

Continued from Page 30

Ann Bickford (Continued)

the kind of planning that we are glad to see that there is a change in direction, that there is some thought to the variety. But there is one concern I have in re-reading the Legal Notice as it was published, the proposal to amend the Plan says that you are changing the zoning text to conclude this hierarchy and that at the same time you will be changing the residential zones to bring them in line with the hierarchy, if I understand this correctly. I'm concerned that when you do this, it be done in such a way that there would be no technical challenge to what is done and in studying the maps and going back to the existing zoning there are a few areas that I really wonder if it is covered properly in the text, and that is there appears to be several areas in the existing zoning which are actually changing zones, they are not presently residential zones but if the Middletown Press map is correct they would become residential zones. I speak particularly down in the Laurel Brook area where there is an I-2 zone on the West side of South Main Street and it exists now as an I-2 zone, however it is shown in this new proposed zoning as a country residential zone. The same thing is true on Route 9, there's an I-1 zone, service industrial shown on the East side of Route 9, and a portion of that appears to go to a residential zone. There is a section up in the North section of Town which is now an I-2 zone and on the new map there is an area that becomes white which means it is no longer residential but there is not an explanation of what it does become. I don't know the explanation of that but what I am concerned about is that if you literally are changing what is now residential and re-working all the residential areas to a new hierarchy, it seems to me that some of these other areas that are not presently zoned residential would have to be taken as another step, they could not be thrown in...it seems to me another step would have to be taken to change what is now an industrial area to a residential area.

Chm. Gionfriddo

George (Reif), do you have a five second explanation?

George Reif

Yes, the explanation is that she is correct. The only areas that are proposed included in any change of lot sizes are areas that are currently zoned residential. Obviously, several maps have gotten put together. There is a proposal in the Plan of Development to change the area in the location of the Laurel Brook Reservoir from industrial to residential.

Ann Bickford

All right. Then there is a confusion of maps here, that is what I was hoping because I would hate to see you do something and then have it challenged on something that was... thank you.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Anyone else?

Roger Ogren, 467 Kelsey Street, Middletown

Good Evening, my name is Roger Ogren and I live at 467 Kelsey Street. There seems to be great concern by large landholders about diminishing assets under the current zoning proposal. I would like these people to understand that if the current zoning continues, we the homeowners stand to lose a percentage of our life savings through diminished assets as well.

Continued from Page 31

Roger Ogren (Continued)
 Those of us who have chosen to make Middletown our home intend to be here in the future. In contrast, some large landholders may not be here and certainly most developers do not intend to live here. The goals of these ^{two} groups is to produce the highest possible profit that the land will yield. If this approach to design by profit is allowed to continue as our Plan of Development, then we, in fact, do not have a Plan of Development at all. We are homeowners, and as a Zoning Board we step beyond today to insure that the end result of development does not impact us with nonreversible problems. Greater demands on our sewer systems, the already shallow water supply, our schools and road systems must be monitored carefully. This control cannot be realized if all available acreage is developed into the smallest lot size possible. If the problems mentioned do develop in the future, who will be left holding the bag, the developers, land owners and current Zoning Board will probably not be here. The responsibility there falls back into the hands of the homeowners. I would further like to say that for those people who say there is no harm done in carrying this conversation about the new proposal into another year, they need only look at the proposal before the Board on Maple Shade Road and see if we continue to wait the kind of damage that can be done. I think it is very important to move on this issue and move soon. Thank you very much.

Chm. Gionfriddo
 Thank you.

Jan Miller, 500 Maple Shade Road, Middletown
 Jan Miller, 500 Maple Shade. Member of the infamous ^{Your} Neighborhood Friends. We did get a questionnaire out, not a questionnaire because I left questions out, the questions I added on the copies that you have, it was a request for support, a demonstration of support. I agree, before Roberts Farm was sold and we were confronted with the possibility of an intensely dense development I really did not know about the Plan of Development, the Plan...I have lived in cities all my life, except when I lived in New York, it was too big, but I have lived in small towns and I never went to a Planning & Zoning meeting so it is not surprising that when you go around and inquire from people they don't know much about it. They will know about it when something happens in the Community that seems disastrous, then you will see them and that's appropriate, life has a lot of demands made on people. In fact, this Plan of Development has been discussed in this room perhaps ten times, I'm not sure, each time there was a notice and shortly after Lucas Held wrote an article. I know when I go through the paper, I read selectively, right now I'm reading about earthquakes in Mexico, so the fact it is not on the top of people's minds is not surprising nor is it something to say that they are lacking civic responsibility. The responsibility comes when something is happening in your community that you feel must address yourself to. This questionnaire was distributed, we distributed about 350 and I was astonished that I have 117 responses. Some people wanted anonymity, these are twenties...some people wanted some degree of anonymity and I said that it would be regarded as a ballot...because it is an emotive issue, I don't think they wanted people looking at the names. I said we would treat it as a ballot but that if there was any question we would ask some disinterested body like a member of the League of Women Voters to check addresses and names and be sure that the number I report is correct, it was 117 responses, all affirmative. The pressure upon us

