

Received 6/14/2021

Robert and Kerry Wichowski
685 Wallingford Road
Cheshire, CT 06410

Town of Cheshire
Planning and Zoning Commission
84 S. Main Street
Cheshire, CT 06410

Re: Public Comment to the Public Hearing June 14, 2021
648 Wallingford Road

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comment to the matters before the Commission related to the property known as and located at 648 Wallingford Road. We respectfully submit the foregoing for the consideration of the Commission related to the decisions before it on the aforementioned property and formally protest the Zone Change and Map Change as provided in Connecticut General Statutes §8-3(b):

This Matter Is Properly Tabled

As a preliminary matter, consideration and discussion of these items are properly tabled until such time as the relevant zoning regulations and statutes regarding the availability of the documents to be considered are met.

As the Commission is aware, Connecticut General Statute §8-3a requires that all meeting documents be available for public inspection at least ten (10) days prior to the scheduled meeting date. I would note that a recent and substantial document (revised site map) was just uploaded to the portal and was in fact dated June 8, 2021 with the public hearing scheduled for June 14, 2021. Further, multiple other documents were filed within the ten day period, including *inter alia*, the response to the Fire Comments Dated June 7, bearing no received time or date stamp, the storm drain computation sheet, bearing a date of June 8, 2021, and no received time or date stamp, and the response to engineering comments, dated June 7, likewise with no received time or date stamp. As these documents contain information necessary to adequately analyze and respond to the application, and these documents were not made available for inspection more than the statutorily required ten day period, this meeting must be tabled in order to provide the requisite amount of time, or in the alternative, these matters must be denied and resubmitted as a cohesive application.

In the event the Commission declines to table or deny the matter in light of the above, please consider my following position on the requests:

The Zone Map Change Should be Denied

On the agenda, there is an application for a Zone Map Change Petition to change the currently zoned R-40 lot to an ARPRD (Age Restricted Planned Residential Development) lot. This change is properly denied as it will fundamentally alter the character of the area in a manner that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Cheshire. As the Commission is aware, the Comprehensive Plan includes encouraging an orderly pattern of residential development in the Town...and avoid the disorderly and blighting pattern of unguided development. In reviewing the current Zoning Map, there

currently exist three ARPRD zones, one along Route 10, near commercial areas, one along Route 691, surrounded by industrially zoned areas, and one surrounded by parks and farmland. The approval of an additional 40 units of AR housing would dramatically increase the density of AR housing in Cheshire so that it would be greater than all of the surrounding areas, and in fact would have the highest density of AR housing in all of New Haven County. The change in zoning of this small parcel upon which there is a plan to place Forty (40) individual single-family housing units would certainly constitute unguided and disorderly development in violation of the Consolidated plan.

Further, the parcel directly borders R-80 zoning, which requires the lots to be much larger than the current R-40 lots. Allowing a substantial parcel of land in this section of town would, as stated, alter the fundamental character of the Town.

Many of the sitting Commissioners campaigned specifically on maintaining the character of this Town. Approving this Zone Map change would violate those campaign promises and in fact eviscerate the stated purpose and entire function of Zoning.

The Application for Preliminary Development Plan and Application for Final Developmental Site Plan Should be Denied

The parcel, as a whole, is approximately 18 acres in size, there exists, pursuant to Cheshire Zoning Regulations, the ability to develop and build on only 10 of those acres, the remainder being wetlands. Taking aside for the moment that the IWWC wrongfully held that there were 3.48 acres of wetlands when in fact there are over 8 acres of wetlands on the actual property per GIS and the Town's topography and it is upon these 10 acres that 40 single family residences (SFRs) are slated to be built. There is only one proposed full time entry and egress roadway, which meets only Wallingford Road. The Cheshire Fire Department has expressed several concerns regarding the size and layout of the road, which should not be taken lightly. Specifically, with the amount of units, a second method of access is required. Either the number of units must be reduced, or access to Talmadge Road must be planned in. Either way, the current PDP is properly denied in the interest of public safety.

The response of the applicant to the fire comments is to place a right of way and paved access route through two of our citizen's back and side yards, those residing at 369 and 377 Charles Drive. Placing yourself in the shoes of those families, the town that you call home is considering approving a taking of your property, not for the public good, but to solely to enrich another of its citizens. A citizen that happens to be the father of the Chair of the very entity that will approve the plan. Taking the property of two families to enrich one is not an action any of this town would be proud of and is, quite frankly, despicable.

