

Correspondences Received Between 4:30 p.m., April 25
and April 28

Heidi Samokar

From: Laura House <LauraHouse@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: very distrubing proposal

I went to the public hearing last night about the proposed development plans for the Tolland "village" and I'm extremely worried about the future of this town. The zoning laws were originally put into place to protect the heritage and culture of Tolland. I sincerely hope that this Board doesn't feel so empowered as to change the laws and risk destroying what is so precious about this town in a world already dominated by commercialism.

I was horrified by the details discussed last night. A shuttle bus running between the "village" and UConn until midnight. Really? So we can have our high school students jumping on buses to go to UConn and we can have UConn undergraduate students heading to Tolland to go to the Electric Blue. The architect in his own words indicated that having undergraduates living in the proposed apartment building would be a "disaster" and definitely would not be in the best interest of the town. I'm not an expert in this area but I believe there are fair housing laws that prevent us from screening or preventing qualified applicants from living there. So I'm not sure how we can ensure that the apartment complex doesn't, in fact, become another housing options for college students.

In my opinion, what was proposed as a "quaint village" concept has blown up into a large scale commercial operation. I'm not opposed to some development in the area but I don't think anyone who was initially in favor of a Tolland "village" was envisioning 5 story hotels, 369 unit apartment complexes and drive thru fast food restaurants. What is being proposed is NOT a village concept. We should stop using that term because it's very misleading to the general population. It was clear to me last night that the developer wants to capitalize on the continued growth and popularity of UConn without any regard for preserving the culture and characteristics of Tolland. The project was originally referred to as the "Gateway to UConn" which exposes how the focus has always been about UConn and not about Tolland and its residents.

I grew up in Tolland and I moved back to Tolland to raise my kids in the same small town. I actually went to school with Sue Erickson's sons. I even had her as a substitute teacher numerous times during my school years. I can't even fathom that she would even consider exploiting this town for the benefit of UConn and not its own residents after having raised her own family here.

If this plan were to pass, I am extremely doubtful that Tolland would remain the #34 best place to live in the United States. Sadly, I would seriously consider moving my family out of Tolland if a development plan of this magnitude including a large hotel and 369 unit apartment building ever passed. It would be a very tragic day for Tolland.

Thank you,
Laura House

Heidi Samokar

From: Lynn Bielawiec
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 9:53 AM
To: Steve Werbner; Heidi Samokar; Dave Skoczulek; Jeanne Schroeder; Kristen Morgan; Paul Krasusky; Rick Field; Robert Green; William Eccles
Subject: FW: Website Contact Us

Good morning, the email below was sent through our website regarding last night's PZC meeting.

Lynn Bielawiec
Executive Assistant
Town Manager's Office
Town of Tolland
21 Tolland Green
Tolland, CT 06084
(p) 860-871-3662
(f) 860-871-3663

-----Original Message-----

From: vtsdmailer@vt-s.net [<mailto:vtsdmailer@vt-s.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 9:49 AM
To: Lynn Bielawiec
Subject: Website Contact Us

Submitted on Tuesday, April 26, 2016 - 9:48am Submitted by anonymous user: 199.231.28.240 Submitted values are:

Full Name: Theresa Campanelli-Miner
Email Address: tcmwbm@gmail.com
Address: 46 Bald Hill Rd. Tolland
Comment or Question:

I was APPALLED at last nights' meeting. It was clearly an insult to the intelligence of the people of Tolland. It felt more like a magic show than a developers presentation.

The first Illusion was the picture that was presented to the meeting which was not accurate to the 5 story hotel they were proposing.

The second was when they stated the housing would not be offered to undergraduates. This cannot be done legally, and as you can see at UConn, the parents can easily rent the housing units there for their children.

The third was that Tolland can support the hotel and businesses. We have not been able to support an Olympia Sporting Goods Store, a toy store, Radio Shack, and a Home Goods Store, all in the Big Y Plaza. The hotel at UConn did not survive.

The presentation also talked of a Panera-like Drive Thru. Panara doesn't have a drive thru. McDonalds, Burger King Wendys and Taco Bell have Drive Thrus.

The presentation also talked of how hidden the 5 story hotel would be. Do you really think we are stupid enough to believe that ANY 5 story building can be hidden?

This project is reckless and poorly presented, TOTALLY not thought out.
You know the right thing to do for the Town Of Tolland. Please do what you where elected to do, protect the citizens of Tolland from reckless developing.

Sincerely,
Theresa Campanelli-Miner

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

Heidi Samokar

From: John O'Neill <irisheaglejohn@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 9:49 AM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: TOLLAND VILLAGE PROJECT ZONING AMENDMENTS

Planning and Zoning Commission,

I attended the public meeting last night at THS and due to the lack of time was unable to speak. I do, however, have three comments to make.

