



Land Use Regulatory Revision Project

Memorandum of Findings

Prepared for:

City of Waterbury
Planning Department
Waterbury, CT

Woodard & Curran
1520 Highland Avenue
Cheshire, CT 06410
1.888.265.8969

March 7, 2008

MEMORANDUM of FINDINGS



TO: Land Use Regulatory Revision Advisory Committee
FROM: Wendy Coffin
DATE: March 7, 2008
RE: City of Waterbury Land Use Regulatory Revision Project

Background

The City of Waterbury routinely acts upon many Planning, Zoning, and Wetland approval applications for significant new residential, commercial and industrial development. It is encouraging that the City has the infrastructure in place to attract developers and support this positive economic growth. However, this growth opportunity has exposed some challenges within the City's current land use development regulations.

In 2005 the Waterbury City Plan Commission adopted a Plan of Conservation and Development that set forth goals and objectives for development in the City. The City, through the Planning Department, is now endeavoring to make comprehensive revisions to the regulations and ordinances that govern development of real property to reflect the goals and objectives of that Plan, and to create a consistent, predictable and efficient regulatory environment for appropriate development within the City.

Introduction

The City of Waterbury hired Woodard & Curran, an Engineering, Planning and Operations firm of Cheshire, Connecticut, with its subconsultant Shipman and Goodwin attorneys, of Hartford, Connecticut (the Team) to work with the Waterbury Planning Department on a project to revise the City's land use regulations. The Planning Department and the Team are collaborating with a Core Committee comprising Jim Sequin, City Planner; Craig Sullivan, City Corporation Counsel; Joseph Geary, Director of Operations, Mayor's Office, Avery Gaddis, Waterbury Development Corporation, Paul Pernerewski, Board of Aldermen and John Lawlor, Director, Department of Public Works. In addition, Paul Pernerewski is leading an Ad-Hoc Committee for the project called the Land Use Regulatory Revision Project Advisory Committee (LURRPAC) comprising 18 people with various experience and backgrounds including City Commissioners, Aldermen, Neighborhood Council Presidents, Neighborhood Association Presidents, City Directors, and other interested parties.

Memorandum of Findings

This Memorandum of Findings communicates the results of our initial efforts to establish the parameters of how the City's existing land use regulations need to be revised. Our research included reviewing existing documents and gathering input from interested citizens. The memorandum identifies the documents reviewed, the activities undertaken to gather information from individuals who use or are otherwise affected by the regulations, the items we propose to consider as we develop revised regulations, and other documents to support the revised regulations for the City of Waterbury.

In addition, this memorandum will serve as the basis for the revision of the regulations. We expect that the LURRPAC will provide us with comments on this memorandum and that those comments will enable us to proceed with revising the regulations, confident that our work is in line with the expectations of the LURRPAC.

Information & Resources Reviewed

Prior to writing this memorandum the Team reviewed the following documents and information resources:

- City of Waterbury Plan of Conservation and Development, November 2005;
- City of Waterbury Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations;



- City of Waterbury Subdivision Regulations;
- City of Waterbury Zoning Regulations;
- City of Waterbury Zoning Map;
- City of Waterbury Code of Ordinances, with supplemental ordinances supplied by the City;
- City of Waterbury Department of Public Works, Engineering Division Policies and Standard Details;
- Model Regulations from various Planning Organizations, Associations, States and Municipalities;
- Land use regulations from other Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Maine communities;
- Smart Growth Guidance;
- US Green Building Code Guidance;
- USEPA and Center for Watershed Protection Guidance;
- Questionnaires completed and returned to W&C by members of the public;
- Telephone conversations with interested parties;
- Mercer Report of the Operations of the Public Works Department; and
- Executive Summary regarding Disaster Mitigation Plan City of Waterbury

Findings

We have organized our findings into five categories. The first is a list of the recommendations identified in the November 2005 Plan of Conservation and Development (PoCD) that will be addressed in the revised regulations. It must be noted that some of the recommendations made in the PoCD have already been implemented by the City, and, therefore are not listed here. The second is a list of general challenges and shortcomings with the existing regulations that the Team identified. The third is a description of the supporting documents we propose to compile into a “Catalog of Engineering Standards for Development in Waterbury.” The fourth is a list of issues and concerns raised through a public questionnaire survey and conversations with City officials, staff and the public. The last is a summary of applicable best practices and land development measures compiled by the Team to be considered for inclusion in the revised regulations.

1. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The 2005 Plan of Conservation and Development (PoCD) that was adopted by the Board of Alderman was developed through a public process to ensure that it included input from the community. We will use the recommendations of the PoCD as the basis of the revisions to the City’s land use regulations.

- Include Townhouses as permitted uses in the RM, RH, and RO districts;
- Include cluster (often referred to as conservation or open space subdivisions) development standards that result in development with more open-space;
- Create mixed use standards for use in RO, CN, and CG districts;
- Update RH district standards;
- Develop means to allow the application of design standards in the downtown area, adjacent to waterbodies, and for Holy Land;
- Limit impervious cover;
- Create CO district for office sites outside of downtown;
- Create IL industrial district to address older industrial areas not suitable for heavy industrial use; allow shopping centers as special permit uses in IL districts;
- Update parking requirements; and
- Shift cost of enforcement to violators.



2. EXISTING REGULATIONS

In our review of the City's existing regulations, the Team found several items that can be revised to make the regulations easier to use and administer. Suggested format changes and consideration for revision and clarification of the types of permits and reviewing authorities, are described in the memorandum prepared by Shipman & Goodwin included in this document as Attachment A. A short list of the proposed revisions follows.

- The regulations can be reorganized so the allowable uses for each district, and the standards for those uses are together in the body of the document. Keep the Table of Permitted Uses as a reference, but not as the only place to find allowed uses for the multiple districts.
- Reduce the detail of permitted uses, consolidate "like uses" into fewer categories.
- The types of permits, approvals, and certificates should be defined, and the granting authority, and threshold for each clearly stated. This can be done in the reorganization mentioned in the item above.
- Clearly describe application requirements for the multiple types of permits, approvals and certificates.
- Develop a comprehensive definitions section for consistent use of terms between the three regulations, zoning, subdivision and wetlands.
- Allow special use permits, with Site Plan Review, for more activities. Reserve actions by the Zoning Board of Appeals for use variances, and appeals.
- Make consistent use of terms for the Commissions and Boards.
- Ensure consistency between the Zoning and Subdivision regulations.
- Include new conservation or open-space subdivision development standards in the Subdivision regulations.
- Include road design and stormwater management standards that allow Low Impact Development techniques.

3. ENGINEERING STANDARDS

We received a comprehensive set of design details from the City of Waterbury Department of Public Works. We also received a collection of policies that are applied by the Engineering Division in their review and approval of development projects. The documents will be compiled into a "Catalog of Engineering Standards for Development in Waterbury" that can be easily referenced by developers. This Catalog will help applicants and the Planning Department understand the standards that infrastructure improvements must meet to be approved by the City Engineer.

