ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Agenda

DATE OF MEETING: Thursday, August 20, 2020
TIME OF MEETING: 5:30 pm
LOCATION OF MEETING: Remote Meeting
www.truro-ma.gov

Open Meeting
This will be a remote meeting. Citizens can view the meeting on Channel 18 in Truro and on the web on the "Truro TV Channel 18" button under "Helpful Links" on the homepage of the Town of Truro website (www.truro-ma.gov). Click on the green “Watch” button in the upper right corner of the page. Please note that there may be a slight delay (approx. 15-30 seconds) between the meeting and the television broadcast/live stream.

Citizens can join the meeting to listen and provide public comment via the link below, which can also be found on the calendar of the Board’s webpage along with the meeting Agenda and Packet, or by calling in toll free at 1-866-899-4679 and entering the following access code when prompted: 611-192-245. Citizens will be muted upon entering the meeting until the public comment portion of the hearing. If you are joining the meeting while watching the television broadcast/live stream, please lower the volume on your computer or television during public comment so that you may be heard clearly. Citizens may also provide written comment via postal mail or by emailing the Town Planner at planner1@truro-ma.gov.

Meeting link: global.gotomeeting.com/join/611192245

Hearing materials can be found at the following web address:
Review of Comments

- Public Comment letter from Chuck Steinman
- Public Comment letter from Karen and Frederick Ruymann
- Public Comment letter from Claire and Mauro Aniello
- Public Comment letter from Julia Lester
- Public Comment letter from Pamela Fichtner
- Public Comment letter from Ron Fichtner
- Public Comment letter from Eve Turchinetz
- Public Comment letter from George Dineen
- Public Comment letter from Hank Keenan
- Public Comment letter from Pamela Wolff
- Public Comment letter from Stephen Williams

Public Hearing – Continued

2019-008 ZBA – Community Housing Resource, Inc. seeks approval for a Comprehensive Permit pursuant to G.L. c. 40B, §§20-23 to create 40 residential rental units, of which not less than 25% or 10 units shall be restricted as affordable for low or moderate income persons or families, to be constructed on property located at 22 Highland Road, as shown on Assessor’s Map 36 and Parcel 238-0 containing 3.91 acres of land area.

- Discussion of response by J.M. O’Reilly & Associates, Inc. to the Cloverleaf Project Second Peer Review by the Horsley Witten Group

Public Comment

Adjourn
Please read into the Public Record the following comments that are intended to make clear the points of my previously submitted comments:

The COVID pandemic has significant new implications for the health and safety for all Truro’s residents, and in particular for future Cloverleaf residents. Many institutions that are cautiously grappling with reopening are extremely concerned about their liability for the spread of Covid-19. Not only are they limiting occupancy levels and creating safer environments, they fear potential lawsuits for not meeting strict State regulations for providing protective measures, or new standards for cleaning and sanitation. The potential liability of the Town and the developer must be taken into account.

The pre-pandemic design of the Building #21 congregate apartment is no longer an appropriate solution for Truro or its seniors. Given the high percentage of deaths in congregate retirement communities and nursing facilities, redesign of the apartment building must be taken seriously. In my comments in the June 25 packet and as further supported by the following excerpts from New York Times (Coronavirus Crisis Threatens Push for Denser Housing, by Kevin Williams, May 6, 2020), it is recommended that Building #21 be replaced with a 9 or 12 townhouse units similar to those previously proposed for the site, of which 6 or 8 could be accessible ground-floor units entered from the front and back. Pertinent to the recommended Cloverleaf redesign are the following excerpts from the NYT article:

"The whole discussion about housing will change. A lot of the bills and laws the Legislature have been discussing will be looked at in a different lens," [Isaiah Madison, a board member of Livable California, a nonprofit group] said.

"I wouldn’t make any big development decisions right now," said Dr. Jackson, a former officer in the Epidemic Intelligence Service at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "The economic fallout is likely to last five years or more," he added, "and people may be wearing masks for several years. Developers will have to factor the pandemic, and other crises, into their plans."

"The desire for denser developments might diminish," [Mr. Yougentob, a Maryland developer] said, and his company may switch its focus to townhomes. "The forced interaction of sharing doors and elevators has caused some anxiety," Mr. Yougentob said, "Townhomes, where you come in and out of your door, and you know you are the only one touching your door handle, provide some comfort." (Emphasis added.)

Responsibility for the apartment building’s daily cleaning and maintenance of commons areas, shared laundry rooms, elevators, stairwells, etc. will be an unanticipated burden and expense. As noted above, people are now fearful of occupying such spaces and are likely to prefer the privacy associated with duplexes or townhouses. The Town’s responsibility for protecting its residents’ health and safety has taken on a whole new dimension. Now is the time for the ZBA to press "PAUSE" to allow enough time for these concerns to be properly evaluated.
Accessible Entry Recommendations

I would like to document my comments at the July 30, 2020 ZBA Cloverleaf Public Hearing regarding the entry steps to the units with photos of examples from the Edgewood Farm Project.

As recommended by the Commission on Disabilities, the developer should consider the replacement of entry steps to the Cloverleaf units with landscape-integrated walkways such as in the photos of the remodeling of Edgewood Farm by the Truro Center for the Arts at Castle Hill. A make-shift plywood ramp as offered by the developer is unsafe, unsightly, and could be slippery when wet.

Integrated landscape and walkway design can eliminate the need for steps.

The first two photos show the entry to the offices with a walkway that uses landscaping and a planting bed to create an entry without steps leading directly into the building at the interior floor level.

