

Transcript For March 22, 2022 (7:10 - 9:21 P.M.)

Art Moran - Moving onto number 6 the Public Hearing. We do the roll call. Rich Chalifoux.
Rich Chalifoux - Here.

Art Moran - Zach Turner is excused. Denise Beale.

Denise Beale - Here.

Art Moran- Charles Raymond.

Chareles Raymond - Here.

Art Moran - Doreen Rankin.

Doreen Rankin- Here.

Art Moran - Mike Sinko.

Mike Sinko - Here.

Art Moran - Nate Koniacko is absent. I'm sorry I'm going to put him as excuse because he'd have to recuse himself anyway. Ah, Fred Eddy.

Fred Eddy - Here.

Art Moran - Terri Eickel.

Terri Eickel - Here.

Art Moran - And we'll continue to seat Terri in place of Zach. So Public Hearing, Special Exception Application #2021-03, Blue Camp CT, LLC, Applicant and Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation, Owner for the property located at 451, 455, & 495 Route 2; development of a comprehensive luxury recreational campground pursuant to Section 10.4.11 Vacation Resorts which includes recreational campgrounds in accordance with Section 18.11. Um, do you have any comments Kathy?

Kathy Warzecha - Before we get started with the hearing I know I provided ah thumb drives for several members of the Committee, the Commission and they were Terri, Fred, Denise, and ah that was it, because they were not present at the last meeting and if you would all, I'm going to pass this around and if you could tell us if you listened.

Terri Eickel - I listened to all 4 hours and looked at every exhibit.

Kathy Warzecha - Thank you

Fred Eddy - I listened to all the Public Hearing records and looked at all exhibits.

Denise Beale - I also listened to the recording up until 6:30 and I did not get a chance to look at all the exhibits.

Art Moran - Any more comments?

Kathy Warzecha - I would like to add a few things into the record then we can head into comments from the developer. Okay I'm going to add exhibit 53 - a letter dated March 2, 2022 from Keith Wucik our Fire Marshal and he has indicated that he has no comments or concerns regarding this development. Um Exhibit 55 - is a letter dated March 2 from Justin LaFountain from SeCCOG to Kathy Warzecha regarding Blue Water Development and he wrote

comments regarding the application ah um a on behalf of er the your Commission. Exhibit 56 is a letter dated March 11th, from Harry Heller to Kathy Warzecha and the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding ah, I have to look at that because there's a blank there. Ah um let me just pull that out. Okay, it's from Harry Heller and it is ah um adding several, providing several additional items ah to the Commission which he provided an overview to. Alright and he also provided an overview to some of the changes that were being done to the plan. Okay so that was 56. Ah 57 is a letter dated March 9 from Benesch to Kathy Warzecha and that is a response to the SCCOG comments. Exhibit 58 is the Blue Water Roadway Plan prepared by Benesch and that is dated January 4, 2022. Exhibit 20 ah 59 is the Stormwater Management Plan ah Report I mean dated March 8, 2022 from Benesch and that was to the Wetlands Commission and the Planning Commission. Exhibit 60 is the ah a Revised Summary Plan dated March 9, 2022 from Benesch to the Planning Commission and that is also on the website. Exhibit 61 is the a letter dated March 1st from Northeast Aquatic Research from Jen and George Knoecklein. Exhibit 62 is ah from Eastern Connecticut Conservation District, Inc dated 2004, ah 2004 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Management, Chapter 11-P3-3. Exhibit 63 is a letter dated February 11, 2022 from Connecticut Audubon to John Moulson and it was also asked to be added into the record of the Planning Commission, ah for the Planning Commission. Exhibit 64 is a Neighborhood Impact Study prepared by Roth Appraisal dated March 15th. Exhibit 65 is an extension from Harry Heller dated ah an extension request from Harry Heller dated 3/21 ah um 2022. And that letter requested a 30-day extension so we extend the Public Hearing until the April Meeting. Alright. And um we can take action on that during the regular portion of that meeting.

Art Moran - Attorney Heller, are you ah would you like to add anything else?

Harry Heller - Good evening ladies and gentlemen and the Commission. Can you hear me?

Kathy Warzecha - No, here use this one.

Art Moran - I shut that one off.

Kathy Warzecha - Oh you did? How do you turn it on?

Mike Sinko - Maybe the bottom.

Kathy Warzecha - Oh the bottom.

Harry Heller - This one is off. Push the bottom?

Kathy Warzecha - Here.

Harry Heller - Now can you hear me?

Kathy Warzecha - There.

Harry Heller - For the record my name is Harry Heller and I'm an attorney at an office at 736 Norwich-New London Turnpike in Uncasville and I'm representing the applicant Blue Camp Connecticut LLC. as well as the owners, the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation. Also with me this evening is James Barley, our representative of Blue Camp Connecticut. Andrew McCoy, an associate in my office. Ryan Dean, our Landscape Architect; and Will Walter, the Civil Engineer

on the project. Um, in listening to the items that were added to the record this evening, I think there were two more response letters that I didn't hear added to the record. One was the response to the Traffic comments by Tighe & Bond.

Kathy Warzecha - I think that was actually added at the last meeting. But I'll look.

Harry Heller - Okay,

Kathy Warzecha - Um, I know that it's in here.... Okay....

Kim Lang - I got it, Exhibit 29.

Harry Heller - Okay and how about the response letter to the Planner's comments?

Kathy Warzecha - Yup, that's in there. That was added at the last meeting. I believe it's Exhibit 37.

Harry Heller - Okay. Um, as the Commission is aware we have parallel proceedings ah before both your Commission and the municipal's Inland and Wetlands and Watercourse Commission. So as a result of review comments that have been received from both your consultants as well as the Wetlands Commission consultants ah we have been making periodic revisions to the plans. Ah, we submitted revised plans, ah, as supplement to the traffic report revised stormwater management report to the Town on March 9th. Ah, I've spoken with your planner and do not have review comments simulated yet with respect to those submissions. But, what I'd like to do this evening is to go through the revisions that have been made to the plan and other pertinent information that has been submitted into the record with the understanding that the comments this evening with the understanding that this Public Hearing will continue in order that our consultants can make the staff aware and elicit any comments to the revised plans. Um, and if necessary respond with any comments on any further revisions. Now, since we were here last month we've had two Hearings before your municipal Wetlands Commission. Ans as a result of those Hearings, and investigations conducted by a consultant hired by Connecticut Blue Camp, LLC which have provided information with respect to sensitivity of Avery Pond and an opinion on activities that were proposed in the Site Development Plan with respect to proximity of Avery Pond. We've made fairly substantial revisions to the Site Development Plan which is before you for consideration. And it's a result of those comments it also implicates a matter that was of significant debates at prior Public Hearing before your Commission. That was the question as to whether or not the 75 foot setback from a parcel under separate ownership applied to a setback of any recreational campsite in this project from Avery Pond. As a result of the ah, that the opinions that the applicant has received from its consultants with respect to activities and proximity to Avery Pond we have made revisions to the plans which makes the 75 foot setback contained in the Zoning Regulations academic. As the revised plans now comply with those requirements.

On the board before you, is the rendering of the overall development plan for the project. This is the project as it was presented to you at the February 23 Public Hearing and you'll note that ah, that we have a number of campsites located along the southerly shoreline of

Avery Pond. We have glamping sites on the north westerly peninsula which is the high point adjacent to the pond as shown here on the billboard. And we have crossing to it through a narrow portion of wetlands in order to gain access to that glamping site. We had also proposed an elevated boardwalk down to a floating dock in Avery Pond, which was proposed as a project amenity. As a result of the comments that we have received, ah, and from our own limnologist that I'm going to enter into the record. I don't have enough of these for everyone. Enter one for the record and a few for the Commission members. We have the determination to eliminate all activity within 75 feet of Avery Pond. In order to address the limnologist concerns as well as eliminate the issue with respect to whether or not the 75 foot setback from a parcel under separate ownership applies to Avery Pond. And in looking at the limnologist recommendations, he had additionally recommended to us that we need to pull back a minimum of 50 feet from Avery Pond. When we evaluated, ah, what that would do to the project; it was decided that we would pull back 100 feet from Avery Pond. Because there was no material difference in the impact on the project by doing so. So, the revised plans, March 9th plans, that has been submitted into the record changes the proposed landscape of the project to what you see before you. You can see that all the recreation campsites along the southerly and south easterly shoreline of Avery Pond have been eliminated. Ah, we're proposing no activity whatsoever on the north westerly peninsula, that is adjacent to the south easterly part of Avery Pond. Ah, the elevated boardwalk crossing to access that area has been eliminated. Albeit, we have also modified the glamping sites in the north easterly piece of the peninsula. The number of glamping sites in that area has been reduced. As we presented to the Commission last month, we are only allowing access to this area by golf cart. However as a result of the modified design, this roadway can accommodate an ambulance, if an ambulance needs to access that site for emergency purposes. And we have ah, included the turning radii on the revised plans that have been submitted to the Commission so they can verify an ambulance can access that area. As we also indicated in, ah, our presentation last month, the project is accessed by one access road which leads into the stage parking for the Welcome Center and amenity area of the park project. The site is encumbered by a ah, the taking, by the state of Connecticut, of all rights of access to this property along Route 2, but for the area that was left without non-access rights taken in the area that the driveway was proposed. It was to meet the requirements of your regulations that require a emergency means of ingress and egress with more than 150 campsites, we have included a structural emergency travel lane immediately adjacent to the access road entering the site. And that emergency access way will be constructed of concrete pavers embedded in the ground. They are then back filled with structural material and topped with topsoil and seeded so it looks like grass, but has the structural stability to accommodate an emergency vehicle. In conjunction with the permitting of this project, the applicant is required to obtain a permit from the Office of State Traffic Administration. Um, in conjunction with that proceeding, the applicant's engineers have requested that the non-access line be broken in

order to provide a second area of access. So you can see on the easterly side of the site, what we're showing from the site plan is a secondary access that lines up with the easterly roadway within the site which will become available if ah, the State of Connecticut's, um, Office of State Traffic Administration grants a break in the non-access line, a secondary access will put in to provide emergency access to that area and location. That is not part of this application because it is not available from the Office of State Traffic Administration, but we do have positive feedback, um, from the State, that will be granted and if it is granted it will be modified to provide the emergency access at the easterly end of the site.

