

Conservation Commission

Meeting Minutes

January 26, 2026

Remote meeting via Zoom

Members Present: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Vice-Chair Nina Villanova, Robert Mosher, Thomas Roby, and, Douglas Troyer and Philip Edmundson

Members Absent: Henry (Bob) Hidell

Staff Present: Shannon Palmer, Conservation Officer & Natashja Molina, Administrative Assistant

Chair Carolyn Nielsen opened the meeting at 7:02PM and read the following statement:

“This meeting is being held remotely as an alternate means of public access pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025 and all other applicable laws temporarily amending 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 the chair at the start of the meeting in accordance with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 20(f) so that the chair may inform all other participants of said recording.”

1. Minutes

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher to approve the meeting minutes from 11/17/2025 as drafted.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 6-0.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson, Nina Villanova
Opposed: None

Vote: Commissioner Mosher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Edmundson to approve the meeting minutes from 12/8/2025 as drafted.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 4-0. (Eligible)

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Nina Villanova
Opposed: None

2. Requests for Certificate of Compliance (COC), 387 East Street, DEP No. 034-1417, Robin Koske

Meeting Documents: Staff memo and Request for Certificate of Compliance

Ms. Palmer explained an Order of Conditions was issued in 2020 for a new septic system, a letter from the engineer was provided stating substantial compliance. She noted staff had visited the site and recommended a full COC.

There were no questions or comments from the Commission.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to issue Certificate of Compliance for 387 East St, DEP No. 034-1417

The motion passed by a roll call vote 7-0.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Nina Villanova, Douglas Troyer Philip Edmundson
Opposed: None

3. Request of Extension of an Order of Conditions, 6 New Towne Drive, DEP No. 034-1395
Meeting Documents: Staff memo and Request for Request for Extension Letter by Crocker Design

Taylor Corsano, Project Representative from Crocker Design Group, explained to the Commission the applicant was requesting a three year extension for an Order of Conditions issued in 2021, the project was placed on hold due to the pandemic. She stated that once they were ready to start the project had to go before the Planning Board for site plan review. She noted from the state tolling period the project had been extended until February 2026.

Ms. Palmer recommended granting a one-year extension at the Commission's discretion, noting that work had not yet commenced. She also stated that several minor revisions were anticipated and could likely be addressed administratively.

Chair Nielsen asked the Commission if they agreed with the one year extension.

There were no objections.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to issue one year extension of Order of Conditions for 6 New Towne Drive, DEP No. 034-1395

The motion passed by a roll call vote 6-0.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Nina Villanova, Douglas Troyer Philip Edmundson

Public Meetings

1. CONT. Bare Cove Park Drive, (0 Fort Hill Street), Town of Hingham

Chair Nielsen explained to all present the request before the Commission was solely for confirmation of the wetland resource boundaries.

Matthew Sanford, PWS, RSS, Project Representative from SLR, addressed the Commission and explained the peer reviewer, Horsley Witten, had conducted a site visit in December however SLR was not able to be present. A second site visit was held on 1/23/26 with HW and SLR to review the flagged wetland boundary at which changes were made to the delineated wetlands. He shared the updated site plan and explained the revisions:

- The wetland line (Wetland A) to the east was modified as well as its associated buffers
- The limits of the potential vernal pool were also added with Wetland B to the north

Mr. Sanford stated that HW had not yet submitted their final report so they will need to continue the meeting.

Ms. Palmer has no comments.

Mr. Sanford agreed to a continuance to February 9, 2026.

Vote: Commissioner Mosher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Troyer, to continue the public meeting for Bare Cove Park Drive/0 Fort Hill Street with consent of applicant to February 9, 2026 at 7PM.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 5-0 (Eligible)

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Nina Villanova, Douglas Troyer

Opposed: None

Commissioner Villanova left the meeting 7:20PM

Public Hearings- Chair Nielsen read the public hearing statement and opened the hearings.

1. CONT. 24 Shipyard Drive, DEP No. 034-1542, Sea Chain Marina, LLC
Meeting Documents: Staff memo, NOI, Site Plan and proposed maintenance activities document submitted 1/20/26

The hearing was continued for the applicant to prepare a Master Plan for the marina maintenance program.

