

Anna Wynn

RECEIVED

From: Elizabeth Burdick
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 1:04 PM
To: martyengrew@gmail.com; natewoody7@gmail.com; Anna Wynn
Cc: Hannah Gienau
Subject: FW: Suggested Parking Regulations For Multi-family and Mixed Residential/Commercial Uses
Attachments: Suggested Multifamily & Mixed Use Parking Regulations.pdf
Categories: Completed

JAN 27 2026

Land Use Department

All, Please see the below email and the attachment received from Eric Treaster today. Thank you.

Liz Burdick, Director of Land Use & Planning
Town of Ledyard
741 Colonel Ledyard Highway, Ledyard, CT 06339
Telephone: (860) 464-3215
Email: planner@ledyardct.org

From: Eric <bsaofnl-eric@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 11:57 AM
To: Elizabeth Burdick <planner@ledyardct.org>
Subject: Suggested Parking Regulations For Multi-family and Mixed Residential/Commercial Uses

Good morning, Ms. Burdick,

As you requested, I am sending the following directly to you.

Please provide a copy of the attachment, titled "*Suggested Parking Regulations For Multi-family and Mixed Residential/Commercial Uses*," to Chairman Wood and the PZC Commissioners. It is intended to be public information.

As you know, I follow land-use issues and sometimes express concerns and make suggestions regarding regulations that are important to our town's development. My understanding is that the Commission is in the process of amending its parking regulations to comply with §18-(d)-(9) and §§'s19-(a), 19-(b), 19-(c), and if necessary, 19-(d) of HB 8002, which became effective on January 1.

Attached is my analysis of HB 8002 as it applies to multi-family and mixed-use residential/commercial parking requirements.

Pages 6–8, the last three pages, present a full set of compliant parking regulations that may be helpful.

The attachment is intended to help update the parking regulations to be consistent with HB 8002.

I will briefly introduce and discuss the attachment and its proposed parking regulations during the upcoming PZC regular meeting.

I encourage the Commission to consider using the attachment in support of an agenda item when it discusses compliance with the complex parking requirements of HB 8002, which are challenging.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions or suggestions.

Respectfully,

Eric Treaster

RECEIVED

JAN 27 2026

Land Use Department

Eric Treaster
10 Huntington Way
Ledyard, CT 06339
BSAOFNL-ERIC@YAHOO.COM
860-536-6240

27 January 2026

To: Chairman Wood
Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission

Suggested Parking Regulations For Multi-family and Mixed Residential/Commercial Uses

As you know, I follow land-use issues and sometimes express concerns and make suggestions regarding regulations that are important to our town's development. My understanding is that the Commission is in the process of amending its parking regulations to comply with §18-(d)-(9) and §§'s19-(a), 19-(b), 19-(c), and if necessary, 19-(d) of HB 8002, which became effective on January 1.

The following is my analysis of HB 8002 as it applies to multi-family and mixed use residential/commercial parking requirements. Pages 6 - 8 are a suggested set of compliant parking regulations. You are welcome to use the suggestions as you wish.

Analysis of HB 8002

Section 18-(d)-(9) provides:

"... Zoning regulations ... shall not Require a minimum number of off-street motor vehicle parking spaces for any residential development except as provided in section 19 of this act."

Section 19-(a) provides:

"(a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (d) of this section, no zoning enforcement officer, planning commission, zoning commission or combined planning and zoning commission shall reject an application for any residential development solely on the basis that such development fails to conform with any requirement for off-street motor vehicle parking spaces unless such officer or commission finds that a lack of such parking spaces will have a specific adverse impact on public health and safety that cannot be mitigated through approval conditions that have no substantial adverse impact on the viability of such development."

As such, the Commission can deny any proposed multi-family and mixed use developments, consisting of any number of units, if its proposed off-street parking is likely to result in a "specific adverse impact on public health and safety."

Examples may include on-site parking that will:

1. Cause drivers to circle a neighborhood while searching for a parking space, leading to increased traffic that constitutes an increased chance of accidents and is a specific adverse impact on public safety that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
2. Result in cars parked inappropriately, such as on sidewalks or on town right-of-ways, that will pose risks to pedestrians, especially children and individuals with disabilities, by forcing them to walk on the roadway, which constitutes a specific adverse impact on public safety that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
3. Result in blocking access for emergency vehicles and delaying response times during critical situations, which constitutes a specific adverse impact on public health and safety that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
4. Result in vehicles idling or moving slowly in search of parking, which will contribute to air pollution that affects the respiratory health of residents with asthma and other diseases, which constitutes a specific adverse impact on public health that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
5. Increase the number of conflicts among residents over precious on-site parking spaces, which will lead to disputes that affect community relations and, specifically, constitutes a specific risk to individual safety that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
6. Lead to stress on the emotional health of residents during snowstorms when on-street parking is prohibited and there is no available on-site parking, which constitutes a specific adverse impact on health that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.

Under §19-(a), for proposed multi-family developments consisting of 16 or fewer units, even if an applicant proposes one (or more) parking spaces for each studio and one-bedroom dwelling and two (or more) parking spaces for each dwelling unit with two or more bedrooms, the Commission retains the authority to deny such applications if it finds that the proposed on-site parking will have a "specific adverse impact on public health and safety" that cannot be mitigated through approval conditions that have no substantial adverse impact on the viability of such development."

It was probably not the intent of HB 8002, which for developments with 16 or fewer units, likely intended the Commission to have the authority to prepare a parking needs assessment only when fewer than one space per studio or bedroom and two spaces per two-bedroom is proposed. But §19-(a) is what it is.

Section 19-(b) of HB 8002 provides:

"(b) A municipality may require a minimum number of off-street motor vehicle parking spaces for a residential development that contains **more than sixteen dwelling units**, as defined in section 47a-1 of the general statutes, provided any such municipality shall allow the proposed developer of such development to submit to the zoning enforcement officer, planning commission, zoning commission or combined planning and zoning commission a parking needs assessment that conforms with the requirements of subsection (c) of this section.

Such officer or commission shall condition the approval of such development on the construction of off-street parking spaces not exceeding: (1) One such space for each studio or one-bedroom dwelling and two such spaces for each dwelling unit with two or more bedrooms, or (2) the number of such spaces recommended for the development by the parking needs assessment submitted pursuant to this section, whichever results in the least required number of off-street parking spaces."

§18-(d)-9, together with §19-(b), means that the regulations can impose any minimum off-street parking requirement it wishes for multi-family and mixed use developments consisting of more than 16 units.

However, it also means the number can be reduced if the applicant submits a "parking needs assessment" that complies with §19-(c) if it shows fewer spaces will not have a specific adverse impact on public health and safety.

If the applicant submits such a study, and it shows fewer spaces will not have specific adverse impact on public health and safety, then the number supported in the "parking needs assessment," or one space for each studio or one-bedroom dwelling and two spaces for each dwelling unit with two or more bedrooms, whichever is less, becomes the minimum number of required parking spaces.

Section 19-(c) of HB 8002 provides:

"(c) A parking needs assessment submitted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall be paid for by the proposed developer and shall include an analysis of (1) available existing public and private parking that may be used by residents of the proposed development, (2) public transportation options that may be used by residents of the proposed development that mitigate the need for off-street parking, (3) projected future needs for off-street parking for such proposed development, and (4) any relevant local traffic, parking or safety study."

On-street parking is legal in most of Ledyard. However, due to the town's narrow roads, on-street parking will almost always disrupt normal traffic flow by requiring passing drivers to slow down and cross onto the oncoming lane. Passing a post office delivery truck while it is parked and delivering mail is an example of the danger created by Ledyard's narrow roadways.

In addition, the town has an ordinance that prohibits on-street parking during snow events. Ledyard has little public parking and no public transit, which, if it existed, might justify reducing the required minimum number of off-street parking spaces.

Because of the difficulty in satisfying the criteria in §19-(c) due to Ledyard's narrow roads, its no-parking ordinance for snow events, its lack of public transit, and its lack of public parking, an applicant for a 17-unit or more multi-family development is unlikely to submit a "parking needs assessment" to justify fewer on-site parking spaces.

Section 19-(d) of HB 8002 provides:

§19-(d) provides an opportunity for the Commission to *"... adopt not more than two conservation and traffic mitigation districts in which the municipality may require a minimum number of off-street motor vehicle parking spaces for a residential development that contains fewer than sixteen dwelling units"*

Its purpose is to allow the regulations to impose a minimum of one on-site parking space for each studio or one-bedroom dwelling, and two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit with two or more bedrooms, for multi-family and mixed use developments with 16 or fewer units, when on-street parking exists but is seldom available. For example, downtown New London is an area where safe on-street parking exists but is seldom available, or the parking has time limits that make the spaces unusable for residents and extended-term guests.

There is no need or benefit for the Commission to adopt conservation and traffic mitigation districts for Ledyard.

Additional Suggestions Related to Multi-family and Mixed Use Developments

- A. Multi-family and Mixed Use developments in Ledyard's Development Districts should require a special permit so the Commission will clearly have the authority to **find** that a shortage of parking spaces will have a specific adverse impact on public health and safety.
- B. Multi-family and Mixed Use developments in the Development Districts and the LCTD should require a special permit and be subject to the same standards and criteria in §11.3.4 of the zoning regulations as are multi-family developments in the residential districts, which appropriately require special permits.
- C. A special permit should be required for Multi-family and Mixed Use developments in the development and LCTD districts to avoid risks associated with the improper imposition of subjective criteria and standards.

The parking lot landscaping requirements in §9.4.6 of the zoning regulations are an example. It includes, *"... Such islands shall be designed and located to maximize the attractiveness of parking lots by providing ornamental landscaped areas and shade. The design of such islands must assure adequate circulation, aesthetic appeal, shade, and capacity for snow storage as a result of plowing."* These requirements are lawful only when applied to Multi-family and Mixed Use developments that require a special permit, but are unlawful when applied to as-of-right developments, including as-of-right uses that require a site plan review.

There are dozens of conflicts in the regulations in which *subjective* requirements, such as *"adequate circulation," "aesthetic appeal,"* and the requirement that *"exterior lighting systems shall be designed ... to minimize or substantially reduce light trespass ..."* that are lawful for special permit uses but are unlawful when imposed on as-of-right uses. A special permit should be required for any use that requires *subjective decisions* to determine compliance with the regulations. *As-of-right uses should require only objective determinations of compliance with the regulations.*

D. Resolve the conflict between the definition in §2.2 and §8.28.A of the zoning regulations.

§2.2 – "RESIDENCE, MULTI-FAMILY: *"A structure, or group of structures, on one (1) lot, each containing three (3) or more dwelling units, with each dwelling unit having either a separate or joint entrance. May include apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and cooperatives."*

and

§8.28.A – *"Apartment/Condominium complexes may consist of a single or multiple buildings,"*

A simple correction would be to amend §8.28.A. to:

§8.28.A – *"Apartment/Condominium complexes may consist of a single multi-family residence or multiple multi-family residences,"*

Proposed Multi-family & Mixed -Use Parking Regulations

Add §9.4.1.22 as follows:

22. Multi-family & Mixed use Residential/Commercial Developments with 16 or fewer units:

1. There is no minimum amount of required on-site parking.
2. The Commission reserves the right to deny the application if it finds that a dearth of parking spaces will have a specific adverse impact on public health and safety that cannot be mitigated through approval conditions.
3. Specific adverse impact on public health and safety may include proposed parking that will:
 1. Cause drivers to circle a neighborhood while searching for a parking space, leading to increased traffic that constitutes an increased chance of accidents and is a specific adverse impact on public safety that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
 2. Result in cars parked inappropriately, such as on sidewalks or on town right-of-ways, that will pose risks to pedestrians, especially children and individuals with disabilities, by forcing them to walk on the roadway, which constitutes a specific adverse impact on public safety that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
 3. Result in blocking access for emergency vehicles and delaying response times during critical situations, which constitutes a specific adverse impact on public health and safety that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
 4. Result in vehicles idling or moving slowly in search of parking, which will contribute to air pollution that affects the respiratory health of residents with asthma and other diseases, which constitutes a specific adverse impact on public health that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
 5. Increase the number of conflicts among residents over precious on-site parking spaces, which will lead to disputes that affect community relations and, specifically, constitutes a specific risk to individual safety that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.
 6. Lead to stress on the emotional health of residents during snowstorms when on-street parking is prohibited and there is no available on-site parking, which constitutes a specific adverse impact on health that cannot be mitigated except by increasing the amount of on-site parking.

4. Parking for the Commercial Component of a Mixed Use Residential/Commercial development is one (1) space per 250 square feet of GFA (Ground Floor Area) of commercial use, plus one (1) space per employee on the maximum shift for each commercial use.

Add §9.4.1.23 as follows:

23. Multi-family & Mixed use Residential/Commercial Developments with 17 or more units:

1. The minimum amount of required parking is 1 space per studio unit, 1 space per one-bedroom, and 2 spaces per unit with two or more bedrooms, plus 1/2 space per dwelling for guests, plus the required number of handicapped accessible parking spaces. The applicant may provide additional off-street parking spaces if he chooses.
2. The Applicant may submit a "parking needs assessment" to request the Commission to approve fewer on-site parking spaces. If submitted, the "parking needs assessment" shall include an analysis of:
 1. Available existing public and private parking that may be use by residents of the proposed development,
 2. Public transportation options that may be used by residents of the proposed development that mitigate the need for off-street parking,
 3. Projected future needs for off-street parking for such proposed development, and
 4. Any relevant local traffic, parking or safety study.
3. The "parking needs assessment," if submitted, should recognize that many of Ledyard's public roads are narrow and parked vehicles usually require a passing car to slow down and enter the oncoming traffic lane; the town prohibits on-street parking during snow events; the town has no public transit; and the town has little or no public parking.
4. The application will be approved with the proposed number of fewer parking spaces if the applicant's "parking needs assessment" shows that the reduction in the number of on-site parking spaces will not have a specific adverse impact on public health and safety, such as the examples shown in §§'s 9.4.1.22.3.1 – 9.4.1.22.3.6.
5. Parking for the Commercial Component of a Mixed use Residential/Commercial development is one (1) space per 250 square feet of GFA (Ground Floor Area) of commercial uses, plus one (1) space per employee on the maximum shift for each commercial use.
6. Parking spaces must be paved and striped.

7. Parking areas shall be designed to include one or more areas of sufficient size to bank snow during snow events without reducing the number of parking spaces.
8. The site plan shall include identification of handicapped accessible parking spaces.
9. The site plan shall identify guest parking spaces.
10. All parking must be within the building envelope.
11. Parking area lighting shall be shown on the site plan.
12. Parking area landscaping shall be shown on the site plan (if a special permit is required.)

Delete §8.28.A as follows:

~~"A. Apartment/Condominium complexes may consist of a single or multiple buildings, and if located within the R20, R40 or R60 districts, shall not be permitted on lots of less than five (5) acres."~~

Replace §8.28.A with the following:

"A. Apartment/Condominium complexes may consist of a single multi-family residence or multiple multi-family residences, and if located within the R20, R40, or R60 districts, shall not be permitted on lots of less than five acres."

Amend the "Residence Multi-Family" Entries in the Use Table (§6.4):

Replace the "SPL" requirement for "Residence Multi-family" developments in the LCDD, MFDD, GFDD, and RCDD districts with a "SUP" requirement.

Amend the "Mixed use Residential/Commercial" Entries in the Use Table (§6.4):

Replace the "SPL" requirement for "Mixed Use Residential/Commercial" developments in the LCDD, LCTD, GFDD, RCDD, CM, and NC districts with a "SUP" requirement.