



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

December 16, 2016

Mr. John H. Goodwin, Chairman
Planning and Zoning Commission
Town Hall
77 Main Street
New Canaan, CT 06840

Re: Planning, Land Use, and Zoning Analysis of the Grace Farms Foundation Special Permit Application at 365 Lukes Wood Road, New Canaan, CT.

Dear Chairman Goodwin and Commissioners:

The following report has been prepared by me at the request of Jennifer Holme and David Markatos who are the owners of 1328 Smith Ridge Road and abutting neighbors to Grace Farms. To complete the record on my report I have visited the subject property, the abutting streets, and neighborhood area within the past 60 days. My Curriculum Vitae is also submitted for the record in this matter.

The report outlines several **key planning and zoning issues which prevent the approval of the special permit application**. In order of importance, these key issues include the following:

1. The Zoning Regulations do not allow multiple principal uses on a single lot.
2. The intensity of use, the collective impact of the uses—the specially permitted and existing religious institution use, and the existing, but unpermitted, clubs and organizations use and philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions use —on Grace Farms are already *encroaching on and adversely impacting the neighboring area and neighboring properties*. Allowing/permitting the existing intensity of uses will simply ensure the continuance of *encroachment and adverse impacts on neighboring areas and properties*.
3. The requested special permit does not satisfy the required standards of approval in the New Canaan Zoning Regulations as specified in Article 8 (Procedures), Section 8.2 (Commission Procedures), subsection B (Special Permit Application), and subsection 4 (Special Permit Criteria). Specifically, Section 8.2.B.4 Subsections (a) Suitable Location for Use, (b) Appropriate Improvements, and (g) Plan of Conservation and Development.
4. There are several significant issues regarding use, how uses are conceptualized, and how uses are allowed in Article 2 (Definitions) and Article 3 (Residence Zones) which are not addressed in the application, that require greater standards for approval than simply the



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

Special Permit Criteria in Section 8.2.B.4, and need careful considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

5. The application fails to promote “the goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development” (p. 166), as required in the Zoning Regulations as a standard for approval of Special Permits. This is of critical importance since the Plan of Conservation and Development—in Chapter 5 (Enhanced Livability), subsection (Protecting Residential Neighborhoods), and (Ensuring Institutional Uses are Appropriately Scaled)—recognizes significant and serious issues of scale, intensity, and inadequacies of the Special Permit Criteria in the Zoning Regulations to address the encroachment and impacts of institutional uses on neighboring residential properties.
6. The application for special permit is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning in that a reasonable expectation for such a collective and co-location of institutional uses is not conceptualized or expressly allowed in the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning.
7. The application is inconsistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development “goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations” regarding Chapter 4 (Nurture Downtown) and Downtown as a focal point for community; and that Grace Farms Foundation special events and programs are better suited for a Downtown location and would enhance the vibrancy and prosperity of Downtown New Canaan.

The report will further discuss each of these key planning and zoning issues, although not in the same order as listed above. The report is present in five sections:

Section I. The Existing Site and Application

Section II. Land Use – Overview and General Findings

Section III. The Plan of Conservation and Development

Section IV. The Comprehensive Plan of Zoning

Section V. Conclusions

I. The Existing Site and Application

The site, Grace Farms, for this proposed special permit application is approximately 80 acres and located in the ‘Four Acre’ Residential Zone. Institutional uses are permitted in residential zones and the Grace Farms site has an approved special permit for a religious institution use. Grace Farms is a pastoral and picturesque landscape that is mostly maintained as open space surrounding the internationally recognized River Building. Grace Farms is situated in a predominately residential neighborhood of the



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

picturesque and romantic suburban style with large lots and large homes. Grace Farms is bounded by residential uses/homes on all sides.

The special permit application, as described by the applicant, is a “request for a Second Amended Special Permit for authorization of an additional principal use on the Grace Farms property as a ‘Club or Organization’ and ‘Philanthropic or Eleemosynary Institution’ use for Grace Farms Foundation, Inc. itself. In addition to the existing Special Permit use of a ‘Religious Institution’ previously granted in 2013 and will continue to be exercised by Grace Community Church, and associated modifications to the 2013 Special Permit, as detailed in the Application dated September 26, 2016.”

II. Land Use – Overview and General Findings

From a land use planning perspective, the existing Grace Farms site is generally consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development, the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning, and the overall character of the low-density residential neighborhood. What I mean by this is that New Canaan is a pastoral and picturesque suburban community, and Grace Farms is consistent with the pastoral and picturesque aesthetic that dominates neighborhood. It should be noted, within the context of the pastoral and picturesque character of New Canaan, there is a long tradition of modernism and quality modernist architecture, with which Grace Farms and the River Building are also consistent. With that said, while Grace Farms is generally consistent with the character of New Canaan and New Canaan’s land use policies, Grace Farms (including the special permit application) also exhibits inconsistencies regarding the character of the neighborhood, specific land use policies, and the interpretation and administration of the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning. For example, regarding the character of the neighborhood, the black chain link fence (including the guard house and entry gates) that encloses the property conveys a message and image of security, as opposed to a message and image of privacy conveyed by stone walls and driveway gates that dominate residential properties in the area. The fencing alerts the visitor to a non-residential and institutional use.

Regarding land use and the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning, the inconsistencies associated with Grace Farms are primarily manifested in the context of intensity—the intensity of the existing institutional use(s) (including the requested special permit to legitimize such uses)—creating *encroachments and adverse impacts on the surrounding residential neighborhood and neighboring residential properties*. The fact is, the conflicting nature of institutional uses and residential uses is not inherent within the institutional uses themselves. The individual use of the existing religious institution or the individual uses of the unpermitted ‘Club or Organizations’ and ‘Philanthropic or Eleemosynary Institutions’ on their own, do not conflict with the residential character of the area or to a degree, even the neighboring residential properties. The conflicts—the encroachment of the institutional uses on and their adverse impacts on neighboring residential properties—are the result of the co-location and co-existence of such institutional uses that collectively create an intensity of use that is inconsistent with the residential



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

character of the neighborhood and neighboring residential properties. In the work of land use planning, this is common. The intensity of use is often the greater challenge and issue than the use itself. Unfortunately, intensity of use, regardless of the specific use (institutional or other) is very difficult to manage, regulate, and enforce—especially when an intensity of use is proximate to residential uses. Simply put, intensity of use is the problem to solve.

III. The Comprehensive Plan – New Canaan’s Plan of Conservation and Development.

The Plan of Conservation and Development is an advisory policy document that allows a community to plan for future growth, development, and conservation, and how it will meet the ever-changing needs of the community over time. While the Plan of Conservation and Development is, generally speaking, an advisory policy document that the Planning and Zoning Commission is not bound to, the New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission has codified the Plan of Conservation and Development in the Zoning Regulations (Section 8.2.B.4.g) as one of the criteria for considering and evaluating a Special Permit application. Section 8.2.B.4 states, “In considering any application for a Special Permit, the Commission shall evaluate the merit of the application with respect to the following factors”, one of which is the Plan of Conservation and Development. Section 8.2.B.4.g (Plan of Conservation and Development) explains, “The proposed use or activity...promotes the goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development”.

Adopted in 2014, the New Canaan Plan of Conservation and Development (Plan of C & D) provides a ‘vision and plan for the future’ development of New Canaan. Therefore, the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Plan of C & D must be considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the proposed application for Special Permit must promote the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Plan of C & D.

In this regard, Chapter 4 (Nurture Downtown) and Chapter 5 (Enhance Livability) provide important considerations for the Planning and Zoning Commission. I will begin with Chapter 5 (Enhanced Livability), since it deals directly with Institutional Uses, the subject of this proposed application. The Plan of C & D explains, the “livability of a community is the result of the factors that add up to its quality of life” (p.51). This is important and relevant to the proposed application and the concerns of the neighbors, whose concerns are essentially about the threat to their quality of life that the existing use of the site has created, and the proposed application seeks to intensify.

