

Planning Board Members

Town of Littleton

37 Shattuck Street

Littleton Mass 01460

Good Evening. My name is Mark Gallagher and my wife and I live at 307 Harwood Ave. We purchased our lot from Mr. Glavey Sr. in 2016. I believe we may be the only direct abutter to the proposed sub division since our property was carved out of the main parcel.

During the period of time we had the property under agreement, we were required to test our lot for a sub-surface septic system. The property soil conditions were very difficult, the perc rate was very high and most importantly the ground water was within a couple of feet of the surface of the ground. Prior to purchasing the lot, we noticed on the far side of our property, away from the Glavey farm house, there is a large swale cut along the boundary which interconnect with other swales (farm trenches) on the adjacent parcels to help lower the ground water and surface run off because of the poor soil conditions and high water table.

To avoid having a wet basement we elevated our home and brought in a substantial amount of fill to grade up to our new home. We have over 2' of stone under our foundation with drains under the floor in the basement. We back filled with $\frac{3}{4}$ " stone and brought the stone within 18" of the top of our foundation to allow the water a clean basis to flow into our under drains and away from the house. The under drains flow downhill to the swale at the base of our driveway and into the towns collection system. The water flows from these drains most of, if not all of the year. We were fortunate to have the ability to elevate our home and get positive drainage from the foundation-something the proposed development plan does not seem to provide.

Our septic system is for a 5 bedroom house. Because of the water table it is "mounded" about 8' above the natural grade of the property and occupies over 4000 square feet of the lot. Almost 10% of the lot size is occupied by this system. This would be quite an impediment with the proposed development plan.

I am explaining these impediments we overcame during the construction of our house so the Board can understand the ground water table, soils conditions which are similar on the property, and the impediments future property owner's may face on the adjacent land. I am concerned with the proposed lot layout that my privacy will be eliminated and the changes in the soils conditions post construction will cause my lot and house to flood during peak events with the changes to the ground water table. I would request the Planning Board require a hydrogeological study be performed on the property to map the existing conditions and determine the effects of the homes planned on the site and their effects on the existing homes. It appears the planned foundations have no ability to outflow their foundation drains to day light from reviewing the grading plans.

As a professional Developer and Home Builder I would be a hypocrite to try and stop the Glavey Family from developing their property and selling the development. My goal is to try and influence the Development team to develop the property in a manner which dignifies the Glavey's legacy as Littleton residents and to honor the spirit and requirements of the open space development bylaw.

Having said this my further preliminary concerns are as follows;

The Property sits on a Scenic Road. The Open Space Bylaw speaks to preserving the vista's along town roads similar to the precedent the Planning Board set with the approval of Cooper Farm and Durkee Farm. It would seem logical to protect the open field along the front of Tahatawan/Harwood road as opposed to placing the entire density of the proposed development along the roadside and clearly visible when you drive down this scenic road. See section 173-100 C. (2) Further, the criteria for approval in #173-100 (2) and (5) speaks to the visual character of the open space being visible from the existing roads. Clearly this isn't viable in the existing submission when 20% of the proposed density is within 40' of the existing scenic road.

There has been a great deal of discussion on the area in the existing field and the density proposed through the various plans. The density as it sits today is very similar to Wildflower Meadows off Rte 2 A which is an approved 40 B project. Is that what the Open Space Development is supposed to look like? When you look at Durkee Farm and Cooper Farm it seems the precedent set on those two approvals are now being abandoned.

The underlying plan (Density Yield Plan) which the Open space plan density is based upon is flawed. The plan did not demonstrate the ability to construct a standard sub division by right for the density requested. Many of the lots are in the wetlands, inside the buffer or not supported by sub surface testing. By virtue of the large wetland tracks on the property, the majority of this space would be protected by default under the wetlands protection act. The base density of (14 homes) is not supported with the initially submitted Yield Plan. Further, the changes in August by the applicant clearly removes lots in the approved plan for the placement of a common septic area. It would seem logical you get one or the other, but not both densities and a large common septic which impedes into the common space or makes the lots sizes smaller to maintain their proposed density.

I would request the Planning Board revisit this plan and require the development team to comply with all of the requirements of submission including providing the board with a plan showing lots which could be permitted and developed including the requirement to support a 4 bedroom septic system on each lot as part of the submission. Please remember my initial writings herein with the size and height of our septic system when you look at the individual lots shown on the underlying plan. Mr. Ringwald spoke to this shortfall in his August presentation to the Board when the Developer moved to a common septic area due to "grading issues" with the new lot layout. The underlying plan has to demonstrate the viability of the lots not just that they can exist on a paper plan.

It would appear from reading the ordinance that the existing submission should not be found complete. Section 173-97 A-J require a great deal more information for the planning Board and the Town residents to review. If you review the submission for Durkee Farm you will see a more complete and comprehensive package provided by a Developer. The Planning Board and the Towns people should all have the opportunity to review all of the required submission materials prior to engaging the applicant.

Lastly the proposed location of the Street Entrance at the intersection of Tahatawan and Harwood is likely to cause a lot of traffic accidents and safety issues. The proposed road is in one of the dense area of street trees and is densely forested with a beautiful stone wall. There are alternative locations that the Planning Board should consider which would require less tree cutting, minor or no stone wall alterations and is more in keeping with a scenic road permit and construction.

I have hired Sue Carter as our Engineer and Mark Browboski as our Attorney to review our rights as an abutter and resident of the Town as well as advising us on the review of the submission materials and speak on our behalf as the application and process moves forward. I am sure we will have more questions as the process unfolds.

Thanks in advance for your time

Mark M Gallagher

307 Harwood Ave

Littleton Mass 01460