

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING: OCTOBER 10, 2023

WRITTEN TESTIMONY: PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED CHANGE OF ZONE AT 1555 NEW LONDON TPKE & FELDSPAR RIDGE

First Name	Last Name	Street Address	Written Testimony: Per Council rules & procedures, testimony at public hearings is limited to 5 minutes. Please limit your written testimony to what can be reasonably read to the record of the public hearing in 5 minutes.
Dave	Gorman	25 SMITHBROOK TERRACE	<p>I am writing to oppose the construction of 182 units (or any Planned Area Development) at the 30+ acre lot at 1555 New London Turnpike. There have already been a number of accidents at the intersection of Uplands Way, Tall Timbers and New London Turnpike as people come down the hill of New London Turnpike at speed. The intersection of Kinney Road and New London Turnpike at the top of the hill is even worse due to poor visibility in both directions as people come up the hill around the curve or go over the top of the hill and down New London Turnpike. Adding hundreds more cars to these intersections would greatly increase these hazards. Even with occasional speed traps on New London Turnpike, cars still travel well in excess of the speed limits in both directions. Adding a traffic light or worse, a stop sign, at the bottom of the hill would increase congestion on what is already a very busy road. Glastonbury must draw the line on large increases of traffic and additional traffic signals before the congestion seriously causes our town to lose its charm. New London Turnpike already has several condominium developments and the Tannery apartment project all funneling traffic onto this road. Existing intersections will soon be overwhelmed. Living in the neighborhood, I know that no one has done a traffic study on New London Turnpike to predict the possible effects of a significant increase in traffic here. New London Turnpike is a major access road to Glastonbury High School. Adding significant additional congestion to a road traveled by high school teens would be a huge mistake which could not be solved after the fact. I respectfully request that the preliminary development planned be rejected outright.</p>
Ketki	Vahalia	166 Feldspar Rdg	<p>I respectfully testify in opposition to the change of zone from Rural Residence to Residence A, and a Planned Area Development (PAD) for 30.32 acres at 1555 New London Turnpike, Lot S-1A Feldspar Ridge, and 50 Feldspar Ridge for approximately 182 townhouse units. The reasons for my opposition are as follows: 1. The Feldspar Rdg neighborhood is a Rural Residence zone, with single-family homes. The addition of a PAD zone with 182 units that will attract renters and temporary residents will significantly impact the character of the neighborhood. 2. The town had a school redistricting not so long ago, with Eastbury elementary school closing. Since then, Hopewell has run out of capacity and the 5th grade students have been moved to Gideon Welles school. This proposal will exacerbate the capacity issue at Hopewell, which in turn will impact our children's education. 3. The incongruent nature of a PAD with entrance from Feldspar Rdg and the uncertainty of quality elementary school education for residents will have an adverse effect on the evaluation of properties on Feldspar Rdg. 4. The entrances to the parcel are planned to be off Uplands Way and Feldspar Rdg – these streets were not designed to handle the expected significant increase in motor vehicle traffic. Given that both streets have steep gradation, this will lead to traffic hazards especially during severe weather events. 5. The planned 182 units are more than the sum total of all units on Uplands Way and Feldspar Ridge. This will cause a significant increase in emission of noise, light and smoke (from grills and cooking), impacting quality of life for the current residents of the two streets. 6. Most of the residences on Feldspar Ridge have well water, the addition of 182 units could cause issues in the quality and quantity of well water for current residents. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>

Stewart	Everard	89 Autumn Ln	The current zoning of Rural Residence is correct for the the 30 acres in question.
---------	---------	--------------	--

