

**HINGHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JANUARY 26, 2026@ 7:00 PM
REMOTE MEETING**

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

Planning Board Members Absent: Crystal Kelly

Also Present: Emily Wentworth, Community Planning Director

At 7:03 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, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Kevin Ellis, and Gordon Carr and Tracy Shriver.

Hearing(s) & Discussion

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

Chair Shriver moved 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 requested to continue the application.
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 February 9, 2026 at 7 PM and extend the decision deadline to March 26, 2026.
The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

**109 Weir Street
Site Plan Review (continued from January 5, 2026)**

Chair Shriver moved on to 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 and Sean Hardy P.E., Hardy Mann Design Group presented on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Griffiths advised board members that revisions were made based on feedback and comments from the board and community members including their desire to minimize disturbed areas and maintain the natural aesthetic. The changes included use of bituminous concrete for the driveway and reducing ledge removal using hydraulic hammering. He also explained that they did look into flipping the layout of the house as suggested by a Board member but determined that it would have run through the 100-foot buffer zone.

Member Tondorf-Dick questioned data on the neighborhood analysis pointing out the new house is approximately five times larger than the house that stood before. Mr. Griffiths pointed out the note below the provided chart. Mr. Hardy acknowledged the house is substantially larger pointing out that the architect included a garage and a heated area in the living space calculation. Member Tondorf-Dick went on to discuss the scale and proportions in relations to the abutters noting the existing house is much

smaller than those around it are. Mr. Hardy confirmed that the ledge removal was down toward the water. Member Carr had no questions as previous concerns were addressed. Member Ellis asked for clarification about extent of blasting. Mr. Hardy confirmed there would be no blasting; the applicant wants to use hydraulic hammering. Member Tondorf-Dick who asked about the blasting/chipping impact on the trees. Mr. Hardy responded it is standard to hammer ledge and it is not a large area. He pointed out the project referred to previously was a large subdivision to the rear of this property and likely had a much larger area/volume of ledge removed than what the applicant is proposing

Chair Shriver asked for public comment. There was none.

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 ALR Homes LLC 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 109 Weir Street in Residence District C, 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: Kevin Ellis, Gordon Carr, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Tracy Shriver
Opposed: None

8 Franklin Rodgers Road
Site Plan Review Modification

Chair Shriver moved on to the next item which was an application from Lauren and Andy McEleny to modify a Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, originally issued November 19, 2024, to revise the driveway, hardscape, deck, pool/spa, cabana, and planting details while maintaining the previously approved stormwater system and overall area of disturbance for a single-family dwelling reconstruction project at 8 Franklin Rodgers Road in Residence C District.

Gabriel Padilla from Grady Consulting presented on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Padilla presented changes to the driveway design including the elimination of a permeable paver circle, and all surfaces will be paved. There will be a reduction of pavers in the pool patio reducing the overall impervious surfaces. He also noted the increased size of the cabana, which not affect impervious area limits, and the stormwater system will would remain as previously designed. He responded to peer review comments regarding a Cape Cod berm.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked about the SE location of the driveway in relation to wetlands. Mr. Padilla stated the distance and edge of the road remained the same. The change was the shape. Member Tondorf–Dick also asked about the setbacks and tree protection zones. He asked if any trees were lost because of the revisions. Mr. Padilla said there were no changes with regard to the trees.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment. There was none.

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

That the proposed modification does not materially or adversely affect conditions governed by the Site Plan Review Design and Performance Standards set forth in § I-I of the Zoning By-Law; as such, the project constitutes a minor modification of the Site Plan Approval, issued November 19, 2024.

Chair Shriver made a motion, seconded by Kevin Ellis to WAIVE Site Plan Review under § I-I.9 of the By-Law in connection the application of Lauren and Andy McEleny to modify previously approved driveway, hardscape, deck, pool/spa, cabana, and planting details while maintaining the previously approved stormwater system and overall area of disturbance for a single-family dwelling reconstruction project at 8 Franklin Rodgers Road in Residence C District.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

55 Industrial Park Road
Site Plan Review Modification

Chair Shriver moved on to the next item which was an application from Fifty-Five Saxon Hingham, LLC, to modify a Special Permit A3 under § V-A.5.o and Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, originally issued February 10, 2025, to increase the number of landbanked parking spaces; reorient the building layout; and update architectural and landscaping details at 55 Industrial Park Road in the Industrial Park and South Hingham Development Overlay Districts.

