

**TOWN OF HADDAM  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING/MEETING  
TOWN HALL  
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT  
THURSDAY, 4 FEBRUARY 2016  
UNAPPROVED MINUTES  
*Subject to Approval by the Commission***

**ATTENDANCE**

X	Steven Bull, Vice Chairman
X	Arthur Kohs
A	Michael Lagace
X	Jamin Laurenza, Chairman
X	Wayne LePard
X	Carmelo Rosa
X	Edward Wallor, Secretary
X	Robert Braren, Alternate
X	Raul de Brigard, Alternate - Seated
X	Liz West Glidden, Town Planner
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Laurenza, chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Attendance/Seating of the Alternates**

Attendance was taken and all regular members as well as Mr. de Brigard, alternate, were seated.

**3. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda**

None.

**4. Public Comments**

None.

Prior to the start of the public hearing, Mr. Laurenza explained the hearing process.

**5. Public Hearing: Referral of Proposed Regulation Updates for Sections 6, 7A, 21.12, 17.5, 23, 30.6, The Housing Opportunity District, Section 4 Table 1, and the Definitions Section of the *Town of Haddam Zoning Regulations***

Mrs. Glidden reported that she had received inquiries in regard to Section 23, Accessory Uses, Buildings and Structures. Mrs. Glidden explained that the purpose of the chapter is to have reduced setbacks for small sheds less than 15 feet in height and to differentiate between accessory buildings such as sheds from buildings and principle dwellings. Mrs. Glidden noted that Attorney Mark Branse assisted with drafting these regulations.

Mrs. Glidden reviewed the section pertaining to 23.8 - Buildings, Structures, and Uses Accessory to a Farm in particular subsections c, d, and e. Mrs. Glidden stated that it wasn't the Commission's intent to be unfriendly to farms, that it has been recommended that Section 23.8.e be deleted, and that the Commission is agreeable. Mrs. Glidden also stated that the balance of the regulation is merely a clarification.

Terry Smith, Maple Ave. West, clarified that Section 23.8.e would be deleted. In regard to Section 23.1.b.2, Mr. Smith felt that it was cumbersome to understand and believes that it's meant to read that a structure cannot be located within 10 feet of the side or rear lines.

John Halfinger, Candlewood Hill Road, Halfinger Farms and representative for the Town of Haddam, River COG Regional Agriculture Council, expressed his appreciation to the Commission in regard to the removal of Section 23.8.e. Mr. Halfinger distributed copies of Section 23 with the subsections that concerned him circled and with notations (Exhibit A).

Mr. Halfinger reviewed the following subsections: **23.1.b.3** – Would like to keep the distance at 50 feet rather than the proposed 100 feet noting that lot size and topography can make meeting this requirement difficult. **23.1.b.4** – Would like to see this remove. Felt that this was limiting the type of animal that's acceptable. **23.1.b.8** – Would like the following wording removed "other than those used to house fowl or poultry" noting that it limits the type of animal that's acceptable. Mr. Halfinger stated that he understands roosters can be challenging; however, that should be either a discussion between neighbors or handled like any other noise compliant. **23.6.3.B** – Would like to see this removed noting that a number of people have dogs, that there are pre-existing half acre commercial zones, and 50 feet on a 100 foot lot wouldn't allow for the installation of a dog house. **23.8.e** – Item has been addressed (removed). Mr. Halfinger stated that he understands that the Commission is trying to make things easier, but when the regulations begin to affect animals and farms, then there's a need for tweaking.

