

**TOWN OF COLUMBIA
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Adella G. Urban Administrative Offices Conference Room
323 Route 87, Columbia, CT
Monday, July 8, 2024 7:00 pm

Regular Meeting – HYBRID

Join Zoom Meeting:
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/8531359919>

Meeting ID: **853 1359 9919**

or join by phone 1-646-558-8656 same ID.

THIS IS A HYBRID PUBLIC MEETING. THE PUBLIC CAN ATTEND IN-PERSON OR ELECTRONICALLY. THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THIS AGENDA CONTAINS THE LINK TO ACCESS THE MEETING ELECTRONICALLY.

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES**
- 3. ADDITIONS/CHANGES TO AGENDA**
- 4. APPROVAL OF PZC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES of June 24, 2024**
- 5. AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS**
- 6. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING:**
 - 6.1 PZC 2324-05:** Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Sections 21.2.3.11, Replace current Section 52.7.19, and Eliminate Section 52.7.21, for Multi-Family Dwellings. **(Received 5/13/24)**
 - 6.2 PZC 2324-06:** Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Sections 8.3 for Accessory Dwelling Units and Two-Family Dwellings. **(Received 5/13/24) (Amended 6/27/24)**
 - 6.3 PZC 2324-07:** Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Section 9 Definition of Structure. **(Received 5/13/24)**
- CLOSE OR SCHEDULE TO CONTINUE PUBLIC HEARING**
- 7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (Discussion/Possible Action)**

- 7.1. PZC 2324-05:** Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Sections 21.2.3.11, Replace current Section 52.7.19, and Eliminate Section 52.7.21, for Multi-Family Dwellings. **(Discussion/Possible Action or Public Hearing Continuation)**
- 7.2. PZC 2324-06:** Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Sections 8.3 for Accessory Dwelling Units and Two-Family Dwellings. **(Discussion/Possible Action or Public Hearing Continuation) (Amended 6/27/24)**
- 7.3 PZC 2324-07:** Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Section 9 Definition of Structure. **(Discussion/Possible Action or Public Hearing Continuation)**

8. NEW BUSINESS (Discussion/Possible Action)

9. REGULATION REVISIONS (Discussion)

10. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS:

- 10.1** CT Chapter of the American Planning Assoc. Housing Forum

11. COMMISSION OPEN DISCUSSION:

12. AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS:

13. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

14. ADJOURNMENT

**TOWN OF COLUMBIA
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Adella G. Urban Administrative Offices Conference Room
323 Route 87, Columbia, CT
Monday, June 24, 2024 7:00 pm

Regular Meeting – HYBRID

MINUTES

Members Present: Chairman Rick Nassiff, Vice-Chair Justin Riendeau (via Zoom), Vera Englert, Thomas Currier, Dave Holcroft, Robert Powell, Walter Tabor, Larry Preston (Alternate)

Members Excused: Ed Madrak (Alternate)

Staff Present: Town Planner John Guskowski (via Zoom), Fire Marshal Mike Lester, Board Clerk Mary Kay Hyman

Others Present: 28 Members of the Public (6 via Zoom and 22 in-Person) and 2 Members of the CoDE were present.

1. CALL TO ORDER: R. Nassiff called the meeting to order at **7:04 PM**.

2. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES:

No Seating of Alternates – All members present

3. ADDITIONS/CHANGES TO AGENDA: None

4. APPROVAL OF PZC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES of May 13, 2024

R. Powell **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes of May 13, 2024 as presented; R. Nassiff **SECONDED; MOTION PASSED 8:0:0**

5. AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS:

R. Nassiff reviewed the guidelines for conducting a Public Hearing.

6. OPEN PUBLIC HEARING: R. Nassiff **OPENED** the Public Hearing at **7:05 PM**

R. Nassiff explained that members of the Commission did hold several meetings as a Subcommittee over several months, which were open to the public, to discuss these Amendments. He thanked the members of the CoDE for their attendance and input at these meetings. He then stated that all three Amendment Applications will be addressed together and read them into the record.

