

Continued from Page 14

Mr. Reif (Continued)

also permits variations of lot sizes so that new lots in long established neighborhoods may be the same size as the older lots. The topic of lot sizes is directly related to zoning which is one of the major tools used to implement planning. Middletown, Connecticut made a commitment to be a planned City six decades ago. Today, Middletown is, or is very close to being, a world class community. Certainly, part of this achievement can be attributed to the commitment to planning. The lot size issue is not so complicated that it cannot be resolved by this Commission for the best interest of the future of Middletown. In order to display the proposal of the new lot sizes we have as our base the City's present zoning map, all the colors and the letters and what have you are there, it's relatively easy to see. The second sheet is the new proposed area zones, I'll go back to that in a minute. The top sheet is something that looks like a work of modern art. There is a diagram that shows where all the water and sewer lines are currently located. The green outlines the areas that have both water and sewer, all the areas within these lines have water and sewer obviously, it's the older part of the City, including the Central Business District. The blue area is outlined, or shows where the water lines are and the orange shows where the sewer lines are and it's very important to realize that any suggestions associated with lot sizes are also directed related to the location of water and sewer facilities. Probably nobody can see through this paper, but some of you have come up and looked at it closely and others will look at it as the evening goes on. What we have done, is created for four or five lot sizes that are the same numbers that we have now. They are almost in reverse of what we have, it goes from R-1 to R-4 and then to RR, we are continuing the Rural Residential concept which is currently in place in the Westfield area. That will be retained even though the lot size will be somewhat different. There will be two areas that really have the same basic new lot sizes, R-1 and R-2 areas will require 100 feet of frontage and 15,000 square feet. The difference in the R-1 and the R-2 is that the R-1 will allow the variations in terms of new lots that have the same frontage and are as existing lots. They are the older neighborhoods. In every case, they are areas that are already almost totally built up, there are still some places that might have room for new lots. The R-2, I have already said, will retain the same lot size - frontage, 100 feet of frontage and 15,000 square feet as the current R-1 size. The difference begins in the R-3 areas. And the major R-3 area is South of the area off...South of Randolph Road where that is already built up...it is between that built up section and the Southern boundary - the power line. There is one other area out near the Westfield area still East of the interstate highway that has not been totally developed that we propose as a R-3 zone. The R-4 zones will be primarily that area South of the power lines and the Maromas area that are far away from the possible extension of water and sewer facilities. There is another area just West of Higby Road that we are proposing for an R-4 zone. As an example, how things go, the subdivision that you are considering now is already in, so no matter what you change this to it is not going to influence the lot sizes here. As we have done in the past, we have a display of the lot sizes, on the bottom we have the existing sizes that are now in the zoning code. One, we tend to overlook, from time to time, is the lot of record. Anyplace in Middletown, no matter what residential zone it is in, there are lots of record. The frontage can be as little as 50 feet and, obviously,

Continued from Page 15

Mr. Reif (Continued)

there is no maximum but lots of record will continue to be available for use irregardless of how we, whether or ont there is a new zoning plot or not, so that means if a person has a small lot or a big lot whether they are in an area that requires the extension of water and sewer, they'll still be able to use that as a lot of record. Secondly, one of the points of argument in the current regulations is that the lot sizes in the R2, R3 and R4 are all the same size. The R1, you well know, is if water and sewer is available, 100 x 150, without water and sewer the R1 size is 200 x 200 and 40,000 square feet. Currently there are two sizes required in the Rural Residential. First, 200 ft. of frontage, 1. it has water and sewer (inaudible)...the other is 400 feet. Let's work down this way, we'll start with the new proposed for Rural Residential is 200 feet of frontage by 300 or 60,000 square feet which comes to 1.4 acres...the R4 zone would require 45,000 square feet, 200 x 225 feet.. the R3 would be 150 feet of frontage, 200 feet deep and 30,000 square feet, about .7 acres, that would require both City water and sewer. The R2 zone would have 100 frontage, 15,000 square feet, 150 feet deep, that also would obviously require water and sewer. The R1 is the same size ad the R2, that would be the neighborhoods that would permit the variation in frontage and area to match existing neighborhood lot sizes. We have two other categories on our list of zones, one is M - Multiple Family Use and in most cases these are areas that already have multiple families and possibly some nearby areas that might be logically included in the multiple family areas and the MX is a...stands for Mixed Use, that would allow multiple family and other things that are currently allowed in the R4 zone, such as offices, so if you look at this you will see M and MX zones. We have those to solve, the problem of where to continue to allow multiple families and where to allow the mixed use. For example, along Washington Street, it is an area that is currently zoned R4 and we will change that to MX and that would allow residential as it does now, multiple family and offices.

