Racial Bias Case

By MATTHEW L. WALD

GLASTONBURY

MOST of this town's 52,5 square miles are covered with expensive single-family homes, and town officials and residents like it that way. Even so, the Justice Department charged last week that the town's housing policy was racist. With United States Attorney Richard Blumenthal confirming last week that similar allegations were being investigated in other towns, the Glastonbury case could set an important precedent.

Mr. Blumenthal, speaking to reporters, declined to name the towns and would not say whether the Justice Department's investigation would lead to additional litigation.

Almost all of Glastonbury's 27,000 residents are white. The complaint filed in Federal District Court by the Justice Department noted that Hartford, five miles to the northeast, was 27.9 percent black and 7.3 percent Hispanic, according to the 1970 census.

Glastonbury, according to the Justice Department, "has pursued a policy and practice of preventing the development of racially integrated low- and moderate-income housing," by rejecting two proposals for such housing in 1978 and 1979 that were "anticipated to have substantial numbers of black and Hispanic residents." At the same time, the town was approving development of more expensive multifamily housing "whose residents are anticipated to be exclusively or predominantly white," the complaint said.

Town officials who rejected the proposal - thereby denying minority-group members rights they are guaranteed under the Fair Housing Act of 1968 - did so either because they themselves wished to keep blacks and Hispanics out, or "because of community opposition which is at least in part racially motivated," according to the complaint.

Richard S. Borden Jr., the town manager, denied the charges. "We disagree with the allegations contained in the complaint and feel the town has not discriminated and certainly does not have an objective the exclusion of low- and moderate-income housing in the Town of Glastonbury," he said.

"Whatever was done was proper planning and zoning practice," said Harvey A. Katz, the town attorney. Mr. Katz contended that it would be up to the Justice Department to prove racist intent.

The remedies sought in the complaint are not specific. It would, for example, bar Glastonbury from "exercising its municipal powers in any manner which has the purpose or effect of excluding persons on account of race, color, or national origin," and calls for "all appropriate affirmative actions to correct the effects of its past discriminatory practices and insure the full enjoyment of the right to equal housing opportunity, including such affirmative steps as will lead to the development of an appropriate number of units of racially integrated low- and moderate-income housing."

In practice, if a judge ruled against Glastonbury, he might demand that the town produce a housing plan for his approval, the way other cities found guilty of school segregation have been required to develop busing plans.

Proving discriminatory intent may be difficult.

"It's ludicrous," said T. James Murray Jr., the chairman of the Town Planning and Zoning Commission. "Glastonbury probably has the most sensitive record in providing housing for low- and moderate-income people in the greater Hartford area."

Mr. Murray listed a 195-unit public housing project with subsidized rents, and a church-sponsored development of about 50 units. In addition, he said, the town had approved 300 to 400 units of condominium housing that sold in the low $20,000 range early in the last decade.

The two projects cited by the Justice Department, Mr. Murray and others said, were turned down for specific reasons that had nothing to do with who might move in. The minutes of Planning and Zoning Commission meetings and Town Council meetings that considered the projects - minutes that were examined by Justice Department lawyers last summer and may become part of the evidence against Glastonbury - included such objections as the lack of sidewalks and schools.

In at least one instance, a member of the audience at a hearing complained about "niggers" who might move in. Whether town officials were bowing to a racist sentiment in the community when they rejected the project is likely to be an issue in court.

According to Henry Kinne, a Republican member of the Town Council and its chairman in the late 70's when his party was in the majority, "There are three reasons, and it's hard to distinguish between them."

One is what he called "the no-growth syndrome." "The last people who come in want to be able to look at the cornfields," he said. "Just lately we've had some $125,000 condominiums come in, and there's just as much wrath and talk and reasons why we don't want those in."

In addition, he said, "There are some economic feelings about poor people, and there are some racial feelings."

But even if "racial feelings," as Mr. Kinne put it, are proved, it remains to be seen whether they were a factor in the rejection of these projects.

According to Richard Eigen, the director of community development, the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development had approved a "marketing program" for the apartments under which the town could "affirmatively market the housing within the confines of the community, for the first three or four months."

The project would probably have been all right anyway. The Town Council knew that, Mr. Kinne said. "I don't think the fact that the Planning and Zoning commission turned down any project is to do anything in the color, he said.