Phil Cordeiro from Allen and Major Associates and Sean Papich, Papich Landscaping presented on behalf of the applicant. They discussed a modification to the building design, which included reorienting the building layout to better highlight the architectural features, increasing banked parking spaces to 17, maintaining the same stormwater system and tree retention as was previously presented.

Mr. Cordeiro reminded the Board of the innovative and contemporary design of this project and shared that the owner updated the architectural feel of the building, to make it appear as if floating. He noted the A3 special permit allowed some banked parking spaces on-site. He asked for a modification of that A3 special permit to increase the banked parking to 17 spaces. He explained they can accommodate the 38 spaces required by zoning however, the building will be fully and completely occupied by Saxon Partners, constructing 21 parking spaces is more than adequate for the maximum 11 employees per shift, as well accommodations for visitors. The request for increase in the banked parking is to draw focus to the building, and minimize the amount of impervious surfaces on site. He also reminded to the board, the stormwater systems were designed to handle the full build-out as reviewed by the town's peer engineer.

Member Tondorf-Dick provided positive feedback to the all-electric design and efforts to meet all energy codes as well as use of the building design to promote their brand. He asked if the trees in the buffer zone were the ones saved on the original plan. Mr. Cordeiro responded that the all-electric designed and operable windows will remain in place in this new design. He noted that reconfiguring the banked parking did not preserve additional trees, as it was an already disturbed area. He noted that the area would remain green until the banked parking is required. Member Tondorf-Dick asked if there were the potential of putting a second story on this building. Mr. Cordeiro responded that the site does not support a two-story building. He also shared that they approached the Board of Health for a waiver in exchange for doing a nitrogen treatment system. The Board of Health was not in favor of the waiver. Member Tondorf-Dick asked Mr. Papich to walk through the tree plan and plantings. Mr. Papich reviewed the plans and noted the changes, which concentrated on the plantings around the parking areas. He also noted the plantings around the building were updated to enhance the design in which the building appears to hover. He noted the east area was previously paved or existing building. He shared that whole area will be conservation seed mix and the size of the area will make it feel like a meadow.

Member Tondorf Dick praised the project as leading and unique. He went on to ask about the handicapped spaces and ramp. Mr. Papich responded it was a precipice piece, a bridge going to the building and kept a low sidewalk, to eliminate the need for rails and prevented visual intrusion on the face of the building.

Member Carr asked about the land-banked parking spaces and if the plan was based on the demand of the current user and if that demand increased or they should sell the building the meadow goes away and the banked spaces developed. Mr. Cordeiro replied yes and shared that the property will be Saxon's headquarter building so they will be in control the parking demand in this location. They have 11 full-time employees. He also noted a trigger criterion in the A3 special permit, which we would carry over through this process.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment. There was none.

There was a brief discussion about the peer review engineer's comments and the applicants pending response. Following the discussion of these pending materials, the Board voted to continue the hearing to February 9, 2026.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick to CONTINUE the hearing on the application of Fifty-Five Saxon Hingham, LLC, to modify a Special Permit A3 under § V-A.5.o and Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, both originally issued February 10, 2025, to increase the number of landbanked parking spaces; reorient the building layout; and update architectural and landscaping details at 55 Industrial Park Road in the Industrial Park and South Hingham Development Overlay Districts to February 9, 2026.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

9 Porters Cove Road

Site Plan Review Modification

Chair Shriver moved on to the next item which was an application from Danielle And James McClure to

modify a Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, originally issued July 8, 2024, to revise the garage, driveway, hardscape, and grading details; increase the size of the pool/spa; and add two sheds, a sports court, and a putting green/play area at 9 Porters Cove Road in Residence District C.

Chair Shriver, as an abutter to the property, recused himself from the hearing. Kevin Ellis stepped in to lead the hearing.