Continued from Page 32

Jan Miller (Continued)
is that the first item on the Agenda tonight, the gentleman who thought that that was a sample of a Development, if he will look at the Agenda he will see that that is before the Commission and will have a Hearing in this Forum if it is to be heard before the end of the year. So we don't have forever, we can't sort of academically investigate what ideal solutions would be and, as a matter in fact, in life there are no ideal solutions. I think that we have a Planning Commission, I don't think you can go Planning & Zoning Board, you can't go through this Town without seeing evidence the...when I first came here eight years ago I thought...I once got nearly attacked by a bunch of women when I said that this was a Town with the deadest downtown I've ever seen and they said 'you don't know a thing about it.' Well nobody would say it was a dead downtown, nobody would say that there isn't evidence of all kinds of development and growth with the Redevelopment Program. Industry has come to this Town, development have come to this Town, industrial development, that certainly will bring some sort of advantage, tax advantage and community advantage. This is a Town where there all sorts of job opportunities, I see all sorts of evidence of a Planning & Zoning Commission in operation, though I will admit that there is nothing you do that could not be done differently. Right now we have the problem of the potential for development in the South Middletown area and the diagram of the Trican Development can be duplicated in various places in the area. In fact, right across from Trican, the Trican Development, is Paul Reynolds Development which will also have access to sewer and water and access to Coleman Road and there is no reason why that should not follow suit, if Paul Reynolds is so inclined. There is a lot of acreage there. This would completely alter the nature of that...the Community that we have bought our homes in would no longer be that Community and all these people...now, Connie Comfort referred to an exclusivist sort of thing. Nobody going through South Middletown would say that the population living there is a stratified population on the upper level, they are mostly little capes or ranches meticulously kept up by people who have tremendous pride in their homes. There is no evidence of wealth where the lots are larger at the other end of Maple Shade Road where I was fortunate enough to find a house, I never bought that house until all my children were grown, I did not live that way when I first got married, I lived in a place where the bed folded up and that's where you made the living room. There is a small area of development...I would say deeply wounded at the potential for the destruction of their environment, and that's what this is about, we're not imposing anything on people who own land, we just ask them to be considerate of us and think of us when they are thinking of trading their land in for money. What responsibility they have to the Community the land lies in and certainly the Trican Development, we feel is inflicting a wound but whatever problems I can't even imagine how they can exist on the road there because in the wintertime if two cars go by my house they have to do it, you know what they say about porcupines, very carefully. The area won't tolerate heavy development without disastrous reconstruction of it and I think that should be thought of. I would like to read one or two comments of the kind that have come in these questionnaires: 1. Totally in favor of the new proposal for the rezoning of Middletown, we need areas like South Middletown with large lots for the homeowners that desire more property, more privacy, and a rural atmosphere. If we wanted to live in densely populated areas with small lots, we would

Continued from Page 33

Jan Miller (Continued)
have purchased in the City. They go like that, I won't read anymore to you, I think the response was far beyond what I thought I would get because one does not expect people to get out and mail things or deliver things somewhere...as to the exact lot size on the larger end, I think... we have done some research and other people will be discussing that but it does not seem to me as if it is imposing drastic hardships on anyone. I think I have said everything that my notes included.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Thank you Jan (Miller). Are you going to turn those in to us for....

Jan Miller
(inaudible) few people felt sensitive about the fact that, well if you would like to have them and be certain that they are for general publication, I said they would be like a ballot, that they would reflect....

Chm. Gionfriddo
I would like to have them upstairs in case members of the Commission would like to look at them.

Jan Miller
Okay, well I would like to keep them confidential only in terms of I think people want not to be sort of, known publicly.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Well, you will have to understand that if they are up there members of the press would have access to them and could not guarantee that they would not publish the names of people who signed them. We could not ask them not to, but that would be within their discretion.

