

Agenda
Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission
Monday November 10, 2025
7:00 p.m.
Robert F. Parisi Council Chambers
Town Hall - 45 South Main Street

Call to Order
Pledge of Allegiance
Roll Call
Consideration of Minutes- September 8, 2025

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Special Permit/City of Meriden/143 Hanover Street #405-25
(**NO ACTION**: Continued to 12/08/2025)
2. Text Amendment-Family Child Care Home and Group Child Care Home #903-25

EXECUTIVE SESSION

3. Executive Session pursuant to CGS § 1-225(f) & § 1-200(6)(B), to discuss Sunwood v. Planning & Zoning Commission
4. Action on approval of Sunwood Development #102-24, in accordance with Court decision.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND STAFF

5. Administrative Approvals-
 - 374 North Colony St/374 NCR, LLC #308-25
 - 174 Center St/Glidden #309-25
 - 61 North Plains Industrial Rd/MacFarlane #224-25
 - 214 Center Street/Dagliere #310-25
 - 600 North Colony Rd. Unit 1/Donovan #311-25
 - 33 Ashlar Village/Masonicare #225-25
 - 208 North Colony Rd./Piekarski #312-25
6. ZBA October Decisions
7. ZBA Notice

Individuals in need of auxiliary aids for effective communication in programs and services of the Town of Wallingford are invited to make their needs and preferences known to the ADA Compliance Coordinator at 203-294-2070 five (5) days prior to meeting date.

Staff Notes
Wallingford Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
Monday, November 10, 2025

1. #903-25 Family Child Care and Group Child Care Homes

- Text amendment to bring our zoning regulations into compliance with CGS §8-3j
- I worked directly with the Law Department to amend the definitions and add a new Section to fully comply with the State statute
- They have been reviewed by the Law Department and confirmation for compliance to the State must be received before December 1

2. Sunwood Appeal Decision

- Corporation Counsel will be in attendance to go over the decision in the Sunwood Appeal
- A new motion was written and agreed upon by the plaintiff and Town Staff

Other notes:

- I sent out a request to SCRCOG for each Town and their detached ADU regulations. They sent out a request to each Town and compiled a memo, that I included in your packets, that details which Towns in our SCRCOG region allow detached ADUs and by what process. I did not put it as a discussion item for the agenda, but I wanted to send it out for your information.
- If the line item says Yes under “Restricted to Only Primary Structure” then the Town does not currently allow detached units

RECOMMENDED MOTIONS
Wallingford Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
Monday, November 10, 2025

1. #903-25 – Family Child Care and Group Child Care Amendments

Zoning text amendments to Section 2.2 and addition of Section 6.39 to comply with CGS §8-3j on language dated October 9, 2025 because:

2. Approval for re-subdivision 8-30g – Sunwood Development Corp. – 1136 Durham Road #102-24

In accordance with the Court decision issued in Sunwood v. Planning and Zoning Commission, Approval for a re-subdivision and site plan approval request for Sunwood Development Corp. under Statute 8-30g to construct a 13-lot residential development at 1136 Durham Rd. on plans entitled “The Cozy Corner an 8-30g Subdivision” dated January 24, 2024 and revised to July 1, 2024 subject to:

1. All comments from the Fire Marshal’s office
2. All comments from the Town Planner
3. All comments from Town Engineer, Alison Kapushinski
4. All comments from Scott Shipman, Senior Engineer, Water and Sewer division
5. All comments from Environmental Planner, Erin O’Hare
6. Memo from the Chief of Police dated 8/9/2024
7. Memo from the Acting Fire Chief dated 8/9/2024
8. Submission of recorded covenants for all easements associated with this subdivision. Including, but not limited to: Declaration of Covenants and restrictions for the storm drainage system, Drainage easement in favor of the proposed homeowner’s association, declaration of private sanitary sewer easements and electrical easements, declaration of sight line easement and declaration of snow storage easement. This documentation must be filed prior to the issuance of any building permits.
9. All easements must be filed and approved by the Town prior to any lot being sold or issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy.
10. That the Town Engineer and Town Planner are notified when construction is to begin.
11. Inspection of all erosion and sediment controls by the Environmental Planner and the Town Planner before construction is commenced.
12. An Erosion and Sediment Control bond in the amount of \$35,500.
13. A Road improvement bond in the amount of \$357,000, posted in accordance with CGS § 8-25. If the applicant posts the bond in accordance with § 8-25(d)(1), the following language shall be added to the stamped subdivision plan, filed on the land records: No lot shall be transferred to a buyer before any required financial guarantee is posted or before the approved public improvements and utilities are completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the commission or its agent.
14. Bond for electrical utilities to be determined by and posted with the Wallingford Electric Division.
15. Final Affordability Plan forwarded to the Planning and Zoning office.
16. Six (6) copies of the approved, final plans forwarded to the Planning and Zoning office



Town of Wallingford, Connecticut

JAMES SEICHTER
CHAIRMAN-PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

KEVIN J. PAGINI
TOWN PLANNER

WALLINGFORD TOWN HALL
45 SOUTH MAIN STREET
WALLINGFORD, CT 06492
TELEPHONE (203) 294-2090
FAX (203) 294-2095

Legal Notice

The following Public Hearings will be heard at the Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission's meeting of **Monday, November 10, 2025** at 7:00 p.m. in the Robert F. Parisi Council Chambers of Town Hall located at 45 South Main Street.

1. **#405-25**- Special Permit request for the City of Meriden to operate a material storage area at the south end of the Meriden Markham Airport – R-18 Residential District
2. **#903-25**-Proposed Amendment to the Town of Wallingford Zoning Regulations to allow Family Child Care Homes in compliance with CGS §8-3j by amendments to Section 2.2 and creation of a new Section 6.39

WALLINGFORD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

STEVEN ALLINSON, SECRETARY

DATED AT WALLINGFORD
10/24/2025

PUBLICATION DATES
10/28/2025
11/04/2025

Individuals in need of auxiliary aids for effective communication in programs and services of the Town Of Wallingford are invited to make their needs and preferences known to the ADA Compliance Coordinator at 203-294-2070 five (5) days prior to meeting date.

**Wallingford Planning & Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
Monday, September 8, 2025
7:00 p.m.
Robert F. Parisi Council Chambers – Town Hall
Town Hall – 45 South Main Street
MINUTES**

Chairman Seichter called the meeting to order at approximately 7:15 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

Roll Call: Present: James Seichter, Chair; James Fitzsimmons, Regular Member; Jeffrey Kohan, Regular Member; Joseph Sanders, Alternate; Bryan Rivard, Alternate; David Parent, Alternate; and Kevin Pagini, Town Planner. Also present were Thomas Hogan, Wright Pierce, and Jon Skaarup, GM2, peer reviewers for the traffic study.

Chairman Seichter noted that the Peer Reviewers were selected and hired by the Town. The applicant had no input.

