

Kristine Sullivan

From: Karen Sklarz <ksklarz@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 3:52 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: New zoning laws

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Dear Mr. Sullivan,

I am opposed to the new zoning laws that are going to transpire as a result of the new affordable housing regulations being imposed. I believe that this will lead to increased taxes in a town with already high taxes and a decrease in property values that are already way down.

Sincerely,

Karen Sklarz

11 Deepwood Road
Woodbridge CT

January 3, 2021

Dear Commissioners Greenberg, Schatz, Skolnick, Klee, Wallace, Zamir and Alternate Kennedy,

New Year's greetings to you. We would like to add our voices to those Woodbridge residents expressing opposition to the zoning application for 2 Orchard Road, Woodbridge. We are homeowners and taxpayers in Woodbridge and live 3/10 of a mile from 2 Orchard Road.

Our understanding is that the proposal by the current owners of 2 Orchard Road is to raze the existing house for the purpose of building a 4 family residence with a 9-car parking lot. The petitioners have also requested the elimination of all current zoning restrictions. As others have pointed out, our current zoning is based on the absence of city water and sewerage in most of the town, including 2 Orchard Road, and dependence on well water and septic. Neither of us are engineers so one house might not make a difference. However, a town-wide suspension of this zoning could be disastrous from a public health and quality of life point of view.

The particular location of 2 Orchard Road is also problematic from a traffic point of view. We are both walkers, and our route typically runs from our home to the corner of Newton Road and up to Orchard. Cars already run the stop signs at Newton and Prospect and Orchard with impunity, as well as speed on all three roads. What happens when traffic increases? With one house probably not much. But if it sets precedent for town-wide high density housing, we should anticipate magnified traffic concerns.

We are aware that there are state statutes requiring a certain portion of housing in each town to be "affordable." We do not know how Woodbridge fares on this measure, and trust the members of the Town Plan and Zoning Commission to act in accordance with statute. Neither the town nor its taxpayers should be subjected to extensive litigation if, in fact, Woodbridge is not compliant with state statute.

However, assuming it is compliant, there is one other matter of concern. It has been reported that the petitioners have alleged racial bias as a rationale for their application: that Woodbridge excludes based on race. If this report is true, then the petitioners are guilty of the worst kind of racial bias, which is to assume that upper middle-class communities are only white. As a bi-racial household, we respond that this assumption is absurd. Carol, a Black woman, has owned this home and lived at this address since 1994. What determines access to Woodbridge is a resident's ability to afford to live here. To that point, there are many Black professionals living in Woodbridge: Judge Earl and Dr. Dara Richards, Robert and Tasha Reid, Attorney Sandra and Phil Haywood, Drs. Gary and Deborah Desir, Ira and Denise Rock, and Valerie and Larry King, to name but a few. The same reports that allege racial bias also report that people of Asian descent have been omitted from the statistical analysis. We do not know if this is true. If it is, it underlines all the more the absurdity of the allegation.

We ask you to decline the application for 2 Orchard Road, Woodbridge and continue to preserve the current residential zoning regulations for Woodbridge.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Galloway, M.S., P.T. and the Rev. Dr. Brian R. Bodt

11 Prospect Road, Woodbridge, Connecticut. 06525

203.397.0555 (home)

carol9996@hotmail.com

brianbodt@sbcglobal.net

copy: ksullivan@woodbridgect.org

Kristine Sullivan

From: gerilynle@optonline.net
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 2:46 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Opposition to multi-family housing

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

To Town Plan and Zoning Commission: We are long time residents of the town of Woodbridge. We moved to Woodbridge for its rural character, good schools, and numerous walking trails. Because the town does not have city water or sewer service, lots are zoned for at least 1 ½ acres. Not only will multi family housing burden our school system but will be additionally detrimental to our water supply and septic system. We strongly oppose multi-family housing in the town.

Gerilyn and Robert Lehman 36 Old Quarry Road

Kristine Sullivan

From: ADRIANNA RICHTER <kittydocs@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 2:06 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Orchard Road Zoning Change

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Please count my family of four people over the age of 21 as coming out AGAINST any such zoning changes.

Adrianna Richter
Homeowner and Businessowner in Woodbridge, CT

This is such an important time for your leadership in our town and with our residents. Please rise to the occasion and show the intelligence and compassion of our community by helping us arrive at compliance on our own terms.

Additionally, I would also like to reiterate my concerns regarding the conflict of interest of Mr. Klee (see my letter of October 11, 2020). Attorney Rob Klee, Chairman of the TPZ, appropriately disclosed to the Commission and the attendees that he has professional relationships with Attorney Anika Singh Lemar and law student Karen Anderson. Ms. Singh Lemar was a colleague in a private law firm and is now a colleague at Yale. Ms. Anderson is his student at Yale. Both women are parties to the Application for Zoning Regulation Amendment and an Amendment to the Town Plan of Conservation and Development.

I believe a conflict exists, and there is a likelihood that his personal and professional relationships could materially interfere with his independent professional judgment or result in a conflict.

Please see: Rules for Professional Conduct, Rule 1.7 Conflict of Interest: Current Clients, Rule 1.8 Prohibited Transactions and Rule 4.2 Transactions with Persons Other Than Clients: Communication with a Person Represented by Counsel.

I was very disturbed that when this item was raised at the last meeting there was absolutely no discussion and his refusal to recuse was accepted at face value. At the very least, a discussion among the other TPZ members might have given an appearance of investigation and consideration, so that the conclusion would be more understandable.

Again, thank you for your service to our community.

Sincerely,

Karen Kassap

203-430-2182

14 Orchard Road
Woodbridge, CT 06525

January 3, 2021

Woodbridge Town Planning and Zoning Commission
Woodbridge Town Selectmen
11 Meetinghouse Lane
Woodbridge, CT 06525

Dear Commissioners and Selectmen,

I am writing to voice my opinion about the application by the Open Communities Alliance (OCA) and the Yale Law School Fair Housing Development Clinic, requesting rezoning of Woodbridge to allow multi family homes at 2 Orchard Road and throughout the Town.

That Woodbridge needs to be brought into compliance with fair housing laws in Connecticut should not be a surprise to town leadership and it is an issue about which we might have been proactive. We were not, and now we are in a reactive position, where we have to defend ourselves and our integrity. This is not the way to build support or consensus for changes that need to occur.

I am writing to suggest that it is not too late for the TPZ to take a leadership role in addressing this problem and to take steps to present ourselves and our town in a more positive light. We can acknowledge the needs of our community as well as our role in society at large, by taking steps to achieve change on our own terms. It would be an unfortunate mistake to allow the OCA and the Yale law students, neither of whom has a vested interest nor a personal connection to our town, to dictate the terms by which we change, grow and adapt.

I strongly support the suggestions made in a letter (dated Jan 2, 2021) by my neighbor, Mary Gorham, to consider partnering with the nonprofit organization, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, "LISC" (see www.LISC.org). I would also suggest that there may be other city planning professionals and organizations who could work with our town leadership to develop a compliant housing plan that would be acceptable to the majority if not all Woodbridge residents. I believe that to achieve compliance requires more than a regulatory change, it requires town wide support and a pride in the change. If a plan is developed by our town leadership with resident input, rather than imposed on us by well meaning interlopers, we would see town wide support and could become the standard of positive change.

Kristine Sullivan

From: John Pelizzari <scriptcellar@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 1:45 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: P&Z Proposal

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

My wife and I will be unable to attend the 1/4 town meeting. However, we wish to express our desire that the town NOT permit the proposed multi-family unit, at 2 Orchard Rd. Thank you for bringing attention to this matter, and for working on behalf of our town.

There is much to agree with on all the comments from our neighbors regarding this property's current ownership and how it will affect our town and the financial impact to all of us who own homes here. As many neighbors have pointed out there is significant diversity that exists in our community, we just don't wear it on our sleeves like other communities or groups who need to get "likes" and use it to promote their so-called brand of righteousness. The irony is not lost on us that this well-funded and educated group is calling on us to facilitate their social change. Those who have lived here for a few years know well the neighboring city of New Haven (Bridgeport or Waterbury) would be a better recipient of this group's apparent resources and multi-billion-dollar endowment from which they preach firmly upon. They can continue to browbeat us with comparative and supporting documentation, but the answer is clear why this should not happen in this area for one main reason, infrastructure (aquifers and septic). We object to the proposal to amend the zoning in Woodbridge to allow multi-family housing in this area of our town.

Forest Glen Dr resident

Kristine Sullivan

Subject: FW: Consideration from Woodbridge residents regarding upcoming Zoning meeting

Dear Members of the Town Plan and Zoning Commission,

We are writing as Woodbridge residents, parents of students at Beecher Rd. School and Amity Middle School, and a professional business owner in town. We would like to give input prior to the January 4 Zoning meeting related to multifamily housing.

-We wish for our town to be in accordance with Connecticut law.

-We wish for greater diversity in Woodbridge and think that our lives and our children's lives can be bettered by having more opportunities for friendship with people from different cultural, economic, and racial backgrounds. We realize that in our current society, this can only happen by having more affordable housing in Woodbridge.

-We moved to Woodbridge because we love the woods and wish for natural spaces in our town to be preserved.

-We wish for our water systems to be protected.

-We wish for our children to bike and play safely on our street and for changing traffic patterns be considered thoughtfully.

-We received the mailer and find the picture of the multifamily unit on the back to be quite attractive and not unlike many of the large single houses in town. It did not scare us.

In summary, we believe that thoughtful planning with regard to preserving natural space/clean water/safe traffic can be done to make the proposed change in zoning fair and reasonable.

Sincerely,

Shari and Matt Storeygard

27 Deepwood Rd.

To Plan & Zoning Commission:

I am a Ph.D. scientist and hold a CT real-estate salesperson license, living on 3 Tumblebrook Rd.

As an Asian family, we moved to Woodbridge in 200, and our son studied at Beecher Road School and Amity Middle and High Schools. As first-generation immigrants, our child, my wife, and I have not sensed race segregation in the school system or Woodbridge community, instead feeling that Woodbridge welcomes a diversity of people. In fact, Woodbridge population has been rapidly diversifying and the white (non-Hispanic) population percentage of 77.9% is close to New Haven county's average of 75.0 %. The demographic information in the application uses years 2000 and 2017 instead of the most recent data in 2019. As a result, the application is based on the false data. If the applicant still wants to move forward, the application must be resubmitted using correct data.

Woodbridge environment is crucial for not only our drinking water source but also the city of New Haven's. Most homes in Woodbridge use well-water and septic tanks. In Woodbridge, a large portion of land is wetland with a high, widely connected water table. Contamination can spread far and fast. We have found odor in our well water periodically and reported it to the Quinnipiac Valley Health District. Inspector John investigated it in 2017 but the contamination source remains unknown. High-density housing will produce more wastewater that is a threat to the health of the residents in Woodbridge and New Haven.

The proposed four family housing cannot be affordable. 2 Orchard Road was sold to the applicant at \$295,000. Assuming the construction area is 5000 SF, construction cost is approximately \$737,000 for basic conditions (see attached table). This building will cost at least \$1 million to build, and the sales price will be much higher. However, 4-unit buildings in New Haven county are in the price range of half a million dollars, and one or two bedroom condo is often priced at \$100,000 in New Haven county. This four-unit housing will be at least one time more expensive than the average price in the nearby areas. Also, there is no natural gas supply or public water/sewer, sump pumps are required in most homes, and Woodbridge has a high property tax at the mill rate of 41.53. Woodbridge residences pay \$3,000-\$10,000 more than other areas annually in these costs. Because of higher building and maintenance costs, the application cannot be affordable. To make this housing affordable, (1) this application must add an amendment to cap the sale price to the average in the greater New Haven area; (2) before the approval of this application, The Open Communities Alliance must bring extra funding to improve Woodbridge infrastructure including public water/sewer and natural gas pipeline to reduce maintenance costs.

Finally, Mr. Donald Poland's example in which a district in Boston housing value increased by adding high density house is not the reality in Connecticut. Greater Boston's housing price has doubled in the past ten years due to large demand and booming economy. However, such demand in Connecticut does not exist. Additional high-density housing will burden our school systems, the environment, and housing value, while not being affordable.

Frank Wang, Ph.D.
3 Tumblebrook Road

(Attached a table in next page)

Table. Cost of 5000SF building in Hew haven County

Description	Material	Labor	Total	
Direct				🏠
Site Work	\$15,009.00	\$4,021.00	\$19,030.00	🏠
Sewer, Water Gas	\$2,152.00	\$622.00	\$2,774.00	🏠
Septic System	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	🏠
Prepaco Tanks	\$19,221.00	\$3,048.00	\$23,109.00	🏠
Building Concrete	\$37,160.00	\$22,640.00	\$60,000.00	🏠
Outfello Concrete	\$4,988.00	\$4,634.00	\$9,622.00	🏠
Rough Carpentry	\$89,499.00	\$40,757.00	\$136,256.00	🏠
Cabinets	\$31,511.00	\$1,266.00	\$32,777.00	🏠
Finish Carpentry	\$7,735.00	\$6,536.00	\$14,271.00	🏠
Interior Doors	\$10,506.00	\$8,878.00	\$19,384.00	🏠
Exterior Doors	\$4,565.00	\$1,286.00	\$5,851.00	🏠
Insulation	\$21,247.00	\$5,652.00	\$26,799.00	🏠
Exterior Siding	\$28,705.00	\$21,823.00	\$50,528.00	🏠
Roofing	\$16,204.00	\$5,236.00	\$20,440.00	🏠
Hardware	\$2,888.00	\$761.00	\$3,649.00	🏠
Windows	\$8,912.00	\$1,748.00	\$10,660.00	🏠
Drywall	\$24,263.00	\$30,377.00	\$54,640.00	🏠
Painting	\$6,969.00	\$12,054.00	\$19,023.00	🏠
Floor Covering	\$15,092.00	\$6,176.00	\$21,268.00	🏠
Plumbing	\$10,881.00	\$12,570.00	\$23,451.00	🏠
Tubs Showers	\$2,102.00	\$1,410.00	\$3,512.00	🏠
Bath Acces. & Mirrors	\$736.00	\$254.00	\$990.00	🏠
Appliances	\$17,178.00	\$0.00	\$17,178.00	🏠
HVAC System	\$21,804.00	\$14,843.00	\$36,647.00	🏠
Fireplace	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	🏠
Electrical	\$8,109.00	\$9,306.00	\$17,415.00	🏠
Light Fixtures	\$5,856.00	\$1,184.00	\$7,040.00	🏠
Fire Protection	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	🏠
Add Category to Direct				
Direct Total	\$412,292.00	\$224,082.00	\$636,374.00	
Indirect				🏠
General Requirements	\$4,017.00	\$4,095.00	\$8,112.00	🏠
Building Permit	\$13,377.00	\$0.00	\$13,377.00	🏠
Utility Connection Fees (Sewer, Water Gas)	\$6,472.00	\$0.00	\$6,472.00	🏠
Construction Plans & Specs	\$9,585.00	\$0.00	\$9,585.00	🏠
Add Category to Indirect				
Indirect Total	\$33,451.00	\$4,095.00	\$37,546.00	
Contractor Overhead & Profit				🏠
Calculated	\$0.00	\$63,637.00	\$63,637.00	🏠
Add Category to Contractor Overhead & Profit				
Contractor Overhead & Profit Total	\$0.00	\$63,637.00	\$63,637.00	
Add Section				
Total	\$445,743.00	\$291,814.00	\$737,557.00	

Kristine Sullivan

From: Kent Golden <kbgolden@optimum.net>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 11:54 AM
To: Kristine Sullivan; lgreenberg@bandglaw.net; paul@InvestForTomorrow.com; aws@haflaw.com; rjkleee@gmail.com; kwallace@choate.edu; jeff.kennedy@peoples.com; yezamir@gmail.com
Subject: Multi-family zoning application feedback

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Hello,

We have received notice of the application for the town to change its 1.5 acre single-family zoning, and at this time would like to voice strong opposition to that change.

Woodbridge has many attractive aspects, but the one thing that really appealed to us when we moved here was the large wooded lots and focus on single-family houses.

We encourage changes to help diversify the town and possibly offer lower-cost housing (perhaps in single-family units on larger lots), but unfortunately, the proposal would seemingly change the physical characteristics of the town and at least in our view reduce its unique wooded and spacious appeal.

Once the trees and open natural spaces are gone, they rarely ever return. Our town (and world) need them now more than ever.

Thanks,

- Kent and Christine Golden

Kristine Sullivan

From: Tim Austin <timcathyaustin@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Comments for TPZ Meeting
Attachments: Zoning letter 1-2-21.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Please share the below comments with the TPZ.

We are both in agreement with the sentiments of the attached and support the way forward proposed therein.

*Cathy & Tim Austin
183 Ansonia Rd, Woodbridge, CT 06525*

To: Members of the Woodbridge Town Planning & Zoning Commission
From: Mary Gorham, 21 Old Mill Road, Woodbridge
Re: The Open Communities Alliance's 2 Orchard Road LLC Application
Date: January 2, 2021

My family and I have lived happily in Woodbridge for over twenty years. We moved here for the top three reasons most people choose to live here: Excellent public schools, a beautiful, quiet, safe, low traffic, rural setting, and easy access to New Haven.

I attended the Open Communities Alliance's (OCA) presentation to our town on 11/30/20, and am writing to share thoughts on what I believe has happened, as well as what I believe is a good path forward.

Connecticut state law requires that 10% of housing in our town be affordable. I believe this is a good law. It takes into account the need for our town to shoulder some of a regional responsibility to provide affordable housing, provides a pathway for more diversity in our town and schools, and would not necessitate a total zoning change to the entire town, nor result in a large population increase, financial hardship, or environmental damage to our town. It's a good "Goldilocks" solution to many competing needs, and would make our town a more vibrant community.

For a very long time, Woodbridge has been grossly out of compliance with this law. This is wrong and has contributed to the Open Communities Alliance's recent efforts.

The OCA is trying to address crippling racial and economic disparities in our state that have existed for centuries. Their intent is important and laudable. All of us should be working to create racial, economic and social justice.

However, I think both the solution that OCA is proposing to solve these disparities, and the way they are going about it, is deeply ill advised and not in the best interests of Woodbridge for many economic, environmental, and practical reasons. Moreover, it appears the OCA is hoping for a lawsuit so that the case might go to the State Supreme Court, and should they win, that our case would serve as a precedent to change the zoning in all of Connecticut's towns. My sense is their agenda is far greater than Woodbridge.

I think changing all the zoning in Woodbridge to allow affordable multifamily housing throughout the entire town would be a grave mistake for our town. Instead, I recommend we proactively work to create 10% affordable housing in a way that is practical, economical, and broadly supported by our residents. To do this, I recommend we consider partnering with the nonprofit organization, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, "LISC" (see www.LISC.org). LISC has been quietly partnering with towns and cities throughout Connecticut and the United States for many decades, helping local groups understand their options for expanding affordable housing. They do not advocate, and do not charge a fee. What they do instead, is

help towns form a local group of 7 – 10 citizens to uncover affordable housing options that the town as a whole can get behind.

A friend of mine, Lesley Higgins-Biddle, who is a long-time resident of Bethany, recently retired from LISC after nearly forty years of programmatic work with LISC throughout Connecticut. If Rob Klee would like to have an exploratory conversation with Lesley, I would be happy to make an introduction for Rob to her. After speaking with her, should the prospect of using LISC sound promising, Rob could ask Lesley if she might make an introduction to the current LISC leadership in Connecticut in order for Woodbridge's TPZ Commission to meet with them. Should the TPZ find LISC's experience and knowledge base useful, the TPZ could then decide to partner with LISC so that our town can use them as a resource. LISC is funded by the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority (CHFA), so all of the technical assistance we might want from them would be free to our town.

I believe taking advantage of LISC's knowledge and experience would help empower us to find zoning and housing options that are sensible, economical, inclusive, and that garner widespread support in our community. It will also help us understand how we might increase our racial and economic diversity, become in compliance with the law, while preserving what we all so love about our town. I urge the TPZ to consider this option to create a thoughtful path forward.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Kristine Sullivan

From: Yi Xie <unknownxy81@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 11:04 AM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Re: changes of zoning regulation

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Dear Ms. Sullivan,

How are you? My name is Yi Xie. I am a resident of Woodbridge and my family is living at 6 Raymond Rd.

I am writing to OPPOSE the change of Woodbridge zoning regulations and proposal to build multi-family house. I attended the last online hearing and afterwards heard a lot of discussion among the community. From there I understood and completely agreed with the concerns regarding the traffic, water and sewage system and most importantly the school system, which will need substantial financial investment to expand.

Also, as an Asian immigrant, I disagree with one of the major arguments in their proposal related to diversity. As I understand from the recent demographics, the non-white population sums more than 25% in the town and this ratio is increasing. The increment comes from families like us - we moved to the US in 2009 and I have worked for Yale University since then. We were living in New Haven until April 2020 when we bought a single-family house here. This is a great town and yet affordability (another argument in the proposal) is not a problem to us, if I can secure a job. I think my point is, Woodbridge is not an isolated place to any people.

I sincerely urge the zoning committee members to consider the concerns from the community and disapprove the proposal.

Many thanks to your hard work and consideration!
Yi Xie

Kristine Sullivan

From: katrena engstrom <racebrook25@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 10:52 AM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Fw: Town Zoning Amendment -- some action needed

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Hi Kristine,

The applicants may go to state court first on this matter, as is typical of zoning cases. But it seems to me that they could also file in federal court. In any case, it will be very expensive for the Town.

If the Town amends the zoning regulations in the next few months to permit options for multi-family zoning, the parties could work together to resolve the matter.

Kit Engstrom

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: katrena engstrom <racebrook25@yahoo.com>
To: ksullivan@woodbridged.org <ksullivan@woodbridged.org>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021, 10:39:03 AM EST
Subject: Town Zoning Amendment -- some action needed

Hello Kristine,

I received a mailing from "Woodbridge Residents for Town Planning" asking for comments on the multi-family zoning application to be sent to you.

Our family has lived in Woodbridge since 1982.

We believe strongly that there **MUST** be zoning for multi-family housing and/or mixed use housing with affordable housing components designated as a zone or zones somewhere in the town **WHICH MAKE SENSE** in terms of access to public transportation. Newton Road certainly is not a reasonable location for multi-family housing.

It is recommended that the Town work to set up a mediation in this matter as soon as possible before we have to spent \$400-500,000 in legal fees for the next few years and make fools of ourselves.

The Yale Law Clinic looks like it spent the past 8 months (very productively) setting up their submission to federal court and later, the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals.

We don't want to go down that road.

Suggested mediators:

Check for mediators working with the federal court in CT
Retired state Judges: Jonathan Silbert, Beverly Hodgson
James R. Hawkins, Stamford

Good luck!

Kit Engstrom
1215 Racebrook Rd.

Kristine Sullivan

From: Kelly, William <william.kelly@yale.edu>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 10:40 AM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: OCA zoning issue

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Dear Ms. Sullivan,

I am writing in hopes that you will convey to the TPZ my support of Mary Gorham's proposal that the Town consider a partnership with LISC as it works toward a goal of 10% affordable housing. This goal is too important and the circumstances and consequences are too complex to move quickly on a single option, and the experience that LISC has with various CT towns suggests that this path may be even more effective than that set forth in the OCA request.

