



Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes Wednesday March 9th, 2022

Town of Kingston
26 Evergreen Street, Room 200
Kingston, MA 02364

Present: Jim Franklin (Vice-Chair), Dorothy MacFarlane, Glen Duffy, Megan Hickey

Virtual: Buz Artiano

Absent: Dana Duperre

Staff: Matt Penella, Conservation Agent
Mike Perrin, Assistant Conservation Agent

Location: Town Hall Offices Room 200

Commission Meeting Opened: 6:30 p.m.

Chairperson Vendetti: The date is March 9th, 2022. The time is 6:33pm. Commissioner Artiano will be attending virtually, and Commissioner Duperre is absent. According to Open Meeting Law, Buz and Megan can still vote, but all votes will need to be held as rollcalls. We will now vote to open the meeting.

VOTE: PASSES 6-0-0 (Kalina, Jim, Glen, Dot, Buz, Megan)

Kalina: Please note we are doing a hybrid meeting with in-person and virtual attendance. If a member of the virtual public would like to make comments during a public hearing, please use the "raise hand" function on Zoom, and you will be assigned a speaking time. If you are listening in via Telephone Dial-In, press *9 to raise your hand, and then press *6 to unmute yourself. This meeting is being recorded by PacTV and a record of this meeting will be posted on the Kingston town website as soon as we are able. Anyone intending to make an audio or video recording of this meeting should notify the Chair at this time.

BUSINESS:

I. Signing Documents

Kalina: Will the Agent please brief us on what needs to be signed?

Matt: We have bills for MS4 support through Environmental Partners Group, a bill for MassCor for the aluminum Hall Property sign, a bill for Pare Corporation for inspection of the Kelleher Dam, and a bill for Beals and Thomas for the 48 Howland's peer review.

II. Action Items

a) Pratts Pond Parcel

Kalina: Will the Agent please update us on the Pratts Pond parcel acquisition project?

Matt: The owners still want to donate the parcel. We need an official vote from the ConCom to accept the donation as the next step.

VOTE: Dot makes the motion to accept the donation of the Pratts Pond parcel, Jim seconds; PASSES 6-0-0.

Kalina: I would like to express our sincere gratitude for the donation and our appreciate for the generosity of the owners.

b) 21 Wapping Rd

Dot: This is a neighbor and a friend, so I am recusing myself.

Matt: On February 8th, Mike and I were on the property while a tree crew was present. We spoke to Newcomb's Tree Service and Matt Teuten, owner of the property, about the situation. We walked the property together. We made contact because the proximity of the tree work to the Jones River. The owner explained that the trees removed were damaged from a winter storm and presented a hazard to the house. We saw three stumps, tire tracks, and maybe some other tree removal. This work would require a filing because it is within 200ft of the Jones and therefore in jurisdiction. Matt provided some photos, and we did not feel that the photos fully represented the work. We reached out and informed Matt that he should file an after-the-fact RDA. Matt reached out and said he wanted to chat more and show more evidence. It does not appear that the clearing was egregious, but the Commission did not get the ability to control the work, such as leaving some sections of dead trees for habitat. Now it is up to the Commission for what should be done.

Matt Teuten: 21 Wapping Rd. A large pine and several smaller trees were damaged in a storm in the fall. The pine lost a leader limb and had previous damage. Some of the smaller trees came down over the lawn. I never wanted to remove these trees but they proposed a risk to the house, and I did not know I needed to file. We wanted to create more habitat, so we would like to plant a young pine near the river and the trees were removed at the minimum. I want as much habitat as we can hold in the yard.

Glenn: Matt, did you mention there were more trees taken down on the site?

Matt Teuten: No, what I have shown tonight is what Matt and Mike saw on February 8th.

Matt Penella: It appeared to be roughly three trees. It seems like it checks out.

Jim: Matt Penella, was there anything else you were concerned with?

Matt P: No, this is procedural. We may have asked for some trunk left for habitat. The ConCom still needed to be informed though it is a small project. The Commission can decide to request an official filing or we can handle it in-house using an Admin Review.

Megan: Tree #4, close to the river, was this cut all the way down to stump?

Matt T: The stump remains but the tree had to be cut down to the stump due to rot.

