



**Town of Barnstable  
Conservation Commission**  
230 South Street  
Hyannis Massachusetts 02601

Office: 508-862-4093

E-mail: [conservation@town.barnstable.ma.us](mailto:conservation@town.barnstable.ma.us)

**MINUTES – CONSERVATION COMMISSION HEARING**

**DATE: February 17, 2026 @ 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.

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 live via Xfinity Channel 8 or high definition Channel 1072. It may also be accessed via the Government Access Channel live stream on the Town of Barnstable's website: <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.

**Remote Participation Instructions**

<https://townofbarnstable-us.zoom.us/j/84900233850>

**Meeting ID: 849 0023 3850**

**US Toll-free • 888 475 4499**

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 [Edwin.Hoopes@town.barnstable.ma.us](mailto:Edwin.Hoopes@town.barnstable.ma.us), so that they may be displayed for remote public access viewing.

Public comment is also welcome by emailing [Edwin.Hoopes@town.barnstable.ma.us](mailto:Edwin.Hoopes@town.barnstable.ma.us). Comments should be submitted at least 8hrs prior to the hearing.

Conservation Commission meeting materials are available through Laserfiche. Links to application materials can be accessed [HERE](#).

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair F. P. (Tom) Lee. Also, in attendance were Vice-Chair/Clerk Angela Tangney, Commissioners Abodeely, DeMelo, Hearn, Kaschuluk, and Sampou.

Conservation Administrator Ed Hoopes and Administrative Assistant Kim Cavanaugh were also present.

**I. REQUESTS FOR DETERMINATION**

- A. Pamela Robertson.** Remove and replace the existing deck located at the back of the property for a new 20 x 30' deck at 70 Maple Street, West Barnstable as shown on Assessor's Map 132 Parcel 021-002. **DA-26014**

There was no representative in attendance for the hearing.

The item was tabled until the end of the meeting.

Taken at end of meeting

No representative attended the hearing.

Issues discussed:

- There were no questions from Commissioners.

Public comment: None

A motion was made to approve the project as a negative determination.  
Seconded.

Aye – Abodeely, DeMelo, Hearn, Kaschuluk Lee, Sampou, Tangney  
Nay –

- B. Donna Hardy.** Install 22 Push Piers along the right side and in front of main home (interior) and install five foundation Push Piers along south main side of garage (exterior) and replace eight existing deck supports at 726 South Main Street, Centerville as shown on Assessor’s Map 086 Parcel 082. **DA-26015**

Commissioner Kaschuluk recused himself from this application.

The applicant was represented by Masoud Ssaed and Carlos Linera of Groundworks.

Issues discussed:

- Push Piers are similar to helical piles.
- The only ones being used outside the structure are at the garage.
- The process for installation was reviewed.
- The estimated depth is between 4 and 8 feet. In some instances, they can go down 15 feet.
- The contractor has done these on the Cape in the past.
- They go down until they hit load bearing strata.
- The company provides a lifetime warranty on the piers.
- There are no environmental issues to be considered.
- They are galvanized and designed not to rust or rot.
- The deck is also sinking into the ground. Ten jacks will be installed under the deck to lift the deck.
- The footings under the jacks will be a hard plastic material.
- The site was a hole which was filled in and a house was built on it.
- There is concern that water may start coming up once they start digging.
- The resource area off the deck side is a wood retaining wall. The wall is not part of the project.
- The project will not affect the retaining wall.
- No work is being done beyond the deck.

Public comment: None

A motion was made to approve the project as a negative determination.  
Seconded.

Aye – Abodeely, DeMelo, Hearn, Lee, Sampou, Tangney  
Nay –

## **II. NOTICES OF INTENT**

- A. Robert J. IV & Thomas P. Remmes.** Removal of brick paver patio, installation of permeable paver patio and fire pit within 50’ buffer at 536 Shootflying Hill Road, Centerville as shown on Assessor’s Map 193 Parcel 029. **SE3-6342**

The applicant was represented by Michael Malynowski of Allen & Major Associates along with the owners.

Issues discussed:

- Dimensions for the existing paver patio area need to be added to the plan.
- The species selected for the mitigation are not normally used.
- The mitigation needs to be put in the 50’ buffer.
- The plant variety is not sufficient.

- There are a lot of places that are showing mulch.
- A revised plan is needed to show a better distribution of the mitigation.
- This application is the result of an Enforcement Order. The patio and walkway would not be approved if this were a new NOI application.
- The pathway needs to be removed and a lot of mitigation added along the water for the patio.
- There is approximately two feet of vegetation along the lake.
- The property owner addressed the Commissioners:  
The location of the mitigation was to help any runoff coming down the driveway.  
The consultant advised the pavers are permeable.
- Commissioner Hearn responded that it is more than dealing with running water. Vegetation provides a filter for nutrients.
- Owner advised under the patio section no vegetation was able to grow.

Commissioners continued:

- A better plan needs to be submitted.
- The area to the west side would not be approved.
- It is essential to put mitigation between the deck and the lake.
- A continuance is needed.
- The location and type of species should be revised.
- The walkway from the front door to where the patio is, is egregiously wide. Some type of stepping stone could be half as wide.
- The consultant requested written comments from Ed.
- A continuance was requested to March 17, 2026.