A. Enhanced Livability

The existing specially permitted use on the Grace Farms site is a religious institution, and while the religious use may provide some impacts to adjacent properties (proximity of parking facilities and lighting), it is not the religious use that poses threats to the quality of life for the neighbors. The threats to neighboring properties have come from the illegal use and intensification of ‘clubs and organization’



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

and ‘philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions’ uses on the site—the very uses being requested in the proposed application for Special Permit uses. This should be of serious concern to the Planning and Zoning Commission since the Plan of C & D recognizes the existing incompatibility issues created by institutional uses and the threats that institutional uses pose to residential neighborhoods. In fact, 11-pages (pages 56 - 66) or 11.3% of the Plan of C&D is dedicated to ‘Protecting Residential Neighborhoods’ and most of which focuses on ‘Ensuring Institutional Uses Are Appropriately Scaled’ (p. 56). For example, the Plan of C & D when discussing the need for ‘Ensuring Institutional Uses Are Appropriately Scaled’ explains (p. 56):

...some changes may be warranted to the regulations to ensure that some of the institutional and other uses currently allowed in residential zones (such as those identified in Section 3.2.C of the Zoning Regulations) have an appropriate scale and intensity for their location.

There is no doubt that institutional and other uses currently allowed in the residential zones are community assets and they help enhance the overall quality of life. The challenge is to find an appropriate balance so that such uses fit into the community and neighborhood.

Currently, institutional and other uses currently allowed in residential zone are allowed in residential districts by granting of a Special Permit by the Commission. Since there are no additional standards or provisions related to most of these uses, they are subject to the same dimensional standards as have been established for the residential uses within the zoning district.

The above statements from the Plan of C & D in a chapter titled ‘Enhance Livability’, in a section titled ‘Protecting Residential Neighborhoods’, and a subsection titled ‘Ensuring Institutional Uses Are Appropriately Scaled’ clearly recognizes that some institutional uses in residential zones pose threats to residential neighborhoods, residential properties, and the quality of life of residents. Most important, the Plan of C & D recognizes that “appropriate scale and intensity” (p.56) of uses are critically important. Furthermore, the Plan of C & D recognizes that the existing Special Permit criteria in the Zoning Regulations are inadequate to deal with such uses. The Plan of C & D explains (P.58):

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 residential properties (noise, lighting, traffic, drainage, etc.) (emphasis added).

This language provides a clear recognition that threats of *encroachment or impact regarding noise, lighting, traffic, drainage, etc.* harm residential neighborhoods and neighboring properties—the very issues concerned neighbors are raising regarding the proposed Grace Farms application. The Plan of C & D conceptualizes three possible approaches to minimize and/or manage the encroachment or impact of institutional uses. The three possible approaches include:

- “Enhanced Special Permit Criteria” (p. 58)



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

- “Establish An Institutional Zone” (p. 60)
- “Planned Development District” (p. 61)

While there are pros and cons to each of these options for addressing the *encroachment or impact* of institutional uses, all three options, as conceptualized in the Plan of C & D, fall short of addressing the key issue and challenge regarding institutional uses in general and specifically the Grace Farms site. The key issue and challenge is the *intensity of use*. In fact, the only way to adequately address the *intensity of use* is to limit the *intensity of use*. Granting the requested special permit would not only allow the existing *intensity of use*, but also would encourage further and greater *intensity of use*.

The Plan of C & D ‘Implementation Element’ provides the following three recommendations to “ensure institutional uses are appropriately scaled” (Page IE-16):

1. Seek to minimize and/or manage the encroachment or impacts of institutional uses and other uses allowed in residential zones on neighboring residential properties (noise, lighting, traffic, drainage, etc.).
2. Adopt zoning provisions to help ensure that institutional uses and other uses allowed in residential zones have an appropriate scale and intensity for their location.
3. Consider establishing an enhanced special permit process, an institutional zone, a “planned development district”, or other approach for managing institutional uses and other uses allowed in residential zones.

The above recommendations are identified in the ‘Implementation Element’ as top priorities and were assigned a 2014 target date for being addressed by the Planning and Zoning Commission. While work has progressed, the Commission’s proposed amendment, ‘Institutional Uses in Residential Zones’ has yet to be adopted. However, even the working-draft amendment falls short of addressing the appropriateness of scale and the intensity of use for Grace Farms. However, it should be noted that Subsection 3.2.D.4.f of the working-draft amendment, as written, states “There shall be no noise amplifying devices or speakers located on the exterior of the building unless required for security purposes or unless the Commission grants their use for a special event.” Knowing that noise devices are an existing issue—creating encroachments and impacts on neighboring residential properties—and proposing such draft language further emphasizes the Planning and Zoning Commission’s recognition of the threat of *‘encroachment or impact of institutional uses’* on residential neighborhoods and neighboring residential properties.

From the perspective of planning, specifically comprehensive planning (the Plan of C & D) and land use planning, there is recognition of the inherent challenge associated with the proximity of different (potentially conflicting) land uses, and the New Canaan Plan of C & D has identified this challenge regarding institutional uses in residential zones and neighborhoods—specifically the appropriateness of scale and intensity of use. What is most interesting is that the Planning and Zoning Commission is confronted with an existing specially permitted institutional use (a religious institution) where activities



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

on the site of the institutional use have intensified through the growth of unrelated club and organizations and philanthropic or eleemosynary institutional uses. Moreover, it is the existing club and organizations and philanthropic or eleemosynary institution uses -- specifically the intensity of these uses -- that are creating the *encroachments and impacts* on the residential neighborhood and neighboring properties.

This is a unique circumstance where the Planning and Zoning Commission is confronted with an existing condition that provides a view into the future. Regardless of the legal status of the uses occupying Grace Farms, the existing uses at Grace Farms are creating *encroachments and impacts* (negative impacts) on neighboring residential properties. Therefore, the Commission does not need to speculate as to what may be the issue in the future if it approves the special permit, but can in the present time see what the future will be if the Commission grants the special permit. Allowing the addition of clubs and organizations and philanthropic or eleemosynary institute uses to the existing site will ensure continued *encroachments and impacts* to neighboring properties. In fact, the *encroachments and impacts* will not only continue, but also will most likely intensify. By granting the special permit and allowing the additional uses, the Planning and Zoning Commission will be approving and allowing an *intensity of use* that is inconsistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development and clearly not compliant with Special Permit criteria in Section 8.2.B.4 of the Zoning Regulations, specifically criteria (g) 'Plan of Conservation and Development'.

B. Community

Not surprisingly, this is not the only area where the proposed application conflicts with the goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development. The proposed uses at Grace Farms also conflict with Chapter 4 (Nurture Downtown), and are inconsistent with the policies and recommendations aimed at creating a more vibrant and community oriented Downtown New Canaan.

The Grace Farms Foundation mission, in part, is focused on community. However, community in the context of planning, is an ambiguous word with many meanings. For example, community can be the place (the town or neighborhood), community can be the collective relationship of residents in a shared space or place, or community can be shared interests (the Kiwanis, Elks Club, or youth sports leagues). The New Canaan Plan of Conservation and Development discusses 'community character' as physical character or as quality of life and sense of place. Therefore, when confronted with concept of community, as planners, we need to ask 'what kind of community' are we discussing and 'who's community' is being served.

While the mission, in part, of the Grace Farms Foundation is aimed at creating and serving community, this does not mean their community is the same community as envisioned by the Plan of C & D, or that the aims of creating and serving community are the same. There are differences in community, a sense of community, and service to community between public parks and community centers owned and



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

operated by the Town of New Canaan, and the semi-public Grace Farms philanthropic activities and club or organization structure. For example, the space of public parks and community centers are spaces of public community, which are different than the gated and security patrolled space and community of Grace Farms.

