

HINGHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 23, 2026 @ 7:00 PM
REMOTE MEETING

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

Planning Board Members Absent: None

Also Present: Emily Wentworth, Community Planning Director, Rachel Agiorgitis, Senior Planner

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; Crystal Kelly, Kevin Ellis, Gordon Carr, and Gary Tondorf-Dick

Hearing(s) & Discussion

18 Elm Street Site Plan Review Modification

Chair Shriver began with an application from Matthew Falconeiri, Falconeiri Construction Inc. to modify a Site Plan Approval, originally issued June 18, 2025 under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to authorize a sports court and retaining wall at 18 Elm Street in the Residence A District.

The application was filed following issuance of a stop work order, dated November 25, 2025 and amended and restates on December 18, 2025, from the Building Commissioner. The Order was issued after abutters complained about a new sports court on the property that was not permitted by the Board in its original Site Plan Approval.

A site visit was scheduled for Saturday, March 21, 2026. Member Kelly and Member Carr attended, a quorum was not met

Attorney Jeff Tocchio, DTM Law, representing the Weibleys at 107 Main Street, reviewed the site plan including the new sports court. . Atty. Tocchio shared photos of the existing sports court and surroundings. Atty. Tocchio described the new plantings which would screen the court and added that photometric information was filed. He explained that they have spoken to the neighbors on Elm Street and have worked with the Historic Commission.

Member Ellis inquired as to why they worked with Historic but failed to submit anything to the Planning Board. Member Ellis went on to say that the Applicant circumvented the whole (Site Plan Review) process, eliminating the opportunity for neighbors to provide input. Atty. Tocchio agreed and said he did not want to give excuses, he explained how they got to this point and that they were now looking for a “fresh start” and went on to present the photometric drawings.

Member Tondorf-Dick shared his own photos of the site. He described the sentinel Copper Beech trees that were removed and suggested new Copper Beech trees be planted. Greg Weibley, 107 Main Street, responded that no Copper Beech trees were removed, but that they would plant what is needed. Member Tondorf-Dick suggested they have a landscape architect prepare a plan adding that in addition to the Lincoln apartments, the view from Old Ship Church needs to be screened.

Member Kelly offered her input from the site visit and felt that the court looked smaller in person and the newly planted trees would be effective. Although she shared the others’ frustration regarding the process, she felt the area was well done and noted the walls were approved by Pat Brennan, the peer reviewer engineer.

Member Carr reiterated that the Board is doing their best given the situation and there is no way to “un-ring the bell”. He said they can only take the applicant team at their word to make the best of it and agreed with Member Tondorf-Dick’s suggestions. Chair Shriver asked if the neighbors have seen the new lights, to which Atty. Tocchio said they have not and nothing has been done on the site since receipt of the stop work order from the Building Inspector.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment. There was none.

Chair Shriver proposed to approve the application with the condition that a new landscape plan, including the proposed trees, be provided by the Applicant. Ms. Wentworth agreed that such language could be crafted for the conditions and also permits would be required, through the building department, for the retaining wall, if it exceeded 4 feet in height, and for the modifications. Member Tondorf-Dick clarified that he would like to see new Beech trees planted to replace those which were removed and they should be sized to reestablish the upper level of foliage. Mr. Weibley maintained that no Beech trees were removed. Member Tondorf-Dick referred to the photos on the screen that indicated otherwise. Had the application preceded the site work the mitigation might have been discretionary. The mitigation was agreed to by the applicant’s attorney also.

Attorney Jeff DeLisi, representing Matt Falconeiri, Falconeiri Construction, spoke to the access easement and stop work order. Ms. Wentworth replied that the legal restriction of the easement and frontage is not a part of the Site Plan Review.

Chair Shriver asked about the additional language needed for a motion to approve. Ms. Wentworth proposed the following, “As part of the building permit for the retaining wall, or for an electrical permit for the lighting revisions, the applicant shall submit to the Community Planning department a landscape plan prepared by a registered landscape architect depicting any protected trees removed from the site in connection with the sports court, and proposed mitigation to create an over story of new Copper Beech trees to better screen the sports court.”

Member Ellis reiterated his earlier comments regarding the Applicant's failure to follow the Site Plan Review process and the future ramifications of approving such a project. He emphasized the lack of neighbor input and warned that he would vote against this if had been opposed by the neighbors. He did not want this particular project to be indicative of the way the Planning Board approaches these projects.

