

Preliminary Subdivision Comments

**Plan: Healey Corner
195 Tahattawan Rd**

Date Submitted: October 26, 2018

		Comment Received	Sent to Applicant
Board of Health		12/6/2018	12/27/18
Conservation Commission		1/8/19	1/9/19
Highway Department			
Fire Department			
Police Department			
Light Department			
Water Department			
Building Department			

Additional Comments:

MacIver Dec. 6, 2018

Peeke Dec. 25, 2018

Sent to applicant

12/27/18

..



**Nashoba Associated Boards of Health
Environmental Health Service
30 Central Avenue, Ayer, Ma. 01432**

M E M O

DATE: 12/6/18

TO: Littleton Planning Board

FROM: James Garrefffi, Agent, Littleton Board of Health

RE: 195 TAHATTAWAN RD.

The Board has review the Preliminary Subdivision Plan for "Healy Corner," and approves the plan subject to the following conditions.

- 1.) Each lot must have a source of potable water.
- 2.) Each lot must be served by a sewage disposal system in compliance with Title 5 and the Littleton sewage disposal system regulations. Significant soil testing has been conducted on the site but the testing is not shown on this plan.
- 3.) No burying of wood waste from lot clearing operations is allowed without compliance with 310CMR16.000, Site Assignment regulations.
- 4.) Any blasting materials used shall not be perchlorate-based.
- 5.) All detentions/retention structures shall minimize standing water.
- 6.) All phases of construction shall be done to minimize noise, odor and dust that would be injurious of public health and/or cause a "condition of air pollution."



Littleton Conservation Commission
P.O. Box 1305
37 Shattuck Street
Littleton, MA 01460
Phone: 978 540-2428 FAX: 978 952 2321
E-Mail: agreen@littletonma.org

MEMORANDUM
195 Tahattawan
Preliminary Subdivision

From: Amy Green (Conservation Coordinator)

To: Maren Toohill

Date: January 8, 2019

At the meeting last night, the Conservation Commission asked that I expand on the Commission comments from December 10, 2018. The Commission feels that there are some major issues with the proposed layouts and presumed number of lots.

On the Conventional Subdivision plan, the stormwater basins are in the 50-foot No Disturb Area (NDA) of the Littleton Wetlands Protection Bylaw regulations, and several of the lots require a wetland crossing, in particular Lot 5. It's not clear if Lots like 9 and 11 can be designed with no work in the NDA. Any work within the NDA, including grading or clearing, would require a Waiver from the Bylaw regulations, and that Waiver has a very high standard and typically includes the requirement of meeting a public interest standard.

On the Open Space Development, stormwater control will be required, but it isn't shown where it will be and that it can be outside the NDA. Lots 10-13 in particular would require a wetland crossing, and for at least two of them it's not clear if grading and/or septic could be designed without getting in the NDA.

The Commission stresses that especially with new build, it's very risky to assume that a Waiver could be issued for any work in the NDA.

In general, the Commission would support the Open Space Development plan, especially as it would appear to reduce impacts to wetlands and wildlife habitat areas. The Commission would also urge the owner to commit to public open space linkages in coordination with the Commission. The property could provide very important linkage to hundreds of acres of adjacent lands held by the Commission (some in cooperation with Sudbury Valley Trustees) and Littleton Conservation Trust.

Littleton Conservation Trust
43 Foster St.
Littleton, MA 01460

Littleton Planning Board
Town Administration Building
Shattuck St

RE: Submission of comments for Planning Bd Meeting for 6:40pm discussion on Glavey Family Trust 43 acre Preliminary Sub Division

And Preliminary Subdivision Online plans:

<https://www.littletonma.org/planning-board-projects/195-tahattawan-subdivision?fbclid=IwAR0IJb7P3sS4Xq7b5zV-FQRYTJZgX4ssZc5Gr1KgVELt-XMLja6Z01eEha4>

There will be a discussion about accepting a Conventional Subdivision Plan (with 14 lots) or an alternative Open Space Subdivision Plan (with 17 lots) tonight at the Planning Board Meeting tonight (Thursday 12/6 at 6:40pm in room 103)

Usually the Open Space Subdivision Plan is preferable due to clustered dwellings and good preserved open space. In this specific case the open space plan has two clusters of dwellings connected with a bridge over wetlands, which more or less defeat's the benefits of a open space plan.