The third photo shows a subtle ramp leading to a landing at the interior floor level, and a step from that to the lawn for those who are able to use it.
Dear Colleagues,
When Truro Town Meeting approved buying the Cloverleaf parcel in 2016 for affordable housing, we understood that the intent was to build 12-16 units. This was clearly the voters’ understanding and intent, since the Select Board comments to the article, upon which Truro voters could and did explicitly rely, stated this goal. We assumed that number would go forward, because it is what our Zoning Bylaws allow for affordable housing and what our Board of Health regulations allow as a safe number for the 3.9 acre property, namely up to 17 bedrooms. We are still fully behind this Town Meeting approval of up to 16 units on this property.

However, as we have learned that the Truro Zoning Board of Appeals is actually considering an application for 39 units/70 bedrooms on that land, so close to Pond Village, alarm bells that were quietly ringing in the background are now loudly peeling for our community. The more we have learned of this proposal, the bylaw and health regulation waivers it requires, and the dangers of water contamination, the more concerns we began to have, primarily about the potential impact on the drinking water in our neighborhood and the threat that might pose to our health and safety, not to mention our home equity.

At this time, Pond Village property owners are conferring with one another, moving to get our well-water tested, deepening our understanding of nitrogen/nitrates and other contaminants in drinking water and its consequences for health, and trying to understand why many experts say even levels as low as 1 ppm are a health threat in drinking water. We are trying to understand why the Cape Cod Commission recommends no more than 5ppm, and the EPA accepts a standard of 10ppm, while also saying that it doesn’t apply to private wells for which the risks seem greater.

We are not convinced that the ZBA has yet devoted sufficient attention to the health and safety of Pond Village and other nearby residents. Before the Board starts actually deliberating on the many requested waivers, we request that Pond Village be listed as an agenda item for a scheduled meeting so that we can be represented directly before the Board, rather than as a Public Comment at the end of the meeting. We support community housing developed in a manner that does not threaten our health and safety. We believe the Town can accomplish both and hope for the opportunity and time to be informed better and to inform the ZBA.

Please distribute this to the ZBA.

Thank you,
Karen MacDonald Ruymann
Frederick W. Ruymann
Dear Colleagues,
When Truro Town Meeting approved buying the Cloverleaf parcel in 2016 for affordable housing, we understood that the intent was to build 12-16 units. This was clearly the voters’ understanding and intent, since the Select Board comments to the article, upon which Truro voters could and did explicitly rely, stated this goal. We assumed that number would go forward, because it is what our Zoning Bylaws allow for affordable housing and what our Board of Health regulations allow as a safe number for the 3.9 acre property, namely up to 17 bedrooms. We are still fully behind this Town Meeting approval of up to 16 units on this property.

However, as we have learned that the Truro Zoning Board of Appeals is actually considering an application for 39 units/70 bedrooms on that land, so close to Pond Village, alarm bells that were quietly ringing in the background are now loudly peeling for our community. The more we have learned of this proposal, the bylaw and health regulation waivers it requires, and the dangers of water contamination, the more concerns we began to have, primarily about the potential impact on the drinking water in our neighborhood and the threat that might pose to our health and safety, not to mention our home equity.

At this time, Pond Village property owners are conferring with one another, moving to get our well-water tested, deepening our understanding of nitrogen/nitrates and other contaminants in drinking water and its consequences for health, and trying to understand why many experts say even levels as low as 1 ppm are a health threat in drinking water. We are trying to understand why the Cape Cod Commission recommends no more than 5ppm, and the EPA accepts a standard of 10ppm, while also saying that it doesn’t apply to private wells for which the risks seem greater.

We are not convinced that the ZBA has yet devoted sufficient attention to the health and safety of Pond Village and other nearby residents. Before the Board starts actually deliberating on the many requested waivers, we request that Pond Village be listed as an agenda item for a scheduled meeting so that we can be represented directly before the Board, rather than as a Public Comment at the end of the meeting. We support community housing developed in a manner that does not threaten our health and safety. We believe the Town can accomplish both and hope for the opportunity and time to be informed better and to inform the ZBA.

Thank you for your thoughtful attention,

Claire Aniello
Mauro Aniello
SUBJECT: Pond Villagers Placed on ZBA Agenda | Cloverleaf Hearings

Dear Colleagues,

When Truro Town Meeting approved buying the Cloverleaf parcel in 2016 for affordable housing, we understood that the intent was to build 12-16 units. This was clearly the voters' understanding and intent, since the Select Board comments to the article, upon which Truro voters could and did explicitly rely, stated this goal. We assumed that number would go forward, because it is what our Zoning Bylaws allow for affordable housing and what our Board of Health regulations allow as a safe number for the 3.9 acre property, namely up to 17 bedrooms. We are still fully behind this Town Meeting approval of up to 16 units on this property.

However, as we have learned that the Truro Zoning Board of Appeals is actually considering an application for 39 units/70 bedrooms on that land, so close to Pond Village, alarm bells that were quietly ringing in the background are now loudly peeling for our community. The more we have learned of this proposal, the bylaw and health regulation waivers it requires, and the dangers of water contamination, the more concerns we began to have, primarily about the potential impact on the drinking water in our neighborhood and the threat that might pose to our health and safety, not to mention our home equity.

At this time, Pond Village property owners are conferring with one another, moving to get our well-water tested, deepening our understanding of nitrogen/nitrates and other contaminants in drinking water and its consequences for health, and trying to understand why many experts say even levels as low as 1 ppm are a health threat in drinking water. We are trying to understand why the Cape Cod Commission recommends no more than 5ppm, and the EPA accepts a standard of 10ppm, while also saying that it doesn't apply to private wells for which the risks seem greater.