Regarding community, Chapter 4 (Nurture Downtown) of the Plan of C & D establishes Downtown New Canaan as a focal point of community life. For example, the Plan of C & D recommends 'Consider Establishing An Entertainment Venue' (p. 48) and to 'Continue Special Events in The Downtown' (p. 49). Together, these two sections not only seek to provide a means of nurturing and enhancing Downtown, but also recognize that community focused activities can and should be in the Downtown—conceptualized as physical venues and special events. For example, the Plan of C & D explains (p. 49):

activities are important to attracting residents and visitors and should be continued. In addition, opportunities to expand the number of events or extend their time period...should be pursued.

As indicated in the Commercial Market Study, opportunities to integrate special events in the downtown with other activities in New Canaan (such as those held by the Nature Center, the 'Glass House', and other organizations) should also be pursued.

Grace Farms Foundation is one of these other organizations and their special events and programs are well suited for Downtown New Canaan, an appropriate location. Not only would such events and programs enhance the community focus of Downtown, they would further contribute to vibrancy and economic prosperity of Downtown New Canaan. Utilizing Downtown New Canaan as the location for the Grace Farms Foundation's special events and programs would draw the Foundation into the New Canaan community, creating a greater focal point of community in Downtown, and the potential for a strong symbiotic relationship between the Town, the Foundation, and the residents of New Canaan.

In conclusion, regarding the New Canaan Plan of Conservation and Development, the Grace Farms Foundation application for a special permit to allow clubs and organizations and philanthropic or eleemosynary institute uses on the site are *inconsistent with the goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations of the Plan of C & D*. The conflicts created by institutional uses in residential zones are well documented in the Plan of C & D and the existing uses (legal or not) and *intensity of such uses* on the Grace Farms site, exemplify the problems of *encroachments and impacts on neighboring properties*. More importantly, the *intensity of use* existing on the Grace Farms site today foreshadows a future of increased *intensity and perpetual encroachments and impacts* on neighboring properties. The only way to adequately address the *intensity of use* and to avoid continuous future enforcement issues, is to simply limit the *intensity of use* permitted on Grace Farms. Furthermore, New Canaan has a Downtown that is growing as a focal point of community activity and would benefit from the special events and programs provided by the Grace Farms Foundation. Moving and hosting these events and programs in Downtown New Canaan would mutually benefit New Canaan, Grace Farms Foundation, and the residents of New Canaan by bolstering the vibrancy, economic prosperity, and sense of place and community that is vital to a sustainable and resilient Downtown.



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

IV. The Comprehensive Plan of Zoning – The Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map

In Connecticut, the zoning regulations and zoning map, as a collective document, is defined as the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning. The Comprehensive Plan of Zoning sets forth the community's future development plan and provides property owners with a *reasonable expectation* for the present and future use of land within zoning districts. This is important to understand regarding the Grace Farms Foundation application for a special permit to allow additional clubs and organization and philanthropic or eleemosynary (as defined in the Zoning Regulations) institutional uses on a site already occupied by a specially permitted religious institution use. Therefore, to understand how the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning is important regarding this application, requires us to think carefully about how zoning is interpreted, administered, and enforced. To accomplish this, the following analysis will walk the Commission through a detailed interpretive process of New Canaan's Zoning Regulations and how the Regulations apply to the Grace Farms Foundation application—keeping in mind that when interpreting zoning regulations, we must narrowly interpret specific terms and phrases.

A. Interpretation Principles

To begin, I want to explore how the Regulations are to be interpreted regarding use, specifically, principal use. Section 1.5 (Interpretation of Regulations), subsection A (Permitted Uses and Activities), subsection 1 states "Any principal use of land, buildings or structures not expressly permitted by these Regulations in the various zoning districts is prohibited." The critical interpretive concept informs us that any principal use must be expressly permitted or it is prohibited.

Article 3 – Residence Zone, Section 3.1 (Purposes) explains that "residential districts *may* [emphasis added] allow for certain non-residential uses when it can be demonstrated that they are compatible with nearby residential uses and preserve neighborhood character and property values" (p.41). As stated, this provision sets forth a *qualifier* for permitted and specially permitted uses. That is, it is not enough for a use to be listed as a permitted or specially permitted use, but that any non-residential use that is listed as permitted or specially permitted must also demonstrate that the use is *compatible with nearby residential uses and preserves neighborhood character and property values*. That is essentially a three-part test for any use, before we can begin to consider the specific special permit requirements, and the burden of proof to demonstrate such requirements is on the applicant. While the Grace Farms Foundation application includes testimony regarding property values, it does not specifically address or demonstrate how the proposed institutional uses are compatible with nearby residential uses or how said uses preserves neighborhood character.

The three-part test is not the only test for uses that are expressly permitted (or expressly specially permitted). Article 3 – Residence Zone, Section 3.2 (Principle Uses & Structures), subsection C (Permitted by Special Permit) expressly permits the existing 'religious institutions' use and requested 'clubs and organizations' and the 'philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions' uses provided a special permitted is granted. However, each of the uses is presented and described with specific qualifiers that



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

limit the use being expressly permitted. Essentially, the qualifiers explain how or when a use is expressly permitted. For example, Zoning Regulations present the three uses in question on the Grace Farms site as follows:

- “Religious institutions when located on and served by a collector or arterial road as identified in the Plan of Conservation and Development” (p. 44).
- “Clubs and other organizations providing social, cultural and recreational uses serving a community need or convenience and not including any activity carried on primarily for profit” (p. 45).
- “Institutions of philanthropic or eleemosynary organizations serving a significant community need” (p.45).

While the Plan of Conservation and Development (2014) does not identify collector or arterial roads, it is reasonable to assume that State Routes 123 and 124 are arterial roads. Planimetrics’ Roadway Classification Plan for New Canaan denotes Luke’s Wood Road as a collector road in that it links directly to Rte. 124 (notwithstanding dead-ending in New York State at the intersection of Puddin Hill Road and West Road, both designated as local roads) and, on that basis, the existing religious institution use could be deemed to meet the qualifier. The qualifiers for the other two uses are even more tenuous. For example, clubs and organizations must be “providing social, cultural and recreational uses” and they must be “serving a community need or convenience.” Therefore, a club or organization is not expressly permitted unless it meets the qualifier. The clubs or organizations must demonstrate to the Commission they serve a community need or convenience. The same is true for the other requested use. Institutions of philanthropic or eleemosynary organizations are required to serve “a significant community need” to be expressly permitted in a residential zone. The Grace Farms Foundation application does not address these qualifiers, nor does the application identify the community need, or demonstrate how they serve a community need, or a “significant community need.” More troublesome is that the Zoning Regulations do not specifically explain what it means to be “serving a community need or convenience” or to be “serving a significant community need.” This returns us to the discussion above regarding community, the multiplicity of meanings of community, and what New Canaan considers community or a community need to be versus what the Grace Farms Foundation considers as community or community need to be. Whose community needs are being served?

B. Principal Use

A greater concern is revealed when we examine the definition of principal use and the uses permitted (and special permitted uses) in the Residence Zones. To start, while each of the uses (religious institutions, clubs and organizations, and philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions) that are the subject of the Grace Farms Foundation application and site are expressly permitted (provided they meet the qualifiers discussed above) individually, the Zoning Regulations do not expressly permit or address these uses collectively. To say it another way: the Zoning Regulations do not allow for multiple uses, or what is often known as a mixed use development, on a single site in a residence zone. This creates a



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

fatal problem with the Grace Farms Foundation application, in that having more than one principal uses on a site is not expressly permitted in the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning.

Article 2 – Definitions, Section 2.2 (Defined Terms) defines a principal use (or Use, Principal as listed in the regulations) as “the primary or predominant use of any lot or building” (p. 37). *Predominant means having superior strength, influence, or authority, or being the most frequent or common. Primary means the first in order or rank of importance* (Merriam-Webster Dictionary). Therefore, a literal interpretation (narrowly interpreting the zoning provisions) of the principal use definition informs us that a lot cannot have two or more uses, otherwise there would be *no* ‘primary or predominant’ use. This conclusion is further evidenced by the definition of an accessory use (Use, Accessory), which is defined as being “subordinate to the principal use of a lot” (p. 37). A second or third (or more) use, is not ‘primary or predominant’ and could only be interpreted as *accessory or subordinate to the principal use*. Similar definitions also exist in the Regulations for ‘Building, Accessory’ and ‘Building, Principal’. It also needs to be noted that “The New Illustrated Book of Development Definitions”, cited in Section 2.1.C, also defined ‘Principal Use’ as “the primary or predominant use of any lot or parcel” (p. 208).

Mixed-uses or mixed-use development are not expressly permitted in any zone in New Canaan. However, mixed-uses are expressly implied in commercial zones that allow commercial and residential uses on the same lot. Section 2.2 (Defined Terms) defines ‘Mixed use Developments’ as having “more than one type of use in a building or set of buildings” (p. 29) and that “these developments must include residential units” (p.29) and “may contain multiple combinations of the allowed uses as outlined and permitted in that zone” (p. 29). Even if the Residence Zones expressly permitted mixed-use development, the proposed uses in the Grace Farms Foundation application do not include a residential use and as result, do not constitute a ‘mixed use development’.

The Grace Farms Foundation application focuses on the requirements for special permit, but does not address how uses are conceptualized, administered, and interpreted in the New Canaan Zoning Regulations. Unfortunately, as submitted and presented, the Grace Farms Foundation application requesting a special permit to allow ‘clubs and organizations’ and ‘philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions’ uses on the Grace Farms site fails to recognize and address the compatibility requirement, the qualifier requirements, and the core (or critical) issue of principal uses—the fact that multiple principal uses (or mixed use development) are not expressly permitted in residential zones and therefore are prohibited.

C. Special Permit Criteria

Regarding the Special Permit Criteria (Section 8.2.B.4); if the Commission were to interpret the regulatory provisions and principal use differently, determining that multiple principal uses or mixed-uses were allowable, the application could proceed, but then specific issues related to the special permit criteria still exist. Article 8 (Procedures), Section 8.2 (Commission Procedures), subsection B (Special Permit Application), subsection 4 (Special Permit Criteria) provides a total of seven criteria that the



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

applicant/use must demonstrate or satisfy. From a land use planning perspective, three of the criteria that the application does not satisfy are: subsection (a) Suitable Location for Use, subsection (b) Appropriate Improvements, and subsection (g) Plan of Conservation and Development. The following are discussions of each of the three Special Permit Criteria (Section 8.2.B.4):

1. **Subsection a (Suitable Location for Use):** The three use (religious institutions, clubs and organizations, and philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions) are individually permitted via the granting of a special permit, as requested by Grace Farms Foundation. However, the collective or co-location of the uses is not suitable for the location. The Comprehensive Plan of Zoning is intended to provide property owners with a *reasonable expectation* as to the use of land, both present and future use. While the three uses individually are expressly and specially permitted uses, collectively they are not contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning. This is important to understand, since the co-location and collective impact and result of these three uses, are different and more *intense* than the single existing religious institution use. *It is the collective intensity of the three uses that makes the location unsuitable for granting the special permit.* As discussed above, the existence of the three uses on the site today are *encroaching on and negatively impacting neighboring properties*. The site and uses have already demonstrated that the Grace Farms site and location is not suitable for the collective intensity of these uses. As important, since the co-location and co-existence of three principal uses (and the intensity of such uses) are not contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning, a reasonable expectation is not provided, and the uses are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning.
2. **Section 8.2.B.4.b.III (Appropriate Improvements):** It is evident, based on the complaints and concerns of the neighboring property owners, the requirement that the “proposed use or activity shall have no adverse effect upon the neighboring area resulting from the use of signs, exposed artificial lights, colored lights of any nature, flashing lights, loudspeakers or other noisemaking devices” is not being satisfied by the existing use and conditions of the Grace Farms site with the co-existence of the three uses (legal or not). Therefore, it is unrealistic to think that the circumstances and conditions can be satisfied or will improve if the special permit is granted. The site, as used today, specifically regarding lighting and noise is *adversely impacting the neighboring area and neighboring properties*.
3. **Section 8.2.B.4.g (Plan of Conservation and Development):** The Plan of C & D is regarded as an advisory policy document and the Planning and Zoning Commission is not *bound to the policies and recommendations of the Plan*. However, in the context of the special permit application process, the New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission has codified the Plan of Conservation and Development in the Special Permit Criteria of the Zoning Regulations. Specifically, Section 8.2.B.4 (Special Permit Criteria) states: “In considering any application for a Special Permit, the Commission shall evaluate the merit of the application with respect to the following factors” (p. 165), the application “promotes the goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development” (p. 166). Therefore, the Commission has essentially bounded their decision-making process to ensure that an application for special permit “promotes the



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development” (p. 166). In this case, the Grace Farms Foundation application, the Commission must consider the discussion and recommendations in Chapter 5 (Enhanced Livability), subsection (Protecting Residential Neighborhoods), and (Ensuring Institutional Uses are Appropriately Scaled) of the Plan of C & D. The Plan of C & D recognizes that serious issues of scale, intensity, and inadequacies of the Special Permit criteria to address the impacts of institutional uses already exist (see discussion above in Plan of C & D section). Based on the discussions and recommendations in the Plan of C & D regarding institutional uses in residential zone/neighborhoods and ensuring that institutional uses are appropriately scaled, it is nearly, if not completely, impossible to contemplate a scenario when and where the Grace Farms Foundation application for a special permit to allow and add ‘clubs and organizations’ and ‘philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions’ uses in this residential neighborhood could demonstrate the application “promotes the goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development” (p. 166).

The Grace Farms Foundation application requesting a special permit to allow ‘clubs and organizations’ and ‘philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions’ uses on the Grace Farms site fails to satisfy the Special Permit Criteria of ‘Suitable Location for Use’, ‘Appropriate Improvements’, and the ‘Plan of Conservation and Development’. Therefore, in addition to and regardless of the critical issues regarding compatibility of use requirements, the use qualifiers, the key issue of principal uses and the fact that multiple principal uses (or mixed use development) are not expressly permitted in residential zones, the application falls short of satisfying the special permit criteria.

Conclusion

From a planning, land use, and zoning perspective, my professional opinion is that the primary issue regarding the Grace Farms site and the special permit application is that the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning does not conceptualize multiple principal uses or expressly permit multiple principal uses on a single lot. Related to this primary issue are a host of secondary issues. These secondary issues include how uses are conceptualized and allowed, how the application fails to promote “the goals, objectives, policies, or recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development” (p. 166), and how the application does not satisfy the special permit criteria for approval. Collectively, these issues and shortcomings of the application demonstrate why the application should not be approved. More importantly, these issues and shortcomings all highlight the issue of *intensity* and the *intensity of use* occurring on the Grace Farms site. *Intensity of use* is the very reason multiple principal uses are not typically allowed in residential zones. The only way to adequately deal with problems of *intensity of use* is to not allow such *intensity of use* to occur in the first place. As used today, the Grace Farms site is creating encroachments and negative impacts on the neighboring residential area and neighboring residential properties. This is the very problem of intensity of institutional uses the Plan of C & D



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

addresses and seeks to resolve. Granting the requested special permit to allow the addition of 'clubs and organizations' and 'philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions' uses to the Grace Farms site in this residential zone/neighborhood will exacerbate the problem, undermining the purpose of the Plan of C & D, contradict the reasonable expectations provided to property owners in the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning, and upset the predictability and stability that provide New Canaan's residential neighborhoods their high quality of life.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Donald J. Poland".

