

176 Conn. App. 570 SEPTEMBER, 2017 613

St. Joseph's High School, Inc. v. Planning &amp; Zoning Commission

In addition, the commission heard testimony specifically addressing the character of the abutting residential neighborhood and the quality of life of its residents.<sup>30</sup> Helga Beloin, who stated that she lives across the street from the Shahs, explained to commission members how the proposed use would adversely affect the quality of life for nearby residents. She recounted her firsthand experience with noise emissions, parking problems, loitering, and disruptive behavior in the neighborhood on days when major sporting events are held at the school. Although she tolerated such activity during the daytime, she explained why allowing that activity at night would harm her and other neighbors, stating that when the evening “rolls around, it’s over. . . . [W]e’re all getting ready for bed . . . it’s quiet [and] we can do it . . . . We retired for the night, went to bed, started our new day, you know, refreshed from a good night’s sleep. And now that’s going to be impossible.”

Adverse impact on property values was also a significant concern of abutting property owners.<sup>31</sup> During his

<sup>30</sup> As Lawrence Ganum, who also lives near the school, told commission members, his family “moved here for a reason, for a certain quality of life,” and, after noting the problems of noise emissions and loitering in his neighborhood, stated that the proposed use would have “a massive impact on a very quiet, peaceful and comfortable neighborhood.”

Karen Draper, a neighbor of the Shahs, testified that the proposed use “will affect the enjoyment of my property, it will increase the amount of loitering at the end of [her street], and will add a considerable amount of traffic.” Jeffrey W. Strouse stated that he and his neighbors were “just trying to protect the value of our land and the quality of our lives.” Alluding to the various conditions of approval proposed by the school, Robert Haymond, another resident, stated: “I’d just like to ask, why limit the days of the week? Why turn down the lights? Why agree to turn them off early?” Haymond then answered his own question: “[T]he reason is, because they affect the community.”

<sup>31</sup> In his remarks, another resident who lives near the school, whom the record identifies only as S. Edelman, opined that the proposed use would cause “major housing depreciation . . . . [There are] about [six to seven] houses; they are exposed to [the school]. Those [six to seven] houses, they also have neighbors, they have houses across the street. You bring the price of one house down, exponentially, the whole neighborhood will go down. People, when they [consider purchasing a home] nowadays, they look at

NOTE: These pages (176 Conn. App. 613 and 614) are in replacement of the same numbered pages that appear in the Connecticut Law Journal of 19 September 2017.

614 SEPTEMBER, 2017 176 Conn. App. 570

---

St. Joseph's High School, Inc. v. Planning & Zoning Commission

---

rebuttal, Rizio stated that “there was no evidence at all put forth with regard to housing, depreciation of housing values.” It nonetheless remained the burden of his client, as the applicant requesting a special permit, to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the commission that its application fully complied with the general standards contained in Article XV, including those concerning the impact on property values. *Loring v. Planning & Zoning Commission*, supra, 287 Conn. 778 (*Norcott, J.*, dissenting). During the public hearing, the school provided no evidence whatsoever on that issue, only Rizio’s bald assertion that the proposed use “will have no impact on the neighborhood . . . .” Moreover, the commission heard ample testimony about the adverse impact that moving major sporting events at the school from daytime to nighttime would have on the adjacent residential area. In addition, several neighbors opined that the proposed use would detrimentally affect their property values, the character of their neighborhood, and their quality of life. The commission, as arbiter of credibility, was “entitled to credit the testimony and evidence adduced during the [public hearing] in arriving at its ultimate conclusion” as to compliance with the requirements of the regulations. *Children’s School, Inc. v. Zoning Board of Appeals*, supra, 66 Conn. App. 630; see also *Hayes Family Ltd. Partnership v. Town Plan & Zoning Commission*, 115 Conn. App. 655, 662, 974 A.2d 61 (denial of special permit upheld when “evidence was presented that the plaintiffs’ proposal would directly impact neighboring residential properties not only by way of increased noise and traffic, but also in that it would adversely affect their property values”), cert.

---

what’s the house [values] on each of the lanes. They don’t pay attention that this house has a flaw in terms of being exposed, they look at that one price and the whole neighborhood will come down.” On a similar note, Jeffrey W. Strouse reminded the commission that a principal purpose of the regulations, memorialized in the preamble thereto, was “to preserve and protect” property values. Trumbull Zoning Regs., art. I, § 1. In his view, the school’s application was likely to damage the value of neighboring residential properties.

176 Conn. App. 570                      SEPTEMBER, 2017                      615

St. Joseph's High School, Inc. v. Planning & Zoning Commission

denied, 293 Conn. 919, 979 A.2d 489 (2009). In exercising its discretion over whether the general standards of Article XV sufficiently were met, the commission could have concluded, on the record before it, that the school had not established that the proposed use would not adversely affect neighboring property values, the character of the adjacent neighborhood, or the quality of life of its residents.

### C

#### Conclusion

Under the substantial evidence standard that governs challenges to commission determinations, the commission's decision "must be sustained if an examination of the record discloses evidence that supports any one of the reasons given." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Rural Water Co. v. Zoning Board of Appeals*, supra, 287 Conn. 294. "The question is not whether [a reviewing court] would have reached the same conclusion but whether the record before the [commission] supports the decision reached." *Burnham v. Planning & Zoning Commission*, 189 Conn. 261, 265, 455 A.2d 339 (1983). A zoning commission has discretion to determine whether a proposal satisfies the requirements for a special permit; *Irwin v. Planning & Zoning Commission*, supra, 244 Conn. 628; and judicial review is confined to the question of whether the commission abused its discretion in finding that an applicant failed to demonstrate compliance therewith. In the present case, testimonial and documentary evidence exists in the record on which the commission could have found that the school did not demonstrate compliance with the general standards of Article XV in multiple respects. The Superior Court, therefore, improperly sustained the plaintiffs' appeal in part.

The judgment is reversed and the case is remanded with direction to dismiss the plaintiffs' appeal.

In this opinion the other judges concurred.

NOTE: These pages (176 Conn. App. 615 and 616) are in replacement of the same numbered pages that appear in the Connecticut Law Journal of 19 September 2017.