- To: Chairman McKnight, Wrentham Planning Board
- CC: Chairman Immonen, Wrentham Conservation Commission Chairman Smith, Wrentham Board of Health Chris Gallo, Wrentham Selectman
- RE: Special Permit Application for Senior Living Development (Sheldon West 1139 West Street and Sheldon Meadow - 20 Hancock Street)

Dear Members of the Planning Board, Conservation Commission and Board of Health,

My husband and I live at 46 Hancock Street and are direct abutters to the proposed Sheldon Meadow project located at 20 Hancock Street. We wrote a letter on July 9, 2022 stating our concerns of the negative impact this development will have on our property, related to the high water table, effects on our septic and leach field, as well as the safety of our two daughters (almost 3 years old and 9 months old). These concerns are still very valid from our position on July 9, 2022.

As we stated in our previous letter, we understand there is a need for a development and housing and want to respect a landowner's right to develop land; however we have had and continue to have significant concerns with the negative impact this specific development will have on our property. While we acknowledge that the developers have worked hard to meet the regulations of the bylaws the intent behind the bylaw has not been met. We wanted to bring forth our concerns related to the intent of the bylaws, please see below: 390-13.5 Senior Living Communities

- A1 "The purpose of this section are to provide for housing options for a maturing
 population the reduce maintenance cost and are more affordable than traditional
 single-family dwellings." This development does not meet this bylaw based on all of the
 substantial cost of the proposed unitsas well as the added fees for snow removal,
 trash removal, and all of the other necessary private services that will be needed
- A4 "The purpose of this section are to promote development that is in harmony with the Town's natural features and resources, its historic and traditional landscapes..." This development does not meet this bylaw, While the house may be designed to look similar in nature, they are not in harmony with the historical features. They are double in size of many of the homes in this area with less acreage, resulting in a cluster development and losing the beauty of nature in this part of Wrentham.
- D11 "An SLC shall have an amenity structure designed to allow for a variety of passive and active recreational activities that support the residents..." while there is a gazebo type pavilion, it is not an enclosed structure and has no heat. I cannot imagine that anyone, let alone a senior over the age of 55, will be outside during the winter months when it is snowing or as low as 25 degrees using this amenity structure. The intent of this bylaw is to create a space for the neighbors to join as a community and as stated in the bylaw "areas for neighborhood meetings, event space and any other opportunities to

create and promote an integrated neighborhood-type environment," this cannot be done or used during the winter months, only meeting this bylaw during warm weather.

In our opinion, the below bylaws that are not met have a significant impact on the abutters in the neighborhood:

390-13.5 Senior Living Communities

- H2 "Structures located near the project property lines shall be designed and located in a manner that reflects consistency and compatibility with neighboring areas, and shall include appropriate use of building density, heights and design to minimize intrusion on neighbors." This bylaw has not been met in our opinion. Due to the amount of fill needing to be brought in, the developers are proposing six foot walls to retain the fill located a handful of feet away from abutters property. Essentially there is a plateau that is created. The wall and plateau design does not currently exist anywhere in the neighborhood and this wall structure would drastically alter the look and feel of the neighborhood. Sidewalks also come within a few feet of abutters property. Residents of the proposed development could be walking on this section of sidewalk, almost on top of abutters property, looking down on abutters as they mow their lawns or their children are playing in the backyard. The building height, density and design of this development is significantly invasive and intrusive to the direct abutters of this project.
- H3 "Outdoor recreation or gathering areas, particularly those that may generate significant noise and/or light and glare, shall be located to minimize intrusion on neighboring properties." is not met. With the project looking down on our property any lighting that is used for those residents to back out or pull into their driveways or driving around to enter or exit the development, as well as the street lights and walking path lights will be shining down on our property; not even including the lights and noise of snow plow machines at all hours of the night shining in on our windows into our bedrooms because the streets will be at the same level if not higher than our houses.
- H10A "The Planning Board reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to impose more stringent standards and/or reduce the number of units to ensure that impacts generated by the project are adequately addressed with the following considerations...slopes defined as moderate slope" this bylaw is also not met. We are significantly concerned with the slope that is proposed behind our home. We have requested verbally during 2 Planning Board meetings as well as in a formal letter submitted July 20, 2022, why homes 1, 2, 3 and 16 cannot be removed to make the slope less severe leading into our property and the response from the application and their lawyer was that the project has already been reduced and it wouldn't be financially beneficial. This poses a big concern for our home. We are located on the corner of the development where there is no retaining wall or anything holding the fill or water from our yard. We requested the homes be removed. To go from flat land behind us to such a significant slope does not seem to meet the intent of this bylaw.
- J1 "The proposed SLC will not have an adverse effect that outweigh its beneficial effects on either the neighborhood or the Town..." this bylaw is not met. While the developer has worked hard to make changes to the original plan that was submitted, the concerns that we have presented over and over again are not being taking into consideration related to the adverse effect this project will have on the neighborhood, including but not limited to:

- Change in water table
- Traffic
- Snow removal and runoff water
- Significant slopes and grading
- Having a skyline right now that will be turned into a home built 4-6 ft above our current homes
- No privacy from the development the residents can look down on our property when they are walking on the sidewalk
- Residual effects of months of fill being transported in
- Not meeting the nature of the historical and charm of West Wrentham
- Having retaining walls built so close to our properties
- Possible financial burden if one of the drainage systems fails or it is not sloped correctly and we end up with water damage to our home or property

We want to sincerely thank the committee's hard work, consideration and time they have spent reading all of our concerns over the past few years as this development has unfolded. We hope that we can work to ensure that the intent of the bylaws are being met. As parents of two young daughters under the age of 3 years old, we want to make sure our children can grow up in a safe and healthy environment without having to worry about the significant impact this development will have on our property and our well-being.

My husband and I would like to respectfully ask the board to vote in opposition to this proposed development for the reasons cited above, as well as our previous letter from July 9, 2022.

Thank you, Tara Nash Patrick Nash

Tara and Patrick Nash 46 Hancock Street Wrentham, MA 02093

CC: <u>concom@wrentham.gov</u> <u>ebugbee@wrentham.gov</u> <u>cgallo@wrentham.gov</u>