

RECEIVED

JAN 29 2019

Debra Dennis

From: Michael Antonellis
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 1:19 PM
To: Debra Dennis
Subject: FW: RE: [Lancaster MA] Goodridge Estates Handicapped Parking (Sent by Mike McCue, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING)

More comments

-----Original Message-----

From: PAUL RICH [mailto:[paul.rich@cityoflan.com](#)]
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 1:03 PM
To: Michael Antonellis
Subject: Fwd: RE: [Lancaster MA] Goodridge Estates Handicapped Parking (Sent by Mike McCue, [mccue@cityoflan.com](#))

> ----- Original Message -----

> **From:** Mike McCue <[mccue@cityoflan.com](#)>
> **To:** Jeanne <[jeanne@cityoflan.com](#)>
> **Date:** January 28, 2019 at 10:20 PM
> **Subject:** RE: [Lancaster MA] Goodridge Estates Handicapped Parking
> (Sent by Mike McCue,
>
> Hello Jeanne,
>
> Nice to meet you on Thursday. Update-- regarding elevator requirements, after the meeting I dug deeper into details. Although elevators are required, there are also exceptions. I am working through this at present with the MOD and will provide you with their full detailed assessment. However, they have two questions that I in turn have for you:
>
> 1. From what I heard, in addition to the basement level of apts and the 3 floors above this, there is also a mezzanine in these buildings. Is that true and if so, are there common areas for residents in this mezzanine or is the mezzanine area for apartment units only?
>
> 2. I believe the buildings each have 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom units, correct?
>
> Thanks, and also, thank you for your patience, as these rules and regulations can be tricky with lots of loopholes, exceptions etc.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Mike McCue
> President
>
>
>

> -----Original Message-----

> **From:** Jeanne <[jeanne@cityoflan.com](#)>
> **Sent:** Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:30 PM

> To: Mike McCue <mike.mccue@townoflanaster.com>
> Subject: Re: [Lancaster MA] Goodridge Estates Handicapped Parking
> (Sent by Mike McCue, mike.mccue@townoflanaster.com)
>
> Mike
> The board of appeals is meeting next Thursday at 7 pm at Mary
> rowlandson. Please plan to attend and discuss
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Jan 15, 2019, at 3:24 PM, Contact form at Lancaster MA <cmsmailer@civicplus.com> wrote:
>>
>> Hello jrich,
>>
>> Mike McCue mike.mccue@townoflanaster.com has sent you a message via
>> your contact form (<https://www.ci.lancaster.ma.us/user/563/contact>)
>> at Lancaster MA.
>>
>> If you don't want to receive such e-mails, you can change your
>> settings at <https://www.ci.lancaster.ma.us/user/563/edit>.
>>
>> Message:
>>
>> Hi Jean,
>>
>> During our last Commission on Disability meeting, the question of HC
>> parking at Goodridge Estates arose, as it appears that there are
>> only provisions for
>> 1.7 vehicles per apartment in the current plan. If there only 1.7
>> per apartment, then what provisions are there if any, for
>> handicapped parking? I do not know what the total number of spaces
>> in the development would be in the proposal, but handicapped parking
>> would be required. This is important not only for residents, but also for guests that are visiting residents.
>>
>> In light of this and also other reasons, on the surface, 1.7
>> vehicles certainly seems inadequate for this development. Can you
>> please reply, or perhaps we can discuss it further. I tried reaching
>> you by phone via the number published on the town website, but I
>> received an out of service recording.
>>
>> Thank You,
>> Mike McCue
>> Chair, Lancaster Commission on Disability
> ;
>>
>

The contents of this email and any attachments are the property of the Town of Lancaster Massachusetts and subject to the Public Records Law, M.G.L. c. 66, section 10. When writing or responding, please remember that the Massachusetts Secretary of State's Office has determined that email is a public record and not confidential.



Caron Environmental Consulting

978-874-5469

Wetlands • Forestry • Permitting • Habitat Studies

RECEIVED

JAN 24 2019

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
AND PLANNING

Lancaster Conservation Commission
701 Main Street
Lancaster, MA 01523

Re: Review of Wetland Delineation
Crescent Builders/Sterling Road

Dear Commission Members:

As requested we have reviewed the wetland delineation on the above-referenced site which is subject to an ANRAD filing. We have conducted two on-site reviews; on June 19 and 22, 2018. Joyce Hastings from GLM Engineering Consultants, Inc. was present for both on-site reviews.

The delineation of wetlands on this site is quite complex and in many areas there are subtle differences between the uplands and wetlands. The review was based upon observations of the plant communities, soil characteristics and hydrologic indicators.

