

**Town of Scituate
Conservation Commission
Town Hall Selectmen's Hearing Room
Meeting Minutes
May 11, 2016**

Meeting was called to order at 6:21 p.m.

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

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

Mr. Harding called the meeting to order.

Agenda: Motion to amend the agenda to discuss Kenilworth, 290 Hatherly Road Request for Mediation, Certificate of Compliance for Wenzel, 141 Lot 3 (149) Old Oaken Bucket Road, and Doherty, 85 Edward Foster Road Mr. Schmid. Second Ms. Scott-Pipes. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Snow read the ad

Request for Determination: Cote, Central Ave. (fence – 11 lots approximately 605')*

Paul Mirabito from Ross Engineering was present at the hearing. Proposing a 2' to 3' high split rail fence along 11 lots purchased one or two years ago just along the street line. Applicant wanted to put the fence 10' off the westerly edge of the pavement, but DPW preferred it about 20' for liability reasons. It will be surveyed and all hand work, no machines and minimal vegetation impact. The purpose is to keep people out; lots are not buildable. Ms. Caisse: would the town put a guard rail up if the Cote's paid for it? Mr. Gallivan: Property owner should look into old fishing access or pier access. Originally it to keep people off to protect the area, but it doesn't look like that is possible. 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: Winter Hill GC, 124 Turner Road (decks)*

Louis and Anderson managers of the company were present at the hearing. Originally proposed removing front, side and back decks and extending back deck another 20', but it was too close to the salt pond. Replacing front two decks and side to same footprint and extending deck south toward driveway 20' and back deck cantilevered for less impact on the ground, with a 4' overhang. Plot plan was submitted. Replacing all sonotubes and footings. Spread material around on the site, don't put any material in the marsh. 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: Foley, 45 Ocean Drive (decks)*

Paul Williams was present. Two existing decks one in front and one in the rear. Both decks are in poor condition; dangerous situation. Rebuild the two existing decks, rear deck is accessed through the house, both are at the same elevation proposing a 3'9" elevated walkway to connect the two decks. Existing staircase at the front and relocate the stairs at the rear. Need additional footings for the walkway. Mr. Harding: no extension of decks, just the walkway? Yes. There is no displacing of any vegetation. Mr. Gallivan: vegetation in back yard should be fine. Boxes 3 and 4 need to be checked. Notified one abutter and they are all set. Using standard big foots; minimal disturbance Paved drive on right hand side. 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. Schmid. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Request for Determination: Clancy, 704 Country Way (septic)*

Jeff Hassett from Morse Engineering was present at the hearing. Property slopes from Country Way to a vegetated wetland at the rear, flagged by John Zimmer. The leaching field is about 51' off the wetland and septic tank is about 71'. The entire back yard is encompassed by a stone wall and potential runoff during construction should be retained within that stone wall; soils were good; Board of Health is reviewing. Ms. Scott-Pipes: site visit with Pat; very steep slope and very wet beyond the stonewall; runoff will be aggressive. Seems like the septic should be located at the side of the house; there is a lot of land. Can't understand how all that area has poor soils. Seems like the placement is very poor. Jeff was told they started out front, but material was not as good. Jeff was not on site, but was advised to go. Tried to keep it up on the slope as far as possible; minor grading, coming up about a foot. Soils were that bad on the side? Yes, they abandoned it. Previous septic is in the same location. Mr. Schmid: if we conclude there is no other reasonable place, then under the law they can go to the 50' buffer? Mr. Gallivan: If it doesn't perc in the front, we would say fine, but we would encourage it to be moved if possible. Don't think there is a way we can say it has go out front; more of a Board of Health regulation; however, usually we see all the test pit locations. Didn't bother to log them because the soils were not good. At the rear it can flow by gravity, but anywhere else it would have to be pumped and those systems lead to more failure. Mr. Schmid: if we approve, it is under the assumption that there is no other place for it. Mr. Gallivan: When you have a steep slope you do worry about breakout. It is a standard system, but it was designed with a rubber break out barrier down slope 15' away. Too bad we don't have a couple of soil logs. If they are able to stay out of the 50' buffer it is hard to make them retest. 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)." There is a lot of land on the side of the house Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Request for Determination: Kelly, 61 Collier Road (install retaining wall, crushed stone area, pathway and stairs)

Stacey & Brian Kelly were present at the hearing. Built house in 2005 and we are experiencing some erosion at the back of the house. Material is a combination of sand, loam and crushed stone. Want to fix a walkway that is eroding, by putting in a pervious stone, probably 6' off the wall by the length of the house. And the retaining wall would be approximately 12" high, probably granite, to hold back the bank. They showed some pictures. Drops 75' feet down to a stonewall; they face 4th Cliff. Mr. Gallivan: selected between pavers or stones? Leaning toward pervious stone; stepping stones. Small area, makes it safer and would allow what grass is there to remain. 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)." There is a lot of land on the side of the house Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Compliance: Wenzel, 141 (Lot 3 149) Old Oaken Bucket Road

Lawn and house is OK, but two sheds that didn't appear on the approved plan are within the 100', not within the 50'. Also a couple of rain gardens were on the approved plan, but there is a couple of rhododendrons, not a stormwater planting. Mr. Mirabito: soil is gravel; foundation was dry; moved house back an extra 10'; flat lot. The original approved plan showed a vegetative basin. They should have come back to the Commission to install the sheds. Any water that might run off the lots will go in the cranberry bog. Two vegetative basins that weren't put in. But there is good drainage. But that wasn't the plan. Mr. Schmid: We conditioned what was supposed to happen, not going to vote for a Certificate. There is a purpose for the stormwater regs. Soil is so pervious didn't need stormwater. Could come back with a revised plan. Ms. Scott-Pipes: Stormwater study was done and not followed; orders are still open. Paul is saying it is not a wetlands issue, it is a stormwater issue. Mr. Snow: When the plan comes to the Commission, we deal with stormwater. No other mitigation? Some plantings were done. They are right at the 50' buffer. Either pull house back or do some mitigation. Take a look at the stormwater. One shed is in the 50' buffer. Mr. Harding: if people are going to change things they should come back to us if they want a Certificate. House is 9' further away from the wetlands. Also there is a cranberry road that the company uses. Stormwater piece of the two rain gardens is significant. Sheds could be constructed out of our jurisdiction. Think we need to be reassured that the stormwater pieces are not needed. Ms. Scott-Pipes: want the stormwater checked by someone else before we issue a Certificate. The stormwater basins are outside the 100' buffer. Mr. Schmid: the whole permit was based on the stormwater calcs; we gave the permit on the whole project; want to see calculations.

Certificate of Compliance: Doherty, 85 Edw Foster Road:

There is a P&S on this. Asphalt added to the driveway; 12' x 20' and flares out to 20' x 40', not on plan. Three things that recharge the area aren't shown on the plan; 12 or 15 plants were added. Pile of yard waste was removed. Question is on the shape of the driveway. Mr. Snow: a couple of concerns, roof recharge wasn't shown on the plan. Recharge area is in, debris is removed, only other item is the driveway. Driveway is pitched toward the street. Mr. Schmid: permitted something, pass on this one. Mr. Harding: same concern, same thing every time, they expect us just to approve it; we are pretty flexible overall. Ms. Caisse: No. Why can't people do what they get approved. Plans should be as we condition. If we fix with an amendment, that is fine. Mr. Gallivan: we've approved one thing, probably could have been handled along the way. We get it after-the-fact and no mitigation. Mr. Harding: Part of it is, we have been reluctant to make it tough on people, and they just keep pushing. Mr. Snow: let's say the owner got it approved, it happens all the time, didn't plan on this, didn't visualize it, they need to come back to the issuing authority; this isn't working for us. We did permit the job, but now if they want this piece of driveway, it is an application from the owner or suggested mitigation. Paul Mirabito: not making light of what he did, but it is an extremely small area outside the 100'. Mr. Snow: if we know where water is getting into the wetland, maybe a small raingarden; looking to be fair and reasonable. At some point that water is running back to the marsh. Ms. Scott-Pipes: we don't make life difficult for them, we are trying to follow the rules and regs.

Wetlands Hearing: Haufler, 19 Peggotty Beach Road (new build) (cont.)

