

Conservation Commission
Meeting Minutes
May 4, 2026
Remote meeting via Zoom

Members Present: Chair Carolyn Nielsen, Robert Mosher, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson, Henry (Bob) Hidell and Thomas Roby

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Shannon Palmer, Conservation Officer & Natashja Molina, Administrative Assistant

Chair Carolyn Nielsen opened the meeting at 7:04PM and read the following statement:

"This meeting is being held remotely as an alternate means of public access pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025 and all other applicable laws temporarily amending 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 the chair at the start of the meeting in accordance with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 20(f) so that the chair may inform all other participants of said recording."

Business Items:

1. Requests for Certificate of Compliance (COC)

a) 10 Chestnut Place, DEP No. 034-1437, Zakary Glasberg

Chair Nielsen stated the applicant had requested to withdraw their application for a Certificate of Compliance.

b) 47 Smith Road, DEP No. 034-1367, Carl Dei Agnoli

Meeting Documents: Staff memo and Request for Certificate of Compliance

Carl Dei Agnoli, homeowner, explained he had been working with staff in this request. He noted some minor differences of placement of a shed and the patio was constructed slightly larger. He stated the plantings had survived the two year monitoring period and everything was in stable condition.

Ms. Palmer explained to the Commission the OOC was issued in 2020 for construction of an addition, garage, deck and relocation of a shed. She explained the mitigation originally consisted of removal of knotweed however removal became too large of a task and staff had concerns with long term viability. Ms. Palmer explained they worked with the homeowner to enhance a planting area closer to the wetland. She noted they had installed a split rail fence which clearly demarcates the mitigation area to prevent encroachment and disturbance. She recommended a full COC.

Vote: Commissioner Mosher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Edmundson, to issue a Certificate of Compliance for 47 Smith Road, DEP No. 034-1367

The motion passed by a roll call vote 6-0

In Favor: Carolyn Nielsen, Robert Mosher, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson, Bob Hidell and Thomas Roby

Opposed: None

c) 2 Langlee Road, DEP No. 034-0408. Joseph and Laurie Flynn

Meeting Documents: Staff Memo and Request for Certificate of Compliance

Joe Flynn, homeowner, explained to the Commission, the home was built in 1994 as part of a development by Vosser Associates. He noted it was discovered that they had not received a Certificate of Compliance until recently when they were selling their home.

Ms. Palmer explained that staff had no issues and recommended the full COC.

Vote: Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to issue Certificate of Compliance for 2 Langlee Road, DEP No. 034-0408

The motion passed by a roll call vote 6-0

In Favor: Carolyn Nielsen, Robert Mosher, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson, Bob Hidell and Thomas Roby

Opposed: None

Public Hearings- Chair Nielsen read the public hearing statement and opened the hearings.

1. Cont. 25 Bare Cove Park Drive, DEP No. 034-1559, Town of Hingham Recreation

Vote: Commissioner Hidell made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to continue public hearing for 25 Bare Cove Park Drive at request of the applicant to May 18, 2026 at 7PM

The motion passed by a roll call vote 6-0

In Favor: Carolyn Nielsen, Robert Mosher, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson, Bob Hidell and Thomas Roby

Opposed: None

2. 18 Shipyard Drive, DEP No. 034-1560, Samuels & Associates

Meeting Documents: Staff Memo, Notice of Intent and Site Plans Revised 4/30/26

Abutters were notified via Certificate of Mailing on 4/24/26 as certified in Affidavit of Service signed by Tricia Turchinetz of ECR submitted with the NOI.

Adam Brodsky, Esq., of DTM Law, representing the applicant, introduced the proposed project to the Commission consisting of a proposed patio and site improvements and provided the following information:

- The parcel is part of the Hingham Shipyard redevelopment project originally permitted in 2003.
- The redevelopment project was described as including approximately 19.7 acres of previously developed and predominantly degraded Riverfront Area.
- The subject parcel was noted as approximately 64,280 sq.ft.
- The relevant resource areas were identified as Riverfront Area and Buffer Zone to coastal wetland resources.
- The proposal involves reconfiguring a small portion of the developed parcel by relocating existing site elements and creating a new patio and was to result in a reduction of impervious areas on the site.
- The project was described as meeting the performance standards for redeveloped Riverfront Area and protecting relevant wetland values under both the Wetlands Protection Act regulations and the Hingham Wetland Regulations.
- Proposed mitigation measures in compliance with the Hingham Buffer Zone Mitigation Policy.
- The project was noted as having been reviewed and approved by Zoning and Planning Departments.