Jan Miller
Well, I would not think that it would be of general interest really so....

Chm. Gionfriddo
Well, I'm just letting you know that if they are in the Planning & Zoning Office they are going to be subject to the newspapers getting them.

Jan Miller
Well, there were only a few who seemed hesitant about it, I would assume that there would be some discretion....

Chm. Gionfriddo
Thank you. Is there anyone else? I would only ask, and please don't take this the wrong way, we'll stay here as long as there are people who want to speak, but I know some of you have been here at multiple meetings, I would just ask you not to repeat...I'm not directing this at you Jim, I would just ask you not to repeat statements that you have made and that we have heard at other meetings, only because we have other business and some of us would like to get home if humanly possible before midnight.

Continued from Page 34

Jan Miller

I found another thing in my notes, I think a lot of people came tonight. They came because we responded to the fact that the Council for our opponents, we seem to be in opposition although I really think we should not, requested a hand...a demonstration of hands. Now we have had lots of people here lots of times, I did this partially in response to that and I wanted to say that from now on I hope we don't have to have lots of people here. I hope that those of us who come are understood to represent the constituency and that we do not need to have a show of hands. I think that people have been very good about coming up, they have had to leave their homes, they don't really need to as often as we have asked them to, and I would like not to have to ask them again but please not to have shows of hands or if they are we can say we represent thus and so many people.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Well, let's put it this way, I was not going to tell the individual last time that he could not ask for a show of hands but I could safely say that the decision that we make is not going to be based on a show of hands at one meeting. Okay?

Anthony Guida, 575 Coleman Road, Middletown

Good Evening, my name is Anthony Guida, Coleman Road. I have been before this Commission the last two meetings. I hope not to repeat what I have said before, I think the Commission realizes how I feel about the Plan. However, a number of items that were stressed here...at the last meeting if you remember we got a lot of publicity about the microphone and I was reading for other stuff the paper might have come (sic) up with, however, the only other thing I read about the last meeting was that there was a lot more land owners and farmers at the meeting than there were other people. Some groups were quite disturbed about that situation and I think this is why we've got a full house tonight. The farmers and the land owners by far do not outnumber any other group that are in the room or anywhere else. One thing that was brought up here tonight that we haven't had in the past couple of meetings is that I think there's a middle ground here now and I was pleased with that. I also was pleased that some of the comments that were made that they are going to consider some of the information and input that had been put in here which the last time there was no such commitment. I also feel that since we... there can't be any winners or losers in this whether it be the farmers or the homeowners or what, why, there should not be and I don't want the Board to feel that just because there's a greater number of either side or because of more land and so forth, I don't think that that is the issue at all. I feel since we have been coming to these meetings and getting a lot of input, I think that the Board here is a little confused as well as us as to just what we do want. I was thinking about this whole thing, Mr. Chairman, and could a sort of a Task Force be thought of or presented by the Board, from some people from the Town Planning and these different groups that are so interested and make an effort and spend night after night to come down here, and get some input and put together these things because certainly me as a landowner I'm not looking to...I'm not against one-half acre lots on all the land in the Southend or on ours. To rebut to a couple of these things that were said about the landowners, namely Professor Reynolds who is a good friend of all of us, he could have

Continued from Page 35

Anthony Guida (Continued)

sold that land a number of times. The Hubbard family which I talked to Betty Wyskiel, they could have sold that one hundred times to developments. There's any number of all the land owners here that could have done that, if this is the kind of Middletown we wanted up until this time. I don't think that it is fair for them to think that everybody is going to pull a Roberts farm on them. We could have done that a long time ago. So, please take that all into consideration and if we can find a middle ground here, get some kind of a Task Force together, I'm one hundred percent in favor.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Tony (Guida), the only thing I would say with respect to that is I think that is the function of the Commission as we sit here, we digest the information that we get from everyone who has come to speak over the last few Public Hearings and I think to the extent that you have heard some of us speak this evening, there probably will be some bearing down of the Proposal toward a compromise that would be, hopefully if not acceptable to one hundred percent of the people, acceptable to a large percentage of the people. I think the concept or the necessity of a Task Force is probably not there in that we've heard the input from various parties and I think the Commission has to boil it down into some kind of a workable solution, and I think we're in the right direction.

Anthony Guida
Thank you.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Anyone else?

Kathleen Didato, Kelsey Street, Middletown
Kathleen Didato, Kelsey Street, Middletown. I agree with you. We voted you people in, we respect you and we hope that now that you are voted in you are going to make these decisions, that you are going to think this over in everybody's case, for all ways. But it is embarrassing that we started this thing in 1977 or 1979 for the first map and it is now 1985, I think that it isn't right to wait another whole year. I think that you people are definitely reliable enough that you've gotten voted in, now do something about it.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Anyone else wishing to speak?

John S. Otfinoski, 247 Miner Street, Middletown
I would like to thank the people who put the air conditioning on. I'm John S. Otfinoski, better known as John Ott, I was much delighted with what the Chair said about the compromises and so forth, and I think that was only possible through the efforts of all the people here, whether for or against. It probably brought that out and it's probably going to help the Commission make a decision. As Tony (Guida) said there are no losers or winners, and I think you have to compromise and take a middle of the road issue because you've got to deal and satisfy all people in the City. Therefore, they've got some strong points and I realize that we're probably not going to have a Task Force and I'm sure that if we didn't come to these meetings and raise issues, perhaps the Chair would have not

Continued from Page 36

John S. Otfinoski (Continued)
compromised so what you said tonight, at least you are listening and I've got faith in you as elected officials. I wanted to bring up, I think in the Courant today it showed Meriden zoning... Wallingford zoning going into owner of single family houses may convert them to include one small self-contained apartment. Under prior zoning rules, this could not be done without the approval of the Zoning Board of Appeals. The new regulations will encourage people to keep elderly parents at home, providing housing for older children, and increase the rental market, so far. Now, I think that's something that I wish the Commission would address and look into and possibly get input from towns like this that are adopting this ruling because they must have some merit doing the same thing that you gentlemen are doing on the Board here, or as Chairpeople here. So therefore, there is some middle of the ground to be gained and I wish you would just keep listening and maybe we'll all walk out of here partly satisfied. Thank you.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Okay, I just want to add to what you said that obviously the purpose of us having all of these Public Hearings is to get the kind of input that we have been getting and naturally we all have our not preconceived notions but we all have our ideas about how we would like to see things and probably without people coming forward and explaining other perspectives, then we would all go off on our own merry way without really looking at the other side, so I would say to the extent that everybody that has come forward in these Hearings and expressed their opinion has given us different perspectives then I think clearly its been of benefit. I do want to say that that is the case. I would appreciate... I think the Commission does appreciate all those who have spent many hours coming out here and giving us their input. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak this evening?

Basil J. Moore, 540 Maple Shade Road, Middletown
I'm Basil Moore, I'm a professor of economics at Wesleyan and about a year ago I prepared a very elementary benefit cost study of the effect of rezoning for the South Farms District. I have attempted to update that and I have made 25 copies. I would just like to say a very few words about the motivation behind it. I would like to suggest that the Commission can reasonably themselves as like Directors of a Corporation and the Corporation, in this case, is Middletown. Now, one of the functions as Directors of a Corporation is to take steps that will increase the value of that Corporation, the value of its shares, if you like. The Commission is in a similar situation, the results of your decisions affect the value of property rights in Middletown, and while I'm sympathetic to the notion that you should be trying to seek a common ground, I think we're kidding ourselves if we pretend that there are no gainers and there are no losers. I would like to suggest that the reason why this controversy has been so sharp is because there are very substantial differences in the effects of rezoning on different groups. The property owners who are for rezoning in the South Farms District will gain because sooner or later the improved quality of life (less congestion) will increase the value of their property. The land owners and the farmers, in the short run at least, will lose from rezoning because they can cut their land into a fewer number of lots and therefore the value of their property

Continued from Page 37

Basil Moore (Continued)

will be lower. Now, what I would suggest is a fact of life but as economists are fond of pointing out, it doesn't mean that it is a zero sum gain, that is, the gains by one group do not necessarily equal the losses by the other group. This very simple benefit cost study that I have done attempted to put numbers on the gains to property holders in the South Farms area, and the losses to land owners and farmers in the South Farms area and then add them up. Something like that, I would suggest, is a reasonable proposal for the Commission at least to consider. I feel quite strongly that the framework of this approach is sensible. I don't feel as strongly about the numbers and the conclusions because I don't feel confident that the numbers that I was able to collect are terribly firm, but to give you an example of the orders of magnitude involved, there are apparently something like 1,000 property owners in the South Farms area, and if the average lot size is 30,000 then we are talking about \$30,000,000 total aggregate value of land owned property in the South Farms area. If you make assumptions about the effect on property values of different types of rezoning, then you can get an estimate of the gains which was received by lot owners and if you make similar assumptions about the number of undeveloped lots owned by farmers and land owners, and this is the figure that I found most difficult to ascertain, if you take undeveloped lots on existing roads the estimate is apparently something like 200, but if you consider putting in new roads the estimate increases substantially from 700 up to as many as even 1,000. At any rate, the conclusions of my study with the numbers that I was given make it quite clear that the benefits of rezoning along the lines that the Commission suggested would on balance increase total property values in the area by something like from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 net. That is, the gains by the homeowners would far outweigh the potential losses to the landholders. One final point, we can't deny that there will be losses to land owners as a result of rezoning, and it would seem appropriate, somehow, that they could be compensated because what I'm suggesting is that the winners of rezoning would gain more than the losers will lose. The existing property holders can't really turn around and compensate the landholders but it would seem entirely appropriate if the Planning & Zoning Commission could get together with the relevant Tax Assessors. The farmers and land owners who will undoubtedly lose on such a zoning change were compensated even further by lower tax liabilities because Middletown itself, remember, if the result of your rezoning decision is to increase total property values will benefit from greater tax proceeds because the wealth of Middletown will in turn rise. I would just like to say in conclusion, this is obviously an economist's position, you should not really be misled to think that property values simply reflect materialistic dollars and cents and therefore are not an appropriate consideration. Increases in the quality of life in the sort of town that we have will be reflected in higher property values, so it seems to me that it is entirely appropriate to use that criteria as a goal.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Thank you.

Basil Moore

I will leave these reports here on the table. I think there are 35 in total so if anyone in the audience would like to pick some up, they would be available. Thank you.

Continued from Page 38

Chm. Gionfriddo
I would suggest, Nino (Martucci), why don't you pick up some for members of the Commission. Is there anyone else wishing to speak?

(Inaudible) person from the audience.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Some of the questions that you asked will be answered I would assume probably not this evening, but Staff and Members of the Commission that were here will take the opportunity to answer the questions possibly at the next meeting.

Richard Eigen
If I could, I would just like to quickly answer the question that was asked of me by one of the people and make two other very quick points. I think the question that was asked of me relates to the study that was done by Professor Moore from Wesleyan. There are two different things that you are talking about, one is increased value to the homeowner, and second is the tax dollar you get from the single family house. We did a study in Simsbury and the study in Simsbury indicated that you don't really get increased tax dollars except from apartments and commercial properties. Single family homes, because of the school population that it generates, come out about even as far as tax dollars that are generated. Whether you are talking about 15,000 square foot or 60,000 square foot lots, you are going to get from between -\$25.00 to \$150.00 per lot. That is what we came up with in Simsbury, it is generated to the town in tax dollars. I think the Wesleyan professor is mixing the benefit to the property owner versus the tax dollars that you get from the single family houses, those two things are mixed in what he wrote. The other quick point that I would like to make as far as the questionnaire, we are involved in doing two Plans of Development and as I said last time, Suffield and Windsor Locks, we have done questionnaires in both towns, we have gotten between 20% and 25% of the households to respond because we went out and tried to get responses to questionnaires. You have gotten 117 responses from Neighborhood Friends, if we got 20% to 25% of the households, we would be getting 3,200 households or 8,000 people responding. So, keep those numbers in mind and the kind of good response you can get from a good questionnaire getting people involved in the planning process.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Thank you. If there is....

Comm. Leinwand
Can I ask a question?

Chm. Gionfriddo
Yes. Commissioner Leinwand.

Comm. Leinwand
Procedurally, how do we put a compromise or an alternative plan on the table? How do we take four or five Public Hearings and begin to suggest that some of us are thinking along different lines, how do we float some things out there and see if it begins to get people smiling a little bit more than they are now? How?

Continued from Page 39

Chm. Gionfriddo

George (Reif), I'm wondering in light of the fact that we've heard a number of alternative suggestions, whether or not you and Nino (Martucci) might sit down and try to synthesize some of what we have heard in these Hearings into a Plan would draw a lot of these comments in and try to work out some kind of a compromise.