During the initial site visit we immediately found some wetland areas between Flags 18-28 to 18-31 and the road. In this area there are pockets dominated by wetland species, that have hydric soils and which appear to have standing water in the spring. Following our initial site visit Ms. Hastings re-delineated the wetlands in this area. Two non-bordering wetlands were delineated; the 500 and 700 series. Despite the close proximity of the various wetlands in this area these two areas do appear to be isolated. Accordingly, they should not be regulated as Bordering Vegetated Wetlands under the Wetlands Protection Act, but we believe they should be subject to regulation under your local bylaw. In addition these areas are potentially subject to federal jurisdiction. In addition, the previous wetland line in this area, from Flags 18-27 to 18-31 was re-delineated, and expanded, with Flags 18-600 to 18-609.

The purpose of our second on-site review was to examine these changes. With these revisions the wetlands appear to be accurately depicted in this area.

In addition to the above-referenced changes several other adjustments and additions to the wetland delineation were warranted. In each of these areas Ms. Hastings adjusted or added wetland flags to our satisfaction. These changes are outlined below:

- Flag 18-38 was moved out ~15'.
- Flag 18-54 was moved out ~15'.
- There is a vegetated wetland (which appears bordering) just off the property near the southeast corner of the site. This area was delineated with Flags 18-501 to 18-504.
- Flag 18-63 was added to extend the delineation up to the property line.
- Flags A to C were added to extend the delineation up to the property line.
- Flag 18-126 was moved out ~12'.
- Flag 18-125 was moved out ~15'.
- Flag 18-143 was moved out ~10'.

247 Bragg Hill Road • Westminster, MA 01473
Fax 978-874-1790 • Email: caronenv@aol.com

Edits are from Art Johnson

'its far more

dangerous than

noise + dust —

+ aerial emissions

from a chemical fire

go over a fence —

- We requested that a wetland area on the north side of Sterling Road be shown approximately

With the revisions noted above it appears that the wetland delineation on the site accurately delineates the extent of wetlands on the site. The revised plan, dated May 21, 2018 by GLM Engineering Consultants, Inc. appears to accurately reflect all of the changes that were made.

If you have any questions in regards to this matter please feel free to contact us.

Very truly yours,

CARON ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING

By,



Charles E. Caron

EPA Tier II site

because of Large Toxic

Chemical Use —

w/ a FEMA plan —

~~in complab~~

incompatible

its n

Debra Dennis

RECEIVED

JAN 29 2019

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
AND PLANNING

From: Michael Antonellis
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 10:21 AM
To: Debra Dennis
Subject: FW: [Lancaster MA] Lancaster Public Water Supply Concerns (Sent by Greg Jackson,

From: Jeanne [mailto:
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 9:02 PM
To: Michael Antonellis
Subject: Fwd: [Lancaster MA] Lancaster Public Water Supply Concerns (Sent by Greg Jackson,

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Contact form at Lancaster MA" <cmsmailer@civicplus.com>
Date: January 26, 2019 at 1:41:00 PM EST
To: [redacted]
Subject: [Lancaster MA] Lancaster Public Water Supply Concerns (Sent by Greg Jackson,

Reply-To: [redacted]

Hello jrich,

Greg Jackson, [redacted] has sent you a message via your contact form (<https://www.ci.lancaster.ma.us/user/563/contact>) at Lancaster MA.

If you don't want to receive such e-mails, you can change your settings at <https://www.ci.lancaster.ma.us/user/563/edit>.

Message:

Re: Lancaster Public Water Supply Concerns
From: Greg Jackson
Date: 01/26/19

Dear Chairman Rich,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Zoning Board of Appeals at Thursday night's meeting with resident's concerns about the impact of the proposed Goodridge Brook Estates project on Lancaster's public water supply. A copy of my comments is appended below for the Board's reference.

Throughout the special permit hearing process, you have heard from many different residents that they are worried about the potential lasting effects that this development will have on the town's water infrastructure, whether it be through degraded service, or quality, or higher bills.

As residents have made clear at earlier hearings, the water reports received from Haley and Ward were incomplete and inadequate. In previous comments to the ZBA, we have provided examples to support these conclusions. Please refer to residents' comments from 12/2/18 on this subject.

We have repeatedly asked the Board to seek a comprehensive engineering analysis to determine the impact of GBE on the town's water system. As I stated Thursday night, this is necessary because the scope of the H & W reports is limited to water capacity and provides no guidance with respect to infrastructure, service, or quality.

If existing problems are not identified and resolved up front, the Applicant will be blamed for them, whether they are their fault or not. So, it is in the best interest of the developer to complete a thorough analysis of the water system and establish its current condition. It would benefit the town to resolve existing problems in advance of any more construction.

We have also requested that conditions be placed on the project's permit to hold the Applicant responsible for addressing its likely impact. Given the size of this project, it's reasonable to expect the developer would be accountable for any issues they may have on the administration, operation, or maintenance of the water system.