We are not convinced that the ZBA has yet devoted sufficient attention to the health and safety of Pond Village and other nearby residents. Before the Board starts actually deliberating on the many requested waivers, we request that Pond Village be listed as an agenda item for a scheduled meeting so that we can be represented directly before the Board, rather than as a Public Comment at the end of the meeting. We support community housing developed in a manner that does not threaten our health and safety. We believe the Town can accomplish both and hope for the opportunity and time to be informed better and to inform the ZBA.

Please distribute this to the ZBA.

Thank you,

Julia Lester
Dear Colleagues,

When Truro Town Meeting approved buying the Cloverleaf parcel in 2016 for affordable housing, we understood that the intent was to build 12-16 units. This was clearly the voters’ understanding and intent, since the Select Board comments to the article, upon which Truro voters could and did explicitly rely, stated this goal. We assumed that number would go forward, because it is what our Zoning Bylaws allow for affordable housing and what our Board of Health regulations allow as a safe number for the 3.9 acre property, namely up to 17 bedrooms. We are still fully behind this Town Meeting approval of up to 16 units on this property.

However, as we have learned that the Truro Zoning Board of Appeals is actually considering an application for 39 units/70 bedrooms on that land, so close to Pond Village, alarm bells that were quietly ringing in the background are now loudly peeling for our community. The more we have learned of this proposal, the bylaw and health regulation waivers it requires, and the dangers of water contamination, the more concerns we began to have, primarily about the potential impact on the drinking water in our neighborhood and the threat that might pose to our health and safety, not to mention our home equity.

At this time, Pond Village property owners are conferring with one another, moving to get our well-water tested, deepening our understanding of nitrogen/nitrates and other contaminants in drinking water and its consequences for health, and trying to understand why many experts say even levels as low as 1 ppm are a health threat in drinking water. We are trying to understand why the Cape Cod Commission recommends no more than 5ppm, and the EPA accepts a standard of 10ppm, while also saying that it doesn’t apply to private wells for which the risks seem greater.

We are not convinced that the ZBA has yet devoted sufficient attention to the health and safety of Pond Village and other nearby residents. Before the Board starts actually deliberating on the many requested waivers, we request that Pond Village be listed as an agenda item for a scheduled meeting so that we can be represented directly before the Board, rather than as a Public Comment at the end of the meeting. We support community housing developed in a manner that does not threaten our health and safety. We believe the Town can accomplish both and hope for the opportunity and time to be informed better and to inform the ZBA.

Please distribute this to the ZBA.

Thank you,

Pamela Fichtner
Dear Ms. Carboni and Ms. Sturdy,

Please include the attached letter in the packet for the August 20, 2020 Truro Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. Because of its perspective I will join the meeting to elaborate.

Thank you,

Ron Fichtner
To: Members, Truro Zoning Board of Appeals:

I am submitting this to the ZBA because I believe the Town of Truro can and should do better. It has the opportunity to create a model for affordable housing on Cape Cod. It should seize it.

Those desiring to live and work in Truro are attracted for the same reasons those of us who love Truro are: its open spaces, proximity to nature and the sea, picturesque views, and unique history.

Through research, we have become aware of the need to build and support communities that promote mental and physical health. We have come to understand the critical role of housing in addressing our nation's greatest public health concerns. They include obesity, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, asthma, injury, violence, social inequities, and depression. Alarmingly, the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic underscores these concerns.

We also know that the greatest burden of these diseases falls upon those with lower incomes, minorities, the elderly and those with disabilities. It is precisely those in these categories who are intended to benefit mostly from new affordable housing construction in Truro, and its availability.

Truro's answer to its need for housing, in addition that it be affordable and available, should also meet the critical criterion of promoting and sustaining public health to the greatest degree possible.

How is this best done? By building an environment that encourages physical movement, has ready access to green space, facilitates and invites social interactions and a sense of community, has walking paths, is away from road noise, is isolated from fumes and particulate matter from vehicles, has a nearby school, and is diverse in its inhabitants.

The intention of this public comment is not to be specifically critical of the Cloverleaf proposal, but instead to advocate for giving the Walsh property Truro's most immediate priority for affordable housing because of its superior potential. It does that by optimizing contributions to public health, rather than risking it, while allowing for the design of a planned community
that will attract new Truro residents wishing to make homes here, and is scalable when additional units are needed.

In marked contrast, development on the Walsh property would not require waivers from many long-established safeguards. It would also be free of the uncertain environmental and legal impacts facing the Cloverleaf proposal, including long-term potential fallout on well-water quality and property values in the areas of the effluent wastewater plume from the Cloverleaf development.

Transferring development of affordable housing to the Walsh property puts Truro farther along on the path to being a sustainable community by developing an environment that could serve as a model for affordable housing on the Cape. I am aware that shifting gears at this juncture may be a difficult challenge to leadership, but I am reminded of the adage, "A stitch in time saves nine."

Members of my family have been continuous residents of Truro since 1907. My career has been devoted to public health, and for much of three decades, I served as an epidemiologist and mathematician in leadership positions at the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Three relevant references from the scientific literature are listed below.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment.

Ron Fichtner, Ph.D.


To the Truro Planning Department:

SUBJECT: Pond Villagers Placed on ZBA Agenda | Cloverleaf Hearings

Dear Colleagues,

When Truro Town Meeting approved buying the Cloverleaf parcel in 2016 for affordable housing, we understood that the intent was to build 12-16 units. This was clearly the voters’ understanding and intent, since the Select Board comments to the article, upon which Truro voters could and did explicitly rely, stated this goal. We assumed that number would go forward, because it is what our Zoning Bylaws allow for affordable housing and what our Board of Health regulations allow as a safe number for the 3.9 acre property, namely up to 17 bedrooms. We are still fully behind this Town Meeting approval of up to 16 units on this property.