Fiona Vardy, Project Representative from Foth, explained to the Commission they have submitted an outline of priorities and the intent of the application was to avoid submitting a NOI for each individual repair activity over the next three years. The marina contains 315 timber piles, 33 steel piles and approximately 5,700 SF of floats. She referred to the site plan and pointed out the portion of the project area that contains shellfish habitat. If maintenance were required in that area, they would coordinate with the Shellfish Constable. Ms. Vardy identified the locations of up to five steel piles on L Dock that require replacement, as well as one timber pile that was damaged during a storm. These items were included in the priority maintenance activities, along with general storm-related wear and tear and floating dock maintenance. She further explained that the shipyard conducts multiple field investigations annually, which may include diver inspections. The marina compiles an overall list of maintenance needs and prioritizes them based on urgency, contractor availability, cost, and the seasonal window during which the work can be performed.

Ms. Palmer stated that the ongoing priority list would be based on the results of routine inspections. She noted that if permitted, the project could be conditioned to require the submission of inspection reports and notification to the Commission prior to the commencement of any work. She recommended closing the hearing.

Commissioner Troyer asked for clarification regarding the replacement of the steel piles, specifically what the work would entail and whether any assessments had been conducted to date on the timber piers.

Matt Riley, Hingham Shipyard Marina, responded that the steel pilings are located on I Dock. The pilings would be sleeved and replaced in place, with no disturbance to the surrounding area. He added that timber piles on A Dock are of concern due to storm damage, noting that one piling had broken, was removed, and will need to be replaced. Mr. Riley indicated that divers conduct annual inspections of the floating docks to assess their condition. A schedule would be established to inspect each group of docks on a rotating basis and anticipated that divers would be on site for approximately two weeks per year to complete these inspections.

Commissioner Troyer expressed concern regarding the need for notification to the Commission specifying what activities would be taking place and their exact locations.

Chair Nielsen opened the discussion to members of the public.

Anita Ryan, resident, questioned how potential pollutants are handled during ongoing maintenance.

Mr. Riley responded that they do not anticipate any pollutants to be introduced to the water system during these processes.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to close public hearing for 24 Shipyard Drive, DEP No. 034-1542.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 4-0. (Eligible)

In Favor: Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson

Opposed: None

2. 22 Del Prete Drive, DEP No. 034-1550, Jennifer & Philip McGuire

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to continue the public hearing for 22 Del Prete Drive, DEP File No. 034-1550 at request of applicant to February 23, 2026 at 7PM.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 4-0-1.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Douglas Troyer

Opposed: None

Abstained: Phil Edmundson

3. CONT. 56 Burditt Avenue, DEP No. 034-1549, Trustees of Derby Academy

Meeting Documents: Staff memo, NOI, Stormwater Memo and Site Plans revised 1/8/2026

Brad Holmes, PWS from ECR, explained this was a continued hearing for an after-the-fact air handler unit that was installed for the gymnasium at Derby Academy. Since the last presentation a peer review was completed by PGB Consulting for the stormwater at the Commission's request. He noted that based on this review some adjustment to the plan were made. He added that the mitigation proposal had also been revised to align with the Buffer Zone Mitigation Policy. Mr. Holmes described the mitigation proposal which includes 20 trees and 31 shrubs. The treatment area was also expanded to remove non-native plants including, glossy buckthorn, burning bush, and oriental bittersweet. He noted it would create and enhance the Buffer Zone throughout the area.

Joe Malo, PE, Narragansett Engineering, acknowledged the comments from the peer review and noted runoff from air handler unit, concrete pad, and retaining wall to be collected and discharged to underground stormwater system. He explained a soil evaluation and test pit was completed since the last meeting and as a result the system would be dropped down lower to provide adequate cover as this was the best option to avoid altering the grade and creating further disturbance.

Ms. Palmer questioned if there was an update on the submittal to the building department as this was an unpermitted activity, and no permit was acquired through Building or Conservation.

Walter Sullivan, Esq., representing Derby Academy, responded that he had spoken with the building department and it was his understanding they had what was required.

Ms. Palmer inquired about the existing stormwater system located in the area and whether it had been relocated.

Mr. Malo explained existing stormwater system which handled some of the gym roof runoff was relocated when the retaining wall was built and he noted they are proposing to relocate it again.

Ms. Palmer questioned if there was any consideration to use the existing system or expand to allow for the additional runoff.

Ms. Malo explained the routing was different between the two systems and that they were unable to tie them together.

Ms. Palmer confirmed with Mr. Malo that an O&M plan had been submitted. She questioned if any information was found regarding the Conservation Easement, noting that a prior OOC and letter from Derby Academy referenced a Conservation Easement in this area.

Mr. Sullivan responded that he had researched it but was unable to find any record of a recorded easement. He noted that a COC had been issued.

Ms. Palmer reiterated that the RTU was partially located in the 50 foot buffer and that the Commission would need to determine whether the proposed mitigation was sufficient for the impacts. She noted that the Buffer

Zone currently has limited vegetation and recommended relocating some of the proposed plantings at the base of the retaining wall to the slope area, where invasive species would be removed, to enhance the resource area.

Chair Nielsen asked for clarification as to whether the new stormwater system had been installed and whether stormwater was currently sheeting off.

Mr. Malo confirmed that the new stormwater system had not yet been installed. He stated that the area currently consists of crushed stone and underdrains and that, because the discharge flows to a coastal resource area, there is no requirement for peak flow mitigation.

Chair Nielsen stated the mitigation plantings would be more effective if they were planted closer to the cove rather than next to the retaining wall.

Mr. Holmes responded that they were proposing a planting area and agreed with Ms. Palmer's recommendation to interplant native species once the invasive species are removed.

Chair Nielsen opened the discussion to members of the public. No members of the public came forward.

Commissioner Troyer questioned the Conservation Easement associated with DEP number 034-0513.

Ms. Palmer explained that one of the special conditions of that prior Order required the recording of a conservation easement however, there was no evidence that it had been recorded. She noted that there were no clear meeting minutes documenting the matter and acknowledged that the Commission would not typically issue a COC unless all conditions had been satisfied at the time.

Chair Nielsen questioned if it could be included in a special condition to work with Mr. Sullivan on the Conservation easement recording.

Mr. Troyer questioned if the applicant would be amenable to recording a conservation easement.

Mr. Sullivan responded that he and Derby Academy would work with staff on the matter.

Chair Nielsen noted that a conservation easement adjacent to Broad Cove would be appropriate, provided all parties were amenable.

Vote: Commissioner Mosher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Edmundson, to close public hearing for 56 Burditt Ave, DEP No. 034-1549.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 4-0 (eligible).

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Douglas Troyer

Opposed: None

4. 73 Gilford Road, DEP No. 034-1552, Judith Struss

Meeting Documents: Staff memo, NOI and Site Plan revised 1/14/26

Colin McSweeney, McSweeney Associates, explained to the Commission the proposed project was for a new upgraded septic system. He referenced the associated resource areas, including the ACEC, Flood Zone, Coastal Bank, and the Weir River. The upgraded system would consist of a 500 gallon tank with nitrogen reduction and tertiary treatment, discharging to an infiltrator system. The existing cesspool would be filled and abandoned. Mr. McSweeney stated the lot is constrained, with limited space and the presence of ledge, and that the proposed location was the only feasible option for the system.

Ms. Palmer acknowledged that the placement of the system in proximity to the resource area was not ideal; however, she stated that no alternative locations were available. She noted that the project had received Board of Health approval and that the proposed system represents an upgrade with nitrogen removal. Ms. Palmer recommended issuance of the OOC.

Commissioner Troyer questioned the size of the existing cesspool in comparison to the proposed system.

Mr. McSweeney responded that the cesspool was not very deep. Based on test pits conducted on the opposite side of the house, bedrock was encountered at approximately six feet. He referenced the site plan to show the locations of the proposed tank and infiltrator system.

Chair Nielsen opened the discussion to members of the public. No members of the public came forward.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to close public hearing for 73 Gilford Road, DEP No. 034-1552 and issue Order of Conditions with Findings of Fact and Special Conditions as noted in Staff memo.

Suggested Findings of Fact

- A. The work described is within Areas Subject to Protection under the Town of Hingham Wetland Regulations, Riverfront Area and Buffer Zone, and the Commission finds the area is significant to the following wetland values as described under Sections 21.1 and 22.0: protection of public or private water supply; protection of groundwater; flood control; erosion and sedimentation control; storm damage prevention, including coastal storm flowage; prevention of water pollution; protection of fisheries; protection of shellfish; protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat; protection of rare species habitat; protection of recreation; and, protection of aesthetics.
- B. The proposed work has been found to comply with the performance standards set forth under Section 22.0(d) of the Hingham Wetland Regulations (HWR) for work in the Buffer Zone and with incorporation of the special conditions included in the Order, including erosion and sediment controls during construction, the project will not alter or adversely affect the adjacent resource areas. The Commission has found the proposed work in the 50 foot Buffer Zone is necessary to replace a failing system as there are no alternative locations on the lot. Furthermore, the nitrogen removing system will be an improvement from the existing conditions and benefit the resource areas. As such, the Commission has determined, in accordance with Section 2.B of the Hingham Wetlands Protection Bylaw, the applicant has made a clear and convincing showing that the proposed work in the 0-50 foot buffer strip and its natural and consequential impacts and effects will not adversely affect the wetland values of the Bylaw, and grants a waiver authorizing the proposed activities.
- C. The Commission has determined the proposed work complies with Section 23.1 of the HWR, as the work includes replacement of an existing system constructed prior to the effective date of the regulations, with no alternative location available on the lot. Furthermore, as described in the project narrative, a modern nitrogen removing system is proposed significantly improved treatment when compared to the existing cesspool, resulting in a benefit to the resource areas. Also, the proposed 3 bedroom septic system has been approved by the Board of Health.
- D. The Commission does not confirm the boundary of Riverfront Area as shown on the approved plan. Mean Annual High Water of the tidal river was not delineated in accordance with 310 CMR 10.23 and the boundary shown on the plan is approximate to document the property is within the RA. The proposed septic upgrade is exempt from the riverfront regulations under 310 CMR 10.58(6)(c).
- E. Based on the above, the Commission has determined the project complies with the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act, M.G.L. Ch. 131 §40 and Implementing Regulations, 310 CMR 10.00, and the Hingham Wetlands Protection Bylaw (Article 22) and Wetland Regulations.

Recommended Special Conditions

23. Upon completion of construction and prior to issuance of a Certificate of Compliance, the Applicant shall submit to the Conservation Commission a Final Septic As-Built Plan stamped by a Professional Civil Engineer or Registered Sanitarian licensed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts stating that the work has been built in “substantial compliance” with the plans approved by the Conservation Commission. All deviations from the approved plans must be noted in the letter. The As-Built Plan shall include all wetland resource area boundaries with associated buffer zones

The motion passed by a roll call vote 5-0.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson

Opposed: None

5. 9 Porters Cove Road, DEP No. 034-1551, 9 Porters Cove Road, LLC

Meeting Documents: Staff memo, NOI and Site Plan submitted 12/23/25

Abutters were notified by Certificates of Mailing on 12/23/25 as certified in Affidavit of Service by Brad Holmes of ECR.

Brad Holmes, PWS, Environmental Consulting & Restoration (ECR), explained to the Commission the property is located on the southeast side of Porters Cove and contains Riverfront Area, Salt Marsh, and FEMA flood zone. He stated that the applicant is proposing an ecological restoration project to eradicate phragmites on the property. He identified on the site plan, the property boundaries and noted that work would be limited to the shaded area shown on the plan. He added that there were still outstanding comments from Ms. Palmer that needed to be addressed.

Ms. Palmer stated that the Commission has approved similar ecological restoration projects in the past. She stated some concerns regarding the use of herbicides, particularly given that the site is within an ACEC and a NHESP Priority Habitat area. Ms. Palmer acknowledged the determination letter from Natural Heritage which found the project would have no impacts on listed species. Also, DEP also had no comments on the application.

Chair Nielsen questioned the plan following phragmites removal.

Mr. Holmes explained that the Salt Marsh was expected to revegetate naturally after removal of phragmites. He described a three to four year management plan to monitor and allow for natural revegetation. If natural regrowth is not successful, Salt Marsh plugs would be planted. He added that the project would include annual updates and ongoing monitoring.

Chair Nielsen noted apprehension about the long term eradication of phragmites.

Chair Nielsen opened the discussion to members of the public.

Tracy Shriver, 12 Boulder Glen Road, abutter, spoke in support of the project. She stated that she had undertaken a similar process on her property and the phragmites was successfully mowed and hand-treated.

Clark Frazier, 50 Bonnie Brier Circle, commented that he has observed the presence of algae in Porters Cove while kayaking and requested that attention be given to water quality.

Ms. Palmer stated that she would look into the matter and follow up with Mr. Frazier.

Hilary Homer, resident, asked about phragmites located on adjacent property that are not included in the application.

Mr. Holmes responded that those areas are on another property and cannot be addressed as part of the current application.

Chair Nielsen added that would be have to be initiated by that homeowner.

Mr. Holmes requested a continuance until February 23rd.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to continue public hearing for 9 Porters Cove Rd, DEP No. 034-1551 with consent of applicant, to February 23, 2026 at 7PM.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 5-0.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson

Opposed: None

6. 123 Summer Street, DEP No. 034-1553, Dana Palmer-Donnelly
Meeting documents: Staff memo, NOI, Site Plans revised 1/20/26

Abutters were notified on 12/31/25 via Certificate of Mailing as certified in Affidavit of Service signed by Tish Campbell.

Tish Campbell, Project Representative from Tish Landscape Design, presented the project to the Commission. She explained the proposal to refinish the existing pool, construct a new cabana, and reconstruct the surrounding patio, portions of which lie within the 50 foot Buffer Zone. She noted a 1,500 SF mitigation planting area that would provide better ecological diversity and enhanced the wetland buffer.

Ms. Palmer stated that a revised site plan had been submitted only a few days prior and required further review. She commented that the proposed mitigation area would provide a benefit, particularly given the steep slope at the corner of the proposed work area, which offers an opportunity to enhance the buffer to the wetland resource area. She noted that fencing is typically required on the upland side of mitigation areas to prevent future encroachment and to ensure the area does not become part of the landscape. She recommended relocating the fence or installing permanent markers to clearly demarcate the mitigation area. Ms. Palmer expressed concern about the proposed work in the 50 foot Buffer Zone which will result in an increase of 7 SF of impervious area. She indicated in her opinion, the increase was not justified by the requested waiver.

Ms. Campbell responded that the area was designed to allow access around the pool. She explained that the slight increase in patio area would allow space for seating while still providing clearance for wheelchair access.

Commissioner Troyer asked for clarification on the area in question and emphasized the primary issue would be allowing new impervious within the 50 foot buffer.

Chair Nielsen questioned how much impervious area would remain within the 50 foot buffer if the patio corner were rounded.

Ms. Campbell responded there would be none.

Chair Nielsen asked if the applicant would be amenable to removing the patio out of the 50 foot buffer.

Dana Palmer-Donnelly, owner, agreed and would work with Ms. Campbell on the revisions.

Chair Nielsen opened the discussion to members of the public. No members of the public came forward.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to continue public hearing for 123 Summer St, DEP No 034-1553 with consent of applicant to February 9, 2026 at 7PM
The motion passed by a roll call vote 4-0.

Commissioner Roby was unavailable during the roll call

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson

Opposed: None

Other Business:

1. Vote to ratify Enforcement Order, 10 Village Lane (issued 8/14/25), Discussion on Restoration/Replication Proposal, ECR

Commissioner Troyer recused himself

Ms. Palmer explained to the Commission that staff issued an Enforcement Order in August 2025 for expansion of lawn and encroachment into the wetland and buffer zone. Since that time, staff met on site with Brad Holmes of ECR and the property owner to review a proposed restoration plan. She indicated that in her opinion, the proposal would not meet the local wetland regulations, as it would allow a portion of the unpermitted alteration within the wetland to remain. Staff requested the area be fully restored.

Mr. Holmes explained the homeowner, John Driscoll, has complied with the Enforcement Order and has worked to develop a restoration plan. He presented the existing condition plan and noted a Bordering Vegetated Wetland delineation and showed the limit of clearing and existing lawn. He noted that an as-built plan from 2007 depicted a wetland line which was used as a reference. A soil analysis was conducted within the lawn area to determine the extent of wetland soils. The proposal includes both restoration and wetland replication components. He explained that the lawn turf area shown in green on the site plan would be removed and restored to wetland. He further noted that the area shaded in orange, approximately 1,620 SF, would remain as lawn to function as a buffer strip. In addition, a wetland replication area of approximately 2,760 SF is proposed at a 2:1 ratio, located to the left of the restored area. He stated that the replication area is intended to offset the buffer strip that would remain lawn while improving overall wetland resource area values and allowing the homeowners reasonable use of their property.

