**APPROVED MINUTES - CONSERVATION COMMISSION** TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2021, 2020 6:30 P.M., ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE (HELD REMOTELY) MARSHFIELD TOWN HALL, 870 MORAINE STREET, MARSHFIELD, MA

MEMBERS PRESENT – James Kilcoyne (JK) Chair, Bert O'Donnell (BO) Vice Chair, Arthur Lage (AL), Joe Ring (JR), Rick Carberry (PC), Craig Hannafin (CH), Susan Caron (SC), Bill Grafton, Conservation Administrator (BG)

#### **MEMBERS NOT PRESENT** – None

CALL TO ORDER – JK motions to open the meeting at 6:30 PM. CH second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CHyes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

## **MINUTES**

- The minutes of the February 2 and 16 meetings were presented for approval. No comments or suggested changes were made on the floor.
- JK motions to accept the February 2, 2021 minutes as written. JR second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.
- JK motions to accept the February 16, 2021 minutes as written. SC second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: ALyes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

# **CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS**

- Meetings will be held remotely until further notice as per the Governor's Emergency Executive Order of March 12, 2020, suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law. All votes will be taken by roll call. Commissioners should identify themselves before speaking, and all parties should mute themselves until they want to speak.
- The Commission has reinstated the "three continuance" policy whereby "should an applicant request three continuances or should they fail to properly address questions of the Commission for three hearings, then on the third date the Commission, at their discretion, may open the hearing and deny without prejudice for lack of information." Applicant will be able to reapply when they have all the necessary information to proceed, without having to wait the two year period.
- The procedure for hearings is that applicants or their representative(s) will have 5 minutes uninterrupted to present their project. This will be followed by BG's comments (1 minute), Commissioner comments/questions (10 minutes, with extensions by motion and vote), public comment, and vote. Public comments are to be addressed to the Chair or Hearing Officer. Pre-vote polls may be conducted to gain the perspective of the Commission.
- The updated Chapter 505 regulations have been posted on the Town and Commission Websites. A public hearing to approve the regulations will be held on March 18.

## **BUSINESS**

# B1 485 Pleasant St, house & workshop revised locations/DeMinimis Activity or Conservation Permit -**Kirsten Snow**

- Greg Morse (GM), Morse Engineering, present for Kirsten Snow (KS) and John Snow (JS), who purchased the property after OOC SE42-2735 was issued, permitting a raze and rebuild on the lot with planting plan. KS and JS now wish to change the footprint of the new house which would increase its size by 460 sq ft, but reduce impervious area within the 50 ft buffer by 136 feet. Setbacks between the house and wetland and limit of work would remain the same as approved. The Snows would also like to move or reconstruct the existing shed approximately 10 ft closer to Rugani Ave, but would keep it outside the 50 ft buffer to the wetland on the lot. GM would like the changes to be approved as DeMinimis Activities that can be captured on the As-Built Plans.
- JK asks if there is any change to the septic system? GM indicates no changes to the system capacity or location. The new system has been approved by the Board of Health. In response to a follow-up from JK, GM indicates that the new shed location is previously disturbed area.

- BG feels the proposed changes are slight enough to count as DeMinimis Activities. JK polls the Commissioners on whether to approve the proposed changes as DeMinimis Activities or require an amended OOC: BO DeMinimis; SC DeMinimis; CH DeMinimis; JR DeMinimis; PC DeMinimis; AL DeMinimis; JK DeMinimis.
- JK motions to approve the proposed activities as DeMinimis Activities that can be captured on the As-Built Plans. PC second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

# B2 16 Joyce Street, deck removal & support inquiry in coastal dune about DeMinimis Activity vs. Conservation Permit – Jim Daddario

- Property owner Jim Daddario (JD) present. JK has looked at applicant's proposal and feels it is clearly not DeMinimis, but applicant would like further guidance. The yard was altered as a result of sea wall reconstruction work. JD states that the activity he is contemplating includes repairs to decking and other exterior structures; this would include the addition of a couple extra steps off the back corner of the deck for easier access to the side yard. He would also like to add about 50 sq ft to the front part of the existing deck to aid in the repair and support of the balcony above, and remove a 220 sq ft lower-level deck and covert to usable space with some plantings.
- JK feels the proposed work could be permitted as an RDA, and polls the Commissioners on whether to allow the project to be filed as such: SC RDA; CH RDA; JR RDA; PC RDA; AL RDA; BO RDA; JK RDA.
- BG confirms JD shall submit an RDA with engineered drawing for: 1) removal of approximately 220 sq ft of deck, 2) approximately 50 sq ft added for balcony support, and 3) small set of steps approximately 10 sq ft as there is no access at present.
- JK motions to require the filing of an RDA, with engineered drawing, for the work at 16 Joyce St proposed by the property owner. SC second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

## B3 John Sherman Estates/Subdivision Special Conditions Review – Greg Morse & Paul Driscoll

• BG requests that this matter be tabled, as he and Commissioner AL will be discussing the status of the site with Greg Morse in the near future.