Paul Seaberg, Grady Consulting presented on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Seaberg explained the status of the previously approved Site Plans and explained the proposed modifications that include a new sport court, larger pool and spa, lowering of the garage slab and first floor elevation, addition of kids play area, two sheds, and an updated landscape design. He advised that the modified stormwater designs were reviewed by Pat Brennan and were found to support the increased stormwater runoff. The increase in land disturbance is associated with the construction of the drainage rain garden for the driveway, proposed sport court, play area and putting green.

Sean Papich, Papich Landscape Design outlined the new planting plan and hardscape design. Mr. Papich explained the spa was extended to become a plunge pool with some additional fencing. The play area will use the existing boulders making it a more natural space and the sport court had been added in the lower corner. He pointed out a couple of pine trees on the right would be removed and he reviewed in detail the plantings that will be done to replace the trees. He noted the terraced areas would change slightly, but remain very similar to the previously approved plans.

Member Ellis asked how close the neighboring home was and felt it was “as close as you can get” to a property line. Mr. Papich responded that they were about 5 ft. off the property line. Member Ellis pointed out this corner lot has three houses in close proximity. He requested additional information on lighting for the sport court and the impact on neighboring properties. Mr. Papich responded, stating there was some discussion of low level lighting on the recreation court. Member Ellis noted cut-off lighting that is 12 feet in the air, would be bright from a neighbor's vision standpoint. Mr. Papich and Seaberg will provide the lighting plan.

Member Ellis moved on to ask about the increased impervious area. Mr. Seaberg responded that it was mainly due to the sport court, noting the previous design was significantly reducing the peak flows and volume from the site, capturing the entire proposed driveway. He noted with the new Sport Court, they were still, below the existing peak flows and volume without changing the stormwater design. Member Ellis asked how the sport court drained. Mr. Seaberg stated it pitched off to the yard areas to the right and left. Mr. Papich said they would be pitching toward the planting bed between the house and the sport court. Member Carr asked for clarification of the increase in impervious square footage. Mr. Seaberg explained the sport court is 1,400 square feet, there would be two additional sheds and the spa area is within the existing patio area. He advised there was also some grass added to these patio areas. This did not affect that area at all he also confirmed the play area and putting green are pervious surfaces.

Member Tondorf-Dick raised concern about the sport court being 4 foot above the surrounding grades. He noted how close the property line was and asked how they intended to keep the activity within the site and not rolling into the neighbors' yards. He also pointed out that stepping up from the area is a downslope facing the water, a 4-foot step up to the terrace, and step up 8 foot to a first floor of the house. He felt the swales were very close to the adjacent property and asked how one keeps the runoff on this site.

Mr. Papich stated regarding the sport court was not meant for tennis, there is a fence in the area and he felt that there is no need to surround the court. The wall at the court area is about 3 ½ ft. above it with a garden area, that would be pitched to the planting bed. He and Mr. Seaberg also pointed out the lot slopes toward the house.

Member Carr asked the applicant to clarify the calculation of pervious materials.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked about noise mitigation. He asked if there should be a fence around the court to contain activity and mitigate sound. Mr. Papich responded they were using vegetation. The surface will be paved similar to a driveway and that there is a straight board fence along that property line. There was a brief discussion of sounds from various sports. Ms. Wentworth shared that the town received a citizen's petition related to noise generated by pickle ball indicating it may be discussed at town meeting. Member Ellis suggested the Board could poll the public since the hearing would be continued for the lighting information.

Member Ellis asked for public comment. There was none.

The board agreed to continue the hearing in order to review a complete plan, including lighting details, to ensure neighbor concerns are addressed.

Kevin Ellis made a motion, seconded by Gordon Carr, to continue the hearing for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, originally issued July 8, 2024, to revise the garage, driveway, hardscape, and grading details; increase the size of the pool/spa; and add two sheds, a sports court, and a putting green/play area at 9 Porters Cove Road in Residence District C to February 9, 2026 at 7PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor:	Gordon Carr, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Kevin Ellis
Opposed:	None

Chair Shriver returned to the hearing.

