

A Critique of the  
Proposed Planned Housing Design District

Prepared for the Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission

Prepared by Charles Vidich Associates

40 Frontage Rd, Ashford, CT 06278

July 15, 2024

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Extend the Moratorium .....	3
What Need is the Proposed PHDD Zone Trying to Meet? .....	3
Alternatives Not Considered .....	3
Option 1 .....	3
Option 2 .....	4
Option 3 .....	4
Critique of the PHDD Zone .....	4
Dangers Posed by a Floating Zone.....	4
Proposed PHDD Floating Zone versus other Floating Zones in Connecticut.....	5
Floating Zones and the Tether Principle .....	6
Planning Pause.....	6
Contract Zoning .....	7
Housing Capacity Analysis .....	7
Need for Conservation and the Consequences of Ignoring It.....	8
Focus Development where Public Sewer and Water Exist.....	8
Limit the Amount of Multi-Family Development .....	9
Traffic Impacts .....	9
Impacts to Forest and Farmland.....	11
Housing in Commercial Zones .....	11
Density and Density Bonuses.....	11
Fee in Lieu of Housing.....	12
Public Notice to Affected Landowners .....	12
Definitions for Key Terms Used .....	13
Conclusions.....	13
Appendix 1: Acres of Underlying Zones Impacted by Proposed PHDD .....	14
Appendix 2: Status of Floating Zone Multi-Family Development in Connecticut: 2024.....	15
Appendix 3: Developable Parcels under Proposed PHDD Zone .....	16

## Introduction

The proposed Planned Housing Design District (PHDD) suffers from a variety of planning and administrative issues that are set forth in this summary of concerns. We first review the importance of extending the moratorium. Then we discuss important alternative approaches to developing multi-family housing. The third section of the report reviews the technical, legal and planning concerns posed by floating zones. The fourth section addresses some of the unintended consequences that may arise from using a floating zone strategy on development patterns in Mansfield. We also review technical flaws in the draft proposal and then summarize the major conclusions of our analysis of the proposed PHDD zone.

## Extend the Moratorium

The proposed Planned Housing Design District (PHDD) is unworkable and creates a wide range of obstacles to multi-family housing simply by not having specific standards. The proposed regulations can't be fixed in the next six weeks and for this reason the current moratorium on the DMR zone should be extended an additional 12 months. Failure to extend the moratorium, means the commission will be rushing the development of the proposed PHDD floating zone without any meaningful input from the public or independent professional planners with expertise in housing issues.

## What Need is the Proposed PHDD Zone Trying to Meet?

Before a meaningful blow-by-blow review can be made of the PHDD proposal, the commission needs to decide what housing needs it intends to meet. Mansfield's affordable housing plan does not have any connection to, nor does it support, the "scatter shot" approach to building high density housing throughout the town. No consideration has been given to the land use, transportation, and environmental constraints that exist on all the parcels eligible for development under the proposed regulations. Our extensive review of the criteria for landing a PHDD floating zone found 239 parcels that qualify (see later sections of this report).

## Alternatives Not Considered

Before the commission acts, it should consider three alternatives to the current PHDD proposal which may be quite relevant to the goal of creating more affordable housing.

### Option 1

It is likely the commission is unaware of Public Act 24-143, effective October 1, 2024. This law enables municipalities to build multi-family dwelling units as of right and, in exchange, they will be granted .25 points per unit toward activating a housing moratorium. Under this new law, this means that if 300 multi-family dwelling units are created in Mansfield, the commission creates 75 points (i.e.  $300 \times .25$  points per unit = 75 points) that activates a five-year moratorium on multi-family housing. In my opinion, this is a short-cut strategy to a more deliberative multi-family housing regulation. It is an approach NOT based on reliance on the commission's legislative authority to enact zone changes. The proposed PHDD zone is essentially a "contract zoning" approach with no

explicit standards. Public Act 24-143 grants credits for recently completed multi-family housing if certificates of occupancy are issued after the effective date of the new legislation (i.e., October 1, 2024). This new law could be of great benefit to Mansfield.

## Option 2

Developers can propose any zone change they wish and completely avoid the proposed PHDD zone change procedure. Why should they waste their time negotiating with the commission on a zone change under the PHDD concept when everything in that proposed approach is negotiable? Where is the planning in this process? This is a case of using a zone change to force developers to do what the commission wants – even when the commission doesn't know what it wants. The public doesn't know what you want either. Any smart developer will skip the PHDD zone change concept and propose their own approach without all the baggage contained in the proposed PHDD zone change standards.

## Option 3

There is a far more appealing choice than any of the above options. Affordable housing developers don't have to adhere to Mansfield's zoning regulations if they build affordable housing under Section 8-30g of the statutes. All they need to do is propose the minimum number of affordable housing units to meet section 8-30g standards and then wait for the commission to deny their application. Then they can immediately appeal to the Connecticut Superior Court in New Britain and get the commission's denial overturned. The bar for overturning the commission's decision is quite low. Unless a developer creates serious safety or environmental concerns, they will be approved.

The more cumbersome the commission makes the proposed PHDD zone, the more obvious the other options are better ones for developers and the public – especially option #1. In summary, all three options mentioned above are far more appealing to developers than the proposed PHDD floating zone concept. Any developer who values their time and money will understand these options and will choose accordingly.

## Critique of the PHDD Zone

As a professional planner with over forty years of experience, I have not seen a floating zone proposal that has so few development standards, so few factors that determine where the zone will be tethered and so much focus on negotiation of development standards at the zone change phase. To help the commission understand these concerns, this report outlines the findings of a statewide examination of all multi-family floating zones in Connecticut (appendix 2). In a later section of this report, we review the technical issues with the proposed PHDD regulation.

## Dangers Posed by a Floating Zone

The Planned Housing Design District (PHDD) replaces the Designed Multi-Residence (DMR) District. It is a floating zone and as such is not presented on the zoning map for Mansfield. This raises transparency concerns since the proposed PHDD creates dozens of potential locations for multi-family development without providing explicit map references for the impacted properties throughout Mansfield. While a floating zone is authorized by case law and Connecticut General

Statutes, its indiscriminate use in rural areas poses a threat to property values, quality of life and traffic conditions on rural roads – especially for those living next door. Where a floating zone may land is a “black box” process that can destabilize single family residential zones in Mansfield. The Mansfield Planning and Zoning commission should do its homework and identify explicit locations where multi-family housing is needed and make it clear on the zoning map. This is called “truth in planning.” This cannot be achieved through a floating zone. Most other Connecticut municipalities allow multi-family housing by one of two ways; by right (31 municipalities), or by special permit (102 municipalities).

