

Pamela and David Cochrane
198 Central Street
Acton, MA 01720

April 3, 2012

To Members of the Planning Department,

We are writing in regard to the Central Street (behind 12 Summer Street) P.C.R.C. Special Permit Application as we have a number of concerns.

First of all, we are concerned regarding the **wetlands** and wonder whether the applicant's plans are adequate for protecting them. For example, the plans appear to have a common driveway running along the edge of the wetlands; it is hard to believe that there will not be damaging run-off from rain and snowmelt. In addition, the plan calls for filling in of some wetland areas to accommodate the driveway.

We are further concerned regarding the **property line between the cemetery and the application property**. Having walked the property, there appears to be some question whether the cemetery shed is on cemetery property or on the application property. It is our belief that an independent survey of the property line between the cemetery and application property should be done with a review of records/property lines going back beyond what is available on-line.

In addition, we have concerns regarding the following items:

Item 14: Is it certain that there are no rare or endangered species of plant or animal life on the property? If it is certain, who made that determination?

Item 15: There appears to be an old quarry/gravel pit on the property.

Item 17: The walking trail on the property is a well-used path (acknowledged in item 16) and, contrary to the application statement, has been used for many years as a recreation area for walking, running, and cross-country skiing.

Item 18: The application claims that the site does not include scenic views; the site does overlook the historic chapel and the rest of the Mt. Hope Cemetery and the houses would dramatically change the view from the cemetery.

Item 21: The application states there is no hazardous waste on the site. If the cemetery shed is in fact on the application property (see question at beginning of comments), is it known that the shed does not store any hazardous materials?

Item 23: The application states that there is nothing of historical interest. What of the GAR boundary markers and the remnants of headstones near the shed? Did the applicant consult with the Historical Commission or the Acton Historic Society as recommended on the application?

Item 31: The application states that there is no undeveloped adjacent land. It would seem that some of the land sold to the Town of Acton by Sweeney is still undeveloped.

Item 32 and item 36: Indication of 15 bedrooms in 3 units (5 bedrooms/unit on average) is inconsistent with a projection of 6 children entering the school system. Either there are a lot of extra bedrooms or it is likely that more than 6 children will enter the school system. Additionally, the applicant has not indicated the distance from the nearest school.

Item 35: The applicant has not provided an estimate of response time for the fire department.

Item 36: See above under Item 32.

Items 37-48: These items have not been completed by the applicant.

We think it worth taking additional time to clarify these issues before granting a permit to the applicant to proceed.

We thank you for your time in considering our concerns.

Sincerely,

Pamela Cochrane

David Cochrane