



TOWN OF
STONEHAM
MASSACHUSETTS
Town Hall
35 Central Street
Stoneham, Massachusetts 02180
BOARD OF APPEALS
781-279-2695

Stoneham Board of Appeals Minutes
Thursday, November 21, 2024
Town Hall Hearing Room
6:00 PM

Members of the Board present: Chair Tobin Shulman, Vice Chair Robert Saltzman, R. Michael Dufour, Eric Rubin, Kevin McLaughlin and Associate Member William Sullivan.

Also present: Town Clerk Maria Sagarino acting as Clerk to the Board of Appeals, Attorney Charles Houghton, Ian Gasco-Wiggin of JM Corcoran Company, residents of Pond Street, Gorham Ave, Flint Ave & Rowe Street and Attorney Chris Heney.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Tobin Shulman at 6:05 PM. Mr. McLaughlin led the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Shulman introduced the Board and explained the procedure for the public hearings.

The Board confirmed the next meeting dates as December 19th and January 23rd.

Mr. Shulman moved to the next agenda item for the Weiss Farm insubstantial change for the pump station amendment approved by DEP which was requested by Ian Gasco-Wiggin of John M. Corcoran & Company. Mr. Saltzman stated that the Board should solely be looking at this as an insubstantial change and nothing more. We aren't warranting the product. We aren't guaranteeing any result. DEP has weighed in on this and they have approved it. This Board will just look at it from the point of view of is this or is this not an insubstantial change. Mr. Gasco-Wiggin acknowledged that was what they were requesting the Board to do. Mr. Sullivan agreed with Mr. Saltzman but added that all of these levels were set by DEP. They were not set by this Board. We defer to DEP on this matter. We don't want it as a liability issue for the Town. These are DEP regulations. Mr. Shulman agreed and stated we are not engineers.

Mr. Saltzman made a motion to approve the insubstantial change for the pump station amendments that DEP at approved. Mr. Sullivan seconded. A roll call vote was taken. All 5 members voted in favor 5-0. Mr. Sullivan voted in place of Mr. Rubin who is recused from this matter.

Mr. Saltzman mentioned that Bob Griffin had recommended a watershed study. He had spoken with Brett Gonsalves who suggest McKenzie Engineering. Mr. Saltzman made a motion to authorize the Town Administrator to engage an individual to do a watershed study. Mr. McLaughlin seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All members voted in favor 5-0. Mr. Sullivan again voted in place of Mr. Rubin.

Mr. Shulman moved to the six month extension of 3-5 Graystone Road Decision granted on December 21, 2023 which was requested by Attorney Houghton. Mr. McLaughlin made a

motion to grant the extension for 3-5 Graystone Road as well as the Rockville Park Decision which was granted on November 30, 2023. Mr. Saltzman seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor 5-0 to grant both extensions.

Mr. Shulman introduced the first public hearing and read the legal notice for 10 Whipple Avenue into the record as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing Thursday, November 21, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application by Ivaylo Filyov, 10 Whipple Avenue, Stoneham, Massachusetts to construct a 6.2 foot x 24 foot front porch and mudroom at 10 Whipple Avenue. The petitioner is requesting a variance of the Stoneham Town Code, Chapter 15, Section 5.2.1 Dimensional Requirements. The required front setback in the Residence A District is 20 feet. The proposed front setback is 13.1 feet for the structure and approximately 7’ for the stairs. A Plot Plan of 10 Whipple Avenue prepared by Edward J. Farrell, Professional Land Surveyor dated September 18, 2024 may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk's Office.”

Ivaylo Filyov appeared before the Board to explain the requested relief. He had purchased the house a year ago and has done a lot of work. Now he’d like to build a mudroom because the front stairs lead directly into the living room. He’d like to keep dust and dirt out of the house by creating more of an entryway. Mr. Shulman acknowledged that given the shape of the lot, there is nowhere else to put the mudroom. It appears that the stairs stay and the mudroom is built over the landing.

Mr. Saltzman stated that the setbacks are 7 and 13 so it wouldn’t effect visibility. Mr. Filyov agreed and said the Town left room to build sidewalks but there are no sidewalks. Mr. Dufour added that the steps come out further now then they will with the new plan and the floor of the porch is down a step.