Donald J. Poland, PhD, AICP, CZEO
Planning Consultant

[This document was prepared by Donald J. Poland, PhD, AICP, CZEO. The opinions and findings presented here are based on sound planning principles and the professional experience and expertise of Dr. Poland. The information provided in this report are specific to the proposed application, unique to the location and circumstances, and should not be interpreted to apply to any other applications or locations.]



DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING

PHONE: 860.655.6897 – E-MAIL: dpoland@gomanyork.com – www.gomanyork.com

Biography - Donald J. Poland, PhD, AICP, CZEO



860.655.6897

dpoland@gomanyork.com

Dr. Poland is a geographer, planner, and community strategist with over twenty years' experience in land use planning, community development, and economic development. Having worked in the public, private, non-profit, and academic sectors, Dr. Poland offers a unique perspective and understanding of the social, economic, spatial, governance, and policy challenges that face our urban areas.

Internationally trained, Dr. Poland earned his PhD from University College London, Department of Geography, *Cities and Urbanization* program. His doctoral research focused on urban ecology, ecological resilience, and how ecological metaphors and theory can help us understand urban environments as complex adaptive systems. This has allowed Dr. Poland to develop a unique approach to planning and urban policy that focuses on urban environments as complex adaptive systems that need to be managed through strategic interventions and governance.

Dr. Poland's consultancy covers a wide range of planning areas, while focusing on smaller cities and often weak-market communities that struggle to compete for investment. Using complexity theory and ecological resilience as a framework, Dr. Poland develops strategic and scaled interventions designed to reposition communities to compete for investment. Dr. Poland's consultancy work has included post-Katrina planning, land use, and redevelopment strategies for St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana, an economic investment strategy for the City of Oswego, New York, the preparation of a HUD NSP-2 application for Venango County, Pennsylvania, and the assessment of land use permitting processes in Salisbury, Connecticut. In addition, he has been accepted as an *expert witness* in the areas of *land use planning*, *neighborhood redevelopment*, and *community development* in the United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana.

Dr. Poland is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners and a Certified Zoning Enforcement Official. He is a Past-President of the CT Chapter of the American Planning Association, a founding member of the CT Partnership for Balanced Growth, governor appointee on the CT Board of Examiners for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, and served on the Board of Trustees for the CT Trust for Historic Preservation. Dr. Poland currently serves of the board of the Bushnell Park Foundation and is a fellow with the Connecticut Policy Institute.

His academic work has included an appointment as *Visiting Lecturer in Public Policy*, Graduate Studies Program at Trinity College, Hartford, CT. He also lectures in geography and urban planning at the University of Connecticut and Central Connecticut State University. He was awarded the Connecticut Homebuilders 2003 Outstanding Land Use Official Award and is a 2004 alumnus of the Hartford Business Journal's Forty Under Forty award. Dr. Poland enjoys European travel, is a licensed private pilot, and lives in Hartford, Connecticut.

CURRICULUM VITAE

DONALD J. POLAND, PhD, AICP, CZEO



Dr. Poland is an urban geographer, planner, and community strategist whose work focuses on assisting communities to compete for wealth and investment (socio-economic prosperity) through strategic interventions that build community confidence, foster pride in place, create predictability in market, and grow demand.

dpoland@gomanyork.com

www.gomanyork.com

860.655.6897

1137 MAIN STREET
EAST HARTFORD, CT 06108
PHONE: 860.655.6897
E-MAIL: DPOLAND@GOMANYORK.COM
WEB: WWW.GOMANYORK.COM

Biography - Donald J. Poland, PhD, AICP, CZEO



860.655.6897
don@donaldpoland.com
www.donaldpoland.com

Dr. Poland is a geographer, planner, and community strategist with over twenty years' experience in land use planning, community development, and economic development. Having worked in the public, private, non-profit, and academic sectors, Dr. Poland offers a unique perspective and understanding of the social, economic, spatial, governance, and policy challenges that face our urban areas.

Internationally trained, Dr. Poland earned his PhD from University College London, Department of Geography, *Cities and Urbanization* program. His doctoral research focused on urban ecology, ecological resilience, and how ecological metaphors and theory can help us understand urban environments as complex adaptive systems. This has allowed Dr. Poland to develop a unique approach to planning and urban policy, called Adaptive-Planning. Adaptive-Planning treats urban environments as complex adaptive systems to be managed through strategic interventions and governance.

Dr. Poland's consultancy, while covering a wide range of planning areas and providing extensive services, focuses mostly on smaller cities and weak-market communities that struggle to compete for investment. Through the use of Adaptive-Planning, Dr. Poland develops strategic and scaled interventions designed to reposition communities to compete for investment. Avoiding rigid conventional approaches, generalized planning theories, and homogenizing best-practices that often ignore the unique site and situation of communities and urban spaces, Dr. Poland scales strategies and interventions to best address the individual circumstances and needs of the community.

Dr. Poland's consultancy work has included post-Katrina planning, land use, and redevelopment strategies for St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana, an economic investment strategy for the City of Oswego, New York, the preparation of a HUD NSP-2 application for Venango County, Pennsylvania, and the assessment of land use permitting processes in Salisbury, Connecticut. In addition, Dr. Poland has been accepted as an *expert witness* in the areas of *land use planning*, *neighborhood redevelopment*, and *community development* in the United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana.

In Connecticut, Dr. Poland works with Goman + York Property Advisors as Senior Vice President of Urban Planning. Nationally, he works with czb based in Alexandria, Virginia. With czb he has worked on housing market analysis in Hermosa Beach, California, zoning regulation updates to implement the comprehensive plan in Canton, Ohio, and an innovative economic and governance assessment in Millinocket, Maine to deal with the impacts of a mill closing.

Dr. Poland is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners and a Certified Zoning Enforcement Official. He is a Past-President of the Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association, a founding member of the Connecticut Partnership for Balanced Growth, governor appointee on the CT Board of Examiners for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, and served on the Board of Trustees for the CT Trust for Historic Preservation. Dr. Poland currently serves a vice president for the Bushnell Park Foundation and fellow with the Connecticut Policy Institute.

His academic work includes an appointment as *Visiting Lecturer in Public Policy*, Graduate Studies Program at Trinity College, Hartford, CT. He also lectures in geography and urban planning at the University of Connecticut and Central Connecticut State University. He was awarded the Connecticut Homebuilders 2003 Outstanding Land Use Official Award and is a 2004 alumnus of the Hartford Business Journal's Forty Under Forty award. Dr. Poland enjoys European travel, is a licensed private pilot, and lives in Hartford, Connecticut.