What are the motivations for making it extremely difficult to create high-density and/or multi-family housing? Why not define the zones in advance rather than create complicated formulas that link the development to collector or arterial roads that are either 1) identified within the “future Land Use Map” in the areas called “Compact Residential” found in the Plan of Conservation and Development or 2) tied to specific collector and arterial roads located in the RAR-90 zone. Who knows what roads are collectors and what roads are arterials? This may be easily answered by those who spend their life reading Mansfield’s zoning regulations. However, most citizens are unaware of the list of arterial or collector roads listed in *Section 190.15, Street Classification* of the zoning regulations. The result is citizens are confused and don’t understand the townwide scope of the proposed PHDD floating zone. Similarly, the commission should avoid the awkward use of the concept known as “regulation by reference” by forcing citizens to consult the Mansfield Plan of Conservation and Development to determine the geographic scope of the “Compact Residential” zone. Why not explicitly include the “Compact Residential” map as an appendix to the zoning regulations? That is called “one stop shopping.”

#### *Proposed PHDD Floating Zone versus other Floating Zones in Connecticut*

After completing a review of the twenty (20) floating zones in Connecticut used to create multi-family housing, the proposed PHDD is unique in its failure to establish specific standards for development or specific performance standards that apply to multi family or duplex housing. Eighteen of the twenty floating zones used for multi-family housing in Connecticut do not require a master plan. The master plan concept (borrowed from Andover’s zoning regulations without its detailed performance standards) creates excessive documentation requirements that make multi-family housing costly and time consuming to complete.

There is a good reason why all the municipalities in Connecticut that use floating zones have explicit standards; without specific standards to guide the process, what can the public or the developer expect for an outcome? A third concern is the proposed PHDD zone places extensive obstacles to increasing affordable housing and their ability to achieve the 10% affordable housing goal endorsed by Section 8-30g of the Connecticut General Statutes. In contrast, many of those using floating zones elsewhere in Connecticut focus their efforts on achieving some level of affordable housing, including seven that have adopted the state’s Incentive Housing Zone concept. These seven municipalities use the State’s Incentive Housing program authorized under Sections 8-13m through 8-13x of the Connecticut general statutes. Mansfield’s PHDD zone is not explicitly establishing affordable housing goals or objectives. Why is the commission avoiding this important housing need?

### *Floating Zones and the Tether Principle*

Perhaps, one of the most important concerns for many citizens is where will the proposed PHDD land? Based on extensive research conducted by the author, the proposed floating zone can land on (i.e. be tethered to) 239 potential locations in Mansfield. This is an unprecedented application of the floating zone tethering principle. Tethering establishes the precise location or locations where a floating zone can land. Across Connecticut, the use of tethering may be tied to 1) specific zones, 2) specific parcel sizes, 3) specific roads and/or 4) specific infrastructure that supports development. To assist the commission with the development of meaningful tethering concepts the author reviewed the tethering approaches used by the twenty municipalities with extant standards. Our primary finding is that none of the twenty Connecticut municipalities with multi-family floating zones have such undefined tethering guidelines as found in the proposed PHDD zone.

Specific tethering approaches used are as follows. Andover tethers its multi-family housing to business and industrial zones; Avon ties their tether to the village center zone; Barkhamsted tethers their Incentive Housing Zone to specific areas with the necessary infrastructure; Bethany limits their floating zone to two specific roads; Cheshire limits most of their development to four specific state highways; East Hampton limits the tethering of their Village Housing Overlay zone to the town village area; East Windsor tethers its multi-family development zone to village areas where there is public sewer and water; similarly Fairfield tethers its Designed Residence District to areas with public sewer and water; Farmington tethers its Housing Opportunity District to one road (Middle Road) that must have sewer and water; Madison limits multi-family housing under its Housing Opportunity District to land within 3,000 feet of a collector road having minimum frontage of at least 200 feet and parcels must be 4 acres but not more than 5 acres (implying there are only a few such sites that qualify); Marlborough limits its Designed Multiple Residence to land that has adequate highway capacity and meets very specific street frontage requirements among many other development standards; Middlefield tethers its Environmental Conservation Rural District to two zones and requires a 10 acre minimum parcel size; and Westbrook limits its Incentive Housing Opportunity zone to the town center or within a specific distance of transit services.

These examples underscore the vast difference between the approach proposed in Mansfield and the rest of the state of Connecticut. Standards for landing the floating zone need to be specific and tied to the public interest in reducing traffic congestion, enhancing existing development patterns and supported by access to public water and sewers. The proposed PHDD has not provided any specific development guidelines to avoid high density development in the rural RAR-90 zone. High-density development is not appropriate in rural areas. Furthermore, rural collector roads were not designed for high traffic volumes. These are basic land planning principles.

### *Planning Pause*

The PHDD development zone needs to be replaced. The best approach is to establish specific standards and establish either multi-family as of right as provided by PA 24-2143 incentives or through a robust special permit process. The proposed PHDD floating zone for multi-family development is confusing – largely due to its lack of explicit development standards. The commission should table the proposed regulations. In the interim, the commission should complete an after-action report on the housing and land use impacts created by recently approved multi-family housing developments in the last two years. Simultaneously, the commission should

give strong consideration to completing a long-term housing capacity analysis before undertaking the proposed PHDD or any other proposed housing regulation. Mansfield has approved more multi-family housing in the last two years than any municipality in Connecticut. Your achievements are commendable. There is no need to rush into more housing without determining the traffic impacts, occupancy levels, and affordable housing benefits you have already approved.

## Contract Zoning

Rather than present specific development standards with specific criteria for approval, the commission is proposing to take what I would call a “contract zoning” approach. Under this regulatory approach, the developer would propose a multi-family housing development based on design considerations that are without details or standards. This approach presumably allows the commission to negotiate the characteristics of the development to their liking. But the question becomes: “what does the commission like?” It is not possible to know the answer to that question since the phrase “design considerations” is so vague that no two people could possibly agree on their meaning or interpretation. It appears the commission is taking this approach because of the obvious aesthetic and siting failures made in the Four Corners area.

The proposed cumbersome and opaque review and approval process is not a substitute for the hard work of developing specific standards that both the developer and the residents of Mansfield can accept and understand. If Mansfield is looking to encourage multi-family housing it should have precise standards for developers to follow – not these overly cumbersome seven step procedures. The procedures will not only turn off developers they add to the cost of housing.

