

## Conservation Commission

### Meeting Minutes

May 18, 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 & Natasha Molina, Administrative Assistant

**Chair Carolyn Nielsen opened the meeting at 6:30PM 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."*

**Workshop: Hingham Harbor Resiliency Project, Town of Hingham**

Meeting Documents: Hingham Waterfront Resiliency Project Presentation 5.18.26

Chair Nielsen introduced the workshop, stating it was one of several projects being proposed to improve the waterfront 3A corridor with special attention to climate resiliency.

J.R. Frey, P.E., Town Engineer, added that this project has been in the planning stages for some time and he noted they have been wanting to ensure they have the correct regulatory framework in place.

Fiona Vardy, Project Lead of Foth, addressed the Commission and explained that they were preparing for the upcoming filing of the first Notice of Intent and the goal was for the filings to align with the project construction and funding schedule. She indicated that the first NOI would address coastal resiliency efforts, followed by subsequent NOI filings for Bathing Beach, Town Boat Ramp O&M, and Town Warf and Barnes Warf, to provide contiguous coastal protection. Ms. Vardy described the following coastal resiliency components of the project:

- MEPA review process had been completed
- The proposed project area was the inner Hingham Harbor
- The project proposed raising the existing bathing beach and boat ramp parking lot, their existing elevations approximately eight to nine feet and some portion below existing flood elevation
- The minimum proposed elevation was 11.5 feet, NAVD 88 for the parking lot
- The existing boat ramp profile would be raised to elevation 12 feet
- A raingarden was proposed on the western side of the site
- On the eastern part of the boat ramp a grass berm was proposed that will have a crest elevation of 12 feet.
- Existing revetment to be improved to have a gradual shift of 3 to 1 slope and increase the dune crest to 12 feet.
- During MEPA review a concern was raised about end erosion

Jeremy Packard, P.E. of Foth, elaborated on the erosion issue that came up during MEPA review and explained that the end effects were caused by the re-construction of the revetment. He stated that the proposed modification included flattening the revetment face slightly and realigning the structure to better match the

existing dune alignments. He noted the area would be addressed as part of the Beach Operation and Management Plan and would be submitted as part of the second NOI filing.

Ms. Vardy continued the presentation by discussing the proposed revetment improvement at the eastern side of Whitney Warf.

John Ramsey, of Sustainable Coastal Solutions and member of the Foth project team, added that granite blocks would be added to the top crest of the revetment to achieve elevation protection up to 14 feet.

Commissioner Edmundson questioned which climate models were being used for the planning the project.

Mr. Ramsey responded that they relied on NOAA's predictions. He acknowledged that several other statistical analyses out there but explained using climate predictions considered more likely.

Commissioner Edmundson questioned if the projections were based on NOAA's own calculations as opposed to Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

Mr. Ramsey confirmed NOAA used its own calculations but noted it does align with the IPCC relatively well through 2070. He noted NOAA predictions fell below IPCC's extreme projections and above their intermediate projections.

Commissioner Edmundson noted IPCC had recently revised their projections to reflect much lower impacts.

Mr. Ramsey responded that the projects assumptions aligned more closely with the IPCC's intermediate predictions.

Commissioner Edmundson expressed concern about ensuring the project is consistent the latest revisions from IPCC.

Mr. Ramsey responded that IPCC released initial results, it had not provided all regional details. He stated the information being used for the project would be the most current data on sea level rise.

Commissioner Hidell questioned whether the elevation of Route 3A had any proposed changes.

Ms. Vardy responded the roadway was part of the MassDOT project. She noted some components of the their project interface with MassDOT improvements along 3A including widening the entrance driveway to the bathing beach parking lot and constructing temporary retaining walls to facilitate phased construction.

Commissioner Hidell questioned where the 3A grade would be raised.

Mr. Frey responded that 3A generally remain unchanged however, one section between Ship and North Street where a vertical curb would be introduced.

Ms. Vardy briefly reviewed the subsequent NOI filings: NOI 2 Operations and Maintenance Plan, NOI 3 Town Warf, and NOI 4 Barnes Warf.

Chair Nielsen stated she would prefer to have more protection than less.

Commissioner Hidell stated that multiple climate models and construction alternatives should continue to be researched and evaluated.

Mr. Ramsey stated this was not only for the future but for current flooding that was already occurring and the project was being designed to address one to two feet of sea level rise.

Commissioners and the Foth team further discussed flooding and considerations for storm surge and major storm event.

Ms. Palmer stated the Commission's role would be to review the NOI submission for compliance with the state Wetlands Protection Act and local regulations with a focus on resource areas.

Mr. Ramsey stated that the project team had worked to comply with state and local regulations while minimizing impacts to resource areas and where possible reducing impacts compared to existing conditions.

The presentation concluded and Chair Nielsen thanked the project team for coming before the Commission.

### **Business Items:**

#### **1. Meeting Minutes**

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher to approve the meeting minutes from 4/13/2026 as drafted.

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

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher to approve the meeting minutes from 4/27/2026 as drafted.

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. Requests for Certificate of Compliance (COC)**

##### **a) 4 Pine Grove Road, DEP No. 034-1441, Peter Phan**

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to continue the Request for Certificate of Compliance for 4 Pine Grove Road, DEP No. 034-1441, to June 8, 2026.

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

##### **b) 2 Langlee Road, DEP No. 034-0869, Joseph and Laurie Flynn**

Meeting Documents: Staff memo and Request for Certificate of Compliance

Ms. Palmer explained to the Commission the Order of Conditions was issued in 2006 for an addition, noting the addition was built further from the resource area than originally proposed. Staff recommended issuing the COC.

**Vote:** Commissioner Hidell made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to issue a Certificate of Compliance for 2 Langlee Road, DEP No. 034-0869

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 Meetings:**

1. 25 Mill Lane, Jared Krieger

Meeting Documents: Staff memo, RDA and Site Plan revised 5/18/26

Brad Holmes, PWS, Project Representative from ECR, explained to the Commission the proposed project consisted of installation of a pool, fencing and equipment. He explained the resource areas on the site were Bordering Vegetated Wetland to Cushing Pond and Riverfront Area associated with Crooked Meadow Brook. He explained the site contained an existing rear deck and they are proposing a reduced size deck and with the proposed pool occupying a portion of the existing deck area. He noted they had answered staff questions regarding the installation of the fence and how the pool would be supported on and within the existing ledge. He noted a small portion of work takes place within the 100 foot buffer and small amount of deck and pool within the outer Riverfront Area.

Jared Krieger, homeowner, added the existing deck was in disrepair and largely a replacement of existing deck.

Ms. Palmer stated the project was proposed in the outer Buffer Zone and outer Riverfront Area just within the outer 200 foot area. She noted that Mill Lane runs between the resource area and proposed work and indicated that staff recommends the Negative Determination.

Commissioner Hidell questioned the pool discharge.

Mr. Holmes responded that the pool systems did not have to be drained out. He stated that no dry well was proposed.

Mr. Krieger added that when needed a pump truck would come to pump out the water and take it off site.

Commissioner Troyer noted that this procedure typically applied to complete pool drainage and questioned how backwash would be handled.

Ms. Palmer responded that the standard condition could be included for pools regarding de-chlorination and discharge.

Commissioners were in agreement.

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to issue a Negative #2 and #6 Determination of Applicability for 25 Mill Lane with Findings of Fact and Special Conditions as noted in the Staff Memo and the standard pool conditions to address maintenance.

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. 26 Westmoreland Road, Thomas and Azita Mcdermott

Meeting Documents: Staff memo, RDA and Site Plan Revised 5/7/26

Lucas Dumke, General Contractor and Project Representative, explained to the Commission the proposal consisted of a 227 SF addition and deck and the addition would have a foundation and crawl space four feet in depth. He also explained an addition of a front entrance that would consist of two footings with a slab foundation.

Ms. Palmer stated the addition was within the outer 50 - 100 foot buffer, there was a flagged Bordering Vegetative Wetland and an intermittent stream to the south, and the resource areas were flagged by Ken Thomson. She explained some time ago the wetland in this area appears to have been altered by a prior owner and the statute of limitations has passed for enforcement. She noted the area is currently lawn and the wetland flags, as placed by Mr. Thomson, were based on indicators of hydrology and soils. Ms. Palmer had no concerns with the addition and added there would be a requirement for mitigation for the increase in impervious area. She recommended a condition to coordinate with staff and incorporate some restoration of the altered wetland area in the mitigation area.

Commissioner Troyer stated in the staff memo it notes the area was previously filled and compromised of soil, rock, concrete and debris within the vegetative side of the lawn.

Ms. Palmer responded that this was in the existing area closer to the stream where it was currently lawn and would be incorporated into the mitigation plan.

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher to issue a Negative #3 and #6 Determination of Applicability for 26 Westmoreland Road with Findings of Fact and Special Conditions as noted in the Staff Memo.

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  
Meeting Documents: Staff Memo, NOI, Site Plans and Wetland Exhibits revised 5/14/26

*The hearing was continued to address staff comments and complete a peer review of the Stormwater Report.*

Chair Nielsen made an announcement before the hearing began regarding the Commission's authority and jurisdiction. She explained the Commission enforces the state Regulations and Hingham Regulations within 100 feet of a wetland and 200 feet of a river and she also reviewed the local no disturb zones and definition of a redevelopment. She explained that evaluating a project on an already disturbed site was different from evaluating a project on a pristine site and the standard for a redevelopment is to improve existing conditions which is what the Commission is responsible for determining.

Mike Moonan, Project Manager and Landscape Architect from CHA, explained to the Commission most the project was presented at the first hearing and then summarized the feasibility study that had been previously conducted to select a project location. The chosen site (25 Bare Cove Park Dr.) would remove a contaminated building, improve stormwater management, reduce impervious surface area, eliminate existing development within the 50 foot buffer zone and restore the disturbed buffer area with native vegetation. He then referred to a color coded existing conditions plan to clearly identify wetland resource area and buffers.

Mr. Moonan displayed photos of the existing site conditions and then turned over the presentation to the Project Engineer.

Jason Pollard, P.E. from CHA, explained the changes made to the site plan since the last hearing including: an expansion of the sidewalk south of the proposed court to seven feet wide to accommodate the correct parking lot length requirements; a reduction in court dimension between the two bays of courts by narrowing the walkway between them; the impervious was a net zero with the changes that were made.

Mr. Moonan displayed a visual rendering of what the courts would look like from the street and a rendering of what the courts would look like with clear and solid color attenuation barrier around the site.

Jay Hall, PWS from CHA, explained the table on the site plan that showed the buffer zone mitigation summary. He stated that the proposal represented an improvement in the buffer and resource areas and confirmed that there would be no impervious area within the 0–50 foot buffer and none within the Certified Vernal Pool buffer. Some impervious area was proposed within the 50–100 foot buffer and approximately 4,137 square feet of impervious area would be removed from the Riverfront Area. Mr. Hall acknowledged that several questions had been raised by the Conservation Officer and others. In response, the team had provided a supplemental table to address those questions. He reiterated that there would be no work within the Bordering Vegetated Wetlands, Inland Bank or Area of Critical Environmental Concern. The work would be limited to the Buffer Zone, with removal of most impervious surfaces except for limited impervious area within the 50–100 foot buffer and a small amount within the Riverfront Area.

Mr. Moonan reiterated that because there was no impervious in the buffer area no mitigation was required in accordance with the Commission's policy. He also noted there were no changes to the erosion control plans and the limit of disturbance line has not changed.

Mr. Pollard went over the grading and drainage plan and explained the site and courts still drain from east to west. He noted the water would be picked up in a series of trench drains then conveyed underground through stormwater pipes and catch basins to an infiltration system. Mr. Pollard explained the stormwater catchment structures were revised to include deep sumps, hoods and a spillway that allows water to overtop. He added the infiltration basin was reinforced with a concrete headwall. Mr. Pollard then went over the attenuation fabric attached to the 15 foot high fence with stainless steel fasteners and secured at 14 inches on center.

Ms. Palmer questioned what the capability of the fabric was.

Mr. Pollard responded it was a heavy duty vinyl fabric that does absorb sound. He noted a sound study was performed and a key take away was many of the residences were beyond 800 feet from the outer perimeter and the fabric would reduce the decibel levels at those residence to below an ambient noise level. He stated ambient noise level was around 40-45 decibels and the approximate highest decibel was around 36.

Ms. Palmer clarified that the Commission jurisdiction is the wetlands, however, public comment letters were received that highlighted concerns regarding noise level impacts on wildlife.

