

Continued from Page 13

Mr. Stein submitted by the Planning & Zoning staff strikes me, in my relative ignorance, as a reasonable compromise among the kinds of motivations and pressures that I understand exist. It establishes what appears to be an acceptably, orderly pattern of reasonably controllable growth. Perhaps there hasn't been as much research in some areas of the Plan of Development as might have been. I think Mr. Eigan suggested a number of things that were very useful, methods of implementing the concepts which are represented in the plan. I'm not sure that those kinds of tools of land use management belong in a Plan of Development. If you have a ten year plan it seems to me that rational kind of planning approach suggests that you always, in the first year of a new ten year plan, today, we put in a new ten year plan, tomorrow, in concept, at least, we are in the first year of another ten year plan. We shouldn't simply turn to planning once every ten years, or five years or whatever our cycle is. That's where these methods of implementation come into play. Daily you are asked for zoning approval, weekly, so to speak, you are asked for subdivision approval, monthly, you are asked for subdivision regulation changes, quarterly you are asked for zoning changes and annually you are asked for planning. The plan is to me, even though it may be, in some areas, inadequately researched, the most important thing for you to cement down now. It's the one area where, it is the most general of your responsibilities and the one within which you can have the flexibility to move to meet changing demands of the city. As soon as you make a subdivision regulation, however, as were made recently, within a plan that's ten years old now, those subdivision regulations cement in old concepts under old rules or attempts to make new concepts under old rules or allow the economic interests, or whatever it is, to get in under an old rule. Perhaps more wordily than I should have, I'm trying to say to you that I believe you have a rational plan in front of you, that it may not be the best of all possible plans but no plan ever is and I would urge you to implement that plan, vote on it and accept it as quickly as possible so that you can get on to the next job, which is to implement the zoning regulations and allow more modern approach to the land use of the city to continue to take place. Thank you very much.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Thank you, anyone else?

Stan Bysiewicz
My name is Stan Bysiewicz, I live on South Plum Road, I'm a lifetime resident of Middletown. As a matter of fact, I first learned of the new plan, planning & zoning changes two weeks ago. I had made the last meeting and I believe this is the third meeting that we are discussing a plan that is to survive for the next ten years. I am terribly surprised that we are thinking in terms of having a deadline to pass the plan that was proposed by November. I go back twenty-five years ago and we were planning to build a house. Do you know it took us a whole year to put together some plans. We had a notebook, wherever we saw a room that we liked we put it in the notebook then we got an architect and we put a house together. It took us twelve months. I don't see any need for a lasting plan to have any kind of deadline and certainly not by November. I'm also a father of four children and I'm concerned about their ability to ever build or own a home with the increased lot sizes. Scott, Denton and Company of New Haven indicates the average household income in Middletown as of January 1, 1984 was \$25,000. Do you know what kind of a mortgage this qualifies that person for? At 12%? \$60,000. If they have to pay \$40,000, \$30,000 for a lot how are the parents going to afford to buy the lot for them? I read an article in the Middletown Press yesterday that indicates it takes \$140,000 to raise a child to age eighteen, that's before you educate them. If you educate them, certainly, you are not going to be able to buy a lot for them so they can get a home of their own. Aren't we interested in the citizens of Middletown? Are we concerned about the people that are moving into Aetna so they can have larger lot sizes? They have no problem, they can buy one, two or three lots if they like a larger lot. Wethersfield I think is still a prestige community, do you know what the largest lot size in Wethersfield is? 20,000 square feet. I don't think that lot sizes necessarily provide the kind of people that are going to be living in the community and, besides, I think it is more

Continued from Page 14

Stan Bysiewicz

important that we work for the people that are already here, that have lived here for awhile. I strongly urge the Commission to continue talking about the proposed plan without putting any kind of deadline. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo

Okay, just so we understand, that's a deadline that I have suggested, obviously, if the Commission is not ready to vote, we won't. #2, this process has been going on for at least a year, since '83, at the staff level and we had a Public Hearing or two last year and this is the third or fourth one we have had this year. If the Commission is not comfortable or ready to vote than we certainly won't be voting before November but this isn't something that we have rushed into in two or three months, the staff has been working on it for an extended period of time.