The Commission should seek legal advice about the seven-step procedure – especially the conflation of the zone change with the Master Plan Development process. The commission proposes to integrate the zone change concept with a detailed development scheme that is normally the purview of the site plan or special permit procedure. This approach forces the developer to create housing that meets the desires of the commission. Yet, without explicit performance standards, and height, bulk, area, setback, and buffer standards, how can the developer or the public know the outcome in advance?

Rather than a proposal for a zone change to meet specific standards, the commission has chosen a bargaining session where anything can be negotiated. This approach raises significant issues with due process, public hearing procedures and the impartiality of the commission to review the developer’s proposal. Once again, how can the developer know what you want when there are no explicit standards? The proposed PHDD represents a flawed zone change procedure. Please consider retaining outside independent legal counsel as well as land use and housing experts who are familiar with floating zone case law, fair housing laws, and urban planning principles. The proposal as written is much like giving the police the authority to make up traffic tickets for whatever violation they want to invent on the spur of the moment. Please correct this problematic use of the zone change procedure.

## Housing Capacity Analysis

Since the Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission has not provided an overview of its multi-family housing objectives or its long-term plan for the multi-family housing needs of Mansfield

residents, we must presume there is a great need for this form of housing. However, there is no evidence provided, no housing needs assessment, nor any housing after action report that has evaluated the success of past multi-family housing developments in meeting the town's housing needs. Perhaps, more importantly, what groups or income levels need housing in Mansfield? Is the proposed zone intended to meet the housing needs of the town's ageing population, its young residents or UCONN students seeking off-campus housing?

Without a purpose statement and a housing needs assessment supporting the proposed PHDD zone, the public is at a loss for why the commission is continuing to massively expand the amount of multi-family housing. Appendix 3 contains a list of properties that fall within the project siting criteria set forth in the draft PHDD regulations. While this list excludes a few impacted properties (e.g., the land now being developed for the so-called "Standard" at Four Corners and that owned by Joshua's Trust), it indicates the potential for 34,477 additional multi-family dwellings if the 239 eligible locations are developed for that purpose. This level of potential multi-family development has never been proposed by any Connecticut municipality during the last fifty years. It is unprecedented and inconsistent with basic urban planning concepts such as creating energy efficient patterns of development, compact development and focusing growth to locations with public water and sewer services.

## Need for Conservation and the Consequences of Ignoring It

The commission has not provided documentation or addressed the consequences of allowing multi-family or duplex housing throughout Mansfield. What will be the environmental, transportation and open space impacts of the proposed floating zone? The Commission is not merely responsible for development initiatives. In 1995 the Connecticut legislature changed the Plan of Development to the Plan of Conservation and Development. Balancing Conservation with Development is critical and yet the commission has failed to address the conservation needs of Mansfield to a level commensurate with its development aspirations. Specifically, adding a potential 34,000 more dwelling units under a build out scenario for the PHDD zone will trigger a need for 1) more water resource protection, 2) more open space for human recreation, 3) wider highways, 4) more commercial development and 5) more air pollution mitigation strategies. If the commission intends to double the town's population, it needs to anticipate all these potential impacts and do so in a cost-effective fashion. The discussion below addresses some of the potential unintended impacts of the proposed PHDD zone. Based on our analysis, the proposed multi-family zoning strategy is inconsistent with best practice for floating zones in Connecticut. It is also in conflict with the following land use concerns.

### *Focus Development where Public Sewer and Water Exist*

This section of the report reviews the more detailed consequences of the proposed PHDD zone. Based on our calculations using the town assessor's property records, the proposed development regulation will affect 5,874 acres of Mansfield (appendix 1). The draft regulations enable any lot with five (5) acres or more in the RAR-90 zone to be developed for multiplex housing at densities of ten (10) dwelling units per acre. This might be acceptable in areas where public sewers and water exist but is inconsistent with rural areas of Mansfield without such services. Development within Mansfield's sewer service areas make the best use of existing infrastructure and creates energy efficient patterns of development, supports existing business zones, and reduces discretionary



automobile use. Compact development ensures the long-term protection of drinking water and the town's public water supply watershed that serves the Windham Water Works. Furthermore, Mansfield also needs to plan for the protection of potential drinking water supplies such as the 4.92 square mile Cedar Swamp Watershed. That watershed has an average daily flow of 5 million gallons a day and remains one of the most important water sources available for its future development needs. Without an adequate plan for protecting potential drinking water resources, Mansfield will soon run out of water even with its access to the Shenipsit Reservoir. Simple math explains the dilemma posed by over-development proposed by the PHDD zone:

1. At full buildout 34,477 dwelling units are enabled by the proposed PHDD zone
2. If each of the 34,477 dwelling units contains two bedrooms = 68,964 bedrooms
3. Public Water Systems require developers to plan for 150 gallons of water/Bedroom
4. 68,964 bedrooms times 150 gallons per day = 10,343,100 gallons per day

These calculations suggest the Planning and Zoning Commission should consider the long-term drinking water capacity impacts of the proposed PHDD zone change. More importantly, the anticipated water demand set forth above can't be met by the town's current agreement with the University of Connecticut concerning access to the Shenipsit reservoir.

#### *Limit the Amount of Multi-Family Development*

While Mansfield has obligations under Section 8-30g to provide affordable housing, it must also consider the impacts on public services created under the build-out scenario: up to 34,000 more dwelling units requiring police, fire, ambulance and other public services. The University of Connecticut has a responsibility to meet the housing needs of its students. Has the commission worked with UCONN to develop a long-term solution to on campus student housing? What if all off-campus housing used by students could be made available to Mansfield residents? Perhaps the commission should recommend purchasing and renovating existing single-family dwellings along Hunting Lodge Road that are currently occupied by UCONN students. If the houses used by these students are placed under the Mansfield Housing Authority, this might free up enough housing to eliminate the need for the proposed PHDD zone. This could be accomplished through a fee in lieu of housing strategy.

#### *Traffic Impacts*

The proposed regulations do not distinguish between arterial and collector roads when it comes to density considerations. Arterial roads are generally better designed, with wider widths and governed by the Connecticut Department of Transportation. In contrast, many collector roads in Mansfield are often poorly aligned, narrow in width, with limited sightlines, and incapable of accommodating high traffic volumes. The proposed regulations allow any parcel with five acres or more meeting developable land requirements to be used for multi-family or duplex housing. This places the cart before the horse; it forces developers to justify why his or her parcel is suitable for development when this responsibility should be that of the commission.