Ms. Palmer referred to the Staff Memo which she acknowledged was quite lengthy. She noted the administrative comments on the NOI application have been addressed by the applicant and compliance with the redevelopment standards for the Riverfront Area and performance standards for Buffer Zone were addressed in the revised project narrative and the supplemental submitted materials. She stated in her opinion, the applicant had demonstrated compliance with the relevant sections of the WPA and local regulations. She noted that the reduction in impervious surface was significant and traditional Buffer Zone mitigation was not technically required. The project includes more than 7,600 square feet of restoration plantings, which will create a native vegetated buffer where asphalt or building currently exist resulting in a

significant improvement to the vernal pool and surrounding wetlands. Ms. Palmer acknowledged that a complete site cleanup, including removal of historic debris, would be beneficial however such work was beyond the scope of the current project. She further stated that the project also resulted in overall improvement in regards to stormwater management. As a redevelopment project with an existing stormwater system, the applicant is required to meet state standards to the maximum extent practicable. She noted that the applicant had exceeded those standards by incorporating deep sumps, an infiltration basin, and other measures to improve water quality from site runoff, noting these did not currently exist. The stormwater system had been peer-reviewed by PGB Engineering who determined the project complied with the stormwater standards. Ms. Palmer also addressed several additional points raised during the public hearings:

- The project would not result in any impacts to the Certified Vernal Pool.
- A wildlife habitat evaluation was not required as the 100ft VPPZ is a local regulation and no statutory impact thresholds had been exceeded.
- The ACEC boundary was shown on the plan and that the project was clearly outside its limits.
- The Commission was not being asked to confirm the ACEC boundary and should not do so, as it is not a jurisdictional boundary.
- Stormwater runoff volume was reduced under proposed conditions.

Ms. Palmer stated that from a staff perspective, there were no further issues.

Ms. Nielsen questioned if Ms. Palmer had had enough time to review the submitted materials.

Ms. Palmer confirmed that she had enough time to review the materials. She also noted several public comment letters were submitted today that she did not have a time to review, but added most of the comments were not related to wetlands or within the Commission's purview.

Chair Nielsen agreed she had seen some comment letters that were valid comments but not within the Commissions regulatory authority.

Commissioner Hidell questioned the depth of the drainage basin at the northwest side of the site.

Mr. Pollard responded that the spillway elevation was 17.75 and the bottom of the basin was at 14.

Commissioner Hidell questioned if borings were performed in that area and what type of debris was found.

Mr. Pollard confirmed two borings were performed.

Mr. Moonan responded ground water was well below 4 feet below the basin, so a groundwater mounding analysis was not required. He explained the basin was modeled to hold the water sufficiently to meet the requirements for the TSS removal.

Commissioner Hidell questioned the vernal pool elevation and the soils at the bottom of the collection basin that would infiltrate the water before it enters the vernal pool.

Mr. Hall responded that the vernal pool was below elevation 10, he noted in the spring time may be closer to 10 feet.

Mr. Pollard stated the bottom was compromised of a sandy base and the infiltration basin would be replaced with a sand or gravel. He stated the vernal pool elevation was below the basin by approximately four feet.

James Kinney, CHA, added the soil assessment done for the two test pits came back as approximately nine feet of sandy loam material. He added deep sumps and hoods were added to all upstream basins, which would provide oil separation and material separation from the water before it enters the basin.

Commissioner Hidell added the design of the project was well done. He also expressed concerns over flooding.

Ms. Palmer stated all stormwater standards for redevelopment were met and currently the site did not provide any recharge or treatment.

Chair Nielsen opened the discussion to members of the public.

Anita Ryan, 37 Baker Hill Drive, asked for the updated plans that were presented to be made public.

Mr. Moonan responded that the graphic of the rendering of the pickleball courts was not provided before the presentation tonight.

Ms. Ryan additionally asked for the ACEC boundary be removed from the plan if there was no determination of the ACEC boundary. She questioned the water recharge for the perennial and intermittent stream if the proposal was to divert stormwater into the catch basins. She also had concerns how the wetlands would function without the water that is proposed to be diverted away.

Mr. Kinney explained the project is discharging to a critical area and the regulations require storing and infiltrating the water quality storm. The basin was designed to only store and treat that size storm, in accordance with the standards, and all other storm events higher than the basic requirement are still discharging into the wetland. He noted in all storm events, the wetlands would still be receiving water.

Chair Nielsen noted ACECs are generally not regulated under the Commission's jurisdiction, except that docks are prohibited within an ACEC. She stated that the Commission recognized the environmental sensitivity of the area and is carefully considering those resources during its review.

Claudia Eaton, 19 Ocean View Drive, stated she was appreciative of all the work that was done on the project and attentiveness to the environment and vernal pool. She stated all ages are looking forward to playing pickle ball on public land.

Chair Nielsen suggested conservation markers be placed by the vernal pool.

Commissioner Hidell agreed.

