

**Town of Scituate
Conservation Commission
Town Hall Selectmen's Hearing Room
Meeting Minutes
June 29, 2016**

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

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

Also Present: Patrick Gallivan, Agent, Carol Logue, Secretary

Agenda: Motion to amend the agenda to delete Whitley, 9 Lightship Lane for Orders and replace with Cote, 135 Humarock Beach (r/r). Certificates of Compliances: delete 125 Captain Peirce Road and add 43 Whittier Drive. Request to review a revised plans for 108 Edward Foster Road Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Schmid. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Informal: Ballfield/Parking Beaver Dam Rd.: Dan Fennelly, 10 Highland Crossing, President of Scituate Little League as well as on the subcommittee for field use for Recreation. First project is putting a parking lot at Roach Field / Beaver Dam. About 25 cars come to each game and there are about 12 spots, rest park on the street or in the neighborhood; a very unsafe situation. Want to add on to the existing parking lot to eliminate the problem. Proposing 100' x 200' lot behind the batting cage in right field that has a fairly flat area with trees; large enough for about 50 cars, based on current standards for parking. Entrance and exit is in a good location for visibility. Entrance would be paved going up a slight hill and the lot itself would be gravel. Trying to make the project as simple and inexpensive as possible; looking for CPC money. Lot will be open in the spring and summer and a chain across for the winter. It is close to the field for visibility for the police. How does this involve Conservation? Wanted to cover all the bases before making CPC proposal. Met with police, who gave contingent approval based on the final plan, DPW, Selectmen, Planning; all informally. It was suggested that we have a meeting with abutters and put a legal notice in the Mariner. May be moving it a little closer to the batting cage fence, which is about 20' or 30' from the edge of bushes and trees and parking would go to that edge. May not have to file, but at worst it would be an RDA; the wetland is beyond the stone wall, down by the railroad tracks. The closer to the ballfield the better; need to see final approved plans. Looking for Conservation support. Good project, no reason Commission wouldn't support.

Informal: Dog Park Discussion: Adrienne Rowles was present; Andrew Boyle could not attend. Fact sheet was passed around. Looking at town property directly in front of Go Green. There is only one other resident and they were in favor; considering 2 acres. Large dogs would have one full acre and small dogs would have half an acre with a 20 car parking area. Have actively received over a 1000 signatures; should be able to get 2500. Question is how do you feel about the location? Go Green is with DPW. Only thing if you found that you have resistance and you moved more toward Driftway Park, at some point there are wetlands in the back. Conservation parcel is about 8+ acres, the other land is leased from the town for Go Green. This is the area DPW was using for a little nursery. The Commission stated when you want to stake it out, they would be glad to go out and take a look. Meeting with TA and DPW next week and requesting funds from CPC sometime over the next 60 days. Try and keep the places clean, that's one of the issues we have keeping trails clean.