Chm. Gionfriddo

We are going to open this up to the public, but I also...I talked to George (Reif) about this today and I was going to say it publicly...I'm going to ask George (Reif) and Nino (Martucci) to work on a proposal for the Commission dealing with cluster zoning. We heard many times from members of the public, their concern about terrain and topography and parcel of land that are...where large sections would be undevelopable, and what we are going to ask the staff to do is to work on a proposal dealing with a concept of cluster zoning which would come back to the Commission for its consideration. It will not, obviously, be able to be voted on at the same time if we continue on the same path we are going, as the changes in the residential lot sizes but for members of the public who are concerned about that concept this is a commitment that we will, as a Commission, consider and there will be Hearings on it and you will have an opportunity to be heard on it, and we will vote on whether or not we wish to have that in the City of Middletown. So, is there any member of the public then, I'm not going to ask pro or con, just any member of the public who wishes to be heard on this particular issue of residential lot size changes, please come forward.

My name is Philip Karpel, I am a resident of Middletown.

I had a question, but I also have a comment. I think it was maybe two

Continued from Page 16

Philip Karpel

months ago when you had your first Public Hearing on this that I came before you in a much more passionate tone and tried to point out that I thought you were missing an awful lot of information and acting quite hastily, and it now seems that that information is finally coming in and I'm glad to see it is being reacted to. I might also point out, Steve (Leinwand), it might not be a bad idea, I know you have a lot to do, but, not only the cluster subdivision, what you are seeing tonight, some concept or consideration should be given to the concept of a subdivision on an existing City street versus a subdivision with new streets so that you don't run into the problem that I think one of the applicants had earlier today. I think a lot of municipalities have what they consider to be (inaudible) subdivisions, one where you are not putting in new streets and you don't have to meet all the restrictions. The question is, I don't think I heard what...when you get to the RR zone, which, as I understand it, there is one in town on Atkins Street. Is there any distinction between a lot with or without water and sewer?

Chm. Gionfriddo

No.

Mr. Karpel

Don't you think that's rather short sighted in light of the fact that water and sewer is going to be on Atkins Street probably between now and next April.

Chm. Gionfriddo

The zone, as it currently exists, is one acre with water and sewer and two acres without water and sewer. The current proposal is basically an intermediate point between the two which basically states "to require 60,000 square feet whether or not there is water and sewer" and I think what we've tried to do with respect to this particular change in lot sizes, is to get rid of the concept of varying sizes based on water and sewer, you know, whether or not a lot has water and sewer or whether it does not have water and sewer, and that's basically what we are trying to do in the RR zone also.

Mr. Karpel

Well, something, I'm not going to beleaguer the point, but there's a bit of logic that escapes me because, as I understand it, as Mr. Reif indicated, there is an area on the other side of town that is being proposed for larger lot size because of the very reason that water and sewer will not be reaching that point in the near future and I just submit that it's going to be very, very shortsighted to take an area as large as the RR area as it now exists and totally ignore the fact that within the next nine months there will be water and sewer there because you are going to have to face that issue, if not now, then.

Chm. Gionfriddo

I guess my only answer to that would be is that this Commission, at one point, held numerous Public Hearings on what we considered to be appropriate for that particular area of Westfield and the Commission basically determined that it was in favor of larger lots because of the fact it is a historic district and the nature of the area for that area. Once again,

Continued from Page 17

Chm. Gionfriddo (Continued)

we are being asked to make the decision whether we are going to stand by what we did out there less than a year ago, maybe it was more than a year ago, or whether we are going to change it and the Commission is going to have to make that decision. Are there any members of the public who wish to be heard?

