



## HULL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

253 Atlantic Avenue, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

Hull, MA 02045

Phone: 781-925-8102

Fax: 781-925-8509

**May 9, 2006**

**Members Present:** Sheila Connor, Chair, John Meschino,  
Jim Reineck, Frank Parker

**Members Not Present:** Sarah Das, Vice Chair, Judie Hass

**Staff Present:** Anne Herbst, Conservation Administrator  
Ellen Barone, Clerk

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

**Agenda Approved:** Upon a **motion** by J. Meschino and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by F. Parker and a **vote**  
of 4/0/0;

It was voted to: **Approve** the Agenda for May 9, 2006

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

It was voted to: **Approve** the Minutes of April 25,  
2006 as amended.

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

**7:55pm Nantasket Pier, Map 37/Lot 60 (NE35-961)** Opening of a public hearing on the  
Notice of Intent filed by the Town of Hull for work described as replace 25 rotted and  
damaged pilings.

Applicant: Kurt Bornheim, Harbormaster

Mr. Bornheim presented the plans to replace rotted and/or damaged pilings on the Nantasket  
Pier. The pier was built in two stages in 1984 and 1985. Sixteen of the existing pilings are oak  
and the remaining pilings are CCA wood. The work to replace the pilings will take  
approximately 4 – 5 days. If materials are received after marina is up and running, the work  
will take place in the fall so as not to interfere with use of the marina.

The Commission requested that the replacement pilings be greenheart wood and not the  
traditional CCA wood. Mr. Bornheim agreed. A Special Condition will be added requiring the  
use of greenheart wood.

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

It was voted to:

**Close** the Public Hearing, **approve** the project and to **discuss** the Draft  
Order of Conditions. The Order of Conditions was **signed**.

**8:00pm 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

ntial units and 5,000 square feet of commercial space with parking underneath.

Applicant: Girolamo Taverna

Abutters/Others: Holly Preston, Jerry Preston, Jill DeCosta

The Commission received copies of the peer review that was conducted by David Nyman of ENSR. The Applicant's response to comments was received today, May 9, 2006 and stated that the Engineer agreed upon all comments and has made the changes requested on the plans. The Applicant submitted new plans.

The Commission requested that the Applicant's Engineer respond to each comment/question individually in detail indicating what changes have been made as a result of the comments and provide answers to the questions that remain unanswered.

An abutter expressed concerns relating to existing drainage issues and flooding in the neighborhood and to her property. She does not feel that the existing Town drainage can handle any additional drainage entering the system. The Abutters also feels that fill has previously been put on the property.

The Commission advised the abutters that since this project is considered a commercial project, it is required that a stormwater plan be developed to retain all runoff on the property. The Commission also advised the abutters that they should contact the Town with their issues of the Town drainage problems since this does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Conservation Commission.

The Commission explained that the comments and plans received from the Applicant's Engineer will be forwarded to the Commission's Engineer for a final review to verify that all changes and questions have been properly addressed.

The abutters requested a copy of the ENSR report and were advised to contact E. Barone.

The Abutters questioned whether they had a right or any say at all as to whether this building goes up. Such as if they just don't want it or if it is too high or they just don't like it. The Commission advised the abutters that as long as all rules and regulations are followed, they will not be able to stop it. The abutters asked if they had a committee to block it, would that work. Again they were advised that if the rules and regulations were followed they could not stop it. They were advised that if after the site is developed and they feel that water from this site is contributing to their problems, they may make a complaint and the issue would be investigated.

The Commission agreed to request that David Nyman of ENSR attend the continued hearing to answer any outstanding questions.

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

It was **voted** to:

**Continue** the Public Hearing to May 30, 2006, at a time to be determined.

**8:30pm 11 D Street, Map 16/Lot 108**, Opening of a Public Hearing on the Request for Determination filed by Girolamo Taverna for work described as a front deck with 5 footings.

Applicant: Girolamo Taverna

ed the plans for the project that includes construction of a front deck with the installation of five footings. A fire had damaged the home. The interior has been renovated. Mr. Taverna presented an overview plan of the project.

The Commission conducted a site visit and found no issues.

§ Upon a **motion** by J. Meschino and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by F. Parker 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**.

**8:35pm 87 Hampton Circle, Map 36/Lot 180**, Opening of a Public Hearing on the Request for Determination filed by Susan Fletcher for work described as decks on rear and sides with footings and plantings for erosion control.

Applicant: Susan Fletcher, Ed Biggins

Representatives: Chris Gambel, Dan Gharibian

Mr. Gambel presented the project that includes the removal of an existing small cement curbing along the driveway and replacement with a wall constructed of stone set in cement that will meet the existing foundation. There are also plans to install facing on the existing foundation wall that would be done with rocks set in concrete and adhered to the wall. The plans also called for 12 footings for a rear and side deck.

The original application pertaining to the wall indicated that it would be added on top of an existing wall. The plans submitted did not show enough detail about the project such as elevations, existing and proposed conditions.

Mr. Gharibian briefly talked about plantings for erosion control for a steep slope at the rear of the property. There is also an existing patio along the sea wall that the applicant would like advice concerning options to remove or replace. Plans are not complete for this work.

Due to the additional work necessary for the wall and the placement of decorative stone on the foundation wall requiring the mixing of concrete, the Commission informed the Applicant that it would be necessary to file a Notice of Intent that would include all aspects of the proposed project with the necessary plans.

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

It was voted to:

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

**9:00pm 37 Central Avenue, Map 16/Lot 89**, Opening of a Public Hearing on the Request for Determination filed by Kathy Gendrolis and Edward Warren for work described as footings for a deck and stairs.

Representative: Charles Cogliano

Mr. Cogliano presented the project to include the installation of four footings and stairs that will be added to an existing platform deck. The existing cement walkway will remain.

The Commission conducted a site visit and found no issues.

§ Upon a **motion** by J. Meschino and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by F. Parker 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**.

**9:02pm 179 Spring Street, Map 3/Lot 37**, Continuation 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.

Applicant: Derek Triantafillou

Mr. Triantafillou presented the project that will include the construction of a small front porch with a roof that will require the installation of four sonotubes. The Commission questioned a notation on the plans that represented a proposed driveway. The Applicant is not requesting a determination on the proposed driveway at this time. A notation to this effect was made on the plans.

§ Upon a **motion** by S. Connor 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**.

**9:10pm 63 Highland Avenue, Map 5/Lot 75 (NE35-xxx)** Opening of a public hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by R.H. Construction for work described as a single family home addition.

Representative: Michael Joyce

This is an after the fact filing for an addition with a footprint of approximately 200 square feet. A foundation plan was submitted. The drainage plans for this project were submitted and approved on a previous Notice of Intent DEP #NE35-958. At this time DEP had not yet provided a file number for this project.

§ Upon a **motion** by J. Meschino and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by J. Reineck and a **vote** of 3/0/1; (F. Parker abstained)  
It was **voted** to:

**Continue** the Public Hearing to May 30, 2006, at a time to be determined.

**9:15pm 125 Main St, Map 2/Lot 3 (NE35-939)** Continuation of a public hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Acushnet Marine, Inc. for work described as extension to existing pier and construction of a dock at the end of the pier.

Applicant: Stephanie Aprea

Representative: Adam Brodsky, Bruce Tobiasson

Abutters/Others: Sandra Minelli, Ernest Minelli

This project has been reviewed by Ocean and Coastal Consultants, Inc. on behalf of the Commission; the comments were issued to the Commission in a letter dated March 30, 2006. A copy was also provided to the Applicant's Engineer, Mr. Bruce Tobiasson.

Mr. Brodsky informed the Commission that the project has received approval from MEPA and that the Chapter 91 license was still pending. The Army Corps of Engineers Permit will be submitted.

Mr. Tobiasson presented the technical aspects and responses to Ocean and Coastal Consultants' comments. The Commission received a written response. There will be no dredging. The piles will be power driven a minimum of 15 feet into the bottom soil. The piles

of timber and steel. The approach pier will be constructed with timber piles. The floats will be constructed with the steel piles. The timber will be treated with CCA. Soil borings were not required for this site, as existing piles in this area have proven to be effective. The structure is designed to withstand impacts of 75 mile an hour winds. The height of the piles is sufficient that floats will not come off over the top. Work will begin at the supply pier then continue with a floating barge. There will be no heavy construction equipment, cranes, etc used in the beach tidal zone.

Mr. Tobiasson was gracious to answer many questions for the general knowledge of the Commission.

The abutters questioned whether the Coast Guard has approved this project. Mr. Brodsky explained that the Coast Guard Navigational division will be commenting as part of the Army Corp of Engineer's process. Approval will not come from the Coast Guard Station in Hull.

The responses from Mr. Tobiasson will be forwarded to Ocean and Coastal Consultants for a final review.

§ Upon a **motion** by J. Meschino and **2<sup>nd</sup>** by J. Reineck and a **vote** of 4/0/0  
It was **voted** to:  
**Continue** the Public Hearing to May 30, 2006, at a time to be determined.

#### **Issues/Discussion by Commission:**

HRA project MEPA review Comments. Mr. Vernon Wood was present for this discussion as a concerned citizen. A. Herbst completed a brief summary of the requirements from the EOEA and also changes made since the Commission reviewed the project. As MEPA is not a permitting agency, and it is not a requirement that the Commission respond, the Commission will not respond to the EIR report that was received. The Commission will contact David Nyman for his comments when the project goes back to DEP for review. The Commission will also consider responding to the issues brought forward by the HRA in their letter of appeal relating to timeliness and P. Paquin's involvement.

Due to the fact that a quorum would not be present at the scheduled May 23, 2006 meeting, the next meeting will be May 30, 2006.

Upon a vote of 4/0/0, J. Meschino motion, F. Parker 2<sup>nd</sup>, it was voted to approve an Emergency Certificate for the removal of the existing building at 7 Bay Street that was damaged by a car.

16 Lewis St. request for Certificate of Compliance – S. Connor motion J. Meschino 2<sup>nd</sup> Vote 4/0/0 to issue the Certificate of Compliance. While on site, a deck was noticed that was not permitted. The Commission requested that the Applicant file an after the fact filing of an RDA.

The Design Review Board would like to increase the communication between Boards and Commissions throughout the Town.

The Commission reviewed and approved the draft letter concerning the update of the dune repair project.

Discussion on request for sand to be placed on DCR beach walkways – The DCR must file a permit request.

Community Preservation Act – Discussion of upcoming town referendum.

scheduled to hear applicants for appointment to the Commission on Tuesday, May 23, 2006.

**10:45pm** Upon a motion by J. Meschino and 2<sup>nd</sup> by F. Parker and a vote of 4/0/0; the meeting was adjourned.