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

- a. The modification 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 development, as modified, meets all applicable Design and Performance Standards.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Crystal Kelly, to APPROVE the application of Matthew Falconeiri, Falconeiri Construction Inc., to modify a Site Plan Approval, originally issued June 18, 2025 under § I-I of the By-Law to authorize a sports court and retaining wall at 18 Elm Street in the Residence A District, subject to the following conditions:

1. Recording of Decision. 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. Prior to application for any permits from the building department, including but not limited to the retaining wall or electrical permit for the lighting revisions, the Applicant shall submit to the Community Planning Department a landscape plan, prepared by a registered landscape architect, depicting any Protected Trees removed from the site in connection with the sports court and proposed mitigation to create an overstory of Copper Beech trees to better screen the sports court for the Lincoln School Apartments.
3. All conditions of the previous Site Plan Approval, dated June 18, 2025, remain in full force and effect unless specifically modified by this Decision.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

1192 Main Street Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver went on to 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.

The Applicant did not respond with new materials or information prior to the meeting. The hearing will be continued,

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 By-Law to construct a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 1192 Main Street in Residence District B to April 6, 2026 at 7 PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

109 Weir Street Site Plan Review Modification

The Board went on to an application from Doug Keach, ALR Homes LLC to modify a Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, originally issued February 2, 2026, to relocate the erosion controls approved in connection with the reconstruction of a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 109 Weir Street in Residence District C.

Pat Easley, ALR Homes, presented a plan showing how the erosion control measures were changed as directed by the Conservation Commission. Ms. Wentworth added that a number of trees will be going in between the wetland line and the principal erosion control line, which was the preferred solution of the Conservation Commission.

A brief discussion followed among Board members regarding the designated stockpile area, construction entrance (with the recommendation that the existing driveway remain in place during construction) and work space on the right side of the site. Mr. Easley explained the reason for the stockpile location, agreed to the driveway remaining, and explained there was ample space to maneuver over the ledge along the right side of the house.

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

That the proposed modification does not 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 February 2, 2026.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to WAIVE Site Plan Review under § I-I.9 of the By-Law for the application of Doug Keach, ALR Homes LLC, to relocate the erosion controls approved in connection with the reconstruction of a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 109 Weir Street in Residence District C.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

16 Foley Beach Road Site Plan Approval Modification

Chair Shriver continued with an application from Doug Keach, ALR Homes LLC, to modify a Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, originally issued May 24, 2024, to revise hardscape, grading details, retaining wall, and stormwater management details at 16 Foley Beach Road in the Residence A District.

Mr. Easley, ALR Homes, shared the revised As-Built which showed the spot grades. He also reviewed what was done since the last meeting. Mr. Brennan, PGB Engineering, agreed with the changes and added that he provided photos from his March 11, 2026 visit. Mr. Brennan went on to explain that the existing line of hedges act as a natural swale and he felt comfortable that water will be captured as intended.

Member Tondorf-Dick inquired if the wall would require a railing, as it was over 30" height. . He also asked this be added as condition as well as submitting a detail of the retaining wall since it is over 4' height. Ms. Wentworth said the two items would be administered by the Building Dept.

Based on the information submitted and presented during the review, and the deliberations and discussions of the Board during the hearings, the Board made the following findings in accordance with the Approval Criteria under § I-I,7. of the By-Law:

- a. The modified 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 modified development meets all applicable Design and Performance Standards.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gordon Carr, To GRANT the application of Doug Keach, ALR Homes LLC, to modify a Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the By-Law, originally issued May 24, 2024, to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related hardscaping, landscaping, grading, and drainage at 16 Foley Beach Road in Residence District A, subject to the following conditions:

1. Recording of Decision. 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. Maintenance of Protected Trees. The Protected Trees retained and all mitigation trees 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.
3. The Applicant shall verify with the Building Department whether the retaining wall requires a permit for type and whether it is required to have a guardrail fall protection at the due to being over 30 inches in height. Verification to be submitted to the Community Planning Department.
4. All other conditions of the previous Site Plan Approval, filed May 24, 2024 remain in full force and effect unless specifically modified by this Decision.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

19 Kimball Beach Road

Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver reopened an application from Jason Graca for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, utilities, and stormwater improvements at 19 Kimball Beach Road in the Residence A District.

Jason Graca presented as the applicant. He began with the new landscape plan and showed mitigation for the one protected tree that was removed. Member Tondorf-Dick stated it was an excellent tree choice and inquired about the shape and angle of the driveway. Mr. Graca said it was done to keep the width at 22'.

Mr. Brennan, PGB Engineering, said that tree protection and root zone information was still needed. He said the walkway on the landscape plan was not shown on the civil plan, but felt it should not adversely affect the stormwater capacity. Mr. Graca confirmed the walkway would be impervious pavers.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment. There was none.

Based on the information submitted and presented during the review, and the deliberations and discussions of the Board during the hearings, the Board made the following findings in accordance with the Approval Criteria under § I-I,7. of the By-Law:

- 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 Jason Graca for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, utilities, and stormwater improvements at 19 Kimball Beach Road in the Residence A District 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. Front Walkway. Prior to application for a building permit, the Applicant shall confirm whether the front walkway is pervious or impervious and show it on the plan.

4. Landscape Plan. Prior to application for a building permit, the landscape plan shall be revised to include tree protection measures for Protected Trees and include a planting schedule for removed trees and proposed or mitigation trees.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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, Kevin Ellis, Crystal Kelly, Tracy Shriver and Gary Tondorf-Dick
Opposed: None

4 Del Prete Drive Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver reopened an application from Stephen Niosi, 4 Del Prete Drive Realty Trust, for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, utilities, stormwater improvements, and landscaping improvements at 4 Del Prete Drive in the Residence A District.

Attorney Walter Sullivan, representative for the Applicant, introduced Tim McDermet from his office and Meghan Bruckman of Civil and Environmental Consultants, Inc. Ms. Bruckman presented the site plan, pointing out the drainage subsurface infiltration system, French drain along the house, maintaining the existing overhead electrical, and robust landscape plan was intended to provide screening and tree removal mitigation. Mr. Sullivan added that the Peer Review comments were addressed.

Member Tondorf-Dick expressed concern about the groundwater as it relates to the house foundation and in-ground pool. Ms. Bruckman explained there was a 3' separation between the foundation and the groundwater which meets MA rules and that the soil profile was a sandy substrate. She did not have information on the pool.

Mr. Brennan, PGB Engineering, said that the outstanding items to be addressed included the French drain along the house which requires additional waterproofing, and the easement/access to the sewer line across the back of the lot. Ms. Wentworth explained that the ownership of the back yard sewer line is unclear and would need to be resolved, but the Sewer Department has indicated that the project would need to connect to the existing sewer line in the road in front of the house.

Chair Shriver addressed the fact that, based on the .47 FAR, the proposed project will be the biggest house on the smallest lot in the neighborhood. A lengthy discussion about the size and scale of the house followed. Both Member Ellis and Member Kelly felt the house was very large for the lot. Chair Shriver noted the reduction in open yard space. Member Tondorf-Dick agreed that the proposed house is out of scale and character of the neighborhood. Tim Johnson, Architect, responded that the house is within the zoning setbacks and appeared larger because of the garage. . Member Carr retorted that it appears larger because it is larger and stated it was a departure from the existing character and scale as outlined in the by-law. Mr. Sullivan suggested it was "nebulous on both sides", to which Member Ellis strongly disagreed. Chair Shriver emphasized the lot was very small as compared to similarly sized homes on the street.

Chair Shriver suggested a continuance. Mr. Sullivan and Ms. Bruckman asked for guidance on how to proceed with a re-design. Member Carr said that the neighborhood analysis should guide the design. Member Tondorf-Dick requested that the Applicant to focus on the massing, floor areas, and gross floor area as they compare to the neighborhood. A brief discussion followed. Member Kelly agreed that the proportions need to be in line with the rest of the neighborhood. Member Tondorf-Dick suggested the applicant work in 3-D in order to see the workable parameters.

Chair Shriver suggested a continuance to April 6, acknowledging that might not be enough time for the Applicant.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Ellen Rathke, 62 Hersey Street, said she agreed that the house is too big. She talked about the history of Del Prete Drive and felt the house next door was better than the one proposed, and would like to see it more proportionate. She added that there is an existing drainage swale along the back of the lot, often flowing with water, suggesting drainage might be an issue.

Resident Howard Asnes, 3 Del Prete Drive, agreed with Ms. Rathke stating he has been a resident since 1965. He expressed his concern about the construction disruption and basement flooding.

Chair Shriver made a motion, seconded by Member Tondorf-Dick, to CONTINUE the application Stephen Niosi, 4 Del Prete Drive Realty Trust, for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, utilities, stormwater improvements, and landscaping improvements at 4 Del Prete Drive in the Residence A District to April 6, 2026 at 7 PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

Administrative Items

100 Industrial Park Road Occupancy Update

Amazon submitted a request to operate a Robotic Facility instead of a Last-Mile Delivery Station at 100 Industrial Park Road in the Industrial Park and South Hingham Development Overlay Districts.

Ms. Wentworth explained that the Board issued decisions authorizing a warehouse distribution center at 100 Industrial Park Road to be used as an Amazon Last Mile. The project was completely built out per the approved plans, and received an occupancy permit in August of 2022. She advised that almost immediately thereafter, Amazon began re-evaluating their business decision to actually operate the Last Mile Transit Station. . Since that time it has remained mostly vacant.