Stan Bysiewicz

You are interested in community participation, are you not? It's been three weeks, three meetings, that is, six weeks, I believe, that citizens have been involved.

Chm Gionfriddo

Excuse me, we have had citizen involvement for a substantially longer period of time than three meetings and #2 I certainly am interested, and so is the Commission, in citizen participation because if we weren't we wouldn't be here and I believe one night we were here until almost 11 o'clock discussing this particular issue and this is at least the fourth or fifth Public Hearing that we have had on it and we are going to have at least one, if not two more, and we are willing to sit here and listen as long as the public is willing to come and speak. Is there anyone else?

Donald Hamer

Good Evening. My name is Donald Hamer, I'm with the law firm of Katz and Scoville in Glastonbury and we are here tonight representing Francis Krue on Randolph Road. I think I can make my comments briefer than they were going to be because they paradigm, to some degree, those of Mr. Eigen earlier. In criticizing the proposal, we kind of approach it from the sense of is it a bad proposal altogether or does it simply go too far. We think the latter is the case, that it really goes too far and in a sense it even runs against the expressed intent of part of the Zoning Code. We think the proposed changes would, in fact, be a barrier to orderly and beneficial development throughout the city, that the changes would not strike the balance that's needed between dense and sparse development throughout the city, or contemplated in the Code. I found that the increased lot requirements are so overbroad that the exceptions, in the long run, are going to turn out to be more pervasive than the rule. I think there was a comment at the last hearing that the proposed changes with the various lot sizes would create such an administrative maze that it would be chaos not only for the citizens but for the bureaucrats, as well, and the City Administration. Two criticisms we have, #1 for our client, obviously, as well as other individuals similarly situated in the city, the Krue property has about 37½ acres bounded roughly by Randolph and Maple Shade. Under the current regulations the availability of water and sewer that would accommodate approximately 100 housing parcels. Again, as noted at the last meeting and again this evening, there's probably some topographical considerations that render it a question whether or not there is, in fact, that much developable land around. Under the new proposal, however, that would be shrunken, given the same assumptions, to a maximum of 37 parcels and again, we think there is some balance that can be struck here. Obviously there are sanitation considerations, this Commission inherently has the authority to make ad hoc or specific findings or requirements with respect to any specific proposal for development and we do not think it necessary to have these overbroad and numerous classifications based almost entirely on lot size. Number two, not only is it a financial loss, obviously, to those property owners that have numerous acres that in years future that they would be developed. Obviously if you lower the yield on the property it is going to lower the value of it as well. That's

Continued from Page 15

Donald Hamer
bad enough, but there doesn't seem to be any compensation on the other side, no corresponding benefit to the city. We submit that having one acre lots in and of itself doesn't guarantee very much with respect to the quality of life in Middletown. As Mr. Eigen suggested, there are many considerations other than pure lot size that need to be considered. Query whether dedicating such a large geographical area of the city to one-acre residential zoning would be in the long term interest of the city. I think there was a report from the city's housing task force not long ago that stressed the need for more economical housing in the city. That's not going to be available under a plan that takes away a large portion of the city and dedicates it to one-acre zoning. Finally, does the city really need one acre lots with 200 foot frontage and such a large proportion of it to maintain a pleasant, country residential setting. We submit that, on the contrary, such a use of so much of the city's land is neither economical or efficient and would be a waste of the city's resources. Are the one acre lots necessary for health and sanitation purposes? Again, they are not, but in any event, there are already other controls for those considerations in the event that they are needed with respect to any particular proposal. In summary, I guess we just state that as pointed out in previous hearings, we think it would result in administrative maze for both citizens and government officials. We think the proposed designation of the entire South, Southeastern and Western sections of the city as country or rural will ultimately have to result in there being so many exceptions to the rules that the city will be even further from the Plan of Development that is sought. We think it will stifle healthy growth of the community, the ability for new people to move in or the people who already live here to expand and build their own homes, as it has been noted by someone else here this evening. We think for these questionable results a few individuals are going to be made to pay a healthy price, such as Kruse, who will be asked to take, basically, a one-third value on what their property is presently worth. We think there is a middle ground that the Commission should consider and we think that that middle ground should incorporate all the various factors that go into a high quality land use and planning and we'd respectfully suggest that the plan, as proposed, not be adopted but rather a different plan should be considered which incorporates these other factors. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo
I guess I would just ask one question of you, I keep hearing of a middle ground considering all these concepts, what do you envision, what's the middle ground between what we have now and what is currently being proposed?