1) The developer and architect did a fine job of trying to disguise the height of the buildings with their plans, however this is just smoke and mirrors as far as I am concerned. If I am going to use this area for shopping or dining and am standing next to a 300 foot long by 65 foot high building it is going to look like just that, a 300 by 65 foot building. Can someone please explain to me how that fits into the character of this town when nowhere else in town would I be faced with a building anywhere near that size.

2) It is beyond me how we are even considering changing the zoning regulations for a hotel, that by the developers own words "is marginally feasible at best." That sure sounds to me like a recipe for failure.

3) The Tolland Historical Society was 100% correct in the letter that they submitted to the commission and I fully support their views.

In closing, if this developer cannot develop this property profitably within our current regulations then he is not the developer for it. If this type of development cannot be done in that area under our current regulations then this is not the type of development for that area. Let's not develop for development sake or we will all regret it.

We must protect the character of our town at all cost and it is your job to do just that. Please do what is right for this great town in which we all live.

Sincerely,

John G. O'Neill
39 Pilgrim Drive
Tolland, CT 06084
28 year resident
[Irisheaglejohn@aol.com](mailto:irisheaglejohn@aol.com)

Heidi Samokar

From: Josh <jcorlett13@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 11:33 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Tolland Town develop

My wife and myself are not in favor of the hotel and apartments planned to be built behind Papa T pizza.
Thanks for stopping the construction.
Mr. Mrs. Corlett

Sent from my iPhone

Heidi Samokar

From: Charles Rees <charlir8@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 9:00 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Zoning Changes...

I am absolutely opposed to the zoning amendments proposed by NE REAL ESTATE for the Tolland Village Area. A 50,000 sqft 4 story hotel, and 8 buildings with 369 apartments would radically change our beautiful and unique small town. Strategically placed traffic lights and widening 195 for better access to UCONN makes sense, but this major development will do irreparable damage to a town we have loved for over 30 years.
Charles Rees

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Heidi Samokar

From: Zoe Krause <zoe.krause@live.com>
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 7:17 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Application for Zoning Changes

Hello,

I am a current resident of Tolland and have been for the past 14 years. I grew up here and graduated from Tolland High School. In reading about the proposed zoning changes made on the application from NE Real Estate, I whole-heartedly support the proposal for their project. I, and the members of my family, see absolutely no valid reason to stand in opposition of the expansion of the businesses and housing in the town.

We look forward to seeing this project progress.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinion.

Zoe Krause

Heidi Samokar

From: Delanea Davis <delanea@solsticestrategypartners.com>
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 6:51 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: TVP

Good evening,

My name is Delanea Davis. I am Tolland resident and a business owner in town. I send this message to voice my support of the Tolland Village Project.

While some may get lost in the weeds of how this changes the town, there is a higher level perspective and value to this effort. Connecticut ranks as one of the worse places to own a small business. It is hard enough to beat the odds of a 50% failure rate in Year 1 in business. We need support at the community level, private sector level and legislative level to make a meaningful change in this state.

This effort will create a much needed culture shift so we become an innovative state. We are lucky that Tolland is in the epicenter of this movement. We have the chance of being a part of something great. This effort allows us to stop the bleed of losing the best minds, great businesses and great people to other states with better standards of work and quality of life.

We are not asking to put a prison in town... We are looking to transform our town and state into something great.

Thank you!
Delanea Davis
Solstice Strategy Partners, LLC

Sent from my iPhone

Heidi Samokar

From: Hc <hcurley80@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 5:07 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Zoning

I am a Tolland resident and registered voter. I oppose the zoning change.

Heather Croteau

Sent from my iPhone

Heidi Samokar

From: kcdauidson@gmail.com on behalf of Ken Davidson <ken.davidson@pobox.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 1:24 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Support for TVA zoning changes

I am writing to express my strong support for approving the zoning changes proposed by NE Real Estate LLC in P&Z application #16-2 related to the TVA.

I have been a Tolland resident and homeowner for 24 years. During that time, and especially more recently, people have complained that our taxes are too high and that we need a larger commercial and industrial tax base. At the same time, they complain that the school system receives too much money, then they condemn the board and administrators because the quality of the school system is on a decline. We can't just sit idly by and continue to tax our residents right out of town.

Several years ago, people started talking about wanting to take advantage of our town's proximity to UConn. Much of the traffic to and from the university travels through Tolland, so let's use that to our advantage. The TVA was created to bring in retail and commercial business to the area just off the interstate. The technology corridor was supposed to attract high-tech business and create a local silicon valley along Rt 195. Finally, let's build a hotel so all those UConn visitors have some place to stay before Mansfield builds one and beats us to it.

Then nothing happened. No developer could make it economically feasible. The town couldn't attract the target businesses. People continue to use Tolland as simply a pathway to UConn and look at it out their car windows as they drive through.

We now have a developer who has figured out a way to start to make this work. Let's get this ball rolling and finally start to expand this town's commercial tax base.