Request for Determination: Historical Society, 16 Country Way (install steps for access to Gristmill) (cont.)
Motion to continue to the hearing to September 7, 2016 Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Parys. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Request for Determination: Rodriguez, 23 Pleasant Street (septic repair)*
Jeff Hassett from Morse Engineering and Fidelio Rodriguez were present at the hearing. The permit has expired and it is a failed system. House is a four bedroom, generally flat, with two pits. Wetland ditch connected to a buried pipe. Showing 100' to the pipe. 1500 septic tank, 1000 gallon pump chamber, leaching has been put as far from the ditch as possible, approximately 50+'. Straw wattles may work on this lot. Where the pool and patio were there is a lot of concrete and debris that needs to be cleaned up. Applicant wants to get it looking respectable. 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: Olschan/Shweky, 24 Webster Street (concrete walls) (cont.)
Atty. Adam Brodsky was present at the hearing. Reconstructed burned down building. Discussed the walls that are perpendicular and parallel to the ocean. Mr. Brodsky stated that the clients were allowed to retain the walls. Plans showed walls and the applicant applied and received a Certificate of Compliance. After the Certificate was issued the mason came and repaired the existing parallel walls on the north side and added blocks on south side. Homeowners received a letter; thought we'd reached an agreement. They are above the AO flood elevation. Agree the beach side wall will impede flow and needs to be brought down to grade. Willing to remove the additional blocks parallel to the beach. Hired Stan Humphries, a coastal geologist, and he submitted a report. He agreed with the parallel walls, but the perpendicular walls will not affect coastal storm flowage. Superimposed the flood elevation on the pictures. Exhibit 2: remove four courses on the front facing side under the porch and three in the center. Client insists there was a wall under the stairs. Stan stated that it complies with the WPA and local bylaw. Ms. Scott-Pipes respectfully disagrees with most of what was said. Wall in front is basically to retain the dune. The only other thing he wanted was to save the south side for the court yard, but the court yard is no longer there; see no reason for any of the walls to be raised up. Front retaining wall, perpendicular and parallel underneath the house are not supposed to be there. Stan has calculated the amount of walls to removed. If this was a new house, walls would never be allowed. Parallel wall was not there, it was a staircase to the courtyard. Mr. Brodsky: Regardless it complies with the WPA. Mr. Schmid: asked the applicant to hire a coastal geologist, seems reasonable to follow his parameters. Mr. Harding: have to agree with almost everything Penny said. There was very little discussion about the walls, because there was no disagreement. What was gone was to stay gone. A Certificate was issued and then work was done. The water does not always come in at one direction; it may be legal, but it is not smart and would deflect water to the abutters. Mr. Parys: This is not what was represented.

Section near patio and section on side is very different than what was existing. When you put a house on pilings you remove the foundation. Mr. Brodsky: South side, Exhibit 1 wall was damaged by the firemen and rebuilt to the exact previous height. Commission has a problem with the perpendicular walls on the north and south side. If the client is instructed to remove them, Mr. Brodsky has been asked to withdraw the application. Ms. Caisse: attest to the fact that it is not correct that only the north facing wall will get water; Humarock is unique. Mason wasn't available until fall; work was done in October. Mr. Gallivan: disagree with Stan's letter that they meet the performance standards. This contradicts their Notice of Intent which states: "The proposed project will replace an existing full foundation with a pier foundation, thus allowing coastal flood waters to run under the structure. . ." That's why there wasn't discussion about the walls. House two doors down was allowed to keep the wall and patio area in front; made some concessions. Don't believe because the house was destroyed by fire, that we should allow items that don't meet the performance standards. Mr. Snow: allowed the patio wall, but when visited with Carmen Hudson, everything else was going. Not clear in the minutes or plans what was agreed to. Best recollection beyond the wall for the patio is the wall on the south side where the wrought iron fence is, was steps and privacy to the courtyard., but it was not 4 courses higher; there was some give and take. Unfortunately this is not a clear cut issue. Mr. Gallivan: the biggest issue is that the house is on pilings. Mr. Parys: they did ask to leave the high privacy wall, but it is higher, look at the original plan, shows 6 stairs then 3 stairs. Also asked to keep the retaining wall at grade and a wall where the sliders were. Letter from LEC states that the walls will not significantly change the flow around the house. Mr. Schmid: Rebecca Haney doesn't agree. Mr. Gallivan: But the original proposal stated they would remove the walls; state performance standards are not met. We could talk to the property owner to request another coastal geologist. Rebecca Haney said they all had to come down. Mr. Brodsky: North wall is not going to get lowered anymore. Ask that you not close; withdrawing the filing. There is no alteration of the resource areas. In this location there was a fire; they have the right to rebuild. Ms. Caisse: regardless of a fire, if you elevate it allows flow. Mr. Parys: if you took everything from the south privacy wall to the north down to grade it would be pretty close to what was discussed, but privacy wall has to come down 4 courses. Take the walls under the house down to grade. Actually shouldn't get into the number of courses, just stay with the grade. Mr. Snow: a Certificate of Compliance was issued with the walls there? We rely on the Notice and engineer's verification. The applicant has the right to withdraw, or we can close or continue. If we close, we set orders, which could either be an approval or denial. Or they can withdraw and we will have to take action for removal of the walls. Can't gamble on a denial; not asking for a vote. Mr. Schmid, Ms. Caisse and Mr. Parys: take walls down to grade between the south and north wall and remove everything underneath that was added; against all height that was added. Mr. Brodsky withdrew the application.

