

Implementation of PA 21-29 Subcommittee

MINUTES

June 29, 2023

3:00 p.m.

Main Level Meeting Room

ZONING COMM. PRESENT: Mrs. Andersen, Mrs. Hill, Mr. Solley, Mr. White
HOUSING COMM. PRESENT: Mrs. Gorra, Mr. Woodroffe
ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Charles

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

Mr. Solley reported that after having reviewed the document, "Municipal Practice Group Update," by HalloranSage at the previous meeting, the subcommittee had come to a consensus on the following matters. 1. Ten percent Affordable units will be required for MFH projects. "Affordable" is defined in CGS 8-30g, but whether that statute will be referred to in proposed Section 13.12 or whether Affordable will be defined without reference to 8-30g will be determined after a review of the draft by Atty. Zizka. 2. Not all MFH will require a special permit. Some smaller projects as defined in the draft sections 13.12.4.A and B will be by right and will require a site plan review by the Commission. Mr. Solley said he agreed with this decision. Mrs. Andersen also agreed but thought to be consistent, detached accessory apartments should also be by right.

The current regulations concerning accessory apartments were discussed. Mr. Solley noted Washington was not required to comply with Section 6 of PA 21-29 regarding accessory apartments because the Commission and Board of Selectmen had formally opted out per state statute. Mrs. Andersen referred to the language in PA 21-29 and questioned whether changes to Washington's accessory apartment regulations were still needed in order to comply. The reasons such revisions were not required were noted. Mr. White suggested the final draft of Section 13.12 be reviewed by Atty. Zizka who would look for conflicts with PA 21-29.

Mr. Solley recommended the subcommittee focus today on maximum lot coverage permitted for MFH and the total footage and floor area permitted for MFH units.

Lot coverage: Mr. Solley reviewed current section 11.5, which specifies the lot coverage permitted: 15% for lots less than 2 acres in size, 12.5% for lots 2 to 3 acres, and 10% for lots over 3 acres. He asked if the subcommittee thought an increase in lot coverage for

MFH should be granted or whether the current range was adequate. A discussion followed. It was noted that the current regulations also provide the opportunity to apply by special permit for up to a 50% increase in lot coverage and decrease in minimum setback in most business districts when specific standards are met. It was the consensus to use the existing Section 11.5 for MFH projects, noting doing so would be easier to administrate.

During this discussion it was pointed out that in the current draft, MFH was not permitted in New Preston mainly because it is built out and so close to the Aspetuck River. Noting that the local Health Department, CT Dept. of Health, and the Inland Wetlands Commission would all have input regarding how many MFH units a property can support, it was the consensus to broaden Section 13.12 and to permit MFH in the New Preston Business District.

Individual unit size was not specifically addressed except that Mr. Solley noted the current maximum size of accessory apartments is 1200 sq. ft. measured within the walls of the unit and compared this to the typical Quarry Ridge unit which has two stories plus an attached garage with a bonus room above.

Mr. Solley said the current draft permits a maximum 30 MFH units when accessed by a state highway and 20 units when accessed by a town road. He asked about situations where access is from a state highway, but most of the property is within the residential district. Because the traffic generated by MFH developments could be a major concern, it was the consensus to retain the language in the current draft.

Mr. White asked if the number of MFH units per project could be granted a variance. Mrs. Hill questioned whether a petition to amend the regulation might be more appropriate than a variance.

Mrs. Hill noted it was hoped adoption of the MFH regulations would result in some smaller projects in keeping with the appearance of existing neighborhoods. She suggested language be added at the end of Section 13.12.6 to state that adaptive reuse of existing buildings is encouraged. Mr. Solley thought "encouraged" should be changed to "permitted." It was also thought "conversion" should be substituted for "reuse." It was agreed this sentence should be added as 13.12.6.J.

Mrs. Hill will send out a draft #7 to all to review prior to the next meeting. Any comments or problems should be sent to Mr. Solley. If everyone is satisfied with that draft, it will be referred to Atty.

Zizka for review. If another meeting is needed before the draft is sent to Atty. Zizka, it will be held on July 13.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill