

<http://www.metrowestdailynews.com/news/opinion/letnelson10072003.htm>

Letter: More questions than answers on Wayside

Tuesday, October 7, 2003

I'm writing concerning recent coverage of the proposed campus by Wayside Youth and Family Services.

The Sucker Pond Neighborhood Association (SPNA), a group of more than 80 participating neighbors, has been openly supportive of Wayside's work. Because of a few vocal individuals, your paper has accused SPNA of "harassing Wayside." This is an erroneous accusation based on no evidence.

The issue is not a matter of whether or not Wayside is a "good" organization, but whether or not it is a good decision to put such a large development in the middle of a neighborhood. The property Wayside purchased is zoned R-1 for residential development. Wayside is planning to build a large, multi-use complex, costing around \$14 million, to house its administrative offices, meeting space, cafeteria, gymnasium and housing for 72 youth, with more than 100 parking spaces. All of this is going to be squeezed onto about 6 1/2 acres of Wayside's 14-acre property. It should be noted that Wayside increased their overall acreage by purchasing an adjacent building on Lockland Avenue earlier this year. Who is to say that Wayside won't purchase more adjacent houses in the future?

There will be only one entrance and exit driveway on Lockland Avenue, within 50 yards of the already-dangerous Route 9/Lockland Avenue intersection next to the Dunkin Donuts across from the State Police. There is a projected more than 300 new car trips per day in the mornings and evenings. With a choice between sitting on blocked Rte. 9 or a short cut, drivers will cut through the adjacent neighborhood -- one with many children, many school buses and no sidewalks, except for one side of Lockland Avenue.

Wayside has an expensive road ahead to clean up the site's hazardous materials to make it safe for habitation. I agree it would be good to clean it up, but I'm not sure the tradeoff is better -- increased traffic, noise, air and light pollution. This is not good for public safety, public health and the environment. And, on top of all these issues, this proposed development may not be reviewed by the Framingham Planning Board because of the Dover Amendment.

The bottom line is that there are more questions than answers concerning this proposed multi-million dollar project using taxpayers' dollars. I hope there are more answers soon.

DONNA K. NELSON, Framingham

<http://www.metrowestdailynews.com/news/opinion/letnelson10072003.htm>
