

HINGHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 4, 2026@ 7:00 PM
REMOTE MEETING

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

Planning Board Members Absent: None

Also Present: Emily Wentworth, Community Planning Director and Rachel Agiorgitis, Senior 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 members present including: Crystal Kelly, Tracy Shriver, Kevin Ellis, and Gary Tondorf-Dick.

Hearing(s) & Discussion

**23 Otis Hill Road
Site Plan Review**

Chair Shriver began the meeting by reopening the hearing for 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. The initial hearing on this matter opened on April 6, 2026.

Xander Oram, Merrill Engineers, presented on behalf of the applicant. He was joined by Sean Papich, Landscape Architect and Steven Myers the architect and applicant. Mr. Oram shared the plans and outlines changes made to the house size in response to feedback received in the previous hearing. The house was reduced by 1,100 SF living area and 1,300 gross area this change included increasing the setback to 13’ along the left side of the lot. He explained that the house was now the eight largest in neighborhood. Mr. Oram went on to state that grading and drainage patterns would remain the same.

Mr. Papich, explained that the landscape design changed slightly to accommodate the new shape of the house. He added that the house was now 1’ lower and the retaining wall next to the driveway was approx. 3’ tall. He also reviewed the trees, both new and to be removed.

Mr. Myers reiterated the reduction in the house size, as well as the shift away from the left property line was in response to the comments made by the Board. He explained that the majority of the house was within the zoning setbacks, including the right side of house and he felt it was a better design.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked about the perspective view and if the intent of the planter in front was to make the house look smaller. Mr. Myers agreed. Member Tondorf-Dick spoke about the architecture of the existing home and asked if there could be any details added to the proposed house to make it feel more horizontal. A conversation followed about the Craftsman style, which Mr. Myers appreciated, but is not using here.

Member Kelly said that she appreciated the efforts of the Applicant and the house was much less imposing and a step in the right direction. Chair Shriver agreed.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Sara Traylor and her husband, 17 Otis Hill Road, asked about the back tree that was on their property line. She asked if they could work with the Applicant to keep the tree. Mr. Myers said he wanted to work with the neighbors, but the tree was diseased and invasive, to which Mr. Papich agreed. Mr. Traylor asked if the tree could be replaced with a new one and Mr. Myers agreed. After a brief discussion by Chair Shriver

and Ms. Wentworth, the verbal agreement about the tree would not be added as a condition, as the coordination with the neighbor was noted on the site plan.

Tony Messina, 27 Otis Hill Road, said he appreciated the changes and has no further concerns.

Based on the information submitted and presented during the hearing for Site Plan Review, Chair Shriver made the following 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 Steven J. Meyers, Trustee Of The Meyers Family Living Trust, for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the 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, 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 work on the site commences.
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: Kevin Ellis, Gordon Carr, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Crystal Kelly, Tracy Shriver,
Opposed: None

210 Hull Street Site Plan Approval Modification

Chair Shriver continued to an application from 210 Hull Street Trust LLC to modify a Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, originally issued June 26, 2025, to adjust the previously approved dwelling footprint, driveway length, deck and patio configurations at 210 Hull Street in the Residence C District.

Xander Oram, Merrill Engineers, presented on behalf of the applicant. He shared the updated site plan and explained that the applicant moved the house slightly, by 5 feet, to avoid a ledge outcrop and the site plan was adjusted accordingly. The change resulted in a footprint decrease of approximately 150 SF and no updates were needed for the stormwater structures.

Chair Shriver asked about the division of land and Mr. Oram explained the layout of the common drive and associated grading. Gary Tondorf-Dick asked about the ledge location and if the floor elevation was reduced. Mr. Oram replied that the floor elevation remained the same. He also explained adjustments to the grading noting the overall drainage pattern would remain the same.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment.

Ann Riley, 214 Hull Street, said that she appreciated that the builder talked to the neighbors. She asked why the electric lines connect across the street. She stated that she lives on the side of the street serviced by National Grid and noted the applicant is connecting their electric through 311 Rockland Street to be on municipal electric service. Chair Shriver said that this had not changed since the approved plan. Ms. Riley went on to reiterate the project's connection to municipal electric and commented on the size of the house. Mr. Oram explained that the utilities had not changed from the approved site plan. Ms. Riley continued to describe a non-working streetlight, removal of trees, wildlife, the use of municipal electric, and the "crisscrossing" lines. A discussion between Member Tondorf-Dick and Ms. Riley followed in which they spoke about neighborhood lighting in general, electric service, and lighting the nearby Vietnam memorial. Member Kelly suggested that Ms. Riley speak to the Select Board about this issue. Chair Shriver confirmed that the electrical service was going underground so there was no crossing of lines. Member Ellis and Member Carr added that Ms. Riley's concerns were not part of the Board's scope. Ms. Riley then suggested holding up the project, which the Board rejected. This was followed by a brief discussion during which the Board recommended again that Ms. Riley speak to the Select Board.

