

From: Lorraine Iovanni <l.iovanni@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 4:19 PM

To: Sarah Mellish <ZBAChairperson@manchester.ma.us>

Cc: Gail Hunter <HunterG@manchester.ma.us>; Manchester Essex Conservation Trust <conserve@mect.org>; Citizens by the Sea <info@citizensbythesea.com>

Subject: Final Thoughts on SLV/ For ZBA 40 B Hearing 7/27/2022

ATTN: Chair of ZBA and All ZBA Members

Cc: Gail Hunter (Please distribute to all Board Members before the Hearing)

Dear Ms Mellish and Board Members,

Along with a very significant number of residents, I have attended the 40 B Forums and followed the hearing from a procedural and substantive point of view. I have listened to other residents and read correspondence that has made its way to the MBTS Website on 40 B under correspondence. I have written to the ZBA during the course of this proceeding.

What I have deduced from this event, and I am hopeful that all ZBA Board Members have also arrived at the same conclusion, we CANNOT permit waivers to our zoning ordinances that protect our Town.

From a basic point of view, the SLV design does not reflect the character of Cape Ann and certainly not MBTS, as it looks like a fortress and prison as opposed to a luxury apartment building; it does not promote community spirit based on its location; and it fails to address our Complete Streets Agreement with the State by the absence of connecting walkways (most 40 B developers are attempting to "connect" people...this design disconnects these potential residents from the community.) Certainly, very little regard has been given to the safety of children, the disabled and seniors from what I see.

From a basic safety situation, the duty of all Town Governance is to provide for the public safety of its residents. This design fails to do so by having one egress for large firefighting equipment and ambulances. There is absolutely no certainty that in the event of a major forest fire or medical emergency, that a fallen tree, snow and ice, and multiple vehicle accident on that one road will not be present. Our current zoning calls for 2 egresses into a development that one enters on one long entry...why not here? Most responsible developers would include in a design a secondary egress; and SLV knows it is restrained from doing so and doesn't care. Furthermore, my understanding is that should a chain link fence be installed surrounding the perimeter, residents would have a challenging time exiting via the forest in an emergency. This is not reasonable and certainly is not in the interest of public safety.

With regard to the environment, our residents, taxpayers, and all MBTS Boards are the stewards for generations to come. During Covid, WE ALL BECAME OUTDOOR CITIZENS, as Mr. Judge terms it. It was a savior for many in terms of mental and physical well being. Placing a monstrosity of the SLV caliber on Shingle Hill Place denies our citizenry with mental and physical well being. Are cars, asphalt and cement to replace solitude and peace? How much development is enough?

The threat to natural habitats, wetlands and vernal pools; destruction of the green landscape which affects climate change; storm water runoff leeching into our water supply are not priorities for a developer such as SLV. The MO is destroy, build, profit, and leave.

The original design included an onsite wastewater treatment facility; apparently, SLV abandoned this design with the false narrative that they would be protecting our environment by connecting to our water and sewer. (I continue to hold that the State DEP would have recognized the environmental challenges to this design, denied the permit, and probably would have barred the development.) We all know that connection to our sewer is LIMITED per the State. Our existing homeowners/taxpayers have the expectation that they will have a preference if it is doable to connect. Why would we consider sewer hookup to an rental apartment building first that will not necessarily house MBTS taxpayers? Moreover, our drinking water supply is finite, as we have seen recently with State-wide drought conditions. Why would we consider expansion of this precious resource when we will need to be prudent, as we go forward, especially with the Lincoln St well in need of remediation?

My reaction to this development leads me to one question: why the risk to our Town, Resources, Environment, Character, and TAXES, for only a small percentage of AH units, when Mr Engler and his company will walk away with an enormous profit? What are we left with?

Zoning regulations are in place in every Home Rule Town to protect the Town, its residents, its resources, its environment. The full ZBA has the mandate to do so first and foremost. I call upon the ZBA to recognize this as a seminal moment for the Town. Given the threats to this Town by this development, I am confident that the State will recognize, not every AH initiative serves the best interests of the State's housing crisis. More people will be adversely affected in MBTS than will receive a benefit. As residents of this Town, please do your very best to make this clear and deny the waivers and not permit this development.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the full ZBA for their time, effort, and dedication during the administrative hearing. This is a challenging process.

Thank You,

Lorraine Iovanni

20 A Pine St