Mr. Shulman opened the hearing to the public. With no comment made, Mr. Saltzman made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. Rubin. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Saltzman stated that the shape of the lot is narrow and small creating a hardship. There’s no other place to put the mudroom. He made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. A roll call vote was taken. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Seeing a lot of people in the room for 104 Pond Street, Mr. Shulman took 8 Highland Ave out of order as the next public hearing and read the legal notice into the record as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing Thursday, November 21, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application by Patricia Strachan, 8 Highland Avenue, Stoneham, Massachusetts to construct a 7.46 foot x 18.80 foot porch at 8 Highland Avenue. The petitioner is requesting a variance of the Stoneham Town Code, Chapter 15, Section 5.2.1 Dimensional Requirements. The required front setback in the Residence A District is 20 feet. The proposed front setback is 18.74 feet. A Plan of Land for 8 Highland Avenue prepared by Stephen E. Stapinski,

Professional Land Surveyor dated October 3, 2024 may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk's Office.”

Brent Last, the contractor for Ms. Strachan, appeared before the Board to explain the relief being requested. He will be building an extension to an existing farmer's porch. The front is 16” short of the setback requirement. They want to tie into the existing porch to connect to the rear which will create easier egress for the 1st and 2nd floor.

Mr. Shulman asked about the existing setback. Mr. Last explained that it is angled and encroaches as you get to the stairs Mr. Saltzman added that to keep it even, it needed to be squared off. Mr. Last agreed. He also added that this improved look will be good for the neighborhood.

Mr. Shulman opened the meeting up to the public. With no members of the public wishing to speak, Mr. Saltzman made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. All members present voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Rubin made a motion to grant the relief. They are just squaring it off. It doesn't derogate from the intent of the bylaw and will serve the public good. Mr. Dufour seconded. A roll call vote was taken. All members present voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Shulman read the legal notice for 104 Pond Street into the record as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing THURSDAY EVENING, November 21, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application by Trinity Home Builders, LLC, 429 S Main Street, Andover, MA 01810 to build three duplex condominium residences at 104 Pond Street, Stoneham, MA. The proposed use requires a variance of Section 4.2.3 and a variance of Sections 4.2.3.1 and 4.2.3.1(a) as the proposed use does not have an existing dwelling. It is all new construction on vacant property. A variance of Section 4.2.3.1 (c) will be required as that section requires at least one (1) off street parking space for each bedroom in the converted portion of the structure. Each unit has three bedrooms which will require 18 parking spaces. The proposed plan provides 12 parking spaces. Also, a variance of Section 4.2.3.1(e) will be required as that Section requires that the exterior appearance of the structure shall not be altered with specific exceptions and the proposed is all new construction. Plan may be seen and daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk's Office.”

Mr. Houghton appeared before the Board and showed a rendering while explaining that the property has been a vacant lot for some time now. Years ago it had been a flower shop with a greenhouse. He informs the Board that this will need approval from the Conservation Commission. He explained that buildings A, B & C can be built without variance to the setbacks. He stated that many years ago it was looked at for a subdivision but it would be harder to blast and build a road. The proposed plan is the best way to develop the site with the buildings in front, open space in back and leaving the big tree in front.

Mr. Houghton continued to discuss the grades between addresses. He added that building a road could be detrimental to the environment. Mr. Houghton described the parking for the units.

There would be two car garages and each unit would have a driveway. They have added an extra fire hydrant to the plan at the Fire Department's request. There will be no blasting whatsoever.

Mr. Rubin stated that the three buildings as it sits today don't have setback issues. The variance is for an existing structure that doesn't exist. Mr. Houghton agreed and there is a variance for parking.

Mr. Dufour questioned the garage at each unit. It would be a two car garage with tandem parking in the driveway. Seems adequate. Mr. Houghton stated that the bylaw is unclear so the Building Commissioner took the conservative approach. The plan does provide 2 per unit plus a driveway.

Mr. McLaughlin asked how they get onto Pond Street and if the front will be hot topped. Mr. Houghton stated there will be 24' wide hot top.