Wetlands Hearing: Friedman, 134 Oceanside Drive (porch addition)*

Jeff Hassett from Morse Engineering and David Friedman were present at the hearing. Abutters' notification was submitted. Atlantic ocean is to the east. Deck wraps around. On ocean side currently there is an open deck with a roof; no living space above. Extend first floor deck an additional 4', second floor roof, converted to a second floor deck in the same footprint. Sonotubes will be replaced by big foot sonotubes. All work in existing lawn. Anticipate 4 to 5 sonotubes. Currently the deck extends 8' and extending an additional 4' x 35'. Might leave existing steps and extend 2 additional steps. Back from the seawall about 90'. Mr. Harding: any additional disturbance putting in sonotubes? Will use a small excavator; easy access around the right side. 2016 floodplain is lowered by 1'. Request a narrative. What about wooden pilings to get away from the big foot design? Would think could use a pile driver rig. Mr. Snow: should use a big foot to support the stairs; combination of driven piles and big foot sonotubes. Thought they were poured concrete without the big foot. Understood the big foot was required. Then again the building department will be looking at it. Haus Mueller Collin, just south closer to the seawall; will lose site of Minot, it will change the entire setting, block line of sight, plus the waves will come right over the deck and into his house. Mr. Snow: line of sight can't be our concern; we deal with the resource areas. Possibility of damage; this house sits on a full foundation. Wouldn't approve a solid foundation. By putting the deck on sonotubes, water will go under it. That house was knocked off the foundation in 1978. Previous owner put an addition on the upper floor, lost line of site. Roof is not extending any farther; roof line isn't changing. Upstairs deck is only 8' off the house not 12'. Motion for a close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Schmid. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Amelang, 27 Mordecai Lincoln Road (barn & septic)*

Brendan Sullivan from Cavanaro Consulting and Todd Amelang were present at the hearing. Abutters' notification was submitted. Voluntarily upgrading septic system. This is two condo unit, Todd's mom lives in Unit 1. Resource areas: Bound Brook in back, BVW, and land subject to flooding. Most work is outside the BVW 100'. There is an existing shed that is to be razed. In the outer riparian zone there will be a 26' x 46' barn, with a concrete apron and gravel drive extension. Original cottage removed in 2012 and paved drive removed; gravel now. Ms. Scott-Pipes: did think the shed was supposed to be removed with the last filing. Also question going back that far on the lot for the barn. That would be within the 100' to 200'. Mr. Schmid: does it matter how long ago the impervious was removed? No, the biggest thing is there was something removed from the 100' inner riparian zone. Ms. Scott-Pipes: Board of Health approval yet? No. If anything the system would come closer to the house. Mr. Gallivan: Notice of Intent was comprehensive with an alternative analysis. Any kind of mitigation, lawn goes right to the river? Maybe there could be some plantings. Possibly at the 50' or 75' buffer line it could go left in a natural state, maybe mow once or twice a year; keep cut, but keep high. Donna Foley, 30 Mordecai Lincoln Road: It can be only one story? Mr. Snow: Commission has jurisdiction on impacts to the ground. That would be Building or Zoning question. Martha Paradis, 25 Mordecai Lincoln Road: groundwater is extremely high, with every septic system, we add another sump pump. Raising the grade a little. As far as disturbance from septs, typically they leach much better; we look at that as a gain. Just seems like there is a shift in groundwater. Do we want to close this, or do we want to keep it open for Board of Health approval? Need to sign a waiver because we won't be meeting again until July 20. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote. Move shed.

