



**Town of Barnstable
Conservation Commission**
200 Main Street
Hyannis Massachusetts 02601

Office: 508-862-4093E-mail: conservation@town.barnstable.ma.us

FAX: 508-778-2412

MINUTES – CONSERVATION COMMISSION HEARING

DATE: June 7, 2022 @ 6:30 PM

This meeting of the Barnstable Conservation Commission is being recorded and transmitted by the Information Technology Department of the Town of Barnstable on Channel 18. Under MGL Chapter 30A Section 20, anyone else desiring to make such a recording or transmission must notify the Chair.

Remote Participation Instructions

The Conservation Commission's Public Hearing will be held by remote participation methods.

Alternative public access to this meeting shall be provided in the following manner:

1. The meeting will be televised via Channel 18 and may be accessed the Channel 18 website at <http://streaming85.townofbarnstable.us/CablecastPublicSite/watch/1?channel=1>

2. Real-time public comment can be addressed to the Conservation Commission utilizing the Zoom link or telephone number and access code for remote access below.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://townofbarnstable-us.zoom.us/j/87088199162>

Meeting ID: 870 8819 9162

888 475 4499 US Toll-free

3. Applicants, their representatives and individuals required or entitled to appear before the Conservation Commission may appear remotely and are not permitted to be physically present at the meeting, and may participate through the link or telephone number provided above. Documentary exhibits and/or visual presentations should be submitted in advance of the meeting to Darcy.Karle@town.barnstable.ma.us, so that they may be displayed for remote public access viewing.

Public comment is also welcome by emailing Darcy.Karle@town.barnstable.ma.us. Comments should be submitted at least 8hrs prior to the hearing.

This meeting of the Barnstable Conservation Commission is being recorded and transmitted by the Information Technology Department of the Town of Barnstable on Channel 18. Under MGL Chapter 30A Section 20, anyone else desiring to make such a recording or transmission must notify the Chair.

**REMINDER TO APPLICANTS:
FEES FOR LEGAL ADS ARE LISTED BELOW. PLEASE MAIL CHECKS TO CONSERVATION, 200
MAIN STREET, HYANNIS, 02601**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair F. P. (Tom) Lee. Also in attendance were: Vice Chair Louise R. Foster, Commissioners Hearn, Morin and Sampou. Commissioner John Abodeely arrived late at 6:55 p.m. and Clerk George Gillmore was absent.

Conservation Administrator, Darcy Karle was present along with Administrative Assistant, Kim Cavanaugh.

The Chair advised all revised plans should be submitted 7 days in advance of meetings going forward.

I. OLD AND NEW BUSINESS

- A. Park City Wind – Park City Wind – Craigville Beach – Article 97 and easements: the Conservation Commission will consider and vote that the following properties located at 997 Craigville Beach Road, Centerville map 206 parcel 13, and 20 South Main Street, Centerville map 228 parcel 138 are Article 97 land and are surplus to municipal, conservation and open space needs.

Patrick John, Hans Van Lingen, Evan Ridley and Attorney Charlie McLaughlin represented Park City Wind.

- Pat Johnson of Avangrid explained the project.
- Attorney Charles McLaughlin addressed the Commissioners and explained the requirements and reasoning for the Commission vote.
- The vote must be unanimous of the Commissioners present.
- The locations of the easements were reviewed by Hans Van Lingen of Park City Wind.
- Attorney McLaughlin advised the route of the design plan.
- Kate Connolly addressed the Commissioners and explained the reasoning for the unanimous vote.