William Kelly
89 Pease Road

Kristine Sullivan

From: katrena engstrom <racebrook25@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 10:39 AM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Town Zoning Amendment -- some action needed

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Hello Kristine,

I received a mailing from "Woodbridge Residents for Town Planning" asking for comments on the multi-family zoning application to be sent to you.

Our family has lived in Woodbridge since 1982.

We believe strongly that there **MUST** be zoning for multi-family housing and/or mixed use housing with affordable housing components designated as a zone or zones somewhere in the town **WHICH MAKE SENSE** in terms of access to public transportation. Newton Road certainly is not a reasonable location for multi-family housing.

It is recommended that the Town work to set up a mediation in this matter as soon as possible before we have to spent \$400-500,000 in legal fees for the next few years and make fools of ourselves.

The Yale Law Clinic looks like it spent the past 8 months (very productively) setting up their submission to federal court and later, the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals.

We don't want to go down that road.

Suggested mediators:

Check for mediators working with the federal court in CT
Retired state Judges: Jonathan Silbert, Beverly Hodgson
James R. Hawkins, Stamford

Good luck!

Kit Engstrom
1215 Racebrook Rd.

Kristine Sullivan

From: Bruce Thompson <bjthomp@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 9:34 AM
To: lgreenberg@bandglaw.net; paul@InvestForTomorrow.com; aws@haflaw.com; rjkleee@gmail.com; kwallace@choate.edu; jeff.kennedy@peoples.com; yezamir@gmail.com
Cc: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Orchard Road Zoning Variance

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Members of the Woodbridge Town Plan & Zoning Commission,

I am writing to each of you to voice my opposition to the application for a zoning variance to permit multi-family housing on the property located at 2 Orchard Road. And, I am also strongly opposed to the concurrent application to eliminate all existing zoning restrictions that prevent multi-family housing in other areas of Woodbridge.

I object to these changes for the following reasons:

1. The change from a single-family dwelling on a minimum 1.5 acre lot to a multi-family dwelling on the same size lot would nullify the purpose of the current restriction: providing enough space to safely separate a septic system and a well. A multi-family dwelling increases the likelihood of well and aquifer contamination and over taxation of the latter. The current zoning requirement is no more restrictive than admittance to Yale Law School.
2. A multi-family dwelling requires multi-family automobile accommodation, namely parking. Parking requires paving, and paved parking lots increase runoff and heat absorption. On our currently overheating planet which is experiencing more extreme weather events, these are considerations that should not be ignored. Plus, a large slab of striped asphalt and a collection of parked cars is unsightly and out of character with the aesthetics of Woodbridge's residential areas.
3. Multi-family housing, because it allows more people to live in a designated space, means population growth. More people means a greater strain on the services provided by the town: schools, police, fire fighting, wear and tear on the roads, refuse disposal, etc. that will require more tax revenue to cover. The argument that the additional cost to provide the additional services will be offset by an increase in the tax base is false. As an example of increased education costs, Councilman Larry Chatzidakis of Mount Laurel, NJ, who is also a state assemblyman, says each house [or, in this case household] in a development is a tax burden. "We do simple math," Mr. Chatzidakis said. "One home, say, \$150,000 with two children, will cost \$16,000 in school costs and will generate about \$3,000 [in tax revenue]. It's simple. Every house, you're at minus \$13,000." (*The New York Times*; "Trying to Hold Back The Sprawling Suburbs Through 'Smart Growth'"; June 20, 1999)

For these reasons, I urge you to vote to reject the aforementioned zoning change requests and to vigorously oppose any future litigation related to these issues. Also, you can be assured that I will be noting how each of you voted on this issue and that I will be taking your position into account the next time I vote for a TPZ candidate.

Regards,

Bruce Thompson

17 Milan Road
Woodbridge, CT

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Kristine Sullivan

From: Jason Morrill <jason@sector13.org>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 9:05 AM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Cc: Sheri Cifaldi-Morrill
Subject: Letter re OCA Zoning issue
Attachments: Zoning letter 1-2-21.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Hi Kris,

Sheri and I share Mary Gorham's thoughts and concerns outlined in the attached letter. Please indicate to TPZ that we support Mary's suggestion to an agreeable resolution to this matter facing our Town.

Best,

Jason Morrill & Sheri Cifaldi-Morrill

1182 Racebrook Road

Woodbridge

From: Mary Gorham <mary@marygorham.com>
Date: Saturday, January 2, 2021 at 12:13 PM
To: <ksullivan@woodbridgect.org>
Subject: Letter re OCA Zoning issue

Hi Kris,

Attached please find a letter to the Town Planning & Zoning Commission regarding the OCA's efforts to change all of Woodbridge's zoning to accommodate affordable multifamily housing. Please pass this letter on to the members of the TPZ. Many thanks in advance.

Best regards,

Mary Gorham

21 Old Mill Road

Woodbridge, CT

mary@marygorham.com

(203) 376-3367

To: Members of the Woodbridge Town Planning & Zoning Commission
From: Mary Gorham, 21 Old Mill Road, Woodbridge
Re: The Open Communities Alliance's 2 Orchard Road LLC Application
Date: January 2, 2021

My family and I have lived happily in Woodbridge for over twenty years. We moved here for the top three reasons most people choose to live here: Excellent public schools, a beautiful, quiet, safe, low traffic, rural setting, and easy access to New Haven.

I attended the Open Communities Alliance's (OCA) presentation to our town on 11/30/20, and am writing to share thoughts on what I believe has happened, as well as what I believe is a good path forward.

