

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, February 15, 2011**  
**Town Hall, 120 Main Street**  
**7.00 PM**

1 Present: J. Simons, R. Rowen, M. Colantoni, R. Glover, C. LaVolpicelo, T. Seibert

2 Absent:

3 Staff Present: J. Tymon, J. Enright

4 Meeting began at 7:02

5 **POSTPONEMENT**

6 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: 125 Flagship Drive,** Application for Wireless Facilities Special Permit-Site  
7 Plan Review. Proposal for construction of a 140 foot multi-carrier wireless tower, with associated equipment at the  
8 base of the tower and the installation of 9 panel antennas with associated equipment cabinets in the Industrial 1  
9 zoning district.

10

11 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

12 **Gerry Brown:** Discussed C. Foster's proposed zoning change regarding two-family dwelling units in the R-4  
13 District.

14 **J. Tymon:** C. Foster has proposed a change to the Zoning change for the R4 District. He would like the zoning  
15 changed making pre-existing two family houses 'as of right' so that in the case of modifications or additions they  
16 would not have to go to the ZBA for relieve.

17 **G. Brown,** Inspector of Buildings Town of North Andover, stated that C. Foster had brought this to the Zoning  
18 Board of Appeals and to the Town Planner. The petition is really not something we need to do because everything  
19 prior to the date of the Zoning change was as a matter of right and what exists exists and anything after the date of  
20 the Town Meeting when the Zoning was changed to require the Special Permit have been either getting Special  
21 Permits or being denied. C. Foster states that he thinks it could be interpreted differently and I do not think it can. I  
22 do not think a change needs to be made. I believe what is being asked for is already there.

23

24 **Street Acceptance:** Carter Field Road, Tom Zahoruiko

25 **Tom Zahoruiko:** Has been working through the paperwork since October with Public Works, DPW, and Town  
26 Counsel. Is expecting to have it complete by Town Meeting. Wanted to make sure that the Board doesn't have any  
27 issues or concerns specifically that he can address in the meantime.

28 **J. Simons:** Just make sure the required punch list gets done.

29 **J. Tymon:** Has met with DPW, Town Counsel and it is on the Warrant.

30 **R. Rowen:** As long as everything on the punch list is complete we would recommend acceptance. There is no  
31 reason that we wouldn't.

32

33 **1627 Osgood Street:** Tom Murtha is proposing to open a veterinarian office within the CDD3 Zoning  
34 District.

35 **J. Tymon:** The veterinarian office is an allowed use within the CDD3 District. The applicant, Tom  
36 Murtha, is proposing a small addition to the back of the existing building which would put the building a  
37 little over the 3,000 square foot threshold. In the CDD3 District there is a Special Permit requirement for  
38 "no building in excess of 3000 sq. ft should be constructed, reconstructed, erected, or altered. I have asked  
39 him to come before the Board to see if he can get the Board to agree to waive that requirement.  
40 Previously the building was used as a Union office building. I asked the applicant to come before the  
41 Board to see if CDD Special Permit could be waived.

42 **R. Rowen:** Can we in fact waive it?

43 **T. Murtha:** Has been a veterinarian last 25 years. Primarily does surgery and would like to open a  
44 general veterinarian practice and surgical referral practice.

45 **J. Simons:** How big is the building now and how big will it be?

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, February 15, 2011**  
**Town Hall, 120 Main Street**  
**7.00 PM**

46 T. Murtha: Right now it is 2,900 sq. ft. Depending how you interpret the bylaw I didn't think it qualified  
47 for the requirement of the Special Permit since it says 3,000 sq. ft. or more. It doesn't say if that is when  
48 it is started or when it is finished. I want to put approx. a 560 sq. ft. addition on which brings it up to  
49 about 3460 sq. ft.

50 J. Simons: It is property that is currently zoned for that. Does it fall under Site Plan Review? Is it a  
51 business use currently?

