

HINGHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 6, 2026@ 7:00 PM
REMOTE MEETING

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

Planning Board Members Absent: None

Also Present: Emily Wentworth, Community Planning Director, Rachel Agiorgitis, Sr. 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: Gary Tondorf-Dick, Crystal Kelly, Gordon Carr, and Tracy Shriver.

Hearing(s) & Discussion

1192 Main Street
Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver opened the meeting with 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.

Brendan P. Sullivan, Merrill Engineers and Land Surveyors, presented on behalf of the applicant. He shared the site plan and described that the driveway was in the same place but smaller. He explained that the garage was removed to reduce massing, made smaller, and was now detached. He added that the house size was reduced, the façade facing the street now includes a door and porch, and the gutter lines were lowered to make it appear smaller.

Chair Shriver asked about grading along the front. Mr. Sullivan explained that the grades will wrap around sides to make it more level. Member Kelly complimented the applicant for listening to the Board and asked about landscaping along lot lines. Mr. Sullivan said the screening plantings were the same along the lots lines as in previous plan noting the existing big tree will remain.

Member Tondorf-Dick expressed appreciation for the scaled down house and changes in the architectural character and scale of the proposed home being more consistent with the neighborhood context, but asked why the main front door porch doesn't face Main Street. Mr. Sullivan said it was to center the house, be within septic setbacks, and maintain a back yard space. Member Tondorf-Dick said

the view driving from Queen Anne's corner will be good and unblocked due to the existing wetlands. He went on to compliment the architectural details and then asked about the gross area ratio and how it compares with neighbors. There was a brief discussion amongst the Board about the size of other homes, and former homes like Scarlet Oak, that are in the area. Member Tondorf-Dick asked about grading, specifically the valley along the side of the saltbox house next door, and could that area be modified. Member Tondorf-Dick also asked if more hardy evergreens could be planted such as Cedar, rather than Arborvitae. Mr. Sullivan said he would be open to working with planning staff on this.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked if there were any outstanding civil items from the peer reviewer, Pat Brennan, PGB Engineering, confirmed that all of his concerns were met, except for the septic, which was smaller than required for a five bedroom house. Member Carr agreed; the septic was discussed, but can be handled by Board of Health. Member Tondorf-Dick offered the fact that groundwater moves quickly in the area and spreads far, based on the gas spill that happened nearby. Mr. Sullivan confirmed that they are following the rules and monitoring the gas plume.

Member Carr said the project revisions represented a large improvement from the previous version. Member Ellis agreed.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment. There was none.

Based on the information submitted and presented during the hearing, Chair Shiver 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 Anton Cela for Site Plan Approval 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, 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 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.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

4 Del Prete Drive Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver reopened the 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 B. Sullivan and Meghan Bruckman, P.E., Civil & Environmental Consultants (CAC), Inc., presented the project, which included newly revised architectural drawings reducing the size of the

house. Ms. Bruckman explained that the FAR was reduced 19% to .38 and the house was reduced by 1,000 SF. She went on to describe the attic was only a half story and the area over garage was reduced. Chair Shriver noted the house was similar to 6 Del Prete and added that the Board appreciated the effort to reduce its size.

Member Tondorf-Dick reviewed the house as it compared to its neighbors, with the new FAR of .38, and noted the lot coverage is still the same. Ms. Bruckman agreed and said that was to keep their stormwater mitigation and foundation design the same as the previous version. Member Tondorf-Dick said that it was still a large house compared to its context.

Member Ellis questioned the reluctance to change the size of the house footprint, although it met setback requirements. Member Tondorf-Dick said that he believed the house still didn't meet the Site Plan Review Criteria in Section "C" for character and scale consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Member Kelly said that she didn't think it was substantially larger than other homes in the area and the change to the garage reduced the massing. She agreed that it was important to consider the neighborhood, but the changes made it much less impactful. A Board discussion followed regarding the sizes of neighborhood homes. Member Carr agreed that the applicant reduced the overall size and FAR.

Attorney Sullivan emphasized the applicant's desire to respond to the Board, but also to have a home with room to grow. A conversation followed about the scale and character of the proposed house and the Board's concerns. Chair Shriver focused on the garage with the master bedroom on top was unprecedented in the neighborhood, and the resulting total width of the house was the main problem with the design.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Ellen Rathke, 62 Hersey, spoke to the large size of the house and lot sizes in the neighborhood.