Wetlands Hearing: Sheehan/Garrity Asphalt Reclaiming, 227 & 234 CJCH (clean up petroleum from machine fire)*

Kevin Sheehan, wetlands scientist from Tetra Tech and Jeff Garrison, licensed site professional were present at the hearing. Abutters' notification was submitted. Machine was scrapping down the asphalt and burst into flames and fire melted a hydraulic hose; lost a substantial amount of hydraulic oil. The fire department extinguished the fire and all that material washed down to catch basins. Catch basins flow north and drainage comes out to the west side to a pond. When the water gets high enough it then flows to a culvert pipe to a second wetland. There are wetlands to the west and east. The plan shows the BVW in green and blue is the intermittent stream bank. A little bit of flow across the culvert, therefore contamination on the west side and just over 100' on east side. Commission issued an Emergency Certification, but unfortunately weren't able to get out there during the 60 days the Emergency Certification was valid. Pads have kept it from migrating any further. Under MA contingency plan, sediment criteria is more strict and the residuals exceed that criteria. What is proposed on both sides of the road (crossed hatched area shown on the plan) and intermittent stream areas, excavate down one foot and replace in kind. Plan shows access on both sides. Cut vegetation down to grade, lay planks or swamp mats, go in with a mini-excavator. No overnight stockpiling, removed the same day it is excavated. New material brought in, pull out contaminated material and put new material in, then pull out mats.

Then when everything is stabilized go in and do the plantings. Stream channel: line bank with coconut fiber logs; they last a long time to allow stabilization of the bank. Ms. Scott-Pipes: contamination only goes down one foot? Yes. This is just beyond PJs. Mr. Schmid: stream flowing? Dry this week; it is not a very big watershed. In the spring as much as 6" of water. Matching the appropriate soils? Sandy loam top soil; concluded a good top soil is a pretty good match. Mr. Gallivan: number of comments from DEP. There is a string of regs. Tend to match the vegetation on the planting plan. Want the wetland dry. Kind of why we waited this long. Pat will talk to DEP tomorrow to see if they can start before the orders are issued. Abutters gave permission to go through their property. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Diamond Development, 101, 103 & 105 Hatherly Road (common drive, drainage improvements & detention basin)* Brad Holmes, ERC and Steven Bjorklund were present at the hearing. Abutters' notification was submitted. Notice of Intent for a residential compound development at 101, 103 & 105 Hatherly Road. A few months ago filed an ANRAD application to delineate the BVW in the eastern portion of the site. Currently there is a single family residence at 105 with existing paved driveway and attached garage; 2.76 acre parcel, which will be removed. There is an outlet that discharges to the drainage system which we are going to try and fix. Proposing three new single family dwellings with removal of the existing dwelling which is where the drainage system will be installed. All development is outside the buffer zone. Location of driveway and stormwater basin are within the buffer zone. Under four dwellings doesn't require DEP stormwater management standards, but stormwater is triggered under the local bylaw and meeting best management practices under the state regs. Driveway and utilities, all designed between the 50' and 100' buffer. Headwall will be fixed to repair culvert. Brown shading on the plan is heavily dominated by Japanese knotweed. Going to coordinate with Chris Polatin, licensed pesticide applicator to treat knotweed. They work over a 3 year period. After treatment wildlife seed mix will be planted. Proposing mitigation shrubs and wildlife seed mix to enhance the buffer and stabilize the area. A residential compound driveway can serve up to five homes requiring a 20' driveway, but that can be waived down to 18' by the Planning Board with the consent of the fire chief, and Pat sent confirmation for 18' as well, which has been done already. Drainage was designed on a 20' so there is a safety factor in there. Mr. Schmid: amount of disturbance in the 50' and 100' buffer; at what ratio is the remediation to the disturbance? Fixing area already disturbed, with the exception of the knotweed treatment; adding better plantings, but corner of the house is in the 50' buffer, but it is within an area already disturbed and it is basically regrading and replanting. Mr. Gallivan: could Steve go through the rundown of the SWIPP plan - Stormwater Pollution Prevent Plan once a certain amount is disturbed. EPA actually requires it. Consists of one page, plus details that shows all the erosion controls. It is a during construction type of plan: crushed stone stabilized entrance, show where material will be stockpiled, areas for refueling machinery, storage if machinery is left on site, as well as construction or storage trailers. Everything is located outside Conservation jurisdiction. It is filed online and have to have plan on site if you don't hear back within 14 days you are OK to start. Planning Board wanted them file for the SWIPP before their approval and it is approved. General flow of water is down front, accepts a lot of water now, replacing pipe and a water quality swale goes to the manhole down to the ocean. Peter Palmieri from Merrill went through the 10 DEP stormwater standards; they meet all best management standards. Is the tree line shown on the plan going to remain the tree line? Most of the tree line in Commission jurisdiction is set in stone, but out of jurisdiction wants to be sure it would be possible to remove one. All the homes will be served by town sewer. Infiltrators will be used for the roof runoff. Is the headway entirely in the buffer? Filed to disturb 200 sq. ft. Have to find the pipe and set the headwall right at the edge of the wetland. Alteration in the 50' buffer is small. Essentially restoring 200 sq. ft.; more of a temporary disturbance. Basically the area above the wetland line is all fill; once cleaned up should be better. Mr. Snow: Concerned about that pipe, Dreamwold had a pipe that didn't go anywhere. DPW is asking him to replace that pipe. Maybe divide some of the numbers of shrubs, unless you think it is better to cluster by the wetland line; Brad knows better. John Adams, 65 Booth Hill Road, owns 99 Hatherly: in 1995 septic was condemned, same contour as the headwall. Whatever is put into the headwall will go into his property. Mr. Snow: that headwall is draining that area. If something happens with that, then he has more of an issue; detention is proposed. Mr. Holmes: by fixing that headwall and letting it drain out, there will be less water. Additional detention area is uphill from the present wetland. Flat in the wetland area, some water just stands there, hoping it will eliminate some of the water once the pipe is repaired. Now water comes uncontrolled to the wetland. Less water will go into the town drainage system; hoping engineers did it right. Do we want to wait to see what Planning says and see what Merrill's letter says? Need a waiver signed. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Schmid. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Request for Determination: Murphy, 145 Captain Pierce Road (septic repair/leaching field)*