George Reif

I think you may consider bringing this Public Hearing on the Plan of Development to an end. I think you have heard so many ideas here and other ways, from telephones and letters and what have you, it may be time to integrate everything and come up with a modified Plan.

Chm. Gionfriddo

I guess what I am afraid of is I don't want to see, even though this is what very well could happen, I don't want to see the seven of us come up with our own individual Plan and sit here next meeting or the meeting after and each of us try to hammer out or try to convince four other people that our individual Plan is what should be. What I would suggest to you (George Reif) and Nino (Martucci) is why don't you sit down and try to come up with something to look at at the next meeting that would put together some of the issues and concerns that we have heard raised here this evening. I know that I have spoken to you previously about consolidating the number of lot sizes that we have on the map from five down to three, that is one area that I have talked to you about, and we have heard a lot of other concerns from members of the public, I would like to think that perhaps next meeting we could have something that people could look at and maybe they could tell a little better based on what they have at the next meeting whether or not we are moving in the right direction.

George Reif

Okay, I would like to emphasize again that it is not just this meeting, you have been at this since the Spring of 1983.

Comm. Leinwand

For those who haven't been here....

Chm. Gionfriddo

I understand that George (Reif) and I think a lot of us understand that. Commissioner Leinwand.

Comm. Leinwand

I guess that there are three ways to do it. There is way number one which is just sort of be quiet and George (Reif), you and Nino (Martucci) just go and do your thing and come back and make comments on it, or there is the more common way which is I call you up or I wander in in private and tell you what I think, or there is the way I'm going to do it which is to tell you right now what I'm thinking in public. I have talked to too many people who have come to too many of these meetings and asked the question "So what do you think about all of this stuff, what is the Commission going to do" and I guess that I don't really know what the Commission is going to do. I do know that the proposal that is before us does not stand a chance of going through, I can read the faces of my colleagues as well as anybody. But what I

Continued from Page 40

Comm. Leinwand (Continued)
as concerned about is whether or not a compromise is going to go through as well and George (Reif), I say this to you but I also say it to the people who have been coming to meeting after meeting after meeting and I say it to float an idea because I want to know whether or not it goes far enough to appease one side and far enough to appease the other side, and in the bottom line that serves the interests of the Community. I think that your red area is unnecessary. If you look at the map, we don't need 7,500 square foot lots. I think our "In Filling Provision" takes care of that. I think that we have an area of downtown Middletown and its surrounding environment...environs that you have in red and yellow that ought to be 15,000 square foot lots. It works, it has been R1, it ought to stay R1, or R15, or something like that, 100 x 150 foot lots, with 25 foot setbacks, I think makes sense. I don't think you create more nonconforming lots and I think you keep it. I think that the light blue and the orange goes too far. I think that one ought to think about combining both of those areas into an R30, and talk about having the potential density of those areas from 15,000 square feet to 30,000 square feet. I think that we make a giant step forward in terms of controlling the long term population explosion of this Community, we preserve tremendous value on the farms of the people in that area and responsibly allow for quality development by talking about 150 x 200 foot lots, 30,000 square feet, two-thirds of an acre, perhaps going to 35 foot setbacks. I think the dark blue area at sixty, as we said earlier, is crazy, and I think that those are areas where you are never going to really bring...maybe even go to fifty foot setbacks. I think that that kind of a structure consolidates the five into a more manageable three, I think it removes the excesses of the 60,000 and the nonconforming problems of the 7,500. I think that it gives the City a hierarchy that, in fact, is desperately needed. As I said it controls the density and thus the population in a rational fashion, and I think that it is important that you look along those lines, that we come back with a proposal that is much tighter, that begins to get at a compromise and I think that we keep the Public Hearing open longer so that people have a chance to say whether, Leinwand you're crazy or yes, that begins to make sense, or what. I thank you for listening.

