

**From:** Jacob Murray <jrmurray028@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 16, 2025 2:48 PM

**To:** Martha Taylor <m.taylor@newburyma.gov>; Planning Director <PlanningDirector@newburyma.gov>; Assistant Planner <assist.planner@newburyma.gov>

**Subject:** 34 Central Street

Hi Martha, Kristin, and Daniel,

I am an abutter to the project at 34 Central Street and also a Civil Site Engineer. I just began to review the plans and reports for 34 Central Street and as I reviewed the peer review letter there are some huge glaring omissions in the filing. So much so that I don't want to waste my time reviewing the submission before these are corrected. The peer review includes a lot of them, but I will highlight them:

- The plans are at 40 scale and not 20 scale and do not show enough detail to be properly reviewed.
- The septic system does not have nearly enough test pits to meet the requirements so it can't be reviewed.
- No reserve area for the leaching system is shown. This will take up the same size as the proposed active leaching system. This location could greatly alter the design of the entire site and needs to be shown. It is not possible to review the entire project without this.
- The drainage analysis is missing 3 of the 8 storm analyses.
- The stormwater retention areas have only one and zero test pits. Given the size and ledge on site there should be at least 6 in each.
- I can't see how there will be 2' of groundwater separation in the bioretention area so close to the wetlands, yet there are no test pits in this system.
- The drainage analysis does not break down how each of the 9 MA DEP standards are met. Is infiltration met? Is water quality met? No details are given. There is no Stormwater Checklist.
- The narrative is one page. This should be a detailed narrative showing how each of the criteria of the Site Plan Review regulations are met. The applicant has supplied none of this.
- No table is provided showing how the site meets MBTA bylaws. This is critical to the project.
- There are numerous gaps in the grading.
- The architectural plans do not match how the buildings are graded out.

- The applicant is proposing a 15' cut in ledge. How is this to be done? Blasting? Is there a blasting plan?
- There is no 10' separation between water and sewer lines, an industry standard for the last 50 years.
- It looks like the detention areas are being used to mitigate the 100 Year Storm with 2' separation to groundwater table. If this is so a mounding analysis is needed for the detention basins.
- I ask that the Town have the traffic study peer reviewed as this is a very dangerous curve with an existing road (Central Court) nearby and it needs to be done correctly.
- Has the Town considered rerouting the end of Central Court as part of this project through the Town land to the north?

In summary, the plans and reports and narratives are well, well short of being sufficient enough to be properly reviewed and commented on. Please have the applicant revise them so we can have a thoughtful thorough review. Any review at this point in time will be unproductive since there are so many large deficiencies.

I cannot make the meeting tonight as I have a Cons Com meeting in western MA. Please feel free to read my email at the public meeting.

Your Truly,

Jacob R. Murray, PE LEED AP

15 Parker River Drive, Byfield, MA