14 Highview Drive Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to the next item which was an application from Leo Yazykov for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, utilities, and landscaping improvements at 14 Highview Drive in Residence District A.

Leo Yazykov, the applicant, presented to the Board. Mr. Yazykov explained that although the house is much larger than the existing dwelling they were able to maintain the impervious area by eliminating the pool and turning it into the subsurface filtration area. The proposed dwelling is a five bedroom 5,000 SF home. The massing is to the back of the property where the lot slopes down and the garage is under. The front of the home visually appears to be 1 ½ stories and is similar to the surrounding homes. He stated he met with the Crow Point Neighborhood Development Association to discuss the project and concerns brought up by the neighbors were addressed at that time. He mentioned that the direct abutter at 16 Highview Drive share a driveway with this property. He said that he would work directly with them regarding working hours, noise and any other concerns and that he is aware there are small children at that address.

Mr. Yazykov went over the neighborhood analysis. He presented a bell curve analysis showing the house's relative size, which Member Carr praised for its visualization of neighborhood patterns. An extended discussion of the shared driveway followed. This included an explanation that at one time the two homes were owned by the same family and that the entrance of the driveway was wide enough for two cars to pass.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked how the Crow Point Development Association felt about the project. Mr. Yazykov shared that he had spoken to the Managing Director, and shared the meeting information. He was unsure if any of the members are in attendance.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Jake Gaffey and his wife, 16 Highview Drive, expressed concerns about the shared driveway and requested the possibility of splitting it into two private driveways. Mr. Yazykov confirmed this was feasible and that the infiltration system would accommodate the extra impervious area. The Board agreed to revisit the driveway modification plan after demolition and further site assessment.

Simon Lloyd, 12 Highview Drive, neighbor on the left, complemented the plan and presentation. He also asked if the pool mechanical house would be razed as he believes and is the existing fence on or over the property line.

Ms. Wentworth replied both have been proposed as a condition of approval as well some propane tanks that were flagged by the peer review engineer. It will be addressed in the conditions and the applicant would the need to secure his permission to cross onto the property. Mr. Yazykov spoke directly to Mr. Lloyd and arranged to share his information so they can connect. He believes the propane tanks have already been removed.

Chair Shriver asked for additional public comment, there was none.

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 Leo Yazykov for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, utilities, and landscaping improvements at 14 Highview 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. The Applicant shall seek authorization from the owners of 12 Highview Drive to complete the removal of the shed, propane tanks, and fence associated with the pool that encroach onto their property. Documentation of such authorization shall be submitted to the Community Planning Department prior to the commencement of any work.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
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:	Gary Tondorf-Dick, Kevin Ellis, Gordon Carr, Tracy Shriver
Opposed:	None

1192 Main Street

Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to the next item which was an application from Anton Cela filed an application 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.

Anton Cela, applicant, presented to the Board advising that tonight he is presenting only the architectural plans. He started by noting the garage was turned in the other direction making it less visible from the street. The house itself has not moved at all. Member Tondorf-Dick asked if the applicant was looking for approval of the architectural plans. Mr. Cela said yes and that he would work with Merrill on site plan after knowing if the house was compliant. Member Tondorf-Dick commented on the scale and massing on the proposed dwelling. He noted that typically the formal face of the house faces the street. He gave a brief historical outline of the cadence of Main Street. He suggested the applicant reference the book, “Big House, Little House, Back House, and Barn”. He acknowledge the applicants intent with the garage location but suggested it be moved to the back. He also commented on the elevations in relation to the massing noting the façade is very long and he felt the windows were too small. He went on to identify the historical significance and character of some abutting properties. He also suggested a gable roof versus gambrel as the Gambrel style make the massing look larger.

Mr. Cela disagreed with the massing noting it is only 24’ to the peak from the first floor. He stated the buyer has been firm in her request and has already conceded the two towers and to reduce the square footage. He noted the significant amount of commercial buildings on Main Street including schools and churches and he felt this building would not be out of place. An extensive conversation about massing and linear appearance of the house followed as well as the visibility from Main Street.

