

Lori Longhi
1427 Enfield Street

Zone Change PH3040MA

Good evening commissioners,

At the last meeting it was mentioned that Blair manor was in a residential district R-44 that turned into this SDD district. But that property was not in any way similar to this application.

First it was a virtual Meeting during COVID. The properties across the street and next door Blair Manor were in all the Scitico design overlay district. We know that overlay zones are a more flexible zoning with mixed uses. The properties directly to the east and south of Blair Manor are the State of CT and it is 124 acres, the western abutter was the CT Water Company - a utility 13 acres. The zoning density actually went down to 5.1 units per acre in the area. It had been empty for several years and the building was deteriorated.

They submitted a complete set of site plans, a drainage report, a current traffic report, an environmental report, floor plans and they paid for both a zone change and a site plan review.

The chairman disagreed when the engineer said that there would be no increase in traffic for the 43 units. The chairman said there would be.

The chairman actually said he thought it was spot zoning.

The chairman asked three times if anyone wants to speak in favor or against the applicationNO ONE came forward.

That in itself is a major difference from this application. The neighborhood is speaking out. The Blair manor application had the State of CT and the Connecticut Water Company as abutters plus garages, apartments, McDonalds, a mall, package store, gas station and then a few houses across the street. That property may have been residential but the area was more commercial. The simple and plain reading of the regulations is that the SDD is not supposed to be used in a Residential zone as the tables are only in the Business section.

The 1297 Enfield Street property is in the historic district surrounded by residential houses. It is not in an overlay. There are 4 industrial properties that abut this application but they are located on the other side of Interstate 91. They count as abutters but they typically don't speak.



It is clear to me when the applicant talks about density at 9.3 and then mentions the MFHD they forget that that particular district is required to have 60 acres. They can't compare themselves to the MFHD zone because they don't have the correct acreage they are 25 acres. I remember writing that regulation and we were very specific to a minimum of 60 acres and that is why the density was allowed to be so high at 10. They have less than half of the acres. Yet they want to be almost equal in the density. In the Plan of Conservation and development the Historic section it says to reduce density and reduce traffic.

Clearly if you allow this zone change you will be allowing a greater density and increased traffic. They want you to focus on their narrative which is housing. But it has been proven that Enfield already has enough. There is housing approved not yet built.

Approved by you but not yet built. These are the reasons it is not good for Enfield. It doesn't make sense to me that we need to change a zone, for a particular group to benefit them. They have other options but choose not to do them.

We don't have enough answers on the exact height of these buildings and in our district the maximum height is 2.5 stories. We don't have the architectural plans, parking or circulation and many of the requirements needed to make an informed decision.

At the last hearing I touched on parking. I said the applicant is proposing .75 of a parking spot... that is not even 1 spot per apartment. I mentioned in residential section 2 parking spots is required and age restricted is 2 spots are required. Going back into the minutes of the approved apartments for Blair Manor they also used 2 spots per unit and 359 Hazard Avenue just recently approved apartments and used 2 per unit. With 250 apartments they need 500 parking spots just for the apartments. They propose 154 spots and that's including the Montessori school. The issues are endless. This is not a site plan review. Based on these facts I can only hope that you do the right thing and vote down this zone change.

Thank you for listening.

Re: Meadow Manor, LLC
612 Hazard Avenue


There are no activities or uses proposed within the aquifer protection area. Stormwater is directed away from the aquifer and the environmental report confirms the proposed development will not impact the aquifer.

Enclosed with this application are the following supporting documents:

- Site Plan Set (sheets 1-11) by J.R. Russo & Associates, LLC dated 3/24/21
- Drainage Report by J.R. Russo & Associates, LLC dated 3/24/21
- Traffic Report by FA Hesketh & Associates dated 3/30/21
- Environmental Report by One Earth Environmental dated 4/6/21
- Architectural floor plans and elevations (sheets 1-9) by Russell & Dawson dated 4/5/21
- Copy of property deed
- Wetland application for determination of permit need including checklist and fee of \$75 (\$15 DPN + \$60 state fee).
- Zone change application from R44 to SDD with fee of \$380 (\$310 for <10 acres + \$10 sign fee + \$60 state fee).
- Site Plan Review application with fee of \$552 (66,410 s.f. x 0.005 + \$160 + \$60 state fee)

We look forward to presenting this project to IWWC and PZC at the next available meeting dates. Please let us know if you have any questions before then.

