

BOLTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
7:30 PM, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2024
BOLTON TOWN HALL, 222 BOLTON CENTER ROAD
In-Person and Via Zoom
MINUTES

PZC Members Present In-Person: Chairman Tom Manning, Marilee Manning, Thomas Robbins

PZC Members Present Via Zoom: Vice-Chair James Cropley (7:45pm), Arlene Fiano, Alternate Diane DeNunzio

PZC Members Absent: Steven Clark, Jeremy Flick, Alternate Tom Crockett

Staff Present Via Zoom: Patrice Carson, AICP, Consulting Director of Community Development, Michael D'Amato, Zoning Enforcement Officer, Recording Secretary Kacie Cannon

Others Present In-Person: Atty Ed Joy, Michael Bugnacki, Morris Silverstein, Brian Mensinger, Andrew Ladyga

Others Present Via Zoom: Tyler Clark

1. Call to Order: T. Manning called the meeting to order at 7:33pm. D. Denunzio was seated for J. Flick.

2. Approval of Minutes: November 13, 2024

M. Manning MOVED to APPROVE the regular meeting minutes of November 13, 2024 as presented. D. Denunzio SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0.

3. Residents' Forum:

Morris Silverstein stated that he previously spoke to the PZC regarding an expansion to a non-conforming property on behalf of Tyler Clark and asked if there was an update on this. T. Manning stated that there was a discussion on vertical expansion; however, a formal text change and public hearing would be required for the PZC to consider and implement the amendment. He suggested that Mr. Silverstein submit a formal text amendment for public hearing. P. Carson noted that a formal application and fee would be required to submit a text amendment. Mr. Silverstein stated that he would not be submitting the application but would be happy to assist with the process if needed.

Andrew Ladyga stated that he is preparing to market his properties on Boston Turnpike and asked if the PZC could provide a letter of support welcoming potential buyers and the potential for development of housing. T. Manning replied that the first step would be to speak with staff, and the next step would be to request an informal discussion with the PZC to gain an understanding of their stance on the matter. He added that the PZC would not provide a formal statement. P. Carson explained that the PZC is not in a position to write such letters as it could cause bias in any future applications that come before the PZC. She advised Mr. Ladyga to look at the housing plan online that was approved by the PZC and part of the Plan of Conservation and Development. P. Carson added that the sewer is intended for commercial activity, not higher-density residential development.

Tyler Clark informed the PZC that he is working on putting a text amendment together for the vertical expansion of his non-conforming property.

4. Staff Reports:

P. Carson stated that staff met with someone about a Right-of-Way. She also noted that a few meetings had taken place regarding a property on West Street; however, the property was just sold, and the matter is no longer an issue. She stated that she does not believe there will be a development on the property as the buyer seems more interested in using it for hunting.

P. Carson shared several photos of the new trail behind the gas station located at 271 Hop River Road. She noted that the trail is very impressive and shared photos of a bridge that was built over the stream and a drainage pipe that was installed under the trail for water to pass so it does not run over the trail. P. Carson stated that she is unsure when the gas station will open. She spoke with the Hop River Trail Alliance to see if they might maintain the trail if necessary. P. Carson reported that she is also working on providing information on the Cider Mill property for the state.

M. D'Amato was also unsure when the gas station will open. Other than meetings with property owners, he spoke with a gentleman who acquired a lot through the Town's tax sale. The property is a very small lake lot, and the owner is trying to determine if he can build a house on it. M. D'Amato spoke with the owner's engineer today, and he stated that their conversation reminded him of previous discussions with the PZC about the lack of clarity in the term "coverage" as it pertains to building coverage versus impervious coverage. He stated that the terms need to be clarified at some point.

Vice-Chair James Cropley joined the meeting.

5. Public Hearings:

a. APPLICATION: Zoning Regulation Amendment to Section 450-6.1N(12)(a) Traditional Multiple Dwelling Complexes for (the Elderly) Seniors, Reducing the Resident Age Restriction from 62 to 55 Years of Age, Michael Bugnacki (#PL-24-5)

T. Manning opened the Public Hearing. P. Carson read the Legal Notice. P. Carson stated that the Capitol Regional Council of Governments (CRCOG) has not replied, and the hearing will need to be kept open for their response until 35 days has passed. She added that the PZC can still hear from the public, and a Notice to Abutters was sent to everyone within 500 feet of the property.

