

Date: 06/12/2023

RE: PL-23-7



Dear: Planning and Zoning Commission of Waterford:

We are writing to voice our concerns about the Proposed Clark Lane Development by Scott Gladstone of Kingstown Properties LLC.

This project is deemed affordable housing and using the 8-30g law as a caveat for the Developer to make lots of money on the backs of our Town and our Residents, override town zoning laws, while creating a low quality of living and being insensitive to already existing neighbors. Several neighbors were told by Vision during appeal appointments our homes will be devalued due to the trailer park being built behind us. This proposal is taking value and property away from the original owners that there housing was originally built and established in Waterford according to zoning rules and regulations.

This project is consisting of 47 Mobile / prefab homes on 5 acres behind 11 modest homes on 5 acres utilizing a law 830-g to allow them to try to put whatever they want and take away proper setbacks and buffers from current residents to line their own pockets. These will be all rentals and no owners. They are allowed to use this state law because 15 will be deemed affordable and deeded for 40 years. Based on their affordability plan 7 will rent for \$1756.00 and 8 will rent for \$2434.00 which is not affordable for renting a mobile home on swampy wetland with no green space or any amenities for families on the plans. The rest of them, 32 will all rent at higher market rate. All tenants will pay their own utilities so nothing will be included. This is a very expensive rental, and the affordability is questionable.

That's \$31,764.00 per month of revenue on the affordable units and then suppose he rents the others at \$2800.00 per month that's an additional revenue of \$89600.00 per month. Total whopping minimum possible monthly revenue of \$121,364.00 per MONTH. That is a lot of monthly revenue on one property to say he can't afford to provide any green space, extra parking for guests, playground for the kids, buffers to existing neighbors, or less density. Scott Gladstone complains that they need to cram all this density in to make any money. I am not so sure that I believe that, and no financials have been seen to prove this. This is an overcrowded, unattractive dense living area with little focus on the quality of living.

This property is a flag lot/ rear lot, and this would never be allowed in this demographic location with this much density without using the 830-g law to override zoning rules that are in place to protect the existing taxpayers. Scott Gladstone of Kingstown properties is circumventing town zoning and building codes and really exploiting the statutes established to benefit all of Waterford for his own financial gain.

He started out proposing 24 units and then got greedy and jumped up to 47. On a P&Z meeting in July of 2021 he stated clearly, and it's recorded that if the town did not agree with his plan, he would walk but

109R & 131 Clark Lane
Public Hearing
PL-23-7
Exhibit 18

now he turned around and added 830-g and threatened to sue his own town. What a good neighbor and local business owner in town!!!!

Clark Lane is a modest neighborhood, and we really look to our Town Officials for guidance and protection however many are feeling let down that this project is being even considered. Being a modest neighborhood, this area was targeted knowing many residents would have limited resources to afford expensive lawyers and experts to fight on our behalf. We are at the mercy of the Town officials to protect us.

Scott Gladstone and Kingstown Properties LLC is an inexperienced and careless developer which really shows in this proposal. How can we trust he will even do what he says he is going to do? Completion bonds and Financial Compensation Bonds for the neighbors should be considered for the mess he is going to create.

We have concerns about:

1. Deforestation for this new project will really affect us. The woods and the trees help buffer noise from the dog pound, High School events, Parties that they have at Bates Woods Park, and other properties on that side of the property. We already live on Clark Lane, one of two major north / south throughways in town. With the busy street in the front, we mainly utilize the back of our property for more peaceful living. **We are asking for proper 50 feet setbacks from our existing property line and a less dense project.**
2. We also do not want people from this development walking through our yards so we would ask for a fence of 10 feet vinyl fence with arborvitaes on Scott Gladstones side of the fence spaced correctly for growth so that they will grow taller than the fence to preserve some of our privacy, quiet, water uptake, and air quality. Kingstown Properties must be required to maintain the fence line.
3. We would ask that the density is reduced, and greenspace be added plus an overflow parking lot. It will not be safe when the tenants have visitors and since there is no parking, visitors will have to park on the narrow private road causing fire truck and police cars to be unable to pass through when needed. As the plans state each mobile home will have a propane gas tank so if there is a fire, with this density, the whole project plus our houses will be in great danger of fire. Grills and firepits should not be allowed. We are questioning if a full size (126x12x36 ft) Firetruck can properly enter the private road since the site plans only show space large enough for a garbage truck.
4. Many of the existing neighbors have large mature trees where the roots extend out and can be damaged during and after construction. Scott of Kingstown Properties is planning to dig a 3 to 5 feet ditch on the eastside and pushing that dirt to the westside of the property to accommodate existing high-water table and storm water treatment plan based on their site plans. This amount

of movement will cause soil instability. We are in fear that they will cause damage and disease to our trees, and therefore we are requesting proper 50ft setbacks based on current zoning laws. This is a family neighborhood including seniors and small children, and it is unsafe to have these large trees damaged and unexpectedly falling in our backyards and on our homes and family members. Our mature trees provide shade and are necessary to for our quality of life that we enjoyed for decades. Mature trees and preservation of nature are consistent with Waterford's Preservation of Conservation and Development Plan. Minimal destruction of trees is part of the LID – low impact development plan and quality of life for residents.