As a result of the changes that have been incorporated into the revised plan, the number of proposed recreational sites including both RV sites as well as, um, glamping sites has been reduced from 302 to 280. A reduction of 22 sites.

Included in your plan set are the ah, in your revised plan set, as of March 9, 2022 the overall grading plan and ah, and the individual grading plan for the scale of the project. Of note on the overall plan is the fact that we have incorporated into the design two proposed created wetland areas. One to the northwest and one to the southeast of the cul-de-sac at the easterly end of the site, it's approximately 16,000 square feet of grade wetlands that is now proposed in conjunction with the development of that proportion of the site. The design for those spaces has been coordinated with the project's landscape architect as well as project ecologist George Logan, and there is a basin enlargement and planting sheet that is included your revised set that specifies the particular plantings that are specified for those two graded wetlands systems which are designed to create a different suite of habitat within the property that will attract birds and butterflies.

Terri Eikel - I'm sorry did you just say change the habitat? Um, I just didn't hear well.

Harry Heller - I, I said it creates a suite of habits that aren't currently present on the property.

Terri Eikel - Thank you, I just wanted to be clear, thank you.

Gentleman from the audience - You're showing pictures that people don't get to share.

Art Moran - Sir, sir

Gentleman from the audience - I'm leaving.

Art Moran - Okay. We'll have public comment very shortly please. Can you turn it a little bit, can they see?

Harry Heller - Within the site there are a mixture of compact sites, pull-through sites, as well as back-in RV sites. And there are maneuvering lanes between those sites in order to access them. And when you review the site plans you'll see we have two types of maneuvering lanes. We have crown maneuvering lanes, where there is a crown in the road. Those roadways will be gravel topped with stone dust. And they are designed to shed water off of the roadway. We also have inverted maneuvering aisles through the site, ah, where the center of the maneuvering aisle is depressed. And that is part of the stormwater drainage system and you can see about 4 feet of that maneuvering aisle will be paved in order to control runoff and to direct runoff to the

catch basins which are located in those maneuvering aisle and that stormwater will be discharged to the stormwater treatment system.

Since the last meeting we have also incorporated lighting plans that are included in the plan set which is presented for consideration. And the illumination plan, included in your plan set, demonstrates the fact that there will be no transient light created by this project. All the fixtures in this project are downlighting fixtures and, ah, the illumination is 0 lumens at the perimeter of the project in all locations.

We've also introduced into the record, prior to this meeting, a document entitled Neighborhood Impact Study, Proposed BlueWater Development 451, 455, and 495 Norwich-Westerly Road, Route 2 Preston, CT prepared by Howard Russ, who is a licensed appraiser in the state of Connecticut. If you look at pages, ah, B in the Appendix to the report you have Mr. Russ's education and qualifications and his licenses. The Neighborhood Impact Study is what you'd call a Match Sales Analysis. Um, Mr. Russ was commissioned by the applicant to make a determination as to whether or not the development of this project would have a negative impact on neighboring residential property values. Ah, one of the criteria contained in your Regulations, which based on Public Act 21-29, may or may not apply in the future. However, to address the parameter in your Regulations, if it does apply we have commissioned The Neighborhood Impact Study. What the Neighborhood Impact Study does is to identify sales that have occurred in close proximity to a recreational campground. And then searches for sales of similar properties in locations that are not impacted by proximity to a recreational campground in order to make a determination as to whether or not the one variable, which is the presence of the recreational campground, had had an identifiable adverse impact on market value. And he has evaluated sales slopes in the town of Preston, as well as sales in the town of East Lyme, and the town of Salem in order to determine whether or not there was an impact on, on market value as a result of proximity to a recreational campground. Ah, the report is lengthy, it should be read by the Commission members as there is a wealth of information contained in it. Ah, it talks about not only the sales analysis, but the particular characteristics of this project and its proximity to neighboring residential properties on Lynne Drive. It talks about elevational changes and streaming, um, influences his decisions on his final conclusion; which is the analysis of multiple sales in several area towns, including Preston, Salem, and East Lyme, indicate no declination of value caused by this proximity issue. Based on this analysis is my opinion that the proposed BlueWater Recreational Campground and Resort Luxury Recreational Vehicle Parkon Avery Pond will not have adverse effects on property values in the surrounding neighborhood. So, that highlights the changes that have been made since the Public Hearing in February as well as the additional report that has been submitted into the record. As I indicated there are review comments responses from the mesh on all of the review comments that have been received by the applicant. We are going to meet with your staff in the coming days in order to determine what issues, if any, the staff feels to be outstanding. And for

that purpose I would ask that you continue your Public Hearing to your April meeting. Ah, that concludes my presentation for this evening. If you have any questions for myself or the applicant's consultants, we'd be happy to address them.

Art Moran - Commission have any questions? (silence)

Harry Heller - Thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you.

Denise Beale - I do have a comment.

Art Moran - A comment or a question?

Denise Beale - I could phrase it in a question. Attorney Heller is there a reason, it seems to me that everything, this is a Public Hearing, that everything is kind of directed towards the Commission. And the public can't see these documents that you have been showing us all night. Is there a way to turn it so they are able to view it as well?

Harry Heller - I certainly can, but everything I have used as an exhibit tonight is already in the record and should be on your website. There's no new information here that's not on your website.

Woman from the audience - Then why can't.....

Art Moran - Madam hang on please.

Woman from the audience - I'm sorry...

Art Moran - Alright you can speak in one moment please.

Denise Beale - That was my only question, why is it turned this way, I really feel that everything should be turned so your viewing for all of us not just the Commission. Because it's a Public Hearing.

Harry Heller - I understand that. Ah, you know the logistics are difficult so the administrators who are going to be acting on this application, it's important that the Commission be able to view what I'm talking about and it's hard to turn it in a way that you and the audience can see, it's just the logistics of the room.

Art Moran - How 'bout if we just put the colored one up there and turn it a little sideways please?

Kathy Warzecha - You all have it now, so they can take a look at it.

Art Moran - Thank you.

Harry Heller - How's that?

Art Moran - Perfect, thank you.

Doreen Rankin - I have a question. What are the arrangements for fire pits or grills or will there be wood burning areas or what is the setup for that?

Harry Heller - There is the availability of a firepit at every campsite.

Doreen Rankin - Okay thank you.

Art Moran - Anybody else from the Commission? (silence) Thank you.

Harry Heller - Thank you.

Art Moran - Okay, I'm going to open up public comment to the audience. If you'd like to speak in favor of this project please come up to the podium. And when someone comes up you need to state your name and address for the record. Anyone who would like to speak against this project.

Sue Sliker - I'm very nervous so, ah my name is Sue Sliker and my husband I live at 6 Lynn Drive. And just so you have some idea, um, it's right over in this area, where ah actually this is our house here. The maintenance, the general admitting office if you will, the camp store or tennis courts or whatever that's where they're going in. We're new to Preston. We moved in, in August 2021. And some of the reasons we purchased the property was the small town appeal, Avery Pond, and the wildlife. We were not notified of a campground being built right behind our property by either the seller or the seller's agent. Had we known this was a possibility we would not have purchased the property. Can I, ah, there's been a lot of speaking of about the home values, maybe they may not decrease in value, but the fact of the matter for us personally if we had known that this campground was going in or was even a possibility we wouldn't have moved to this wonderful town. You should be concerned about decreased property values if Blue Camp is allowed to build their campground. And again potential buyers may not be interested if it does go in. We certainly would not have purchased. In addition we are very concerned about the modern turns of the buffers of the wetlands to the campground. Now, I'm new to this whole process of zoning and wetlands so please bare with me. It was stated at a previous meeting that Blue Camp would be responsible for monitoring the buffer zone for infractions by the campers. We truly believe this will not be the case. We believe that this statement will be left unanswered concerns that either committee will have. Again our concerns are behind the property's activities office, buildings, and the pool will be located. This, is this where the dumpsters are going to be placed for the campers to dispose of their trash when leaving the campground. Let's just say it's the 4th of July weekend, and the campground is at full capacity. As each of the campers leave they deposit their trash, which I was told is an average of 6 people per campground for 3 or 4 days. And this is going into the trash dumpster, by the end of the day that dumpster will be overflowing. For example then a rainstorm picks up with gusting winds and distributes some of the trash in the wetlands and along the buffer zone. Is Blue Camp really going to monitor this and pay for the clean up of the wetlands buffer zone? We don't think that's the case. Paying for our campers ourselves we don't think posted signs are going to keep campers out of the buffer zone. We believe that each sign, if they go up, should have very stiff fines indicated to make it detour, deter any infraction. We can foresee campers camping on the edge of the buffer zones, glamping areas, and forgetting their pen lite and walking into the buffer zone and possibly beyond to get kindling for their campfires. And you honestly believe there won't be any campers looking for firewood in this buffer zone and beyond due to the price of wood possibly being offered at the camp store. How is this going to affect the wetlands? Blue Camp says they'll be monitoring this. Our next concern is with the