Commissioner Abodeely joined the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

- The basis of the jurisdiction was explained by Attorney McLaughlin. A policy of “No Net Loss” deals with properties owned by the Town for various reasons. It is for the protection of the public’s right to clean air, clean water, etc. In order for a Town to receive State funding the public's interest must be protected.
- The Article 97 property needs an easement.
- This will be limited to an underground routing of cables.
- The Commission is being asked to support the project so that it does not constitute a loss in terms of the environmental issues that the Commission normally looks at.
- The majority of the project is in the Craigville Beach area.
- There is concern that the information should have been presented to the Commissioners in writing earlier.
- There needs to be clarity on jurisdiction. There may be areas along the route that need to be brought before the Commission.
- This project represents a global goal. The benefits to the environment and the economic impact to the community should be a top priority. It benefits everyone.
- The vote of the Chapter 97 is limited to only the easement not the project itself.
- This is a separate issue from the NOI that has been filed.
- There were months of negotiations on Vineyard Wind 1 and 10 iterations of the Host community Agreement on this matter. The issue is identical to what was presented to the Commission two years ago. It has been thoroughly vetted.
- The benefits to the Town are in the millions and are being dedicated to pollution control.

A motion was made to approve the property at 997 Craigville Beach Road, Centerville Map 206 Parcel 13, and 20 South Main Street, Centerville Map 228 Parcel 138 are Article 97 land and are surplus to municipal, conservation and open space needs.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay - None

II. REQUESTS FOR DETERMINATION

- A. Colonial Gas Company.** Installation of a new gas main extension within the Parker Road ROW, roadway shoulder, and portions of maintained lawn and existing driveways at 461, 441, 369, and 365 Parker Road, West Barnstable as shown on Assessor’s Map 176 Parcels 025-002, 025, 021-002, 021-001 and Roadway ROW. **DA-22015**

The applicant was represented by Jeremy Degler of Tighe & Bond.

There were no questions from Commissioners.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made to approve the project as a negative determination.
Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.
Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou
Nay

B. Sandra L. Howard. Proposed addition to corner of house and kitchen remodel at 40 Winfield Lane, Osterville as shown on Assessor’s Map 116 Parcel 102. **DA-22017**

The applicant was represented by Mark of Rogers and Marney Builders.

There were no questions from Commissioners,
There was no public comment.

A motion was made to approve the project as a negative determination.
Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.
Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou
Nay

C. Emanuel Alves. Remove two pitch pines that have Turpentine Beetle damage at 1359 Route 28, Centerville as shown on Assessor’s Map 229 Parcel 086. **DA-22018**

The applicant was represented by Rob Kennedy of Joyce Landscaping.

Issues discussed:

- There should be a replacement tree for each tree taken.
- The justification for taking down trees for solar panels in the Conservation jurisdiction has not been approved before.
- The trees looked pretty sturdy and healthy during a site inspection.
- The beetles have moved in within the last few months.
- The infected tree could hit the house if it were to come down.
- The function of the trees was discussed.
- One of the trees is in bad shape.
- It was suggested that shrubs could be planted instead of trees. They would serve the same purpose of the trees but would not grow tall enough to impede the solar panels.
- In prior filings and in the guidelines any tree removal within the 0-50’ buffer requires a NOI with an analysis of tree replacement. They were advised to file a NOI.
- The tree to the right does not need to come down.
- The tree to the left is leaning and could hit the house if it came down in a storm.
- A work protocol should be submitted and all under-story should be replanted.
- Solar panel guidelines require a NOI.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made to approve the project as a negative determination subject to receipt of a revised plan for removing one tree to the left and add a replacement tree, a work protocol submitted in consultation with staff, and understory be replanted.
Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.
Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou
Nay

- D. Dilmar Ribeiro.** Build two dormers above the existing garage at 120 Cobble Stone Road, Barnstable as shown on Assessor's Map 316 Parcel 063-001 **DA-22019**.

There was no one to represent the applicant.
It was tabled until later in the meeting.

Ribereio taken after E. Carey.

No one was available to represent the applicant.
A motion was made to approve a positive determination for lack of information.
Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.
Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou
Nay

- E. Karen M Gadbois.** Proposed construction of a 2nd floor addition and construction of a 4' x 18' porch at 15 Birch Drive, Hyannis as shown on Assessor's Map 245 Parcel 134. **DA-22020**

The applicant was represented by Chuck Rowland P.E. of Sullivan Engineering.

Issues discussed:

- A question was raised on new hardscape.
- There is about 40 sq. ft. of new hardscape in the 50-100' buffer.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made to approve a negative determination.
Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.
Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin
Nay
Sampou was unavailable to vote.