Christopher	Gulliver	60 Feldspar Rdg.	<p>Dear Town Council, We urge you to vote NO for the proposed changes to rezone away from Rural Residential. Our primary concerns are as follows: 1. Our property personally shares one of the largest property lines with the proposed development. The impact of such a development is very material for our family, as we're staring down 2+ years of development and the associated dust and blasting to get through the ledge, as condos are built approximately 60 feet from the back of our house (and 40 from our existing deck). 2. The location is inappropriate for a construction such as this. It is far from city-center, and there are no walkable amenities. 3. This construction is more than 2.5x larger than The Woods condos on Uplands. 4. The feeder streets (which are 2 lane, unmarked) are insufficient for the traffic associated with the more than 600 parking spaces in the proposed construction. Both roads leading off the property ultimately plug into Uplands as the fastest path to New London. There is limited capability for expanding the streets. A traffic light would likely need to be added at New London due to the already difficult to turn left during normal flows of traffic. 5. Light pollution will dramatically increase. 6. Our property value will plummet, as our view of trees is replaced with condos. 7. The topography is unique dropping from ~440ft to 286ft from its highest to lowest part. There is a lot of shelf on the property. 8. Would existing protective services (police and fire) be sufficient for these additional houses? 9. The bobcats, deer, bears, coyotes, turkeys, vultures, hawks, and the occasional eagle that call this property home, will be displaced. The runoff of the parking lots will negatively impact the wetlands. 10. Concern about the PFAS chemicals working their way into the ground water during remediation. We are on well water. For these reasons the property should remain Rural Residential.</p>
-------------	----------	------------------	---

Arielle	Reich	116 Feldspar Ridge	<p>I oppose the change of zone at 1555 NL Tpke, Lot S-1A Feldspar Rdg, and 50 Feldspar Rdg for 182 townhouse units. We purchased our home 18 months ago, 5 houses away. We moved into a neighborhood where our children could safely play. My father was a victim of a pedestrian traffic fatality and this issue is near and dear to me. I knew of the empty space near my home and inquired about the zoning and was assured that the land would only allow for rural residential building - now within a few weeks of any public discussion, that promise will be broken. I must believe that leaders of this board are concerned about the existing taxpayers and homeowners when you vote. We are not opposed to development, but to change an area that is zoned for 9 homes to allow for the development of 182 is directly contradictory to what brought us here. This is not about disrupting commercial areas or "changing the face of a community" it's about impacting families and communities. There is enough land in this town to develop. Why isn't there a process to secure land that is more than viable that won't break a promise to existing neighborhoods? The developers made it clear that the only way that the remediation could be financed is by producing enough inventory to make the budget work - and that's what led to the 182 units. Is that really what should drive decision making? Please don't benefit 1 project at the cost of so many neighbors who oppose it. Last year there was a party with about 75 cars and the police had to travel up the road on foot. If there had been a fire that night, there would have been a tragedy. These roads are incapable of handling an additional 180-200 cars a day. 182 units are more than the sum total of all units on Uplands & Feldspar and will add an insurmountable strain to Hopewell, which is already at capacity. We have well water, as do many of my neighbors. Adding 182 units will cause issues in the quality & quantity of well water and is a safety risk for us Thankyou</p>
---------	-------	--------------------	---

