

December 12, 2022

Dear Chairman Immonen, Agent Luce and Members of the Conservation Commission:

First of all, thank you for your time and care put into reviewing and commenting on the multitude of documents provided by the applicant in regards to the Sheldon Meadow and Sheldon West proposals. I know I not only speak for myself but also for my neighbors when I say I am grateful for your attention to this important matter.

I am writing to raise concerns and ask questions I have regarding the proposed Sheldon Meadow and Sheldon West SLC developments. Please know that I am speaking as a concerned citizen of Wrentham and abutter to the properties in question. I am not speaking as a member of nor representing the Wrentham Conservation Commission.

Having attended and reviewed the most recent Planning Board and Conservation Commission meetings as well as perused the latest submissions by the application, I continue to have grave concerns about both proposals. The following remain areas of concern or where I have questions.

1. The applicant is very quick to add conditions that the Town is responsible for. Three alone were a part of the applicant's response to the Pawtucket Water Supply Board's (PWSB) initial letter of concern. Seven others were noted at the October 5, 2022 Planning Board hearing. And during the most recent Planning Board hearing, the applicant's counsel continued to push that nearly every objection to their plan could be conditioned.

Getting back to the applicant's response to the PWSB's initial letter of concern, it is stated that the HOA will be responsible for monitoring many important items. This is concerning given there is no guarantee that the HOA will be capable or interested in monitoring things such as fertilizer use, waste management and stormwater system maintenance depending on how it is structured. Not all HOAs are created equal. Given the small scale of these projects and the applicant's stated desire to keep costs down for the residents, it is highly feasible that the HOA could be nothing more than a volunteer group consisting of residents of the communities. Even if the HOA is a hired property manager, how is an off site company going to realistically oversee these important items?

It is equally concerning that the applicant is placing the responsibility of monitoring fill quality on the Town's Conservation Agent. This too is stated in their response to the Pawtucket Water Supply Board's initial letter of concern. Is this something that is a typical request? Is it possible that all 69,000+ CY of fill can be successfully vetted without putting a huge burden on our Conservation Agent? How much will testing cost the town? Attorney Buckley commented at the last PB meeting (12/7/22) that these projects have to "work economically" for them. This, in my mind, translates into finding

the lowest bidder when it comes to construction and fill quality. The applicant gave themselves an “out” in their response to PWSB when they stated: “...a supplier of material will be chosen based on availability and supply...” Given supply chain issues, construction demands, and the economy, there is no guarantee an appropriate supplier who has clean fill will even be available. Then what? Will the applicant be willing to delay construction until one is found? It seems more likely they will go with what they can find at the lowest possible cost to them and return to the town to ask for a concession.

2. In the PVI Site Design letter to the Planning Board dated July 14, 2022 it states the following on page 1. **“It is reasonable to assume a project of this scale could alter groundwater patterns with negative impacts to existing properties.”** It is reiterated in PVI’s most recent letter to the Planning Board dated 12/7/22. In this most recent correspondence, one of the main takeaways I gathered from emailing with Tim Power, the engineer who drafted the report on behalf of myself and Bill and Joudrie Jones, is what is missing from the groundwater mounding analysis is the added effect of septic system flow to the groundwater. The current analysis shows a mound of over 1 foot for the basins. If there is a significant mound for the septic system there’s a risk that will cause a breakout during storm events or prevent the basin from draining within the required 72 hours. I am concerned that evaluating these projects without a septic plan puts the neighborhood at great risk.
3. Finally, I remain concerned that there is development happening within the 100’ buffer zone. The applicant’s calculations remain at or close to the minimum requirements. They have left zero margin for error. I am not sure if this falls into the Commission’s jurisdiction but should it be something that the Commission is tasked with I figured I would mention it. Since they are insisting on building within the 100’ buffer zone, I feel they should not be allowed any concessions should a calculation error be made but instead be required to fix the problem even if it means deconstructing what has been built and redoing. At the Planning Board meeting on 5/19/21, the representative for Weber Farms asked for permission to not have to demolish and repour a foundation that was laid in error due to a miscalculation by the architect. The corner of the foundation cut 5-7 inches into the ‘no build’ zone. “To err is human”, was a comment someone made. **However, the delicate nature of these properties does not allow for any type of miscalculation. Again, there is NO MARGIN FOR ERROR and there are no guarantees there will not be error.**

As I stated at the start of this letter, I appreciate the Commission’s time in reviewing all the documents and hearing the testimony during the public hearings. Thank you for considering my comments and questions as you deliberate further.

Sincerely,

Janet Sozio  
1171 West St.