

Karen Hindenlang  
290 Main Street, Aurora

April 14, 2026

I am grateful the Board of Trustees is preparing to put a Planned Development District (PDD) on the former campus of Wells.

This is the right move for Aurora: giving flexible opportunities to new owners while honoring the college's legacy and respecting the documented wishes of the community.

I have three comments about the proposed revisions to our Zoning Law. Any questions are for the Board's later consideration, with no expectation of answers or discussion this evening.

**1** - The draft says all land formerly zoned Institutional will become part of the PDD. But that is not reflected on the Future Land Use Map, seen in comparison to our current map on p. 28 of the draft amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. For instance:

- a) The future map show the maintenance building, formerly Institutional, zoned Open Space / Recreational, not PDD.
- b) It shows the "President's House" spot zoned as Lakefront Residential. The new owners may wish to use the building for something else. Inclusion in the PDD would permit that; the spot zoning will not.
- c) The future map also brings into the PDD land that was NOT previously zoned Institutional. It puts the campus Mixed-Use district into the PDD. This includes the separately owned Golf Course which apparently would need to be included in the whole-campus PDD application process of whoever buys the campus.

**2.** - I am greatly concerned by the complexity of the PDD application and approval process. I feel the draft amendments suffered from the apparent lack of input from our own Planning Board — which carry the workload for this process (along with out clerk). I hope that can be rectified.

**3** - My last concern is that the draft text eliminates the Institutional Zone entirely — removing it from the Establishment of Districts and Table of Uses — and replaces it on the map with a PDD which seems to have **no** uses by-right until **after** the property owner goes through a lengthy, application and approval process for the **entire** campus.

With the removal of Institutional zoning, it appears that the current draft proposal effectively *eliminates all use by-right* of the campus until *after* the PDD processes have been completed.

(So, what if a new not-for-profit owner wants to have offices on campus as it plans for redevelopment? That use would not be permitted? And can the Golf Course operate in the interim as part of the PDD?)

A PDD zone provides a blank slate and invites the landowner to make proposals, but it does not provide basic zoning regulations for the campus. It appears that the draft puts the campus in a zoning limbo — with no permissible uses — until the owner completes the PDD process.

The Wells Legacy Society has submitted a comment letter from a board member with 35 years of experience as a land-use attorney. The letter provides a clear explanation of — and solution for— this problem, as well as the other issues I cited earlier. I strongly recommend that you read and fully consider that letter as you move forward with work on the Zoning and Comprehensive plan amendments.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you.

*KAHindenlang*