Mrs. Glidden addressed Mr. Halfinger's concerns: **23.1.b.3** – The reason for the increase from 50 to 100 feet from a watercourse is due to the 50 foot setback as well as a 50 foot upland review area; however, Mrs. Glidden understands Mr. Halfinger's concern. Mrs. Glidden agrees that the distance should be reduced to 50 feet as an individual who may want to construct within the upland review area can come in for an agent approval permit and it would require a variance. **23.1.b.4** – Doesn't feel the housing of chicken or fowl is appropriate on a property line and that some distance from the setback would be more appropriate, it's still allowable, but a permit is required. Mr. Halfinger stated that he can build a house 20 feet from the property line, but a chicken coop needs to be 25 feet. Mr. Halfinger also stated that he, as a farmer, doesn't want to be picked out from the individual who wants to house equipment, garbage, etc. Mrs. Glidden asked Mr. Halfinger how he would feel if chicken coops were the standard setback. Mr. Halfinger stated that chicken coops should be included like everything else and not separated out. Discussion followed in regard to the setback for a house v. a chicken coop as well as noise and odor no matter the distance and the size of the coop. Mr. Kohs agreed with Mr. Halfinger. After further review of the subsection, Mrs. Glidden stated that it wasn't the Commission's intent to limit size. Mr. Rosa stated that the Commission's intent was to allow residents to have a 200 square foot shed without having to obtain a zoning and/or building permit. Discussion followed in regard to the building size (200 or 550 square feet) with Mrs. Glidden stating buildings under 200 square feet not be subject to setbacks; buildings under 550 square feet have a reduced setback; and all others would have setbacks. Mrs. Glidden reviewed the Table 4.

Discussion followed in regard to the discrepancy of the updated documents – not matching what is being shown during the Power Point presentation, what is available on the website, and some of the Commissioners copies (some had unrevised copies).

Mr. Halfinger stated that he doesn't want farming, whether commercial or backyard, to have more stringent regulations than the everyday homeowner. Mrs. Glidden stated she understood. Mr. Laurenza asked how many chicken complaints are received per year. Mrs. Glidden stated approximately five or six. Mr. Halfinger stated it's not a lot and that it should be handled as a noise complaint. The Commission agreed and asked that 23.1.b.4 deleted.

Mr. Halfinger stated that if anyone on the Commission has any questions or concerns, to call him to discuss the matter (business card given to each Commissioner).

Mr. Smith asked for clarification regarding the setbacks for the various sized structures (200 square feet or less on the property line; 201 to 550 square feet at least 10 feet and side or rear yard, 30 feet front yard; and over 550 square feet at least 20 feet). The Commission agreed that's what's being proposed. Mr. Bull voiced concern over a structure sitting right on a property line. The Commission agreed to change the setback to 10 feet for any structure under 550 square feet (will also allow for maintenance of the structure/property) and with this change 23.1.b.8 would be deleted completely

In regard to 23.6.3.B, Mrs. Glidden stated that the reason was probably a hangover from another town. Mrs. Glidden noted that outdoor commercial kennels are allowed and there is a setback for that. Mrs. Glidden wasn't opposed to removing this wording. Mr. Rosa stated that he didn't believe it was intended for someone's personal dog, but rather for kennels. The Commission was in agreement to delete 23.6.3.B.

The Commission thanked Mr. Halfinger for his input. Mr. Halfinger thanked the Commission for listening to his concerns.

Melissa Gibson, Candlewood Hill Road, confirmed that 23.8 would be removed. Mrs. Glidden stated yes.

Janice Ehlemeyer, Community Resource Planner, River COG, stated that she was in support of Mr. Halfinger's suggestions. Mrs. Glidden reported that Ms. Ehlemeyer submitted a letter, dated 3 February 2016, from Walter Adametz, Chairman, on behalf of the River COG Regional Agricultural Council which summarizes what was discussed (Exhibit B).

Mr. Smith asked if the revisions, as discussed tonight, would be published for review by the residents to make sure all are in agreement. Mr. Laurenza stated yes. Mrs. Glidden stated she will place the revised regulations on the town's website.

Ann Faust, Dickinson Road, Middlesex County Coalition on Housing and Homelessness, commended the Commission for considering an Incentive Housing Zone (IHZ) as it's important to diversify the town's tax base and good for economic development. Mrs. Faust stated that the town is too dependent on three and four bedroom single family homes. Mrs. Faust reviewed data from the Asset Limited, Income Constraint, Employed (ALICE) Report, United Way, noting that in Haddam four percent of households are living under the poverty line and 13 percent are in-between the poverty line and the survival budget (1 in 5 struggling to pay for housing). Mrs. Faust stated that 25 percent of renters and 37 percent of homeowners spend more than 30 percent on housing; and that this is not a stable situation. Mrs. Faust stated on behalf of the Coalition, she supports the IHZ.