However, as we have learned that the Truro Zoning Board of Appeals is actually considering an application for 39 units/70 bedrooms on that land, so close to Pond Village, alarm bells that were quietly ringing in the background are now loudly peeling for our community. The more we have learned of this proposal, the bylaw and health regulation waivers it requires, and the dangers of water contamination, the more concerns we began to have, primarily about the potential impact on the drinking water in our neighborhood and the threat that might pose to our health and safety, not to mention our home equity.

At this time, Pond Village property owners are conferring with one another, moving to get our well-water tested, deepening our understanding of nitrogen/nitrates and other contaminants in drinking water and its consequences for health, and trying to understand why many experts say even levels as low as 1 ppm are a health threat in drinking water. We are trying to understand why the Cape Cod Commission recommends no more than 5ppm, and the EPA accepts a standard of 10ppm, while also saying that it doesn’t apply to private wells for which the risks seem greater.

We are not convinced that the ZBA has yet devoted sufficient attention to the health and safety of Pond Village and other nearby residents. Before the Board starts actually deliberating on the many requested waivers, we request that Pond Village be listed as an agenda item for a scheduled meeting so that we can be represented directly before the Board, rather than as a Public Comment at the end of the meeting. We support community housing developed in a manner that does not threaten our health and safety. We believe the Town can accomplish both and hope for the opportunity and time to be informed better and to inform the ZBA.
Please distribute this to the ZBA.
Thank you,

Mimi Turchinetz

Mimi Turchinetz, Esq
Boston, Massachusetts

Listen, if you can stand to.
Union with the Friend means not being who you’ve been,
being instead silence: A place: A view
where language is inside seeing.

Rumi  Persia (Afghanistan)
Dear Colleagues,
When Truro Town Meeting approved buying the Cloverleaf parcel in 2016 for affordable housing, we understood that the intent was to build 12-16 units. This was clearly the voters' understanding and intent, since the Select Board comments to the article, upon which Truro voters could and did explicitly rely, stated this goal. We assumed that number would go forward, because it is what our Zoning Bylaws allow for affordable housing and what our Board of Health regulations allow as a safe number for the 3.9 acre property, namely up to 17 bedrooms. We are still fully behind this Town Meeting approval of up to 16 units on this property.

However, as we have learned that the Truro Zoning Board of Appeals is actually considering an application for 39 units/70 bedrooms on that land, so close to Pond Village, alarm bells that were quietly ringing in the background are now loudly peeling for our community. The more we have learned of this proposal, the bylaw and health regulation waivers it requires, and the dangers of water contamination, the more concerns we began to have, primarily about the potential impact on the drinking water in our neighborhood and the threat that might pose to our health and safety, not to mention our home equity.

At this time, Pond Village property owners are conferring with one another, moving to get our well-water tested, deepening our understanding of nitrogen/nitrates and other contaminants in drinking water and its consequences for health, and trying to understand why many experts say even levels as low as 1 ppm are a health threat in drinking water. We are trying to understand why the Cape Cod Commission recommends no more than 5ppm, and the EPA accepts a standard of 10ppm, while also saying that it doesn't apply to private wells for which the risks seem greater.

We are not convinced that the ZBA has yet devoted sufficient attention to the health and safety of Pond Village and other nearby residents.
Before the Board starts actually deliberating on the many requested waivers, we request that Pond Village be listed as an agenda item for a scheduled meeting so that we can be represented directly before the Board, rather than as a Public Comment at the end of the meeting. We support community housing developed in a manner that does not threaten our health and safety. We believe the Town can accomplish both and hope for the opportunity and time to be informed better and to inform the ZBA.
Please distribute this to the ZBA.

Thank you,

George Dineen
Dear Colleagues,

When Truro Town Meeting approved buying the Cloverleaf parcel in 2016 for affordable housing, we understood that the intent was to build 12-16 units. This was clearly the voters’ understanding and intent, since the Select Board comments to the article, upon which Truro voters could and did explicitly rely, stated this goal. We assumed that number would go forward, because it is what our Zoning Bylaws allow for affordable housing and what our Board of Health regulations allow as a safe number for the 3.9 acre property, namely up to 17 bedrooms. We are still fully behind this Town Meeting approval of up to 16 units on this property.

However, as we have learned that the Truro Zoning Board of Appeals is actually considering an application for 39 units/70 bedrooms on that land, so close to Pond Village, alarm bells that were quietly ringing in the background are now loudly peeling for our community. The more we have learned of this proposal, the bylaw and health regulation waivers it requires, and the dangers of water contamination, the more concerns we began to have, primarily about the potential impact on the drinking water in our neighborhood and the threat that might pose to our health and safety, not to mention our home equity.

At this time, Pond Village property owners are conferring with one another, moving to get our well-water tested, deepening our understanding of nitrogen/nitrates and other contaminants in drinking water and its consequences for health, and trying to understand why many experts say even levels as low as 1 ppm are a health threat in drinking water. We are trying to understand why the Cape Cod Commission recommends no more than 5ppm, and the EPA accepts a standard of 10ppm, while also saying that it doesn’t apply to private wells for which the risks seem greater.

