericho Road to allow: proposed addition, extension or structural change to dwelling, porch on easterly side shall NOT be converted to living space or a foundation constructed capable of supporting a 2nd floor over said porch.
15. Request for Administrative Approval for 68-2628 - 15 Tenth Ave. Additional parking to comply with Planning's requests. Portion of site is located in LSCSF in lawn area and at or near the limit of the 100' buffer; plan attached. (in file)
16. Dobie, re: Osprey pole – Audubon OK, but if in the marsh check with ConCom; NSRWA fabulous idea, Sara Grady will let you know of any guidance; NHESP – not in any Priority Habitat so no further review by NHESP; Mass Wildlife no permits required from them; and DEP has no objections.
17. Recording of OofC for 68-2667 – Murphy, 5 Jason's Lane – Bk 48648 pg 209 (in file)
18. Notification of Abutters re: Burke, 50 Surfside Road (in file)
19. Pictures of 7 Barry's Landing
20. Zoning re: 108 Captain Peirce Road – division of parcel – GRANTED

21. Zoning re: 33 Barker Road – a 748 sq. ft. addition GRANTED
22. Division of Marine Fisheries re: 8 Holmes Street – recommendations: 4 pilings with float stops set at least 2-1/2' above the substrate during periods of low water, otherwise use adjustable float shoes, as the impact will be less than the use of skids' relocate to deeper water, possibly through the use of longer seasonal ramp or an additional bent; needs to be at 2-1/2' of water under the float during low water to minimize impacts to shellfish habitat; no barge groundings be allowed. (in file)
23. Request to postpone the fence issue to the next Commission meeting. Dr. Tornetta is not available to attend.
24. Planning Board re: Form A Application 573 Country Way – 8 Hatchet Rock Road
25. Letter re: fence at Tornetta, Atlantic / Barratt – fence has made access extremely small. (with pictures)
26. Board of Health re: 129 Ann Vinal Road – rubbish and debris accumulated on property. Bldg. and BOH met with owner – meeting again August 29th at 5:30 p.m.
27. DEP File #68-2670 – Bard, 8 Holmes Street (in file)
28. DEP File #68-2671 – Burke, 50 Surfside Road (in file)

Motion to Adjourn Mr. Parys. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Logue, Secretary