6.1 PZC 2324-05: Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Sections 21.2.3.11, Replace current Section 52.7.19, and Eliminate Section 52.7.21, for Multi-Family Dwellings. **(Received 5/13/24)**

6.2 PZC 2324-06: Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Sections 8.3 for Accessory Dwelling Units and Two-Family Dwellings. **(Received 5/13/24)**

6.3 PZC 2324-07: Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Section 9 Definition of Structure. (Received 5/13/24)

J. Riendeau presented a detailed Power Point (see attached), explaining the Regulation Amendments.

R. Nassiff asked for input from the Subcommittee members and the Town Planner.

W. Tabor stated he is in favor of the changes.

R. Nassiff stated he is also in favor based on the difficulty and expense of building in the State of CT and the need to provide affordable housing for family members and possible caretakers. These changes could allow for multifamily developments on larger lots with no restrictions on who lives there and allowing people to use their land how they choose to. He stated the Commission is trying to eliminate Regulations where they are not needed and make the process simpler to understand.

J. Guskowski stated that these changes are more of a philosophical change to the Regulations than a physical change to the Town. He stated a lot of this language already existed in the Regulations such as Multifamily Regulations in the Commercial District and Retirement Housing Regulations and that this consolidated and simplified a lot of that. He stated he does not feel that these changes will lead to thousands of units on the drawing board, but it will open things up to more areas of the Town and to a broader age and income spectrum, which is important.

T. Currier stated he thought that the 750 sq. ft. was going to be upped to 900 sq. ft.

R. Nassiff said this is something up for discussion and they want to hear input from the public.

W. Tabor replied to T. Currier that the 750 sq. ft. max is applicable to homes of 2000 sq. ft. or less.

Carol Kubala of 37 Lake Road stated she is in favor of the changes and that she would prefer the 750 sq. ft. be increased to 900 sq. ft. She then asked if there is a minimum or maximum to the allowable size home built in Columbia. She also asked where the 30% for an Accessory Dwelling came from, because 30% of a 5,000 sq. ft. home would be a much larger unit.

W. Tabor stated that is essentially the case.

R. Powell added, based on the 30%, if you have a 2001 sq. ft. home, the Maximum would be 600 sq. ft., which is less than the 750 sq. ft.

R. Nassiff stated the 30% was comprised to keep the structures/additions in character with the neighborhood. He stated they are trying to address real needs without a lot of rules. He stated you could theoretically put an Accessory Dwelling unit on your property and rent it out, but that is not a level of Regulation for the Subcommittee. He stated based on the current Regulations, taking the existing lot coverage limitations into consideration, a homeowner already could have built a larger structure. He stated the Subcommittee wanted the Regulations changes to be Accessory in general as opposed to a two-family house.

Millie Ramsey of 100 Hunt Road asked what the lot limitations for the footprint of a building is.

R. Nassif replied 10% on Conforming lots and theoretically 15% on a Non-Conforming lot.

R. Powell stated there are of course Set Back limits as well as Septic System and Well locations that affect the potential size of a structure.

Millie Ramsey asked if her 2690 sq. ft home on 2 acres at 30 % would allow for a detached 807 sq ft structure according to the proposed Regulations.

R. Nassiff stated yes, those would be the guidelines under the current Regulations as well.

M. Ramsey stated she feels there are situations like siblings living together, a caretaker live in, wheelchair accessibility, that would require at least an 850 sq. ft. 2-bedroom house. She referenced the 2022-2027 Affordable Housing data for the Town of Columbia and stated that the Town of Columbia already has at least 91 dwellings of two or more families and the medium sq. ft. of a unit is 852 sq. ft. She stated she would like the Regulation changes to reflect at least this size and then defer to the 30% beyond it.

Paul Kubala of 37 Lake Road asked what the minimum lot size is for a single-family house.

R. Nassif replied 50,000 sq. ft

Paul Kubala asked if he wanted to put an Accessory Dwelling that is larger then the allowable size, could he go to the PZC to get an increase.

R. Nassiff replied, NO, not under the current Regulations.

R. Powell stated there is the option to bring it to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

R. Nassiff agreed but stated you would have to have proof of hardship.

Ruth Gordon of 8 Basket Shop Road stated she agrees with an increase to 900 sq. ft.

