The Board of Selectman meeting will be available to view live on Zoom. Those wishing to participate in public session may do so at the appropriate time, when called upon.

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81570935136?pwd=bENKZkRKZkd4Zmp2TkITM3VnTENDz09

Or dial in: +1 (929) 205-6099
Meeting ID: 815 7093 5136
Passcode: 334744

6:45 P.M. – PUBLIC HEARING
TOWN HALL – MEETING ROOM
Granby Water Pollution Control Authority (GWPCA)
Setting Sewer Use Rates 2022-23

I. Consideration of Granby Water Pollution Control Authority (GWPCA) Setting Sewer Use Rates for 2022-23

TOWN OF GRANBY
BOARD OF SELECTMEN
REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, MAY 16, 2022
TOWN HALL MEETING ROOM
7:00 P.M.
AGENDA

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC SESSION

III. MINUTES
   A. Approval of BOS Meeting Minutes – May 2, 2022

IV. APPOINTMENTS
   • Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Wild and Scenic Committee – Alternate (Fred Jones)
   • Conservation Commission (Greg Dion)

V. OLD BUSINESS
   A. IBAC Update
   B. Strategic Plan Update
VI. BUSINESS

A. Draft Affordable Housing Plan
   1. Public Work Session
   2. Discussion of Possible Action to Revise and/or Adopt Plan

B. Consideration of Capital Equipment Loan
C. Consideration of Budget Transfer for Gasoline, Diesel Fuel, and Recycling Collection Accounts

VII. TOWN MANAGER REPORT

A. Budget Operations, MIRA

VIII. FIRST SELECTMAN REPORT (Mark Fiorentino)

IX. SELECTMAN REPORTS
   (Sally S. King, Frederick A. Moffa, Mark C. Neumann, Kelly O. Rome and John Bell, Student Liaison)

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting is scheduled for June 6, 2022
TOWN OF GRANBY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 16, 2022

TO: GWPCA

FROM: Erica P. Robertson, Town Manager

REGARDING: I. Consideration of Granby Water Pollution Control Authority (GWPCA) Setting Sewer Use Rates for 2022-23

Each year the Granby Water Pollution Control Authority must assess users for the cost of sewer use. These user costs cannot be passed on to general taxpayers.

A public hearing notice was published for tonight’s meeting held at 6:45 p.m. The GWPCA should move to approve setting the sewer use rates for 2022-23.

Based on estimates needed for the year and our meter readings, I have determined that we should charge residential users a minimum of $220.00 for average gallons (55,000 gpy) used per year and $308.00 per year for commercial/industrial users (100,000 gpy). For all gallon usage (residential and commercial/industrial) above the minimum rate, it is recommended to be charged $.0065 per gallon. There is no change from last year in the recommended sewer rates.

A motion to approve the rates for 2022-23 should be made by the GWPCA.

MOTION to set the 2022-23 sewer rates for residential users at a minimum of $220.00 for average gallons (55,000 gpy) used per year and $308.00 per year for commercial/industrial users (100,000 gpy). For all gallon usage (residential and commercial/industrial) above the minimum rate will be charged $.0065 per gallon.

pc: Lauren Stuck, Collector of Revenue
TOWN OF GRANBY
BOARD OF SELECTMEN
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES
May 2, 2022

PRESENT: Mark Fiorentino, First Selectman; Sally King, Vice-Chairman; Frederick Moffa, Kelly Rome; Erica Robertson, Town Manager

ALSO PRESENT: Abigail Kenyon, Director of Community Development

ABSENT: Mark Neumann

The Regular meeting of the Board of Selectmen was called to order by First Selectman Mark Fiorentino at 7:08 p.m.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC SESSION

There were no public comments.

III. MINUTES

ON A MOTION by Selectman King, seconded by Selectman Rome, the Board voted (4-0-0) to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2022 meeting as presented.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

There were no new appointments.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. IBAC Update

First Selectman Fiorentino reported the Intra-Board Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet on again on Wednesday, May 4, 2022 from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. to finalize the list of potential projects to distribute to the public. A public workshop will be held on Monday, May 23 at 6:00 p.m.in the Town Hall Meeting Room for those interested in the list and providing feedback.

B. Strategic Plan Update

Boards and commissions have started to submit proposed goals. The deadline was extended by a few weeks to give the boards additional time. Discussion of the goals and next steps is tentatively on the agenda for the second Board of Selectmen meeting in June. Additional goals and ideas can be submitted to the Town Manager.
VI. BUSINESS

A. Granby Wildflower Meadow Presentation

Members of the Friends of the Granby Wildflower Meadow presented the background on the group and provided an update to the Board. The group has made good progress toward the goal of turning the 5-acre Town-owned field at 175 Salmon Brook Street into a native wildflower meadow and a stop on the Pollinator Pathway.

The goals of the organization are to:

- Install native plants that will support pollinators, which will in turn, support local agriculture
- Beautify an unused town field that is close to the center
- Provide educational opportunities on the importance of native planting and land stewardship

The group formed a Board of Directors, submitted an application for 501(c)3 status and applied for grants. To date, they have received over $7,000 in grants from the Pomeroy Brace Grant Fund and the Granby Education Foundation.

A few members of the board are environmental scientists and have extensive backgrounds and education in this area. Zach Donais provided an overview of the invasive species in the field and the affect on the plants and animals in the area. The project aims to bolster biodiversity of native plants and animals to enhance the environmental function of the site and to provide education to the community.

Next steps for the Friends of the Granby Wildflower Meadow include: a Planting and Education Day on June 4th, meadow maintenance including bi-weekly mowing and watering as needed, and adaptive management.

The group requested Town support for the initial scalp mowing, overseeding, regular mowing and building a small parking lot.

E. Robertson and M. Fiorentino shared concerns about the Town’s commitment to the project and the details will require further discussion with the Town Manager and Board of Selectmen. Board members will meet with the Town Manager to work out important areas such as legal requirements and insurance liability.

B. To Consider and Take Action on Public Act 21-29 Parking Requirements for Dwelling Units

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing at their meeting on April 26, 2022 to opt out of Public Act 21-29 which contains a provision which states zoning regulations shall not “require more than one parking space for each studio or one-bedroom dwelling unit or more than two parking spaces for each dwelling unit with two or more bedrooms unless the municipality opts out. Due to the lack of other transportation options in Granby, many people rely on cars. Therefore, the Commission determined an adequate number of parking spaces are needed on sites to accommodate
cars to prevent both overflow parking on adjacent properties and on-street parking, which may cause safety issues. The Commission approved the opt-out unanimously, 6-0-0.

ON A MOTION by Selectman King, seconded by Selectman Rome, the Board voted (4-0-0) to opt out of the parking requirements as outlined in subdivision (9) of subsection (d) of section 8-2 of the General Statutes, as amended by Public Act 21-29.

C. To Consider and Take Action on Public Act 21-29 Accessory Apartments

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing at their meeting on April 26, 2022 to opt out of Public Act 21-29 which establishes a provision allowing the construction of accessory apartments on all lots with a single-family home unless a municipality chooses to opt out by January 1, 2023. PA 21-29 also outlines other parameters relative to the size and structure of accessory apartments as well as permits and approvals. The Commission decided to opt out of the state provision and revise the current Town regulation.

The Commission had concerns allowing all accessory apartments as of right, particularly detached apartments. On smaller lots, there was a concern detached apartments may not be compatible with the neighborhood and parking and access may be more difficult. The Commission decided such apartments would be best regulated through a Special Permit Process and approved the opt-out unanimously, 6-0-0.

ON A MOTION by Selectman King, seconded by Selectman Moffa, the Board voted (4-0-0) to opt out of the accessory apartment requirements as outline in section 6 of Public Act 21-29.

VII. TOWN MANAGER REPORT

Town Manager Robertson presented her report and highlighted the following:
- Two new employees joined the Police Department: Patrol Officer Ram Martinaj and Dispatcher Goldie Appah-Jemison.
- Renee Deltenre, Land Use Coordinator in the Community Development Department starts on May 11.
- A grant award in the amount of $19,600 was received from the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving Pomeroy Brace Fund for upgrades to the Durable Medical Equipment Loaner Closet at Holcomb Farm.
- The Town received its first payment of $6,366.50 from Connecticut Public Act 21-58 which addresses many environmental concerns including the issue of litter caused by the carless disposal of alcohol beverage containers known as “nips”. The funds were deposited in the Solid Waste Fund to be used in accordance with the Public Act.

VIII. FIRST SELECTMAN REPORT (Mark Fiorentino)

- The First Selectman asked the members of the Board to pick up their packets early for the May 16, 2022 meeting and review the submitted questions and comments.
on the Affordable Housing Plan in order to be prepared for the Public Hearing on the plan.

- A Town Hall meeting will be scheduled for Monday, June 13, 2022 with a morning and evening session at the Senior Center.

IX. SELECTMEN REPORTS

No reports.

ON A MOTION by Selectman King, seconded by Selectman Rome, the Board voted (5-0-0) to recess the meeting to Executive Session at 7:53 p.m. to discuss a real estate transaction.

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION

First Selectman Fiorentino called the Executive Session of the Board of Selectmen to order at 8:00 p.m.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss a real estate transaction. Town Manager Erica Robertson and LAFD Fires Chief John Horr, Jr. were in attendance.

ON A MOTION by Selectman S. King, seconded by Selectman K. Rome, the Board voted (5-0-0) to adjourn the Executive Session at 9:07 p.m.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

ON A MOTION by Selectman F. Moffa, seconded by Selectman K. Rome, the Board voted (5-0-0) to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Erica P. Robertson
Town Manager
TOWN OF GRANBY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 16, 2022

TO: Board of Selectmen

FROM: Erica Robertson, Town Manager

REGARDING: IV. - Appointments

The following position are open. The name in parenthesis is the last person to hold the position. When appointments are ready to be made, the following motions are recommended:

That ____________ be appointed to the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Wild & Scenic Management Plan (LFSWS) as an alternate for an indefinite term. (Fred Jones)

That ____________ be appointed to the Conservation Commission for the balance of a four-year term beginning immediately and ending January 13, 2025. (Greg Dion)
Town of Granby

Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF)
Preiminary Project List – May 4, 2022

The Town of Granby, like many local government entities across the nation, finds itself with a generous inflow of federal funding meant to mitigate the health and economic impacts of COVID-19. Granby has the rare opportunity to critically review local needs and evaluate opportunities to help the Town move out of this pandemic as well as to plan for future health emergencies.

Background
The American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) was signed into law by President Biden on March 11, 2021. It guaranteed direct relief to cities, towns, and villages in the United States (Sec. 9901: Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds). According to the State of Connecticut Office of Policy and Management, Granby is entitled to $3,405,503.39 ($2,235,099.85 from the county allocation and $1,170,403.54 as a non-entitlement unit). Funds will come to Granby in two payments from the State. The first payment of $1,702,751.69 was received on June 22, 2021, and the remaining balance will be received in June 2022.

How are ARPA funds permitted to be spent?

There are four eligible uses for the funds. They are as follows:

1. To respond to public health emergency & its negative economic impacts.
2. To provide premium pay for essential workers.
3. To provide government services to the extent of revenue lost due to COVID-19.
4. To make necessary investments in water, sewer, or broadband infrastructure

ARPA funds may not be spent for the following purposes:

1. Match funds for other federal grants.
2. Pay down unfunded pension liabilities.
3. Pay down interest or principal on outstanding debt.
4. Pay legal settlements.
5. Premium pay for telework.
6. Contributions to “rainy day” funds.
7. Anything that violates the American Rescue Plan Act, Uniform Guidance conflicts of interest requirements, and other federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
Funds must be obligated by December 31, 2024 and expended by December 31, 2026. While this may seem like an adequate timeframe, local governments across the state, as well as the State of CT itself, have many projects to complete. Time to go out to the market for our projects as well as to build them is needed as Granby will be competing for the same vendors and contractors as neighboring towns.

On January 6, 2022, the United States Department of the Treasury issued the Final Rule for use of the SLFRF program funds. The most significant change from the interim rule is related to Lost Revenue. Previously lost revenue had to be calculated with a very cumbersome methodology. The Final Rule offers a standard allowance for revenue loss of up to $10 million, allowing recipients to select between a standard amount of revenue loss or complete a full revenue loss calculation. Recipients that select the standard allowance may use that amount – in many cases their full award – for government services, with streamlined reporting requirements. This is very significant to Granby. The Town of Granby will be taking advantage of this important change in the program by using our full allocation as lost revenue.

What is considered government services?
Granby, by taking the standard allowance, may use all our funding for government services. Generally, these are services traditionally provided by recipient governments are government services, unless Treasury has stated otherwise. Here are some common examples, although this list is not exhaustive:
- Construction of schools and hospitals
- Road building and maintenance, and other infrastructure
- Health services
- Environmental remediation
- General government administration, staff, and administrative facilities
- Provision of police, fire, and other public safety services (including purchase of fire apparatus and police vehicles)

Work to Date
At the January 18, 2022, Board of Selectmen meeting, a modified Intra-Board Advisory Committee (IBAC) was established. In the past, IBAC was charged with researching matters of common interest in attempt to promote efficiencies by having the BOS and BOE working together. The newly charged committee has a broader assignment. IBAC will examine topics of importance for the Town of Granby, as determined by the First Selectman. The American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (Federal Stimulus Monies) received by the Town of Granby will be the first topic to examine.