rising price of gas, which we do not see going down any time soon, what happens to this property if it goes defunct? They have already lowered the number of campsites from, I believe, 304 to 280. The wetlands are already going to be disturbed somewhat and the wildlife will be gone. We will have a ghost town of campsites in our backyard. One of the other concerns is, and I just heard this for the first time tonight, is that it is now ambulance accessible with a turn around or whatever. Ah, I do not know if it's capable of taking a firetruck in there, say a fire breaks out in one of the campers. Yes, they're all supposed to have, um, a fire extinguisher, however, who's responsible if this gets out of control? Um, in the case of the ambulance, um before I knew there was an ambulance going in there it was stated that a golf cart was going to pick somebody up, there's no medical supplies on board and taken to the front entrance of the campground. Who's liable for that? Does that come back to the town of Preston? Is that Blue Camp? Who pays for that? In a wrongful death situation who's going to pay for that? And, it's the same for fire and police? When things go wrong and things will go wrong. And who's going to pay for that? I thank you for your time and consideration.

Art Moran - Thank you. Anybody else like to comment? Come on up.

Margaret Gibson - Can you hear me alright? My name is Margaret Gibson I live at 154 Watson Road here in Preston. We have heard the applicant in many public hearings argue that neighborhood compatibility is not an issue you weigh as you evaluate the proposed Blue Camp application. I say that neighborhood compatibility is a hugely appropriate measure and a vital aspect of determining whether any proposed development be allowed. At first neighborhood compatibility was dismissed as inappropriate with the applicant citing Public Act 21-29. However, Justin LaFontaine, in a string of letters and other stuff under his name, in a letter to Kathy Warzecha on March 2, disagrees with the applicant's interpretation of 21-29 believing that the applicant's interpretation was not accurate with respect to the property values in the neighborhoods adjacent to the proposed campground/parking lot. I bring up this disagreement and interpretation to make this point. The attorney for Blue Camp represents, of course, Blue Camp. Justin LaFontaine, to my knowledge, has no skin in the game, so to speak, as he made his review. When there are differences in legal interpretation on this or any other point made in these hearings the matter should be settled in an impartial setting, consulting an impartial legal expert, or coming to a decision in the courts if necessary. Vanessa working for the applicant has said the disagreement between the two legal interpretations is academic because of the neighborhood impact report by Howard Russ lately submitted, ah thus being a real estate appraiser, who found that there was no adverse impact on real estate values in the Lynn Drive neighborhood should Blue Camp be approved. I would like to make this point very clear, adverse impact on property values or lack thereof is only one aspect of neighborhood compatibility, money is an issue, but not the only one. In this neighborhood impact report, Mr. Russ writes as follows on page 4, in reference to Preston's own Section 10 Resort/Commercial District; and I quote, "The purpose of the District is to promote tourism or either commercial

development which may also contain activities that may serve a wide range of needs for area residents. It is intended that such development be located and designed to enhance qualities of the site and the town.” In reviewing the applicant’s plan, I ask you to consider if there are activities that would serve a wide range of needs for Preston residents. Is the development located and designed to enhance qualities of the site and of the town? Since this application has been submitted months ago, there have been numerous revisions and adjustments because the application contained activities that were adverse to Avery Pond, the wetlands, and the water courses. While the applicant has made changes, revisions, clarifications and so forth it has also withdrawn activities and campsites that would have affected Avery Pond as a viable environment. Maybe that some of the previous justifications that we heard were adapted aptly. I believe there are further adjustments to be made, ah in regards to this proposal, even restrictions, if this application is endorsed. First I want to address the appropriateness of location. Yes, the property owned by the Mashantucket Pequot Nation is zoned Resort/Commercial and it’s certainly true that removing RV campers from Foxwoods Casino parking lot is advantageous to Foxwoods. But the location is not appropriate as it, as has been determined for Avery Pond, wetlands, and watercourse; nor is it neighborhood compatible with neighboring quiet community, long established and enjoyed by tax paying Preston residents. There is a casino not far up the road, even closer is a Preston residential neighborhood which will be impacted. Perhaps Mr. Russ is right, about the real estate values, although in comparison it must have been made during the housing market which right now is pretty high, and as we know the housing market fluctuates, and by the way a lot. Perhaps he’s right, but every common sensible bone in my body doubts it. But look at the quality of life. The trees will block the campground from the neighbor’s views, Mr. Russ asserts. But blocking the view doesn’t make Blue Camp go away. RV pollution of the air by carbon emissions, noise pollution will not be blocked. I want to return for a minute to Connecticut Public Act 21-29. On page 4 of the Act we are told that a Zoning Commission is authorized to regulate the height and number of stories or size of buildings or other structures. This is a build after all, as far as I can see, that has mostly focused on cluster zoned, neighborhoods, and affordable housing. The Special Exception applied for by the applicant contains few buildings and permanent structures, but transient RV’s cover and densely carpet the site. It appears we are told by Connecticut Public Act 21-29, has the authority to determine the percentage of the area that may be occupied. Moreover, the Planning and Zoning Commission can regulate and reduce the density of population. Though it won’t be resident population, but the coming and going of daily or roughly every three days will be roughly 1,000 transient tourists. That’s a lot of people in a small town. And let’s bear in mind that the resort/commercial development is proposed for the benefit of transient residents, their ease and comfort and not to enhance the town or its adjacent neighborhoods. Asked if Preston, by Kathy Warzecha, if Preston residents would be allowed access to the campground, the answer given by the applicant was this, No. But if

Preston residents will suffer from increased traffic in summer months for the number of vehicles using Route 2 is at its highest, it will suffer from that. The number of people using the campsites, crowds the site and especially the wetland areas. With this in mind, please consider: one eliminating the remaining glamping sites nestled back in the wetlands; two greatly reducing the number of RV parking pads and in so doing reducing the pressure on the soil and water and air, maintenance, noise, lighting, and carbon emissions, and neighborhood and traffic impacts. The applicant has asserted that it needs a certain number of campsites in minimum to make a profit. But the applicant's profit is not the responsibility of the PZC, they could go elsewhere. I know a casino up the road, not far which has acres and acres of land. Let me also ask that the Commission require and review any insect or rodent control plan that Blue Camp proposes to use. Spraying for mosquitoes, putting out poisons for rodents this is not acceptable to wetlands or close to wetlands activities. The Commission should also request a plan that entails cleaning and remediating fuel and oil spills will be carried out due to Mr. LaFontaine writes the number of vehicles on site and proximity to the wetlands and Avery Pond. This plan would be in addition to the regular maintenance checkoffs on sewage and water treatment that were, that's already proposed. Reducing the number of RV parking sites would lessen the impact of problems caused by their presence. The proposed recreational campground and parking lot as currently designed is simply out of scale. It's too big. It's out of balance with the site it will have a negative impact on the town of Preston. It is not small retail. It is large and ungainly and potentially, even with all the alleged safe guards proposed, it's degrading to the environment both humans and natural. Attorney Heller writes at length about Preston's Plan of Conservation and Development which on other points misses the relevance of our discussions, except when he can make an interpretation favorable to his client. The Plan of Conservation and Development, while drawing attention to and endorsing the agricultural and quiet way of life we have come accustomed to; does also state, and Attorney Heller emphasizes, that Preston, Preston would like to be business friendly. Attorney Heller warns that municipal officials quote "need to heed the objective" end quote of being business friendly saying that developers will evaluate the receptivity of towns, this town as they decide whether or not to make a capital based decision or an investment in Preston. I wish to point out, respectfully, that business friendly does not mean that all who apply are welcome. Business friendly needs to be kept in balance with other valued aspects of press, of Preston's way of life. Those who wish to invest in the town of Preston, should be aware that they must come with an application for development that enhances the quality of life in the town of Preston as well as adds to its tax base. Resort/commercial mentions small scale retell, retail establishments, research, office, parks, tourism, manufacturer, and recreational facilities. Tourism and recreation okay, but within scale and within balance and with attention to Preston's quality of life. Having little adverse effect on real estate value is not all that is necessary to think about when considering neighborhood compatibility. Do not dismiss neighborhood compatibility as value to consider as you evaluate this plan as to whether or not

it enhances the site and the town. I stand with those in this room who ask you to reject the applicant's proposal. If however there is a recommendation in favor of the applicant's proposal I ask the Preston Planning and Zoning Commission to use its authority to restrict the number of campsites and parking sites and that in a business friendly way allow the town of Preston to stand up for itself and its resident's values preserving the balance between human and natural environment and the balance between quality of life and quantity of tax dollars. Thank you for your time.