Brad Holmes, PWS, of Environmental Consulting & Restoration (ECR), representing the applicant, further explained to the Commission the proposed redevelopment project:

- Mr. Holmes referred to the existing conditions plan and noted that the bulkhead served as both the top of the Coastal Bank and the Mean High Water Line, which establish the 200 foot Riverfront Area.

- The project was located within the 100 foot Buffer Zone and the 200 foot Riverfront Area.
- The proposal was to reconfigure the area by removing the lawn, concrete walkway and replace it with a concrete patio for proposed bar and pervious pavers for the seating area and remaining area to have synthetic turf seating area.
- The project would result in a reduction of impervious surface within the 0 - 50 foot buffer, with only a small increase within the 50 - 100 foot buffer.
- The existing landscape plantings would be relocated to a mitigation planting area adjacent to the project area.
- The mitigation proposal will use native species from a coastal plant list to revegetate an area of lawn.
- The updated plans were submitted to the Commission, including utility connections from the existing building to the proposed outdoor bar area.
- A proposed canopy was described to cover the bar area, which consisted of a permeable fabric material with slots and would not function as a fully impervious structure.
- Additional architectural details and plans of the patio, bar, and seating areas were also provided.
- The area was part of the Hingham Shipyard Redevelopment Project and had previously contained a building surrounded by concrete surfaces before redevelopment occurred.
- The project complied with both the Commission's Buffer Zone standards and riverfront redevelopment standards, with no adverse impacts identified.

Michael Fitzpatrick, Samuels & Associates, applicant, explained he was involved with the original redevelopment of the Shipyard site and is now before the Commission for this request to make this area a vibrant mixed use community for people to walk the waterfront area.

Ms. Palmer stated she had reviewed the narrative portion of the submission but was still reviewing the recently submitted revised plans. She noted that the revised narrative appeared to address most of her comments regarding compliance with the riverfront and buffer zone regulations. However the updated plans now included a proposed artificial turf area which had not been shown in the original submission. She explained that although the patio project represented a relatively minor component of the overall Shipyard redevelopment, the Commission was still obligated to ensure compliance with the redevelopment standards under the riverfront under the state act and bylaw. Also, the project must demonstrate an improvement over existing site conditions. She indicated the project area currently consists of grass, which is permeable and also noted that while turf can be designed to allow permeability, it is generally classified as impervious under state stormwater standards due to concerns regarding long-term permeability and maintenance. She stated that the determination of whether the artificial turf is acceptable would ultimately be at the Commission's discretion and questioned whether lawn could remain in place or whether an expanded patio area might be preferable to the proposed turf. Ms. Palmer noted if the turf was considered impervious it would affect the project's Buffer Zone mitigation calculations. She then asked the Commission to consider if artificial turf located within the Buffer Zone and Riverfront Area would result in an improvement over existing conditions if constructed to be permeable.

Chair Nielsen stated she does not see how artificial turf is an improvement over grass.

Commissioner Hidell stated the AstroTurf was a problem, he asked for clarification of the specific characteristics of the turfs permeability.

Mr. Holmes noted that its intent was to be fully pervious with a subbase that will allow for percolation of water.

Mr. Fitzpatrick added that the material that gets placed to prep the turf is permeable, the synthetic blades of grass turf is woven a material and the infill is sand. He explained rainwater would be able to go through the sand layer, mesh and substrate and then infiltrate into the ground. He explained this turf was chosen for this reason to allow for infiltration of stormwater.

Commissioner Edmundson asked for further clarification of how the water gets through.

Mr. Fitzpatrick explained the strands of synthetic blades of turf are integrated into a woven fabric and the woven fabric itself is like passing through a screen. He added the material below this is a base coarse material that has aggregates in it and sand then passes through into the natural material below.

Commissioner Hidell noted that in his experience permeable synthetic turf, the pores become clogged and water begins to run off the surface. He questioned what the maintenance would be.

Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that the maintenance would include raking, cleaning and replacing the sand. He stated they could provide an operation and maintenance plan. He also added that if pavers were suggested, they would be open to changing the material due to time sensitivity.

Commissioner Hidell asked Mr. Fitzpatrick in his professional opinion if he thought patio stone would provide more infiltration and less maintenance.

Mr. Fitzpatrick responded stones would provide less infiltration and less maintenance. He explained that patio stone would occupy more space with a solid impervious surface compared to having the entire space open. He stated there would be more maintenance required with the turf. Mr. Fitzpatrick added the turf has a permeability rate greater than 300 inches per hour.

Commissioner Hidell expressed concern with the restaurant adhering to the maintenance plan.

Mr. Fitzpatrick assured the restaurant and Samuels & Associates as the landowners would comply.

Commissioner Troyer questioned how long the synthetic turf they are proposing has been used and what background information was available.

Mr. Fitzpatrick indicated the permeable turf has been around for a while.

Commissioner Troyer added an O&M plan would be helpful and his concerns are related to ensuring the turf continues to be permeable.

Commissioner Edmundson questioned if artificial turf has been discussed before.

Ms. Palmer noted, in her experience, this was the first commercial project where it has been proposed within the Riverfront Area and 50 foot buffer. She also noted that there were stormwater considerations, the regulations may not yet have caught up with newer products, but that turf is currently considered impervious under stormwater requirements.

Commissioner Edmundson added that having a maintenance plan would provide continued oversight and that it would benefit the office to gain experience with the product, particularly given the environmental advantages associated with artificial turf. He stated that he was inclined to try to make it work.

Chair Nielsen stated the only other time she recalled turf being proposed within a jurisdictional area was for the Ward Street Fields project, at which time the Conservation Commission required natural grass instead.

Mr. Holmes added that with turf there would be an elimination of the fertilization and irrigation needs.

Commissioner Troyer responded the biggest concern was that it falls within the 50 foot buffer and additional information was needed.

Chair Nielsen questioned the expected lifespan of the proposed surface. She expressed concerns about the potential shedding of micro plastics over time and the site's close proximity to the water and questioned whether the material could break down as it aged potentially resulting in plastic entering the harbor.

Mr. Fitzpatrick stated it was extremely durable, the operations and maintenance plan would include replacement of sections or the entire surface at designated intervals to address concerns about deterioration over time. Mr. Fitzpatrick added given the concerns surrounding the turf material, the applicant would be willing to replace the turf with permeable pavers across the entire surface if that approach would provide greater comfort regarding permeability.

Commissioner Hidell stated that the issue of micro plastics was an important consideration and if the turf were replaced on a reasonable maintenance schedule it would likely contribute less to micro plastic pollution than tire debris from vehicles in adjacent parking areas. He added that the material offered potential filtration advantages by reducing debris entering harbor discharge channels. He stated that with proper maintenance the proposal was worth trying.

Commissioner Mosher stated that if the turf was currently considered impervious under the regulations, the town may need to amend its regulations before approving this.

Mr. Brodksy added due to time constraints and concerns regarding the proposed turf, the applicant was prepared to revise the proposal to use pervious pavers instead. He added that the project would not adversely impact the coastal wetland resource area within the developed Buffer Zone.

Ms. Palmer clarified that the site involved a vertical buffer Coastal Bank within an already developed 50 foot Buffer Zone. Ms. Palmer stated that the plans had not yet been fully reviewed and draft findings and conditions had not been prepared.

Chair Nielsen stated that she would like additional time to evaluate the proposed installation and maintenance of the turf. She noted that the applicant had the option to withdraw the turf proposal and proceed with permeable pavers instead.

Chair Nielsen also emphasized the need for the Conservation Agent to review the proposal in detail before further consideration and suggested that the applicant request a continuance to the next meeting.

Mr. Fitzpatrick stated he would provide additional information on the proposed turf and pavers and agreed to the continuance.

Chair Nielsen opened the discussion to members of the public. No members of the public came forward.

