

**Linda M. Finucane**

---

**From:** Peter Nannucci <peternannucci@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 28, 2014 1:37 PM  
**To:** Linda M. Finucane  
**Subject:** Land Use Committee Docket Item 165-14 - 3-5 Auburn St special permit  
**Attachments:** 3-5\_Auburn\_St-165-14.pdf

Dear Ms. Finucane,

Please distribute the attached letter to the Land Use Committee / Board of Aldermen ahead of tomorrow's Land Use Committee public hearing at which Docket Item 165-14 regarding 3-5 Auburn St will be heard.

Please confirm receipt of this email.

I have attached my letter as an attached PDF and additionally included the text thereof below.

Thank you,  
Peter Nannucci  
61 Chaske Ave, Auburndale

--

Dear Chairman Laredo, members of the Board of Aldermen Land Use Committee:

**RE: #165-14: RICHARD D. SEWALL petition for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to demolish an existing single-family dwelling and construct two sets of two attached single-family dwellings for a total of four dwellings including waivers from the side-and rear-yard setback and lot coverage requirements and relief to locate a driveway within 10 feet of a side lot line at 3-5 AUBURN STREET, Ward 3, on land known as SBL 33, 3, 15 & 16, containing approximately 23,426 sf of land in a district zoned MULTI RESIDENCE 1. Ref: Sec 30-24, 30-23, 30-9(b)(5)a) and b), 30-15 Table 1, 30-15(b)(5)a) and b) of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2012.**

I would like to express my opposition of the special permit application for 3-5 Auburn St on the following grounds:

1. While this combined property may contain 23,426 sq ft of land, it is an L shape with only **45 ft** of frontage so doesn't even meet the old lot standards for MR1 which calls for a minimum frontage of **70 ft**. The property additionally narrows significantly from the street so the proposal will adversely affect abutters in terms of the proximity to their homes.
2. Side setbacks for old lots are already only 7.5 ft, versus 10 ft for new lots. This is already very tight and should not be further reduced. In my opinion waivers for side setbacks should generally not be approved without good reason since that is the only buffer between a proposed development and abutters. If this property is too narrow to allow for what is being proposed while at the same time maintaining the minimum side setbacks, then the proposal should be not approved without a reduction in scope. Additionally, since these two parcels are being combined as part of the special permit application, should new lot setbacks not apply?

3. Four units adds significant mass to the property and will negatively impact the immediate neighbors and neighborhood in terms of increased density, noise and driveway and other traffic. Lot coverage limits are imposed so that a reasonable amount of open green space can be maintained. This should not be waived purely so that more units can be squeezed onto said property.

4. This property is on the corner of Washington St. With a frontage of 45 ft straddling the corner this means the driveway location will put incoming and outgoing vehicles (8+ of them) in an awkward and somewhat dangerous position as vehicles taking a right from Washington onto Auburn generally go around that blind corner pretty fast (i.e. at or nearing the speed limit).

Sincerely,  
Peter Nannucci