Jeff Hassett, Morse Engineering, Atty. Robert Galvin and Christian Haufler were present at the hearing. Commission asked if the project was under the new stormwater bylaw. Plan has been updated. This project doesn't disturb 15,000 sq. ft. or not more than 25% impervious, therefore does not fall under the stormwater bylaw. Two revisions to the plan under the preliminary flood maps V Zone elevation 17'; house will be elevated on piles. Discussed the area that was filled, which is represented by small dots on the plan. All the fill will be removed and replanted and another hatched area will be planted to enhance the buffer. Will replace a culvert and install a post-and rail fence on the buffer. Mr. Schmid: there is nothing there; 25% is considered on a developed property. But the project does not render more than 25%. Mr. Snow: drainage work shown on the plan? No. What are you proposing? Replace damaged pipe under the road. Mr. Schmid: How many square feet is the project altogether? Don't have the amount of disturbance. Can give you the footprint of house? It is a 20,524 sq. ft. area, about a 1,068 sq. ft. modest house. What about from the fence to the property line? About 70' deep by 45' wide on average. Ms. Scott-Pipes: Over half the house is in the 50' buffer; have issues with that, don't think it is a buildable lot. Mr. Harding: a little more positive about the changes, because the house is elevated and removal of fill. Ms. Caisse: agree with Rich. Things are moving forward. Mrs. Welsh on same side: concerned about the vegetation overhanging the stonewall and trees. Across the street had been flooded in the past. Want to make sure no one gets impacted. When the area is restored it will diminish the flooding across the street. The pipe will be for overflow only. That area captures more stormwater than it ever did before; more flood storage capacity. Roof infiltrations? Can do that. When the work is done it may be a BVW. One of the things was hoping not to see two lots or one giant development. Would agree to restrict that property. Mr. Gallivan: Complicated, make the best of a tough situation. Amount of disturbance will be compensated by the improvements to the site. Currently it is not the 50' because it is filled. Mr. Harding: Would need a specific planting plan. All the drainage needs to be specified. Mr. Gallivan: now that it is going up on pilings, take out what is not suitable. Asphalt driveway? Top of piles are at 19.2', top of 1st floor is 20.2'. Pervious pavers could be used for the driveway. We've hashed this a lot; this is an altered site, that they started to do legally. Now trying to make the best of the situation. Originally approved for the fill, getting improved drainage, just an IVW under our jurisdiction, house on piles; minimal disturbance. Have to weigh the pieces. Mr. Schmid: our job is to do the best we can with projects that come in front of us; we've done what we can to the best of our ability. Hate to have anything done in the 50' buffer, but in balance we have to take a look at the overall project. Silt sock. no straw wattle. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote..

Wetlands Hearing: Gioioso, 0 Central Ave. (across from 214) (pile supported dock)*

Jack O'Leary from Sitec and Joe Gioioso were present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Dock is similar to neighbor's pile supported on South River side of Humarock, wooden pile support dock 72' dock, 31' gangway, 12' x 24' float. The area is a cobble beach; no eelgrass beds or tidal flats; and AE flood zone. Spoke with Harbormaster, Army Corp permit, Chapter 91 and Waterways as well. Ms. Scott-Pipes: What kind of pilings and spacing? Wooden 12" diameter pilings, 20' apart with cross braces, high enough for proper clearance,

driven at least 15' down; spacing guidelines of DEP and Chapter 91. Working from the water. Just cobble beach, no salt marsh, some rip rap that DPW placed near the road and a bit of a guardrail. Triggered by the riverfront and did an alternative analysis. Not much could be done. Taking into account the spacing between decking and elevation, it is not completely shaded. At low tide nothing sits on the ground. Float is set at least 3' above the bottom at low tide. Original plan went out farther, harbor master pulled it back to the other docks on either side. Ms. Caisse: how far out are you from the guardrail? 17' to the first pilings. Mr. Harding: It is a beach, still have to protect it if any work is done from the street. Mr. Gallivan: lucky it isn't marsh, it is coastal beach. Calculation for riverfront is based on piles that are driven 549 sq. ft.; land subject for coastal storm flowage 650', and coastal beach 4.71'. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Smith, 151 Border Street (dock)* - NO ELECTRONIC COPIES