Vote: Commissioner Hidell made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to continue public hearing for 18 Shipyard Drive with consent of the applicant to May 18, 2026 at 7PM.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 6-0

In Favor: Carolyn Nielsen, Robert Mosher, Douglas Troyer, Philip Edmundson, Bob Hidell and Thomas Roby
Opposed: None

Other Business:

1. 44 North Street, Discussion on Waiver Request regarding HWR Section 24.0 (Special Flood Hazard Zone)
Gregory Morse, P.E., from Morse Engineering addressed the Commission and explained the purpose of the discussion was to obtain the Commission's feedback on a proposed project at 44 North Street in the downtown district. No application had been filed to date. He noted the FEMA flood zone for the majority of the downtown district was Zone AE Elevation 11, and the proposal was to construct a restaurant on the first

floor and addition off the back. Preliminary discussions had been held with the Building, Planning, Historic, Zoning and Conservation Departments. The HWR specifically prohibit expansions of existing structures within the AE Zone. Mr. Morse indicated the project will be designed to improve conditions in the flood zone and also to be flood resilient. The existing building will be brought into FEMA compliance. He asked the Commission if they would consider granting a waiver for this property to allow an expansion.

Michael Rocino, AIA, RA, of Ember Architects, explained the property backs up to Station Street and that the town had expressed interest in creating a more vibrant area along this alleyway. He explained that the proposal included bringing the existing addition into compliance with flood regulations and installing flood vents in the historic portion of the structure. They also want to improve ADA accessibility on the property and it would difficult to do this from the North Street side. Mr. Rocino referenced the submitted memorandum and stated the project involves demolition of an existing nonconforming and non-historical structure located within FEMA Flood Zone AE and would result in a net increase in flood storage capacity.

Ms. Palmer explained the Commission does not need to make a definitive decision tonight but may offer preliminary feedback as to whether the requested waiver could be considered. She noted that expansions of this scale had not been approved to her knowledge however the Commission has allowed reconstruction of structures that are larger in the flood zone with free passage of flood waters or flood resistant construction. She stated that there was some precedent for approving expansions that resulted in improvements to existing conditions. For this location, there is no velocity zone or coastal flood zone and therefore did not present the same concerns as projects that had been subject to stricter standards. She further explained that the HWR regulations were more stringent than Building, Zoning, and Planning requirements with respect to structures in flood zones.

Chair Nielsen questioned the proposed flood passage for the historic portion of building and if it had a dug basement.

Mr. Rocino responded that the basement was used only for utilities but stated they are willing to discuss how floodwater passage could be accommodated.

Chair Nielsen questioned if the utilities would be raised to a higher elevation.

Mr. Rocino stated it would be up for discussion. He explained the design component is at a stop with advancement of design due to the HWR Section 24. Mr. Rocino explained the proposed plans are only conceptual at this point.

Chair Nielsen questioned where the flood zone was on the property.

Mr. Rocino brought up a plan with the flood zone and noted it goes through about half of the building. He noted the first floor of the building was at elevation 17 and noted it was FEMA compliant.

Commissioner Hidell questioned what the foundation was made of.

Mr. Rocino responded it was made up of concrete block and poured concrete.

Mr. Morse added the new foundation would be timber piles to allow passage of flood waters.

Commissioner Troyer commended the presentation and stated that he would like to review examples of waivers granted for similar projects, as well as a justification explaining why the referenced provision would not apply to the proposed project. He also noted that, per the HWR, a variance from the Zoning Board would be required.

Ms. Palmer explained the language in the HWR regarding variances is not necessarily appropriate as a variance would need to be granted by the ZBA and therefore, the provision is not enforceable by the Commission. She further explained the question was whether the applicant had demonstrated sufficient justification for the Commission to grant a waiver based on the factors presented.

Commissioner Troyer stated that he understood the explanation and believed it was worthwhile to give the request additional consideration if it could be established that the Commission had the authority to grant a waiver. He added the proposal was very close to meeting the requirements and appeared to provide benefits to the property.

Chair Nielsen responded, under the Bylaw, the Commission had the authority to grant waivers but was not required to do so.

Commissioner Hidell questioned whether the proposed addition would need to be elevated with piles and stabilized. He added he agreed with Commissioner Troyer's comments.

Mr. Morse stated the first floor would be 3 feet above flood elevation consistent with requirement and the area beneath the proposed addition would consist of pervious soil or crushed stone allowing any floodwaters to infiltrate beneath the structure. The project would comply with all applicable FEMA requirements. He expressed that the intent of the regulations section was to prevent adverse flooding impacts and asserted that the proposal would result in a net improvement to the site. Mr. Morse explained that the existing addition at the rear of the building currently impeded the free flow of floodwaters, whereas the proposed design would allow water to pass more freely beneath the structure. The project would increase the site's flood storage capacity and would bring the existing building into greater compliance. He indicated the project represented a suitable candidate for waiver consideration and expressed appreciation for the Commission's discussion and input.