# B4 New Town Request For Certified Abutters List - Discuss & Ratify Usage - Bill Grafton & Commissioners

- BG requests authorization for the Conservation Office to use the new Certified Abutters List approved by the Assessor's Office with respect to abutter notifications.
- JK motions to authorize use of the new Certified Abutters List for abutter notifications. AL second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Prior to the start of the public hearings, JK announces that the hearings for Spectrum Homes Lot 9 (2893) and Lots 10-13 (2895), and Dewey (2893) have been continued.

### 2887 Murphy, Brewster Rd (Road impvts. & storm water mgmnt facilities)......cont from 10/20/20 (Bert)

- Continued Hearing; BO Hearing Officer. Attorney James Creed Jr. (JC); John Zimmer (JZ), South River Environmental; and Terry McGovern (TM), Stenbeck & Taylor present for applicant. JC states that he learned Saturday morning that the peer review consultant, Goldman, had run out of funds. JC sent an e-mail in response to all Commissioners which he begins to recap; at this point, JK notes that applicant has five minutes to present their project to the Commission, and he assumes the reason applicant requested a hearing tonight is so the Commission could vote. JC replies he doesn't know how a vote could occur this evening given the peer review report is not completed.
- BO agrees that the Commission is waiting on the peer review report and notes there seems to be a breakdown in communication, as the Commission was made aware of the issue with regard to additional on February 12 and BO thought this was conveyed to applicant. BG states Goldman advised him the funds were starting to dwindle, but they didn't advise the funds were nearly exhausted until roughly the 17th or 18th. He then conveyed that information as part of an e-mail to TM on February 23rd.

- JC cites 505-5 Section G(9) of Commission regulations, stating that the consultant fees shall be reasonable cost and expenses in accordance with a schedule in Section 9, and argues this schedule was not followed, as the Commission accepted Goldman's bid of \$8400, which JC characterizes as 10x more than the low bidder and 2x more than the middle bidders. JC also notes that the three middle bidders had closed-end contracts such that their total billing would not exceed their bid, and that applicant relied on a Commission representation that Goldman's bid was a better proposal that would answer all its questions. JC's understanding is that Goldman has only conducted a draft review thus far, may require thousands more dollars to complete their report, and will not release the report until paid in full, which is unacceptable to applicant. At this point, BO suggests that further commentary on this issue be addressed to Town Counsel; JC concurs but states he wants the questions in his e-mail answered before his client provides any more funds to complete the peer review report, which he contends should not have cost half the original \$8400 bid.
- BO asks JC if he wants TM to present an update regarding the project? JC states that a final presentation can't be made without having seen the peer review report. JR at this point objects to what he characterizes as JC's disrespectful tone with the Commission as well as staff, and asks that the hearing proceed in a more civil manner.
- At this point, TM gives an update on revisions made on his end. He sent all plan and drainage revisions to Brian Donahoe (BD), Goldman Consulting, and the subsequent exchanges dealt with coming up with the best treatment drain solution addressing the concern of the Commission with regard to respecting setbacks to the wetlands, while still providing the required treatment to an Outstanding Resource Water plus some method of recharge which would lie outside of the abutting well setbacks. As a result, TM has reconfigured the bottom part of the drainage to use a combination of pea stone diaphragm along the edge of the pavement below the last catch basin at the corner of Chilton Street. The diaphragm extends to a vegetated filter strip, leading to a shallow rain garden for treatment but not recharge purposes, which will then discharge via a stone filter berm to a detention basin at the lowest point. The basin remains above the AE flood zone, and a final outfall and stilling basin extends just inside the 25 ft buffer to the wetland, which is allowed under the performance standards.
- TM also notes that the first downstream catch basin includes a first-defense treatment unit similar to those used at the Green Harbor marina. They have also provided the required minimum amount of discharge to the southwesterly side of Brewster Road. TM states that BD thought he was on the right track with the changes, but his review is not completed as of this date. TM also states that they have respected the abutting neighbor's well setbacks with regard to recharge, and believes they are providing the recommended treatment drain.
- BO asks whether the water flowing from catch basin 1 to 2 go through the defender unit? TM indicates it does, and catch basin includes an oil and gas hood, as typically required by Planning Board review engineer Pat Brennan. BO asks how the water flows from the defender units? TM confirms it flows first to the leach pits and then to the detention basin, thus handling 1300-1400 cubic feet of recharge and meeting the TSS performance standard by the time of discharge. TM further states that the system is designed to not to back up stormwater in the direction of abutter Mark Ochs, but rather to route it downhill through the treatment fixtures to the discharge point. BG thinks TM has made progress in the stormwater system design, but ultimately his comments, as well as TM's redesigns, will ultimately pivot off the final report from Goldman, which will be needed to complete the hearing.
- PC asks TM where the detention basin discharges; it will discharge through a 12-inch pipe into the outfall and stilling basin. PC thanks TM for his efforts in revising the drainage system, and comments on the complexity of the project given the location of the proposed house and the street improvements required by the Planning Board; he feels that the cost of the engineering reviews are likely a small percentage of the overall total project cost, and are necessary in order for the Commission to make the right decision. PC also feels that Goldman, although a larger and more costly company, does high-quality work that he trusts; AL and JK second PC's comments. JK adds that TM and BD have worked together on the Green Harbor Marina project, and he thinks the project is making progress. At this point, JK feels there is not a need for further "public update" hearings on this project, and the Commission could possibly vote on a decision tonight unless applicant would prefer to continue. BO would like to review BD's report before a vote. JK responds he interprets a request to be on a meeting agenda as a request for a decision, and would prefer that applicant wait until all information is in before requesting time on a future agenda.