5. Many residents including other areas of Waterford agree that this is an overly large retention and bio retention basin. Due to its grand scale and its ineffectiveness at pulling out nutrients and pollutants, it will be a hazard and next to our Middle School which is public town property. The basin is 5 feet deep (our water table is at least 2 feet below the surface) and 240 feet long which cannot be secured or enforced and will cause multiple hazards. Middle school students are very vulnerable, and this basin will be an attractive nuisance to all students and children in this area. Also, we feel the walking trail with egress to our school is unacceptable. When speaking to the assistant principle he stated that they have one entrance and one exit to the school for a reason and it protects the students while keeping track of who is on campus. Scott Gladstone does not have students in Waterford schools anymore so he could care less what happens to the school or children due to his project and this plan shows it. We are concerned with Scotts vision of adding walking trails in the woods with egress to the middle school that will attract kids or predators to hangout near a school is a BIG NO and raises many red flags.
6. We are worried about the health and safety of the existing neighborhood and children, teachers, and staff of the middle school due to diseases brought by mosquitos because of the football sized retention basins, high water table, and standing water. Since they are changing the ecology which is how currently we keep the mosquitos at bay we are worried this will be a breeding ground. It only takes 5 days for a mosquito to breed and hatch and they breed often. Waterford has had issues with Mosquitos spreading disease in the past shutting down sports and school events forcing residents inside before dusk. We are emphasizing that this project is with too much impervious surface being added there requiring these overly large retention basins.
7. Traffic will be a major concern. The proposed mobile home park will add at least 100 plus additional cars added to Clark Lane will cause major backups and issues. The two-way entrance will be a major accident problem due to limited distance between entrance/exit and the intersection, of Clark Lane, Chester Street, and Fog Plain Rd. New London high school and Magnet high school has changed their entrance and exit dumping all traffic onto Chester Street causing further backups starting January 1, 2023. There is not enough leeway after cars turn on to Clark Lane to stop and enter/exit the new project which will cause accidents and unsafe conditions. Also please note that we noticed traffic study box falling over and not working properly during school winter break in December 2022 although traffic study stated it was done November 3rd. We feel that this is a faulty traffic study and should be re done when school is in session to accurately capture the traffic numbers. The change in the flow of traffic was done

after January 1, 2023, which is not accounted for in their traffic study done in supposedly November. They also mentioned/suggested in their traffic study that town makes changes to existing roads at Fog Plain/ Clark Lane intersection in the future, but they negated to say the new development would increase traffic. Again, this puts burden on the town and the taxpayers to accommodate Gladstone.

8. The east side of this project behind approx. 10 to 12 trailer homes will have an 8-foot steep drop which will be unsafe. They are moving the dirt and pushing the units right up to the steep drop because there is not enough space in this narrow strip of land that they are cramming too many units on. A development like this would make more sense if they had one row of units which would also provide more room for setbacks, parking for overflow, greenspace, playground, or club house.
9. In their application statement of Design Compatibility, the applicant deceptively picked and chose only a few houses on Clark Lane and Chester Street (New London CT) to show similarities but is false. All houses on Clark Lane are stick built and have basements and or attics along with side, front, and rear yards for green space which is not comparable to this trailer park design. Oxford Ct trailer park which was also listed as a similar property however it has amenities such as fitness center, club house, barbeque area, playground, and dog park which is un comparable to Kingstown properties proposed development. They mainly compared the spacing of units in Oxford which does not seem similar and if units are spaced closer together with green space areas again, they would make more sense and provide a quality of life where families can thrive verses this crowded project with no open space or amenities.
10. Since the closing of the New London Dump this area has been prone to issues with Rat infestations. Currently they under control. They thrive in overcrowded living areas which we all agree this will be and with the removal predatory animals due to habitat loss with the deforestation for this new project we feel there will be a problem again. We insist that the applicant provide professional extermination services year-round.
11. There are No amenities and there is No onsite management, and we are worried that there is no enforcement of any of the rules such a parking on the road which will be unsafe. Who will monitor that there is only one family per dwelling and lessees are not subleasing the mobile homes. Short term rentals should be addressed and not be allowed for this property. Parking will need to be strictly enforced since it is such an overcrowded / tight space and there is no overflow parking listed on the plans. Two parking spaces for a 3-bedroom mobile will be difficult to adhere too.

Sincerely,



Christine Haase



Arlene Sherman

9. Additional Information

☒ ☐

☒ ☐

☐ ☒

☒ ☐

☐ ☒

☐ ☒

How much open space is proposed (SF/AC)? _____/_____ Percent of property(s) _____

Use and purpose of open space: _____

10.	Previous Land Use Permits Associated with the Property(s)
-----	---

Date Issued

Approved Use/Activity

site plan approval of an assisted living facility (never built)

Permit to conduct regulated activity within upland review area

SECTION 4 - MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (R-20)

- 4.1 GENERAL** The minimum lot size in this district shall be 20,000 square feet subject to conformance with the lot design standards of Section 3.34 of these regulations. The following shall be permitted uses within this district. (Amended 7/2/90, Effective 7/13/90)

4.1.1 One-family dwellings.

4.1.2 Farming, except piggeries and the raising of animals for the production of pelts, provided that no farming shall be permitted on any lot which is less than 120,000 square feet in size.

Roadside stands not over 200 square feet in size, only when used for the sale of farm products, shall be permitted only if such stand is accessory to a farm use existing on the lot on which said stand is located. All such stands shall be set back 15 feet from the front property line and shall be provided with at least three off-street parking spaces in addition to those parking spaces required to serve the other uses of the property. All of the products offered for sale at any stand established under this provision shall have been grown or produced on said property.

4.1.3 Public libraries, public schools, and places of worship, subject to the approval of a site plan under the provisions of Section 22 of these regulations.

4.1.4 Public or private parks and playgrounds, subject to the approval of a site plan under the provisions of Section 22 of these regulations.

4.1.5 **CUSTOMARY HOME OCCUPATIONS**, as defined in Section 1 herein and subject to the provisions of Section 3.11 of these regulations.

4.1.6 **ACCESSORY USES** as defined in Section 1 herein and subject to the provisions of Sections 3.9 and 3.10 of these regulations.

4.1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units in accordance with Section 3.36 of these Regulations.

4.2 USES PERMITTED IN THE R-20 DISTRICT SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF A SPECIAL PERMIT

The following uses may be permitted in the R-20 District, if approved by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of Section 23 of these regulations.

4.2.1 Radio or television antennae, flagpoles, towers, chimneys, water tanks or standpipes, any of which extend more than 40 feet above the ground or private antennae more than 20 feet above the residential structure on which they are to be erected or more than 40 feet above the ground.

4.2.2 Cemeteries.

4.2.3 Buildings and structures and sub-stations operated by utility companies, but excluding service yards and outside storage areas.

4.2.4 Municipal facilities including firehouses and parking lots serving firehouses.

4.2.5 Convalescent nursing home, places for assisted living, hospitals, medical clinics, or medical service laboratories. (Amended 8/19/08)

4.2.6 Private educational institutions (Amended 8/19/08)

4.2.7 Age Restricted Housing, subject to the provisions of Section 3.17 of these Regulations. (Adopted 10/01/2000)

- 4.2.8 Adaptive Reuse Development subject to the provisions of Section 18a of these Regulations.
(Effective Date 9/1/14)

4.3 MINIMUM LOT FRONTAGE AND WIDTH

No lot in this district shall have less than 85 feet frontage on a public street, and each lot shall be at least 100 feet in width at the building line

4.4 MINIMUM SETBACKS

- 4.4.1 Front Yard - 50 feet, except when lots front a State Highway, the minimum setback shall be 75 feet.

- 4.4.2 Side Yard - 20 feet.

- 4.4.3 Rear Yard - 50 feet.

4.5 BUILDING COVERAGE (amended 6/15/03)

The aggregate building coverage on any lot in this district shall not exceed 25% of the total area of said lot, except that the Commission may, by special permit, allow an increase in coverage for existing Nursing Homes up to 35% where such expansion is for the purpose of creating private rooms, there is no increase in beds, and all patient beds are accessible at ground level. Section 23.9.1 shall not apply in the case of an application for a building coverage exception.

4.6 MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT

No building in this district shall be constructed, reconstructed, extended, enlarged, moved, or altered in any way so as to have a maximum building height in excess of 35 feet, except as provided in Section 3.6 of these regulations.

4.7 OFF-STREET PARKING

Off-street parking spaces shall be provided for each lot within this district in accordance with the provisions of Section 20 of these regulations.

4.8 SIGNS

All signs erected within this district shall conform to the requirements of Section 21 of these regulations.

4.9 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

No development shall be undertaken on any lot within this district nor shall the existing character, including vegetation and topography, be disturbed from its natural state except in accordance with the provisions of Section 25 of these regulations.