



Town of Griswold



28 Main Street
Griswold, CT 06351
Phone (860) 376-7060, Fax (860) 376-7070

**GRISWOLD PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARINGS & REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

OCTOBER 11, 2005

GRISWOLD TOWN HALL

I. PUBLIC HEARING (7:00 P.M.)

1. Call to order:

Chairman Clyde Seaman called this public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Members Clyde Seaman, Chair, Gail Rooke-Norman, Daniel DeGuire, Philip Anthony, Alternate Martin McKinney, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Member Roland Harris, Alternate Anne Hatfield, and ZEO Peter Zvingilas

3. Determination of Quorum:

C. Seaman appointed Alternate M. McKinney to sit for Member Roland Harris. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matter Presented for Consideration:

A. SUB 01-06 Kisilywicz, Joseph & Lisa A., 40 BMW Drive, Griswold, CT. Property location: 151 Rixtown Road. - Applicant requests approval of a 2-lot re-subdivision with a shared driveway for property located at 151 Rixtown Road. The subject property is located in the R-60 zoning district.

C. Seaman stated to let the record show that Alternate Anne Hatfield and ZEO Peter Zvingilas arrived at 7:02 p.m.

C. Seaman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. John Faulise, Boundaries LLC was present to represent the applicant. He passed out additional plans to the Commission. J. Faulise presented the green cards to the Commission. He submitted two letters to the Commission from A. Gosselin, Sanitarian for health department approval for lots 1 and 2. **EXHIBITS A & B.** He explained the proposed resubdivision to the Commission stating that a flag lot would be created from the existing lot with a shared driveway for lots 1 and 2. J. Faulise

explained that the lots meet the requirements for the R-60 zone. He gave a brief history of the lots.

J. Faulise explained that because of the way the wetlands run on the property, the driveway would run parallel with a discontinued road that was deeded to the Town of Griswold. He stated that IW&WCC approval has been granted and copies of the permits are in the file. Lot 1 has 3.85 acres and lot 2 has 3.65 acres which is well within the regulations for the R 60 zoning.

P. Anthony asked if Red Barn Road was being used. J. Faulise stated no but that it was an abutting property to the proposed lot. There was an outburst from a member of the audience. C. Seaman explained that she would be heard when the applicant has made his presentation at which time he will ask for comments from the public later.

J. Faulise explained that Red Barn Road is a cart path that runs up to Richardson Hill Road. He explained that when he was there the road was barricaded and chained off by one of the property owners. He stated that the lots were sized for four bedroom houses with septic systems with driveway accesses through a common driveway which has been done in the past in the town.

C. Seaman asked if the Rixtown Cemetery has access on Red Barn Road. J. Faulise stated yes but that the cemetery was accessed from Rixtown Road as well. M. McKinney asked how big Red Barn Road was. J. Faulise explained that it is a path for use by an ATV, more like an old logging road and that it was not for use by a car. P. Anthony asked about it being a rear lot with 51 foot frontage. J. Faulise stated yes.

P. Anthony asked D. Sorrentino for his concerns. D. Sorrentino voiced his concerns for the unusable frontage as it applied to the Subdivision Regulations. He read Section 5.2 of the Subdivision Regulations into the record and asked for the Commission's interpretation of the regulation. There was discussion of this matter including the length and location of the shared driveway.

M. McKinney asked about the area of encroachment. J. Faulise explained the encroachment by the abutting property owners; the Mains have a substantial amount of lawn in the encroachment area. A. Hatfield asked if a title search was done. J. Faulise stated that a title search was done. He explained that the abutting homeowners did not have any ownership interest. There was discussion of this matter.