52 J. Tymon: It is an allowed use. It does not fall under Site Plan Review, the addition is not large enough,  
53 and it is not consider a change of use. It has been rezoned as CDD3 and it was previously business use  
54 (professional office) not a residential use.

55 R. Rowen: It is only a positive. It is good for the Town.

56 J. Simons: The only issue is that you don't want a circumstance that someone has a 2,000 sq. ft. building  
57 and wants to put a 10,000 sq. ft. addition on and we say the starting point is less that the 3,000 sq. ft.  
58 That is the only concern I would have. Unless there is clearly something that doesn't permit this I am ok  
59 with it.

60 R. Rowen: It is less than a 25% increase in size.

61 T. Seibert: Not changing anything on the facade that you see from the street, there is not height issue, and  
62 there is plenty of parking.

63 J. Simons: Asked for a sense of the Board that this project is ok and does not require a Special Permit.

64 **MOTION**

65 R. Rowen made a motion to express that sense. The motion was seconded by M. Colantoni. The vote  
66 was unanimous.

67  
68 **0 Methuen Ave**: Walter and Scott Eriksen to discuss road improvement/access plan for 0 Methuen Ave,  
69 Lot 30.

70 J. Tymon: There have been applications for roadway improvements for Methuen Ave. in the past. One was  
71 withdrawn without prejudice and one was an application for a duplex. Currently Methuen Ave is partially paved,  
72 but not paved to this lot. My advice to the applicant was to apply for a Definitive Subdivision for roadway  
73 improvement to get access to this lot. They are looking to build a single family.

74 Walter Erikson, Built Best Construction: Showed a visual of how far in from Sutton Street the road is paved and the  
75 surrounding house locations. Proposing to apply to DPW to extend the road 98' and construct a driveway to access  
76 the one house lot. The application will be for a conforming single family home. The house in the back will  
77 continue to access via Wood Ave. The lot already exists as a lot. It was two lots previously and in now one lot.  
78 The road and driveway would be maintained by the applicant.

79 R. Rowen: Is there drainage in the existing paved piece?

80 W. Erikson: There is some drainage. We will be putting in rooftop drains and an infiltration system. The house is  
81 26x36 with a two car garage.

82 J. Tymon: Have the wetlands been recently flagged and has Conservation reviewed them?

83 W. Erikson: Yes, and Conservation has issued an Order of Resource Delineation.

84 J. Tymon: If they do submit an application there should be a drainage review by L. Eggleston.

85 W. Erikson: We will submit it for roadway improvement.

86

87 **BOND RELEASE**

88 **1025 Osgood Street**: John Grasso is requesting two bonds for the 'Treadwell's Site' totaling \$13K be released.

89 J. Tymon: There are two bonds for an as-built---Site Plan Review \$10,000 and Watershed Special Permit \$3,000 for  
90 1025 Osgood St. A site inspection has been completed and everything is in good order and we have an as-built.

91 The OOC was approved by the Conservation Commission. There was a requirement in the Site Plan Review  
92 application for a water quality testing program in the Decision; however, these reports were not found in the file.

93 The testing was required for the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) and the CO was issued years ago. It was not  
94 required for the bond releases. There is also a \$5K bond that is in perpetuity for this project.

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, February 15, 2011**  
**Town Hall, 120 Main Street**  
**7.00 PM**

95 R. Rowen: The bond was for site opening and the site is open.  
96 J. Simons: If they have done everything that they are required to do for the bonds then we should release the bonds.

97 **MOTION**

98 A motion was made by R. Rowen to release the site opening bonds for the ‘Treadwell’s Site’, 1025 Osgood Street.  
99 The motion was seconded by R. Glover and the vote was unanimous.

100

101 **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

102 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: 58 Country Club Circle**, Donald Stanley is requesting a  
103 Modification to a Watershed Special Permit in order to finish the interior of a detached garage and to connect the  
104 garage to water and sewer through existing connections between the garage and the house.

105 J. Tymon: Distributed a draft Decision for review.

106 **MOTION**

107 R. Rowen made a motion to close the Public Hearing for 58 Country Club Circle. The motion was seconded by T.  
108 Seibert. The vote was unanimous.

109 **MOTION:**

110 R. Rowen made a motion to approve the Special Permit Modification for 58 Country Club Circle, as amended this  
111 evening. The motion was seconded by T. Seibert. The vote was unanimous.

112

113 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: Dale Street Athletic Field**, The Town of North Andover is  
114 requesting a Watershed Special Permit to construct an athletic field and parking area outside of 100’ buffer to BVW.

115 J. Tymon: The project engineer has submitted a more detailed plan and a written overview of the stormwater  
116 management system.

117 J. Tymon: Reviewed updates that have been made to the plan since last meeting. The information has been  
118 reviewed by Gene Willis and he has said that he does not have any issues with the proposed plan. At the last  
119 meeting an issue regarding safety around the detention pond was discussed. It was suggested that a fence might be  
120 needed at certain points. That is something we may want to look at once it is constructed.

121 T. Zahoruiko, Fields Committee, the depth of the detention pond and the amount of water that would be held is  
122 much less than we discussed at the last meeting. There is a perimeter fence all the way around the field separating in  
123 from any of the drainage facilities. This fence provides a barrier around the playing surface and the active recreation.

124 R. Rowen: So balls aren’t going to go out into Dale Street routinely?

125 T. Zahoruiko: It is a multi-purposed athletic field which will hold varying sports. The balls are not typically kicked  
126 out the side of the field. That is why the parking lot is located where it is---for safety purposes.

127 J. Simons: I think it is simple enough that we can build it and then make minor adjustments based on experience out  
128 there.

129 J. Tymon: handed out a draft Decision for the Board to review.

130 **MOTION**

131 T. Seibert made a motion to close the Public Hearing for the Town Athletic Field for 0 Dales Street. The motion  
132 was seconded by R. Glover. The vote was unanimous.

133 **MOTION**

134 T. Seibert made a motion to approve the Watershed Special Permit for 0 Dale Street from the Fields Committee, as  
135 amended this evening. The motion was seconded by M. Colantoni. The vote was unanimous.

136

137 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: 1003 OSGOOD ST.** Watershed Special Permit and Site Plan Review  
138 Special Permit for construction of a new 21,000 sq. ft. restaurant/office/retail building.

139 J. Tymon: The new plan with the barn staying in its current position has been submitted. The project has been  
140 reviewed by VHB and L. Eggleston. All of L. Eggleston’s concerns have been resolved. The architectural design  
141 and comments from VHB, including traffic flow within the site, will be reviewed tonight. A fire truck access plan  
142 was submitted and is being reviewed by the Fire Department. Questioned what type of delivery trucks would be on  
143 site and if there is enough queuing space?

144 Chris Tymula, Civil Engineer was present along with J. Grasso, developer, and D. Annino, architect, J. Smolak,  
145 attorney.

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, February 15, 2011**  
**Town Hall, 120 Main Street**  
**7.00 PM**

146 C. Tymula: The plan submitted is the same as the last meeting. The primary changes are relative to stormwater.  
147 Reviewed the major changes to the stormwater plan. Addressed each of the seven comments from VHB.  
148 R. Rowen: Is the barn still proposed for restaurant use?  
149 C. Tymula: Yes, the design has not changed.  
150 R. Glover: Any changes to the parking at 1025 Osgood Street?  
151 C. Tymula: No, previously there was a proposal to reduce some parking spaces but not any more.  
152 D. Annino, Architect, Annino Incorporated: Reviewed the proposed architectural design and materials proposed.  
153 Presented two options for the color of the barn and exterior of the building. Requested the Boards opinion of the  
154 options.  
155 The Board had mixed opinions on the color scheme.  
156 J. Tymon: There is a member of the Historical Commission here to see the project. Because of the age of the  
157 building there are demolition permits that have been requested by the applicant and he will have to go before the  
158 Historical Commission.  
159 J. Simons: Stated he thinks that the keeping of the original barn in the exact same location and making it a focal  
160 point of the whole project is a tremendous plus. Keeping the barn intact preserves the key historical feature of this  
161 site.  
162 T. Siebert: Asked if the exterior material is the same as 1025 Osgood Street.  
163 D. Annino: Yes  
164 R. Rowen: stated he preferred the blending of the buildings as opposed to the barn red.  
165 R. Glover: Do you have a snow removal plan? Specifically, for safety reasons, for the front area where the turn in  
166 from the road is located?  
167 C. Tymula: There are snow storage areas along the front and side of the building. It is up to the development group  
168 to maintain good sight lines. There is a note in the plan that excess snow will be hauled off site. There will not be  
169 any snow storage in the back because of the watershed.  
170 C. Tymula: Stated that he did speak with Fred McCarthy, Fire Department, and it was his opinion that the hydrant  
171 located at 1025 Osgood Street would be suffice given that the building would be sprinkled; however, he has to talk  
172 to the Chief about it.  
173 J. Simons: Stated that he thinks we should plan on closing the Public Hearing at the next meeting and that a draft  
174 Decision should be prepared.  
175 J. Tymon: Suggested that she talk to L. Eggleston to see if a water quality testing requirement would be appropriate  
176 for this site as it was included as a condition in the Decision for 1025 Osgood Street.  
177 R. Rowen: Asked to have a clause added to the Emergency Response Plan that the valves are exercised once or  
178 twice a year.  
179 Kathy Szyska, Chairman NA Historical Commission: The house is much older than the barn. The Historical  
180 Commission is one of the sign offs for the project. Explained that the applicant has to come before the Historical  
181 Commission for demolition and explained the criteria for the 12 month demolition delay. Provided some history of  
182 the house.  
183 T. Seibert: What is the purpose of the delay?  
184 K. Szyska: The delay is to try to find a buyer or to work with the developer so to find an alternative to demolishing  
185 the structure.  
186 T. Seibert: This project has been before us for a long time and it should be recognized that they have been looking  
187 at this for a very long time. They have done a significant study.  
188 J. Simons: The history of this property in terms of development goes back 6 to 8 years. There have been many  
189 proposals and nobody wanted to keep the house and many didn't want to keep the barn. The economics for keeping  
190 the house didn't work. There might be an opportunity to incorporate some piece of the house on the site.  
191 K. Szyska: They still have to come before the Board. Suggested that if a developer is thinking about buying a  
192 historic property in Town they may want to call the Commission first.  
193 R. Rowen: suggested that the Planning Board write a letter providing an outside opinion and some of the history of  
194 what has been reviewed in the past.  
195 J. Smolak, Attorney for the applicant: A demolition permit was pulled by the applicant before the demo bylaw went  
196 into effect and has been extended continuously through until approx. October of last year. The Building Inspector

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, February 15, 2011**  
**Town Hall, 120 Main Street**  
**7.00 PM**

197 has taken the position that since the permit was pulled prior to the enactment of the bylaw that there wouldn't be a  
198 need to go through historic review. As a result of the permit extension act there is an automatic two year life for any  
199 permit that was in effect between Aug 15, 2008 and Aug 15, 2010. This demo permit was in effect during this  
200 period. It is not to say that we wouldn't work with the Historical Commission.

201 K. Szyska: Someone from the Historic Commission spoke to someone at G. Brown's office within the last two  
202 weeks and was told that the permit has expired.

203 T. Seibert: That is what J. Smolak has stated but there is a prevailing law which grants it an automatic extension.  
204 The person that was spoken to at G. Brown's office may not have known that.