Kieth Trosell of 27 Johnson Road stated he does not support any of the proposed Regulation changes. He stated he moved here because it is a small town with lower taxes and a nice lake, and he feels that lower income housing and an increase in population density will change the character of the Town. He also stated an increase in population density will mean more people at the lake and its small beach. He also stated he feels the Regulation changes are Incentivizing the problems that come with lower income and the eventual Section 8 residents. He stated he feels this will lead to an increase in taxes due to a need for more police, a change in the fire department, a high school, and sewers. He stated this could allow for a developer who can work within the restrictions of a septic system to build several units on a 10-acre lot, and he does not have the time to come to every Town meeting every time a developer wants to change the character of the Town. He stated he has watched this happen in too many surrounding towns.

Catherine Rowe of 27 Lake Road stated she was the Chair of the Commission on Aging for eight years and there is a desperate need for alternative housing in Columbia and for those who want to stay in the Town and cannot afford their larger homes or manage the properties. She stated that for eight years they tried to find buildable property in the Town for Senior Housing and due to water table, rock ledge etc. there are not the same buildable lots as some of the other towns that would allow such large developments in Columbia, but there is a need for alternate housing and based on her previous research 900 sq. ft. is the size needed to accommodate, handicap

accessibility, larger bathrooms, caretakers, which requires another ½ bath etc. She stated there is a desperate need for affordable housing for seniors on fixed incomes and young couples starting off or wanting to help their parents.

Jon Dilworth of Upper Woodland Terrace stated he currently lives in a 900 sq. ft. house, and it is the taxes that will affect him if they increase. He also stated his concern regarding traffic flow with an increase in population in the Town. He stated this is a small rural farm town and he feels the character needs to be preserved.

V. Englert stated regarding the square footage, the Commission was trying to take into consideration the cost to build per square foot and a 750 sq. ft. home is much more affordable than a 1000 sq. ft. home.

J. Guskowski clarified that the 30% sq. ft. cap of a detached structure is not the same for an addition. He stated if you were to build a two-unit addition onto an existing structure, if it meets setbacks etc., there is no limit to the size as this is proposed.

Joan Hill of Cards Mill Road stated the difference in the caps between attached and detached structure does not make sense to her. She asked what the elevation limits will be.

R. Nassiff stated the elevation limits will be 35 ft., within the conforming setbacks, as they are currently stated in the Regulations.

Joan Hill then asked about Regulations that require an engineer to evaluate the adequacy of the lot and how is one acquired.

R. Nassiff stated that the Town does have the right to have a lot reviewed by its Consulting Engineer, who is on retainer with the Town, and the applicant would be responsible for the cost.

Joan Hill then stated her concern would be with people turning the structure into Air BNB's and asked if there would be a limit on this type of use.

W. Tabor stated this would be hard to enforce.

R. Nassiff stated that this is a valid concern, but there is absolutely no way the PZC can enforce this use. He stated this may be something that the BOS could enforce from an ordinance standpoint.

Joan Hill then stated she feels any Regulation changes should be for the whole Town and that the Lake Zone should not be exempt. She stated large development outside the Lake Zone will still have impact on the lake. She also stated there is undeveloped land in the Lake Zone that could be used, and this is limiting the Town development.

Carol Coley of 61 West Street stated that in response to V. Englert's point about affordability, if someone needs are met by a 750 sq. ft. structure and that's financially what they can afford, they can do that regardless of whether the maximum is 900 sq. ft. or not. So the cost should not mean the limit should be 750 sq. ft.

Karen Friedman of 8 Cherry Valley Road stated she agrees with the 900 sq. ft. but feels it should be regardless of the size of your home. She stated if you can put a 30 X 30 Garage on any size

home it should be the same for an Accessory Unit. She states as a social worker she sees a lot of people who need live in help and says she feels these options are imperative.

Maggie Ewald of 47 Rte. 87 stated she has been a member of the Commission on Aging for several years and she agrees that housing needs to be made affordable for those who have volunteered, given their time, helped in the school system and want to remain in the Town they enjoy living in. She also stated she has worked with older adults her entire life and agrees with the 900 sq. ft. for handicap accessibility etc.

Rhonda Kincaid of CoDE thanked the PZC for their conscientious and thoughtful work and for welcoming their input during the meetings. She stated she wholeheartedly supports these changes, but they would like the maximum to be increased to 900 sq. ft.