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to close the public hearing for 25 Bare Cove Park Drive, DEP No. 034-1559

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. Cont. 18 Shipyard Drive, DEP No. 034-1560, Samuels & Associates  
Meeting Documents: Staff Memo, Notice of Intent and Site Plans Revised 4/30/26

*The hearing was continued for the submission of supplemental information comparing turf to permeable patio.*

Brad Holmes, PWS, Project Representative from ECR, addressed the Commission and explained that additional information on the synthetic turf had been requested at the last hearing comparing the turf to alternative permeable surfaces. The information was submitted on the turf and subbase which would utilize a substrate designed to provide full permeability. A waiver request had also been submitted for the work proposed within the 50 foot Buffer Zone as well as a revised planting plan and O&M Plan for the turf. He reminded the Commission the project was for a patio within existing lawn, concrete walkway and removal of inkberry that will be transferred to another area. He explained the project required 127 SF of mitigation which has been exceeded through the addition of a dense native planting area, where there is existing lawn, to mitigate for the impacts within the 50 foot buffer.

Michael Fitzpatrick, applicant, addressed questions raised at the previous hearing regarding the turf and he informed the Commission they consulted with a Civil Engineer and noted the proposed substrate was designed to compact while maintaining void spaces allowing for fast drainage and a permeability rate comparable to that of natural turf.

Ms. Palmer explained that the revised plan came in this afternoon and she had not had enough time to review it in detail. She requested more detail regarding the additional planting area and questioned how the area would be maintained over the long term and who would be responsible for its upkeep.

Mr. Fitzpatrick explained the area was part of the POA for the property. He stated Samuels & Associates and The Launch were responsible for this area.

Ms. Palmer questioned if they were required to maintain a certain amount of green spaces under Zoning.

Mr. Fitzpatrick stated a certain amount of open space was required and there were different categories of open space. He noted this native planting area would be the same category as lawn resulting in a one to one replacement.

Ms. Palmer mentioned at the last hearing there was in depth discussion regarding pavers vs turf. She acknowledged the permeability of artificial turf had been demonstrated but she still had hesitation regarding the conversion of lawn to synthetic material in the 50 foot buffer and Riverfront Area. She added the site clearly had constraints, the resource area was separated from the project by a concrete walkway, and the Commission could consider granting a waiver. Ms. Palmer stated her concern was setting precedent for conversion of grass to artificial turf at other locations on the property however the additional mitigation area does provide some justification for the Commission if they were inclined to grant a waiver.

Chair Nielsen stated she also had concerns with removing lawn within the 50 foot buffer.

Commissioner Hidell questioned how the turf would be maintained.

Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that an O&M plan was submitted that explains several steps such as vacuuming, raking and sweeping. He noted the intent is to prevent the tuft from being matted down and keep the sand layer from being packed tightly.

Commissioner Hidell questioned if the vacuuming would be enough to lift the debris out and allow the turf to be permeable and the lifespan of the turf.

Mr. Fitzpatrick explained the raking and brushing would be what would keep the permeability to agitate and aerate the sand layer. He also stated the turfs lifespan was about 8-10 years. He noted in this location there would be higher maintenance and at year eight, it would need to be replaced and would be taken offsite and disposed of.

Commissioner Hidell questioned if there was a slope of the land that hold the turf in place.

Mr. Fitzpatrick noted a slight slope he explained when it comes to stormwater it's going to be caught in the turf and then infiltrate in.

Chair Nielsen stated she was surprised this common area was being converted to commercial use and questioned if there would be other areas that are currently vegetated that would be swapped out and proposed for commercial use.

Mr. Fitzpatrick responded it could come up but noted the space was limited.

Commissioner Troyer referred to the previous discussion regarding pavers in the area rather than turf.

Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that he had offered the idea to the business, but after discussion with The Beth restaurant the operator preferred the artificial turf.

Commissioner Troyer asked the other Commissioners if their position would be changed if there were pavers proposed instead of turf.

Chair Nielsen agreed and reiterated the Bylaw prohibits removal of vegetation within the 50 foot buffer. She noted there was no difference in her opinion as there would still be vegetation removal.

Adam Brodsky, Esq., of DTM Law, representing the applicant, stated in his opinion the intent of regulating the 50 foot buffer strip is actually to preserve naturally vegetated conditions, citing HWR Section 22.2, and there was no naturally vegetated conditions in this area. He stated the site was a redeveloped riverfront area which contains lawn and the Coastal Bank does not contribute sediment to a coastal beach. He indicated, whether its turf or pavers, the project would not impair the wetland values associated with the Coastal Bank. Mr. Brodsky also noted the existing stormwater management system for the Shipyard Development meets the standards.

