

Agiorgitis, Rachel

From: Tara Thiessen Healey <tarathealey@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 9, 2026 12:56 PM
To: Wentworth, Emily; Agiorgitis, Rachel; Sjostedt, Paula; Planning
Cc: Peter Healey
Subject: 22 Howe Site Plan Review - Public Comment Submission for 8-10-26 Planning Board Meeting

Planning Board,

We are writing with comments for your consideration regarding the upcoming Site Plan Review for 22 Howe St.

We have resided in Hingham for 15 years at 19 Howe St, across the street from 22 Howe.

We look forward to welcoming our new neighbors and, generally, are supportive of their future plans to install a sport court and enjoy their property and this neighborhood to the fullest.

Our main concerns involve ensuring an accurate accounting of the “Existing Trees” that were removed on 22 May 2026, and how an assessment of the applicant’s Tree Protection and Mitigation Plan for Protected Trees, in light of the pre-removal conditions, may provide important justification for appropriately scoped remedies for the applicant’s project moving forward.

Comments:

- The Landscaping Plan appears to be missing “Existing Tree” notations along the southern (Maclean adjacent) property line. Video from 22 May 2026 shows a large tree inside the southern line (near the porta potty) being felled by the tree removal company, PS Tree Service. However, this “Existing Tree” is not shown in the Plan. In addition, before and after photos from that day reflect one or more additional felled trees along that side of the property that should be reflected in the Plan. (Reference photos included below.) PS Tree Service may have records of the number, sizes, and/or locations of felled trees. **Please ask the applicant to correct the Landscaping Plan to account for any missing “Existing Trees”.**
- The Landscaping Plan (see the black and white version at <https://www.hingham-ma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/28595>, *not* the color rendering) appears to show 13 Existing Tree “bubbles” which total 230 caliper inches, but the Plan’s legend indicates just 185 total caliper inches. Additionally, these totals do not include existing trees that may have been missed along the property’s southern line. **We respectfully request that the applicant provide the tree inventory used to calculate the total caliper inches on the Landscape Plan, including the location, species, and DBH of each Existing Tree included in the calculation.** This information would allow the Board and abutters to verify that the Landscape Plan accurately reflects the pre-removal conditions on the property.
- **If a Tree Protection and Mitigation Plan for Protected Trees was required but not submitted, we respectfully request that the applicant provide one.** This step also seems important for identifying the Significant and Protected Trees that were removed, which would seem to bear on site plan review and tree replacement determinations.
- **Please evaluate how the Board would have weighed the applicant’s request to remove all “Existing Trees” from the property.** Please consider also that many of these trees were located on the perimeter of the property.

Should it be the case that many of the applicant's tree removals were unlikely to have been approved by the Board, then we support Board consideration of remedies commensurate with the extent of any noncompliance (i.e. larger/more plantings than would typically be required).

And vice versa, if the Board would likely have approved the applicant's wholesale removal of existing trees, then the impact of any process noncompliance is minimized, and it would seem the applicant's plan might be reviewed on a more straightforward basis against existing Town standards.

- We support the applicant's planned installation of a sport court, but are sensitive to lighting concerns based on awareness of lighting issues with a previous sport court installation in Crow Point. At present, it seems like the lighting is directed down and away from the applicant's house. To the layperson, it is unclear what, if any, impact this lighting location may have on neighboring properties. The proposed fence and trees/plantings may also help address these lighting considerations, but the latter may take some time to grow in order to serve that purpose. **We would appreciate the Board's careful review of the sport court's lighting location and photometric plan to determine no adverse impacts on neighboring properties.**
- We saw remarks in the planning documents to "decrease the number of driveways off of Howe St" and a waiver request to expand the primary driveway to approximately 30' "as the project proposes to consolidate existing parking areas to eliminate a second curb opening on Howe St". We will leave the waiver request to the Board's discretion, but wanted to clarify that there was not previously a second residential driveway on the property. The developer laid gravel in that area to facilitate temporary vehicular access and parking during construction of the new house. **We therefore ask the Board to consider whether elimination of that temporary construction access provides a basis for the requested waiver from the Town's 24' maximum driveway width.**

We appreciate the Board's time in reading these remarks and taking them into consideration as you prepare for the 10 August Planning Board meeting. Thank you for your good work.

Tara and Peter Healey
19 Howe St

REFERENCE PHOTOS (Southern Property Line):



22 May tree removal photo of southern line



8 Aug "after photo" of southern line