III. NOTICES OF INTENT

- A. Shoestring Properties LP.** Multifamily dwelling units replacing restaurant and parking lots at 110 and 115 School Street, Hyannis as shown on Assessor's Map 326 Parcels 121 & 125. **SE3-5998**

The applicant was represented by Dan Ojala, P.E. of Down Cape Engineering.

Issues discussed:

- There will be ground floor parking. It will be approximately 5 feet below grade level. A question was raised if this will make it a more resilient habitat if there is sea level rise.
- The foot print is identical to what was approved before. They are going up a half level, There is very little change.
- There is a transformer in the 0-50 and a four car parking space in the 0-50' buffer. A question was raised if they be relocated outside the 0-50' buffer.
- The parking spaces were previously approved.
- Is there a reason it can't be moved out of the 50' buffer.
- If they removed one of the parking spaces it would get everything out of the 50'. They are paying for it with mitigation plantings.
- The parking requirements would still be met if the parking space were removed.
- Two of the parking spaces could be moved back toward South Street.
- This is a big project in a rural area. The one parking space should not be a big issue to move.
- Cars bring in oil dripping and other issues to the 50' buffer.

- It could be brought to the zoning board to bring the parking space behind the building.
- Storm water reports should be submitted for three years.
- Plants being put into the buffer area were reviewed.

Public Comment:

Wayne Kurker – Raised concern about the aesthetics and the property line. He will review the property line with Dan Ojala.

A motion was made to approve the project subject to receipt of a revised engineering plan and planting plan to move one of the parking spaces outside of the 50’ buffer, and plant the space, the leach rate has to be verified during the construction and adjust the drainage design as necessary.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay

- B. **Oyster Harbors Club Inc.** Control of invasive and/or nuisance vegetation through use of physical, mechanical techniques to benefit the resource area(s) at 2067 Oyster Harbors, Osterville as shown on Assessor’s Map 071 Parcel 004-001. **SE3-5995**

The applicant was represented by Jeffrey Castellani from Solitude Lake Management.

Issues discussed:

- The procedure may need to be done more than once within the three years depending on the results of the first treatment.
- This is just mechanical removal.
- Annual monitoring reports need to be submitted and staff approval could be given to re-do the process within the 3 years.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made to approve the project subject to receipt of annual reports for three years and notifying staff if the procedure will be re-done.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay - None

- C. **Paul Capasso.** Installation of a new in-ground pool and stone patio at 116 Bay Shore Road, Hyannis as shown on Assessor’s Map 325 Parcel 079.

The applicant was represented by Hannah Raddatz of BSC Group.

Paul Capasso addressed the Commissioners – The Stone wall to the east is done. The pool is flush with the deck.

The revised plan is dated June 7, 2022.

Issues discussed:

- A question was raised where the mitigation is going. There is an area from a prior filing that needs to be re-planted.
- There will need to be a wall around the pool.
- A questions was raised where the drawn down for the pool is located.
- There needs to be demarcation for the new mitigation.

- The L in the corner needs to be taken off the plan.
- The demarcation has to be at least 1 1/2 feet high.
- Draw down drywells will be added outside the 50' buffer and the mechanical pool equipment for the pool will be added to the plan.
- The mitigation plantings were reviewed.
- A question was raised if there is a fence around the pool. It should be added to the plan.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made to approve the project subject to receipt of a revised plan showing the demarcation of mitigation area, mechanical room, draw down for the pool, railing fence around the in-ground pool, the top elevation of the wall around the pool, and the removal of the L shape around the revetment, notice that the existing buffer strip is going to be changed to the planting plan.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay

The SE3# has not been issued. There will need to a continuance.

A motion was made to open Capasso again.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay –

A motion was made to continue the project to June 21, 2022 for issuance of DEP # and any comments.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay –

- D. **William Cole.** Replace existing gravel driveway with pavement and associated drainage at 439 Elliott Road, Centerville as shown on Assessor's Map 227, Parcel 111. **SE3-5999**

The applicant was represented by Dan Ojala, P.E. of Down Cape Engineering.