Based on an analysis of the 239 eligible parcels that could be built under the proposed regulations, only 57 of the 239 parcels (24%) are on arterial roads (i.e., Route 195 also known as Storrs Road; Route 32 also known as Stafford Road, Route 44, also known as Middle Turnpike; Route 275 also known as South Eagleville Road and Route 430 also known as North Eagleville Road). Higher

density development is best located with access to arterial roads since they are designed with greater capacity for higher traffic volumes. In addition to the five arterial roads, the proposed regulations enable development on 22 collector roads throughout Mansfield (Table 1). The five

<b>Table 1: Collector and Arterial Roads Serving Parcels Eligible for Development under the Proposed PHDD Zone</b>	
<b>Arterial/Collector</b>	<b>Number of Parcels Eligible for Development</b>
Atwoodville Rd	10
Bassetts Bridge Rd	10
Baxter Rd	5
Birch Rd	1
Browns Rd	21
Chaffeeville Rd	7
Codfish Falls Rd	15
Conantville Rd	2
Depot Rd	1
Gurleyville Rd	17
Hunting Lodge Rd	3
Knowlton Hill Rd	1
Mansfield City Rd	24
Maple Rd	10
<b>Middle Tpke</b>	<b>17</b>
Moulton Rd	4
Mount Hope Rd	7
<b>North Eagleville Rd</b>	<b>8</b>
Pleasant Valley Rd	3
Puddin Lane	3
Separatist Rd	4
<b>South Eagleville Rd</b>	<b>4</b>
South Frontage Rd	2
Spring Hill Rd	4
<b>Stafford Rd</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Storrs Rd</b>	<b>27</b>
Wormwood Hill Rd	11
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>239</b>

greatest potential development locations are on Mansfield City Road (24), Brown’s Road (21), Gurleyville Road (17), Codfish Falls Road (15), and Wormwood Hill Road (11). These five collector roads account for 88 eligible parcels or 37% of all the eligible parcels in Mansfield. It is important to recognize that eligible parcels include those that have vacant land as well as those that have already been developed for single family dwellings or other uses. The reason this analysis includes both is because the proposed PHDD regulations do not distinguish between these two categories. The effect of this regulation may be to destabilize existing neighborhoods if a developer should buy one or more existing single-family dwellings, tear them down, and propose high density duplex housing in the RAR-90 zone.

The RAR-90 zone will be the most impacted by the proposed PHDD zone. As can be seen in Appendix 1, of the 5,874 acres that are eligible for development under the PHDD zone proposal 5,455.8 acres, or 93% of those properties are in the RAR-90 zone. The long-term consequences of these proposed regulations are a recipe for sprawl development at the expense of the environment and at significantly higher local government costs for road maintenance, and public services. Sprawl development, at high densities, also poses

a long-term threat of failing septic systems or failing community leaching fields – absent public sewers.

Shouldn’t the commission look out for the best interests of the community and pre-select collector and arterial roads that have sufficient road and sewer carrying capacity?

### *Impacts to Forest and Farmland*

A total of 83 of the 239 parcels of land that qualify as a potential PHDD zone contain 25 acres or more of land and therefore play an important role in maintaining farm and forest land in Mansfield. Parcels of 25 acres or more represent sources of food, fiber and open space in Mansfield and should be preserved – not developed. Instead of allowing virtually any five acre or greater parcel to be developed for multi-family housing the commission should focus development where road systems, public sewer and water, and access to commercial services are most available.

### *Housing in Commercial Zones*

Mixed use development has many benefits. It enables housing to be closer to shops and services thereby reducing travel by automobile. However, the proposed PHDD floating zone does not provide sufficient detail to enable mixed use development to occur. Instead, since the regulations applies to developed as well as undeveloped land, the draft PHDD provides incentives to tear down existing commercial development and replace it with multi-family housing resulting in a potential net loss of commercial services in Mansfield.

Once again, lacking specific development standards for multi-family housing in commercial zones means the commission will be addressing each proposal on a de-novo basis. As previously mentioned, the commission is avoiding explicit standards to guide its decisions. The result is “contract zoning” reflecting the whims of the commission depending on their skills and expertise.

The courts recommend zoning regulations be uniform in their application within any given zone. While floating zones may serve as an exception to the uniformity rule, there are practical reasons for why development standards within different zones should have unique requirements sensitive to the underlying land uses and conditions of each zone. An effective floating zone is best limited to one zoning district or to a limited geographic area. Where that is not possible, unique requirements, specific to each zone, should be given strong consideration. That is why at least one Connecticut municipality requires their multi-family floating zone to comply with the performance standards and height, bulk and area requirements of the underlying zone.

### *Density and Density Bonuses*

The commission proposes to provide extremely generous density bonuses of up to five dwelling units per acre for low income and workforce housing. Since there are no constraints on the location for offering higher densities, residents in the RAR-90 zone will face uncertainty if their neighbor’s property might soon be generating large volumes of traffic. For example, according to the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (11<sup>th</sup> Edition, Volume 2) single family attached housing generates 5.91 vehicle trips per dwelling unit. Assuming a 50% development potential for a 5-acre lot ( $5 \times 50\% = 2.5$  acres), there could be 25 dwelling units (2.5 acres X 10 duplex dwelling units per developable acre=25 dwelling units per acre) without density bonus incentives. This density of development would generate 147 vehicle trips per day. However, five more dwelling units could be created if the density bonus option is activated for low income and workforce housing. Alternatively, density bonuses can also be granted by the fee in lieu program. For example, under that scenario a \$15,000 fee could be generated for the Town’s Housing Trust Fund (i.e., a 1% fee for each dwelling unit with a market value of \$3000,000. This would generate \$3,000 per dwelling unit for Mansfield. If the parcel is five acres in size, then for each one dwelling unit per acre built on a five-acre parcel the town would get a total of \$15,000).

These fiscal benefits may be valuable to the Mansfield Housing Trust Fund, but they have traffic impact consequences. The result of increasing the number of dwelling units on a five-acre parcel from 25 to 30 units would increase vehicle trips for a duplex development on that five-acre parcel in the RAR-90 zone by 20% (i.e., 5.91 trips per dwelling unit times 30 = 177, compared to only 147 vehicle trips for the same development with only 25 duplex units). The traffic impacts would be far greater if the parcel selected for development is 10 acres with five developable acres (5 developable acres X 10 DUs/Acre X 5.91 trips per DU = 296 vehicle trips). The implications are clear, high density, including density bonuses, only make sense where public sewer and water are available and there is access to an arterial highway.