Crowd - Here, here, yeah!

Art Moran - Thank you. Anybody else would like to comment?

Steven Ballirano - Good evening, Steven Ballirano, 107 Cooktown Road, Preston. Thank you for this opportunity to address the Committee. Back in February a group submitted a petition with almost 400 signatures opposing the development as was present. Having spoken directly to over 60 of neighbors, ah most I didn't know, ah that signed the petition; I echo their concerns. At the last public hearing, excuse me, issues of traffic congestion, decrease property values, and public safety among others were their top concerns. In reviewing the February 22nd responds, in the Bensch responds to RV traffic impact study item number 4, under the summary section states there are no standing developments in the vicinity of the site that will add significantly to the intersection study. Just as this was submitted, Foxwoods announced a massive expansion plan. The state hospital property, which I called out in the last meeting, ah, will impact Route 2A considerably, Route 2A isn't even part of the traffic study. There's been no update to the traffic study, and no explanation that the traffic study will be updated. The right way of going about this in terms of traffic studies if you look at the data that was submitted, they need the Memorial Day to October 30th timeline captured. All vehicular traffic must be included not just RV's, like all the other secondary vehicles, like folks know, include traffic, etcetera, etcetera. In addition, Route 2A must be included in the traffic impact study as a revision before you approve or disapprove under your consideration, these things are vital. In order to make an informed decision relative to the potential traffic congestion inherent to this project I'll edit support, and I'll make another point about congestion in a minute. I submit that the above information is critical again to the process. I found some interesting articles, um, that um I'd like to share with you tonight relative to this project and parks in general. I read an interesting study, and I'll submit to the Committee and Mr. Heller; from IQ Lynn, on August 2016 at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee. Dr. Lynn submitted as his doctorate analysis for his PhD in Philosophy Geography, it's entitled Assessing the Effects of Cars on a Community using hydronic models and multilevel, to be clear Dr. Lynn's dissertation is on parks in general not specific to RV parks, but you'll get it in a minute. However, this can be applied, ah under the consideration ah this ah that you're considering this project. How can I say this, in my 42 years at Stop & Shop, 13 of those years were as vp of sales and vp of strategic operations throughout the USA for the parent company. Part of my time, which was the most enjoyable time I would say, was based on site

location committee work that I was involved with, I was a committee member. I was involved with the best minds in the business - real estate, legal, finance, and marketing analysis. They had a keen understanding of impact analysis and, and the application process. As you can imagine with some of the projects they had, had to go through. In to it, (cough) excuse me, so going back to Dr. Lynn's findings, I want to call out specific findings within the 110 page report that he submitted. And it goes like this; Individual parks facilities influence on property values are rarely found; active recreation is more likely to introduce disturbance and therefore negative impact on adjacent property values. There's a direct correlation based on the distance of the park, the impact is greatest within 1500 feet, however, influences can be found 2,000 to 3,000 feet especially when parks are large in size. Park size is positively related to proximate property value in the impact, by noise and congestion. That's why I called out the significance of the traffic study and the need to get a revised study so we know really what we're up against with summer traffic. Impacts, active recreation and their negative impact on adjacent property values. Events at this, this, ah, the developers site; have not been called out. I have not seen it anywhere on the website. Last, last meeting I called out; some of the activities at their other properties: swimming pool parties, Fourth of July fireworks, Mardi gras, car shows, wine and beer festivals, food trucks, jeep jamborees, music ah from RV owners, and some 1,700 campers at one time. The noise I will submit to you is amplified by the water, and it carries trust me. If you heard the 2016 concert that was held on the property you would know what I mean. The park size, 65 acres, 220, 208 RVs, well within 300, 3,000 feet of many residential homes. Again park size, directly related to approximate property values. Congestion, the Russ Appraisal Services, ah talks about, ah sizes of, ah sorry the Russ Appraisal Narrative lists a bunch of parks. Now this came in really late so I didn't have a chance to dissect it, but I did look at several of the key, of the RV campgrounds that were called out in the area. And I will tell ya they are nowhere near in scope when you look at impacts. Ah Island RV park East Lyme, has 19 sites; Seaport Campgrounds, Stonington, 24 sites; Sterling KOA in Sterling, Connecticut, 160 sites; Country, Countryside RV Park in Jewett City, 108 sites. I'm going to tell ya I'll go through the rest of the list and there's not going to be another 300 RV park sites. Not directly enough to do an analysis on property values. One other point relevant to the impact analysis study submitted by Russ Appraisal, I can tell you, based on my experience with some certainty, if 30 homeowners that about this project have an appraisal analysis done, the data can, can be interpreted many different ways. It can show negative impact, it really depends on how the story's told and how you twist the data. For example, distance to the project, size of the house, home values based on amenities - swimming pool, no swimming pool; garage, no garage; radiant heat; solar panels. A number of different things: square footage, size of the home, lot size, distance to the nearest major highways, presents of water - ocean, river, lake; just to name a few. The numbers can be massaged to show favorable or unfavorable results based on many applied factors. I've been there, trust me, it can happen. A couple of other factors I wanted to share with you tonight, um

from some of my reading. From Youngsville, Louisiana a newspaper article dated June 9, 2016, and I quote, "Since the proposed RV application, a number of new homes have been listed as much as 7% below market value. Homeowners lost scheduled showings because potential buyers heard that there might be an RV park. To date 3 homes sold at under market value, just a threat of an RV park has reduced prices." Black and white, not what might happen, what did happen. Another news article, Johnston County, North Carolina, dated October 2017, "The Planning and Zoning rejected an RV park over concern about property values in Smithfield, North Carolina on a 33 acre site, with 148 RV spaces, and 48 cabin rentals. Commercial Real Estate Appraiser, Bruce Saucer, testified for the developer, that an RV park would not injure adjacent property values, the Board disagreed and voted 4 to 2 to reject the project. While I don't propose we use this project to conduct a pre and post study on the impact on property values when an RV park is developed. There is enough empirical information to indicate that the impacts will be negative, and property values will plummet in surrounding neighborhoods. At the last Public Hearing, it was stated for the record that if this project was approved it would generate some \$230,000 in incremental property taxes, potentially making the developer the second highest tax payer in Town. The Grand List was published and the, ah, top 10 taxpayers were listed. Um, the number 10 spot, ah, on the list contributed \$836,000 in property taxes, the proposed Blue Water project would not, not even make the Top 10. Additionally I submit, this will have an increased demand on the Town's public resources along with increased property revenues, would eat up the \$230,000. For this and for all of the above reasons I, I, er, submit, ah, I respectfully submit that you reject this project. Thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you.

Steven Ballirano - Here's a list of the websites that I used, and a hardcopy of each of the papers that I quoted for the record.

Kathy Warzecha - What was that? No I'm just going to just put these in as they give it. I'll read this, so, Exhibit 67 is going to be controversial RV, ah RV park rejected by the town board and that is dated October 4. That's 67, ah Exhibit 68 is opinion mixed on RV park in Youngs, Youngsville; and 69 is, ah, the, the study he referred to, um, entitled ah, Assessing the, ah, Effects of Parks on Surrounding Property Values using hedonic model, model and multilevel model. Um, so those will be the ah, new Exhibits, okay. Ah wait, and also that will be 70. That is Park Impact Articles which is just a list of articles, okay.

Art Moran - Come on up.

Michael Hotchkiss - My name is Michael Hotchkiss and I reside at 138 Lincoln Drive in Griswold. I grew up at 20 Lynn Drive in Preston, Connecticut, where I used to live on.. Ah, I'd just like to add some comments here to what we've heard here this evening. Ms. Sliker whose problem is she just moved into the neighborhood. I believe Mr. Fowler said in June and in particular with, and as well Mr. Heller, were aware the young couple who used to live in that house, expressed strong dissatisfaction with the idea of this project was moving into town. They put mark, they

put their house on the market very shortly thereafter. So I think that is definitely a sign as to whether or not property values change, the dissatisfaction of this project is very clear to the people who live in this neighborhood. And they are willing to move out over it. Ah, Ms. Sliker, Ms. Sliker would not have moved in. As we've heard from Ms. Gibson, um there have been inaccurate statements around this project. We were told many times this was the minimum economically feasible project, by Mr. Heller, now they've pulled back to 280 which is great, and you know setting back 100 feet is also great; but that also highlights that this was not a true statement. You know there were obviously other ways this project could be construed that are fairly economically feasible for the developer otherwise he would no longer be pursuing it. We know that there are higher gas, diesel prices and many anecdotal cases of people canceling their RV orders at this time, ah, scaling back their travel plans for summer of 2022. So this 232 tax figure or 234 whatever, said to be the second highest, is obviously not the second highest tax payer in town as we just heard. Again very inaccurate statements just kinda getting the story that's nicely stated. Traffic - anyone who misses this turn for this RV park, they're going to be turning into the school to turn around, their GPS is going to take them up Overlook and Tanglewood Drive or down Lynn Drive. Um, those are very small streets and I think, you know, having hundreds potentially of these RVs going through these streets isn't something we've heard about; but it's going to be disconcerting to people who live in these neighborhoods. And, um, also I'd just like to add, we've heard about foraging down in the boundaries. Obviously you're not going to stop kids from going into these places. We've also heard about noise. I strongly suggest that if this project is approved that fencing be required around the project and or sound barriers to the sites that we see from the highway. Thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you. Anyone else would like to come up and comment?

