

**HINGHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JANUARY 5, 2026@ 7:00 PM
REMOTE MEETING**

Planning Board Members Present Remotely: Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Crystal Kelly, Tracy Shriver

Planning Board Members Absent: None

Also Present: Emily Wentworth, Community Planning Director

At 7:01 PM Chair Shriver called the Planning Board meeting to order and stated the following:

“This meeting is being held remotely as an alternate means of public access pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025 suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law. You are hereby advised that this meeting and all communications during this meeting may be recorded by the Town of Hingham in accordance with the Open Meeting Law. If any participant wishes to record this meeting, please notify me at the start of the meeting in accordance with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 20(f) so that I, as Chair, may inform all other participants of said recording.”

Chair Shriver confirmed no other attendees requested to record the meeting.

Chair Shriver took roll call attendance of other members present including,

Hearing(s) & Discussion

**Off Old Derby Street and Whiting Street
Preliminary Subdivision**

Chair Shriver moved on to the first item, which was an application from 177 Old Derby Development, LLC for a Preliminary Subdivision of approximately 104 acres of land located between Old Derby Street and Whiting Street (Route 53). The proposed plan includes an extension of Old Derby Street and layout of a new connector road to Whiting Street to provide access to nine new subdivision lots.

Prior to the hearing, the applicant made a request to continue.

Tracy Shriver made a motion seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick To CONTINUE the application of 177 Old Derby Development, LLC (the Bristols) for a Preliminary Subdivision of approximately 104 acres of land located between Old Derby Street and Whiting Street (Route 53) that includes an extension of Old Derby Street and layout of a new connector road to Whiting Street to provide access to nine new subdivision lots to January 26, 2026 at 7 PM and extend the decision deadline to March 26, 2026.

The motion passed by roll call vote:

In Favor:	Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Crystal Kelly, Tracy Shriver
Opposed:	None

**1192 Main Street
Site Plan Review**

Chair Shriver moved on to the next hearing which was an application from Anton Cela for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to construct a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 1192 Main Street in Residence District B.

Prior to the hearing, the applicant made a request to continue the hearing and extend the decision deadline.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gordon Carr, to CONTINUE the application of Anton Cela for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to construct a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 1192 Main Street in Residence District B to January 26, 2026 at 7 PM and extend the decision deadline to February 26, 2026.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor:	Gary Tondorf-Dick, Crystal Kelly, Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis, Tracy Shriver
Opposed:	None

22 Del Prete Drive Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to the next agenda item, which was the application of Jennifer and Philip McGuire for Site Plan Review under Section 1-I of the Zoning By-law. The proposal for 22 Del Prete Drive includes two additions to the existing home, a new swimming pool, and associated hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage improvements. It was noted that the project also requires an Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission, which was meeting the same evening.

Paul Gunn of Morse Engineering presented on behalf of the applicant. He described the existing property as a single-family home of approximately 4,900 square feet on a 31,000-square-foot lot, part of which includes wetland resource area. The site currently contains a paved driveway, decks, walkways, retaining walls, and a mix of lawn, landscaped, and wooded areas. A drainage easement and associated pipe run along the left side of the property, conveying runoff from Del Prete Drive to the wetlands.

Mr. Gunn explained that the proposed additions and pool would increase the gross floor area to just over 6,300 square feet, resulting in a floor area ratio consistent with neighborhood averages. The driveway would remain largely unchanged, and new hardscaping, including retaining walls under 48 inches and pervious patio areas, would replace existing features. Stormwater impacts would be mitigated through a subsurface drywell system, which had been reviewed by Pat Brennan, with all comments addressed. He also shared that two trees within the protected tree yard are proposed for removal: a non-native blue spruce and a 10-inch ornamental cherry. The landscape plan includes significant mitigation plantings, including 17 new native evergreens, 11 western arborvitae and 6 eastern red cedar. The architectural plans prepared by John Turoki were also reviewed.