Charles Harris

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Charles Harris. I live at 249 Chamberlain Road, Middletown, I no longer have a big problem with lot size. I do have a problem with lot size of any description on parts of the available area that could be used in the R3 zone. Example, the West side of the East Ridge of the Millbrook Valley is known to be unstable. I'm afraid that R3 lot sizes on those site hills could be a problem the same that California now experiences in some of their areas. What topsoil is there, what coverage is there, and I guess perhaps this tied in and this is where it is hard for me and it's been hard for you people to separate the topography issue, which I'm delighted to see is being taken into consideration. That area out there, if we go now on just lot size, I think you should be concerned of what can happen in there. It just will not adjust itself and lend itself to merely saying and I don't mean postage size in relation to lot size you just can't chop a piece into the side of those hills without being in trouble. If you accept the lot sizes and you choose to vote to accept the lot sizes as they are presented and I don't have a problem with these other than in relationship to those slopes. Then, I think you are in an area where... maybe something should be done about it. I don't know how you can control these, I really don't. We get involved in the effect that this has on taxes, some of us have paid taxes for years on land that we know can never be put into acceptable developments. Somewhere along the line, if this...parts of this land...is parts of developable land, somebody has got to start to pick up the tax part of it, also. So, the pieces have got to be tagged together. One thing that bothers me here, that you people don't see and I don't see as I sit back there, where you are in the process now where we post notices of these Hearings. However, they do not cover the areas that are, say, 500 feet distant from the outside perimeters of the development under consideration. Lot size out there, again, and I won't belabor the point longer, somehow you've got to put something in here somewhere whether its with lot sizes or where, and all of a sudden you are going to have to say "no, you can't develop that piece of property under existing codes for lot size, there are areas already where this exists and you just can't do it." Thank you.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Thank you, Charles. Anyone else?

Jan Miller

Jan Miller, 500 Mapleshade Road, Your Neighborhood Friends Association. I'm very happy that Charlie doesn't have a problem with lot sizes and I hope that applies to the rest of the Commission. We do support this rezoning proposal very strongly. We hope that the Commission will unanimously approve it. I feel that there is a certain, perhaps obligation the Commission has to our Community having devised the instrument of the boulevard which will allow much denser development than heretofore. I think the Commission, as a counter to that, as a reaction to that, one action does produce a need for a reaction and that is that where that

Continued from Page 18

Jan Miller (Continued)

boulevard can be used for a density of development that is inappropriate to an area, that the rezoning will take care of that. I feel it is (inaudible) that the...there was a lot of bitterness when rezoning gave way to the boulevard and...but we are a forgiving group... and we will forgive you for it, if you address it.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Is there anyone else wishing to be heard this evening?

(Unidentified lady from the audience)

I'd just like to clarify a point concerning the R3 zone. As I read it in the Middletown Press, this area was an area where City sewer and water could be accessible. According to you tonight, Mr. Reif, on the R3 zone City sewer and water are a requirement. Which...I'd like a clarification on which is correct.

Mr. Reif

It is a requirement to have water and sewer for lots in the R3 zone, new lots in the R3 zone.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Anyone else?

Ann Bickford

Ann Bickford, 1409 Country Club Road, Chairman for the Westfield Residents for the Rational Development in Middletown.

We did attend the meeting the other Monday to get a feeling for what the new plan would be and we have had time to discuss it in our Executive Committee and we feel that it...we do support the modification because we feel overall the important features of the proposal which we did support, go on record supporting in the last Hearing have been retained. Some of the features that we do consider very important that you have held on to are the fact that we would no longer have a kind of a, what we feel, is an unstable zoning pattern where the zones density changes with the introduction of one or both utilities. We feel that is a detrimental form of zoning because it doesn't allow for really long term view of what your neighborhood is going to be like. We also feel that it has been...it is a logical approach to the densities that we have and supports the...we feel the staff has done a good job in locating the areas that are presently in the pattern that they really essentially placed the zone on a pattern that already exists in the community and I think that is a desirable goal. We are sorry that the rural residential zone was eliminated from the Southern portion of town as part of your compromise, we think that that would have been a desirable addition to the community and we are sorry that it was, the proposed expansion of the rural residential zone in the extremity of the Westfield section was cut back, but we understand that you had to compromise. One thing I think that is also important, the thing for Commissioners to think about and that is, I guess in a sense, an answer to what Mr. Karpel was talking about for a number...we've had a number of plans of development, I believe George (Reif) can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the first one may have been prepared by Milo Wilcox in the fifties, and I guess there...I think it's actually a State Mandate that it be updated every ten years, or is that a....