People complain that it will ruin the small-town charm. Interstate 84 has already done that around the exit 68 on and off ramps. Nobody would argue that an interstate is quaint, so why are people trying to claim that it is? This entire project is a long distance from Tolland Green and isn't at all visible from there, so won't affect the core of our small town center. I like the architectural design being proposed and also like that they are taking advantage of the topography to disguise the height of the buildings and help them blend into the surrounding area. The photos of the balloons that were flown illustrate the concept nicely.

I continue to hear all kinds of other doom-and-gloom predictions about UConn's crime rate and partying coming to Tolland. It's in nobody's best interest, neither the town's nor the developer's, to allow these things to happen, and from what I've seen in the plans, they won't happen. Every plan, change, and new development has

risks and potential downsides. We can't let the worst-case "what ifs" scare us into burying our heads in the sand. If this town is to continue to grow and prosper (or even maintain status quo), we must move ahead with projects like these.

I think the changes requested related to the height and length of buildings should be made, as should those for the setbacks and for establishing the distance from "adult entertainment." Limiting building heights based on their elevation relative to Merrow Rd. is also a good idea that limits the PZC's risk of tall buildings in future projects. My only reservation about the drive-through is that the developer could settle for a lower-grade restaurant instead of working harder to sign a higher-end establishment, but I have no problem with drive-throughs in general and for years have thought they should be allowed.

This is not another Buckland Hills area. There is no risk of rampant development creeping into the center of town and ruining the Green. That's what zoning is for in the first place. Once the TVA is established, the only direction development can move is to the east of the highway, which was the plan all along. Let's finally start to implement what our town has been planning for years.

Ken Davidson
304 Babcock Rd

Heidi Samokar

From: Rudy Rudewicz <rudy@journalinquirer.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 11:40 AM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Zoning changes proposed at 4/25 meeting

Hello Heidi

I am a long time resident of Tolland. Before I moved to Tolland I researched how many apartment the town has compared to surrounding towns as a way to judge the stability of the schools. I am opposed to the proposed zone changes the developer has requested. The zoning requirements that are in place protect Tolland from becoming another Vernon or Manchester with all the social problems that towns with a large number of apartments all have. Apartments mean a transient population without a sense of ownership. The proposed development plan is really not a plan at allsimply apartments that the developer is trying to tie to Uconn to give it a more appealing spin.

I ask your committee to enforce the zoning requirements. To consider a \$100.00 a nite hotel within a short walk from a strip club is inviting prostitution and drug activity. It may be a hotel 6 or it may be the "No Tell Motel". This cannot be allowed and if there are zoning restrictions already in place I beg you to save Tolland and just say no to the requested variances.

Also please consider that most apartments and hotels begin as very nice additions to a neighborhood. What will these apartments and hotel be like in 5 years? In 20 years? In 40 years? You simply have to drive to Vernon or Manchester Or East Hartford to see. So even in the best case scenario the zoning changes that have been asked for will change the future of Tolland in a negative way.

I have been told that both Coventry and Willington are considering adding hundreds of apartments but without allowing strip clubs or hotels. If they do then the only people left to live in the Tolland apartment will be the single parents who now live in apartments in Rockville, Manchester and East Hartford and want a better school for their children.

Please do not be swayed by the economic development committees proposal. They are off base. I am sure they are nice and well meaning people who would like to see all their hard work come to fruition but an apartment complex and a hotel next to the strip club is just no way to develop Tolland.

The commission has a responsibility to the residents and taxpayers.....the concept of being a public servant.....not to bend and alter the regulations so they work for the developer. Except for the first speakers who were committee members, every resident who spoke at the meeting was opposed to making the zone changes. This was an overwhelming majority who are asking that their request be heard to not alter one single zone change and thereby protect the town from this debacle .

Thank you in advance for doing the right thing,

Walter Rudewicz
38 Lawlor Rd.

Phone 860-550-5582

Heidi Samokar

From: Andy Gineo <agineo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 10:10 AM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: My objection to the Tolland Village project

Ms. Samokar,

Please add this to the public record and forward to all affected parties my strong objection to the Tolland Village project.

The appeal of Tolland is the family oriented, nature-filled, idyllic New England town. Spoiling our natural beauty and tearing down forest to create this development is not what Tolland residents want. We want our town to strictly deny dense projects like this. By allowing this type of development, you destroy the character that Tolland has built over the past decades and centuries.

There has been no consideration over traffic issues, local services like police and fire, and the potential for future large scale development. It is easy to allow a town to get over built, and impossible to go back once you allow developers access. Stop this development NOW and stop future developments from the beginning.

Please respond with your thoughts on this email.

Regards,

Andy Gineo

Heidi Samokar

From: Nitex7 <nitex7@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 2:31 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Opposition to Zoning Changes for current Hotel/Apartment Propsal

To Zoning and Planning Commission: Our family wishes to join with the overwhelming opposition expressed at last night's public hearing in regard to the current zoning changes proposed to facilitate this proposed project. The project is inconsistent with the values and interests of Tolland residents. Thank you. Ena and William Rita, 296 Goose Lane (860) - 870-5290

4/25/2016

To Whom It May Concern:

“Most people characterized Tolland as a rural community today and would like to see those characteristics retained. Residents clearly want their valued quality of life retained as the Town grows.” This quote is taken right off the Tolland Town website.