The Board noted that the front façade and massing would remain largely consistent with the existing structure, with most of the expansion occurring at the rear of the house and therefore not visible from the street. Member Tondorf-Dick asked several questions regarding plantings, species selection, and neighborhood scale. Member Tondorf-Dick noted Site Plan Review Criteria C and commented that although the massing of the proposed home in regards to the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood homes was larger, the lot was also much larger in proportion. Landscape architect Sean Papich explained the rationale for choosing arborvitae and cedar. Mr. Gunn emphasized that the additions are modest and consistent with surrounding homes. Mr. Gunn added that among the 15–16 homes analyzed, the proposed house would fall near the middle in both floor area and floor area ratio.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment. There was none.

Based on the information submitted and presented during the hearing Chair Shriver presented the following finding(s):

- a. The proposed development, as conditioned by the Approval, will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the prospective occupants, the occupants of neighboring properties, and users of the adjoining streets or highways, and the welfare of the Town generally.
- b. The proposed development meets all applicable Design and Performance Standards.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick to GRANT the application of Jennifer and Phillip Maguire for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to construct two additions and a pool with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 22 Del Prete Drive in Residence District A, subject to the following conditions:

1. Proof of Recording. The Applicant shall file a certified copy of this decision in the Registry of Deeds and provide evidence of such recording with the application for a building permit.
2. Pre-Construction Meeting. A preconstruction review meeting with inspection of the erosion control installation and marked limits of clearing shall be required before issuance of a building permit.

3. Limits of Work; Tree Protection Areas. During clearing and/or construction activities, the marked limit of work shall be maintained until all construction work is completed and the site is cleaned up. All vegetation beyond the limit of work shall be retained in an undisturbed state and no stockpiling of topsoil or storage of fill, materials, or equipment may occur within the protected area. Without limiting the foregoing, Protected Trees to be retained shall be surrounded by temporary protective fencing or other appropriate measures before any clearing or grading occurs, and maintained until all construction work is completed and the site is cleaned up. Protective barriers shall be large enough to encompass the Critical Root Zone of all Protected Trees to be preserved. Inspection of the protective barriers shall be required before issuance of a Building Permit.
4. Construction Vehicles. All construction vehicles shall be parked onsite. No construction vehicles shall enter the premises before 7 AM on any given construction day. In the event it is not feasible for construction vehicles to park onsite, the Applicant shall schedule a police detail to safely direct traffic.
5. Inspections. Inspections shall be required during construction, and prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, of all elements of the project related to or affecting erosion control, limits of work, and the approved drainage and stormwater system installed for the project. The Planning Board may require, at the applicant's expense, the establishment of a consultant fee account pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44 Section 53G, to fund the cost of such inspections.
6. As-Built Plan Requirement. Upon project completion an as-built plan must be submitted to the Building Commissioner and Community Planning Department prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, and in no event later than two years after the completion of construction. In addition to such other requirements as are imposed by the Building Commissioner, the as-built plan must demonstrate substantial conformance with the stormwater system design and performance standards of the approved project plans. The as-built plan must also demonstrate substantial conformance with all other aspects of the approved project plans, including landscaping.
7. Maintenance of Protected Trees. Each Protected Tree retained, and all trees planted to mitigate the removal of Protected Tree(s), shall be maintained in good health for a period of no less than twenty-four (24) months from the date of final inspection, or issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, if applicable. Should such tree(s) die or be removed within such twenty-four (24) month period, the owner of the property shall be required to replace such tree with a tree consistent with the requirements within nine (9) months from the death or removal of such Protected Tree or new tree.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor: Gary Tondorf-Dick, Kevin Ellis, Gordon Carr, Crystal Kelly, Tracy Shriver
Opposed: None

25 Arnold Road
Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to the next item which was an application from Spiros and Athena Giannaros for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 25 Arnold Road in Residence District A.

Spiros Giannaros, the applicant, began by saying the existing structure was in a state of severe disrepair. He stated their goal was to prevent the construction of an "oppressively large" home that had been previously planned for the site. He worked with his builder Jay Graca to design an oversized cape that sits lower to the ground, to preserve the streetscape and the natural shade provided by the existing Norway Maples.