Consideration of Minutes – August 11, 2025, Regular Meeting

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday, August 11, 2025, Regular Meeting of the Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission as submitted.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons: Second

Vote: Unanimous to approve with Commissioner Rivard abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

**2. Special Permit/Midwood Management Corp/1000, 1020, 1030, 1044, 1080 Barnes Road
(Continued from 08/11/2025) #401-25**

Commissioner Fitzsimmons noted the new correspondence for the record. Email from Shirley Shadish to Planning & Zoning Commission dated August 13, 2025; email from Joe Heeran to the Zoning Office dated August 14, 2025; email from Ed Hohmann to Chairman Seichter dated August 17, 2025; memo from the Department of Engineering to the Planning & Zoning Commission dated August 20, 2025; Letter from Jack Arrigoni to Kevin Pagini and the Planning & Zoning Commission dated August 21, 2025; email from Ed Hohmann to the Zoning Office dated August 29, 2025 including the July 12, 2021 meeting minutes and the August 9, 2021 meeting minutes; email from Thomas Hogan, Wright-Pierce to Kevin Pagini, Town Planner dated September 2, 2025; letter from James Bubaris, Bubaris Traffic Associates to Kevin Pagini, Town Planner dated September 3, 2025 regarding Response to Opposition Concerns including tables and exhibits; letter from Joan Munger to the Wallingford Planning and Zoning dated September 3, 2025; Letter from the Wallingford Chief of Police, John Ventura to Kevin Pagini, Town Planner dated September 3, 2025; email from Jack Arrigoni to Kevin Pagini and the Planning & Zoning Commission dated September 4, 2025; letter from Jon Skaarup, GM2 to Thomas Hogan, Wright-Pierce dated

September 5, 2025; email from Ed Hohmann to the Planning & Zoning Commission dated September 5, 2025; and a letter from Catherine J. Wall, Walls Farm Inc to James Seichter, Chairman dated September 8, 2025.

Chairman Seichter noted that Commissioner Rivard and Commissioner Sanders will be voting this evening.

Presenters included Attorney James Perito, Halloran & Sage, 265 Church Street, New Haven; Kevin Cornell, 59 Green Hill Road, Orange, and Chris Fezza, representing Midwood Management Corp; George Cotter, PE, OCC Group, and Jim Bubaris, Bubaris Traffic Associates, East Hampton.

Atty. Perito stated that they submitted additional materials in response to questions from the last meeting. He stated that sidewalks were added to all employee parking frontages and that the landscaping will be partially reduced because of the sidewalks. Revised Site Plans were submitted.

Mr. Cornell stated that the company has owned this property for 35 years, and they have been a good neighbor. The town created the regulations for this zone, and they used the regulations to create a master plan for development. He agrees that the first 1000 ft. of Northrop has different characteristics than the road north of this site. He stated that the application meets all the criteria for a Special Permit.

Atty. Perito noted that the letter from the Chief of Police states that the development will not be classified as a significant traffic generator.

Mr. Bubaris explained that after the last meeting, he went to OSTA to see what was included in the background data they told him to use. He asked if the other area developments (1107, 1117, 1200 Northrop, 850 Murdock Avenue, 932 Northrop, and 5 Research Parkway) were included. The head of the DOT Planning Division suggested that they take the analysis and add those developments in again. So the background traffic data includes all but this project then added this project. He evaluated all the signalized intersections on Leigus, Northrop, and the I-91 ramps, as well as the unsignalized intersections on Northrop that serve this site. The analysis found that all the signalized intersections will continue to operate at levels of service B to C, and the unsignalized intersections at levels A to C. So, basically, there will be no change to the level of service. Mr. Bubaris reported that he went back to OSTA and asked about 5 Research Parkway and how it used to have D & E level service. OSTA said that there has been a significant drop in traffic since 2018. He noted that if you take the same size development as office use versus warehouse, there would be 6 to 7 times the traffic. He clarified that the approved 5 Research Parkway warehouse is included in the numbers.

Chairman Seichter asked how they arrived at the numbers for the analysis. Were all the area projects not included to begin with? Mr. Bubaris replied that he understood that all the approved projects were included. OSTA looks at submitted projects to see if they are approved and keeps increasing the base with each project. OSTA said to add them again, but they are all low-traffic generators. Mr. Bubaris reported that he calculated the volumes of the other developments based on the square footage and

the ITE manual. Then he expanded the numbers for the passenger car equivalents. He shared his numbers with OSTA.

Commissioner Kohan asked for the classification of Northrop Road. He noted that it differs from Research Parkway. He noted that he took a walk down the road and there were buses, trucks, speeding traffic, and other pedestrians. Atty. Perito noted that the road changes. Commissioner Kohan asked where the truck access begins or ends. The road starts to narrow from about 25 ft. near Rt. 68 to about 20 ft. He also asked about the angle of the truck access and exit. Mr. Cotter showed the truck entrance on the drawing, 450 ft. from Rt. 68, and noted that the angle is 70 degrees. Trucks will come from Rt. 68 and will have no reason to be on Northrop Road beyond this driveway. They will provide a no left turn for the truck traffic. Commissioner Kohan asked about the turning radius for trucks heading to Rt. 68. Mr. Cotter replied that the area for the turn was designed to meet the requirements, and the trucks will stay in their own lane. They will not cross over the center line. They use a template that estimates the wheel pattern. Northrop Road is wide enough. He noted that the second truck access is straight into the property. He added that sight lines are more than adequate. Commissioner Kohan stated that the safety aspect is troubling.

Mr. Skaarup asked what template was used. Mr. Cotter replied 65 to make sure some of the largest vehicles could adequately make the turn and stay in the lane. Mr. Skaarup stated that it is consistent with what should be done. It is standard practice. There should be more than adequate room.

Commissioner Kohan noted that the levels of service for the area intersections had been D and E when other warehouses were proposed. He noted that the levels of service don't increase with this development. He asked how much more traffic there would have to be for the intersections to fail. Mr. Bubaris stated that the current level of service for these intersections is B and C, and they will continue to do so with this development. Commissioner Kohan stated that there is a lot of confusion over the traffic numbers. The intersection of Rt. 68 and Research Parkway is not included in this report. That intersection has a service level of D. He doesn't agree that traffic is less. We have to take into consideration the Post Office and the Amazon sorting facility. Atty. Perito noted that this is why the Town engaged the peer reviewer. The peer reviewer reviewed all the submissions. Traffic studies are based on a scientific approach, not perceptions. Commissioner Kohan asked how conservative the numbers are in this report. He is concerned with the pre- and post-COVID numbers.

