Presentation to New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “P&Z”) regarding Permit Application (the “Permit Application”) by Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc., Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. at a hearing scheduled for November 19, 2019
Overview

• The Oenoke Ridge Neighbors’ Association (the “ORNA”) hereby requests that the New Canaan P&Z reject the Permit Application based upon the following grounds that are highlighted and summarized herein.

- The Permit Application is opposed by nearly all of the surrounding neighbors including St. Mark’s Church, the Oenoke Association at Heritage Hills, the New Canaan Preservation Alliance and the surrounding neighbors on Oenoke Ridge and adjacent streets. The Application is also opposed by the community at large as evidenced by the signatories and comments to an online petition, articles in local papers, written submissions to the P&Z and speeches tonight.

- The New Canaan Historical Society and St. Michael’s Church are neighbors of the proposed development, but their support of the Permit Application disqualifies them as supporting neighbors since both organizations have agreements to be paid by Waveny in the event that the Permit Application is approved. They are further conflicted since they will have a significant ongoing financial interest in the development.
The planned development’s size, scope, height and architectural character are obtrusive for the surrounding neighborhood and inconsistent with the surrounding historic district.

The development will cause traffic congestion, drainage issues and property devaluation negatively impacting and impairing the surrounding neighbors as will be highlighted by ORNA experts.

The development violates the Town planning guidelines to be observed by the P&Z as outlined in the Town POCD and Village District Design Guidelines. Approval of the Permit Application would be inconsistent with the recent P&Z rejection of the Glazer housing proposal at the Roger Sherman Inn.
ORNAA Submissions

• Ten of the surrounding single-family properties of the proposed development are ORNA members.

• In addition, The Oenoke Association is a member of ORNA representing approximately 165 housing units, 130 property owners and 250 residents of voting age in Heritage Hills.

➢ The ORNA property owners comprise nearly all of the surrounding homes of the proposed development running down Oenoke Ridge (including residents on Oenoke Lane) and then to the east with the residents of the Oenoke Association at Heritage Hills.

➢ The ORNA is represented by Joel Green, Esq of Green & Gross PC.
ORNAL Submissions (cont’d)

- Objections in opposition to the Permit Application by owners representing more than 70% of the properties within 500’ of 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, including the Oenoke Association and St. Mark’s Church. Such neighbors constitute more than the 20% of the area of the lots affected by the proposed Permit Application within 500 feet in all directions of the property included in the proposed change thereby requiring a two-thirds vote of all P&Z members in order to approve the Permit Application.

- Signatures from more than **1,400** New Canaan residents and concerned members of the community to an online and written petition in opposition to the Permit Application.
Wrong Location

• The Waveny project is objectionable due to its location, size, scale, height, and architectural design situated on a small slice of land neighboring the Historic District and God’s Acre, across from St. Mark’s and the Great Lawn and towering over its neighbors on Oenoke Ridge and the Oenoke Association at Heritage Hills.

  ➢ The current lots are within the Town’s one-half acre zoning.
  ➢ As Waveny’s attorney stated at its preapplication meeting with the P&Z in July 2019, current zoning laws would not permit this development absent a special permit or overlay zone.
  ➢ The proposed project is totally inappropriate and will detract from the look and feel of New Canaan in a location that is particularly representative of our village charm, open spaces and history.
  ➢ The proposed development will impair the image of New Canaan to incoming visitors since Oenoke Ridge acts as a Gateway to New Canaan.

Preserve New Canaan
Size and Mass of the Proposed Development

- The project is approximately 3-4 stories and in excess of 135,000 sq. ft.
- The project is approximately 2 city blocks long.
- The project would be the third largest building in New Canaan, only the High School and Saxe Middle School would be larger. The project would be approximately:
  - 7.1x larger than Waveny house.
  - 4.2x larger than Town Hall.
  - 1.5x larger than the Waveny facility on Farm Road.
  - 5x larger than the New Canaan Inn.
  - 1.6x larger than the New Canaan Y.
  - 1.4x the length of the high school football field.
Size and Mass (cont’d)

• The proposed building occupies nearly the entire proposed combined parcels, eliminating almost all of the open space bordering the historic district and would require the elimination of more than 30 mature trees.

• The proposed amenities reveal the mass of the project. Despite the purported claim that facility residents will use the downtown area, the complex is a massive self-contained housing unit whereby residents will have no need to leave the facility. In addition, walking access to and from the downtown area is stymied by the steep hill incline of Oenoke Ridge. The steep hill incline was noted by P&Z members in their rejection of the Roger Sherman application.
Size and Mass of the Proposed Development (cont’d)

• The oversized, massive commercial development includes the following amenities (as presented by Waveny in the Permit Application and Town meetings):

  - 120-seat movie theater
  - Swimming pool
  - Locker Room
  - Gym
  - Fitness Studio
  - Exam Rooms
  - Emergency Department
  - Discovery Room
  - Television Room
  - Living Room

  - Coat Check
  - Bistro
  - Café
  - Private Dining Room
  - Main Dining Room
  - Outdoor Dining area
  - Commercial Kitchen
  - Wine Cellar
  - Game Room

  - Multiple Salons & Hair Treatment Rooms
  - Work Room
  - 1,000 sq. ft. Staff Lounge
  - 4,000 sq. ft. Resident Storage
  - 9 Public use Restrooms
  - Back-of-House Commercial Laundry
  - 87 underground parking spaces
  - Air condenser units located on the roof
  - Multiple generators
Latest updates: Waveny submitted yet another update on November 14th

• The overwhelming majority of the building is 50-55 feet high (Wings B & C)

• The West side has been reduced by ~4 feet for a small portion of the building (Wing A) in an attempt to sway the P&Z that the views along Oenoke Ridge and Oenoke Lane would not be obtrusive, despite the clear mass of the building being 50-55 feet high

• Drawings omit the height of the East frontage (Wing D) which would loom high above Heritage Hills
Latest updates - continued

• Renderings attempt to persuade the viewer that the 50-55’ height of the mass of the building would not be visible from Oenoke Ridge and Oenoke Lane.

• Despite the building being 38 feet high on this side (West) end, the “8-10 foot new trees” cited by Waveny’s representatives at last month’s P&Z miraculously reach the peak of the roof pitch.

• The “35 foot set back” proposed in the overlay zone appears to be much further in the distance.
Reminder: this is a partial view of what the proposed building would look like
Height and Viewshed

• The height of the proposed complex is significantly taller than the existing community of historic homes and would significantly impair the viewshed of the neighboring properties.

  ➢ The surrounding houses are only 1.5-2 stories in height many of which are in the historic district compared to the proposed 3-4 stories plus roof pitch of the proposed development.

  ➢ The Oenoke Association Heritage Hills apartments are approximately 30 feet below grade of the complex. At the eastern side bordering Heritage Hills, the complex is a full 4 stories, 5 plus roof pitch that will loom over the apartments, block afternoon sunlight and negatively impact property values.
Height Comparison and Loom Factor

- Despite Waveny’s claim that the height is consistent with the neighborhood, every section is significantly higher than the surrounding homes, and in multiple cases the structure is more than 2x as high as surrounding homes.

- Previous drawings indicated the East side would be 50 feet high, which would tower over the Heritage Hill residents who live ~30 feet below.

- The building would tower over the existing 15’-25’ Historical Society buildings that would sit directly under the south end and prominently visible from God’s Acre.

- The Waveny housing proposal would sit on the highest point of this area, above all neighbors.

- The 8’-10’ trees Waveny plans to plant will do nothing to mask this loom for decades, if ever.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Wing A</th>
<th>Wing B</th>
<th>Wing C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waveny housing proposal</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Oenoke Lane</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Oenoke Lane</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Oenoke Lane</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Oenoke Ridge</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>138%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Oenoke Ridge</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Oenoke Ridge</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Oenoke Ridge</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Gerish Lane</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Residence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed SHOZ amounts to Spot zoning and is one of many claims that would expose New Canaan to serious legal challenges

• Proposed Paragraph 5.10 is obviously tailored precisely an exclusively to the building Waveny has designed for this specific plot of land

• The beneficiary of this special legislation which has been narrowly tailored could only be Waveny

• These characteristics of the self-created and defined SHOZ satisfies the definition of “spot” zoning which has been recognized as discriminatory land management and rejected multiple times by Connecticut state courts (see Campion v. Board of Alderman, 85 Conn. App. 820, 849 n.21 (2004))

• Adopting restrictive and exclusionary special legislation that benefits only one party would open New Canaan up to multiple avenues of serious and expensive litigation
Approval would contradict the P&Z decision to reject the Glazer Development Proposal at the Roger Sherman Inn

• Just a few years ago, the P&Z rejected a much smaller proposed development attempting to use an overlay zone at the Roger Sherman Inn which is close to the proposed Waveny project on Oenoke Ridge.

• As part of the Roger Sherman hearings, it was noted that the POCD states that the Town should maintain the open feeling of the larger lots and states that higher density housing is only appropriate near town and should be discouraged outside of town.

• The Roger Sherman decision is directly on point and should serve as guiding precedent for the rejection of the Permit Application.
Roger Sherman Inn (cont’d)

• The P&Z noted in the Roger Sherman hearings that Oenoke Ridge is the gateway to New Canaan and a development of the size proposed (which was much smaller than the Waveny proposal) would impair visitors’ impressions of New Canaan. Here are some quotes from P&Z members from the Roger Sherman hearings:

  ➢ “It seems like a lot of product on a small amount of space. The design seems nice but it’s still a very intensive use of a prominent parcel of land in town on a major highway, an entry into town.” John Kriz

  ➢ “We have M2 [Merritt Village] project coming along that will provide similar housing. We have zones that provide space for this kind of thing. Seniors want to live in town, but you do not want to hike the [Oenoke Ridge] hill two or three times a day. That’s not really walking.” Elizabeth DeLuca

  ➢ I have concerns that if we continue to extend cluster housing, which is a term I don’t like, do we continue to allow non-single family housing to push its way outward [from town]? I am worried that it could potentially set a precedent that other developers could use…” John Goodwin
The Plan of Conservation & Development (the “POCD”)

• The Preamble of the Zoning Regulations states that the P&Z is required to give careful consideration to the implementation of the POCD.
• Section 3A of the POCD states that the physical character and appearance of New Canaan has been a significant factor in attracting people to New Canaan including preserved open spaces and parks, low intensity uses, historic buildings, mature trees and scenic views. The POCD states that high density housing is only appropriate near town and should in fact be discouraged outside of town.
  ➢ The open space of the Great Lawn and the surrounding historic homes are exactly the types of areas the POCD was intended to preserve from the type of development being proposed. The proposed development is in fact the total opposite of what the POCD directs the P&Z to do in considering Special Permits, zoning changes or overlay zones.
  ➢ The proposed development significantly exceeds the current zoning coverage and is not permitted under current zoning regulations absent a special permit or overlay zone.
Section 4 of the POCD explains the importance of maintaining a “Gateway to New Canaan” in community design and “placemaking”.

The P&Z commissioners noted in their rejection of the Glazer project at the Roger Sherman Inn that dense housing on Oenoke Ridge would negatively impact a visitor’s impression of New Canaan since Oenoke Ridge serves as a gateway to New Canaan.
Section 5 of the POCD, entitled “Protect Residential Neighborhoods”, notes the following:

- Institutional uses in residential zones must be an appropriate scale and intensity for the location.
- The POCD states that with respect to institutional creep within residential zones “since there are no additional standards or provisions related to these uses, they are subject to the same dimensional standards as have been established for residential uses within the zoning district.”
- The POCD states “As part of any application for establishment of such uses (or expansion of existing uses), the Planning and Zoning Commission should seek to minimize and/or manage the encroachment or impact of institutional and other uses currently allowed in residential zones on neighboring properties (noise, lighting, drainage, etc.).”
- Due to the location, size, scale and design of the proposed development, the Permit Application is an unacceptable encroachment and violates the tests set forth in the POCD for P&Z action.
The Village District Design Guidelines

• The POCD refers to the Village District Design Guidelines as a supplement to the POCD.

• Section 3.0 of the Village District Design Guidelines states “In general, the placement of new development should be aesthetically pleasing and fit in contextually with the historic buildings in and near the Village District. Particular consideration should be given to the impacts any new development or redevelopment might have if adjacent to or in close proximity to the Historic District. New development, or renovation and additions, should reflect these principals by enhancing Village district streetscapes…”

• The Permit Application does not fit in contextually with the surrounding historic buildings (including the adjacent Historical Society) which are adjacent to the proposed development.
Village Design Guidelines Should Protect the Historic District from this Type of Development

• As the P&Z has noted in prior hearings, property owners who comply with zoning regulations (as well as historic district regulations) must have faith that the zoning regulations will be uniformly enforced. Residents of the adjacent Historic District who have absorbed the additional costs of regulation, including planning, construction and burdensome regulatory review, should also be protected from the negative impact of the proposed development on the New England character of the surrounding neighborhood.

➢ The adjacent historic district is subject to extensive regulation regarding any construction with the intent to preserve the historic character of New Canaan. Most district homes date from the 1800s and early 1900s. In order to comply with the zoning and historic commission regulations, homeowner renovations typically cost more than typical unregulated homes.

➢ Considering the additional cost of home ownership in the Historic District, the P&Z should carefully consider the impact of the proposed development which negatively impacts the historic New England character of the neighboring properties.
Lighting Study

• The POCD mandates that the P&Z consider the impact on residential zones of lighting, drainage and noise.

➢ Waveny has provided a very limited and inadequate one-page lighting rendering as part of their Permit Application that merely shows examples of the three types of light fixtures proposed to be used but does not specify the location, number, intensity or impact of the lighting scheme.

➢ It is fair to assume that the lighting requirements for a massive senior living facility will be akin to an airport terminal undermining the tranquility of the Great Lawn and the surrounding neighborhood and homes. The current lighting surrounding the New Canaan Inn and driveway is already intrusive, and the required lighting of a 135,00 sq. ft. senior living facility would overwhelm the tranquility of the neighborhood.

➢ Since the Permit Application fails to provide adequate information regarding lighting, the P&Z cannot fully assess the impact on surrounding neighbors thereby rendering the Permit Application insufficient and inadequate.
Neighbor Objections

• Neighbors’ Objections: When originally proposed to the P&Z in July 2019, the Chairman of the P&Z noted that the site may be attractive if there are no surrounding neighbors impacted by the development other than the Historical Society. This is simply not the case since the ORNA comprises nearly all of the surrounding homes commencing at Hampton Lane, running down Oenoke Ridge (including residents on Oenoke Lane and Gerrish Lane) and then to the east with the residents of the Oenoke Association at Heritage Hills. The traffic, engineering and appraisal studies submitted by the ORNA support the ORNA’s assertion of the negative impact on their properties and neighborhood.

➢ It is the ORNA’s understanding that this at least the third attempt by Waveny to force this development upon similar neighborhoods within New Canaan. At some point, it should become clear that there is an issue with the development siting plan, rather than the neighbors.
Opposition Differs from Prior Applications

• Unlike other proposals that have come before the P&Z (notably Merritt Village), the impacted church, St. Mark’s, has taken a definitive position in opposition to the proposed Waveny development.
  ➢ *St. A’s did not take a position* and remained neutral regarding Merritt Village application.
  ➢ St. Mark’s who donated the original land now used for the New Canaan Inn, stated in their letter, “Concluding that the proposed project would permanently and meaningfully interfere with our campus and impede St Mark’s ministry, the Vestry voted to not support it.”

• In both the Merritt Village and the Roger Sherman Inn applications, there were numerous impacted neighbors who voiced support for the applications. In the current Waveny Application, the surrounding and impacted neighbors are nearly unanimous in their opposition to the Waveny Application.
  ➢ The New Canaan Historical Society and St. Michael’s Church are neighbors of the proposed development, but their support of the Permit Application disqualifies them as supporting neighbors since both organizations have agreements to be paid by Waveny in the event that the Permit Application is approved. They are further conflicted since they will have a significant ongoing financial interest in the development.
The New Canaan Preservation Alliance Opposition

• The New Canaan Preservation Alliance, one of New Canaan’s strongest voices for the preservation of New Canaan’s history and charm, has submitted a letter to the P&Z in opposition to the Waveny proposal stating:

  ➢ “The proposed Waveny CCRC is simply too massive for the site, and the three story, block-long building will *loom over the Historic District* and destroy its rural historic character and sense of “place”. Visualize the exterior lighting at night, and how the building will look in the day with new landscaping after most of the mature trees are cut down for construction. It will dominate the view looking north from God’s Acre, and simply over-power the Historical Society campus and St. Michael’s Church. The view looking south from St. Mark’s Great Lawn, which, incidentally, was designed to merge with the rural aspect of the Historical Society buildings, will now be interrupted by the block long façade of a faux-colonial style monstrosity.”

  ➢ “The NCPA, while recognizing the need for more senior housing, believes the approval to permit construction of the Waveny CCRC at the Oenoke site by the New Canaan Planning & Zoning Commission *would totally undermine the protection and guarantees that the Town’s zoning regulations* afford homeowners when they purchase a home in a single family zone. The Waveny application is not a hardship for which a special zoning variance could be justified and granted.”
Widespread Community Opposition

• The ORNA is submitting signatures to its petition in opposition to the Waveny development. More than 1,400 New Canaan residents, concerned citizens, tax payers and voters have signed the petition either in person or online. A review of the signatories reveals that the opposition is not concentrated in a few neighbors who Waveny has attempted to label as NIMBY. Instead, the signatories are from a wide distribution of addresses throughout New Canaan and include some of New Canaan’s leading senior citizens.

• A sampling of comments posted online and in a letter to the New Canaanite:
  - “We are sympathetic to the need for senior housing in New Canaan but this is not the right location for such a development. It is not compatible with the surrounding historic, residential and sacred aesthetic.” Marianne Buchanan
  - “I’m signing because this type of development simply does not fit in the historic town center of New Canaan. It will ruin the aesthetic of the town, and completely disrupt the flow of traffic.” Derek Case
  - “This proposal is enormously inappropriate for the location. It would change the character and nature of the surrounding area including the Historic District forever. If this type of retirement housing for the affluent elderly is needed it should be done at a different location. Even a scaled down version would be destructive. Just say NO!” Michael Gregorio
Widespread Community Opposition (cont’d)

- As a lifelong resident of this community, whose father was the founding president of Waveny Care Center and whose mother proposed the first plan for assisted living to the town of New Canaan back in the 80’s, concern for our aging citizens and their quality of life is in my blood. In the past I’ve served on Waveny Care Center’s Board of Directors and I am currently on the Advisory Board to Staying Put in New Canaan. I am in full support of a plan to create housing for seniors, particularly if it offers graduated levels of care, but I am not in support of the proposed plan that would be located at 65 Oenoke Ridge Road. As the gateway into and out of downtown, the campus that exists between and around the Historical Society, St. Michael’s and St. Mark’s would not just be compromised, but destroyed. By allowing the proposed facility to be built at 65 Oenoke Ridge, we’d be breaking the rare and beautiful boundary that distinguishes downtown from out of town. New Canaan is a village. Please don’t let it sprawl into this historic, peaceful area. Please don’t rewrite the rules to allow this. **Gigi Priebe**

- No change in zoning should be approved. This is an inappropriate choice of a location for the proposed development. If there is sufficient need for such a development, it would be better placed near the core of the town, on a flat parcel, with easy access to the downtown and its amenities—shops, library, theater, restaurants— and the transportation hub. The Schoolhouse parking lot is one possible location. Pine Street is another. And the design, mass and scope of the facility should be consistent with the character of the town utilizing the multitude of amenities that already exist here not building more. **Robin Beckett**
Widespread Community Opposition (cont’d)

- “I'm signing because I don't think this type of building belongs in this spot.” Mary Kranzlin

- “why so close to town and not further up north - the traffic is already worse than in NYC - especially where we live on Heritage Hill - EVERYBODY speeds and endangers the life of a street where mostly seniors live in about 140 condos - stop this nonsense.” Brigitte & Fred Campano

- “This is just all wrong, in every possible way: size, location, target (i.e., very wealthy) audience. I want to know if other sites were considered for this oversized building project. It is hard to imagine that Oenoke Ridge is the only possible location. Also, the expected buy-in cost will price out many town residents anyway. Heartfelt thanks to the creators of this website! You obviously love New Canaan as much as I do!” Eloise Killeffer

- “This is an overbuilt facility. In the wrong place given St. Mark's Great Lawn, New Canaan's Historic District- the northern gateway to our small town. I have confidence the Waveny network can find an alternate and more suitable location for this important facility.” Terry Spring
Widespread Community Opposition (cont’d)

- As a member of the New Canaan Historical Society, I object strongly to the visual impact the proposed center will have on the campus of the Historical Society. As a member of St. Mark’s Episcopal Church, I do not want a huge housing complex looming over the Great Lawn.” Skip Hobbs

- Do the citizens need to repeat, again and again, that another unsightly large edifice detracts from the “next station to heaven”, not enhances our town? We will get to that “station” soon enough, let us not place it at this venue. Mimi Dickerson

- My wife and I believe that New Canaan is the most beautiful quintessential New England "village" we've ever seen, and we have had the good fortune of living here for the past 20 years. The number one concern for us, and I am sure for everyone who has chosen to live here, is the preservation of New Canaan's special character and charm. The proposed residence, while noble in purpose, and worthy of pursuit, strikes at the very core of New Canaan’s character in three critical ways:
  - By placing a full service residence in the very gateway to New Canaan's historical center, next to the Historical Society and in the midst of God's acre
  - By producing a design of such grand scale that it dwarfs the existing neighborhood homes, churches, and surrounding open grounds.
  - By adding substantial strain to the limited surrounding infrastructure that is not designed to handle another 71 residences, and adding to the density to our downtown that has noticeably increased in recent years. Bob and Benne Drunckenmiller
Widespread Community Opposition (cont’d)

First, let me thank you for taking the time to read my concerns regarding the Waveny LifeCare Network proposal for 65-73 Oenoke Ridge. I am a neighbor that lives in Oenoke Association Condos, and I have several concerns about the project. I think it is fair to say that most people support the idea of some sort of affordable senior housing in New Canaan. I have lived in this town over 25 years and know this has been a topic for as many years as I have lived here. That being said, the proposed project is misplaced at the current proposed location and with a $800k buy-in and at least $4k a month in fees, in my opinion does not support the concept of “affordable” senior housing. The size and scope of the building is just too large for the plot of land being considered (although Waveny has been saying that it is on a 3.5 acre parcel, the reality is the new construction will be on a 1.5 acre parcel, the remaining two acres of the campus is taken up by the New Canaan Inn so unless that New Canaan Inn is being torn down, it is disingenuous to include that land in the plans or marketing of this project)…

Neighbors at St Marks, Oenoke Association and other neighbors in the area are strongly opposed to the project. They represent a large group of people. Just Oenoke Association alone has 165 households. St Marks represents a large group of New Canaanites. I realize that St Michaels has said it supports the project as has the New Canaan Historical Society. However, I don’t believe that NC Historical Society’s support can be viewed as neutral since they are the sellers of the land (and therefore have a financial benefit to seeing this project go through) and have also said they need the $ from this land sale for their operational budget. There is also speculation that the Historical Society will receive an annual payment from the operational profits of the facility - if that is indeed true, can they be considered objective at all? What other areas were considered for the project? If the answer was no, why? There needs to be more transparency in this site selection process. A 3-4 story high, 150,000 sq ft structure near Gods’ Acre, one of the loveliest spots in New Canaan, will be forever changed with this looming structure. The view as you drive into town from Pound Ridge will look as if we have a Marriott and the town will lose it’s charm and quaint feeling. In addition, neighbors will be in a shadow of a 50-70 ft structure that is also built up on a ridge, so it will appear even larger (just look at how high Merritt Apartments are looking and picture that height on that small parcel of land. I honestly don’t see how this can even be considered. A couple of years ago, P&Z turned down the application of Roger Sherman to be knocked down and 8-12 houses being built on that lot saying the density would change the look of the town. Please be consistent and adhere to those same principles when reviewing this project and vote NO. Karin Stumpenhagen
Widespread Community Opposition (cont’d)

• We would very much like to voice our vehement opposition to the proposed development project on Oenoke Ridge Road. We are new residents of New Canaan, as of last week. We purchased the home at 90 Oenoke Ridge Road this past August. After many years in Darien, we were very excited to move our family to New Canaan. Our children attend St. Luke’s School (our oldest graduated in 2018) and we have increasingly felt our family life has been drawn to New Canaan. When the house at 90 Oenoke Ridge became available, we jumped at the opportunity. We have driven by this house, and this area often on the way to drop our children at school. We have long admired the classic New England charm of this part of town and when the chance to own a home here became available, we moved quickly to purchase the home. The week we have spent here unpacking and settling in, we have come to appreciate how truly idyllic this part of town is. You can imagine our surprise and disappointment when we learned this week of the proposed project almost directly across the street from us. The scale of this project is almost hard to comprehend. The fact that New Canaan would consider this development, in a historic district of town, is truly upsetting. A very large part of why we were so enthusiastic to buy our home is the beautiful and historic location it occupies in town. We feel that if this development were to proceed, it would damage what makes New Canaan so special. We moved to New Canaan, after over 20 years in Darien. In large part, what we love about New Canaan is the classic New England village feel, which is increasingly hard to find in surrounding towns.

A huge project such as the one proposed, would certainly benefit from a larger space in town. We sincerely hope that the Planning and Zoning Commission will reconsider the location of this project. Paul and Karen Stamoulis
No Neighbor Input in Planning

• Waveny made several unkept promises that it would not proceed with the development without the cooperation and approval of neighbors. In December 2018, The Waveny CEO stated,

➢ “The expectation is we will go, before choosing, to meet with the town and go over and meet with neighbors to make sure they can support what we are thinking about doing. So this is not something where we will design it and lay it out and close on the land and then go to [Planning & Zoning] to push it through. This is something where we are going to be inclusive of all the community and give everyone an opportunity to look at it, talk about it, neighbors, look at plans and drawings and make sure before go to P&Z to have input and support to do what we want to do and what we believe is the need for the area.”

➢ The Waveny CEO further stated to a group of realtors that it would not proceed with its development if neighbors expressed opposition.

• Waveny represented that it made a presentation to its neighbors at the New Canaan Library in August but failed to notify any of the surrounding neighbors except one.

➢ Despite representations that it has attempted to act as a good neighbor, Waveny failed to inform its prospective neighbors of its impending plans over the two-year planning period of the development.

➢ Waveny did not include any prospective neighbors in its focus planning groups.

➢ Waveny conducted a flawed traffic study during the slowest periods of July and October and then misrepresented in a presentation that the study was conducted during the school year in May.

➢ Waveny has continued to press its Permit Application despite the objections of nearly all of the surrounding neighbors, St. Mark’s Church and the Oenoke Association at Heritage Hills.
Waveny has Ignored Community Wide Opposition

• Waveny has embarked on a sweeping community wide sales pitch in an attempt to garner support but have left out the people most impacted by the development. The Waveny sales pitch has been met with consistent opposition:
  ➢ Waveny was invited to present at the Library, the Oenoke Association at Heritage Hills, the New Canaan Men’s Club and other organizations and has consistently been met with severe opposition from the senior citizen residents of the Oenoke Association.

• The online petition in opposition to the Petition has been signed by more than 1,400 residents.

• Numerous residents, including senior citizens have written directly to the P&Z, the New Canaan Advertiser and the New Canaanite expressing their opposition.
Exhibits and Appendices

1. Objections in opposition to the Permit Application by owners representing approximately 70% of the properties within 500’ of 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, including the Oenoke Association and St. Mark’s Church. Such neighbors constitute more than the 20% of the area of the lots affected by the proposed Permit Application within 500 feet in all directions of the property included in the proposed change thereby requiring a two-thirds vote of all P&Z members in order to approve the Permit Application.

2. Online Petition Signatures (more than 1,400 signatures) and Comments

3. Letter to St Mark’s congregation regarding Waveny Proposal

4. New Canaan Preservation League Letter to P&Z

5. Letters to P&Z (*not comprehensive*)

6. Letters to the New Canaanite

Appendix A: Members of the ORNA
Appendix A: Members of the ORNA

1. Oenoke Association, Inc., representing approximately 165 housing units, 130 property owners and 250 residents of voting age in Heritage Hills, 77 Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
2. Joseph and Beth Bucciarelli: 7 Oenoke Lane, New Canaan, CT 06840
3. Deborah Green and Vivek Mohindra, 40 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840
4. Lauren and William Frank, 20 Oenoke Lane, New Canaan, CT 06840
5. Josephine Gray, 139 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840
6. Laura and Kenneth Saverin, 24 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840
7. Katherine B. Mountcastle, 37 Oenoke Lane, New Canaan, CT 06840
8. Thomas and Dorothy Coughlin, 143 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840
9. Robert and Benne Druckenmiller, 81 Oenoke Lane, New Canaan, CT 06840
11. Chris and Emily Burns, 33 Gerrish Lane, New Canaan, CT 06840
To:  The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date:  October 29, 2019

Re:  P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the "Applicants") pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the "Subject Properties")

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Oenoke Association, Inc.
On behalf of the Oenoke Association, Inc and the properties within the Association:

By:  

Name:  James Stevens
Title:  President, Board of Directors
Address:  Oenoke Association, Inc.
121 Heritage Hill Road
New Canaan, CT 06840

James Stevens

Nancy Reda

Laurie Balestrino

Linda Carles

Michael Clarner

Tomas Chadwick

Sandy Gallagher

Darcy Jones

Karin Stumpenhagen
To: New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "P&Z")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN"), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the "Applicants") pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the "Subject Properties")

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.
St. Mark's Parish

By: Stanley A. Twardy

Name: Stanley A. Twardy, Sr.
Title: Senior Warden
Address: 111 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: Beth and Joseph L. Bucciarelli
Address: 7 Oenoke Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Lauren and William P. Frank
Address: 20 Oenoke Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Deborah Green and Vivek Mohindra
Address: 40 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Laura Saverin
Address: 24 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Josephine Gray
Address: 139 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: Beth and Joseph L. Bucciarelli  
Address: 7 Oenoke Lane  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Lauren and William P. Frank  
Address: 20 Oenoke Lane  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Deborah Green and Vivek Mohindra  
Address: 40 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Laura Saverin  
Address: 24 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Josephine Gray  
Address: 139 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: Beth and Joseph L. Bucciarelli
Address: 7 Oenoke Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Lauren and William P. Frank
Address: 20 Oenoke Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Deborah Green and Vivek Mohindra
Address: 40 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Laura Saverin
Address: 24 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Josephine Gray
Address: 139 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: Joseph A. Bucciarelli  
Address: PO Box 756  
New Canaan, CT 06840  

Name: Lauren and William P. Frank  
Address: 20 Oenoke Lane  
New Canaan, CT 06840  

Name: Deborah Green and Vivek Mohindra  
Address: 40 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840  

Name: Laura Saverin  
Address: 24 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840  

Name: Josephine Gray  
Address: 139 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: Joseph A. Bucciarelli  
Address: P.O. Box 756  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Lauren and William P. Frank  
Address: 20 Oenoke Lane  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Deborah Green and Vivek Mohindra  
Address: 40 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Laura Saverin  
Address: 24 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Josephine Gray  
Address: 139 Oenoke Ridge  
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: Michael Minter
Address: 90 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Thomas J. Coughlin
Address: 143 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Dennis Manning Trustee
Address: 135 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Stephen Matthews
Address: 137 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Emily Nissley
Address: 24 Drummond Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Robert E. Mallozi
Address: 30 Oenoke Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: Stephen Matthews
Address: 150 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840
NAME: THERESA-MARIE SPRING
24 GERRISH LANE
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840
Name: John Callahan  
Address: 50 Oenoke Lane  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Scott and Stacey Essex  
Address: 21 Oenoke Lane  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Ryan Longfield  
Address: 10 Gerrish Lane  
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Katherine Mountcastle  
Address: 37 Oenoke Lane  
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: John Callahan
Address: 50 Oenoke Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Scott and Stacey Essex
Address: 21 Oenoke Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Ryan Longfield
Address: 10 Gerrish Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840

Name: Katherine Mountcastle
Address: 37 Oenoke Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840
ARMIJO JOEL A
38 GERRISH LA
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

Deborah Armijo
38 Gerrish Lane
New Canaan, CT 06840
Name: Paul and Karen Stamoulis
Address: 90 Oenoke Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signatures and addresses of property owners]

[Print names]

SEE ATTACHED
61 Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
62B Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
62C Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
64C Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
66A Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
70B Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
72B Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
76B Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
76D Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
80A Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
80C Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
81C Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
82B Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
82D Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
83A Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
86 Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
88A Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
108B Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
132C Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
136B Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
140B Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
151A Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
167A Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the "Applicants") pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the "Subject Properties")

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signatures and addresses of owners]
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN"), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the "Applicants") pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the "Subject Properties")

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3 e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Mary Anne Casey
Owner/Signature

Penny Powell
Owner/Signature

John M. Casey
Owner/Signature

Penny Powell
Owner/Signature

Mary Anne Casey
Print Name

John M. Casey
Print Name

Penny Powell
Print Name

Thomas A. Chadwick
Print Name
The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

KAI LI
Print Name:
83 Heritage Hill Rd APT B New Canaan CT 06840
Address of Property Owned

MEIFANG LI
Print Name:
83 Heritage Hill Rd APT B New Canaan CT 06840
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Owner's Signature]

Owner/Signature

[Print Name]

[Address of Property Owned]

[Owner's Signature]

Owner/Signature

[Print Name]

[Address of Property Owned]

[Owner's Signature]

Owner/Signature

[Print Name]

[Address of Property Owned]
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS, WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Anne F. Gesualdi

Print Name

H3 B Heritage Hill Rd.

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signatures]

Owner/Signature

Jason Toris
Print Name
79 Heritage Hill Rd
Address of Property Owned

Diane J. Gotzler
Print Name
119 Heritage Hill Rd.
Address of Property Owned

Sofia Tournas
Print Name
82c Heritage Hill Rd
Address of Property Owned

Rebecca Gallagher
Print Name
28B Heritage Hill Rd
Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Mona Gossy
Print Name

57 Heritage Hill Rd
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signatures and names of owners]

[Address of Property Owned]

[Print Name]

[Address of Property Owned]

[Print Name]

[Address of Property Owned]

[Print Name]
Re:  P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. ("WCLN"), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Kathleen M. Drogo
Owner/Signature

Kathleen M. Drogo
Print Name

64 D. Heritage Hill, R.
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Barbara B. Mason
Owner/Signature
Print Name
140-C Heritage Hill Rd with % interest in Oenoke Association, Inc.
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature
Print Name
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature
Print Name
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature
Print Name
Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for November 7, 2019, for the purposes of considering an application of Waveny Life Care Network, Inc. (WLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS: WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS”) to renovate, expand and construct a new residential facility on properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.1.b of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owner of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

__________________________  __________________________
Owner/Signature            Print Name

__________________________  __________________________
Owner/Signature            Print Name

__________________________  __________________________
Owner/Signature            Print Name

__________________________  __________________________
Owner/Signature            Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Address of Property Owned

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the "Applicants") pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the "Subject Properties")

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500") feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Debra Shet
Owner/Signature

Debra Siker
Print Name

114 Heritage Hill Rd N.C.06840
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Kathleen Chestok
Owner/Signature

Kathleen Chestok
Print Name

114 D Heritage Hill Rd
Address of Property Owned New Canaan CT 06840

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Darcy Jones
Owner/Signature

Darcy Jones
Print Name

125 A Heritage Hill Rd
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re:  P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signatures]  
Owner/Signature  Print Name  
[Address]  Address of Property Owned

[Signatures]  
Owner/Signature  Print Name  
[Address]  Address of Property Owned

[Signatures]  
Owner/Signature  Print Name  
[Address]  Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS.” WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-30(e) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.5.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Print Name: SUE S. CRESS
Address of Property Owned: 94 A HERITAGE HILL RD

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Evelina Dragneva
Owner/Signature

Evelina Dragneva
Print Name

151 B Heritage Hill Rd, New Canaan CT 06840
Address of Property Owned

Levon Tchakmakjian
Owner/Signature

Levon Tchakmakjian
Print Name

151 B Heritage Hill Rd, New Canaan CT 06840
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signatures and addresses of property owners]

Deborah Conner
Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

[Other owner signatures and addresses]

[Additional owner signatures and addresses]
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN"), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the "Applicants") pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the "Subject Properties")

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signatures]

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Print Name

Print Name

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Address of Property Owned

Address of Property Owned

Address of Property Owned

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the "Applicants") pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the "Subject Properties")

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.c. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Sandra Gallagher
Owner/Signature

James Gallagher
Owner/Signature

Sandra Gallagher
Print Name

126 Heritage Hill Rd/Unit A
Address of Property Owned

James Gallagher
Print Name

126 Heritage Hill Rd/Unit A
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Barbara Wilson
Owner/Signature

10 BC Heritage Hill Rd
Address of Property Owned

Carole Ruffett
Owner/Signature

85 Heritage Hill Rd
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signature]
Owner/Signature

[Signature]
Owner/Signature

[Signature]
Owner/Signature

HOBIE FINN

Print Name

140 A HERITAGE HILL RD

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Marguerite Aitken
Owner:Signature

132 B Heritage Hill Rd.
Address of Property Owned
NEW CANAAN, CT. 06840

Owner:Signature

Owner:Signature

Owner:Signature

Owner:Signature
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)  
Date: October 29, 2019  
Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Laurie Balestrino
Owner/Signature

Laurie Balestrino
Print Name

87 HH
Address of Property Owned

Charles Balestrino
Owner/Signature

Charles Balestrino
Print Name

87 HH
Address of Property Owned

David Noffs
Owner/Signature

DAVID NOFFS
Print Name

123 D
Address of Property Owned

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission")

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the "Special Hearing") dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application") of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. ("WCCHS") and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. ("NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the "Applicants") pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the "Subject Properties")

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500') feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Signatures and addresses]

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Judith G. Halleran
Owner/Signature

Judith G. Halleran
Print Name
101 Heritage Hill Rd.
New Canaan, CT 06840
Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS; WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.e and 8.2.D.3.e. of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Owner/Signature]

[Print Name]

Address of Property Owned

[Owner/Signature]

[Print Name]

Address of Property Owned

[Owner/Signature]

[Print Name]

Address of Property Owned

[Owner/Signature]

[Print Name]

Address of Property Owned
Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned

Owner/Signature

Print Name

Address of Property Owned
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission (the “Commission”)

Date: October 29, 2019

Re: P&Z Special Hearing (the “Special Hearing”) dated September 24, 2019, rescheduled for October 29, 2019 regarding the Permit Application (the Permit Application”) of Waveny Care Life Networks, Inc. (WCLN”), Waveny Care Center Health Services, Inc. (“WCCHS”) and the New Canaan Historical Society, Inc. (“NCHS, WCLN, WCCHS and NCHS are collectively referred to herein as the “Applicants”) pertaining to the properties located at 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840 (the “Subject Properties”)

Pursuant to Section 8-3(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 8.2.C.3.c and 8.2.D.3.e of the New Canaan Zoning Regulations, the undersigned, as owners of the following properties within five hundred (500’) feet of the Subject Properties, hereby object to, protest and oppose the Applications filed by the Applicants.