Public comment:

Guy Tlapa 547 Shootflying Hill Road - The amount of and height of the arborvitaes is a concern for his view. There is a deeded right of way path about ten feet wide that is not shown on the plan. There is a row of shrubs along the path that cuts across the deeded area. The consultant advised there was a hydrangea planted to far into the path that can be removed.

Mr. Tlapa was advised that his concerns are not subject to Conservation jurisdiction. He will contact the owner.

A motion was made to approve the continuance request to March 17, 2026.

Seconded.

Aye – Abodeely, DeMelo, Hearn, Kaschuluk Lee, Sampou, Tangney

Nay –

**B. Gregory J. & Julianne P. Pinto, Trustees - JDC Ocean Avenue Realty Trust.** Proposed management of invasive phragmites at 47, 57 & 63 Ocean Avenue, Centerville as shown on Assessor's Map 226 Parcels 035, 036, and 149. **SE3-6360**

The applicant was represented by John O'Dea, P.E. of Sullivan Engineering and Consulting.

Issues discussed:

- The project will be ongoing.
- In places where there is marsh grass some hand cutting will be done.
- The mowing will not occur in these locations.
- The owners want a healthy marsh. They do not want the phragmites taking it over.
- There is no plan for subdividing the property.

- It is a great project.
- Monitoring reports should be submitted.
- They are good stewards of the land.
- The contractor should be CERP Certified.
- A management plan should be submitted to Conservation for review and approval a month before they begin work.
- A question was raised on why the contractor has to be CERP Certified.
- There is a very limited pool of CERP's.
- A certain type of training is required to be CERP certified.
- A licensed and qualified pesticide applicator could be considered.
- Not everyone who has a pesticide applicators license is qualified for this type of project.
- Because they are working in a wetland they should be CERP Certified.
- If in the buffer they can consider other qualifications.
- Because they are licensed pesticide applicators does not mean they have the knowledge of the plant species.
- Should Ed be responsible for making sure someone is qualified.
- There needs to be some criteria established for Ed to use.
- For this project they should be CERP Certified.
- Ed is willing to work with others who are not CERP Certified but he needs some guidelines.

Public comment:

Dr. Geradin - 23 Laurel Lane, is in support of the project. The phragmites have taken over in the area. Whoever did the first project did a good job. People should be encouraged to do these kinds of projects. It will help the native species to re-populate the area. Help for the Pintos should be encouraged.

Special conditions for the project were reviewed:

The CERP Professional should be sent to Ed for approval

A Management Plan for 3 years needs to be submitted

Annual reports to be submitted for three years

Another management plan if extended will be submitted if the project is extended beyond three years.

A motion was made to approve the project with the above conditions.

Seconded.

Aye – Abodeely, DeMelo, Hearn, Kaschuluk Lee, Sampou, Tangney

Nay –

The homeowners were thanked for doing the project.

Commissioner Demelo will draft some considerations for allowing other contractors.

### III. CONTINUANCES

- A. Ocean Gate Condominium.** To increase sand behind the seawall to 7' from the existing 5.5' and addition of four stairs going toward the water at 21 Hawes Avenue, Hyannis as shown on Assessor's Map 323 Parcel 002. **SE3-6353 Continued from 2/10/26. WC Form received.**

The applicant was represented by Roy Okurowski, P.E. of WRS Engineering.

Issues discussed:

- The NHESP letter dated February 12, 2026 was acknowledged.
- The sand will be 7 inches, not 7 feet.
- A question was asked if bringing in the sand is going to fix the problem.
- The water comes over the wall. It is a serious problem in the area.

- Consultant is requesting the Order of Conditions saying they can restore the sand in perpetuity.
- Sand could be put on top of the wall which could be washed over the wall in a storm.
- Sand could be brought in every other year.
- Fixing the stairs will not fix the sand problem.
- The top of the seawall is 7'. A higher seawall would help.
- It was suggested to the owner but they did not want to go that route at this time.
- Will the sand be flat with the wall or will there be a berm.
- Extra sand could be added but it will all be taken away.
- This will not solve the problem. It is better than what is there now.
- They can come back and ask for an extension but it should not be issued in perpetuity.
- The NHESP letter was read into record.

Public comment: None

A motion was made to approve the project as submitted.

Seconded.

Aye – Abodeely, DeMelo, Hearn, Kaschuluk Lee, Sampou, Tangney

Nay –

#### **IV. MINUTES**

##### A. February 3, 2026

A motion was made to accept the minutes as submitted.

Seconded.

Aye – Abodeely, DeMelo, Hearn, Kaschuluk Lee, Sampou, Tangney

Nay

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded.

Aye – Abodeely, DeMelo, Hearn, Kaschuluk Lee, Sampou, Tangney

Nay

The time was 8:09 p.m.

**Upcoming Meetings:**

<b>Month</b>	<b>6:30 P. M.</b>	<b>3:00 PM</b>
March	3, 31	17
April	14, 28	21
May	12, 26	19