John Cavanaro from Cavanaro Consulting was present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Smaller than the above dock. Resource areas are different, Chapter 91 is exempt from riverfront, do not file an alternative analysis. Water dependent use, there is no alternative that is feasible. 1st step is with Conservation; sent a copy to the Harbor master. We don't file for a Chapter 91 license or Army Corp Permit until we get an Order of Conditions. Army Corp. has jurisdiction, if you work below mean high water. They have jurisdiction over waters of the United States. Familiar with their general standards. 4' wide dock, 4' above the salt marsh, which is a combination of cobble, mixed bag; not the salt marsh you generally think of. Designed to stay with the contour of the land not at the minimum height; based on elevations. Try to blend them in with the landscape. Try not to design pile supported floats, don't think they are necessary also creates permanent piles in the navigable waters. Use bottom anchored floats; ramp and float comes out seasonally and removable walkway; only thing that stays is the pier which is about 47' long. Designed so the bottom of the float is 18" above at mean low water. Mr. Schmid: Going across land? Everything is land based. Will use pads and repair any disturbance. Use 10" piles, spaced a little closer. All elevations are based on tide, look for extreme high tides. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Whitley, 9 Lightship Lane (addition) (cont.)

John Cavanaro from Cavanaro Consulting was present at the hearing. Maybe some outstanding issues with this property. Found three documents: an Order of Conditions from 2005, a Superceding Order and a Court agreement. Previous owner received approval to replace the septic but not the work in the 50' buffer. It was finally agreed to allow the project, but mitigation plantings were never done. That has to get addressed. One thought would be to install the mitigation plantings and file for a Certificate of Compliance. Expanding greenhouse area on the right 250' sq ft, proposing 600' sq ft. of additional mitigation, keep the 600' intact and add to it. Mr. Schmid: area that was cleared behind the patio, how do we know that was the same? It is an enormous amount of clearing. Back left corner is where the septic is; from the patio to the stonewall is a little over 20'; 10' deep mitigation; just grass. Mitigation went to the salt marsh line. Ms. Scott-Pipes: minutes stated nothing else would be allowed in the 50' buffer. Would love to see the mitigation plantings. Side of house where greenhouse is, 10' off that for the addition. That is very steep. Inheriting problems, discussions, and decisions from a prior owner. Ten feet of lawn and then drops down to the wetlands. Thinking of the runoff. Mr. Gallivan: proposing a concrete foundation? Yes. Might put it on pilings as an alternative. Could get down to 20 sq. ft from 100 sq. ft. Could put infiltration on the side. First floor will be at 17'; flood compliant. Mr. Schmid: so much work is done in the 50' and 100'. Put it on piles or piers, reduce the footprint that touches the ground. Mr. Snow: complete mitigation and with the additional mitigation. Maybe allow 10' of grass after the addition, with a pile foundation and flood compliant. A planting plan needs to be submitted. Motion to continue the hearing to June 1, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Olschan/Shweky, 24 Webster St. (concrete walls) (cont.)

Atty. Adam Brodsky was present. Last meeting the hearing was opened and immediately continued; no one attended. Abutters' notification was submitted. Issues about the retaining walls. Two courses of cement block will be removed from the parallel east wall, originally there were four. On the northern wall, originally there was six, added two for a total of eight. Pat asked applicant to file a Notice of Intent. Resource areas: barrier beach, coastal beach, flood zone, and coastal storm flowage. No real alteration of a resource area. Work was done without authorization of the homeowner. Northern wall is perpendicular to the beach and it was suggested that the additional blocks could stay. That wall will not increase flood waters. If an order is set, applicant will do the work and file for a Certificate. Ms. Scott-Pipes: want all the walls to be at the original height. On the north side, they put three courses. Thought we had an agreement with the Commission. This is an AO flood zone elevation 2', the two courses are above flood elevation. If you have a wall parallel no flood impact. No practical difference to retain two additional blocks. Southern wall was not changed. Mr. Harding: the biggest concern was the eastern wall. Mr. Gallivan: don't understand the perpendicular wall. Regarding the mason, the homeowner is responsible. We issued a Certificate without the walls. Have photos with the building on pilings. Clearly against DEP regs.; clearly in violation with work on a barrier beach. We wrote a letter regarding this violation; nothing was done; we said file. Asking for a wall to be allowed around three sides in a velocity zone. Mr. Snow: these walls were preexisting to the fire. When he rebuilt this house after the fire, they weren't directed to remove the walls. These people didn't elect to do the work on their own. Agree they are going to lower the east wall that fronts the beach. Just the north wall is taller. Does it really matter if it is two courses higher? DEP had no comments. It is agreed there shouldn't be walls around a new build. Mr. Gallivan: there is language in the minutes we could pull out. To drop that other wall, is it going to make any difference? It will cause channelization, they will get more water. Mr. Brodsky: walls are in the AO flood zone. North wall is perpendicular to the beach. Ms. Scott-Pipes: stairs and patio are parallel and that's a wall now; water would run down the stairs and run under the house. Motion to continue the hearing to May 18, 2016 at 6:20 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Harding. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Higgins, 12 Moors Circle (addition)* - NO ELECTRONIC COPIES