- Attorney Kim Kroha (KK), representing abutters Mark Ochs (MO), Eileen Jackson (ET) and Ken Jacobson (KT), agrees that the Commission could vote on the matter tonight but that it would be in the best interest of all to wait for the final peer review report. KK feels applicant has taken some steps to address her client's initial concerns but notes that they still have some additional concerns which were set forth in the November 30th e-mail that BG provided to the peer reviewer, with a request that those responses be included in the report. Given these outstanding issues, KK would prefer that the Commission and applicant agree to a continuation.
- BO indicates he would prefer to see the final peer review report before voting and asks if applicant would assent to a continuation. JC states for the record that they did not ask to be on tonight's agenda for a vote, but rather to discuss the peer review report, which was not forthcoming. Given what he characterizes as a likely denial if the matter is put to a vote, JC will assent to a continuance provided it not be counted towards the Commission's "three continuance" policy. BO would not be inclined to count a continuance towards the policy; JC assents to a continuation. BG points out there should be sufficient time for the report to be completed and all parties to review and respond.
- JK does not object to not charging applicant with a continuance, but feels that when an applicant does not ask for a continuance, the assumption of all Commissioners is they should come prepared for a vote, and applicants should request a continuance if they are not prepared for a vote. JC points out for the record that he did not find out until Saturday that there would be no peer review report, after the deadline for requesting a continuation. JK feels in this case, JC should have requested a continuation prior to the deadline when he did not have the report in hand. BG reiterates that he emailed TM on Tuesday, February 23, which included a weekly update from BD date 2/19/2021 containing Goldman's request for additional funds in order to complete the report.
- All parties discuss a continuation date; BG feels it will depend on when applicant can provide the additional funds to
  Goldman; JK states the Commission technically doesn't need the report, but rather a statement from the applicant
  that they have provided the final information the Commission needs to make a decision, and it is up to applicant
  whether or not this should include the peer review report. JC states he will need to find out how long it will take his
  client to raise the required funds. After further discussion, the matter is continued to April 6; applicant can request
  a continuation to a later date as needed. BG will work with JC and Town Counsel with respect to the additional
  funding.
- BO motions to continue the hearing to April 6, 2021. AL second. Approved 6-1-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-no, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