Professional Experience

Planning Consultant and Community Strategist CONNECTICUT PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, LLC <i>Responsibilities:</i> Planning, zoning, economic development, and neighborhood reinvestment services for public, private, and non-profit clients.	2008 – Present HARTFORD, CT
Planning Consultant and Community Strategist CZB, LLC <i>Responsibilities:</i> Planning, zoning, housing, and neighborhood reinvestment strategies.	2010 – Present ALEXANDRIA, VA
Senior Vice President, Urban Planning GOMAN + YORK PROPERTY ADVISORS <i>Responsibilities:</i> Project management, land use planning, and economic development services.	2013 – Present EAST HARTFORD, CT
Visiting Lecturer in Public Policy, Graduate Studies Program TRINITY COLLEGE <i>Responsibilities:</i> Teach courses in urban planning in the public policy graduate program.	2015 – Present HARTFORD, CT
Instructor, Geography and Planning CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY <i>Responsibilities:</i> Teach undergraduate and graduate courses in geography and planning.	2009 – Present NEW BRITAIN, CT
Adjunct Lecturer, Planning UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY <i>Responsibilities:</i> Teach urban and regional planning.	2010 – Present STORRS, CT
Executive Director THE NEIGHBORHOODS OF HARTFORD, INC. <i>Responsibilities:</i> Executive management and implementation of a 'Healthy Neighborhoods' strategy.	2004 – 2008 HARTFORD, CT
Director of Planning and Development TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR	2000 – 2004 NEW BRITAIN, CT
Associate Planner PLANIMETRICS, LLP	1998 – 2000 AVON, CT
Zoning Enforcement Official TOWN OF EAST HARTFORD	1996 – 1998 EAST HARTFORD, CT
Research Planner AMADON & ASSOCIATES, INC.	1994 – 1996 HARTFORD, CT

Education

Doctorate, Geography - Cities and Urbanization UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON, DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY	2016 LONDON, ENGLAND
Master of Science, Geography – Concentration in Planning CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY, GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT	2000 NEW BRITAIN, CT
Bachelor of Arts, Geography and Psychology CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY, GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT	1995 NEW BRITAIN, CT

Professional Affiliations

Association of American Geographers (AAG)	2009
American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP)	1999
American Planning Association (APA)	1995
Connecticut Chapter - American Planning Association (CCAPA)	1995
Connecticut Association of Zoning Enforcement Officials (CAZEO)	1995

Consultancy Experience and Selected Projects

Dr. Poland's professional experience, while mostly focused on smaller and weak-market communities, has included a diverse range of clients and complex projects throughout the United States. The following is a partial list of clients and projects that Dr. Poland has worked on over the course of his extensive consultancy career—including projects with czb and Goman + York.

Clients	Projects
Oswego, City of – Oswego, NY	URI Economic Investment Strategy (2015)
Hutchinson, City of – Hutchinson, KS	Healthy Neighborhood Training (2015)
Hartford Healthcare – Newington, CT	Facilities and Land Use Assessment (2015)
Canton, City of – Canton, OH	Comprehensive Plan & Zoning Rewrite (2014-15)
Stafford, Town of – Stafford, CT	Consulting Planner (2014-15)
Bloomfield, Town of – Bloomfield, CT	Economic Development – Town Center (2014-15)
Bristol, City of – Bristol, CT	Downtown Development Plan Assessment (2014)
St. Bernard, Parish of – St. Bernard, LA	Comprehensive Land Use Plan (2012-14)
Millinocket, Town of – Millinocket, ME	Economic and Policy Assessment (2014)
St. Bernard Parish, St. Bernard, LA	Expert witness, federal fair housing cases (2012-13)
Salisbury, Town of – Salisbury, CT	Consulting Planner (2013-14)
North Stonington, Town of – North Stonington, CT	Zoning Regulation Modernization (2013-14)
Canton Downtown Partnership, Canton, OH	Downtown Plan – Planning Assessment (2012)
North Stonington, Town of – North Stonington, CT	Zoning Regulation Review (2012)
St. Bernard Parish – St. Bernard, LA	Expert witness, disparate impact cases (2011)
Dorset Crossing – Simsbury, CT	Zone change and site plan application (2011-12)
Ellington Chase Apartments – Ellington, CT	Zone change – 172-unit development (2011)
Avalon Farms – Glastonbury, CT	Special permit modification (2010)
Chapel West Neighborhood – New Haven, CT	Zone change application (2010)
Salisbury, Town of – Salisbury, CT	Land Use Application Process Review (2010)
St. Bernard Parish – St. Bernard, LA	Zoning Update, TND, and Permitting (2008-10)
Big Sky Enterprise – Middlebury, CT	43-acre zone change application (2009)
Indian River Road, LLC – Orange, CT	14-acre mixed-use development (2009)
Optiwind – Goshen, CT	Special Permit, wind energy generation (2009)
Torrington Senior Living – Torrington, CT	Zoning text amendment (2009)
Cornplanter, Town of – Cornplanter, PA	Comprehensive Plan, Housing Element (2009)
Vernago County RPA – Franklin, PA	HUD NSP-II Application and Strategy (2009)
Woodland Lofts, Inc. – Hartford, CT	Special Permit, 28-units multi-family (2009)
Greater New Orleans Foundation – New Orleans, LA	Post-Katrina Land Use Consulting Services (2008)
M & L Realty – East Windsor, CT	Special Permit, modification for a PUD (2008)
NRT Realty – East Windsor, CT	Zone Change, 30ac, 200,000sf commercial (2008)
Southern Auto Action – East Windsor, CT	Zoning text amendment and site plan (2008)
Baker Residential – Berlin, CT	384 unit affordable housing development (2007)
East Windsor, Town of – East Windsor, CT	Comprehensive Zoning Regulation (2005)

Professional and Community Involvement

Dr. Poland, as a dedicated professional, has been actively engaged in both professional and community organizations. In addition, Dr. Poland has held many leadership roles. The following is a list of those organizations and leadership positions:

Organization	Position
American Planning Association – Connecticut Chapter	Board Member – 1999-present Past-President - 2010-2013 President – 2007-2010 President Elect – 2006-2007 Vice President – 2004-2007 Government Relations Chair – 2001-2004
American Planning Association	Chapter Presidents Council – 2007-2010 State Legislative Liaison – 2001-2004 Delegates Council – 2003-2004
Bushnell Park Foundation	Board Member – 2009-present Vice President – 2015-present
Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation	Trustee – 2006-2012 Grants Committee – 2006-2012
Connecticut Partnership for Balanced Growth	Charter Member – 2002-present Secretary – 2002- 2012 Executive Director – 2008-2011
Community Builders Institute	Curriculum Committee – 2007-2012 Instructor/Faculty – 2009-2012
Connecticut, State of, Board of Examiners: Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors	Board Member – 2010-2014
Connecticut Association of Zoning Enforcement Officials	Board Member – 1999-2004 Newsletter Editor – 2002-2003 Legislative Liaison – 2003-2004
State Taskforce – Clean Air Act Amendments Compliance	Member – 2002-2006
Metro Hartford Alliance	Economic Development Forum – 2000-04 Neighborhood Committee - 2004-2011
Capitol Region Council of Governments	Policy Board – 2000-2004 Transportation Committee – 2000-04 Executive Board – 2000-2004
Connecticut Trolley Museum	Board Member - 2001-2002
North Frog Hollow NRZ	Board of Directors – 2004-2007 Development Committee – 2004-2009
Mortson/Putnam Heights Block Watch	Chairman – 2004-2006

Lectures, Training, and Presentations

The following is a partial list of professional lectures, training sessions, and presentations that Dr. Poland has delivered.