With a few small exceptions, the RAR-90 is not served by public water and public sewer and therefore higher density is not appropriate when such services are lacking. Community leaching fields, while promoted by some housing advocates as the rural solution for high density, are maintenance intensive operations, poorly supervised by the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection and with no oversight procedures in place at the municipal level. When they fail, and these systems do fail, the groundwater consequences are significant. The solution for failed community leaching systems are extremely expensive sewer service extensions. To reiterate, higher density development is not appropriate in the rural areas of Mansfield – whether the housing is for low income, workforce housing, duplex housing, or for the very rich.

#### *Fee in Lieu of Housing*

The proposed regulations provide a bonus of one dwelling unit per acre in exchange for each donation to the town's housing trust fund equivalent to 1% of the construction cost. The text refers to Figure 1 for details but there is no Figure 1 in the draft regulations. Moreover, if this proposal should move forward it would be a giveaway to the developers. Hypothetically a \$300,000 dwelling could generate a \$3,000 fee in lieu of housing at the 1% fee. This is more than generous to developers: it is a pure giveaway. For every \$3,000 the developer pays the town they can add one additional dwelling. What will Mansfield do with the money? This provision is far too generous to developers. However, if it is kept, the fee in lieu should be limited to areas where development can be best accommodated – where sewer, water, and other public services exist.

#### **Public Notice to Affected Landowners**

The commission should make a diligent effort to notify the 239 property owners impacted by the proposed zoning regulations including the abutting property owners. If the proposed PHDD zone is adopted there will be financial and environmental impacts wherever the zone “lands” – especially in the rural RAR-90 zone. A newspaper notice in the *Willimantic Chronicle* is not a substitute for a mass mailing to affected property owners in view of the scope and magnitude of the proposed impacts that will be created by the draft PHDD regulations. The commission needs to distinguish what it is required to do by statute to meet legally prescribed notification procedures and what is appropriate in the context of floating zones. The notification procedures in the Connecticut General Statutes never considered the unique notification challenges associated with floating zone changes. This legislative oversight can be remedied if the commission wishes to be as transparent as possible with Mansfield residents. The choice is distinguishing between legalistic compliance with the statutory notification requirements and a more proactive approach that makes a sincere effort to reach the affected landowners through a direct mail notification.

## Definitions for Key Terms Used

As mentioned above, definitions are needed that explicitly identify the impacted road systems. Very few definitions are provided for other important terms as well. These are critical especially since the words and phrases such as greenspace, graduated setbacks, and Master Plan are not defined directly or by reference to other sections of the regulations. There are numerous other terms that have been used in the draft PHDD that require definition if the public and developers are to understand and implement the proposed regulations.

## Conclusions

The proposed PHDD floating zone should be discarded in favor of transparent and well-defined multi-family housing regulations that provide clear guidance for developers and clear advanced notice to single family property owners of the potential property and neighborhood impacts that will be created by land zoned for multi-family or duplex housing. Floating zones are a poor planning tool for informing Mansfield residents of the multi-family development that may soon abut their property. More importantly, the Commission needs to make a better case for why so much more multi-family housing is needed and who will benefit from its creation. The scope of the proposed PHDD floating zone has never been seen anywhere in Connecticut. Is Mansfield attempting to single-handedly meet the housing needs for all fifty municipalities in eastern Connecticut? The first and fundamental step in managing housing needs is planning. Planning involves determining the need for housing, its location, access to nearby services required to accommodate housing needs. There are also tax consequences to the community. Has the commission studied the fiscal impacts on town services that will be created by proposing to flood the town with multi-family and high density duplex housing units? The proposed regulations do not appear to address any of these planning considerations.

## Appendix 1: Acres of Underlying Zones Impacted by Proposed PHDD

Arterial/Collector	Mansfield's Underlying Zones Impacted by Proposed PHDD							Grand Total
	PB-1	PB-3	PVRA	R-20	R-90	RAR-90	SER-HO	
Atwoodville Rd						211.8		211.8
Bassetts Bridge Rd						175.6		175.6
Baxter Rd						75.1		75.1
Birch Rd						22.6		22.6
Browns Rd						635.4		635.4
Chaffeeville Rd						189.0		189.0
Codfish Falls Rd						343.8		343.8
Conantville Rd				26.8		5.3		32.1
Depot Rd						25.0		25.0
Gurleyville Rd						238.3		238.3
Hunting Lodge Rd					24.8	45.9		70.7
Knowlton Hill Rd						12.0		12.0
Mansfield City Rd			42.0			1,144.2		1,186.2
Maple Rd						123.2		123.2
Middle Tpke		13.3				482.2		495.6
Moulton Rd						49.2		49.2
Mount Hope Rd						159.8		159.8
North Eagleville Rd	1.6				91.6	54.4		147.5
Pleasant Valley Rd			102.5	5.0		58.9		166.4
Puddin Lane				7.2	13.3	18.3		38.7
Separatist Rd					32.1			32.1
South Eagleville Rd						90.8	4.4	95.1
South Frontage Rd				13.4				13.4
Spring Hill Rd						38.0		38.0
Stafford Rd						494.9		494.9
Storrs Rd	37.6	2.6				426.2		466.5
Wormwood Hill Rd						336.2		336.2
Grand Total	39.2	16.0	144.5	52.3	161.8	5,455.8	4.4	5,874.0

## Appendix 2: Status of Floating Zone Multi-Family Development in Connecticut: 2024

Municipality	Is it a Floating Zone?	Require Master Plan	Includes Mixed Use Development	Authorized by Section 8-2J	Requires Bldg. and Lot Size Standards?	Affordable Housing Required	Parcel Size	Is it an Incentive Housing Zone?	Name of Zone
Andover	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	3	No	Mixed Use Floating Zone
Avon	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	5	No	Avon Village Ctr. Zone
Barkhamsted	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NS	Yes	Incentive Housing Zone
Bethany	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	30	No	Housing Opportunity
Cheshire	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	10	No	Age Restricted Overlay
East Hampton	Yes	No	yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	SAUZ	No	Village Housing Overlay
East Windsor	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	4	No	Multi-Family Dev. Dist.
Ellington	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Varies	No	Designed multi-family
Fairfield	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Varies	No	Designed Resid. Dist.
Farmington	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Varies	No	Affordable Housing
Glastonbury	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Varies	No	Planned Area Develop.
Harwinton	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	5	No	Multi-Family
Madison	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	4	Yes	Housing Opportunity
Marlborough	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	NS	No	Design Multiple Resid.
Middlefield	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	10	No	Env. Conservation Dist.
Newtown	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	10	Yes	Incentive Housing Zone
N. Stonington	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	5	Yes	Incentive Housing Zone
Old Saybrook	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NS	Yes	Incentive Housing Zone
Simsbury	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	NS	Yes	Workforce Housing
Westbrook	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	NS	Yes	Incentive Housing Zone
Total	20	2	7	1	19	15		7	

SAUZ = Same as Underlying Zone; NS = Not Specified.