The first IBAC meeting was held on January 26, 2022, in the Town Hall Meeting Room. The committee also met on February 23, March 16, April 27, and May 4. The committee established criteria to evaluate project proposals and reviewed project proposals during their meetings.

Development of the draft list was generally guided by the following sources:

1. Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
2. Master planning documents (i.e., Plan of Conservation & Development).
3. Recommendation of a third-party professional retained in relation to a project or a particular functional area (i.e., IT, mechanical engineers, etc.).
4. Need that became apparent during the height of the pandemic.
Criteria to evaluate the project proposals were established:

- Projects that improve public health and safety.
- Projects that improve capacity to provide services and meet unfulfilled needs.
- Projects that generally fall outside of the capacity of annual budgets to fund.
- Avoid projects that require additional funds to complete unless a source of funds is identified and available.
- Avoid projects that will create operational cost obligations, if possible and practical.

Granby was required to file a Project and Expenditure Report by April 30, 2022. This was completed by the Finance Office. To date, the Town of Granby has expended $36,114.19 from our SLFRF funds. These funds were used last summer by the Parks and Recreation Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>FY21 Purchased</th>
<th>FY22 Purchased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop Up Tents</td>
<td>$ 1,263.27</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Camp equipment &amp; supplies</td>
<td>$ 3,288.03</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning supplies</td>
<td>$ 574.39</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Waterfront Raft</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 16,849.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Picnic Tables</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 6,458.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manikins</td>
<td>$ 4,113.47</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>$ 313.00</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Paddleboards, Lifejackets</td>
<td>$ 3,254.07</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 12,806.23</td>
<td>$ 23,307.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Projects

Town and Board of Education staff have worked since last fall to create a list of proposed projects. These projects are listed in the table below. Proposals shaded in yellow are sorted in descending cost order. Projects that are not shaded are not sorted at all. Shaded projects represent a set of possible proposals that might fit within our allocation. The shaded list totals more than the allocation, but further refinement of costs might allow for some level of funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMHS HVAC</td>
<td>Music, Commons, Votech</td>
<td>$ 700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Technology infrastructure and equipment upgrades</td>
<td>Network Switches, Routers, Firewalls, redundancy equipment, Pc's, WIFI access points, data cabling. Software packages and equipment to provide more efficient and effective services including remote services</td>
<td>$ 525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearns</td>
<td>Explore and implement projects to allow for limited portions of the building to be open for public use.</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Campus HVAC</td>
<td>Upgrade heating/cooling systems. Modernize electronic components and building automation system to gain efficiency. Includes design work from mechanical engineering firm.</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Renovations</td>
<td>Address indoor air quality, productivity needs and energy efficiency in a building that has not had significant upgrades in over two decades. Provide post pandemic library services with better ability to clean surfaces, enhance air flow and ventilation for patrons and staff, and upgrade to reduce the appearance of a &quot;dirty&quot; library with worn and aging FFE.</td>
<td>$ 353,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Rd HVAC</td>
<td>Add HVAC in old section of the school currently no circulation</td>
<td>$ 325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Infrastructure</td>
<td>Assistance with project development and implementation and a small reserve</td>
<td>$ 175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police CAD/RMS System</td>
<td>Replacement computer aided dispatch and records management system</td>
<td>$ 165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Interior Upgrades</td>
<td>Address indoor air quality, workspace productivity, and energy efficiency in a building that has not seen significant upgrades in over 20 years.</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Upgrades</td>
<td>Enhance the Town’s ability to stream and record public meetings in multiple locations. Streamline infrastructure required to broadcast public meetings. Review and enhance communication tools such as the Town of Granby website.</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Station Office</td>
<td>Currently employees are using a jail cell that was purchased 20 years ago as an office. Provide staff a workspace that can will accommodate current needs such as proper heating and ventilation as well as workplace comfort for staff</td>
<td>$ 95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparatus</td>
<td>ATV with trailer for rescue and recovery in hard-to-reach locations</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Health District</td>
<td>Allocate funds to assist the Farmington Valley Health District perform essential public health functions as our regional health department. Funds will be used for staff training, IT infrastructure upgrades, a district vehicle, communication enhancements and community and mental health coordination for the district.</td>
<td>$ 45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXON Fleet Cruiser cameras</td>
<td>This would replace our aging Watch Guard dash cams. They would integrate with our newly purchased body cameras.</td>
<td>$ 42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Portable Traffic Device</td>
<td>Operates by remote control - goal is to have one employee doing traffic control instead of 2. Features a drop bar and red and green lights</td>
<td>$ 28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital recording system Replacement</td>
<td>Replace system that records all calls and radio traffic. Current system is almost 10 years old and has been failing.</td>
<td>$ 16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Shelter facility upgrade</td>
<td>Repairs and renovations needed such as lighting, signage, security upgrades.</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Sign board</td>
<td>Purchase electronic sign board to enhance communication with the public.</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS units</td>
<td>Install GPS units in Town vehicles for emergency tracking</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center Study</td>
<td>Investigate potential economic development in Granby’s Core</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking Path at SBP</td>
<td>Paved, ADA Accessible walking path around SBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior Center kitchen upgrade</td>
<td>Request would upgrade the kitchen in the Senior Center to a commercial kitchen. The project would improve sanitizing capabilities with a commercial grade dishwasher, 3-compartment sink, and grease interceptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rebranding of Senior Center</td>
<td>Marketing consultant fees to review and redesign logo and marketing materials to drive senior center image in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Enhancement of Dining Services</td>
<td>Returning to opportunities to reduce social isolation in older adults post pandemic requires improved dining services options. Current demand for the Elderly Nutrition Program has waned over the course of the last 4 years (including pre-pandemic). Quality of food, freshness and healthy variety are noted as reasons. Funds to pilot a partnership with Fresh Access and Healing Meals to provide a healthier, fresher meal once per week include staff time: additional 4 hours per week ($3,500/year) and materials cost: food ($11,000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Senior Center FFE replacement</td>
<td>Replacement of 20-year-old furniture. The soft fabric covered chairs are showing wear with tears and stains. Carpeting as needed (Billiards room) Round Folding tables for dining services. Replace tables and chairs in Activity Room 1&amp;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Splashpad or Spray Park</td>
<td>Enhancement to Salmon Brook Park Summer programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Holcomb Farm FFE</td>
<td>Needs additional tables and chairs. Because of Covid, many of the events on site had our tables and chairs outside. They have become very worn down and in need of replacement. If we are to keep our wedding venue up to wedding standards, these need to be purchased. The intent is to keep our current older tables and chairs and continue to use them outside for necessary social distancing for all future events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Holcomb Farm replacement equipment</td>
<td>Refrigerator and Ice Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Holcomb Farm Building Maintenance</td>
<td>New interior &quot;Barn Door&quot; separator in Hallway. Main Barn new flooring. Main Barn replacement windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Portable Ice Skating Rink</td>
<td>No fee charged. Open skate at Salmon Brook Park. It would be open throughout the cold weather at a designated area in the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Salmon Brook Park upgrades</td>
<td>Signage, ice machine at concessions, new Lifeguard Chairs, new tennis nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Police Facility Upgrades</td>
<td>20-year-old building - replace flooring, paint etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sewer study and upgrades</td>
<td>Evaluate 3 lift stations and review for I&amp;I. Upgrades to repair as required and to reduce I&amp;I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Apparatus</td>
<td>Ambulance fully equipped and outfitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Solar</td>
<td>Funds to study potential solar projects on Town property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Selectmen

FROM: Erica P. Robertson, Town Manager

REGARDING: VI. BUSINESS – ITEM A
Draft Affordable Housing Plan

BACKGROUND
The Affordable Housing Plan Committee has completed their charge. At their meeting on April 7, 2022, they voted to forward the Town of Granby Affordable Housing Plan to the Board of Selectmen for consideration. The committee worked hard for many months to complete the plan.

This plan is a State of Connecticut requirement. Section 8-30j of the Connecticut General Statutes requires that each municipality in the State of Connecticut prepare and adopt an affordable housing plan. Each town and city must prepare a plan that specifies how the municipality intends to increase the number of affordable developments. Once adopted, the plan is to be updated at least once every five years.

The Board of Selectmen received the draft Affordable Housing Plan at the April 18, 2022, meeting. A public hearing was set for today, May 16, 2022. Tonight’s public hearing will allow the public to voice their questions and concerns with the plan.

NEXT STEPS
Once the Public Hearing is closed, the Board of Selectmen can take one of two actions. The BOS can accept the plan as presented or they can direct staff to make revisions based on the public hearing and their own concerns.

PROPOSED MOTION(S)
To adopt the Affordable Housing Plan in accordance with CGS 8-30j

Or

Direct staff to make revisions as suggested for consideration at the June 6, 2022, meeting.
Affordable Housing Plan

Town of Granby

Draft April 2022
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Introduction

Community Values Statement

Granby values its beautiful open spaces, its thriving farms, and the welcoming nature of our town, our "neighborliness". Granby is a rural town that prides itself on its agricultural roots and its respect for its natural environment. A wealth of protected open spaces are treasured and used on a regular basis by many in our community. Award-winning schools reflect the Town’s commitment to a high quality education and make Granby a top choice for young families seeking good schools and a healthy lifestyle. Granby retains a “small town” feel, there is a strong sense of community and volunteers can be found running boards and commissions, non-profit groups and clubs providing services that enrich the lives of the residents.

We envision Granby continuing to be a vibrant, growing community and are committed to encouraging a diverse, affordable, and equitable housing stock that meets the needs of existing and new residents regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, sex (including gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation), familial status, or disability. We strive to provide a diverse mix of housing opportunities, including a range of affordable housing options, from small footprint apartments to larger footprint houses, for people to upsize or downsize within the community. By providing a range of affordable housing choices, Granby can provide opportunities to remain in the community when economic or familial circumstances change and opportunities to join the community.

What is Affordable Housing?

Affordable housing is generally used to refer to housing which is priced so that persons and families earning 80% or less of the area median income pay 30% or less of their annual income on housing. This calculation is based on household size and incomes are adjusted annually. In Granby, as of 2021, a family of four making less than $83,440 or an individual making less than $58,408 could qualify for affordable housing. Refer to income limits below:

Table 1: 80% Area Median Income based on Household Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$58,408</td>
<td>$66,752</td>
<td>$75,096</td>
<td>$83,440</td>
<td>$90,115</td>
<td>$96,790</td>
<td>$103,466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Housing, Development Program Income Limits based on HUD Median Incomes, 2021 Income Limits

There are different types of affordable housing. The first type is housing which is encumbered in some way to sell or rent at an affordable level. An example would be deed restrictions. The second type is naturally occurring affordable housing. This is market-rate housing that sells or rents at an affordable rate. Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-30g, Affordable Housing Appeals Procedure, only considers the first type of affordable housing, which is housing encumbered in some way. Examples of encumbered housing are government assisted housing developments, units occupied by tenants receiving rental assistance, units financed by the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority (CHFA) mortgages or United States Department of Agriculture mortgages, or housing
units subject to deed restrictions, which limit prices so households earning 80% or less of the area median income pay 30% or less of their income on housing. This Affordable Housing Plan (Plan) will consider both types of affordable housing.¹

As this Plan will address housing that is affordable to households earning 80% or less of the area median income, with affordability calculations based on the 80% threshold, it does not specifically address housing costs for those who make less than this and are considered very low- and extremely low-income.² While there is certainly a need for affordable housing for households in these income levels, this is beyond the scope of this Plan. However, some of the proposed recommendations outlined later in this Plan may very well benefit households of other income levels.

CGS Section 8-30g, Affordable Housing Land Use Appeals Procedure

In 1989, Connecticut passed a law to promote the construction of affordable housing. In municipalities where less than 10% of housing meets the statute’s definition of affordable housing, developers may seek approval for affordable or mixed income housing developments even if the development does not comply with the local zoning regulations. To win an appeal of a denial, the burden of proof is on the municipality to show that 1) the denial was necessary to protect substantial public health, safety or other matters which the Commission may legally consider; such public interests clearly outweigh the need for affordable housing; and such public interests cannot be protected by making reasonable changes to the application; or 2) the development is not receiving government housing assistance funds and is located in an industrial zone that does not permit residential uses. If a municipality’s housing stock is more than 10% affordable, the municipality is exempt from CGS 8-30g.

While this Plan will focus exclusively on affordable housing in Granby, it is important to recognize that the need to plan and provide for affordable housing is not new. The statutory authority to enact zoning regulations includes the requirement that such regulations shall “....encourage the development of housing opportunities....” and “....promote housing choice and economic diversity in housing, including housing for both low and moderate income households...” (Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-2). Every ten years, municipalities are also required to amend and adopt a Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD). Connecticut General Statutes

¹ Section 8 housing, which is known as the Housing Choice Voucher Program, is not specifically addressed in this Plan. While this type of housing counts toward a municipality’s 10% affordable housing requirement under Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-30g, the voucher program is a federal program and falls outside municipal purview.

² The current minimum wage in Connecticut is $14 per hour. For someone earning minimum wage in Granby and working 40 hours a week, this equates to an annual income of $29,120 and they could afford to spend $728 per month on housing. While this Plan does not specifically address affordable housing for lower income brackets, it is important to acknowledge as Granby strives to increase housing options and grow the number of affordable units, there is a need to address housing options for the benefit of those employed in Granby who may also want to live here but are unable to afford to.
Section 8-23 outlines what must be included in a POCD. “In preparing such plan, the commission or any special committee shall consider the...need for affordable housing” and “such plan of conservation and development shall...G) make provision for the development of housing opportunities, including opportunities for multifamily dwellings...(H) promote housing choice and economic diversity in housing, including housing for both low and moderate income households....”