Wendy and Howard Asnes, 3 Del Prete Drive, addressed the fact that the large home at 6 Del Prete was new. They have lived on the street since 1965 and noted that all the other houses (were small), except number 6, and the proposed house would be the biggest and take up the whole lot. She disagreed with granting "yes". She appreciated the effort, but thought it was still out of scale and character.

Member Ellis said that he was not concerned with growth and future homes in the area. He added that the proposed house was an imposing size and the lot was not big enough to support it.

Member Tondorf-Dick agreed with Chair Shriver that the problem with the design was the garage and does not feel it met the requirements for criteria "C"-Scale and Character. A discussion followed among Board members about the site plan review process and review criteria.

Chair Shriver agreed with Member Tondorf-Dick's assertion that the flat front façade was adding to the visual impact and offered his ideas on the size of the house, concluding that the SF was reasonable in the industry.

Ms. Bruckman said the garage could be pushed back to break up the front façade. Attorney Sullivan asked for a continuance and added that he understood that it was a difficult process both for the Board

and the Applicant. Attorney Sullivan requested to be heard at the next meeting on April 13 if possible. Ms. Wentworth explained that was the Board's decision.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to continue the application of Stephen Niosi, 4 Del Prete Drive Realty Trust, for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the 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 Monday April 13, 2026 at 7PM and to extend the decision deadline to May 18, 2026.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

81 Kimball Beach Road Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to the next item on the agenda, an application from Doug Keach, ALR Homes LLC, for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to authorize the reconstruction of a single-family dwelling with related driveway, retaining wall, utilities, stormwater management, and landscaping improvements at 81 Kimball Beach Road in the Residence A District.

Chair Shriver asked if this was the first time the Board was seeing this project. Ms. Wentworth explained that the project was already constructed and went over the 5,000 SF disturbed area. This was a regular site plan review, just after construction.

Gregory Morse, P.E., Morse Engineering Co., Inc., presented the project and explained the situation. He said that the planting of Arborvitae trees triggered the Site Plan Review and a Stop Work Order was issued by the Building Department. Mr. Morse described the site and abutting properties. The existing house and detached garage were razed and new house was built. They took down two trees, which were highlighted in red. He explained that the green line on the plan showed the trees within the Tree Yard were not touched. Mr. Morse reviewed the as-built house and explained the layout and utilities with one waiver requested for electric overhead wires. He highlighted the Arborvitae trees and explained that the site had been landscaped, with no change to the existing drainage patterns. He went on to describe details of the site engineering. Mr. Morse shared current site photos and views. He said the cobble apron on the driveway will be removed as per Hingham DPW and the back and side yard had terraced retaining walls. Mr. Morse said that all Peer Review comments were addressed and the Applicant has committed to installing storm water trenches, as per peer reviewer, Pat Brennan, P.E., PGB Engineering.

Mr. Brennan agreed that the Applicant had addressed his comments and he also recommended a condition that the stone trenches be inspected to allow for reconfiguration as needed due to the ledge on site. Mr. Brennan added that the driveway width at the road needed to be reduced to meet zoning.

Member Tondorf-Dick appreciated the photos and spoke about the height of the house. He was concerned that the high windows on the northwest side would compromise the privacy of the neighboring houses. He mentioned that the Tree Yard and trigger for site disturbance. He asked about

the Tree Yard and for confirmation that no trees had been removed from that area. Mr. Morse confirmed that no trees were taken down from the Tree Yard. Member Tondorf-Dick went on to discuss the height of the windows of the house as they relate to the neighbors and the need for screening with new trees for privacy. Mr. Morse agreed. Member Tondorf-Dick asked if they were going to plant more screening trees and suggested Norway spruce and Eastern Red Cedar. Mr. Morse said they were not planning on planting new trees. Member Tondorf-Dick then asked about the new stormwater items as recommended by Mr. Brennan, which Mr. Morse explained in more detail.

Member Kelly echoed the importance of the landscape screening. She asked if there would be any plantings on the terraces. Mr. Morse said there will be groundcover. Member Kelly acknowledged that it was a strange situation, seeing the project after the fact, with the Board only able to review what was already built.

