

Chm. W. Lee Osborne, Comm. Ron Klattenberg,
Comm. Anthony Vasiliou, Comm. Carl Bolz, Comm.
David Roane, Comm. Jeffrey Pierce, Comm. James
Fortuna

COMMISSION
MEMBERS
PRESENT

Comm. Corrine Dorsey, Comm. Carl Chisem, Comm.
William Hohenstein, Jr., Mayor Maria Madsen Holzberg,
Ex-Officio, Dir. P.W. Salvatore Fazzino, Ex-Officio

COMMISSION
MEMBERS
ABSENT

William Warner, Planning Director, Thomas Nigosanti,
Chief Engineer

STAFF

There were approximately fifteen members of the public.

PUBLIC

Comm. Ron Klattenberg

Item 5.1. Proposed Zoning Code text amendment to modify Section 22 Multi-family M zone to establish a lot size, coverage, and frontage requirements for new lots in the M zone. A copy of the existing and proposed text is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk. Proponent P and Z Department Z96-7

William Warner

My staff comments pretty much explain this. It's a proposal to make the M, new laws in the M zone composed of the R-15 requirements. What what I (inaudible) from the discussions that we have had in the past, due to concerns over the cost of res, over the costs of. It's some kind of a table. The the lack of a, the the, due to the due to the concerns of a lack of a clear plan for the number number of dwelling units and the population at total residential build out and large number of high density single family lots approved in recent years, the Planning and Zoning Commission, you directed me to prepare a zoning text amendment to eliminate the provision which allows for the five thousand square foot lots in the R-1 zone. We did that and the Commission approved that unanimously. During that hearing I said to the Commission I said there are other zones that have high density development provisions where you could have more single family development in at high densities. You asked me to investigate that and report back to you. I reported back to you in a memo June 24, 1996 where I explained that the M zone allowed dwelling unit, lot sizes of seven thousand two hundred and sixty square feet and I explained where the M zones are. Looking at all those different areas, yes there is there is potential for significant development in the M zones. So then the Commission responds, they ask me to prepare this amendment which would create which would create a reasonable lot size for the M zones or single family homes of fifteen thousand square feet. So that is what is before you tonight. If you look at the text, it essentially says that you have to have, that when you subdivide in the M zone, you have to have fifteen thousand square foot lots, a hundred feet of frontage, defines a a building height, defines setbacks for a single family development and, if you remember, we discussed briefly about the interpretation that a previous commission did did in order to to allow a single family development in the M zone. Single family homes were allowed but there was no clear directions as to what the lot sizes were. You have a letter from the letterhead is Alan Temkin Associates, which went to the Commission and the Commission agreed with this letter. So, it's by, essentially by interpretation that a lot size for new lots in the M zone has created and, if

when you agree with the R-15 requirement or fifteen thousand square foot requirement, I think it's very important form that you set a requirement so it's not ruled by interpretation and also, as I said, because of these concerns about the high density development that we approved and the cost of residential that's that's correct, that's what I mean. This high density development lowers the cost and creates a lot of children. So Riverbend doesn't have a lot of children yet but I believe it will and then that creates a real burden on the taxpayer in terms of school costs. So, when you have that there, a extremely high density development, you have very high costs of residential development, which I think we all understand now that residential development is a cost to the City, industrial development is a benefit to the City. It doesn't cost we get somewhere around a dollar thirty for each dollar we get in taxes. For residential we get somewhere around fifty cents or we provide fifty cents of services to industrial for every dollar we get, so industrial development is good. It provides money to the City to support the residential so that that because of the cost of development, because of the lack of a clear plan which we've discussed on numerous occasions. Right now our Plan of Development says sixty-four thousand. That's our build out. Some of you have expressed that you're not comfortable with that and because of the large number of residential development that we have approved, in excess of three hundred units in the past five years. We want to get away from that high density development, so that you have some very good reasons for what you're doing and, also, the interpretation issue that you should codify into the regulations.

Comm. Anthony Vasiliou
Move to close the public hearing, Mr. Chairman.

Comm. Jeffrey Pierce
Second!

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
I have to ask if if any other commissioners wish to speak on this and no one being here, I will accept the motion to close the public hearing. All those in favor of closing the public hearing say aye.

Commission
Aye.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
Opposed say nay.

Comm. Anthony Vasiliou
Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we approve the Zoning Code text amendment to modify Section 22 Multi-family M zone to establish a lot size, coverage, and frontage requirements for new lots in the M zone as proposed by the Planning and Zoning Commission office and I'll speak in support of that.

Comm. David Roane
Second.

Comm. Anthony Vasiliou

I just want to echo Bill's comments. I think this is just a series of proposals to try to deal with the present problem and I think he outlines (inaudible) and I believe, Bill, that this is the last objective that we have to take in order to address this very small lot size issue in Middletown. I think it's one more thing that the Commission's doing to help clean up the code. So, I support this and I ask my fellow commissioners to support this. Let's finish the job tonight.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Comments from other commission members for the record on this? (Inaudible). I don't think we should vote yet because I don't think we've established a clear public record on how the rest of the Commission feels about this. Carl?

Comm. Carl Bolz

For the record, I'd like to establish, you know, my support for this and, you know, I think it's we asked Bill to do this. I think Bill did a good job meeting the request of the Commission and really put together what we had in mind so I'm going to be in support of this.

William Warner

So really what you're saying or, I believe by not saying, is that you agree with Commissioner Vasiliou's reasons for adopting this and you agree it's the consensus of the Commission that those reasons are valid and that's why you're moving forward with this? That's the consensus of the Commission?

Various Commissioners

Yes. Yes.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

There being no further questions on that, I will call for a vote then. Now, all those in favor and I think we should probably read this by roll call.

Comm. Ron Klattenberg

Okay. Commissioner Vasiliou?

Comm. Anthony Vasiliou

Yea.

Comm. Ron Klattenberg

Klattenberg, yes. Bolz?

Comm. Carl Bolz

Yes.

Comm. Ron Klattenberg

Pierce?

Comm. Jeffrey Pierce
Aye.

Comm. Ron Klattenberg
Roane?

Comm. David Roane
Yes.

Comm. Ron Klattenberg
Fortuna?

Comm. James Fortuna
Yes.

Comm. Ron Klattenberg
Chairman Osborne.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
Yes. The Commission has voted unanimously to pass this.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen L. Stevens
Administrative Secretary II