Connecticut state law requires that 10% of housing in our town be affordable. I believe this is a good law. It takes into account the need for our town to shoulder some of a regional responsibility to provide affordable housing, provides a pathway for more diversity in our town and schools, and would not necessitate a total zoning change to the entire town, nor result in a large population increase, financial hardship, or environmental damage to our town. It's a good "Goldilocks" solution to many competing needs, and would make our town a more vibrant community.

For a very long time, Woodbridge has been grossly out of compliance with this law. This is wrong and has contributed to the Open Communities Alliance's recent efforts.

The OCA is trying to address crippling racial and economic disparities in our state that have existed for centuries. Their intent is important and laudable. All of us should be working to create racial, economic and social justice.

However, I think both the solution that OCA is proposing to solve these disparities, and the way they are going about it, is deeply ill advised and not in the best interests of Woodbridge for many economic, environmental, and practical reasons. Moreover, it appears the OCA is hoping for a lawsuit so that the case might go to the State Supreme Court, and should they win, that our case would serve as a precedent to change the zoning in all of Connecticut's towns. My sense is their agenda is far greater than Woodbridge.

I think changing all the zoning in Woodbridge to allow affordable multifamily housing throughout the entire town would be a grave mistake for our town. Instead, I recommend we proactively work to create 10% affordable housing in a way that is practical, economical, and broadly supported by our residents. To do this, I recommend we consider partnering with the nonprofit organization, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, "LISC" (see www.LISC.org). LISC has been quietly partnering with towns and cities throughout Connecticut and the United States for many decades, helping local groups understand their options for expanding affordable housing. They do not advocate, and do not charge a fee. What they do instead, is

help towns form a local group of 7 – 10 citizens to uncover affordable housing options that the town as a whole can get behind.

A friend of mine, Lesley Higgins-Biddle, who is a long-time resident of Bethany, recently retired from LISC after nearly forty years of programmatic work with LISC throughout Connecticut. If Rob Klee would like to have an exploratory conversation with Lesley, I would be happy to make an introduction for Rob to her. After speaking with her, should the prospect of using LISC sound promising, Rob could ask Lesley if she might make an introduction to the current LISC leadership in Connecticut in order for Woodbridge's TPZ Commission to meet with them. Should the TPZ find LISC's experience and knowledge base useful, the TPZ could then decide to partner with LISC so that our town can use them as a resource. LISC is funded by the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority (CHFA), so all of the technical assistance we might want from them would be free to our town.

I believe taking advantage of LISC's knowledge and experience would help empower us to find zoning and housing options that are sensible, economical, inclusive, and that garner widespread support in our community. It will also help us understand how we might increase our racial and economic diversity, become in compliance with the law, while preserving what we all so love about our town. I urge the TPZ to consider this option to create a thoughtful path forward.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Kristine Sullivan

From: Tucker, Mary Evelyn <maryevelyn.tucker@yale.edu>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 8:31 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Cc: Grim, John
Subject: zoning discussion
Attachments: Zoning letter 1-2-21.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Dear Kris,

We wanted to register our agreement with Mary Gorham's thoughtful letter.
Her suggestion merits every consideration and presents a viable way forward.

We hope you will share our email of endorsement with Members of the Woodbridge Town Planning & Zoning Commission.

Gratefully,

Mary Evelyn Tucker and John Grim

29 Spoke Drive, Woodbridge

To: Members of the Woodbridge Town Planning & Zoning Commission
From: Mary Gorham, 21 Old Mill Road, Woodbridge
Re: The Open Communities Alliance's 2 Orchard Road LLC Application
Date: January 2, 2021

My family and I have lived happily in Woodbridge for over twenty years. We moved here for the top three reasons most people choose to live here: Excellent public schools, a beautiful, quiet, safe, low traffic, rural setting, and easy access to New Haven.

I attended the Open Communities Alliance's (OCA) presentation to our town on 11/30/20, and am writing to share thoughts on what I believe has happened, as well as what I believe is a good path forward.

Connecticut state law requires that 10% of housing in our town be affordable. I believe this is a good law. It takes into account the need for our town to shoulder some of a regional responsibility to provide affordable housing, provides a pathway for more diversity in our town and schools, and would not necessitate a total zoning change to the entire town, nor result in a large population increase, financial hardship, or environmental damage to our town. It's a good "Goldilocks" solution to many competing needs, and would make our town a more vibrant community.

For a very long time, Woodbridge has been grossly out of compliance with this law. This is wrong and has contributed to the Open Communities Alliance's recent efforts.

The OCA is trying to address crippling racial and economic disparities in our state that have existed for centuries. Their intent is important and laudable. All of us should be working to create racial, economic and social justice.

However, I think both the solution that OCA is proposing to solve these disparities, and the way they are going about it, is deeply ill advised and not in the best interests of Woodbridge for many economic, environmental, and practical reasons. Moreover, it appears the OCA is hoping for a lawsuit so that the case might go to the State Supreme Court, and should they win, that our case would serve as a precedent to change the zoning in all of Connecticut's towns. My sense is their agenda is far greater than Woodbridge.

I think changing all the zoning in Woodbridge to allow affordable multifamily housing throughout the entire town would be a grave mistake for our town. Instead, I recommend we proactively work to create 10% affordable housing in a way that is practical, economical, and broadly supported by our residents. To do this, I recommend we consider partnering with the nonprofit organization, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, "LISC" (see www.LISC.org). LISC has been quietly partnering with towns and cities throughout Connecticut and the United States for many decades, helping local groups understand their options for expanding affordable housing. They do not advocate, and do not charge a fee. What they do instead, is

help towns form a local group of 7 – 10 citizens to uncover affordable housing options that the town as a whole can get behind.

A friend of mine, Lesley Higgins-Biddle, who is a long-time resident of Bethany, recently retired from LISC after nearly forty years of programmatic work with LISC throughout Connecticut. If Rob Klee would like to have an exploratory conversation with Lesley, I would be happy to make an introduction for Rob to her. After speaking with her, should the prospect of using LISC sound promising, Rob could ask Lesley if she might make an introduction to the current LISC leadership in Connecticut in order for Woodbridge's TPZ Commission to meet with them. Should the TPZ find LISC's experience and knowledge base useful, the TPZ could then decide to partner with LISC so that our town can use them as a resource. LISC is funded by the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority (CHFA), so all of the technical assistance we might want from them would be free to our town.