### 2909 Russell, 126 Beach Street (Elevate Single Family Home & Decks)......NEW (Craig)

- JK reads the legal ad. Hearing Officer CH confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- John Zimmer (JZ), South River Environmental, presents for applicant. The proposed activity is the elevation of an existing SFH and addition of a deck. The lot is 5500 sq ft, and is not in barrier beach or coastal dune, so the elevated home will be on a foundation with flood vents. They are also proposing to take down existing decks in back of the house with a single deck, and resurface the parking area with stone dust.
- BG asks JZ about the methodology he used to delineate the property? JZ went by plants as well as the high tide line.
   BG points out the presence of native plants to the rear of the shed and the edge of the lawn that he would like to be protected by conservation markers.
   BG has no issue with the foundation as proposed, as the barrier beach/coastal dune is located across the Cut River, along Bay Avenue.
   JZ has no issues with posting conservation markers and is willing to submit an updated site plan showing their location by Friday.
   BG suggests the posting of 5 markers; he will work with JZ on their placement.
- JR asks if any walkways are planned for the property? JZ states that the new deck will come off the back of the house and extend all the way to the shed; there is an existing deck off the front of the house, with stairs, that will remain. In response to a query from BO, JZ indicates that most of the equipment currently stored along the side of the house will move to the deck or shed. SC asks if there is any room for native plantings that might improve the site; BG feels these can be made if applicant requests walkways in the future.
- CH asks for comments from the public; none.
- BG indicates that the standard conditions of approval will apply in addition to special conditions requiring the posting
  of 5 conservation markers in the back yard and submission of a revised site plan to the Conservation Office by noon
  on Friday, March 5.
- CH motions to close the hearing and issue Orders of Conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. SC second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

# 2910 Farrell, 41 Prince Circle (Septic, Garage, Addition and 2 Porches)......NEW (Craig)

- JK reads the legal ad. Hearing Officer CH confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- John Zimmer (JZ), South River Environmental, presents for applicant. The proposed activity is a septic repair and construction of addition, garage, and two porches. The lot is in NHESP priority habitat and buffer zone to BVW. There is an existing concrete parking pad in the 50 to 75 ft buffer that will be removed. Applicants would like to pave the driveway, only a portion of which is in the 100 ft buffer. The addition and deck areas are located in previously disturbed lawn. The septic is almost entirely outside the buffer zone. Erosion controls will be placed along the limit of work and around the back of the concrete pad. JZ has sent the NOI to NHESP but has not yet received their comments; BG indicates that he had not received their comments either, which will necessitate a continuance.
- CH notes the presence of a shed and dog kennel in the 25 ft buffer near the wetland; BG indicates there is no record of a permit for the kennel in the file. PC asks about impervious surface increase? JZ indicates the existing impervious surface on the property is 1729 sq ft, which includes driveway areas outside Commission jurisdiction, and the project will ultimately result in an increase of about 3.38% impervious surface in the overall property. JZ notes that the majority of the impervious surface increase is outside Commission jurisdiction. BO asks if the dog kennel can be moved? JZ will check with applicants.
- BO also asks BG and CH if they are satisfied with the location of the proposed conservation markers? BG thinks they need to be relocated upgradient; CH concurs, noting that presently the lawn extends almost to the wetland line. BG would also like applicants to stop cutting and green waste dumping within the 0 to 25 ft buffer, which would help the area rejuvenate. BG also suggests that applicants consider converting the driveway to gravel as a way to mitigate the impervious surface increase; CH notes that the majority of the driveway is outside Commission jurisdiction; JZ indicates he will discuss with applicants. JK agrees that increase in impervious area is a concern but feels the Commission cannot impose requirements on nonjurisdictional areas; CH concurs.
- CH asks for comments from the public; none.
- The matter is continued pending receipt of NHESP comments and revised site plan. JK asks JZ to make sure to request a continuation in a timely fashion if the NHESP comments and other required documents are not ready by 12 noon Tuesday, March 9th; BG concurs.
- CH motions to continue the matter to March 16, 2021. JR second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