We moved to Tolland to enjoy the rural quality of life. Tolland prides itself with its rich historical value. Ironically, Tolland was settled by people who felt that Windsor was becoming overcrowded. Three Hundred years later, this still remains true today. Many of us moved to this location to get away from the hustle bustle of other towns. We love the quality of life that Tolland has maintained.

The building height is currently 3 stories which can be seen around Tolland. For instance, the High school is two stories now add three more floors and imagine that in a small area multiplied by 8 more buildings. According to the Visual Preference survey results in Dec 20, 2010, buildings over 3 stories felt too big or too tall along with a crowded feeling according to the residents polled. Many residents viewed these types of buildings with negatives comments such as Boxy, Urban and not Tolland. When the PZC amended some of these very same zoning regulations last year increasing height and width and allowing for apartment buildings at the request of the town, there was concern as to whether this very same developer had been consulted and, in fact, he appeared on 6/22/15 and said he was “satisfied with the changes.” Yet, He is back for more changes. Not only is he asking for 5 stories, he would like 15 feet dormers on top of that. Essentially, it will be making the building 6 stories high. Perhaps that will be where the developer will put in his penthouse suites under the radar? I am still trying to understand if the retail area and/or parking garages are included in the 5 stories or if that is a whole level on top of that too. If that is in fact the case would that be pushing the height to nearly 8 stories high when including the dormers? Please tell me this isn't the case?!? If this zoning changes to a 5 story multi-family building, it will change the characteristic of Tolland as a whole. Our beautiful rural night sky will be impacted by the height and lights of this ENORMOUS building. Once those height changes are made, it will pave the way for other areas in Tolland to develop as such unless you have legal cause to allow spot zoning. I foresee, if this is passed, that amendments will be in place to allow this type of building Tolland wide not just at the level of 195 and below since how would it be fair to only allow this one developer the changes needed to make his plan profitable but not others? We will no longer remain the quaint town that so many love and cherish. These changes are all being requested for the profitability for the developer not for Tolland.

Along with this application is a request for length variance. As the saying as it goes you give an inch take, in this case, they want a football field. To put this in perspective, the current Developer is requesting changes to our zoning in order to make his buildings the length of a football field minus the end goals. This is not very rural village like. It is ultramodern and designed like a sardine can. Yet again, the developer needs to go longer and bigger to fit more people for his profitability to pan out. This will add a much higher density of people than what the original conception had proposed.

Most people are not against developing the area but, we want it built for Tolland residents. Meaning, bring in the coffee shops and restaurants. Perhaps, townhomes would fit in nicely as the original concept depicted. Transient College students are not looking to be invested in Tolland as their true home destination. They will not be showing Tolland Pride. We need to create an atmosphere where all townspeople will feel welcomed; it is after all OUR Town. Buildings will be stacked up so high that it will negatively impact our small town feel. Stand next to a 5 or 6 story building and look all the way up. Ask yourself, does this really fit our characteristic profile of the Old New England Charm? How can one justify that this is the best for Tolland? UCONN has their own set of issues that do not need to be pushed upon our Town. Perhaps, we aren't the right location for this monstrosity of the University Gateway Village a/k/a Tolland Village

area. I don't see why we can't advertise to find a developer who will actually talk to the townspeople and see what our needs are and build within the perimeters that are currently on file. I also find it questionable that the developer pulled a 180 in terms of presenting this project to the crowd at the High School vs. the presentation he gave at Crandall's. The driving force has changed, it also doesn't change the fact that this is intended for UCONN students as he expressed many times at Crandall's. He's spent two years talking to UCONN and certain members from the town to develop this vision and meet the needs UCONN has for housing. Those two years do not just go up in smoke when he finds out the town doesn't support it, the wording merely gets changed to be more Tolland Friendly when the intent stays the same.

I will leave you with the quote Tolland has on our website again. Please take a moment and read it for a second time and think how this statement will no longer be true if zoning changes are made:

"Most people characterized Tolland as a rural community today and would like to see those characteristics retained. Residents clearly want their valued quality of life retained as the Town grows."

Best Regards,

Ashley Lundgren

30 Hidden Valley

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
TOLLAND, CONNECTICUT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 22, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Josh Freeman, Chair
Sue Errickson, Vice Chair
John Hughes, Secretary
Bruce Mayer, Regular
Andy Powell, Regular
David Skoczulek, Alternate

OTHERS PRESENT: Linda Farmer, Director of Planning & Community Development
George Baker, Town Council Liaison
Gary Jalbert, Economic Development Commission
Mark DePecol, Developer
Dr. Scott Morey, Fenton River Veterinary Hospital

1. **Call to Order:** Josh Freeman, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in Council Chambers.
2. **Public Comment:** Mark DePecol extended his thanks to Linda Farmer for all her assistance in helping with his development project. He appreciated her professionalism and said it was indicative of the town in general. He wished her the best of luck in her upcoming retirement.
3. **Public Hearing(s)**
 - 3.1 **P&Z App. #849 – Town of Tolland** – Proposed Zoning Regulations and Design Guidelines revision in the Tolland Village Area concerning multi-family, hotels, and building heights.