Rob Carlezone from Grady Consulting was present at the hearing. Existing dwelling with a 1500 gallon tank and leaching system. Wetlands are on right side of property. Proposing to retain existing septic tank 63' from wetland and replace leaching system 72.9' away. Proposing silt fence for erosion control that also marks work limit. Mr. Gallivan: wetland line really old, not confirming the line, seems closer than it was in 2006, but everything is over 50' away. There is some yard waste and debris. When you have the equipment there pull out the debris. 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.

Request for Determination: Williamson, Tr., 153 Jericho Road (remove debris behind 153/bring in sand)*

Edward Williamson, Trustee was present at the hearing. Getting with the other units to have debris removed from behind the property. It's an eye soar; there are big pieces of cement, pallets, metal and construction material. Would like to clean it up and bring some sand in. There are 2 kids that live there and play in the back. Will have to dig out some stuff, but will save the rosa rogaza. All the vegetation should stay in place. Any replanting? Mike Adams: own property at 147 & 129 Jericho. Don't know how much material is being added. Storms come in at the back of the parking lot and end up in the driveways to 147 & 149 Jericho. It is lower now, just put sand back. The debris looks like construction debris that was scoured out; good to clean up. How much material? How we would stop it from scouring? Thinking maybe a couple of large stones to prevent the sand from being washed out. Probably a couple of truck loads of sand. Mr. Adams: Maybe a couple of stones would break the flow; it is not an access point now. Another idea would plant some seagrass. Would be in favor of cleaning up, probably plantings would be better. Mr. Gallivan: bring it up to grade, we don't create walls down there. Mr. Snow: Rosa rogosa is a prickly rose bush; maybe some grasses that have deep roots. Vegetation would help erosion. Motion for negative 3 - "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. Schmid. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Lisa Caisse recused herself.