### Appendix 3: Developable Parcels under Proposed PHDD Zone

Zone	Name of Owner	Acres	Address	Duplex, CR, PB	Name of Collector/ Arterial	Abuts/In Sewer Service Area
RAR-90	Barry Burnham	23.8	78 Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	John Papaconstantinow	10.0	Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Judy Spencer	8.6	42 Hurley Lane Abuts Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Clarence & Sylvia Pearl	54.7	197 Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Christopher Weisner	20.0	194 Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Thomas & Lester Pearl	37.1	Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Margaret Porter Life Use	5.2	233 Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Owner not Specified	8.3	243 Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Randall & Sharon Case	37.0	284 Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Barbara Hathaway	7.1	296 Atwoodville Rd	Duplex	Atwoodville Rd	No
RAR-90	Zenia Zlotnick Estate	5.8	Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	Edward Hall	18.4	Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	Erie Bucyrus Acres LLC	16.3	140 Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	David & Sandra Stevens	8.8	475 Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	Shawn Dorman	8.1	423 Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	David & Diana Cyr	27.0	Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	Tina Popeleski Estate	45.1	486 Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	Paul Cardinal	21.2	581 Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	Roger & Tina Abell	18.0	Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	Roger & Tina Abell	7.0	606 Bassetts Bridge Rd	Duplex	Bassetts Bridge Rd	No
RAR-90	Randall Bobb	10.1	Baxter Rd	Duplex	Baxter Rd	No
RAR-90	William & Riley Gionfriddo	31.0	135 Baxter Rd	Duplex	Baxter Rd	No
RAR-90	Charles Galgowski	11.5	117 Baxter Rd	Duplex	Baxter Rd	No
RAR-90	Barbi & Nathan Stebbins	10.6	25 Baxter Rd	Duplex	Baxter Rd	No
RAR-90	Amir Herzberg	11.9	22 Baxter Rd	Duplex	Baxter Rd	No
RAR-90	CT Liberty Group LLC	22.6	3 Club House Circle Abuts Birch Rd	CR	Birch Rd	Yes
RAR-90	160 Browns Rd LLC	10.5	160 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Jeffrey & Donna Bill	15.7	126 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Joshua Trust	21.1	Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Joshua Trust	20.4	Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	John & Kathleen Hawkins	37.2	79 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Jonathan & Jessica Leonard	6.1	149 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Jennifer Mott	8.3	163 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Angela Blossick	5.1	168 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Suzanne Maresig	7.5	213 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Janet Jungen	8.8	Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	James Greene	8.5	242 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No



<b>Zone</b>	<b>Name of Owner</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Duplex, CR, PB</b>	<b>Name of Collector/ Arterial</b>	<b>Abuts/In Sewer Service Area</b>
RAR-90	Jonathan Muszynski	12.3	275 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Kenneth & Cathy Brierley	5.6	266 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Eizabeth Peterson	11.9	Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	JDT Enterprises LLC	46.8	483 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	JDT Enterprises LLC	111.5	438 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Willard Stearns & Sons	258.0	Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Alfred Hyde	7.2	576 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Kiev & Kesin Federowicz	5.4	Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Bruce Graham	19.7	702 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Kelly McShea	8.0	754 Browns Rd	Duplex	Browns Rd	No
RAR-90	Brian Ahearn	8.6	667 Chaffeeville Rd	Duplex	Chaffeeville Rd	No
RAR-90	Robert Moskowitz	34.1	614 Chaffeeville Rd	Duplex	Chaffeeville Rd	No
RAR-90	Gail Marie Olesen	39.9	548 Chaffeeville Rd	Duplex	Chaffeeville Rd	No
RAR-90	Michele & Mallory Bagwell	50.3	572 Chaffeeville Rd	Duplex	Chaffeeville Rd	No
RAR-90	Mary Jane Jackman	25.0	438 Chaffeeville Rd	Duplex	Chaffeeville Rd	No
RAR-90	Faye Titus	8.1	105 Chaffeeville Rd	Duplex	Chaffeeville Rd	No
RAR-90	Wendy Hamlin	23.0	41-61 Chaffeeville Rd	Duplex	Chaffeeville Rd	No
RAR-90	Joshua Keesa Phillips	38.0	302 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Andrew R. Schug	21.3	267 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Michael Cifaldi	29.3	263 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Richard & Kathleen Lacafta	12.3	225 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Robert & Winifred Friedman	10.1	211 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Julie Ann Soja	20.2	187 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	John Gollsneider	67.0	Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Gary Krewson	8.5	178 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Quentin & Margaret Kessel	57.8	97 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Guy & Mary Lou Bradley	6.0	146 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Steven & Alaina Guyette	13.2	138 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Quentin & Margaret Kessel	34.0	Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Didier Destine	12.3	58 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	Lee Cameron	8.7	42 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
RAR-90	David G. Silsbee Trustee	5.1	10 Codfish Falls Rd	Duplex	Codfish Falls Rd	No
R-20	Chatham Hill LLC	26.8	Conantville Rd	CR	Conantville Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Dhiya Alasad	5.3	Pine Ridge Lane Abuts Conantville Rd	CR	Conantville Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Sheila & Kenneth Clark	25.0	Depot Rd	Duplex	Depot Rd	No
RAR-90	Robert Moskowitz	15.6	Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Sarah Bullard	7.3	234 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Town of Mansfield	28.8	Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Robert Moskowitz	6.3	287 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Name of Owner</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Duplex, CR, PB</b>	<b>Name of Collector/ Arterial</b>	<b>Abuts/In Sewer Service Area</b>
RAR-90	Robert Moskowitz	19.5	Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Mary & Keneth Feathers	46.9	371 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Mary Patrone Czaja	6.2	411 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Joseph Kozachek	11.5	441 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Marilyn Brown	6.0	411 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Gerlinde Berege Wallisher	7.5	525 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Shirley Ann Wright	13.1	Woodland Rd Abuts Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Pamela Diggle & William Friedman	10.5	549 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Natalie Shook	5.1	561 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Norman Kelly	34.0	546 Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Monica Ross	5.9	Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Marion Varga	7.8	Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
RAR-90	Slayton & Jeanine Stoddard	6.4	627 Wormwood Hill Rd abuts Gurleyville Rd	Duplex	Gurleyville Rd	No
R-90	Mohammad Ilyas	17.7	Hunting Lodge Rd	CR	Hunting Lodge Rd	Yes
R-90	Corridor Storrs II LLC	7.1	250 Hunting Lodge Rd	CR	Hunting Lodge Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Ponde Place	45.9	Hunting Lodge Road	CR	Hunting Lodge Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Gregory & Mona Anderson	12.0	74 Knowlton Rd	Duplex	Knowlton Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Robins Scott Monaghan	85.9	Mansfield City Rd abuts Stafford Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Leslie Rollins	26.4	Mansfield City Rd abuts Stafford Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
PVRA	Green Gate LLC	42.0	Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Frank Castigliola	191.0	Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Bruce & Margaret Sherber	27.8	872 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Brian Anderson	22.6	840 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Town of Mansfield	51.1	Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Benjamin Lacey	51.0	727 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Troy Mansell	7.5	676 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Kathy & Martin Sholes	42.0	Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Daniel & Laura Greene	10.4	619 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Benjamin & Valerie Moseley	11.2	602 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Adrian & Janet Atkins	9.7	572 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	William Stearns	40.0	519 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Patricia Jucovaty	20.0	538 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	William Stearns & Sons	19.3	474-504 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Kathleen Stearns	36.3	459 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Arthur & Carolyn Stearns	21.1	440 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Willard Stearns & Sons	228.8	40-100 Stearns Rd Abut Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Willard & Billie Stearns	18.7	Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No