VOTE: Jim makes the motion to request the property owner to file an after-the-fact admin review, Buz seconds; PASSES 5-0-1.

c) CPC delegate appointment

Matt: It came to my attention that Dot's CPC appointment was tied to a former Commissioner's term, and we need to renew her appointment.

Dot: I will stay on.

VOTE: Jim makes the motion, Megan seconds; PASSES 6-0-0.

d) Plastic bag ban

Jean Landis Naumann, Recycling Committee: The Recycling Committee has submitted a warrant article to ban single-use plastic bags. Here are some findings: plastic bags are the third largest source of land-based pollution, they tangle and strangle marine wildlife, they introduce toxins and harmful microbes and plastic particles up the food chain which humans then ingest. Each month, Massachusetts produced 100-125 tons of plastic bag waste and they clog recycling operations. They litter the streets and trees. 436 million barrels of oil are used to produce plastic bags, which emits greenhouse gases. The average user only uses the bags for 15 minutes, then they are discarded, but they can last over 1000 years in the environment. We have 5500 reusable shopping bags in recent years, so the majority of residents already use these. Over 145 municipalities across the state have already enacted this ban, including multiple surrounding towns. We believe this is the right step for Kingston.

Jim: What about low-ethylene plastic bags? I would like to hear about more about efforts the recycling committee has made to get townfolks to recycle the bags. As somebody who uses these bags and knows how the plastic industry works, I would like clarification.

Jean: There are collection bins at stores around town, and the bags are collected by a vendor. We found that only 12% of the bags are ever recycled.

Jim: What steps has the committee taken to recycle the bags in town instead of ban? Do we have collection at the transfer station?

Jean: That would require the town hiring a vendor to collect this. They already have them at the grocery stores and Lowe's. I do not believe the town would be interested in hiring another vendor. We can look into it, but we hope to just eliminate the source.

Megan: Recycling accessibility would be something I would like more information on. Maybe a bin to recycle the bags would lead to less bags in the recycling. Or a sign.

Jean: There are signs, but people walk right by them. We hope to eliminate the need for these measures by banning them. This does sound like a conversation for the recycling center.

Megan: What is stopping all of the stores from charging?

Jean: The stores can decide this on their own. We cannot mandate this because we are not designated as a city.

Megan: Is there an option to have paper or plastic?

Jean: I am not sure. We have handed out 5500 shopping bags, so this can be a way to avoid the fee. We will work with stores to place signs in the parking lots reminding folks to bring their reusable bags.

Kalina: Is this an effort of the recycling committee?

Jean: Yes.

Kalina: That is great. The impedance is encouraging the use of reusable bags, not switching to entirely paper.

Jean: Correct. Paper bags have their downfalls too. The reusable bag trend is growing and we feel that we are behind the curve and we should do our part to help the environment.

Dot: The shape of the bag acts like a sail as well. Reusable bag use is a shift, but easily doable, and this will help our environment. I agree with a ban.

Megan: Has there ever been discussion about banning nip bottles? This seems to be a big issue across town, more so than plastic bags.

Matt: I think we could have both a ban and a recycling receptacle. The recycling committee is looking for support from multiple boards, so we do not need to vote now. We should try to get to the questions asap.

Jim: I think steps can be taken before a ban.

Julie: How much impact would banning plastic bags have?

Jean: There are efforts statewide and nationally that would put manufacturers responsible for the funds needs to dispose of their packaging. Tax dollars are being used to dispose of these materials and then the materials are burned.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Section A – 1-13 & 1-15 Old Orchard Ln (Map 59, Lot 53 & 53-3)

Kalina: The time is 7:24pm. I reopen a hearing for 1-13 & 1-15 Old Orchard Lane. The applicant is Mark Guidoboni and the representative is Adam J Brodsky, Esq. The applicant has requested continuance to March 23, 2022.

VOTE: Jim makes a motion to continue, Dot seconds; PASSES 6-0-0.

Section B – Foundry Pond Dr (Map 58, Lot 92-4 & 92-6)

Kalina: The time is 7:25pm. The Applicant has withdrawn this application.

Section C – 48 Howland's Ln (Map 48, Lot 17)

Kalina: The time is 7:25pm. I re-open a hearing for 48 Howland's Lane. The applicant is Scott Cohen of Wrentham Woods LLC and the representative is Theo Kindermans of Stantec. The applicant has requested continuance until March 23rd.