The Town of Granby’s most recent POCD was adopted in 2016. In accordance with State Statute, housing opportunities and affordable housing are outlined in several areas. The full POCD is available on the Town’s website, relevant excerpts are below.

The Ten Year Vision in Granby includes the following statements:
That the Town Center becomes a more vibrant commercial and mixed-use area with:
- A greater mix of new housing units, particularly multifamily and rental units.
That Granby homes continue to be primarily owner occupied, single family, with:
- New opportunities for homes on smaller lots, consistent with existing or improved infrastructure.
- An expansion in the number of rental units.
- Increased housing opportunities for a more diverse group of residents.
- A significant growth in housing opportunities for the elderly.
- The continued increase in the number of accessory apartments.

In the Housing Section, the following goals are outlined:
- Provide the opportunity for the construction of multi-family homes where appropriate.
- Encourage the construction of active adult and elderly housing.
- Encourage the construction of new affordable housing.
- Establish a zone that will provide for higher-density single family housing where soils and infrastructure will support such density.
- Establish a zone that allows for the construction of new homes on lots of less than 30,000 square feet.

The following implementation strategies are recommended:
- Flexible Residential Development (FRD) Density Revisions
  - Consider a density bonus within FRD for the construction of affordable housing for low or moderate income persons.
- Two-Family Structures
  - Consider an amendment to the Zoning Regulations, which would allow the construction of two-family structures or a mix of one and two-family structures in compatible areas where public sewer and/or public water are available and in areas with soil conditions that can accommodate such structures in compliance with the Public Health Code.
- Increased Opportunities for Accessory Apartments
  - Continue to allow accessory apartments. Consider amending the regulations to allow accessory apartments in buildings that are not attached to the primary residence.
- Diversifying the Town’s Housing Base
  - With demographic changes, construction innovations and the desire to further diversify the Town’s housing base, the Town should now endeavor to reduce the current
minimum lot size of vacant and underutilized properties, where public water and sewer exists.

In the Granby Center Section, the following goal is outlined:

- Obtain a greater mix of new housing units, particularly multi-family and rental units.

The following implementation strategy is recommended:

- Housing Opportunities
  - Provide opportunities for a greater number and mix of new housing units, particularly multi-family units, rental units and single-family units on reduced size lots. An increase in the number of residents who live in the Center will ultimately result in a more vibrant, pedestrian friendly Center.

In many ways, it is the vision outlined in the POCD and the goals, recommendations, and strategies that form the foundation of this Affordable Housing Plan.

\[\text{What is multi-family housing?}\]

Multi-family housing will be mentioned throughout this Plan so it is important to understand what constitutes multi-family housing. The Granby Zoning Regulations define multi-family housing as a dwelling containing two (2) or more dwelling units. It is also any property that has more than one dwelling unit located on it. Multi-family housing can range from single-family homes located on one lot, two-family structures/duplexes or triplexes, all the way to developments with 30 or more units. The recently constructed Grand Apartments, Greenway Village, and Copper Brook Village developments are all examples of multi-family housing. Later in the Plan, there may be recommendations for specific types of multi-family housing.

**Plan Development and Process**

The Connecticut State Legislature passed Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-30j, which requires each municipality in the State to prepare and adopt an affordable housing plan. The plan shall specify how the municipality intends to increase the number of affordable housing developments. All municipalities must have a plan adopted by June 2022. Once adopted, the plan is to be updated at least once every five years.

In August 2021, the Granby Board of Selectmen voted to establish an Affordable Housing Plan Committee and appointed members. The Committee was charged with preparing an Affordable Housing Plan pursuant to the State requirements and to present the plan to the Board of Selectmen for review and approval to enable adoption prior to the June 2022 deadline.

The Affordable Housing Plan Committee met for the first time in September 2021. This Plan was developed over a seven-month period.

To develop this Plan, the Committee reviewed current documents and regulations, including the Town’s POCD and Zoning Regulations, retrieved and analyzed the most recent data available from
the U.S. Census, gathered information on public utilities including water and sewer, and invited
guest speakers to address the Committee, including a housing developer and a land use
professional who provided information about the financial feasibility and economics of affordable
housing developments. Throughout the process, all meetings were open to the public and agendas,
minutes, and presentation material were posted on the Committee’s website for public review.

What does affordable housing look like?

There may be a misconception that affordable housing consists of high-density residential
development. This is not the case. Affordable housing can come in many different forms. It can be
a single-family home, a townhome, duplex, or an apartment located in an apartment building. It
can be privately owned or rented. There are many different styles for affordable housing and it can
be designed to be indistinguishable from surrounding market-rate housing units.

Demographic Data and Housing Inventory

To better understand Granby’s housing needs, the Committee first assessed demographic and
population information. The Committee then examined Granby’s current housing stock and
housing costs to determine what type of housing may be needed and how much residents can afford
to spend. To identify barriers to affordable housing, the Committee concluded by assessing the
current Zoning Regulations and infrastructure locations. The resultant strategies and
recommendations are outlined in the next section. Below are the Committee findings.

Demographics and Population Information

Granby’s population grew steadily from 1960 to 2010, increasing from 4,968 to 11,282 people.
However, based on the recent 2020 Census, over the last ten years there was a population decrease
of 621 people. Granby’s current population is 10,903. Population projections from the Connecticut
Data Collaborative show the population may continue to decline slightly over the next ten years to
10,496 people in 2025 and 10,071 people in 2030.

Figure 1: Granby Population Change

![Granby Population Graph](image)
There are more older Granby residents than there are in the surrounding region and state. The American Community Survey 2015-2019 5-year estimates (ACS) reported the median age in Granby is 46.2 years compared to 40.4 in Hartford County and 41.0 in Connecticut and 21.9% of Granby’s population is 62 years or older, compared to 16.8% in Hartford County and 20.7% in Connecticut. Granby’s aging population will have different housing needs and preferences than younger residents and families. While Granby has an older median age and a higher percentage of the population over 62 compared to both Hartford County and the state, it should be noted Granby has a greater percentage of residents under 18 compared to the county and the state, with 22.6% under 18 compared to 21.2% in Hartford County and 20.8% in Connecticut. However, this segment of the population is declining. Based on State Data Center population projections, Granby’s percent of population under 19 will decline from 23.62% today, before recovering to 23.34% in 2035. During this same timeframe, the population over 65 is projected to steadily increase from 18.44% to 22.37%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 69</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 74</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 79</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 84</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Granby Population Projections

Census data show Granby is predominately white; 98.4% of the population identifies as one race and 1.6% two or more races. Of those who identify as one race, 95.5% of the population is white and 0.4% black or African American. This compares to Hartford County and Connecticut where 96.4% and 96.7% identify as one race, respectively, and 70.7% white and 13.8% black or African American in Hartford County and 75.9% white and 10.7% black or African American in Connecticut.
When looking at the median household income, which impacts how much can be spent on housing, Granby has a much higher median household income compared to Hartford County and the state. The median household income in Granby is $121,250 compared to $75,148 in Hartford County and $78,444 in Connecticut.

**Existing Housing Stock**

Based on the most recent data available from the ACS, there are 4,398 housing units in Granby. The majority of these units, 90.5%, are single-family detached homes and only 4.2% have two or more units. These units are largely owner-occupied, with 90.2% of all units owner-occupied and 9.7% renter-occupied.

![Figure 2: Current Housing Stock](image)

It should be noted in recent years there have been several multi-family housing developments approved in Granby that may not be reflected in the data above. A total of 474 apartment units have been approved. Of these approved projects, 184 units have been constructed and are currently occupied. The remaining units are either under construction or are in the planning stages.

With the exception of the recent multi-family housing development approvals noted above, housing construction has slowed considerably since 1999.
Table 3: Age of Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year structure built</th>
<th># of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2019</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the housing units that have been constructed have three or more bedrooms.

Table 4: Size of Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total housing units</th>
<th>4,398</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No bedroom</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>2,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the age of the housing units in Granby and their size, it is important to acknowledge that these housing units may not meet the needs of residents. As Granby’s population ages, it is likely residents will be seeking smaller homes that are more accessible, including ranch style homes or units with the main bedroom on the first floor. They will also likely want a lower maintenance property, which would require a smaller lot size. The homes that these residents are looking to move out of may suit younger families with children.

**Housing Costs**

Following an assessment of Granby’s demographic data and the type of housing units that are available, the Committee explored housing costs to determine if these housing units are affordable.

Based on the ACS, the median house value in Granby is $310,600 and only 11% of homes are less than $199,999.

Table 5: Granby House Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median House Value</th>
<th>$310,600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $299,999</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$300,000 to $499,999 | 1,405  
$500,000 to $999,999 | 564  
$1,000,000 or more | 13

For those renting, the gross rent, which is the contract rent plus the estimated average cost of utilities, is $1,100. The majority of renters pay less than $1,499 a month. It should be noted these rents likely reflect older rental units that were built prior to 1999. Rents in the multi-family developments that have been recently constructed range from $1,750 to $2,500 or more and are not included in the ACS data below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Rent</th>
<th>$1,100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No cash paid</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $500</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 to $999</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,499</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 to $1,999</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 to $2,499</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is considered affordable housing in Granby?

Based on the household size, the table below shows what is considered an affordable monthly payment for housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>80% AMI</th>
<th>30% Share for Housing</th>
<th>Monthly Housing Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$58,408</td>
<td>$17,522</td>
<td>$1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$66,752</td>
<td>$20,025</td>
<td>$1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$75,096</td>
<td>$22,523</td>
<td>$1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$83,440</td>
<td>$25,032</td>
<td>$2,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$90,115</td>
<td>$27,034</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$96,790</td>
<td>$29,037</td>
<td>$2,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$103,466</td>
<td>$31,039</td>
<td>$2,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$110,141</td>
<td>$33,042</td>
<td>$2,753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For rental units, if it is assumed the number of bedrooms needed for a household is one less than the size of the household, the following can be used as the maximum gross rent, which includes utilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Gross Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ bedrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on gross rent data and the monthly housing cost, the majority of existing rental units are considered affordable. As reported by the ACS as noted above, 344 units (85%) have a gross rent of $1,499 or less. When comparing the gross rent to the monthly housing costs, this is slightly above what would be considered affordable for a one-person household and within the affordable range for a household with two or more people. As it is unlikely all 344 units are studios, based on the maximum gross rent by bedroom count, it can be assumed that Granby rents based on bedroom count fall within what would be considered an affordable range. However, as previously noted, the majority of these units were built prior to 1999 and may not meet the needs of current residents. The newer rental units are renting for rates that exceed what would be considered affordable. As many of these rental units are only recently constructed and occupied, they are not included in the ACS data presented above.

What is the 30% Rule?

The most common rule to determine how much a person can reasonably afford to spend on housing and still have enough money left over for every day expenses is that it should not be more than 30% of a person’s gross monthly income. For renters, the 30% includes rent and utilities. If a person owns their own home, it should include homeowner’s insurance, property taxes and utilities, in addition to the mortgage.

For owner-occupied units, the monthly housing cost can also be roughly translated to a maximum purchase price based on the standard that someone can comfortably afford to spend approximately three times their annual gross income on a housing unit.

Table 9: Affordable Purchase Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>80% AMI</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$58,408</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$66,752</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$75,096</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$83,440</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$90,115</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$96,790</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$103,466</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$110,141</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Granby, given there are 2.71 people per household (ACS), for the purpose of determining the amount of naturally occurring affordable housing, a purchase price under $225,000 will be used. Based on information from the Assessor’s database of estimated market values (appraisal), adjusted for inflation to 2021 figures, there are about 900 units with an estimated market value of $225,000 or less, out of a total of 4,148 units. This is considered the amount of naturally occurring affordable housing (ownership, not rental).
While this indicates there may be a significant number of naturally occurring affordable housing units, it does not mean that these units are necessarily available for people looking to purchase a home. An examination of recent sale prices reveals in the last year (from December 2020 to December 2021), there were 192 sales. Sale prices ranged from $60,000 to over $1 million. Of these, 26 units sold for under $225,000; however, only 16 of these units (8% of total sales within this time period) were considered qualified sales. This means these sales were an arm’s-length transaction of a property between unrelated parties who were not under duress to buy the property, which was offered on the open market. For the 16 qualified sales, the units ranged in size from 804 square feet to 1,680 square feet, with a median size of 1,160 square feet. These units were built anywhere from 1800 to 1981, with the majority of them built in the 1950s. While these smaller units could be suitable for Granby’s aging population, based on the year when they were built, they are likely in need of updates to suit current needs. Furthermore, these smaller unit sizes would likely not accommodate families in need of affordable housing who may require additional bedrooms and overall more square footage.

When determining housing affordability, housing costs can be compared to income. A household is considered cost burdened if more than 30% of their income goes toward housing costs. Overall, 918 or 22% of Granby households are spending more than 30% of their monthly income on housing. As shown in the chart below, housing costs pose a significant burden for low- and moderate-income households; the lower the household income, the greater the likelihood the household is considered cost burdened.
Table 10: Cost Burdened Households by Income Bracket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Number of Occupied Housing Units</th>
<th>Number of households that spend 30% or more on housing</th>
<th>Percent of households that spend 30% or more on housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 or more</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero or negative income</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cash rent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Affordable Housing Under CGS Section 8-30g

Based on 2020 data released from the Connecticut Department of Housing, Granby has 143 affordable housing units. This means 3.28% of Granby’s housing stock is considered affordable. The majority of these affordable units are located in government assisted housing developments, including the Salmon Brook Housing and Stony Hill Village developments. These housing developments are age-restricted or an applicant must have a disability to be eligible, therefore younger residents or residents with children would not qualify to live there. These developments also have an extensive waiting list. Stony Hill Village has approximately 100 people waiting for a housing unit and the wait list is about two years. Salmon Brook Housing is similar, with about a two-year waiting list as well.