Amazon recently approached the Town and filed a permit application to update the use of the building. She shared that it does not benefit the Town for the building to remain vacant and unused. The new use by Amazon Robotics would have equipment and machinery from other facilities delivered, dismantled, and shipped back out for reuse. The building would be occupied, and traffic impacts would be significantly decreased from what had previously been approved. In 2021, the traffic report was estimated approximately 1,200 vehicle trips a day in association with the warehouse distribution center. The robotics division was anticipating 8 to 10 deliveries a day and just 8 to 10 employees in the entire 150,000 square foot building.

Amazon would like to preserve their existing permits, as this was anticipated to be an interim use and their business model may changes again. They would come back to the board if that happened, and all conditions of the 2021 permits, which were modified in 2022, would remain in place.

Ms. Wentworth explained that no vote was required and the matter would be handled administratively. She added that Amazon has extended an invitation for the Board to tour the Robotics Facility.

Upcoming Meetings

Chair Shriver briefly reviewed upcoming Planning Board Meeting dates, with April 13th being held open as needed.

The Board briefly discussed Town meeting schedule and where the Zoning Warrant articles were predicted to fall on that schedule.

Minutes

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Member Tondorf-Dick, to approve the minutes of March 9, 2026.

The motion passed by roll call vote:

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

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Kevin Ellis, to adjourn the Planning Board meeting at 9:34 PM.

The motion was passed by roll call vote:

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

Meeting Materials:

Agenda Summary, dated March 23, 2026

18 Elm Street

Application Materials:

Site Plan Review Application, filed December 22, 2025

Site Plan, revised January 5, 2026

Site Plan Details, revised January 5, 2026

Stormwater Report, revised December 31, 2025

Photometric No Shield, dated January 19, 2026

Photometric Sport Court FRONT-REAR SHEILD, dated January 19, 2026

Photometric W-REAR SHEILD, dated January 19, 2026

Stormwater Narrative, revised January 20, 2026

Response to Comments, dated February 2, 2026

Site Plan, revised January 29, 2026

Stormwater Report, revised January 29, 2026

Revised Photometric Plan and Lighting Specification, received February 5, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated January 29, 2026

E. Malvarosa Public Comment, dated February 9, 2026

K. Rein Public Comment, dated March 2, 2026

Response to Comments, March 19, 2026
Plantings Layout and Distances Rendering, dated March 17, 2026
Sport Court Photographs, received March 19, 2026
Photometric Plan, revised March 19, 2026
Site Plan Review Decision, stamped June 18, 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, revised 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

1192 Main Street

Site Layout Plan, revised March 17, 2026
Site Plan Review Decision, filed, February 2, 2026
Site Layout Plan, January 15, 2026
Architectural Plans, dated January 5, 2026
Mitigation Planting Plan, dated September 5, 2025

109 Weir Street

SPR Modification As-Built Narrative, dated January 27, 2026
Final As-Built, revised January 27, 2026
Modification Application, filed February 4, 2026
Modification Narrative, dated January 27, 2026
Final As-Built, revised January 27, 2026

16 Foley Beach Road

Modification Application, filed February 4, 2026
Modification Narrative, dated January 27, 2026
Final As-Built, revised January 27, 2026
Final As-Built, revised March 11, 2026
16 Foley Beach Road PGB Site Visit, Peer Review, March 11, 2026

Site Plan Review Decision, filed, May 24, 2024

Site Plan, dated February 20, 2024

Landscape Plan, undated

16 Foley Beach Road, Hingham, MA, Doug Keach, ALR Homes, New Construction, dated May 15, 2024

19 Kimball Beach Road

Site Plan Review Application, filed January 22, 2026

Civil Plan (1), dated, January 13, 2026

Construction Plans, dated November 4, 2025

O and M Plan, received January 22, 2026

Stamped Existing Condition Plan, dated December 4, 2025

Neighborhood Analysis, received January 22, 2026

Stormwater Report, received January 22, 2026

Response to Peer Review, dated March 6, 2026

Civil Plan, revised March 3, 2026

O and M Plan, revised March 3, 2026

Stormwater Report, revised March 4, 2026

Landscape Plan, dated March 18, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 3, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 9, 2026

4 Del Prete

Application, received February 9, 2026

Application Narrative, dated February 6, 2026

Contact List

Existing Conditions Plan, dated January 20, 2026

Site Plan, dated January 26, 2026

Architectural Drawings, dated December 30, 2025 and revised January 28, 2026

Stormwater Management Report, dated February 2026

Neighborhood Analysis, dated January 27, 2026

Response to PGB Report Comments, dated March 17, 2026

Site Plan, revised March 16, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 10, 2026

Response to PGB Report Comments, dated March 17, 2026

Site Plan, revised March 16, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 19, 2026

100 Industrial Park Road

Occupancy Presentation, received March 20, 2026