J. Faulise stated that the Commission has approved similar shared driveways in the past with access other than the frontage. He explained that the driveway is on the garage side and away from the living areas of the house.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if the applicant was present. J. Faulise stated that the applicant was present. G. Rooke-Norman asked Joseph Kisilywicz if there was an adverse possession claim or a prescriptive rights claim. J. Kisilywicz stated that the Mains have acknowledged that they do not own the property and have stopped using it. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the proposed driveway is close to the house and comes within the side yard setbacks and asked why the driveway is not closer to the stone wall. J. Faulise explained that it was set back from the road for construction purposes. He stated that it would be paved for those areas exceeding 10 percent slope. There was discussion of this matter including paving the driveway of lot 2 prior to construction, the use of hay bales for erosion control during construction, and not exceeding the slope requirement of the regulations.

D. Sorrentino stated that the rear portion of the lot where most of the development will be located has slopes that exceed 20 percent and are identified as proposed limitations to development. He read pages 86 and 87 of the Plan of Conservation and Development into the record. He asked the Commission to consider the limiting factor. J. Faulise stated that they have demonstrated to the IW&WCC of the activity of the wetland and the brook to maintain the regulated area and demonstrated to the sanitarian for the well and septic system. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked what the growth of the lot was. J. Faulise stated that the lot was fully forested and he indicated the limits of clearing. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Anthony asked about the test holes. J. Faulise stated that they were approved by A. Gosselin. P. Anthony asked about ledge. J. Faulise explained the test pit data for lots one and two.

D. Sorrentino asked if there was an easement in favor of lot two over lot one. J. Faulise stated when there is an action from this board, there was an easement in favor of lot two over lot one and CL & P will identify the area for their easement. D. Sorrentino stated that the easement must be shown on the plan. He read Section 4.37 of the Subdivision regulations for the record. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked about the wetlands. J. Faulise explained the location of the wetlands to the Commission. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked for questions from the Commission. Hearing none, he asked for comments from the audience.

Michelle Audet, 77 Juniper Lane. She stated that they built that house without telling us. She stated that when the house was half built, they sent a letter saying they wanted to put a driveway in my backyard. She voiced her concerns for the lack of privacy. She explained that when they bought their home, they were guaranteed that no one would be able to build behind them. She stated that it was all wetlands behind her home in the back with the running brook.

J. Faulise explained that the brook is on the Kisilywicz property by approximately forty feet. He showed the Commission where the brook was located on the plans. He stated that the proposed house on lot 2 is 140 feet from the Audet property and the house on lot 1 is approximate 280 feet from the Audet property. M. McKinney asked where the clear cut limit was on the lot. J. Faulise stated that the IW&WCC required a clear cut limit and showed where the clear cut limit was located. He stated that the lot is all wooded with deciduous forest and some pines. There was discussion of this matter including growth in the wetlands area.

D. Sorrentino stated that he has copies of the Bay Mountain site plan from 1974. He explained this previous subdivision map to the Commission stating that it does not indicate that the lots in question were not buildable. He gave the plan to the Commission for review. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked for other comments from the audience.

Ransom Young stated that he owns property across the road. He stated that the site has been kept clean. He stated that the discontinued road should have a barrier provided by the town. He stated that he spoke to the selectmen to put up a gate across Red Barn Road. He stated that someone had removed the barrier that he put up across the road. C. Seaman stated that that matter should be brought up with the First Selectman. R. Young voiced his concerns for the proposed driveway and for the easement for Red Barn Road. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Commission does not have the jurisdiction over the discontinued road. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked for other comments from the audience.

Patricia Peltier stated that she owns the property to the south and west of the subject property and stated that she had not been notified. J. Faulise stated that he used information from the assessor's office. She explained that she wanted it to go on the record that she was not notified. There was discussion of this matter. She showed the Commission where her property was located. She stated that she did not have any comments on the proposed subdivision at this time.

C. Seaman asked for other comments from the audience.

Andre Audet stated that he was concerned with the proposed driveway along the stone wall. He stated that he could see the stone wall from his home even in the summer time and was concerned for the traffic that would be generated by the driveway. G. Rooke-Norman asked which stone wall he was talking about. He showed the Commission the stone wall in question. There was discussion of this matter including forest growth. He was concerned as well as for the lack of privacy. He suggested that they put up a barrier of arbor vitae to block the view and dampen the noise of the driveway. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked for other questions.