Leigh Cremin - Hello, um you can hear me I suspect. My name is Leigh Cremin.

Art Moran - Can you please use the microphone?

Leigh Cremin - It's near enough

Art Moran - Nah, we've had complaints.

Woman from the audience - We can't hear you in the back.

Leigh Cremin - Okay, my name is Leigh Cremin, and I live at 10 Amos Road. And can you confirm that there's been more information introduced at this meeting to be reviewed or considered by both the Commission and the people.

Art Moran - Everythings on the website.

Kathy Warzecha - Not everything, we got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, seven new,

Art Moran - Is it on?

Kathy Warzecha - ah yes?

Person - No you shut it off.

Kathy Warzecha - Nope it's on, ah we received 7 new exhibits today, tonight and then I, ah added or we added several this afternoon.

Leigh Cremin - So, I meant that you honor the applicant's request and the system's request to extend the hearing comment period, because I have some comments prepared, but I now need time to review this new information to make an informed comment.

Art Moran - The Public Hearing will be extended next month so you will have another chance to comment.

Leigh Cremin - Thank you.

Bob Congdon - Hi, I'm Bob Congdon, 287 Miller Road, um Blue Rock, I was first selectman for a couple years, ah came to my office 3 ½ - 4 years ago. And said they were interested in working with the Mashantucket Tribe to create an RV park on the former Dawley property. They asked what I thought, whether I supported it or didn't support. My answer to them was - it doesn't matter, you follow the zoning regulations, that's what matters. It doesn't matter whether I like it or dislike it. There are other things I'd rather see there, there are other things I would not like to see there even more than this. Ah. But, my thought is the Planning and Zoning has a set of regulations and they have rules so you submit an application, and that's what this applicant did. They followed those rules, I think they should be approved. Thank you.

Art Moran - Would anyone else like to speak on this application? Please keep it down back there. Come on up. Please come up and use the microphone.

Leigh Cremin - Hi, hi I'm Leigh Cremin, sorry I'm tired, long day like everyone else.

Art Moran - Us too.

Leigh Cremin - I thank everyone, thank everyone the Commission, the people, and the developers, thank you for all the time and energy that you put in here. I don't know anyone in this room who doesn't want sustainable development for Preston. And sound sustainable ecological conservation we all want that. You were so articulate, when you spoke sir, just now, about the zoning regulations, absolutely, the idea of the regulations are very important. But we need to stay in the lane, but there is always latitude of travel in the lane. And that's how we get contractual law. And that's how we get to Attorney Heller, because the lane and the latitude of travel within it, is interpretive, it's contractual, it needs to be relative to the travel pathway from the beginning the journey and the destination. You can't just say you made an application and we get a resort, that's very naive. So thank you very much.

Art Moran - Anybody else?

Andrew Stockton - Good evening, my name is Andrew Stockton and I live at 16 Lynn Drive. First I'd like to add a comment to what Steve just said, and one of the things he forwarded to me were some articles concerning assessment that was done concerning how campgrounds can affect property values. And one of the articles that he sent to me said that a lot of it has to do with perception that residents have of the campground or a park. If they think it's a good thing then it really doesn't change, but if has a negative, or the perception is negative then you would expect a decrease in property values. And I just want to give you my observation from when we, ah, as you know, 384 signatures were submitted to you, from Preston residents. We

Gentleman - Drew, Drew could you be a little closer to the microphone please.

Andrew Stockton - ah yes, okay 384 signatures on a petition residents opposing Blue Camp. And the process of getting those signatures, um there was a bit of a conversation with those signing them. I'd like to share some of those comments; like - campground - we don't need another one of those. Comments from people who live by them said - ya know, definitely don't need one of those, I have one in my backyard right now and I'll tell ya about the trask, and the noise, and the intrusion. There were others who said - I'm not going to sign your petition because I live right next to a campground and I think more people in Preston should feel the pain, living by a campground. So that brief experience, ya know, I had collecting signatures, catching people kinda on the fly, I didn't spend much time with them; I think it's pretty obvious that people in Preston have a very negative opinions about campgrounds. And I feel very comfortable saying this is the proof, and who knows how wide an area that will cover. Um, so that is what we gathered, the information getting 384 signatures in less than 10 days, people objecting to Blue Camp, miserable conditions those days, cold and rainy weather. And I know there are some of you who are here who did that, and really gathering 12% of that number represents 12% of Preston registered voters, that's a pretty good sample size. Unlike the sample size that's in the report you just received. Which it could be off a little bit, but I think when it came to the results of Preston, I think it only has 3 sales that were covered. There were, there really wasn't a large number of sales covered in any of these areas. Which really, ah, places significal, significant in doubt, in that study. Likely of that study. Ah, just ta say more ah, about ta what Steve said about the traffic impact. I've always felt about this issue. I look at Preston as ah, you know we're in a interesting situation here, in a way, ah, if you want to look to really analyze traffic you don't just do it right around the area where Blue Camp is planning. For me you really have to go to, to 395 and where the exit entrance for 2A is; you have to go out to 395 where Lisbon Landing is; and 95 where it exits to Route 2. That is really what, for my life where I travel around here, those are the distances that I cover. Basically because we live in an area where there aren't very many commercial services available. So, I would intend, if you look at what's happened in the last few years, some of those roads, ah which I don't think has been included in the traffic study, I think we've had 3 major projects on those roads. Route 2, bridge work there that went on and on and on and on; we had bridge work in two spots on 2A; and we also had bridge work on Mohegan-Pequot Bridge. For long periods of time. I mean that was enough congestion on some and now the idea of bringing in, having 100 RV coming in each day, 100 departing each day, and knowing that there's gonna be more, you know, work on the roads in the future, I don't see the reason to allow this in town. It's not going to provide any real benefits to the residents of Preston. It just doesn't make sense to me, and then just thinking about the worst case conditions that we've had to deal with here and then adding more traffic to that, and we know that there's going to be more work in the future. Um, along with the,da, things,da, that could depress,ah, price, one of the issues is not just having the park there, but what other things,

what other impact it is. Such as the water quality and availability. And it's just come out recently that Blue Camp is going to require 24,000 gallons of water per day. That's what they requested from the Preston Plains Water Company. And you translate that into houses, residents when you use a number that I think is fairly reasonable of a 100 gallons a day; kind of about what I see in my house, and others well anyway, that translates into 240 additional residents drawing off our water supply. And that to me is not knowing, that's, ah, it's a huge increase in demand. Just given the number of customers we have today. Now that places our, our property values at risk. So that's something maybe in these other cases from the reports that you got residents there, residents weren't dealing with, um, you know, threats to their water system, but we are. The other things I think are, you know, a lot of those who live right over on Avery Pond, we really are concerned about the well. When we bought the house during the purchasing there's going to be a little delay in closing the sale. The owner at the time, which was at the end of July, he was saying, you know, he really wanted to speed this up because this is really the time to showcase the house especially with all the wildlife which you see during those months. And I've been living there, ah, many years now, and I ah, you know, really just like talking about. One of the things I have questions about, these magic lights that you just can't see. I don't know how you can light up the whole sea of RVs with their metal sides and provide safe lighting for everyone and no one can see that from a distance. There's just going to be black out there. I, I really need, ya know, some kind of proof, that can actually be done. I'm not ready to buy into that. I don't know about another thing, the smoke from 280 campfire pits, and I realize they won't be all going on at once, but that's a lot out there. And propane, noise from the air conditioners, noise from their outdoor events, of possibly almost 1,700 people out there according to Blue Camp tell us will occupy there. And knowing there's very poor noise retention on water. These are things I feel will definitely cause a reduction in property values. Of Attorney Heller's review of the POCD, I, I think the POCD is a really great reference. I got one in my office there, especially some of what it addresses in 2005, and um, you know, if you want to learn more, want to learn about traffic it's a great place to go. I think there's been some real spin on some of the language in the POD, the POCD. And, ah, I just wanna, comment on that. First of all, it talks about the quantity of commercial applications for Preston. You know, recent, for so few applicants. We have so few applications over the years. I view that as a reason, see that as a justification to approve Blue Camp. Preston is what it is. It has very low population density. Approximately 4 acres per resident. It's not what developers like to see. They want high density, they want access off of interstates, and we don't have that. And there's nothing we can really do about that. Furthermore, we are lucky to be identified by a large casino, Foxhood, Foxwoods, and casinos generally discourage many types of commercial development such as entertainment and grass cones and tourist attractions like antique shows and book stores. Ah, basically, Foxwoods is a big was and after that happens there's really not much left around for other commercial businesses. And that's the reality, and you know, I, I think we accept that. And I think a lot of us