Residents have recently consulted another engineering firm regarding the water situation in Lancaster. Based upon our preliminary discussions, the impact study and permit conditions we are asking the ZBA to pursue are necessary, appropriate, and reasonable for a project of this scope and scale.

The impact upon our public water supply is as critical as any aspect of this project. Goodridge Brook Estates could increase demand by as much as 29,500 Ga/Day. For 8 of the past 10 years, the town has operated with withdrawal levels above its 530,000 Ga/Day average permit level. However, it would likely continue to operate within its 630,000 Ga/Day buffer limit for the next decade without the addition of this development.

I would appreciate it if you would review the appended comments and share them with the Board. Since you were not able to provide answers to my questions Thursday night, I would appreciate your written reply on the issues of conducting an appropriate project impact study and setting reasonable permit conditions with respect to the water system. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank You,

Greg Jackson

1/24/19 Lancaster Residents' Water Supply Concerns

I. Lancaster residents have many concerns about the methodology, accuracy, and completeness of the 11/3/18 water use report from Haley & Ward.

- The report provides best-case scenario projections based upon optimistic assumptions. It describes a population trend that is not fully supported by its own data.

- It does not account for greater use of existing buildings, businesses, and homes that are already connected to the water system.

- It does not adequately allow for growth over the next decade.

- The report does not provide a complete and comprehensive review of the water system's infrastructure.

- It focuses primarily on capacity and does not address the impact of the proposed development on service (eg: water pressure), and quality for existing customers.

- The report does not provide all of the information needed to properly evaluate the consequences of additional future demands and make informed decisions.

Who paid for the H&W Water Use report?

II. The ZBA should request a project impact study from an independent consultant to identify the water system's existing problems as well as any that the proposed development would cause.

- Request flow modeling and hydrant testing to identify and resolve any water pressure issues currently experienced by nearby residences and businesses.

- Review water sampling history to document and address any unresolved quality concerns.

- Identify water system upgrades or modifications required to accommodate the added demand from Goodridge Brook Estates without degrading service or quality for existing customers.

- If no such actions are required, the report should explicitly state that is the case.

What action does the ZBA plan to take?

III. As a condition for permitting the proposed project:

- The Applicant should be required to pay for all related water system evaluation and analysis.

- The Applicant should be responsible for completing any system modifications or mitigation necessary to support connection of their development to the public water supply.

- The Applicant should be accountable for any future WMA adjustments related to their project.

Residents do not want to be financially burdened, through higher taxes or water rates, by any potential infrastructure modifications, WMA compliance activities, or engineering studies required to support this development.

What action does the ZBA plan to take?

Thank you for your time and attention.

The contents of this email and any attachments are the property of the Town of Lancaster Massachusetts and subject to the Public Records Law, M.G.L. c. 66, section 10. When writing or responding, please remember that the Massachusetts Secretary of State's Office has determined that email is a public record and not confidential.

Debra Dennis

From: Michael Antonellis
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 12:41 PM
To: 'Iqbal Ali'; Dean ; 'Robert Truax'
Cc: Debra Dennis
Subject: FW: Math at Goodridge

RECEIVED

JAN 29 2019

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
AND PLANNING

Hi Ali,

A resident just sent this to me. Please be aware of their concerns and be ready to comment on the total number of units proposed at the next meeting.

Best,

Mike,

At the start of the December 13 working session I attended with Jeanne, Crescent Builders said they were removing the 4th floor of the 3 apartment buildings. They stated this took the total rental units from 120 to 96.

That is a reduction of 24 units across 3 buildings, or 8 units per building from the removed floor.

If the 4th floor had 8 units each, the remaining floors 1, 2, and 3 should have approximately 8 units, also. This gives us a total of 24 remaining units per building X 3 buildings = ~ 72 total rental units.

How is it that we still have 96 rental units? Where are the extra 24 units? That is 8 units per building that are physically unaccounted for.

At the working session, I asked Mr. Ali if he intended to include basement walk-outs since they were depicted in a small cross-section. He said yes, depending on the grade, he would like a few per building. I then asked about the "mezzanine lofts" under the eaves, also depicted in the same, small cross-section. He stated these were not separate rental units, rather just an extra living room space.

So how the rentals still as high as 96 units? This confusion, combined with the basement walk-outs and mezzanine lofts that are "extra living rooms" could use clarification.

Could you please ask Crescent Builders to explain?

My understanding from the ZBA in West Boylston is that unaccounted for units were a problem in the Crescent Builders development. I will forward you separately an email I received on this.

Thank you in advance. I am happy to be wrong, and hopefully there is a very logical explanation. It seems to better to double-check this now, not later.

Respectfully,
Victoria Petracca

The contents of this email and any attachments are the property of the Town of Lancaster Massachusetts and subject to the Public Records Law, M.G.L. c. 66, section 10. When writing or responding, please remember that the Massachusetts Secretary of State's Office has determined that email is a public record and not confidential.