

Chairman Klemens' Questions-- December 3, 2024

I would appreciate **written** responses from ARADEV as follows. This does not preclude the Intervener from responding to these questions also:

1. The event barn appears to be the genesis of many (but not all) of the neighbor's concerns, including traffic, noise, parking, and lighting. Can this project function if the event barn were completely eliminated?
2. Could the event facility be relocated into the existing hotel where there is already an existing banquet facility?
3. What is the capacity of the existing banquet facility located within the hotel?
4. If the event barn was eliminated, could some of the parking that adjoins neighboring properties be moved to the interior of the site where the event barn was?
5. Could this project function without the annexation of the Granbery parcel at 53 Wells Hill Road?
6. Currently there are three structures on the Granbery parcel. Can you provide the square footage footprint of these existing structures?
7. Can you provide the square footage footprint of the proposed cottages on the Granbery parcel? For the purposes of these analyses consider the footprint to be the maximum extent of the built cottage, i.e., as if they were not on pilings but located on the ground. Be sure to include the existing cottage (proposed to be retained) in these calculations. Provide a comparison of the built foot print of the Granbery parcel as it exists now with what is proposed.
8. What are the total number bedrooms in the existing Granbery structures? How many bedrooms will exist in the cottages proposed plus the existing cottage?
9. Historically the campus of the Wake Robin Inn had a motel, swimming pool, and a hotel that contained a banquet facility. Are there any elements in your proposed development that are markedly different from what exists now, other than expansion of those elements?
10. Are there any elements of your proposed facility that could be considered **NOT** customary and incidental to upscale hotels within our region?
11. Representations have been made that the Wake Robin Inn is an inactive facility. Please address that with actual data if possible?

I would appreciate **written** responses from the Intervener as follows. This does not preclude ARADEV from responding to these questions also:

1. As the ingress and egress to the site will be on Sharon Road (Rte. 41) why is the position of the Intervener that property values on Wells Hill Road will decrease because of traffic?

2. Salisbury/Lakeville has the one of the most, if not the most, robust real estate market in Litchfield County. A review of the draft 2024 POCD will show this. Given these facts, how can models such as proposed account for valuation decline.
3. Isn't it true that properties in Salisbury/Lakeville routinely sell markedly above the appraised values and corresponding assessments?
4. Given that Salisbury/Lakeville has one of the lowest (if not lowest depending on the year) mill rate coupled with many other factors, properties are highly sought after and in most cases are sold within days or a few weeks of listing. Given these realities, can you explain why properties on Wells Hill Road that abut an existing hotel facility will be devalued? (See Question 1 concerning traffic volumes on Wells Hill Road).
5. Concerning Sharon Road properties, what is the percentage increase in traffic volumes on that State Highway proposed to be generated by this project and how can that percentage affect valuations on an already highly trafficked road?
6. There has been testimony as to the fact that the proposed facility will generate impaired (drunk) drivers. What is unique about this facility that will generate significantly more impaired drivers than any of the restaurants in Lakeville that front on Route 41 or abut Route 41? This has not been an issue with other facilities recently permitted such as Fern and the expansion of The Boathouse.
7. As part of the cell tower application (Docket 501) of the Connecticut Siting Council, a significant portion of the site was environmentally assessed by the CT-DEEP, USFWS, and the CT-CEQ. As this occurred recently in 2021, why is ARADEV to be held to a higher standard than the State of Connecticut held New Cingular Wireless?
8. Under interrogatory/response 13 of Docket 501 the question of core forest was discussed. It was asked/responded to that this site was not core forest as defined by the CT-DEEP. Do you agree with that finding?
9. In the Intervener's testimony it was represented that the site was part of a 300-acre habitat block. What are the constituent components of this block (forests, fields, development) and how does that differ (i.e., how is it markedly unique) from most of the contiguous habitat blocks in RR1 and RR3 zoned parcels in Salisbury? As far as habitat blocks go within Salisbury, wouldn't you agree that this parcel is at the lower end of the acreage within habitat blocks in the RR1 and RR3 zones?
10. Would you characterize "old growth type forest" more accurately as mature second growth forest?
11. Interrogatory/response 41 of Docket 501 concluded upon consultation with the USFWS that there were no long eared bat hibernacula within 0.25 mi. of the site and no maternity roosts within 150 feet of the project area (including access road). Do you agree with this statement?
12. Can the protection of maternity roosts of long-eared bats be managed by seasonal clearing restrictions?