Based on the information submitted and presented during the hearing for Site Plan Review, Chair Shriver made the following 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, as modified, meets all applicable Design and Performance Standards.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Kevin Ellis, to GRANT the application of 210 Hull Street Trust LLC to modify a Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the By-Law, originally issued June 26, 2025, to adjust the previously approved dwelling footprint, driveway length, deck and patio configurations at 210 Hull Street in the Residence C 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. All conditions of the previous Site Plan Approval, dated June 26, 2025, remain in full force and effect unless specifically modified by this Decision.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

25 Lazell Street Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver moved on to an application from Matthew and Elizabeth Horne filed for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to construct an addition to the existing dwelling, replace a swimming pool, reconfigure the driveway, and install hardscaping and landscaping at 25 Lazell Street in the Residence C District.

Paul Gunn, Morse Engineering, presented on behalf of the applicant. He was joined by Jonathan Aprea, Aprea Design and Sean Papich, Sean Papich Landscape Architecture. Mr. Gunn shared the site plan and explained there were no wetlands or conservation restrictions. He went on to describe the existing site, which includes a single-family home built in the early 1800s, multiple gravel driveways, an existing swimming pool in the rear yard, a small-detached structure, and a drainage easement along Lazell Street. Mr. Gunn stated that the applicant was proposing replacement of the pool, improve hardscaping and put an addition on the existing house, which would make the total SF of living area 5,300 SF, and a FAR .03 above the neighborhood average. He further explained that the applicant revised the original plans based on staff input. No changes to the utility service were proposed. Mr. Gunn stated the increase in impervious areas would be directed to stormwater structures.

Mr. Papich, landscape architect, presented the landscape plan. He described the new driveways and circulation routes, walkways and hardscape. He explained by adding robust plantings, with a mix of native plant material, the main intent was to increase the existing vegetative buffer. In addition, Mr. Papich described new plantings at the street corner and the farmer's walls the design, which were in keeping with the style of the street.

Mr. Gunn explained existing tree protection and the mitigation for the single tree removed from the tree yard. He also explained that the neighborhood analysis which included photos and aerial imagery.

Jonathan Aprea, architect, described the proposed home addition. He explained that the addition begins at the current kitchen and consists of a new entry, living area, 2-bay garage and bedroom above. He went on to describe the elevations, rooflines intended to break up the massing, and the new pool. He then described the elevations and materials in more detail, emphasizing that the shape of the addition was designed to take advantage of the long shape of the site and minimize the presence of the architecture at the street. He also noted the pool equipment location.

Pat Brennan, P.E., PGB Engineering, confirmed that his questions from his peer review report have been answered, save a few typos that will be corrected before final submission. He will then reissue a letter that all comments have been addressed.

Member Kelly asked about the construction vehicles and traffic. She was concerned as the neighbor across the street regularly blocked the street during construction. Mr. Gunn explained the plan for construction vehicles with a stabilized entry, and said he would add a second access point to prevent trucks from backing up onto Lazell Street. He added there is a third entrance point on Free Street if needed.

Member Carr asked about the existing vegetative screening as viewed from the hill on Lazell Street. He commented that the majority of trees are going away and that it will be a radically different view. Mr. Papich agreed. A discussion followed about the garage area, size and shape of the driveway, walkways, and additional plantings proposed. Member Carr emphasized that the area will look very different than it does now. Mr. Papich offered to add more American Holly for screening.

Member Ellis asked if the Board should request a reduction to the driveway size. A discussion followed about the driveway size, house layout, and existing screening.

Member Tondorf-Dick talked about the neighborhood and noted that Lazell Street is a scenic road and consists of a lot of trees and fieldstone walls, with houses tucked in behind. He also noted that Free Street and Union Street are more open, but the houses are still set far back. He suggested eliminating the curb cut on Lazell and replacing it with a narrow single lane driveway from Free Street that would reach the garage through the unwooded area. He felt strongly the large driveway and hammerhead on Lazell Street would remove too many mature trees that maintain the neighborhoods historic appeal.