VOTE: Jim makes a motion to continue, Dot seconds; PASSES 6-0-0.

Section D—114 Country Club Way (Map 73, Lot 4-114)

Kalina: The time is 7:26pm. I re-open a hearing for 114 Country Club Way. The applicant is Kevin Tonsberg, CAO Realty Trust and the Representative is Brad Holmes, Environmental Consulting & Restoration, LLC. A Notice of Intent (NOI) was submitted for single family home improvements consisting of deck, house bump outs, garage, retaining walls, patio, fencing, and more within the buffer zone of a wetland resource area.

Matt: We had a site visit February 17. Since then, I found out why the former Commission backed off on the 100ft vernal pools envelope. At that time, both 110 and 114 did not have any protection around vernal pool because the vegetation was cut. The Tonsberg's were responsible for restoration, which seemed like it might get caught up in court, so the Commission allowed leniency on the 100ft envelope to encourage restoration action; this seemed to have worked and the Orders reflects this. This does not mean that the Commission gave up any jurisdiction, but it does take away the Commissioners ability at this time to enforce or request the 100ft envelope.

Jim: How does it work when the applicant deviated from the original Orders even considering this deal?

Julie Johnson, 110 Country Club Way: This is not what happened. I asked for a waiver from the Commission, and they denied it. I did not benefit from the deal you were referring to. The cases were totally different.

Kalina: We are discussing 114 tonight, not 110. If you would like, we can only cover history at 114.

Matt: It is my understanding that the Tonsberg's were responsible for restoration at both 110 and 114 and that they were likely not going to do the work without a lengthy court battle.

Julie: This is not what happened. The Tonsberg's and I parted ways. I did not realize there were any issues, the Tonsberg's then told me that they would take care of it. I kept getting Enforcement Orders so it became clear to me that the Tonsberg's were not going to take care of it, and this is when I hired my own lawyers. So, what you're referring to may have been early on, but do not relate to the 2020 happenings, when I had to put the posts up.

Matt: So the Tonsberg's had nothing to do with the restoration at your property?

Julie: They paid for it. It was \$400.00.

Kalina: I do want to continue discussing the 114 issue.

Matt: I understand where you are coming from and your frustration. This was the explanation that was passed down to me. We are still stuck with the fact that the Commission allowed the 20ft leniency.

Julie: 110 and 114 were not supposed to have houses on them. In 2017, they received an enforcement order to cease and desist. Since then, they have had several violations and eviction notices. They had to remove the porch because it was a violation. I provided photos of Kevin operating hydraulic equipment without a license and photos of him clearing the land. During this time, I observed a deck being built likely in ConCom jurisdiction, then Jason provided a permit barring Conservation approval, which they never received. So now they have a deck that Conservation never signed off on, and it should never have been built because it was never on the site plan. They want even more than the deck even though the house should never have been built.

Brad Holmes, ECR: The historic issues have been resolved with the issuance of the Orders for the house construction, which is still valid. There were unpermitted activities to the rear of the house, which are reflected in the plan before you. I brought this to the attention of the Commission to figure out next steps given the unpermitted additions, and the Commission requested that we file another NOI, which is what we are discussing tonight. Besides the

minimal square footage of deck in the 100ft vernal pool envelope, these unpermitted additions would be permissible.

Jim: I am not sure the current plan adequately reflects the location of the driveway leading to the overhead door off the garage.

Megan: So since the original plan did not reflect these additional features, why does this not void the agreement and Orders?

Matt: They did not void an agreement. The Commission would have to rescind the issued Order of Conditions, which is not an easy thing to do.

Brad: Because work was done that was not on the original Order of Conditions, you asked us to submit a new NOI instead of denying the Orders in full. Or we could have approached you before the work was done and we could have amended the original orders or submitted a new, separate NOI.

Brad: Jim, this photo shows the garage.

Jim: Thank you, I was confused about the placement of the overhead door. Is it a garage?

Matt: During the site visit, he said it would be a workshop and storage for some work-related items.

Brad: A car could not fit in there.

Jim: The applicant did say he would want to pull a car down to the overhead door. He asked if he could pave down to there.

Brad: I told him that we would not be proposing paving that. This would have to be another filing in the future.

Jim: This is why we want to ask about this, because all the future work on the property should be wrapped up in this filing.