Issues discussed:

- The issue that is being addressed is the water runoff from the driveway. A trench drain will be installed and will infiltrate away from the wetland.
- There may be an added benefit if the elevated overflow pipe creates a seasonal vernal pool.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made to approve the project as submitted.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay

- E. **John William Carey.** Construction of new screen porch and deck, and maintenance and repair of existing fire damaged dwelling at 59 West Terrace, Centerville as shown on Map 207 Parcel 116. **SE3-6000**

The applicant was represented by Arlene Wilson of AM Wilson Associates.

Issues discussed:

- The shell stone driveway needs to be shown on the Engineering plan.

- The porch in the 0-50' buffer is predominately new hardscape. There is already some hardscape in the 0-50'.
- The site is constrained and there is no other place to put a deck.
- The deck will be on sonotubes and will be a little more than 20" above the existing grade, equal to the first floor elevation.
- They are dumping leaves near the easement on the side of the shed.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made to approve the project as submitted.
 Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.
 Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Lee, Morin, Sampou
 Nay – Hearn, Sampou

IV. CONTINUANCES

- A. Tobias Welo.** Construction of wave break and planting at 25 and 35 Cove Lane, Osterville as shown on Assessor's Map 052 Parcel 009 and Map 053 Parcel 012 002. **SE3-5976.** Continued from 5/10/22.

Commissioner Hearn has completed the evidentiary review.
 The quorum is everyone.

The applicant was represented by Arlene Wilson of AM Wilson and Associates.

Arlene addressed the Commission:

- Both the Welo and Winchester properties had conditions in their orders that there should be no armoring of the banks because they were built after the regulations were put into place.
- There is a recent case in Wellfleet from April of 2020 that if the prohibitions were not expressed in the permits they were not valid against the property.
- Arlene feels it is not relevant as the structure is not being built on the bank itself.
- All the regulations say "on the bank" not adjacent to the bank.
- The aerial photos that make up Tim's Point show the sediment is moving off shore rather than along the shore.
- The erosion is occurring from drainage flows and according to the regulations should be repaired.
- They have proposed addition of some nourishment and a berm along the top in the planting area.
- The nourishment can be done by hand because it is a small amount.
- The wall is made of a corrugated material which helps to break up the wave energy.
- Significant planting will be done along the top.
- Where a significant shellfish habitat exists the structure is above the high water line and will help ensure the shellfish.
- Arlene feels this is a storm related erosion issue.

Issues discussed:

- Okeefe property had tried some soft solutions without success.
- There was discussion on the definition of a wave break and a coastal structure.
- The intent of the prohibition was that houses after 1978 were not to be built in an area where the house may fall down. This bank was stable when the house was built. It became a problem after Hurricane Bob.
- The erosion is storm related which is why they created the 1978 law.
- The sand will end up along the shore in a storm related event.

- There needs to be a hard look at the language in the regulations. There is a wall next door and properties to the south have stone revetments. A number of solutions have been tried but not successful.
- This is not on the bank it is on the beach. Regulations say “on the bank”. The COC did not continue the prohibition.
- The structure will be filled with sand and plantings which will put on it right up against the bank. There was discussion on it should still be considered “on the beach” or a continuum of the bank.
- It will relocate the bank toe.
- The fill will be all the way to the bank.
- The regulations say this type of structure is not a coastal bank.
- By filling it in, this becomes part of the system and becomes part of the bank.
- The application covers two properties. There is a significant difference in the bank at both properties.
- A wave break is more in the water than along the bank. This a coastal engineering structure.
- One of the missing elements is maintenance of the sand bags. They have not been maintained. If they had been maintained. It is unclear what would have happened if they had been maintained.
- There are two properties involved, one is not included in the Certificate of Compliance, the other is.
- The logic would support the intent of the prohibition.

There was no public comment.

Letter from Arlene Wilson dated June 2nd was reviewed.

- A question was raised why the maintenance of the sand bags was not done. It is difficult to bring sand in to the area. The current owner did not understand they were required to do sand bag maintenance.
- The chair requested information be submitted on the Wellfleet case.
- Because of the fill behind it, this is a coastal engineering structure.
- The sand bags were supposed dissolve over a period of time.
- Allowing this may set a precedent.