205 J. Simon: Believes the applicant is willing to act in good faith to come out with the best reasonable outcome.  
206

207 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: 1679 Osgood Street**, Definitive Subdivision for 8 single-family  
208 residential lots within the R-3 District, submitted by GMZ Realty.

209 J. Tymon: At the last meeting the applicant was asked to provide a yield plan showing the incorporation of the C.  
210 Adam's lot. We do need a signed extension past the end of February. A new set of plans are being submitted that  
211 address issues that L. Eggleston had but there are still a few issues that need to be addressed.

212 J. Coronati: Jones & Beech Engineers, representing GMZ Realty Trust, as well as C. Adams. The yield plan shows  
213 that a standard roadway, cul-de-sac, could be provided with all the lots meeting the zoning requirements. The next  
214 page is a more detailed layout of what we would like to construct. Would like guidance from the Board before  
215 going further. Handed out a list of waivers that would be in conjunction with designing this type of driveway  
216 system rather than a full fledged road. Has received a letter from the Fire Department that says the Department did  
217 not see any issue with this type of design as long as there were markers showing house numbers at the end of the  
218 driveways.

219 J. Simons: You are asking us to waive the construction of a roadway?

220 J. Coronati: Yes, it would remain private.

221 J. Tymon: Instead of us having a Public Hearing for two common driveways the applicant would apply for one  
222 common driveway permit and with the inclusion of the C. Adams lot it becomes a new Public Hearing for the  
223 existing subdivision. We would re-advertise, re-notice for this piece of it.

224 Board: expressed concerns about the design entailing a road off a road and a 12' driveway servicing three homes.

225 J. Tymon: there may need to be a Homeowners Association for maintenance of the structures.

226 J. Smolak, representing C. Adams: We could develop a common driveway easement agreement among the three  
227 property owners to address that. On Dec 21 when we met last we ran this concept by the Board and I asked would  
228 Board agree to this concept if the Fire Department was ok with it and if we could show a proof plan of a full build-  
229 out of a roadway (50' width with a full cul-de-sac) and at that time the Board said yes. I think we have delivered  
230 what the PB had asked for. It may not be an ideal situation but it is the only way to capture that back lot. Otherwise  
231 it is a useless piece of land.

232 R. Rowen: Would the drainage systems be built within the 12' driveway.

233 J. Coronati: No they would be outside of it and would be maintained in the homeowners association.

234 J. Tymon: There is still some discussion with L. Eggleston regarding the large gravel wetland as you enter the  
235 subdivision, on the right. There are only a couple other items. Most have been addressed but I would want to run  
236 this new plan by her again. Next step is to have another notice about the additional lot being added. The common  
237 driveway needs to be noticed as well.

238 J. Smolak: The idea was to keep this hearing open and to supplement the hearing by providing new newspaper  
239 notice and abutter notice indicating the land that is being added.

240 J. Simons: Asked that the extension be signed until the end of April.  
241

242 **MOTION:**

243 R. Rowen: made a motion to accept the extension to the timing of the Decision for 1679 Osgood Street to the end of  
244 April 2011. The motion was seconded by T. Seibert. The vote was unanimous.  
245

246 **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: Amend the Planning Board Regulations**, including applications  
247 and filing fees to accompany the Town of North Andover's Stormwater Bylaw, Chapter 160 of the Town's Bylaw.

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, February 15, 2011**  
**Town Hall, 120 Main Street**  
**7.00 PM**

248 J. Tymon: Had a discussion with L. Eggleston regarding the points that were raised by P. Christiansen at the  
249 previous Planning Board meeting. Many of the points discussed are issues that have been defined in the Bylaw.  
250 With regards to the hydrologic criteria that was used she still feels the TR-55 should still be used. Lisa did make a  
251 proposed change saying that local precipitation data could be added. Lisa also made a suggestion that it is already in  
252 the regulations that for a simple application, we can waive a fee for a smaller applicant and we are allowed not to  
253 have a Public Hearing for a smaller application. There is a lot of leverage for smaller applications that is already in  
254 the regulations.