Chm. Gionfriddo
Excuse me. This is exactly the type of thing that was done under #2 already because we have already both talked to George (Reif) along the same lines so what I would suggest is considering that what I don't want to have happen is that we all...I mean I could sit here and I said I was in favor from going from five to three which is basically along the same lines and I could give all my ideas and Commissioner Pillarelli could give all his and Commissioner Gadomski could give all his, etc. and we would be here until midnight each presenting our own plan, so what I would suggest is perhaps we would want to have a Sub-Committee of this body sit down with George (Reif) between now and the next meeting and try to work up a plan. I agree, let's keep the Public Hearing open another meeting, let that Sub-Committee and Staff come back with a plan at which the public will have an opportunity to look and digest and determine whether or not it meets their approval or not. The Sub-Committee would have the opportunity to present some divergent points of view to George (Reif) which could be incorporated into a plan. If I don't hear any real objections, I'm going to name a panel of three members to sit down with George (Reif) and work up the plan and I'm going to ask Commissioner Leinwand since he has already given us all his ideas to be on it. I will ask Commissioner Cart to be on it. I will ask Commissioner Guiffrida to be on it as the third, and I will sit as a member as well as the Chairman. What I am going to ask is that we get together with George (Reif) and try to schedule some meetings so that we can come back at the next meeting. Actually, what I would like is some kind of a plan worked out in ample time that we can release to the newspapers in advance what is going to be suggested

Continued from Page 41

Chm. Gionfriddo (Continued)

at the next meeting. I want the public to be aware, and this is only going to be a suggestion, because of the fact that three or four members of the Commission are going to sit down with the staff and kick around some ideas, it doesn't mean that what is going to come forward is necessarily going to be a final agreed upon solution. What we are trying to do is find some way of incorporating some of the ideas that we have heard this evening and not have the meeting deteriorated to sessions where nothing is accomplished. What we are trying to do is put together something that is going to engender some more discussion at the next meeting and perhaps bring the issue to a head to everyone's or almost everyone's mutual satisfaction.

Richard Eigen

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if members of the groups that were speaking could be also included.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Because of the fact that it is a Sub-Committee meeting with staff, they are not going to be excluded, it won't be a meeting held in an office some place. I'll have to hold it someplace where the public can come and listen to it. It is not going to be a Public Hearing situation, I'm not going to open the Public Hearing for members of the public to come and give us their input. I think we can safely say that over the last year we have heard the input from the public and we're going to have another Public Hearing at the next meeting and we'll give them plenty of opportunity for input. If we don't do something like this, the only thing I'm going to suggest to you that is going to happen is that we are going to sit here, like tonight, and each individual Commissioner is going to make their suggestion and is going to go up to his map and color the lines a little bit different, and make a few extra changes, and we're going to get no place fast. You have seven people here and seven different ideas of how things should be done, or three or four different ideas, or even if its only two... I would like to see us ^{try to} come up with something cohesive that the body can digest and vote on and the Sub-Committee is the way I see it working best. I may be proven incorrect but we will know that by the next meeting.

Richard Eigen

That's fine. We would just like an opportunity to review what you have....

Chm. Gionfriddo

My object would be to produce something in time enough that you will have it before the next meeting so that you will have time to look at it. Commissioner Carta.

Comm. Carta

One of my concerns is how does each individual Commissioner make his contribution. We have an architect who is talented, we have people who live in the City who have different fields, yet, for my money we have not been able to make individual contributions. The pendulum has swung as far towards exclusive zoning as you can possibly go, you can go a little further, I suspect. Personally, I agree with Steve (Leinwand) there is no way I would vote for this Plan. It is just out of the question. I'll give you just one example. Take all that red area, that's 75 foot front lots, that is an affordable lot on today's market, yet within that red area there isn't any open land. It's a joke, truly a joke. What it says to people who can afford modest housing is we are going to give you something. But if you look, there is nothing there for you to get, really, it's a joke. What I began to hear here tonight is something I have waited for awhile, for the pendulum to begin to swing back again. And what I've heard, which is nice, and that is the people who are swinging it back are not wanting to push it all the way in the other direction. But what I have heard tonight, I have forgotten your name, I'm sorry, Richard Eigen, are talking about how you get it in the

Continued from Page 42

Comm. Carta (Continued)

middle because unless it gets in the middle, I, for one, will not vote for anything other than that. The things that I tried to propose initially about open space, zoning, unusual road layout, unusual lot layouts, are now beginning to become a possible solution. There was not a lot of room for that, which is fine, we need to... all kind of dragging in our own direction, and then we look to see all right, that's not it, where do we go. My concern is how do the other Commissioners get to give their input, if I'm on a Committee I am willing to work on that Committee. Do we come back here and do we say "all right, now this is it, this is what we put together", how do we handle that? I'd like to see that.

Chm. Gionfriddo

No, I'm not trying to exclude anybody from making any input.

Comm. Carta

I think we're going in the right direction.

