

Harry Clark  
130 Old Highway  
Wilton, CT 06897

Planning And Zoning Commission  
Town Hall  
238 Danbury Road  
Wilton, CT 06897

10/7/22

Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission,

With regards to the proposal at 19 Cannon Road:

The scale, density, and form of the proposed development to be served by this extension is not in compliance with the 2019 Plan Of Conservation And Development. While the core of Cannondale could benefit from slightly increased density, there are particular, specific recommendations and goals in the Plan that are not adhered to by the applicant. In addition, the Plan has not laid out boundaries, form, or scale of the Cannondale district, so any project, especially a large-scale project, is premature. There are also health and safety issues with a building of this size at this location.

**Page 39-40 Goal 4: *Preserve Wilton's Rural Character, Historic Resources and Cultural Landscapes*.** Mentioned specifically is the Cannondale National Historic District. The scale, design, and form of the project does not adhere to this goal. A single, monolithic building of this size not only violates all three of the goals, it is seemingly designed to be as exactly opposite said goals as possible.

**Page 49 Goal 1.1: *Increase the Availability of Multi-Family Housing and Smaller Housing Units*.** This section sets very specific guidelines and goals that limit large scale building like the one proposed to Town Center and Danbury Road, south of Cannon Road. "Abutting transition areas" such as 19 Cannon Road, which clearly transitions from busy commercial Danbury Road to the single family neighborhood in Cannondale, are specifically called out as areas of opportunity for "smaller, mixed use" buildings, and "smaller single family homes". The scale of this proposal is far in excess of what any reasonable person would term "smaller".

**Page 68-70:** (Cannon Road as a transition point) Cannon Road straddles two zones as outlined in the Plan; neither one specifies large, multi-story buildings (more appropriate on Danbury Road and in Wilton Center, as outlined in the Plan) Instead, the two zones outline "commercial, residential, and mixed-use development that emphasizes transit-oriented development, community, and village design character and connections to Wilton Center." "Evaluate form-based zoning approaches" for the zone south of Cannon Road, and "Maintain existing low-density, rural development patterns, except in approaches to and within the Georgetown node... enhance the utility and clarity of Adaptive Use regulations that are often used in this area... enable commercial and residential development at limited densities that can be supported by on-site infrastructure" for the zone north of Cannon Road.

**Page 70 Goal 3: *Strengthen the economic viability of the Cannondale area while protecting its unique design and historical character*.** The proposal clearly does neither of these things. The

“economic viability” of Cannondale is an ill-defined goal, and certainly the style and scale of the building is neither unique nor historical. In fact, this building would forever change the “character” of Cannondale for the worse.

**Page 91 Goal 7.1: *Ensure water and sewer policies reflect land-use goals.*** The sizing of the sewer extension is out of scale with the lower densities laid out in the Plan, and will serve to encourage more large-scale developments on adjacent lots, in direct contradiction to the Plan.

**Page 95: *The Cannondale Node-*** “The Town should conduct a Master Planning process to properly define the extent of the Cannondale Node. Once this is done, the Town should align its land-use policies to encourage mixed-use, residential, and commercial development of an appropriate scale and design that is transit-oriented in nature, given access to Cannondale Train Station... densities should be lower than the Greater Wilton Center area and should align with the gradual decrease in density north of Cannon Road.” This survey, and resultant recommendations, have not yet been completed, so no large development should be approved until the Plan is updated.

Besides the clear-cut departures from the PCOD, there are also serious questions about health and safety at this location, including, but not limited to: roadway sight-lines, proximity to a busy railroad grade crossing, proximity to a fragile river ecosystem, and possible additional contamination to an already marginal aquifer that supplies public drinking water. Less dense development of this property would alleviate all of these issues, as well as comply with the PCOD.

Unless and until the developer can answer questions about health and safety you are under no obligation to approve this project, regardless of statute 8-30g.

I ask that you deny the application.

Sincerely,

Harry Clark