Mr. Skaarup stated that the industry standards were followed and that ITE has a good dataset. He is confident that the rates are applicable for the development. The numbers presented were expanded based on the Town regulations. The only way to get a true measure is to count after it is built. They followed the right procedure, and the numbers are reasonably accurate. Commissioner Kohan agreed with the numbers from the ITE. He said that adding those numbers to existing conditions appears to be a discrepancy. What is the correct baseline? Mr. Skaarup replied that they went back to OSTA and added the area development numbers again. So they probably double-counted, which makes the numbers very conservative. Warehouses don't generate substantial traffic. He saw no comment that the northbound off-ramp from 91 was failing. He noted there is extensive stacking on left turn lanes.

250 turns per hour is about the max. There is no need at this point for a second left-turn lane. Peak would add an extra 40 or 50 vehicles. There is a stacking length to handle it. He was surprised at the level around B or C, but that's the worst condition averaged over an hour. He didn't see any condition that would cause that intersection to fail.

Commissioner Rivard asked if the conceptual studies included ingress and egress solely from Rt. 68 and avoiding Northrop Road. Mr. Cotter replied that he can't answer that. He stated that the first 600 ft. of Northrop is wider than further up, and that's why truck traffic is entering there. The intersection of Leigus and Old Barnes is the best traffic solution. There is no other way to get onto the property other than the Leigus Road intersection. Commissioner Rivard asked what would happen if the application were denied. Mr. Cornell replied that they have developed two parcels over the years. If denied, they would wait until they came up with another idea. Commissioner Rivard stated that the Special Permit criteria include appropriateness, conformance, safety, and overall design as it impacts the neighboring area. As for safety, he believes there is an issue where the road is compressed. He asked about the intent of the IX district in this area. Mr. Cornell explained that this area was originally in the I-5 zone with the hope that Connecticut could develop office and research space in that corridor. That didn't happen. Commissioner Rivard stated that he is asking himself if we want the IX district to become a lot of big warehouses. WE may need to look at these zones. This is a large piece of property, and there isn't a lot left. Atty. Perito stated that the zone permits warehousing uses, and the Special Permit is triggered by the trip generation. Commissioner Rivard stated that he wants to avoid creating downstream problems. Atty. Perito stated that this is a cohesive plan. Wetlands looked at it on a global basis to ensure there was no impact on the reservoir or groundwater. The benefit is that you don't get piecemeal development. Commissioner Rivard noted that the POCD is up for review next year, and a lot has changed in the last 10 years.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if there is a tenant yet. Atty. Perito replied no. Commissioner Fitzsimmons clarified that this application has no proposed roadway changes or improvements. Atty. Perito replied correct. Commissioner Fitzsimmons clarified that there is no proposed change to the timing of traffic lights. Mr. Bubaris replied correct. Commissioner Fitzsimmons noted that the Commission is being asked to review and approve for an unknown entity. He agrees that traffic is different from what it was 10 or 20 years ago. The problem is that the traffic study focuses on peak hour traffic, but the traffic will be all day. He asked how employees would get on the site and how trucks would get on the site. Mr. Cotter explained that there are five entrances. For building one on Northrop, employees can enter through the truck lane or go up to the north end of the building to enter on Northrop. For building three in the rear, they can use the driveway for 777 Northrop to come onto the property or come in from Leigus or use the entrance on the east side n Old Barnes. Commissioner Fitzsimmons clarified that the driveways can be used by both cars and trucks. Mr. Cotter pointed out that only two are for both. The first entrance on Northrop and the one at the Leigus intersection are for trucks. Passenger cars can use any driveway. Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated that he is assuming that the trucks will be traditional tractor-trailers since the building is a High-cube Warehouse. Mr. Cornell clarified that the buildings are not categorized as High-Cube. Mr. Pagini noted that they are not

using the land use code for High Cube but the one for General Warehousing. Atty. Perito noted that if a tenant wants High Cube, they will have to come back to the Commission.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons referred to the letter from the Police Chief and his recommendation that truck access off of Northrop Road for building one should be a right turn only on exit. Mr. Cotter noted that they did add that and will have signage. Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked how much traffic they expect to turn north on Rte. 68 from the Leigus exit? Mr. Bubaris replied 15% to the west, with the rest going east.

Commissioner Sanders stated that the presentation was very thorough, but we have to weigh everything. He asked how close the truck entrance on Northrop Road is to where the road widens. Mr. Cotter replied that the entrance for trucks is opposite the Marriott, where it widens for the turn lane. Commissioner Sanders noted that it widens gradually. Mr. Cotter noted that it starts further up. Commissioner Sanders reported that he drove up and down Northrop at 3:30 pm, and there was already a queue to turn onto Rt. 68. He asked how much room there is for a truck to turn right. Mr. Bubaris replied that there is plenty of room for a truck to turn out of Northrop onto Rte. 68. Commissioner Sanders stated that he watched traffic wait for 3 to 4 lights to get out of Northrop. He watched trucks queue up to turn left, then had to stop at two more lights on the overpass. He doesn't see how adding tractor-trailer trucks won't impact traffic. He respects the recommendation from the Chief of Police. Northrop Road is not a place to add tractor-trailer trucks at that intersection. He stated that he's concerned that he is missing something. Mr. Bubaris replied that trucks may find it easier to come out through the Leigus intersection instead at certain times of day. Commissioner Sanders asked how much distance there would be from the back of the truck sitting at the light to the entrance to the facility. Mr. Bubaris stated that there is 450 ft. from the stop bar to the exit out of the site.

Atty. Perito noted that they revised the site plans with sidewalks along the buildings, but not along Barnes Road or Northrop, per the Engineer. Doing so would result in removing vegetation.

Commissioner Kohan referred to the memo from the Town Engineer. While there today, he saw a few trees, but not heavily vegetated. There would be ample room for sidewalks. He noted that there is a nice New England stone wall there and asked if they would be preserving it. He added that the Commission may not have required sidewalks in the past, but we need to rethink that. Other warehouses have nice sidewalks. There is a potential for pedestrians here. It's a safety issue. He noted that the trees are not on the plan, so they are probably going to come down anyway.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lou Maglione, 977 North Farms Road, stated that they chose to live in Wallingford because it has a small-town, country vibe. Large buildings and data centers don't belong here. He is concerned with traffic and safety. He has not seen a reduction in traffic over the last 20 years. It seems to have doubled or tripled just in the last couple of years. Trucks are already coming from Rt. 68, Rt. 91, Research Parkway, North Farms, and Murdock. He noted that lifestyles have changed with van deliveries.

Construction on Rt. 91 affects local streets. The situation is already out of control. He asked who would enforce the stipulations. It is definitely unsafe. He asked the Commission to vote no.

Shirley Shadish, 6 Tammy Hill Road, stated that the section of Northrop is posted no trucks because it is unsafe. But it is not enforced. She asked if that was part of the traffic study. Chairman Seichter understands that it is No Thru Trucks from Carpenter to Rt. 68. Ms. Shadish stated that trucks are not supposed to turn from Rt. 68 to Northrop, but now they are putting a warehouse there. She added that the No Thru Trucks is supposed to be just that section to keep traffic on Research and off Northrop. She asked what had changed to make it safe.