here are happy with the way it is. We like the rural character of town, of our town. And ah as far as people saying, you know, taxes and this and that; face it we have 3,300 registered voters in this town, and basically what it takes to get a budget approved is 400. Four hundred people and you got your budget for the next year. There isn't seem, there isn't much of a rebellion here with people protesting taxes that they pay. But, from my observation, they're kind of happy with the situation, they accept, you know, the fact that a lot of commercial development isn't meant for us. And, ah, there's going to be thoughts that we failed, ah because we had lost commercial development. The density mentioned tonight, talk about the income, the tax revenue that Blue Camp is, ah, expecting to bring in about \$238,000, but ah, just think that's a big number to look at. I just bring this up, I don't know if this Commission is even supposed to look at that, but it has been brought up. And we're getting, well it depends on how you figure it out, ah Blue Camp 7 months a year, um, ah, that's ah, um, if you try to spread that out over a year, a full year, it really comes to about 20%, ah, bring in about 180 people, some will have kids, which some may, that's about a 20% increase. Peak increase is more like 36%. Now that has got to increase the cost of our emergency services. Really when you see your population jump that much. I mean who's, Blue Camp, ah, patrons aren't super human, they're not immune to diseases. There's going to be heart attacks, there's gonna be people passing out from low blood sugar, there are going to be accidents where people are going to be taken away in, you know, an ambulance have to be called. Probably more so there than a home, because ah, they're not in their own environment. They are more likely to have an accident. You know if there's going to be a significant increase in emergency services, that really implies that the amount of money we got in the emergency services that is budgeted is way too much. And I don't believe that's the case, our budget is fairly well scrutinized. So, um, ya know, I would discount that \$238,000 by a significant amount. And you know today if you had to hire two people, upper category for salary, with all the benefits to it, you can chew up, you know, maybe \$150,000 right there. Ah, um, if you have to buy any additional equipment, in order to service the needs, if you had a fire in something like this, all this density in here, and you gotta get in there with fire equipment, you, you may not have the right fire equipment, everything you need right now to handle this. You won't know until you do the study for this. There's quite a density in here, calculate it out, I know the Planning and Zoning Regs allow you 5 sites per acre, but that doesn't consider the whole area of development. When you include what's right in here we're dealing with 17 sites per acre, that pretty high density. With um, ah, how do you work with that in an emergency situation? You know it's really, um, a quite interesting situation. I look at this, or I'd like to see more than a picture like this, I'd like to see the elevational views. That's what I find myself doing a lot these days as I drive up and down Route 2. Where this is planned, that's a half a mile, as you're driving along there, you know, just 40 seconds thinking, 13 foot RVs along here that's your view. That's what you're presenting, that's the view of Preston that people are going to be getting, as they cruise up and down Route 2. Taking about 40 seconds to get from here to

here. That's a long time to see that, a sea of RVs, some of them 13 feet high. So, I'd rather see the picture turned around 90 degrees. Ah, I think that picture would tell me, tell me more than this picture tells me, except all of this high density, it's really when you think about it, boy it's like this is all it is, but because everything up here is wetlands this is the forbidden zone. Um, and I really do worry about nature and the wetlands when you got, you know, sites crammed in like this because you know people are going to venture off and be doing things they aren't supposed to be doing. And, you know, the trash is going to be over here, at the Sliker's as I just spoke. So I think I got everything else in here. I could talk more about other things, I could talk what is the benefits, I could talk about ah, um, employment here, Heller ah, referred to, you know, to the benefits of employment. Well it's seasonal employment. I don't think that's what the POCD was looking for, when you, they wrote it, increase, an increasing the amount of seasonal employment for Preston. Ah, I and a probably large percent of those jobs aren't going to be high paid. And I think there was a goal of POC, a directives of the POCD of raising the average salary for Preston population. Let's see, ah, right. Yeah, alright I, I think I said all I can about this tonight, but I think the POCD is a great document and um as far as I somehow don't see this, I think when you developed the POCD, I don't think you have a picture like, I'd be surprised, I shouldn't say, you know, whoever did it, did it, cause that's alright, but I don't, I'd be surprised that this was the vision you have when you put together the POCD. Well, I think the price is going along with the POC, the POCD is enough to say to me that Blue Camp should be rejected. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Art Moran - Is there anyone else who would like to comment?

Susan Hotchkiss - My name is Susan Hotchkiss and this is my husband Tim, and we live at 20 Lynn Drive. Um, and Leigh just asked me to ask you when the next POCD is going to be, written, created.

Art Moran - We're actually startin' to work on it now.

Susan Hotchkiss - Okay, okay alright I have a few items, a varied assorted items that are relevant. And some people have touched on them before so I'm just going to lightly mention them again, um, things certainly do bare repeating. Um, the smoke from 280 campsites in a highly compacted area will have an increased effect on air quality. I know when I sit by a campfire for 5 minutes, while it's a very nice atmosphere and you can toast marshmallows, but within 5 minutes my clothes stink and they will continue to stink until I take them off and wash them. So, I can't imagine, I, I just can't imagine the effect that haze of whatever cresol or whatever the ash is that is going to, going to then get on the wetlands and the pond with whatever effect that will have.

Gentleman - Seriously cresol. Cresol.

Susan Hotchkiss - What did you say?

Gentleman - Cresol

Susan Hotchkiss - I can't understand you, you have a mask on.

Gentleman - Cresol.

Susan Hotchkiss - Um, the application for the Blue Camp describes in its design the proposed landscape berm along the frontage of Route 2 to buffer the proposed resort development from traffic noise and the visual effect of traffic on Route 2. That is a quote. What about protecting the residential area in close proximity to the RV park, park from the development's noise? The geography, including the echoing effect of the water, makes the residential area near the pond like an amphitheater. The sound is greatly amplified. Right now we can easily hear sounds carried over from any activities such as summer outdoor movies and pool parties. That berm might even contribute to campground noise amplification. I may have missed this when I came a little bit late, but have you gotten feedback from the school superintendent and the resident state troopers about their responses they receive from the developer, um regarding their valid questions and concerns, have you gotten feedback?

Kathy Warzecha - From their response?

Susan Hotchkiss- From their, from their responses.

Kathy Warzecha - I sent it to them, but I haven't gotten anything.

Susan Hotchkiss - You haven't heard anything back. Okay. Will there be an effects on the area's drinking water quality caused by vehicular leakage of fluid leakage into the groundwater. And other influences such as the potential for wastewater and stormwater infrastructure failure. Water supply is another concern, Andrew brought that, ha, brought that up. The developer has stated the Mashantucket - Pequot Tribal Nation, MPTN, has informed them that the supply needs for 1,000+ daily potential campers and the RV park's additional needs, like irrigation of landscaping and so on will not be an issue. It was a surprise for us to hear that the water source for the RV park would be the Preston Plains Water Company community well, owned and operated by the tribe. This is the same source that supplies water to the 60+ year old residential development, formerly known as the Country Squire neighborhood. Our assumption was that the water would be supplied by the tribe's reservation treated water source, which could be assumed is water source for the casino complex. Are, our water supply, our well gets switched to that system if there is an issue. Such as in September when the annual water testing revealed a contamination of e coli. Our assumptions may be wrong, may be very wrong. Can the community well handle this increase in operational capacity and function? From where does the Preston Plains School get its water? You who must make a critical and important decision about this project must require solid, factual information and actuate and timely communication from the water company about this. We residents depend on that water source, from recent experience communication has not been good as far as details about water disruptions of supply and service. This must be absolutely clear before this project can proceed. Finally, why is it that when creating zoning districts in our community the Avery Pond watershed was not included along with Poquetanuck Cove and Amos Lake in a district named Special Resource

Protection Overlay/Amos Lake watershed area and Poquetanuck Cove area? Continuing a description of this zone from the Zoning Regulations quote, “This Overlay District provides protection for the Amos Lake watershed area and Poquetanuck Cove area. The uses and requirements are intended to limit intensive activity which might produce service runoff and brown water contamination that could harm the lake or cove.” end quote. The interconnectedness of Avery Pond and the two streams flowing out of it are situated between Amos Lake and Poquetanuck Cove is very well established. These water sources are part of the alewife migration to and from Amos Lake and Long Island Sound. You all must recall the recently installed fish ladder at Hallville, that’s connected to Avery Pond. The Chair of Preston Agricultural and Conservation Commission, Gary Piszczek, has stated in testimony before Wetlands that this area is part of a wildlife corridor. This oversight is really unfortunate because the healthy, quiet 36 acre Avery Pond and its associated wetlands and watercourses directly impact connected downstream waterways and environments. Is it because it's apparently unfortunately location off of Route 2 that the land by Avery Pond has gotten lumped into the Resort Commercial Zoning District? This development as it’s currently planned, is an intensive activity which might produce service runoff and groundwater contamination that could harm the pond and its related watercourses which eventually will connect with Preston Poquetanuck Cove and beyond. I, I have a link, um, here that goes to a wonderful map that shows the singular connected, interconnected nature of Amos Lake, Avery Pond, and the watershed leading to Poquetanuck Cove. It is very clearly illustrated, um, by that survey map. I have copies of my statement here and a link to the map, but I will send it to the, ah, so people can then click on it, and just see it, that might be a better thing. But, what I would like to say in closing, is that Commission members, to protect this environmentally important watershed this RV park should be redesigned to ensure at least a 100 foot buffer is between any and all activity, permanent structures, infrastructures, camp sites, etcetera, and all wetlands and watercourse. Not just the pond. Thank you.

