

From: Robert Ackroyd <rockyackroyd@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2019 9:57 AM
To: Amanda L. Lessard; jarrod maxfield
Cc: Robert Ackroyd
Subject: Woodside Condominium - Phase 2

Good Morning Amanda,

Thank you for the information you gave me last week.

I have had a chance to review some of the documentation and have spoken with some others in my area. The general conclusion is that this application was submitted and in accordance of the existing zoning requirements and even if something were to change the application would still be grandfathered with existing standards.

It seems that the only way that this project could be minimized is if there are any environmental / sewage / runoff / well issues or any other state requirements that would also need to be in compliance.

Here are a few comments / concerns voiced in my discussions.

1: A highlighted "Core Value" stated through much of the Comprehensive Plan is maintaining Windham as a rural town with farmland, forests, and open space. It was one of the biggest concerns voiced by our citizens. This level of development is inconsistent with those desires in this part of Windham.

2: The density of this development is inconsistent with the basic purpose of the farm / residential zone (Can you give a time line of the changes in the zoning laws that allowed this level of development in this zoning district)?

3: For a development of 53 units with at least two residents in each unit (design load of 106 individuals - or more) - what size leach system (s) is required and how might that affect the adjacent wetland and wells for abutters?

4: What additional permits or applications may or may not apply to this project? A few items listed included:

Land use ordinance (conditional use permit);

State review ordinance

DEP review

Lighting / Light Pollution concerns

Are there others?

5: Note in the application stated there is no public hearing scheduled and that is at the discretion of the Planning Dept. Can a public hearing be scheduled?

6: Can a site walk be scheduled?

7: Would adequate landscaping be installed to minimize impact on adjacent lots?

8: What are the requirements to "qualify as a retirement resident" and is the retirement status for these dwelling cast in stone. (ie - when a resident dies, can the property be passed to family members who do not qualify for retirement or must it be sold to someone of qualifying age)? This is an important point as the density is based purely on the retirement community status - to allow conversion to "non-retirement" use would be an abuse of the zoning restrictions allowed at the time of construction.

9: Would the owner be willing to sell the property at a price to cover existing costs and a profit. It seems there would have been at least a few individuals who would have been interested had they known the property was for sale.

10: Would the developer consider the construction of several high end single family homes on the property as an alternative?

As I stated in the beginning, it seems clear that barring any state or DEP issues on the site there is no obstacles to prevent this project from moving forward. But as a citizen of Windham, I feel that there are other vulnerable sites in our town that could face the same type of aggressive development. If the Windham citizens are truly concerned about the loss of the rural character, as emphasized in the tenets of the Comprehensive Plan, I would ask our town leadership refocus on the desires of the constituents. I understand that the Comprehensive plan is scheduled for updates every three years - can this concept be revisited at the next update.

I ask that this letter be included in the minutes of the Planning Board meeting schedules for this project on Monday April 8, 2019.

Rocky Ackroyd
104 Swett Rd

207-653-7984