Sriharsha	Subramanya	105 Paxton way	I am supporting the petition by community living in around Paxton way against converting farm land behind those houses in to new development lots. Zoning should remain as is.
James	Macchio	134 Feldspar Ridge Glastonbury	I am against/ reject this proposal. While I agree that development is part of any growing town, I don't believe this is the correct location to build a huge new complex / town center/ or any large community of homes. One of the factors is the neighboring homes on Feldspar + Paxton are higher end homes, which would suffered significantly in price due to the assumed price of this potential cluster of additional housing. These developments conform more to a downtown location or more of a starter home area where sales prices are more in line w/ current homes. There are many nice streets in town, but Glastonbury Heights has always had a special allure due to the beautiful private homes along with the close proximity to the center or town. I don't think this type of development is a good idea, understanding how it will clearly negatively affect one of the towns most desirable neighborhoods. We have a lot of wildlife in our neighborhood that lives in these woods and that will all be certainly be disturbed. I know there is a fair amount of ledge on some of this parcel, so there presumably will be a potential for significant drilling or blasting, which could cause significant damage to the foundations on the current homes. Thanks for considering my feedback
Sarah	Dzialo	363 Main St, South Glastonbury, CT, 06073	I am writing regarding the proposed change of zone for 30.32 acres at 1555 New London Turnpike & Feldspar Ridge (continued from the September 26, 2023 Town Council Meeting). I am writing in radical opposition to the change from Rural Residence Zone to Residence A to accommodate 182 dwelling units, and a PAD. Glastonbury used to have tremendous rural charm. Over the generations, this has been very much corroded, as we have been overridden with constant development. Please halt this horrible trend and do not ruin the town any further.
Jenny and Nate	Rickles	229 Feldspar Rdg	We respectfully submit opposition to the change of zone from Rural Residence to Residence A and a Planned Area Development (PAD) for 30.32 acres at 1555 New London Turnpike, Lot S-1A Feldspar Ridge and 50 Feldspar Ridge for approximately 182 townhouse units. The reasons for opposition are as follows: 1. The Feldspar Ridge neighborhood is a Rural Residence zone and has single family homes. The addition of the 182 Townhome units would significantly impact the character of the neighborhood, attracting renters and temporary residents. 2. The closest Elementary school, Hopewell School is already at capacity and did not have enough room for the 5th graders and moved them all to Gideon Wells last year. 3. The roadways are not set up for the additional traffic and would have cars, trucks, other vehicles having to navigate the already narrow Uplands Way. 4. The clearing of the land would most likely entail blasting and could impact the homes in the areas (foundations, wells) and also creating noise and pollution during construction which would impact all of us in the vicinity. 5. The addition of the townhomes would significantly impact the market value of our homes.

Thomas	Burke	322 Paxton Way	JPH Proposed Change of Zone 1555 New London Tpke & Feldspar I am in opposition to the change of zone from Rural Residence to Residence A, and a PAD for 30.32 acres at 1555 New London Tpke, Los S-1A Feldspar Ridge, and 50 Feldspar for approx 182 townhouse units. The neighborhood is a Rural Residence zone, with single-family homes - the addition of 182 units will impact the character of the neighborhood where my family has made our home. The incongruent nature of a PAD with entrance on Feldspar and the effect on elementary education will have an adverse effect on the evaluation of home properties throughout the neighborhood. The plan for 182 units are more than the total of all units on Uplands and Feldspar - this is simply too much for the neighborhood. The emission of light, noise, smoke, traffic will impact the quality and safety of the current residents of the two streets. Thank you for your consideration.
UDAY	Patel	22 Paxton Way, Glastonbury, CT	Respectfully rejecting this development as it will cause tons of problems on top of overdeveloped areas for nearby existing residents.
Elaine	Hawk	238 Feldspar Ridge	I hereby submit my opposition the change of zone from Rural Residence to Residence A and Planned Area Development (PAD) for 30.32 acres located at 1555 New London Turnpike, LOT S-1A Feldspar Ridge, and 5- Feldspar Ridge for proposed development of 182 dwellings. I am a homeowner at 238 Feldspar Ridge. This street consists of single-family homes which ends in a cul-de sac. This is a sought-after neighborhood due to its tranquility and low traffic throughput. It has been safe community for the many families who have school aged children. The proposed addition of a PAD zone with over 100 dwellings will impact the homeowners of Feldspar and Paxton due to potential renters and change the landscape of the neighborhood. When we moved into our home in 2016, we learned that the schools were recently redistricted due to the closure of Eastbury. We had chosen our home due to its proximity to Hopewell School. Hopewell was no longer able to meet the needs of its growing student population a couple of years and as a result the 5th grade students must attend Gideon Welles. Hopewell is the only school that has 5th graders in another school. Their final year experience of elementary school is different than other elementary schools because they are no longer part of their home school. Our children's education will continue to be impacted if this proposal is approved. Many new homeowners sought this neighborhood to raise children due to its safety and proximity to Hopewell. Houses were selling within 30 days of listing. This will impact residents and their home values. The proposed entrances on Uplands Way and Feldspar are not sufficient to handle the increase in traffic. The right side of Uplands Way is already a no parking zone but the street is still narrow when delivery trucks, school buses, cars and landscaping trucks are parked on the other side. The proposed changes will also increase noise, emissions from the construction, increased total carbon footprint,
Jill	Durall	73 Shagbark Road	Stop development. You are ruining our community. The traffic is horrendous already. It is starting feel like a city not a rural town
Chris	Balfanz	199 Stockade Rd.	As a realtor serving Glastonbury for over 30 years I have direct knowledge of the need for affordable housing in Glastonbury. I support the zone change for the property on New London Tpk and Feldspar Ridge. I would also support increasing the amount of affordable units in the development from 20 to 30 or 40% to attempt the better meet the need for affordable housing in our area. If some or all of the affordable units could be designated as rental units that would be an additional bonus as rental inventory is sorely needed in Glastonbury.

Susan	Heffernan-Gaieski	85 Feldspar Rdg	<p>The proposed plan for development does not align with our town Conservation & Development Plan as follows: 1. The proposed development includes removal of highly wooded areas & disruption of an existing ecosystem 2. The proposal is densely populated housing & does not allow for adequate open space 3. Sustainability in development is not a consideration The zone in which the proposed development is located abuts Feldspar Ridge & Paxton Way, which are single family homes built on approximately 1 acre lots. Homeowners on these streets made their home selections seeking a quiet residential area surrounded by woods, conservation easements, & appropriately spaced homes in a RR area. The proposed development does not align with the current development in this area. It suggests removing significant established forestry & packing in densely populated homes within a stone's throw of established RR zones. The proposed development area is surrounded, within less than ¼ mile on all sides, by areas of conservation easement, with streams & a quarry. Densely populated housing will require the removal of currently mature, densely wooded area, forcing animal species out of their natural habitat & away from their water source, the quarry & wetlands. Utilizing Section 8-30g may be a prudent business decision for the developer but, it is not what is best for our community & does not prioritize the needs of the targeted population. If the developer were looking to help the population in need of affordable housing (elderly, families), proposing a dense development of three-story units (with stairs for the elderly to climb), in an area without easy access to town (sidewalks aren't continuous & the area is over a mile, with a 300 ft elevation gain from town with no public transport), would not be the answer. Private business profits should not drive the planned development of our town. Needs of residents (both human & animal) & conservation of undeveloped land should drive our decisions.</p>
PILAR	BOTERO	14 UPLANDS WAY GLASTONBURY CT	<p>In normal day takes me 5 minutes to travel from Uplands Way to the corner of Monaco Ford dealership. During school section takes me 10-15 minutes for the same route. The extra traffic that the high school section creates as travel time for the same distance TRIPLE. If the Town Council and other leaders of the Town of Glastonbury approve the change of zoning to aloud this proposal to move forward, will be like signing a dead sentence FOR ALL OF US that live at Uplands Way and around this area. We will not have an opportunity to evacuee in a case of emergency. I invite all Town Council members to put themselves in our shoes. Would you agree to put your life in this dangerous situation?</p>
Evan	Lyle	37 Uplands Way	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposal to change the zoning of the land parcel from rural residence to a PAD at 1555 New London Turnpike, Lot S-1 Feldspar Ridge and 50 Feldspar Ridge. I'm concerned about the amount traffic on Uplands Way that will be incurred as a result of the change of zoning. Additionally, the access to the proposed PAD on Uplands Way is a narrow area between two residences located on an incline/decline on a curve on Uplands. The road (Uplands) itself is a narrow road with no center line divider and where cars park on each side of road -- the amount of traffic and the narrowness of the area do not lend itself to being the only access into this proposed large development and will create a safety risk. I respectfully ask the council to reject this proposal. Thank you- Evan Lyle (37 Uplands Way)</p>
Russell	Brown	90 Uplands Way	<p>There is a proposal to change the zoning of the former Bona orchard property on New London Turnpike. If this is approved you will be destroying one of the most beautiful & visible spots in town. Please do not do this. I live on Uplands Way & this street is not meant for this kind of traffic. The point at which the new road would come in is where the worst line of sight is when driving up or down the hill. Please keep our town for us.</p>