Paul Gunn of Morse Engineering reviewed the project from its current state to the proposed new residence with a gross floor area of 6,050 square feet. He emphasized the infrastructure improvements, including the abandonment of the old septic system in favor of a new Title V compliant system and the replacement of water and electrical connections. The major focus of the presentation was the improvement of stormwater management. Mr. Gunn pointed out that while the site currently allows

untreated water to flow from the rear to the front yard, the applicant is proposing a subsurface system to capture all roof runoff, plus two drainage wells to protect neighboring properties from overland flow. Mr. Gunn confirmed that no existing trees in the protected yard would be removed. A 10-inch evergreen was removed within the last year and the applicants have proposed a robust mitigation plan including 12 new trees, made up of American Holly and Eastern Red Cedar, to bolster the buffer near the conservation land.

Member Tondorf-Dick questioned the proposed footprint and if it adhered to the setback requirements. He also asked for clarification on the cut and fill plan noting the grades at the front of the house were increasing. He was concerned about runoff affecting neighboring lots. Mr. Gunn advised that the grading was done to keep the basement slab above the groundwater table. He advised that in response to the peer review the drainage had been revised to include two swales 5 foot off the property line that would direct runoff to the street rather than the neighboring properties.

Member Tondorf-Dick also noted the lot is significantly smaller than others in the neighborhood and questioned the scale of the new dwelling in relation to adjacent homes. Mr. Gunn replied that although the gross floor area is slightly above the living area average, the below grade areas do not visually add to the bulk/scale.

Based on the information submitted and presented during the hearing, Chair Shriver made the proposed finding(s):

- a. The proposed development, as conditioned by the Approval, will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the prospective occupants, the occupants of neighboring properties, and users of the adjoining streets or highways, and the welfare of the Town generally.
- b. The proposed development meets all applicable Design and Performance Standards.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to GRANT the application of Spiros and Athena Giannaros for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 25 Arnold Road in Residence District A, subject to the following conditions:

1. Proof of Recording. The Applicant shall file a certified copy of this decision in the Registry of Deeds and provide evidence of such recording with the application for a building permit.
2. Pre-Construction Meeting. A preconstruction review meeting with inspection of the erosion control installation and marked limits of clearing shall be required before issuance of a building permit.
3. Limits of Work; Tree Protection Areas. During clearing and/or construction activities, the marked limit of work shall be maintained until all construction work is completed and the site is cleaned up. All vegetation beyond the limit of work shall be retained in an undisturbed state and no stockpiling of topsoil or storage of fill, materials, or equipment may occur within the protected area. Without limiting the foregoing, Protected Trees to be retained shall be surrounded by temporary protective fencing or other appropriate measures before any clearing or grading occurs, and maintained until all construction work is completed and the site is cleaned up. Protective barriers shall be large enough to encompass the Critical Root Zone of all Protected Trees to be preserved. Inspection of the protective barriers shall be required before issuance of a Building Permit.
4. Construction Vehicles. All construction vehicles shall be parked onsite. No construction vehicles shall enter the premises before 7 AM on any given construction day. In the event it is not feasible for construction vehicles to park onsite, the Applicant shall schedule a police detail to safely direct traffic.
5. Inspections. Inspections shall be required during construction, and prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, of all elements of the project related to or affecting erosion control, limits of work, and the approved drainage and stormwater system installed for the project. The Planning Board may require, at the applicant's expense, the establishment of a consultant fee account pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44 Section 53G, to fund the cost of such inspections.