Mr. Hughes read the legal notice into the record. Ms. Farmer updated the Commission on the proposed revisions since their last meeting. The proposed changes would add multi-family housing as a use in the Tolland Village Area. The changes also address heights, which would allow up to four stories for hotels and up to 3-1/2 stories for multi-family development. She said they have always considered allowable heights as they relate to topography. She reviewed the modified height requirements for both multi-family developments and hotels, noting that the revised language would allow a developer to find ways to mitigate heights. The modifications are a performance standard. She said she has received a concept plan from Mark DePecol and some of the revised changes take into consideration comments from Mr. DePecol's engineer and from neighboring land owners. She said Mr. DePecol's engineer also had made a request to change parking requirements, which prohibited parking between buildings and a public road, but for now it seemed best to keep the parking regulations as is to maintain a relationship between buildings and the connector road.

Mr. Freeman asked for feedback on the proposed changes. Mark DePecol, who attended the meeting, said that with the exception of the changes to the parking features they were hoping for, were satisfied with the proposal. He said they could look more closely at the parking during the Public Hearing process for his application. There were no other comments from the public.

Mr. Mayer said he had a question about Section 7-9 “Standards for Area Development Plans” and how Items 8. b. ii and iii relate to one another. He said the language in “ii” seems to conflict with the language in “iii” and he didn’t want there to be any misinterpretation of the regulations further down the road. It was not clear to him what height buildings might be allowed if a hotel or multi-family development were not actually built on the Main street.

Mr. Powell asked for clarification of what the “Main Street” would be in the Tolland Village Area. Ms. Farmer said the Main Street would be the yet-to-be-built road in the TVA that follows the contours of the development. This would not be Route 195.

Addressing Mr. Mayer’s concerns, Ms. Farmer referred to the Design Guidelines. In general the façade visible from Main Street should not exceed 2-1/2 stories, and she noted that much of the regulations in this section require performance standards. Therefore, Item 8.b.ii would be the general rule, but Item 8.b.iii could be allowed by a simple majority vote from the Commission.

Ms. Errickson asked about a comment in the yellow box under Section 7-6, where the language would change to allow standalone multi-family development. Mr. Freeman said the wording does not specifically state that standalone multi-family is allowed, but by allowing “other” types of multi-family, it does not exclude it.

Mr. Mayer asked about the reference to multi-family dwelling units under Section 10 b. He said from the wording he understands that multi-family development would be restricted by the number of stories, while hotels would be restricted by the total height of the building.

Mr. Hughes expressed some concern about Item 10 e., which changes the maximum size of the sides of buildings from 150 to 200 feet. However, he felt that by requiring the sides to be broken up visually, the massing would be mitigated.

There were no further questions or comments from the public or from Commissioners. Andy Powell/Bruce Mayer motion to close the Public Hearing for P&Z App. 849. Motion was unanimously approved.

4. Public Hearing(s) Action

- 4.1 **P&Z App. #849 – Town of Tolland** – Proposed Zoning Regulations and Design Guidelines revisions in the Tolland Village Area concerning multi-family, hotels, and building heights. Take action on Public Hearing item from June 22, 2015.

Bruce Mayer/John Hughes motion to approve P&Z App. #849 proposed Zoning Regulations and Design Guidelines revisions in the Tolland Village Area concerning multi-family, hotels and building heights, effective July 1, 2015. Motion was unanimously approved.

5. **Approval of Minutes** – Approve meeting minutes of June 8, 2015.

Andy Powell/Bruce Mayer motion to approve the meeting minutes of June 8, 2015. Mr. Powell, Mr. Mayer, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Freeman voted to approve. Ms. Errickson abstained. Motion carried.

6. **Other Agenda Items**

6.1 **Wall Sign – (Scott Morey)** – Review proposed new wall sign which is a second sign at Fieldstone Commons facing Route 195. Ms. Farmer reviewed her memo of June 18. She said the old regulations adopted in 2006 included very specific standards for second wall signs for businesses in Building #1, which has frontage on Route 195, in Fieldstone Commons. She said Dr. Morey’s second sign being proposed is in conformance with the grandfathered signage at Fieldstone Commons.

Ms. Farmer said Dr. Morey is also proposing halo lighting for this sign. They only allow white lighting. He is proposing blue letters for the second sign. Dr. Morey noted that the Route 195 side sign would be halo lit, while the front side sign has channel letters. The sign will not look blue at night.

