
APPLICATION from Aradev

From Lori Shepard <lshepart@aol.com>

Date Thu 9/4/2025 1:51 PM

To Land Use <landuse@salisburyct.us>

Dear Commissioners of the PZC,

There have been numerous concerns about light pollution expressed by the public, and I would like to add several points that may not have been adequately considered by the Commissioners. This out-sized project is far too damaging to the community on MANY levels, seriously impacting the habits and rhythms of humans but I would like to focus on the lighting

First, there is a very high number of outdoor lights: 109 on the plan, and Aradev may even add more ornamental lighting which is not uncommon with such developments. Although lights for reasons of safety are expected, why would 12 bollard lights around the pool be necessary since the pool will not be used at night? In fact, by sunset or earlier it should be off limits. (There should be a locked gate so no one has access to it at night or out-of-season). All outside areas of the property should be reviewed thoroughly, which I do not believe has been done. The large parking area has been identified as a problem, but there are still others such as the pool, cottages, spa and perhaps accessory buildings. In addition, light from inside the buildings has not been discussed, which may also impact the neighbors and the environment.

While it is encouraging to see that the lights specified are 'dark sky compliant' and 2700K, it is not totally clear how much the management is prepared to dim them, how much and at what hours, and if they will have motion sensors. Can outside lights on buildings, especially empty cottages, be turned off completely? Can outdoor lights be completely turned off for a certain number of night time hours? Can lights be dimmed Down at least 75% at some points of the night and at some locations? What conditions can P&Z/the town put on lighting - for astronomical time-clock controls? Certainly, before any Permit is considered, a Salisbury-hired expert in lighting should examine the applicant's plans and the Sequence of Operations documents.

Next, the photometric plans are FLAT, and do not truly comprehend the slope of the property. The visibility of lights on poles cannot readily be ascertained. We should demand trial balloon analyses in several locations before further discussion. Balloon tests were done for the cell tower. Such tests are best done when deciduous leaves have fallen. (A problem with the timing on this application, sadly). We should demand this anyway; and despite this, as so many trees are destined to be cleared from the site, we would understand the balloons only approximate the effect. We know that any trees that are planted will take many years to grow and provide sight-line buffers. Obviously, for many years, anyone down-slope of the lights would be impacted.

In addition, the amount of trenching for lighting, plumbing and other utilities is going to tear up the earth, destroy the chemistry of the soil and the ecosystem of the site. While the developers are

asserting promises, we have no enforcement or guarantees that they will comply fully, now and over time, if this application is approved.

I'm opposed to approval of this application by Aradev.

Sincerely,
Lori Shepard
Salisbury

Sent from my iPod

Sent from my iPad