Table 11: Current Affordable Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governmentally Assisted</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Rental Assistance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFA/USDA Mortgages</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted Units</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings

Below is a summary of key findings based on the information presented above:

- Data show the gross rents in Granby are affordable, however there are only 344 rental units.
- New rental units are not reflected in the data. The rental rate for these units exceeds the gross rent and as a result, these new units are not affordable for many residents.
- There may be naturally occurring affordable housing but this housing may not fit current needs given the year the structure was built and the unit size, as they tend to be smaller. This housing may also not be occupied by those needing affordable housing and there is no guarantee it will remain affordable in the future. (Please refer to page 1 for the definition of naturally occurring affordable housing.)
- Granby’s naturally occurring affordable housing may not be available/come on the market frequently; only 8% of units sold in the past year were considered affordable.
- As 22% of Granby households are cost burdened, there is a mismatch between the amenities and housing features that residents need/want and what can be obtained at an affordable price point.
- Only 143 housing units (3.28% of Granby’s total housing stock) are considered affordable under CGS 8-30g.

Does Granby need additional affordable housing? Examples from Social Services case files:

**Example 1:** An elderly Granby resident is looking to downsize after the loss of spouse and wishes to remain in Granby. The sale of the house provides savings to draw from for a few years. The resident applies for a reduced rate apartment at the Grand Luxury Apartments. Based on income, which is limited to social security benefit, the rent will not be affordable (more than 30% of income will be spent on rent). As there are limited downsizing options in Granby, the resident decides to rent a unit despite affordability concerns. After three years, the savings have run out and the elderly resident can no longer afford the rent. Public assistance for fuel and use of the Granby Food Bank do not offer enough relief. Elderly/Disabled subsidized housing units in Granby are not a viable option as the wait lists are approximately two years long.

**Example 2:** A two-parent household with two children in the Granby school system suffers a financial setback when one parent becomes disabled. The single income is not enough to meet the monthly rent expense. An application for social security disability benefits typically takes several months to process through the system. Public assistance (including State energy assistance, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), State insurance, and the Granby Food Bank) eases the financial burden but is inadequate to enable the family to remain in Granby.

**Example 3:** A single, working mother with a student attending the Granby schools through the Open Choice Program wishes to move into Granby. The student is performing well academically and through both school and athletics, has developed positive relationships with fellow students and teammates. However, the family is unable to find affordable housing to realize their desire to join the community.

---

**Regulatory and Infrastructure Assessment**

**Granby Zoning Regulations Assessment**

The Town is divided into different zoning districts (zones). These zones are as follows: Business (C2), Industrial (I), Rural Conservation (R4A), Rural Residential (R2A), Rural Residential (R50), Residential (R30), Planned Development Multifamily (PDM), Neighborhood and Commercial
Transition (T1), Economic Development (ED) and the Granby Center which consists of three specific zones, the Commercial Center (COCE), Center Commons (CC), and Center Edge (CE). Refer to the zoning map on the following page. There are various uses allowed as-of-right and by Special Permit in each zone (refer to the complete Zoning Regulations posted on the Town’s website). The Committee reviewed the Zoning Regulations to determine where and what type of residential uses are allowed. Below is a summary of the Committee findings:

1. Residential uses are allowed in all zones (either by Special Permit or permitted as-of-right). There are two exceptions: the C2 and I only allow a caretaker’s apartment when associated with the commercial use on the property.

**Single-Family Housing**

2. Single-family housing is permitted as-of-right in the R4A, R2A, R50, R30, PDM, T1, CC, and CE.
3. Single-family houses must be at least 1,000 square feet.
4. Each zone has the following required lot size:
   a. R4A: 4 acres
   b. R2A: 2 acres
   c. R50: 50,000 square feet (1.15 acres)
   d. R30: 30,000 square feet (.68 acres)
   e. PDM: 5 acres
   f. T1, CC and CE: 30,000 square feet (.68 acres)

**Multi-Family Housing**

5. Multi-family housing is permitted as-of-right in the CC Zone.
6. Multi-family housing is permitted by Special Permit in the PDM, T1, COCE and CE Zones.
7. The density for multi-family housing depends on the Zone.
   a. PDM: 8 units/developable acre allowed. Density can be increased to 10 units for elderly housing. A 20% density increase is allowed for elderly and affordable housing.
   b. T1: 8 units/acre.
   c. COCE, CC and CE: 15 units/acre.
8. The lot size required for multi-family units depends on the zone.
   a. PDM: 5 acres
   b. T1: 4 acres
   c. CC and CE: 8 acres
   d. COCE: no minimum lot size specified for multi-family.
9. Multi-family units must be a minimum of 450 square feet for an efficiency, 575 square feet for a 1-bedroom, 700 square feet for a 2-bedroom, and 150 square feet must be added for each additional room.
10. Must be served by public water and sewer.

**Accessory Apartment**

11. Accessory apartments must be associated with a single-family house.
12. Special Permit approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission is required.
13. If detached from the house, a minimum lot size of 2 acres is needed.
14. The apartment must be between 450 and 1,200 square feet.

Active Adult Residential Development
15. Active adult residential developments (55+) are allowed by Special Permit in the R30, PDM, ED, and T1 Zones.
16. Minimum lot size is 10 acres.
17. Dwelling unit must be at least 1,000 square feet.
18. 5 units/developable acre permitted. A 20% density increase may be allowed in exchange for the provision of affordable units.
19. The development must be served by public water and sewer.

As-of-right and Special Permit Uses

As-of-right uses, also called by right, are uses that are specifically allowed in a given zone. Often there will be criteria outlined in the Zoning Regulations and provided the proposed use complies with the criteria, the use is allowed without further consideration. There are situations where even if a use is considered as-of-right, a Site Plan application through the Planning and Zoning Commission may be needed. When making a decision on a Site Plan application, the Commission acts in a ministerial capacity. In other words, the Commission has no independent discretion other than determining if a Site Plan application complies with the applicable regulations. If a development proposal complies with the regulations, it is to be approved.

Special Permit uses are uses which are generally compatible with uses in the zone but because of the nature of the proposed use, special attention is given to its proposed location and operation. When considering a Special Permit use, the Planning and Zoning Commission may impose additional conditions to protect the public health and safety. Under State Statute, all Special Permit applications are subject to a public hearing process. Special Permit uses may also require a Site Plan application be submitted simultaneously for the Commission's consideration.
Town of Granby Zoning Map:
Infrastructure Assessment

As it is not uncommon for affordable housing to rely on increased density for a project to be financially feasible, the location of public utilities can affect the location and type of housing that can be developed. The Committee reviewed the location of existing utilities.

The majority of Granby properties have septic systems and wells. A very small portion of the town (about 5% of its land area) has access to public water or sewer. The map below shows the location of utilities relative to the total land area.

*Infrastructure Location Map:*
Water

Granby is served by two water companies, Aquarion Water Company and Salmon Brook District Water. Aquarion Water Company provides water service to the southeastern part of town, primarily along Salmon Brook Street (Route 10) and Canton Road, south of the Salmon Brook to the Simsbury town line (shown in green on map below). Salmon Brook District Water provides water service to the Granby Center area (shown in blue). Any property located outside of these areas is on a private well. Below is a map showing the water service location.

Water Service Location Map:
Sewer

Sewer service in Granby is relatively limited, with sewer lines mainly concentrated in Granby Center. The sewer runs from Granby Center south along Salmon Brook Street (Route 10) to the Simsbury town line. Due to failing septic systems, the sewer line was expanded several years ago to provide service just to the west of Salmon Brook Street to several properties on Burleigh Drive, Archie Lane, and Canton Road. With that exception, there have been no other recent expansions of the system.

The sewer system is owned by Granby and the Town has an agreement with the Town of Simsbury to discharge all waste to their wastewater treatment facility. Under the agreement, Granby is allocated 380,000 gallons per day. As of the writing of this Plan, a total of 260,400 gallons per day have been committed to existing or planned developments, which includes about 500 residential and commercial users. All other properties in Granby have septic systems.

The sewer service area encompasses the land inside the yellow border shown in the map below. The sewer lines are shown in red.

*Sewer Service Location Map:*
Transportation

Access to transportation also plays an important role in someone’s decision where to live, impacting how easy or difficult it is to reach important destinations, including employment centers, medical appointments, educational facilities, and grocery stores. In Granby, where the majority of residents rely on their personal vehicle, it can be challenging for folks who may not have access to reliable transportation. Locating housing closer to where public transportation is available can help residents who may not have a car or who may be unable to drive. Furthermore, it is important public transportation is offered both at times and to locations that will best meet people’s needs.

Granby is served by CTtransit. There are no local bus routes in Granby, only express bus service. This means there are limited stops and times when bus service is available. For example, in Granby, there are two morning routes that travel through town around 6:30 AM and 7:30 AM. Afternoon service is more frequent, with a bus arriving approximately on the hour from 1 PM to 7 PM. The bus route is limited to stops along Salmon Brook Street and North Granby Road, where service extends as far north to the park and ride lot at First Congregational Church. Based on future housing developments, additional bus stops or routes may be needed.

Simsbury-Granby Express, CTtransit Route Map:

In addition to public transportation, a robust sidewalk and bike path network can also provide alternative transportation options for residents. While the sidewalk network has recently been expanded from the Town Green south to Salmon Brook Park, sidewalks continue to be concentrated in Granby Center. It may be possible to extend the sidewalk south of the Center along Salmon Brook Street, connecting residents to Granby Center and destinations along the way.
Economics and Financial Feasibility

There are many factors that determine if an affordable housing development will be economically and financially feasible, which in turn affects whether or not it will be constructed. Therefore, to identify ways to increase affordable housing, it is important to first understand the economics and finances behind developing affordable housing.\(^3\)

When developing and managing an affordable housing project, or any housing project, there are many associated costs. For a multi-family development for example, this includes the cost of the land, permitting fees (including land use application fees and building permit fees), labor costs, site development costs, utility connection fees, utility user fees, financing interest rates, and tax rates. Each of these variables affects the initial development costs and longer-term operating costs. Developers assess these costs and measure them against what they can expect to receive in rent. If the expected total rent in a development is projected to cover the expenses associated with the project, it is deemed financially feasible.

When constructing a mixed income development, which is a mix of market-rate and affordable units, or an all-affordable development, the profit margins shrink and can even disappear. The rent for market-rate units in a development must offset the lower rents collected on the affordable units. The difference can become so wide that the market-rate unit rents will not make up for the affordable unit rents. At this point, the project is not financially feasible.

Developments that are comprised of entirely affordable units can be even more challenging. Developers typically must seek loans, grants, and other funding sources for a project to be financially feasible. For example, a multi-family rental development in another town relied on a variety of funding sources, including a grant through the Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, funding through the Connecticut Department of Housing’s Competitive Housing Assistance for Multifamily Properties (CHAMP) initiative, energy efficiency rebates, and a deferred developer fee.

In addition to direct costs, sometimes an unpredictable land use approval process for a multi-family development can make underwriting a project more difficult and in turn affect the feasibility of the project. When a development proposal requires Special Permit approval, this means an applicant must appear before the Planning and Zoning Commission for a public hearing. The Commission can determine whether or not to approve the application and may also assign conditions of approval. While this process has the benefit of allowing public input and gives the Commission the ability to assign conditions to mitigate potential concerns, it adds a certain degree of risk for a developer. Prior to even appearing before the Commission, hundreds of thousands of dollars can be expended on engineering plans, traffic studies, stormwater analyses, and other studies. And there is no guarantee that the development plan will be approved. This is not to mention the time it often takes to obtain approval. If a development that requires Special Permit approval is expected

---

\(^3\) The economic and financial feasibility of a specific housing development would be determined either prior to or at the time of application submission to the town.
to be met with community opposition, this may be enough for a developer to decide to explore other locations.

Proof of these challenges to building affordable housing is apparent right here in Granby; no recently approved multi-family development projects include affordable units. When development applications have been presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the applicants were asked about the provision for affordable units, often the response was it was not financially feasible.

Objectives and Recommendations

To increase the number of affordable housing units in Granby, there should be a concerted effort to both increase housing options and to reduce financial and economic barriers to the development of affordable housing. This will in turn facilitate the development of housing units of different price points and varying amenities that will best serve a diverse range of residents. To achieve this, the following objectives and recommendations are proposed. While these objectives and recommendations will require further study and analysis, they are presented here to provide other Boards and Commissions with ideas and options to consider. It may then be decided which ones are best to pursue to increase affordable housing in Granby.

1. Reduce restrictions for accessory apartments

Accessory apartments can provide additional housing options for residents who may not desire a single-family house or who may not want to live in a large apartment complex. Often these are smaller units either contained within an existing single-family dwelling or they are located on the same lot as a single-family house in a detached structure, such as over a detached garage. Due to their smaller size, they are often less expensive than the rent for an apartment in a large multi-family rental development. Not only do these apartments provide additional housing options, but they can help current residents stay in their homes by providing supplemental income which can offset their own housing costs. Under the current Zoning Regulations, accessory apartments require Special Permit approval and there are specific criteria that must be met. Recognizing that these units are an important tool to both diversify Granby’s housing stock and help residents, the following strategies are recommended:

   a. Remove the requirement that all accessory apartments seek Special Permit approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission. Allow accessory apartments to be approved at the staff level provided the application complies with the Zoning Regulations.4
   b. Consider allowing detached apartments on lots smaller than 2 acres.