6. Mitigation Trees. As required under § I-I.6.d.(ii), each new deciduous tree to be planted shall have a minimum caliper of three (3) inches.
7. As-Built Plan Requirement. Upon project completion an as-built plan must be submitted to the Building Commissioner and Community Planning Department prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, and in no event later than two years after the completion of construction. In addition to such other requirements as are imposed by the Building Commissioner, the as-built plan must demonstrate substantial conformance with the stormwater system design and performance standards of the approved project plans. The as-built plan must also demonstrate substantial conformance with all other aspects of the approved project plans, including landscaping.
8. Maintenance of Protected Trees. Each Protected Tree retained, and all trees planted to mitigate the removal of Protected Tree(s), shall be maintained in good health for a period of no less than twenty-four (24) months from the date of final inspection, or issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, if applicable. Should such tree(s) die or be removed within such twenty-four (24) month period, the owner of the property shall be required to replace such tree with a tree consistent with the requirements within nine (9) months from the death or removal of such Protected Tree or new tree.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor:	Gordon Carr, Crystal Kelly, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Kevin Ellis, Tracy Shriver
Opposed:	None

109 Weir Street Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to the next item which was an application from ALR Homes LLC for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 109 Weir Street in Residence District C.

Jackson Griffiths, Hardy + Mann, presented on behalf of the. He highlighted the presence of significant exposed ledge and the site's proximity to Weir River Street Pond. He advised the Board that a new CULTEC 150XL HD system would be installed to manage runoff from the proposed dwelling and the new bituminous concrete portion of the driveway. The system was specifically selected to maintain a 2-foot separation from the high groundwater table (elevation 42). He also noted the plan limits disturbance of slopes (10% or greater) to 4,341 square feet, keeping the project within the threshold for a Minor Site Plan Review. The applicant is proposing a 1,514-square-foot mitigation area and new plantings to compensate for 13 trees removed by a previous owner.

Member Tondorf-Dick questioned the "exposed ledge" and sought specifics on how much rock removal would be required for the new garage and dwelling footprint. He expressed concern regarding the transition between the existing gravel at the base of the driveway and the new pavement at the top. He also asked how the proposed trench drain would prevent gravel and silt from clogging the drainage system over time. He scrutinized the shaded "disturbed areas" on the plan, asking for a clearer connection between the 10% slope disturbance and the proximity to the wetland buffers.

Chair Shriver noted that the applicant's responses to the Town's peer review were submitted only hours before the meeting. He questioned whether the Board had sufficient time to vet the "handful of technical issues" raised. Ms. Wentworth confirmed that although the materials arrived late, Pat Brennan (Peer Reviewer) had reviewed and approved the technical updates.

Pat Brennan, PGB Engineering reviewed his December report and outlined how the applicant addressed those concerns.

Chair Shriver also emphasized the importance of the tree mitigation plan, ensuring that the proposed plantings would effectively replace the canopy lost prior to the current owner's purchase.

Chairs Shriver asked for public comment.

Alexander Jordan, 3 Jordan Way, expressed concern for his and his neighbor's home and the Whites home and the amount of blasting, stating the area is solid ledge and there had been a large amount of

tree damage due to recent blasting in the area. He mentioned some large 100-year-old trees that are in danger. A brief discussion followed.

Chair Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gordon Carr, to CONTINUE the application of ALR Homes LLC for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 109 Weir Street in Residence District C to January 26, 2026 at 7 PM and to extend the decision deadline to February 10, 2026.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor:	Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis, Crystal Kelly, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Tracy Shriver
Opposed:	None

Chair Shriver moved on to a discussion of Zoning Articles initiated by the Planning Board.

Article A - “Height, Building” Definition Reference Correction (Submitted by Planning Board)

The intent of this article is to correct a section reference to the height exceptions under Section IV-C in the definition of “Height, Building” under Section VI. This is a typical clean up article.

Ms. Wentworth introduced Article A, explaining that it is a straightforward “cleanup” amendment intended to correct an outdated section reference within the zoning by-law. She noted that the definition of “height building,” located in **Section 6**, currently refers to **Section 4C(8)**. The correct reference should now be **Section 4C(9)**. She also clarified that Section 4C(8) now pertains to building projections such as porches, chimneys, and bay windows, whereas Section 4C(9) contains the height exceptions relevant to the definition. The proposed amendment simply updates the numerical reference to reflect the correct section.