255 N. Leland, homeowner, 254 Great Pond Road: Has just gone through the Watershed Special Permit process and  
256 dealt with the stormwater requirements. Congratulated the Board for meeting the requirements for the M 4 Permit  
257 by creating a Bylaw. Listened to P. Christiansen at the previous meeting and wanted to support his comments and  
258 concerns. Handed out her concerns and recommendations to be discussed; specifically, the Bylaw and Regulations  
259 going 'over and above' State Stormwater Regulations. The recommendations included: Policy 1) hydrologic and  
260 water quality modeling/monitoring along with cost/benefit analysis to support "over and above", Technical Issues 1)  
261 Regional IDF curves before "throwing out" TP-40 data and 2) Clear and consistent review (design and siting  
262 criteria) for in-house and outside consultant, Procedural 1) Clear and consistent guidelines for waivers and 2) Clear  
263 and consistent guidelines for imposing fees. Would like each recommendation conducted with the help from a  
264 "stakeholders group". Other options: 1) Revise the Bylaw (Federal Standards only) and 2) Keep the Bylaw and  
265 develop/implement regulations in two stages 1<sup>st</sup> Federal standards, 2<sup>nd</sup>) more stringent as needed.

266 J. Smolak: Still concerned about the calculation of the 1" storm in the bylaw that is in excess of the DEP  
267 Stormwater Policy. The DEP put together their stormwater policy with 25 people and hundreds of hours of time and  
268 did the same thing again in 2008. They put in the 1" requirement only for critical areas. Cautioned that if you start  
269 to apply the 1" standard to Subdivisions and Special Permits you are doubling the design size. Thinks that adopting  
270 something that is much more stringent than the DEP standard is a mistake.

271 C. LaVoplicelo agreed that the 1" standard across the board is overkill. It should be tied to the DEP stormwater  
272 policy.

273 **MOTION**

274 A motion was made by R. Rowen to close the Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by M. Conantoni. The  
275 vote was unanimous.

276 **MOTION**

277 A motion was made by R. Rowen to vote on the adoption of the Stormwater Bylaw Regulations, as amended. The  
278 motion was seconded by T. Seibert. The vote was 5-1 with J. Simons, R. Glover, M. Colantoni, T. Seibert, and R.  
279 Rowen voted in favor and C. LaVolpicelo voting against.

280 R. Rowen: noted that even having voted the Board should pay attention and if it doesn't work change it and fix it.  
281

282 **NEW PUBLIC HEARING: 288 Sutton Street** "Mathews Way" Proposal of a Five (5) Lot Definitive  
283 Subdivision.

284 J. Tymon: The Preliminary Plan that was filed did go through review with L. Eggleston, VHB, and Gene Willis.  
285 There were quite a few comments. The plan submitted tonight is new and it hasn't been sent out to the reviewers.

286 J. Smolak, Attorney for the applicant along with G. Saab, Engineer for applicant: We did look first at improving the  
287 adjacent paper street, Ellis Street. As a result of peer review concerns we decided to go with Plan B which is a 5-lot  
288 subdivision proposal. The road would remain private and the associated maintenance would remain private.

289 G. Saab, Engineering and Surveying Services: For the abutter on the corner (Lewis) we added trees along the  
290 property line. Catch basins that the Town Engineer wanted at the intersection of Sutton Street have been put on the  
291 plan and the handicap ramp details are put on the plan. The pond and swale sizes stay the same. The plans also  
292 address all the comments from VHB and L. Eggleston.

293 J. Tymon: will the dwelling units be two-family?

294 J. Smolak: Yes.

295 Sharon Lewis, homeowner, 272 Sutton Street: Asked what changes will be made to Ellis Street.

296 G. Saab: The swale that is there will be cleaned out and the large trees will remain. There will be some smaller  
297 trees dug out with the swale.