---

4 Public Act 21-29 allows the construction of accessory dwelling units, which are also referred to as accessory apartments, on lots accompanying a single-family house unless a municipality chooses to opt out. As of the writing of this Plan, the Planning and Zoning Commission is considering opting out of this provision. However, the Commission will be considering changes to the current regulation and may decide to allow attached apartments as-of-right. Detached apartments may still require Special Permit approval through the Commission.
c. Eliminate the minimum square footage required for an accessory apartment and instead require that the unit size comply with that required by the Building Code.

d. Consider financial incentives for the construction of accessory apartments that are deed-restricted affordable, such as a tax incentive.

2. Encourage the development of multi-family housing

Multi-family housing is only allowed by right in the Center Commons (CC) Zone. In any other zone that allows multi-family developments, Special Permit approval is required. Due to the time, expense, and unpredictable nature of seeking Special Permit approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission, this can be a deterrent for the development of multi-family housing. Such developments also must comply with density maximums, or the number of units allowed per acre, and often there is a minimum lot size needed for the developments, which is in excess of the minimum lot size required in the zone. There are opportunities to modify the Zoning Regulations to encourage the development of multi-family housing:

a. In addition to the CC Zone, examine other zones where multi-family development is allowed and consider allowing the use by right, instead of by Special Permit approval. This could include two-family structures/duplexes, triplexes, or larger scale multi-family developments, depending on further study and a determination of the appropriateness of the development size. Site Plan approval may still be required from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

b. Consider other zones where multi-family developments may be appropriate. For example, the majority of Granby is zoned R2A, which requires a 2-acre minimum lot size. Where suitable soils exist, some lots in this zone may be able to accommodate two-family structures/duplexes.

c. In the PDM Zone, a density bonus is allowed for the development of elderly housing, and there is an additional density bonus where elderly and affordable housing is provided. Expand the zones where a density bonus is allowed and allow such a bonus for construction of any affordable unit, not just for elderly and affordable.

d. Assess the current density allowed for a multi-family use and consider an increase in density depending on the suitability of the site.

e. In zones where the minimum lot size required for multi-family developments exceeds the minimum lot size in the underlying zone, consider a reduction in the required minimum lot size for multi-family developments.

f. Consider a change to the Zoning Regulations to require a certain percentage of units constructed in a multi-family development be deed-restricted affordable; this is known as inclusionary zoning. If a developer is unable to comply with the requirement, consider a provision that would allow payment into a housing trust fund. The funds could then be used for the development of affordable housing.

g. Explore establishment of a housing trust fund (see 2.f.).

h. Consider financial incentives for the construction of affordable multi-family housing developments, such as a tax abatement, reduced building permit fees, reduced sewer connection fees, or other incentives.
3. Encourage the development of single-family affordable housing

The majority of Granby requires a 2-acre minimum lot size, with some areas requiring a 4-acre lot (4A Zone). The larger the lot size, the less economically feasible it is to construct affordable housing. Density restrictions also limit the number of units that may be constructed. Modifications may be made to the Zoning Regulations to encourage the construction of single-family affordable homes:

a. Where public water and sewer exist, or in other locations where there are suitable soils, consider the reduction of the minimum lot size; smaller lot sizes would reduce the overall cost of the house/property, increasing the financial feasibility of developing affordable housing.

b. Consider a density bonus within Flexible Residential Developments (FRD) for the construction of affordable housing.

c. Consider a modification to the Zoning Regulations to require the set-aside of a certain number of affordable housing units in any planned residential subdivision. Similar to the aforementioned recommendation (see 2.e.), if a developer is unable to comply with the requirement, consider a provision that would allow payment into a housing trust fund. The funds could then be used for the development of affordable housing.

d. Explore establishment of a housing trust fund (see 3.c.).

4. Promote the modest expansion of public infrastructure

As stated previously in this Plan, much of Granby lacks sewer and water service. This limits the density of housing units that can be constructed in many areas in town, particularly where the soils may not be suitable to support septic systems. Much of Granby also lacks access to public transportation, which can affect where people decide to live if they do not have reliable transportation. The location of public infrastructure and transportation options should be examined and the Town should support expansion where appropriate. The following is recommended:

a. It is recommended that the sewer service area map be modified to allow for an expansion of the service area north and south of Floydville Road to the East Granby town line, and eliminate the areas north of Crest Road, along North Granby Road.

b. Request regular updates from the water and natural gas companies, which are not Town-owned, on their infrastructure plans for Granby.

c. Monitor bus routes and propose changes as may be needed to better serve Granby residents. If there is an increased need for bus transportation based on future housing plans, the town should pursue additional bus routes or stops with CTtransit as needed.

d. Promote sidewalk connections and additional bike paths.

5. Actively seek partnerships with affordable housing developers

The Town owns land that may be appropriate for the development of affordable housing. This land ranges from smaller properties that may be suitable for one or two homes to larger properties that could accommodate a greater number of housing units. Some of these properties also have access
to public infrastructure that would allow for an increase in density, or the number of units per developable acre.

a. Study Town-owned land and determine which properties will likely not be needed by the Town for future municipal facilities or uses. Of the properties that remain, determine which ones may be best suited for residential development.

b. Explore partnerships with affordable housing developers and non-profit entities with experience in affordable housing development to facilitate residential development on Town-owned land where appropriate.

What is a Flexible Residential Development (FRD)?

A flexible residential development (FRD) arranges homes closer together in groups on smaller lots than those normally required by the Zoning Regulations. FRD permits a reduction in lot size and a variation in shape and location without increasing the overall density, following the approval of a Special Permit. All land within the R30, R50 and R2A Zones is eligible for a Special Permit for a FRD.

Conclusion

In recent years there have been efforts to diversify Granby’s housing stock, as evidenced by the recent approval and construction of several multi-family housing developments. As of the writing of this Plan, the Planning and Zoning Commission is also reviewing the Accessory Apartment Zoning Regulation. While this demonstrates progress in providing additional housing options, more needs to be done to provide a range of housing types to meet the needs of current and future residents. Progress is also needed to provide affordable housing options so that both current residents may stay in town as circumstances change and there are opportunities for new residents to move here. Further analysis of the objectives and strategies outlined in this Plan, as well as additional community input, will be an important step in determining how to implement this Plan and increase affordable housing in Granby.
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Affordable Housing Plan Questions

1) Pages 3-4 list some implementation strategies from the POCD related to housing. What is the status of each of these?

   Progress has been made on the following items:

   - Greater mix of new housing units, particularly multifamily and rental units.
   - An expansion in the number of rental units.
   - Increased housing opportunities for a more diverse group of residents.
   - The continued increase in the number of accessory apartments.
   - Granby Center—obtain a greater mix of new housing units, particularly multi-family and rental units.

   235 apartments were approved at 280 Salmon Brook Street in Granby Center, 205 units at 2/3 Murthas Way (apartments, duplexes, single-family homes), and 34 apartments at Greenway Village (474 total units). All of these are, or will be, rental units.

   Numerous accessory apartments have been approved over the years.

   PZ also recently approved changes to the zoning regulations to allow attached accessory apartments by right—this may lead to an increase in additional accessory apartments. Prior to the change, all accessory apartments required special permit approved.

2) On page 7, we reference 474 multi-family units that have been approved recently. Do we have a map that shows where these units are located?

   See map on slide.

3) Do the final conditions of approval for any of these 474 units require the developer to set aside units that meet the state standard of affordability? The 80/30 standard?

   No.

   It should be noted the development at Murthas Way was required to set aside 10% of units to be affordable for people earning 80% of the median income for Granby. The developer is in compliance with this condition of approval. This does not meet the state statute definition of affordable housing under CGS 8-30g as affordability under 8-30g is based on the area median income or state median income, whichever is less.

4) Page 8 contains a reference to median house value in Granby. Is this based on assessed value?

   No. This is based on American Community Survey data and it would be appraised value.
5) Am I thinking about this correctly? With the encumbered (143) and natural occurring (900) we are at 25% affordable housing 1043 properties out of 4148 correct? (page 10 & 12)

Based strictly on the numbers yes, but the naturally occurring affordable housing does not count towards a town’s 10% threshold for affordable housing under CGS 8-30g. There is no guarantee this housing will remain affordable in the future nor is there a guarantee that it is occupied by people who would qualify for affordable housing.

In today’s housing market, we are also seeing properties appraise at $50-90k above what we are showing on the appraisal on the town property card—which is what was used to calculate the number of naturally occurring affordable housing. So the number of naturally occurring affordable housing units is likely lower given current market conditions.

6) Are private rentals factored into the numbers above?

The 143 unit count does include some private rentals.

The naturally occurring affordable housing is based on appraised value from the town property card. The town does not have data as to how many of these properties are being rented.

7) Page 13 (pink box) contains examples of affordable housing needs. Example #1 refers to an application for reduced rent at the Grand Luxury Apartments. Do we know how the application process works and what reductions are available? Are the owners of this project required to make applications available?

An applicant submits an application, including income documentation, to The Grand and it is forwarded to the Granby Director of Human Services. She reviews the application to determine if the applicant qualified for the reduced rate apartment and will then inform the management company the person has qualified for the program. The applicant still needs to comply with standards outlined by the apartment complex—credit check, etc. Currently a 1 bedroom is $1,502, 2 bedroom is $1,669, and 3 bedroom is $1,836 for this program.

Five units are currently occupied under this program. Thirteen units are required so when a unit becomes available, the unit will first be offered to someone on the wait list who qualifies for the program before being offered to someone at market rate.

8) Page 16 contains a copy of the current zoning districts. Can you print a larger version of the map with at least the major streets identified?

See map on slide.

9) Can the boundaries of the sewer and water service areas be overlaid onto the zoning map? (page 17 & 18)
See map on slide.

10) I didn't fully understand the description of the CTransit service in Granby. Where do the express routes go to/come from? What is the process for changing/adding routes? (page 20)

The Express route comes to/from Downtown Hartford, stopping in Simsbury and Granby—see Route 912 Simsbury-Granby Express in pink. This can be explained in more detail in the plan if needed.

The town would have to work with CTransit for any changes. CTransit would likely assess ridership, planned/current development, etc. to determine if changes are warranted.

See map on slide.

11) Can you explain the special permit process and why it is so burdensome? (page 21)

A special permit requires an applicant to fill out an application and a submit fee and site plan, if required, to the Planning and Zoning Commission. A public hearing is required on all special permit applications. The Commission has some discretion when approving a special permit—they consider traffic impacts, adequate parking/access, suitability of the site, neighborhood compatibility, etc. This is different from a site plan approval process. If a site plan is required and an applicant meets the criteria outlined in the zoning regulations, the Commission acts in a ministerial capacity—they have no other discretion other than determining if an application complies with the applicable regulations. The Commission tends to hold public hearings on site plan applications even though not required under state statute. The applicant can modify a proposal to address concerns raised during a hearing, but they are not required to if the application complies with the zoning regulations.

Therefore with a special permit process, there is some unpredictability. An applicant can spend significant funds on engineered drawings, traffic studies, etc. to have an application denied. Whereas with a site plan, if the site plan complies with the regulations, it is likely to be approved.

If staff were to do the approvals for the special permit process would that include public notice and an opportunity for public comment?

No. If anything is approved at the staff level, no public hearing is required. If an application meets the criteria outlined in the zoning regulations, it would be approved.

12) Footnote 4 on page 22 refers to the Planning and Zoning Commission's work on special permits for accessory apartments. Has the Commission finalized anything?

Yes. PZ amended the accessory apartment regulations. Attached apartments are allowed as of right and detached apartments require special permit approval. The regulations outline
criteria/standards that must be met and allow only one accessory apartment per lot. Prior to the change, all accessory apartments required special permit approval.

13) pg 23 2 c. what is a density bonus? Does that simply mean they can develop more units in a smaller space?

Yes, correct. In the PDM Zone, the maximum density for multifamily dwellings is 8 per developable acre. The maximum density for elderly housing is 10 units per developable acre. An increase in density up to 20% of the allowable units is permitted for elderly and affordable.

14) Page 23 Recommendation 2c refers to a density bonus currently available in the PDM zone where "elderly and affordable housing" is provided. Does this mean that, to qualify, each unit must be both restricted to elderly residents and be affordable? How are elderly and affordable defined?

Yes, correct. There is both an income and age restriction.

Elderly is over 65.

Affordable is someone making 70% of the median family income for Hartford Area as published by the Department of Housing.

15) pg 23 2 f What is intent of this suggestion? "The funds could then be used for the development of affordable housing." Would the town give money to developers who do affordable housing projects?

The town would likely partner with a developer for the development of affordable housing. The specifics would have to be studied in more detail.

16) pg 24 Why was the sewer lines originally drawn to include areas north of Crest Road. Was it soil conditions? Is there any negative impact to that area if the map was to be redrawn?

It was likely not based on soils and was more likely to allow potential connection of Kelly Lane School into the sewer system, if needed. Lots in the area are compliant with zoning and sized to accommodate septic repairs. There is no history of excessive septic failures.

