

Reasons the Opponents Don't Want this High School Approved

Property Values: The neighborhood is very tranquil and rural, with excellent privacy. The proposed school is a high-intensity, commercial development that will be very intrusive, very close to, and directly visible from, adjacent homes. *This is the complete opposite of the situation with the Mansfield school.* If this school is built, home values will decrease by an average of 22.4%.

Traffic: If approved, traffic on Outer Ridge Road will increase from 30-50 cars now, to almost 200/day. The road is dangerous as it is; proposed improvements won't correct these deficiencies, increasing traffic will make the situation worse and will likely result in more accidents in the future. Ditto for using the existing building for a small church. There would be far less traffic generated by a small church, or by 2 or 3, 4-bedroom, single-family homes than by this proposed high school.

Supporters vs. Opponents: The applicant touts how many people support this project, but their claims are misleading. Supporters universally praise the Slate Lower School's education model, and how much the current students enjoy going to school, but this is irrelevant, these hearings are not a popularity contest or a vote, and the Commissions is not charged with ruling on whether this school is good or not. Few of the supporters claim that this site is a good location for the proposed school, none considered the negative impact on the neighborhood, nor the proposal's failure to meet zoning requirements or the POCD, and these supporters would still support this high school regardless of where it is eventually located. An analysis of the applicant's latest claims shows that there are **43** supporters and **86** opponents within the Blue Hills neighborhood. The following tables shows how many supporters and opponents live near the site.

| Opponents | | | |
|-------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Distance | 0.5 miles | 1-miles | Total |
| North Haven | 33 | 18 | 51 |
| Hamden | 7 | 19 | 26 |
| Total | 40 | 37 | 77 |

| Supporters | | | |
|---------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| Distance | North Haven | Hamden | Total |
| Within 1/2 mi | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Within 1 mi | 19 | 2 | 21 |
| Total <= 1 mi | 22 | 2 | 24 |

There are **67** supporters who have a relationship with the Lower School – that is, they have a vested interest in having the high school approved. What IS important is that **77** opponents live within 1-mile of the proposed site, compared to **24** supporters. The opinions and concerns of the 74 people who live closest to the proposed site, and who would be most negatively impacted by the high school, should count for more than the opinions of the 24 people who have vested interests and wouldn't be negatively impacted by the high school.

Intensity of Development: The Commission's decision will have far-reaching consequences. What will become of the school if it is built, and then its owners no longer want to operate a school? The proposal violates many zoning regulations because it does not provide: "An adequate, convenient, and safe vehicular and pedestrian system..." (§10.1.2.1); "A site layout that will have the minimum potential

adverse effect upon the established character or potential use of any adjoining properties..." (§10.1.2.2); "Considerations of the project's impact on the natural environment, with emphasis on minimizing any potential adverse effects thereon." (§10.1.2.3); "The reasonable screening at all seasons of the year from the view of adjacent residential properties..." (§10.1.2.4); and, "Expected storm drainage loads, including off-site conditions where considered appropriate by the PZC." (§10.1.3.20).

Impact on the Neighborhood: This project is a commercial development and it is too intense, too intrusive, and too large for such a small site. Any project of this scale would be incompatible with the neighborhood. This is the complete opposite of the Mansfield school. Any application of this size and intensity violates all of the requirements of §1.1.1 of the North Haven P&ZC Requirements because it DOES NOT: promote the general welfare of the community; lessen congestion in the streets; prevent the overcrowding of land; avoid undue concentration of population; and, encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout town.

Plan Of Conservation and Development (POCD): This proposal violates key recommendations that Milone & Macbroom made in the POCD, because it does not: reduce the adverse impact of vehicular traffic on Mt. Carmel Avenue, Blue Hills Road, and Outer Ridge Road; protect scenic roads that contribute to the Town's character; protect high quality wetlands and their ecosystems; manage sewer expansion areas; protect sensitive habitats and natural resources by preserving watercourses wetlands, and aquifers; and, serve the needs of the wider community.

Zoning Regulations: This application does not meet key zoning regulations: there will be extensive site grading and clearing on approximately 80% of the site, impervious surface area will triple from 0.40 acres to 1.21 acres, and 40 mature trees will be removed (§7.5.2.4); impervious surface area will triple from 0.40 acres to 1.21 acres, out of 2.97 acres (§7.5.2.5); grading will result in creation of exterior grades less than five feet above maximum groundwater elevation (§7.5.2.6); soil erosion and sediment from the site will enter bodies of water and wetlands (§8.1.1.3); sedimentation and flooding will cause erosion and damage to adjoining properties (§8.1.1.4); off-site erosion and sedimentation will occur (§8.1.5.1); peak flow rates and runoff volumes will damage adjoining properties (§8.1.5.3); grading or regrading will damage any adjoining property, including but not limited to, damage caused by the diversion of surface waters upon said adjoining property (§8.1.9.3); the plans do not provide for an adequate, convenient, and safe vehicular and pedestrian system (§10.1.2.1); any proposal of this size will have a huge adverse effect upon the established character or potential use of any adjoining properties. (§10.1.2.2); the project will have significant, adverse impact on the natural environment (§10.1.2.3); a project of this size cannot provide reasonable screening at all seasons of the year from the view of adjacent residential properties (§10.1.2.4); and, a project of this scope has large storm drainage loads that will degrade off-site conditions (§10.1.3.20).

Tim Lee Quotes, from 2017 Mansfield School P&ZC Hearings:

- “I say that not to demean or belittle the peoples’ interest in the property, but if the opponents are going to come and say, ‘Hey, we live next door. You have to consider our feelings,’ I think the Board should really consider who is in favor of the application and who is opposed to the application.” 10/2/17, page 20.
- “The Clarks were agreeable to a restriction that they would not seek any residential development of the 24-acres of the property during the existence of the school. It’s not our intention to put the school on one portion of the property and subdivide to put houses on another portion of the property.” – 10/2/17, Page 26.
- “...the Clarks are willing to agree to a restriction that the property will not be put to – for use for University purposes, if it gives the Commission some peace of mind.” 10/2/17, Pages 26-27.
- “Once again, the property is about 25-acres. We are utilizing for school purposes about two acres; the remaining portion of the property is going to be undeveloped at this time. We are not offering a restriction over the entire 25-acres of the property, the remaining 23-acres of the property. However, we are agreeing that that portion of the property will never be used for residential development. We’re not going to subdivide it. We’re not going to split it off and sell it to a developer.” 10/2/17, Page 28.

Tim Hollister Quotes, from 2017 Mansfield School P&ZC Hearings:

- “The general principles are that every application is different, every application that comes before you depends on facts, studies, impacts, such as what you’ve heard here tonight. Every parcel of land and its surroundings is different. That is especially true with uses that you have already classified as special permit uses.” 8/7/17, Page 53.
- “So to say that approval of one special permit application implies or binds you to approval of another is just simply inconsistent with the nature of the application and the use. Approving one application does not bind this Commission to grant any other application, even if it’s for the same use in the same zone.” 8/7/17, Pages 53-54.
- “I think you know even without us explaining that an elementary school is a fundamentally different use from anything that might be associated with a college or university; most notably because elementary school students, they don’t drive, they are always under the supervision of parents or administrators or teachers. Zoning regulations routinely differentiate between colleges and universities, high schools, elementary schools. Your regulations do and you would too in reviewing any specific application.” 8/7/17, Page 54.
- “So there is nothing in this application that should give you pause as to some future application, whether by Quinipiac or any other use.” 8/7/17, Page 55.