Zone	Name of Owner	Acres	Address	Duplex, CR, PB	Name of Collector/ Arterial	Abuts/In Sewer Service Area
RAR-90	Stearns Brothers	7.9	Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Stearns Brothers	108.5	271 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Willard Stearns & Sons	65.0	209 Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Green Gates LLC	42.0	Mansfield City Rd	Duplex	Mansfield City Rd	No
RAR-90	Edward Wazer	5.4	253 Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Masonicare Charity	44.5	259 Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	Yes
RAR-90	J&B Byron Real Estate LLC	8.1	219 Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	No
RAR-90	Edmund & Nancy Tomasik	15.0	203 Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	No
RAR-90	Akiko Nishana	5.4	Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	No
RAR-90	Edmund & Nancy Tomasik	12.5	Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	No
RAR-90	Anthony Kotala	5.2	135 Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	No
RAR-90	Depot Associates	14.5	Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	No
RAR-90	Michael & Carissa Nunnini	6.4	52 Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	No
RAR-90	Emily Beth Hale	6.1	132 Spring Hill Rd Abuts Maple Rd	Duplex	Maple Rd	No
RAR-90	William Twohill	27.5	541 Middle Tpke	CR	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	CMC Storrs S{PU LLC	30.9	497 Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	Charles Ausberger	6.0	472 Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	Paul Duckett	23.9	366 Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	Guildford Park LLC	152.2	Forest St. & Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	Jill Barger	25.3	Mansfield Rd abutting Route 44	Duplex	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	Peter Fish	27.4	Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	Xinshang Zhang	41.0	Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	No
RAR-90	Xinshang Zhang	5.0	705 Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	No
RAR-90	Greg Chicowski	10.0	53 Old Tpke Rd Abuts Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	No
RAR-90	L. Maeve Ward Revielle Trust	36.0	139 Old Tpke Abuts Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	No
RAR-90	Peter Rausitscker	41.0	Codfish Falls Rd Abuts Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	No
RAR-90	William Grayckis	5.5	973 Middle Tpke	Duplex	Middle Tpke	No
PB-3	Pasquale & Donna Ferrigno	5.9	555 Middle Tpke	CR	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	Sun Rolling Hills LLC	50.5	536 Middle Tpke	CR	Middle Tpke	Yes
PB-3	574-596 Middle Tpke LLC	2.4	596 Middle Tpke	PB Zones	Middle Tpke	Yes
PB-3	S&P Properties LLC	5.0	611 Middle Tpke	PB Zones	Middle Tpke	Yes
RAR-90	Forest for the trees LLC	22.9	Moulton Rd	Duplex	Moulton Rd	No
RAR-90	Terrapin Properties LLC	6.1	108-110 Moulton Rd	Duplex	Moulton Rd	No
RAR-90	Donghang Cheng	7.3	118 Moulton Rd	Duplex	Moulton Rd	No
RAR-90	James Raynor	12.9	55 Moulton Rd	Duplex	Moulton Rd	No
RAR-90	Molly Thorkelson	42.9	303 Mount Hope Rd	Duplex	Mount Hope Rd	No
RAR-90	Anne Thorkelson	18.8	Mount Hope Rd	Duplex	Mount Hope Rd	No