We are not convinced that the ZBA has yet devoted sufficient attention to the health and safety of Pond Village and other nearby residents. Before the Board starts actually deliberating on the many requested waivers, we request that Pond Village be listed as an agenda item for a scheduled meeting so that we can be represented directly before the Board, rather than as a Public Comment at the end of the meeting. We support community housing developed in a manner that does not threaten our health and safety. We believe the Town can accomplish both and hope for the opportunity and time to be informed better and to inform the ZBA.

Please distribute this to the ZBA.

Thank you,

Hank Keenan
Hello Liz,
Hope you are well! Please add the below to the packet for the ZBA meeting. I will also attend. Would you be so kind as to send me the link for the meeting when it is available? Thanks. Pamela

Good afternoon Commissioners,

My name is Pamela Wolff.

Since your July 30th meeting I have been told by a number of Truro residents that I’m wasting my time and yours trying to influence the decisions of the ZBA; that the Cloverleaf Plan is baked in, a done deal, and nothing I or any other citizen may have to offer will affect the outcome. I can only hope that is not true.

One of the most stunning statements made at the last meeting came up almost as an aside: That the playground which was part of the RFP has been dropped entirely from the current plan. When questioned, the developer offered that children could play in the very tiny back yards of the townhouses, or they could find their way to the public playground behind the town’s Council on Aging building. I find this statement unacceptable. Which of the minuscule back yards will be devoted to the daily activities of perhaps dozens of kids? What facilities might be provided by the residents of that house? Swings, slides, a sandbox? Toilet access? What about the kids that might be living in the apartment building? Would they be welcomed into the back yards of the townhouses?

How will the town feel about a stream of moms daily pushing strollers along route 6 in the rain or cold…and back! Or perhaps the Town might be petitioned to provide a jitney service?

The incentive created by the funding for the municipal water system has allowed the developer to max out every square inch of turf at the cost of the livability of those who are squeezed into this development. Playgrounds are not an amenity for developments of this size. They are a necessity.

I have been a supporter of State Senator Julian Cyr since his first run for office. I think he has represented his constituents well. But I must take exception to his closing comments in the op-ed published in the Cape Cod Times and elsewhere.

He states that he sees no merit in any of the deeply concerning issues that have been brought forward by a wide range of citizens. That he rejects them wholesale out of hand as racist is irresponsible. His remarks are not worthy of the good man I have thought him to be.

Thank you
2nd letter to the ZBA from S. Williams

JI-28-20

I had assumed that any responsible discussion about “affordable housing” would be confined to that single issue alone. Sadly, that is apparently no longer the case. Now, it has been insinuated (in a JI-23-20 op-ed by State Senator Julian Cyr) that anyone who has the audacity to question any aspect of “this particular version” of affordable housing known as the “Cloverleaf Proposal” is, per force, a racist! Hogwash!

This gratuitous libel may have been motivated by the fact that a group of Truro residents had the effrontery to write a very civil and well reasoned letter questioning several design aspects of “this particular version” noting that its size and density are well beyond the scope of what had been originally presented. And, it should be noted that this modestly worded and well-reasoned critique was subsequently co-signed by more than 75 people who, this op-ed would now seem to assert, are all racists!

Or, might it just be possible that they’re right? And that the numerous and major design flaws of this “Cloverleaf Proposal” invalidate the size, and expense of “THIS PARTICULAR VERSION” of affordable housing?

I also wrote a highly critical letter in opposition... not to “affordable housing” in general but to specific aspects of “this particular proposal.” In the course of 8 pages I cited some of the many problems which I felt the ZBA should consider before approving this project à priori given that, in my opinion, “this particular proposal” falls far short of what we should expect and be trying to achieve here in Truro. And just because I believe we can do something much better than “this particular version” of affordable housing, does the lengthy list of my objections make me a racist as well?

Stifling dissent is bad enough (... think of it as voter suppression...) but rejecting any efforts to improve this project out of hand is even worse! We all know that racism is a problem on the Cape but it’s ludicrous and irresponsible to assert that building this enormous 39-unit 70-bedroom complex on this disproportionately tiny 3.9 acre parcel will solve it. So let’s agree to put the distraction of that desperate slander aside, and giving everyone the benefit of the doubt, let’s also stipulate that everyone who has an opinion about the “Cloverleaf Proposal” IS in favor of “affordable housing” in one form or another.

That, I think, is a much more reasonable starting point!
But the issues before the ZBA now are not just about “affordable housing” any more. The primary issues are all about density and quality... it's about cost and extortion... and it's about the major corruption of process that enables a **private developer** to grossly expand the originally agreed upon number of units to such an extent that a 1½ million dollar public water supply **must be built** (but not at their expense, mind you!) to make their “proposal” even marginally feasible.

**Some key issues which still need to be addressed include:**

1) **Unfunded Liability:** The developer of this proposal is not a philanthropist. He is not here to provide ‘year-round employment’ (**which we actually need even more than affordable housing!**) but only for the considerable **private profits** this project will generate. And please note that he can “sell” his corporate shares at any time and walk away from any liability lawsuits. **Can Truro do that? And who owns the land?**

2) **Exceeding Voter’s Approval:** In 2016, when the voters at the Truro Annual Town Meeting (ATM) agreed to accept the “Cloverleaf,” (Please note BofS “Comment” below Article 20) it was done with the clearly **stated intention** of creating between 12 to 16 units of affordable housing which were, and are, appropriate for the spatial limitations of this site. On 3.91 acres, Title V allows for 17 bedrooms. **Why not build on that model** which would not overwhelm the site and create so many other costly problems? Bigger, as in this specific case, is not necessarily better.

3) **The Major Problem:** with **“this particular proposal”** is that the proponents are now seeking ZBA approval to jam 50 lbs. of sugar into a 5 lb. Bag... in other words, exceeding the original concept with more than **23± additional units and more than 54± additional bedrooms** and actually expecting everyone to just “go along”... because some people feel that after “god, motherhood and apple pie,” this huge complex of “affordable housing,” (even on this undersized 3.91 acre parcel), should be exempt from any criticism, any opposition, or even public discussion. **Why do proponents of this flawed project consider it such a holy crusade?**

4) **Who Will Benefit?:** The result of **“this expensive swindle”** is that the State and the Town are going to have to spend a lot of unnecessary funds, and tax-payer dollars, **“just so the developers can make their profit goal”**. So perhaps we should be asking: **“Exactly who is being subsidized here?”** And what exactly is the Town’s share in this project? **Are we expected to pay for the roadway as well as a still undisclosed share of its water main?** Please tell us now before coming into a ATM to ask for funding!
5) **Density & Bad Siting:** Another problem is that the density of 39 units with 70 bedrooms on a 3.91 acre site makes it unnecessarily congested for the as many as the 140 people who may end up living there and who, given their economics, are the least likely to protest... not to mention that such density is being inappropriately sited immediately adjacent and down-wind of the constant noise and the unhealthy stench of carbon monoxide exhaust fumes from a major 4-lane highway drifting over the site 24/365. Will any of the proponents of this project actually stand up and dare to say that such an afflicted site is an ideal setting for raising children? Or, are we actually just saying that this much is good enough... as in, you know, for the working-poor? As in: "Let them eat cake?"

6) **Septic Issues Ignored:** Another problem with such high-density at this site is that the septic effluent of 70 bedrooms requires a Title V septic design for 7700 gallons per day... (Yes, that's 2,810,500 gallons per year!) situated directly atop the very center of our fragile single-lens aquifer in the middle of North Truro. Yet no one seems interested in getting the Mass DEP to step in and offer THEIR assessment of what environmental damage might accrue over the long term from this river of... well, you know what flows downhill. **Why is there such a lack of curiosity about this?** Is the greed or size of "this particular version" of affordable housing SO important that Truro must gamble, and jeopardize, the very viability of our shared water supply? In my opinion, this is wholly irresponsible!

7) **Requests for Too Many Exceptions:** Aside from the fact that the parking plan for this complex of 39 units and 70 bedrooms, with its "two-car-deep parking spaces" does not meet Zoning Bylaw requirements, (it is also inadequate, completely unworkable and should be rejected as such!)... my previous criticism noted that this proposal also comes with numerous, but unwarranted requests for sideline variances, and the expectations of even more exceptions to our height-of-building regulations. (See their Exhibit T). **Variances**, such as these, require an applicant to meet all 3 of these separate qualifications: Lot shape; soil conditions & topography; and "hardship" financial or otherwise. As I pointed out in my 1st letter to the ZBA of Mr-12-20, the developers DO NOT QUALIFY for even one such exception... especially given that they've had more than ample time to make their design fit within the limitations of our local regulations and minimum standards... just like everyone else who lives in Truro. The ZBA might also note that Chapter 40-B does not grant any immunity from such local standards (see Chapter 40-B Handbook pg. 1). And, any case they might allege about their "hardship" is entirely and deliberately self-created! Their refusal to even try to comply with local standards reflects a
presumptuous and arrogant intrinsigence which, I believe, the ZBA should reject out of hand!

8) **The Drawbacks of the Cloverleaf Site:** This site was originally intended to have 12 to 16 units. Title V allowances of 10,000 sf. of lot-area-per-bedroom shows the actual area of 3.91 acres (or 170,319 sf.) just allows for 17 bedrooms, but at that density it would be a ‘site-appropriate’ proposal! If the Town needs more affordable housing after that we should consider the “Walsh Property” just south of the school which does not have all the spatial limitations and potential hazards to public health that the “Cloverleaf” site presents and would also NOT REQUIRE the public expenditure of a costly 1½ million dollar water system just so the developer can stuff the “Cloverleaf” 3.91 acre site with 23± more units and 54± more bedrooms than the original agreement envisioned... and which grossly exceeds Title V allowances! Why are we being rushed into subsidizing such an unexamined expansion at this less than ideal site? Consider how many units could be built for half that 1.5 million dollars at the Walsh site. So, why are we wasting that money on the Cloverleaf?

9) In closing it is my hope that the ZBA will decide to NOT APPROVE “this particular version” of affordable housing, and that by the time another proposal can be developed it will include “priority occupancy” FOR TRURO RESIDENTS rather than bringing even more people to Truro when what we really need here most is more work and year-round jobs for the people who already live here! Try solving that problem or at least consider it... because in the long run, 70 more bedrooms will only exacerbate our problem of joblessness... and not solve it! The Walsh site invites a staggered program for the on-going construction of affordable housing... in yearly increments of say 3 or 4 units a year where subsidies might actually address the needs of Truro residents! In a better location!

‘this particular version’ of affordable housing is not in the public interest.’

10) Finally, if I were seated on the ZBA, I would move to approve the original concept of 12 to 16 units (w/ 17 bedrooms), give the developer 2 or 3 months to bring back plans for that number which do not require ‘sideline variances’, nor exceptions to the ‘height-of-building regulations’, and which would also not require the expenditure of a 1½ million dollar water subsidy, and which actually do meet basic Title V allowances... and then I would ask for a second! A simple majority is all you need for this. And remember your primary responsibility is to Truro, not the developer!

