

**HINGHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**APRIL 13, 2026@ 7:00 PM**  
**REMOTE MEETING**

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

**Planning Board Members Absent:** Crystal Kelly

**Also Present:** Emily Wentworth, Community Planning Director, Rachel Agiorgitis, Sr. Planner

At 7:02 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, Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis and Tracy Shriver.

### **Hearing(s) & Discussion**

---

#### **4 Del Prete Drive**

##### **Site Plan Review**

Chair Shriver began with the continuation of 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. Attorney Sullivan explained that when they last met, the Board said it would be preferable that the garage be moved 5' back. Ms. Bruckman reviewed the site plan, revised sketch, and cut views, showing the new garage 5' set back, with. She explained that the recess was provided to give a visual reduction of the massing. The change had been added to the civil plan and updates were made to ensure compliance. Attorney Sullivan asked for the Board to consider the improvement for the Site Plan Review criteria.

Member Tondorf-Dick felt the setback helps focus the view on the house and asked for confirmation on the reduction of FAR. Ms. Bruckman said it was now .38 and Member Tondorf-Dick mentioned it looked similar to the neighboring house. He asked about the unusual existing back sewer line. Ms. Bruckman confirmed that they would connect to front sewer line in the road and the origin of the back line is unclear. She said she would update plans accordingly for the Building Permit.

Chair Shriver asked for Board comments. Member Carr said he had no comments. Member Ellis felt the .38 FAR was still an extreme outlier and he did not see this project as a model for what the Board is trying to achieve. Chair Shriver felt the small lot is the problem. Member Ellis said sometimes the site does not support the house the owner wants to build.

Chair Shriver opened the hearing to public comments.

Ellen Rathke, 62 Hersey Street, still thinks house and garage are too big. She doesn't know what else can be done to make revisions. She was also concerned about the bus stop at end of street and the construction crews needed to be cognizant of that.

Wendy and Howard Asnes, 3 Del Prete Drive, appreciated the attempt, the position of the Board and the applicant. Ms. Asnes said they had lived there so long, and were not objectors to change, but asserted that it was about the people who live in the neighborhoods. She added that she is not a bad neighbor, and wanted the new owners to enjoy their home. She asked about the building process and the rules and hours for work.

Member Tondorf-Dick mentioned the Planning Board's Residential Compatibility Standards subcommittee and the ways this project was a good example of things such as the proportion between open space lot coverage that can be covered.

Chair Shriver agreed that the applicants in general should show more context, look at the proposed house in a bigger scale and felt the Board should ask for more information on the surrounding neighborhood.

Member Carr asked about the bus stop question. Ms. Wentworth said that there is a standard condition about parking constricted vehicles on site, and if the vehicles are not able to be contained on site, a police detail must be used. Ms. Wentworth confirmed that construction could start at 7:00 AM.

Member Tondorf-Dick offered additional comments regarding the context such as the proportion between open space lot coverage that can be covered, to which Chair Shriver suggested the subject could be discussed further in the Planning Board's Residential Compatibility Standards subcommittee at a later date.

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

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

Chair 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. **Site Plan Revision.** Prior to application for a building permit, the Applicant shall complete and submit revised site plan civil drawings to reflect the 5' garage setback.
3. **Architectural 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.
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. **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 Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis, Tracy Shriver

**Opposed:** None

Chair Shriver opened the meeting to Other Business.

Ms. Wentworth advised the next Planning Board Meetings were scheduled for May 4 and May 18. This was followed by a discussion about Town Meeting and how it would be handled if it extended for a third night. Chair Shriver and Ms. Wentworth advised the Board to hold May 11 open in case it was needed for a Planning Board Meeting. Ms. Wentworth asked Board members to submit any conflicts with the upcoming summer schedule.

Chair Shriver volunteered to be the Planning Board liaison for the Town Meeting. Ms. Wentworth added that on Sunday before Town Meeting there would be a moderator's meeting. She added that potentially the Chair could be the liaison for two or all three items on the warrant. Member Carr offered to be the back-up liaison for the North Street Fire Station if needed. Ms. Wentworth said she would prepare notes for each. Chair Shriver felt it was not necessary for the Board to meet on site prior to Town Meeting. Ms. Wentworth advised no meeting would be posted and reminded the Board they cannot meet with a quorum unless it is posted.

Chair Shriver suggested looking ahead to items needed for the Town meeting in 2027 and establishing a priority list. He went on to list some of the possible issues such as FAR, Hatfield, and trees. He asked for Board input.

Member Carr asked if there could be a façade area ratio and had the concept been discussed. Chair Shriver said it was an interesting idea and had not been discussed yet. Chair Shriver noted that under Historic, the front setback was the average of the neighbors, and wondered could that be applied to Site Plan Review. Member Carr suggested a handout at Town Meeting to explain Site Plan Review and the Board's role.

Member Tondorf-Dick agreed that the proportions of façades is the biggest issue and could the Board create a façade ratio for better balance. He added that Hatfield could be considered a Special Permit. He also pointed out that temperatures are rising around town about the scale and size of tear downs and new houses.

In response to earlier suggestions, Ms. Wentworth said the moderator needed to approve all handouts in advance of Town Meeting and that Facebook, website, and Harbor media allowed for far more flexibility for sharing information. Ms. Wentworth added that making Hatfield a Special Permit would be a burden for Zoning Board and doesn't solve the problem of having something more substantive.

Member Tondorf-Dick suggested more clarification was needed on how to interpret the Hatfield law. In response, Member Ellis offered that Hatfield should be less of the focus. He added that the Board was just trying to make things the right size and should set some marks to hit, without making the process impossible.

Ms. Wentworth clarified the difference between performance standards, which can be waived and a new dimensional standard, which would create the need for a variance. A discussion on followed.

Member Tondorf-Dick then asked if item "C" for scale and character could be expanded. Member Carr replied that applicants know to come in high, so there was room to work with and come down to what they actually want.

Chair Shriver agreed with the points made and asked if there was other business to be discussed.

Ms. Wentworth said that a residential development by the Bristol brothers would be on the table next year. She suggested another item for discussion could be changing the concept of a tree yard for non-residential properties as it doesn't meet the intent. A discussion followed about previous projects and tree yards.

Chair Shriver made the motion to adjourn at 8:04 PM, which was passed by roll call vote.  
The motion passed by roll call vote.

**In Favor:** Gary Tondorf-Dick Gordon Carr, Kevin Ellis, Tracy Shriver

**Opposed:** None

#### Meeting Materials

##### **23 Otis Hill Road**

*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*

*Architectural Plan Revisions, received April 9, 2026*

*P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 10, 2026*

*P. Brennan Peer Review, dated March 19, 2026*