Mr. Pagini reported that he talked to the Chief and Deputy Chief of police, and 'No Thru Trucks' means those that are not in business on the road should not go there. The Chiefs know it's not enforced as much as it should be. He offered to get more clarification. Chairman Seichter noted that it is an enforcement issue.

Ms. Shadish asked if it could be made a condition of approval, or do we just remove the signs. She would like to see it enforced. It is a safety issue.

Ed Hohmann, 12 Marie Lane, stated that he has an issue with the baseline of the traffic study. The higher capacity numbers from 2019 should be added. The Post Office distribution center is doubling its operation. That was not factored in.

Mary Mushinski, State Representative, spoke on behalf of River Advocates of South Central CT on the impact on North Farms Reservoir. We need to protect the public values of this largely undeveloped shoreline of the lake. At least 120 species of birds can be found there, including bald eagles. To protect the lake, we can require a wide border of trees and shrubs on the east shore at least 50 ft. from the water's edge. The most sensitive time for nesting is in the spring and fall. They should only blast September, October, and November to protect the eagle population. She stated that the proposed stormwater collection treatment and groundwater recharge systems are commendable. One challenge will be to ensure that the oil/water/grit separation system will continue to work for decades. She suggested a bond for the continued maintenance of the stormwater system for future owners. She suggested requiring the removal of any poisoned pest animals. She encouraged preserving wildlife at the reservoir.

Joseph Celotto, 7 Coventry Court, referred to the traffic study maps. He asked about the "additional developments". Mr. Bubaris replied that all the ones they added were mentioned in the memo. Some are approved but may not be built yet. Mr. Celotto clarified that the revised background number for the 2026 PM Peak, traffic coming up Rt. 68 passing Northrop is 1,075 vehicles. Mr. Bubaris replied that when everything is approved and built, that will be the total volume. Mr. Celotto asked what this application would add to the traffic. Mr. Bubaris replied 134 trips in the morning peak hour and 136 in the afternoon peak hour. Of that, they expect tractor-trailers will be 59 trips or 20% in the morning peak and 61 in the evening peak hour. This is based on data on warehouses across the country. Mr. Celotto

noted that traffic is already bad. He is concerned that we don't know who the tenant will be and that property values will go down.

Walt Jakubisyn, 940 North Farms Road, stated that his house is right on the reservoir. He doesn't want to look across and see a warehouse. One building will be very close to the reservoir. There are lots of baby geese there in the spring. He doesn't want to change the rural nature of the area. It's almost like a nature preserve now. The property values will go down. This will ruin the area.

Joe Heeran, High Hill Road, stated that he had difficulty understanding what the data is for the traffic studies. The state maintains an algorithm, but input comes from traffic specialists. It is already so unsafe that it was noted in two prior traffic studies commissioned by the Town. There are recommendations for improvement, but it is still unsafe. People walk and jog from the hotel. We should not be settling for minimum standards. It is hard to weigh risks and benefits when there is no benefit. This will be an eyesore. Please don't put them in.

Bruce Cwirka, 1043 Northrop Road, stated that most of his neighbors had to install a turnaround so they could get out of their driveways. You can't turn left out of your driveway. Traffic is horrific. The road is not wide enough. Northrop Road is a thoroughfare, not a street. It is only 22 ft. wide. The recommendations for road improvement were not implemented. He reported seeing 85 trucks a day. He stated that there isn't enough room for more than one truck to turn off the property onto Rt. 68. What are we going to do to protect the taxpayers? He noted the natural beauty of the stone walls on Northrop Road. He agreed with adding sidewalks. Safety is not addressed. We need a bond to protect the residents. Please consider another option for that property. He suggested a senior housing facility. There is already 1.8 million sq. ft. of warehouse space available in a two-mile radius of Northrop Road. Why do we need more?

Rich L'heureux, 10 Coventry Court, stated that he doesn't object to developing the property. He is concerned that there is no mention of a tenant. He asked what would be stored there. Will there be hazardous materials? He mentioned fumes from idling trucks. Building two will be two football fields long. Warehouses have to have 45 ft. clear inside. Then on top of the roof are heating and a/c units. They will end up being 5 stories high. These buildings will be massive with no windows. These warehouses will not share the characteristics of the neighborhood. There are plenty of existing buildings for lease. Out of the 10 criteria for evaluating a Special Permit, this proposal only meets two criteria.

Celine L'heureux, 10 Coventry Court, stated that she would like the Commission to vote it down. Consider how it is benefiting Wallingford. Consider the future. She asked the applicant to consider other uses.

James Petlak, 1000 North Farms Road, noted that nothing has been said about the four buildings already built on the north side of Northrop Road in Meriden. This project will double the traffic on Northrop. These buildings are so big that Wallingford doesn't have fire apparatus to handle these 5 – 6 stories tall.

Don Crouch, Economic Development Specialist, stated that this district was developed specifically to accommodate industrial warehouse and distribution uses. This project matters because it strengthens the grand list without adding heavy service demands, it responds to market demands, supports jobs and growth, it aligns with the Plan for Conservation and Development by attracting business, and it remains competitive. These regulations were updated a couple of years ago. Traffic was looked at by four experts. This is a high-quality professional development. More projects will reduce taxes for residents.

John Grammatico, 997 North Farms Road, stated that traffic is already saturated. This is a wildlife sanctuary. Putting a massive building 50 ft. from the reservoir will ruin that beautiful wildlife sanctuary. What about trash that will blow into the reservoir? He asked the Commission to vote it down.

Jack Arrigoni, 18 Martin Trail, noted that this is considered one warehouse for traffic but is actually three. He quoted from prior traffic studies and noted that the level of service for the intersections went from B&C to D&E. He referred to the report provided by the Traffic Engineer. He stated that the numbers don't add up for the additional developments. He asked questions about tables B and D in the traffic study for the Research Parkway proposal and the Northrop Road proposal. Mr. Bubaris replied that the two tables represent the same number of sq. footage of buildings. Mr. Arrigoni questioned the way the study was done.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Seichter turned the floor back to the applicant.

Mr. Fezza reviewed the 10 criteria for a Special Permit and how this application met them. This development will be one of the few sites in the zone. They went through a lengthy wetlands review and were commended for the sewage and stormwater management. They will have buffers on the west side. They moved truck traffic away from the reservoir and moved all traffic internal to the site. As for street capacity, experts agree that there is capacity. They will do their best to maintain as many of the trees as possible, and they have a bond from the Wetlands Commission. They are cognizant of concerns for the environment. As for Fire Department capacity, the buildings will have to have ERS sprinklers. Parking is robust. There are five vehicle entrances and exits. They understood the concerns of neighbors. The buildings will be big boxes. The top of the building will be 45 ft. That is the max on the site. They comply with all regulations. The regulations were changed so that this site can be developed. This is a prime site to be developed as a commercial corridor. They believe that the first 400 ft. of Northrop allows for trucks. They have been as thoughtful as they can be with the truck entrance. As for the definition of 'No Thru Trucks', it means no origination or destination in that town that the road is in, so it doesn't necessarily prevent trucks. This project could generate over a million dollars in tax revenue for the Town.

Atty. Perito stated that there is no question that the rest of Northrop is a country road. When considering safety for a Special permit, it is not based on anecdotal stories but based on expert testimony. The experts indicated that it is safe. This design is cohesive to minimize the impact on the environment. The record supports this use.

Commissioner Rivard asked if they would consider limiting the Northrop right turn only, exit to emergency use only. Mr. Fezza replied that they can't. Mr. Cornwall stated that it would send all the traffic to the Leigus Road extension.

Commissioner Kohan referred to a recent CT Federation of Planning and Zoning Agencies newsletter article on deciding which expert to believe. A court case determined that a Commission is not required to believe any of the witnesses/experts. He stated that he feels there are still unanswered issues, such as mitigating noise and hazardous material spills mitigation. He is not convinced that a sidewalk is needed. Lastly, the stone wall was not discussed.

Atty. Perito stated that the stone wall will remain except for where the driveways cut through. They showed the stone wall on the plan. He noted that the stone wall would need to be removed if they put in a sidewalk due to having to move the utility poles. Commissioner Kohan stated that the sidewalk could go on the other side of the stone wall.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Seichter called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to close the public hearing for application #401-25 Special Permit/Midwood Management LLC/1000, 1020, 1030, 1044, and 1080 Barnes Road

Commissioner Fitzsimmons: second

Vote: Rivard – yes; Kohan – yes; Fitzsimmons – yes; Sanders – yes; Chairman Seichter – yes.

Commissioner Sanders stated that he would go with the Town Engineer on the sidewalks. This location has challenges. He noted that the Police Chief says that this won't exacerbate the problems, that it is not a further burden. The application was very thoughtfully done. Unfortunately, we need the Town and State to improve the roads. The Commission doesn't improve the roads. He thanked the applicants for their time and effort. The project has merit, but there is a lot to weigh.

Commissioner Rivard agrees that warehousing is an approved use. He wishes there were a pathway to protect that Northrop exit and not use it. This is a difficult site from a safety perspective. We can't further exacerbate an existing issue for safety. He agrees with progressively developing Wallingford's future in this zone. Nobody disputed the risk. Traffic studies don't contemplate a regrowth of existing businesses. Another consideration is the potential adverse effects on the surrounding community and the lake.

Commissioner Kohan stated that the Economic Development Commission doesn't look at the whole community. This would be something that is not beneficial to the neighboring community. He doesn't think tax revenue should be spent to improve roads to benefit businesses. We don't know what the real numbers are for traffic. There are other things that were not discussed that affect the surrounding neighborhoods.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons noted that this Commission does Planning and Zoning. Two years ago, there was a moratorium on warehouses so the Commission could review the regulations. There wasn't much public input. We don't get to tell people how to use their land. Regarding the warehousing use, the applicant has presented adequate information and responded to the questions. He quoted from the letter from the Chief of Police: "I agree with the assessment that the implementation of these warehouses on Northrop Road will not increase traffic in the area and will not be classified as a significant traffic contributor." Chief Ventura is Wallingford's legal traffic authority. The second part of the Chief's letter with comments on recommendations for road improvements is not in the scope of this Commission. Commissioner Fitzsimmons believes the applicant has raised the issues and addressed the Commission's concerns. He believes this development is appropriate for this zone.

Chairman Seichter stated that the major concern is traffic. The Commission requested a peer review of the traffic report and comments from the Chief of Police. The professionals say it's okay. He believes that the traffic report doesn't support the safety concerns. The application complies with regulations and meets the criteria for a Special Permit. He supports the application.

Hearing no further comment, Chairman Seichter called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to approve Special Permit application #401-25 for Midwood Management LLC for a Special Permit and Site Plan Approval request to construct three warehouse buildings totaling 415,000 sq. ft. and associated parking on plans entitled "Site Development Plans for Warehouse Complex" dated September 23, 2024 and revised to August 29, 2025, subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. **Comments from Environmental Planner, Erin O'Hare, dated 5/13/2025**
2. **Comments from Senior Engineer, Tom Flannery, Water and Sewer Division, dated 07/10/2025**
3. **Comments from Town Engineer, Alison Kapushinski, dated 06/16/2025, 06/25/2025, 07/14/2024, 08/07/2024, and 08/20/2025**
4. **Comments from the Fire Marshal, Brian Schock, dated 07/02/2025 & 07/09/2025**
5. **Comments from the Chief of Police, John Ventura, dated 09/03/2025**
6. **The use of rodenticides (first and second generation) and neonics (insecticides) shall be prohibited on the site.**
7. **An excavation permit is required from the Department of Engineering for any work within the right-of-way.**
8. **That native plantings are used that are conducive to the surrounding environment.**
9. **That the final plans are revised to prohibit left turns for trucks exiting onto Northrop Road.**
10. **Operation & Maintenance Plan, or Notice of said Plan, to be filed on Wallingford Land Records.**
11. **Once final architectural plans are compiled and a tenant is finalized, the applicant is to submit a final set of plans that match the architectural door locations for review by the Town Engineer and Town Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.**

12. Erosion and sediment control bonds shall be posted for each phase as construction progresses in the amount of \$60,500.00 for each specific phase.
13. Six (6) copies of the final plans forwarded to the Planning and Zoning office.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons: second

Commissioner Kohan: Amendment to the motion. Item 3 change 07/14/2024 to 07/14/2025 and change 08/07/2024 to 8/07/2025.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons: second

Vote: Rivard – no; Kohan – no; Fitzsimmons – yes; Sanders – no; Chairman Seichter – yes.

The application is denied.

BOND RELEASES

2. Choate Rosemary Hall – 138 North Elm Street/Hill House Served #213-23

Mr. Pagini reported that this bond can be released.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to release the bond for Choate Rosemary Hall at 138 North Elm Street for the Hill House Served application #213-23

Commissioner Fitzsimmons: second

Vote: Unanimous

REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND STAFF

3. Administrative Approvals – noted as approved
 - a. 37 Silliman Rd/Barbieri #220-25
 - b. 5 Hamlin Ave/Baldarelli #221-25
 - c. 11 Quarry Run/Stanton #222-25
 - d. 50 Wooding Rd/Gatavaski #223-25
4. ZBA Notice of September 15, 2025 – no comment

Mr. Pagini noted that no applications have been received for October, so as of now, there will be no October meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to Adjourn the Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission for Monday, September 8, 2025, at 10:41 pm.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons: Second
Vote: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl-Ann Tubby
Recording Secretary

TEXT AMENDMENT SECTION 6.39

**FAMILY CHILD CARE HOME AND GROUP CHILD CARE
HOMES**

#903-25



Town of Wallingford, Connecticut

JAMES SEICHTER
CHAIRMAN-PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

KEVIN J. PAGINI
TOWN PLANNER

WALLINGFORD TOWN HALL
45 SOUTH MAIN STREET
WALLINGFORD, CT 06492
TELEPHONE (203) 294-2090
FAX (203) 294-2095

October 9, 2025

Town Clerk - Town of Cheshire
Town Clerk - Town of Durham
Town Clerk - Town of Hamden
City Clerk - City of Meriden
Town Clerk - Town of Middlefield
Town Clerk - Town of North Branford
Town Clerk - Town of North Haven

Re: Proposed Amendment to the Town of Wallingford Zoning Regulations to allow Family Child Care Homes in compliance with CGS §8-3j

Dear Town/City Clerk,

In accordance with the Connecticut General State Statutes, enclosed please find a copy of the proposed amendment to the Town of Wallingford Zoning Regulations initiated by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

A public hearing for this application is scheduled for November 10, 2025.

Regards,

Kevin J. Pagini
Town Planner

10/9/2025

Changes to the Town of Wallingford Zoning Regulations – Family Child Care Homes, compliance with CGS 8-3j

Amend Definition in Section 2.2:

Family Child Care Home -A private family home that provides care for up to six children, including the provider's children, who are not in school full-time. During the school year, providers may take up to three additional children who are in school full-time; If the provider has more than three children in school full-time, all of them are permitted. Care is provided for no less than three and no more than twelve hours within a 24-hour period on a regular basis. More than twelve hours of care is allowed on an intermittent basis but may not exceed 72 consecutive hours; must meet all requirements of CGS §19-77(a)(3) and must be licensed by the State of CT.

Group Child Care Homes – offers or provides a program of supplementary care (A) to not less than seven or more than twelve related or unrelated children on a regular basis, or (B) that meets the definition of a family child care home except that it operates in a facility other than a private family home; must meet all requirements of CGS §19-77(a)(2) and must be licensed by the State of CT.

Removal of current definition:

~~***Family Day-Care Home*** – A private family home, caring for not more than six (6) children including the provider's own children not at school full-time, where the children are cared for not less than three (3), nor more than twelve (12) hours during a twenty-four (24) hour period, and where care is given on a regularly recurring basis.~~

Add new Section:

§6.39 - Family Child Care Home and Group Child Care Homes

A. Notwithstanding any other provisions of these regulations, the following are permitted in all residential zones:

B. Family Child Care and Group Child Care homes located in residences and licensed by the State of Connecticut



NAUGATUCK VALLEY
COUNCIL of GOVERNMENTS
49 Leavenworth Street, 3rd Floor, Waterbury, CT 06702 • 203-757-0535 • 203-755-8686 • nvcoct.gov

903-25-01

RECEIVED

NOV 04 2025

WALLINGFORD

PLANNING & ZONING

STAFF REFERRAL REPORT

TO: Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission, Mayor of Wallingford, Town Planner,
and Zoning Enforcement Officer

FROM: Emely Ricci, Community Planner II, NVCOG, 49 Leavenworth Street, 3rd floor,
Waterbury (203) 757-0535

DATE: November 03, 2025

NVCOG FILE NO.: WALL-13-100925-Z
MUNICIPALITY: Town of Wallingford
DATE RECEIVED: October 09, 2025
TYPE OF REFERRAL: Text Amendment
DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: November 11, 2025
APPLICANT: Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

The Town of Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission has proposed to amend Article II, Section 2.2 - Specific Terms of the Wallingford Zoning Regulations. The amendment will remove the current definition for "*Family Day-Care Home*" and replace it with two new definitions of "*Family Child Care Home*" and "*Group Child Care Home*" for clarification.

Additionally, a new section will be included in Article IV – Use Regulations; the section will be titled "*6.39 - Family Child Care Home and Group Child Care Homes*." The new section will outline the permitted uses of these facilities in the Town of Wallingford's residential zones.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

NVCOG Staff finds the proposed text amendments to not be regionally significant and not have intermunicipal impact.

* * * * *

This staff recommendation is transmitted as written above unless we receive comments or objections within five days of the time you receive this proposal. If objections cannot be resolved within the scope of the original recommendations, you may submit a reconsideration request to the Regional Planning Commission for further discussion of the findings.

WALL-13-100925-Z

Cherie Murchison

From: Kevin Pagini
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 12:01 PM
To: zoning; Cherie Murchison
Subject: Fw: Sunwood Agenda

Kevin J. Pagini
Town Planner
Town of Wallingford
P: 203-294-2090

From: Janis Small <jsmall@wallingfordct.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 11:55 AM
To: Kevin Pagini <kevin.pagini@wallingfordct.gov>
Subject: Sunwood Agenda

Agenda items:

Executive Session pursuant to CGS § 1-225(f) & § 1-200(6)(B), to discuss Sunwood v. Planning & Zoning Commission

Action on approval of Sunwood Development # , in accordance with Court decision.

Janis M. Small
Corporation Counsel
Town of Wallingford
Law Department
45 South Main Street
Wallingford CT 06492
(203)294-2140
jsmall@wallingfordct.gov



Town of Wallingford, Connecticut

LEGAL NOTICE

The Wallingford Zoning Board of Appeals, at their Meeting of Monday, October 20, 2025, voted to take the following actions:

They voted to approve :

1. #25-032 – Variance Request/5 Research Parkway Wallingford, LLC/Above Ground Utilities (Below Ground Utilities required) to provide electric service at 5 Research Parkway in a WI District.
2. #25-033 – Variance Request/Kovacs/front yard of 3 ft. (20 ft. required) to modify previous Variance Approval of 4 ft. front yard to construct a single bay detached garage at 105 Grandview Avenue in R-18 District.

WALLINGFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS


KAREN RADDATZ, SECRETARY

DATED AT WALLINGFORD
October 21, 2025

PUBLICATION DATE
October 24, 2025



Town of Wallingford, Connecticut

LEGAL NOTICE

The Wallingford Zoning Board of Appeals will hold the following public hearings at their Meeting of Monday November 17, 2025, 7:00 p.m., in the Robert F. Parisi Council Chambers, Town Hall, 45 South Main Street.

1. #25-034 – Variance Request/Buckley/Accessory Building area of 547 sq. ft. (max 300 sq. ft. permitted) and Accessory Building height of +/- 12 ft. (max 10 ft. permitted) to construct a pool house at 9 Nutmeg Court in an RU-40 District.
2. #25-035 – Variance Request/RNB Home Improvement/side yard of 13 ft. (20 ft. required) to construct an addition (pavilion) at 20 Sorrento Road in R-18 District.

Should you wish to review the above-listed application(s), or have any questions regarding these matters, please contact the Wallingford Planning Office at 203-294-2090.

WALLINGFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

DATED AT WALLINGFORD:

October 29, 2025



KAREN RADDATZ, SECRETARY

POSTING DATES

November 4, 2025

November 11, 2025

“Individuals in need of auxiliary aids for effective communication in programs and services of the Town of Wallingford are invited to make their needs and preferences known to the ADA Compliance Coordinator at 203-294-2070 five (5) days prior to meeting date.”

CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF PLANNING & ZONING AGENCIES QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

RECEIVED
OCT 20 2025

Fall 2025

Volume XXIX, Issue 4

FARMINGTON
PLANNING & ZONING

STATUTORY AGGRIEVEMENT DETERMINED BY DISTANCE TO PROPERTY LINE

When a property owner appealed a decision of an inland wetlands commission to approve his neighbor's application to construct a pool within a regulated area, the issue of statutory aggrievement was raised. While the owner's property was within 90 feet of his neighbor's property line, it was unclear whether the owner's property was within 90 feet of the wetland area involved in the application.

To arrive at an answer to this question, the court looked to Section 8-1(1) of the Connecticut General Statutes and how courts have applied its statutory aggrievement provision. In so doing, the court applied what is known as the 'bright line' rule which states that the land involved in the decision is the entire parcel and not just the wetland area of the property. Thus, since the neighbor's property was within 90 feet of the subject property, he was aggrieved. *Schulz v. Conservation Commission*, FBT-CV-24-5054401 (1.30.25).

HEALTH CONCERNS BASED UPON SPECULATION

A decision to deny an affordable housing application was reversed by a court because the reason for denying the application did not outweigh the need for affordable housing within the town. The application proposed to construct 42

residential units on a 1.7-acre site. While the property was located in a residential zone, an abutting parcel was located in an industrial zone and was the location for a business which stored and sold rock and stone. This use tended to emit dust, which had led to complaints from neighboring residents.

The commission denied the application for the sole reason that the location of the proposed affordable housing next to the stone and rock business would potentially expose residents to harmful dust. The court found this reason to be an insufficient reason to deny the application. The concern was speculative at best and based upon unfounded concerns of commission members. In addition, the stone and rock business was subject to conditions when it was approved, which included the installation of a sprinkler system to suppress dust. The ZEO had testified at the commission's hearing that when the sprinkler system was used, dust was not a concern. *Saunders v. Planning & Zoning Commission*, LND-CV-23-6176868 (6.6.25).

SOCIAL MEDIA USE BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

When a city manager started to use his personal facebook page to announce city government actions and promote his own activities as city manager, did he transform his facebook page into a public forum? The question arose when the city manager blocked a

Written and Edited by
Attorney Steven E. Byrne
P.O. Box 1065, Farmington CT 06034-1065
Tel. (860) 677-7355
attysbyrne@gmail.com
contact.cfpza@gmail.com

CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF PLANNING & ZONING AGENCIES QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

Fall 2025

Volume XXIX, Issue 4

person from commenting on his facebook posts. That citizen filed a lawsuit claiming that by blocking him, his first amendment rights were violated.

The U.S. Supreme Court found no violation of the First Amendment because the action of blocking comments on the facebook page in question did not involve a government action. In determining whether social media activity, such as having a facebook page, constitutes government action, the court applied the following test: if the text of state law requires an officeholder to maintain a social-media account, the official uses state resources or government staff to run the account, or the account belongs to an office, rather than an individual officeholder. These situations, make an official's social-media activity fairly attributable to the State and thus a state action. *Lindke v. Freed*, 144 S. Ct 756 (2024).

WHAT IS LIVESTOCK

A cease-and-desist order was issued to a property owner in regard to his two pygmy goats. While his lot was nearly one acre in size, the ZEO had determined that the two goats fell under the large animal category and that 2 acres of land were necessary to comply with the zoning regulations. The property owner disagreed, saying that his goats came within the small animal category and was thus in compliance. An appeal to the zoning board of appeals

resulted in the affirmance of the order. An appeal to court followed.

The court found that the zoning board of appeals decision affirming the ZEO's order that the keeping of the pygmy goats violated the zoning regulations was correct. The regulations defined a large animal in part by referencing some examples, such as horses, sheep and pigs. The same was done for defining small animals, stating they were similar to rabbits. The court found that while size was one factor to consider, so was the manner of keeping the animals and the effect on neighbors. Evidence in the record showed that the goats were kept within a fenced enclosure similar to what would be used for a horse, and that accumulated manure produced offensive odors and attracted flies. *Weljkovic v. Zoning Board of Appeals*, NNH-CV-24-6142987 (4.16.24).

LAND INVOLVED IN AN APPLICATION

When certain developers were on the verge of seeing their planned distribution center approved by the required land use agencies, the State legislature intervened and enacted Connecticut General Statutes Sec. 8-3m. This law prohibited the approval of warehouse facilities under certain circumstances, such as that the parcel or parcels of land upon which the facility would be constructed could not have 5 acres or more of wetlands within them.

Written and Edited by
Attorney Steven E. Byrne
P.O. Box 1065, Farmington CT 06034-1065
Tel. (860) 677-7355
attysbyrne@gmail.com
contact.cfpza@gmail.com

CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF PLANNING & ZONING AGENCIES QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

Fall 2025

Volume XXIX, Issue 4

The developers' initial plan was to build a distribution center on 2 pieces of land, both of which contained wetlands and would be affected by the new law. Upon the passage of the new law, the developers amended their plans, adjusting the property line shared by both parcels so that most of the wetlands were shifted to one parcel with the buildings shifted entirely to the other parcel which now had far less than 5 acres of wetlands.

Invoking the legal principle of improper segmentation, the court ruled that Sec. 8-3m still applied to this proposed distribution project as the two parcels were still intimately involved. While one parcel was free of buildings, it would still contain drainage and utility structures and an emergency driveway access connected to these buildings. Thus, this parcel, which contained over 5 acres of wetlands, was part of the project and within the reach of Sec. 8-3m. *Middlebury Small Town Alliance LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission*, UWY-CV-24-6075302 (1.31.25).

REPAIR BEFORE REPLACEMENT

Without obtaining the necessary certificate of appropriateness, a homeowner replaced the windows in his historic home. In support of his decision to replace his windows without the necessary certificate, the homeowner submitted a letter from the fire marshal ordering him to repair or replace his windows so that his home would have

secondary exits. The historic district commission interpreted this order to mean that the homeowner either was to repair the existing windows and only if repair was not possible, replace them. The application for the replacement was denied.