But Glastonbury - the tenth town in the nation to be sued for housing discrimination under this law - may be facing an unspoken issue, the violation of an agreement with a Federal agency, as a requirement of H.U.D.'s Community Development Block Grant Program, the town submitted a long-term development program in which it committed itself to building more low-income housing.

"We said we'd do it, and we didn't do it," said Mr. Kinne. With the rejection of the two projects listed in the Justice Department's suits, H.U.D. cut off money to Glastonbury, which withdrew from the program.
Justice Department Sues Yonkers, N.Y., Glastonbury, Conn., in Segregation Cases

The suit also charged the city and the Yonkers Community Development Agency with allocating almost all subsidized housing in minority communities.

The suit filed in federal court in New York asks that these local government agencies be barred from continuing the alleged discriminatory practices. It also asks that they be ordered to develop a housing integration plan and a school desegregation plan for the next school year.

The Glastonbury suit charges that the suburb refused to approve proposals to build housing for poor and middle-income persons, while endorsing multifamily housing for the wealthy. The suit says this violates the Fair Housing Act of 1968. It asks that the town, whose population is 27,000, be ordered to clear the way for construction of integrated housing for persons with lower incomes. The suit was filed in federal court in Hartford.

Responding to the Justice Department suit, Dr. Joan Raymond, superintendent of schools in Yonkers said:

"Regardless of whatever court action may result, it is our intention to continue to negotiate with the federal government to amicably resolve the matter."

The Associated Press reported the superintendent said, "We shall continue our work with the community towards meeting our stated objective of integrating the Yonkers public schools during the 1980-81 school year."

Southern Peru Co. Can't Deliver Dyno Copper

NEW YORK — Southern Peru Copper Corp. said it couldn't meet its 1980 production goals because of a strike by workers at its copper mines in Peru due to a strike.

The strike began Nov. 2 at Chuquicamata, a mine in Peru, affecting many of Peru's largest copper facilities.

Orient-Karely

Johnson Products Says It Can't Collect Loan To Chief's Late Brother

CHICAGO — Johnson Products Co. says it can't collect on a $59,718 loan it made to the late John E. Johnson, a former vice president of the company and brother of its chairman and chief executive officer, George E. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson also is executor of the estate of his brother, who died in June 1979.

The loan default and George Johnson's possibly conflicting roles were disclosed in

Steel Production Fell 0.8% in Latest Week

Steel production at the nation's mills last week fell 0.8% to 2,733,000 net tons, from 2,791,000 tons in the previous week, but was 4.5% above the 2,270,000 tons produced a year earlier.

The American Iron and Steel Institute said the nation's steel industry used 80.4% of its production capability last week, compared with 81% the previous week and 78.5% a year ago.

Separately, the institute reported that steel imports in October totaled 1,141,000 long tons.
December 8, 1980

Mr. Raymond F. Robinson, Editor/Publisher
The Manchester Evening Herald
16 Brainard Place
Manchester, Connecticut 06040

Dear Mr. Robinson:

I read with great interest the observations contained in your editorial of December 3, 1980 entitled "Federal Harrassment". The editorial really does give a very candid and blunt summary of the entire problem of the U.S. Justice Department suing the Town of Glastonbury and other communities.

On both a personal and professional basis, I have to agree with your conclusion that it is patently unfair for HUD, through the U. S. Justice Department, to haul a town into court and accuse the town of racist motivation simply because people express their objection to a zone change and a Town Council agreed and declined to grant the change. In my view, to intimidate free expression by citizens at a public hearing is counter to the American Democratic process.

Very truly yours,

Richard S. Borden Jr.
Town Manager

RSB:cm
Editorial

Federal harassment

Those in Manchester who have been fighting federal control of town affairs probably can be most sympathetic with the people of Glastonbury who now face a lawsuit because the Justice Department again is indicating an entire community for racism.

Jimmy Carter's Justice Department has filed suit against Glastonbury contending decisions based on town zoning ordinances were racist motivated.

The lame-duck Justice Department is expanding its proven pattern of harassment by filing suit against another town.

Those, who during the recent Community Development Block Grant campaign claimed a yes vote would have no impact on town zoning, apparently have been proven wrong by this case in Glastonbury.

The federal government, by suing the town, is again attempting to take local control out of local hands, placing zoning decisions in the hands of bureaucrats with no interest in the character of the town.