Professional Training Programs	Topic
American Planning Association, CT Chapter	AICP Exam Preparation Course (2012-2015)
Community Builders Institute Continuing education for economic development and planning professionals	Planning for Economic Development – I & II, 2009–2012 Best Practices in Land Use Approvals, 2010 The Healthy Neighborhoods Approach, 2007 Certification Program Instructor, 2002-2003 Neighborhoods & Zoning Enforcement, 2007 Flexible Zoning Techniques, 2002 Drafting Zoning Regulations, 2001
Connecticut Association of Zoning Enforcement Officials Professional certification program for zoning officials	
Professional Presentations	Topic
American Planning Association – Policy Conference Washington D.C. 2003	Legislative Best Practices – Connecticut
American Planning Association – National Conference Denver, CO 2003	Steering States Toward Smart Growth
Community Development Network - National Conference Baltimore, MD 2005 & 2006	The Healthy Neighborhoods Approach Hartford and Healthy Neighborhoods
Neighbor Works America – National Conference Philadelphia, PA 2013	Neighborhood Intervention – Fresh Eyes Block Walk – East Camden
Yankee Institute – Future of Freedom Summit New Haven, CT 2015	Free to Live: Letting our Cities Thrive
National Community Development Association Hartford, CT 2006	NHI's Healthy Neighborhoods Strategy
Southern New England Planning Conference Worcester, MA 2013	After the Storm – Post-Katrina Planning in St. Bernard Parish
Connecticut Conference of Municipalities Hartford, CT 2013	Positioning Communities for Investment - Economic Development
Southern New England Planning Conference New Haven, CT 2012	West Hartford Center and the Remaking of Urban Space
Southern New England Planning Conference New Haven, CT 2006	NHI's Healthy Neighborhoods Strategy
1000 Friends – Connecticut Smart Growth Conference New Haven, CT 2007	Sprawl or Suburbanization?
Connecticut Housing Coalition – Housing Forum Hartford, CT 2004 & 2005	Neighborhood Reinvestment – Case Study A Tale of Two Cities, Hartford & Stamford
Connecticut Community Development Association Hartford, CT 2003- 2004	Connecticut Legislative Issues
Connecticut Bar Association – Real Estate Section New Haven, CT 2004	Smart Growth Policy in Connecticut
HBA – Developers Council Berlin, CT 2003 – 2004	Smart Growth in Connecticut Working With Planners/Mock Hearing

Academic Experience

Dr. Poland has the full-time equivalent of nine years' experience—including two-years full time—lecturing in geography, planning, and public policy as a *Visiting Lecturer* at Trinity College, *Instructor* at Central Connecticut State University, and as an *Adjunct Lecturer* at the University of Connecticut, University of Saint Joseph, and Manchester Community College. He has taught a total of 15 undergraduate and graduate courses. Dr. Poland's experience includes being second advisor to three graduate student capstone projects/theses and leading three 18-day European study abroad courses. The following is a summary of the courses Dr. Poland has taught:

Trinity College	Brief Course Description
Public Policy 833 Urban Planning	Philosophies, theories, and principles involved in the planning and practice of urban areas. (1 Section)
CCSU	Brief Course Description
Geography 569 Independent Study	Exploring Urban Theory and Neighborhood Regeneration. (1 Section)
Geography 559 & 459 Advanced Field Studies	Study Abroad: The Great Cities of Western Europe. (2 Sections)
Geography 530 Graduate Internship	Supervised graduate internship for a housing and retail market study. (1 Section)
Geography 514 & 483 Design of Cities	This course explores the architectural and spatial design of cities in the context of planning movements and emergent spatial formations. (1 Section)
Geography 518 & 445 Environmental Planning	Examines the environmental impacts of land development and natural constraints on planning and public policy decision-making. (3 Sections)
Geography 518 & 441 Community & Regional Planning	Philosophies, theories, and principles involved in planning of regions and urban areas. (7 Sections)
Geography 516 & 440 Rural Land Use Planning	Land use patterns and the planning process in agriculture, transportation, recreation, industry, population and settlement in rural areas. (1 Section)
Geography 518 & 439 Urban Geography	An exploration of cities through theories of centrality, materiality, infrastructure, globalization, design, segregation, consumption, and public space. (6 Sections)
International 360 International Studies	Study Abroad: The Great Cities of Western Europe. (2 Sections)
Geography 241 Introduction to Planning	Introduction to the principles and practices of planning at various spatial scales—regional, urban and neighborhood. (10 Sections)
Geography 220 Human Geography	A survey of the world's peoples and their cultures through topics of population, religion, culture, social problems, resources, and environment. (7 Sections)
Geography 110 Introduction to Geography	Geography as physical, spatial, and social science. Basic theories and patterns of spatial and human relationships. (12 sections)
Geography 100 Search in Geography	Study Abroad: X and the European City. (1 Section)
Geography 100 Search in Geography	Study Abroad: The Great Cities of Western Europe. (2 Sections)

Academic Experience (Continued)

UConn		Brief Course Description
Geography 4210 Urban & Regional Planning		Philosophies, theories, and principles involved in planning of regions and urban areas. (7 Sections)
MCC		Brief Course Description
Geography 201 Urban Geography		An exploration of urban geography through concepts of centrality, materiality, infrastructure, globalization, architecture, experience, segregation, consumption, and public space. (6 Sections)
Geography 100 Introduction to Geography		Geography as physical, spatial, and social science. Basic theories and patterns of spatial and human relationships. (12 sections)
SJU		Brief Course Description
Geography 100 World Regional Geography		Survey of the lands, people and places in the world's major culture regions. (1 Section)
CCSU		Capstone Project/Thesis Second Supervisions
Jeremy DeCarlie Thesis		The Route 11 Project and the Changes that Lie Ahead.
Alexandra Johnston Thesis		How the Presence of the Metro North New Haven Line Affects the Sense of Place of the Residents of Fairfield, Connecticut.
Ali Fernandez Comprehensive Exams		Comprehensive Exams
CCSU		Study Abroad Courses – Course and Travel Description
Great City of Europe Study Abroad		The Geography of the Great Cities of Western Europe (London, Paris, Heidelberg, Munich, Venice, Florence, and Rome) introduces students to the history and human geography of these Western European cities. Students experience these European cities first hand, while engaging in discussions, lectures, excursions, and tours aimed at exploring and understanding the geographical context of history, culture, and lifestyle of these European cities. Academics include the spatial organization, design, and functioning of cities. Urban themes include centrality, mobility, global cities, nature, infrastructure, consumption, and public space.
X and the European City Study Abroad		'X' and the European City explores the dynamic interplay of the two subjects, where mathematics and urban geography enhance each other to reveal infinite possibilities for exploring the European city. By utilizing an applied mathematics approach to geography, cities, and travel, students learn and experience how X (math) and the city shape our lives. The course explores the mathematics that are inherently found in cities, travel, and geography in general, with the context of the European city and landscape as the backdrop. Students gain practice in practical travel mathematics and also discover the endless ways in which mathematics is "hidden" in the world around us.

Academic Papers, Presentations, and Research

The following is a summary of Dr. Poland's academic accomplishments related to papers, presentations, and research. While Dr. Poland is new to academia and the completion of his dissertation, he is actively involved in research related to his dissertation and other research interests.

Academic Papers & Presentations	Topic
City Planning in the Age of Climate Change University of Connecticut, West Hartford, CT (2016)	Panel Discussion – Moderator
The City in Connecticut History Fairfield University, CT (2014)	Paper Presentation – The Case of Hartford 1805-1880: An Early Suburban Milieu
Association of American Geographers New York, NY (2012)	Paper Presentation – The Remaking of Urban Space: Making Sense of Urban Change
University College London London, England (2011)	PhD Upgrade Workshop – The Remaking of Resilient Urban Space
Research Paper – In progress On-going research project	The American Suburban Vision: The Case of Hartford's Early Suburban History
Association of American Geographers Seattle, WA (2011)	Paper Presentation – An Urban Geography of Small Urban Places
University of Connecticut – Geography Department Storrs, CT (2009)	Guest Lecturer – Urban Sprawl and Suburbanization
University of Connecticut – Geography Department Storrs, CT (2008)	Guest Lecturer – Planning Issues in Connecticut
Clark University – Community Development Program Worcester, MA (2006)	Guest Lecturer – Alternative Neighborhood Reinvestment Strategies

PhD Dissertation Summary

Dr. Poland earned his PhD at UCL, Department of Geography *Cities and Urbanization* program. Primary supervisor: Dr. Alan Latham. Secondary supervisor: Dr. Andrew Harris. Thesis proposal examiner: Dr. David Bell, University of Leeds. Viva Defense external examiner: Professor Mark Jayne, Cardiff University. Internal examiner: Dr. Susan Moore, The Bartlett, School of Planning. Title: *Urban Resilience – Evolution, Co-Creation, and the Remaking of Space: A Case Study of West Hartford Center*.

Abstract: Dissatisfied with the large urban bias—the overreliance on large cities, spectacular sites, and paradigmatic cases—he sought to explore how urban theory informs us about change in smaller cities and mundane urban spaces. He argued that much of our urban understandings juxtapose the city as one kind of space and the suburban as another kind of space even though the distinction has become blurred. As a result, he argued that our understandings of city, suburb, and gentrification often fall short of conceptualizing and understanding the remaking of smaller, mundane, and suburban spaces such as West Hartford Center.

Utilizing a case study approach, Dr. Poland explored the space of West Hartford Center and the Center's remaking from 1980 to 2012. Through the metaphorical lens of urban ecological resilience, he explored the Center as a complex adaptive system that has been resilient—having the capacity to absorb shock and disturbance while maintaining its function and structure. In doing so, he further explored how the actors and their actions—business owners, government officials, and consumers—coalesce into a dynamic process of re-creating urban space.

Non-Academic Publications and Media Appearances

The following is a summary of Dr. Poland's non-academic publications and appearances. In addition, Dr. Poland is regularly interviewed and quoted in newspaper articles on planning, development, and the real estate market in metropolitan Hartford.

Articles – Op-Eds	Title
The Hartford Courant – Sunday Commentary	Where Does Our Road Lead? (2015) Smart Growth Strategy Must First Embrace Real Growth (2008) Hartford's Bad Rep Is Bad Rap (2006) Hartford Needs to Lighten Up (2005) Six and the City (2004) Building from Strength (2004) Where Growth is Concerned, Denser May be Smarter (2004) Betting the House (2003) A Question of Character – Go With Building All Homes (2003)
The Hartford Business Journal – Commentary	Hartford Revitalization: Bad Policy (2013) In Praise of Sprawl (2007) Suburbanization, Not Sprawl (2007)
American Planning Association – Planning & Environmental Law Journal	Kelo in Connecticut (2005)
Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association – Connecticut Planning Magazine	The Evangelicals and Suburban Ideals (2010) Hartford: A Suburban City (2010) Book Review – The Complete Guide to Zoning, By Dwight Merriam (2005)

Media Appearances	Program
CBC – Atlantic Voice	When the Stacks Came Down, Millinocket, Maine (2015)
Where We Live (WNPR Radio)	Hartford's I-Quilt Plan (2012)
Where We Live (WNPR Radio)	West Hartford Center - the Remaking of Space (2011)
The Ray Dunaway Show (WTIC Radio)	A Balanced Growth Strategy for CT (2008)
Restoring America (HGTV TV)	The Victorian Lady and Ashley Street (2005)
Hartford's Rising Stars (WHCN – Radio)	NHI and Healthy Neighborhoods (2005)
Faith Works (Radio)	Creating Social Equity (2005)
University of Harford (Radio)	NHI and Healthy Neighborhoods (2004)

Expert Witness – Land Use Planning and Neighborhood Redevelopment

In August 2011 Dr. Poland was accepted as an expert witness in the areas of *land use planning*, *neighborhood redevelopment*, and *community development* in the United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana. The following are five disparate impacts cases for which he has testified and been retained as an expert witness:

Jurisdiction	Case
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana	United States of America, vs. St. Bernard Parish. No 2:12-CV-00321 (2013)
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana	NOLA Capital Group, vs. St. Bernard Parish. No 2:12-CV-00322 (2013)
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana	Greater New Orleans Fair Housing Action Center, vs. St. Bernard Parish. No 2:12-CV-00325 (2013)
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana	Greater New Orleans Fair Housing Action Center, vs. St. Bernard Parish. Et Al. No 2:11-CV-00858-HGB-SS (2012)
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana	Greater New Orleans Fair Housing Action Center, Et Al, vs. St. Bernard Parish, Et Al. No 2:06-CV-07185 (2011)

Legislative Experience and Testimony

Dr. Poland has established himself as a leader in planning and urban policy. As Government Relations Chair for CT Chapter of the American Planning Association and as Executive Director for the CT Partnership for Balanced Growth, Dr. Poland has approximately eight years' of government relations and public policy experience. In these roles, Dr. Poland has engaged in many facets of the legislative process. This has included proposing bills and successfully working a half-dozen bills through the legislative process. In addition, he has testified before numerous legislative committees, at dozens of legislative hearings, and on countless proposed bills related to planning, land use, development, and transportation. The following is a sample of Dr. Poland's legislative experience:

Government Relations	Highlights and Descriptions
Legislative Hearings	Has testified before many legislative committees to support and oppose over 100 proposed bills between 2000 and 2010.
Bill Screening	Assisted the Planning and Development Committee with bill screening and drafting statutory language for a number of bills in 2003 and 2004.
Informational Hearings	Has been invited to testify on informational hearings regarding planning, state plans, smart growth, and transportation related issues.
American Planning Association	Participated in the development of and adoption of APA's Smart Growth Policy Guide as a member of the National Delegates Assembly.

References

The following is a list of references that cover Dr. Poland's career in planning and academia:

Consulting References

Candace Watkins

Disaster Recovery Specialist
Louisiana Office of Community Development
Disaster Recovery Units
1450 Poydras Street
New Orleans, LA 70112
Office: 504-556-9725
E-Mail: candace.watkins@la.gov.com

Amy Birdsall, Assoc. AIA

Planning and Zoning Director
City of Oswego
13 West Oneida Street
Oswego, NY 13126
Office: 315-342-8154
E-Mail: abirdsall@oswegony.org

Employment References

Elliot Ginsberg

President and Chief Executive Officer
Connecticut Center for Advanced Technology
22 Pitkin Street, Suite 100
East Hartford, CT 06108
Office: 860-291-8832
E-Mail: eginsberg@ccat.us

Mike Goman

Principal
Goman+York Property Advisors, LLC
1137 Main Street
East Hartford, CT 06108
Office: 860-841-3271
E-Mail: mgoman@gomanyork.com

Academic Employment References

Cynthia Pope, PhD

Professor and Past-Department Chair
Department of Geography
Central Connecticut State University
P.O. Box 4010
New Britain, CT 06050-4010
Office: 860-832-2799
E-Mail: PopeC@mail.ccsu.edu

Lisa Bigelow, MBA

Associate Director
Center for International Education
Henry Bernard Hall 123
Central Connecticut State University
New Britain, CT 06050-4010
Office: 860-832-2042
E-Mail: Bigelow@ccsu.edu

William R. Barnett, PhD

Dean of Graduate Studies
Trinity College
300 Summit Street
Hartford, CT 06106-3100
Office: 860-297-2527
E-Mail: William.Barnett@trincoll.edu

Valarie R. Wilson, PhD

Professor of Geography
Manchester Community College
4th Floor Tower, AST
Great Path
Manchester, CT 06045
Office: 860-512-2760
E-Mail: vwilson@mcc.commnet.edu

Academic, PhD Advisors

Alan Latham, PhD (Primary)

Senior Lecturer, Geography
Department of Geography
University College London
Room G19, Pearson Building, Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT
Office: +44 (0)20 7679 0525
E-Mail: alan.latham@ucl.ac.uk

Andrew Harris, PhD (Secondary)

Senior Lecturer, Urban Studies
Department of Geography
University College London
26 Bedford Way
London, WC1H 0AP
Office: +44 (0)20 7679 5528
E-Mail: andrew.harris@ucl.ac.uk