13. Can the protection of maternity roosts of long-eared bats be augmented by retaining certain tree species that provide optimal maternity habitat? Please describe those trees by species and identify where these trees occur on the site. How many of these trees are being preserved in the current development plan and how many are being lost?

WakeRobin

From Allen Cockerline

Date Tue 12/3/2024 11:27 AM

To Abby Conroy

Abby,

Can we get a few more questions to the applicant and intervenor. Given the deadline we are facing I think it would be helpful.

1. The first big question for me is how is this not an expansion given that it is adding the Granberry property? The exclusion of the Granberry property would add a buffer while reducing the development impact. Another approach could be simply a further reduction of development activity on the Granberry parcel.

2. Next question related to that is the idea of incorporating the event space into the main building. If it were buried in the core of the larger building it seems logical that sound containment would be more easily achieved. This also puts the burden of sound containment front and center in hotel guests enjoyment of their stay. I would support an increased footprint to accommodate this.

3. What effect would a solid fence within the planted area surrounding the north parking lot have on sound traveling to adjoining areas? Are there other areas that could benefit from similar treatment? Auto noise and the behavior of guests are a concern.

4. I'm not sure that the drainage into the CT DOT easement will be increased or decreased. There will be an improvement in the roadside conditions but it seems that the same square footage of the drainage area may not increase and may in fact decrease. Most of the DOT drainage is less than ideal so any reduction in runoff from both the applicants property and the DOT ROW would be positive. Is there any chance of infiltration within the DOT easement prior to the catch basin?

5. My last concern is in regard to the Rawlings report. To me this demonstrates a reduction in value from the town appraisal. No quantitative value was established though and I think it's fair to say that everyone knows these values are far from what properties in Salisbury sell for which is often many times the tax assessment values. I'm not sure it meets the "unreasonable adverse effect" cited in 803.3. What are the actual variables in lot values used by the assessor's office?

Questions Re Wake Robin Application

From Cathy Shyer

Date Tue 12/3/2024 12:26 PM

To Abby Conroy; Charles R. Andres

Thanks for this opportunity, below are **rough outlines** of questions I would like answered from the applicants so far and in haste!

1. Are you in discussions with the owners of the property on the right of the existing WR driveway on Sharon Rd (up on the hill, new balconies, currently unoccupied) to purchase this property ?
2. If you were to purchase any additional abutting properties would you commit to only using them for staff housing
3. Would you agree NOT to promote or advertise the Salisbury Town Beach aka the Grove to your guests?
4. Would you ask your guests NOT to walk or run on Wells Hill Road or south bound on Sharon Rd?
5. How would you mitigate the noise from clean up of the restaurant or event spaces ie bottles, garbage haulage.
6. You were asked by Mrs Cruger in one of the earlier hearings to please identify other hospitality properties that you have developed or operated. Was this question ever answered and would you please share that information ie names and addresses with us.
7. Can you please address the issue raised by the interceder that the development of a spa and event space is not allowed in RR1.
8. If the entire project was permitted how long would you expect demolition to take ? How long would you expect construction of the new facility to take ?
9. How and where would you promote such a resort?
10. Do you see a market for mid winter and shoulder season business

Question for tree experts both interceder and applicant's Mr Townsend (?) about the roll of mature trees in absorbing noise.

Best,
Cathy