

## Debra Dennis

---

**From:** Erin Smith  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 10, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Debra Dennis  
**Subject:** Comment for Planning Board Meeting 12/14

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** planning

Good Day Debra,

I would like to request the following letter/comment be added to the agenda for this coming Monday's Planning Board meeting. I am not sure of the formal process, but I am looking for a response from the Board given I was not allowed to give a comment or ask questions on the subject of the booster station in the Poras Development at the last meeting in Nov. 25th.

Please let me know if there is anything else I need to do in order to have my comment presented.

Thank you,  
Erin

**Here is my formal comment I would ask be presented at Monday's meeting:**

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Good Evening Board,*

*I would like to ask why the Planning Board, specifically what appears to be the chair, Russell Williston, is continuing pursuit of non-compliance claims that the booster station approved in the Flexible Development special permit issued by the Lancaster Planning Board to the Poras Realty Trust and Weinerwald II Realty Trust?*

*According to records, this subject has been visited, appeals heard, decided upon, and evaluated by the Board of Appeals, Building Inspector, and town council.*

*In the KP Law letter sent to the town dated April 10, 2020, it is clearly stated the town acted in accordance with bylaws, the town process', and state law regarding the town's approvals, time for appeals, and placement of the booster station for the development on what will become open space once the town accepts the development and the builder transfers it to the town.*

*Mr. Eichman, the town council who wrote the letter from April, cited not only pertinent law but also precedent backing up his evaluation that the booster station meets requirements, he noted appeals time frames have long since passed, and the pump station is an accessory to the Development and therefore is allowed on what is planned to become open space.*

*While, in my opinion, maybe this building could have been better designed as an underground vault to preserve the open space views, and maybe the town should look at that as a priority of processes to change going forward, clearly the approval process and placement of the booster station is in alignment with CURRENT bylaws and Massachusetts state law.*

*The continued refusal to accept the town's BOA and council evaluation combined with the Planning Board's Chair involvement in the previous appeals begins to look as though a public servant is looking to pursue a personal agenda with a public position and great ethical/conflict of interest concerns are beginning to rise.*

*I feel the Board's time could be far better spent directing attention at true violators, who fail to answer or act to correct violations cited that could have far more impact on the town long term or focusing on amending current bylaws to further protect open space within state law than continuing to revisit a town approved development with an approved legal pump station.*

*I look forward to your response and explanation because as a new resident of this wonderful town our public board members need to be sure to maintain the highest ethical standards and follow town bylaws and processes as interpreted by the law, not personal interests.*

*Sincerely,  
Erin Smith  
62 Hawthorne Lane*

\*\*\*\*\*