I believe taking advantage of LISC's knowledge and experience would help empower us to find zoning and housing options that are sensible, economical, inclusive, and that garner widespread support in our community. It will also help us understand how we might increase our racial and economic diversity, become in compliance with the law, while preserving what we all so love about our town. I urge the TPZ to consider this option to create a thoughtful path forward.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Kristine Sullivan

From: Nate Case <natehcase@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 8:09 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: OCA zoning issue

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

I have been following the OCA zoning issue for some time. I have read Mary Gorham's letter about it and it is one of them few that both encapsulates the problem and offers a reasonable solution. I agree with her sentiments.

Nathaniel Case

91 Center Rd, Woodbridge, CT 06525

--

Nathaniel Case

91 Center Rd.

Woodbridge, CT 06525

Kristine Sullivan

From: Ken Yanagisawa <dockeny@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 7:54 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Cc: lgreenberg@bandglaw.net; paul@investForTomorrow.com; aws@haflaw.com; rjkleee@gmail.com; kwallace@choate.edu; jeff.kennedy@peoples.com; yezamir@gmail.com
Subject: Multifamily Home application

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

As Woodbridge residents for over three decades, we are not in favor of building a 4 family home at 2 Orchard Road, and certainly do not support the redefinition and elimination of Woodbridge's current zoning regulations.

Thank you.
Julia Shi, MD and Ken Yanagisawa, MD

Kristine Sullivan

From: Robert, Marie <marie.robert@yale.edu>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 7:45 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: agree with letter by Mary Gorham

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Hi Kris,

Earl Glusac and I have written before about our opposition to the proposal to change housing in Woodbridge. We support the letter Mary wrote and are completely open to this wonderfully reasonable and correct approach.

Best, Marie

586 Amity Road

Marie E. Robert, M.D.
Professor of Pathology and Medicine
Yale University School of Medicine
203-785-2788

Kristine Sullivan

From: Anne Boucher <amboucher@mmm.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 7:34 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Cc: Anne Boucher
Subject: The Open Communities Alliance's 2 Orchard Road LLC Application
Attachments: Mary Gorham Zoning letter 1-2-21.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Kris,

I am writing to let the Zoning Committee know that I am in agreement with the letter that Mary Gorham sent to the Woodbridge Town Planning and Zoning Commission on Jan 2nd (copy attached) and the path forward that it suggests.

Thank you,
Anne Boucher
574 Amity Road
Woodbridge, CT 06525
203-393-2983

To: Members of the Woodbridge Town Planning & Zoning Commission
From: Mary Gorham, 21 Old Mill Road, Woodbridge
Re: The Open Communities Alliance's 2 Orchard Road LLC Application
Date: January 2, 2021

My family and I have lived happily in Woodbridge for over twenty years. We moved here for the top three reasons most people choose to live here: Excellent public schools, a beautiful, quiet, safe, low traffic, rural setting, and easy access to New Haven.

I attended the Open Communities Alliance's (OCA) presentation to our town on 11/30/20, and am writing to share thoughts on what I believe has happened, as well as what I believe is a good path forward.

Connecticut state law requires that 10% of housing in our town be affordable. I believe this is a good law. It takes into account the need for our town to shoulder some of a regional responsibility to provide affordable housing, provides a pathway for more diversity in our town and schools, and would not necessitate a total zoning change to the entire town, nor result in a large population increase, financial hardship, or environmental damage to our town. It's a good "Goldilocks" solution to many competing needs, and would make our town a more vibrant community.

For a very long time, Woodbridge has been grossly out of compliance with this law. This is wrong and has contributed to the Open Communities Alliance's recent efforts.

The OCA is trying to address crippling racial and economic disparities in our state that have existed for centuries. Their intent is important and laudable. All of us should be working to create racial, economic and social justice.

However, I think both the solution that OCA is proposing to solve these disparities, and the way they are going about it, is deeply ill advised and not in the best interests of Woodbridge for many economic, environmental, and practical reasons. Moreover, it appears the OCA is hoping for a lawsuit so that the case might go to the State Supreme Court, and should they win, that our case would serve as a precedent to change the zoning in all of Connecticut's towns. My sense is their agenda is far greater than Woodbridge.

I think changing all the zoning in Woodbridge to allow affordable multifamily housing throughout the entire town would be a grave mistake for our town. Instead, I recommend we proactively work to create 10% affordable housing in a way that is practical, economical, and broadly supported by our residents. To do this, I recommend we consider partnering with the nonprofit organization, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, "LISC" (see www.LISC.org). LISC has been quietly partnering with towns and cities throughout Connecticut and the United States for many decades, helping local groups understand their options for expanding affordable housing. They do not advocate, and do not charge a fee. What they do instead, is

help towns form a local group of 7 – 10 citizens to uncover affordable housing options that the town as a whole can get behind.

A friend of mine, Lesley Higgins-Biddle, who is a long-time resident of Bethany, recently retired from LISC after nearly forty years of programmatic work with LISC throughout Connecticut. If Rob Klee would like to have an exploratory conversation with Lesley, I would be happy to make an introduction for Rob to her. After speaking with her, should the prospect of using LISC sound promising, Rob could ask Lesley if she might make an introduction to the current LISC leadership in Connecticut in order for Woodbridge's TPZ Commission to meet with them. Should the TPZ find LISC's experience and knowledge base useful, the TPZ could then decide to partner with LISC so that our town can use them as a resource. LISC is funded by the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority (CHFA), so all of the technical assistance we might want from them would be free to our town.