Continued from Page 19

George Reif

They are trying to change the regulations that require that, but the answer is no, it is not.

Ann Bickford

Generally speaking, though, I think this town has done it almost on a ten year basis and ever since that first plan the sections at the extremities of town have been shown in the Plan of Development as a lower density as I suppose that this makes sense...time is running out, I mean, that was thirty years ago and if it isn't implemented now the future that the former Planning Commission saw for Middletown and recommended, it will all be kind of chewed up. It's starting to be chewed up as it is. I think we have a very good variety of lots in town and I think much more so than many communities, we have so much land, more land than most cities have, as it is, in the state. I think it is a very desirable thing, we are very fortunate to be able to have this variety to offer to people and I think it makes Middletown a very unique place to live. So, I think it is an opportunity that you Commissioners have now to bring to fruition something that has been a long term plan for a long time...the Plan of Development...it really is not a new idea, so we hope that you will implement this. We strongly support it. Thank you.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Thank you. Is there anyone else? I do have a letter we received from Midstate Regional Planning dealing with this issue which all the members of the Commission have in their packets but which I will read into the record. "Dear Mr. Gionfriddo, Thank you for referring the proposed residential rezoning plan to the Midstate Regional Planning Agency for review and comment. At the Agency's October 1, 1985 meeting it was voted to inform you of the following recommendations. 1. The number of residential zones proposed appears excessive and should be reduced possibly to three. 2. In order to effectively protect Middletown's scenic and natural resources and at the same time permit affordable housing, a density zoning regulation should be developed and implemented at the same time the residential zoning is being redefined. 3. Lot sizes need to be closely coordinated with the existing and proposed sewer and water service areas, the extension of the utilities by the City or private developers needs to be part of a growth management plan to support the proposed residential zone structure. 4. The wide reaching change proposed should only be implemented within the context of a comprehensively updated plan of development. The staff will be pleased to meet with the Commission or your staff to discuss these recommendations. Very truly yours, Jeffrey L. Colegrove Executive Director." Is there anyone else wishing to be heard? At the subcommittee meeting I had indicated that I would hold this Hearing open until the next meeting with the anticipation that at that time the Commission will, hopefully, be prepared to consider voting on this proposal. I think we've heard and had numerous public hearings, I think, I anticipated a larger crowd to come tonight, but I think, basically, what this indicates perhaps is that people have come and given us their input and that perhaps we are starting to wind down the need for the Public Hearings at this point. I will stick to what I said at that time and, unless I hear an objection from the Commission, I'll continue the Public Hearing until the next meeting. I would hope and ask that members of the Commission

Continued from Page 20

Chm. Gionfriddo (Continued)

consider what the subcommittee has proposed and be prepared to give some discussion to it at the next meeting. I think it would be incumbent on all the Commissioners present to express their views one way or the other before we vote. I know at least three or four of us have been pretty widely quoted as to where we stand on it, but I think if we are going to vote on it at the next meeting...George (Reif) I'd also ask you to have some language drawn up for the next meeting so that we'll know the parameters of what each of these zones are going to be...are going to say...in our regulations. That gives you time to do that. Get it out to us, if you can, before the Meeting so that we'll have time to look at it. I would just ask that members of the Commission hopefully come prepared on the night of the 23rd to discuss this and bring it to a vote, if possible. Does anyone on the Commission have anything they want to say? Commissioner Carta.

Comm. Carta

I have a question and a request. The first question was...I didn't... I'm not sure that I understood some of the things that George (Reif) said and one I'm sure I don't understand is the lot in the R3 zone... the way I heard it...was that if you don't have sewer and water you can't develop R3 zone...is that correct or not correct? Or were you saying all the R3 zone land, if they don't have sewer and water can do nothing with their land? That's the way I'm hearing it.

