AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. Regular Meeting Minutes
      12-06-2019 Draft Minutes
      2-07-2020 Draft Minutes

3. REVISIONS TO ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS
   A. Potential Short Term Amendments (In Advance of Rewrite)
      Potential amendments include but are not limited to: efficiency units, home occupations, accessory structures, parking, signage, historic villages and administration/enforcement/procedures.
      Short Term Amendments

4. OTHER BUSINESS

5. COMMUNICATIONS

6. FUTURE MEETINGS

7. ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES (NOT YET APPROVED)

Members Present: P. Aho, K. Rawn, V. Ward
Staff Present: L. Painter, J. Kaufman (Pollinator discussion only)

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
Aho called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

MINUTES
Ward MOVED, Rawn seconded approval of the November 15, 2019 minutes as presented. Motion PASSED unanimously.

CONSULTANT SELECTION
Interviews have been scheduled for Monday, December 9th and Tuesday, December 10th. Staff asked if members had any changes to suggested questions provided to members in advance of the meeting; no changes were identified.

REVISIONS TO ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

Draft Pollinator Resolution
Members reviewed the draft Pollinator Resolution and potential ways in which the Zoning Regulations could be updated to support protection of pollinators. Kaufman joined the discussion to answer questions regarding restrictions on use of certain insecticides. Review of previous drafts to address pollinators will be added to the task list for the regulations.

Zoning Map Revisions: Non-residential and Mixed Use Districts
Members reviewed locations and boundaries of proposed Business Cluster and Village Center districts. The following areas were identified as being in need of refinement:

- Eagleville-explore possibility of expanding business district at intersection of 32/275 to better reflect actual uses
- Perkins Corner-review boundary of district on east side of Route 32 at Highland Road
- Spring Hill-review boundary of current NB-1 district and revise to conform to full properties as opposed to split zoning church and inn parcels.

Non-Residential and Mixed Use Districts: Permitted Uses and Development Review Process
Due to time constraints, members agreed to review the draft permitted uses for Business districts prior to the next meeting. Painter reviewed the Norfolk, CT definition and regulations for Bed and Breakfasts and Country Inns. Members expressed support for similar regulations, including adding provisions that would allow for a larger B&B in the RAR-90 district subject to
special permit approval in addition to Country Inns, which would be permitted in Village Center districts by special permit.

COMMUNICATIONS
No communications were received.

FUTURE MEETINGS
Special Meetings have been scheduled for 12/9 and 12/10 for consultant interviews. A follow-up meeting needs to be scheduled to select the preferred firm. Members suggested 12/13; Painter will see whether absent selection committee members Hall, Cooley and Kaufman would be available on that date.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:50 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Linda M. Painter, AICP
Director of Planning and Development
DRAFT MINUTES

Members Present: P. Aho, V. Ward, L. Cooley
Staff Present: L. Painter, J. Kaufman, J. Woodmansee

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Aho called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

MINUTES

Ward MOVED, Cooley seconded approval of the December 19, 2019 special meeting minutes of the Consultant Selection Committee as presented. Motion PASSED unanimously; Kaufman and Painter also voted in favor as members of that committee.

UPDATE ON CONSULTANT NEGOTIATIONS/SCOPE OF WORK FOR ZONING/SUBDIVISION REWRITE

Staff updated members on negotiation of the contract with the selected consultant and reviewed a draft framework/outline. The consultant will meet with staff to review and finalize a draft framework prior to a workshop with the PZC. The PZC workshop will also identify top priorities for the first phase of the rewrite project. Members also discussed preliminary ideas for advisory committee and community engagement in the process. Staff will work with advisory committees to encourage them to identify what they are looking for in the regulations instead of just responding to the draft regulations. Members also discussed the idea of having a joint advisory committee meeting to provide an overview of the process and phase 1 priorities after the PZC workshop. With regard to general community engagement, members expressed a preference for hosting community information workshops after the public hearing draft has been finalized by the PZC.

REVISIONS TO ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

Phasing of Rewrite/Phase 1 Priorities

Members reviewed a draft list of priorities for Phase 1 of the rewrite. Aho expressed interest in moving the reintroduction of the R-40 district to Phase 1 if possible; staff will review with the consultant.