P. Zvingilas stated that the minimum easement width should be specified. J. Faulise stated that he would be willing to establish the easement width. There was discussion of this matter. P. Anthony asked D. Sorrentino formally address this matter of easement dimensions for future reference of base minimum requirements.

C. Seaman asked for further comments. Hearing no further comment, he closed the public hearing at 7:50 p.m.

II. PUBLIC HEARING (7:15 P.M.)

1. Call to Order

Chairman Clyde Seaman called this public hearing to order at 7:50 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Members Clyde Seaman, Chair, Gail Rooke-Norman, Daniel DeGuire, Philip Anthony, Alternates Martin McKinney, Anne Hatfield, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, ZEO Peter Zvingilas and Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Member Roland Harris

3. Determination of Quorum:

C. Seaman appointed Alternate M. McKinney to sit for Member Roland Harris. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matter Presented for Consideration

A. SE 02-06 Baron, Elias, 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold. – Property Location: 2247 Glasgo Road, Griswold, CT – Applicants request approval of a Special Exception for gravel extraction operations associated with the construction of a farm pond for agricultural use. The subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district.

C. Seaman asked if anyone was present to represent the application. Elias Baron presented his application to the Commission. C. Seaman asked for the green cards. E. Barron stated that he requested an extension because he was unable to adequately to notify his neighbors and would like another 30 days to do that. C. Seaman asked D. Sorrentino if this was correct.

D. Sorrentino stated yes, and that a written note from E. Baron was needed asking for a 30 day extension allowed by the statutes. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Commission, in the past has allowed applications to drag on month to month to month, she cautioned the applicant that all of the application must be complete when he comes before the Commission again or she would vote against the application. She stated that it was not fair to the Commission or the Townspeople. E. Baron stated that everything will be complete. He stated that he would pay any other fees required.

D. Sorrentino asked E. Baron if had just said that he would reimburse the town for the legal advertisement. E. Baron stated that he would if he needed to please the Commission, yes.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to continue this public hearing at the applicant's request to November 14, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. P. Anthony seconded the motion. C. Seaman stated that a motion has been made and seconded to continue this public hearing and asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

III. PUBLIC HEARING (7:45 P.M.)

1. Call to Order

Chairman Clyde Seaman called this public hearing to order at 7:55 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: Members Clyde Seaman, Chair, Gail Rooke-Norman, Daniel DeGuire, Philip Anthony, Alternates Martin McKinney, Anne Hatfield, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, ZEO Peter Zvingilas and Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Member Roland Harris

3. Determination of Quorum

C. Seaman appointed Alternate M. McKinney to sit for Member Roland Harris. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matter Presented for Consideration

A. SE 01-06 Franciscan Friars of the Immaculate, 199 Colonel Brown Road, Griswold. – In accordance with Section 10.6 of the Griswold Zoning Regulations, applicant requests approval of a Special Exception for construction of a bell tower in excess of 35 ft. in height. The subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district.

C. Seaman asked if there was anyone present to represent the applicant. A. Hatfield stated that she was leaving the room for the record.

Father Bonaventure McGuire was present to represent the Franciscan Friars of the Immaculate for the construction of the bell tower. He explained that they were asking for approval of the bell tower to be built and that it required a special exception because it was over the regulation height of 35 feet. Fr. McGuire stated that they were asking to go to 50 feet tall. He explained that the bell would be supported by a steel support and not by the stone structure so the vibration would be transferred to the steel support.

