See attached – also the point raised by Greg from Keller about the idea of allowing developers to give a utility allowance for internet to projects is something worth looking into as more cost effective for both residents and property owners.  It is true that bundling for phone/internet/cable is pretty common and offers cheaper access than stand-alone service like the property would have to provide.  Owner-provided Internet feels a bit like something that sounded good ten years ago but with bundling or unlimited cell data plans it’s a bit hard to believe access to the Internet is a problem for anyone these days.

Thanks – one other thought on the proposed definition of infill and how having to redevelop sites is a barrier: in nearly every case this would require a rezone, and while in tough economic conditions or depressed local economies I have found municipalities are open to the idea, in a stable economy or healthy local economy they usually really hate to downzone properties from a commercial use to residential and I have been shot down on that more than once in the middle of the IN application round as a result.   Generally it comes down to a) they feel you are trying to shoehorn in residential in an area that local planning feels is better suited for other uses, and b) they get more in property taxes from commercial than residential both thanks to the state rates on different property types and property valuations.