Member Carr elaborated on the unusual process, focusing on the Applicant's estimate of the area to be disturbed and how close it was to 5,000 SF. Ms. Wentworth explained that the Building Department usually requires a fence to be installed along the limits when a project's estimate of disturbed area is so close to the threshold. Member Carr stressed that he does not like after-the-fact reviews like this project and Chair Shriver added he was a proponent that all raze and rebuild projects should be required to apply for Site Plan Review. Member Carr agreed with the stormwater condition suggested by Mr. Brennan.

Member Kelly asked if this project would trigger the 75% disturbance with the proposed future by-law. Ms. Wentworth said it would not have done so.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Erika Craciun, 83 Kimball Beach Road, said that it was tricky, as the house was already built. She said the house was too big and the AC units are in front. The views presented at the meeting didn't show what it looked like in real life and her visitors often had negative comments about it. Ms. Craciun was upset with the process being sidetracked so the builder could save money. She also noted the noise during construction. She hoped for changes to the process and this wouldn't happen to others. Chair Shriver responded by saying that there are changes and subcommittees being developed.

Adrienne and Stephen Oesterle, 11 Paige Street, are the owners of the new home and have been waiting for occupancy. They are from MN. Their daughter passed away and they relocated to be near their son, who is a Boston firefighter and will be living there. They added that they will be great neighbors and were very glad to be in Hingham. They asked for conditional occupancy. They appreciated what the Board is trying to do, but they also needed to move forward.

Betsy and Mike Coyne, 3 Foley Beach Road, asked questions about the stormwater trenches and if there would be more digging. Mr. Morse described the crushed stone trenches would be 2.5-3' deep and varying widths, done with a mini-excavator, with no more drilling or jack-hammering. Mr. Morse said they would be no closer than 10' to the lot lines and connect to Kimball Beach road. Mr. Coyne added that he disagreed that the house met the scale and character of the neighborhood and wished he had known the process better. They welcomed the new neighbors and conceded, "What's done is done".

Member Tondorf-Dick added that the project was a good example of why a Residential Compatibility Standards Subcommittee is needed to study the balance between open space and lot coverage, with Crowe Point as the “poster child”.

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 Stephen Niosi, 4 Del Prete Drive Realty Trust, for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the 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, 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. Plan Revision. Prior to application for a building permit, the Applicant shall revise the architectural plans to specify additional water proofing of the foundation walls.
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. Details of the proposed waterproofing system shall be provided on the architectural building plans and additional water proofing should be specified, as per Peer Review Report, Patrick Brennan, PGB Engineers, dated March 19, 2026.
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. Sewer Line. If access to the sanitary sewer line at the rear of the property be required, the Applicant shall be responsible for removal of the planting and replanting once access to the sanitary sewer is no longer required. Alternately, the Hingham Sewer Department may require that service to the dwelling be relocated to the front of the property to connect with the main in Del Prete Drive.
9. 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.
10. 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, Crystal Kelly, Kevin Ellis, Gordon Carr, Tracy Shriver
Opposed:	None

35 Smith Road

Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver opened an application from Oak Development and Design for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, walkways, utilities, stormwater improvements, and landscaping improvements at 35 Smith Road in the Residence A District.

Jeffrey Couture, P.E. of SITEC Engineering and PJ Antonik of Oak Development presented the project. Mr. Couture shared the site plan and described the existing slopes and drainage. He went on to explain the proposed project, trees to be removed, septic system, and utilities. He described the house size, landscape, and driveway. Mr. Couture went on to explain that there will be retaining walls for the site grade change, which is almost 10' from one end of the site to the other. He explained the increase in

impervious area and how it will be mitigated. He added that the Applicant is requesting a waiver for the overhead utilities and went on to share the grading and architectural plans.

Mr. Couture explained the neighborhood analysis. Within a 750' radius there were seven houses with larger SF totals and the houses across the street are smaller. He shared photos of the existing house, with 33 Smith Road next door, which is similar in comparison. 40 Smith Road across the street is larger as well as other nearby newer houses. He offered that the proposed house is not an unreasonable departure from what is existing in the neighborhood.