P. Anthony asked if the property was wooded. Fr. McGuire stated that the area is wooded. P. Anthony asked Fr. McGuire where the tower would be located. Fr. McGuire explained where the tower would be located. P. Anthony asked if the abutters were notified. Fr. McGuire stated no, he didn't think that they needed to notify the abutters. D. Sorrentino stated that a letter was sent stating when the public hearing would be and that abutters must be notified. Fr. McGuire stated that we must have misunderstood the letter. P. Anthony stated that the legal requirement is that the abutting neighbors must be notified. Fr. McGuire stated that they wanted to get the foundation in so that it could season for a few months and asked if they must wait another month. P. Anthony stated yes it is the legal guidelines for their protection.

P. Anthony asked P. Zvingilas if there was a problem and asked if he had any issues for the bell tower. P. Zvingilas stated that it was way out in the woods. C. Seaman asked about the check list form and the items that were marked not applicable. He stated that there was nothing for abutters on the checklist. D. Sorrentino explained that the form is used when the application is accepted for the materials submitted that complete the application. He stated that D. Szall sends a letter stating that abutters must be notified.

Fr. McGuire asked if the hole could be dug for the tower since they have a benefactor to dig the hole. P. Anthony asked P. Zvingilas if there was a problem with digging the hole. P. Zvingilas stated that the hole could be dug with a barrier set around the hole. There was discussion of this matter including obtaining a building permit for the hole.

C. Seaman asked about the history of the 35 foot limitation in the regulation. G. Rooke-Norman asked whether the height could be dealt with in another fashion other than a special exception. D. Sorrentino read Section 10.6 into the record. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Anthony made a motion to continue this public hearing to November 14, 2005 at 7:45 p.m. G. Rooke-Norman seconded the motion. C. Seaman stated that a motion has been made and seconded. Father Angelo stated that a special exception was granted before for the church and he asked if a new special exception was needed for each building. P. Anthony answered yes. P. Zvingilas asked if the foundation footing permit could be issued. C. Seaman stated that it could be issued. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked for further discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

IV. REGULAR MEETING (8:00 P.M.)

1. Call to order:

C. Seaman called the regular meeting to order at 8:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Members Clyde Seaman, Chair, Gail Rooke-Norman, Daniel DeGuire, Philip Anthony, Alternates Martin McKinney, Anne Hatfield, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, ZEO Peter Zvingilas and Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Member Roland Harris

3. Determination of Quorum:

C. Seaman appointed Alternate M. McKinney to sit for Member Roland Harris. There is a quorum for this public hearing. C. Seaman stated that Alternate A. Hatfield had not yet returned.

4. Approval of Minutes:

A. Approval of Minutes of the Special Meeting of August 29, 2005

C. Seaman asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of August 29, 2005. P. Anthony made a motion to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of August 29, 2005. M. McKinney seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

B. Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 12, 2005

C. Seaman asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 12, 2005. G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to approve the minutes of September 12, 2005. P. Anthony seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

5. Correspondence and Attachments:

C. Seaman stated that the correspondence is listed on the agenda and was received in our packets. He asked if any items were open for discussion. There was no discussion of the items listed.

A. Memorandum dated 9/2/05 from Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments regarding DEMHS Distribution Plan for FY 2005 Funds

B. Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual Training “New Guidance for Protecting Water Quality”, October 26, 2005 at Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, 5 Connecticut Avenue, Norwich, CT

C. Letter dated 9/27/05 from Atty. Mark Branse regarding the Polinsky settlement.

D. Letter dated 9/26/05 from Connecticut Water Company regarding receiving copies of the Commission Agendas.

6. Matters Presented for Consideration:

A. SUB 01-06 Kisilywicz, Joseph & Lisa A., 40 BMW Drive, Griswold, CT. Property location: 151 Rixtown Road. - Applicant requests approval of a 2-lot re-subdivision with a shared driveway for property located at 151 Rixtown Road. The subject property is located in the R-60 zoning district.

C. Seaman stated that this was a prior public hearing. He asked for a motion. P. Anthony stated that it is not the prettiest subdivision I have ever seen but it does meet the base requirement of the regulations and that D. Sorrentino has stated his concerns that it does not meet the regulations. D. Sorrentino stated that the Commission needed to interpret Section 5.2 regarding access and that it does not meet the Plan of Conservation and Development that addresses slopes.

