

Planning Board,

We are direct neighbors of 22 Howe Street and submit the following for your consideration.

We have lived in Hingham for 22 years and we enjoy being good neighbors. We share a very long fence with the applicant and we look forward to getting to know them. The clearcutting of every tree on their property has negatively affected our enjoyment of our property this summer. Nearly every house in our neighborhood has very large overstory deciduous trees that provide privacy, shade, noise reduction, wind mitigation, and stormwater control. While their proposed Landscape Plan shows that they intend to mitigate these issues by planting new trees, we do not believe that their plan and the intended replacement trees are sufficient.

In 2020 our Town voted to have a Tree Preservation Study Committee work to identify the best way to encourage the preservation, protection, and promotion of trees in our town. The Planning Board changed the Zoning By-Law in 2022 to address our community's concerns. Applying for Site Plan Review is the trigger meant to protect these valuable trees.

The applicant removed nearly every tree on the lot including 2 Significant Trees and likely 11 Protected Trees on May 22, 2026 prior to applying for Site Plan Review.

Comments/Questions

- Landscape Plan: Trees Marked as "Existing Tree to Be Removed" were all removed on May 22, 2026 - needs correction and perhaps recalculation of tree caliper inch removed.
- Landscape Plan: The applicant is required to submit a Tree Protection and Mitigation Plan for Protected Trees as part of Site Plan Review. I don't see the Protected and Significant trees identified on the Landscape Plan. Please ask the applicant to prepare/correct this submission.
- Landscape Plan: Can the landscape plan be revised to show the actual canopies for the new trees on their planting dates? Or alternatively can the plan be revised to show the future year on which the trees will be the sizes shown on the plan? For example, a 3" caliper red oak only has a canopy of 3-5 feet.
- The applicant's clearcutting of the lot violated the requirements to preserve and protect Significant and Protected Trees. Is there an additional planting requirement for each Significant Tree (36") that was removed? How will you address this after the fact since they have already been removed?
- We would ask that the applicant replant trees larger than the 3" caliper dbh minimum.
- We would ask that the applicant plant Green Giants larger than 7'-8'.
- The applicant did not preserve existing vegetation (6)(d) and did not limit clearing of the development envelope for the sports court (6)(e).
- Please require the applicant to comply with all provisions of (8)(e) Maintenance of Protected and Replacement Trees notwithstanding our current drought conditions.
- Can the applicant please describe the intended use of the "accessory shed"?
- Can you please require additional noise and light mitigation (perhaps planting of Green Giants) around the sports court?

- Can you please confirm that the lights on the sports court comply with zoning and maintain privacy for all neighbors?

Regardless of intent (we don't believe the applicant intended to violate the Zoning By-Law), the applicant should be required to replant more than the minimum trees because their actions have removed many, many more trees than likely would have been allowed had they sought permission. This can be accomplished with a combination of larger trees and/or more trees. We would like to regain some of the privacy and noise mitigation that we previously enjoyed as quickly as possible.

Many thanks for your hard work and consideration of our questions and requests.

Neil Smith and Jennifer GaySmith
6 Westview Circle