Attorney Ed Joy introduced himself on behalf of Michael Bugnacki and stated that Mr. Bugnacki has been a builder in the community for several years. He stated that the application is for the property located at 7 Loomis Road, which is a six-unit building with a Resident Age Restriction of 62 years of age, and Mr. Bugnacki is seeking to reduce the age restriction from 62 years of age to 55 years of age.

P. Carson stated that all four tenants submitted letters of no objection. Atty Joy added that several good applicants have been turned away based on their age, and changing the age restriction would help to get the remaining two units occupied. He also stated that the amendment would not cause a hardship for any other complexes in town and added that many complexes, such as mobile home communities, commonly restrict the age to 55 and older.

T. Manning asked Atty Joy if any studies have been done for adjacent towns or states regarding the age restriction in elderly communities. Atty Joy replied that there have not but noted that he will provide a study in the form of an addendum.

Brian Mensinger asked for clarification on the language in Paragraph A, which states that no tenant shall be evicted due to a change in personal circumstance such as death, divorce, etc. as he believes the "etc." is too broad and could leave the door open to tenants who do not meet the age requirement. Atty Joy agreed that it could happen if, for example, an elderly resident is involved with a younger individual who is a co-habitant. He stated that if the older individual passed away, the language protects the younger individual from losing their residence.

Mr. Mensinger shared concerns about younger residents such as a younger adult residing in a unit with their elderly parents. Atty Joy stated that the young adult would not be on the lease, therefore, the rule would not apply. P. Carson further clarified that particular part of the regulation is already in effect and is not part of the change being requested by Mr. Bugnacki. She added that approving the reduction of the age restriction would apply to any future developers of senior housing, and they would receive the benefit of housing tenants aged 55 and older. J. Cropley asked if it is typical for senior housing to allow residents 55 and older. P. Carson stated Atty Joy will be providing that information to the PZC.

P. Carson stated that the next meeting will be held on January 8, 2025, and the PZC can assume that CRCOG approves of the Application if no response is received within the 35-day time period. Mr. Bugnacki asked how many days have lapsed. P. Carson stated that the letter was sent to CRCOG on November 25, 2024, and they have until the end of December to respond.

T. Manning MOVED to continue the Public Hearing until January 8, 2025 at 7:30 p.m. at 222 Bolton Center, in-person or virtual. J. Cropley SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0.

b. APPLICATION: Modification of Special Permit to Allow Reduction of Resident Age Restriction from 62 to 55 Years of Age for 6-Unit Senior Housing Project, 7 Loomis Road, Michael Bugnacki (#PL-24-4)

T. Manning introduced the item for Public Hearing. P. Carson read the Legal Notice. She stated that the hearing will need to be continued to January 8, 2025 as well to allow time for CRCOG to respond.

Atty Joy representing Mr. Bugnacki reiterated his previous comments regarding Mr. Bugnacki's interest in reducing the age restriction for tenants at 7 Loomis Road from 62 years of age to 55 years of age. He added that he will submit a report on the typical age restrictions of senior housing communities in the surrounding areas at least one week prior to the January 8, 2025 meeting. Atty Joy stated that he expects he will find that 55 years of age will be the common requirement for most communities. He echoed his previous comments that approval of the Application will not impose any burden on other senior complexes in the community and will open up the option for future senior housing developments to offer units to residents 55 and older.

T. Manning MOVED to continue the Public Hearing until January 8, 2025 at 7:30 p.m. at 222 Bolton Center, in-person or virtual. D. Denunzio SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0.

6. Old Business

a. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE DECISION: Zoning Regulation Amendment to Section 450-6.1N(12)(a) Traditional Multiple Dwelling Complexes for (the Elderly) Seniors, Reducing the Resident Age Restriction from 62 to 55 Years of Age, Michael Bugnacki (#PL-24-5)

Since the public hearing is still open, this item is deferred.

b. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE DECISION: Modification of Special Permit to Allow Reduction of Resident Age Restriction from 62 to 55 Years of Age for 6-Unit Senior Housing Project, 7 Loomis Road, Michael Bugnacki (#PL-24-4)

Since the public hearing is still open, this item is deferred.

c. Other: No other old business.