Dave Peterson, Filley Road, asked if the Commission would be voting on the regulations or if they merely wanted the opinions of the public. Mr. Laurenza stated that they can discuss the housing zone. Mr. Peterson noted that he hadn't read through all the material; however, in regard to the affordable housing asked what changes are being proposed. Mrs. Glidden recommended that Mr. Peterson go to the town's website to review the regulations and that she would provide her email.

Mrs. Glidden reviewed the proposal noting Ferry Point, Old Saybrook, and that she found it to be attractive. Mrs. Glidden reviewed "Notes on Incentive Housing and Affordable Housing" (Exhibit C) and explained that affordable housing is deed restricted and protected for 40 years. Mrs. Glidden reported that Haddam doesn't have a lot of housing diversity – young people, singles, empty nesters, seniors – and that the town is vulnerable to the Affordable Housing Act (Connecticut General Statute 8-30g). Mrs. Glidden explained how the town would be able to obtain a four year moratorium from the state (would need 37 additional affordable housing units) and noted that an affordable housing zone is recommended within the town's Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD).

Mr. Peterson asked what part of the proposal would be helping the town. Mrs. Glidden further explained the HOD proposal. Mr. Peterson again asked how the proposal would benefit the town. Mrs. Faust stated that affordable housing complexes do pay property taxes and it diversifies the tax base. Mrs. Faust discussed an affordable housing study.

Amy Pear, Park Road, asked if Haddam didn't have something on the books to help work through the process, then the town will be forced to do so if a builder came in under 8-30g. Mrs. Glidden explained that an 8-30g can be developed anywhere and would bypass zoning (the town would have no say in the matter whether or not the town has a program). However, if the town has a program and the town reaches two percent affordable housing, the town can obtain a moratorium.

Mr. Peterson asked if a developer had the right to this type of housing all along. Mrs. Glidden explained the difference between an 8-30g development v. an affordable housing development (ratios change). Mr. Peterson stated there's probably a reason why this type of development hasn't been developed in town.

Megan Peterson, Filley Road, asked about social services for this type of development; and if the 8-30g is a state or federal mandate. Mrs. Glidden stated it's a state mandate and probably comes from the federal government. Mrs. Peterson stated if the town hasn't felt the impact, why the town is reacting now. Mr. de Brigard stated the town has felt the impact. Discussion followed in regard to the proposal allowing current Haddam residents the opportunity to stay in town. Mrs. Faust explained that she receives numerous phone calls a day from people who need assistance.

Ms. Pear asked if the town was looking to retain those people who are either downsizing or introducing themselves to the housing market to stay in town. Mrs. Glidden stated the town is looking for a diverse community – age, economic, etc.

Mr. Halfinger asked if the state requires affordable housing, it would be 30 percent; and if the town requires it, it would be 80 percent. Mrs. Glidden stated yes. Mr. Halfinger stated at 80 percent, we would be talking working people and this may be in the town's best interest.

Sue Costa, Walkley Hill Road, stated that the proposal is not for low income, but rather affordable housing; and believes there is a distinction between the two. Mrs. Costa stated that she had viewed a graph pinpointing the areas in town that had been looked at. Mrs. Glidden stated that the town had received a grant, hired Milone and MacBroom to assist with a study, and that several areas were looked at to land an IHZ (not feasible, can't meet the requirements); however, a Housing Opportunity District (HOD) would be feasible. Discussion followed in regard to the current owners of the parcels that were considered being agreeable to having an HOD zone placed on their properties.

Mrs. Peterson asked if the income would be based on 80 percent town or state. Mrs. Glidden stated whichever is lower. Mrs. Glidden stated that she spoke to a representative of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Mr. Peterson stated that in the long term it's probably a financial loss; and by increasing the density, the town's population would increase which in turn would increase educational costs, but not necessarily the tax base. Mr. Wallow stated no, as the units would be one or two bedrooms.