Ms. Farmer said if the Commission approves, they would need to modify the wording of the December 18, 2006 approval to add “for grandfathered signs” and eliminate the color restriction on the sign itself.

Andy Powell/John Hughes motion to approve a second sign on Building #1 in Fieldstone Commons with criteria from the December 2006 approval, modifying the language to reflect that the sign facing Merrow Road not exceed 18 square feet as grandfathered and to have no color restriction. Motion was unanimously approved.

6.2 **P&Z App. #850 – Tolland PZC** – PA 490 Open Space – Remove Section 3-18 of the Zoning Regulations “Designation of Public Act 490 Land.” State statutes grant this authority to the legislative body. Commission to set Public Hearing date.

Ms. Farmer reviewed her June 18 memo, explaining that many, many years ago the Town made the entirety of Tolland eligible for Open Space designations. These include farming, forest, and PA 490 land. The PA 490 land has been administered by the Planning & Zoning Commission. These designations provide a tax incentive to the property owners not to develop the land. She said over the years some changes in requirements were made on what size lots should be eligible for the PA 490 designation. Presently the PA 490 Open Space designation applies to lots that are a minimum of ten acres over the minimum lot size. Ms. Farmer said their Plan of Conservation and Development calls for continuing this

Heidi Samokar

From: CHRISTINE <christine.thompson@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 8:16 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Tolland Village area

I have lived in Tolland since 1993. I am employed here at CNC Software, I attend church here, I shop here, and raised my children here.

I was originally in favor of the Tolland Village development plan which had a 3 story hotel and 2.5 story residential units in a village like setting. I would love to see more affordable housing in Tolland and another business for tax revenue.

I was dismayed to see the latest revised plan which raised the height limits on buildings and removed the small town village character previously planned. Suddenly the Tolland Village area is all about the developers. They propose big, commercial looking hotel and a more densely populated apartments. This plan gives developers an amazing 7 years of tax credits and destroys our small town character. What is the plus side for Tolland? What I see is more costs for us in terms of town services, road maintenance, traffic, and possible crime as we add a hotel within 300 feet of the Electric Blue.

I am against these revisions to the zoning and ask you to vote a resounding NO!

Christine Thompson
65 Noah Lane Tolland, CT
860-454-7891

Sent from XFINITY Connect Mobile App

Heidi Samokar

From: vtsdmailer@vt-s.net on behalf of cableme44@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 7:41 AM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: [Town of Tolland CT] University Gateway Village Zoning Changes

Hello hsamokar,

Robert P. Tamiso (cableme44@comcast.net) has sent you a message via your contact form (<http://www.tolland.org/user/421/contact>) at Town of Tolland CT.

If you don't want to receive such e-mails, you can change your settings at <http://www.tolland.org/user/421/edit>.

Message:

Dear Planning and Zoning,

There is an urgent need for commercial development in this town and the Gateway Village with its high end hotel would be a good start. The region really needs a high end hotel and it would be a huge success. Please approve the zoning changes as proposed. It is time to allow drive thru's as there is no reason to keep a large stand alone drug store out of this town. We are tired of driving into Vernon for the drug store and embarrassed to send our overflow friends and family to an inferior hotel out of town when they come to visit us. There are countless other good reasons to go forward with this project, like jobs, but you get the idea.

The naysayers always come out in force when there is a hint of change but we have a major highway going through our town. Let's take advantage of it.

Sincerely,

Robert Tamiso

April 27, 2016

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission,

I moved to Tolland in January 2012. I was looking to purchase a home with character in a small town with a good school system. I found just that. My home was built 218 years ago. I love the fact that my home has history and I love the fact that this town has a rich history. The character of the town is why I am here. My children get the opportunity to learn about Tolland history in 3rd grade and participate in Tolland Green Days. I bring my children to the Red and White to buy penny candy. We go to the Hicks Sterns Museum for concerts in the summer. These are the things that I love about Tolland.

Shortly after moving here, I looked for ways to become involved in the community. I became a Girl Scout leader. For the past three years, I have led the Town's Girl Scout Program as well as my own troop of girls. I also became a Church School teacher at UCC Tolland. In short, I invested in my community.

I say all of this because it is very important to me to maintain the small town historic character of Tolland. There is a reason that Money Magazine voted this town the 34th best small town in America. It is because we have a small town character.

I recently met with the developer who has applied for zoning changes in the Tolland Village Area ("TVA"), which borders my property and is said to be the **Gateway to the Tolland Green** in various town documents. And I have done research on the history of the TVA. I have learned that the TVA is part of the Tolland Plan of Conservation and Development ("POCD"). This document is used as a framework for decision-making with regard to conservation and development activities in Tolland. The POCD provides "goals and recommendations that reflect the overall consensus of what is best for Tolland and its residents in the future." Public input played an important role in preparing the plan. At the time the POCD was created, there were ongoing planning exercises to develop style guidelines for developers so the TVA has the overall architecture and appeal that the community wants. Residents participated in workshops and telephone surveys to shape the POCD.