7. New Business

a. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE DECISION: FY 2025/26 Budget

P. Carson shared a spreadsheet outlining the current budget expenditures so far for the 2024-2025 fiscal year, which runs from July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025, and the budget request for the 2025-2026 fiscal year. She noted that Payroll expenditures include everything through November 2024; however, Advertising expenditures do not include all of November so that amount will increase. P. Carson stated that no budget increases are needed; however, she mentioned that the budget is based on PZC activity, but the Commission generally stays within the range allotted. P. Carson noted that several items will not be expensed until later this fiscal year such as dues, fees, office expenses and professional training.

T. Manning asked if any input was provided on the budget. P. Carson stated that a letter was received indicating that budget submissions are due by December 20, 2024. The budget may be more difficult this year due to increases in various expenses, and budget cuts may be necessary. The PZC will not need to submit an add/drop package since the budget request will not change.

M. Manning asked if unspent funds are returned to the Town. P. Carson stated that the funds are generally returned and applied to areas where overspending has occurred.

T. Manning MOVED to APPROVE the FY 2025-2026 Budget as presented. J. Cropley SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0.

b. Election of Officers

P. Carson stated that the PZC Chairman and Vice Chairman/Secretary positions are open for nominations.

J. Cropley MOVED to nominate T. Manning as Chairman. A. Fiano SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0. A. Fiano MOVED to nominate J. Cropley as Vice-Chairman/Secretary. T. Robbins SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0.

c. Other

T. Manning stated that he learned at the last Regional Planning Commission meeting that several communities no longer have an RPC. He explained that staff now does the work of the RPC in those areas and takes any requests to the Mayors and Selectmen for approval. T. Manning stated that, after discussion, the Regional Planning Commission decided to keep the RPC as it serves as a great resource and provides excellent speakers. He added that he will continue to attend the RPC meetings.

8. ONGOING DISCUSSION: Bolton Subdivision and Zoning Regulations

T. Manning asked if the staff has any recommendations. P. Carson stated that there are none at this point. However, there are questions about the differences between building coverage and impervious surface coverage that M. D'Amato mentioned earlier. She asked the PZC if they wanted to treat building coverage the same as impervious surface coverage as they are currently two separate categories. A.

Fiano asked if they are both calculated the same way. P. Carson stated that she believes it would be very similar since impervious surfaces include roof runoff and runoff of an asphalt driveway, unless it is a gravel driveway, real brick sidewalk, or other surface that is more pervious.

P. Carson noted that properties are allowed 25% coverage but is unsure if that includes both buildings and all impervious surfaces. T. Manning stated that it should be defined as building coverage. M. D'Amato stated that the dimensional requirements reference lot coverage and impervious coverage; however, the definitions reference building coverage and impervious coverage which causes confusion. He stated the lot coverage could be 15% but the impervious coverage could be 20%; however, there is no percentage for building coverage as building coverage is only mentioned in the definitions. T. Manning stated that lot coverage is the same as building coverage and recommended replacing any references to lot coverage with building coverage. M. D'Amato replied that the change would make it more inclusive but it would not clear up the confusion between the different coverage percentages.

P. Carson asked if it would be easier to say that a lot can be covered up to 25% with buildings or impervious surfaces or if it would be better to keep it separate. M. D'Amato stated that there does not appear to be any value in separating them and agreed the Town should just regulate the total coverage. T. Manning noted that he believes it is separate because a building could take up all of the impervious coverage and that is why it is limited to 25 percent. He added that any additional impervious coverage can be added at a different percentage. P. Carson clarified that the impervious coverage percentage should be higher than the building coverage and that the lot coverage should be removed. T. Manning confirmed that is correct. P. Carson stated this is usually not an issue on large lots; however, it becomes confusing on smaller lots when an owner wants to add a shed.

M. D'Amato stated that the best way to codify it would be to show the calculation or add a third column to include the term. He added that when the Lake District regulations were adopted in Ashford, they specifically included how to calculate coverage, particularly regarding an open deck that would allow water to pass through. He explained that the deck would not be included as coverage, and structures measuring 200 square feet or less would be exempt. He added that including the calculation instructions and options, such as the deck option, helped avoid confusion and encouraged adding coverage that would not be counted. T. Manning asked if M. D'Amato could provide those calculations. M. D'Amato added that the R1, R2, and R3 percentages are the same but he does not know how they would need to be adjusted based on the lot size. He noted that staff will review it further. P. Carson added that the R1 and R2 minimum lot sizes are 40,000, and the R3 minimum is 22,500.