Stephen Williams
MEMORANDUM

FROM: J.M. O'REILLY & ASSOCIATES, INC.
John O'Reilly, P.E., P.L.S.

RE: Second Peer Review, July 6th & 9th, 2020
Cloverleaf Project

Responses to the second Peer review by Horsley-Witten are as follows:

Contingency Plan: If the system fails to meet the 10.0 ppm of total Nitrogen at discharge:

- Owner, manufacturer, design engineer and plant operator shall develop improvements, based on the issues as presented, make the necessary adjustments to the operation of the plant to maximize the treatment performance.
  - An example of the process if there is an exceedance of Effluent Limits - Once the sample is returned to the Operator showing an exceedance of the discharge:
    - BOH will be notified
    - Operator will re-sample effluent and obtain results within 48 hours.
    - If Limits are still not met, operator shall review with the BOH the recommended steps to be taken so as to bring the system within compliance.
    - Operator shall re-sample after 30 days of plant modification.
    - If sample is still exceeding the limits of effluent, operator shall consult with the manufacturer of the treatment process to see what additional steps need to be taken.
    - BOH shall be notified of the 30 day sample and recommendations of the manufacturer. Operator shall implement the recommendations of the manufacturer.
    - If upon adjustments the system is not achieving the 10 ppm of total Nitrogen, the owner shall present to the Board of Health proposed corrective actions to the treatment train so as to ensure the 10 ppm of total Nitrogen.

Groundwater Monitoring:
- The Plan Sheet 2 of 6 has been revised to incorporate two monitoring wells. The first well is located up-gradient with the second monitoring well, down gradient.
- Sampling shall be taken quarterly, once system is up and running, or as required by the BOH.
Page 4: Item #4 – Pipe sizes:
- Clean out detail is now provided on sheet 3 of 5.
- Pipe diameter notes have been adjusted.

Page 4: Item #5 – Setbacks:
- Drainage Facility #3: Leaching facility has been shown to be 25.5 feet away from the leaching facility.
- On Sheet 5 of 6, additional notes have been added to address the concerns of the setbacks from the drywells for the roof runoff and the foundation areas.

Page 4: Item #6 – Groundwater:
- We will update the distance to groundwater once soil testing is completed.
- Based on the groundwater study HW completed, we anticipate a groundwater separation of +40 feet

Page 5: Item #8 – Operation and Attendance:
- See Contingency Plan on page 1.

Page 5: Item #1 - Stormwater:
- A MA Stormwater Report has been prepared for the development. The report identifies the project is designed in compliance with the requirements of the Stormwater handbook, Vol 1.-3.

Page 5: Item #2 – Contributory Area:
- Contributory areas have been edited with the development of the Stormwater Report.

Page 5: Item #3 - Contributory Areas:
- See above.

Page 6: Item 4 – Roof Runoff:
- Attached are the calculations for the roof run off drywells for Building #21. The calculations are based on the 50 year storm.
  - Building #21 with a roof area of 5,900 sf, requires a storage of 985 sf or three 12’x6 drywells with a capacity of 1,120 cf.
  - Ratio of 5,900 sf for three drywells = 1,960 sf per drywell.
  - The smaller buildings are 790 sf.
  - The drywells are proposed to handle 1 and half building or 790 sf + 395 sf = 1,185 sf
- Based on the sizing, the drywell configuration may be adjusted during the construction document phase. All drainage shall meet the 50 year storm requirements.

Page 6: Item 5 – 50 year storm:
- The ZBA requested the stormwater controls be sized at 50 year storms.
- The submitted Stormwater Management Plan address the 2, 10 and 100 year concerns.

Page 6: Item 6 – Sheet Flow:
• Stormwater management report has been prepared and submitted for review.

Page 6: Item 7 – Water back up into the catch basin:
• Stormwater management report has been submitted along with the updated drainage calculations.

Page 6: Item 9 – Additional Comment:
• Stormwater management report has been submitted along with the updated drainage calculations.

Page 7: Item 10, 11 & 12 – Additional Comments:
• #10 – The elevations have been edited.
• #11 – We are assuming some of the “benches” as described in the erosion control documents will allow the catch basin grates to be constructed to allow water to enter the system. We would envision straw wattles or Bio-logs to be used if needed.
• #12 – Sheet 1 of 6 now reflects boulders along the entrance off Highland so as to protect the drainage swale.

Page 7: Item #2 – Comments on Other Utilities:
• There will be 3 feet of cover over the leaching field. Siting a short post light, including the underground conduit (18” below ground +/-), will not impact the field.

Page 7 to 9: Other Site Design Comments:
• #1 – The phasing of the project will still need to be worked out given the water main work by the Town.
• #2 – Sheet 6 of 6 has been prepared to address the erosion controls through-out the site. The protocols identified on Sheet 6 and within the Safe Harbor Documents shall be incorporated into the phasing of the project, in conjunction with the Town’s work.
• #3 – Cuts and Fills of the updated plans are attached for review.
• #4 – Erosion control plan has been developed for the entire site so as to be incorporated with the phasing of the project, in conjunction with the Town’s work.
• #5 – The travel way for the highway is about 125 feet to the west of the project area and is about 8 to 10 feet below the elevation of the western property line in the area of buildings 10-12, 14-16 and 18-20. The intent is to add additional screening within the landscape plan so as to enhance the existing screening to the highway. The developer has no authority to plant within the highway-DOT layout.
• #6 – Landscape plan addresses the subsurface leaching facility and the location of the planting material. Note, the leaching facility is proposed to be 3 feet below ground. The types of plants over the leaching facility are shrubs and plants with shallow root systems. The two small shad trees will be relocated away from the leach facility.
• #11 – Snow removal: In the event of a large snow fall, the snow will be stored to the west of the entrance drive, the area to the south of units 2-4, at the corners of the building #21, in front of
the rear units, to the north of the rear drainage swale and around the visitor parking within the central common area.