Chair Shriver asked about the trees to be removed. Mr. Antonik said he spoke to the tree warden and he said they can be removed. The two in the back, Mr. Antonik said, are overhanging and a hazard. Chair Shriver also asked about the house location. Mr. Antonik said they wanted more back yard. Member Ellis also asked about the removal of the trees. Mr. Antonik said that the trees are very big and an insurance liability.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked about the grades and retaining walls. Mr. Couture said that they're not trying to bring the grade up, but maintain what is there. He noted that the gable end design and massing is consistent with surrounding homes. Chair Shriver added that the grading on the site plan doesn't match the architectural plans. The Applicant agreed and Mr. Antonik went on to describe the walls.

Member Ellis asked the Board to examine the removal of the trees, as he isn't convinced that the Applicant's argument holds. He stressed that it is important to maintain the streetscape. A discussion with both the Applicant and Board members followed about existing trees and proposed mitigation trees.

Member Kelly said she has no concerns that haven't been addressed. Member Carr agreed that this road is very different than it once was and added that the house was thoughtfully placed. Peer reviewer, Mr. Brennan had nothing to add.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Dana Greeley, 30 Smith Road, asked about SF of new house. It was about 3,000 SF for the first and second floor, explained Mr. Antonik. He added that they strove to keep the roof lower, by finishing the basement and not the 3rd floor. There was discussion about the size of the house and what others were doing in the neighborhood.

Laura Donovan, 28 Smith Road, asked about the SF, as her house is 1,500 SF and they have her listed as over 2,000. Mr. Antonik explained that gross area is different from living area and they got their information from the town website. Ms. Donovan stressed that calculations are misleading. She went on to say that the street was never meant to have two million dollar homes and the other houses are getting dwarfed. A discussion followed on how to compare the house sizes. Ms. Donovan reiterated her point that big houses in such a neighborhood are not necessary. Member Tondorf-Dick explained that the Board is wrestling with these issues and there was a new subcommittee that she should join.

Amy Greeley, 30 Smith Road, expressed concern with taxes increasing for her and others. Chair Shriver said he understood, but it was outside of the Board's review. Member Tondorf-Dick said the resident could speak to the Assessor to confirm her property tax calculations.

Bill Donovan, 28 Smith Road, asked about the Board's philosophy on inserting uncharacteristic homes within neighborhoods. He asked the Board to articulate.

Chair Shriver explained the history of Site Plan Review and that some neighborhoods began changing before it was in place. He explained that now the Board sees more projects, most for raze and rebuilds, however many large homes were built before the Site Plan Review was in place and now they are part of the scale and character of neighborhoods. He added that new tools will be added to the Board's review, and the Board tries to walk a line between the extremes.

Member Ellis said proposed rules to limit lot coverage were rejected at Town Meeting. He said it is not without effort that the Board was trying to address these issues.

A discussion followed about the approval of this project and Chair Shriver explained the difference between the gross area of a house versus the livable area. Erik Grabowski, 45 Smith Road, asked about his gross area and living area, resulting in a discussion on the subject.

Chair Shriver reviewed the proposed conditions for planting an Oak in front of the house, or a native species hardwood tree, as suggested by Member Tondorf-Dick. Mr. Antonik agreed to size between 4 and 6" caliper.

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, with the exception of a Standard under § I-I, 6.h requiring an underground electrical/communication connection. A waiver of this Standard to allow an overhead connection will not adversely impact the interests set forth in subsection a. above.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick To GRANT the application of Oak Development and Design 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 35 Smith Road 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. 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.
3. Public Shade Tree. No tree within the Smith Road right of way shall be removed without the authorization of the Tree Warden/Department of Public Works. Evidence of said authorization shall be submitted with the application for a building permit.

4. **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.
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 new 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, Crystal Kelly, Kevin Ellis, Gordon Carr, Tracy Shriver
Opposed:	None

23 Otis Hill Road Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to the next hearing which was an application from Steven J. Meyers, Trustee Of The Meyers Family Living Trust for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, decking, walkways, landscaping, utilities, and stormwater improvements at 23 Otis Hill Road in the Residence A District.

Brendan P. Sullivan, P.E., Merrill Engineers, presented the project. He explained that there were trees to be removed which are damaged or diseased. He went on to share the architectural plans.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked the applicant to explain the grades. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the calculations and compared them with peer reviewer Patrick Brennan's calculations to determine the grade plane. A discussion followed about the grades, slopes and height of new house.