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Name of Owner</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Duplex, CR, PB</b>	<b>Name of Collector/ Arterial</b>	<b>Abuts/In Sewer Service Area</b>
RAR-90	Russet Equities	10.7	264 Mount Hope Rd	Duplex	Mount Hope Rd	No
RAR-90	Golden Goat Farm	34.8	Mount Hope Rd	Duplex	Mount Hope Rd	No
RAR-90	Robert Deskus	25.6	203 Mount Hope Rd	Duplex	Mount Hope Rd	No
RAR-90	146 Mt Hope Rd LLC	10.6	146 Mount Hope Rd	Duplex	Mount Hope Rd	No
RAR-90	Frank Spakoski	16.4	150 Mount Hope Rd	Duplex	Mount Hope Rd	No
RAR-90	Philip Mathews	16.7	409 S. Eagleville Rd	Duplex	North Eagleville Rd	No
PB-1	Freda Sanderson	1.6	134 N. Eagleville Rd	PB Zones	North Eagleville Rd	Yes
R-90	Eugene Salorio & Alison Hilding	8.7	17 Southwood Rd Abuts N. Eagleville Rd	Duplex	North Eagleville Rd	Yes
R-90	Damon & Brissette Weis	5.0	N. Eagleville Rd	Duplex	North Eagleville Rd	No
R-90	Chadwick Rittenhouse	55.5	N. Eagleville Rd	Duplex	North Eagleville Rd	No
RAR-90	Roger Perfetto	5.2	461 N. Eagleville Rd	Duplex	North Eagleville Rd	No
RAR-90	Roger Perfetto	32.5	N. Eagleville Rd	Duplex	North Eagleville Rd	No
R-90	RAAR Development LLC	22.4	N. Eagleville Rd	Duplex	North Eagleville Rd	Yes
PVRA	Bruce & Franca Hussey	102.5	488-500 Mansfield Ave Abuts Pleasant Valley Rd	Duplex	Pleasant Valley Rd	Yes
R-20	Bruce & Franca Hussey	5.0	Mansfield Avenue Abuts Pleasant Valley Rd	CR	Pleasant Valley Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Paul Randazzo	58.9	223 Pleasant Valley Rd	Duplex	Pleasant Valley Rd	Yes
R-90	Clint Chamberlain	13.3	169 Puddin Lane	CR	Puddin Lane	Yes
R-20	Christopher Lowe	7.2	89 Puddin Lane	CR	Puddin Lane	Yes
RAR-90	Willard Stearns & Sons	18.26	Puddin Lane	Duplex	Puddin Lane	Yes
R-90	Timothy Sperry	5.1	Separatist Rd	CR	Separatist Rd	Yes
R-90	Azmtalat Zakhiedein	7.8	8 Separatist Rd Abuts S. Eagleville Rd	CR	Separatist Rd	Yes
R-90	Jay Ruecki & Julie Brown	13.5	128 S. Eagleville Road	CR	Separatist Rd	Yes
R-90	Charles Owens	5.7	38 Separatist Rd	CR	Separatist Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Jay Shivers (Life Use)	38.2	336 S. Eagleville Rd	Duplex	South Eagleville Rd	No
RAR-90	Lawrence Ross		1 South Eagleville Rd	Duplex	South Eagleville Rd	Yes
SER-HO	Eagleville Green LLC	4.4	113-121 S. Eagleville Rd	CR	South Eagleville Rd	Yes
RAR-90	CT Liberty Group LLC	52.6	101 S. Eagleville Rd	CR	South Eagleville Rd	Yes
R-20	Elizabeth Rowan	8.6	High Street	CR	South Frontage Rd	Yes
R-20	J.R. Silvester Space Services	4.8	600 High Street	CR	South Frontage Rd	Yes
RAR-90	CT Liberty Group LLC	6.0	170 Spring Hill Rd	Duplex	Spring Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Dhya Alasad	5.9	92 Spring Hill Rd	Duplex	Spring Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Jeffrey & Lisa Ward	5.2	55 Spring Hill Rd	Duplex	Spring Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Jeffrey & Lisa Ward	20.9	Spring Hill Rd	Duplex	Spring Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Karen Green	41.0	Stafford Road	Duplex	Stafford Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Karen Green	177.0	1090 Stafford Road	Duplex	Stafford Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Kerry & Bruce John as Trustees	26.7	852 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	Rosemary Farrell	34.1	796 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Name of Owner</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Duplex, CR, PB</b>	<b>Name of Collector/ Arterial</b>	<b>Abuts/In Sewer Service Area</b>
RAR-90	Leslie Rollins	26.0	694 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	Linda S. Clark	11.8	389 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	Terri Olesen	6.5	379 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	PCD Realty LLC	7.0	Stafford Road	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	PCD Realty LLC	7.3	Stafford Road	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	PCD Realty LLC	7.2	Stafford Road	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	PCD Realty LLC	13.6	Stafford Road	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	David Cheney	6.4	114 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	Mason Brook LLC	10.0	3 Merrow Rd Abuts Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Thomas & Shirley Zemek	7.9	1682 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Laura & Kenneth Quinn	5.1	1681 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	No
RAR-90	Robert Marquis	6.2	1663 Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Forest for the trees LLC	45.5	Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Karen Green	55.5	Stafford Rd	Duplex	Stafford Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Pat & Jean Johnson	8.6	299 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Keltz Harris	12.5	316 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	324 Realty LLC	5.4	324 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	PBR Investment Limited	15.0	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Karlis & Elsa Ruments	6.9	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Richard Cavie	7.0	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Gail Louise Hitchcock Trustee	12.7	435 Storrs Road	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	424 Storrs Rd LLC	8.3	424 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Charles A. Deboen	21.8	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Deborah Oliver	23.7	521 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Yao Y. Arellano & Nico Waters Boney	5.7	563 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	William & Joy St. Martin	5.6	601 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Carol Cowan	37.7	26 Sperry Hill Rd abuts Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Patricia Maines	27.2	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Water LLC	5.9	1096 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	Yes
RAR-90	David Francis & Linda Pelletier	6.1	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
PB-1	Eastbrook LLC	27.6	95 Storrs Rd	PB Zones	Storrs Rd	Yes
PB-3	CFI Property Co.	2.6	1660 Storrs Rd	PB Zones	Storrs Rd	Yes
RAR-90	BPOZ 1750 Storrs Rd LLC	19.0	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Norman and John Richard	10.9	1808 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Ling Li	8.7	1775 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Kim Kaminski	7.5	80 Cedar Swamp Rd Abuts Route 195	Duplex	Storrs Rd	Yes
RAR-90	MP Park LLC	12.0	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	Yes

Zone	Name of Owner	Acres	Address	Duplex, CR, PB	Name of Collector/ Arterial	Abuts/In Sewer Service Area
RAR-90	BPOZ Storrs Rd LLC	9.0	Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Forest & Farm LLC	119.0	2007 Storrs Rd	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
RAR-90	Forest for the trees LLC	30.0	Tolland Tpke Abutting Route 195	Duplex	Storrs Rd	No
PB-1	Mansfield Hayes-Kaufman	10.0	137 Storrs Rd	PB Zones	Storrs Rd	Yes
RAR-90	Barbara Nagy	77.8	661 Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Emine Cichowski	8.3	733 Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Gregory & Mona Anderson	25.9	Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Lee Ann Brown & Wendy Knight	5.1	Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Barbara Nagy	35.2	Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Jaqueline Greene	6.4	767 Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Victor Green	22.5	Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Domonic Shool	6.6	Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Artis & Randall Bobb	9.7	Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Artis & Randall Bobb	98.3	840 Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
RAR-90	Anne Thorkelson	40.4	614 Wormwood Hill Rd	Duplex	Wormwood Hill Rd	No
<b>Source:</b> Charles Vidich Associates based on the online Mansfield property records database, July 2024.						