A discussion followed about the related changes to the driveway layout, town drainage easements, turn-around sizes, tree removals needed, as well as the general character of the Lazell as a country road with cars and barns traditionally being in the back. The conversation continued and circled back around to the existing driveway layout, the driveway uses, and the perceived front façade of the house.

Chair Shriver summarized that the opinion of the Board was the driveway was too big and too many trees were coming down. He asked the Applicant if these two items could be minimized. He also reminded the applicant of the revisions required for the Peer Review.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment. There was none.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to CONTINUE the application of Matthew and Elizabeth Horne for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the By-Law to construct an addition to the existing dwelling, replace a swimming pool, reconfigure the driveway, and install hardscaping and landscaping at 25 Lazell Street in the Residence C District, to May 18, 2026 at 7:00 PM and extend the Decision Deadline to June 18, 2026.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

**25 Bare Cove Park Drive, Carlson Pickleball Complex
Site Plan Review**

Chair Shriver moved on to an application from the Town of Hingham for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law to demolish an existing building and construct eight pickleball courts, parking area, and related improvements on a portion of 25 Bare Cove Park Drive (Map 69, Lot 44) in the Official and Open Space District.

Mike Moonan, RLA, CHA Consulting, Inc. presented on behalf of the Town of Hingham. He was joined by Mark Thorell, Director of Recreation, TOH, and James Kinney, and Jason Pollard of CHA Consulting, Inc. Mr. Moonan explained that work on the project began over two years ago and began with a study completed in 2024 on possible sites court site. He explained the current site includes a condemned building. He shared photos of the existing conditions. He went on to state the proposal was to build eight pickleball courts, noting the area would be smaller than the Hingham High School tennis courts. He then shared an aerial view of the proposed court location and presented the site plan.

Mr. Moonan described the wetland resource areas and vernal pool near the project. He showed the adjacent uses and driveways. He then shared the evolution of the project with the previous plans and how the project has gone from 12 down to 8 courts, which allows the design to remain outside of the 50’ wetland buffer zone. He described the layout of the courts, site amenities, parking and plantings. He went on to show the demo plan, construction layout plan, and impervious areas. He continued to describe the grading and stormwater management.

Pat Brennan, P.E., PGB Engineering, went over the peer review. He reported the test hole he recommended was completed, but he had not received the report prior to the hearing. He talked about the stormwater calculations, construction details, and cleanouts. He asked for the proposed catch basin in the parking area to have a 4’ sump and a hood. Mr. Brennan went on to talk about the parking layout and the need for more room at the walkways and car overhangs to comply with ADA. He noted that the retaining wall would require a building permit. He felt the items identified in the report could easily be addressed by the Applicant.

Mr. Moonan advised they were making revisions based on the test pits and clay sub layers discovered. He said they would continue to make revisions as needed, including adjustments for the car overhangs on the sidewalk. He concluded by stating that revised plans would be submitted within the week. A discussion about the car parking spaces followed.

Member Kelly commended the Applicant for making revisions needed in order to stay out of sensitive wetland areas. She also asked if the proposed number of parking spots was enough and questioned the number of users at peak hours. Mr. Moonan explained that the traffic study said there would be no

significant increase. A discussion followed amongst members of the Board and the Applicant regarding the number of parking spots, demographics for use, and the time patterns of use.

Member Tondorf-Dick questioned how the applicant intended to manage runoff to protect the vernal pool. Mr. Kinney explained the stormwater system would manage the runoff.

Member Tondorf-Dick then asked about the sound levels at adjacent properties, the nearby DPW and Electric work area and office buildings. He explained his concern was with the staccato nature and pitch of pickleball, as opposed to a low hum of an industrial building, adding that the pickleball sound was difficult to listen to on a prolonged basis. He went on to discuss decibel levels and asked about the sound mitigation. Mr. Moonan explained the proposed soundproof fencing. He added that the distance to area homes was sufficient to mitigate the sound, even without the special fencing. He stated the decibel levels would remain very low for the homes. Member Tondorf-Dick asked about the nearby office and service buildings (DPW and Electric departments). Mr. Moonan said that there would be very little noise inside the buildings. Mr. Pollard offered that although the noise is sharp, the attenuating barrier, in addition to lowering the sound level, softens the pitch of the sound.

A discussion followed about the courts and the usage throughout the season.

Member Tondorf-Dick went onto ask about outstanding conservation issues. Mr. Moonan explained that the process with the Conservation Commission was ongoing and the configuration of the current site plan was based on meetings with them.