If the map is redrawn, the area would fall outside the sewer service area. This means the town would not consider extending the sewer system to that area and therefore those properties would not have the ability to tie into the sewer system. Further study would be needed.
17) One strategy recommends considering a density bonus for affordable housing in the FRD zone. Does the current code allow for such applications? (page 24 3b)

No. There is no density bonus currently allowed for FRD.

18) Several of the recommendations refer to "suitable soils". How do we determine suitability? Does suitability mean permissible for wells and septic systems? Would we determine suitability by areas/regions, or for individual properties?

Suitability is based on soil type. There are soil maps available online to determine soil type in a particular area, USDA NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Services).

Yes, suitability in this context refers to its ability to support septic systems and a reserve area.

It could be based on area as typically soil maps are done on a higher level. Detailed sampling would have to be conducted to determine site specific suitability for an individual property.

19) Recommendation 5 refers to smaller town owned properties that may be suitable for housing. Do we have a complete inventory of these? (page 25)

We have a list of all town-owned properties and yes, some may be suitable for housing. Detailed surveys/analysis would have to be completed to determine building potential.

20) It seems that the 2 big obstacles are: Infrastructure (water/sewer and septic/well) and Current zoning. Out of the possible recommendations made which gets us the closest to filling the gap to get to Granby to 10%. Or would it take all of those proposals to do so?

It will likely require a combination of at least several of the proposals/recommendations to develop affordable housing in Granby. The intent of the plan is to outline options and the BOS can select which ones should be studied in more detail.

21) How/when does P&Z weigh in on this as much of this proposal impacts areas they govern.

PZ has been provided updates on the plan throughout the process and the Affordable Housing Plan Committee Chair sits on PZ and served as the liaison. It is expected PZ would take their guidance from the BOS as to which elements of the plan to study/consider further.
Dear BOS;

I am very concerned about the “survey” printed in The Granby Drummer. The author’s name does not appear. By the way the questions are written, it is clear to me that the writer has an ax to grind. Clearly, this is not a town government survey, though the writer wants to present his “results” to you at next Monday’s meeting. I want to know how seriously you plan on taking his “results”, when you do not know if this survey reached the greater Granby population, beyond the author’s supporters. For example, I missed the survey on first reading p.9 because of its formatting and only found it when my neighbor directed me. How many others have also missed it or been mystified by its language?

Sincerely,

Josi Klein
15 Harmony Hill Road
Granby
Please find attached my comments on the Affordable Housing Report that was recently sent to the Board of Selectmen in Granby, CT.

Michael R Larsen
My name and address is:

Michael R Larsen
301 Cone Hill Drive
West Granby, CT 06090

This letter is written to comment on the version of the Affordable Housing Committee’s that was sent to the Selectmen.

I agree with the general idea that low-cost housing is in short supply in Granby. The formula cited from the Affordable Housing regulation seem arbitrary, but I agree with the general observation that housing for people with limited means is in short supply here. Generally, the cost of living is high in the New England area.

I agree with the sentiment expressed in an Opinion piece in “The Granby Drummer” by R. W. Maier that the Board of Selectmen should ask the State of Connecticut to put a moratorium on the Affordable Housing and Section 8 act as has apparently been done by several other small towns in Connecticut. The cost of housing is in general a problem in the Northeast, but I don’t believe that can be solved by unfunded mandates from our state legislature that were created years ago independent of the “facts on the ground” in many small towns in the state. I plan to write to our state representative to ask for his support in putting a moratorium on this push to have towns respond by June 2022 and commit to a plan independent of the desire of residents of the town or the financial viability of meeting the terms of the Affordable Housing Act.

There are several points on which I take issue with the report and recommendations.

The Affordable Housing Plan that was submitted starts out with a statement about preserving the rural look and feel of the area, but that is not consistent with the likely result of the proposal. My view is that increasing housing density beyond the center of Granby area would be a detriment to the look and feel of the Town of Granby. I can accept some limited additional rental units near Granby Center, although I do so reluctantly (I like the old homes on Route 10 in the center of Granby).

The committee has not dealt with the financial viability of the implied changes from altering the density of housing offered. For the most part, Granby is not set up to accommodate high-density tract housing given the lack of water and sewer service. Given the low tax base of that additional housing, it is unlikely that those homes or apartments would be able to cover the cost of extending water and sewer service which would mean pushing up taxes on current Granby residents by some unknown but likely material amount. Even without the cost of extending water and sewer services, the effect of adding more residents in low cost (relatively low tax residences) which increases the need for town services without a commensurate increase in revenue will increase the tax burden for current Granby residents.

As seen and heard at the last town meeting immediately prior to the vote on the budget referendum, our current residential tax load is problematic for many residents. We moved here in 2001 for the schools and the rural look and feel of the area and accepted that good schools in a rural town with no
industrial base means high residential taxes yet I do feel like Granby may be approaching the limits on what residents will accept.

It would seem too that the committee has ignored comments from commercial developers that the affordable housing option is not financially viable. One could, by giving tax abatements, make it financially viable for developers to put in affordable cost housing, yet the issue of who would cover those tax abatements and what the effect of additional services required by additional population without a commensurate increase in the tax revenues from that newly developed property was not addressed.

I would also say, that if there is a desire to keep more seniors here in Granby that any move to increase local property taxes is not consistent with that goal. On a personal level, we are retired and like living here but the total state and local tax burden does make us wonder about how sensible it is to stay in Granby. If you increase local property taxes to cover the Affordable Housing agenda needs, you will most likely drive out a portion of the retirees currently living in Granby. The retirees who move out would likely be replaced by households with children who in turn will boost the need to fund our local schools through more taxes (a potential death spiral in financial terms).

In general, retiring in Connecticut is not the most practical financial choice given our state and local tax levels as well as overall high cost of living. I read the stories of individuals who had retired here in Granby on a limited income and ran into trouble and thought that should be not a surprise to anyone who has thought through funding retirement living.

It is unclear that we have any appreciable amount of land in Granby where increasing the density of housing outside of areas covered by city water and sewage is environmentally feasible given the topography here, yet the committee gives the impression that it wants to move to do so. Then too, it's unclear how far the topography of the area will allow the town to extend water and sewer lines.

The report meanders between talking about affordable housing as defined by statute as encumbered property and affordable housing on the open market which I found confusing. I also found it confusing that there was not a stated goal of number of housing units for the encumbered low-cost housing or low-cost housing on the open market. How far would the Town of Granby have to go to make the State of Connecticut happy in the view of those on the Affordable Housing Committee?
CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I'd like to thank all the community members that put in the effort to create the Affordable Housing Plan for consideration by the BOS. I've downloaded and read through the plan and am impressed by its thoughtful and responsible approach to improving the diversity of housing options in Granby. This is an excellent plan that allows us to move forward in a flexible, considered way.

I am particularly supportive of the plan’s efforts to expand bus transportation in Granby. We need better public transportation options to allow more people to take the bus rather than drive cars everywhere. Doing this in a considered, thoughtful approach is what is best for Granby. We pride ourselves on our environmental awareness. Reducing car traffic is an excellent goal for Granby.

As a parent of young adults, I worry that they will never be able to afford to live in Granby as we lack the types of housing that I was able to find when I was there age in a different state. Multi-family housing that is affordable can fit within the rural character we all love about Granby. We should be exploring ways to expand options for families at all stages of life - young people starting out, families with young children, adults, and our aging seniors. We are a town that should not simply be about one type of resident - expanding our housing stock will be good for all of us that want to stay in Granby, even when our kids are out of the schools.

Thank you for considering this and I hope you will approve the Affordable Housing Plan. I have lived in Granby for 25 years and believe this plan is good for this town.

Lynn Guelzow
41 Cooley Road
North Granby, CT 06060
I’d like to voice my support for the Affordable Housing plan that was submitted to the Granby Board of Selectmen. I’ve read the entire plan and believe the committee did a great job in developing the plan and making recommendations that will be helpful to allow people to stay in the community as their life changes and to attract new/more diverse people to our community. I’m a proud Granby Bear for the past 18 years. When it was time for us to downsize as our children became adults, I was grateful that the apartments at The Grand were available. While I wouldn’t consider these apartments to be “affordable” by the definition provided in the plan, it is a place where we can use less space and utilities, yet still be part of the Granby community. An extra bonus in this multifamily environment is that the 130 apartments allow us to have a nice little subcommunity of Granby residents. When we lived in our home, every neighbor was 1-2 acres away and we rarely had a chance to talk to any of them or develop relationships unless we walked by their home. At The Grand, we see and talk to our neighbors every day and can have good fellowship around the common BBQ, clubhouse and pool areas. The Grand is also full of all kinds of diversity from gender to race to age to disability to veterans to sexual orientation and many more categories that make us different but still part of the same community. I’d imagine there is also some economic diversity here as well.

I think The Grand can be considered a great prototype of the value of diversity through various housing types, including multifamily homes. One great benefit is that it gives community members more options! Even the newly developed single and two-family rental homes they are building at The Grand will give people more options. If people would like to move to the community but can’t fully afford a down payment or property with a lot of land, these rentals will allow them to be part of the community until they’re ready to purchase their own home. This was not meant to be a sales pitch for The Grand. I’m just sharing that it is a perfect example of the many options smaller/more affordable housing can provide to existing and future community members.

Please feel free to share this with the Board of Selectmen and let me know if you have any questions or I may clarify in any manner.

Thanks,

Ken Mourning
Ken@KREPPartners.com
I would like to express my support of the committee’s Affordable Housing Plan and my hope that the plan is accepted by the Town. I am particularly in support of reducing lot size requirements for ancillary dwellings on a lot (in-law apartments, above garage apartments, and “Granny pods”). I also support the development of multi-unit housing in areas where building requirements (soil/sewer/water) can be satisfied. The town would greatly benefit from increased diversity and an increase in housing options.

Laura Matheos
7 Candlewood Ln
Granby
Comments/questions regarding Objectives and Recommendations:

1. Reduce restrictions for accessory apartments. Right now the current Zoning Regulations require Special Permit approval AND there are specific criteria that must be met.

The recommendation is to allow approval at staff level provided the application complies with the Zoning Regulations. It seems that the change here is to eliminate meeting the specific criteria but there is no documentation of what that criteria is so how can we assess the impact of this recommendation without understanding the specific requirements that will no longer have to be met.

I think we should not have a specific statement on record that detached apartment are allowable on lots smaller than 2 acres. This can be confusing to the applicant and staff who will have authority to approve the application. At one point it was represented to me that the 2 acre lot size was in place to insure that there is room for primary septic system and a backup system. Usually when a single family house is built the septic system is designed and built based on the number of bedrooms and/or bathrooms. Adding another bedroom and bathroom via an accessory apartment would seem to require an upgrade to the septic system at a minimum and if the current septic system was the maximum allowable, how can the load from an accessory apartment be accommodated in a healthy manner. There would also be the issue of the existing well to provide the additional water needed and the impact this might have on neighboring wells.

2. Encourage the development of multi family housing. It says that the time, expense, and unpredictable nature of seeking Special Permit approval can be a deterrent for development of multi-family housing. It would seem to me that if the approval process is unpredictable, there is something that needs to be corrected with the process, irrespective of encouraging the development of multi family housing.

Further, the R2A zone has been in place for many years, citizens have spent money for the land based on the then current zoning requirements. Allowing multi family housing in the R2A zone serves to change the character of the neighborhood and could result in a decline in market value of the older housing stock. Again the specific criteria that the Special Permit process requires is not available to evaluate this recommendation. Having experienced multi family housing, I know that non-owner tenants are not as likely to respect and follow rules for discharging waste into septic systems as well as respecting the general property rights of the landlord.
3. Encourage the development of single family affordable housing. It states that Granby requires a 2 acre or 4 acre lot size, in part because of soil type and needs of a septic system. How does recommending smaller lot sizes or higher density automatically make the soil that has been in place for hundreds of years magically more suitable? And increase the availability of well water without affecting neighboring wells?

Providing set asides for affordable housing will only increase the cost of the non-affordable houses in a particular subdivision. Establishing housing trust fund to be funded by developers would also make new houses more expensive than they would otherwise be.

4. Promoting expansion of public infrastructure. This seems to have merit.

5. Actively seek partnerships with affordable housing developers. This too seems to have merit as long as it doesn’t allow changes to zoning which, in addition to septic needs, could also impact the water levels available to wells on neighboring lots.

