

February 3, 2019

Dear Mr. Antonellis,

I am writing to you to underscore my concerns regarding the extensive 40B project to be located off of Sterling Road as put forth by Mr. Iqbal Ali of Crescent Builders. I live at 46 South Meadow Road, and have been actively following the Comprehensive Building Permit hearing for this project because it has a direct impact on my neighborhood as well as all of Lancaster.

This 40B proposal is located on a site that is zoned "residential" but which contains 40% wetlands; as such, all of the construction is compressed into the buildable areas of the property. The end result portrays an overly congested development that stands to significantly increase the population of Lancaster while presenting the town with severe maintenance issues related to traffic, infrastructure, safety and town services.

During the Comprehensive Permit hearing, requests for information from our Zoning Board of Appeals (and even the Massachusetts Housing Authority) go unanswered. It's my understanding that the 40B permitting process is supposed to be a negotiation; yet, Mr. Ali categorically refuses to consider important safety and environmental issues during this process. Instead, his representatives keep pressing the ZBA to make all of these serious concerns conditions to be addressed after he receives his permit, boldly stating that they want to minimize their expenses until the project is approved. Yet, the issues that the developer wishes to side step are substantive and therefore cause the most concern, including:

- There is a need for appropriate environmental analysis of this site to be performed in the very near future. Our town Conservation Commission and a well-known and very well respected wetlands scientist have both raised this issue. Another consideration: the development site is currently forested. Once the trees are taken down, how does that affect water runoff for the surrounding wetlands areas? Additionally, the wetlands surrounding the development will provide breeding grounds for mosquitoes and ticks, presenting potential public health issues.
- The site is located next to a lumber processing facility that has been designated as an EPA Tier II site due to the quantity of dangerous chemicals used in the course of the work performed on the site as well as the amount of fuel stored on the site for the facility's heavy equipment and kiln. Across the road, in similar terms of chemical usage, another company performs powder paint coating for a myriad of uses. Representatives from both companies have expressed concerns about children coming onto the industrial properties.
- The applicant categorically refuses to provide roads wide enough to accommodate school buses within the development. Instead, he deems it appropriate to have children wait for school buses by Sterling Road. Given the heavy truck traffic associated with the industries on Sterling road, this rationale is foolish and dangerous.
- There is a need for an independent water study to be performed to appropriately address water infrastructure concerns left unanswered in the Haley & Ward reports presented to the ZBA. Lancaster's 2 wells draw from the same aquifer; therefore, in-depth analyses need to take place related to water quality, water pressure and the impact of this large development on the overall health of the aquifer itself.
- Mr. Fred Hamwey's engineering report has identified multiple, fundamental engineering issues that Crescent Builders refuses to address; yet, the applicant states that answers will be provided after the Comprehensive Permit has been issued. Mr. Hamwey is on record stating that this tactic is inappropriate given the importance of the unresolved issues since they affect the lay-out of the project itself.
- Sewer connections remain unresolved.

Perhaps the greatest concern is that there are only 2 public meetings remaining in the Comprehensive Permit Hearing. The Hearing officially ends on April 1, 2019. Due in large part to Crescent Builder's inability to provide substantive information to the ZBA, Mr. Ali has already allowed 2 extensions for the hearing; however, he stood to benefit from those extensions. He very well may disallow further extensions, because all of these unresolved issues involve the feasibility of the project itself. Why would the applicant agree to another extension if he doesn't think it furthers his project? He can just go to the Housing Appeals Committee, cry foul and fully expect to win. If that's the case, how do all of these issues get resolved in the short time remaining?

Jeanne M Rose