D. Sorrentino stated that it does meet the requirement of a flag lot. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman voiced her concerns about the area of encroachment located on the plan and there might be a claim for the adverse possession. She stated that there should be a determination from Atty. Branse if a lot can be approved with a 50 foot strip needed to meet the frontage requirement and then that strip is taken by adverse possession, is the lot still an approved lot. There was discussion of the matter including a letter needed from the Mains stating that there was no adverse possession.

C. Seaman suggested a condition be made on the decision so that this matter need not be tabled. J. Faulise stated that according to the regulations the Commission can take technical clarification once the public hearing is closed and he asked if he could offer this advice to the Commission. C. Seaman asked the Commission if there was a problem with this offer. There were no comments from the members.

J. Faulise stated that the frontage for lot 1 is well in excess of the lot. He stated that lot 2 can be given frontage from lot 1 and the regulations would still be accommodated. J. Faulise stated that Mr. Kisilywicz does have a letter from the Mains in respect to those improvements on his property. He had approached the Mains for a release so that they would not hold him responsible for anything that occurred in that lawn area. J. Kisilywicz stated that he had a letter of release from the Mains. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated she appreciated the neighbors concerns of the woods becoming someone else's yard and that the neighbors have 1/2 acre lots and prior approval of the subdivision was in 1973 and they bought their lot in 1983 so if they had gone to P & Z they would have seen that there was a subdivision approved in their backyard prior to buying the property.

C. Seaman asked for a motion on the application. D. DeGuire made a motion to approve the application with conditions: 1. Show a minimum of 25 foot easement for CL&P, utilities and the driveway on the plan. 2. Documented letters to release any adverse possession on the encroachment. P. Anthony seconded the motion. There were 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes by G. Rooke-Norman and M. McKinney.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino to address driveways and lot slopes in the regulations. There was discussion of this matter.

B. SE 02-06 Baron, Elias, 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold. – Property Location: 2247 Glasgo Road, Griswold, CT – Applicants request approval of a Special Exception for gravel extraction operations associated with the construction of a farm pond for agricultural use. The subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district.

C. Seaman stated that this application was continued and asked for a motion to table. G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to table to the next regular meeting. P. Anthony seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

C. SE 01-06 Franciscan Friars of the Immaculate, 199 Colonel Brown Road, Griswold. – In accordance with Section 10.6 of the Griswold Zoning Regulations, applicant requests approval of a Special Exception for construction of a bell tower in excess of 35 ft. in height. The subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district.

C. Seaman stated that this application was also continued and asked for a motion to table. P. Anthony made a motion to table to the next regular meeting. G. Rooke-Norman seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

D. ZP 03-06 Przulucki, William J. 663 Voluntown Road, Griswold - Applicant requests approval for expansion of the existing retail sales and repair facility at Advanced Automotive to construct a new showroom, courtyard and associated site improvements. The subject property is located in the C-2 zoning district.

C. Seaman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. John Faulise, Boundaries LLC, was present to represent the applicant, William Przulucki, who was also present.

D. Sorrentino stated that the application should be modified to show the name of the corporation is the applicant. J. Faulise stated that William Przulucki is the sole proprietor of Jess-Shele.

J. Faulise explained that the proposed building is 4680 square foot showroom addition. J. Faulise handed plans to the Commission. He explained the existing building, associated driveways, access, and the fenced in stock area in the rear. He explained the expansion of Advanced Automotive. He explained the grading of the lot, additional paving, and addition parking spaces to accommodate the expansion of the area.