R. Powell asked if the U.S. or State Department of Housing for the elderly has a minimum 2-bedroom unit size. He stated the State Department of Housing used to Finance housing projects and they had one and two bedroom requirements that may still exist. He stated it may be a good idea to investigate this instead of arbitrarily grabbing at numbers.

Joan Hill of 29 Cards Mill Road asked if there are existing Regulations in place why are these changes being made.

R. Nassiff explained that the existing Regulations regarding Accessory Dwellings were written proactively based on external information from the then Town Planner. He stated they were the first to write such Regulations before the State imposed their Regulations, much like they are now using science to determine what you can build in terms of number of units on a piece of property.

Joan Hill then said she feels, regarding keeping the character of the Town, that the PZC needs to commit to keeping private water and private septic in their Plan of Conservation and Development.

R. Nassiff stated that he cannot speak for people in the future but currently, based on the cost alone, it is incomprehensible.

R. Powell stated it would have to be mandated.

Anne Dunnack of 103 Lake Road stated there was a time when there was not going to be a Nutrient Allocation Plan, but now there is, therefore never say never.

Paul Kubala of 37 Lake Road stated he supports Zoning, otherwise the Town will have a hodge podge of buildings, so he supports Zoning even though he does not like it.

Carol Coley of 61 West Street expressed her appreciation of the Boards work and of the Subcommittee putting something in place before it is mandated by the State.

Millie Ramsey of 100 Hunt Road thanked the PZC for their work and on these Regulations changes.

R. Nassiff stated that back four to five years ago when they revised the Plan of Conservation of Development one thing that left a lasting impression was individuals saying they wanted a place in Town that they can rent and live in without having to care for land. He stated at that time he

spoke with developers regarding building in Town and there wasn't any interest, so this is another way to provide this opportunity. He stated he can foresee some small changes to the complexity of the Town but not a huge increase in density because there is so little developable land and that was the motivation behind these changes. He also added that the Lake Zone Overlay was left out because it is a precious resource to the Town and the Commission needed more time to study the impact on the lake and did not want to hold up the the whole process while doing so, inevitably protecting the Town while still providing housing opportunities. He stated he is in support of protecting the feeling of the Town of Columbia.

Maggie Ewald of 47 Rte. 87 asked if prefabricated structures are allowed.

R. Nassiff stated they are allowed, they are not regulated, but they must meet building codes.

Millie Ramsey of 100 Hunt Road stated she thought R. Powell made a good point regarding the State Regulations on building size and feels it should be investigated.

CLOSE OR SCHEDULE TO CONTINUE PUBLIC HEARING:

At **8:30 PM** R. Nassiff **MOVED** to **CONTINUE** the Public Hearing on Items 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 to **Monday, July 8, 2024 at 7:PM**. T. Carrier **SECONDED**; **MOTION PASSED 8:0:0**

R. Nassiff explained that due to the Public Hearing being Open the Commission should not discuss the hearing with the Public.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (Discussion/Possible Action)

7.1. PZC 2324-05: Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Sections 21.2.3.11, Replace current Section 52.7.19, and Eliminate Section 52.7.21, for Multi-Family Dwellings. **(Discussion/Possible Action or Public Hearing Continuation)**

7.2. PZC 2324-06: Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Sections 8.3 for Accessory Dwelling Units and Two-Family Dwellings. **(Discussion/Possible Action or Public Hearing Continuation)**

7.3 PZC 2324-07: Town of Columbia, Zoning Amendment Application to Revise Section 9 Definition of Structure. **(Discussion/Possible Action or Public Hearing Continuation)**

R. Nassiff asked J. Guskowski if letters received needed to be read into the record. J. Guskowski stated copies were provided to the Commission members and to the public and suggested the individuals be listed in the minutes.

For additional Public Comment, please see the attached letters received from:

Sarah and Andy Keleher

Judi Jordan of 3 Lake Ridge Drive

Lori Behling of 16 Latham Hill Road

Jill Zorn – 18 West Street

Karen Vanderbilt

8. NEW BUSINESS (Discussion/Possible Action)

8.1 C.G.S. 8-24 Referral - Open Space Acquisition on Route 66

J. Guskowski stated this is a C.G.S 8-24 which requires that any time a municipality makes significant investment, acquires or divests of land, acquires an interest in land such as an easement, expands roads, sewer water lines etc., it is obliged to present that proposed Acquisition or Improvement to the Planning Commission and have the Planning Commission comment on the proposed Investments applicability or in harmony with the goals of the Plan of Conservation and Development. So that is why this is before you this evening and, in this case, this is a proposed Acquisition of Open Space Land by the Town of Columbia, and it is a piece of land at #330 on Route 66. He stated it's approximately 23 acres of land that's to be split off an existing house lot of about three and a third acres. It currently contains a cell tower, and it backs up to the Town of Columbia recreation park property. It would allow for a small pull-off area of gravel parking on Route 66 so people can park, enjoy the forest and the open space access through the woods to the recreation park. This will expand the Town's open space holdings. The Selectman and the Town Manager have worked out an agreement with the current owner that they would leave the driveway access. There is an easement to the tower itself that is deeded to the tower even though the underlying land is currently privately owned and would be publicly owned, the tower would not be disturbed and the driveway access to the tower would not be disturbed.

D. Holcroft asked who would own the lease to the Tower.

J. Guskowski confirmed that the Town would inherit the Tower lease, but he does not know the financials of the transaction.

D. Holcroft asked what the cost of the land was.

J. Guskowski stated in the past the Town has paid approx. \$2000 per square foot which would be about \$45,000.00.

A. Dunnack explained that the tower square of land was sold years ago. She stated there is no income potential from the tower.

R. Nassiff **MOVED** to **APPROVE** and Support the Open Space Acquisition of #330 Route 66 by the Town of Columbia (C.G.S. 8-24), W. Tabor **SECONDED**, V. Englert **ABSTAINED**. **MOTION PASSED 7:0:1**

8.2 Appointment of Interim Zoning Enforcement Officer Manuel Medina

J. Guskowski stated that the new Enforcement Officer started today and will be working in tandem with Manuel Medina, the Interim Officer, and himself, during the transition. He stated Savannah is not certified at this time but will be going through the certification training.

R. Nassiff confirmed that in the interim John has the certifications needed for any sign off.

R. Nassiff **MOVED** to **APPOINT** Manuel Medina the Interim Zoning Enforcement Officer. W. Tabor **SECONDED**. **MOTION PASSED 8:0:0**

8.3 Appointment of Zoning Enforcement Officer Savannah McInvale

R. Nassiff **MOVED** to **APPOINT** Savannah McInvale as the Zoning Enforcement Officer. W. Tabor **SECONDED**. **MOTION PASSED 8:0:0**

9. **REGULATION REVISIONS (Discussion):** None

10. **COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS:** None

11. **COMMISSION OPEN DISCUSSION:** None

12. **AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS:** None

13. **EXECUTIVE SESSION:** None

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

R. Powell **MOVED** to **ADJOURN**; R. Nassiff **SECONDED**; **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at **8:47 PM**.

Respectfully submitted by Mary Kay Hyman, Board Clerk

Please see the minutes of subsequent meetings for approval of these minutes and any corrections hereto.

This meeting can be viewed in its entirety on the Town of Columbia You Tube Channel

PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS CONCERNING MULTIFAMILY DWELLINGS

May 2024- Planning & Zoning Application Version

21.2.3.11 – Multifamily Dwellings, except in the Columbia Lake Watershed Overlay District, per Section 52.7.19 (Replaces the current regulation reference to **Neighborhood Retirement Housing**)

52.7.19 Multifamily Housing [Replaces current 52.7.19 “Neighborhood Retirement Housing” and 52.7.21 “Multifamily Dwellings”]

52.7.19.1 Intent: To provide for a **broader and more affordable variety of housing in a development pattern by permitting an increase in density within the development and allowing alternative housing types with a site design that is in harmony with** and preserves natural, scenic and historic site design features; and to provide incentives and opportunities for the creation of affordable housing.

52.7.19.2 Required Approvals: A Special Permit shall be required for any proposed Multifamily Housing, except in the CM-1 District, where a Site Plan approval shall be required. The Special Permit may be issued only by the Columbia Planning and Zoning Commission after a public hearing and shall be issued only in conformity to the provisions of Section 52.7.19 of these Regulations. A pre-application review with the Commission is strongly encouraged.

52.7.19.3 Definitions: For purposes of this Section, the following definitions shall apply:

Multifamily Housing: A building, or group of buildings located on a single parcel of land or multiple contiguous parcels containing three or more total dwelling units.