That aside, large portions of the parcel are currently undeveloped. There is an abundance of unique wildlife currently that has made this area its home, including Bald Eagles, Red Tail Hawks, bobcats, foxes etc. Demolishing the area and developing same will either destroy the habitat of these protected species or force them to find other homes in currently developed areas. In the interests of protecting endangered and protected wildlife, this application is properly denied. At the very least, an environmental, endangered or protected species study must be done before this plan is somehow approved.

Further, according to the traffic study that was commissioned by the Developer, this development will result in anywhere from a 10-20% increase in traffic on the road. It should be noted that the numbers from the study occurred in June of 2019, which was before the COVID-19 pandemic dramatically shifted the traffic patterns and resulted in an increase of traffic in the form of delivery and service vehicles. Regardless, the study posits an average of 2500 daily trips on the road with the

development adding potentially 448 daily trips on the road. The study's unsupported and unsubstantiated bald conclusion that an increase of 20% of traffic on the road is acceptable is dubious at best and is unsupported by methodology or citations. There is already a problem with speeding and traffic on the road, with the increased traffic, this offers a dangerous increase. In the interest of public safety, the PDP should be denied.

Additionally, there is no benefit that this zoning and map change would impart to the town, nor is there any benefit that this development would have to its residents. In deliberating the approval of this development, you, the honorable Commissioners must ask yourself, what good will changing the rules bring to the Town of Cheshire. The answer is, simply, none. Mr. Lovely points out that the approval of the AR development would bring increased tax revenue into the town while reducing educational expenses. This is unsupported by law or fact. As I am sure the town is well aware, there is a property tax credit ran and funded by the town for the elderly. Instead of an increase in the tax base as the applicant has posited, there might actually be a decrease, therefore increased tax revenue is not a benefit to be relied upon by the Commission.

The applicant further states that the town will benefit from not having additional school aged children in the development. The assumption is flatly wrong. According to the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995, there is no exclusion of those under the age of 55 allowed. The only requirement is that one occupant of 80% of the properties be over the age of 55. That means that school aged children can live in any and all of the properties as long as there is one adult over the age of 55 that lives in 32 out of 40 of the units. Additionally, the applicant fails to realize that the cost per student is not what it costs each additional student but rather a per capita function of the aggregate education costs of the education of the students of Cheshire. Again, no benefit to the town as stated by the applicant.

There are no amenities planned, no clubhouse, fitness center, community center that would make this a community. Let's call this what the developer, applicant and the Commission know this to be: This is merely a bald attempt at a cash grab and a thinly veiled ploy to cram as many properties as possible on a small lot for the purpose of increasing the gross sales and therefore money in the pocket of one citizen and one non-local developer under the guise of an age restricted community.

This developer also has a history of over-promising and not delivering. We only need to look at the North Ridge Development in Southington. The new golf course, which was used as a carrot for Southington to approve his massive housing development, has still yet to materialize after 5 years of promises. This issue is too important, too potentially devastating to the wildlife, wetlands, community and Town to take a chance like the Town would to approve of this zoning and map change.

Conclusion

The proposed applications are properly denied by the Commission. Reading the minutes from the WPCA meeting, Mr. Urbano felt similarly who remarked on the minutes that "This was a lot of units crammed into a small piece of property." And that "[i]t was a large project for a residential area." We agree, the scope and level of construction on this parcel will have a extremely disruptive effect on the area for years. Upon completion, the character and nature of the area will be fundamentally altered at odds with Cheshire's Comprehensive Plan.

The approval of this application will be directly at odds with several of the Commissioner's campaign promises and statements such as, but not limited to:

Sean Strollo: "I do not feel that Cheshire will be overdeveloped...we have to fight to keep residents in the homes they have now. I will support the residents."

Jeff Natale: "I believe that Cheshire can become overdeveloped if each subdivision application is not vetted to ensure that the development meets or exceeds the current zoning regulations. We do not need a new subdivision on every empty tract of land...Cheshire is a very desirable community for families and the character that attracts families to town should be preserved."

Gil Linder: "We must, however, remain vigilant to protect our open spaces."

Matthew Bowman: "Cheshire needs small subdivisions to maintain its youth and vibrancy."

