



Town of Montville, Connecticut

Department of Land Use & Development

Planning & Zoning
Inland Wetlands & Watercourses
Economic & Community Development



Director's Report

To: Planning & Zoning Commission

Subject: All of Us at North, LLC: Residences on the Thames (857 Units)

Prepared by: Dennis Goderre, PLA, AICP; Director of Land Use & Development

Date: April 1, 2026; issued for April 2, 2026 Special Meeting; Rev. 4/2/26 (see prior report for attachments)

Summary

After further review, I cannot make a recommendation to the Commission to support or not support the extension of utilities to enable the development along Massapeag Side Road. Simply put, more due diligence is necessary on the part of the developer and collaboration with the Town and State.

Development along Route 32 is permitted as of right under our zoning. I encourage the developer to pursue an application as they indicated they would do.

A focus of my review has been gaining an understanding the State process, how the Town's decision factors into their timing, and where the State stands in their vetting/decision process of this development. It has become clear over the last 48 hours that the State is far from making any decision to provide financial support for this project. This is explained below.

Staff has also worked to understand items associated with the development itself. I issued comments to the development team, whom responded midafternoon Wednesday. I have attached both correspondences to this report. The developer will review ~~their~~their response during their presentation Thursday.

On Monday, Chairman Pieniadz issued a letter to David Kooris of the CT Municipal Development Authority (attached). CMDA is a quasi-public agency and assists communities with redevelopment. They are not a state agency but may advise on matters related to community development. The Chairman's letter asked several questions specific to the State process. Mr. Kooris responded to me via email and his response is attached. Based upon this correspondence and our preceding telephone communication, it became apparent there is a substantial amount of due diligence the developer must complete for the State to seriously consider this funding request.

In addition, I spoke with CT DECD Deputy Commissioner Matthew Pugliese. He confirmed a 'rural infrastructure' fund with ~\$30 million exists, however, it must be approved by the Bond Commission prior to use. There are no foreseen plans to place this 'fund' on the Bond Commission agenda and no project has been identified for funding. Allocating money from this fund is based upon a competitive process, a process which at the moment has no identified timeline to even commence. All indications point to a very protracted schedule.

While there have been preliminary discussions between DECD and the developer, additional information requested from the developer is necessary and to date not received by DECD. Please refer to my email to Mr. Pugliese and I am expecting a written reply from him as well.

Considerations

My recommendation to the Commission is to neither support or not support this contemplated infrastructure improvement which is necessary to support the proposed development upon Massapeag Side Road.

1. Timing

With respect to the units on Massapeag Side Road, the developer should come back to the Town with this request when the State has made these funds available through their competitive process.

2. POCD

The town's POCD does not mention support for extending water or sewer in this area.

3. Lack of Certainty/Risk Management

Such a funding request would require the Town's acceptance of funds. The Town needs further input from the State on its process, willingness and position. This includes the Town's obligations of accepting money, administering this project and our risks associated with possible construction overages, errors and omissions.

4. Public Benefit

The Commission, and Town Council, should have a clear understanding of the public benefit as the Town will bear the burden of staff time administering the funds, along with risks as noted above.

5. Priority of Immediate Housing Opportunities

There are other immediate housing opportunities which may be better positioned to support the region's housing needs. For example, the Village Apartments (ECHO) project at 82 Jerome Road

represents a shovel-ready initiative in need of funding. This project includes over 200+ units located in the Town Center and is supported by existing infrastructure. We embrace the opportunity to work with the State to move such infill projects forward immediately. They align with our current CIF-funded revitalization goals for the Town Center and Palmertown areas. Infill developments along existing infrastructure and bus transit lines with nearby community services is smart growth. We have opportunities to help with regional housing needs.

6. Respect for the Regulatory Process

The developer maintains the right to apply for land use permits based on current zoning or to file for a zoning amendment to meet their objectives. The Commission's judgment will be reserved for a formal application that follows the statutory regulatory process, including required public hearings and technical staff reviews, as may be required.