9. Correspondence

P. Carson sent out correspondence regarding Land Use Commissioner training taking place tomorrow, December 12 at 1:00 p.m. She added that a link to the webinar is provided once you register. This is a Fair and Affordable Housing Land Use Commission training with 0.5 training requirement credits.

10. Adjournment

J. Cropley MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 8:36 p.m. T. Manning SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0.

Respectfully submitted by Kacie Cannon

Kacie Cannon

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

January 6, 2025

TO: BOLTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REPORT ON ZONING REFERRAL Z-2024-124: Proposed text amendment to reduce the resident age restriction from 62 to 55 years of age for traditional multiple dwelling complex for the elderly and for 7 Loomis Rd.

COMMISSIONERS: Receipt is acknowledged of the above-mentioned referral. Notice of this proposal was transmitted to the Policy and Planning Division of the Capitol Region Council of Governments under the provisions of Section 8-3b of the Connecticut General Statutes, as amended.

COMMENT: The staff of the Regional Planning Commission of the Capitol Region Council of Governments has reviewed this zoning referral and finds no apparent conflict with regional plans and policies or the concerns of neighboring towns.

The public hearing date has been scheduled for 1/8/2025.


In accordance with our procedures this letter will constitute final CRCOG action on this referral. Questions concerning this referral should be directed to Jacob Knowlton.

DISTRIBUTION: Planner: Andover, Glastonbury, Hebron, Manchester, Vernon, Coventry

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Bartiss-Earley, Chairman
Regional Planning Commission

William Rice, Vice Chairman
Regional Planning Commission



Jacob Knowlton
Community Development Planner

Palazzini, Danielle

Subject: FW: Senior Housing Regulation Amendment
Attachments: Age Restriction Info.pdf

From: Carson, Patrice <pcarson@boltonct.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 12:40 PM
To: Palazzini, Danielle <dpalazzini@boltonct.gov>
Subject: FW: Senior Housing Regulation Amendment

Internal (pcarson@boltonct.gov)

[Report This Email](#) [View My Quarantine](#) [Protection by Novus Insight](#)

This just came in. If possible, can you update the packet before you leave today? I would include Atty Joy's email and the attachment only. I would just print out his email and the attachment and scan it as one document to add. You may have a better way to do it?

*Patrice L. Carson, AICP
Consulting Director of Community Development
Town of Bolton
860.359.1454*

From: Edward Joy <ejoylaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 12:33 PM
To: Carson, Patrice <pcarson@boltonct.gov>
Cc: M.T.S. Builders <bugnacki@aol.com>; Mike Bugnacki <mikebugnacki64@icloud.com>
Subject: Re: Senior Housing Regulation Amendment

Patrice,

See attached on the issue of a Deed Restriction in a rental complex for a 55 and over age restriction:

1. CT OLR Research Report from 8/21/1997 , state funded congregate elderly housing complexes must have a Age 62 and over restriction. The age restriction can lowered even in a state funded complex if circumstances require it.
2. US HUD Fair Housing Act: Housing for Older Persons. In order for a complex to be deemed elderly housing with a 55 and over age restriction, there must be a minimum of 80% occupancy by age 55 and over occupants.
3. Town of Coventry Zoning Regulations defines Senior Housing as having at least one occupant of no less than 55 years of age.
4. Town of Manchester Zoning Regulations Article II, Section 20.03(c)2, Elderly deed restriction for independent living units must be occupied by at least 1 person having attained the age of 55 Years.

It seems clear that the age 62 in always the minimum age in a State and/or federally funded congregate housing complex but that in privately owned complexes the age restriction of 55 and older, if otherwise approved by a municipality does not violate State or Federal Fair Housing Laws.

Eddie

Law Offices of Edward J. Joy, LLC
128 East Center Street
Manchester, CT 06040-5204
Phone:860-432-4065
Fax: 860-432-4791

The information in this e-mail message and any attachments thereto have been sent by an attorney or his/her agent, and is or are intended to be confidential and for the use of only the individual or entity named above. The information may be protected by attorney/client privilege, work product immunity or other legal rules. If the reader of this message and any attachments thereto is not the intended recipient, you hereby are notified that retention, dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message and any attachments is strictly prohibited.

Topic:
ELDERLY; HOUSING (GENERAL);
Location:
HOUSING - ELDERLY;
Scope:
Connecticut laws/regulations;



The Connecticut General Assembly

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH

Room 5300
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106-1591

(860) 240-8400
FAX (860) 240-8881
olr@po.state.ct.us



August 21, 1997 97-R-0939

TO:

FROM: Helga Niesz, Principal Analyst

RE: Non-seniors in Senior Housing Complex

You asked if there is any legal limit on the number of disabled non-seniors that can live in a senior housing complex. You also want to know if they can "jump" a senior over a disabled non-senior on the waiting list in order to keep the complex filled mostly with senior residents. You asked if there is any specific percentage of seniors to non-seniors that is allowable in senior housing.

SUMMARY

Connecticut state-assisted senior housing is generally restricted to the elderly (age 62 or over) and the non-elderly disabled (which are included in the definition of "elderly" for this purpose). Connecticut law does not limit the number or percentage of non-elderly disabled that can live in a senior housing complex. There are also no provisions for "jumping" a senior citizen over a non-senior disabled person on a waiting list. Massachusetts, on the other hand, has legislation that sets policy objectives, but no absolute limits, of 86.5% elderly and 13.5% non-elderly disabled in senior housing projects.

The Connecticut law also allows housing authorities, with the Department of Economic and Community Development's approval, to temporarily drop the admission age to 55 in situations where not enough qualified people apply, but this is rarely used.

One type of elderly housing, congregate housing, is restricted by state law to people over 62 who are frail and need assistance with the tasks of daily living.

Federal law also has no specific limits for elderly or disabled, but allows federally assisted housing complexes to designate specific areas for seniors and disabled persons.

ELDERLY HOUSING STATUTES

Connecticut law allows "elderly housing" to be restricted to seniors and disabled people. Although state law generally prohibits discrimination in housing based on age, one of the exceptions is "housing for older persons" (CGS § 46a-64c).

To be eligible for elderly housing in Connecticut, an applicant must be age 62 or older or be certified by the Social Security Board as totally disabled under the Social Security Act. Someone can also meet the definition if any other federal board or agency has made a determination of total disability. But individuals are not eligible if they (1) currently use illegal drugs, (2) currently abuse alcohol and have a recent history of disruptive or dangerous behavior and their tenancy poses a direct threat to other tenants or to the property, or (3) have a recent history of disruptive or dangerous behavior and their tenancy would pose this same threat (CGS § 8-113a).


State law restricts state-assisted elderly housing projects to elderly and disabled people unless the housing project is unable to attract enough elderly tenants (people aged 62 or older who lack the income to live in decent housing without financial assistance and people who have been certified as totally disabled by the Social Security Board under the federal Social Security Act or by any other federal board or agency (CGS § 8-113a(m)). If the project cannot attract enough elderly tenants it may, with the Department of Economic and Community Development commissioner's approval, rent to people over 55 if they meet the other eligibility requirements. To get the commissioner's approval, the project must demonstrate that it cannot attract enough elderly tenants and that it has adequately advertised the vacancies.

State-assisted congregate housing, on the other hand, is restricted by state law to people 62 years of age or older who have difficulties with one or more activities of daily living. It is designed as an alternative to nursing homes for the low-income frail elderly (CGS § 8-119e).

We have enclosed copies of prior Office of Legislative Research reports that may be of interest to you.

HN:lc

Attachments: OLR Report No.: 97-R-0360, 97-R-0282, 97-R-0191, 96-R-1126, and 96-R-1052

 An official website of the United States Government [Here's how you know](#)



Español



Home (/) / Program Offices
(/program_offices) / FHEO Home
(/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp)
/ The Fair Housing Act: Housing for
Older Persons

THE FAIR HOUSING ACT: HOUSING FOR OLDER PERSONS

The Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability or familial status (families with children under the age of 18; pregnant women and people in the process of obtaining custody of children under 18, or persons with written permission of the parent or legal guardian). However, it contains a limited exemption from the familial status prohibitions for housing for older persons.

What Are the Fair Housing Act's
"Housing for Older Persons"
Exemptions?

Website Feedback

How to Qualify for the "55 or Older" Exemption

File a Complaint

Additional Resources

What Are the Fair Housing Act's "Housing for Older Persons" Exemptions?

The Fair Housing Act specifically exempts three types of housing for older persons from liability for familial status discrimination. Such exempt housing facilities or communities can lawfully refuse to sell or rent dwellings to families with minor children *only* if they qualify for the exemption. In order to qualify for the "housing for older persons" exemption, a facility or community must comply with all the requirements of the exemption.

The Housing for Older Persons exemptions apply to the following housing:

1. Provided under any state or federal program that the Secretary of HUD has determined to be specifically designed and operated to assist elderly persons (as defined in the state or federal program);
2. Intended for, and solely occupied by persons 62 years of age or older; or
3. Intended and operated for occupancy by persons 55 years

[Website Feedback](#)

of age or older.

The 55 or older exemption is the most common of the three.

How to Qualify for the "55 or Older" Exemption

In order to qualify for the "55 or older" housing exemption, a facility or community must satisfy *each* of the following requirements:

- At least 80 percent of the units must have at least one occupant who is 55 years of age or older; and
- The facility or community must publish and adhere to policies and procedures that demonstrate the intent to operate as "55 or older" housing; and
- The facility or community must comply with HUD's regulatory requirements for age verification of residents.

The "housing for older persons" exemption does not protect such housing facilities or communities from liability for housing discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, disability, or national origin.

File a Complaint

If you think your fair housing rights have been violated, you may file a

Website Feedback complaint

(/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp/online-complaint) with HUD or contact (/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp/contact_fheo) your local FHEO office.

Additional Resources

HOPA Regulations at 24 C.F.R. §§
100.300 – 100.308

(<https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2017-title24-vol1/xml/CFR-2017-title24-vol1-part100-subpartE.xml>)

HOPA Questions and Answers
(/sites/documents/DOC_7769.PDF)

FHEO's Disability Page
(/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp/disability_main)

Pet Ownership for the Elderly
and Persons with Disabilities;
Final Rule

(<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2008/10/27/E8-25474/pet-ownership-for-the-elderly-and-persons-with-disabilities>)

Back to FHEO Home
(/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp)

Agency

Resources

U.S. Department of
Housing and Urban Development


[Website Feedback](#)

451 7th Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20410

T: 202-708-1112


TTY: 202-708-1455

[Find a HUD office near you \(/localoffices\)](#)



[Privacy Policy \(/privacy_policy\)](#) | [Web Policies \(/library/bookshelf1\)](#) | [Accessibility \(/accessibility\)](#) | [Sitemap \(/siteindex\)](#)

Website Feedback



ZONING REGULATIONS TOWN OF COVENTRY CONNECTICUT

Adopted by the Coventry Planning and Zoning Commission

Effective Date: November 13, 2006

REVISION DATES:

- 06/06/07 – Section 6.14
- 07/30/97 – Section 6.10.02.j.
- 03/31/09 – Section 5.01.05(a)
- 05/11/09 – Section 4.06.08
- 11/23/09 – Section 6.05.01.a.2
- 02/12/10 - Section 6.07.02.i
- 09/27/10 – Section 6.03.01a3.i, 6.05.01.a.2.i, 6.06.02.a.1.i (Ag Accessory Structure)
- 10/12/10 - Section 6.06.03, 6.07.03, 6.08.3, 6.12.03, 6.13.03 (Design Guidelines)
- 10/12/10 - Section 6.03.02n (Specially Permit Uses) and Section 2.02 (definitions)
- 04/01/11 - Section 6.06, 6.07, 6.08, 6.09, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 6.13
- 06/01/11 - Section 6.03.02.o (GR40/80 Specially Permitted Uses) Wineries & Social Gatherings Accessory;
6.03.02.p 'Agriculture and Accessory Retail Uses not to Exceed 2,500 s.f. in area'
- 08/01/11 - Section 2.02, 4.02.01.iii, 4.03.03.b, 4.06.05, 4.11.c, 4.12.05.b.6, 4.12.06.f, 4.14.02.b, 5.01.03, 5.04.02,
5.04.03, 5.05.01, 6.03.01, 7.02.01, 7.02.03, 7.04
- 06/15/12 - Section 4.06.01.g.4; 4.06.01.g.5; 5.02.04; 5.03.03; 5.05.01.a.5; 5.06.02.b; 5.06.03.b.f; 5.06.04.a;
5.06.07.d, f, 6, 7, i, j, k; 5.06.09.f; 5.08.02; 6.09.02.c; 6.10.02.h; 6.11.02.h; 7.02.02.h.i; 7.02.03.e, i, j;
7.02.07.1; 7.03.06.c; 7.03.08.b; 8.03; 9.02
- 03/07/13 - Sections 6.11.01.a.9 and 6.10.01.a.10
- 03/24/14 - Sections 2.02, 4.02.01.c.1, 4.02.01.c.2, 4.04.03.c, 4.14.02.i, 5.02.03.d, 5.04.09, 5.05.05.01.c.4,
5.05.01.d, 5.12.06, 5.13.05.j, 5.13.05.k, 6.06.02.i, 6.07.01.a.1, 6.07.01.a.10, 7.03.07, 7.04.08.d,
Subdivision Regulations - Chapter V, Sections 2 a, b, c, d; 2.d.1, 2 A, B; 2.d.2; 2.e.1, 2, 3; 2.f, g, h,
i, j; 4, 5 a, b, c; 6; Road Regulations – Sections 50A.4, 50A.5, 60C.2, 60C.3, 60C.4
- 09/15/14 – Section 7.06.01
- 06/08/15 - Sections: 4.03.03.d, 4.06.01.g, 4.06.01.g.4, 4.14.02.c.2, 5.03.05.c.10, 5.13.05.g, 6.03.01.a.3, 6.03.02.q,
6.04.02.b, 6.04.02.d, 6.05.01.a.2, 6.06.01.a.1, 6.07.01.a.9, 6.07.02.kk, 6.09.02.f, 6.10.02.k, 6.11.02.j.
- 04/22/16 - Section 4.06.01.e

Restaurants: A commercial establishment used primarily for the preparation, sale, and service of meals or other prepared foods to the public for consumption on or off the premises. The sale of prepackaged or unprepared food shall not, in and of itself, cause an establishment to be deemed a restaurant.

Resubdivision: A change in a map of an approved or recorded subdivision or resubdivision if such change (i) affects any street layout shown on such map, (ii) affects any area reserved thereon for public use, or (iii) diminishes the size of any lot shown thereon and creates an additional building lot, if any of the lots shown thereon have been conveyed after the approval or recording of such map.

Road: Same as "Street".

Screening: Natural or man-made materials used to limit the visibility of a structure or land use from a street or from nearby property.

Senior Housing: Housing in which at least one member of the household is at least fifty-five years of age; and in which no more than one member of the household may be less than fifty-five years, provided that said member must not be less than twenty-one years of age. A deed restriction related to the age requirement must be approved by the Commission and Town Attorney, and recorded on the land records of the Town.

Septage: Domestic wastes pumped from septic tanks.

Septage Lagoon: An open pit, depression, or pond used to hold septage.

Setback: The minimum distance that must be maintained between a structure and a street right-of-way or lot line in order to meet the yard requirements of these Regulations.

Side Lot Line: See "Lot Line, Side".

Side Yard: See "Yard, Side".

Sign: Any device for visual communication used to announce, advertise, identify, or attract attention to any object, project, place, person, activity, institution, organization, or business. The term "sign" includes any structure or natural object, such as a tree or rock, utilized as a visual communication device. For the purposes of these Regulations, the term "sign" shall also include interior signs, if located on a window or within three (3) feet from a window and if obviously intended for viewing from the exterior, but shall not include the flag, pennant, badge, or insignia of any government, governmental agency, school or religious organization; decorative flags or banners on residential property; signs directing or guiding traffic and parking on private property but bearing no advertising matter; official traffic signs; or notices required by law.

Site Plan: A drawing or series of drawings by which proposed or existing uses, dimensions, or conditions of land or any building or structure are graphically illustrated. A "zoning permit plan" and a "special permit plan" are two different types of site plans.