Member Carr offered comments on the neighborhood analysis requirement of Site Plan Review and that it was intended for applicants to use as a tool to inform their design. He went on to say that the project was on the higher end of the scale and stands out as decidedly larger than the others in the neighborhood. Mr. Sullivan responded with their rationale compared for the size of the house, to which Member Carr disagreed. A discussion followed, with Chair Shriver stressing that the FAR of the proposed house is double the average in the area. Member Kelly agreed that the house seems larger. Member Tondorf-Dick agreed as well and elaborated on the house's height and close location to the neighbors.

Chair Shriver asked if the existing 7' setback could be widened. Steven Meyers, Trustee of The Meyers Family Living Trust, explained that the design of the house was based on the vertical nature of the lot, as so many in the neighborhood. He explained that there are a lot of big homes in the neighborhood and that there is an openness due to topography that can't be seen in the plans. He described how the house works with the site. A lengthy discussion followed.

Member Ellis questioned the uniqueness of the site. He added that the house would be an outlier and would become the new benchmark. Mr. Meyer disagreed and added the rules are vague in Hingham compared to other municipalities.

Member Tondorf-Dick offered his thoughts on the larger than surrounding neighborhood homes size, scale and character of the proposed house and its impact on the neighborhood. He also acknowledged the densification of the neighborhood. Chair Shriver said the height of the rear elevation is at the maximum height allowed. He felt it made the home appear like a 4 story from the rear. He expressed concern about the effect on the people that live below. Chair Shriver suggested in lieu of a site visit Members could visit individually in an effort to reduce any delayed time.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Tony Messina/Christine Falvey, 27 Otis Hill Road, asked about the calculations and landscape plan. Sean Papich, Landscape Architect, explained the landscape plan including the removal of 4 trees that were damaged or deceased. The addition of 5 evergreens in the rear for screening and the addition of a magnolia in the front. There will be ornamental shrubbery planted around the foundation. Typically in

this neighborhood they do not plant large shade or canopy trees in an effort to honor the neighbors view/sight line. A brief discussion of potential site visits followed.

The motion was made by Tracy Shriver, seconded by Gordon Carr, to continue the application of Steven J. Meyers, Trustee Of The Meyers Family Living Trust for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with related driveway, decking, walkways, landscaping, utilities, and stormwater improvements at 23 Otis Hill Road in the Residence A District to Monday May 4, 2026 at 7PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

222 South Pleasant Street Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to the next hearing which was an application from Matthew Falconeiri, Falconeiri Construction Inc. for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with an attached garage, and make related driveway, hardscaping, landscaping, utilities, and stormwater improvements at 222 South Pleasant Street in the Residence C District.

Brendan P. Sullivan, P.E., Merrill Engineers, presented the project. He shared the plans and explained the history of the previous plan and owner. He went on to describe the location and site. He explained the proposed home, driveway and septic system, all of which will not be near the buffer zones. He shared the landscape plan and described the utilities. Mr. Sullivan went on to explain the neighborhood analysis and that the proposed house is in the middle range compared to other homes in the vicinity. Sean Papich, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plan.

Peer reviewer Pat Brennan, PGB Engineering said that he had no issues with the site plan. He did point out the septic design architectural plans did not match in bedroom size and this would need to be addressed for the Board of Health. Otherwise he was satisfied with the plan.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked about the existing perimeter trees and the new trees. Mr. Papich indicated that they would be waiting to speak with a potential buyer before finalizing and additional planting. He also asked if there is going to be a pool. Mr. Papich said there was no plan for a pool. Member Tondorf-Dick said the house seems to be contextual in scale and character with others on South Pleasant Street. Member Kelly said it was an appropriate house for a large lot and she has no concerns.

Member Carr felt the current proposal was much more appropriate than that which was proposed by the previous developer and agreed with member Tondorf-Dick that the proposed site and design was consistent with the neighborhood. Member Kelly felt it was appropriately sized to the parcel.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Randy and Karen Otto, 234 South Pleasant Street, commented that they were extremely relieved that the former project was not constructed. They went on to say they have no objections to the current

proposal. They are happy the brush vegetative buffer will remain and asked about the outdoor lighting Mr. Papich said there is no outdoor lighting plan. He felt that any purchaser would only low level pathway lights which should not affect the Ottos. Mr. Otto asked about the big tree shown at the front and whether it's still there. Mr. Papich agreed to drive by and verify the existence.