Scott Golding, Esq. of DTM Law, representing the owner, stated the Driscoll's have been very compliant and hired ECR quickly to start the process. He noted the alterations were inadvertent.

Ms. Palmer stated her primary concern was the wetland fill and the regulations do not allow fill within wetlands unless it is a Limited Project for up to 2500 SF however this was not a Limited Project. She further explained that the proposed restored buffer was located within filled wetland and expressed uncertainty as to how it complies with the regulations. Referring to the site plan, she noted that the red line represents the existing wetland boundary, while the darker shaded area represented the previously existing natural buffer, approximately 17 feet wide abutting the wetland. She stated that, in her opinion, the previously existing native buffer should be restored. She added that if wetland fill were to be allowed by the Commission, she would recommend the applicant file an after-the-fact permit to demonstrate compliance with the wetland regulations.

Chair Nielsen read the Hingham Wetland Regulations Section 22, Performance Standard 3 and noted the regulations clearly state that the expectation is that the wetlands be restored. She also referenced Section 23.6 which states no fill shall be placed in any resource or buffer area. Ms. Nielsen suggested the resource area be restored as intended by the regulations and a full restoration plan be submitted to the prior wetland line.

Mr. Holmes added that at the end of the property would have additional created wetland of approximately 1620 SF than what previously exists on site. The process would include lowering the elevation to slightly lower than the wetland and create additional wetland area. He reiterated that proposed area to remain altered is small and approximately 80-90% of wetland would be restored.

Ms. Palmer noted that the success rates for wetland replication are generally low and explained that the proposal would require removal of an existing natural buffer in order to create a new wetland. She emphasized that the regulations would not support a finding that allows such an approach. Additionally, she pointed out that new lawns are not permitted within the 50 foot buffer and this proposal would retain lawn in the 50 foot buffer where none previously existed.

Commissioner Mosher agreed with Ms. Palmer

Mr. Holmes requested a site visit with the Commission once the snow cover is gone as work would not be able to be started until end of March/April regardless.

The Commission was amenable and the Chair indicated a site visit would be scheduled when weather is warmer in the spring.

Vote: Commissioner Mosher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Edmundson, to ratify Enforcement Order issued on 8/14/25 for 10 Village Lane and continue discussion on restoration proposal to spring 2026.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 4-0.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Philip Edmundson

Opposed: None

2. Vote to ratify Enforcement Order, 383 East Street (issued 1/8/26)

Ms. Palmer explained to the Commission that this was a violation within jurisdictional areas as well as encroachment on town property. She noted that there had been alteration of wetland and buffer zones and that the homeowner had contacted ECR regarding the issue. A significant amount of time had passed with no formal response so the EO was issued to establish the requirement for a restoration plan and the removal of structures from town property, with a deadline of March 2026.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to ratify Enforcement Order issued on 1/8/26 for 383 East Street.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 5-0.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson

Opposed: None

3. Vote to ratify Enforcement Order, 0 Whiting Street (issued 1/8/26)

Ms. Palmer explained the violation was discovered during routine review of a building permit and included expansion of pavement and structures in the Buffer Zone associated with the abutting commercial business. The EO was issued to two parties, the property owner, Bristol Brothers, and the commercial business. She explained staff has met with all parties on site and they are working cooperatively on a restoration proposal.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to ratify Enforcement Order issued on 1/8/26 for 0 Whiting Street

The motion passed by a roll call vote 5-0.

In Favor: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Bob Mosher, Thomas Roby, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson

Opposed: None

4. Conservation Officer Updates

Ms. Palmer asked the Commission if they were agreeable to changing the meeting time to 6:30pm. The Commission were mostly supportive but decided to hold off until all members were present.

Ms. Palmer also notified the Commission of DEP's scheduled on-site meeting for the appeal of the Pickle Ball wetland determination.

Adjourn

Motion: Commissioner Troyer moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Mosher seconded the motion. The motion passed by roll call vote 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00PM

Approved on: March 9, 2026