[Owner Signature]

[Print Name]

[Address of Property Owned]
Greetings,

Stop the proposed development at 65 Oenoke Ridge

**Signatures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Oenoke Development Project</td>
<td>2019-09-10</td>
<td>Gabriel Tume</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Frank</td>
<td>2019-09-10</td>
<td>Stephanie Curin</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Saverin</td>
<td>2019-09-10</td>
<td>Maizie Underwood</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Green</td>
<td>2019-09-10</td>
<td>Peter Warner</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Essex</td>
<td>2019-09-14</td>
<td>Abigail Hadley</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayne Benton</td>
<td>2019-09-14</td>
<td>Roy Abramowitz</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Connors</td>
<td>2019-09-14</td>
<td>George Henschel</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Hudson</td>
<td>2019-09-14</td>
<td>Linda Simons</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wil Warren</td>
<td>2019-09-14</td>
<td>Austin Meredith</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Simon</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>Kyle Vaneekeren</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Sheppard</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>Mark Ferrara</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Krug</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>Pavel Plechacek</td>
<td>2019-10-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Keating</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>Demari Watst</td>
<td>2019-10-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage Mcdowell</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>2019-10-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOEL ARMijo</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>Jose Alvear</td>
<td>2019-10-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estela T</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>Harry Serhi</td>
<td>2019-10-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Samsel</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>Logan Riddle</td>
<td>2019-10-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Montoya Macias</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Jaquari Lord</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon Glover</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Ajay Bongane</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharine Mountcastle</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Rachel Moore</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Frank</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Connor Monahan</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olivia english</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Renuka das Renuka das</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Andrade</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Alexandria Phaeton</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Steele</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Sacha McClymont</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Stimpson</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Chris Foster</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hudson</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Robert Carroll</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Penman</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>savitri pal</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwyneth Walker</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>VICTOR LUNA</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty J Lovastik</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Kyle Gentry</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan L. Cerbone</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Natalie McCue</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Cerbone</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Chris Mims</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanne Casey</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Nicole Lafontant</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi Allen</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Rosalyn Nieves</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Seaman</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Joshua Allen</td>
<td>2019-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Beckett</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Mel Sauls</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Saverin</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Jennifer Pagan</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Raymond</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Yolanda Gruseke 64 Heritage Hill Road</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Einstein</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>John Collins</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Stuart</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>Kaela Church</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Shew</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Barbara Carroll</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Petitjean</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Dara Schmoyer</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip Hobbs</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Mark Mayes</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Campisi</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Cindy Firman</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Cox</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Rich Zeichner</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance York</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Diana Saverin</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Jetnil</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Brianna Murray</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Holahan</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Mya Draper</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Ethridge</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Amy Hattaway</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robert afong</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kirstyn Wesley</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Seelert</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Ethan Denman</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelli Bussan</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>David Usrey</td>
<td>2019-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffy Andrada</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Meme Rorie</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Mohamad</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Joseph Vitaliano</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presley Dillon</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Tamar Machaidze #</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Howarth</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Joseph Mcdonough</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Lawer</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Carla Muir-Robinson</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice Laird Lair</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Aspen Lair</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Beecher</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Lexie C</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lally Jurcik</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Mia Gonzalez</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca Romano</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Sayyed Hussain</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Davis</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>David Carel</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA BENINGTON</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Bradley Mayfield</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorsey Horowitz</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Nate Nelson</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tierney</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Ilyse Simon rdn cdn</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Sligar</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Ali Francolla</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretel Schneider</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Sasha Swerdlow</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Stumpenhagen</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Steve Swerdlow</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Walker</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kaisa Anderson</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Cohen</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Chad Baum</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Wexler</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Derrick Bowlin</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Buczkiewicz</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Alden Duren</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbe Walter</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Matthew Kruse</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristen Mccaughey</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Jlynne Berning</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Hepler</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Natalie Ann Cruz</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staige Grymes</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Charlotte Heward</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Liberi</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>REGINA HUNI</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Casey</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Linda Johnson</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Stone</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Faisal Ahmad</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Harris</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Nora Lechowicz</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Walter</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>John Gillam, III</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luba Radoslavova</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Alayna Rogers</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Brennan</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Lori Ferrell</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carol schofield</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kara Kortum</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jackie g</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Bailey Studebaker</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite Aitken</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Ashona Ingram</td>
<td>2019-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Miller</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Missy Ham</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrianne Davenport</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Jainish Amin</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Tropeano</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kevin Ledford</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bliss</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kyle Lessard</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor Gaydon</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Joshua Stanek</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Lee</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kaiya Peytcheva</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Scheidl</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Hunter Jeffs</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Cuoco</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Leslie Little</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joel adelman</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kadin Selzler</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Wingent</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>mariah zerillo</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Powell</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Mohit Mehta</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Hennessy</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Queen Obosu</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Sandor</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Brandy Turcotte</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randi Eckstein</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Marie Fogli</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Buzzeo</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Joseph Illingworth</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Alechman</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Patrick McMullen</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa Percy</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Erin Girondo</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Bain-Colon</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Nicholas Claude Colabella</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna Twichell</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Marcy D H McKee</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Reda</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Suzanne Conron</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi Findlay</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Michael Dorfsman</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Gallagher</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Anthony Balsam</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Wingent</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Allen Rosenquist</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra DiCamillo</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>bethany zralka</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Wingent</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Diego Betancourt</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neele Stichnoth</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Alan Sheiner</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Alter</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Eloise H.P. Killeffer</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Cromwell</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>James H. Riehl, Jr.</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Andres Rodriguez</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Frances Jeffrey</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Kilkenny</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Greg Carlon</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON NICHOLAS</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Sara Lou Wolter</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devani Maijala</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Jerry Camporine</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Spring</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>steven altieri</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Celaya</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Jennifer Altieri</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalit Tyagi</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Lon Gashi</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Chimera</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Mark Strachan</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazuko Franklin</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Brett Nardini</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Robillard</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Byron Kittle</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnie Miller</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Margaret Kittle</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Kaluba</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Karen Bodick</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giny Apy</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Timothy Hanlon</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Beebe</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Patricia Beyer</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Shaw</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Ellen Ryon</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabe Stark</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>James Kelly</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Brannan</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Nate Bowie</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jane vanderzee</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Naomi Heim</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Hodges</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Ted Beyer</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanka Bryan-Bybel</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kenneth Reilly</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahfeen Qureshi</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Robert Gardner</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Powilatis</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Donald Bodick</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Brennan</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Michael Buscher</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Williams</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Kevin Sheridan</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura Sieghart</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Melissa Martella</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bouton</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Qu’Neisha Lewis</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Villegas</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>David Douglas</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunaina Bhagwani</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Edward Douglas</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Cheslok</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Jane A. Dweck</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Jones</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Jack S Dweck</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Webster</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>john mooney</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Kennelly</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Beth Petrunoff</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Morgan</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Denis Colacicco</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cait Newman</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>erika long</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon Mearkle</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Katherine Sullivan</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Acevedo</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Norman Brown Jr.</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karie Kelly</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Wilifel Masong</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Pascal</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Sue S. Gress</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Hostetter</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Paul Shotton</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Zhang</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Robert Carpenter</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Hoffman</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Fred &amp; Brigitte Campano</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talia Silvestro</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Joseph Mason</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Thomas</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Jenna Tools</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Russell</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Eleanor Shotton</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Halpert</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Cindy Still</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Dijs</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Laurie and Chuck Balestrino</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura Delany</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Holly M Watts</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren Larkin</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Robert Thesing</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taryn sonesson</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Beverly Burch</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Henderson</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Elizabeth Torrenzano</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Marschalk</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>robert bayne, jr</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Dixon</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Janet Schmitz</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Lorenz</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Lynda Shotton</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Montee</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>rylie dehart</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Knight</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>David Burns</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Keane</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>Daniel Douglas</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Civitillo</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Alexander Trofimov</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Tiani</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Joseph Duffy</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Dolby</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Jack Hawkins</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Grunberg</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Bradley Berger</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Saddler-Hsu</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Arthur Berry</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha king</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Cynthia MacCollum</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Jardim</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Steven Barlow</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shana Halsey</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Monica Lee</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Schoonmaker</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Karl Slatoff</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Fulk</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>J clive Thatcher</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Smith</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Scott Dudley</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Dyrvik</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Kieran Kilkenny</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jera flood</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Brenda Walston</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Clemente</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Ava Albrecht</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Glass</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Zack Crawford</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Higgins</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Kelly Akehurst</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Brossy</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Scott McMurry</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Howe</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Jasmine Baylon</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Schott</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Michelle Diliberto</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Flynn Gerritsen</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Christian meg</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Silverman</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>William Mix</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lochtefeld</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Alfie Wong</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa Mellinger</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Lily Patton</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tucker wilson</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Sarah Shevchik</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Basaran</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Liza Wong</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Mitchell</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>David Staheli</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana McKenna</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Diane Gennaro</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Scardino</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>James Buckner</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Prescott</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>David Williams</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Barn</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Aurelio Alvarez</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inga Smith</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Mohamed Hassan</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie gri</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Jack Howard</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Johnson</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Mary TILGHMAN</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Fewster</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Bruce Berger</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Michalik, PhD</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Alfred Morris</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Barber</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Kristin Womack</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Robinson</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Suzanne and George Megrue</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Krongard</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Bridget Barket</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Sahaguian</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Christie Ulrich</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Walsh</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Micaela Porta</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Kimble</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Silvana Grant</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Pacheco</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Martha Maloney</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Mazar</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Troy Nelson</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Simpson</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Isabel Lane</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Patrick</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Joseph Busak</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Krivo</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Jahqual mumford</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Harris</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Caroline Turpin</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIKA DAVIES</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>kELLY O'Connor</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ Taylor</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Jack Trifero</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arianne Kolb</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Jackson Smallman</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Townshend</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Deborah Dayton</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Potter</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Phyllis Mason</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Magliacano</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Steve Zales</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Zuckerman</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Destiney Walters</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Schmidt</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Elizabeth Martin Smith</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Haselberger</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Nameerah Ali</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Petkovich</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Anne Hutcheson</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin O'Brien</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Rodney Strong</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Emerson</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Denise Mihailoff</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Holme</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Kayla Powe</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Wingent</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Catherine Hollstein</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Palanza</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Daniel and Linda O'Donnell</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrianne Silva</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Jacob Song</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Gregorio</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Yvette Slatoff</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gregorio</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Ron Ulrich</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefania Bopp</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Triniry Moore</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Burns</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>wayne seltzer</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana Carmack</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>freda seltzer</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Ziesing</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Deryl Jahnke</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keturah Bracey</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>Dan Shevchik</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Daly</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>hamdi abdikadir</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Weber Reid</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Ron Fine</td>
<td>2019-10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Scholl</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Tina Miller</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances O'Neil</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Charlotte Britt</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Perkins</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Tiny Tim</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Jonker</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Amanda G</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Peters</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Michaela Grace</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>megan abramczyk</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Garrett</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>ANNE DIFRANCESCO</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Choyce</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Cynthia Reed</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Villarreal</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Justin Podlesak</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miredel cortes</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>chris sullivan</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Gesualdi</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Nancy Gilbert</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Crokenden</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Angela Materna</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miladys Alvarez</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Skilyn Roberts</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rachel lampen</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Layne Allen</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Silverman</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Julia Bergheim</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Polk</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Wenbo Shao</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niva li</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>William Parrett</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Zamora</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Diane Parrett</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Silverman</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Stephanie Mercer</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dave hamburger</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Christine Place</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Crisafulli</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Devon Burger</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharani Kurma</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Don Hawks</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Harris</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Guy Porpora</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesly Vasquez</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Kate Watts</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine MacKenzie</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>yeet yotre</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Mayer</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Sebastian Sanchez</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze Hobbs</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Todd Bruno</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Cohen</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>John Fusek</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariko LeBaron</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Zoe Shaw</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Varvatos</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Don Shaw</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zame Sparsity</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Tony Gay</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Reid</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Abbi Smith</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wilson</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Virginia Ayres</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Cross</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Madison Mager</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Stewart</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>cxshy gage</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Slade</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>James Thompson</td>
<td>2019-10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera M. Russo</td>
<td>2019-09-20</td>
<td>Erica Fenelus</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Betts</td>
<td>2019-09-21</td>
<td>Mayree Clark</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karina Salazar</td>
<td>2019-09-21</td>
<td>Joe Castro</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn O'Brien</td>
<td>2019-09-21</td>
<td>Gisele Spencer</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Warren</td>
<td>2019-09-21</td>
<td>Jonathan Martin</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charles Clary</td>
<td>2019-09-21</td>
<td>Krin Asselta</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Finn</td>
<td>2019-09-21</td>
<td>Thomas Materna</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Prostor</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Calan Moses</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Case</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Harrison Whitaker</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Miller</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Arshia Verma</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Case</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Jessica Pearson</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Davenport Kavookjian</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>david martinez</td>
<td>2019-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Toughill</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Craig Hoelzer</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Creedon</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Norbert Tuma</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sandra rose</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Hunter Duncan</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Chan</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Shyanna Costa</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haik Kavookjian</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Troy Shipley</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Luchs</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Debbie Volpe</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Jeanniedhart@gmail.com">Jeanniedhart@gmail.com</a> Hart</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Mike Elliott</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo BIGI</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Sylvia Pew</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavia Bigi</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Smita Singh</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Winalski</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Casey Whitlow</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Carles</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Pauleen Lorenzo</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Saldarelli</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Marlene Green</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Bossin</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Stewart Bradley</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Matthews</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>rilie russell</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mila Halsey</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Jeremy Walden</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjie Halsey</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Noah Forker</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Longfield</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Abigail Devine</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Bossin</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Nhiyeil Anderson</td>
<td>2019-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Gallagher</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Alice Carter</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Burley</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Mariham Latif</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Minter</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>Michael Lombardi</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Winalski</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Khanh Trinh</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Miller</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Uncle Dick</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Longfield</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>LAVIO LAVANA</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa Ives</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>LOLA Gentry</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Marshall</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Frank</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Sally Davis</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Murphy</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>John Dunn</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Coffey</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>MinhTrang Tran</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ansaldi</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Brittany Bray</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Hoffhine</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Adrianne Farmer</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Coffey</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>William Donovan</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hunkeler</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Alexander Rockwell</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David E. Moran</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Robert Bundy</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Loomis</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Cade Foriester</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>william curren</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>vera rahn</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Watts</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Ellie Bowman</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Townshend, Jr.</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Hannah S</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Kelly</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Mary Treece</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace Blackwood</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>Jovana Ramirez</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Lewis</td>
<td>2019-09-23</td>
<td>carole buffett</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Besgen Jr</td>
<td>2019-09-24</td>
<td>Sheila Klein</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelli Birk</td>
<td>2019-09-24</td>
<td>Jackson Cruise</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Murphy</td>
<td>2019-09-24</td>
<td>Karen Szymanski</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Sanders</td>
<td>2019-09-24</td>
<td>David Ham</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Buscher</td>
<td>2019-09-24</td>
<td>Alice Donnelly</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khambia Clarkson</td>
<td>2019-09-24</td>
<td>Jacob Essick</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Roach</td>
<td>2019-09-24</td>
<td>mimi dickerson</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Downey</td>
<td>2019-09-24</td>
<td>Alva Solomon</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robert Albus</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>Sharie McDougald</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Clancy</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>John Dickerson</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Gerges</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>Tina Pursley</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Handler</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>Ahree Kelly</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katherine sullivan</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>Karen Camporeale</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alexander watson</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>Dudu Budu</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callie Creighton</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>Laura King</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Dewey</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>Anne E. Marasco</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Dewey</td>
<td>2019-09-25</td>
<td>Ana-Maria Leeming</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Willis</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Lex Leeming</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander E. Carles</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>avery cates</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alek Roomet</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Nanna Sigurdardottir</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla Kollar</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Susan Leeming</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Dooley</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Faith Shepard</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addie vaughan</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Shyanne Carrero</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Mahoney</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>kyah robinson</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allie Hanks</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Judy Devine</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Roomet</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Anita Custer</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Manion</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Violeta Rodriguez</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lindholm</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Laura Rubinfeld</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Tonkovich</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Adam Rey</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Marich</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Miriam Bardales</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Berkman</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Jason Yanes</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaso Koumasidis</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Hailey Silva</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Armijo</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Rajaa Laaribi</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steven davis</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Wendy Cutler</td>
<td>2019-10-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dena Savage</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Seth Williamson</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Holland</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Robin Beckett</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia Hearle</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Sarah Jones</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnulfo Becerra-garcia</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Kevin Hampshire</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Pelham</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Sammy Walkey</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Corpening</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Shahitta Crouch</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Shambrock</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Brianna Pol</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Streinger</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Vickash Moonassar</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Benetti</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Erynn Jensen</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yilian Herrera moro</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>sydney Baca</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Merwin</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Juniper Luna</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Hlubek</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Nancy Parisi</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mickey squishy</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>Latifa Jaafar</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Hudak</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Jayden Trowers</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Kilarjian</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Haifa Dakdouk</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Holani</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Alan Marzullo</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alison Salerno</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Edward Abrams</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanani Awong</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Karina Diaz</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Ray</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Cheyenna Johnson</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Thomas</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Dana Mallozzi</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Colbath</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Kathy Fraino</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Burns</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Najwa Alawar</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Megrue-Smith</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Christopher West</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Holmes</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Karen LaFavor</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Fox</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Kaylin Adams</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorisa Harris</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Johnd On</td>
<td>2019-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Dorney</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Natalie Petersen</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Kamalii</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Blake Greiner</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward McCarrick</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Christopher Mattern</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Castleberry</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Mark Bell</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Howard</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Codey Shaffer</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Andre Weiland</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Tyler Clark</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Gannalo</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Paul Gjuraj</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne Case</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Yolanda Gjuraj</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Raleigh</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Dakota Bercik</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Liu</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Nancy Scranton</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Clarner</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Sarah Mattern</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah VanDivner</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Maddie Liedtke</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel c Adelman</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Camille Depalo</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Starobin</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Lily Besler</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Grillo</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>Sara Firdous</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Williams</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Patricia Greeney</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Sweetser</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Betty Lou Nakila</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert LaPlant</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Noella L</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Dingwell</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Stephanie Goodman</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Gulka</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Brian Moynihan</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Alex</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Colton Stewart</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Lopez</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Lauren Holt</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Fleming</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Charrylynstar Moltaikwari</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Druckenmiller</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Lauren Amick</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Vandunk</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Brocky Harrington</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Hunkeler</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Jean M Queen</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stevens</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Baylor Beitel</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Norman</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Ellen Kieman</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mara Vazquez</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Susan George</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyla condon</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Kaya Benjes</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer corniello</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>David Bao</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Mendez</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Elisabeth Pope</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Ritchie</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Charlie Nevin</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Mendez</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Ian Morgan</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany Hubert</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Jimmy Jallilul</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Quinonez</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Samuel Gonzalez</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Williams</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>melody goldenloo</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Patel</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>chloe gray</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Torres-Batara</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Margaret Worthington Gilson</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Rodriguez</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>Rebecca Paniwozik</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Gonzalez</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Chris Woodhouse</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiyah Boston</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>J.R. Golon</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Garcia</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Mary Herzog</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin King</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Barbara Mason</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie McPartland</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Carys Lucas</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Ortega</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>KEVIN GALLO</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy Jones</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Kerry Curran</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Elbaz</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Zach Stoner</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Terenzio</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Lawrence Apo</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Sechan</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Brittney Wildasin</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Sechan</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Joe Hakimov</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Farmer</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Douglas George</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustin Standage</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Judith Kamerschen</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina DeBeradinis</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Pamela Valentine</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim Potanin</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Per Holmberg</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Potanina</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Tammie Stimack</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Simpson</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Deasia White</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksm smith</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Cristian Rivera</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Arango</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Katie Brooks</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Lettersheck</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Kaleb Travis</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kero lol</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Hayley Dennis</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bruno</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Kaylie Rickert</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Welch-Reynolds</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Ella Sweeney</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Wood</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Landan Smith</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janay Machado</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Annie Read</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Nagle</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Nathaniel Warren</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaie Natson</td>
<td>2019-09-29</td>
<td>Nico and Elee Friarton</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Corbet</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>nasia smith</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Hillermann</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Nate Thaler</td>
<td>2019-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Fox</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Claude I Herring</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Olson</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Jennifer Barrett</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Fernandez</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Layla Phommakhy</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Pullin</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Katie and James Dunning</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Chavarria</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Pieter Engel</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Looney</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>matt sheffer</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyree Adams</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Ryan Brim</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Crosby</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Alexandria Fillers</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracie Lang</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Christopher Hann</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madelyn Radel</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Leslie Mitchell</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendon Winters</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>ROGER SAUNDERS</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Beatty</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Rosalia Cogswell</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivette Maldonado</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Michael Cavins</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McCormick</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Xavier Krach</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beatriz viacava-goulet</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Chelsea W</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody Ford</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Arnaya Gonzalez</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carles</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Eli Miller</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyra robinson</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Drew Mills</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Horton</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>Kathleen Patten</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Webster</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Joey Winder</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Zeiders</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Hussein Charara</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Bucciarelli</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Gabriel Alarcon</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Gibson</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Cindy Yoo</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Bledsoe</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Rosalie Nava</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bayzick</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Haylie Atwell</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himanshu Chaudhry</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Michelle Salomon</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobin Moon</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Connor Mohoney</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Bubrosky</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Izzy Barreiro</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Bizal</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Laurin White</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa May</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Matthew Taylor</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leticia de Pimentel</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Colleen McManus</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauchlan Gibson</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Alex Hobbs</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Moore</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Marty Skrelunas</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA AI</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Gillian Brown</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Buchanan</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Alejandro Tarango</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Buchanan</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Sebastian Saucedo</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Lover</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Ramtin Sarparast</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Chaisson</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Madds C</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luna Brambila</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Tony Kaye</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Ross</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Reto Koller</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Baer</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Kate Koller</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hoag</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Meredith Landis</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder Stokes</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Barbara Teichgraeber</td>
<td>2019-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha Nguyen manh</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Julio Zamora</td>
<td>2019-10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Previdi</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Abigail Canoe</td>
<td>2019-10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvin Malboa</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Iris Choi</td>
<td>2019-10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Cadiou</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Christine McRedmond</td>
<td>2019-10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Meier</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>milani castanon</td>
<td>2019-10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerri Crume</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>nolan schreiber</td>
<td>2019-10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arne Thune</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Rodrigo Cota</td>
<td>2019-10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryann Rossi</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Teresa Girolamo</td>
<td>2019-10-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina Yuupov</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Andrew Zappelli</td>
<td>2019-10-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alethia Pappageorge</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Deborah Haines</td>
<td>2019-10-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian McGough</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Robert Geitz</td>
<td>2019-10-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Perez</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Amy Sales</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle McAllister</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Pamela Stutz</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIE KING</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Michelle Reutter</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Mcfarland</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Celina Antal</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarrett Osborne</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Arshad Allibhai</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra Leskanich</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Addison Creel</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rommel Lachapelle</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Jessica Bottini</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Tomalin</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Susannah Dacey</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Desmond</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Andrew Dacey</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mikey iszczak</td>
<td>2019-10-02</td>
<td>Alexandra Stinchcomb</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Dann</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Ballsack Johnson</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewie Steward</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Jenesiz Mendoza</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia Ketarkus</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Charles Blin</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Menjivar</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Elisei Mica</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>em vu</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Hayden Garner</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolan Scrale</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Andrew Liu</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Polnareff</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Nick Krapek</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari Dominguez</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Igor Kurtukov</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nataliah Castro</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Jason Williams</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trey Druvenga</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Valeri Whitmer</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Bushey</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Charlotte Mayer</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Little</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Kevin Lawson</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peg Skelton</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Sophia Hagendorf</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Mchenry</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Josh Stinchcomb</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael Flores</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Frederick Whitmer</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben K</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Julian Bailon</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jackson</td>
<td>2019-10-03</td>
<td>Heather Stormy</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Liberti</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>Lawrence Frost</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Boss</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>Ashley Patterson</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Garcia</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>Reyjay Collazo</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Belopolski</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>Audrey long</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo Lopez</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>Brad Souvigny</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir Garcia</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>christine ross</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddy Boy</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>Phyllis Antush</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Courtesis</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>WILLIAM PIKE</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Dann</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>Annemarie Simko</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keifer Sroka</td>
<td>2019-10-04</td>
<td>Colette LeBrun</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristin Evans</td>
<td>2019-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Toris</td>
<td>2019-10-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zander Stolp</td>
<td>2019-10-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Ocegueda</td>
<td>2019-10-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Real AssBtch</td>
<td>2019-10-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susanna Anderson</td>
<td>2019-10-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Kuzmics</td>
<td>2019-10-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recipient: New Canaan Connecticut P&Z