Member Carr asked whether state statute provides any mechanism for correcting such minor “Scribner’s errors” without requiring a full Town Meeting vote. Ms. Wentworth responded while purely grammatical or punctuation corrections can sometimes be made administratively, this particular change could be interpreted as substantive because it alters a cross-reference, even if the intent is obvious. She further explained that it was identified jointly by the zoning office and the building department while reviewing a project and recommended that the Planning Board bring forward the correction. A brief discussion followed.

Ms. Wentworth advised the Warrant Article would ask whether the Town should amend the zoning by-law by replacing the reference to Section 4C(8) in Section 6 with a reference to Section 4C(9). The Board’s motion, if taken, would be to recommend adoption of Article A as presented.

Gary Tondorf-Dick asked whether any members of the public wished to comment. Chair Shriver confirmed that no public comments were offered.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Crystal Kelly, to RECOMMEND Article A as presented be moved forward for inclusion in to Town Meeting.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor:	Crystal Kelly, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Tracy Shriver
Opposed:	None

Article B - Brew Pub, Brewery, Winery, or Distillery Use Update

The intent of this article is to expand the locations where the Brew Pub, Brewery, Winery, and Distillery use is allowed under Section III-A, Schedule of Uses, by Special Permit A2 to include the Office Park, Waterfront Business, Industrial, and Limited Industrial Park districts.

Ms. Wentworth moved on to Article B and reminded the Board that this specific use was established two years prior (2024) and is currently permitted by Special Permit (A2) in three districts: Business A, Business B, and the Industrial Park. Ms. Wentworth explained that the proposed article seeks to expand these allowable locations to include the Office Park, Waterfront Business, Industrial, and Limited Industrial Park districts.

Ms. Wentworth advised that the original 2024 article faced some community opposition and characterized the initial rollout as a “trial run.” She advised that despite the 2024 approval, the town has

received no applications for these uses in the existing three districts. She offered some additional insight on district suitability:

Industrial District (North Hingham): much of this is within the Shipyard Redevelopment area, which already allows drinking establishments. She asked if the Board truly wanted to expand this to sites like Lincoln Plaza or the Talbot site.

Waterfront Business: this district is very small (only three properties, one publicly owned) and suggested it may be inappropriate for such use due to size constraints.

Member Tondorf-Dick expressed uncertainty about supporting expanding the use beyond the existing districts and asked if there had been any actual demand or incoming applications. Ms. Wentworth responded that while there have been inquiries; no one has officially "pulled the trigger." She also raised a concern from the Board of Health regarding licensing.

Member Kelly suggested that if an expansion were to happen, the Shipyard makes the most sense as an "ideal" and "attractive" location. She argued that since the current districts have not attracted business, moving the use to a more popular area might encourage new businesses to enter the market. Ms. Wentworth countered that the Shipyard's specific zoning already allows for these uses.

Member Carr expressed strong skepticism. He argued that there is no "demonstrated market failure" to justify expansion noting that the 2024 districts were modeled after successful peer towns and insisted the town should give the current rules more than 18 months to see if demand develops. He was not convinced the article should move forward to Town Meeting.

Member Ellis noted that while he is not strictly opposed to the idea he remained cautious about the best way to draw in applications.

Article C - Site Plan Review Updates

This article would amend procedures under Section I-I by (i) eliminating Site Plan Review in association with a Special Permit A2 or Special Permit A3 unless the project separately meets land disturbance thresholds; (ii) requiring Minor Site Plan Review for projects that disturb 75% of total lot area regardless of total land area disturbed; (iii) requiring submission of a recorded decision for any project subject to Site Plan Review and not just those subject to a building permit; and (iv) enabling the Planning Board to establish an administrative review process for certain Minor Site Plans or minor modifications of approved site plans.

This article also makes formatting changes related to the above and deletes an incorrect reference under subsection k. of the Submittal Requirements.

Ms. Wentworth moved on to Article C and advised the Board this would be a familiar topic noting the major Site Plan Review overhaul in 2021. The core of the proposal is to eliminate "meaningless" reviews triggered solely by a Special Permit (A2 or A3) when no physical changes are occurring on a site.