A draft list of the engineering standards to be included is attached to the Memorandum of Findings as Attachment B. As the project evolves, Woodard & Curran will identify other details and standards that the Department of Public Works should consider developing and adding to the catalog. The final document will be updated by the Department and its Board as standard practices change.

4. ISSUES AND CONCERNS IDENTIFIED

The Team held many conversations with Planning Department and Public Works Department staff to identify the specific challenges the Planning Department encounters as they work with the public, developers and engineers to apply the City's land use regulations. Based on these discussions, some of the items that we propose to consider for inclusion in the draft revised regulations and supporting documents, which are the next deliverable for the project, will include the following:

- Include definitions and procedures to characterize the actions to be taken when development is proposed on a "paper street";
- Include language to explain the process for the City's approval and acceptance of infrastructure improvements;



- Explain the developer's rights or restrictions with regard to the capacity of existing utilities to accommodate the increased demands of the proposed development;
- Stormwater management regulations, to meet CT DEP MS4 General Permit requirements must be included;
- Include a list of City departments and their technical review focus for each project submitted; establish review timelines; and define the process that each Department will follow in preparing a written review memorandum;
- Include a pre-application process that developers may request to get informal review and input for their proposed project in the conceptual phase of its development; this process will include designation of a lead City department, a list of other departments that will be invited to the meeting, and a procedure to record the comments and results;
- Consider use of Comprehensive Citation Regulation, similar to that used in City's "Blight and Litter" ordinance program, as a means of enforcement of fines for land use and development violations;
- Eliminate spot zoning by requiring contiguous areas, such as whole blocks or lengths of blocks, where appropriate, to be rezoned; and
- Consider the effects the Centralized Permit Center project being implemented by the Waterbury Development Corporation will have on the permitting process.

The Team also conducted a survey using questionnaires and held telephone conversations with members of the public who have an interest in the land use regulatory revision process. Attachment C is a compilation of the information gained from the completed questionnaires that were returned. Particular comments and/or issues raised include the following:

- Conduct weekly meetings with departments to go over applications;
- Allow more heavy industrial development;
- Better enforcement and more inspectors, to ensure developments are in accordance with the approved plans, and
- Carefully consider where mixed uses are allowed.

The Team will work with the City to define the best way to address these issues and /or concerns.

5. BEST PRACTICE LAND USE MEASURES FOR CONSIDERATION

There are three categories of land use practices that the Team proposes be allowed, in concept, in Waterbury. Based on the City's feedback and direction, we propose to include elements of these practices as "desirable" components of the revised regulations with, perhaps, a general narrative description of their benefits, uses and applications. However, since these are varied and often complex technical and engineering topics involving further study and consideration, both in terms of their suitability and geographic location across the City on different projects, the revised regulations cannot fully define nor adopt all of these practices at this time. Rather, we propose that these be established as "placeholders" in the revised regulations until such time as additional planning and development consideration has been given and engineering details developed to allow specific regulatory standards to be written and reviewed by the City. We will also highlight the existing regulations that appear to either inhibit or be in conflict with achieving these smart growth and green building objectives, so that the City can consider whether to modify these provisions. Methods that may be used to implement these land use measures are briefly described in the last section of the attached memorandum prepared by Shipman & Goodwin.

- Smart Growth – Encompassed in this category are measures allowing, but not mandating, mixed-use combining residential and commercial development projects, shared parking, and street connectivity development.



- Low Impact Development – This type of regulation promotes the use stormwater management practices that mimic natural hydrologic conditions, for example for groundwater recharge, when developing or redeveloping property.
- Green Building – Green Building Code standards as applied to building projects are wide-ranging and typically address a building’s energy use and the sustainable practices used during its construction and long-term use. Waterbury may not want to institute a requirement that proprietary certifications, such as LEEDS®, be secured for development projects; rather it may want to encourage green building practices by deleting requirements from its regulations that are in conflict with green building practices and offering incentives to developers who incorporate these preferred green measures in their projects.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The City of Waterbury, its citizens and the Woodard & Curran Team have identified areas of the land use regulations that need to be improved to enhance the permitting process and development in the City. Woodard & Curran and Shipman & Goodwin have examined the City’s 2005 Plan of Conservation and Development, existing land use regulations, model regulatory guidance, and input from City staff and members of the public in an effort to identify the most suitable approach to revising the City’s land use regulations.

Our research identified obvious revisions to the existing regulations necessary to restructure the existing regulations and create a more user-friendly process, accessible to developers, engineers, community groups and the public at large. However, as described previously and in the attached memorandum prepared by Shipman & Goodwin, some of the proposed revisions will require City officials and Departments to assess the current process and decide which Agents, Commissions and Boards have authority to issue which permits, approvals and certifications under the proposed regulatory framework. This should be done before the Team can start drafting a revised set of regulations. We recommend that Woodard & Curran and Shipman & Goodwin continue to work with the City Planning staff, Core Committee, and the LURRPAC to decide how to resolve some of the issues and inconsistencies identified and also which of the Best Practice Measures to employ.

We look forward to meeting with the City to resolve these issues and receive further direction so that we may proceed with drafting the revised regulatory documents. This is certainly an exciting process that will result in better growth management tools and positive economic opportunities for Waterbury.



**ATTACHMENT A: MEMORANDUM OF SUPPLEMENTAL
INFORMATION PREPARED BY SHIPMAN &
GOODWIN**



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN LLP
COUNSELORS AT LAW

MEMORANDUM OF SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

TO: Land Use Regulatory Revision Advisory Committee
FROM: Christopher J. Smith, Shipman & Goodwin LLP
DATE: March 3, 2008
RE: Recommendations Concerning the Land Use Regulations of the
City of Waterbury

I Introduction:

On an overall basis, the City of Waterbury's land use regulations provide a fairly explicit process for obtaining approvals for proposed uses of real properties located in the City. This includes the zoning, inland wetlands and watercourses, and subdivision regulations. However, the general format of the regulations, in particular the zoning regulations, may be confusing to the average user. In addition, the zoning/planning regulatory framework provides for a substantial division of decision-making authority between the zoning administrator, zoning commission, plan commission, and zoning board of appeals, that is, most likely, not warranted and unnecessary. Such multiple agency review may not only be inefficient, but, more importantly from a potential user's perspective, result in decisions inconsistent with Waterbury's Zoning Regulations which were promulgated by one municipal agency - the Zoning Commission.

Therefore, at the outset, there are some "big picture" issues to be resolved by the land use agencies of the City of Waterbury before embarking upon details associated with creating or modifying particular zone districts and uses, or establishing authority for the implementation of new zoning/planning tools. However, all of these items may be addressed contemporaneously.

