

**Joseph J. Serwatka, P.E.**  
**Post Office Box 1016**  
**North Andover, MA 01845**  
**978-314-8731**

February 25, 2024

Ms. Lisa Pearson, Director  
Salisbury Department of Community Development  
Town Hall  
Salisbury, MA 01952

Re: 159 Beach Road  
Definitive Plan Review

Dear Ms. Pearson:

I have received Definitive Subdivision Plans (6 sheets dated 12/5/23); Drainage Report dated December 14, 2023; application for approval of definitive plan, and letter dated February 6, 2024, all for 159 Beach Road, prepared by Civil Design Consultants, Inc. I have reviewed the submitted material and offer the following comments:

Sheet C-3, Definitive Subdivision Plan

1. The plan shows two proposed lots, which would typically be created with an ANR plan. The board may want to question why a "definitive subdivision" has been submitted.
2. The plan notes that "no development or conveyance" of a portion of the land on both lots can occur until the land is removed from land court. The board may want the applicant to address whether this has been completed.

Sheet C-4, Grading, Drainage & Utilities Plan

1. A 60' by 40' dwelling, which may not be the actual size, is depicted on each lot. No stairs, decks or patios are shown. The board may want more definitive information as to the dwelling size and design.
2. The dwellings are depicted about 12' off the property line, which does not allow for vehicles to be parked in the driveways without extending into the Old County Road layout. The board may want the plan to depict driveways of adequate depth to allow for vehicles to be parked entirely on the lot.
3. The sewer design is not adequate, in my opinion. The proposed sewer manhole should be located on the site, with both 4" laterals contained within the lots, rather than running along Beach Road. An easement may be required on lot 2 for the lot 1 sewer lateral.
4. The plan depicts porous pavement driveways extending into Old County Road. The DPW may require the driveway aprons in Old County Road to be typical bituminous concrete pavement.
5. The plan shows that much of the existing wooded area will remain on lot 2, but it also shows the proposed water/sewer services running through the wooded area. If the intent is to preserve the trees, it would be advisable to bring the water/sewer services in from Old County Road.
6. The plan appears to show that one existing tree in Old County Road will need to be removed to install the lot 2 driveway.
7. Project note 15 states that "no building permit for any new dwelling shall be granted by the building inspector until the base course of the roadway pavement to serve each unit has been completed to the satisfaction of the planning board". As no roadway is proposed, the engineer should explain what is meant by the note.

8. Project note 16 states that “construction shall not result in the net loss of soil material from the site”. The soil test pits indicate 6-6.5 feet of fill on lot 2 that may have to be removed for the construction of the dwelling and roof drywell system. The engineer should address whether the note applies.

#### Sheet C-5, Construction Plan

1. Project note 16 again states that “construction shall not result in the net loss of soil material from the site”, but note 18 states that “all earth removal shall comply with the regulations and the town of Salisbury’s by-law requirements”. The engineer should address whether the notes are correct.
2. Project note 17 requires that planning board’s engineer to approve any soil or earth material brought to the site. Typically any fill material must comply with the regulations or engineer’s specs.
3. The proposed limit of work should exclude the proposed wooded area to remain on lot 2.

#### Drainage Report

1. Watershed maps should be submitted so that the report can be reviewed, as would be typical.
2. The submitted Checklist for Stormwater Report should be stamped and signed by a professional engineer, as required.
3. The checklist states that the project is a redevelopment, but the calculations states that it does not meet the criteria for redevelopment. The engineer should correct this discrepancy.

Should you have any questions relative to this letter, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Serwatka, P.E.