Commissioner Troyer read Section 24(i) of the HWR and advised the representatives to take this into consideration as they moved forward.

All of the Commission members were generally in favor of the request and consideration of a waiver.

Chair Nielsen thanked the representatives for bringing this to the Commission for their feedback.

2. 383 East Street Enforcement Order, Vote on Wetland/Buffer Zone Restoration Proposal, ECR

Brad Holmes, PWS, of ECR, representing Grant Daley, homeowner, addressed the Commission and explained an Enforcement Order had been issued and he was appearing before the Commission with a restoration proposal. Mr. Holmes provided the following details on the restoration:

- The lot was developed with a single family home and the homeowner operates a landscape company out of the home.
- There was some unauthorized activity along the Pond and Isolated Vegetated Wetland adjacent to the home.
- A full wetland delineation was performed and a full existing conditions plan was created to evaluate the activities requiring restoration.
- The areas proposed for restoration were identified on the plan for the Commission including replication of wetland along the pond and buffer restoration.
- A red line depicted on the plan represented the approximate limit of occupation as it existed in 2008 based on an aerial photograph overlay.

- The existing fence will be removed and relocated to serve as the new limit of occupation or maintenance area and that a small treehouse located within the restoration area would be removed.

Mr. Daley acknowledged that the area near the pond had been regularly maintained and mowed for recreational use. He noted that the maintained area had transitioned into grass due to ongoing mowing practices. Mr. Daley stated that they are willing to restore the area back to a vegetated wetland.

Ms. Palmer asked if Mr. Holmes had identified any encroachments or violations in the southwestern portion.

Mr. Holmes responded he did not observe any.

Ms. Palmer stated that based on the existing conditions it seems there was some disturbance in that area that may need to be address separately. She explained she was still reviewing the submitted plan, however the planting plan looked good and proposed restoration of both the wetland and buffer zone that was altered. The altered area by the Pond is town owned property under management of the Recreation Department. She indicated the Department had been informed of the violation and had reviewed the restoration proposal but had no comments. Ms. Palmer stated she would still like to see some notes added to the submitted plan but overall it represented a significant benefit to the pond. She recommended the Commission approve the plan contingent upon submittal of revisions to be reviewed by the Conservation Officer.

Commission members were in agreement.

Vote: Commissioner Hidell made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to approve the replication and restoration planting plan as shown on Existing Conditions Sheet prepared by Merrill dated April 8, 2026 and require revised Restoration Proposal by ECR incorporating specifications for the proposed work, to include oversight and monitoring, to be approved by staff. Restoration work as approved shall commence during the current growing season of 2026.

The motion passed by a roll call vote 6-0-1

In Favor: Carolyn Nielsen, Nina Villanova, Robert Mosher, Philip Edmundson, Bob Hidell and Thomas Roby

Opposed: Douglas Troyer

3. 10 Village Lane Enforcement Order, Vote on Restoration/Replication Proposal, ECR

Brad Holmes of ECR explained to the Commission, this issue was previously discussed at prior meeting and some members had conducted a site visit. He stated they are proposing wetland restoration and vegetated buffer restoration with a small area of lawn to remain. The change from the previous plan reviewed by the Commission was an additional buffer revegetation component to support the wetland. He further explained the wetland replication area would be 30 feet in width with a slope of 3:1 to meet the buffer area and cleanup and removal of a historical composting yard from the previous owner would be part of the proposal Mr. Holmes indicated there would be more wetland onsite than previously.

Ms. Palmer stated that she fundamentally disagreed with the opinion that the proposal to keep lawn and replicate wetland represented an improvement over restoring the original wetland and Buffer Zone. She explained that for decades the area had been maintained as intended, functioning as a wetland with a Buffer Zone. After the house was built, a native vegetated buffer had existed in the area (approximately 17 feet) but had since been altered from the extension of lawn. She stated, in her opinion, the area should be restored to its pre-existing conditions, including full restoration of the wetland and the vegetated buffer that existed when the property owners purchased the property.

Chair Nielsen agreed noting that the Commission's Regulations regarding restoration of areas subject to violations called for full restoration to original conditions and did not allow for additional altered areas within the Buffer Zone. She stated that the regulations specifically prohibited extending new lawn into the 50 foot buffer zone. She noted the site visit had been helpful and that there was a clear demarcation in elevation on the property indicating where the wetland had formerly extended. Chair Nielsen observed that the area was noticeably lower in elevation, suggesting that the wetland had existed there relatively recently and also that a neighboring property owner who had also encroached into wetlands had been required to fully restore the area. She stated that for consistency the Commission should require the same standard of restoration in this case.