Sincerely,



Dana Steele, P.E.
J.R. Russo & Associates, LLC

Anthony Spazzarini
40 Post Office Road

RE: PH 3040MA 1297 Enfield St

Under section 5.60 of your Special Design District regulations under "Procedure"
It says that for the application of a Special Development District, it shall be both a zone change and site plan review procedures. Then if you go to your site plan review section you will know it is clearly not a site plan review when there is no

Contours or grades

Buildings with dimensions or elevations

Floor Plans

Sanitary sewer and storm water management

It appears that even though this is a 40+ million dollar nonprofit project that is for the sole benefit of the sisters and community builders they still did not want to spend any money for site plans. Anyone who hasn't figured out that this is a cash cow for the community builders is naive. The nuns won't be participating in any of the management they are just collecting a check from the land lease.

It's the neighborhood and the town that will be harmed by this project if it goes forward.

I have been in construction my whole life, the information on this application is not adequate for any site plan review. I don't see how you can vote any other way than no.

I am sorry I have to be here tonight.

I have lived in Enfield my whole life and I have lived on Post Office Road for 60 of those years. I served on Planning and Zoning for from the late 1960's to the early 1970's. There are very distinct zoning sections of the Zoning Regulations. The three are Residential, Business and Industrial zones. It is not the intent of the regulations to be moving things from the different sections into other sections of the regulations. This SDD zone is in the business zone -it is simply **NOT** in the residential zone it can't be used in the residential zone.

Aside from the fact the SDD zone simply doesn't apply to a residential district. The density in our residential zone is 1.25 per acre the applicant is proposing 9.3 per acre that is eight times more. How is that a benefit to the immediate neighborhood? How is that a compatible density for everyone abutting this site? It's not compatible.

I am 83 years old and I don't think I have ever come before this board to oppose anything in this town. This application is not good for our town It is not good for our neighborhood. It's not good for the sisters or it's not good for the Little Sisters of the Poor abutting this property next door. I can't believe that this application even got this far. I am here tonight because I am not in favor of this zone change.

Thank you

PH3040MA

Site plan approval criteria,

Traffic Access

Circulation and parking

I would like talk a bit on parking and traffic. I went to one of the informational meetings but you could not see the parking on the screen, you couldn't see it in your master packet. We all know parking is going to be an issue, we all know traffic is a problem. The applicant used .75 spaces for housing for the elderly but residential is 2 and Age restricted is 2 parking spaces. We have our town wide EMS rolling out ambulances day and night from that corner, we have four schools and it seems like we all know about the traffic but the applicant want us to think this old study is good enough. When we had the Enfield High School application we had in many hearing four pages of minutes just talking about traffic in. (Some of you may remember this) When I sat on the board I was so concerned about the safety of the kids at Enfield High and I saw the need for a light back then. I had safety concerns then and I still have them now. Fast forward to today everyone is talking about a need for a light because of the increase in traffic!

I stopped looking at the traffic report after I saw it was 2016 data brought forward....then redistributed. Do you think this acceptable? I don't think so. We insisted on counts from the high school and all of the intersections and streets that were affected by the new high school. We got very different information when we asked for the accidents from the police department vs the state data base information. I still have those reports.

But the statement in the report that took the cake for me was that they went to the town of Enfield to identify any other pending or approved developments- and literally said no developments were identified.

YET... but just down the road across from the high school is the Enfield Housing Authority it is soon to be renovated, the complex is adding additional housing units that no one seems to know about? Not doing the traffic study while school is in session and not getting actual data are the type of things that creates doubt and miss trust between the residents and the applicant. What are the actual Levels of service of traffic with current data? But now that school is out we won't get that information but that would have been a traffic report I would have liked to have read.

The document is not even a traffic report it is just an impact statement.

Lori Longhi

1427 Enfield St