Letter: Greetings,

Stop the proposed development at 65 Oenoke Ridge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Essex</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-15</td>
<td>&quot;Stop the overdevelopment of New Canaan.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia English</td>
<td>Wilton, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>&quot;I am signing this petition against the 65 Oenoke proposal, as this proposed project would destroy the historic and bucolic nature of our village/town. New Canaan needs to retain its unique feel in order to attract new, and maintain current, residents. Building a large venue like this in a residential area right next to our historic center would be an enormous mistake. If we lose our town’s character, we will become indeterminate like every other town and will have an even harder time attracting families in this temporary market downtown. We need to take the long view and protect what we have. Sincerely, Olivia B. English&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty J. Lovastik</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>&quot;While I understand the need for a CCRC in New Canaan, the size of this project on less than 1 acre of land, will have a looming effect in the area. The P+Z Commission allowed for zoning changes for a developer to proceed with the Merritt Village project despite over 1,000 signatures against it. New Canaan P+Z Commission, please stop changing our regulations to allow developers to alter the character of New Canaan.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Beckett</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-16</td>
<td>&quot;No change in zoning should be approved. This is an inappropriate choice of a location for the proposed development. If there is sufficient need for such a development, it would be better placed near the core of the town, on a flat parcel, with easy access to the downtown and its amenities—shops, library, theater, restaurants—and the transportation hub. The Schoolhouse parking lot is one possible location. Pine Street is another. And the design, mass and scope of the facility should be consistent with the character of the town utilizing the multitude of amenities that already exist here not building more.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Beecher</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>&quot;A development of this scale has no place in downtown New Canaan. Why bother even putting it downtown? It seems as though it has been designed so that the residents never need to leave its confines.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Carter</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>&quot;Please please stop! This will detract from the beautiful character of New Canaan. Also, we have a glut of housing already with a huge development being built new St A’s. We don’t need more congestion, traffic and big buildings. Let’s give business to the bars, restaurants, and theater already downtown! I know the petitions for Merritt Village and to stop that awful wall didn’t do anything, but still signing here and praying that we don’t totally kill the New Canaan charm, culture and property values.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Schofield</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>&quot;I object to the scope (largeness) of the project given its proposed location. Choose a more fitting location in town.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Powell</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>&quot;too large f1r the property&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Sandor</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>“The Town should have purchased Merritt Apts for Senior housing. They knew this was the last best place for the units - Kevin Moynihan was on this committee.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Gallagher</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>“The proposed retirement home is too massive for Oenoke Ridge Road! Why would New Canaan P&amp;Z even consider such a huge building in a historical area???”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Wingent</td>
<td>Urchfont, England, UK</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>“I have family in New Canaan and know it well and the last thing this beautiful town needs in another unnecessary development! And please don’t use the “it’s for seniors” excuse. There are enough developments for them without ruining New Canaan to accommodate the oldies. It’s a town for young families so they could put the old folk on the outskirts! The site was intended for a single family home NOT a massive housing complex so please keep it that way. Thank you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Wingent</td>
<td>Devizes, England, UK</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>“This is far too large a development for the historic town. By all means have a place for the seniors but on the outskirts of town and leave more room for young families. I am speaking as a senior myself.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Spring</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>“This is an overbuilt facility. In the wrong place given St. Mark's Great Lawn, New Canaan's Historic District- the northern gateway to our small town. I have confidence the Waveny network can find an alternate and more suitable location for this important facility.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giny Apy</td>
<td>new canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>“I hope the board of the historical society understands the amount of support they will see vanish by selling house to be torn down to make this happen. I support idea but not location, we can do better.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Lorenz</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2019-09-17</td>
<td>“This looks so cheap. Brokers are already having a tough time selling houses in this down market and this eye sore would have been a deterrent if I was out searching for a home now and not two years ago. The town should be focusing on working with landlords and commercial owners on Elm and Main to attract exciting and viable businesses as it’s now starting to look like a ghost town. This is the wrong way to keep this town thriving! So so sad this is even a possibility.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Clemente</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>“Sheila Clemente”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Flynn</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>“That Is not the place for something that big. It just isn’t.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lochtefeld</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>“We need to stop overdevelopment in town”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa Mellinger</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>“Enough is enough”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie gri</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>“Developers are ruining our town”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Pacheco</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>“The zoning is there to stop this kind of buildings in town. Please don’t change it so just a few people can make money affecting all of us who live here.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gregorio</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-18</td>
<td>“This proposal is enormously inappropriate for the location. It would change the character and nature of the surrounding area including the Historic District forever. If this type of retirement housing for the affluent elderly is needed it should be done at a different location. Even a scaled down version would be destructive. Just say NO!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Crookenden</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>“This proposal is completely inappropriate and massively out of scale for this location. Zoning is in place for just this reason - to protect against overzealous developers. There may be a need and a place for senior living but this is NOT the solution. Uphold our zoning and preserve our town’s center for uses consistent with its beauty and character.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Case</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-22</td>
<td>“I'm signing because this type of development simply does not fit in the historic town center of New Canaan. It will ruin the aesthetic of the town, and completely disrupt the flow of traffic.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander E. Carles</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
<td>“I find the scale and aesthetic to be so shocking that it blows my mind that it would be considered. We need to get the word out. This may also be a Trojan horse for something equally as terrible but smaller. Both unacceptable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Megru-Smith</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-27</td>
<td>“There must be a better location for a development that is this large! please not in the historic district right next to the Historical Society!! Love the mission to expand retirement housing…but in a more appropriate location.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Raleigh</td>
<td>Norwalk, CT</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
<td>“We do not need this major development in our town. New Canaan should remain the lovely town it is.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Buchanan</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>“We are sympathetic to the need for senior housing in New Canaan but this is not the right location for such a development. It is not compatible with the surrounding historic, residential and sacred aesthetic.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Baer</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>“What is going on at the planning and zoning board that they would not throw this out after one meeting”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Sheiner</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
<td>“The P&amp;Z folks have a responsibility to preserve what makes New Canaan so special and not just give in to developers who merely want short term financial reward and leave permanent damage in their wake.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Ryon</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-09</td>
<td>&quot;The size and scope of this project is out of line for this property.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Brown</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
<td>&quot;The scale of the project overwhelms that neighborhood and will increase congestion in that area.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Shotton</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
<td>&quot;The proposed location on Oenoke Ridge is far too small and utterly inappropriate for a development of this size.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred &amp; Brigitte Campano</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-10</td>
<td>&quot;brigitte &amp; Fred Campano - why so close to town and not further up north - the traffic is already worse than in NYC - especially where we live on Heritage Hill - EVERYBODY speeds and endangers the life of a street where mostly seniors live in about 140 condos - stop this nonsense&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfie Wong</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
<td>&quot;We moved to NC for it's charm. It's no longer the same with all the commercialization already in the downtown area.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Buckner</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
<td>&quot;Dislike turning the town into a horizontal skyscraper.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E Kranzlin</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-11</td>
<td>&quot;I'm signing because I don't think this type of building belongs in this spot.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Materna</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-13</td>
<td>&quot;If so many zoning laws have to be changed to allow for such a project to proceed, why has it even gone this far? What's the point in the zoning regulations if we don't follow them or can change them at will? This project has no place being squeezed into an area that is intended for single family use. I would hate to live over there if this is allowed. Plus the complete destruction of the habitat in that area would be irreparably harmful and shameful.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Holt</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-20</td>
<td>&quot;As a seventh generation New Canaanite I am horrified at many recent developments in the town that my family has loved and occupied for centuries. Short-sightedness in the face of the almighty dollar should have no place in this town. The Historical Society stands to gain - why not pledge an annual amount to this valuable institution so that it will not have to prostitute its land (and supposed institutional values) in order to survive for more generations of my family. Please reach out to all of your neighbors and friends in town who may have pitched the &quot;giant postcard&quot; in the recycling bin without giving it the benefit of a thorough reading, so they can sign as well. This plan is atrocious.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean M Queen</td>
<td>Williamstown, MA</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
<td>&quot;My family owned 24 Oenoke Ridge, across from the Historical Society, for 44 years, so I knew the neighborhood well. It has always been the charming heart of New Canaan. Historical buildings have anchored the town, yet they are rapidly disappearing, their uniqueness lost to massive buildings that destroy the essential character of the town. My husband and I moved away with our children in 1985, just as this move began. I see this development project as the fatal blow to what was a wonderful community in which to grow up. It seeks to capitalize on a small space, crowding high paying residents in what appears to be an attempt to bully and diminish what has been established for many years. Why? Why there? Aren't there other spaces that would not have as severe impact in size, light pollution, traffic on the neighbors? Frankly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Duffy</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-21</td>
<td>“I do not want a building such as this taking away the few open spaces that are left in this area. It will also cause an increase in the amount of daily traffic along this road.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Cohen</td>
<td>New Canaan, CT</td>
<td>2019-10-27</td>
<td>“My wife and I have lived in NC for over 20 years. NC is losing its “small town feeling”. Building this monstrosity would be a big mistake!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 24, 2019

Dear brothers and sisters in Christ,

We write with an update on the Vestry’s discernment related to Waveny LifeCare Network’s proposal to build a senior housing development adjacent to St. Mark’s campus. The Vestry met on Sunday, September 22 and voted not to support the proposed project. Shortly after the meeting, we met with Waveny’s leadership and informed them of the Vestry’s decision.

The decision was not reached lightly. We have a long and broad shared history. St. Mark’s had an instrumental role in the founding of the Inn over 30 years ago, and many of you are Waveny residents, clients, or volunteers. Waveny is a treasured organization in New Canaan.

Mindful of the importance and complexities of this issue, immediately following Waveny’s presentation to us on July 28 the Vestry appointed a subcommittee to research the proposal and its impact on St. Mark’s. On August 7, you all received a letter inviting your comments. Shortly thereafter, we engaged counsel with experience in New Canaan property and zoning matters. A special meeting of the Vestry was convened on Tuesday, September 17 at which the subcommittee shared its diligence, and the Vestry began discernment.

Taking into account the information provided by the subcommittee, independent review of the application before Planning & Zoning, advice of counsel, and your input, the Vestry engaged in thoughtful and faithful discernment. Concluding that the proposed project would permanently and meaningfully interfere with our campus and impede St. Mark’s ministry, the Vestry voted not to support it.
We thank you for your thoughtful input and for your prayers.

Faithfully,

The Reverend Peter Walsh
Rector

Stan Twardy
Senior Warden

Mark Thorsheim
Junior Warden
November 11, 2019

Dear brothers and sisters in Christ,

*Grace and Peace to you from God our Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ.* (Philippians 1:2)

We write with an update from your Vestry on its work regarding Waveny LifeCare Network’s project proposed for the lots next to the St. Mark’s campus. The Vestry members are mindful of their primary responsibility for “the property and business affairs of the Parish” (as it says in our By-Laws), as well as the importance of this issue for so many. Much has happened since we last wrote at the end of September. There have been many thoughtful conversations amongst the people of St. Mark’s and between the leadership of St. Mark’s and of Waveny. Though we greatly honor our friends at Waveny, the Vestry at its last meeting re-affirmed our opposition to the proposed project in this location.

**These are the primary concerns:** while we are devoted to elder care, we are committed to maintaining St. Mark’s property rights and we believe the size and density of the proposed project on this site would negatively impact the life of our campus.

**We are devoted to elder care.** Of course, St. Mark’s parishioners and ministries care for the seniors of the parish and the greater New Canaan community as an integral part of daily church life. Moreover, in the mid 1970’s when a group of New Canaanites sought a location for elder housing, St. Mark’s made it possible for The New Canaan Inn to be built. We carved out 1.5 acres of our land, contributed 60% of the purchase price, and loaned the balance, extending that loan term to 20 years interest free. We also gave up ownership of our driveway to become the entrance to the Inn, maintaining a right-of-way for St. Mark’s. Fifteen years later, when the Inn wanted to purchase the adjacent lot (parcel 893, behind the yellow house), St. Mark’s gave a grant to help make it happen.

**We are committed to maintaining our property rights.** Our predecessors generously supported the Inn, and wisely protected our property and the parish’s interests at the same time. The deed for the Inn property contains some restrictions on appearance and use, including a provision for St. Mark’s to resume ownership under certain circumstances. The deed for parcel 893 grants St. Mark’s a right of first opportunity to purchase it in the event of a transfer. Those prudent Vestries understood that neighboring uses matter, and that supporting the public good should not put at risk the sacred beauty and open use of our campus. The proposed merger of these two lots with the third (the yellow house) to accommodate this project threatens St. Mark’s property rights.
We believe the size and density of the proposed project would negatively impact the life of our campus. Our campus in its current form and setting is an integral part of St. Mark's life and New Canaan life: as the setting for worship, celebration, mourning and fellowship; for Preschool, Food Pantry, Boy Scouts and Men's Club; for vigil when the community is in pain; and for the work of so many service organizations in town. And no ministry reaches to every corner of the campus more than May Fair. For 10 days in May as rides and tents are erected, hundreds of volunteers come and go, and the Holy Smokers take over the lower parking lot, the campus is transformed for fun and fellowship, generating grants to community organizations from the proceeds. The addition of over 100 neighbors, their staff, visitors and caretakers will bring a concentration of activity at the edge of and onto the campus that will sometimes be at odds with these ministries in ways known and yet unknown.

Looking ahead
At the next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on Tuesday, November 19, representatives of St. Mark's and others opposing the project will provide a fulsome description of why Waveny's proposed design and scale are problematic for this location. We as a body are compassionate for the need for affordable housing for seniors in our town and pray that a more suitable location can be located for such a project.

We understand that the Vestry's position is prudent for some and painful for others. With prayerful hearts we are seeking to do the right thing for the parish in the long run.

If you have any questions or comments, please be in touch with us. In addition, please hold the whole community in prayer.

Faithfully,

The Reverend Peter Walsh
Rector

Stan Twardy
Senior Warden

Mark Thorsheim
Junior Warden
Planning & Zoning Commission  
Town of New Canaan  

Attn: John Goodwin, Chairman  

Re: Application of Waveny LifeCare Network to Construct a Retirement Complex at 65 Oenoke Ridge

September 30, 2019

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the P&Z Commission;

The New Canaan Preservation Alliance submits herewith the unanimous opposition of our Board of Directors to the proposed construction of a residential complex for seniors at 65 Oenoke Ridge Road (the “CCRC”). Our rejection of the proposal is based on the extensive professional experience of the NCPA board members in architecture, engineering, city planning, historic preservation, and our long-term commitment to preserve and enhance the historic small-town character of New Canaan.

Affordable senior housing is an admirable cause that most New Canaan residents support. However, the issue is where to site a senior residential complex, and what impact it will have on the community character that brought us all to New Canaan in the first instance, and whether the location enhances or reduces the value of adjacent residential properties. The proposed Waveny CCRC is simply too massive for the site, and the three-story, two blocks-deep building will loom over the Historic District and destroy its rural historic character and sense of “place”. Visualize the exterior lighting at night, and how the building will look in the day with new landscaping after 30 plus mature trees are cut down for construction. It will dominate the view looking north from God’s Acre, and simply over-power the Historical Society campus and St. Michael’s Church. The view looking south from St. Mark’s Great Lawn, which, incidentally, was designed to merge with the rural aspect of the Historical Society buildings, will now be interrupted by the two city blocks-deep, 450 foot wide façade, designed without regard to surrounding residential architecture.
Construction of the retirement complex will require a number of P&Z approvals which are contrary to the regulations that have protected property values in the town’s single-family residential zone. These include permitting: multi-resident housing; site coverage in excess of allowed limits; reduced setbacks; building height; exterior lighting; and running a business in a residential zone. Most importantly, the NCPA, while recognizing the need for more senior housing, believes the approval to permit construction of the Waveny CCRC at the Oenoke site by the New Canaan Planning & Zoning Commission, would totally undermine the protection and guarantees that the Town’s zoning regulations afford homeowners when they purchase a home in a single family zone. The Waveny application is not a hardship for which a special zoning variance could be justified or granted.

Many neighbors, including St. Mark’s Church and the Oenoke Association, also oppose this application.

Finally, we understand there is a deed restriction that specifically limits construction to a single family house on one of the site parcels. This deed restriction runs “with the land,” and is consistent with the zoning regulations which cover the Oenoke Ridge Road neighborhood.

The P&Z Commission denied the application of Andy Glazer to re-zone the Roger Sherman Inn property for multiple single family residences in order to protect the character of the Oenoke Road neighborhood. The NCPA encourages the P&Z Commission to reject the Waveny CCRC proposal at 65 Oenoke for the same reason.

Yours Sincerely,

On behalf of
The Board of the New Canaan Preservation Alliance

Neele-Banks Stichnoth
President
By Electronic Mail

November 13, 2019

Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of New Canaan
c/o Lynn Brooks Avni
Town Planner of the Town of New Canaan
New Canaan Town Hall
77 Main Street
New Canaan, Connecticut 06840

Re: Application and Petitions respecting change in zoning for, and special permits respecting a proposal for 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge Road

Dear Honorable Chairman and Commissioners:

Please accept this letter on behalf of Frederick and Valeri Whitmer of 26 Ferris Hill Road, New Canaan as part of the public comments respecting and opposing the tripartite application respecting 65 and 73 Oenoke Ridge Road made by David J. Rucci, Esq., as Authorized Agent for the New Canaan Historical Society and Waveny Care Center Health Services, LLC (hereinafter, collectively and variably, either “Waveny” or “Applicants”). The thrust of their prayer for relief is to amend New Canaan’ Zoning Regulations, to change certain zoning boundaries and thereafter to permit an otherwise unauthorized construction of a large structure that the Applicants intend to offer as a Senior Housing residence. (hereinafter, “the Application”).

We oppose the grant of any portion of the Application. The relief Applicants seek is obviously outside the allowable limits of New Canaan’s zoning; but it is very much more: the Application utterly ignores and transgresses the legalities of zoning in the context of New Canaan’s regulatory land management scheme, and, if granted, would inflict irreparable damage on the entire zoning regime in New Canaan. We are both long-time parishioners of St. Mark’s Episcopal Church, and although we fully support St. Mark’s continued and legally justified opposition to this Application, we write separately to express our personal views in opposition. St. Mark’s neither asked us to make these comments nor reviewed them before submission.
We believe that granting Applicants the breathtakingly broad relief that they have requested from New Canaan’s carefully constructed Zoning Regulations, which have long preserved the character and aesthetics of our Town that we all cherish, would decimate the integrity of the Zoning Regulations and create vast new opportunities for other, later applications, whose aims would be less arguably beneficial than those touted by the Applicants here. Put perhaps less forcefully, the exceptions the Applicants seek here---and indeed must have as their proposal is otherwise out of bounds---in order to begin their construction would both enshrine the “exceptions” they now seek into existing law and precedent, and by virtue of have been granted those exceptions would swallow up and eliminate the rules as they exist now.

**SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS IN OPPOSITION**

For the reasons we detail here, we firmly believe that the proposal should be denied entirely.

1. Applicants support their arguments with misleading and distorted characterizations of the neighborhood. (See within, pp. 5-7)
   - The two-dimensional map shown to the Commission mischaracterizes the neighborhood as “commercial” ignoring the open landscape of St. Mark’s, the Nature Center, the Presbyterian Church and even the Historical Society.
   - The Application ignores or disregards the entirely residential neighborhood on the west side of Oenoke Ridge, directly across from the proposed facility.

2. The Applicants hyperbolically and erroneously describe the project as a one-time opportunity to serve what they strategically characterize as the “Common Good”(see pages 7-8)
   - The Application argues that no other location could be found that meets the need for senior independent housing as they perceive it---for these Applicants---itself a doubtful, but importantly, an irrelevant consideration
   - Applicants presented an unrepresentative sampling of New Canaan “seniors” as the purported designers of the project, another irrelevancy.
3. Applicants’ reliance on the support of adjacent neighbors—the New Canaan Historical Society and St. Michael’s Church—is compromised by the bias engendered by the substantial financial compensation they will receive and should not be considered as evidence of the project’s positive reception. (See p. 8-9).

4. Perhaps most important and most threateningly, the “spot zoning” that would result from rewriting the zoning regulations to fit this project would leave New Canaan vulnerable to future lawsuits by developers such as those which have been successfully waged in other towns. (See pages 9-11)

A. **REBUTTAL TO COMMENTS SUPPORTING THE APPLICATION**

I attended the October 29, 2019 Commission hearing and heard the presentation by the Applicants. I was struck by a common theme among those supporting the application, including by both the Applicants’ many speakers as well as the public comments: not one supporter addressed either the legality of the application or its overall impact on the structure of New Canaan’s zoning regime. The entire thrust of the supportive comments was the value and benefit, in the abstract to be sure, of having a facility as described in the Applicants’ materials, in New Canaan. Whether there is such value, however, is decidedly not the fulcrum on which this Application turns.

The manifest failure of supporters of this Application meaningfully to address the Application’s obvious, detrimental, indeed hostile impact on the neighborhood where the construction is proposed, and the Application’s impact on the overall structure of New Canaan’s zoning was surely no accident.

There seemed, from the very outset of the presentations and subsequent supporting comments an unspoken, though not unintended accord to focus on one asserted ‘fact’: the ‘need’ New Canaan supposedly has for such senior housing. Whether there is such a ‘need’ precisely within New Canaan’s town borders is debatable, but that ‘need,’ even if it exists, does not, alone, either support or justify laying waste to the salutary and positive effect of New Canaan’s zoning regulations. Dispassion in decision according to law, not compassion in consideration according to sentiment should be the hallmark of the Commission’s deliberations. We trust that the Commission will act in full satisfaction of its sworn duty to act rationally and legally to achieve the legitimate goals of proper zoning within our town: denial of the Application should be the result.

We firmly believe that granting this Application would in fact do violence to New Canaan’s zoning regime in many ways, which we doubt the Applicants intended, but which are both foreseeable and demonstrably negative.
The Commission’s Duty is to Enforce zoning “to enhance community character and protect the public health, safety and welfare”

The starting point of any analysis of any application should begin with an understanding of the structure and purpose of the Zoning Regulations. This Commission has articulated clearly the purpose and intent of zoning in New Canaan in the Preamble to its extensive, thoughtful and comprehensive Zoning Regulations, which we cite here as the foundation of our argument why the Application offends the regulations and should be denied:

“These Zoning Regulations are intended to guide land use activities in New Canaan in ways that will maintain and enhance community character and protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

The Planning and Zoning Commission, in recognition of the need to balance numerous factors when establishing or revising Zoning Regulations, has given careful consideration to the following:

1. Protecting natural resources;
2. Protecting existing properties and neighborhoods;
3. Allowing for new development that will be in keeping with overall community standards and meet community needs;
4. Establishing a positive approach to community development that will encourage appropriate development;
5. Promoting good civic design and arrangements;
6. Ensuring the reasonableness and legality of regulatory provisions; and
7. Furthering implementation of the New Canaan Plan of Conservation and Development.”

(emphasis supplied). And if this comprehensive statement were itself not enough, this Commission took care to make its overarching purpose even more explicit in its next paragraph.

“It is the general purpose and intent of these Regulations to foster the use and development of land in an orderly
manner by both private and public interests *with special consideration given to the appearance of the community as a result of such development.*”

(emphasis supplied throughout the foregoing citations.)

We believe that granting the Application would be contrary “to the appearance of the community” by approving a development in a disorderly way and one that would disregard nearly all of the enumerated considerations set forth by the Commission as the guiding principles of its considerations respecting land use.

Applicants have argued that the area into which the proposed project would be built is now predominantly commercial and not residential. To support that dubious assertion, the Applicants promoted a demonstrative map, which colored the campus of St. Mark’s church, the campus of the Historical Society and the New Canaan Nature Center, integral with the campus of the Presbyterian Church one color, and then isolating with another color the single family dwelling, currently owned by the Historical Society in an effort to show the supposedly non-residential nature of the neighborhood. The manifest purpose of this misleading map was to support an argument how this new, massive structure would “fit right in” to the existing neighborhood, which, according to Applicants is already primarily commercial. Applicants’ argument and support in this context are utterly misleading.

First, the representation of the neighborhood through a flat, two-dimensional map drawn from an aerial view distorts the perception of the true nature of the neighborhood. An aerial photograph\(^1\) shows strikingly how both sides of Oenoke Ridge in this neighborhood are virtually identically green, open spaces. The fact that St. Mark’s ten acre campus and the adjoining, integrated parcels bearing the Nature Center and the Presbyterian Church as well as the Historical Society’s campus, take up a large amount of acreage, as was shown on the Applicants’ advocacy-driven map, gives the mistaken impression that this is a commercial street. That characterization is contrary to fact and would doubtless come as a surprise to the residential neighbors along Oenoke Ridge.

Second, the perception on a daily basis of this neighborhood is not determined or considered either by Applicants’ flat map or the aerial view; it is

---

\(^1\) One such photograph is available from Google© Maps at: https://www.google.com/maps/place/111+Oenoke+Ridge,+New+Canaan,+CT+06840/@41.1509583,-73.5011514,270a,35y,64.66h,44.93t/data=!3m1!1e3!4m5!3m4!1s0x89c2a70f352f23e7:0x4581d6c10a2382c2!8m2!3d41.152121d-73.4975515.
the street view from pedestrians and vehicles that matters. The aerial view, however, is helpful to the extent that superimposing the large, proposed building on the long sliver of land upon which the Applicants intend to put their planned structure, shows strikingly what a jarring addition the facility would be to the neighborhood. The scale and coverage of the proposed facility is utterly out of proportion to the other residential structures in the neighborhood.2

The second consideration, “protecting existing neighborhoods and properties,” strongly militates against granting the Application. The character of Oenoke Ridge, once one has surmounted the hill from God’s Acre, as one bends past the former single family dwelling that houses the New Canaan Historical Society and its property, is overpoweringly residential, on both sides of the street, contrary to the Applicants’ suggestions on October 29. The Great Lawn of St. Mark’s constitutes open space, practically a park for the town, and contributes to the predominant residential character. The Presbyterian church likewise, virtually integral with the Nature Center, does not detract from the residential feel of the neighborhood. So, too, even the Roger Sherman Inn, an unmistakably commercial operation3, has an appearance consistent with the residential context, one that promotes the residential character of the street. The balance of Oenoke Ridge and its perpendicular side streets are universally residential. Indeed, there is, accordingly a distinct demarcation between “downtown” New Canaan and residential New Canaan, as the aerial map and a dispassionate, street-level observation would confirm. To suggest, even by intimation as do the Applicants, that the 70 unit behemoth that is the goal of their Application, is simply a large residential structure offends logic and reality. This is not just another large house on Oenoke Ridge; the Application proposes a multi-unit, multi-family dwelling, whose coverage would smother a relative postage stamp size property, whether viewed from the street or overhead.

We suggest, for example, that were a developer to propose building a purely residential, not senior housing, structure of the character and dimension of the Application’s project, even in a residential zone, the application would be immediately and forcefully rejected. The Application

---

2 This point is also of relevance to the spot zoning issue we detail below at p.9 and its probable negative consequence on future developments in New Canaan.
3 It is likely a better characterization of the churches and the Nature Center as non-residential, but the point, ultimately, is that the neighborhood is residential into which the houses of worship and the Nature Center fit congenially. The Applicants’ proposed facility would change the appearance of the street and the neighborhood, contrary to the intentions of the schema of New Canaan’s Zoning Regulations.
accordingly proposes too much construction, on too little land, shoe-horned into an otherwise overwhelmingly residential neighborhood to the detriment of the remaining neighborhood. Granting the Application would not protect existing properties and neighborhoods, one of the principal goals of responsible land management in New Canaan according the very language of the Zoning Regulations; it would transform them, negatively, and, as a consequence, accelerate commercial ‘creep’ in New Canaan. Such a result would be directly contrary to the Commission’s espoused, principal goal of protecting existing properties and neighborhoods.

The Application also disregards the third consideration, except to the limited extent that the elaborate, expensive, and enormous structure proposed in the Application as Senior Housing, somehow is asserted to meet a community “need.” As stated earlier, that “need” was the only drum that the supporters beat in their presentation to the Commission on October 29. But even conceding that it would be a “good thing,” a conclusion we neither accept nor reject, the decision for the Commission is not, in the abstract, whether such a facility would be “good.” The Commission’s responsibility is to render decision on this specific Application, affecting a specific place at a specific time, not to grant any request simply because it appears to be praiseworthy. This Application fails to satisfy the legal requirements of the Zoning Regulations and the legal exercise of authority respecting land management in New Canaan. The Application should therefore be rejected.

Similarly to be rejected is Applicants’ argument that denying this Application would mean such a facility could never be built. The Executive Director of Waveny, who told the Commission that there was no other place in New Canaan they could find to satisfy their criteria, including cost, even if accepted as true, is of no relevance to decision here. The Commission is empowered to decide the merits of this Application as it is presented now, not against the vague suggestion that “if not this, then nothing” argument, even if made, hand-over-heart sincerely. Given the eroding prices for land and houses in New Canaan, a reality of which the Commission can take judicial notice, or perceive by reading any of a number of analyses of the local real estate market, it strains credibility to say that this is the only place one such facility could be built. Whether or not true, the sentiment is irrelevant.

We also believe that consideration four would be contradicted by granting this Application given that the enormity of the proposed structure is hardly likely to “encourage appropriate development.” The reason should be clear enough in reviewing the plans. The proposed structure sprawls across nearly the whole length of two current lots. Such extensive coverage and scale are hardly models for future “appropriate” development, unless massive structures
are to become universally "appropriate," an argument a future developer will surely make if this Application is granted.

Indeed, the description of the origin and characteristics of the proposed structure is both misleading and aimed at the human sympathies of the Commission and the New Canaan public. At least three times in the material submitted on the Application, the Applicants assert that the "proposed project...was designed by our own seniors of our community." Whatever the selected "seniors" said to the Applicants about their wish list for such a facility, the design put before the Commission was created by professional architects, who did their work together with the professional staff of Waveny as a business venture, not an eleemosynary exercise. It is a misleading hyperbole to assert that "our" seniors designed the project. At best, whatever selected seniors offered up in their wish list, they neither "designed" the building any more than these otherwise unidentified "seniors" have been shown to be a representative sample of New Canaan seniors---or indeed "seniors" in general.

Similarly, the Applicants' repeated bolding and italicizing of the phrase "common good" throughout the their Statement in support of the Application with respect to the special permit aspect of their application constitutes their marketing of a conclusion that is not supported by the reality of the Application. No amount of repetition or emphasis in the Applicants' Statement in support of their application changes the hard reality that well over 1200 New Canaan citizens, my wife and I included, have taken the time and effort to oppose this application by signing a petition against the Application as proof that the Applicants' repeated characterization that this application is in the common good is, at least, very much open to question.

Indeed, the Application touts the merits of its application by citing two separate facts, neither of which survives reasoned, dispassionate analysis: first, that Waveny, a thus-far unimpeachable public benefit has provided fine service to the community for many, many years and therefore can be counted on to do the "right thing;" second, in the Applicants' own words, the proposed project "has prominent next-door neighbors willing to support [the] application in writing and to recognize the common good that this program addresses." They included but are not limited to New Canaan's Historical Society and St. Michael's Lutheran Church." (emphasis in the original)

First, of course, Waveny will be the beneficiary of the proceeds of any purchases and maintenance payments of the new facility if built, so its effort to build this facility, by introducing a stream of affluent "seniors" into the Waveny Health Care network, gives Waveny's interest in this project a distinctly economic incentive to achieve. Second, the two named, supportive institutions are slated to receive direct financial benefit from the project if and only if
approved. Their supportive view can hardly be unaffected by being financially advantaged by selling what they own to the new project to enable it to proceed. The other direct neighbor, St. Mark's, has opposed and continues to oppose the Application.

**B. Granting the Application exposes New Canaan to future legal challenges and/or disruptive development**

As I wrote earlier, not one person addressed the legality of the many exceptions to the existing zoning regulations that Applicants would need to gain a green light to their plans, including the insertion of a new ¶5.10 to the Zoning Regulations in which they specify just who could apply for a Senior Housing unit in New Canaan. This omission was surely no happenstance. The imposition of the enormous structure that Applicants propose in that Application would offend the current zoning regime—a fact recognized by their petition to amend the zoning regulations precisely to fit their profile and their proposal in language tailored specifically, though written in objectively abstract terms, to enable *only* Waveny to benefit.

I turn now to demonstrate why, in the discharge of its duties, the Commission cannot and should not acquiesce to the Applicants' overly ambitious and disruptive plans.

The Applicants propose to amend and supplement the current Zoning Regulations of New Canaan to include a new ¶5.10, which creates and defines what the Applicants call a Senior Housing Overlay Zone. The provisions of this new paragraph were obviously tailored precisely and exclusively to legitimate the very proposal that, notwithstanding this change *still* requires special permits to construct. An informed analysis of that proposed amendment, however, demonstrates that it constitutes legislation that would benefit Waveny and *no one else*. Although written in deceptively neutral and objective language, the cold reality is that *only* Waveny could qualify to take advantage of this provision. Consider the statement of purpose in the proposed, new ¶5.10:

> The Senior Housing Overlay Zone (SHOZ) is intended to add independent dwelling units for seniors within a facility(s) which is owned and operated by a philanthropic or eleemosynary institution that provides a continuum of care from independent living, to congregate living to convalescent homes.

The italicized language of the Applicants’ proposed addition to New Canaan’s Zoning Regulations thus specifies that *only* a non-profit that offers a full range of services from “independent living, to congregate living to convalescent
homes” would qualify. Unquestionably, in the real world in which Waveny operates and in which this Commission must decide this application, no one, other than Waveny would qualify at the threshold to apply for the further required special permits. It is beyond rational consideration that anyone could in the reasonably foreseeable future fit into this very narrowly tailored definition than the already long entrenched non-profit, Waveny.

Then, to complete their “draft the regulation to fit the proposal” strategy, Applicants prescribed all of the dimensional, set back and coverage requirements contained in proposed ¶5.10 to bring the Application’s structure to just within the reach of this new provision. In other words, Applicants have crafted a regulation to benefit the Applicants---and no one else---and to do so in a way that appears uniquely and particularly shaped to accommodate their design and affect only a very small and distinct parcel of land. This of course is not the usual and lawful circumstance where an Applicant tries to fit within existing specifications.

In reality, what the Applicants propose directly concerns only one, discrete land area, which the Applicants call the Senior Housing Overlay Zone and has the following characteristics: 1) it is small, though embracing a current allocation of three lots; and 2) the zoning changes Applicants propose affect and benefit only the existing land owners of this small area: Waveny and the New Canaan Historical Society. These characteristics of Applicants’ self-created and defined “zone” satisfies the very definition of “spot zoning.” See, e.g., Konigsberg v. Board of Aldermen, 283 Conn. 553, 592-93 (2007). As one court noted without qualification, “Spot zoning is impermissible in this state.” Campion v. Board of Aldermen, 85 Conn. App. 820, 850-59 (2004), rev’d on other grounds, 278 Conn. 500 (2006).

The adoption of Applicants’ new ¶5.10 is effectively special legislation, namely, legislative action that benefits only one party, and which does so in such a way to shield the benefitted party, i.e., Waveny, from any future competition in its services. That is another reason to deny the Application, but hardly the most important, practical one. Likely more significant is the very

---

4 “Two elements must be satisfied before spot zoning can be said to exist. First, the zone change must concern a small area of land. Second, the change must be out of harmony with the comprehensive plan for zoning adopted to serve the needs of the community as a whole. . . . The vice of spot zoning lies in the fact that it singles out for special treatment a lot or a small area in a way that does not further such a [comprehensive] plan.” (emphasis supplied (Citation omitted; internal quotation marks omitted.) Campion v. Board of Aldermen, 85 Conn. App. 820, 849 n.21 (2004), rev’d on other grounds, 278 Conn. 500 (2006).
real possibility that another, for-profit enterprise might mount a court challenge to this restrictive and exclusionary definition to expand its reach into New Canaan. It cannot be said that any such challenge would inevitably fail: spot zoning raises very sensitive issues, not easily or quickly resolved. Precisely because “spot zoning” has long been a concept of discriminatory land management, disfavored by courts, even an ultimately unsuccessful legal challenge would enmesh the Town in the uncertainty, and significant cost of litigation.

In addition to the undisputed and immediate economic benefit that these proposed changes will confer on only the two current property owners, Waveny, owner of the Inn, and New Canaan Historical Society, owner of a parcel to be purchased by Waveny from the Historical Society to assemble the new parcel, the proposed structure will cover the newly assembled parcel virtually completely. While Waveny and New Canaan Historical Society will be advantaged financially from adoption of the multitude of changes and special permits required for this Application, that benefit to them alone on this small parcel nevertheless comes at the disruptive cost of imposing a monstrously large, utterly out of character edifice onto the Oenoke Ridge neighborhood.

The result of granting this Application would thus work a dramatic alteration of the character of the Oenoke Ridge neighborhood, would upset the overwhelmingly residential character of that neighborhood with the massive, multi-unit, multi-family structure, out of all character and keeping with the neighborhood, and one that would dwarf all its surrounding structures, save only the bell carillon of St. Mark’s.

* * * * * * *

CONCLUSION

We recognize that any opposition to the desires and intentions of a philanthropic entity, especially one as widely revered locally as Waveny, with its long history and nurturing of civic goodwill in New Canaan, invites opprobrium. But, for us, and apparently for the nearly 1300 of our New Canaan neighbors who have signaled their opposition to this Application in a circulated petition, the grant of this Application would represent a profound and lasting mistake, one that would forever damage, and we suggest damage irreparably, the integrity of New Canaan’s zoning and would greatly disturb, not protect the character of New Canaan in the Oenoke Ridge neighborhood and beyond. The New Canaan Historical Society, in supporting this Application, for its own pecuniary benefit, to enrich its own coffers, would itself then, ironically, make New Canaan history---to the town’s lasting detriment.
We accordingly urge the Commission to deliberate carefully on all the many steps needed by the Applicants to realize this project and to conclude, as have we, that this Application asks too much of the Town, seeks to add to New Canaan’s Regulations in inappropriate ways, and, ultimately thereby, hopes to erect a massive facility out of character with the neighborhood, whose presence will disrupt the orderly regulation of land use in New Canaan and be a continuing source of zoning controversy. In consequence, we urge that that the Application should be denied in all respects.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

FREDERICK L. WHITMER

cc: Valeri Whitmer
   Vestry of St. Mark’s Church
To the members of the P&Z Committee,

I am a direct neighbor of the proposed 65 & 73 Oenoke Ridge development. My wife and I have three children (ages 4, 2, and 1) and we were very purposeful in our decision to move to New Canaan 3 years ago. We unequivocally support the charitable mission of Waveny LifeCare, the need to care for our seniors, and the treasured place institutions like the Historical Society hold in this town. We hope the community and our representatives also support families like ours who have chosen to raise our children and spend our lives in New Canaan. We are strongly opposed to the location of this massive commercial development and believe it would forever tarnish the character of New Canaan.

I grew up in Darien, but we chose New Canaan for the quaint village downtown and the natural open spaces out of town. We were lucky to find a wonderful location among town treasures like the Historical Society, St. Mark’s Great Lawn and God’s Acre. Like all neighbors subject to historic district regulations, we welcomed the knowledge that we paid a little more for our home and would incur more costs in the future precisely because we appreciate this setting so much. Never for a moment did we imagine a development like this could be considered for such a precious location on the Gateway into New Canaan.

The reasons this development is ill-conceived are numerous:

- Location among St. Mark’s Great lawn, God’s Acre, Historical Society, valued open space and the picturesque Oenoke Ridge Gateway into town
- Massive scale – this would be the 3rd largest building in town, towering up to 4 stories on the highest point north of town, overlooking downtown and blocking the views for all neighbors and passersby
- The architecture is aesthetically unpleasing and completely out of character with our New England village
- Commercial nature of the facility. The amenities are too numerous to list, however, they demonstrate no intent for residents to patron our town businesses
- The price point is out of reach for most seniors in town and contradict any notion that this development would support our seniors who have the most need and risk

This location is clearly about money and profit. The land is being bought cheap. If Waveny has found itself in an unsustainable financial position, we must collectively find a way to support it without sacrificing the things that make New Canaan special and attractive to both visitors and new residents. If the town is committed to help Waveny, there are other locations available. We cannot sell out New Canaan’s character and soul.

Moreover, I believe every resident in town should be concerned about the process that led to this point. Development planning for this specific location has been in the works for over a year, yet many neighbors were not aware of it until the last few weeks, even days. Undefined “focus groups” were convened that appear to have excluded direct neighbors and many of our most prominent seniors. The site application includes a number of disingenuous submissions, some of which are so biased that they demonstrate clear intent to mislead (e.g., a traffic study conducted on July 9th). Waveny has repeatedly
stated that they would listen to neighbors and not move forward without neighborhood support, yet every non-conflicted neighbor opposes this location, including St. Mark’s who gifted Waveny its own land 40 years ago. Longstanding and highly respected residents have been bullied and derided in public forums, simply for voicing their opposition to the location of this project. The community at large has demonstrated widespread opposition through petition signatures and letters, despite many residents still being unaware of the proposed development. Meanwhile, Waveny is expending huge amounts of financial resources and management time on commercial development, both of which could be better used caring for their residents.

It takes considerable effort and time away from family and work for individual residents to challenge unfair and unbecoming processes like this. I am confident our community shares a higher vision for how we engage with each other and find solutions. Once we lose the features that make New Canaan special, they cannot be regained.

I implore the P&Z to reject this location and work earnestly with Waveny to find a solution they need to continue their charitable mission in town.

Most sincerely,

William P. Frank

20 Oenoke Lane
Stop the Development @65 Oenoke
1 message

Lauren Frank <laurenbfrank@yahoo.com>  
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov  
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov  

Tue, Oct 29, 2019 at 11:12 AM

To the Planning and Zoning Commission

I live at 20 Oenoke Lane and while my Husbands previously submitted letter covers our collective views on the proposed development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge Rd I wanted to include my person views on this project:

- **Demand:** I strongly believe that as a community we need to support our seniors. There has been a lot of discussion about the need for senior housing during the Merritt Village Approval and for the 65 Oenoke Ridge Development but where is the data? Anecdotal references and buzz words for politicians while campaigning are not data. The data that is widely published shows the drop in values and increase in time on the market for homes in our town; that is real data that must be considered when developers make proposals to further commercialize our town. It is one thing to refurbish and replace an existing structure with something more modern and accommodating. It is entirely different to eliminate the open spaces and town treasures that make New Canaan unique. I want to see facts around the focus groups, demographics and lack of senior housing because it is clear that there are already many in-process and planned development which do not require zoning changes in town. Furthermore, I believe the P&Z committee should consider how a development which creates 70, high-priced units that are open to any buyers (not just New Canaan residents) would make any material impact on the broader needs of our most needy seniors in town.

- **Location:** When we left NYC 3 years ago, I felt strongly that New Canaan was the place that we should raise our family. New Canaan is a quintessential New England village. It boasts beautiful architecture, a walkable downtown, and a quaint Historic District that we are proud to call home. There is nothing about the proposed project, including the architecture that complements our towns features. And now that the leaves are falling, the floodlights already in place illuminating The Inn parking lot creates a distracting eyesore on the evening drive into town; the addition of new required lighting for a facility of this scale would overwhelm the views and make the approach to New Canaan look like the approach to a mid-sized city. It makes me sick to think that this building would be the view as people drive or walk to and from New Canaan.

- **Size:** If you were to approve this building, it will be the 3rd largest building in New Canaan, ~135,000 sq feet, 4 stories high that its peak on a tiny parcel of land between St, Marks Great Lawn and the Historic Society

Planning and Zoning I implore that you to vote NO to the development @65 Oenoke Ridge

Lauren Frank  
20 Oenoke Lane
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

1 message

Jason Toris <jason.toris@gmail.com>  
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov  
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov  
Bcc: theoenoke@gmail.com

Mon, Oct 28, 2019 at 11:34 PM

Your Name: Jason Toris

Your Address: 79 Heritage Hill Rd, New Canaan, CT 06840

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:
The plot is too small, the building will look very out of place, traffic will increase, the special amenities like a movie theater are just down the street, it's certainly not that affordable, and it takes away from the small town charm (one of the many reasons I moved here from the city and chose this location as my first home ownership).
To: The New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission

Dear Members:

I am against the size of the proposed project off Oenoke Ridge Road, because it is way too large and will fundamentally change the look and the nature of our residential neighborhood. It will also lead to considerably more congestion in that area of Oenoke Ridge Road. There is already a fair amount of traffic associated with Oenoke Lane. If this project were to be allowed, the traffic situation in the area would be much worse.

We moved to New Canaan eight years ago, because we loved the town, the residential nature of the area, and the fact that our property is close to town. We would not have purchased our home if a project of this size had been part of the landscape. We expect to spend the rest of our lives in our New Canaan home. If this project were to be approved, there is a distinct possibility that we would move from New Canaan, because of the detrimental changes to the neighborhood resulting from the project. I am shocked that the Planning and Zoning Commission would consider a development this large on such a small piece of property, and I hope that you vote it down.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Town of New Canaan -

My husband I are relatively new residents of New Canaan. We reside at 135 Denman Ridge. We bought this house for many reasons -- but one was to be residents in a nice quiet area close to town.

I am upset about the new proposition to build an extension of Waverly -- so close to our home. Many others feel the increased traffic + noise + all that goes with it would be a major inconvenience + a safety hazard. As the
Road curves right at that location,

Please consider another spot for a project of this magnitude & importance on the area.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Manning

135 Denorale Ridge
New Canaan, CT 06840
To: New Canaan Planning & Zoning Commission

From: Dennis J. Holly Manning
135 Denute Ridge, New Canaan

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Waveny Life Care Project - Denute Ridge

By way of introduction, my name is Dennis Manning. My wife Kathy and I purchased 135 Denute Ridge in December 2018.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed project. The plan does not fit the character of our part of New Canaan. The area has a Marks Church and single family residences. A large multi-unit project doesn't fit. If the project was approved a year ago, it would have been a consideration in our decision to buy or not buy the house.

The increased traffic attributable to the project will create hazards. It has been more than once my wife and I have navigated the curvy Denute Ridge Road just south of the project. Overtaking the cars on Denute Ridge is a constant concern. We have made it a point to keep the sidewalk on the west side of Denute Ridge.

In my opinion, the project is not appropriate for this area and we believe it's not in the best interest of New Canaan.

We also want to point out that the sidewalk is used by many walkers, including the elderly.
with baby stroller.

A project of this size simply does not belong in our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

[Signature]

Denise Madden
135 Oak Ave.
To: Planning and Zoning

I write in opposition to the building project under consideration at 65 Oenoke Ridge.

I write in support of Waveny Care Center’s desire to provide greater care opportunities to ‘us’ in New Canaan and our relatives who may choose to spend time here.
I Certainly support our wonderful Historical Society and their desire to preserve a secure future for the archives and history of what they and we continue to prize as our charming “Small New England town.” We have the 2nd largest collection of historical clothing in the state. How wonderful that we have that distinction.
The question is how the town can continue it’s legacy of being a charming “Small New England town” when projects as large as the one at 65 Oenoke Ridge Rd is being seriously considered to be appropriate.

The Sr. living facility you are being asked to grant zoning variance for will be 4.2 times the size of our Town Hall and the 3rd largest building in town, after the High School and our Jr. High School,
You are being asked to place this very large building that is to house at least 65 apartments in the midst of a residential area for single homes in a ½ acre and 1 acre residential zone. Neither school is built in the midst of a residential area and they are lit only on special occasions, not lighted every night of every year, as this structure will be.

The Schools are not built near a blind State rd corner nor do they have a visual impact on town landmarks, in this case, St Marks Church, the Great Lawn in front of St Marks Church and the Historical Society itself, Nor are they adjacent to the area of town we call God’s Acre ... an area that reminds each of us that, indeed, We do live in “A Small New England Town.”

Please: We have looked forward to finding land to build a gracious Assisted Sr. Living campus since the 80s. There is still open land to be considered.

Please reject 65 Oenoke Ridge.

Thank you,
Josephine Gray
139 Oenoke Ridge, town

[Signature]
10/25/19
Senior living alternatives

There are other sites in town that are more appropriate than the Oenoke Project which would not create traffic hazards and would give our older residents "level" walking access to town. We might also seriously reconsider a campus on Lapham Rd near the West entrance to Waveny Park and what used to be called Lapham Senior Center, as well as just up the road from Waveny Care Center:
It was vetoed a few years ago but might be reconsidered at this point.

OR:

The Mulch pile Yard on Lapham Rd is bordered by a parcel of land to the south that is owned by the town. Combine the two and we would have a fantastic site for a truly lovely campus. This location would give immediate access to all the amenities that Lapham Center has to offer: movies, discussions, exercise classes, music lessons, bridge lessons, classes in foreign languages ... hospitality luncheons – etc. etc. etc. and the joy of Waveny park which includes the Power House and it's programs, The Town Players, the beautiful gardens, the walking trails etc. etc. and a charming non-denominational church at the south corner and be within a mile of medical care at Waveny Care Center. The idea of a trolley on wheels that would run back and forth to town comes to mind as a perfect way to limit more traffic with the dwindling parking spaces we're experiencing at the moment.

On the other hand ...

The Oenoke project would present a dangerous traffic situation on Oenoke. It's entrance and exit would happen just north of the upper entrance to the Historical Society which is just north of the blind corner of the Historical Society's Brown House's yard.

[Signature]

139 Oenoke Rd
Dear Lynn And Lola,

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed construction of the Waveny Senior Center at 65 Oenoke Ridge. I moved to New Canaan eight years ago and rented near the Roger Sherman Inn until I found the right home to buy. I fell in love with the neighborhood around Oenoke Ridge so much that I ended up buying a home in the Historic District, across the street from the proposed site. After listening to arguments both in favor and against the proposed facility, from neighbors and developers, I have come to appreciate the needs of senior citizens in our town, but I strongly believe this is the wrong site for such a facility.

The size would be tremendous for that small plot of land and completely out of character with the surrounding Historic District and the image of New Canaan as a bucolic New England town. I find it immensely hypocritical that as a resident of the Historic District, I cannot even change my front door without permission from the Historic District Commission. The purpose is clearly to preserve the character of the town, as with zoning regulations, and I agree with that. So why go through so many cumbersome approval procedures to nit-pick residents' renovations, forcing them to spend considerably more, when we then let a developer come in and ruin it with a complex of this magnitude?

I am also concerned about the increased traffic for motorists and pedestrians alike, despite the developers' traffic reports, which seem architected to serve their purpose. What will happen to the beloved May Fair at St. Mark's Church? And the impact of massive amounts of light emanating from the facility at night? Conversely, it will take away natural sunlight from the Heritage Hills condominiums as it casts a huge shadow over their facility. In the winter it will be especially dark, and I'm not convinced by the argument about the trees being the same height.

Russ Barksdale has claimed publicly that Waveny consulted nearby neighbors for their input on the project. I was never consulted, nor was my husband or any of my neighbors except one. So to state that they reached out to neighbors when they really contacted one person seems like a gross misrepresentation of the truth.

If this facility is so important, let's please find a better place for it. The people in this town, including the seniors it's intended to honor, worked very hard to make New Canaan the charming and welcoming place that it is. Letting a developer ruin it will ultimately do them and all of us a disservice.

Respectfully yours,
Deborah L. Green (Debbie)
40 Oenoke Ridge
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

1 message

Whitmer, Frederick <FWhitmer@kilpatricktownsend.com>  Mon, Oct 28, 2019 at 8:01 AM

PLEASE NOTE: You were BCC'd

To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Please register my opposition to the proposed development at 65 Oenoke Ridge. I am a resident of New Canaan, living at 26 Ferris Hill Road.

The building that is proposed would catastrophically alter impact the neighborhood and would destroy any sensible demarcation between “downtown” and a residential neighborhood. The economic benefit to the Historical Society and St. Michael’s would be transitory; the damage to the zoning regimen of New Canaan would be permanent. I strongly urge the members of P&Z to reject outright the proposal.

Frederick L. Whitmer
Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP
The Grace Building | 1114 Avenue of the Americas | New York, NY 10036-7703
office 212 775 8773 | cell 914 482 4513 | fax 212 775 8821
fwhitmer@kilpatricktownsend.com | My Profile | vCard

Confidentiality Notice:
This communication constitutes an electronic communication within the meaning of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 2510, and its disclosure is strictly limited to the recipient intended by the sender of this message. This transmission, and any attachments, may contain confidential attorney-client privileged information and attorney work product. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Please contact us immediately by return e-mail or at 404 815 6600, and destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

***DISCLAIMER*** Per Treasury Department Circular 230: Any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.
Stop the 65 Oenoke Development
1 message

Vivek Mohindra <mohindrav@gmail.com> Sun, Oct 27, 2019 at 8:12 AM
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov, lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: theoenoke@gmail.com

Hi,

I have been a resident of 40 Oenoke Ridge (very close to the proposed development) for 8 years. We moved here from Austin TX, and love the look-and-feel of New Canaan.

We have been extra diligent in maintaining this look-and-feel as we have embarked upon fixing our house. For example, when we wanted to put in new windows (the originals were single-pane, very leaky), it would have been 35% cheaper for us to put double-hung windows instead of casement windows. We worked closely with the historic society - which correctly pointed out that the double-hung windows won't preserve the same look. Even though it cost us an extra $50,000 (and several weeks), we decided to honor their request in the spirit of preserving the character of the house and neighborhood. Needless to add, that extra money could have been really useful for other things we wanted to do. We subsequently made several other renovations, and each time incurred (by my estimate) an extra 20-25% cost just in the spirit of maintaining the character.

Now, much to my surprise, we find out that the P&Z is planning to give a go-ahead to this development which clearly violates the look-and-feel of the neighborhood. As a single home owner, I have incurred all this extra cost to maintain the character of this town. So why is it that Waveny and the developers are being given this free pass for such a blatant and egregious violation?! This just doesn't seem fair.

I was never consulted on this development - despite Waveny stating publicly that it consulted with the neighbors.

I fully agree we need a solution to the Senior housing in town. I have spoken with the CEO of Waveny who assured me that he will share all the facts that went into their recommendation on the site and development. But despite several reminders, he has not shared that information. I have to believe that either Waveny did not do its homework, or there are other political/nefarious factors involved in this choice. I have to imagine that this information is likely subject to a FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) request, and I intend to pursue that to the full extent permitted by law.

I would urge the P&Z Board to turn the approval request for 65 Oenoke down. Otherwise you run the risk of opening a Pandora's box in terms of over-development of the town center and destroying the very character that the seniors of this town helped create.

I am sorry I will be overseas at the time of the hearing otherwise I would have attended and made my position known in person.

Regards,

Vivek
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

1 message

Edward <edwardbel98@gmail.com>                           Thu, Oct 24, 2019 at 10:42 PM
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Your Name: Edward Belopolski

Your Address: 78 Heritage Hill Road, Apt C, New Canaan, CT

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:

This project is ill conceived and misplaced in this location. Also, it will create nuance and disturbance for owners who live nearby. The project will also ruin the look and feel of New Canaan. This facility must be situated in a different location instead of being crammed into a tiny parcel located on the gateway to town, adjacent to three churches and God's Acre, and the New Canaan Historical Society. The proposed construction, its size and scale will dwarf the neighboring homes and Heritage Hills apartments, where my apartment is located. The project architectural design is not suited for a New England town.

Sincerely,

Edward Belopolski
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge
1 message

Mary Anne Case <macase@caseportfolio.com>                        Thu, Oct 24, 2019 at 6:50 PM
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Your Name: Your Address: Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:

Mary Anne Case, 114A Heritage Hill Road, (Oenoke Condos), New Canaan, CT 06840

To Planning and Zoning re the proposed CCRC

10/24/2019

Two important pages were missing from the plans filed in the building department and should be provided before the P & Z board can make a fully informed decision.

1. The architectural plans and drawings filed at the Building Department do NOT provide a section drawing that illustrates height of the CCRC at the point of its rear garage entrance continuing down the slope of the hill beyond the CCRC property and descending into the Oenoke condo directly below it at that point. Such a section drawing should be provided and should include a section of the Oenoke building directly beneath the CCRC garage entrance. Such a section will demonstrate the juxtaposition and respective heights of the two buildings. It will also demonstrate there is no room remaining between the CCRC garage and the fence at its property line to provide a buffer of plantings to screen the towering CCRC from the condo(s) below it.

2. The BFJ Traffic Impact Analysis dated August 2, 2019 does NOT provide a dedicated plan of the entire St Marks Church property and the entire proposed CCRC property for the purpose of illustrating both the existing shared and adjacent driveways, access ways and parking lots and the proposed shared and adjacent driveways, access ways and parking lots emanating from Oenoke Ridge Road. Such a drawing is necessary to clarify and make apparent the inherent traffic issues that will exist if the CCRC is built. The BFJ Traffic Impact Analysis is fragmented and does not address the overarching and complex problem of CCRC traffic combined with the church traffic.

3. Does the engineering study for storm water drainage provide for severe climate change in the future? The slope from the CCRC above to the condos below is both dramatic and challenging, the CCRC land will be paved and built upon, and most of the existing mature trees on the CCRC property will be removed.

4. From a personal and professional point of view I feel the both scale and banal design of the CCRC will severely undercut New Canaan's prestige as a center of architectural vision.

Mary Anne Case, NCIDQ

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1?ik=2c6480635e&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1648316830060461855&simple=msg-f%3A16483168300...
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Peggy Aitken <peggylaitken@optonline.net>  Thu, Oct 24, 2019 at 2:53 PM
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Your Name: Peggy Aitken


I am opposed to the development at 65 Oenoke Ridge because:

The buildings are much too large for the available space and will dominate the landscape on Oenoke Ridge and on the road next to it, Heritage Hill Rd.

A project of this size will cause major drainage problems for the condominiums (The Oenoke Assoc.) that are immediately downhill from the project on Heritage Hill Rd.

The concentration of traffic that a community of that size will create will cause dangerous traffic conditions on Oenoke Ridge and especially during the morning and evening traffic to the train station in New Canaan.

Just the construction noise and dirt - for at least 18 months - will seriously affect the quality of life for the Oenoke condominiums. And will seriously affect the value of the units.

When finished, the lights from the building and the roads next to it, will shine down on that entire section of New Canaan and dominate the town.

That project does not belong in that location on such a small amount of ground.

Please, do not approve of the application!!

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge
1 message

Amy Starobin <amystarobin@gmail.com>  Thu, Oct 24, 2019 at 12:32 PM
To: lynn.brooksavl@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Your Name:  Amy Starobin
Your Address:  78A Heritage Hill Road, New Canaan

I am opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge for the following reasons:

1. A project of this size and proximity would loom over my apartment. My apartment would be almost directly behind the proposed building and therefore any light I receive from the rear windows would be blocked.

2. Since the building is so imposing and will take up almost all of its land a very large drainage system would be necessary. The necessary pipes would most likely run between and through the Oenoke condo building and property. The installation of such a system would be very disruptive to our neighborhood.

3. I rent my unit and anticipate the noise, dirt and disruption from the constant construction will negatively impact my tenant's living conditions and the possibility of continuing to rent the apartment. It would certainly devalue the property of the Oenoke Condominiums that abutt the proposed building.

Please vote to deny the Development at 65 Oenoke Ridge.

Amy Starobin
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge
2 messages

Karin Stumpenhagen <kstumpenhagen@gmail.com>  Thu, Oct 24, 2019 at 9:11 AM
To: lynn.brooksavl@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Karen Stumpenhagen
167 Heritage Hill Road Apt C
Please give this email to all P&Z members, thank you.

To the esteemed members of the Planning and Zoning Committee:

First, let me thank you for taking the time to read my concerns regarding the Waveny LifeCare Network proposal for 65-73 Oenoke Ridge.

I am a neighbor that lives in Oenoke Association Condos, and I have several concerns about the project.