George Reif

Well, that's why I was emphasizing the feature we have in the Zoning Code in Middletown, the lot of record. If you have a lot of record you can use that. There are many, many lots around Middletown that are a wide variety of sizes that can be used...we are not erasing all the property lines that exist so that...part of your answer is that there are lots that you can use in an R3 zone. If you want to lay out a new subdivision then you have to meet the requirements of the proposed R3 zone.

Comm. Carta

So, you still have not come down on it clear for me. I hear there's lots of record, I know there is around the city but there certainly are minority amounts of them. There are not a huge amount of lots of record. Nevertheless,...

George Reif

There are many more than you think.

Comm. Carta

Okay, however many there is there is...the question for me is...If, in...see, I haven't...you have to forgive me because this is the first moment that I've seen this, in truth, from here, I can't even tell what't going on.

George Reif

I think I made that observation.

Comm. Carta

Right, there's no way I even know what the proposal is until I can have it in my hand and look at it, so, it will be clear that existing

Continued from Page 21

Comm. Carta (Continued)

tracts of land in an R3 zone, unless they have available to them sewer and water can do nothing.

George Reif

Yes, correct, the water and sewer may not be there they have to extend their lines.

Chm. Gionfriddo

George, I'm going to suggest that I thought about that since Monday and my gut instinct would be that if I owned a piece of land out there and I had to run the water and sewer line an excessive distance in order to develop it at all, that would be kind of unreasonable that I would think there should be some flexibility, that if you owned a piece of land in R3 and you wanted to develop it that you ought to be able to develop it with the same size as an R4 lot if there is no water and sewer...unless you can tell me why that's not logical.

George Reif

Well, how far down the line would you promote that, you know, if you get into the R2 zone and the R1 zones, you would only do that for the R3 zones.

Chm. Gionfriddo

We are talking about the area where water and sewer is available but not there. That I would think that if...I would think that if you want to be able to develop a lot, an R3, and let's say you only have one lot and you have to run water and sewer an excessive distance in order to develop the lot. I would think if you wanted to make it a 45,000 square foot lot, you should be able to do it.

George Reif

Okay, there is no such thing as only one lot, if you have one lot it is a lot of record. If you want to divide a parcel of land, then you get into the issue you are talking about.

Comm. Carta

(inaudible)...complete the logic. So, I actually don't have an objection at this time, it's a process for me to get clear...I can't even know where the R3 is so I'm claiming a little ignorance here but 30,000 square feet in accordance with State Health regulations is adequate for septic system and well...it's proper, not a problem. With a 200...what is it, a 200 foot front in R3? The present R3 proposal is 200 feet?

George Reif

No, 150 feet.

Comm. Carta

Okay, that was like our R1 before we changed it at the time of Royal Oak Subdivision, it was 150 foot frontage.

George Reif

Royal Oak's is 200 feet for 40,000.

Comm. Carta

No, prior to that we changed it.

Continued from Page 22

Comm. Carta

Anyway, we changed our R1 lot. We used to have, I believe...

George Reif

We had one that used to have 20,000 square feet, maybe you were thinking of that.

Comm. Carta

No, I thought it was 150 foot frontage. I stand corrected. Anyway, the question for me is if it has water and sewer, I guess it's the same confusion for me as it was for Attorney Karpel. It's when you say you've got a lot that's 30,00 square feet, 150 foot front, that can support well and septic system if the test proves so. In the same token you are saying...I see the logic you are saying if we had well and septic you can't downgrade it. The statement that you can't develop it doesn't work. There is something wrong there for me, anyway.

George Reif

Okay, I want to remind you that the subdivision regulations you adopted which became effective July 1st requires in all new subdivisions the installation of utility lines.

Comm. Carta

But that doesn't give them sewer and water. It gives them empty lines into the ground.

George Reif

Right, the implication however is that every effort will be made in major new subdivisions to have utilities installed at the very beginning so later streets don't have to be torn and that sort of thing.