The 43 acre Glavey Family Trust land separates some 8 publicly accessible abutting/contiguous town owned land parcels on the northwest side (toward the Town Forest and Foster Street) from some 9 publicly accessible abutting/contiguous town and conservation trust lands on the southeast side (toward Newtown Hill Area). Also two adjacent Mary Brown owned parcels are currently in play not mention other development in the contiguous general area

There needs to be some additional planning with open space planning groups (Conservation Commission, Open Space Committee, and Littleton Conservation Trust) that serve the Littleton public, the Family Trust Land Planners, and perhaps a Planning Board Representative to see if a better plan can be generated and see if an interconnected land parcel and/ or greenway can connect these two large permanently protected open space areas. I would suggest a walk over of the areas of concern.

The Littleton Conservation Trust would be glad to participate in a site walk and discussions with all others involved. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours,

Donald MacIver

Don MacIver, president

978-952-2706

Attached: One page map indicating publicly accessible permanently protected open space/ conservation land abutting and contiguous to Glavey Family Trust Land



Maren Toohill

From: Douglas Peeke <mail2dpeeke@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 25, 2018 9:46 AM
To: Maren Toohill
Subject: Glavey proposal comments

Hi Maren,

As an abutter to the proposed development, here are my comments on the Glavey preliminary proposal dated October 2018

Sheet 2, Conventional Subdivision

1. Access to lots 5, 9 and 14 are blocked by wetlands. Should the Conservation Commission weigh in on the validity of these lots before calculating a density yield plan?
2. I drove by the area and currently it looks like about 1/2 of Lot 13 and the driveway for lot 14 have standing water. Roughly in the middle of proposed lot 13 there is a large drop off in elevation. The lower section, which has the standing water, is not much higher than the indicated wetland on the proposal. When looking at the area, I wonder how much of this low land acts as a buffer when we get a lot of rain. The runoff from a lot of acres of land flows beside this land and then under Harwood Ave. and then to Long Pond. If the culverts under Harwood Ave. cannot handle the short-term flow rate, the water will back up and temporally raise the water line surrounding the wetland area. Any place that has a low slope leading away from the wetland will get impacted. I would suggest a sight walk by the Planning Board and by the Conservation Commission be done before deciding how many houses could be built using conventional subdivision zoning. Some of the concerns mentioned here should also be considered when looking at other plots that abut or overlap the wetlands.

Sheet 3, Open Space Development

1. Plan note 2. Is indicating that three house lots can be added due to Littleton Zoning Section 173-104(B). A look at the Conventional Subdivision shows that lots 12, 13, and 14 are the three lots being used for 173-104(B). However, when taking a closer look, lots 13 and 14 only have a narrow piece of land on Harwood Ave. Also, as noted in the Conventional Subdivision comments above, this area might not get approval for three lots. Given that the intent of 173-104 is to preserve significant areas of scenic woodland or agricultural lands along public road frontage, I feel that, at most, one additional house should be allowed to the density calculation.
2. No storm water management areas are shown. Will the four long driveways need storm water management due to their proximity to wetlands? How is snow taken care of with so many driveways being in such a narrow region which is next to wetlands? Conservation Commission feedback?
3. Would it be safer (emergency vehicle access) to have a road instead of the four driveways, even if the 750' multiple egress is slightly violated?
4. Access to lots 10-13 is through a wetland. A means should be provided under the driveways to connect the wetlands to prevent an isolated wetland. Don't want to see the "farmers pond" problem repeated. An alternate might be to carve out the area between lots 13 and 16 to connect the newly isolated wetland to an existing wetland. Either way, of course, the Conservation Commission needs to weigh in.

Personally, I prefer that this development uses an open space layout instead of a conventional layout. When acquired by the town, the added open space would connect Littleton Conservation Trust land with Town of Little land creating a larger contiguous area. The addition of this open space would also improve the odds of creating a bike lane from the Harwood Ave/Tahattawan Road area to the commuter rail.

Douglas Peeke

65 Grimes Lane
Littleton MA