Mr. Shulman stated that there is nothing on the lot now. There's no dwelling and it is in Residence A. This would be a conversion of an existing building that we don't have. He added that with 72663 square feet it is a large piece of land in Stoneham. If you put in a 24' driveway, why not a road? He also asked about the zone near building C. Mr. Houghton explained that the road would require a 50' layout and you would need a lot of waivers. You could make it but you'd have a lot more pavement. Mr. Shulman acknowledged that there are difficulties. It feels like a stretch to conversion of an existing dwelling with a vacant lot. With the amount of earthwork that needs to be done it looks like you could just make a roadway with lots that conform with less forgiveness from the ZBA. Mr. Houghton stated there would be a 100 foot radius for the cul de sac. You'd be taking the whole area to build the roadway. The builder, Angus Bruce, explained why he chose this route. He felt there would be minimal impact. He wouldn't end up taking all of the trees down. It would be less intrusive. There would be a little bit of grading in the 100 foot buffer but the Town would get a section on the right side that would be given to Conservation. It would allow Conservation an expanded area. With a more traditional plan, they would push the plan all the way up to the 25 foot buffer zone and would require blasting. He was trying to impact the neighbors the least. For dwelling 104 on the plan, they lose the parking with a traditional plan. With this plan they keep the parking. They don't need to use parking on the other side. He didn't want to disrupt what they have now. The idea on this plan was to make it nice but not to impact the homeowners around so they see a full blown development. He left a lot of green space. He would leave the big tree in the front. He showed a nineteen unit project that he just completed in Melrose with before and after pictures. A formal subdivision will impact the neighbors more.

Mr. Saltzman asked if the intention was not to see the six units from the road. They hide each other. Mr. Bruce agreed that he didn't want all six units staring them in the face. He didn't want to strip the lot.

Mr. Saltzman believed that a site visit might be in order now that the Board had seen the plans. Mr. Bruce believes that would be an excellent idea for the board and the neighbors. Mr. Saltzman stated the Board would come but it's up to Mr. Bruce as to the neighbors. Mr. Bruce believed the neighbors should come and see this project versus the formal project with the subdivision.

Mr. Shulman thinks that makes sense but wanted to open the meeting up to the public. Mr. Saltzman added that when this site visit does happen, the abutters and neighbors have been invited and should make it their business to see it. Mr. Houghton and Mr. Bruce offer to stake the property for the site visit so that the Board and neighbors can better visualize. Mr. Shulman agreed with that idea and then opened the public hearing.

Carlos Alventara of 104 Pond Street spoke against building duplexes in the Residence A District that allows single families as too much. It's overbuilding. Reduction of parking will impact the neighbors. He mentioned firetrucks turning and snow removal could be a problem. It's almost creating new zoning. He spoke about children walking and the narrow almost nonexistent sidewalks.

Rob Romeo of Gorham Ave has concerns mimicking Carlos Alventara. There are two bus stops at Gorham and Pond and there is activity in the morning and evening. He mentioned the Greater Boston Academy. It is an extremely busy area. He questions the Conservation aspect. Mr. Shulman explained that they would need to file a notice of intent with the Conservation Commission.

Charles Poole of 97 Pond Street spoke against the project. This is a single family residential community. This project is out of character.

John Calkins of 102 Pond Street is a direct abutter who said he would have the back of these buildings right up against him. He mentioned all of the water in the area with the plants and vegetation. If you put in asphalt where will all the water go? Will there be flooding?

Sean Kearns of 96 Pond Street is excited that the property is being developed because it is somewhat derelict now, but he is concerned about safety. There is a bus stop for the Charter School and the Northeast Vocational School. The lot is about 34,000 square feet for the building. Getting in and out will be dangerous.

Attorney Bill Heney appeared on behalf of resident Manny Tsiantoulus of 30 Murdock Road. Mr. Heney stated that the petitioner has not met the threshold. The applicant is applying for a variance for an existing dwelling that isn't there. He should go before the Planning Board for a subdivision under the subdivision control law. Even if you agree with what they want to do there is no structure.