We are led to believe this suit is clear and simple harassment by the Justice Department.

A convincing case could be made, that the Justice Department, in the waning days of the Carter administration, is trying to set up a case load that could be used later to embarrass President-elect Reagan.

On Jan. 20, Reagan will take office with a new attorney general. The new Justice Department will have to decide whether or not it will pursue pending cases.

We think the Glastonbury suit is an attempt to place the Reagan Justice Department in a position where it could be accused of tolerating racism.

Much ado could, and probably will, be made of Reagan administration abandonment of suits that have racial overtones.

At first reading it could be made to appear the new president is following some kind of a new policy of the hated and remembered "Benign Neglect" of the Nixon administration.

Glastonbury, like Manchester, is not a community of racial hatred.

But the Justice Department is trying to make it appear as if the control of local zoning and development by local people is some sinister plot to prevent racial minorities from finding homes in town.

The federal government is again trying to take more control of our daily lives away from elected local decision-makers and give it to bureaucrats who probably have little appreciation for the character of our communities.

It is another step in the kind of social engineering the federal department of Housing and Urban Development has made famous.

Towns are told they will continue to control their own destiny. But when local decisions disagree with HUD, towns may expect to be hauled into court and accused of racist motivation.

We are convinced that those with prejudiced viewpoints are a small minority.

When acts and opinions of racial or ethnic hatred are expressed by individuals, those individuals should be held accountable.

But to indict an entire community because the town zoning ordinances do not comply with the grand social scheme of HUD is wrong and contrary to the American tradition.
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CONNECTICUT,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2
COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, United States of America, alleges that:

1. This is an action brought by the Attorney General on
behalf of the United States of America pursuant to Title VIII of
the Civil Rights Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. §3601, et seq. (hereinafter
the Fair Housing Act).

2. This Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to

3. The defendant, Town of Glastonbury, is a municipality
in the County of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

4. The Town of Glastonbury has a land area of approximately
53 square miles. It lies approximately five miles southeast of
the City of Hartford, Connecticut, and is a residential suburb of
Hartford.

5. In 1970 the population of the Town of Glastonbury consisted
of approximately 27,000 persons, of whom more than 99% were white.

6. In 1970 the population of the City of Hartford consisted
of approximately 158,000 persons, of whom approximately 27.9% were
black and approximately 7.5% were Hispanic.
7. The Town of Glastonbury exercises general municipal powers, including zoning and building permit authority, over the real property within its borders.

8. The defendant has pursued a policy and practice of preventing the development of racially integrated low and moderate income housing in Glastonbury. This policy and practice has been implemented, among other ways, as follows:
   a. By failing and refusing to grant the necessary approvals for the development of low and moderate income multi-family housing which is anticipated to have substantial numbers of black and hispanic residents (such as, for example, the "River Meadows" project in 1978, and the "Nye Road" project in 1979), while granting the necessary approvals for the development of higher income multi-family housing whose residents are anticipated to be exclusively or predominantly white;
   b. By failing and refusing to grant the necessary approvals for the development of low and moderate income multi-family housing which is anticipated to have substantial numbers of black and hispanic residents (such as, for example, the projects referred to in subparagraph 8(a), supra), because of community opposition, which is at least in part racially motivated; and
   c. By failing and refusing adequately to meet its obligations with respect to low and moderate income family housing during the years when it was
participating in the federal Community Development Block Grant program.

9. The low and moderate income housing units that would have been or would be developed in the absence of the policy and practice described in paragraph 8, supra, would be dwellings, as defined by 42 U.S.C. §3602(b).

10. The actions of the defendant described in paragraph 8, supra, have had the purpose and effect of limiting the opportunity for black and hispanic persons to obtain housing in the Town of Glastonbury and maintaining the Town's virtually all-white character.

11. The actions of the defendant described in paragraph 8, supra, constitute:

   a. A pattern or practice of resistance by the defendant to the full enjoyment of rights granted by the Fair Housing Act; and
   b. A denial to groups of persons of the rights granted by the Fair Housing Act, which denial raises an issue of general public importance.