Member Kelly asked about the 15' high sound barrier and if there are examples in other communities. The Applicant replied they would share examples with the Board. Member Ellis agreed with looking at existing court designs and asked if the applicant could also show a view of what the court complex will look like from the street. A brief conversation followed about the installation, appearance, and maintenance of the sound screen.

Chair Shriver asked for public comment and noted that the project would be continued for another hearing.

Anita Ryan, 37 Baker Hill Drive, first commented on the wetland resources and limited parking. She asked if the project could be reduced to six courts. She then asked if the Board could hold a site visit. Ms. Ryan commented that the applicant did not consider the neighbors who live upland in the sound study. She informed Members that she was the president of the Christina Estates Homeowners Association, which is atop Baker Hill. She shared that residents there are very concerned about the noise impact. She went on to ask if a noise simulation could be conducted. She went on to questioned the use of lawn fertilizer near the sensitive wetlands and the jurisdiction of the fire hydrant ("fire extinguisher") shown in the site photos. She asked for clarification on the name "Carlson Complex", to which Mr. Thorell responded. Ms. Ryan also asked about the total area of the development, and submissions to MA DEP. Mr. Moonan responded and explained the required state and federal submissions for the project would complete, including a SWPPP.

Hilary Tutko, 25 Hillside Terrace, echoed the request from Ms. Ryan for a noise simulation.

Chair Shriver summarized by asking the Applicant to provide examples of the fence and sound barrier. Member Kelly added that they also asked the Applicant to provide examples of other sites using the same or reasonably equivalent sound barriers, so Members could visit if possible.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to CONTINUE the application of the Town of Hingham for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the By-Law to demolish an existing building and construct eight pickleball courts, parking area, and related improvements on a portion of 25 Bare Cove Park Drive (Map 69, Lot 44) in the Official and Open Space District to May 18, 2026 at 7:00 PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

**146 Chief Justice Cushing Highway
Site Plan Approval**

The Board opened an application from Vetcor Of Massachusetts LLC d/b/a Hingham Animal Clinic for Site Plan Approval under § I-I and a Special Permit A3 Parking Determination and/or Waiver under § V-A of the Zoning By-Law to construct an addition and reconfigure the parking area at 146 Chief Justice Cushing Highway in the Residence C District.

Scott Fanara, P.E., Grady Consulting, presented on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the site plan, parking layout, and existing conditions. He emphasized the improved parking, which eliminated the need to back up into the Chief Justice Cushing Highway. He went on to describe the septic system, stormwater mitigation and rain garden. He concluded that the applicant's goal was to modernize the facility.

Pat Brennan, PGB Engineering, reviewed his peer review report. He explained the details for the stormwater structures, rain garden and trenches. He noted that the retaining wall would require a building permit and the driveways were greater than allowed, but felt the extra space was needed for truck access. He said the photometric plans indicate no light would spill on adjacent properties. Mr. Brennan felt the Applicant could easily address his findings. Mr. Fanara agreed to revise the plans according to Mr. Brennan's recommendations.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked about the entrance and exit driveway widths as well as site distances. Mr. Fanara said the entrance drive was wider was to maintain the number of parking spaces. In addition, he felt that there are sufficient sight lines. Member Tondorf-Dick also asked about snow storage. Mr. Fanara's response was that it could be pushed into the back parking spaces or removed. Mr. Fanara confirmed that there would be no increase in use of the facility.

Member Kelly felt the parking was a big improvement to what was there now and Member Carr agreed.

Chair Shriver opened the hearing to the public.

Stephen Paul Shoemaker, 275 East Street, said he was not in favor of the additional paving being proposed and driving around the property. He thought the changes were very large.

Horace Wong, 291 East Street, said that he lived behind the property and the proposed design will encourage people to come into his yard. He explained that visitors to the veterinary clinic walked their dogs on his property and did not clean up. He disagreed with the proposed changes to the site and expressed concerned about the noise and duration of construction.

Mr. Fanara said that site lighting would not spillover onto adjacent properties. He explained the stormwater mitigation will prevent water from flowing into the neighbors' yards and the post construction conditions will be an improvement. He said that the construction should take approximately 3-6 months. Chair Shriver added that the start time of work is 7:00 AM.

Member Tondorf-Dick asked if a fence could be added to the back of the property to secure the lot line. Mr. Fanara replied that he would speak to the Applicant. A brief discussion followed.