Request for Determination: McDonough Paving / Libertine, 240 Central Ave. (remove section of asphalt/repair and resurface)*

Kevin McDonough was present at the hearing. Photos were submitted. Residual stone at the right side of house and portions of the driveway are actually missing. Don't know what the condition is until it is cleaned up. Maybe able to salvage underneath the deck. May have to replace most of it. Footprint stays the same. Portion dug up to dig up the water line. Could remove a little of the area under the deck. Lift all the asphalt, regrade and repave. Mr. Snow: We look for a little loss of impervious. Gravel won't work, she is elderly. 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.

Request for Determination: Gerroir, 14 Stone Ave. (addition)*

Dan Quale, Architect and Michael & Lisle Gerroir were present at the hearing. Surveyed by Ross Engineering. Extend house 12'. The existing site contours are 10 to 15'. First floor elevation is 18'.1; second floor will be up about 9' more feet. Flood zone A. Either on piers or sonotubes, originally a full foundation. No structural engineered plans yet. Adding some flood vents. 2012 map doesn't show it in a flood zone. FEMA 2016 will impact the property. More of a concern is the foundation. In an A zone, can have a full foundation. New construction would need to be a 1' above base flood elevation. Mr. Parys: won't help to have it 1' higher with the addition, because the rest of the structure isn't. Mr. Snow: the only way would be if they raised the whole house. Whether or not you do the addition the new flood maps will determine if you are in compliance or not. Thought it might be better to put addition on piers. You can do either piers or foundation. 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.

Request for Determination: Francis, 82 Pheasant Hill Drive (in ground pool)*

Kristine Allman with Aquanot Pools was present at the hearing. Proposing an in ground gunite pool. Small 10 x 10 area where there is a small rock wall. Intermittent stream is a 100' buffer; BVW is 10' off the stream. There is a shared septic serves 4 homes. Where they wanted to put original pool, they would need a NOI, the homeowner pulled back closer to 80' away, clearing a few trees. Not confirming the wetland line. We did a lot of negotiation. 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.

Mike Adams, 108 Edward Foster Road – Revised plan: deck revisions. Planted 2500 beach grass plugs, went edge to edge. House is lifted on foundation and previously had four decks attached without railings. Raised it 5'. Decks will be outdoor living space. Rather than have four separate decks with four landings, would like to replace with what is shown in red on the sketch. Existing was about 800' sq. ft. and proposed deck is 1400' sq. ft. With the landings, the old decks would take up 1100 sq. ft. + more impacts. Consolidating to two landings, would be about 1500 sq. ft. Move the deck in about 3' on the north side from the property line. Area in back where he wants to add the deck is a sparse lawn. There will be one entrance in the front and one entrance in the rear. Decks will be supported on concrete 2' x 2' piers. There were 12 sonotubes with footing for the old decks and with new configuration there will be 15, three more piers. Wooden deck with a stairway from each.

Request for Determination: Swierzewski / O'Connell, 1 Dickens Row (cobble under decks/relocate rocks/temporary fence)*

No one showed. Mr. Gallivan did presentation. First house on right at the seawall. Septic gets ripped out every year. Big boulders were out by the street. People cut under their house to get to the seawall. They want to put in a temporary fence. Motion for 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.

Coastal Advisory Committee / Mr. Harding: met last evening in Humarock. First such meeting where we brought it out to one of the villages; will do two or three others this summer, not exactly sure which sections when. Bring the coastal activities plan and all of the information that has been started to be disseminated to the town. Was pretty well received, residents seemed interested and well received, in some cases the residents weren't happy but they were happy a committee came to them. Easement language was discussed.

Beach Committee / Mr. Schmid: Letter from the 3rd Cliff Association that they have noticed increased police presence which they are happy about. Of course still the problem of drinking and trash. Ms. Caisse attended the last beach meeting. Basically highlighted was a \$10,000 allowance from the town to determine some little shade structures to sit and wipe feet off and where to store them if removable. Harbormaster was there also. Bathrooms are most likely the next step. Right now nothing in the works.

