

April 22, 2020

To: The Littleton Planning Board

Subj: Healy Corner

As stated in my December 19, 2019 email to the Planning Board; due to the way the frontage on Harwood Ave. was handled, I am concerned with the integrity of the Healy Corner proposers. As such, I decided to look closer at the latest Density Yield Plan (DYP) and Open Space Development (OSD) proposals for other areas where important information is lacking.

For the DYP

Lot 13

This lot has an easement for the driveway which services the adjoining lot. The driveway to the adjoining lot is not shown. This driveway needs to be shown so that it can be determined if the proposed highlighted shared driveway would, in reality, be shared by three lots. The driveway easement has been mentioned at meetings. I wonder if this information was left out because it changes the ANR status of the lot and thus disqualify it for adding a bonus lot. A three-way shared driveway would require a fire truck to be able to turn around at the driveway on lot 13.

After viewing the site from Harwood Ave. and looking at the plan, I get the impression that this is a paper lot. The lot is very sloped as can be seen by how many elevation lines are between the house and the shared driveway. Squeezing a house and septic system between the 50' buffer and the shared drive will take a lot of fill. I don't think this can be done without violating the 50' buffer zone. In fact, as drawn, the house is already violating the 50' buffer zone. More information is needed, such as realistic grading information, and then an opinion from the Conservation Commission on if it would approve changes to the 50' buffer.

Lot 14

The driveway might actually be a three-way shared driveway. See lot 13 for more detail as to why. If it is a three-way shared driveway, it is required to have a turnaround with a minimum 75' radius which would have to be shown on the plan. As with lot 1, a three-way driveway would disqualify this lot for adding a bonus lot.

The driveway goes through a 50' buffer, requiring a waiver from the Conservation Commission. Would this waiver affect the ANR status?

Lot 6

This lot looks like a paper lot to me. The driveway crosses a wetland and has a large area in the 50' buffer zone. The driveway also does not show the 75' radius turnaround required of three-way driveways. The turnaround would add even more area violating the 50' buffer zone. The house and septic system are shown as touching the 50' buffer zone. Any required grading would affect the 50' buffer zone. With the high bar used for crossing a wetland and for changing a 50' buffer zone, I

personally don't think this lot would get the go ahead from the Conservation Commission. An opinion would be very beneficial.

Lot 9

The driveway needs to be update to show that a fire truck can turn around. A requirement of a three-way shared driveway. The house and septic system touch the 50' buffer zone. Is this a realistic lot?

Lots 6, 8 and 9

The shared driveway is long. Does it require an infiltration basin? If yes, it needs to be added to the plan. Is there a place to fit it without violating the 50' buffer zone?

For the OSD

The Rev 1 Highlighted Plot Plan shows 17 lots. Assuming all lots on the DYP are valid and that the 2 undeveloped lots on Harwood Ave. are ANR lots, there should be a maximum of 16 lots on the OSD plan. 14 lots from the DYP and 2 "bonus" lots for the 2 lots on Harwood Ave. that were not developed.

After taking a closer look at the OSD plan, I no longer believe that the OSD is beneficial for the town of Littleton.

1. The open space being given to the town is a narrow strip of land around the back portion of the development. Is it even possible to walk around this strip with the numerous sections that are in wetland.
2. Large portions of the "open area" will be privately owned. The residents of Littleton gain nothing from this. This violates, if not the wording, the intent of the open space areas. The argument that a CR placed on the land benefits the town is an extremely weak argument. Most of the privately held open space is either wetland or 50' buffer zone. As such, they can not be developed. Any trees can not be cut down. In fact, you aren't even allowed to do things like mow them. Thus, there is very little gained by adding a CR to these areas.
3. The small area with 14 houses packed in to it does not fit the character of the neighborhood.
4. The OSD development does not meet the intent of open space development. Two items under design criteria stand out to me. "Protection of visual character by having open spaces which are visible from major roads." "Protection of major street appearance and capacity by avoiding development close to or egressing directly onto such streets."

In comparison, the Durkee development had to have a lot of their open space next to Foster St. The Durkee development also was told at Planning Board meetings that the open space had to be given to the town.

Douglas Peeke

65 Grimes Lane