And most importantly:

Reading the minutes from the hearing on October 15, 2014, Commissioner Kurtz, in voting to deny the subdivision on a three acre lot on Talmadge Road into three one acre lots so that local resident that inherited the property could accommodate her family, stated that, "Regulations are in place for a purpose."

With that statement we could not agree more. This area is zoned as R-40, meaning that each SFR must be on one building acre, to place 40 units on 10 acres would subvert the purpose of the zoning regulations and render meaningless the hard work that the Commission and the Planners do in town

We hope the Commission will view this application in an objective light and see that, as it stands, is at odds with the Comprehensive Plan, will cause harm to the community, its residents, and the environment and must be denied.

Very Truly Yours, \



Robert Wichowski



Kerry Wichowski

Say No to Whispering Oaks!

Recipient: **Cheshire CT Planning and Zoning Commission**

Letter: **Greetings,**
Oppose Whispering Oaks!

Signatures

Name	Location	Date
Kerry Wichowski	Hamden, CT	2021-05-29
Brooke Redmond	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-29
Matthew Planeta	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-29
Theresa Gumpert	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-29
Rrick Morico	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-29
Mark Izzo	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-29
Lisa Plumley	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-29
Kim Morico	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-29
Chris Plumley	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-29
Michelle Solis	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Wesley McIntire	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
John Pagano	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Adam danielson	wallingford, CT	2021-05-30
Joanne Newton	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Shelly Fisher-Parsley	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Lisa McNabb	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Nicole Smith	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Laura Clark	Cheshire, CT, CT	2021-05-30
Daniel Smith	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Paul DeFelice	Hollywood, US	2021-05-30

Name	Location	Date
Jill Feinberg	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Christine Morico	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Kelsey Davis	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Linda Kelly	Mansfield, MA	2021-05-30
Megan Defelice	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Ruth Koleske	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Anthony Koleske	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Sarah Pisani	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Adam Kaluba	Burleson, TX	2021-05-30
Karla Jespersen	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Pamela Guglielmino	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Juliet Rivera	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Robert Wichowski	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-30
Kellie Booth	Plantsville, CT	2021-05-31
William McCarthy	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-31
Dorothy Anthony	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-31
Jessica Persico	Cheshire, CT	2021-05-31
Drew Fraser	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-01
David Schrumm	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-02
Kimberly Shelby	Henderson, US	2021-06-02
Mark Hall	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-02
Katherine Hall	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-02

Name	Location	Date
Cheryl Guetens	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-02
Justin Mercugliano	Millinocket, CT	2021-06-02
Anne McNulty	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-02
Christine Pittsley	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-02
J Montgomery	Milford, CT	2021-06-02
Patricia Pepe	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-02
Linda Boulanger	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-03
Rick Cannavaro	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-03
Cliff Gillman	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-03
Cameryn Guetens	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-03
Elizabeth Alexander	Warwick, RI	2021-06-03
Mark Alexander	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-03
Destiny Gillman	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-03
David Dent	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-03
Michelle Daniels	Coventry, CT	2021-06-04
Megan Heidgerd	Hixson, TN	2021-06-04
Kathy Gillman	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-04
Kellen Murray	Westbrook, CT	2021-06-04
Margaret Montagna	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-04
Eric Fekete	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-04
Occhio Orsini	Skillman, NJ	2021-06-05
Cindy Smith	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-08

Name	Location	Date
kirstin Avitable	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Gabriella Beisler	East Haven, CT	2021-06-09
Candice Meyer	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Kelly Pattison	North Kingstown, RI	2021-06-09
V MP	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Jody Daniels	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Anthony Avitable	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Linda Sheintop	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
spyro kallivrousis	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Emily Trocchi	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Nancy Bergvik	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Henry Bolden	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Benjamin Shafer	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
John Guglielmoni	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Donna Perazella	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Mark Rabin	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Elizabeth DePalma	West Hartford, CT	2021-06-09
Gary Mower	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
charles martin	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Traci Fanning	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Concerned Resident	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Alex Martin	US	2021-06-09

Name	Location	Date
Dennise Mijangos	Jupiter, US	2021-06-09
Chris Lockery	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Chery Lockery	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Steve DiSorbo	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Taryn DiSorbo	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Joseph Perazella	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Judy Rabin	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Dan Labowsky	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Michael Mongillo	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Mary Labowsky	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-09
Graeme Scandrett	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Rebecca Scandrett	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Lule Tracey	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Christopher Tracey	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Viola Leslie-Foley	Burke, US	2021-06-10
Amber Michelle	-, US	2021-06-10
Kim Santino	Manchester, CT	2021-06-10
Nicholas Cianciola	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Karen Angelo	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Raymond Angelo	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Raymond Vissat	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Brenden lee	Elk Grove Village, US	2021-06-10

Name	Location	Date
Leslie Vélez	West Valley City, US	2021-06-10
John Ellis	Tampa, US	2021-06-10
Lou LaMay	Harrisburg, US	2021-06-10
Ashley Magana	Fullerton, US	2021-06-10
Amire carver	detroit, US	2021-06-10
Melanie Esposito	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Kimberly Christensen	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Brooklyn Barton	Southlake, US	2021-06-10
Reid Richardson	Atlanta, US	2021-06-10
Jennifer Allen	Indianapolis, US	2021-06-10
Christian Cole	Belleville, US	2021-06-10
Jennifer Tanger-King	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-10
Andrew Sacco	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Paul Huntley	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Raymond Noonan	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Shannon Borner	Muncie, US	2021-06-11
Evolet Cervantes	Dallas, US	2021-06-11
Cross Kid	, US	2021-06-11
Andrew Hart	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Maura Murcko	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Mary Barbosa	Boca Raton, FL	2021-06-11
Melanie Roman	New Milford, CT	2021-06-11

Name	Location	Date
Sarah DeLing	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Sophie Yale	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Jaime Marie Pagano	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Rebecca Honjo	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Larissa Lukashenko	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Suzanne Perlroth	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
Laura DEGENNARO	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-11
James Fanning	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-12
Yasmeen Farid	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-12
Saima Pasha	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-12
Carlton Helming	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-12
Mary Helming	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-12
Arill Nyquist	Staten Island, US	2021-06-12
ella dubose	Dothan, US	2021-06-12
Alyssa Jimenez	Lehigh acres, US	2021-06-12
Kristine Ford	New London, CT	2021-06-12
Vaughn Ditzman	Dawsonville, US	2021-06-12
Tim Maurer	Anaheim, US	2021-06-12
ken eberhardt	Severna Park, US	2021-06-12
Logan Sanders	Glendale, US	2021-06-12
Mohammad Pasha	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-12
Stacey Voorhees	US	2021-06-12

Name	Location	Date
Ali Shuaebi	150 22 128 th st, US	2021-06-12
Zanib Iqbal	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-12
Ahmad Sana	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-12
Charles Hynes	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Gregg Helming	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Somia Farid	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Fatimah Farid	New York, NY	2021-06-13
Abdullah Choudhry	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Nicole Jeracka	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Courtney McCarthy	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Marriyah Farid	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Boris Karolicki	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Jeannette Karolicki	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Barbara Burch	Azle, TX	2021-06-13
Jarrood Slater	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Jeffrey horowitz	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-13
Andrea Bascetta	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Richard Bascetta	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Sara Buell	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Jeff Buell	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Colin Fanning	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Jason Como	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14

Name	Location	Date
Cal Odermatt	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Robert Roles	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Tahir Choudhry	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Jerry O'Neill	Hamden, CT	2021-06-14
Susan Murray	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Julie Robertson	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Diane Colechia	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Lavanya Subramani	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Kevin Murray	Manchester, CT	2021-06-14
Beverly Petersen	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
david Sheehan	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Barbara Hekeler	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Joan Perry	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Robert Thomas	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
joel Geffin	cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Beata Grzymala-Puka	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Jill LaMadeleine	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Samantha Hekeler	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Liam Dahlberg	Cumming, GA	2021-06-14
James Coleman	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
PATRICIA YOUNGBERG	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Lauryn Carbone	Cheahire, CT	2021-06-14

Name	Location	Date
Susan Hummel	New Haven, CT	2021-06-14
Ralph Carbone	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14
Ryan Carbone	Cheshire, CT	2021-06-14

MEMORANDUM

Received 6/14/2021

To: Cheshire Planning and Zoning Commission

June 13, 2021

Re: 648 Wallingford Rd, "Whispering Oaks"

We object to the request for a zoning change regarding the property at 648 Wallingford Rd. The proposal requests that zoning be changed from a minimum of 1 acre lots in order to position 40 single family homes on approximately 10 acres.

