

JUL 27 2020

Members of the Cheshire Planning and Zoning Commission

Planning Dept.

RE: Zone Map Change Petition and Special Permit Application of
Lamp Realty, LLC

I have read some of the comments submitted that relate to the Zone Map Change Petition and Special Permit Application of Lamp Realty, LLC. After reading them I am compelled to communicate with you further relative to this application. I was pleased to see that the majority of the comments spoke to a particular comment I made in a letter to Chairman Kurtz on July 9th. I noted as follows:

- “Among all of the verbiage, statistics and data are two critical items that I believe deserve significant consideration in your deliberations. Page 2 section II. 3. of the document titled “Need for Affordable Housing Memo with Exhibits part 1” notes that “The Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Plan of Conservation & Development 2008 (“Plan”) recommends promoting the “construction of **decent, attractive**, and affordable housing options . . .”(emphasis added). It further notes “Another recommendation is to “[c]ombat the stigma of affordable housing by requiring **quality and attractive** affordable housing units.””. Why do I feel they are critical? Because they strike to the core of what is needed. The population that would benefit from this requirement are looking to obtain what attracted us to our neighborhoods, space, tranquility, safety, etc. They are not looking to duplicate the conditions they seek to escape from.”

In my opinion, the majority of the comments, statements, questions, etc., of those you heard from are seeking to preserve the character of their neighborhood. They want to preserve the character for both themselves and the potential tenants of the proposed developments. Their concern about traffic speaks to a desire for safety (both adults and children) and the impact of pollution (both air and the potential impact upon the wetlands). Both reasonable concerns for current and future residents. The concerns about the relative increase in density associated with the development is also a reasonable concern, a serious concern for all of us during the current pandemic. We have read and heard news accounts of people (at least those with the means to do so) who are leaving their multi-unit housing units for lower density housing. The comments about the woods, pond and wetlands recognize their value to mental health and well-being, providing an island of calm in a an otherwise stressful world. The insertion of a large concrete environment seriously disturbs the current environment. In addition to the potential for creating a pandemic hot spot, the insertion will immediately create a heat sink counteracting the cooling effect of the foliage it will displace. There is proposed landscaping, but not enough to offset the negative effects of the parking lot and building structure. There were comments relative to children, but again, this was relative to the dangers presented by significant traffic on less than adequate roads, the requirement for children to wait for a school bus on a busy major road, the lack of

suitable sidewalks, etc. We are concerned for the safety of our children, our neighbor's children and the children of the potential occupants of the development. There were comments about the potential impact of an increase in the children attending schools, but it appears to me that such comments were spurred by the reference to decreased school enrollment within the documents submitted by the applicant.

I will note that there is a degree of skepticism regarding the current process. However, when one considers a public statement indicating that developments generate approximately 6 trips per day for a total of 900 trips and then state that the proposed Hazel Drive development will generate a considerably lesser number of trips (50!). One can understand a level of concern. Consider the IWWC committee minutes indicating that the standard calculation that generates an estimate of 23,484 gallons per day for the development at 50 Hazel Drive was changed to a calculation that generated an estimate of 12,005 gallons per day. Apparently, there was a discussion between a representative of the applicant and a representative of the town and they decided that the change should be made because the units will be smaller

Perhaps, the Commission, Applicant and Citizens can work together to improve this application along the lines I suggest.

Gary L Carter