Donna	Kidwell	22 Williams Glen Way	In Connecticut a family would need to work 85 hours per week at minimum wage to afford a two bedroom rental unit. Creating affordable housing in Glastonbury is critical to decreasing the affordable housing shortage in our region for the workforce that is needed and senior citizens on limited incomes. The New London Tpk./Felspar proposal is a star towards the goal of developing new construction of affordable housing with the following considerations: 1. Increase the Affordable units to 30% With half at 60%AMI and half at 80% AMI. 2. Affordable units should be rentals and not homeownership. 3. Develop an affirmative marketing plan so the units will be marketed regionally. 4. Work with a developer to insure a plan that will be financially viable to include that a meaningful number of units will be accessible for those with mobility challenges. Please give these suggestions consideration as we work to make the community community we love more equitable and inclusive. Donna Kidwell
-------	---------	----------------------	---

William	Marut	264 Carriage Drive	My name is William Marut. I have lived in Glastonbury for 37 years. I am writing to advocate for additional affordable housing in Glastonbury -- not for selfish reasons -- but for the general welfare. Specifically, this is in regards to the New London Turnpike and Feldspar Ridge condo development. I request that 30% to 40% (not 20%) be affordable. Of the affordable units, I request that one half be affordable at 60% Area Median Income (60% = \$80,000 per year for a family of four), and the other half be affordable at 80% Area Median Income (80% = \$106,000 per year for a family of four). Secondly, I request that the affordable units be rental, rather than homeownership. Third, I request that Glastonbury require an affirmative marketing plan to ensure that the units are marketed regionally. Fourth, I recommend that the town work with the developer to develop a financially viable plan for a meaningful percentage of units that are accessible to people with mobility challenges. To allay any fears about affordable housing, I point out that there is a strong consensus among researchers that mixed income housing with a moderate portion of affordable units does not create negative impacts in a higher income community like Glastonbury.
---------	-------	--------------------	--

Chairs Gullotta and Zanolungo, Honorable Members of the Town Council and Town Planning and Zoning Commission, my name is Rob Dakers, 15 Trifiro Circle. Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts on the proposed condominium development off New London Turnpike and Feldspar Ridge, as well as your ongoing service. While understanding this is a preliminary hearing, I want to indicate my support for this proposal, broadly, as the review of it and its particulars proceeds. As widely documented and experienced by so many, Connecticut and its cities and towns, including Glastonbury, face a crisis in terms of housing costs and shortage of housing options. This crisis undermines the economic vitality upon which we depend, exacerbates our workforce shortage, and harms folks in every area and all but the highest income levels. The starter homes and other housing options, locally enabled and available in decades past and which helped my family and so many friends and neighbors get their start in Glastonbury, are now few and far between. The proposal before you could help respond to the need for more multi-unit housing options resulting from smaller sized households and an aging population. The provisions that a portion of these units be more affordable is critical to meeting a deeply pressing need, although I strongly support further strengthening the proposal's affordable unit provisions. As I understand, the proposal's units per acre is similar to a neighboring development. In regard to open space concerns, similar style developments nearby this proposal and located elsewhere in town generally involve an overall more efficient use of available space. Multi-unit developments, including near our house, have, through the years, been approved and developed in a manner that complements surrounding areas while meeting vital community needs. I believe this can be accomplished here. As deliberations continue, thank you for your consideration of my thoughts.

Robert Dakers 15 Trifiro Circle

I do not support the zone change at 1555 New London Tpke. Thank you!