Our property line falls within the boundary of homes impacted, as per the Zone Change Map dated April 7, 2021, however our address is not listed on the document and we were not officially notified of the plan.

Concerns of the impact on the neighborhood include increased traffic, water runoff and the effects on wildlife. Most of all, the development proposed is entirely inappropriate for this residential neighborhood. There is no tree line buffer along the property frontage, and only a limited tree line along the Charles Drive properties. Those who have lived here for years as well as those who have moved their young families here recently chose a quiet residential neighborhood which will be drastically and permanently altered.

We have heard no one make the case that Mr Kurtz should not be permitted to subdivide and develop his property. Any such development should be done in accordance with the existing zoning laws, which have been deemed appropriate for the neighborhood. This plan presents nearly double the number of homes he had proposed just a few years ago, and on less acreage than previously planned.

"Regulations are in place for a purpose." This statement is attributed to Mr Kurtz during a Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, Oct 15, 2014. The neighbor at 628 Wallingford Rd was looking to subdivide her 3 acre property into three one-acre lots in accordance with her mother's will and was met with objections by Mr Kurtz.

Who benefits from this plan if it is approved? Certainly not the homeowners who will remain here after Mr Kurtz moves away. It appears that Mr Kurtz is looking to have regulations changed in order to increase his profit, at the expense of the surrounding homeowners. There is no logical reason to change zoning to enable a footprint of tiny lots surrounded by one acre lots. We trust that our opposition will be counted despite our property not being listed on the Zone Change Map as it should have been.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.



Lisa H Plumley



Christopher S Plumley

Received 6/14/2021

Town of Cheshire
Planning and Zoning Commission
84 South Main Street
Cheshire, CT 06410
Fax: 203-271-6639

June 13, 2021

Re: Letter of Protest
648 Wallingford Road

Dear Commissioners:

We, all the fee owners of a lot within five hundred feet of the property for which the zoning and map change is being sought, do hereby formally protest the approval of the proposed changes. The Commission should not approve either the zoning change from R-40 to ARPRD nor the Map change that has been proposed for the property listed above. This letter of protest is intended to comply with Connecticut General Statute §8-3(b).

Our reasons for opposing this change is more fully set forth in the attached memorandum.

Very Truly Yours,

Owners of 400 Sir Walter Dr, Cheshire CT


Lisa H Plumley


Christopher S Plumley

Received 6/14/2021

June 14, 2021

Opposition to planned development at Whispering Oaks, Cheshire, CT:

My husband and I own a house on Sir Walter Dr. around the corner from this proposed subdivision. First it was 13 houses, which was bad enough, and now the parties involved are greedily seeking 40 houses by changing the requirements. This is outrageous.

People in the neighborhoods of this part of Wallingford Rd, Talmadge Rd., Clearview Dr., Charles Dr. and Sir Walter Dr., purchased homes on large lots with good privacy. This is what we desired. It is a quiet area at the end of the town line. For many of us, our children grew up here and the area is cherished. We have good neighbors and good boundaries between us. People keep up their properties and beautify their lawns.

Putting in a 40 house subdivision on a parcel of land where a mansion sits, intended to be a mansion, is immoral and unconscionable. It will grossly affect our neighborhood property values, will increase the traffic, the noise pollution in building and living there, and will back right into the Charles Drive area and maybe other areas. This will force sewers where most people have good septic systems. This will impede nature and the wildlife in this lovely area. This will cause massive traffic issues with cars from 40 houses pulling out of one or two roads onto Wallingford Rd. The water table will not support it. As it is, this whole neighbor is among the first to lose electric power in the town and among the last to get it restored. In short, it will cause massive havoc all because of GREED.

There have been stakeholders involved who have conflicts of interest. One hand feeds the other in this town. This is immoral and unacceptable.

Let them find another place for their subdivision far away from our cherished neighborhoods. Many of us moved into Cheshire because we loved the open land and farms. They are going quickly because of greed of developers. What has happened with Cheshire's open land that we love? This is absolutely unacceptable. We demand justice for the residents who will be affected. Town of Cheshire, do your duty and listen to your constituents.

Thank you.

Mary Helming PhD, APRN, FNP-BC, AHN-BC
Professor Emerita, Quinnipiac University School of Nursing
Carlton Helming, CPA, CVA, CITP, CFE, CTP
Owner, Helming & Company PCs
Wallingford, CT

Mary Helming Carlton Helming