Mr. Hamer
I think of two factors immediately, #1 being that the choices for lot size should not be either 15,000 feet or 46,000 feet, I think there is a large middle ground in there that would be considered to be adequate for a country residential style of housing without having a one-acre lot. The second would be, I think it goes along with the first, is that in considering lot size you also have to consider the other factors that go along in a professionally planned type of community, which are what are the various land uses that the citizens require. With expanded growth and population what will be the recreational needs? What will be the commercial needs? What are the needs for roads? I think all of those things go in along with the consideration of lot size and has to be considered together and that is why we think a plan that is based so basically on a presumption of large lot sizes, not necessarily the best plan.

Chm Gionfriddo
Any members of the Commission have any questions? Thank you. Anyone else? Ted, why don't we let people who haven't spoken first.

Jan Miller
Jan Miller, 500 Maple Shade Road. My question is, "are we talking about Item #5 or 6?"

Chm Gionfriddo
I think somewhat within the Plan of Development under

Continued from Page 16

Chm Gionfriddo
Item #5 the lot size issue is in the Plan of Development as well in the Zoning Code Text and Map, I think the last speaker was basically talking about Item #6 and I was going to say that after he spoke. I would prefer generalized comments first about the Plan of Development then when we get to Item #6 if you want to talk about particular zoning changes on lot sizes we'll get into that, in particular.

Jan Miller
You still have Item #6

Chm Gionfriddo
We still have Item #6.

Anthony Guida
Hello. Anthony Guida, Coleman Road. As you know, I was here at the last meeting, you know that I am opposed to the set footage that's in here. One of my questions is, you spent, like you said, Mr. Chairman, until 11 o'clock at that meeting and there was a lot of feedin, feedback, whatever you call it. Has the board, we have a map, and I don't see any changes on the map, or anything that they said would be changed from these meetings and you said you have had a number of them which I'm sure you did, but I think to the people that have all made an attempt to come here and this is my second or third time, has anything been considered in any changes to this point?

Chm Gionfriddo
The only thing I can say, Tony, is that each member of the Commission was going to listen to the public as they speak and weigh the comments that the public has made in determining a final decision on the Plan of Development and on the change in zoning and there could very well be amendments from the Commissioners during the time of voting that would reflect some of these changes. I'm not going to say that they are or they are not, we haven't sat down as a body and formally discussed it because that's not appropriate, but each Commissioner is listening to the comments as they are being made and is weighing them and at the time they vote they will either reflect them in amendments or consider them and vote against or reject the comments because they feel they-maybe other considerations outweigh them and vote to approve-but each Commissioner will have to make that determination at his own time.