Comm. Carta

I just actually wanted a clarification of it. The request I have is it sounds like significant changes have been made. It sounds like we're moving to the middle of the road here. I simply want to understand it. In order for me to understand it all I have to have the material available to me. I have a request to the Commission that we get something in our hands in the way of a map showing where the changes are. A sheet of paper telling what those changes are, the square footage of the lots, the frontage of the lots.

George Reif

I think we sent something. I think the lot sizes have changed since we sent it but there was some general mailout that was closely related to these sizes.

Comm. Carta

So, you hear my request. As a Commission member I need to now quickly get up to speed on what it is we're going to change so that questions like the one I just asked may be very viable. We need to get an answer for them before we get approving it and find out we've got ourselves a mess in general on specific little areas. Thank you.

Chm. Gionfriddo

George (Reif), could you please make sure that all members of the Commission have what Commissioner Carta is asking and I think it's

Continued from Page 23

Chm. Gionfriddo (Continued)

important because like I said I think the next meeting we should be prepared to get into a discussion that will hopefully lead us to a resolution one way or the other and I don't want people to be uninformed at that point.

George Reif

We could make a print of that map which would be helpful. It would not show everything. You'd have to use that in relationship to a zoning map.

Chm. Gionfriddo

We have already received the original proposal so if you send us this proposal we'll be able to compare the original proposal with this proposal and see what changes have been made. If you send us the written material in the meantime then that should answer a lot of the questions. If Commissioners have questions of George between now and the 23rd I think they should contact him and try to get as many answered as possible.

Comm. Carta

Fine, what I'm after is as much material as I can get. I have one more comment. I would just like to address the fellow Commission members. Everything I've heard here sounds good and I just need to study it given I've been an opponent of swinging too far to the left for exclusive, restrictive zoning. The one thing that is missing for me and I heard it tonight and I personally think it needs to be included, and that is the open space subdivision. The subdivision that allows you flexibility of design. While that somehow sounds to people like high density, the opposite thing to what various people want, I say that no, it isn't. Actually, it is probably one of the few tools that I would try to in some way get that installed in the subdivision regulations. It's one of the few tools that allows you to stay away from slopes pointed out that don't work, ledge that isn't the best place to develop. It's one of the things that allows large chunks of green space and usually does not, in fact, unless you write it that way, does not have you have more homes than you would ordinarily have on the piece of land. And its the only tool that allows you to operate outside of a very (inaudible). There isn't anything that allows you...there isn't anything in the design regulations that allows you to get outside of that. It simply does not exist. And to delude ourselves, I don't think anyone is deluding themselves intentionally but to think that what we're proposing solves that problem, it does not. When you're in the terrain that we're in here in New England the truth is regulations that are like railroad tracks, always the same, and they try to be applied to a piece of land that's like a fingerprint, each one different, it simply doesn't work. What turns out is the bulldozed terrain, the altered landscapes, the very things that people argue here to get rid of is in fact what you create. And it's, well it's difficult, for many people to handle... the fact is that what brings about what they want is more flexibility not more restriction. Flexibility that is watched over, managed, guided. That's something I don't know that I've ever gotten it across, but it's something that I've argued for when the example that we're given here

Continued from Page 24

Comm. Carta (Continued)

which is typical subdivisions by a gentleman, the Planner, was obvious to what I'm talking about here. For me, that's an intricate part of what we're doing, that's...I really don't feel comfortable about having that come later. I think it's so intricate\* to what you're doing, that in fact that may avoid four or five subdivisions that will come quickly on the heels of this, that are passing this, which would turn out to be cookie cutter subdivisions. Believe me, those subdivisions do not please me. They do not obviously please the people who are living on Higby Road, Westfield...they are appalled by them. But you must understand they've given no one the design flexibility to operate outside that. So they look economically and they look engineering wise, they create exactly what they can create within the regulation which is usually what we don't like.

Nino Martucci

May I respond to that?

Comm. Carta

I would just ask my fellow Commissioners to look very seriously about incorporating that along with...I just do think to incorporate it later is to allow for more subdivisions to come in and do the very thing that we're saying that we don't want to have.

