

---

June 10, 2020

Ms. Loni Fournier, Senior Planner  
Hingham Conservation Commission  
210 Central Street  
Hingham, MA 02043

**RE: Notice of Intent (File # SE-034-1364)  
23 Isaac Sprague Drive, Massachusetts  
Staff review responses**

Dear Commission members,

On behalf of our client, Trevor Byrne, please find the responses addressing the comments from the Conservation Commission's staff. Our responses are below the comments in italics. Revisions to the plans are as follows:

1. Is a separate landscaping plan still forthcoming or does your revised plan include all of the proposed landscaping?

*The Landscape Plan is included in this submission. My plan shows the buffer zone enhancement and mitigation tree plantings, and the landscaper's plan depicts more of the upland and pool/patio plantings.*

2. Would it be possible to lighten the color of the existing trees in the front yard to make the replacement trees more identifiable?

*The existing trees have been lightened, as requested.*

3. The project will be in front of the Sewer Commission on June 11<sup>th</sup>. Please keep us in the loop on the discussion/outcome of that meeting. I may include a draft condition for the Conservation Commission to review, relative to needing the Sewer Commission's approval before work within the easement can begin.

*We will keep you advised as to the outcome of the meeting. I'm sure a condition relative to the Sewer Commission's approval would be acceptable.*

4. Regarding the level of clearing that's noticeable on the 2017—18 aerial imagery, I still find it rather alarming, but at this point, there's no easy way to quantify what was removed (specific number of trees and their health at the time), which also makes it challenging to identify an after-the-fact remedy. It will ultimately be up to the Commission to decide whether this work warrants any further discussion.

*Some unsafe trees were removed, no grading changes were made. Some clearing of poison ivy (the family is highly allergic) and new lawn areas were planted. In a good faith effort, two (2) additional trees will be planted.*

5. Do the values in the Buffer Zone Impacts table represent existing or proposed conditions? The lawn values, in particular, are what confused me, as much of the area is currently maintained as lawn and no new lawn within 50' of either resource area would be allowed.

*These impact values represent the proposed condition. There is far more lawn areas within the 50' buffer zones under the existing condition.*

6. Additional info is still needed on the pool house foundation, but I understand that Trevor is working with his contractors on this. In terms of stormwater management, I will recommend the use of drip edge stone trenches or splash guards for downspouts. I think drywells would be excessive, especially since they would be located in the 50' buffer zone and immediately adjacent to an area that was constructed to handle stormwater.

*We have relocated the future (Phase II) pool house approximately 8' further out of the buffer zone. The areas of slab construction versus foundation wall have been added and clarified on the revised plan. The roof runoff will be handled via downspouts and splash guards and these notes have also been added to the plan.*

7. Please add dimensions and a label to the blank rectangle next to the pool house, as I understand from Trevor that will also be utilized as part of the pool house.

*This area has been clarified with notations and dimensions, as requested.*

8. Please delete the pergola lable if the structure is no longer part of the proposal.

*The pergola and labels have been removed, as requested.*

9. Regarding mitigation (#10 from my original comments), are 11 bushes in 550 sqft of landscaping beds (from the Buffer Zone Impacts table) the only mitigation being proposed? In order to meet the Commission's recent requirements, at least 1,516 sqft would need to be included in the plan (120 sqft (2:1) + 1396 sqft (1:1), for "pool/structures" in Buffer Zone Impacts table).

*We have added additional planting areas (beds) and buffer zone enhancement plantings, as requested. The total area of mitigation is 1,100 s.f.*

10. Finally, did make another site visit to try and sort the IVW flaggin/fence/property line issue. I measured between the second drainage swale flag (DS2) and the nearest IVW flag and got roughly 57' so, in terms of the resource area and their buffer zones, I'm comfortable with what the plan depicts. However, I am still confused by the relationship between the fence and the property line. I'll pass along the attached images for your reference. You may be familiar with "georeferencing" plans within ArcGIS. I attempted to do that with your plan, using various anchor points, which are numbered in the attached. Despite my best efforts, I couldn't get all of the main features on your plan to match up with the aerial imagery and at no point was I able to see the fence running askew, as your plan depicts. Whether that's a coordinate system issue or something else, I'm not sure. It's confusing and frustration, but also admittedly, beyond the scope of my review here.

*We have reviewed the data and information you have provided. We believe there may be a difference between coordinate systems and that would explain the rotational differences.*

*Lastly, we feel we have improved the plan considerably, in that we have proposed less building footprint area, managed to decrease the tree removal, added more tree replacements and increased the buffer zone enhancement quantities.*

Please contact our office if you have any questions regarding these revisions.

Respectfully submitted,  
J.K. Holmgren Engineering, Inc.

S. Scott Rogers, ASLA

S. Scott Rogers, ASLA

John K. Holmgren, P.E.

John K. Holmgren, P.E.