

No, no, no!

HR 1024 is mostly just a gift to developers. If you were really serious about creating more affordable housing in CT, you'd mandate 75% or more of new development in the zones you've targeted was "affordable," still leaving plenty of cash on the table for builders. Or you'd help towns fund building projects on your themselves. Or you'd invest money in public transportation, so people could afford to live all over the state, not just along a few overtaxed train lines.

Not for nothing, even CT's definitions of affordable are laughable. I can't think of one of these high-density developments I'd consider when downsizing to when we leave our 2,800-square foot Westport house. They're all too expensive!

YES, we need more affordable housing. But this Band-aid is one of those tragic "overlord" attempts--like mandating that teachers and police officers change tacks in an attempt to fix systemic societal problems--that will backfire. I'm not saying I have all the answers, or a plan to address inequity, but I know a feel-good boondoggle when I see it.

FWIW, I'm a registered Democrat and I often vote against my own personal interests if I believe it'll lead to a better society.

Please think outside the box here. More development is not the answer to every problem.

Thank you,
Stacy Prince
5 Little Lane