Andrew Faulkenstein an architect also representing the resident at 30 Murdock Road appeared and stated the site plan as submitted is inadequate. It does not show the lot coverage, the location and dimensions of all of the structures or floor plans. You need hard line drawings and people want to see floorplans. You should have full architectural plans. He also asked about traffic safety. We don't know how many cars. Where will guests park? Along the public way?

Michael Simon of 98 Pond Street commented on the footprint wider than the road would be. This would be three duplexes. There isn't a lot of that in the neighborhood. It's not consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

Julio Flores of 62 Gorham Ave stated that it's an eyesore now but he agrees with everything everyone has said. It's a family neighborhood. He doesn't agree with having this conversation because there is no existing dwelling. It's a vacant lot.

Mr. Houghton responded to many of the comments. He explained that flooding would not be a concern. This project would go before the Stormwater Board for approval of the infiltration system. His client doesn't believe the subdivision is best. He stated that the site visit would be an opportunity to get a sense of what could happen. He stated that something will go here sooner or later. Can you get a plan that's better? Mr. Bruce also commented that the neighbors had given him stuff to think about. He heard the concerns about the sidewalk and he can make it safer to get around. He also stated that he doesn't think people understand the difference between building the subdivision and what he is proposing. A site visit will help. He also mentioned that he is willing to reduce the units to two bedrooms. As far as 104 Pond Street, he was trying to allow them to keep parking they have which they don't actually own. Mr. Shulman asked about an easement agreement. Mr. Bruce agreed. He then mentioned that people can look up Blueberry Hill in Melrose to see what he builds.

Sandra LoPriore of 28 Wilson Road stated that the Board should make the site visit at 4PM in the middle of the week so they can see the buses.

The Board set the site visit for Thursday, December 12th at 3PM. Mr. Rubin made a motion to continue the public hearing until December 19, 2024 at 6PM. Mr. Saltzman seconded the motion including that there would be a site visit on December 12th at 3PM which the neighbors were invited to attend. All members present voted in favor 5-0.

The Board took a five minute recess at 7:20PM. They reconvened at 7:29 PM.

Mr. Shulman read the legal notice for 1 Montvale Avenue into the record as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Board of Appeals will hold a Public Hearing THURSDAY EVENING, November 21, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hearing Room, Town Hall to hear all persons interested in the application by One Montvale Ave LLC, 99 East Elm Street, Everett, MA 02149 to renovate the building at One Montvale Avenue, Stoneham, MA to add 51 residential apartments. The proposed use of the building will be 20,779 square feet for Mass. General Brigham/Mass Eye and Ear which requires 104 parking spaces, Thibeault Development 5,413 square feet which requires 16 parking spaces and the balance of the building of 51 apartment units which requires 51 parking spaces for a total parking demand for the building of 171 spaces. The existing parking facilities consist of a two level garage on the Flint Avenue side of the property that has 79, 9'x18' parking spaces that are accessed by a 24 foot drive aisle and an additional 20, 9' x 18' spaces that are accessed by a 19' 5" drive aisle These 20 spaces will require a variance of Section 6.3.4.2 for aisle width. The multi-level garage on Montvale Avenue contains 29, 8' x 17' spaces accessed by a 20 foot drive aisle (Level 1), 23, 9' x 18' spaces that are accessed by a 20' wide drive aisle (Level 2) and 29, 8' x 17' spaces accessed by a 19 foot drive aisle (Level 3). This totals 81 spaces in the multi-level garage on Montvale Avenue. A variance of 6.3.4.2.3 will be required for the 23, 9' x 18' spaces in the multi -level garage that are not accessed by a 24 drive aisle and the 58 spaces in the multi-level garage that are 8' x 17' and are accessed by a 20' or 17' drive aisle will require both a variance of 6.3.4.2.3

(aisle width) and a variance of 6.3.4.1.1 minimum parking space size of 9' x 18'. There are an additional 45, 8' x 17' spaces that are accessed by a 20 foot wide drive aisle on levels 4 to 7 of the Montvale Ave garage for a total of 305 spaces on site. Additionally, the proposed height of the building of 61' 8" will require a variance of Section 5.21 which allows a height of 45'. Plans may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk's Office."