Brad Holmes was present at the hearing Abutters' notification was submitted. Garage addition within the footprint of the existing gravel driveway. Proposed garage is more than 50' from the BVW, but within the 100' buffer. FEMA AE flood zone, elevation 10'. Runs through the existing paved driveway. Portion of the garage is within the floodplain. Spoke with the architect, it will have breakout panels. Will comply and be reviewed by the building department. Additional roof deck. House has an existing deck and the addition will sit over it. Roof deck over the garage. Ms. Scott-Pipes: there are wood chips right up against the marsh. Mr. Gallivan: there is also a shed next to the wetland that the Commission hasn't received an application for. Do you have plantings for this? From the phragmites toward the house maybe some plantings, just mulch. Make up for the shed that they didn't file for. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Schmid. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Rapczynski, 43 Surfside Road (repair concrete pad/rebld stairs/stone parking/& plantings)*

Matt & Michelle Rapczynski were present at the hearing. Abutters' notification was not submitted. Because there was work being done without a permit the applicant was allowed to explain the project. Was working at the house and was stopped and told to file a Notice of Intent Not making any significant changes: parking area of crushed stone, board did not favor paving; started pouring and covering existing concrete; want to do some plantings; install correct footings; and install a fence. Building permits were not required for a number of the repairs. Bought house in 2014 and there had been several burst pipes and ice dams. Did the whole exterior over. Mr. Gallivan: wanted to make sure they filed for concrete pad and deck replacement. Where is the fence? Want to copy the same fence as the Gills have next door. He removes his fence every year; copying that format. Put in a curb for the neighbor. Concrete stairs were done first they were discintcrating. Mr. Gallivan: this is an after-the-fact filing. Any old plans – septic – stairway showing inside the wall? Mr. Snow: These plans need some more work to show what is proposed and what has been done. Not enough clarification, no construction detail. We need elevations, detail as to how this is being built. If another Commission looks at this in years to come, won't know what is going on or went on. Don't see a detail on footings. Ms. Scott-Pipes: Frank is right, went back to 2006 minutes to find out. Very little description. Mr. Gallivan: even for decks we get more detail. Ms. Caisse: we don't know what exists; no dimensions; need some measurements on the plans; location of sonotubes. Happy to add dimensions to the plan. Ms. Scott-Pipes: gives us a record. Concrete bench being installed? In order to do exterior siding, left a cut line across the pad, put back same bench, 18" high. Where it used to be a slab, it is now a wall. Want more detail, real information as to what is happening. Mr. Schmid: Not sure it is what it was. Couple elevations; anything new or replaced should be denoted; footing detail; and anything raised off the surface; in other words what was flat at one point, that is now up. Flood zone is part VE and part AE. Motion to continue the hearing to May 18, 2016 at 6:35 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Schmid. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Violation: Martin, 264 Clapp Road (vegetation removal)