Buz: I disagree with the statement that gravel is better than loam and seed. With the history and the fact that the applicant has expressed wanting to pave that section, we could find in the future that it has been paved. So if the applicant wants to pave that, that should be included now. Also, weed killer will likely be sprayed on the gravel section, which is way worse than fertilizer of lawn. In the last round of filing for the house, it was stated clearly that no work could be done in the back of the house. I have reservations about this project, and I agree that we should deal with the violations on the original Orders rather than hear a new application.

Brad: The Commission requested a new NOI to deal with the changes. The only feature within the buffer zone is a small section of deck, roughly 100sqft, and everything is outside of the 50ft no structure zone off the IVW and outside of the 100ft vernal pool envelope. We have shown that the features do not impact the wetlands values set forth in the Kingston Wetlands Protection Regulations.

Buz: The problem with whatever outcome we reach is that the applicant has shown he will likely keep building and adding and changing the house without proper approval. There is a willful neglect to follow the approved plans and I believe this will continue.

Brad: What is the solution?

Buz: I want to see all the work that the applicant plans to do on this NOI application.

Brad: I did not believe that the Commission would entertain paving that section since it is in the buffer zone. What would the Commission's feelings be?

Buz: It is not on us to provide our feelings.

Brad: Everything we plan to do on the property is shown on the plan.

Kalina: I would like the Agent to weigh in.

Matt: I would not like to see pavement in this location. I think this would lead to more salt introduced to the vernal pool. I believe we have to address violations as they come in, and we could still issue an enforcement order if he does pave that section.

Megan: We agreed to not enforce the previous violations?

Matt: No. Brad came before the Commission and asked how they should proceed, by filing a new NOI or if the Commission wanted to take enforcement action.

Julie: What about the deck?

Matt: I am talking about the deck as well. The issue could have issued an enforcement order or fines to get him back into compliance, but they requested a new NOI to cover the deviations.

Julie: So compliance would be taking down the deck.

Matt: No, because the deck is permissible.

Julie: I disagree because it was not on the plan. I think the deck should come down.

Matt: Permissible would mean it fits the scope of our regulations.

Megan: So it could have been approved, but it was not because it did not come before us.

Kalina: We are not discussing language tonight. If something is permissible, you can ask for a permit. Whether or not we provide that is another question. In this case, no permit was asked for and a deck was built. So now the deck was built, and we have the NOI in front of us to ask for permission as well as forgiveness.

Buz: What is the fence material?

Brad: I can get these specs.

Buz: I would like to see the sturdiest and most expensive fence possible to discourage future violations.

Brad: The conservation markers are up. I can get the specs.

Buz: This should and will be in the Order of Conditions.

Matt: I would actually not recommend wildlife passage in this case. It could be a sink for wildlife.

Jim: I think to even hear the application, we should receive additional protections on the wetlands due to the encroachment on the vernal pool envelope. I think everything that wants to be done on the property should be presented in the plan. Reprocessed stone contains asphalt which would negatively impact the wetland. I think any lawn proposes an issue because lawns here require fertilizer and chemicals. I agree with Matt and Buz regarding the fence. These are my concerns.

Matt: What if the fenced in area was lawn, but everything west would be restoration area?

Brad: I believe you are mixing permits. The drywells are mitigation. I think we could match the square footage of the deck in the envelope to an extension of the restoration. I know the Commission does not like the Orders already issued, but they are valid. Other than that, I have done all I can in the project area.

Matt: Typically, mitigation is bigger than 1:1.

Brad: We can do 2:1. All this can be permissible.

Jim: We requested some additional mitigation, and I believe you should talk to the applicant about what we have requested.

Brad: I will and I will provide a revised plan.

Dot: Can we request no fertilizer on the dog area or lawn?

Brad: That is possible.

Matt: Is the dog area going to be lawn? I know the applicant may have wanted to do woodchips.

Brad: I do not want to introduce any other changes. The area is designated as yard area.

Jim: We did hear from the applicant during the site visit that he would want to do woodchips or something of the likes. The applicants representative is asking us to vote, so I think we should vote to approve or deny or continue.

Buz: The applicant has a right to force a vote, but I would like to see the specs for the fence. I would like to see the prepared order of conditions well before the vote to approve or deny.