Mr. Houghton appeared before the Board to speak on behalf of his client. He explained the history of the building. In 1985 they built garages and renovated the building to sell furniture. The building most recently was occupied by several Federal agencies including the IRS and Coast Guard. At the moment, the only remaining tenant is Mass Eye & Ear. The petitioner just moved his offices into the building due to the low occupancy. He understands the Town would like it to remain commercial space but with the high vacancy rate they need to do something and a housing use is allowed.

Mr. Houghton explained the parking. Mass Eye & Ear requires 104 spaces and 51 for the proposed units with a total of 171 required spaces. Mr. Houghton indicated the parking garages were built on variances. A lot of the spaces are 17 feet instead of the required 18 feet. Some spaces physically there just can't be counted at all. There are a total of 295 spaces when counted. There are a lot of people in and out of Mass Eye & Ear on a daily basis. He also mentioned that at 3PM today, he only saw 5 cars parked on Flint Ave.

Mr. Houghton explained that the units would be 1 & 2 bedroom with a rent about \$2500-\$3300. There would be 7 affordable units. Again he indicated that they just couldn't find tenants for the office space. They are in competition with Unicorn Park in Woburn. Mr. Houghton believes with most people working from home you should see less traffic than medical use or an IRS office.

Mr. Houghton believed that the building itself with the garages causes a hardship. The parking garages keep cars off the street for parking.

Mr. Saltzman asked if the problem with the occupancy stemmed from COVID. Mr. Houghton stated that COVID had nothing to do with the IRS leaving but, yes, in general COVID did decrease the demand for office space. Mr. Rubin asked about Mass Eye & Ear and how long they will still be there. Mr. Houghton responded that they had just entered into a new 10 year lease.

Mr. Houghton asked the architect to then explain the plan. He began by saying that the Montvale entrance takes you to level 1. The Main Street entrance brings you to level 2. The first floor is currently vacant. The second floor is partially vacant plus Mass Eye & Ear. What they are proposing would be some units on the first floor and amenities on the first floor. They are proposing some townhouse style units with a residential entry off Montvale. The façade is already 10-13 feet back and not looming over the street. There will be no studios. Just 1 & 2 bedrooms. Flat and townhouse style.

Mr. Saltzman asked how high the ceilings would be. The architect indicated it would be 8'6" minimum. There will be a lot of ceiling height and windows.

Rick Salvo the engineer spoke about the parking garages and access around the back and onto Montvale Ave. There is a two level garage which is fairly compliant. It is small by zoning bylaw

but fine practically speaking. There are 295 spaces total. He mentioned that he had no problem driving his large SUV into the garage. The 8' x 17' spaces are smaller but manageable.

Mr. Saltzman asked if his SUV fit in all of the spaces. He indicated that he could. The issue is that the spaces don't comply with the zoning bylaw. Mr. Saltzman asked if there would be a plan to rent out spaces. Mr. Salvo indicated there was not. Mr. Dufour asked how many spaces there would be to change them to today's size. Mr. Salvo stated that the problem is that you cannot change the width from the outer walls to inner walls. To make 9 feet you'd be losing a space every 9 feet. Mr. Rubin asked if the residential units would park in a defined spot. Mr. Salvo thought they'd be determined by convenience.

Mr. Saltzman stated that with 51 residences the number one concern of neighbors would usually be parking but this property has plenty of parking right inside the building. Mr. Saltzman wondered if the gate was locked. If anyone can go in then anyone will go in. Kimberly Powell an employee for the developer stated that they installed gates a year ago due to vandalism and kids hanging out making bonfires in the garage.

Mr. Shulman invited the public to comment. Bob Hudson of 13 Flint Ave. wanted the Board to understand the neighborhood and the parking situation. On paper it looks great. When the IRS had an office there was parking on both sides of Flint Ave. The Town allowed Gaetano's to have a function hall on the ground floor of 271 Main St. Mr. Houghton responded that the function hall never happened. Mr. Hudson continued to say there are 14 houses on Flint Ave. The bottom third has no curbing. People can't walk when the cars are parked there. Aside from parking on Flint, they also park on Rowe Street. He mentioned that when he left he counted 15 cars parked on Flint. If there is 1 car per bedroom you will have 75 more cars. Mr. Houghton stated you can make it 100 cars. They still have over 2 spaces per unit.