Mr. Holmes added that the current project is a riverfront redevelopment of a prior redevelopment project. He explained the previously approved Shipyard redevelopment project already exceeded their mitigation requirements and the area was not required to remain as lawn. He then displayed GIS aerial footage of the site from 2005 showing the site as a concrete degraded area before redevelopment.

Commissioner Troyer questioned if they had received approval from other boards.

Mr. Fitzpatrick noted approvals from Planning and Zoning Boards.

Commissioner Hidell stated that artificial turf slows runoff, reduces erosion and may support groundwater recharge. He expressed support for allowing the proposal as a limited experiment, noting that the site had been significantly improved over the years and that evolving technologies may warrant reconsideration of older regulations.

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

Chair Nielsen conducted a straw poll of the Commissioners to see if they would be willing to grant a waiver to allow the turf in the 50 foot Buffer Zone.

Commissioner Troyer, Mosher, Hidell and Edmundson agreed with the waiver request.  
Commissioner Nielsen and Roby did not agree.

**Vote:** Commissioner Hidell made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to close public hearing for 18 Shipyard Drive, DEP No. 034-1560

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

Brad Holmes, PWS from ECR, explained to the Commission, at a previous meeting the replication and restoration plan was presented to the Commission and it was requested that the replication proposal at the southern portion of the site be removed and the wetland be fully restored. The proposal is to restore the vegetated buffer and wetland with a full planting plan and restoration for each area. Mr. Holmes stated the wetland restoration consists of a wet meadow proposal, which includes saplings and clustering of shrubs together to maintain openness within the herbaceous layer.

Ms. Palmer stated she was appreciative of the adjustment to the plan as the Commission had requested a full restoration of the wetland and Buffer Zone but noted the number of plantings were significantly reduced from what was normally seen due to the proposal of a wet meadow. She stated staff would like to see shrubs at higher density to restore the wetland functions and values and recommended the Commission adopt the plan as proposed or adopt with the requirement to submit a plan with additional shrubs for increased diversity, to be approved by staff.

Chair Nielsen questioned the quantity of additional shrubs staff had in mind.

Ms. Palmer responded that the proposal contained approximately 50% of what DEP normally recommends for restoration planting areas and noted that, with 75% survival, the density does not seem sufficient for a 7,000 SF area.

Commissioner were in agreement with staff's recommendation.

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to require a revised Restoration Proposal incorporating additional native shrubs, to be approved by Staff, with restoration work to commence during the current growing season of 2026.

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. 90A Industrial Park Drive (Violation), Vote on Restoration Plan and issue Enforcement Order

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mosher, to continue discussion on 90R Industrial Park Road Violation to June 8, 2026.

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

3. Conservation Officer Updates – None

4. Nominate Vice Chair

Commissioner Troyer volunteered himself as Vice Chair.

**Vote:** Commissioner Hidell nominated Commissioner Troyer to be Vice Chair, seconded by Commissioner Mosher.

The Motion passed by roll call vote 6-0.

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

Opposed: None

**Public Hearing: Hingham Wetland Regulations- Proposed Revisions**

Meeting Documents: Summary of Revisions May 2026 and Draft Revised Wetland Regulations

Ms. Palmer stated Horsley Witten Group was contracted to assist with the regulations updates. HW, in coordination with staff and Chair Nielsen, had prepared 5 iterations and the final draft was being presented to the Commission. She explained a word document with tracked changes in strikeout/underline had been distributed and made available to the public. She noted Town Council has not yet reviewed the revisions but is currently doing so. Ms. Palmer went over the more significant revisions and referenced the redlined document in her presentation.

Chair Nielsen stated the 75 foot setback for commercial structures may need to go into the Bylaw.

Ms. Palmer stated there will be more discussion at coming meetings and the draft had been sent to all departments for comments. She requested the Commission review the language on coastal resiliency.

Commissioner Edmundson questioned if the coastal resiliency provisions referenced any standards or models.

Ms. Palmer responded they incorporated the Climate Smart regulation provisions from MACC and language from the Nantucket Wetland Regulations. She stated that Nantucket's language was selected because it was the most enforceable and easiest for applicants to interpret. She added that the language was modified to fit the community while minimizing the need for engineering review on every project. She noted that only a limited number of municipalities had adopted similar climate resiliency provisions.

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

**Vote:** Commissioner Troyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Hidell, to continue the public hearing for the revised wetland regulation to June 22, 2026.

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

**Adjourn**

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:22PM

Approved on: July 27, 2026