Amol Luktuke 16 Derby Way
Glastonbury CT
06033

Dear Glastonbury Town Council and Planning and Zoning Commission Members: My name is Josh Pawelek. I live at 60 Wagon Rd. in Glastonbury. I am submitting testimony in support of the condominium development proposed for New London Turnpike and Feldspar Ridge. However, I also hope changes can be made to the current proposal so that more of the units are more affordable for middle and lower income families, as well as more accessible to elders and people with disabilities. First, given that only 5.5% of the housing units in Glastonbury are "affordable" as defined by the CT General Statures Section 8-30g; and given that the greater Hartford region currently lacks 36,000 affordable units and Glastonbury has a role to play in addressing that need; I respectfully request that at least 30% of the units in the Feldspar Ridge development be designated as affordable, with half of those affordable at 60% of the Area Medium Income, and half affordable at 80% of the Area Medium Income. If possible, having an even greater percentage of the units designated as affordable would be ideal. Second, given that Glastonbury has a serious lack of affordable rental housing, I respectfully request that the affordable units in this development be designated as rental housing. Third, I respectfully request that the town require an affirmative marketing plan to ensure that the units are marketed regionally. Finally, I respectfully request that the town work with the developer to establish a plan for a meaningful percentage of units to be accessible to people with disabilities. Respectfully submitted, Josh Pawelek

Josh Pawelek 60 WAGON RD

We respectfully testify in opposition to the change of zone from Rural Residence to Residence A, and a Planned Area Development (PAD) for 30.32 acres at 1555 New London Turnpike, Lot S-1A Feldspar Ridge, and 50 Feldspar Ridge for the following reasons: The Feldspar Rdg neighborhood is a Rural Residence zone with single-family homes. The addition of a PAD zone with 182 units (and expected lower sale price as compared to existing properties) will significantly detract from property values. The entrances to the parcel were not designed to handle the expected significant increase in motor vehicle traffic. Both streets have steep gradation that will lead to traffic hazards especially during severe weather events. The planned 182 units are more than the sum total of all units on Uplands Way and Feldspar Ridge. This will cause a significant increase in emission of noise, light and smoke (from grills and cooking), impacting quality of life for the current residents of the two streets. Environmental disruption is a significant concern - there are conservation easements to be considered, disruption to wildlife, wetlands crossing, loss of trees, and impact to existing home structure/foundation due to the presence of ledge and blasting that may need to occur during clearing. Most of the residences on Feldspar Rdg. have well water. The addition of 182 units could cause issues in the quality and quantity of well water for current residents. Sewer infrastructure is a concern as well. The location of this development is of significant distance from the Town Center with no access to public transportation or continuous sidewalks into Town. This proposal will exacerbate the current student capacity issue at Hopewell School and could create redistricting disruption and expenses for the Town. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mike and
Melissa Miner 146 FELDSPAR
RIDGE

My name is David Liscinsky and I live at 100 Bellridge Road, Glastonbury. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed New London Turnpike and Feldspar Ridge development and for your service to the Town. I would like to indicate my support for the proposal and any modifications that would increase affordability for those below the local median income of \$106,000 for a family of 4. Please consider increasing the current 20% allowance. Any increase in affordable housing in Glastonbury will especially help our current and future workforce and Seniors. Thank you again for your consideration and all you are doing for Glastonbury

David Liscinsky 100 Bellridge Road

Open Communities Alliances and Erin Boggs (resident of Glastonbury) writes in support of this proposal with a few adjustments:
• Affordability: We request that at least 30% of the units be affordable, with half of those affordable at 60% AMI and half affordable at 80% AMI. If possible, having an even greater percentage affordable would be ideal (~40%) in part because affordability at 80% AMI is not so different from 100% AMI. • Rental Housing: Due to the acute need for rental housing, we recommend that the affordable units be rental rather than homeownership and that the rental units be scattered throughout the development. • Marketing: We encourage the town to require an affirmative marketing plan to ensure that the units are marketed regionally. • Accessibility for People with Mobility Challenges: We recommend that the town work with the developer to develop a financially viable plan for a meaningful percentage of units that are accessible to people with physical mobility challenges.

Erin Boggs PO Box 130, East
Glastonbury, CT
06025