## 2908 Weymouth, 257 Oak Street (Addition to SFH & Relocate Septic)......NEW (Joe)

- JK reads the legal ad. Hearing Officer JR confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Terry McGovern (TM), Stenbeck & Taylor, presents for applicants Brian Weymouth (BW) and Meaghan Weymouth (MW). The proposed activity is the construction of an addition to the existing SFH and relocation of the septic system. BW notes that the addition will be built 10 ft off the house, away from the wetlands, and will be connected to the house by a mudroom; it will house a two-car garage and new master bedroom above. Stenbeck & Taylor will relocate the septic system. TM adds that the addition will be to the east side of the house in an area of existing driveway. Part of the paved driveway in the rear will be removed, resulting in a small net decrease in impervious area on the property. The septic tank, currently located where the addition is to be constructed, will be relocated inside the driveway island, in line with the existing pipe. Impacts from the relocation will be on the opposite side of the house from the wetland. Erosion controls are proposed along the limit of work.
- BG states that he visited the property and observed wetland facultative plants, including sweet pepperbush and red maples, in the back. He also noted that the wetland delineation shifted significantly downgradient between the 2010 and current plans, and observed what appeared to be alterations to wetlands in back extending to 271 Oak. BG would like to see conservation markers posted along 25 foot buffer line to avoid any future cutting and encroachment, and suggests that applicant discuss mitigation on 271 Oak directly with the owners. The clethora / sweet pepperbush are likely to rejuvenate if left alone. BG also notes that the current plans do not show existing wetlands across Oak Street or an area in back which probably qualifies as an IVW under the Town Bylaw.
- TM states that Brooke Monroe (BM), Pinebrook Consulting, had renewed the flags coming down beside the house in November; BG specifies the area between flags 8-11 as his area of concern. MW states that the flags may be different in this area because they have an easement on 271 Oak, and the flags were moved when they obtained the easement, to mark where it went to; the easement is filed with the Town. BG states that if filling of wetlands

took place in the easement, applicant is required to mitigate at a 2:1 rate, and it appears that 1000 sq feet of wetlands were filled in back.

- BO asks MW if the easement she referenced was an area the previous owners used as a yard? She indicates the area had been used, and the elderly owner of 271 Oak no longer lives in the property; their back shed is technically on his land, and they were advised legally to get an easement and permission to use the area, which was done in 2013.
   BG agrees that there may have been some historic activity in the area, but states there also appears to have been fill added to the area sometime after 2010 based on conservation records.
   BG requests that the area in back be flagged and soil samples taken to determine the extent of the wetland.
- JR suggests a continuation to allow for reflagging of the property, and for applicants to work with BG to resolve the issues regarding activities in back; BG requests a continuation to April 6 to allow him to walk the property with BM. JK notes for the record that the Commission is not able to guarantee approval of the project on that particular date, or any project for which it does not yet have the final plans. BG and PC thank applicants for their cooperation in agreeing to the April 6 continuation.
- JR motions to continue the hearing to April 6, 2021. CH second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

# 2820 Amended Follett, 300 Ridge Road (driveway, walkway, wood platform, landscape)......NEW (Joe)

- JK reads the legal ad. Hearing Officer JR confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- JR indicates that the filing is a request for an Amended OOC due to deviations from the plans approved under OOC SE42-2820. John Zimmer (JZ), South River Environmental, presents for applicant. The deviations from approved plans include installation of a paved instead of pervious driveway, HVAC unit on a gravel base, gas meter and junction box on the side of the house, as well as some landscaping and pavers in front of the house. As mitigation for these additions, they are offering to relocate the conservation markers to the edge of the lawn, plant high tide bush and Virginia Rose in the area between the lawn and salt marsh, and plant bayberry bushes along the side of the fence.
- JR has no issue with the HVAC unit or gas meter, but notes that the original plans from 2019 included a smaller gravel driveway that came out from the garage; applicants worked with BG and the Commission on the original filing, received and recorded their OOC, and therefore must have known they weren't supposed to put in a much larger paved driveway; that they did so anyways strikes JR as segmentation, and he personally would like to see the driveway removed. CH would like to see an impervious table for the property; BG notes that the table wasn't required when the project was originally approved, but agrees one should be provided now. PC agrees with JR that the driveway is an egregious deviation. AL thinks the only solution, given the small size of the lot, is making the driveway pervious. JK agrees with the Commissioners that applicants must respect their Orders of Conditions, but suggests converting part of the driveway to pervious material, in addition to the proposed mitigation, as a possible resolution. SC feels requiring removal would not be unreasonable, as this is a major deviation from the OOC in a sensitive area. BO feels JK's idea has some merit, as the Commission would gain the additional mitigation offered by JZ; PC concurs as it would also improve drainage along the street and the appearance of the driveway.
- Regarding lack of impervious table, BO notes that applicants own a lot of marsh, so the percentage of impervious area still comes out to be relatively small. However, BG notes that the square footage of impervious area is still high.
- BG would also like a narrative and planting table for the mitigation, as well as a specific location for the relocated conservation markers. Long term monitoring will also be needed for the plantings. At this point JR believes Commission consensus is in favor of JK's proposal. After further discussion, the matter is continued for an updated site plan with RPE stamp, planting plan including planting table, and impervious table with cross-sections. JZ indicates they are willing to cooperate with the Commission and assents to continuation to April 6.
- JR motions to continue the hearing to April 6, 2021. SC second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: AL-yes, CH-yes, JR-yes, PC-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, JK-yes.