Dwelling Unit: A single unit providing complete, independent living facilities including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.

Unbuildable area: The area, expressed in square feet, within the site that is comprised of wetlands soils, watercourses, lakes, ponds, swamps, marshes, flood zone A per FEMA maps, slopes greater than 20%, and easements prohibiting building development.

Affordable Units: Housing units that comply with Conn. Gen. Stats. §8-13m. to 8-13x

52.7.19.4 Application for Multifamily Housing:

A. Information Required to be submitted:

1. Application signed by the owner(s) and agent(s), if any, stating the ownership of the property to be developed and summarizing the development proposal.
2. An approval of the septic system design by the appropriate authorizing agency.
3. An approval of the water supply system from the appropriate authorizing agency.
4. Key map of the neighborhood on a scale of 1" = 400' showing the relation of the proposed development to abutting properties and to existing and proposed streets.
5. Certified A-2 base map, on a scale of 1" = 40', showing the following:
 - a. Location of benchmarks.

- b. Size of the development in total acreage.
 - c. Location of any ponds, brooks, or inland wetland areas, as certified by a soil scientist.
 - d. Two-foot contours extending fifty (50) feet beyond site boundaries. Contour information shall be collected by an actual field survey or by means of photogrammetry (aerial topography).
 - e. Location of unbuildable area. Notes should reflect the total area (in square feet) of buildable and unbuildable areas on the site.
 - f. Location of subsurface sewage disposal area and site testing locations for the same.
 - g. Location of water supply.
 - h. Location, dimension, and basement floor elevation of all buildings; as well as foundation and footing drains.
 - i. Location of internal private roads, individual driveways, parking areas, and parking spaces.
 - j. Location of accessory buildings, structures, and facilities.
6. Architectural plans showing accurate elevations, height, bulk, construction materials and other massing, architectural, and design features of the proposed development.
 7. Stormwater Plan per Section 6.3 of Columbia Subdivision Regulations.
 8. An erosion and sedimentation control plan prepared in accordance with Article VIII of the Zoning Regulations of the Town of Columbia.
 9. Landscaping plan that demonstrates sufficient buffering between proposed development and adjacent residential properties (may be incorporated as a part of the Site Plan referenced in Section 51) including:
 - a. Planting schedules - type, number, minimum size of trees and/or shrubs and other plants.
 - b. Treatment of seeding and sodding.
 - c. Pavement types for vehicular and pedestrian movement.
 - d. Type, height and density of any proposed screening or fencing.

52.7.19.5 Standards: Any application for a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 52.7.19 shall meet the following requirements:

- A. Development Size and Location: The minimum size of Multifamily Housing development is 150,000 square feet, shall be located in a Residential District (RA) and shall have a minimum frontage of fifty (50) feet at the street line of a public street.
- B. Maximum Dwelling units per acre: The maximum number of dwelling units in the Multifamily Housing Complex shall be determined by soil capacity and State Public Health Code.
- C. Affordable Unit Density Incentive: 100% of maximum unit per acre density, as defined in 52.7.19.5 (B) may be utilized if a minimum of 20% of units are set aside as "affordable units" as defined in section 52.7.19.3
 1. Affordability Percentage. At least twenty percent (20%) of the dwelling units will be rented or conveyed subject to an incentive housing restriction. Such restriction shall