Anthony Guida
Very good. One other thing I would like to mention to these people that are, have been so strong in the larger lots and I don't want a repeat of a lot of what has been said about them being more expensive and so forth. But I think another thing that should, that I got mixed up from these meetings is, the town or the city is sort of looking in the ten year period to slow down on water, sewer and what have you for the economy of the whole town and this may have a lot of merit, at the same time, though, we are trying to attract, we have one of the best industrial sections that you can possibly...a lot envy us the industrial park which is all we have in our town. This section needs people to support that industrial park which is also a great base to our tax structure in this town. From that we are going to need housing and if we restrict this to what is proposed, I think that we all are making a mistake. Another thing that I should mention, some of these people that are for a larger tract of land that are a little bit out in suburbia, that doesn't necessarily mean that it is out on the Durham town line or where but if they are going to have large lots and, Lord knows there is enough pollution and well pollutions, and this town has even had its share of it in different sections of town where they've had to run sewer lines to protect the people's homes and ect. and there was no reason for where our water came or anything of that sort, it just happened and that's where it was, you can correct me if I'm not saying it right in the neighborhood of Brown Street we had a section of something of that. Now, anybody that owns a two acre lot or an acre and a half or a larger lot of frontage and runs sewers through they will know that it's very costly to do it. I think it is also a consideration, whether it is water,

Continued from Page 17

sewer or what, if it is going to be needed it is going to cost the town more and the landowners and this is another thing that I feel why it's not there. So, please, some of these people step back and take a look at what's there because in a few years to come it may be your children or yourself, you'll feel sorry for what you tried to propose and do right now.

Chm Gionfriddo
Is there anyone else?

Charles Harris
Mr. Chairman, I'm Charlie Harris. Members of the Commission, I'm Charlie Harris, I live on Chamberlain Road, a lifelong member of the City of Middletown. Two things that I see in that that concern me. I don't see any control where some developer scalping desirable land and dumping what is left. Many a property owners are faced with the fact that in order to turn their property into cash developers come along and they come to the property owner and they make him some kind of a deal where they will buy 20 acres or 50 and leaves them with 30. That developer doesn't, as he used to years ago, buy the 50 acres and then come before you. He plays tic tac toe with you people day in and out through attorneys and developers that they don't buy until they let the team know exactly what the Zoning Commission is going to let them do. A great many areas in Middletown where we can't develop it, and I'm not just talking stream beds, wetlands and ect. I'm talking about areas where you would have to be a billy goat in order to live on it. If the prime part of those parcels is cut out for development and the other is left, whose responsibility is it? There are no teeth in zoning to take care of that....(change of tape) sit down with our worthy and well qualified tax appraiser to get some of his views on this. We can't just go by lot size, it's not possible. All it does is, dig ourselves a hole. Somewhere you have to get some kind of a control to stop a developer, and I've sat in the audience here and listened to it, watched it happen, the developer latches on to an attorney, a surveyor, the property owner is in the middle, the property owner has said, "okay, I'll pay you if the Zoning Commission says that that 20 acres in the corner can be developed. His name isn't on the deed, it is still the property owner's. One way to fix this is to fix it so nobody ever comes before this Commission to ask for a development of a piece of property until he has filed a legal deed that it belongs to him instead of playing tic tac toe between the Commission and the property owner. As far as areas of other parts of Connecticut, the lower part of this valley is unique, somebody has to pay the taxes on the land that can't be developed. Sure, you can say someone is going to buy the streambeds, that could very well be, but I think and, I might be wrong but I doubt it, that if I owned a big chunk of ledge and it had 5 acres that I could develop, if the tax appraisal is properly done on that that piece of ledge isn't going to be worth too much money. What happens then if the other little bit of acreage goes to a developer and he develops it and I sit back and say, "I'm not going to pay my taxes, let the city have that piece of land" You have nothing anywhere that I can find that stops little tiny pieces of land being abandoned by the property owner because of the tax. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo
Anyone else? If not, okay.