Certificate of Compliance:

25 Sixth Ave: never did the work OK.

44 Wampatuck Ave. – report from E.E.T., which was very accurate, there is no deck on plan, but deck on house, Can't issue

141 Old Oaken Bucket Road – next to Mooney's. As-built doesn't show septic and there are a couple of sheds.

43 Whittier is OK.

Enforcement:

174 Branch redo stormwater numbers try to show where the driveway was moved didn't change stormwater. Buffer zone identified, he's cleared it and he is going to plant. Told him they were on for the 20th

Michael Loring – couldn't come tonight. Need to be specific to the existing order.

Pin Oak Drive – cleared probably in the buffer. Brad Holmes went out; they are on for the 20th

Town Way Ext. beach work – have the name. Will send a letter.

Clapp Road buffer alteration – will be on next meeting

31 Candlewood – plan back from Merrill – there are issues. Trees will be coming out. On for the 20th.

Minutes: April 20, 2016

Motion to approve the minutes of April 20, 2016 Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Order of Conditions: Cote, 135 Humarock Beach (raze/rebuild)

Motion to condition the project Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

CORRESPONDENCE

June 16, 2016 – June 29, 2016

1. Request for a CofC for 68-2584 – 258 Central Ave. – engineer’s letter, CLE, no as-built, no check (in file)
2. 68-717 – referencing 2 properties 125 & 127 Captain Peirce – Attorney believes since the property used to be a single parcel that Order doesn’t affect 125 (in file) (seems we should issue a CofC just in case, and it came in as 125 but . . .)
3. Attorney General’s approval of April 1, 2016 Warrant Articles #15, 16 & 18 re: Stormwater Bylaws.
4. Planning Board re: Scituate Historical Society – split a non-buildable lot between two adjacent properties. No new buildable lots will be created – discussed June 23, 2016.
5. Planning Board re: 21-23 Ford Place - Site plan special permit for mixed use development in the village business overlay district – razing Greenbush Post Office. Densities of 18-20 units per 40,000 sq. ft. Site is 6,400 sq. ft.
6. Mosquito Control 15 Foxwell Lane. Reclamation of the site will begin June 27, 2016 weather permitting. Water course will be kept as natural as possible, spoils will be used to fill depressions; other spoils will be spread thinly and evenly along the edges.
7. Request for CofC 68-1058 – 25 Sixth Ave. – Request, \$100, that’s all no as-built or engineer’s letter
8. 24 Webster Street - LEC/Stam Humphries letter re: walls at site (in file)
9. MACC Due Renewal \$541.00
10. Recording of OofC for 68-2597 - 9 Lightship Lane (phragmites removal) (in file)
11. Pictures of 24 Webster Street (in file)
12. Notification to abutters (form) re: 134 Oceanside Drive (in file)
13. Information re: Roach Field Parking Lot Proposal (Beaver Dam Road)
14. Scituate Public Schools thank you for partnership with the Vocational Life Skills Program
15. DEP On-site – 1000 Glades Road - Inspection for Water Quality Certification Wednesday, July 13, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. (NO FILE)
16. 68-1577 – Final Decision for Stockbridge II Realty Trust (in file)
17. Request for CofC for 68-2521 - 30 Inner Harbor Road – Request, Engineer’s verification, As-Built and check (in file)
18. Revised plans for 68-2617 – 134 Oceanside Drive – corrected an abutter (in file)
19. Revision for 108 Edward Foster Road (in file)
20. Stormwater Magazine
21. Planning Board re: Major Site Plan Review/Stormwater Permit 6 Old Country Way - 17 parking spaces & 1 handicapped space. Existing 3 bedroom dwelling that may be moved from site.
22. Pictures of Town Way - violation

Motion to adjourn Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Motion to adjourn 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Logue, Secretary