Specifically, the defendant's conduct has denied housing and made housing unavailable to black and hispanic persons because of race, color, or national origin, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §3604(a), and has interfered with the exercise or enjoyment of rights granted to developers and potential residents by the Fair Housing Act, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §3617.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff prays that this Court enter an order enjoining the defendant Town of Glastonbury, its officers, agents, employees, successors, and all those in active concert or participation with it or any of them, from:
a. Engaging in any conduct which denies, abridges, or interferes with the exercise of any right secured by the Fair Housing Act;

b. Exercising its municipal powers in any manner which has the purpose or effect of excluding persons on account of race, color, or national origin from residing in the Town of Glastonbury; and

c. Failing or refusing to take all appropriate affirmative actions to correct the effects of its past discriminatory practices and ensure the full enjoyment of the right to equal housing opportunity, including such affirmative steps as will lead to the development of an appropriate number of units of racially integrated low and moderate income housing in the Town of Glastonbury.
Plaintiff further prays for such additional relief as the interests of justice may require, together with the costs and disbursements of this action.

BENJAMIN R. CIVILETTI  
Attorney General

By:  
DREW S. DAYS III  
Assistant Attorney General

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL  
United States Attorney

ROBERT J. REINSTEIN  

JOEL L. SELIG  

CARL W. GABEL  
IRIS MCCOLLUM GREEN  
Attorneys  
General Litigation Section  
Civil Rights Division  
Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
(202) 633-2856
An Unused Welcome Mat?

Glastonbury has agreed to put a welcome mat out for low-income home-seekers. The only problem is, the mat has no doorstep to go along with it.

The town struck a favorable deal in the consent decree that ends the Justice Department's discrimination suit. But there is little reason to believe that the agreement will produce any new homes for the poor.

No decision was reached on whether the virtually all-white community discriminated against low-income people, especially from minority groups, thereby violating the 1968 Fair Housing Act. The Justice Department raised its case after Glastonbury rejected two low-income housing proposals in 1978 and 1979, although other allegations of discrimination were also noted in court.

Under the terms of the deal, Glastonbury effectively agrees not to block new low-income housing at a time when interest rates remain prohibitively high and housing subsidy money has all but dried up.

The town will pass an unusual resolution welcoming people of all races, colors, creeds and national origins. In other words, Glastonbury will publicly acknowledge that it joins other enlightened people in opposition to bigotry.

Other parts of the agreement call for the town to expedite low-income housing, although it will be up to Glastonbury to decide on specifics.

Local officials, who have consistently denied any intention to discriminate, have said they will not need to make many changes in housing development procedures.

The toothless agreement is further evidence that the federal government, under the current administration, has little interest in fighting discrimination cases. Last year, for example, the Justice Department decided not to appeal a federal court decision that cleared Manchester of racial discrimination.

The department has only filed two minor fair housing suits nationally in the past two years.

One can hope that skepticism about the Glastonbury agreement will prove unwarranted, that more low-income housing will be built in the town. Perhaps local officials will rise to the occasion and put meaning into their high-minded resolutions with aggressive, practical plans that will help ease housing problems for the poor in Greater Hartford.

But people will have every reason to doubt the town's sincerity if all it can show after the agreement is an untread-upon welcome mat.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff

vs.

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CONNECTICUT, Defendant

CIVIL ACTION NO.: H-80-770

NOVEMBER 17, 1982

CONSENT DEEDRE

The plaintiff United States, on December 1, 1980, instituted this action against the defendant Town of Glastonbury, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§3613 and 3617, seeking relief for alleged violations of the Fair Housing Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. §3601 et seq.

The Town of Glastonbury maintains that it has pursued policies and practices supportive of and conforming with the Fair Housing Act, and denies that it has violated the Act's provisions. The parties wish to avoid the uncertainty and expense of litigation. Accordingly, without an adjudication on the merits, the parties agree to resolve this case by entry of the following consent decree, the purpose of which is to promote equal housing opportunities within the Town for low and moderate-income families. Findings of fact and conclusions of law are waived.
I. INJUNCTION

It is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREE that the defendant Town of Glastonbury, Connecticut, its officers, officials, agents, servants, successors and all persons in active concert or participation with any of them, are hereby permanently enjoined from:

A. Engaging in any conduct which violates the Fair Housing Act and denies, abridges, or interferes with the exercise of any right secured by said Act; and

B. Exercising its municipal powers in any manner which has the purpose of excluding persons on account of race, color or national origin from developing, buying, leasing or residing in any housing in the Town of Glastonbury.

II. FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

It is further ORDERED that the defendant Town of Glastonbury, its elected and appointed officials, employees and their successors shall undertake the following affirmative steps to encourage and aid in the full enjoyment of equal housing opportunity:

A. Assist Developers

(1) The Town shall cooperate with and aid any potential developer of or applicant for approval of proposed low or moderate-
income rental housing by providing all available information concerning such matters as the existence of sites for such housing, zoning procedures, environmental data, traffic patterns and roads, and existing and proposed public improvements and facilities, to the extent permitted by applicable Federal, State and Town laws and ordinances. To this end, the Town shall, within three (3) months after the entry of this decree, identify areas containing potential sites within its borders generally appropriate for the construction of multi-family rental housing for low and moderate-income families; and the Town shall provide such information, along with any information it has with respect to the availability of such sites, to potential developers and applicants. Identification of any such areas containing such potential sites shall not by itself change nor be construed as indicating a future change of the designation of the site's underlying zone existing at the time such identification is made; the usual procedure for effectuating zone changes shall remain applicable in all respects.

(2) The Town shall expedite to the extent permitted by applicable Federal, State and Town laws and ordinances, and reasonable under all attendant circumstances, the review and evaluation process for low and moderate-income rental housing
applications, the publication of all relevant notices, the arrange-
ment of meetings with staff and appropriate officials and Town
Boards and Commissions; and the scheduling of board or commission
hearings and public hearings.

(3) The Town shall sponsor and conduct, through the
Town Human Relations Commission, public and private educational
meetings, seminars and conferences, for real estate brokers
and agents, Town officials and employees with responsibilities
under this decree, residents, and builders and developers, to
acquaint such persons with the provisions of all Federal, State
and Local fair housing laws; the zoning regulations; developer
incentives which may be considered and allowed in appropriate
applications; the procedures applicable to the proposed development
and construction of low and moderate-income multi-family housing
units within the Town; the generally appropriate and available
areas having sites for such proposed development; and the provi-
sions of this decree. Such meetings, seminars and conferences
shall be offered and conducted at least bi-annually during the
period within which this decree remains in force and effect.

(4) The Town shall encourage prospective developers
of low and moderate-income rental housing to locate projects
in Glastonbury by making it known to such developers, as outlined
above, at such time as an application is filed, or upon written or personal inquiry at the Office of Community Development, that the following incentives may be considered and allowed where the need for one or more such incentives is demonstrated in a particular development for which application has been made, and where such incentives would be appropriate and allowable under applicable State and Town laws and ordinances:

(a) Increased densities;
(b) Relaxation of other cost-increasing land use or zoning controls;
(c) Tax abatements;
(d) Assistance and support for prospective developers of low and moderate-income rental housing to help them obtain construction loans and other forms of financing and subsidies through meetings with, appearances before and correspondence with such agencies as the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, the Connecticut State Department of Housing, and such other federal, state or private sources of funding or subsidy as may be available.

(5) The Town shall encourage prospective developers of multi-unit rental housing to set aside 15 to 20 percent of their
units for rental to low and moderate-income tenants at a below
market rental by making it known to such developers, as outlined
above, at such time as an application is filed, or upon written
or personal inquiry at the Office of Community Development,
that appropriate incentives such as those described in paragraph
II(A)(4) above, may be considered and allowed where the need
for one or more such incentives is demonstrated in a particular
development for which application has been made, and where such
incentives would be appropriate and allowable under applicable
State and Town laws and ordinances.

(6) Nothing in this decree is to be construed as
preventing the Town from exercising its discretion, consistent
with the purpose of this decree and applicable state laws and
town ordinances, as to which incentives, if any, shall be granted
in any particular case. The Town shall make the availability
of the various incentives known to prospective developers, who
then may apply to the appropriate Town body for the consideration
of a request for a particular incentive.

(7) The Town shall inform developers that low and
moderate income rental units produced with assistance provided
pursuant to this decree must be affirmatively marketed in an
effort to attract tenants of all races, colors and national
origins.