Potential Short Term Amendments (In Advance of Phase 1)

Members reviewed a list of proposed short-term amendments prepared by staff and concurred with the recommendations. Staff will prepare detailed amendments for review by the Committee at the next meeting.

FUTURE MEETINGS

Ward MOVED, Cooley seconded to adopt the revised July 2020 meeting dates as presented at the February 7, 2020 meeting. Motion PASSED unanimously.
ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:20 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Linda M. Painter, AICP
Director of Planning and Development
MEMO

To: Regulatory Review Committee
CC: Jennifer Kaufman, AICP, Senior Planner; Jillene Woodmansee, Planning Specialist/ZEO
From: Linda Painter, AICP, Director
Date: February 7, 2020
Subject: Short-Term Zoning Regulation Amendments

As staff works with the Committee and selected consultant to identify priorities for Phase 1 of the Zoning Rewrite, staff has identified some amendments that we would like to see addressed in the short-term given questions and issues that frequently arise during the permitting and enforcement process. In some cases, we already have draft language that could be adjusted for inclusion in the existing regulations. For others, staff would prioritize drafting language for review at the Committee’s next meeting. This list is what staff has identified to-date; additional items could be added as needed.

SUGGESTED CHANGES RELATED TO PERMITTING/ENFORCEMENT FAQ

Efficiency Units
We have had countless requests over the last few years as well as two requests in the last month regarding the potential for establishing efficiency units in detached structures. The most recent requests were both related to helping residents age in place. As part of work done on the zoning rewrite, there is draft language that would:

- Change the term from efficiency unit to Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)
- Change the review process from Special Permit to Zoning Permit
- Allow ADU’s in detached structures
- Establish specific design standards for ADU’s to compensate for the change from special permit to zoning permit review

Home Occupations
- As this is an even-numbered year, we are once again in the process of renewing home occupation permits. One of the ideas raised as part of the zoning rewrite process was changing the renewal period for home businesses from every even-numbered year to years ending in a 0 or 5.
- Staff also recommends changing the term “bed and breakfast” operations to “transient overnight accommodations” which includes both B&B as well as Airbnb operations. This change would formally codify the interpretation under which we currently operate.
Recent review of the permit section of the regulations indicates that some renumbering may be needed; there appear to be some sections listed under revocation that are broader in nature and should not be shown as a subset of revocation.

**Accessory Structures**

- Article 8, Section B.1.d provides an exception to principal building setbacks for storage sheds provided they do not exceed certain size requirements and are not used as a garage or to house humans or motor vehicles. As this exception is limited to sheds, other accessory structures of similar size (pergolas, gazebos, pavilions) as well as 1-car garages are required to meet principal building setbacks. Staff would recommend that this provision be revised to be more general in nature.

- The Connecticut Building Code currently exempts swimming pools accessory to one-family dwellings that are no more than 24” deep and one-story accessory structures that are 200 square feet or smaller from obtaining a building permit. However, our regulations still require zoning permits for such structures. Staff recommends that the RRC consider exempting these structures from the need to obtain a zoning permit. The structures would still be subject to setback requirements; enforcement of setbacks would be handled through enforcement if setbacks are violated instead of through the permitting process.

**Administration and Enforcement**

- When the Town retained CME to provide Zoning Agent services, one of the recommendations from Mike D’Amato was that we replace the term Certificate of Compliance with Certificate of Completion to clarify that the Certification was being issued based on conformance of construction with approved plans.

- The current organization of Article 11 is confusing; additionally, the procedures for Site Plan Review and Special Permit are currently located in Article 5 and the procedures for Amendments to the Zoning Map and Regulations are located in Article 13. As part of the short-term amendments, staff would like to explore the possibility of replacing these three articles with a different breakdown/organization based on the framework for the new regulations that we will be reviewing with the consultant team. Current options include:
  - Combining all administration, enforcement and procedures into one chapter
  - Combining procedures (zoning permits, site plans, special permits, variances, reg/map amendments) in one article and general administration (ZEO, enforcement, etc. in a separate article)

**Parking**

Article 10, Section D.11 specifies that the required cross-hatch area be located on the right-hand side of each accessible space. This requirement is not consistent with state or federal requirements, which offer more flexibility. Staff recommends that this section be amended to require that accessible spaces conform to state statutes and regulations with regard to number, design and location.

**Signs**

While the entire section needs significant work, one minor fix recommended by staff is clarification regarding public/governmental signs.