



## HULL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

253 Atlantic Avenue, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor  
Hull, MA 02045

Phone: 781-925-8102

Fax: 781-925-8509

**April 25, 2006**

**Members Present:** Sheila Connor, Chair, Sarah Das, Vice Chair, John Meschino, Judie Hass

**Members Not Present:** Jim Reineck, Frank Parker

**Staff Present:** Anne Herbst, Conservation Administrator

**7:40pm** Chair Connor called the meeting to order

**Agenda Approved:** Upon a **motion** by J. Hass and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by S. Das and a **vote** of 4/0/0;  
It was voted to: **Approve** the Agenda for April 25, 2006

**Minutes:** Upon a **motion** by S. Das and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by J. Meschino and a **vote** of 4/0/0;  
It was voted to: **Approve** the Minutes of April 11, 2006 with corrections as discussed.

**Bills:** **Approved and signed** by All.

**7:53pm 509 Nantasket Avenue, Map 26/Lot 168 and 184 (NE35-956)** Continuation of a public hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Girolamo Taverna for work described as three residential units and 5,000 square feet of commercial space with parking underneath.

The Applicant requested a request to continuation

§ Upon a **unanimous vote** of 4/0/0;  
It was **voted** to:  
**Continue** the Hearing to May 9, 2006 at a time to be determined.

**7:55pm 158 Manomet Avenue, Map 19/Lot 57,** Opening of a public hearing on the Request for Determination of Applicability filed by Stan Slawsby for work described as 12 concrete footings for a new deck.

Representative: Joe Redman

Mr. Redman presented the plans for the project. They had planned to use existing footings for the new deck however they are only cinder blocks which are not legal. The new footings will be hand dug and extra dirt under the porch will be flattened.

The Commission conducted a site visit and no issues were found.

§ Upon a **motion** by J. Hass and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by J. Meschino and a **vote** of 4/0/0;  
It was voted to:  
**Close** the Public Hearing, and **issue** a **negative** Determination of Applicability. The Determination of Applicability was **signed**.

**aset Avenue, Map 21/Lot 76**, Opening of a public hearing on the Request for Determination of Applicability filed by Lilia Chavez for work described as the installation of 3 footings for a new deck.

Representative: Joe Redman

Mr. Redman presented the plans for the project.

The Commission conducted a site visit and no issues were found.

§ Upon a **motion** by J. Meschino and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by J. Hass and a **vote** of 4/0/0;  
It was voted to:

**Close** the Public Hearing, and **issue** a **negative** Determination of Applicability. The Determination of Applicability was **signed**.

**8:00pm 80 Kenberma Street, Map 24/Lot 1**, Opening of a public hearing on the Request for Determination filed by Michael T. Shaughnessy for work described as 7 concrete footings for a front porch.

Owners: Connie Shaughnessy, Michael Shaughnessy

Mr. & Mrs. Shaughnessy presented the plans for the project. Wooden piers that are deteriorated at the bottom currently support the porch. The area around the piers has been blocked to maintain the position. Installing the concrete footings would be a permanent solution.

The Commission conducted a site visit. It was observed that there was no rear exit. The Applicant was questioned whether they were planning to do work at the rear at the house. The Applicant stated that they were planning to obtain a building permit for additional work to replace and change portions of the home that had been burned. The Applicant is planning to install a concrete pad at the bottom of stairs. The Commission suggested that the Applicant add this pad to his current application.

The Applicant drew on the plan to indicate that a concrete pad will be placed under the back porch.

§ Upon a **motion** by J. Meschino and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by J. Hass and a **vote** of 4/0/0;  
It was voted to:

**Close** the Public Hearing, and **issue** a **negative** Determination of Applicability. The Determination of Applicability was **signed**.

**8:10pm 179 Spring Street, Map 3/Lot 37**, Opening of a Public Hearing on the Request for Determination filed by Derek Triantafillou for work described as a front porch with roof using four sonotubes.

The Applicant was not present. The Commission conducted a site visit. The Commission had questions regarding the project. The Commission will wait to see if the applicant appeared later in the evening to vote. The Applicant never arrived.

§ Upon a **unanimous vote** of 4/0/0 and a **vote**  
It was **voted** to:

**Continue** the Hearing to May 9, 2006 at a time to be determined.

**8:15pm 7 Bay Street, Map 34/Lot 2**, Opening of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Steven Buckley for work described as demolition of an existing building and

on of two multi-family buildings with associated parking, filling, grading and stormwater management.

Owner: Steven Buckley

Representatives: David Kellem, Stan Humphries, R. E. Hannigan

Abutter/Other: Richard Cox

Mr. Humphries presented the project to include a site plan and a building plan, a revised grading plan and a drainage plan. The Zoning Board has approved the proposed building plan. The boring results on the eastern and western sides of the site showed that there is fill and sand to a depth of 10-16 feet, 5 ft to 7 ft thickness of peat and organics below that, and then marine clay below that. Some borings went to 32 feet. The proposed foundation plan is based on information found in the test borings.

The proposed building plan indicates two structures to be built. The plan indicates that there are portions of the building that will be within the 100 ft buffer zone. Mr. Humphries presented copies of a Chapter 91 license dated 1933. There are three objectives that the project is trying to meet which are:

1. To get the living space out of the hazard zone which is the 100-year flood elevation. The plan is to bring the elevation up to a minimum of 11.5 ft. The garage entrances would be on the interior of the buildings. The plan allows free movement onto the street. The plan would allow for drainage to be kept on the site.
2. Introduce and take an opportunity for what is considered landscaping fill and that is indicated above the 11.5 elevation up to 14 ft. This landscape fill accomplishes two things; it will hide or mask the mass of the building. Proposing to bring fill up the side of the building approximately 3 or 4 ft that would allow for seaside plantings, and have a walkway and steps down.
3. The other objective would allow the accomplishment of keeping drainage from the fill and the new development on site. A swale on the east and west sides of the building number 1 and on the west side of building number 2. Drainage from the undeveloped parts of the site will be channeled into an existing depression leading to the bay. No drainage resulting from the fill will go off site.

The Commission questioned why the drainage will be channeled into an existing drainage swale that leaves the site if they are planning to keep all drainage on site. Mr. Humphries stated that this would be covered in more detail with the drainage plan.

The work area will be contained by hay bales.

The Commission questioned whether there is a pipe presently on the site. The Chapter 91 License shows an easement and a culvert and a pipe that has now collapsed. An investigation of that issue is not complete at this time. Any work in that area will be presented in another notice of intent. The Commission is concerned with storm water runoff. Will be covered in the drainage presentation.

An abutter is concerned about the storm drain that currently doesn't work. Would like that to be repaired. The street floods and if the storm drain doesn't work and or if the pipe is removed the neighborhood and his property will be flooded.

Mr. Hannigan presented the stormwater management plans. The existing municipal easement and drainage on site will not be used for this project. The drainage plan consists of the recharge galleys for the roof runoff, a set of two for building number 1 and a second set of four for building 2. For the remaining paved area there is a series of 25 leeching galleys that will recharge the paved surface from the driveway and parking area and the walks. Mr. Hannigan explained that the stormwater systems will be built just below the fill.

The Commission brought up the issue of storm flowage down for Anastos Corner. The Commission would like to discuss ocean storm drainage. Mr. Humphries stated the drainage system is just for rainstorms, because in an ocean storm, the site will be completely flooded. A discussion followed covering the high speed flow to the site, which will increase due to deflection on either side because of the fill. Mr. Hannigan feels that there may be a redirection of flow but not a velocity change as a result of the fill. The Commission questioned, "why if the applicant feels that there will be minimum changes in a rain event in the flow of water, why can't they increase the size of the proposed drains to accommodate the additional flow". The Engineers will look at that aspect. The Commission expressed concern about the redirection of storm flowage by the added fill and buildings.

A discussion followed concerning the repair of the existing storm drain. Who has the authority to order the repair? The Owner is willing to talk to the Town and repair the drain. The Commission asked if the Engineer would consider accommodating additional runoff into the galleys that are planned.

A discussion followed concerning the conditions of the area during past storms, flooding, water flowing at a high speed. When the corner building is removed, that in itself will change the deflection of the water.

Mr. Humphries also explained possible plans for landscaping at the roadway with possible resting places for people who may be biking or walking.

The Applicant would like to come back with changes that were discussed as a result of this meeting. The Engineer questioned whether the Commission is asking that the buildings be constructed on piles. The Commission noted that piles are an alternative approach. The Commission is just stating that there are other ways to get the residences out of the flood zone than just using fill. The Applicant will submit new plans within two weeks for submittal for peer review.

The Commission conducted a site visit on April 18, 2006 prior to a previous filing.

§ Upon a **motion** by J. Hass and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by J. Meschino and a **vote** of 4/0/0;

It was voted to:

Submit the project for peer review.

§ Upon a **motion** by S. Das and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by J. Meschino and a **vote** of 4/0/0;

It was voted to:

**Continue** the Public Hearing to May 23, 2006 at a time to be determined.

**9:20pm Discussion** of restoration plans for Driftway Road embankment.

Representative: John Riley

John Riley attended the meeting to discuss the revegetation of the Driftway bank. It was agreed that he will hydro seed and add either little or no additional loam the area will be covered securely with a mat. The work will be done after May 1, 2006 and avoid heavy rain periods.

**14 F Street** – The Commission discussed a potential violation and agreed to conduct a site visit.

**A Street** – The Commission discussed the fact that tops of trees had been cut off at this site and concluded that there was no violation. The Commission asked the Administrator to send a

forming him that any work that may destabilize the bank would require a permit.

**Dune between G and H Street** – A resident complained that locus trees were growing in the dune and was concerned that they posed safety problems and requested to be able to remove them. The Commission conducted a site visit and concluded that the trees are buckthorn. The buck thorn should not be removed as it would destabilize the dune.

**Main Street** - The Commission requested that the Administrator investigate placement of fill along the sea wall along Main Street.

**RDA – 42 Q Street** – The Commission agreed that a curb along the driveway is not required as the affected neighbor did not want it constructed and the driveway will be pitched to keep runoff from the neighbor.

**Potholes on the Railroad Bed** – The Administrator reported that the Highway Dept requested permission to fill potholes. The Commission requires a specific plan for that activity.

**56 Holbert Ave.** – The Conservation Administrator requested advice on a project. Was advised that the Owner should file a Notice of Intent.

**45 Salisbury Rd.** - The Commission expressed concern that the swale on the property was filled in. The Conservation Administrator and Chair conducted a site visit as requested by the applicant and found that once the vegetation was removed from the property, there did not appear to be a swale.

Note: Citizen P. Paquin was present for the entire meeting.