- require that, for a least thirty (30) years after initial occupancy of the development, the dwelling units will be sold or rented at, or below, prices that will preserve the units as housing for which persons pay thirty percent (30%) or less of their annual income, where the income is less than or equal to eighty percent (80%) or less of the area median income. In determining compliance with this Section, the Commission will use regulations or guidelines published by the Connecticut Office of Policy and Management, the Connecticut Department of Housing, or any other successor agency designated in accordance with Conn. Gen. Stats. §8-13m. to 8-13x.
2. Affordability Plan. Each applicant for multiple housing units within the Multifamily Housing development will provide an affordability plan that will detail the administration, monitoring, and enforcement of the dwelling units to be sold or rented at below market rates as described above. The plan will include proposed deed restrictions or covenants, lease agreements, common interest ownership documents, bylaws, rules and regulations, sample income calculations, and any other information as the Commission may require to establish compliance with this Section and Conn. Gen. Stats. §8-13m. to 8-13x.
 3. Designation of Administering Agency. The applicant will indicate the name, address, and other contact information for the agency that will administer the sale or rental of the dwelling units that are subject to the below-market sale or rental in accordance with this Section.
 4. Affordable dwelling units may be offered for sale or rental in individual, public, cooperative, or condominium ownership. Documentation as to management, organization, and incorporation of applicable ownership associations will be submitted to the Commission at the time of filing the application for a Multifamily Housing development.
 5. Affordable units shall be of a construction quality and design that is comparable to market-rate units within the development and shall be dispersed throughout the development.
- D. Market rate housing unit yield shall be 70% of the total calculated unit density as defined in 52.7.19.5 (B) if less than 20% of the total units are set aside as restricted affordable units as defined in this Section.
 - E. Community buildings, recreational facilities and open spaces designed for, and used principally by, the residents are permitted as accessory uses.
 - F. Setbacks: All buildings shall be set back 50 feet from property lines of residential properties that abut the perimeter of the applicant parcel(s).
 - G. Sewage Disposal: Each dwelling unit shall be connected to an approved sewage disposal system.
 - H. Water Supply: Water Supply facilities must meet the requirements of the State Health Code.
 - I. Parking, driveways and roads shall meet all standards set forth in sections 8.12, 8.12.2, 61 and all other Regulations applicable to parking, driveways and roads.
 - J. Home Occupation uses shall be allowed in conformance with Section 8.5.1 of the Zoning Regulations of the Town of Columbia.

- K. Appropriate signage shall identify the entrance to the complex, intersections, directions and patterns of vehicular movement. The placement, size and height of the signs shall conform to the requirements of Section 62.
 - L. The Multifamily Housing development may be developed in stages. The initial site plan shall show the full development with the first stage depicted in detail, future stages may be shown in concept. Future stages shall require Special Permit approval by the Commission.
 - M. Fire Protection: The applicant shall submit a fire protection assessment letter from the Columbia Fire Marshal that includes, if needed, recommendations for the installation of any additional facilities necessary to provide sufficient water for the development.
- 52.7.19.6 Evaluation Criteria: In considering the proposed application, the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be guided by the following:
- A. The location of principal and accessory buildings in relation to one another.
 - B. The height, bulk, and density of buildings in relation to one another.
 - C. Traffic circulation within the site; amount, location, and access to parking; traffic load or possible circulation problems on existing streets; pedestrian safety throughout the site and in the immediate neighborhood.
 - D. Conformance with the intent and goals of the Plan of Conservation & Development.
- 52.7.19.7 The Commission may provide for bonding of all required common improvements and for soil and erosion control.
- 52.7.19.8 The owner of the development is responsible for the maintenance of all common improvements and for maintaining the provisions of the approved Special Permit and Site Plan and the verification of occupancy qualifications.

Accessory Dwelling Unit and Two-Family Dwellings

Text Amendment Draft – Planning & Zoning Application Version, May 2024

- 8.3 Accessory Dwelling Unit and Two-Family Dwellings:** A second dwelling unit, either as an accessory dwelling unit or as a conversion to a two-family dwelling, may be added to a single-family house, or may be added in a new or existing free-standing structure, with approval from the Zoning Enforcement Officer, provided the following conditions are met:
- 8.3.1 A second dwelling unit located within the primary single-family structure may be created either within the existing building footprint or through a structural addition.
 - 8.3.2 A second dwelling unit created within the existing primary structure shall be considered a two-family dwelling and shall not have restrictions as to size other than the bulk standards generally applicable to single-family structures in the subject zoning district.
 - 8.3.3 A detached or free-standing accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed ~~30% of the floor area of the primary dwelling unit, except that primary dwelling units having less than 2000 square feet of floor area may have an accessory dwelling unit which does not exceed 750 square feet~~ 950 square feet of Floor Area;
 - 8.3.4 The new dwelling unit shall include an independent kitchen and bathroom;
 - 8.3.5 The sanitary facilities have been approved pursuant to Public Health Code as being adequate to serve the increased requirements;
 - 8.3.6 Adequate off-street parking is available on the parcel;
 - 8.3.7 An accessory living unit meeting the above conditions may be added within an existing or newly-constructed customary accessory building, provided that no more than one accessory living unit may exist on a single parcel.
 - 8.3.8 Only two total dwelling units shall be allowed on each eligible parcel.
 - 8.3.9 All other Height, Area, and Yard Requirements of these Regulations shall be applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units and Two-Family Dwellings