Site Plan Review/Site Plan Approval: Whenever the term "site plan review" or "site plan approval" is used in these Regulations, the term is intended to refer to a formal process in which the Commission itself, rather than professional staff designated by these Regulations, reviews, and decides upon a zoning site plan.

Soil Scientist, Certified: An individual who is duly qualified in accordance with standards set by the Office of Personnel Management (formerly the U.S. Civil Service Commission).

**TOWN OF MANCHESTER, CONNECTICUT
ZONING REGULATIONS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Press "Control" and click
the mouse to go to desired
Section.*

*Press "Control" and
"Home" together to return to
the Table of Contents*

ARTICLE I

GENERAL

- Section 1 INTRODUCTION
- Section 2 DEFINITIONS
- Section 3 ZONES
- Section 4 APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS
- Section 5 PUBLIC HEARING NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

ARTICLE II

ZONING USES

- Section 1 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL ZONE
- Section 2 RURAL RESIDENCE ZONES
- Section 3 RESIDENCE AA ZONE
- Section 4 RESIDENCE A ZONE
- Section 5 RESIDENCE B ZONE
- Section 6 RESIDENCE C ZONE
- Section 7 PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ZONE
- Section 8 COMPREHENSIVE URBAN DEVELOPMENT ZONE
- Section 9 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BUSINESS ZONES
- Section 10 BUSINESS I ZONE
- Section 11 BUSINESS II ZONE
- Section 12 BUSINESS III ZONE
- Section 13 RESERVED
- Section 14 BUSINESS V ZONE
- Section 15 CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT
- Section 16 INDUSTRIAL ZONE
- Section 17 OFF STREET PARKING ZONE
- Section 18 HISTORIC ZONE
- Section 19 FLOOD PLAIN ZONE
- * Section 20 ELDERLY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT (EHD) ZONE
- Section 21 PROHIBITED USES
- Section 22 SPECIAL DESIGN COMMERCIAL BUSINESS ZONE
- Section 23 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS ZONE
- Section 24 GENERAL BUSINESS ZONE
- Section 25 DESIGN OVERLAY ZONE
- Section 26 FORM BASED ZONE

ARTICLE III

AREA AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS

- Section 1 NONCONFORMING LOTS OF RECORD
- Section 2 MAIN STREET FRONT YARDS
- Section 3 IRREGULAR SHAPED LOTS
- Section 4 CLUSTER SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS
- Section 5 UNIT OWNERSHIP
- Section 6 REAR LOTS
- Section 7 LOT MERGER

20.03

Elderly housing development is permitted in an EHD zone provided the Planning and Zoning Commission, after a public hearing, finds that the following standards and criteria have been met:

- (a) Public water and sanitary sewer systems must be provided for the development.
- (b) Except for elderly deed restricted housing, public transportation or adequate municipally provided transportation specifically for and used by the elderly must be available to the site. This requirement may be waived provided the applicant submits satisfactory evidence of sufficient commitment to provide convenient transportation as a service to the residents of the facility. Transportation must provide service to facilities including but not limited to shopping, personal care establishments, health care establishments or practices, adult day care and places of worship.
- (c) Residency requirements shall be imposed by the developer and run with the land limiting the occupancy of elderly housing units as follows:
 1. All congregate housing and assisted living units shall be occupied by persons at least 62 years of age who desire or require residential accommodations or support services. For double occupancy at least one occupant must be age 62 and the other at least age 50. A unit may be occupied by the surviving member of a household, regardless of age, if the other household member at the time of death met the age requirements for occupancy.⁴
 - ✱ 2. Elderly deed restricted independent living units shall be occupied by at least one person 55 years of age or older. A unit may be occupied by the surviving member of a household, regardless of age, if the other household member at the time of death met the age requirements for occupancy.⁵
 3. Multi-family elderly housing shall be occupied by persons at least 62 years of age or older. A unit may be occupied by the surviving member of a household, regardless of age, if the other household member at the time of death met the age requirements for occupancy.⁶
- (d) Reasonable traffic circulation exists to and from the site taking into consideration roadway capacities and level of service, access to parking and access to the site by emergency or other public safety vehicles.

⁴ Amended 06/19/2006, effective 07/08/06

⁵ Amended 06/19/2006, effective 07/08/06

⁶ Amended 06/19/2006, effective 07/08/06