John Otfinoski
I'm John S. Otfinoski, better known as John S. Ott. I've come into this situation of interest recently, also and perhaps, as during the summer months I don't have the interest or did have the reading time to keep up with what was going on here. After listening to all the speakers, some of the speakers, they have brought up some very good points and I think at particular time it does concern me because I happen to be a property owner and we are going from a minimum to a fairly good maximum and it seems like we are pushing a time table which the Chairman says they are not. Due to all these conflicting reports, and we have had some gentlemen, Mr. Eigan, that brought up some real good points, some sound plans and since we have so much input we have some additional people here that have concern. Maybe we have t

Continued from Page 18

John Otfinoski
 property owners concern also, which we have to listen to. Due to this, I think that this plan should be, not be acted upon favorably and should be held off until we can sit down with the people with interests, with the groups who favor this plan and try to get perhaps a middle ground decision on it. I'm not one to say that a 15,000 foot lot is appropriate in some places and neither is a 45,000 lot, or whatever it is, appropriate in another place. You people sitting on the board, if you have an acre of ground now I don't think you would be here, you'd be home taking care of it. Everybody can't do it and we seem to...it bothers me because we talk about housing for the needy, the City is talking about imposing restrictions upon suburban developers in the City to provide low income housing, we have gone into condominiums because this is the only thing some people can afford, it gives them really no land, it just gives them the rights of a tenant, practically. Then we abandon that and then we talk about the people who want affordable residence and then we seem to jump into a maximum area all of a sudden, this poor condominium guy will never buy a house here. He is going to seek condominiums all the time, then. So, somewhere there has to be a middle road, and it has to be the input of all people, I like the idea Mr. Eigen said, questionnaires sent out to residents just to get their feeling. As you know, only those who are in favor of something or opposed sometimes that have the interest coming here and making themselves heard. I didn't come in here before, I always thought that the Commission would do a good job. I think you did a good job, I think you did a wonderful job, you've got a - you are on the right track - but I think if you allow the interested people to put some input into this thing, get these professional planners, their ideas, see what other towns have been doing, get all that together and let's come up with a plan that will be something worthy of Middletown. I think that this should be - not be acted upon now - I don't think there is a time for it, I think it is too hastily put and I someday don't know if my children are ever going to have a lot, I guess I'm going to have to give them a couple of acres but there is just no way that I see having an acre of land saying that this is adaptable for everybody, it is not depends on the type of crop or the topography of the area and a lot of other factors. Commission to suspend this for now, if possible, not make their individual vote and let's get more input on the idea. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo

I appreciate very much your input and anyone else's input and that's partly the reason that we asked the Middletown Press to put their map in the newspaper this week so the members of the public would understand the ramifications of what we are doing and I think your suggestion about trying to accommodate the views of all parties concerned is what, exactly, we are here attempting to do in listening to the comments. As far as suspending, we will keep at least one or two more Public Hearings and more if that is what the Commission directs the Chair to do, as far as how it is going to be handled. When the Commission is ready and indicates to me that they are ready to vote and make a decision, that is when the time the decision will be made, the Chairman cannot impose a time frame for decision making on the Commission, I'm only one vote out of seven so, as far as that is concerned, you can rest assured the Commission will dictate when it feels comfortable with a decision on this particular problem. The Chairman may feel more comfortable than the Commission at a certain point but that's, like I said, only one vote out of seven. Are there any members of the public who wish to be heard?

Joe Guida

I'm Joe Guida, I live on Coleman Road, I'm a taxpayer and property owner and I'm not going to take up too much of your time, we've talked quite a bit here this evening. I would just like to tell the Commission that I am opposed to the large building lots. I have always been in favor of putting the land to its best use and I don't think that the acre and acre and a half size lots is putting the land in Middletown to its best use. Also, I don't see any need for a speedy vote on the acceptance of this plan. It is going to serve no purpose, it's a ten year plan and I ask the Commission to look at it, at every aspect and do their best to come up with a plan that will satisfy all the people in this community, not just a few. Thank you.

Continued from Page 19

Chm Gionfriddo
Anyone else?