Chair Shriver agreed that the plans did not address the street. He suggested presenting a landscape plan. He felt that looking at a complete project would be more helpful suggesting that a perspective, aerial or rendering would be helpful. He asked the other members if they would like to add anything. Member Carr felt good points were raised but that it is difficult to give perspective or input without the full plan. Member Ellis had nothing to add. Mr. Cela asked what the members would like to see on this lot. Member Tondorf-Dick suggested the applicant view the project at 14 Highview Avenue. He also referenced the book, “When I Think of Hingham”, noting there is a picture of the original Victorian that sat on the property. He stated it was not necessary to copy either house but use them as a reference to mass and scale.

A brief discussion about scheduling the next hearing followed touching on material needed from other suppliers. Ms. Wentworth pointed out that a holiday and school vacation week immediately precedes the next hearing. Mr. Cela asked for the earliest available date, which was February 23 at 7 PM., Ms. Wentworth identified the materials and that they would need to be received 2 weeks prior to the meeting.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick 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 February 23, 2026 at 7 PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

Chair Shriver moved on to a discussion of Zoning Articles initiated by the Planning Board. Three zoning articles were identified, and the Board opted to schedule a follow-up meeting for February 2, 2026 to when all members could be present. Chair Shriver opened Article D; North Fire Station Zoning District advising the Select Board initiated the zoning article to rezone the property located at 230 North Street. Assessors Map 60, lot 119, from the Official and Open Space District to Business A District.

Chair Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick a motion to continue Zoning Article Hearings, Article B, Article C, and Article D to a Planning Board meeting on Monday, February 2, 7 p.m.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

Mr. Wentworth, announced interviews with four candidates for the Senior Planner position have been scheduled for the following Monday.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gordon Carr, to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting at 9:20PM PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

Meeting Materials:

Agenda Summary, dated January 23, 2026

Off Old Derby Street and Whiting Street

Preliminary Subdivision Plan Application (Form B)
Preliminary Subdivision Plan, dated December 2, 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
Response to Comments, received January 2, 2026
Narrative Letter, received January 2, 2026 - Signed
Site Plan, revised January 2, 2026
Architectural Plans, revised January 5, 2026
HydroCAD Report, revised January 2, 2026
Narrative Letter, dated January 15, 2026
Response to Comments, dated January 20, 2026
Site Plan, revised January 15, 2026
HydroCad Report, revised January 14, 2026
Architectural Plan, January 15, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated December 9, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated January 5, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated January 21, 2026

8 Franklin Rodgers Road

Site Plan Modification Letter, received January 13, 2026
Site Plan, dated November 25, 2025
HydroCAD Report, dated November 25, 2025
Watershed Plan, dated November 25, 2025

55 Industrial Park Road

Site Plan Review Waiver Request, dated December 18, 2025
Site Plan, revised December 18, 2025
Floor Plan and Rendering, dated December 18, 2025
Tree Removal Summary, dated December 16, 2025
Revised Stormwater Information, dated January 7, 2026
Site Plan Review Waiver, stamped August 12, 2025
Site Plan Review Decision, filed February 10, 2025

Special Permit A3 Decision, filed February 10, 2025

9 Porters Cove Road

Site Plan Review Modification Application, filed December 8, 2025
Site Plans, revised December 3, 2025
Planting Plan, revised October 31, 2025
Hardscape Plan, revised October 31, 2025
Stormwater Report, revised November 6, 2025
Stormwater Report, revised January 5, 2026
Response to Comments, January 19, 2026
Architectural Plan, revised January 19, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated January 5, 2026

14 Highview Drive

Site Plan Review Application, filed December 22, 2025
Impact Report, dated October 20, 2025
Site Plan, Dated October 20, 2025
Stormwater Report, Dated October 20, 2025
Architectural Plans, Dated November 27, 2024
Disturbance Plan, dated November 15, 2025
Site Plan, revised January 6, 2026
Response to Comments, dated January 19, 2026
Site Plan, revised January 19, 2026
Stormwater Report, revised January 19, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated January 14, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated January 21, 2026

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
Architectural Plan, revised January 15, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated August 20, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated September 9, 2025

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

Article D – North Fire Station Zoning District