Chm. Gionfriddo

If any individual Commissioner has input that they would like to make to George (Reif) to incorporate in this, then by all means do it, that is what we're here for. The only reason I'm suggesting a Sub-Committee, rather than sitting around a table like this to try to come up with something is I think it would be unworkable for us to sit here as seven Commissioners with alternates and staff and try to present something cohesive that the public would be able to digest. Any Commissioner who has input that they would like to make can make it...they can come to the meetings. Just because there is a Sub-Committee of four people, anybody is welcome to come and Seb (Passanesi) or anybody who wants to come and say "this is what I think should be done", certainly that is the way it has to be, or he can talk to staff, he can talk to me, he can talk to any member of the Sub-Committee. When the Plan is proposed, he is a member of the Commission, he is going to have his input right here on the floor. All I am looking to do is to try to follow what you said, which is to take the divergence of opinion that we have heard today and to try to work up something that will allow the pendulum, as you (Comm. Carta) say, to swing to someplace where we would all feel comfortable. I don't want us to have a series of amendments on the floor that lose on 4-3 votes or 6-1, or 5-2 votes, which is where we are heading and at that point we have accomplished nothing. What I sense is that we are getting to a point where people can all live with some compromises that will probably come out of a Sub-Committee meeting, and that is where I would like to see us head. If the Commission feels I am wrong and would like to do it some other way, I would be glad to listen and do it any way the Commission would like.

Comm. Carta

The thing I find valuable what is beginning to go on, and I want to say this so that the Residents' Groups hear it differently, it is a danger what I'm going to say and what you are going to hear is like I'm speaking against you, it may sound that way, and I request you don't hear it that way. The outside people that I have heard speak tonight, the Planner (Richard Eigen), even some people that are heading up other groups, they are bringing in a less emotional opinion here, they are bringing in some professional, a little colder, opinions. The farmer wants it one way, the home owner wants it the other way. We may never reach the perfection for both, but I'm very interested in getting input of the disinterested party. I'm very interested, I think even the staff has worked so hard they can't help but have an investment in it. It is an enormous amount of work, their pride is mixed in there, their talents, it is very difficult, it is very difficult for the Commission members. They live in different neighborhoods, they have different friends, are pressured by different people...it is very difficult.

Continued from Page 43

Commissioner Carta (Continued)

What I have seen tonight is very good. I did not see the outsider pushing heavily in a particular direction. I say what is needed is a person that says "listen, this is an alternative...this is another alternative", we have not had enough of that. We have brought our own...we speak through our own filters which are our particular desires and a lot of times, we do not hear it. We believe we're doing the best thing, we don't bring that independent viewpoint. I would somehow like to take that in to our Committees and begin to assimilate that.

Chm. Gionfriddo

I guess I could safely say that nobody could say that I did not name a Sub-Committee that represented all points of view. What I would suggest then is that we are going to adjourn this Public Hearing....

Commissioner Leinwand

One second. There is one last point. George (Reif), we have spent so much time on residential, I just don't want to lose the fact that there are still critical outstanding issues that have to be addressed and that have not been brought to the Commission yet about where we put more multi-family housing, where we put more industrial land, and what we do with our three major arterial routes. We were told that we were going to get a long map, rolled down the table, that show us Route 72, and a long map to show us Route 17. I think that next time we have got to find time to deal with those, as well.

Chm. Gionfriddo

George (Reif), if you have them, don't roll them out tonight. I also have here this evening four or five letters that were sent to me on The Plan of Development, some of which included comments about industrial land. And what I would ask...I'm going to give them to Hope (Kasper) and ask her that she xerox them, send them to members of the Commission, we'll make them part of the record. I'm not going to close the Public Hearing on either portion of this this evening, we'll leave it open until at least October 9th on both The Plan of Development and the Zoning Code. For members of the public who have been here and have shown a lot of interest, we will try very hard as a Sub-Committee to get you what it is that we are going to come up with prior to October 9th so that you will know what is going to be proposed before you walk in the door or what is going to be suggested for discussion, so what I would suggest to you is that probably October...I hate to tell you that you have to come out of your homes again but at least some of you on October 9th would probably want to be here to see what it is that will come out of the Sub-Committee. What I'm going to do, unless somebody clicks their microphone and interrupts me, is adjourn these Public Hearings until October 9th and ask for a ten minute recess.

ADJOURNMENT 9:50

ADJOURNMENT

Transcribed by

Joyce L. McLane