Ted Stein

Would the Chairman and the Commission indulge me, Ted Stein, Patterson Drive, with a second appearance having to do with the point of order? Much as I would like to rebut some of my neighbors, the Guidas whom I have known for a long time, who came up here as I did and stated their opinions, I'm afraid we would, with our respective axes, chop down the tree of your patience rather quickly. On point of order, or points of order, are these - Somehow I get kind of angry and I wonder if there is a legality that you might legitimately enforce. At testimony before a Public Hearing in the City of Middletown, not a person who is not a resident of Middletown, who comes with perhaps very valid and good information and input, but who is unwilling or unable to state the Constituency which he represents. That angers me. I believe that those who speak at these hearings in Middletown should be Middletown folk, or should make it clear who it is that retained them to speak in their behalf. Second, in respect to the Glastonbury attorney whose name escapes me and who has now left, so we cannot clarify this, who spoke on behalf on Mrs. Kruze. Her deceased husband, Corny Kruze, was a Professor at Wesleyan, a Senior Professor at Wesleyan, before I came to Middletown thirty years ago. My question is, that he might have been speaking for Mrs. Kruze's conservator and I wonder if it is reasonable for someone to come here to speak before you if they represent someone, claiming to represent, someone who lives in a specific area when, in fact, they don't. Is there any way by which your group can clarify the interest of those who speak before them? Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo

I think the reason I asked the original gentleman who he represented was so we could put on the record what the names of the individuals were that he did represent, and I think, probably, and I take him at his word, to the best of his ability he did identify that Mr. Bysiwick requested him to be here and there were other individuals here in the room whose names he was not aware, I would have no reason to think that he wasn't telling us the truth with respect to that. We have, at many Public Hearings, previously allowed individuals from outside the City of Middletown to come and give their opinion, this gentleman is here as an expert, he is not claiming to be a Middletown landowner and I think the Commission is sophisticated enough and knowledgeable enough to take into account the opinion of an expert who is outside the City of Middletown, versus the testimony of somebody who's in Middletown and gives its own weight and merit to the individual people who come here to speak. I won't shut the door to people who want to come here to speak, will allow anyone to speak as long as they identify where they are from and to the extent that they are able to identify who they represent, that is why I did ask the question. With respect to the attorney, I can only take him at his word, as well, I don't know the situation of the family and who he would have represented here on other than what he stated. To answer one question that was made and I'm not going to debate it, there is some -- if the Commission came to some determination in their own mind as to how they wish to proceed on, and I think what we have heard, in general in the last half of this discussion is the discussion on Item #6 which is the residential lot sizes. If the Commission, at some point, were to decide that a larger lot size were the way to go then there, clearly, would be some need to bring it to a vote within a relatively near future because as long as we don't vote on this, then the older regulations are in effect and subdivisions would be coming in under the older regulations. Naturally, if the Commission decided that they were not prepared to go to larger lot sizes or felt that the older regulations were, older lot sizes were sufficient, than that would be an academic issue, but if the Commission decided that they wanted to go to a larger size of lots then there would be some merit to not dragging it out to a long period of time because, at that point, if a number of subdivisions came in the point could become academic. If there is no one who wishes to speak on Item #5, I'm going to continue Item #5 until the next meeting and move to Item #

Continued from Page 20

Comm. Sbalcio
Item #6: Continued Public Hearing to amend Zoning Code
Text and Map/Proponent P & Z Commission

ITEM #6: CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING
TO AMEND ZONING CODE TEXT AND
MAP/PROPONENT/ P & Z COMMISSION

Chm Gionfriddo
Okay, this, in particular, deals with the change in residential lot sizes, I would ask that those who have already spoken with respect to this issue, unless they have something new to add, not to get up and rehash the same ground and those who have been waiting to deal with this issue, now is the appropriate time.

John S. Otfinoski
John S. Otfinoski, second time around. I just would like to have, perhaps, a show of hands of the people here on the present proposed lot sizes who, in this room, are in favor of it?

Chm Gionfriddo
All those in the audience who are aware of what the present lot sizes are being proposed are and are in favor of the revisions now being proposed by the Planning & Zoning Staff, please raise their hands. Okay, all of those who are aware of what Planning & zoning staff is proposing, who are opposed, please raise their hand. Okay? Is that what you are looking for?