Thank you for considering my concerns. Richard Zlotnick, 177 Notch Road.
Affordable Housing in Granby

Survey Results

May 12, 2022
Purpose

- First, what proportion of property owners would like to do something with their property that would help us to create more housing options in town? **(SUPPLY)**

- Second, what proportion of current residents or local workers would choose a different housing option if it was available? **(DEMAND)**

- Third, how do residents feel about **key recommendations** in the plan?
Responses (299 electronic, 8 paper)

Detached home/land owner on less than 2 acres | 158
Detached home/land owner on 2 or more acres | 112
Renter, other adult household member, attached home owner | 19
Employee of a local business, living outside of Granby | 10
Neither a Granby resident or local employee | 8
TOTAL | 307

www.surveymonkey.com

Responses Volume

April 8 - May 10
If zoning regs allowed, I would...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Detached home/land owner on less than 2 acres</th>
<th>Detached home/land owner on 2 or more acres</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add an accessory (&quot;in-law&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apartment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivide my lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build/convert to another type of multi-family housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No responses for “build/convert to a duplex/triplex” (except 2 under “Multiple”)

Currently there are 74 single-family properties with an attached accessory apartment, and 3 with a detached accessory apartment
If housing was available, I would...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Detached home/land owner on less than 2 acres</th>
<th>Detached home/land owner on 2 or more acres</th>
<th>Renter, other adult household member, attached home owner</th>
<th>Employee of a local business, living outside of Granby</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none of the above - I like my current home</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't plan to move to or stay in Granby</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move/downsize to a single-family home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move to &quot;active adult&quot; (55+) housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move to a multi-family rental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move to a single-family rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move to elderly/assisted living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>299</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Feelings on Key Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate reviews for multi-family projects</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use town-owned land for affordable housing</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two family houses in R2A zone</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate reviews for accessory apts</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached accessory apts on &lt;2 acres</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-aside units in single-family developments</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller Lots in existing zones</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Smaller Lots (detail)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Detached home/land owner on 2 or more acres</th>
<th>Detached home/land owner on less than 2 acres</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Class

- **(All)**
- **SingleFamily**

### #Parcels / Lot Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>R4A</th>
<th>FRD</th>
<th>R50</th>
<th>R2A</th>
<th>R30</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>696</strong></td>
<td><strong>1107</strong></td>
<td><strong>1621</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Granby Assessor’s Office**

Roughly 25% of R30 and R50 lots are less than zone minimum!
# Making Granby "affordable"

**Categorization of free-text comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Most Important Thing&quot;</th>
<th>Detached home/land owner on less than 2 acres</th>
<th>Detached home/land owner on 2 or more acres</th>
<th>Renter, other adult household member, attached home owner</th>
<th>Employee of a local business, living outside of Granby</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Taxes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial base</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce expenses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Tax Relief</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller homes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No subsidies/mun exp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Other" comments
on making Granby “affordable”

I've watched this happen before. Knock down one home, put in 10 subdivisions in its place. Soon our beautiful farm town Will be unrecognizable.

I can honestly say I don’t know. I would like to preserve the rural feel of Granby, not pack housing in on smaller lots. Conversely, I would like to stay in town as we get close to retirement age, but realistically won’t be able to afford to. I’m not opposed to accessory apartments, but feel there should be structure to the planning of them, each application approved to ensure they visually fit the area.

It is not Granby's responsibility to make housing more affordable. The market determines affordability. I am not against adding more apartments or multifamily homes that meet the "affordable" guidelines as long as they are placed in areas that are already cleared walkable to the center of town. I don't believe affordable houses would be valuable to those looking for them far away from the walkable town center where groceries can be purchased. There is value in being near the town center for these types of neighborhoods as public transportation, beyond what is already available, will not need to be added as well.

Why is this the goal?

Keep apts out

Your question is not clear, why are there quotes around the word affordable? There is no grammatical need for them.

Affordable Housing should be required or negotiated as part of all multi family developments on main routes with access to water, sewer, and transit.

Granby is inherently not affordable to live in with current infrastructure. It’s funny, I’m sure that most people would be supportive of something such as a house built by habitat for humanity, but on a larger scale people are vehemently opposed to helping anyone but themselves.

---

From other than Granby residents/workers:

Affordable housing should be in every town in the United States. People should be able to live in the town where they work. Where we live an order of religious sisters bought a triplex. They then gave it to the town who is now in charge of bringing it up to code and maintaining the building. The town will rent out the three units in the building. This is a win-win for everyone.

Similar to Simsbury, Granby needs to address it’s lack of population diversity and creating housing diversity is a great place to start.
Summary

Recommendations majority of respondents disagree with

RECOMMENDATIONS

- reduce restrictions for accessory apartments
  - ✓ remove SP requirement
  - ✓ allow detached on lots smaller than 2 acres
  - ✓ eliminate min sf req

- encourage MFH
  - allow by right in zones other than C-common
  - allow in other zones
  - allow density bonus in other zones
  - increase density bonus
  - reduce min lot size in zones where MFH permitted
  - require deed-restricted % of units/contr to trust fund

- encourage affordable SFH
  - reduce minimum lot size where water/sewer is available
  - density bonus within FRD
  - % affordable in new subdivisions/contr to trust fund

- seek partnerships with developers
  - determine which town-owned land could be developed
  - explore partnerships with developers and non-profits

- expand infrastructure
  - financial incentives
  - housing trust fund
TO: Board of Selectmen

FROM: Erica P. Robertson, Town Manager

REGARDING: VI. BUSINESS – ITEM B
Consideration of Capital Equipment Loans

BACKGROUND
The Fiscal Year 2021-22 Town Adopted Budget includes approval for the loan purchase of a senior van and maintenance equipment for the Town and buses, maintenance equipment, and technology equipment for the Board of Education in the small capital fund.

With a capital equipment loan program, the Town is able to spread purchase costs over several years. The Board of Finance recommends this practice. Liberty Bank offers an interest rate of 2.50% for a four and one-half year loan agreement and Westfield Bank offers an interest rate of 3.75% for the same four and one-half year loan agreement.

In addition to the usual small capital 4.5-year loan agreement, the Town is asking for the approval of:

1. A two-year loan program through the Q&D fund for the Board of Education’s one-to-one computing program to purchase chrome books and iPads for students in the amount of $34,000 at a rate of 2.25% from Liberty Bank and 3.25% from Westfield Bank. Below is the table for the information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liberty Bank</th>
<th>Westfield Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>Estimated Total Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$34,000 (2-year term)</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>$ 1,167.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$526,000 (4.5-year term)</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>$ 33,879.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 82.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 35,130.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of the competitive interest rates offered by Liberty Bank, Liberty Bank is recommended for both loans. A resolution by the Board of Selectmen to initiate this year’s plans follows:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Town of Granby is entering into Equipment Lease/Purchase Agreements ("Promissory Note") and/or Loan Agreements in an amount up to $526,000 for four and one-half years and $34,000 for two years with the Liberty Bank;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that these Agreements are hereby approved and that the action of the official of the Town of Granby in signing these Agreements on behalf of it be, and is hereby, ratified, confirmed, and approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Manager of the Town of Granby, be, and is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to sign on its behalf the Agreements and any addenda, schedules, notes, loans, and security agreement, UCC financing statements, disbursement authorization, or other instruments issued under the provisions of the Agreements, and any other instruments or documents which may be necessary or expedient in connection with agreements upon or in fulfillment of the provisions of the Agreements.

EPR/kc

Pc: Kimi Cheng, Director of Finance
MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Selectmen
FROM: Erica Robertson, Town Manager

REGARDING: VI. BUSINESS – ITEM C
Consideration of Budget Transfer for Gasoline, Diesel Fuel, and Recycling Collection Accounts

Background
The Public Works department has faced several significant increases in their budget this fiscal year. The price of gasoline and diesel fuel has skyrocketed. Unfortunately, our contracts for both ended during this period. The recycling account has also reached a point where it can no longer support the additional (second) barrels that many residents have requested. The following accounts require a budget transfer:

1. Diesel account: At this time, we would like to request an appropriation of $27,000 to cover the cost of diesel fuel for the remainder of the fiscal year. The contracted price rose from $1.88/gallon to $2.516/gallon from 2021 to 2022. This increase applied to the average gallons used per year (50,670) is a $31,922 increase in cost. Possible price increases were noted in my budget presentation.

2. Gasoline: A transfer of $15,500 to the gasoline account is needed to cover the remainder of the fiscal year. Price of gas rose from 1.6127/gallon in 2021 to $2.4390/gallon in January 2022. This increase applied to average gallons used in six months (12,500) is a $10,329 price increase.

3. Recycling: Since the introduction of single stream recycling, the town has absorbed the cost of second recycling barrels handed out to residents. During COVID, the number of requests increased significantly. The amount for these extra barrels was not included in the budget. Therefore, the recycling account is short and will require a transfer of $6,700 to cover expenses through the end of June.

Next Steps
Since the significant increases in prices were beyond the Fiscal Year 2021-22 adopted budget, a budget transfer is requested according to the Town Charter. There is enough funding in the debt service line item to cover these increases.

EPR/kc
pc: Kimi Cheng, Director of Finance
    Kirk Severance, Director of Public Works
Pursuant to section 10-6(e) of the Granby Town Charter, I am forwarding the request to you for comment. The Board of Finance will then hear this request for comment as well.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** The Board of Selectmen authorizes the transfer of $49,200 from the $3.4M Bond Projects-school 3/21 expenditure line item to Gasoline, Diesel Fuel, and Recycling Collection line items in the amount of $27,000, $15,500, and $6,700 respectively and forwards this request to the Board of Finance to approve.

EPR/kc

pc: Kimi Cheng, Director of Finance
Kirk Severance, Director of Public Works
TOWN OF GRANBY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 16, 2022

TO: Erica P. Robertson, Town Manager

FROM: Kimi Cheng, Director of Finance

Highlights for Revenues:

April tax collection is consistent with the previous years at 102%.

Total billed for auto supplement was $620,456.79 and collected $566,371 as of April 30, 2022, which brings the collection rate for the auto supplement budget to 157%.

Received $5,287,197 Education Cost Sharing grant for the fiscal year 2022, which is $8,883 over the budgeted amount.

Building Permits Fees revenue line item continues to grow strong and better than last year for the same period (269% vs. 135%).

As of April 30, 2022, the total revenue collected and received is at 102%, which is $810,145 over the budget.

Highlights for Expenditures:

General Administration deficits are for Salaries and IT Operations (monthly service agreement), for which we will request a year-end transfer from Contingency Payroll Regular and Misc. Expenses line items to cover these overages.

Building Inspection deficit is for Salaries line item due to a position reclassification from Admin. Assistant to Land Use Coordinator and salary increases budgeted in the Contingency Payroll Regular line item.

Property Assessment, Community Development, Police Dept. Administration, Public Works Administration, and Recreation departments’ deficits are due to salary increases budgeted in the Contingency Payroll Regular line item. The Town was in contract negotiation with the unions when the FY22 budget was adopted.