The proposed zoning amendments do not comport with the POCD. The goals of the POCD include **maintaining the character of Tolland**. 5-story 300 ft. long buildings (the size of football fields without the end zones) that allow for housing density of 369 apartment units, drive-through restaurant, and the other changes proposed by the builder have the potential to change the character of this town forever. These changes are not only visually unappealing, but they make it possible to have an incredible concentration of people in a very small area. This concentration of people will result in noise, traffic and safety concerns that will directly impact our community and our quality of life in a negative way.

Although the developer states that the apartments will be a multi-generational attraction and that retirees and young professionals will want to live here, I think that this representation is insupportable given the amount of students who will be occupying these units. Although the developer is now trying to rebrand this project as something other than university housing, nothing about the project has changed since the developer's original presentation to us at Crandall's with the exception of the name change from "University Gateway Village" to "Tolland Village Project" and the fact that the hotel will no longer be the Hilton Tru, but will now be another Hilton or Marriot hotel. Otherwise, it is the exact same project.

Another goal of the POCD is to **create a "sense of place."** Creating a mini version of Storrs Center for university students to enjoy is not the Sense of Place contemplated in the POCD. In the developer's presentation to town residents on April 9th at Crandall's Pavilion, it was clear that aside from one larger restaurant, the small amount of commercial space would NOT be geared toward the town residents or the surrounding town residents, it will be geared toward hotel patrons and the complex residents who will

primarily be university students. There will be no shopping – just another gym. I am absolutely in favor of development that would result in places for residents to shop and dine, but that is not the purpose of this project and the developer has said as much. This project is not the sense of place envisioned in the POCD.

Years ago, my neighbors had a chance to participate in workshops to develop a concept for the Tolland Village Area. They were made to feel that their input was valued and that they had a say in the process of developing a commercial area that serves as a gateway to our town's Historic District. At recent town meetings, we have been told that the concept developed through town resident's input is not possible and was simply a dream. Maybe we need to go back to the drawing board if the original TVA concept isn't possible and consider other ways to develop this parcel of land that are both possible and in line with the town's character - that meet the needs of the town's residents – not UCONN's needs.

The bottom line is this developer has done two years of research to determine that this project will be profitable for him. But I don't know that we as a town have done the research to determine that the project is profitable for us. To allow zoning changes in hopes that we can turn a profit without having the hard numbers on the impact of such changes seems foolish on our part. And what besides profit is the benefit of the project for our town? Once the zoning changes are in, we will have a very hard time rejecting the project as a whole down the road, or any other project of this magnitude for that matter. We may have a say in some design elements, and other aspects of the project. But the project will go forward. And any project that requires these zoning changes is inappropriate for our town under the POCD.

At this point, we are being asked to embrace a project simply because it is possible for a developer to make a profit on this UCONN-based concept. And this particular project aside – none of the requested zoning changes are going to result in something in line with our town's character. We are being asked to irrevocably change the character of this town through zoning changes for the all mighty buck. And I don't think we know what the real return on investment will be at the end of the day.

We find ourselves at a crossroads here. We can approve zoning changes that will forever change this town's character. Or we can stay true to our small town values and keep our zoning in line with the character of our town. I ask that you take into account how these zoning changes will impact our town's rich history and unique character when you make your decision.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Alona Croteau". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Alona Croteau
8 Cider Mill Road

Heidi Samokar

From: Louise Marcella <ltmarcella@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 3:36 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: opposition to the development in village area

We are 100 percent against this proposed development. It will ruin the character of the town. It would benefit mostly UCONN and the developer not Tolland. Remember that once you allow all requested variances they want the Tolland residents will have to live with the effect forever which will be negative. We don't need Tolland to become a mini version of Manchester or East Hartford.

Ted & Louise Marcella

Heidi Samokar

From: Ruth Morrison <ruth.morrison@perfectviewremodeling.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2016 9:47 AM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Tolland Village Project

To whom it may concern:

I have lived in Tolland almost all of my 56 years. My parents moved here in 1950 and have been large land owners since. They settled in Tolland for the same reason I am here; the town, it's charm, it's history! I lived in a more developed town for a few years because I was drawn to an old Victorian house. When I moved I knew the town and what I was in for. I expected that, knowing I was only going to spend a short time there and my child was in private school so I had no need for the school system in that town. I always knew I would come back to Tolland when the time came. It did, I'm back and we are raising our granddaughter. We came back because we wanted the quiet town atmosphere and the school system.

My fear is, in changing the zoning you give the opportunity for far too much growth. We have several empty buildings in Tolland, we have several houses for sale many of which are nice starter homes. I remember the days when we never thought houses would be built in certain areas due to wetlands, but they were. I guess the bottom line is if we let one developer in that wants 5 story building WITH the option of dormers/cupolas another 15' high we have to let everyone else who comes along do the same. We will be the next Manchester. This will create a strain on all of our facilities and you may also lose a number of our great towns' people.

