

March 14, 2021

(Planning and Development Committee)

Subject: Bill Numbers **HB 6107, 6613, 6611, and SB1024**

To: Co-Chairs Cassano and McCarthy-Vahey, Ranking Members Hwang and Zuklo

From: Mary Ann Turner, 7 Meadow Road, Enfield CT 860-306-2023 – [maryannturner@cox.net](mailto:maryannturner@cox.net)

I am writing in opposition to bills (**HB 6107, 6613, 6611, and SB1024**)

As a member of the ZBA and Economic Development in the town of Enfield I can speak from experience ... we take pride in being an open community with different housing stocks and our zoning rules are more than adequate to do such. I am OPPOSED to these legislative “arm grabs” of diverse housing in CT – specifically Enfield - when local zoning rules are adequate to allow multi-use communities without State intervention.

In Enfield our current PZC has taken enormous amount of time revising and putting into place rules that will allow and strengthen the Enfield community regarding housing and multi-use regulations. Enfield has put new “pro-active” regulations in our “transit area” have encouraged the area to be a TIFF district which will encourage all types of growth – including a variety of housing.

These “one-size-fits-all” regulations being proposed are not necessary and are ill advised. You can’t expect what may be right in Enfield will be right for Middletown or Old Lyme. This “copy-and-paste” form of legislation won’t work because local conditions should always dictate where conditions would be the most successful.

The P&Z Commissioners take into account many aspects of building types and put conditions on projects for the betterment of Enfield. The onus on towns to secure funding to expand sewer and other infrastructure requirements makes the town take on the burden that should be handled by the builder.  
HB 6611

The fact that in HB 6613 the legislation proposed will lead to exponential overdevelopment with no affordable units in the very end and the thought that this bill would make local zoning rules “null and void” unless this “over reach of bureaucratic” maneuvering is passed proves it should get a negative vote.

SB 1024 – is a grand over-reach it is difficult to know where to start. The removal of public hearings, the cluster of housing units per acre, elimination of height restrictions or setbacks, overcrowding of land, the potential to destroy historic and preservation lands, forced density development with little to no parking, removal of sidewalks and bike paths and safety concerns will be ignored – makes this a NO vote.

The actual fact that HB 6107 REMOVES Enfield’s own Zoning Commission to a designated – “working group” of 13 specific types of so called bureaucratic experts and no inclusion of representation of rural or suburban communities ...is utterly amazing and ridiculous. Who knows the town better than the people who ACTUALLY LIVE THERE or are we to believe the “unelected handful of majority party appointed bureaucrats knows all?

You want to make CT GREAT AGAIN, then be part of solution to fix what is broken, but leave what isn’t alone. These are Dangerous Bills and I strongly express a NO VOTE on all of them.

- - -

Mary Ann Turner

7 Meadow Road

Enfield, CT 06082