This Memorandum, prepared by Shipman & Goodwin, LLP, in conjunction with the offices of Woodard & Curran, will first address the "big picture" issues that the Committee may wish to address while reviewing and updating the City's land use regulations. Second, the authors address specific modifications to existing regulations, and propose some flexible zoning/planning tools for the Committee to consider implementing within the City's existing land use regulatory procedures to both promote development opportunities within, and protect the citizens and resources of, the City of



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN LLP.
COUNSELORS AT LAW

Waterbury consistent with the most recent Plan of Conservation and Development.

II. Overall land use regulatory format, and delegation of decision-making authority:

A. Identification of different types of land use approvals:

The undersigned strongly recommend that the Committee consider redefining the various land use permits/approvals provided for within the City's land use procedures. Specifically, the following structure and terminology is recommended (the order is ranked by the intensity of use and related level of review authority, and the recommended decision-making body is also designated):

- i. Zoning Permit or Certificate of Zoning Compliance (see current Sections 7.1 and 7.14): This type of permit would be an "over the counter" permit to be "granted" by the Zoning Commission's designated authority (e.g., Zoning Administrator and/or Zoning Enforcement Officer). This would be an administrative approval to be issued within a timeframe established in the Zoning Regulations, if desired. The requirements for filing such permit request would be provided for in the Zoning Regulations (comparable to current Section 7.14 for Certificates of Zoning Compliance). Other details such as possible notice and publication requirements could be considered. Generally, such permits are required for low level use actions such as residential or accessory uses.
- ii. Site Plan review and approval: This type of permit is an administrative permit that would be reviewed and acted upon by a municipal land use agency (preferably the Zoning Commission and not the Plan Commission as presently provided for by the Zoning Regulations). This is the lowest level of agency review provided for by Section 8-3(g) of the Connecticut General Statutes ("CGS"). Generally, such permits are required for low level use actions such as retail and/or office/commercial below a certain square footage (e.g., 5,000 or 10,000 s.f.), where larger, more intense retail and/or commercial uses (e.g., above 5,000 or 10,000 s.f.) would require a



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN^{LLP}

COUNSELORS AT LAW

higher level of review such as special permit approval. As provided by State law, a public hearing on a site plan application is not required (but may be entertained at the discretion of the reviewing agency), and certain statutory timeframes are required to be complied with whereby noncompliance with such statutory timeframes results in an automatic approval of the site plan application. It should be noted that site plan review is generally a more streamlined review process relative to the usually more involved special permit and special exception review and approval processes.

- iii. Special Permit review and approval: This type of permit is an administrative permit that would be reviewed and acted upon by a municipal land use agency (preferably the Zoning Commission – not as is presently provided for in the multi-faceted Articles V and VII of the Waterbury Zoning Regulations). This is a higher (more stringent) level of review afforded by CGS Section 8-3c. Generally, such permits are required for moderate to high intense use actions such as larger retail (greater than 10,000 s.f.), or commercial/office center or park uses. As provided by State law, a public hearing is required. Noncompliance with established statutory review timeframes does not result in an automatic approval. Finally, a special permit use is generally more involved (requires more information from an applicant and takes more time) than site plan review. Therefore, special permit review should be reserved for more intense uses.
- iv. Special Exception review and approval: This type of permit is an administrative permit that may be reviewed and acted upon by either the Zoning Commission or Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). This is the highest level of agency review afforded by CGS Section 8-3c (as to the Zoning Commission), or CGS Section 8-6 (as to the ZBA). Generally, a super-majority vote is required if such review authority is retained by the Zoning Commission (e.g., two-thirds; this is not required by State law, but often is provided for by a municipality in its zoning regulations). If such special exception decision-making authority is delegated by the Zoning Commission thru the Zoning Regulations to the ZBA, then a four out of five vote



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN^{LLP}

COUNSELORS AT LAW

majority is required for ZBA approval (this four out of five vote majority by a ZBA is required by State law). The same State statutory public hearing and timeframe provisions that apply to special permit review apply to special exception review. Special exception review is generally reserved for more intense uses such as excavation, boarding homes, package stores, and auto repair-related uses such as currently provided by Section 5.13. [Note: as a potential alternative, certain special exception review and approval authority may be delegated to the ZBA for certain uses, and special exception review authority for other uses may be retained by the Zoning Commission (i.e., there may be a “split” in the review of certain uses as “special exceptions” between the ZBA and Zoning Commission if so desired).]

- v. Variance review and approval: This is the power to grant variances of certain provisions of the Zoning Regulations. This authority, and others (e.g., right to entertain an appeal of a zoning enforcement decision), are delegated exclusively to the ZBA by CGS Section 8-6, and are not really relevant to the discussion presented in this portion of the subject Memorandum.
- vi. Subdivision review and approval: This authority, which includes cluster subdivision review and approval authority, is exclusively delegated to the Plan Commission by CGS Sections 8-25 and 8-26. As with variances, such authority is not really relevant to the subject discussion, but was added to provide reference to such authority in the overall land use regulatory format (e.g., subdivision and resubdivision approval authority is provided for in the City’s Subdivision Regulations, not Zoning Regulations).

B. Revise Format to Include Permitted Uses for Each Zone District:

First, it is recommended that each permitted use in every Zone District be explicitly designated as subject to one of the first four types of zoning approvals discussed above (e.g., 1. certificate of zoning compliance; 2. site plan; 3. special permit; or 4. special exception). This should be provided for in the specific section that applies to each Zone District. For example, there would be a Section for General Commercial



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN^{LLP.}
COUNSELORS AT LAW

District (C.G.) as currently exists in Section 4.3. However, the permitted uses would be explicitly provided under Section 4.3, perhaps in the general use terminology currently utilized in Section 2.3. Section 4.3 would designate each general use and whether such is subject to a certificate of zoning compliance, site plan, special permit or special exception review and approval.

Second, the existing Table of Permitted Uses provided in Section 2.3 would remain. The Table would indicate whether a particular type of permitted general use is permitted in the C.G. Zone District (e.g., Section 4.3 would indicate that “Entertainment and Recreation Uses” are permitted in the C.G. Zone, subject to site plan review. Table 2.3 would specify the particular types of permitted “entertainment and recreation uses” in the C.G. Zone. If a particular “entertainment and recreation use” is not provided for in Table 2.3, then it is prohibited in the C.G. Zone.).

This format will permit an individual to first identify which zone district her or his property is located within, and then, by simply turning to the applicable zone district’s section in the Zoning Regulations, determine not only which uses are permitted in the zone district, but also the type of permit approval that is required for such permitted use (once again, whether a certificate of zoning compliance, site plan, special permit, or special exception approval, is required). The user would then turn to existing Table 2.3 to determine if a proposed particular use (movie theater) falls within the general permitted use category (entertainment and recreation use) that is permitted in the property’s zone district (C.B. Zone). Once again, if a proposed use cannot be found with the general use categories of a zone district, or within the specific uses provided for in Table 2.3 as to the zone district, then the use is prohibited within the zone district.