Mike: This is the opportunity to talk about special conditions, such as preventing herbicide in the crushed stone area. The lawn area falls outside of the current NOI in front of us because it was approved in the previous Orders.

Jim: I think we should make a motion and move on.

Brad: I will provide the information that Buz has requested and the mitigation area.

Buz: I would like to see specs for the pervious pavers.

Brad: Can this be a special condition?

Buz: No.

Jim: I would also like to see details on the repurposed stone.

Brad: I did not see any asphalt in the mix and do not understand the concern with asphalt.

Jim: It was clear to me during the site visit.

Glenn: In the wording of the NOI, the description includes 'and more' and it should be specific to what is in the application.

Mike: This was the wording presented in the NOI, yes.

Matt: I do not think the Commission would be stuck with this because all activities should be accounted for in the plan.

Megan: What are our options?

Kalina: There was a motion to continue the hearing made by Jim and seconded by Dot.

Matt: The Commission can vote to deny and enforcement action could require the removal of the deck. The applicant then has the opportunity to take the Commission to court.

Brad: There is also an appeal option.

VOTE: Jim makes a motion to continue the hearing until March 23rd, Dot seconds; PASSES 6-0-0.

Section E – 88 Ring Road (Map 61, Lot 29)

Kalina: The time is 8:25pm. I re-open a hearing for 88 Ring Road for a Notice of Intent received for work associated with the construction of a home addition, construction of a stone revetment, and associated site grading within 100 feet of a wetland resource area. The Applicant is Alex Darzenta and the Representative is Joseph Webby of Webby Engineering Associates, Inc. Does the representative have any comments?

Joe Webby: We addressed the comments presented by the Commission at the last meeting and at the site visit, and we submitted revisions. I am here to answer any questions.

Mike: Mr. Webby addressed our concerns about the FEMA flood zone, and we found that our AxisGIS page has outdated FEMA data. The project is outside of the FEMA flood zone. The only comment from last meeting that I do not feel was addressed was a landscaping or restoration plan. The bare area that exists now will need a lot of thought and work. I was present for the site visit and we found that some of the erosion control was failing. The erosion control should be addressed and any material gathered in front of the current erosion control should be cleared out. The Commission also brought up test pits to see if any wetlands have been filled.

Jim: Has any digging been done?

Joe: No, we would not dig without permission. We can coordinate this with the office.

Jim: During the visit, you could see some sheet flow and down to the back of the property. My question now is if any wetlands were filled.

Buz: I'd be concerned about the test pits because we do not know when the wetlands were filled. My concern is the woods road, would this be part of the restoration area?

Joe: No, the road is not owned by the applicant.

Glenn: How quickly can the erosion control get fixed?

Joe: This can be done quickly.

Jim: I think we should continue and wait for test pit data.

Joe: The 23rd can work. I want Brad Holmes there to look at the soils.

Mike: Please send photos of the fixed erosion control before the next meeting.

VOTE: Jim makes the motion to continue the hearing until March 23rd, Dot seconds; PASSES 6-0-0.

III. Enforcement

a) 29-31 Main St

Kalina: Can the Agent please update us on the situation at 29-31 Main St?

Matt: No change due to the weather.

b) May Ave/Post Ct

Kalina: Can the Agent please update us on the situation at May Ave/Post Ct?

Matt: The Commission voted on February 9th to issue enforcement orders under KWPR and WPA. The orders were sent and received.

c) 97 Main Street

Kalina: Can the Agent update us on the situation at 97 Main St?

Matt: We were able to get in touch with the owner. I met a representative out to discuss the immediate issues the Commission wants addressed. He agreed that they would clear the dumping on the cart path then the rest of the property in 180 days. They are eventually filing with the Commission for a development plan out there.

d) 19 Ring Rd

Kalina: Can the Agent update us on the situation at 19 Ring Rd?

Matt: We observed some cutting along Ring Rd that was near a visible wetland and a wetland on the DEP layer. There was a contractor in a skid steer moving dirt around. They made a mess of the road. The highway foreman stopped because they had removed bollards on the side of the road. The contractor said he did not have a business. I explained that the work would need a filing with the Commission because it was occurring 100ft from a wetland and briefly explained how the filing process works. He said that the homeowner was responsible for the tree work and that the owner had just been cleaning stuff up. This was clearly not the case because we observed green pine limbs stacked in the wetlands. I issued a stop work order and explained that they would have to come before the Commission at the next

meeting. It appears they are not here tonight. I informed them in a voice message that a notice of violation would be issued. If there is no response to that, we should issue enforcement.