7. Integration with On-going Planning Initiatives

The extension of public utilities into a predominantly undeveloped area has broad, permanent implications for the Town. A decision of this magnitude cannot be responsibly made in a condensed timeframe. The Commission needs an evaluation period over the next 18–24 months to ensure the project is weighed against the following ongoing municipal initiatives:

- a. Water and Sewer Capacity. Ensure the town has a comprehensive understanding of water availability and sewer capacity to support current obligations and long-range growth suitable for the Town.
- b. CIF Funded Revive and Renew (RT 163/32): Evaluation of the final recommendations of this CIF-funded study to determine their appropriateness for adoption to be completed June 2026.
- c. Municipal Housing Plan: Completion of the plan in conformance with HB 8002; schedule June 2026-September 2027.
- d. POCD & Regulatory Updates: The comprehensive update of the Plan of Conservation and Development and the modernization of zoning/subdivision regulations to address new density and which is anticipated to commence in July, 2026 with anticipated end date of December 2027.

There will be a public participation process and the developer is welcome to participate in all planning efforts.

8. Strategic Alignment & Fiscal Impact

The Commission must determine if focusing intensive infrastructure in a greenfield area—at the potential expense of our established village centers—is the most fiscally responsible path for Montville. The POCD and Housing Plan will allow for a comprehensive assessment of the impacts on our schools, Parks & Recreation facilities, and public safety staffing, ensuring that any large-scale growth does not result in a net deficit for current residents.

Motions for Support or Not in Support

Should the Commission choose to support or not to support this utility extension, I have provided the following motions for your consideration:

Not in support

I make a motion to not support the State's extension of water and sewer along Fort Shantock Road, Massapeag Side Road and Derry Hill Road.

In Support

I make a motion to support the extension of water and sewer along Fort Shantock Road, Massapeag Side Road and Derry Hill Road. This support is conditioned upon the following:

- a. Applications shall be filed to all land use boards and commissions and which applications may or may not be approved.
- b. Clarity shall be provided to the Town with respect to the sizing of the new infrastructure, specially if the system will support growth upon adjacent land, should the additional capacity be available in the new system;
- c. Senate Bill 151, specifically its requirement that lots be permitted to be subdivided into 5,000 SF or less when along public water and sewer, or planned water and sewer, does not pass or will not have an adverse impact on the subject neighborhood;
- d. The state shall require the developer to construct a minimum number of units to ensure housing diversity and return on investment of the bond; the town shall be including g in this decision process to ensure community needs are achieved;
- e. The development includes a diverse housing type mixed as defined by middle housing, excluding architecturally incompatible quadplex and perfect sixes, and as the State has mandated the town to accommodate under HB 8002;
- f. The capacity of water and sewer to support development in areas currently served by water and sewer is not adversely impacted, as adversely impacted is determined by the commission based upon final evaluation of the systems by WPCA and the developer;
- g. Should water and sewer capacity be adversely impacted, funds shall be provided by a source other than the Town to upgrade the WPCF and obtain additional water supply from Groton Utilities;
- h. The developer works with the town, at the developer's expense, to define a legislative master plan review process that will be applied to the entirety of the proposed development, excluding the parcels fronting RT32 which currently have access to water and sewer;
- i. The developer provides recreational fields, sidewalks, multi-use path (pending feasibility), trails, full riverfront access along parcels owned by the developer and during initial phases and subsequent phases, said schedule of development subject to legislative approval during the master plan review process noted above;
- j. The housing mix offered is diverse in product type and offers the following:
 - i. A minimum 10% of the units of home ownership options in the form of townhomes;

- ii. A minimum 10% of the units be established in as set aside for senior housing (62) and older;
- iii. As stated by the developer, 30% of the market rate, homeownership and senior housing units be set aside as affordable for 80% and 60% AMI (15%/15%)