Ms. Wentworth detailed the specific changes proposed to Section I-I of the Zoning By-Law:

- I. eliminating Site Plan Review in association with a Special Permit A2 or Special Permit A3 unless the project separately meets land disturbance thresholds
- II. requiring Minor Site Plan Review for projects that disturb 75% of total lot area
- III. requiring submission of a recorded decision for any project subject to Site Plan Review and not just those subject to a building permit
- IV. enabling the Planning Board to establish an administrative review process for certain Minor Site Plans or minor modifications of approved site plans
- V. formatting changes related to the above and deletes an incorrect reference under subsection k. of the Submittal Requirements

The Board discussed continuing the zoning hearings and the upcoming Board schedule. Ms. Wentworth shared that the Select Board will also be moving forward a zoning article however; it could not be advertised in time for the current meeting.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Crystal Kelly, to continue proposed warrant articles B & C to the January 26, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

The motion passed by roll call vote:

In Favor: Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Crystal Kelly, Tracy Shriver
Opposed: None

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Kevin Ellis, to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting at 9:49 PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

In favor: Gary Tondorf-Dick, Crystal Kelly, Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis, Tracy Shriver
Opposed: None

Meeting Materials:

Agenda Summary, dated December 31, 2025

Off Old Derby Street and Whiting Street

Preliminary Subdivision Plan Application (Form B)
Preliminary Subdivision Plan, dated December 2, 2025

1192 Main Street

Site Plan Review Application, stamped July 22, 2025
Site Plan Review Application, revised September 4, 2025
Site and Landscape Plans, dated July 21, 2025
Stormwater Report, dated July 21, 2025
Architectural Plans, dated September 30, 2024
Response to Staff and Peer Review Comments, dated September 4, 2025
Site Plan, Revised September 4, 2025
Stormwater Standards, updated September 4, 2025
Room Count, dated September 30, 2024
Revised Architectural Plan, received September 8, 2025
Explanation of Revisions, revised October 16, 2025
Site Plan, revised October 16, 2025
Architectural Plan, dated October 2, 2025
Site Plan, revised October 21, 2025
Architectural Plan, revised November 19, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated August 20, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated September 9, 2025

22 Del Prete Drive

Site Plan Review Application, filed November 20, 2025
Contact List, received November 20, 2025
Site Plan, dated November 13, 2025
Architectural Plans, dated March 19, 2025
Landscape and Mitigation Plan, dated November 20, 2025
Stormwater Report, dated November 17, 2023
Neighborhood Analysis, dated November 13, 2025
Response to Comments, December 29, 2025
Site Plan Review Application, revised December 29, 2025
Site Plan, Revised December 29, 2025
Landscape Plan, revised December 23, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated December 9, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated December 31, 2025

25 Arnold Road

Site Plan Review Application, filed November 24, 2025
Contact List
25 Arnold Road, LLC - MA Business Entity Summary, received December 18, 2025

Site Plan, dated November 4, 2025
Architectural Plans, dated November 11, 2025
Landscape Plan, dated November 13, 2025
Cut & Fill Plan, dated November 4, 2025
Arborist Letter, dated October 21, 2025
Stormwater, dated November 5, 2025
Neighborhood Analysis, dated November 13, 2025
Response to Comments, December 19, 2025
Site Plan, Revised December 17, 2025
Landscape Plan, Revised December 18, 2025
Cut & Fill Plan, Revised December 17, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated December 9, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated December 31, 2025

109 Weir Street

Site Plan Review Application, filed November 13, 2025
Narrative Letter, dated November 13, 2025
Contact List
Site Plan Sheet Set, dated November 12, 2025
Architectural Plan, dated May 24, 2025
HydroCAD Report, dated November 10, 2025
Mitigation Planting Plan, dated September 5, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated December 9, 2025

Article A - "Height, Building" Definition Reference Correction (Submitted by Planning Board)

Full text of proposed amendment

Article B - Brew Pub, Brewery, Winery, or Distillery Use Update

Full text of proposed amendment

Article C - Site Plan Review Updates

Full text of proposed amendment