(8) The Town, through its Human Relations Commission, or other appropriate designated agency, shall implement an affirmative marketing plan in an effort to attract tenants of all races, colors and national origins, and assist developers of low and moderate-income rental units in their affirmative marketing efforts, as follows:

(a) Publicize to the Hartford area minority community the availability of housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, color, or national origin by placing advertisements in the Hartford Courant and in at least one local newspaper which circulates principally in the Hartford area minority community, at such times as rental units in public housing are available or are anticipated to become available. The advertisements shall appear in such size and frequency as is compatible with budgetary restraints;

(b) Contact the Hartford Housing Authority, as well as outreach or social services oriented organizations which serve the Hartford area minority community, for referrals of prospective tenants at such times as vacancies in public or privately owned low and moderate-income rentals are known to exist or are anticipated; and
(c) Refer such prospective minority tenants to the Town’s Public Housing Authority and to the managers of privately-owned buildings in which low and moderate-income rental units are located and are known or anticipated to be available.

(d) Insofar as the Glastonbury Housing Authority and its units are herein concerned, the obligations hereunder are subject to and may otherwise be limited by the H.U.D. regulations and H.U.D. approved policies and agreements applicable thereto, and also to the waiting lists already in place at the time of entry of this decree.

E. Enact a Fair Housing Resolution

Within thirty (30) days of the entry of this decree, the Town shall enact a Fair Housing Resolution welcoming persons of all races, colors, creeds and national origins to reside in the Town and setting forth a policy of nondiscrimination in all aspects of housing within its borders.

III. COMPLIANCE REPORTS AND INSPECTION OF RECORDS

It is further ORDERED that:

A. Within four (4) months after the entry of this decree, and every four (4) months thereafter for the period
for which this decree remains in force and effect, the Town shall serve on counsel for plaintiff a report containing the following information:

(1) Documentation of the Town's activities conducted pursuant to paragraph II(A)(3);

(2) Copies of all affirmative advertising placed pursuant to paragraph II(A)(8);

(3) A list of each private housing complex by project name, address, size (number of units), and developer to which the provisions of paragraph II(A)(5) have been applied;

(4) The name, address, and phone number of each developer of low and moderate-income housing who has applied to the Town for the incentives offered to such developers pursuant to paragraph II(A)(4), or who has inquired in writing for information regarding such incentives;

(5) A list of each multi-family P.A.D. complex of over Twenty (20) units by project name, address, size (number of units), and developer, approved by the Town's zoning authority.

B. The Town shall maintain and retain until the expiration of this decree any and all records which are the source of, or contain, any information pertinent to its responsibilities under this decree. The United States shall be permitted if
it deems it necessary to conduct inspections of such records to ascertain the Town's compliance with the provisions of this decree.

IV. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION AND DISSOLUTION

The Court shall retain jurisdiction of this case for purposes of observing compliance for a period of two years, it being understood that during such time the plaintiff shall have the right to move the Court for appropriate relief should the defendant be in violation of this decree.

This decree shall be dissolved by its own terms two years after its entry without the need for application or motion of counsel, and the Court shall thereafter be divested of jurisdiction as to this matter.

Nov. 17, 1952

[Signature]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The undersigned apply for and consent to the entry of this Order:

For the Defendant, Town of Glastonbury

William S. Rogers, of Alcorn, Bakewell & Smith
One American Row
Hartford, CT 06103
Tel. (203) 522-1216
Its Attorneys

For the Plaintiff, United States of America

Iris McCollum Green
IRIS MCCOLLUM GREEN
United States Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
General Litigation Section
Washington, D.C. 20530
Attorney
(202) 633-2856

THE GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL:

Henry A. Kinne, Chairman
Seymour H. Geyn
Seyna F. Rogers
George F. Adamson

Richmond Perley
Marcia Erley
Allen Pfeffer
Richard S. Beeder

Walter J. Cusson
William E. Ferris
Lois A. Muraro
While 2 Clastonyndury Projects Lose Out

BY KRISTINA GOODNOUGH

Hartford Courant, April 1, 1981
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Town To Submit Housing Report
Glastonbury Outlines Efforts to U.S. In Move Stemming From Bias Suit

By JAN TOMAS
Courant Correspondent

GLASTONBURY — Town Manager Richard S. Borden Jr. will send the U.S. Justice Department the town's first report Tuesday on its efforts to attract low- and moderate-priced housing.

The report will be very thin. "We're still organizing," Borden said last week. "We should be able to beef up the next reports."

The statement is the first in a two-year series of reports to be delivered to the Justice Department every four months under the terms of a consent decree the town signed Nov. 17, settling a Justice Department housing discrimination suit against Glastonbury.