Ryan Hogan, 150 Chief Justice Cushing Highway, said that people also walk dogs on his property, and the clinic was not helpful in resolving the situation. He thought the new parking layout was safer and asked if there were curb stops to prevent cars from driving onto his property. He also asked about the rain garden.

Mr. Fanara confirmed that the number of parking spaces remains the same. He said that the new parking lot would have Cape Cod Berms and striping to clearly indicate the areas and prevent driving beyond the lot. He said the rain garden will hold water at times, up to 2.5' or so, and will be maintained on a set schedule.

Katelyn and Will Domey, 295 East Street, said they are located behind the vet and asked about the area with the rain garden and changes to their backyard view. Mr. Fanara said the existing brush in the area will be cleared to install the landscape plan and the trees in the 10' setback will remain. Ms. Domey talked about the existing drainage patterns.

Mr. Shoemaker asked the Board to consider the residential impact of the new parking lot.

Mr. Fanara advised the increase for impervious areas is 3,440 SF. Board discussion of the neighbor's concerns, Cape Cod berms, fencing, and screening followed. The Board determined that the hearing be continued and a site visit scheduled.

Tracy Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gordon Carr, to CONTINUE the application of Vetcor of Massachusetts LLC d/b/a Hingham Animal Clinic for Site Plan Approval under § I-I and a Special Permit A3 Parking

Determination and Waiver under § V-A of the By-Law to construct an addition and reconfigure the parking area at 146 Chief Justice Cushing Highway in the Residence C District, to May 18, 2026 at 7:00 PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

The Board reviewed the upcoming meeting dates: May 18, June 1, June 15, and June 29. Chair Shriver will be absent on June 15 and Member Ellis will serve as Chair. Ms. Wentworth said they could also reorganize the Board at the end of the June 29 meeting.

Chair Shriver shared that the Zoning Amendments passed at the April Town Meeting.

The minutes for April 6 and April 13 were presented for approval. The Board asked for more time to review Member Tondorf-Dick's edits before presenting for vote.

Ms. Agiorgitis gave a brief report on the recent meetings of the Traffic Committee sharing that the locations under review were the intersection and related areas at North and Main Street and the intersection of French, High, and Ward Street.

Chair Shriver made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting at 10:23 PM.

The motion passed by roll call vote.

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

Meeting Materials:

Agenda Summary, dated May 4, 2026

Application Materials:

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, 2026

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

Site Plan, revised April 27, 2026

Watershed Plan, revised April 27, 2026

Average Grade Calculation, revised April 27, 2026

Average Grade Sketch, revised April 27, 2026

Landscape Plan, dated April 24, 2026
Architectural Plan, revised April 27, 2026
HydroCAD Report, revised April 27, 2026
Neighborhood Analysis, revised April 27, 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
C. Falvey and T. Messina Public Comment, received April 7, 2026

210 Hull Street

Minor Modification Memo, dated March 30, 2026
Site Plan and Common Driveway Plan, Dated March 30, 2026
Architectural Progress Set, dated February 22, 2026
Site Plan Review Decision, stamped June 18, 2025
Special Permit A3 Decision, stamped June 18, 2025

25 Lazell Street

Site Plan Review Application, filed March 23, 2026
Site Plan, dated March 16, 2026
Stormwater Report, dated March 16, 2026
Architectural Plans, revised August 20, 2026
Landscape Plan, dated January 21, 2026
Site Plan Review Application, updated April 16, 2026
Site Plan, dated April 16, 2026
Architectural Plans, dated April 21, 2026
Response to Comments, dated April 29, 2026
Site Plan, revised April 29, 2026
Stormwater Report, revised April 29, 2026
Peer Review, dated April 28, 2026

25 Bare Cove Park Drive

Site Plan Review Application, filed April 6, 2026
Site Plan Review Application, additional signature, revision filed April 6, 2026
Letter to Planning Board, dated March 30, 2026
Permit Drawings, stamped March 26, 2026
Wetland Exhibit Sheet S-1, revised March 31, 2026
Drainage Report, stamped March 30, 2026
Traffic Report, submitted March 10, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated April 21, 2026

146 Chief Justice Cushing Highway

Site Plan Review Application, filed March 16, 2026
Special Permit A3 Application, filed April 6, 2026
Site Plan, dated March 11, 2026
Stormwater Report, dated March 3, 2026
Permit Set, dated July 9, 2025
SPA3 Application, revised April 6, 2026
Site Plan, revised April 9, 2026
Stormwater Report, revised April 9, 2026
P. Brennan Peer Review, dated April 28, 2026