Commissioner Hidell asked if there was any history on the drop off at the rear of the property noting a distinct drop of about a foot.

Mr. Holmes responded it was likely from the old fill and suggested it was probably all farmed at a one time. He explained there were weeping willows on the property which are not native. He also noted a presence of a berm and then further down Weir River.

Commissioner Hidell stated that he was inclined to see the area restored to its natural condition and expressed concerns regarding potential flooding impacts.

Mr. Holmes added that under the proposed design the replicated wetland area would be approximately 1,380 sq.ft. larger than the existing wetland area. He stated that the proposal would therefore provide additional wetland area and increased flood storage capacity compared to restoring the site strictly in kind.

Ms. Palmer stated the restored wetland would provide flood storage capacity however the Commission did not typically approve projects proposing larger replicated wetlands to offset alterations for additional flood storage capacity. She explained that the Commission's role in violation matters was generally to enforce restoration of the altered wetlands in order to restore the functions and values that the wetlands originally provided.

Adam Brodsky, Esq., representing the owner, stated that ecological value of wet meadows as a form of wetland, noting that they provide flood storage capacity and unique habitat. He stated that the proposed wet meadow would not replicate Bordering Vegetated Wetland exactly but would instead create a different type of wetland that could provide comparable or potentially enhanced environmental values through increased habitat diversity. Mr. Brodsky also stated that the property owner had acknowledged responsibility for the violation and had not attempted to dispute or avoid responsibility. He suggested that it was reasonable to request to retain a small portion of lawn area if compensatory wetland replication was provided. He stated, in his opinion, the proposal offered an overall environmental benefit through the creation of wet meadow habitat.

Ms. Palmer clarified that she did not believe the Commission was unwilling to consider a wet meadow habitat restoration proposal for a wetland. However, such a proposal would still require full restoration of the altered wetland and would not allow lawn to remain within the wetland area. She emphasized the issue was that the existing lawn was located within the wetland itself, rather than within the Buffer Zone. Ms. Palmer further stated that she was not aware of any prior project in which lawn had been permitted to remain within a wetland area, particularly within the 50 foot buffer.

Mr. Brodsky noted that while he could not cite a specific example in Hingham, he had observed similar enforcement cases elsewhere where Commissions and property owners reached compromises involving acknowledged violations.

Mr. Holmes stated that the proposed design was to remain well below the regulatory threshold he referenced for allowable wetland alteration with replication and suggested that the project may have been approvable if submitted as a permit application prior to any work being done.

Commissioner Hidell questioned if they intended to continue the lawn in this area.

Mr. Holmes described the proposed layout, including a restored wetland area, buffer restoration, and a maintained lawn area to the limit of historic wetland line in 2007.

Commissioners Nielsen indicated that she preferred full restoration of the wetland to its historic boundary line, consistent with restoring previously altered conditions rather than retaining any portion of lawn within the wetland area.

The Commission was in agreement for a revised plan to be submitted for a full wetland replication.

Mr. Holmes agreed to a continuance to May 18, 2026.

Vote: Commissioner Hidell made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to continue discussion for 10 Village Lane Restoration Plan to May 18, 2026 and require revised Restoration Plan eliminating the wetland replication and incorporating full restoration of altered wetland and Buffer Zone.

Commissioner Troyer was

The motion passed by a roll call vote 5-0

In Favor: Carolyn Nielsen, Robert Mosher, Philip Edmundson, Bob Hidell and Thomas Roby

4. Conservation Officer Updates

Chair Nielsen stated that the Vice Chair position would need to be filled as the previous Vice Chair Villanova had joined the School Committee. She asked the Commission to consider whether any member would like to volunteer or whom they would like to nominate to fill the position.

Ms. Palmer stated the final draft of the updated Hingham Wetland Regulations, prepared by Horsley Witten, would be distributed for the Commission's review and would be presented at an upcoming public hearing.

Adjourn

Motion: Commissioner Mosher moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Hidell seconded the motion. The motion passed by roll call vote 6-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:53PM

Approved on: July 13, 2026