I think it is fair to say that most people support the idea of some sort of affordable senior housing in New Canaan. I have lived in this town over 25 years and know this has been a topic for as many years as I have lived here. That being said, the proposed project is misplaced at the current proposed location and with a $800k buy-in and at least $4k a month in fees, in my opinion does not support the concept of “affordable” senior housing. The size and scope of the building is just too large for the plot of land being considered (although Waveny has been saying that it is on a 3.5 acre parcel, the reality is the new construction will be on a 1.5 acre parcel, the remaining two acres of the campus is taken up by the New Canaan Inn so unless that New Canaan Inn is being torn down, it is disingenuous to include that land in the plans or marketing of this project).

Here are some points that I hope P&Z will look into when considering this project:

1. Focus Group - how many people were in the focus group (10, 100, 500?), when was it done (2 months ago or 2 years are very different economic climates) and was it a representative sample of all seniors in this town? I live in a complex that happens to have many seniors that live in it and none that I know were asked to be in a focus group; in fact many of my senior friends in this town were never asked to be in a focus group. So, that leads me to ask, where did Waveny get the list of names? Is this focus group made up of only Waveny donors/friends? If so, is that a true representation of all seniors? That seems like a skewed focus group.
2. How does the current economic climate of housing sales affect the potential of people living in the proposed facility? If someone can’t sell their $2+million home, will they be able to even afford the buy-in of $800k?
3. Neighbors at St Marks, Oenoke Association and other neighbors in the area are strongly opposed to the project. They represent a large group of people. Just Oenoke Association alone has 165 households. St Marks represents a large group of New Canaanites. I realize that St Michaels has said it supports the project as has the New Canaan Historical Society. However, I don’t believe that NC Historical Society’s support can be viewed as neutral since they are the sellers of the land (and therefore have a financial benefit to seeing this project go through) and have also said they need the $ from this land sale for their operational budget. There is also speculation that the Historical Society will receive an annual payment from the operational profits of the facility - if that is indeed true, can they be considered objective at all?
4. What other areas were considered for the project? If the answer was no, why? There needs to be more transparency in this site selection process.
5. Given the plethora of condos recently built or being built in the area (Cross Street, Vitti/East Ave, Merritt Apartments, Locust/Forest), aren’t we possibly flooding the market? The Merritt Apartments alone will have 120 units, with elevator access. Won’t this possibly be a place where some of the “focus group” people may be interested in living? Shouldn’t we see how all that plays out first before we go ahead with another 70 units?
6. New Canaan has a notorious high water table. I understand that Waveny did an analysis of this, but will P&Z be doing an independent analysis to assure that the affects of this project don’t flood neighbors?
7. What will a structure of this size do to the property values of neighbors? Condos in this town have already seen a large increase in property taxes this year (the average increase in our complex was over 35% in one year I). This has resulted in lower prices in recent sales and any additional decrease in property value may be catastrophic to current owners. Which brings up another point - how will these Waveny units be taxed by the town? Will it be like a condo or home or will it be taxed differently since it considered a senior facility? Or will it have some tax exempt
status since it's considered part of a medical facility organization? If that's the case, will these 70 units even be generating income for the tax base?

A 3-4 story high, 150,000 sq ft structure near Gods' Acre, one of the loveliest spots in New Canaan, will be forever changed with this looming structure. The view as you drive into town from Pound Ridge will look as if we have a Marriott and the town will lose it's charm and quaint feeling. In addition, neighbors will be in a shadow of a 50-70 ft structure that is also built up on a ridge, so it will appear even larger (just look at how high Merritt Apartments are looking and picture that height on that small parcel of land. I honestly don't see how this can even be considered. A couple of years ago, P&Z turned down the application of Roger Sherman to be knocked down and 8-12 houses being built on that lot saying the density would change the look of the town. Please be consistent and adhere to those same principles when reviewing this project and vote NO.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards, Karen Stumpenhagen
167 Heritage Hill Road

The Oenoke Development Project  <theoenoke@gmail.com>  Thu, Oct 24, 2019 at 10:11 AM
To: William Frank <Wfrank@wcas.com>, ksaverin@crescenttrust.com
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Beatrice Camporine <beatricecamporine@yahoo.com>
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Jerry camporine
Your Name:
1046 weed street new canaan ct
Your Address:

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:

Sent from my iPad
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Andrea Matthews <odileworks@yahoo.com>
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Subject: Your Name:

Your Address:

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:

Sent from my iPhone
October 22, 2019

To the Editor,

I am writing to encourage members of our town’s planning and zoning commission, leaders of our community and other concerned citizens to reconsider the proposed location for a retirement complex at 65 Oenoke Ridge Road. As a lifelong resident of this community, whose father was the founding president of Waveny Care Center and whose mother proposed the first plan for assisted living to the town of New Canaan back in the 80’s, concern for our aging citizens and their quality of life is in my blood. In the past I’ve served on Waveny Care Center’s Board of Directors and I am currently on the Advisory Board to Staying Put in New Canaan. I am in full support of a plan to create housing for seniors, particularly if it offers graduated levels of care, but I am not in support of the proposed plan that would be located at 65 Oenoke Ridge Road.

As the gateway into and out of downtown, the campus that exists between and around the Historical Society, St. Michael’s and St. Mark’s would not just be compromised, but destroyed. By allowing the proposed facility to be built at 65 Oenoke Ridge, we’d be breaking the rare and beautiful boundary that distinguishes downtown from out of town. New Canaan is a village. Please don’t let it sprawl into this historic, peaceful area. Please don’t rewrite the rules to allow this.

I would hope that the leaders of this community, along with town officials, could come together and re-channel the energy that’s going into this current fight to come up with a better location — one that does not shoehorn something into the wrong space. I understand that certain locations were turned down in the past, but that does not prevent us from reexamining them. There is a better place for this.

Sincerely,

Gigi Brush Priebe
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Sandra Gallagher <jimsan1964sg@gmail.com>  
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov  
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov  
Bcc: theoenoke@gmail.com

Mon, Oct 21, 2019 at 9:28 PM

Your Name: Sandy Gallagher

Your Address: 126 Heritage Hill Road Unit A, New Canaan

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:

It is sad to hear the New Canaan P&Z will be voting on constructing a mammoth facility at 65 Oenoke Ridge to provide a retirement solution to senior New Canaan Residents at the expense of all other residents. I agree with the concept of a CCRC in our town but the property choice is appalling. As an owner, I believe the facility is too big for property size and location. It will decrease the value of many nearby homes, like mine, and that is just not fair!!

The proposed facility will take over the landscape and destroy the natural historic beauty of our town! A yes vote will create a city eyesore that will be detrimental to the entire town. Once you vote yes, there is no turning back and you will never be able to get back the quaint town all of Connecticut loves.

There has to be property at Waveny that more suits the size of this facility. You need to take all residents into account. You need to vote NO and do not continue your plan to DESTROY our town. Take a look at Merritt Village, it too is oversized for its location and the town. Let it be a lesson to us.

Thank you.
Sandy & Jim Gallagher
475-558-9209
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge
1 message

Jayne Dutil <jadcat@optimum.net>
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Mon, Oct 21, 2019 at 9:09 PM

Your Name: Jayne Dutil
Your Address: 155 Heritage Hill Road Apt. B, New Canaan CT 06840

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge: The proposed construction is too large for the space available.

It will add to the overbuilding that has taken hold of our quaint town in recent years.

As an owner and resident of one of the Oenoke Association's 164 condos on Heritage Hill Road, I feel that it will have a deleterious effect on the quality of life of us all.
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Thomas W. Lynn <twlynn@aol.com>
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lolla.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Mon, Oct 21, 2019 at 6:49 PM

Your Name: thomas w. lynn

Your Address: 211 laurel road

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:
This plan is in the wrong place...do NOT destroy this beautiful, peaceful neighborhood with this out of place, outsized, overbearing project. It also wreaks of commercialism...why would anybody promote and/ or welcome this in their residential neighborhood.
Please stop the insanity.

Sincerely,
Thomas W. Lynn (a 45 year taxpayer)
Stop the Development @65 Oenoke Ridge- Senior living venue
1 message

The Oenoke Development Project <theoenoke@gmail.com>  
Mon, Oct 21, 2019 at 2:38 PM
To: Lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: Lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov
Bcc: The Oenoke Development Project <Theoenoke@gmail.com>, ksaverin@crescendotrust.com, William Frank
<Wfrank@wcas.com>, Jobygray@yahoo.com

On behalf of Mimi (Mary) Dickerson
Address: 41 Thrush Lane, New Canaan

----- Forwarded Message -----  
From: mimi dickerson <mimidickerson1@gmail.com>
To: jobygray@yahoo.com <jobygray@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2019, 10:36:31 AM EDT
Subject: Senior living venue

Oct 21, 2019

Planning and Zoning Committee
The Town of New Canaan

Re : Senior living and assisted living site

To Whom it May Concern,

As a resident of New Canaan for 39 years as well as being a Senior citizen, there is probably a pretty good chance I will die here, therefore I have been following your plan with great interest.

I also applaud your foresightedness in realizing that this area of senior attention has not been addressed appropriately in our well planned community.

However, this site should not be forced upon the town without a choice of other suitable venues. Once again, you are forcing the building of a large edifice contradicting current P&Z regulations. Again. Do we need to elaborate on the overused word of “transparency”? 

Do the citizens need to repeat, again and again, that another unsightly large edifice detracts from the “next station to heaven”, not enhances our town? We will get to that “station” soon enough, let us not place it at this venue.

Why do you wish to place another carbuncle on the face of New Canaan? You can do better.

Sincerely,
Mimi Dickerson
A noble cause with unintended negative consequences.

It is clear that a dedicated group of New Canaanites have been working hard and successfully to provide services to its senior citizens to allow them to remain in the community. It appears that its most ambitious goal over the past 40 years has been to build a first class residence in New Canaan for seniors with all the appointments of a five star hotel. It's an initiative which seems to have reached a point where a final resolution has to be rewarded for the long-standing effort regardless of any deeply felt concerns about the latest option.

My wife and I believe that New Canaan is the most beautiful quintessential New England “village” we’ve ever seen, and we have had the good fortune of living here for the past 20 years. The number one concern for us, and I am sure for everyone who has chosen to live here, is the preservation of New Canaan’s special character and charm.

The proposed residence, while noble in purpose, and worthy of pursuit, strikes at the very core of New Canaan’s character in three critical ways:

- By placing a full service residence in the very gateway to New Canaan’s historical center, next to the Historical Society and in the midst of God’s acre
- By producing a design of such grand scale that it dwarfs the existing neighborhood homes, churches, and surrounding open grounds.
- By adding substantial strain to the limited infrastructure that is not designed to handle another 71 residences, and adding to the density to our downtown that has noticeably increased in recent years.
We understand and support the goal of providing alternative senior residences that adds to the continuing care available in New Canaan. We understand the frustration of a dedicated group of our citizens who have been working hard for many years to achieve this goal. However, we do not understand why other proposed locations, e.g. Waveny leaf fields, or scaled back versions have been rejected. Instead we find ourselves looking at the building of a large residential complex that threatens the very character of our lovely village—the very charm that keeps all of us here in the first place.

Bob and Benne Druckenmiller
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Jean Neubohn <alphamunch@icloud.com>
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Sat, Oct 12, 2019 at 9:10 AM

Jean Neubohn

Your Name:

Your Address: 175 south bald hill road

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:
My family and I first came here from NYC 7 years ago. We took the train out for a "day in the country "and walked around the charming town of New Canaan then up Oenoke road wandering around getting a feel for this wonderful town. We were hooked! It took us a few more years before we would finally make the big move. What we love most beside the amazing community is the charming country small town feel. It is kind of a curated charm. Very thoughtful in its preservation. Such a building right next to our church would be horrific eyesore to say the least. There is no charm, it's huge, and it's municipal in an area that is quaint and relaxed. It's the wrong fit. People visit and move here because of the charm of the town and the people of New Canaan. Our beautiful downtown right off the train line is such a huge draw. On weekends I see young families from the city, getting off the train, walking around and like we did years ago, strolling up to the Rodger Sherman for brunch. Imagine seeing a huge ugly mall like building? Also the traffic.....I believe it's also very expensive for seniors. I volunteer with seniors and have talked to them. No one is on board.. not the location, the style of the building or what is being offered there.

Jean Neubohn

Sent from my iPad
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Duke Beecher <dukebeecher@yahoo.com>
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Sat, Oct 12, 2019 at 8:55 AM

Your Name: Henry Beecher
Your Address: 363 Main Street

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge: Please consider the long-term consequences of this decision because if this is approved it cannot be undone. This specific spot is a crucial location in terms of town character. Anyone who loves what New Canaan stands for should see the deleterious effects that this would have. If this is a project that people feel strongly that the town needs then it should be somewhere else that does not impact and cheapen the feel of downtown.

Sent from my iPhone
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Your Name: Sofia Tournas

Your Address: 82 c heritage hill road new canaan conn

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge: please no commercial buildings next door to my place
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge
1 message

Bradley Berger <pufferb@optonline.net>  
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov  
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov, Bradley Berger <pufferb@optonline.net>

Bradley Berger

1323 Ponus Ridge

Sir/Madam:

The proposal to build The Waveny Project at 65 Oenoke Ridge is completely inappropriate in terms of scale and location. Please do not allow this. The town Planning and Zoning experts simply MUST slow down the development of these large-scale condominium projects that are popping up all over.

Take a breath, analyze and let's absorb what the long-term ramifications are for our precious village. Let's allow a few years go by in order to assess how the extremely large Karp project on Park Street, plus others currently under construction, are going to affect the town.

Developers are turning our quaint New England village into an urban condo village such as those found in Queens or in Florida. Before long we will start putting in bus stops. Stop the insanity before it's too late.

Thank you.
Bradley Berger
Resident for 23 years who would like to stay another 23 years!

Sent from my iPhone
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Your Name: M. Mayer
Your Address: 1056 Silvermine Road

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:

Right idea, wrong place. Yes, New Canaan could benefit from a senior living facility. It’s proposed location adjacent to one of the town’s few Local Historic Districts and God’s Acre is the absolutely wrong place! NO! Planning & Zoning, the Karp rental unit development, with the fake wall, is a major negative to the town…please don’t make another development approval error here. Oenoke Ridge has zoning regulations for a reason. Protections are in place. Please respect those.
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

1 message

Ron Petrunoff <Petrunoff@seamaxcapital.com>
To: "lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov" <lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov>
Cc: "lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov" <lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov>

Thu, Oct 10, 2019 at 8:43 AM

Your Name: Ron Petrunoff

Your Address: 446 Brookside Rd, New Canaan

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge: The area should be continue to be bound by the current zoning restrictions. Instead of regularly giving variances to projects, we should review the entire zoning plan and change it if there is agreement by the citizens of the town to do so. Managing by exception is poor managing.

DISCLAIMER: This electronic mail message, together with any attachments, is confidential to Seamax Capital Management LLC ("Seamax") and the intended recipient(s), and may be legally privileged. If you are not an intended recipient, please do not read, copy, distribute or otherwise use or retain this communication for any purpose. Kindly notify the sender immediately of the transmission error by replying to this message, and delete the message and all attachments from your system. Although the e-mail and any attachments are believed to be free of viruses or other defects that may affect a computer system, Seamax disclaims any responsibility for loss or damage arising in any way from the entry or acceptance of this transmission into the computer system of any recipient.
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

Your Name: Kevin Sheridan
Your Address: 807 Weed Street

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge: This structure, just like the abomination on Park Street, will ruin the character of New Canaan. Please stop trying to espouse this project as good for senior citizens and be honest that it is a play for tax revenues. Call it what it is. This project will only enrich special interest groups and developers at the expense of New Canaan tax payers. I am strongly opposed to this and any other massive development in our town.

Kevin J. Sheridan
Joint Global Head of Healthcare Investment Banking
Jefferies LLC
520 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Work: +1 212 707-6431
Mobile: +1 917 692-9753
ksheridan@jefferies.com

Jefferies archives and monitors outgoing and incoming e-mail. The contents of this email, including any attachments, are confidential to the ordinary user of the email address to which it was addressed. If you are not the addressee of this email you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any form whatsoever. This email may be produced at the request of regulators or in connection with civil litigation. Jefferies accepts no liability for any errors or omissions arising as a result of transmission. Use by other than intended recipients is prohibited. In the United Kingdom, Jefferies operates as Jefferies International Limited; registered in England: no. 1978621; registered office: Vintners Place, 68 Upper Thames Street, London EC4V 3BJ. Jefferies International Limited is authorized and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority.
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge
1 message

rcyoung <rcyoung@optonline.net>
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Wed, Oct 9, 2019 at 9:11 PM

Your Name: Robert Young
Your Address: 219 Michigan rd

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:
It is so obvious this project is over the top and out of proportion. It is DOA.

Regards,
Bob

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy Note® 4, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge
4 messages

ksaverin@crescendotrust.com <ksaverin@crescendotrust.com>  
To: lynn.brooksavl@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov

Mon, Oct 7, 2019 at 4:03 PM

Your Name: Kenneth and Laura Saverin

Your Address: 24 Oenoke Ridge, New Canaan, CT 06840

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:

Location, Location, Location. This project is in the wrong location. The size, scale, height and design are inappropriate for the proposed location (a) looming over the historic district, (b) sitting in the middle of God’s acre despite the objections of St. Marks Church and (c) towering over the Oenoke Association Heritage Hills apartment complex. How can P&Z approve this proposal when P&Z rejected Andy Glazer’s Roger Sherman smaller senior housing proposal a few years ago? P&Z cited the fact that the Glazer project on Oenoke Ridge would impair visitor’s impressions of New Canaan since Oenoke Ridge is the “Gateway to New Canaan”. Citizens from throughout New Canaan have expressed their opposition through the online petition at www.oenokeridge.com well as at numerous Waveny presentations where even senior citizens have asked that Waveny find a new location.
Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission:

I live directly across the street from the site where Waveny LifeCare wants to construct a 39'-6" tall (west face), slightly more than 455 foot long, 135,000 square foot, seventy unit condominium for seniors. It is in the One-Half Acre Residence Zone, contiguous to the Historic District, the Historical Society itself, the One Acre Residence Zone, the Apartment Zone and across the street from more of the One Acre Residence Zone. St. Mark’s Church, although taller, is only about 155' in length or roughly one-third as long, and contains 27,804 square feet of “living area,” about one-fifth that of the proposed structure. St. Mark’s Church, along with its other buildings, sits on a 12.4 acre site, whereas the proposed facility would occupy a ±1.6 acre site. There is a proposal to merge the ±1.9 acre Inn site with the aforementioned ±1.6 acre site, but that has not been approved. Furthermore, The Inn, with 26,891 sq. ft. of “living area”, has previously been granted a variance allowing 2.4 times the normally permitted coverage. Density for the proposed facility has already been revised from one unit for every 1,750 square feet to one unit per 1,200 square feet. In either case, it is dramatically greater density than is presently allowed and is extreme for this location. No amount of “fine tuning” can make this appropriate for the neighborhood. It should also be noted that the Plan of Future Development shows 65 Oenoke Ridge as Medium Density Residential, not Higher Density Residential and certainly not Community Facility/Institutional Use. More important, however, are the following competing goals put forth in the POCD.

While the POCD does call for more senior-friendly housing in and near the center of town, there are many other POCD objectives to be considered. The preferred locations for high density housing are in the Apartment Zone, the B Residence Zone (two-family) and the three Business Zones. High density housing is to be discouraged elsewhere unless there is a significant community benefit. However, there are other suitable sites still available in the Business Zones that would provide seniors with safe, level, walkable, and far more convenient access to downtown, rather than the steep, taxing and potentially dangerous slopes of God’s Acre. The POCD also asks that the Planning and Zoning Commission strive to protect residence zones and minimize the encroachment or impact of institutional and other uses presently allowed in residence zones on neighboring (not just contiguous) residential properties. Further, the Commission should assure that the scale, intensity and character of such uses are appropriate for the neighborhood in which they are located. Waveny’s proposed facility would be more of an invasion than an encroachment and totally out of scale and character with this signature gateway into downtown New Canaan. It would indelibly disfigure a unique and beautiful part of town, with expansive open spaces surrounding modern churches and the Nature Center, plus the small town New England charm of
nineteenth century churches overlooking God's Acre, which are complemented perfectly by the serene and open campus of the Historical Society - at least for now. Bear in mind that the POCD additionally recommends that both open space and perceived open space, as well as scenic views, be preserved; this is particularly important near the center of Town, where such sights are uncommon. The Village District Design Guidelines, while not directly applicable, echo objectives in the POCD to preserve, enhance and promote New Canaan's small town way of life, rural character, historic value and scenic charm. Accordingly, these Guidelines state that particular consideration should be given to the impact any new development might have if adjacent to or in close proximity to the Historic District. Should the proposal for a shockingly massive, currently forbidden institutional structure on a small site in the One-Half Acre Residence Zone, contiguous to both the Historical Society and the Historic District be granted dramatically more lenient regulations, or should common sense and good judgement prevail?

