
The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the Connecticut Law Journal or the date it was released as a slip opinion. The operative date for the beginning of all time periods for filing postopinion motions and petitions for certification is the “officially released” date appearing in the opinion. In no event will any such motions be accepted before the “officially released” date.

All opinions are subject to modification and technical correction prior to official publication in the Connecticut Reports and Connecticut Appellate Reports. In the event of discrepancies between the electronic version of an opinion and the print version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest print version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears on the Commission on Official Legal Publications Electronic Bulletin Board Service and in the Connecticut Law Journal and bound volumes of official reports are copyrighted by the Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, and may not be reproduced and distributed without the express written permission of the Commission on Official Legal Publications, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut.

SCHALLER, J., dissenting. I respectfully disagree with the majority's conclusion that the phrase "medical, dental or similar health-oriented" offices in chapter 60, article X, § 60-10.1 (B) of the New Canaan zoning regulations includes a veterinary facility. Although I agree generally with the rationale expressed in Justice Zarella's dissent, I write separately to emphasize that the key term in the regulation is not "health-oriented" standing alone, which can apply broadly to animals as well as humans, but "similar health-oriented" which, in my view, restricts the permitted uses to human health-oriented applications. (Emphasis added.) Even if, as the majority asserts in footnote 9 of its opinion, the terms "medical" and "dental" are not strictly limited to human health purposes (although it would be unusual to refer to an office for *animal* dentistry), medical and/or dental offices for *veterinary* purposes certainly are not similar to human health care facilities in common parlance and understanding. I believe that a reasonable interpretation of the language of the regulation indicates that it is restricted to health-oriented offices for the care of humans. See *ATC Partnership v. Coats North America Consolidated, Inc.*, 284 Conn. 537, 545, 935 A.2d 115 (2007) ("[i]n construing a statute, common sense must be used and courts must assume that a reasonable and rational result was intended" [internal quotation marks omitted]).

For the foregoing reasons, I respectfully dissent.
