

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING POCD SUBCOMMITTEE HELD Tuesday, December 16, 2020 AT 6:30 P.M.

Call to Order was at 6:41 pm.

Roll Call: J. Castignoli, J. Kader, P. Kearney, J. Mortimer, J. Quish / (Staff) D. Sulkis, M. Greene

Topics for discussion:

1. Discussion regarding “tiny homes” and their potential as a new type of housing in Milford

Chairman Quish said **Mr. Sulkis** had sent out a series of links to current information on tiny homes. **Mr. Sulkis** reviewed the smallest permitted size for single family homes per current regulations, noting a minimum required footprint of 625 sf and a minimum whole-house area of 900 sf. He said that any single-family home in city must connect to the sewer if it is available or alternatively to a septic system. He said a rule of thumb is that there is sanitary sewer service south of parkway, but limited service north of it. He discussed the alternative provision of housing for relatives: accessory apartments in single-family homes. In this approach, semi-autonomous housing must be incorporated within the main house and the relative can't be charged rent. He said there is also a provision in the regulations for a domestic servant to occupy a separate unit on single-family property. He said that in some industrial zones, caretaker housing is allowed, as well as farmworker housing on recognized farms or ranch-hand housing on horse farms. He said that tiny homes tend to do well in some areas and not in others. A successful example is in California where tiny homes have been used in some places to address homelessness. He said that if something comparable were done in Milford, a 5000 sf lot might be populated with 4 tiny homes and an association formed. He reviewed various types of homes with one distinction being between portable versus permanent. The implications for living in such a home also requires a certain lifestyle requires with limited possessions and a place for everything. Other issues may follow on, such as allowing accessory structures like the sheds that were permitted at Ryder Woods after some debate. He noted that so-called granny pods are allowed by the state, but that the city decided to opt out. (There was some debate about this statement.) **Chairman Quish** polled the subcommittee for reactions. **Mr. Mortimer** wondered about using tiny homes as an alternative to 8-30g construction. **Ms. Kierney** said there would have to be a place that has a more affordable sewer hookup, otherwise the hookup would be more expensive than the house. She liked an Oregon model where a tiny home for homeless people is just a place to sleep and wash up. **Chairman Quish** said he envisioned an engineered community with tiny homes and a clubhouse. He said such a community exists in Woodbridge--a tiny home community based a concept of congregate housing. He wondered if there might be a comparable possibility in Milford for some community benefit. **Mr. Kader** liked the idea of a small community but was less sure of the impact on upscale neighbors. **Chairman Quish** said that a R-30 zoned lot might accommodate 1 or 2 tiny homes in addition to the mail house on the parcel. He wondered about the impact on real estate values. **Mr. Castignoli** had similar concerns. **Mr. Sulkis** discussed how the amount of land could be a threshold, for example, if the lot under consideration has more than an acre, a developer could create a condo-like association. For each tiny home, a certain amount of land could be required, so perhaps a tiny home could work on a 5000 sf lot near downtown or near the water, or even be a garage conversion. Mr. Sulkis and the board discussed the possibility that a state task force was looking at the 8-30g statute and the group was eager for an opportunity to learn more and comment as information becomes available. **Chairman Quish** said he intended to read more of Mr. Sulkis's shared articles. Discussion ensued about how best to achieve recommendations on any given topic; **Mr. Kader** felt it might be more productive to run one topic through to resolution. **Chairman Quish** put forward a possible goal of closing one item per meeting. **Mr. Sulkis** said that a consultant could help provide more focus and close items.

Chairman Quish expressed concern about the POCD going to press in December of 2021. He said the Executive Order may build-in breathing room to June or July of 2022 due to the disruptions of COVID19. **Mr. Sulkis** said there are usually 2 rounds of public hearings, first to identify open issues, then to revise and hold a second hearing. **Chairman Quish** said he wants to set up a Wednesday meeting to move forward more quickly. **Mr. Sulkis** a consultant should facilitate the public meetings, as they tend to be seen as objective. The group agreed to schedule a special meeting on Tuesday 12/29 at 6:00. **Mr. Sulkis** was asked to come up with tasks to be assigned and deliverables. **Mr. Sulkis** said he is working on a Request for Proposal (RFP) or Quote (RFQ) in order to hire a consultant.

Looking toward the next topic of historic preservation, **Mr. Sulkis** proposed that Milford Historic Preservation Chair Bill Silver be invited to the Zoom call on 12/29.

Approval of Minutes of 10-20-20 was unanimous.

Member suggestions: none.

Adjournment was at 7:42.