Amy Martin was present. Mr. Gallivan met out on site. All wetlands behind the site, trees cut and vegetation cleared, including a lot of skunk cabbage. Should they file a Request for Determination or a Notice of Intent (NOI). A Notice of Intent; will need a restoration planting plan. Brook Monroe flagged the property and believe some soils were done, but have no written report. In 2009 there was a filing for an addition. Clearly work was done right into the wetlands. Removed a handful of dead, broken ash trees and shrubs; it was a huge mess. No intention of making it lawn. You need wetland and native plants. Didn't use the best judgment. Ms. Martin showed a plan and plant list. It is mud right now. Google earth pictures show what it was like before. Didn't bring in any soil. Obviously you will need to submit an NOI with a planting plan. Should there be erosion control now? It is pretty flat. Slanted a little and there is a Koi pond. Mr. Snow: you should have applied first. MR Survey surveyed the property and put flags on the plan. Not talking any buildings, but would like to go ahead if possible and plant; the sooner it gets done, the better. The NOI can be found on line, maybe Brook Monroe could help. What's the time line? This is already an after-the-fact filing. Plantings: Groundcovers, ferns, spruce, swamp bay sweet magnolia, dog woods, etc.

Minutes:

Motion to accept the minutes of March 3, 2016 Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Schmid. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Order of Conditions: Woo, 27 Seaside Road (elevate)

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

Order of Conditions: Town of Scituate, Oceanside (11th to Kenneth seawall repair)

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

CORRESPONDENCE**April 21, 2016 – May 11, 2016**

1. DEP File #68-2607 – Olschan/Shweky, 24 Webster Street (in file)
2. DEP File #68-2609 – Whitley, 9 Lightship Lane (in file)
3. Division of Marine Fisheries – re: 0 Oceanside Drive - same footprint; no storage in intertidal area; upland side work if possible; no washing of equipment; fuel spills – containment materials (in file)
4. 135 Old Oaken Bucket Road – Amari re: planting changes for better erosion control (in file)
5. Recording CofC 68-2262 – O'Keefe, 273 CJCH – Bk 46627 pg 152 (in file)
6. Planning Board Agenda for 4/28/16
7. Notification to abutters – 12 Moors Circle (in file)
8. Recording of OofC 68-2600 – Seroll, 58 Oceanside Drive – Cert 112732 Bk 00563 pg 132 (in file)
9. Request for mediation - Atty. Hayes re: 290 Hatherly Road (in file)
10. Planning Board re: Accessory Dwelling Special Permit Application 12 Blanchard Road
11. 0 Central Ave (across from 214 Central Ave.) – Waterways License Application form and Public Notice (in file)
12. Zoning Board re: 91 Humarock Beach – raze/rebuild – Granted (in file)
13. Planning Board Agenda for May 12, 2016
14. Recording of OofC – 68-2604 - 11 & 12 Concord Street – Bk 46844, pg 513(?)
15. Recording of 91 Humarock Beach Road – 68-2602 – Cert. 73581 – bk 00367 pg 181 (in file)
16. Recording of 261 Central Avenue – 68-2547 – Cert 96626 bk 00483 pg 26 (in file)
17. DEP File #68-2610 – Gioioso, Humarock Realty Trust, 0 Central Ave. (in file)
18. DEP File #68-2611 – Higgins, 12 Moors Circle (in file)
19. DEP File #68-2612 – Smith, 151 Border Street (in file)
20. Notification to abutters re: 43 Surfside Road – concrete, deck, plantings, and fence (in file)
21. The Vegetation Management Plan Keolis Commuter Services can be found at: FDCerailroadvegetation.com (in file)
22. Amended Planning Board Agenda for May 12, 2016
23. Pictures of 85 Edward Foster Road debris cleaned up (in file)
24. Recording of CofC for 68-971 - Morrissey, 240 Clapp Road (in file)
25. Recording of CofC for 68-1017 – Morrissey, 238 Clapp Road (in file)

26. Notification to Abutters re: Clifford, 43 Whittier Drive (in file)
27. Wildlands News
28. RiverWatch Newsletter
29. FEMA re: Maps considered final.
30. New Owner: Karin K. McKelvey, 89 Edward Foster Road (in file)
31. Recording of OofC 68-2598 – Trachtenberg, 246 Gannett Road (in file)
32. Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project: Peggotty Beach – reclamation will begin June 1, 2016 weather permitting.
33. Existing Conditions Plan for 12 Rebecca Road (in file) RDA coming?
34. DEP File #68-2613 – Clifford, 43 Whittier Drive (in file)
35. Revised plans for Haufler, 19 Peggotty Beach Road (in file)

Motion to adjourn 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Logue, Secretary