Based on the information submitted and presented during the hearing, Chair Shriver made the proposed 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 meets all applicable Design and Performance Standards.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Crystal Kelly, to GRANT the application from Matthew Falconeiri, Falconeiri Construction Inc., for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the By-Law to reconstruct a single-family dwelling with an attached garage, and make related driveway, hardscaping, landscaping, utilities, and stormwater improvements at 222 South Pleasant Street in the Residence C 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. 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 new 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: Crystal Kelly, Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Tracy Shriver
Opposed: None

Chair Shriver moved on the administrative items.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick to approve the Minutes of October 27, 2025 and March 21, 2026 as presented and the minutes of December 8, 2025, January 5, 2026, and March 23, 2026, as amended by Gary Tondorf-Dick.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

The Board discussed the tentative Monday April 13th meeting. Ms. Wentworth said she will touch base individually with Board members about their availability to speak on articles at upcoming Town Meeting.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to adjourn the hearing at 11:07 PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

Meeting Materials

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
Summary of Revisions, dated March 30, 2026
Site Plan, revised March 30, 2026
Architectural Plan, revised March 27, 2026
Neighborhood Analysis, revised March 30, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated August 20, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated September 9, 2025
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated April 2, 2026

4 Del Prete Drive

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
Explanation of Revisions, dated March 30, 2026
Architectural Plan Revisions, received March 30, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 10, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 19, 2026

81 Kimball Beach Road

Application, dated March 5, 2026
Application Narrative, dated March 4, 2026
Contact List
Site Plan, dated March 5, 2026

Architectural Plans, dated June 12, 2024
Landscape Plan, dated March 5, 2026
Stormwater Report, dated March 4, 2026
Neighborhood Analysis, dated March 4, 2026
Proposed Floor Plan, dated February 10, 2026 updated March 25, 2026
Cut & Fill Plan, dated March 26, 2026
Response to Comments, dated April 2, 2026
Site Plan, revised April 2, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 30, 2026

35 Smith Road

Site Plan Review Application, filed February 26, 2026
Request for Waiver, dated February 18, 2026
Project Narrative - 35 Smith Road, received February 18, 2026
Site Plan, dated February 6, 2026
Architectural Plans, received February 18, 2026
Stormwater Report, dated February 5, 2026
Neighborhood Analysis, received February 18, 2026
Response to Comments, dated March 30, 2026
Site Plan Review Application and Neighborhood Analysis, revised March 30, 2026
Site Plan, revised March 27, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 24, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated April 1, 2026

23 Otis Hill Road

Site Plan Review Application, filed February 25, 2026
Contact List
Site Plan, dated February 24, 2026
Architectural Plan, dated February 16, 2026
Landscape Plan, dated February 24, 2026
Tree Assessment, dated February 11, 2026
Stormwater Report, dated February 24, 2026
Neighborhood Analysis, dated February 16, 2026
Response to Review Comments, dated March 30, 2026
Site Plan, revised March 30, 2026
Architectural Plan, dated March 30, 20206
Average Grade Table, dated February 18, 2026
Neighborhood Analysis, revised March 30, 2026
Response to Comments, dated April 2, 2026
Site Plan, revised April 2, 2026
Architectural Plan, revised April 2, 2026
Average Grade Sketch with Perimeters, received April 2, 2026
Average Grade Calc with Perimeters, received April 2, 2026
Average Grade Sketch no Perimeters, received April 2, 2026
Average Grade Calc no Perimeters, received April 2, 2026
Architectural Plan, revised April 3, 2026
Landscape Plan, revised April 3, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 24, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 30, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated April 3, 2026

222 South Pleasant Street

Site Plan Review Application, filed February 26, 2026

Site Plan, dated January 21, 2026

Stormwater Report, dated February 23, 2026

Architectural Plan, revised 3-17-26

Response to Review Comments, dated March 30, 2026

Site Plan Review Application, revised March 30, 2026

Site Plan, Revised March 30, 3036

Existing Conditions Plan, revised March 30, 2026

Architectural Plan, revised March 17, 2026

Landscape Plan, dated March 26, 2026

Stormwater Report, revised March 30, 2026

Neighborhood Analysis, dated March 26, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 26, 2026

P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 30, 2026