An Overlay Zone should not be used to allow an immense senior housing center that would harm our Historical Society (despite any financial benefit thereto), the Historic District, the scenic view over and well beyond the Great Lawn, the neighborhood, the gateway into downtown, and the Town itself. Overlay Zones can be both beneficial and destructive, so they require extremely judicious use and management to make certain that zoning is not destabilized throughout the Town. If this senior housing proposal is approved, no one will have any peace of mind, knowing that at any time something completely out of character, offensively oversized and previously impermissible, if not unimaginable, could materialize within yet another Overlay Zone anywhere in Town. This could easily make owning or purchasing a home in New Canaan unacceptably risky, especially at a time when the real estate market is already weak.

To complicate matters further, this proposal requires a Special Permit. As stated in the POCD, the present criteria are insufficient to ensure that permitted non-residential uses are compatible with the residence zones they will occupy. That leaves little to rely on except the sound judgement of the Commission. Hopefully, we can rely on the Commission's judgement to recognize that Waveny's enormous, out of character facility would further reduce neighboring property values, but more importantly, it would severely diminish the enjoyment of our homes, as the wonderful appeal of this picturesque part of Town would be irrevocably destroyed, thereby diminishing the entire Town.

Sincerely,

Joseph Bruno
Michael and Michelle Buscher
67 Oenoke Lane, New Canaan

Dear Members,

Before your board is the application by The Waveny Life Care Network for their proposed Senior housing project. The application requests that you as a board, approve and grant a major change in the zoning regulations in that location in order for this development to be built.

If granted, this project, in this proposed location, will have a negative impact on the character of our town but most importantly on every New Canaan resident, especially the neighbors of 65 Oenoke. Every resident must be able to trust that our zoning regulations, as written, mean something. The Zoning regulations in New Canaan give home owners and prospective home buyers, confidence that the regulations as written, are important and enforced. Changing these zoning regulations to allow for this project is unfair and not necessary. The closest neighbors of this proposed project never, ever, thought that this piece of property, in a one acre zone, adjacent to our Historical Society could ever be developed as proposed. This piece of property should be held to the current zoning laws. The issue isn't about whether there is a need for housing for an aging population. The issue is not about whether or not Waveny has historically been an asset to the residents of our town. Both of these are true.

For 60 plus years I have always trusted that those of you serving on the Planning and Zoning board understand the big picture for New Canaan. You are often faced with difficult decisions but typically listen to the neighbors and town residents and with a vision of the future, turn down zoning regulation changes and requests such as the one being proposed by Waveny Life Care Network.

Having lived in New Canaan my entire life I have seen and often applauded change and I have rarely felt compelled to write a letter to P&Z. This application is an exception for all the reasons mentioned above. I was born and raised in New Canaan, Michael and I have raised our son Mike and daughter Sarah here and they have both chosen to raise their families here. The reasons for choosing New Canaan to raise a family are always
personal and usually includes a description of its quaint, New England small town feel and look. Allowing such a project could easily erode confidence that New Canaan will remain quaint with regulated growth.

We all need to know that our rules and laws apply to everyone and that we have every right to expect that they are enforced as written.

Best regards,

Michelle & Michael Buscher
67 Oenoke Lane
To: The Planning and Zoning Commission:

We would very much like to voice our vehement opposition to the proposed development project on Oenoke Ridge Road. We are new residents of New Canaan, as of last week. We purchased the home at 90 Oenoke Ridge Road this past August. After many years in Darien, we were very excited to move our family to New Canaan. Our children attend St. Luke’s School (our oldest graduated in 2018) and we have increasingly felt our family life has been drawn to New Canaan. When the house at 90 Oenoke Ridge became available, we jumped at the opportunity. We have driven by this house, and this area often on the way to drop our children at school. We have long admired the classic New England charm of this part of town and when the chance to own a home here became available, we moved quickly to purchase the home. The week we have spent here unpacking and settling in, we have come to appreciate how truly idyllic this part of town is. You can imagine our surprise and disappointment when we learned this week of the proposed project almost directly across the street from us. The scale of this project is almost hard to comprehend. The fact that New Canaan would
consider this development, in a historic district of
town, is truly upsetting. A very large part of why
we were so enthusiastic to buy our home is the
beautiful and historic location it occupies in town.
We feel that if this development were to proceed, it
would damage what makes New Canaan so
special. We moved to New Canaan, after over 20
years in Darien. In large part, what we love about
New Canaan is the classic New England village
feel, which is increasingly hard to find in
surrounding towns.

A huge project such as the one proposed, would
certainly benefit from a larger space in town. We
sincerely hope that the Planning and Zoning
Commission will reconsider the location of this
project.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Karen and Paul Stamoulis
90 Oenoke Ridge Rd.
New Canaan
203-559-1154
Planning and Zoning Commission
Town of New Canaan
77 Main Street
New Canaan, Connecticut 06840

Re: Concern for the proposed CCRC at 65 Oenoke Ridge

Dear Sirs:

I have lived in New Canaan for 46 years. I do not live in the neighborhood of the CCRC proposed for 65 Oenoke Ridge – but over three miles away up next to the Poor Farm on Laurel Road. I am generally supportive of the idea of a CCRC for our town; I remember the controversy over the mulch pile site a decade ago.

My concern with the current proposal at 65 Oenoke (I have seen the slide presentation twice) is that it may change the nature of our community from a “small town” to a “small city.” Consider driving down Oenoke Ridge from the north. What would you see looming up ahead of you on the left? Or driving in from the east along Hemlock Hill? Or coming up from the south along God’s Acre?

The logistical and financial aspects of a CCRC can be daunting. I am not an expert on whether they would permit the currently proposed CCRC to be modified to fit more appropriately within the community. ’Twould be well if that could be done, not well if it could not be done.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard H. Troy
Stop the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge

From: Nancy Gilbert (nancytoddgilbert@gmail.com)
To: lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
Cc: lola.sweeney@newcanaanct.gov
Date: Thursday, October 24, 2019, 04:40 PM EDT

Your Name: Nancy Gilbert

Your Address: 67 Turtleback Road South, New Canaan, CT 06840

Why you are opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge:

We are New Canaan! Not Darien with its Post Road running through the middle, not Greenwich with its heavy traffic and many shops, and not the town of Wilton whose boundaries are difficult to define.

New Canaan has God’s Acre with the Congregational Church established in 1733 sitting at the top. Our first presidential election was not held until 1789 when George Washington became president. We are so typically New England in architecture and feeling as one proceeds past the fire station and up God’s Acre Hill, passing the wonderful homes on the right, next the beautiful Lutheran Church, the fabulous Historical Society with its old buildings painted in historical colors, and up toward St. Mark’s church with it’s lovely open May Fair lawn. All these structures set the feeling of standing together, as one proceeds up Oenoke Ridge Road, open wide, eyes ahead.

I am not against a Continuing Care residence for New Canaan Seniors. I know we have been working on that idea for years when the area by Waveny Park on Lapham Road was considered. And I most sincerely and humbly thank all those individuals who have given so many hours to find answers for our seniors. We are all indebted.

I am opposed to the Development @ 65 Oenoke Ridge because of its location and because of the small space available for the development. I believe it will diminish the wonderful feeling of cohesiveness our town still has at a time in our world when we must particularly hang on to tradition.

Thank you for your consideration.
Dear Commission Members,

My name is Don Gilbert, I have resided at 67 Turtleback Road for the past 44 years. I write in opposition to plans for the Waveny facility to be located on Oenoke Ridge.

When I moved my family to New Canaan in the mid seventies, like so many others, I was drawn to the town for all of its wonderful attributes; its excellent facilities, schools, historic ambience and not least, the serenity and openness exuded by the town itself as a draw to residents, visitors and shoppers alike. The plans I’ve seen for Waveny conflicts with all of the specialness people feel when they come here.

These are qualities very easy lost if large developments are allowed to be shoe-horned into space that was never meant for them; they create a sense of crowding and obscure views as they tower over homes unfortunate to be near. Gode Acre and the surrounding historic properties will never carry the same eminence. One has only to drive past the wall on Park Street to gather a sense of what I’m writing about.

Our family feels a deep commitment to this town; our children were raised here and now also live here. Grandchildren are growing up here. We live almost two miles from the proposed location of the facility but the appearance of the town in its entirety matters to us greatly.

I will close by making it clear that I understand there well may be a need for additional senior living facilities, (I myself may soon be a candidate) but not in the place the Waveny people have chosen.

Don Gilbert

Sent from my iPad
Planning a Zoning Commission

My family moved to New Canaan in the Spring of 2017 from Rowayton. We moved to town for the incredible school system and wonderful community that New Canaan is. Rowayton was changing, demographically and aesthetically.

We were so fortunate to find the current house we own on Denoué Road. I consider ourselves extremely lucky to have found a house in the neighborhood we live in. The peaceful location and proximity to town is second to none in my opinion.

The proposed Waveny Centre Development on Denoué is completely against the character of the community in its proposed location. I am conscious of the need for more housing options for our seniors however the proposed project is, in my opinion, not remotely consistent with the needs, the neighborhood safety or zoning of our single family community.

The intersection at which this development is proposed
Is already a dangerous walking zone. In fact I've had numerous incidents with traffic on the corner when walking to and from the train.

In summary, my family is strongly opposed to the development of the proposed 145,000 square foot senior development project at 65 Demont Edge. The proposal does not fit with either the culture or community in which it is proposed.

A very concerned citizen,

Stephe Matthews
Dear Planning and Zoning Commission,

We are writing in opposition of the proposed CCRC project on Oenoke Ridge.

The community around the proposed location is far more residential in character than institutional as the term is used in the application. The degree to which zoning norms need to be revised to allow this project speaks to the lasting negative visual and volume impact that will be done to this access route to and from our village.

The massive size and coverage of the building does not in any fashion comport to scale of the buildings around the site. St Marks is set on a large property with substantial lawn at its front. The Historical Museum and Society is a series of buildings not much different than homes on large open grounds. That is true for all other buildings along the road including the existing yellow house, the Maple Inn, the Roger Sherman and the homes that line Oenoke Ridge. The proposed building does not resemble the lot coverage or the scale of neighborhood buildings and will permanently damage the New England character of this portion of New Canaan.

We are not opposed in principle to a CCRC in town. It is hard to accept this is the only possible location. The proposal several years ago to consider the area across Lapham Road west of Waveny would much better accommodate the scale of this project and would better align with the existing Waveny Care facility. We do not recall that the planning at that time had moved so far along, perhaps a second look is called for at this time.

With best regards,

Diane and Douglas Dooley

cc: New Canaan Advertiser

91 Gerrish Lane, New Canaan
203 966 1632
Oenoke Application

From: Thomas W. Lynn (twlynn@aol.com)
To: townplanner@lynn.brooksavni
Cc: twlynn@aol.com
Date: Sunday, November 17, 2019, 09:15 AM EST

Thomas W. & Diane D. Lynn
211 Laurel Road
New Canaan, CT 06840

November 17, 2019

New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission
Town Planner@ lynn.brooksavni@newcanaanct.gov
New Canaan, CT 06840

Dear Members of the New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission:

We are writing to you in connection with our opposition for approval for a significant zoning change with respect to the application of The Waveny LifeCare Network.

1) LOCATION- This is NOT the location for such an oversized, commercial-type building - senior housing or not. Yes, commercial - as this is designed to plug the deficit created by the various other Waveny enterprises. The cost of entrance and maintenance is significantly above other area senior housing and will provide few, if any, medical benefits. In essence, it's an expensive, over-sized housing facility - plain and simple.

Further, it poses increased dangers with greater traffic flow on a hilly, circuitous road. Fire hazard potential in a 3 story wooden-framed structure containing an elderly population is indeed problematical.

2) SYMPATHY- Your Chair has indicated that your Committee is sympathetic "to the need for senior housing in town, less focused on potential density". OK! But what right do you have to infringe on private property owners' rights and most assuredly depreciating their home values to satisfy your own sympathies? None in our opinion. Note: we do not live near this site, but, as
45 year owners and taxpayers here in New Canaan, are deeply concerned about your Commission’s precedent in allowing such a zoning change to significantly impact a residential area- any residential area, not just one that happens in this instance to be located in one of the most unique and protected areas in our Town.

In short, please DENY this application, without any conditions or potential to vary the number of units- it’s the wrong project in the wrong place. Thank you for listening

Sincerely,
Diane and Tom Lynn

Thomas W. Lynn
twlynn@aol.com
Members of the St. Mark’s Episcopal Church vestry are not supportive of a widely discussed housing complex planned for a neighboring parcel on Oenoke Ridge, officials say.

The vestry voted not to support Waveny LifeCare Network’s proposal for “The Oenoke” during a Sept. 22 meeting, according to an email sent to members Tuesday and obtained by NewCanaanite.com.

Its decision “was not reached lightly,” said the email, signed by the Rev. Peter Walsh, rector, Senior Warden Stan Twardy and Junior Warden Mark Thorsheim. The elected vestry is a decision-making body for the church and consists of about a dozen people, according to the St. Mark’s website.

“Concluding that the proposed project would permanently and meaningfully interfere with our campus and impede St. Mark’s ministry, the Vestry voted not to support it,” the email said.

The Oenoke is a proposed three-story complex with 28 one-bedroom and 42 two-bedroom units, ranging from 850 to 1,500 square feet. Planned for a parcel south of the May Fair field and including the site of a house that’s owned by the New Canaan Historical Society, it would have an underground parking lot, according to an application on file with Planning & Zoning.

Advocates for the project have said The Oenoke would fill a sorely needed housing gap among New Canaan seniors who want to live independently and close to town, with access to medical and other services.

P&Z was to open Waveny’s application at a special Oct. 2 meeting but it was canceled Sept. 20. P&Z Chairman John Goodwin said during Tuesday night’s regular meeting of the Commission that the application now is expected to come before the appointed body Oct. 29.
“A special meeting of the Vestry was convened on Tuesday, September 17 at which the subcommittee shared its diligence, and the Vestry began discernment. Taking into account the information provided by the subcommittee, independent review of the application before Planning & Zoning, advice of counsel, and your input, the Vestry engaged in thoughtful and faithful discernment.”
Preservation Group: Proposed Residential Retirement Complex Would ‘Loom Over the Historic District’

By Michael Dinan | October 1, 2019

Saying a proposed residential retirement complex would loom over New Canaan’s Historic District, members of a local nonprofit organization dedicated to preservation said this week that they’re opposed to it.

The three-story complex planned for 65 Oenoke Ridge “will dominate the view looking north from God’s Acre, and simply overpower the Historical Society campus and St. Michael’s Church,” according to a Sept. 30 letter to the Planning & Zoning Commission from Neele-Banks Stichnoth, president of the New Canaan Preservation Alliance Board of Trustees.

“The view looking south from St. Mark’s Great Lawn, which, incidentally, was designed to merge with the rural aspect of the Historical Society buildings, will now be interrupted by the two city blocks-deep, 450 foot wide façade, designed without regard to surrounding residential architecture.”

The Historical Society itself supports the project, which would acquire a single-family home that the Historical Society owns and combine it with another parcel in order to create a complex with 28 one-bedroom and 42 two-bedroom units. As part of its application, Waveny is proposing that an “overlay zone” be added to the New Canaan Zoning Regulations to make the project possible.

“The Oenoke” is to allow local seniors “to maintain their independence while providing supportive services and guaranteed access to the full range of care services that form the heart of the Waveny LifeCare Network’s mission,” they said in an open Sept. 20 letter addressed to the New Canaan community. “It will be fully owned, developed and operated by Waveny and will support Waveny’s not-for-profit mission to serve. The community will include many on-site services, recognizing the accessibility
challenges faced by seniors today. Pricing will compare favorably to other CCRCs and will be set to cover the costs of operation and financing and depreciation to ensure long-term financial sustainability. There will be no outside investors expecting or receiving financial returns. All funds remain in the New Canaan community.”

According to Stichnoth’s letter, though senior housing itself is “an admirable cause that most New Canaan residents support,” the issues with the current application are “where to site a senior residential complex, and what impact it will have on the community character that brought us all to New Canaan in the first instance, and whether the location enhancers or reduces the value of adjacent residential properties.”

“The proposed Waveny CCRC is simply too massive for the site, and the three-story, two-blocks-deep building will loom over the Historic District and destroy its rural historic character and sense of ‘place.’ Visualize the exterior lighting at night, and how the building will look in the day with new landscaping after 30 plus mature trees are cut down for construction.”

The Historic District encompasses 21 properties that ring God’s Acre ([map here](https://www.newcanaan.info/Commissions/Historic%20District/Map%20of%20Historic%20District.pdf)).

The St. Mark’s Episcopal Church vestry voted recently ([not to support the Oenoke senior housing complex](https://newcanaanite.com/st-marks-votes-not-to-support-the-oenoke-senior-housing-complex-1816359)) not to support the application, though it isn’t clear whether the church will actively oppose it. P&Z is expected to take up the application at its Oct. 29 meeting. (The full application can be found in the dropdown menu here ([here](https://www.newcanaan.info/departments/land_use/planning___zoning/pending_p_z_commission_applications.php)).

According to Stichnoth, the Oenoke Association—a group representing condominium owners on Heritage Hill Road—is opposed to the application.
Multiple members of the Planning and Zoning Commission expressed negative viewpoints regarding developer Andy Glazer’s hoped-for plan to build six houses on the 1.7-acre site of the Roger Sherman Inn, but longtime member Laszlo Papp cautioned that while not a perfect plan, voting against it could lead to an even less desirable outcome.

The thoughts were expressed at a meeting Tuesday, Feb. 28. Glazer has a deal to buy the Roger Sherman property, at 195 Oenoke Ridge, from owners Nes Jaffre and Joseph Jaffre, and his desire to convert the property to six freestanding houses has drawn a lot of opinions, both for and against.

Four of the eight P&A members in attendance said they did not favor the proposed development. Two members were in favor, two were noncommittal, and three [Bill Redman, Dan Radman and Jack Flinn] were absent.

“What we decide has nothing to do with the Roger Sherman Inn, whether it stays or goes,” said Claire Tiscornia. “My initial reaction to the project was that it looked good. But the more I thought about it, I disagreed with the applicant because we’re setting a precedent. If you approve it [cluster housing] in one place, we’re going to get another project somewhere else. And that really concerns me. For that reason I cannot be in favor of the
“If you have a one-acre house and have houses on either side of you, you shouldn't have to worry about anything other than a single-family house coming next door. People have to have faith in our zoning.”

John Kriz agreed.

“It seems like a lot of product on a small amount of space,” he said. “The design seems nice but it’s still a very intensive use of a prominent parcel in town on a main highway, an entry into town. It just seems too dense. I don’t see a compelling argument why this should be allowed in this particular spot.”

Longtime P&Z member and former Chairman Papp took a more pragmatic view.

“If you come to the conclusion that this plan is not acceptable because it is too dense, you expose yourself to something that may be even worse,” he said. “So when you reach a decision you have to think of the unintended circumstances.”

Elizabeth DeLuca noted that the project, which has been said to be targeting downsizing New Canaan seniors who want to be close to town, does not really work well that way in her opinion.

“We have the M2 [Merritt Village] project coming along that will provide similar housing,” she said. “We have zones that provide space for this kind of thing. Seniors want to live in town, but you do not want to hike the [Oenoke Ridge] hill two or three times a day. That's not really great walking.”
In favor

In support of Glazer’s project was Dick Ward.

“The comments I find most persuasive are from the immediate [Roger Sherman] neighbors,” he said. “It turns out that neighbors on the two opposite sides of the Roger Sherman are strongly in favor of this project, largely because they find the commercial use [currently in place] is objectionable because of noise, lights and automobiles. So if it’s turned down, we’re left with a somewhat dilapidated Roger Sherman Inn, which I guess is going to close no matter what.

“I’m convinced that Glazer has proven himself to be a very competent and caring developer. The Maples Inn [a Glazer project next to the Roger Sherman] is impressive. It looks nice from Oenoke Ridge. I think he will do something that will look nice. The only way he can proceed is with a certain number of units to make it financially viable. The neighbors’ voice should be listened to. Not the people who don’t live [around] there.”

Before tasking Town Planner Steve Palmer with drawing up papers that would work with approval or denial, P&Z Chairman John Goodwin offered his thoughts in a measured tone.

“It’s a clear risk that if we turn down this application we don’t know what we’ll get,” he said. “On the other hand I have concerns that if we continue to extend cluster housing, which is a term I don’t like, do we continue to allow non-single family housing to push its way outward [from town]? I am worried that it could potentially set a precedent that other developers could use… the garden center on Frogtown, the garden center on 123, and we could come up with others.”