## **CONTINUED HEARINGS**

# 2893 Spectrum Homes Inc., 14 (Lot 9) Adelaide Way (New SFH)...............................cont from 12/15/2020 (Art)

- The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on March 16, 2021. Per applicant request, as NHESP CMP renewal is still pending.
- JK motions to continue the hearing to March 16, 2021. CH second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, PC-yes, CH-yes, JK-yes.

# 2895 Spectrum Homes Inc., 16, 18, 20 & 22 (Lots 10-13) Adelaide Way (grading & retaining wall)...cont from 12/15/2020 (Art)

- The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on March 16, 2021. Per applicant request, as NHESP CMP renewal is still pending.
- JK motions to continue the hearing to March 16, 2021. AL second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, PC-yes, CH-yes, JK-yes.

# 2905 Dewey, South River Street (New SFH)......cont from 2/2/2021 (Bert)

- JK reads the legal ad. The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on March 16, 2021 per applicant's written request. Board of Health has advised that siting of a septic system on the property will be difficult.
- JK motions to continue the hearing to March 16, 2021. JR second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, PC-yes, CH-yes, JK-yes.

## **REQUESTS FOR CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE & EXTENSIONS**

## 2560 Welch, 1 Jackson Street [EXT]

- BG recommended issuance of the EXT; he has advised property owners that a COC with ongoing conditions may be another option.
- JK motions to issue a three-year extension for the property, SE42-2560. CH second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, PC-yes, CH-yes, JK-yes.

## 2709 Lohe, 1354 Union Street [EXT]

- BG recommended issuance of the EXT. Property owner recently received an amended OOC; the extension will allow them to complete the newly permitted work.
- CH recuses from voting.
- JK motions to issue a three-year extension for the property. PC second. Approved 6-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, PC-yes, JK-yes.

CH returns to the public meeting.

## 2732 Town of Scituate, South River Dredge [EXT]

- BG recommended issuance of the EXT. Harbormaster Mike DiMeo (MD) advised that the dredging crew had to leave in October 2019, before dredging to the Sea Street bridge could be completed. MD provided details about completed work and justification to continue work under the existing OOCs.
- JK motions to issue a three-year extension. JR second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, PC-yes, CH-yes, JK-yes.

## 1860 Burbank (Now Legro) 250 Damons Point Road [COC]

- BG visited the property and recommended issuance of the COC.
- JK motions to issue a COC for the property. AL second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, PC-yes, CH-yes, JK-yes.

## 2436 1852 Ocean St LLC, 1852 Ocean Street [COC]

- BG observed unsatisfied special conditions E, F, I, J, and L, and noted there was significant commercial debris on site, and the erosion controls had not been removed. Additionally, there was no letter signed and stamped by a professional land surveyor accompanying the Request For COC submittal, which is required as per the COC checklist, and the roofwater recharge system does not discharge into the subsurface as required. He recommended that the request be tabled and the Commissioners visit the property to observe the conditions.
- JK motions to table the request for COC until additional information from applicant is received. CH second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, BO-yes, PC-yes, CH-yes, JK-yes.

### **ENFORCEMENT ORDERS**

Smith, 38 Liberty Street (11/19/18 KS will set early Dec visit); Drosopoulos, 7 Lady Slipper Lane (08/15/18 TC Final Notice); Mahaney, 46 Preston Terrace (12/12/18 BG met with TC); White, 180 Atwell Circle (Escalation letter in Process); Bednarz/Nouza, 65 Ireland Road (Unpermitted Cutting </= 50 ft): Tamara Macuch, 237 Webster Avenue; Stifter, 102 Bartlett's Island (unpermitted revetment wall)

<u>ADJOURNMENT</u> – JK makes a motion to close the hearing at 8:46 PM. JR second. Approved 7-0-0 by Roll Call Vote: JR-yes, BO-yes, AL-yes, SC-yes, PC-yes, CH-yes, JK-yes.

Respectfully submitted, Bill Grafton, Conservation Administrator

Marshfield Conservation Commission Liz Anoja, Conservation Administrative Clerk

James Kilcoyne, Chair Bert O'Donnell, Vice Chair

Art Lage Joe Ring
Craig Hannafin Rick Carberry

Susan Caron