Since each zone district’s section will indicate the type of permit or approval required for each use, there should be a new Article within the Zoning Regulations that addresses the filing requirements, review standards, and approval authority, for each type of permit. For example, new Article VI would be divided into four sections with a section devoted to each of the above-referenced types of approvals (1. certificate of zoning approval; 2. site plan; 3. special permit; and 4. special exception). These



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN^{LLP.}

COUNSELORS AT LAW

subsections would indicate the filing requirements, and general standards of review, for each type of permit. More explicit standards for specified uses such as currently found in Article V, “Supplementary Regulations”, would remain and be referenced to relative to the applicable permitted uses provided for in each zone district’s section. This format will retain the valuable and time-tested standards provided in the existing Article V.

In conclusion, let’s use the following due diligence example for a citizen or potential developer utilizing a format comparable to the above. First, the user determines that their property is located within the C.B. Zone District. Turning to the C.B. Zone District, Section 4.3, as proposed to be modified, the user will see what uses are permitted under the four types of zoning permits. Under the subsection for “permitted special permit uses”, the user sees that an “entertainment and recreation use” is permitted. The user then goes to Table 2.3 and determines whether a movie theater use is permitted as an “entertainment and recreation use” within the C.B. Zone. Once determining that a movie theater use is permitted in the C.B. Zone subject to special permit review, the user then turns to the “special permit” subsection in the Regulations to determine what information is required, and the general standards and process, for obtaining special permit approval. If more stringent standards are required for a movie theater use in the C.B. Zone, then such would be referenced to (not necessarily provided in) the C.B. Zone District Section. The explicit additional special permit standards for a movie theater use would be contained in a separate article comparable to the current Article V, “Supplementary Regulations”, which could perhaps be renamed: “Additional Special Permit and Special Exception Use Standards.” This would permit the City to retain the detailed standards for more intense uses as provided for in existing Article V with only minor modifications to Article V.

C. Reconsider existing delegation of decision-making authority for zoning approvals:

The City of Waterbury’s Zoning Regulations presently delegate most of the decision-making authority on zoning land use matters to municipal agencies not responsible for drafting and promulgating the Zoning Regulations. In other words, although the Zoning Commission



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN LLP.
COUNSELORS AT LAW

adopts the Zoning Regulations, most of the decision-making authority is delegated to the Plan Commission or ZBA. This is very unusual in Connecticut, and results in boards and commissions who didn't draft the Zoning Regulations in the first instance, interpreting and applying the Regulations. This may create significant hurdles to an efficient and consistent land use decision-making process with multiple players who have their own separate legislative powers and responsibilities.

The following are two examples of potential problems with the current procedure:

1. Section 7.44 addresses "Site Plan Procedure" which includes reference to "special permit approval" in subsection (a), requires that the Zoning Administrator "certify" that, essentially, the proposal complies with the regulations (which is usually the responsibility of an applicant's expert), and then provides that the Plan Commission review and approve the site plan which is based upon the Zoning Regulations promulgated by the Zoning Commission. Typically, site plan review is reserved for a municipality's zoning commission. The undersigned has never seen a zoning provision requiring the municipal planner to "certify" that a plan complies with the municipality's zoning regulations (this could be problematic in defending a decision to deny an application by, under current regulations, the Plan Commission if the Planning Administrator certifies compliance). Note: 7.44(d) is probably not permissible (requiring all state permits – STC? – to be obtained prior to a decision being required on the site plan application).
2. Section 2.2, "Interpretation", provides that the ZBA is authorized to determine whether a proposed use falls within a use explicitly permitted by the Zoning Regulations. If the ZBA determines that a proposed use is "substantially similar" to a designated permitted use, then "... such use shall be added to the table and permitted in the zoning districts" This is an interesting example of the Zoning Regulations delegating authority to the ZBA to, in effect, amend the Zoning Regulations. The authority to determine whether a use falls within the Zoning Regulations



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN LLP.
COUNSELORS AT LAW

relative to a particular development proposal should be within the province of the Zoning Commission which drafted the Regulations in the first instance. Only when addressing an appeal from an enforcement order as provided by Sections 8-6 and 8-7, would the ZBA have statutory authority to interpret and apply a Zoning Regulation to a particular set of facts. In addition, only the Zoning Commission may amend the Zoning Regulations.

The authors recommend that the Committee consider having the authority for land use permitting review and decision-making structured similarly to the format discussed above. This would create a format more consistent with the State enabling legislation for each land use board (Zoning Commission, ZBA, and Plan Commission). Such format would also be more consistent with the majority of municipalities throughout the State.

- III. Recommended modifications to clarify procedures, and provide for new zoning/planning tools:
- A. Modifications:
- i. Section 2.2, “Interpretation”, referenced above.
 - ii. Section 6.6, “Abandonment” (non-conforming uses), to make consistent with applicable statutory provision requiring “intent” to abandon.
 - iii. Section 6.4, “Extension of [non-conforming] Use”.
 - iv. Expand upon excavation use regulations whereby perhaps subject to special exception approval (with a super-majority vote required by Zoning Commission, or four out of five vote majority by ZBA). Currently, special permit approval required with detailed standards as provided by Section 5.15-3.
 - v. Specify regulatory requirements and burdens relative



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN^{LLP.}

COUNSELORS AT LAW

to: paper streets (bonding/releases); new intersections (sight lines; slope rights); access to utilities such as sewers for new developments; protest petitions per CGS Section 8-3 (filing requirements, and forms); and land use enforcement powers (issuance of citations and appeal proceedings).

- vi. Provide for a preapplication meeting process to facilitate initial input from the City's professional staff concerning a prospective development proposal. This meeting could be monthly and include a representative from planning, wetlands, engineering, public works, police and fire (and other appropriate City departments). The meeting would be informal whereby a prospective applicant would explain their proposal in conceptual terms for the purpose of obtaining "feedback" pertaining to issues associated with their proposal. There would be no commitment from any participant. The meeting would be for informational purposes only. Such preapplication meeting process is authorized by law. The intent is to formally authorize such process in the land use regulations.

B. Zoning/planning tool options:

- i. Overlay zone procedures for certain districts. Two step process (first, change of zone/overlay with conceptual plan of development; second, site plan with site specific development details – with ability for applicant to combine both steps with a combined application package; detailed standards required; limited to certain areas/zone districts).
- ii. Flexible standards (ability to reduce certain bulk/area requirements when applicant provides designated enhancements – e.g., reduced parking requirements, increased coverage, or reduced setbacks when



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN^{LLP.}

COUNSELORS AT LAW

pedestrian accessibility enhancements provided, or “green building” measures utilized).

- iii. Perhaps provide incentive for less intensive “special permit uses” where “green building” measures are utilized or other enhancements provided, whereby the approval process converts from special permit to site plan, or whereby a site plan approval process converts to certificate of zoning compliance process.
- iv. Conservation or open space subdivision regulations for the Plan Commission whereby the subdivision’s density would be based upon the permitted density for the underlying zone district, or, in the alternative, a density bonus is provided based upon certain enhancements being incorporated into the development proposal (e.g., additional open space; green development measures). Conservation or open space regulations will provide for reduced roadway widths and other infrastructure reduction incentives to encourage subdivision development proposals with smaller lots and greater area devoted for conservation or open space.

IV. Conclusion:

First, the Committee must consider whether to reformat the existing Zoning Regulations based upon permitted uses subject to one of the following four types of zoning approvals: 1. certificate of zoning compliance; 2. site plan; 3. special permit; or 4. special exception. The permitted uses, with corresponding required permit approval, will be specified in each zone district section in the Regulations. In addition, the Regulations will be modified to provide a new article that will delineate the filing requirements for, and general standards of review associated with, each type of required land use approval (e.g., a new article with a separate subsection dedicated to the filing requirements and general standards for: 1. a certificate of zoning compliance; 2. site plan; 3. special permit; and 4. special exception). Finally, for more intensive uses



SHIPMAN & GOODWIN^{LLP.}

COUNSELORS AT LAW

requiring additional standards for approval, Article V will remain with substantially the same format and standards for approval of such uses.

Second, the Committee must consider how the current Zoning Regulations delegate the decision-making authority on most uses to either the ZBA or Plan Commission, and not the Zoning Commission, and whether, based upon the aforementioned suggested new type of zoning approval format, changes should be made whereby decisions on most site specific land use development proposals will be vested with the Zoning Commission. Once again, the Zoning Commission drafted the Zoning Regulations, and is probably best suited to interpret and apply the Regulations on a site by site application basis. This is how Connecticut's zoning enabling legislation is generally structured. This will encourage a more efficient mechanism to process land use applications, and possibly a more consistent body of decisions. Most people agree that this type of decision-making process encourages both trust in a municipality's land use process by the municipality's citizens, and certainty as to development opportunities within the municipality for potential developers.

Third, the Committee must consider how best to clarify certain provisions of the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations to better promote efficiency and consistency in Waterbury's land use process, while ensuring the protection of the general welfare of Waterbury's citizens and the City's resources. In addition, the Committee must consider whether to incorporate certain flexible, but definable, zoning/planning tools into the Regulations consistent with the objectives and goals articulated in the most recent Plan of Conservation and Development.



ATTACHMENT B: DRAFT LIST OF STANDARD ENGINEERING DETAILS AND POLICIES RELATED TO LAND DEVELOPMENT

CITY OF WATERBURY
Water and Wastewater Details

DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE	AUTHOR
1000 GALLON PRECAST CONCRETE OIL SEPARATOR (OILSEP)	UK	UK
1000 GALLON PRECAST PUMP CHAMBER (PUMP)	UK	UK
12" GALLERY DRY WELL DETAIL	UK	UK
12" GALLERY LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL (12GAL)	UK	UK
27" GALLERY LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL	UK	UK
28" GALLERY LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL	UK	UK
30" GALLERY LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL	UK	UK
48" GALLERY LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL	UK	UK
BLIND CONNECTION DETAIL	Feb 17 2007	Bureau of Engineering
CONNECTION TO EXISTING WATERMAIN DETAIL (WMTAP)	UK	UK
CULVERTS A,C AND C RIPRAP INLET/OUTLET DETAIL (DBOUT)	UK	UK
CURTAIN DRAIN DETAIL (CURTAINSEPTIC)	UK	UK
CURTAIN DRAIN DETAIL (CURTDET)	UK	UK
CURTAIN DRAIN DETAIL (FRDRAIN)	UK	UK
CURTAIN DRAIN DETAIL (WCURTRDR)	UK	UK
DIVINE LIGHTING DETAIL (FOOTCLD)	UK	UK
END MANHOLE DETAIL (MDC-ENDMH)	UK	UK
FIRE HYDRANT ASSEMBLY DETAIL (MDC-HYDRANT)	UK	UK
GALLERY SYSTEM CROSS SECTION DETAIL	UK	UK
GALLERY SYSTEM INLET DETAIL (GALIN)	UK	UK
GALLERY SYSTEM OUTLET STRUCTURE DETAIL (GALLOUT)	UK	UK
GATE BOX DETAIL	UK	UK
GRINDER DETAIL (GRINDERPUMP)	UK	UK
GRINDER PUMP DETAIL (WALLINGFORDBASIN)	UK	Underwriters Lab's Inc.
GROSS PARTICLE SEPARATOR DETAIL (OILSED)	UK	UK
HANDICAP PARKING POST AND SIGN DETAIL (HANDSGN)	UK	UK
HANDICAP SIGN DETAIL (HANDICAP)	UK	UK
IMPERVIOUS WATERSTOP DETAIL	UK	UK
INFILTRATOR SIDEWINDER HIGH CAPACITY LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL (15INFILTRATOR)	UK	UK
INFILTRATOR SIDEWINDER STANDARD LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL (12_INFILTRATOR)	UK	UK
LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL (LEFLD)	UK	UK
LOCKING SEWER CLEANOUT FRAME AND COVER (san.details)	APRIL, 2005	UK
LOCKING SEWER MANHOLE FRAME AND COVER DETAIL	April, 2005	UK
MANHOLE ADJUSTABLE RISER/GRADE RING (san.details)	APRIL, 2005	UK
MANHOLE COVER DETAIL	March 19 2007	Le Baron Foundry, Inc
MANHOLE COVER DETAIL	Nov 26 2007	Bureau of Engineering

CITY OF WATERBURY
Water and Wastewater Details

MIXED DETAILS	Feb 6 2007	Bureau of Engineering
OFFSET CATCH BASIN DETAIL	Feb 6 2007	Bureau of Engineering
ORIFICE PLATE DETAIL (ORIF)	UK	UK
OUTLET STRUCTURE DETAIL-MUST BE ADJUSTED VERSION (OUTSTRUC)	UK	UK
PIPE CONNECTION TO C.P.E.P. PIPE SEWER DETAIL (CPEPSADDLE)	UK	UK
PIPE CONNECTION TO EXISTING CATCH BASIN DETAIL	UK	UK
PIPE CONNECTION TO EXISTING SEWER DETAIL (SADDLE)	UK	UK
PRECAST CONCRETE SEPTIC TANK DETAIL (SEPTTK)	UK	UK
RAISE UTILITY CATCHBASIN TOP/MANHOLE FRAME DETAIL (RAISEUTI)	UK	UK
RIPRAP INLET/OUTLET DETAIL (RROUTL)	UK	UK
ROOF DRAIN CLEAN OUT DETAIL (COUT)	UK	UK
SANITARY SEWER VENT REPAIR DETAIL	Feb 15 2007	Bureau of Engineering
SEWER MANHOLE FRAME AND COVER (san.details)	APRIL, 2005	UK
SITE LIGHT DETAIL (LIGHTP)	UK	UK
STANDARD ENDWALL DETAIL (HDWDET)	UK	UK
STORM MANHOLE DETAIL (STMMHDET)	UK	UK
STORM WATER LATERAL CONNECTION DETAIL (STMLDET)	UK	UK
TRASH RACK DETAIL (TRASHR)	UK	UK
TRENCH DETAIL 30" DIA PIPE OR LESS	April 10 2005	Bureau of Engineering
TRENCH EXCAVATION AND BACKFILL DETAIL (CPEPTRENCH)	UK	UK
TRENCH EXCAVATION AND BACKFILL WITH LESS THAN 2.5 ' OF COVER DETAIL	UK	UK
TYPE "C" CATCHBASIN DETAIL (CCBDET)	UK	UK
TYPE "C" CITY OF WATERBURY CATCH BASIN DETAIL (WTBYCBDE)	UK	UK
TYPE "CL" CATCHBASIN DETAIL 9 (CLCBDET)	UK	UK
TYPICAL II MANHOLE AND PRECAST DETAIL (SAN MN)	UK	UK
TYPICAL SANITARY SEWER TRENCH SECTION DETAIL (SAN-TREN)	UK	UK
TYPICAL SECTION OF LEACHING TRENCH DETAIL (SEPTR)	UK	UK
WALKING QUALITY BASIN EMBANKMENT DETAIL (DETBASINCS)	UK	UK
WATERMAIN TRENCH DETAIL	UK	UK
YARD DRAIN DETAIL (YDDET)	UK	UK

CITY OF WATERBURY
Erosion and Sedimentation Control

<u>DOCUMENT TITLE</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>AUTHOR</u>
ANTI VORTEX TRASH RACK DETAIL	UK	UK
BAYSAVER STANDARD DETAIL	December 27 2001	BaySaver, Inc.
CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE DETAIL TRACKPAD	UK	UK
CROSS SECTION EMERGENCY SPILLWAY DETAIL OUTLET	UK	UK
DIVERSION SWALE DETAIL	UK	UK
EROSION CONTROL FOR STOCK PILE MATERIAL DETAIL	UK	UK
GEOTEXTILE SILT FENCE DETAIL	UK	UK
GEOTEXTILE SILT FENCE DETAIL	UK	UK
LEVEL SPREADER DETAIL	UK	UK
MEANDERING STONE SWALE DETAIL	UK	UK
RIP-RAP CHANNEL DETAIL	UK	UK
RIP-RAP OUTLET DETAIL	UK	UK
SCOUR HOLE DETAIL	UK	UK
SEDIMENT TRAP DETAIL (STBASIN)	UK	UK
SEDIMENT TRAP DETAIL (STBSDTL)	UK	UK
SHRUB PLANTING DETAIL - 1	UK	UK
SHRUB PLANTING DETAIL - 2	UK	UK
STAKED HAYBALE	UK	UK
TREE PLANTING DETAIL	UK	UK

CITY OF WATERBURY
Notes and Title Blocks

DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE	AUTHOR
ABBREVIATIONS	UK	UK
ALTA/ASCM BLOCK (ALTRA CERT)	UK	UK
DATUM BLOCK	UK	UK
DATUM WATERBURY NOTE BLOCK	UK	UK
EROSION CONTROL PLAN NARRATIVE	UK	UK
EXISTING UG UTILITIES BLOCK (CALL BEFORE DUG)	UK	UK
INFORMATIONAL PUPOSE ONLY BLOCK (DISCLAIMER)	UK	UK
LEGEND	UK	UK
LEGEND (SEPLEG)	UK	UK
LEGEND EXISTING	UK	UK
NOTES FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL (EROSIONLOTS)	UK	UK
NOTES FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL (ERSIMPLE)	UK	UK
PRODUCED BY PROCESS BLOCK	UK	UK
REVISION BLOCK	UK	UK
SIGNATURE BLOCK MAP SUBSTANTIALLY CORRECT (RODE-CERT)	UK	UK
SIGNATURE TITLE BLOCK UNSIGNED	UK	UK
SIGNAURE BLOCK FOR WATER AND SEWER APPROVAL (MDA APPROVAL)	UK	UK
SOIL SCIENTIST ATTESTMENT BLOCK (WET CERT)	UK	UK
SOIL TEST LEGENDV (TPLEGEND)	UK	UK
SURVERY NOTED BLOCK (CLASS D)	UK	UK
SURVEY CLASS 2 STATEMENT BLOCK	UK	UK
SURVEY DISCLAIMER (LONGCERT)	UK	UK
SURVEY NOTES	UK	UK
UG UTILITY DISCLAIMER BLOCK	UK	UK
ZONING DATUM BLOCK	UK	UK

CITY OF WATERBURY
Roadway and Drainage Details

DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE	AUTHOR
5" PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PCC WALK DETAIL (SIDEWALKS)	February 17 2006	Bureau of Engineering
6" BIT LIP CURBING DETAIL	UK	UK
8" PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PCC DRIVEWAY APRON DETAIL (8PCCSIDEWALK)	UK	UK
ARTERIAL COLLECTOR AND LOCAL ROAD REPAIRS DETAIL (PAVREPAIR)	March 22 2007	Bureau of Engineering
BITUMIOUS CONCRETE DRIVE APRON WITH BIT.CURB DETAIL	July 2 2007	Bureau of Engineering
BITUMIOUS CONCRETE DRIVE APRON WITH CONCRETE CURB DETAIL	January 26 2007	Bureau of Engineering
CAST IN PLACE CONCRETE CURB DETAIL	February 17 2006	Bureau of Engineering
CONC WALK EXP. JOINT AND DUMMY JOINT DETAIL	UK	UK
CONC. PARKING CURBING DETAIL (CURBSTOP)	UK	UK
CONCRETE CURB DETAIL	UK	UK
CONCRETE RAMP DETAIL (DRIVERAM)	UK	UK
CONCRETE WALK DETAIL	UK	UK
DRIVEWAY APRON DETAIL	UK	UK
GRANITE CURB DETAIL	UK	UK
HAMMERHEAD TURN AROUND DETAIL	February 15 2006	Bureau of Engineering
LOCAL ROAD CROSS SECTION DETAIL (RDCSWTBY)	January 31 2006	Bureau of Engineering
PARKING LOT CORNERING RADIUS DETAIL (WB50)	UK	UK
PAVEMENT DETAIL	UK	UK
PAVEMENT DRIVEWAY RESTORATION DETAIL (PAV-SIDEWALKS)	February 17 2006	Bureau of Engineering
PAVEMENT OVERLAY DETAIL	UK	UK
PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PCC PEDESTRIAN RAMP DETAIL (HDCRAMP)	February 17 2006	Bureau of Engineering
POT HOLE REPAIR DETAIL	UK	UK
PRECAST CONCRETE CURB DETAIL (PRE CAST CONCURB)	February 15 2006	Bureau of Engineering
ROAD CROSS SECTION DETAIL	UK	UK
ROAD CROSS SECTION DETAIL (RDCSWTBY)	UK	UK
SIDE WALK RAMP DETAIL (HANDICAPCURVE)	UK	UK
SIDE WALK RAMP DETAIL (HANDICAPSTRAIGHT)	UK	UK
TYPE "A" TRENCH REPAIR ON CITY R.O.W. DETAIL (TRPAVW)	UK	UK
UTILITY TRENCH DETAIL (UTITRE)	UK	UK

CITY OF WATERBURY
DPW Policies and Forms

DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE	AUTHOR	ID	FORMAT
Street Layout and Discontinuance (Abandonment)	4/17/2001	Barry Berson	PL #1	
Privately Owned Force Mains w/in City RoW	3/23/2007	Mark Pronovost	PL#2	
Connection of Privately Owned Laterals to City MHs	5/5/2003	Mark Pronovost	PL#3	
New Driveways and Driveway Repairs	5/11/2007	Mark Pronovost	PL#4	
Paving of Subdivision Roads Between the Dec. 1 and April 1	12/3/2007	Mark Pronovost	PL#5	
Identification of Underground Utility Facilities	5/20/1998	Nicholas Neeley		Memo
Call Before You Dig	5/25/1993	Ernest A. Phillips		Memo
Curb Cuts	11/17/1988	Donald Sullivan		Memo
Review of Plot Plans for Building Permits	8/19/1994	Ernest A. Phillips		Memo
Approval of Paper Street for Building Permit	10/24/1990	Carl Pelletier		Letter
Amendment To Section 17-38 Of The City Code	10/14/1988	Board of Aldermen		Memo
Construction Inspection Schedule - Monday-Friday	1/11/2007			Schedule
Water Main Application-DPH Drinking Water Section	7/13/2005	Kenneth R. Skov, DPH		Memo
Paper Street Development Proposal	4/3/1987	Salvatore Porzio		Memo
Binding Conditions of Permit - Street Opening Permit		Bureau of Engineering		Form
Water Main Application	6/10/2005	Bureau of Water, CTDPH		Form
Plot Plan Review List		Bureau of Engineering		Form
As-Built Review List		Bureau of Engineering		Form
Application for Building Permit	10/17/2007	Dept. of Inspection		Form
Certificate of Use and Occupancy	1953	Dept. of Inspection	32857	Certificate
Application For Zoning Permit		James A. Sequin		Form
Sidewalk Use Permit - Street Use Permit		Bureau of Engineering		Form



ATTACHMENT C: TABULATION OF RESULTS OF LAND USE REGULATORY REVISION QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

City of Waterbury Land Use Questionnaire Results

Question #	Connection to Project	Response
2. Do Waterbury's Land Use Regulations affect you in your everyday life or work? If yes, how?	Resident A	No
	Resident/Bus Owner/Developer B	No
	Resident C	No
	Land Owner D	Left blank - see comments bottom of page
	Resident/Land Use Commissioner E	Left blank
	Resident/ Bus Owner / Attorney F	Yes - he's a real estate lawyer. Also lives near a previously proposed cluster housing dev.
	Bus Owner/ Consultant G	Civil engineer and land surveyor working as consultant
	Resident H	Yes - development directly affects my neighborhood. Traffic, safety and env issues are of concern. Environmental effects are most concerning, undeveloped areas nearby are sensitive and drainage flows through my property.
	Bus Owner/ Consultant I	Civil engineer and land surveyor working as consultant to developers on zoning and planning issues
	Resident J	Yes - driving patterns, recreation and quality of life
	Resident K	No - however, regulations should be updated and the recommendations made in the plan should be followed.
	Other Real Estate Broker L	Yes - permit process is common in brokering
	Land Owner M	Yes - inappropriate development such as condos in middle of single fam neighborhoods cause stress. High legal cost to fight projects. Single fam neighborhoods should remain as such.
	Resident N	Traffic, air and water quality, recreation, are all affected by land use regulations
	Resident/Litter & Beautification Commissioner O	Less urbanization, less multi-families
3. Describe how you envision Waterbury should develop in the next 5 to 25 years.	Resident A	Defined downtown, major neighborhood centers, parks
	Resident/Bus Owner/Developer B	Single family homes, less multi-families, cared-for play areas
	Resident C	Downtown area
	Land Owner D	Left blank - see comments bottom of page
	Resident/Land Use Commissioner E	Does not see any more dev any time soon
	Resident/ Bus Owner / Attorney F	Revitalize industrial, comm and residential properties that have deteriorated
	Bus Owner/ Consultant G	Increase tax base without overcrowding school system
	Resident H	Downtown needs to be improved by bringing in more retail & other bus activities. Need upgraded residential offerings to the core of downtown while preserving the outer areas as single family housing - as promised by the comprehensive plan .
	Bus Owner/ Consultant I	Redevelop downtown area w businesses, townhouses to bring younger people to City
	Resident J	Using green technology and balance between development & open space
	Resident K	Waterbury needs to develop & revitalize the downtown area & focus on economic development
	Other Real Estate Broker L	Highway commercial along I 84 especially S Main and So End bus park
	Land Owner M	Encourage industry in downtown area , develop downtown housing, encourage open space and preserve existing, adopt sustainability in infrastructure repairs and replacement
	Resident N	As a "green" city that emphasizes its urban qualities
	Resident/Litter & Beautification Commissioner O	As a City that made a difference by using its land to create more upper scale homes to balance out the over-abundance of multi-families and condos. I envision a City that retains more open space with walking paths and natural formations. Less litter. Becoming a less urbanized and more quaint city via proper land use.

City of Waterbury Land Use Questionnaire Results

Question #	Connection to Project	Response
4. Is there another Connecticut community that you think Waterbury could use as a good example of land use development? If so, what do you find attractive about that community?	Resident A	W. Hartford - Commercial and residential areas are attractive
	Resident/Bus Owner/Developer B	Signage in Bridgeport ; Roads and sidewalks in W. Hartford
	Resident C	?
	Land Owner D	Left blank - see comments bottom of page
	Resident/Land Use Commissioner E	W. Hartford - good downtown development
	Resident/ Bus Owner / Attorney F	?
	Bus Owner/ Consultant G	Hartford. Waterbury isn't Scarsdale. Get the derelicts off the green and keep downtown clean
	Resident H	Surrounding towns have greenspace areas as part of their planning - all we do in Waterbury is regulate maximum density. Greenspace zoning is not addressed.
	Bus Owner/ Consultant I	New Britain - Dept of Municipal Development is user friendly as well as their regulations for development
	Resident J	Left blank
	Resident K	W. Hartford - has a small town feel & has a busy downtown
	Other Real Estate Broker L	Stamford - all of the above
	Land Owner M	New Haven converted the old telco bldg into luxury townhouses. They also have attractive storefronts to encourage pedestrian shopping
	Resident N	New Haven for its green space, city services
Resident/Litter & Beautification Commissioner O	Middlebury, Southbury, Woodbury, Avon, Cheshire, Litchfield	
5. Innovative and/or alternative methods of structuring land development regulations allow mixed uses, such as residential and commercial in the same neighborhood or building, provide incentives for the preservation of open space and environmentally sensitive areas, and encourage pedestrian and other non-automobile modes of transportation. Do you feel that any of these types of development have a place in Waterbury, and if so, how and where?	Resident A	Careful & defined combination of residential & commercial areas zoning should be specific and once established, changes should be minimal
	Resident/Bus Owner/Developer B	No businesses in living areas
	Resident C	Yes
	Land Owner D	Left blank - see comments bottom of page
	Resident/Land Use Commissioner E	Yes - downtown area
	Resident/ Bus Owner / Attorney F	?
	Bus Owner/ Consultant G	Mixed uses should be allowed. We have great park system. Have developers donate to park system instead of providing for open space that won't be used.
	Resident H	Specific greenspace zoning should be created and incentives established. Density control is not adequate.
	Bus Owner/ Consultant I	Mixed uses in the downtown areas should be encouraged.
	Resident J	Yes - South End
	Resident K	Preserve what little open space we have. There are areas that are currently mixed use - keep those.
	Other Real Estate Broker L	Not yet - move the buses and homeless people off the green. Create market place housing downtown. Restructure city garages with long term leases
	Land Owner M	Mixed used has a place only in the downtown area not the outlying neighborhoods. Create greefields over existing brownfields.
	Resident N	Yes- we must make our city more walkable through mixed use. NY City's goal is a park within 10 min walk of every resident - why can't we do this?
Resident/Litter & Beautification Commissioner O	Mixed use in downtown only. No more commercial invading residentia areas. Would like to see more open space and pedestrian only walking paths etc.	

City of Waterbury Land Use Questionnaire Results

Question #	Connection to Project	Response
6. State and federal regulations require that the City adopt measures for stormwater management for development of sites of an acre or more in area. Do you think Waterbury should adopt measures for stormwater management for developments that cover less than an acre? Why or why not?	Resident A	All construction activities should have a stormwater plan
	Resident/Bus Owner/Developer B	No - stormwater captured in under an acre is fine into a storm dry-well on site
	Resident C	?
	Land Owner D	Left blank - see comments bottom of page
	Resident/Land Use Commissioner E	Left blank
	Resident/ Bus Owner / Attorney F	No - stormwater system in place - expanded would be best in urban setting
	Bus Owner/ Consultant G	The horse left the barn 50 years ago. Try upgrading the City's storm system.
	Resident H	SW management is needed for all development and must be enforced especially during construction.
	Bus Owner/ Consultant I	Less than an acre should utilize City storm system where available or on-site dry-wells.
	Resident J	Yes - to protect our water supply
	Resident K	Adopt measures to control pollutants that may be generated
	Other Real Estate Broker L	Not appropriate question - ask engineer
	Land Owner M	No comment
Resident N	Yes - because it all adds up and can cause severe problems	
Resident/Litter & Beautification Commissioner O	Does not understand what "stormwater management" entails	
7. Have you had experience with the City's Land Use permitting process? If no, go on to question 7, If yes, a) Was it clear to you what permits and approvals were needed for your project? Briefly describe your project? b) Were you able to use one set of plans for all your permit requirements? If no, why not? c) Describe the part of the process that you found to be most confusing. d) Describe one thing that you think would significantly improve the process. e) If you have had a particularly positive experience with the permitting process in another Connecticut community, please name the community and explain what about their process makes it work so well.	Resident A	A. no A. the list is clearer when dealing with experienced engineer B. yes C. unclear process for open space fund, posting/paying a bond for improvements D. better organization and more personnel at City Planning Office E. W. Hartford City Planning - go visit - it's organized and personnel is well trained
	Resident/Bus Owner/Developer B	
	Resident C	A. No
	Land Owner D	Yes; B. yes and no
	Resident/Land Use Commissioner E	Left blank
	Resident/ Bus Owner / Attorney F	No
	Bus Owner/ Consultant G	A. Yes - Most of the time B. No - need different things for wetlands, planning & engineering C. Waiting until the 11th hour to get comments from City Planning staff. D. Get someone in WPCF to respond to calls & plans E. New Britain - has a dept solely devoted to development
	Resident H	Left blank
	Resident/Bus Owner/Developer B	A. Yes - we submit several projects a month B. there are certain requirements for each dept. C. Staff comments 2 hours before the mtg or public hearing D. Devote a single dept to new development for comm and residential E. New Britain - developer does not have to chase staff for comments
	Resident J	Left blank
	Resident K	Left blank
	Other Real Estate Broker L	D. One stop permitting and weekly mtgs with all parties incl fire E. Danbury
	Land Owner M	A. No
	Resident N	Left blank
	Resident/Litter & Beautification Commissioner O	A. yes - attending meetings where others seek permits

City of Waterbury Land Use Questionnaire Results

Question #	Connection to Project	Response
8. Do you think Waterbury's Land Use Regulations are adequately enforced under the following scenarios? a) When proposed developments are being reviewed and approved? b) When the development is being constructed? c) How would you recommend the land use development regulations be enforced?	Resident A	A. yes; B. no; C. Board approval required and monitoring during construction
	Resident/Bus Owner/Developer B	A. assuming yes - not sure B. not at that stage yet C. would rather pay for inspectors' time than to pay for 'open space fund'?
	Resident C	A. No B. No C. No
	Land Owner D	A. yes
	Resident/Land Use Commissioner E	A. No B. No C. self-supportive permit fees that cover the cost of inspection & oversight if needed
	Resident/ Bus Owner / Attorney F	A. Yes B. yes C. ?
	Bus Owner/ Consultant G	A. Yes B. Yes C. As is
	Resident H	A. No - agents are allowed to bend the rules to easily which opens up perceptions of favoritism B. No - enforcement of violations is poor C. Permits should be suspended quickly if violations are not resolved and enforcement must be improved.
	Bus Owner/ Consultant I	A. Yes B. Yes C. The current method by the enforcement officer
	Resident J	A. not clear B. not clear
	Resident K	A. yes B. no knowledge C. hire additional enforcement officers and regulations need to be uniformly enforced across the City
	Other Real Estate Broker L	A. I hear Jim Sequin does a good job and is a pro. Also hear dept is understaffed vs other Cities
	Land Owner M	A. Yes B. cannot comment C. to facilitate input from concerned citizens, hold public hears or neighborhood information sessions. Current regulations favor developers. More balance should be factored into the permitting process.
	Resident N	A. No B. No C. Elect land use boards, hire more inspectors
	Resident/Litter & Beautification Commissioner O	A. No B. No C. Stricter guidelines and people to oversee them