John S. Otfinoski
I hope the Board considers this when they are making their decision.

Chm Gionfriddo
Thank you. Anyone wishing to be heard under Item #6?

Andrew Roberts
My name is Andrew Roberts, 199 Wilcox Road. What the Board is really considering here is taking a direction for this town. This town is in competition with other towns for people, jobs and for housing. The Board is going to have to decide, do you want to attract more higher disposable people, do you want to keep it about the same, do you want more people low disposable income, or what? Over all, we're probably going to get about the same base. We can have smaller lots for people, but they pay less or the other way around. There's no one right way. We are not going to become Glastonbury, we are not going to become another town. But we have to look at the mix of small lots versus large lots and I would like to know the direction of the Board, are we trying to - which way are we trying to take the town - true, if we go with larger lots, our children aren't going to be able to live here, perhaps for the first five years of their lives. When their income rises and they have been out working they can move from across the river to where we, fortunately, already are. What is the mix right now of small versus larger lots in percentage and what will the percentage be when we are done? Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo
Nino, we had asked you to prepare some of those facts and figures, did you have an opportunity to do it?

Nino Martucci
No, I'm halfway through it right now. Number 1, we have a vacant position in the office. Number 2, my planning intern is sick.

Chm Gionfriddo
Would you prefer to wait two weeks to go into it?

Continued from Page 21

Nino Martucci

Yes, because my figures will carry what they are all asking for. What is the land classification, what is all the environmental sensitive areas and what land is going to be left for development. From there we can proceed. I figured if I'm going to do the job once I want to do it correctly.

Chm Gionfriddo

We would prefer to have it done the proper way rather than half tonight and half two weeks from tonight. Just for the public's information that information will be forthcoming at the next Public Hearing. Staff is in the process of preparing it. Anyone else wishing to be heard on Item #6?

Jan Miller

Jan Miller, Maple Shade Road, Member of South Middletown Association and Your Neighborhood Friends. I'll read my part because I always get mixed up, if I don't. A group of representatives of South Middletown Association and of Your Neighborhood Friends has regularly attended Planning & Zoning Commission Meetings for the last year and a half. It has been an instructive experience for all of us. Planning & Zoning, P&Z, has come to mean just that to us. Zoning is intrinsic to a city's orderly and rational development. Large industrial and hotel complexes must be located in designated zones. Multiple housing and Planned Residential Developments, Community recreational, Religious facilities, private residential and shopping areas all must be located in reasonable situations. During our participation in the sessions in this chamber we have witnessed many heated moments, we have produced a few ourselves when conflicting interests clashed. It is clear that issues of property, land and structures come very close to people's financial and emotional interests. It is also a truism that for many people their home is their single, largest investment and a threat to it arouses a great deal of emotion. However, it is also clear that a city has a need to plan for its development and that the function of this Commission is to chart its course. Because Middletown's development has been very rapid in the last two years, the Commission has had to make equally rapid adjustments. When new industrial development has come close to these residential areas, these communities develop initiatives to protect their community's character and to safeguard their home investment. The Commission is caught in the balancing act. We who have witnessed it have indeed come close to understanding, an understanding of how a city grows. But, like all growing organisms, its development cannot go unsupervised or unchecked. The issue concerning the residents of South Middletown is that of redressing the difficulties caused by a Zoning Code that had not been adjusted to the rapid influx of people. Not anticipated, too, was the potential conversion of farm land to development land. The zoning proposal by the Commission for Middletown enlarges lot sizes in radiating sequences, they are not radical and they do not provide for lavish estates. They do provide a potential for housing that will retain the rural character of the area and will assure home owners that they will not suffer depreciation of their investment, in addition, it will have the benefit of making Middletown an attractive place for that managerial staff who have come here with the new businesses and who would rather live in the town where they work than become commuters from nearby towns. The proposal affects areas other than South Middletown and we hope the Commission will act expeditiously to resolve these questions. I would like to add, too, that I have questioned both Mr. Reif and Nino because I was concerned, too, I didn't want to crowd out people who might have a need for lower cost housing but I have ridden around town and I have seen the developing of the growth in Wesleyan Hills and the fact-and I have read in the paper at times, even though Nino doesn't have the figures, they emerge from time to time. There are a great many plans for Planned Residential Developments for Condominium Developments. I think in this room there was a proposal out in the direction of Cromwell for a large number of Condos. Wesleyan Hills is going to have Condos and houses which would be of the allowed acreage which is the current zoning in South Middletown. It would mean a city with a certain kind of uniformity, a dullness and I think this is an attractive city and what we have to do is maintain the attractiveness and I don't think that people who are concerned about their investment will suffer, really. People want to live in attractive places.

Continued from Page 22

Jan Miller
Chm Gionfriddo
Is there anyone else?

Richard Eigan
Richard Eigan, Planning Consultant, Representing Mr. Bysiewicz, et al,

Chm. Gionfriddo
Would you please, for the record, identify where you are from.

Richard Eigan
I live in the town of Wetherfield, I'm associated with Lordwood, Larson and have an office in West Hartford. Just one note, what I feel that is a legal defect in your hearing regarding the change of the zone. In regard to Section 8-3b of the Statutes, that is, and as I said, I work for the Regional Planning Agency in the valley area and the defect is that when any Zoning Commission of a municipality proposes to change a zone within 500 feet of another municipality that's in the area of operation of a Regional Planning Agency, the Zoning Commission shall give written notice to the Regional Planning Agency not later than thirty-five days before the Public Hearing. My information from the Regional Planning Agency is that they were notified on September 5, which was after the Public Hearing was began.

Chm Gionfriddo
Just to clarify this, we considered an issue dealing with South Middletown, George (Reif) if I'm wrong, let me know, earlier and I think it was last year, and we submitted the proposed change of lot size to the Regional Planning Agency in Middletown, Midstate, and we were informed that it was not an appropriate thing for them to consider because the statute requires a change in use. Is that not correct, George? (Reif)

Mr. Reif
The Westfield area that's when you changed from R-1 to R-R, Rural Residential.

Chm Gionfriddo
So, based on that interpretation we have submitted our proposed changes to the Regional Planning Agency for their expertise with the understanding that since it is not a change in use that we did not have to submit them thirty-five days before a Public Hearing began. If someone wished to challenge a decision we made on that technicality that would be within their right.

Mr. Eigan
Yes, I talked to Mr. Reif about that and as you may know the only reason the court overturns zoning decisions are technicalities in Connecticut, they don't look at the issues very much. The statute says, as I pointed out to Mr. Reif yesterday, that if you change a zone or affect the use of a zone you can do either one, you are not affecting the use of the zone but you are changing the zone and I think that word "or" means if you do one or the other you have to submit this to the Regional Planning Agency.

Chm Gionfriddo
Is there anyone else?

Charlie Harris
Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, planned (sic) information. We hear the word "affordable housing". Affordable by whose decision, affordable why and affordable when? Regardless of lot size, what is affordable at the time that lot is initially sold by the time it changes hands three times because of Commissions, it no longer becomes affordable in the eyes of many of the individuals. Lot size does not necessarily pinpoint the affordability. By the time that lot changes three hands it's no longer affordable to the original owner that originally

Continued from Page 23

Mr. Charles Harris
bought it. It's because of Commissions, not because of the territory it is in or the
size of its lot. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo
Charlie, for the record, would you give your name and address again, please.

Mr. Charles Harris
I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm Charlie Harris, Chamberlain Road, Middletown. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo
Thank you. Anyone else? If not, we will continue this Public Hearing until the next
meeting and we will close the entire Public Hearing for this evening and move to Item #3
on the Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT 9 PM

Transcribed by

Dorothy Wilson