The Justice Department charged the town has been guilty of racial bias in its housing and land-use policies. The suit was filed after the town rejected two proposals for low-income housing in 1978 and 1979.

In the decree, the town promised to encourage minority residents to move to the nearly all-white town and to assist developers of low-income or multi-family housing.

In its first report, the town will tell the Justice Department that:

- Conducted a lottery in February to select two moderate-income buyers for new condominiums being offered at below-market rates under a new Planning and Zoning Commission policy. The condominiums will be sold for $25,500, while the 21 other units in the development will be priced at more than $70,000.

- Drew up a map of Glastonbury that designates areas that developers might consider for multi-family housing. The areas are close to commercial centers in the north and south parts of town, where utilities are accessible.

- Adopted a resolution that welcomes minorities into the community and encourages developers to provide housing for low- and moderate-income families.

- Began a revision of the Planned Area of Development, which designates where high-density development is permitted. The revision would increase the number of areas where such development is possible.

- Discussed the possibility of offering tax abatements to induce development of low-priced or moderately priced housing. A tax abatement was given for a recently constructed elderly housing complex of 110 units.

- Organized three fair-housing workshops for developers, real estate agents and prospective renters or buyers. The workshops will be held in April.

The town says it has taken positive action on four of the five major requirements of the consent decree. It has not been able to attract developers of multi-family rental housing for moderate- or low-income people.

Although town officials feel pressured by the federal government to comply with the consent decree, they say such housing cannot be built until the economy improves. Federal housing subsidies for multi-family housing are practically non-existent, developers and planners say, and, without them, construction is economically unfeasible.

"If you could count the apartments built (excluding those for the elderly) in the last five years in the 25-town area around Hartford, you'd be astonished" how low it is, Kenneth Leslie, the town planner, said. "That's the key. Rental housing stock is not economically viable."

The town hasn't moved on the most difficult problem it must solve, changing its zoning to encourage low- and moderate-income housing development.

Town Council Chairman Henry Kinne said last week that controversy is sure to surround the action of a subcommittee of Town Council members and planning officials charged with revising density regulations.

Increasing density around the commercial centers "is about all we can do. We can't affect the market very much," Kinne said. Kinne said one factor that might make it easier for residents to accept changes that would result in construction of low- and moderate-income housing is that all of those who move into that housing would not be from out of town. Many of those who need affordable housing are residents — young couples who grew up in town and now want to buy their own homes.

While town officials say they are committed to fair housing that residents will accept for low-income housing.

There was considerable neighborhood opposition to development of 42 units of moderate-priced condominiums on South Hollow. The Town Council approved the development; the action was overturned in court.

Hartford Superior Court Arnold Aronson ruled in December that the eight-acre project could not be developed because it had not been designated an area allowing high-density development.

There have been other instances in the past few years when residents have opposed high-density, moderately priced housing.

Residents have successfully opposed three housing projects that would grant residents federal Section 8 rent subsidies. The projects would require the development of two projects that would have included single-family, moderately priced houses.

One project, Tara Hills, a development of single-family homes for moderate-income people, was approved and completed by

See Glastonbury, Page C2
The town has developed a map showing several areas containing potential sites for multi-family rental housing for all income level residents. The map, and encouragement for developers to consider Glastonbury, is being circulated in area trade papers.

"Theoretically, we could draw a big circle around the town and say there are sites available," Town Manager Dick Borden explained.

"What we have done is shown those areas where our present zoning indicates a possible higher density and where roads and utilities are in place."

There is to be no effort, Borden said, to designate specific sites. "If there's a for sale sign up, or if someone calls and asks us to pass the word along that his property is on the market, then we'll advise potential developers of those sites," Borden said.

"But we would never indicate that so-and-so's property would be a good spot and urge the developer to go knocking on doors."

The purpose of the map is to carry out the spirit of the agreement reached with the U.S. Justice Department last December in the housing lawsuit settlement. The town stated that it would continue to encourage developers to construct lower and moderate income housing: the map and legal advertisements being placed are simply an emphasis of this point, Borden said.

The designated areas are taken directly from the existing zoning map, with no changes or additions, but the 'potential areas' could provide a surprise or two for those who live in those neighborhoods and aren't aware of the possible higher density provisions.

Any developer proposals made in response to this promotion will be given the same thorough review under existing regulations and zoning laws that all other proposals receive, Borden assures.
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