Chm. Gionfriddo

I'll tell you...the reason I asked Staff to do it in the first place is that I agree with a lot of the things that you said and I feel its something we should consider. The reason I don't think we can necessarily wait to do them together, and I think its reasonably obvious, is that the Planning & Zoning Commission could potentially have a change in membership in a relatively short period of time. We've gone through months of hearings on these things and should there be changes in membership, we would be basically back to square one and I don't think that would be a fair thing either. I think its incumbent on us, if we can, to bring this to a vote while the current Commission is sitting and with the understanding that there is some commitment on the part of the Commission to move forward with this other concept as quickly as possible.

Comm. Carta

I'd like to say one more...there's one more piece I left out of that. If you look, my general complaint and the complaint of many people here is that when you create the large lot size with a large frontage you create an expensive home site, very expensive. And when you do that on a broad basis in the community, you actually alter the socio-economic makeup of the community. Whether you intend to or not, whether you're (inaudible) you drastically alter that into the future. You alter the makeup of the City. The flexible plan I'm talking about can allow you to operate within a zone which in fact says we want a very low density in this zone, but it still allows you to build a subdivision that has cost which is, in fact, drastically lower than if you did the proposed cookie cutter subdivision. It actually allows people to live within a density area which is low, the same amount of lots as if you cookie cuttered it, they can still have an affordable homesite and its a more desirable homesite. So, economically, socially economically, doesn't have the huge impact that the straight forward development does on the community. I say that's very, very valuable and its an aspect we don't necessarily look at.

\* (sic)

Continued from Page 25

George Reif

Can I just say one thing? Can you remember...you've got to, Mr. Carta, you've just got to remember back a few years when Mr. Shea opposed a PRD based on the regulations already in our code. Remember that? We had regulations that permitted cluster development. Had he proceeded to stick to the density we allowed he would probably have his PRD up, but he tried to increase the density, so we merely need to go back to what we've already had and that is what you're talking about. We've already had it, we ought to have it again. I'm reminding you we've already had it and we'll put it back again

Chm. Gionfriddo

Is...rebuttal, you said? (Inaudible) Lets...I don't want this to be a debate.

Jan Miller

No, this is very quick. Because Commissioner Carta has brought this up and usually at the end of a meeting and its...but I agree with one thing because I've done a lot of research calling other communities about lot sizes and I think that there was this conception of a... concept of a cluster of houses is incorporated into the City of Hamden's regulations...that is they have a two acre restriction and any group buying ten contiguous acres can cluster their houses as they wish, and that can be added to this as a later evolution. But in terms of Commissioner Carta's referred a great many times to the viability of younger people being able to acquire homes and raising the base, and I did a little research and the base is very high. I don't know what period you're thinking of, Commissioner Carta, it's been several generations since a young couple getting married can buy a house. You rent, you buy a condo, you accumulate your capital and then you buy and I'll remind you of some of the local prices. In Wesleyan Hills the starter houses are \$90,000, the condos are \$75,000, \$79,000 and in the \$80,000's there are really no low price houses.

Chm. Gionfriddo

Jan, I think you're saying something that most of us recognize. Thank you. Charlie, if its something new, otherwise...okay.

Charles Harris

It is, and I'm concerned with what I just learned. Okay? Number one, are all these Commissioners and is everyone else aware of the fact that those of us that own real property and land pay for one undescribed additional building lot to the lot that our house is on. In other words, I have a building lot that's not described as a building lot. Are you saying that if I've got 20 acres of land and I want to give 10 to two children and that they have frontage on a road they can't build a home because there's no sewer and water? Is this what I'm hearing?

Chm. Gionfriddo

Charlie, what we've discussed with George is the desirability of being flexible in the R3 zone if there's no water and sewer and I think probably in the final thing that's approved there will be that flexibility built in.

Charles Harris

Thank you, Steve.

Continued from Page 26

Chm. Gionfriddo

If there is nothing further, we're going to continue this until the 23rd, hopefully this will be the last continuance on this particular issue.

ADJOURNMENT 8:45

ADJOURNMENT

Transcribed by

---

Dorothy Wilson  
Joyce McLane