Jim: Is he putting a driveway in?

Matt: No. The contractor said he was dealing with drainage issues. It was a mess.

e) 64-70 Summer St

Kalina: Will the agent please update us on the situation at 64-70 Summer St?

Matt: This is the We Print Today area. I was in touch with the landowner and he came in front of the Commission a few months back. After that meeting, he was supposed to file an NOI with the Commission. There were talks about a rain garden and placing a screen on the fence to collect trash. This fell to the wayside and we provided some leniency. I called him recently and told him that he needed to file. I issued enforcement orders for unpermitted work in jurisdiction for the work associated with redoing the parking area. So remedial actions include ceasing and desisting any work, filing before March 25th, and installing proper erosion control including the mesh screen along the brook. Failure to address the erosion control before March 18th will result in \$300/day in fines. The Commission should vote to ratify the orders.

VOTE: Jim makes the motion, Dot seconds; PASSES 6-0-0.

IV. Minutes

Kalina: Do I hear a motion to accept the meeting minutes from February 9th, 2022 as they are presented?

MOTION: Dot makes the motion, Jim seconds; PASSES 5-0-1, Kalina abstains.

V. Updates

a) Eversource VMP & Herbicide

Matt: We received documents from Eversource. We received their vegetation management plan, notice of vegetation management activities for 2022. It is mostly mechanical work. They provided maps of work areas. They also sent a notification document for herbicide treatment in 2022 which aligns with their 5-year plan. They also provided maps for this. This was provided to the Commissioners. No vote is needed. Any questions or concerns?

b) Keolis Right of Way Management

Matt: This is very similar to the Eversource situation. This is the MBTA right of ways.

Megan: Do they also cleaning the trash while they are clearing?

Matt: I can ask. I also want to talk to them about the Tree of Heaven.

Megan: This is off topic, but is the work at Mulliken's done?

Matt: No, this is currently out to bid.

CLOSING REMARKS

Kalina: The next meeting will be held on March 23th, 2022 at 6:30PM. The time is 9:08PM. Will a Commissioner make a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MOTION: Jim makes the motion, Dot seconds. PASSES 5-0-0, Buz lost connection.

Prepared by: Michael Perrin, Assistant Conservation Agent, Conservation Department

Approved by Conservation Commission: 5/25/22

Materials Presented at Meeting:

- Agenda
- Agent/Staff Notes
- Applications, plans, and relevant documents associated with the public hearings and discussions
- Meeting Minutes subject to review and approval



AMENDED 3/8/22



**TOWN OF KINGSTON
NOTICE OF MEETING**

**BOARD: CONSERVATION
COMMISSION**

MEETING LOCATION: Room 200

**DATE & TIME: March 9, 2022
6:30 p.m.**

**AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE:
Matt Penella, Conservation Agent**

This meeting notice is being posted on the Official Town House Bulletin Board, pursuant to General Law Chapter 30A, Section 20. Said notice and agenda must be filed in the Office of the Town Clerk at least **48 HOURS** prior to such meeting. Such filing and posting shall be the responsibility of the officer calling such meeting.

The Commission requests that all members of the public attend virtually. All Commissioners, Applicants, and Representatives are asked to attend in-person. To access the meeting remotely, please use the following instructions:

To access via Zoom:

<https://pactv.zoom.us/j/93546722040?pwd=eitwaksyQm9oVWV1xMTInL0tob1I0QT09>

Passcode: 403139

Or Dial-In by Telephone:

US: +1 301-715-8592

Webinar ID: 935 4672 2040

Passcode: 403139

AGENDA

BUSINESS 6:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

1. Signing Documents
 - Bill for EPG MS4 support
 - Bill for MassCor Hall Sign
 - Bill for Pare Corporation Dam Inspection*
 - Bill for Beals and Thomas 48 Howland's NOI Peer Review*
2. Action Items
 - Pratt's Pond Parcel Donation
 - 21 Wapping Tree Removal
 - Plastic Bag Ban*
 - CPC Re-appointment*
3. Enforcement
 - 29-31 Main St
 - May Ave/Post Ct
 - 97 Main St
 - 19 Ring Rd
 - 64-70 Summer St*