298 S. Lewis: What happens to the status of Ellis Street?

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, February 15, 2011**  
**Town Hall, 120 Main Street**  
**7.00 PM**

299 J. Smolak: Explained the ownership and stated it will still be in the ownership of the current owner. It will be part  
300 of the land that is part of the association. You will still be able to use that roadway as it is currently used. It will  
301 continue to be maintained as it is today. The association will not maintain it. Nothing will change from a  
302 functional standpoint. Access rights can not be impeded.

303 S. Lewis: Asked for a legal document for an easement to her property over Ellis Street.

304 J. Smolak: If you want to legitimize the access we can do that through a formal easement.

305 S. Lewis: Are there limits for times of construction for residential projects?

306 J. Tymon: We usually right that into our Decision for commercial projects.

307 R. Rowen: We can right in something that is reasonable.

308

309 Administrative item: J. Tymon asked to have a form signed by the Board to allow her to be the designee to sign for  
310 Land Court.

311

312 **MEETING MINUTES**

313 **MOTION**

314 A motion was made by M. Colantoni to approve the meeting minutes for the Planning Board meeting held on  
315 01/04/2011. The motion was seconded by T. Siebert. J. Simons, R. Glover, C. LaVolpicelo, T. Seibert voted in favor.  
316 R. Rowen did not vote.

317 **ADJOURN**

318 **MOTION**

319 A motion was made by T. Seibert to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by M. Colantoni. The vote  
320 was unanimous.

321

322 The meeting adjourned at 10:10 PM.

323

324 Meeting Materials: Agenda, PB meeting summary notes, 4 pictures of 1025 Osgood Street landscaped areas,  
325 Curriculum Vitae Thomas J. Murtha, III, D.V.M., Draft decision 58 Country Club Circle, Letter submitted by B.  
326 Osgood, Jr., P.E. regarding 0 Dale St Athletic Field, Letter submitted by Town Engineer, Gene Willis, regarding 0  
327 Dale Street Athletic Field, Draft Decision 0 Dale Street, Proposed Site Plan 0 Dale Street, Statement of Water  
328 Quality Impact for 0 Dale Street, Eggleston Environmental letters date Feb. 9, 2011 and Jan. 6, 2011 regarding 1003  
329 Osgood Street, Proposed elevation 1003 Osgood Street, Proposed Site Development Plans for Map 35 Lot 50 1003  
330 Osgood Street, MHF Design consultants, Inc response to L. Eggleston letter submitted by Chris Tymula, Project  
331 Manager, Yield Plan 1679 Osgood Street, Jones & Beech Engineers, Inc letter dated Jan 14, 2011 regarding waiver  
332 requests, Hydrologic and Hydraulic Criteria specifications submitted by L. Eggleston, Stormwater Bylaw Regulations  
333 Response to Public Comment dated 1/18/11, Mathews Way, 288 Sutton St. Definitive Plan---cover sheet, lot  
334 layout, grading & drainage plan, construction plans, L. Eggleston review letter dated 1/20/2011 regarding 288  
335 Sutton Street, Letter submitted by J. Smolak dated 12/17/2010 requesting waivers for 288 Sutton Street, Letter  
336 from Gene Willis dated 1/25/2011 regarding 288 Sutton Street, VHB review report dated 1/25/2011 for 288 Sutton  
337 Street, Proposed site plan for Methuen Ave dated January 14, 2011, Comments regarding NA Stormwater  
338 Management and Erosion Control Regulations dated Feb. 15, 2011 submitted by Nancy and Edmund Leland,  
339 Planning Board Meeting Minute draft for 1/4/2011, Anderson & Kreiger, LLP letter dated 1/14/2011 regarding  
340 Tryder vs. New England Wireless PCS, LLC, et al., Civil Action No. 2009-092070-D, MVPC brochure.