Tim Hotchkiss - Well, I’d just like to add, ah the limnologist, he was told to just look at the pond, don’t look at the wetlands. So, his concern was the pond.

Art Moran - What is his name?

Kathy Warzecha - Michael I think.

Art Moran - No they stated his name.

Tim Hotchkiss and Art Moran - Tim.

Susan Hotchkiss - But I do have a very lovely little hand colored drawing that shows, it’s very hard to see on the map here, where the outlet is from Avery Pond, let me just see, Tim and I when we first moved in, it’s our first and only house we’ve ever owned. We’ve lived there since 1978 and, ah one of the first years we lived there we took a canoe ride out of the outlet. We went in IndianTown Brook, we went under Route 2 by, by where the Dunkin Donuts is, we went around and around we came to, ah, um ...

Tim Hotchkiss - Shoeville

Susan Hotchkiss - Well it wasn't quite Shoeville yet, it was still IndianTown Brook where there's a little road that goes across IndianTown Brook. We had to portage there, we continued on our way in IndianTown Brook, into Shoeville Brook. We went under Shoeville Road, which is where I tipped the canoe over. That's how far we got, and you know that Shoeville Road continues on, you're in Ledyard, and then we get back into Preston, we, um, we eventually go into Poquetanuck Brook, and you know where that comes out? It comes out by the Brookside and down into the Poquetanuck Cove. It's all connected.

Tim Hotchkiss - That was Shoeville Extension.

Art Moran - Thank you.

Susan Hotchkiss - My lovely little colored drawing.

Kathy Warzecha - Drawing of Avery Pond.

Art Moran - Is there anyone else like to comment in favor or against or?

Patricia Monahan - My name is Patricia Monahan, ah, 50 Lake View Drive in Preston. And, my break she said it all tonight and she said it very well. When reading the reports, and I just started researching, and I'm here to say aren't these reports supposed to be qualified by a factual report. If they are unbiased factual reports, how do we have a report that studies the fragments and doesn't include Avery Pond and we have to have another impact report to address Avery Pond. And it's very true what you heard tonight is the limnologist, when he questioned said I was only asked to Avery Pond. So, the discharge never doesn't only go to Avery Pond, it now goes to IndianTown Brook, because the limnologist wasn't to speak to IndianTown Brook. Um, so, I found an article, and the article stated the environmental impact studies have lost credibility over recent years because they are being increasingly perceived as biased public relations documents. This arises in part because the community generally expects an EIS, environmental impact study, should be an unbiased scientific report. I would hope having factual reports, that this is the procedure for gaining approval for this project. So, we've seen that several times, and when I read over the weekend that now that we had a neighborhood impact study, um, and ah compared sales analysis coming out, I just said it's going to be more of the same, models based on percentages, and no real data. Ah, so, I grabbed the report, I took a look at the report and I just kind of flipped through it at first and I said okay, we have 5 sales here, one subject, one comparable and look at that each one came out to be almost exact same dollar value as the subject; because of all the adjustments that were made along the way. A paired sale is something that appraisers use to determine the value of something. And at first I said, you know, how are we going to do an appraisal on that property, where are you going to find a campground next to a established neighborhood, near a school, on two major arteries, with data before and data after. It can't be found, you're not gonna find it. So, I was very curious as to how you would do it, and paired sales made sense. Because what you do with paired sales is you find a sale that has the same zones, the same lots, the same type

of house, the same type of neighborhood and, and say if you're doing a house you find that house and then you'll find all that criterion the same, but one has one garage and the other have two garages. That's how you're going to find paired sales. That'll make sense and that's how you'll determine the value of a pool, the value of another, two garages compared to one. Like it was Harry said you have to have pairs, and I don't see that the pairs help in this situation there are too many variables, but that's how you get paired appraisals, um I'm not sure what the market comparables are to come up with that figure. I'm not sure I'm convinced that this data isn't any more reliable than a lot of the other data that we've seen. Ah, no, you know, no insult to Mr. Russ at all, he's a qualified appraiser, but yet again back to the limnologist. He produced what he was asked to produce. Um, I think the mere fact that the current owners of the subject properties who are the typical purchasers of the neighborhood and the properties like that, they wouldn't have purchased them; consider the proposal to be an element adverse to their property value if approved. That most future purchasers in this neighborhood feel that it's not good. Um, and I think that the mere fact that 384 residents signed a petition you've seen the objection to this project. I hope that if you feel, ah, that if you do have to approve this application and you know what it's you have to dot and what it's you have to cross; so I would hope that you would require a scaled down, um proposal. Not this here, not bringing in 1,700 additional people to the town. Require that the applicant monitor IndianTown Brook and Avery Pond; deny the use of wood or propane fireplaces that heavily pollute the air, due to the proximity of the school and the neighborhood, the existing neighborhood. That you would require, ah that the snag trees, the den trees, ah the wood that's part of the habitat be left. Request a spill control and countermeasures plan and reporting procedures. Require the physical placement of the RVs we see within the park be minimal. And, um that you review and require an insect and rodent control plan. That's all and I thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you. Anybody else? Ah, no, no.

Man - Oh, sorry.

Woman - But, she's a natural.

Art Moran - And if we could keep it to one speak, one comment for the night. Because there are a lot of comments coming up here and we got other items on the agenda.

Man - I'll be quick.

Art Moran - Ah, I, I don't mean you, just everybody.

John Waggoner - My name is John Waggoner, I live at 41 Lynn Drive and I've been here about 49 years. Um, I appreciate Mr. Congdon's opinion, but if anybody had the opportunity, like we did here the neighbors and come to any one of these meetings, including the Inland Wetlands, and now several meetings with you people; you would come away understanding that these people came in and I think they underestimated what the reaction was going to be and how we'd respond. It reminds me of our big fiasco with the State Hospital with that la-di-dah big park. If you were to attend these meetings, you would see they came in and did not do due

diligence. They never looked at that pond, they thought they were going to swim in it and all kinds of stuff, if you look back at the original proposal. You look at what they proposed originally and the only conclusion you can get is they did not do due diligence. The Inland Wetlands approve it, and at the Zoning Commission, I mean, he comes in here and says they approved it, that's fine that's his opinion. But, he hasn't looked into everything. We talked about traffic, that whole traffic proposal that they put in is bogus. Four days of looking at traffic right down here on the corner. Now they talk about Fridays, four days of possible, ah, RVs coming into that site. If you stop and think about it there's no turning lane for big RVs coming east to west. If that parking lot they propose on their site for vehicles going in there is full, that means they're going to have a blockage of RVs coming in and the only way they're going to get around is going into the east lane, to get around to go through the stoplight. Conversely, going from west to east they got to cross over that lane. Now if there's a backup what is that going to do to that intersection. It's gonna be a mess. The other thing is we talked about water. It's not going to be as planned, it's going to be a couple hundred gallons, it's going to be thousands. So, really we are concerned about the quality of our water. You have to live on Lynn Drive to see what it's like when we have the coliform count go up. To take a shower you need a gas mask. The chlorine comes out and you can't even breathe in it. Try drinking it. So the quality of life by this park is going to affect us conversely. So there are a lot of things in my opinion, because I've attended mostly everyone of these meetings, and including all of these hearings, and we owe these people nothing and they are offering this town nothing, you owe us a lot more. Thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you, anybody else like to make a comment.

Gary Piszczek - Gary Piszczek, Chairman of the Conservation Commission, um, after 64 years of farming I have over the years discovered the overwhelming importance of conserving farmland. The Conservation Commission strives to find a balance in conserving farmland and developing the town's economy. This project does not meet our goal of achieving this balance. The intensity and scope of this project is out of balance with the surrounding residential neighborhood. The watercourses throughout, the animal habitats are infringed upon, and the aquifer beneath it. Many argue the Board can not use this concept of balance to regulatory purposes. We disagree. The location of the glamping sites within and surrounded by wetlands, intruded upon the watercourse and wildlife corridor is surely within the Board's regulatory powers. The existence of these sites will necessitate the use of pesticides for mosquitoes and other insect control which will disturb the fragile balance, balance, the balance that lives in the wetland's habitat. The applicant may argue that reducing the size and scope of their project will impair their financial liability. Again we disagree. And that there are many other attractions near this location, including some of the best features in New England. These are the applicant's advantages comes along with their responsibility to recognize that the proposed site is an ecological rarity. The land being 28 acres of prime farmland and contains a valuable wildlife corridors, and an aquifer and watercourse that can not be found elsewhere in Preston. If the

applicant can not downside the project with the respect and restraint that the land requires and still make it financially viable perhaps they have the wong, the wrong location.

Art Moran - Thank you.

Gary Piszczek - Can I give you it tomorrow, because my wife made a few typo errors.

Kathy Warzecha - It's okay, just send it to us.

Gary Piszczek - Thank you.

Art Moran - Anybody else who'd like to comment? First time commenters.