AMENDED 3/8/22

4. Minutes:
 - February 9, 2022
5. Updates:
 - Eversource Vegetation Management Notice
 - Keolis 2022 Operating Plan

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Section A – 1-13, 1-15 Old Orchard Ln (Map 59, Lot 53 & Map 59, Lot 53-3)

Applicant: Mark Guidoboni; Representative: Adam J Brodsky, Esq. Request for Amendment to Order of Conditions (R. Am. OOC) for DEP Filings SE 037-0869 and SE 037-0854 to repair a sea wall within 100 feet of a coastal resource area.

THIS HEARING WILL BE CONTINUED TO MARCH 23rd

Section B – Foundry Pond Dr (Map 58, Lot 92-4 & 92-6)

Applicant: Joseph Mahoney, J & O Hawk Investment, LLC; Representative: Karen Beck, Principe Engineering. Notice of Intent (NOI) to construct two single-family dwellings, a stormwater catch basin, and a segment of undeveloped paper road within 100 feet of a wetland resource area.

THE APPLICANT HAS WITHDRAWN THIS APPLICATION

Section C – 48 Howland's Ln (Map 48, Lot 17)

Applicant: Scott Cohen; Representative: Theo Kindermans, Stantec. Notice of Intent (NOI) to construct a new 36-unit residential housing development within 100' of a wetland resource area.

THIS HEARING WILL BE CONTINUED TO MARCH 23rd

Section D – 114 Country Club Way (Map 73 Lot 4-114)

Applicant: Kevin Tonsberg, CAO Realty Trust. Representative: Brad Holmes, Environmental Consulting & Restoration, LLC. Notice of Intent (NOI) for single family home improvements consisting of deck, house bump outs, garage, retaining walls, patio, fencing, and more additions within 100' of wetland resource areas.

Section E – 88 Ring Road (Map 61, Lot 29)

Applicant: Alex Darzenta; Representative: Joseph Webby, Webby Engineering. Notice of Intent (NOI) to construct an addition to existing dwelling, construct a stone revetment wall, and site grading within 100' of a wetland resource area.

NEXT MEETING: March 23, 2022 @ 6:30PM

**PLEASE NOTE THE MEETING WILL BE AUDIO RECORDED.
OTHER BUSINESS NOT REASONABLY ANTICIPATED WITHIN 48 HOURS**

The Town of Kingston advises its employees and the public that it does not discriminate on the basis of a person's disability in employment or in access to its programs, services, and activities. This meeting location is accessible to people with disabilities. The Town of Kingston has designated Paul Armstrong to coordinate efforts to comply with the requirements of Executive Order 526, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the federal Rehabilitation Act and various other federal and state laws protecting the rights of people with disabilities. If you have a disability and require a reasonable accommodation to fully participate in this event, please contact the ADA Coordinator no later than forty-eight (48) hours prior to the event by phone at 781-585-0505 or email parmstrong@kingstonma.gov to discuss your accessibility needs. Requests for accommodations or modifications made within the forty-eight (48) hour window will be honored to the maximum extent feasible, but it may not be possible to fulfill them.



KINGSTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION



26 Evergreen Street, Kingston, MA 02364

SIGN-IN SHEET

PLEASE NOTE THIS MEETING IS BEING VIDEO & AUDIO RECORDED

DATE: 3/9/22

NAME	INTEREST	ADDRESS
Matt Teuten	TREE REMOVAL	21 WAPPING RD
Brad Holmes	114 CCW	
Julie Johnson	110 CCW	
Joe Webby	88 Ring Rd	
Alex Dazenta	88 Ring Rd	
Paul Miller	88 Ring Rd	

Action

- NO action

Enforce

Main

May/Post

64-70 Summer

- ~~extend to~~
- extend to April 15
- discuss April 27

19 Ring

EC 1 week

Restore Plan for April 13

Restore Plan April 27

Do we want EO to hold him to these dates?

P Hearing

Section A: 7:25 PM

Jim, Dot

S-O-O

B 7:26 PM
cont. 4/13
Jim, Dot

S-O-O

C 7:56

Jim, Dot

S-O-O

close
Jim, Dot
S-O-O