I believe taking advantage of LISC's knowledge and experience would help empower us to find zoning and housing options that are sensible, economical, inclusive, and that garner widespread support in our community. It will also help us understand how we might increase our racial and economic diversity, become in compliance with the law, while preserving what we all so love about our town. I urge the TPZ to consider this option to create a thoughtful path forward.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Kristine Sullivan

From: schen18268@gmail.com
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 7:20 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: zoning meeting on Jan 4

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Dear Ms Sullivan,

Regarding the zoning meeting on January 4, we moved to Woodbridge because we like the quiet environment and surroundings in the 1.5 acre single family zoning, and we know we pay higher property taxes for it. So far we love it , we feel safe ,we are very happy and enjoy living this kind quiet Neighborhood.

Here we have to say No to zoning change to "a 4 family building with a 9-car parking lot" in 1.5 single family lot , we strongly against to build multi-family units anywhere in town Please keep our town beauty and safety Thank you!

Residents of 3 brierwood drive Woodbridge CT Shumei chen Ming chen

Sent from my iPhone

Kristine Sullivan

From: Hong Su <sufamily66@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 7:04 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Zoning concerning 2 Orchard rd.

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Dear Ms Sullivan,

Wish you a happy new year!

I understand that there is a public hearing on Jan 4, 2021, to change the zoning in Woodbridge so that a multi-family housing can be built. I strongly oppose this change of zoning.

If the zoning changes for some individual who wants to profit from a purchase, our zoning regulations would loose their purpose. Orchard road has always been a single family housing neighborhood. A multifamily house does not fit into the existing infrastructure. Besides, the multi-housings in Woodbridge where there would not much public water supply as well as public sewage treatment system, most of residents rely on pumps from aquifers to get water and septic tanks systems to dispose the sewage, the health condition in this town would soon deteriorate.

(And besides we need more money to re-accommodate the road condition to fit the needs of much more traffic, and almost every resident knows the bad conditions of exit 59 at CT15.

Thanks,

Woodbridge Resident
Hong Wang and Xiping Su
10 Brierwood Dr.
1/2/2021

Kristine Sullivan

From: Sheila Saltzman <saltzman@optonline.net>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 6:33 PM
To: lgreenberg@bandglaw.net; paul@InvestForTomorrow.com; aws@haflaw.com; jeff.kennedy@peoplees.com; yezamir@gmail.com; kwallace@choate.edu; rjkleee@gmail.com
Cc: Kristine Sullivan
Subject: Town Plan and Zoning Commission

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Dear Members of the TP&Z,

I am opposed to the current request to the TP&Z commission to eliminate all current zoning restrictions to allow for multi-family houses in residentially zoned areas of Woodbridge. Woodbridge is mainly dependent on septic systems and wells for our current single family houses, and this proposal could cause serious health hazards and safety concerns. Woodbridge's rural beauty consists of inland wetlands, with streams and rivers running through our bucolic countryside, which requires us to have 1.5 acres or more to maintain adequate septic systems and wells on our properties.

I am eagerly looking forward to attend the TP&Z public meeting remotely on January 4th.

Thank you,
Sheila E. Saltzman

Kristine Sullivan

From: Albert Bellucci <albert.bellucci@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 3:50 PM
To: Kristine Sullivan
Cc: Beth Heller
Subject: Proposed Change to Woodbridge Zoning

[EXTERNAL EMAIL CAUTION] This message originated outside of the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Hello Kristine,

As Woodbridge residents, my wife and I feel the need to register our strong disapproval for the proposed zoning changes to broadly permit multiple occupancy zoning throughout many areas of the Town.

The Applicants' claim that Woodbridge zoning and opposition to changes is motivated by racism is offensive and simply wrong, and possibly chosen to draw support by the mere headline without regard for the substance of the argument. The references to the same throughout the proposed amendment seem designed to support the false premise that the Applicants are somehow rectifying a past offense by the Town. There is no such offense and this claim should correspondingly be discarded throughout.

With this distracting claim removed, the remaining claims reduce to compliance with the applicable regulations. The purpose of zoning at the local level is to address locale specific peculiarities, sensitivities, and character, which is exactly what Woodbridge has done and is doing. The points on health & safety due to the town's dependence on well water and septic systems are also serious & impactful. They have been thoroughly covered previously and by others who oppose the plan so I will not attempt to restate further.

Further, the text of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) is more nuanced than the Applicants allude. The below excerpt shows that the regulations do not simply mandate increased multi-family housing via centrally directed zoning regulations. A thoughtful and methodical evaluation must be conducted to determine the best path forward for development, without degrading safety, or turning a blind eye to economic realities, and while keeping character of the town in accordance with its residents' wishes. The Town has taken steps in this direction as evidenced by the Town's [2015-2025 Plan of Conservation and Development \(POCD\)](#)¹.

Current law²:

CGS 8-2(a) Excerpt: "[Zoning] regulations shall be made with reasonable consideration as to the character of the district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses and with a view to conserving the value of buildings and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout such municipality."

It is interesting to note that an effort was made in 2019 in the form of CT House Bill (HB) 6749 to substantially change the text of CGS Chapter 124 (Zoning), Section 8-2 (Regulations). This change, which would have disempowered local Planning and Zoning Commissions and prioritized low cost housing over other considerations, [did not succeed](#)³. This can be viewed as evidence that current law does not align with the priorities the Applicants support. Having failed to achieve their goals via legislative means, it appears the current Application is an attempt to achieve a similar goal through the judicial system instead.

More could certainly be written, but as proud Woodbridge residents, it looks to us that this municipality is moving forward in full compliance with both the law and the wishes of its residents. Perhaps not in the manner or at the rate the Applicants would like: but whose voices should determine the future of the Town if not those of its citizens?

Respectfully,
Albert & Kira Bellucci

References:

¹<https://www.woodbridgect.org/DocumentCenter/View/150/Town-Plan-of-Conservation-and-Development-PDF>

² https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap_124.htm#sec_8-2

³ <https://legiscan.com/CT/bill/HB06749/2019>