

December 7, 2022

Town of Wrentham Planning Board

Town of Wrentham Conservation Commission

Town of Wrentham Board of Health

RE: Sheldon Meadow & Sheldon West (1139 West Street and 20 Hancock Street)

Dear Mr. McKnight and Members of the Planning Board:

We are Joudrie and William Jones, who live at 32 Hancock Street, a direct abutter to the proposed 20 Hancock development known as Sheldon Meadow. For the last two years, almost three now, we have been living with an on-going nightmare of reviewing what the Developer of this ill-conceived project and the unbelievable amount of controversy that has surrounded it and its associated project at 1139 West Street. In the beginning of this torrid affair of project designs, revisions, unanswered questions and all too much time and money being spent by our Town's Boards, we feel it is time to begin to face reality: these projects are of no value to the citizen's of Wrentham, are cluster developments disguised as Senior Living Communities (SLC'S) and will have several questionable and most probable impacts for many years to come.

The areas of concern and expressed by abutters and many other citizens of Wrentham have been, for the most part, only partially addressed. Topics such as; the out-dated traffic study, conducted during the Pandemic is a joke, the telling of the Massachusetts DOT having informed the developer that crosswalks for senior across West Street is proper is joke #2 and follow that with them requesting an 8" water tie into a 4" 100 year old water main on Hancock Street and having no affect on abutter's water supply or pressure, joke #3, and many, many more.

Frustration has gripped us and would probably grip you as well if they proposed that 16 houses, raised to a level of 6' at their base and rising some 28' to the roof tops, a mere 53' from our property line, with a 22' road way and a 6' walkway between us will have no impact. Ridiculous! Standing in our back yard looking up at traffic passing over our heads only 16 feet away, having snow plows pushing snow off onto the side, a slope of 6 feet down to a "strip Drain" that is expected to handle all that in a 6" pipe is unrealistic, a walking path passing over our heads and going closer as it reaches five feet from our neighbor's (The Moriarty Family, 40 Hancock St.) property. We can go on and on, but the several letters from our wonderful neighbors and other concerned citizens are better at expressing what an impact this whole proposed project has been.

Okay, frustration spent, here is our latest concern, which was sparked by the latest reply from Beals and Thomas, dated December 2, 2022, specifically item 19, which is shown below:

19. Section 5.232 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that all drainage pipe have a minimum diameter of 12-in. As designed, the stormwater management system does not comply with this regulation. We request that the Applicant clarify the design intent and document compliance with the noted regulation.

Applicant's Previous Response: All pipes leading from inlet structures in the roadway are a minimum of 12". Header and outlet pipes from the subsurface infiltration chambers are not, but are not intended to be, as this is an emergency outfall, if large pipes were used it would reduce the overall storage capacity of the system. The trench drain and pipe from area drain-1 leading to SIS1 is also not a 12" as it would be oversized for the small amount of water entering it. The other pipes that are less than 12" are roof drains enters SIS2, and they are sized appropriately for the amount of water entering them.

B+T Previous Response: B+T does not take exception to the use of drainage pipe with a diameter of less than 12". However, we defer to the Board is strict compliance with the referenced section of the Subdivision Regulations is required.

Applicant's Current Response: Howard Stein Hudson has added this as a formal waiver request. The area drain and strip drain utilize a smaller diameter pipe size due to the lack of flow presented to the systems. A 12" diameter pipe is not necessary for these practices.

Current B+T Response: A formal waiver request has not been provided. However, B+T takes no exception to the waiver being requested. We defer to the Board on the status of the waiver being requested.

Please note that: Subdivision Regulations **requires that all drainage pipe have a minimum diameter of 12-in. As designed, the stormwater management system does not comply with this regulation.**

B+T's response was that they do not take exception to the use of a drainage diameter of less than 12" and defer to the Board is strict compliance required? Specifically, we question the line in B+T's response: "the trench drain and pipe from area drain-1 to SIS1 is also not a 12" as it would be oversized for the small amount of water entering it."

Small amount? Who can really predict how much rain will come down in a short or long period, running down a 22' roadway, across a 6' walkway and down a 6' slope, running some 165 feet into a trench drain? Can the pipe ever be over sized, knowing the possibility of a severe storm occurring. Also, we need to note the addition of snow melt can possibly add to the amount of water during the snow melting in early spring.

In the PVI site design report, dated July 14, 2022, under the heading “General Stormwater Comments” states many factors of concern for the retaining wall and trench drain adjacent to our property. This wall and proposed trench drain are all within feet of our property line and the property line of our neighbors, the Moriarty and Nash families.

Here are the PVI comments:

General Stormwater Comments:

1. The stormwater calculations assume the entire bottom of the basins have an infiltration rate of 8.27 in/hr. The details call to modify the loam to allow for infiltration, however no back-up data on the infiltration rate of this material is provided. Typical Loam infiltration rates can be as low as 0.52 in/hr, a 94% reduction in infiltration capacity over the design assumptions.
2. Under existing conditions, surface water follows the natural grade from abutting properties onto the subject property. The low elevation allows this surface water to continue its natural path and pond up on the field after rainfall events providing a natural storage mechanism. The project proposes to fill the property 6-8 feet above the existing field elevations. Filling the site without proper perimeter conveyance systems will cause impoundments of surface water in neighboring properties. Specifically, the property edge at 1143R West Street and 32 and 46 Hancock Street. Little to no detail is provided on how surface water will be conveyed from the edges of these properties. Hydrologic calculations should be provided to demonstrate the flow in proposed conditions and details for the width & depth of a swales system provided to ensure proper drainage.
3. The assumptions for watershed areas and flow paths at 32 Hancock are inconsistent between existing and proposed conditions. It appears the the proposed conditions cause runoff from 40 Hancock to flow into 32 Hancock due to the proposed grading and retaining wall system.
4. The proposed retaining wall adjacent to 32 Hancock is shown to have a “Strip drain” at the top of the wall. Introducing water behind a retaining wall is a poor practice and can create hydrostatic pressure behind the wall leading to failure. In addition, common practice is to provide weep holes at the bottom of wall. This system would result in stormwater discharge into the back yard of 32 Hancock St.
5. The stormwater report provides flow rates for new discharge points; however it does not provide sizing calculations based on velocity of stormwater per Volume 3 of the Stormwater Handbook.

For the reasons listed above we do not believe the applicant has provided adequate information for the Planning Board to make a determination on the project, and as presented, the project potentially creates substantial negative environmental impacts in the Watershed and Aquifer Protection Districts and to the surrounding neighborhood.

We appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments. We hope the Planning Board will take them into consideration prior to making any findings for the project.

In light of all this data and our true concern is that we will have groundwater problems with a waiver for a smaller pipe in the system as requested by B+T. We formerly request that the Board give no waivers relative to reducing the size of drainage pipe in the Sheldon Meadow or Sheldon West proposed projects.

Thank you for your patience, your dedicated hard work and taking the time to read this letter, as bad as our frustrations may be.

William and Joudrie Jones