Anne Sabrowski - I'm Anne Sabrowski, 61 Prodell Road, I find it hard to say we have a process and if it meets the rules it passes. And if it doesn't, it doesn't. We're sitting here at a Public Hearing because we want the public to be heard. And we have special exceptions because we recognize that the public should have a voice in everything we do. And I've been to a few of these meetings, and I've been to Inland Wetlands meetings and I have not, and I've read what's on the website and read what people have been submitting. And I have, tonight is the first time I have seen or heard a Preston resident come up here and say they are for this. And I think that's so important, because we need as tax paying residents, do not have, you don't have the ability to vote yes or no on this issue. But we vote for you, right when we're voting for the Commission at that table, and the job of the Commissioners to represent the people they are hearing from. And there are people that live in this town that should be here, and I think it's important to acknowledge that it's not cut and dry, and it's no if it passes, if it checks all these boxes you can do it. I think it's really important to remember it's part of a process, it's part of our government, that we acknowledge, and, and perhaps, we're better and that we're all doing that by respecting what you guys are doing, and you're here and listening, but I think it's important to acknowledge that. And everyone here and votes for you so you can represent their voice and for the most part all I've heard is that people don't want this. So, I just felt like it just had to be said.

Art Moran - Thank you. Anyone else who would like to speak for the first time? No? I'll give you 3 minutes, how's that?

Tim Hotchkiss - I won't even need that much, um, let me just, just a couple quick points.

Art Moran - State your name, okay.

Tim Hotchkiss - Tim Hotchkiss, 20 Lynn Drive, um one there were other people talking about the studies being done. Their environmental study was a tier one if that; it was only done over a few days. There should be at least a tier four environmental study for also, for also this property is getting towards the end of the Last Green Valley National Corridor. Which is the National Park System, which is also part of the park system. And anything that's said like, we were told at one of the meetings that they're not going to have music over there and stuff like that, they're not going to be doing that. Make sure we get it in writing; if you approve it, everything in writing. Because I talked once to Stephen Works Green when I was walking by it. Stephen Works Green

wants to keep that as a buffer, and to keep it farmland. That's what he told me and I wish I'd got it in writing. Thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you. Anyone else?

Sean Tate - Good evening, my name is Sean Tate, and I live at 18 Overlook Drive, which is overlooking this school. And I just want to come back to where we began, which was with the elegant Margaret Gibson and her, er, um, speech on neighborhood compatibility. And all these factors, not just one, but all the factors that go into this. The things that you have heard, as a couple of other people have said, a populace of Preston, ah who have basically rejected and in many, many, many different forms what is being proposed here. On the basis of air pollution, I'm sitting out there and I'm thinking what am I going to be breathing from campfires? That's something you have to consider. Noise pollution, if there's a rock concert down here and there was, I'd hear that. What am I going to hear? I can hear traffic noise from Route 2, but that's going to keep up and amplify. And when it, ah where I live, I'm on an overlook, it's like a giant amphitheater. And noise is amplified from down here. I don't wanna be sitting here listening to 280, um, er, RVs with radios going and so forth. So, you have to think of that. We have the wetlands, and I attend the whole, the last whole meeting of the Wetlands Commission, very interesting. And people, ah, spoke up and rejected, ah in term, ah, er, rejected the proposal in terms of conservation studies, and we heard a lot about the influence not on just Avery Pond, but the whole Indian Brook estuary that goes from here. So, there are many, many things for you to consider, and I would keep thinking you need a sheet of questions and issues that you have heard here and in other meetings. And, ah, you need to put down yeses and nos. What are the impacts on neighborhood compatibility? What are the impacts on air pollution? The impacts on noise? And nature? So for all of those reasons, I think you seriously reject this proposal. Thank you very much.

Art Moran - Anybody else? You got 3 minutes.

Bob Congdon - I won't be that long.

Art Moran - Any one coming up please address the Commission, not the audience out there.

Bob Congdon - Just for the record I don't believe I ever said I supported or opposed.

Art Moran - State your name and address.

Bob Congdon - Bob Congdon, 287 Miller Road, what I said was we have regulations, and this resort/commercial is part of a special exception. The regulations give up the framework and the special exception gives you the opportunity to hear from the public and adjust those conditions to try and meet the concerns of the neighbors. That's all I was saying. Thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you. Anybody else? Okay, so now I guess would be a good time since the applicant asked for ah,er 30-day extension, um, ah I'm sorry Attorney Heller would you like to speak?

Attorney Heller - Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and again for the record again Attorney Heller, representing the applicant. I won't be long, I won't try to address everything that was said

tonight. But there are some things that really need to be addressed. Ahhh, because I find it difficult to sit there and control myself when factual matters that are patently wrong are being presented to the Commission. First, and again I didn't say a word...

Art Moran - Okay hold it, STOP. STOP. OKAY. ORDER. ORDER.

Many Voices - Yelling.

Art Moran - SIR! Please sit down.

Sir - He's out of line!

Attorney Heller - And again...

Art Moran - OKAY! Let the attorney speak, let the attorney speak what he has to say. He kept his mouth shut while everybody else talked, so please, please give him the floor.

Attorney Heller - I'd like to submit this to Kathy to enter into the record, ah this is a letter from the Preston Plains Water Company, ah, to William Walter from Bensch dated March 16, 2022, and this arose out of, ah comments made at a Public Hearing before you Inland, Wetlands Commission. This letter is in response to certain questions raised regarding the proposed project to be located on Lot 024-451, 024-455, and 024-495 on Map number 25 of the Assessor's Maps maintained by the Town of Preston, Connecticut. This project is being proposed and planned by Blue Camp, LLC. First we understand that there have been questions on how the increased demand on two community wells located on Lynn Drive in Preston would impact water quality from those wells. Water for the proposed project will be provided entirely by the Mashantucket-Pequot Water Treatment Plant. The community wells will not be utilized by the proposed project. Accordingly there will be no increase in demand on those wells; nor any impact on water quality from those wells as a result of Blue Camp's operation. Please be advised that the MP Plant does provide temporary water to Preston in emergency circumstances through an interconnection line. The MP Plant has both the capacity to service the proposed project and to continue to provide the temporary emergency services to Preston. Accordingly there will be no degradation of water quality provided by the MP Plant as a result of the proposed project. Second, we understand there have been questions concerning permitting requirements from the Connecticut Department of Public Health. As noted above the proposed project will not utilize the community wells in Preston. Therefore no additional permitting from DPH is required for these wells. With respect to the MP Plant, the DPH does not issue permits to this facility, rather because the MP Plant is located on the Mashantucket- Pequot Tribal Nation Reservation. It is permitted through the United States Environmental Protection Agency. No other permitting from the EPA will be required based on the increase in use from the proposed project. As noted in our prior Will Serve letter, once the Blue camp has connected to the MP Plant through the current water lines north side of Route 2 and sewer lines south side of Route 2 the MP Plant's existing infrastructure is more than capable of providing the requested service, without water degradation or other impacts to current water service. And that's signed by Bryan Charity, President of Preston Plains Water Company.

The second comment that was made was that there was a misrepresentation concerning the property taxes that would be generated by this project. Based on the information that was obtained from your Grand List, this project will be the second highest tax generator in the Town of Preston. Um, there is one project that is probably the incinerator, ah that pays, that is assessed at about \$33,000,000. Your Hilton Hotel is your second highest asses, assessed property in the Town of Preston at about \$10,000,000. The proposed Blue Camp RV park, ah, um we anticipate will have a value of about \$22,000,000, that's what we've estimated, um when it was 302 campsites. Seventy percent of that is about \$15,000,000 and we're reducing the scope by about 10%; reducing from 302 units down to 280 units. So, we anticipate that it's going to have an assessed value of about \$13,000,000; which will be the second highest tax payer in the Town of Preston.

Um, there were comments about reducing density, about traffic congestion, um, again I will reiterate what Mr. Congdon said. You're not here to serve the will of the residents of the Town of Preston. This is a representative democracy, you in your legislative capacity, have enacted regulations, and those regulations are for the benefit of every property owner in the Town of Preston, including the Mashantucket-Pequot Tribal Nation that owns the property in question, and including Blue Camp, LLC who have leased hold interest in that property. And it's therefore a property owner within the Town of Preston. Your regulations are for the benefit of ALL property owners in the Town of Preston. And it's your job to evaluate the information and the supporting materials and to evaluate the information provided to you during the Public Hearing process and then to render an informed decision. The evaluation criteria for a recreational campground and the general evaluation criteria for the special exception uses in the Town of Preston; nothing more and nothing less. And every property owner is entitled to that consideration. Ah, with that I have a lot more comments, um but we're going to continue this Public Hearing and I'll address that at the next meeting.

Art Moran - Thank you. So at this time, I'm ah, the applicant asked for a 30-day extension to the Public Hearing, can I get a mo

Kathy Warzecha - You have to continue the Public Hearing, you can't take a vote in a Public Hearing.

Art Moran - Okay, I'm sorry, so we'll continue this Public Hearing until the April Meeting.

Kim Lang - Do you want the date?

Art Moran - Yes.

Kim Lang - April 26th at 7 P.M.

Art Moran - April 26th at 7 P.M. here at Preston Plains I'm assuming.

Kathy Warzecha - Um, um.

Art Moran - Okay, so that brings us, and, and just to let everybody know there will be comments that people can make then. Um we still have a meeting to do tonight so when everyone gets up

to leave please give, give us some consideration so we can keep having our meeting. Thank you all for coming. So for number 7 Old Business.

Recording ends at 9:21 P.M.