Dave Costa, Walkley Hill Road, asked what the ratio of affordable units v. market units (how many people would be helped by the proposal). Mrs. Glidden stated that a minimum of 25 percent affordable v. 75 percent market. Mr. Costa stated that most developers would probably do the minimum.

Mrs. Costa asked if a property is to be seriously considered, would the adjacent property owners be notified. Mrs. Glidden stated yes.

Cynthia Tilson, Walkley Hill Road, asked what if a property owner didn't want such a development next door. Mrs. Glidden stated they would have an opportunity to voice their concerns at a hearing.

Ed Munster, Horton Road, stated that when High Meadow was brought into town, the intent was to benefit the internal churn; and asked how many people at High Meadow came from outside of town. Mrs. Glidden stated she didn't have that data.

Bruce Mazzotta, Swain Johnson Trail, stated that he's been listening to how the proposal has been progressing; and that he doesn't know if he, as a builder, would pursue this type of development himself. Mr. Bull stated that input from the public is invaluable to the Commission. Mr. Laurenza stated that Mr. Mazzotta's input at the last meeting was very important and encouraged others to attend the meetings.

Mrs. Costa stated that one of the properties suggested for affordable housing is the same property that was previously suggested for the transfer station. Mrs. Costa stated that they are fearful, not of affordable housing, but all of the activity that would be going on around them. Mr. Laurenza stated that he didn't believe a parcel on Route 154 and Walkley Hill was considered. Discussion followed at length in regard to trying to obtain some kind of control by implementing some regulations, that the Walkley Hill property wasn't found in the study, the 8-30g moratorium, and the cost for a development.

Continued to Thursday, 18 February 2016.

#### **6. Public Meeting: Referral of Proposed Regulation Updates for Sections 6, 7A, 21.12, 17.5, 23, 30.6, The Housing Opportunity District, Section 4 Table 1, and the Definitions Section of the *Town of Haddam Zoning Regulations***

Continued to Thursday, 18 February 2016.

#### **7. New Business**

**Architectural Review Committee (ARC)** – Mrs. Glidden reported that ARC will be reviewing a modification to 18 Killingworth Road (Hi-Way Package Store). The initial proposal was to remove a shed; however, the shed has been moved from one location to another location. A brief discussion followed in regard to the sign having been changed.

**Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD)** – Mrs. Glidden reported that the Request for Proposal (RFP) is out for consultants and are awaiting responses.

#### **8. Old Business**

None.

#### **9. Approval/Correction of the Minutes**

Mr. LePard stated that after reviewing the minutes, he's opposed to the Commission including hoop structures within the regulations and the need for a building permit. Mrs. Glidden stated, in her opinion, most hoop structures are permanent, that they should be considered either an accessory structure or a structure, and that they need to follow the same regulations as any structure. Mr. LePard stated he's against it.

Mr. LePard also stated that he's opposed to the requirement that your septic system has to be pumped prior to receiving any permit. Mrs. Glidden stated the requirement (a permit to discharge and a pump out report) may be changing as it was a provision of the Chatham Health Dept.

Mrs. Glidden asked the Commission's thoughts on whether or not to keep hoop structures within the regulations. The Commission agreed to leave them within the regulations.

**MOTION:** Jamin Laurenza moved to approve the 21 January 2016 minutes as submitted. Carmelo Rosa second. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **10. Chairman's Report**

None.

#### **11. Scheduling of Hearings**

None.

#### **12. Town Planner's Report**

None.

#### **12a. Election of Officer (Secretary)**

**MOTION:** Jamin Laurenza nominated Ed Wallor as secretary. Carmelo Rosa second. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **13. Adjournment**

**MOTION:** Ed Wallor moved to adjourn. Carmelo Rosa second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Bunny Hall Batzner*

Bunny Hall Batzner  
Recording Clerk

**The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 18 February 2016.**