A poll of Commissioners was taken:

Abodeely	leaning toward negative
Foster	leaning toward negative
Hearn	leaning negative
Lee	leaning negative
Morin	leaning to positive
Sampou	leaning toward negative

A motion was made to close public comment and come back on June 21st with a finding.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay -

- B. Paul Fitzgerald** – Construction of approximately 102 ft. sloped stone revetment, approximately 67 ft. of vertical plastic bulkhead, and buffer plantings located at 207 Keveney Lane, Cummaquid as shown on Assessors Map 352 Parcel 023. **SE3-5972 Continued from 3/29/22.**

The applicant was represented by Arlene Wilson of AM Wilson and Associates.

Arlene addressed the Commissioners:

- There were concerns raised by DPW about potential impacts for the proposal to the bridge itself.
- There may be upgrades to the bridge.
- A civil engineer was hired to do a peer review. A copy of the peer review was previously given to the Commissioners.
- His opinion was that the problems being caused are related to the bridge.
- An aerial view was shown. The embankment near the bridge is armored.
- The rip rap along the bridge was not put back properly.
- The bridge has drainage issues which contribute to the erosion.
- Erosion control plantings are proposed to help maintain the bank system.
- The Town has an easement over the Fitzgerald property to maintain the bridge. They are amenable to modify the easement so the Town could install a detention basin in the area to help alleviate overbank flow.
-

Issues discussed:

- A question was raised if the property at number 207 is a buildable lot. There is no intention to build on it.
- Mr. Fitzgerald owns a lot of land across the street.
- Fitzgerald will allow the Town to come in and fix the drainage problem and is willing to install erosion control and planting so the road is not impacted in the future.
- A question was raised on what is trying to be protected. The protection of the road should be addressed by the Town. This is a meadow not a house.
- Optional softer solutions were discussed.
- Armoring a bank is an eye sore to the aesthetics of Cape Cod and the shoreline.
- There is no immediate danger to the road.
- A question was raised if there would be a benefit to doing just buffer plantings without the hard solution. The plantings would probably not survive because of the salt water spray.
- The Town will need to find a way to do the repairs if necessary.
- If approved there would need to be a finding for justification of approving.
- This project could end up impacting the road.
- If the Town were concerned we would have heard back. Have not heard back from DPW or Town Engineer.
- If approval is based on protecting the road we need to hear back from the Town.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made to continue to June 21st to give the Town time to respond to concerns.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay

V. TAKEN UNDER ADVISEMENT

- A. Tobias Welo.** Modifications to existing pier by extending its total length 41', relocating it 3' north and substituting piles for supports at 25 Cove Lane, Osterville as shown on Assessor's Map 052 Parcel 009. **SE3-5984** Continuance from April 26, 2022. **Under advisement from 5/24/22.**

The chair explained the reason for the finding:

The majority of the poll that was taken solidified the decision.

The finding is based on the majority of the poll and includes the reasons why it is being denied.

For legal reasons the order had to have significant findings in order to deny the application.

Ten findings were read in to record:

1. The existing pier (SE3-4545) is a non-motorized seasonal pier with the Order of Conditions issued on Dec 19, 2006. The approved plan is dated Dec 14, 2006. The COC was issued on May 1, 2018. This pier consists of 52 ft 4 inches of boardwalk, 53 ft 8 inches of pier section, 14 ft ramp and 10 ft x 15 ft float with 4-inch piles.
2. The initial proposed pier layout is dated February 1, 2022 and the revised pier layout is dated March 19, 2022 prepared by Sullivan Engineering & Consulting, Inc. stamped by Chuck Rowland. The revised layout consists of 55 ft of boardwalk, 55 ft of pier (with 12-inch piles), 26 ft of ramp, and 200 square ft of float (with 12-inch piles). The width of the boardwalk and pier is 4-ft wide. The proposed boardwalk and pier are on the same alignment of the previous approved seasonal pier (SE3-4545) with 27 ft extension at an angle to the float.
3. This application is subject to Chapter 703, adopted by the Commission under Town of Barnstable Chapter 237, with an effective date of October 26, 2004, as amended 2/6/2018 and 2/29/2018.
4. The shellfish rating for this area is 8 out 10 by the Natural Resources 2011 Sub-Committee rating. This rating has increased from 7 in 2000 to 8 in 2011. As set forth in Chapter 703-4(m) shellfish ratings of 6 or greater shall be presumptively considered as high value shellfish area and shall require 30-inch of water under the propellor in its down position.
5. There is a clearly defined rebuttable presumption in favor of “seasonal” as opposed to “permanent” private docks and piers (reference to Chapter 703-5B, as well as other provisions of this Chapter).
6. This application (SE3- 5984) should be considered as a standalone project and not related to the erosion control project (SE3- 5976) on the same parcel by the same owner.
7. Commissioner Pete Sampou made a reference to the Ryan case (SE3- 5312) where the court upheld the Commission’s determination to not allow the replacement of a seasonal dock with a permanent dock based on evidence of increased presence of exotic species in the waters of the Three Bays including Cotuit Bay, which by their increasing nature and presence have an adverse impact to the resource area. The Commission hereby incorporates the findings and conclusions of the court in the Ryan case. The applicant’s articles for “Do artificial substrates favor non-indigenous fouling species over native species? And The introduction of coastal infrastructure as a driver of change in marine environments” do not provide adequate evidence to overcome the testimony and evidence submitted by our Commissioner, Dr. Sampou.
8. The applicant also proposed an increase on pile size (from 8-inch to 12-inch) and reduce the number of piles (from 30 to 20) and the type of pile materials to reduce the concern of presence of exotic species. However, the Commission finds that these proposed adjustments do not sufficiently mitigate the potential harm to the resource areas caused by the increase in exotic species associated with the change from a seasonal dock to a permanent one.
9. The Commission has relied historically and with confidence on the Shellfish report prepared by the Town’s Shellfish Biologist. In this application, the Town’s shellfish biologist, Elizabeth Lewis, stated that the existing pier was approved as seasonally when standing stock was not even present and now there is a standing stock of softshells in the intertidal zone but the habitat is also suitable for quahogs at the deeper depths. She does not support the relocation of the pier (this is the first

proposed pier layout) and a permanent pier. She also included the shellfish report prepared by Thomas Marcotti, the Town's shellfish biologist dated August 20, 2006. The Commission finds that the testimony of the Town's shellfish biologist is supported by the weight of the evidence and a waiver from the 30-inch rule is not warranted.

10. The public comments had concerns with the proposed pier relocation and extension as permanent pier, and the motor size for potential of prop dredging to the bottom of substrates. There is no public comment in support of this application

Decision:

In consideration of all of the evidence presented, including weighing those facts presented by the applicant and his representative in a light most favorable to the applicant, the Commission finds that the evidence fails to support the presumption favoring seasonal piers.

Accordingly, this application is hereby denied under MGL Ch 131, Section 40, and Chapter 703 under Town of Barnstable Chapter 237 in the interest of protecting the land, and land under water containing shellfish and for protection of recreation areas at said location. The seasonal pier, as previously approved under SE3-4545 shall remain in full force and effect.

A motion was made to approve the finding and decision.

Seconded and voted by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Sampou

Nay - Morin

VI. CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE (ez = no deviations, staff recommends approval)

(* = on-going conditions)

A. 923 Cape View LLC. 923 Sea View Ave, Osterville	SE3-5527	(COC, ez)	Update existing beach house. Coastal Beach, Coastal Bank
B. Wianno Club Holes 3-7 & 10	SE3-5414	(COC, ez)	Drainage Improvements on Coastal Bank, Shrub Swamp

A motion was made to approve A & B.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Gillmore, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay

A motion was made to adjourn.

Seconded and voted unanimously by roll call.

Aye – Abodeely, Foster, Hearn, Lee, Morin, Sampou

Nay

The time was 10:44 p.m.