- #14 – The project does not offer any proposal for invasive species. The existing vegetation appears to be native.

Attached for additional review and information are the testing results of two commercial developments being served by the same technology as proposed for the Cloverleaf Project. The two testing results show excellent treatment capabilities for proposed specified technology. These results hadn’t been previously submitted due to the drastic differences in the properties between commercial/restaurant uses and residential use. Although not applicable to the residential waste stream, the results should give the ZBA and BOH reassurance of the ability of the technology to treat to a 10 ppm level.

Attachments:

1. Roof Runoff Calculations
2. Cuts & Fills (Williams Building Company)
3. Testing Results – Medical Facility (AdCare)
4. Testing Results – Commercial Restaurant
Summary for Pond 7P: (3) 6'x6' Leach Pits, w/ 3' stone

Inflow Area = 0.135 ac, 100.00% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 5.99" for 50-year event
Inflow = 1.41 cfs @ 11.90 hrs, Volume= 0.067 af
Outflow = 0.18 cfs @ 12.01 hrs, Volume= 0.067 af, Attenuation= 87%, Lag= 6.6 min
Discarded = 0.18 cfs @ 12.01 hrs, Volume= 0.067 af

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-24.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs
Peak Elev= 55.28' @ 12.01 hrs Surf.Area= 339 sf Storage= 985 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 40.2 min calculated for 0.067 af (100% of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= 40.1 min (775.3 - 735.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Invert</th>
<th>Avail.Storage</th>
<th>Storage Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>50.00'</td>
<td>509 cf</td>
<td>6.00'D x 6.00'H Vertical Cone/Cylinder x 3 Inside #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>50.00'</td>
<td>611 cf</td>
<td>12.00'D x 6.00'H Vertical Cone/Cylinder x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,036 cf Overall - 509 cf Embedded = 1,527 cf x 40.0% Voids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.120 cf Total Available Storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Device Routing Invert Outlet Devices
#1 Discarded 50.00' **8.270 In/hr Exfiltration over Wetted area** Phase-In= 0.01'

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.18 cfs @ 12.01 hrs HW=55.28' (Free Discharge)
\[\uparrow=\text{Exfiltration} \] (Exfiltration Controls 0.18 cfs)
Regarding the requirements of Section 8 - Soil Removal of the General Bylaws of the Town of Truro:

Williams Building Company has calculated the following volumes for the Cloverleaf Rental Housing Development as proposed per the Site Plan dated 6/5/2020 prepared by J.M. O’Reilly Associates, Civil Engineers.

**CUT & STOCKPILE:**  1,280 cubic yards

CUT groundcover and “duff layer” for reuse

**CUT & FILL:**  7,793 cubic yards

CUT from elevation 55’ to 62’ at center (east) of site;
FILL at rear (north east) of site elevation 36’ to 46’

**EXCAVATE & BACKFILL:**  5,122 cubic yards for building foundations

**CUT & REMOVE:**  8,918 cubic yards

CUT from access roadway and CUT from elevation 55’ to 62’
REMOVE / EXPORT from site
RI Medical Facility - 2018 Installation – Startup August 2018

- Design flow 1,450 gpd
- Actual flow 800-1,200 gpd
- Designed on: influent BOD 480 mg/L, influent TKN 105 mg/L, influent TSS 580 mg/L
- Actual influent numbers: 100 – 400 mg/L BOD (peak of 1,300 mg/L); 80-140 mg/L TKN (peak of 195 mg/L)
- Effluent Limits: <30 mg/L BOD, <30 mg/L TSS, <19 mg/L TN
- Effluent results: <4 mg/L BOD, <4 mg/L TSS, <10 mg/L TN
HSMBR 3.0-N

- Installed in a 6,500 two compartment concrete tank
- 3,500 gallon settling tank - 1,500 gallon flow eq tank - BioBarrier tank - 1,000 gallon pump chamber - dispersed to Bottomless Sand Filter
Commercial BioBarrier Installation

- Seafood Restaurant
- Peak flows of 5,000+ gpd
- Average flows of 3,500 gpd
- Startup May 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>BOD mg/L</th>
<th>TSS mg/L</th>
<th>pH mg/L</th>
<th>TN mg/L</th>
<th>Nitrate mg/L</th>
<th>Nitrite mg/L</th>
<th>Ammonia mg/L</th>
<th>Alkalinity mg/L</th>
<th>FOG mg/L</th>
<th>BOD mg/L</th>
<th>TSS mg/L</th>
<th>pH mg/L</th>
<th>Nitrate mg/L</th>
<th>Nitrite mg/L</th>
<th>Alkalinity mg/L</th>
<th>TKN mg/L</th>
<th>Nitrate mg/L</th>
<th>TN mg/L</th>
<th>Ammonia mg/L</th>
<th>Alkalinity mg/L</th>
<th>FOG mg/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Influent BOD</th>
<th>Influent TSS</th>
<th>Influent pH</th>
<th>Influent TKN</th>
<th>Effluent BOD</th>
<th>Effluent TSS</th>
<th>Effluent pH</th>
<th>Effluent TN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2018</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2018</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2018</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2018</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74.55</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2019</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2019</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>22.9* carbon feed issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2019</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2019</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2019</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2019</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2019</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>33.37* power outage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2020</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2020</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>