Ruth Morrison

--
Regards,
Ruth Morrison
860-214-7619



Heidi Samokar

From: Jessica Uziemblo <jduziemblo@live.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: University Gateway Village

Dear Tolland Planning and Zoning Commission,

I am writing to you today in regards to the proposed "University Gateway Village" project. I am a former resident of Tolland. I grew up in Tolland, graduated from what it now TMS and when I started my own family decided to stay close. I often take my son to visit my mother, who resides in town and frequent Crandall Park for the play ground and walks to the brook. I happened to see signs spread out all over town in opposition to this project and not knowing what it was, visited the website. I am truly saddened to see such a project even being requested to be placed in Tolland and in such a historic and staple part of the town.

I have recently just finished my own fight in my town where the state was looking to place their new training facility. The thought of the damage that would have caused our small community with the pollution, noise and decrease in property values would have been devastating to the way of life. Not to mention, the hard work, effort and sacrifice my family put in to start our lives and put down roots. I cannot help but feel the same emotions when looking at this proposed project and the effect it would have on my beloved home town. This would truly be a devastating transition. I believe this is not in the best interest of Tolland but in the best interest of UCONN. I believe there is a reason why people are attracted to the town of Tolland and the main reason why I wanted to stay close by. This proposed project would greatly take away the "village" feel of the town and change the community forever.

Personally, when first starting out, I moved to Mansfield/Storrs (on the Tolland border) with my husband to start our family. We lived in our house for about 5 years. During that time, we were always on guard about the schedule of UCONN; when is Spring Weekend? When are they moving in and out? When is the next basketball game? All of these factors would determine if we even left our house that day because of the difficulties of traffic, noise and the people who lived around us (college student renting homes off campus). It caused so much daily anxiety that we had to move, there was no way I was going to raise any children in this environment. With this proposed project, the apartments and hotels, I can only begin to imagine what will be brought to the town. Off campus living and partying? Celebratory activities after a UCONN win? Crowding the town with visitors staying at a hotel? I believe people will begin to leave Tolland, a place where so many have called home for so long because it has felt over-run.

I urge the PZC to please consider the voices of your town's people and how this will directly affect everyone, and not just in Tolland, but surrounding towns as well. Even on the Town of Tolland's website does it say "It is this social network and diverse and warm population that creates the "village" aspect of Tolland. Our residents take pride in their neighborhoods, in their town, and in their institutions. It is a community that is generous and supportive of each other." Let's keep this motto and way of life.

Thank you,

Jessica Uziemblo
Resident of the town of Willington

Heidi Samokar

From: Dave Barnas <dave@truehealthunlimited.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2016 5:45 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: Question about University Gateway Village
Attachments: 2016_4_28_SLD_University_Gateway_Village.jpg

Hi Heidi,

My name is Dave Barnas from 31 Tolland Green. Sorry to burden you. I'm struggling to understand how why developer's story for using our Tolland land keeps changing?

I was wondering why the developer's website, which is Senior Living Development, has a listed status of APPROVED FOR USE for Tolland. Several others are SOLD or UNDER CONTRACT.

(Please see attached jpg and let me why Tolland is listed as "Approved for Use.")

Also, what is truly being proposed - a "University Gateway Village," a "Tolland Village Area" or "Senior Living Area"?

Under "Senior Living Sites" here is the mixed message.

<http://www.sldland.com/tolland/>

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,
Dave

Dave Barnas, MS, CES, NASM-CPT
[True Health Unlimited, LLC](#)
(860) 875-8485
[Subscribe Free Today!](#)

Heidi Samokar

From: vtsdmailer@vt-s.net on behalf of jamesnorrisjr@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2016 4:41 PM
To: Heidi Samokar
Subject: [Town of Tolland CT] proposed zoning regulations

Hello hsamokar,

Jim Norris (jamesnorrisjr@comcast.net) has sent you a message via your contact form (<http://www.tolland.org/user/421/contact>) at Town of Tolland CT.

If you don't want to receive such e-mails, you can change your settings at <http://www.tolland.org/user/421/edit>.

Message:

Heidi,

Regarding the proposed zoning regulations off Exit 68, I find it extremely hard to believe that an economic analysis is not available.

Do you mean to tell me that a projection of tax dollars generated versus tax dollars associated spent leading to a projected surplus, that theoretically divided by X is projected decrease in residential/auto property taxes annually to Joe Citizen has not been done?

This process is totally backwards, clearly. No studies (traffic, economics, exact detailed development plan, exact site plans), yet they want to change zoning laws first and open Pandora's box. I quite frankly am appalled at this.

Also, way too much power given to 6 people at end of day. If 70 percent plus folks in town do not want this change, Planning and Zoning Commission could still vote it thru, correct? (I know one that no matter what will) No referendum can be forced?

370 units off Exit 68 is total and complete insanity. Traffic jams galore, night and day.

Thank you,
Jim Norris
300 Plains Rd