Linda Barth of 12½ Flint Ave commented to the Board that the Montvale Ave garage wall is at her backyard. It is not sound. There is a large crack in the wall. Ms. Barth showed the Board a picture of the crack in the wall. She asked about the height and if there would be an addition.

Mr. Houghton explained they plan to build 16 feet higher than the balcony level. Mr. Shulman added that they are proposing to build on top of the existing structure. Ms. Barth believed it would create a lot of noise. With offices you expect a noise reduction at 5 or 6. If it's residential the noise increases. She also thought parking would be a problem. Mr. Shulman assured here that there is plenty of parking.

Mr. Hudson talked about the trucks that park on Flint Ave to unload at Rosetree Plaza. You can't even get down Flint.

Bill Goss of 7 Rowe Street retired 2 years ago and all he has is time to be home. He mentions that he sees delivery trucks and a parking problem. The morning is not so bad. He said it's not just 1 Montvale but a combination of that and Rosetree. Montvale is very busy at night so the tenants would probably come to Flint to avoid Montvale.

Mr. Saltzman questioned whether only 1 lot emptied onto Flint. Mr. Goss stated that they both do. Mr. Shulman wondered if it would help if they knew where to park.

Matt Kilty of 6 Rowe Street is not necessarily opposed. He's not against progress. He would just like more time to digest and understand the project.

Laura Sodergren of 3 Janice Lane had concerns about the 900+ units being built in Stoneham and the traffic. It's a strain on police and fire. Why are we adding 51 more units when we don't need any more housing?

Alison Burke of 38 Lindenwood Road had a concern about children in the units. She was also concerned about traffic on Lindenwood Road.

Zach Carbo of 9 Rowe Street was concerned that no matter the parking there is a convenience factor that is causing them to park on Flint Ave.

Seeing no further comment, Mr. Shulman read a letter into the record from Raymie Parker 111 Franklin Street who is disappointed to lose commercial property.

Mr. Houghton stated that his client is not proposing this to make a profit. There is currently 20% occupancy in his building and that is a problem. He can't cover the taxes without tenants. Something has to give. His client wouldn't be here if it was rented. He's here because he has a problem. Mr. Houghton suggests a site visit.

Mr. Sullivan plays devil's advocate for a moment. He asked how many units could be built without the variances. 42 units by right, correct? Mr. Houghton agreed and stated it would be 51 units by right if they were all flats instead of some townhouses. Mr. Sullivan states that some of the housing is by right.

Mr. Rubin commented that the Board never sees a project that has plenty of parking. This has plenty of parking.

Mr. Shulman asked if the Montvale garage has an exit onto Flint. Mr. Houghton indicated that you can drive straight through. Mr. Shulman asked if it could be closed off. Mr. Houghton stated they might be able to assign spaces in the lease.

The Board discussed a site visit on December 12th after their site visit to 104 Pond Street.

Bill Goss asked about the spaces dedicated to Mass Eye & Ear at the lower level of Flint. Will that still be parking for Mass Eye & Ear? Mr. Houghton indicated it would be and asked Mr. Salvo who stated it would be 50 spaces.

Mr. Saltzman made a motion to continue to December 19th at 6PM with a site visit on December 12th at 4:15PM. Mr. McLaughlin seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Saltzman made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. All members voted in favor 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48PM

Respectfully submitted:

Maria Sagarino
Town Clerk

Documents and other exhibits used by the Board of Appeals during this meeting to be made part of the official record but not attached to these minutes:

A Plot Plan of 10 Whipple Avenue prepared by Edward J. Farrell, Professional Land Surveyor dated September 18, 2024.

Plan of 104 Pond Street by Sullivan Engineering Group dated October 23, 2024.

A Plan of Land for 8 Highland Avenue prepared by Stephen E. Stapinski, Professional Land Surveyor dated October 3, 2024.

A plan of 1 Montvale Avenue by DMS Design LLC dated October 31, 2024.