TEXT AMENDMENT – PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO DEFINITION OF “STRUCTURE” IN SECTION 9 OF COLUMBIA ZONING REGULATIONS

~~Regulations Committee Draft – May 2024~~ PUBLIC HEARING VERSION – MAY 2024

Structure: Anything constructed or erected, the use of which requires location on the ground or attachment to something having location on the ground. As used in these Regulations, structures shall include, but are not limited to buildings, swimming pools, towers, docks, balconies, porches, decks, chimneys, ~~handicapped ramps, bay windows,~~ above-ground storage tanks, ~~satellite dishes,~~ ground mounted solar panels, fences or walls greater than six (6) feet in height, and outdoor storage containers.

~~Retaining walls and, public utility equipment (as defined herein), handicap-accessibility ramps, or residential heating/air conditioning condenser units, propane tanks, handicap-accessibility ramps, and generators no more than ten feet (10') away from the principal building, meeting current Building Code~~ are not considered structures under these regulations.

In the Columbia Lake Protection Area Overlay Zones, new unroofed terraces, patios, and similar hardscape, semi-impervious and impervious surfaces greater than 100 ~~s.f.~~ square feet, or, modifications or additions to unroofed terraces, patios, and similar hardscape, semi-impervious and impervious surfaces after the effective date of these regulations that are equal to or greater than 100 ~~s.f.~~ square feet, shall be considered structures and shall require a Zoning Compliance Certificate but shall be exempt from the setback and lot coverage requirements.

Structures such as piers, docks, boat ramps, and lifts are permitted structures exempt from the minimum yard requirements and are subject to the securing of the necessary permits from the Columbia Board of Selectmen and the Columbia Inland Wetlands Commission. (Effective 8/1/91)



American Planning Association
Connecticut Chapter

Creating Great Communities for All

Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association Housing Forum

Dear Commission Chair,

As a practicing Planner, I often like to say that I am in the “Quality of Life” business. This approach reflects the Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association’s (CCAPA) slogan of “Creating Great Communities for All.” In Connecticut, a lack of affordable and diverse housing creates roadblocks to quality-of-life for many in the communities where we live and work. As a committed volunteer public official, I know you care deeply about your community, the stability of your neighbors and fellow residents, and ensuring that a high quality of life is shared by all. In order to help address housing affordability in our state, the Planners of CCAPA recognize that local zoning and other policy needs to evolve to address new housing types and choices, and that planners and commissioners are key partners in this effort. In Connecticut, we are at a crucial moment, where the need is deep and the time to act is now.

On behalf of CCAPA, I would like to extend this invitation for you to nominate a member of your planning staff **and** one of your planning commissioners to participate in an all-day Housing Forum.

Save the date and time! Event details are as follows:

Wednesday, September 11, 2024.
8:30am- 4:30pm
Hotel Marcel, 500 Sargent Drive, New Haven, CT
Free Parking Available

There is a nominal participation fee of \$20 per person to help defray costs, but all meals and costs are otherwise provided by CCAPA. This event is being specifically designed by planners, for planners and our commissioner partners. Breakfast is provided, followed by morning sessions related to the state of housing affordability in Connecticut followed by a box lunch and working break-out sessions. The break-out rooms will include colleagues from communities that share similar size and other characteristics as yours to brainstorm and share best practices for housing solutions of similar scale and context. We envision that subject matter experts can be available as needed. For AICP planners, we are applying for Continuing Education Credits to be determined. For Commissioners, this one-day event will count towards the State Statute required 4 hours of Commissioner training.

Please RSVP at the following [link](#) which will also bring you to some survey questions that will help in establishing the smaller afternoon working groups and allowing us to be best prepared with the resources that can facilitate this work. The **deadline to RSVP is June 15th.**

I thank you for your service to your community and CCAPA looks forward to working with you on this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Emmeline Harrigan'.

Emmeline Harrigan, AICP, CFM
President, CT Chapter of American Planning Association
ct.planning.org