Total year-to-date February general fund expense is consistent at 83% (vs. 81% last year).
## TOWN OF GRANBY
### BUDGET OPERATIONS SUMMARY
#### APRIL 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ADJUSTED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVENUE RECEIVED</th>
<th>BAL DUE (EXCESS)</th>
<th>% REC'D</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
<th>Apr 21 %</th>
<th>Mar 22 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41010 Current Year Taxes</td>
<td>39,514,514</td>
<td>40,295,859</td>
<td>(781,345)</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>Pymts. Due - July &amp; Jan.</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41020 Prior Years Taxes</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>196,183</td>
<td>13,817</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41040 Interest &amp; Liens</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>124,322</td>
<td>5,678</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41060 Auto Supplement</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>566,371</td>
<td>(206,371)</td>
<td>157%</td>
<td>Billed - December</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>153%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Taxes</strong></td>
<td>40,214,514</td>
<td>41,182,735</td>
<td>(968,221)</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td></td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43170 Spec Ed / Excess</td>
<td>491,779</td>
<td>321,724</td>
<td>170,055</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Pymts. Due - Feb. 75% - June Bal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43200 Educ Cost Sharing</td>
<td>5,278,314</td>
<td>5,287,197</td>
<td>(8,883)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Pymts. Due - Oct. 25% - Jan. 25% - Apr. Bal.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43590 Tuition - Other Towns</td>
<td>1,070,721</td>
<td>721,290</td>
<td>349,431</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>School Bills for Activity</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Education Total</strong></td>
<td>6,840,814</td>
<td>6,330,211</td>
<td>510,603</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43110 Veterans Exempt GT</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>By Assessor Appl. In Aug but receive Pymt. In Dec,</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43120 Misc - State</td>
<td>35,332</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>35,055</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Pymt. Due - June</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43130 Telecommunications</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>13,593</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Pymt. Due - April</td>
<td>119%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43310 Tiered Pilot</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>12,521</td>
<td>(11,460)</td>
<td>1180%</td>
<td>Pymt. Due Oct.; Stated changed to Tiered Pilot</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1180%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43320 SS Dist Tax Relief</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Pymt. Due - Dec.</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43340 E911 PSAP Grant</td>
<td>33,873</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,873</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Will not receive because East Granby opted out</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Municipal Total</strong></td>
<td>89,066</td>
<td>31,154</td>
<td>57,912</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental Revenue</strong></td>
<td>6,929,880</td>
<td>6,361,364</td>
<td>568,516</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43615 Town Clerk Fees</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>297,700</td>
<td>(97,700)</td>
<td>149%</td>
<td>Statutory Collections</td>
<td>153%</td>
<td>138%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43620 Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Application Permit Fees</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43630 Zoning Bd of Appeals</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>(198)</td>
<td>141%</td>
<td>Application Permit Fees</td>
<td>259%</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43640 Building Permits</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>404,204</td>
<td>(254,204)</td>
<td>269%</td>
<td>Building Permit Fees</td>
<td>135%</td>
<td>193%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43660 Inland Wetlands</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>(2,383)</td>
<td>299%</td>
<td>Permit/App. Fees</td>
<td>169%</td>
<td>238%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43670 Short Term Investments</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>104,312</td>
<td>(39,312)</td>
<td>160%</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43680 Rents</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Drummer, Freshies, School Rental</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43690 Sale Maps &amp; Ordinances</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>165%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43700 Snow Plow &amp; Grading</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,838</td>
<td>(238)</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>Private Roads</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43710 Photocopying</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43715 Open Farm Day</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TOWN OF GRANBY
## BUDGET OPERATIONS SUMMARY
### APRIL 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ADJUSTED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVENUE RECEIVED</th>
<th>BAL DUE (EXCESS)</th>
<th>% REC'D</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
<th>Apr 21 % REC'D</th>
<th>Mar 22 % REC'D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43740 Dispatch Services</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Police Bill For Dispatch Services</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43745 Hay Rentals</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>15,494</td>
<td>(1,494)</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>Haying - $10,000</td>
<td>139%</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43760 Library</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>(1,590)</td>
<td>153%</td>
<td>Book Fines, Trust Investment</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43770 Contract - Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Bldg. Dept. Bills Qtrly For Services</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43790 Driveway Permits</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>New Const. Activity</td>
<td>155%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43800 Police Photo/Lic/Permits</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>10,353</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>232%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43840 Returned Check Fee</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43990 Pay For Participation</td>
<td>53,966</td>
<td>32,531</td>
<td>21,435</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Received from BOE</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46038 Miscellaneous</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>82,772</td>
<td>(47,772)</td>
<td>236%</td>
<td>CIRMA, FEMA reimbursement</td>
<td>816%</td>
<td>228%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Departmental Revenues Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>605,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,015,441</strong></td>
<td><strong>(410,439)</strong></td>
<td><strong>168%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>165%</strong></td>
<td><strong>140%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43950 Transfer-in Fund Bal.</td>
<td>2,963,814</td>
<td>2,963,814</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43955 Additional Appropriations</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers In Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,994,314</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,994,314</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Dept. Rev. &amp; Transfer In Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,599,316</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,009,755</strong></td>
<td><strong>(410,439)</strong></td>
<td><strong>111%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>132%</strong></td>
<td><strong>107%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,743,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,553,855</strong></td>
<td><strong>(810,145)</strong></td>
<td><strong>102%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>102%</strong></td>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT. #</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>ADJUSTED EXPENSED</td>
<td>ENCUMBERED</td>
<td>UNENCUMBERED ALLOTMENT</td>
<td>% EXP.</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
<td>Apr 21 % REC'D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>344,153</td>
<td>312,958</td>
<td>73,974</td>
<td>-42,779</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>22,421</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>2,815,806</td>
<td>2,593,966</td>
<td>37,546</td>
<td>184,294</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Town Clerk Operations</td>
<td>161,121</td>
<td>123,737</td>
<td>20,829</td>
<td>16,555</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Probate</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Contingency &amp; Reserve</td>
<td>248,700</td>
<td>93,913</td>
<td>10,048</td>
<td>144,738</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Election Services</td>
<td>48,839</td>
<td>18,999</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>25,195</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Boards, Reg. Prog. &amp; Staff Dev.</td>
<td>70,934</td>
<td>56,864</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>11,753</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Revenue Collections</td>
<td>134,238</td>
<td>103,710</td>
<td>24,476</td>
<td>6,052</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Property Assessment</td>
<td>195,109</td>
<td>156,203</td>
<td>39,665</td>
<td>-759</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021</td>
<td>Finance Management</td>
<td>331,281</td>
<td>276,591</td>
<td>51,328</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>367,799</td>
<td>300,406</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>66,841</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>120,764</td>
<td>98,106</td>
<td>23,133</td>
<td>-475</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Building Inspection</td>
<td>154,149</td>
<td>136,577</td>
<td>40,368</td>
<td>-22,796</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Fire Prevention</td>
<td>351,151</td>
<td>262,543</td>
<td>85,911</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>8,720</td>
<td>8,125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>171,555</td>
<td>171,555</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Police Dept Administration</td>
<td>361,750</td>
<td>308,446</td>
<td>65,323</td>
<td>-12,019</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Police Oper. &amp; Communications</td>
<td>1,873,155</td>
<td>1,451,268</td>
<td>421,201</td>
<td>130,867</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. &amp; Prop. Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001</td>
<td>Public Works Administration</td>
<td>203,738</td>
<td>176,189</td>
<td>40,093</td>
<td>-12,544</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3003</td>
<td>General &amp; Equipment Maint.</td>
<td>1,386,108</td>
<td>1,093,064</td>
<td>281,680</td>
<td>11,354</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3005</td>
<td>Solid Waste &amp; Recycling</td>
<td>938,100</td>
<td>700,925</td>
<td>229,611</td>
<td>7,564</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3011</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>34,383</td>
<td>22,591</td>
<td>10,705</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3013</td>
<td>Infrastructure Maintenance</td>
<td>686,444</td>
<td>503,528</td>
<td>138,300</td>
<td>44,616</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works &amp; Env.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TOWN OF GRANBY

## BUDGET OPERATIONS SUMMARY

### APRIL 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCT. #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ADJUSTED BUDGET</th>
<th>EXPENSED</th>
<th>ENCUMBERED</th>
<th>UNENCUMBERED ALLOTMENT</th>
<th>% EXP.</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
<th>Apr 21 % REC'D</th>
<th>Mar 22 % REC'D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4001</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>583,309</td>
<td>445,095</td>
<td>111,377</td>
<td>26,836</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4003</td>
<td>Social-Senior-Youth-Services</td>
<td>343,907</td>
<td>195,654</td>
<td>49,768</td>
<td>98,485</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4005</td>
<td>Recreation Administration</td>
<td>97,489</td>
<td>80,431</td>
<td>18,280</td>
<td>-1,222</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4009</td>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lib., Rec., &amp; Soc. Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,027,705</strong></td>
<td><strong>721,181</strong></td>
<td><strong>179,425</strong></td>
<td><strong>127,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>88%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>79%</strong></td>
<td><strong>84%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6001</td>
<td>Capital Improvement</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001</td>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,644,620</td>
<td>1,455,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189,620</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Capital &amp; Debt Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,494,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,305,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>189,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Town Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,560,204</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,023,748</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,654,512</strong></td>
<td><strong>881,944</strong></td>
<td><strong>94%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>94%</strong></td>
<td><strong>93%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8001</td>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td>33,183,506</td>
<td>25,336,008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,847,498</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Board of Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,183,506</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,336,008</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,847,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>76%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>74%</strong></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9001</td>
<td>Transfer to OPEB Trust Fund</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Wired in early November</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Transfer</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General Fund Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,743,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,359,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,654,512</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,729,442</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>81%</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOWN OF GRANBY

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Selectmen

FROM: Erica P. Robertson, Town Manager

RE: VII. TOWN MANAGER REPORT

DATE: May 16, 2022

Tonight’s Town Manager report includes information I hope you find of interest. My staff and I are dedicated to working hard each day for the betterment of our community.

Memorial Day Parade

The Town Manager walks with the First Selectman and Board members in the parade. Marchers assemble in the Geissler’s parking lot by 9:30 a.m. The parade proceeds from the Geissler’s parking lot down Bank Street to Route 189 and then proceeds west on Route 189 to Route 10. The parade continues north on Route 10 and stops at the memorial on the corner of Route 10/Route 189 and Route 20 to lay wreaths. The parade will then continue to the cemetery where tribute is paid. Following the ceremony, the parade returns to the green and disbands. Shortly thereafter the Marquis will perform, and a few concessions will have food for sale.

Municipal Solid Waste & Recycling Disposal Overview and Recommendation- see attached
TOWN OF GRANBY
Incorporated 1786

15 NORTH GRANBY ROAD
GRANBY, CONNECTICUT 06035-2125

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Selectmen
FROM: Erica P. Robertson, Town Manager
DATE: May 16, 2022

RE: Municipal Solid Waste & Recycling Disposal Overview & Recommendation

Over the last several months, Kirk Severance and I have been reviewing Granby’s Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) and recycling disposal program and its relationship with the Materials Innovation & Recycling Authority (MIRA). As you may know, trash disposal in Connecticut is changing drastically and it affects most towns and cities across the state.

The purpose of this memorandum is to update the Board of Selectmen on what is happening with MIRA and how it affects Granby. I offer this information for background so that we can discuss a recommendation regarding the Town’s Municipal Services Agreement (MSA) with MIRA at our June 6, 2022, BOS meeting.

How does Granby manage refuse and recycling for residential properties?

The Town’s procedures pertaining to the management of refuse and recycling are outlined in Chapter 144 of the Town Code of Ordinances, “Solid Waste.” This ordinance is cumbersome and, in many areas, very outdated. A full review of the ordinance is recommended.

The Town operates a Transfer Station located at 103 Old Stagecoach Road which is open Saturdays from 8 am to 3 pm. Only Granby residents are permitted to use the Transfer Station. We do not accept regular residential waste, however residents may drop off other items for disposal, such as bulky waste, appliances, electronics, and paint.

The town contracts with Paine’s Inc. based in East Granby, CT. for curbside residential trash and recycling. Paine’s collects the trash and recycling from residents and transports it to a Town specified disposal location. The FY 2023 budget for this service is approximately $953,000. There are two main costs within the solid waste budget; the waste collection contract with Paine’s and the tipping fees we must pay to
dispose of the waste. Currently, tipping fees are set by MIRA. These costs have been rising significantly over the last several years.

**What happens to the refuse and recycling once it leaves Granby?**

Once refuse and recycling is picked up from the Transfer Station or curbside by Paine’s, it is brought to the Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority (MIRA) in Hartford’s South Meadows for disposal.

**What is the Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority (MIRA)?**

MIRA was established by the Connecticut General Assembly in 2014 to serve as a successor to the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority (CRRA). MIRA is a quasi-public organization responsible for the development and operation of systems and facilities that turn municipal solid waste into useful materials. MIRA operates the Connecticut Solid Waste System (CSWS) which includes a single stream recycling facility and a resource recovery (waste-to-energy) facility, both located in the South Meadows section of Hartford, as well as three transfer stations in Essex, Watertown, and Torrington.

**How does MIRA operate?**

MIRA holds long-term municipal service agreements (MSAs) with over forty towns and short-term delivery agreements with approximately 30 private haulers. The agreements allow MIRA to accept waste and recyclables collected at municipal transfer stations and through curbside collections for a per ton disposal fee known as a “tip fee.” MIRA is intended to be self-funded; generating revenue from its waste recovery and recycling activities that are sufficient to maintain its operations.

**What are the terms of Granby’s current MSA with MIRA?**

In 2012, the Town entered into a fifteen-year agreement with MIRA for refuse and recycling disposal. The MSA is set to expire on June 30, 2027. The MIRA Board of Directors sets the “tip fee” each March for the upcoming fiscal year for refuse disposal. Recycling is accepted at no cost. The tip fee for the current fiscal year is $105.00/ton. The tip fee for FY 2023 is $116/ton. The Town budget is based on approximately 4,000 tons at a disposal rate of $117/ton. The MIRA rate was not set at the time the budget was put together. For FY 2023 we are anticipating spending about $453,500 in tip fees to MIRA.

Most importantly, the agreement contains an “opt-out” provision that allows the Town to unilaterally terminate its MSA with MIRA should the tip fee reach a certain monetary threshold. The deadline to opt-out of the agreement for FY 2023 was April 8, 2022.

**What is the issue with the current MSA?**

In December 2020, MIRA announced that the South Meadows waste-to-energy facility would close by July 1, 2022. As an alternative, MIRA has identified a model by which it can provide transfer station services to member towns through June 2027. Under this model, MSW would be sent out of state for disposal.

To affect this transition, MIRA proposed an amendment to the current MSA that would adjust the opt-out provision upward in the remaining years of the contract, effectively eliminating the provision as an option for member towns. The rationale behind the amendment is that it would provide assurance of the viability of a five-year contract to potential contractors and help secure favorable pricing for member towns.
For towns that elect to sign the MSA amendment, the tip fee was set at $111.00/ton. For towns that chose not to sign the MSA amendment, the tip fee was set at $116.00/ton. Granby did not sign the amendment.

Due to the large number of municipalities that have opted out of their MSA, MIRA recently informed us that they will be closing the South Meadows to all disposals. Our contractor, Paine’s will now have to take Granby’s trash and recycling to Torrington. In conversation with Paine’s, they will be overburdened by this change.

What are our options in terms of next steps?

1. **Status Quo - Continue the existing agreement with MIRA for FY 2023.** Municipalities that do not execute the amendment will be subject to a higher tip fee for FY 2023 than those communities that choose to execute the amendment but will retain the flexibility to exit the agreement annually for the remainder of the contract period. Paine’s would receive an unknown level of compensation for taking the trash and recycling to Torrington.

   *This option is not recommended.*

2. **Opt-out of the MIRA MSA for FY 2023.** This would allow the Town to enter a new disposal contract with a lower tip fee than is being offered by MIRA. It would also allow the Town to release Paine’s from any obligation to bring refuse to a disposal site in Torrington. Essentially, we would find a solution that is financially advantageous for Granby and our taxpayers.

   *This option is recommended. Based on bid results shared by communities that have already run procurements for this service this year, staff expect to secure a contract that is advantageous to the Town. It is expected that the tip fee will be reduced to $110/ton. This is an approximate saving of $33,500. (For FY 24 a MIRA tipping fee could be as high as $143/ton.)*

What actions are recommended at the BOS June 6, 2022, meeting?

1. Opt-out of the Town of Granby’s Tier-1 Long Term Municipal Solid Waste Management Agreement (MSA) with MIRA, effective June 30, 2022.

2. Direct the Town Manager to conduct a procurement process to secure a contract with a refuse and recycling disposal site, effective July 1, 2022.

3. Direct the Town Manager to develop recommended amendments to Chapter 144, “Solid Waste” to update the ordinance to current circumstances.

Staff would anticipate coming to the BOS in late June with a contract recommendation for a disposal contractor, and recommendations for amendments to Chapter 144.

Please let us know if you have further questions or require additional information.