The decision was upheld by the court on appeal. The purpose of the order was to make the windows of the house usable as a secondary exit. This could be done either by repairing them so they could be opened and if repair was not possible, the replacement. *Roy v. Historic District Commission*, LLI-CV-6034650 (6.5.23).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Workshops

Four hours of Commissioner training must be completed once every four years or once each term of a commissioner. At the price of \$185.00 per session for each agency attending, our workshops are an affordable way for your board to 'stay legal'. **Email us at contact.cfpza@gmail.com to schedule a workshop.**

ABOUT THE EDITOR

Steven Byrne is an attorney with an office in Farmington, Connecticut. A principal in the law firm of Byrne & Byrne LLC, he maintains a strong focus in the area of land use law and is available for consultation and representation in all land use matters both at the administrative and court levels.

Written and Edited by
Attorney Steven E. Byrne
P.O. Box 1065, Farmington CT 06034-1065
Tel. (860) 677-7355
attysbyrne@gmail.com
contact.cfpza@gmail.com

TO: Kevin Pagini, Town Planner of Wallingford
FROM: South Central Regional Council of Governments (SCRCOG)
DATE: 11/05/2025
SUBJECT: Regional Analysis on Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

SCRCOG conducted a regional analysis of detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) construction and zoning in the region. Detached ADUs are generally a self-contained residential unit that is separate from the primary dwelling structure located on the same lot. For the purposes of this analysis, SCRCOG divided the analysis into two phases. The first phase analyzed existing zoning regulations to see which municipalities allow for detached ADUs, information made available on the National Zoning Atlas. The second phase surveyed our municipalities to confirm phase 1 findings and calculate the number of detached ADUs permitted and/or constructed in the past five years. We received seven respondents for the second phase, so data may not be as up to date or reflect accurate numbers/regulations.

Table 1 shows the zones in which Accessory Dwelling Units are allowed within SCRCOG municipalities, with information as to approval process and if they are required to be attached to the primary structure. As the table suggests, seven of the fifteen SCRCOG member municipalities allow for detached ADU construction. Those seven municipalities are Bethany, Branford, Guilford, Madison, New Haven, North Haven, and Woodbridge. As part of Phase 2, all municipalities were surveyed to make sure the zoning regulation information was correct and to generate an understanding of detached ADU construction/permitting for the past five years. As shown in Table 2, of the municipalities that allow detached ADUs, only Madison and Bethany reported any detached ADU construction in that time. Woodbridge noted that five ADUs were constructed, though all were attached to the primary structure. While SCRCOG cannot draw conclusions on detached ADUs from such a small sample size, factors such as awareness of the permitting process, financial capacity, and zoning constraints may play a role and can be examined further.

Overall, these specific findings cannot draw conclusions regarding permitting or building detached ADUs. As the region continues to explore strategies to diversify housing options and support affordability, understanding the barriers to detached ADU construction will be an important next step. Moving forward, SCRCOG plans to monitor zoning changes and update this analysis as needed, while also assessing municipal experiences to better understand how detached ADUs contribute to broader regional housing needs and to inform future policy coordination among member municipalities.

ADU Zoning Permissions and Restrictions Overview

Bethany	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Business & Industrial	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-130	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-65	Public Hearing	No
Branford	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Center Business	Public Hearing	No
Mixed Use	Public Hearing	No
Residence R-3	Public Hearing	No
Residence R-4	Public Hearing	No
Residence R-5	Public Hearing	No
East Haven	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
ADU's Prohibited in all zones		
Guilford	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Business/Mixed Use (BMU)	Public Hearing	Yes
Guilford Green Business	Public Hearing	Yes
Marine Commercial	Public Hearing	Yes
Post Road Business 1	Public Hearing	Yes
Post Road Business 2	Public Hearing	Yes
Post Road Business 3	Public Hearing	Yes
Post Road Business 4	Public Hearing	Yes
Residential R-1	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-2	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-3	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-4	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-5	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-6	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-7	Public Hearing	No
Residential R-8	Public Hearing	No
RS-1, Summer Cottage	Public Hearing	No
Hamden	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Newhall Center - NC	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residential R-1	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residential R-2	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residential R-3	Allowed/Conditional	Yes

Residential R-4	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residential R-5	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Transect Rural T-2	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Transect Sub-Urban T-3	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Transect General Urban T-3.5	Public Hearing	Yes
Transect General Urban T-4	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Transect Urban Center T-5	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Madison	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Light Industrial (LI)	Public Hearing	Yes
Residential R-1	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residential R-2	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residential R-3	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residential R-4	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residential R-5	Allowed/Conditional	No
Rural Residence RU-1	Allowed/Conditional	No
Rural Residence RU-2	Allowed/Conditional	No
Transition	Public Hearing	Yes
Meriden	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
ADU's Prohibited in all zones		
Milford	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Boating Business (BB)	Public Hearing	Yes
Community Design (CDD-1)	Public Hearing	Yes
Office (OD)	Public Hearing	Yes
One Family Residential R-10	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
One Family Residential R-12.5	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
One Family Residential R-18	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
One Family Residential R-30	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
One Family Residential R-5	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
One Family Residential R-7.5	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
One Family Residential R-A	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residential Office	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
New Haven	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Special High Density (RH-1)	Allowed/Conditional	No
General High Density (RH-2)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Low Middle Density (RM-1)	Allowed/Conditional	No
High Middle Density (RM-1)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residence-Office (RO)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Special Single Family (RS-1)	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
General Single Family (RS-2)	Allowed/Conditional	Yes

North Branford	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Residence R-40	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residence R-80	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residence Garden Apartment R-GA	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
North Haven	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Limited Commerical (LC)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Limited Office (LO)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Office (o-12)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residence (R-12)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residence (R-20)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residence (R-40)	Allowed/Conditional	No
Orange	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Commercial C-1	Public Hearing	No
Commercial C-2	Public Hearing	No
Office Park	Public Hearing	No
Wallingford	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Residence R-11	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residence R-15	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residence R-18	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Residence R-6	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Rural Residential RU-120	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Rural Residential RU-40	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
Rural Residential RU-80	Allowed/Conditional	Yes
West Haven	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Neighborhood Business (NB)	Public Hearing	Yes
Single Family Detached Residence (R1)	Public Hearing	Yes
Single Family Detached Residence (R2)	Public Hearing	Yes
Regional Business	Public Hearing	Yes
Woodbridge	Approval Process	Restricted to Only Primary Structure
Residence A	Allowed/Conditional	No
Residence B	Allowed/Conditional	No
T3-C Sub-Urban	Allowed/Conditional	No

Metrics of Permitting and Construction for Municipalities who Allow Detached ADUs

Municipality	Number Permitted (Detached)	Number Constructed (Detached)
Bethany	2	2
Branford	NA	NA
Guilford	NA	NA
Madison	Have Permitted - No Tracking	Have Construction - No Tracking
New Haven	NA	NA
North Haven	NA	NA
Woodbridge	5 (Attached)	5 (Attached)