J. Faulise stated that the existing area used for display and explained that W. Przulucki is trying to acquire additional property that runs along the stone wall from the Town of Griswold and State of Connecticut along Rte 138 for a new outdoor display area. He submitted a copy a map that was submitted to CT DOT for the record. He explained that the area in front of the stone wall was a portion of Pine Road that is owned by the Town of Griswold and the State of Connecticut owns the property that adjoined Pine Road and it was taken when Rte 138 was created. **EXHIBIT A**

J. Faulise stated that the applicant would like to start construction and the plan is before the Commission with the addition, the proposed display area, and the proposed grading for that area. He stated that the stone display area will be pulled back to private property so that it does not encroach on State property. He stated that the 100 ft of the existing stone wall will be removed and reconstructed along the state right-of-way line with plantings and a paved display area behind the wall.

J. Faulise stated that A. Gosselin has reviewed the plan with a condition for the water use data and future expansion of the septic system He read the letter for the record. There was discussion of this matter.

D. DeGuire stated that there is no future use of Pine Road. J. Faulise stated that there will be no future use of Pine Road. There was discussion of this matter.

M. McKinney asked about the grading lines. He asked if it can be split off to a separate tenant. J. Faulise stated that a change of use would require a review by the Commission. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Zvingilas asked if the applicant had a commitment letter from the State of Connecticut or any other written communication. There was discussion of this matter.

D. Sorrentino stated that he has sent the plan to Atty. Mike Zizka for his review. D. Sorrentino voiced his concerns for a proposed line that does not exist and presently not owned by the applicant. He stated that the applicant should submit a revised plan showing no improvements in that area until the property is acquired from the Town and the State of Connecticut. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked what the showroom would look like. J. Faulise stated that it will look like the existing building. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked about the proposed paved display area being above the road grade. She asked about changing the grade a little and questioned the water run off to Rte 138. J. Faulise stated that it would be graded so the sheet flow and drainage would go to the existing grass area of the property and that there would be no run off to Rte 138. There was discussion of this matter including pervious pavers and drainage of the paved areas of the property.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if the walk way would be covered. J. Faulise stated that it would be a connecting corridor and showed the Commission where it would be located.

D. DeGuire asked about the lighting. J. Faulise stated that there would be lighting in harmony with exiting lighting for security purposes as it exists now.

D. Sorrentino questioned the front landscaping areas as it relates to the display area that will be very close to the front property line even when the land is acquired. He stated that it does not conform to Section 11.8.2.2a. He read Section 11.8.2.2a into the record. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Anthony questioned whether the Commission should be looking at this plan now or wait until it is a finished product. He asked the Commission for their opinion and D. Sorrentino's opinion. D. Sorrentino stated that he had no problem approving this application administratively for the revised plan showing property line in its true location and no improvements over that property line.

M. McKinney asked if there would be an increase in signage for new products. W. Przulucki stated that there would reference to the new product. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Anthony made a motion to approve. M. McKinney seconded the motion. There was discussion on the motion for the following conditions. 1. Administrative approval of the plans by the Town Planner showing everything of the whole proposed display areas within the existing property boundaries.

C. Seaman stated that a motion was made and seconded and asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

A. Hatfield returned at 8:45 p.m.

E. SE 02-06 Helminski, Gary & Vickie, 57060 Tina Marie Lane, Slidell, Louisiana. Property is located at 620 Bethel Road – Applicant requests approval to occupy a camper trailer for temporary housing due to loss of primary residence in Slidell, Louisiana from Hurricane Katrina. Property is located in the R-60 zoning district.

C. Seaman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. Frances Cremona was present to represent the applicant who was also present. She explained that her brother-in-law, Gary Helminski and his family, was staying with her from Slidell, Louisiana because they lost everything to Hurricane Katrina and they want to put a self-contained camper as temporary housing for them because her house is not big enough for all of them.

C. Seaman asked how big the lot was. F. Cremona stated that it was 3 acres. M. McKinney asked how big the trailer was. F. Cremona stated it was 37 feet. M. McKinney asked how long they would be staying there. F. Cremona stated that it would be at least six months.

C. Seaman asked P. Zvingilas if he had issued a temporary permit for six months. P. Zvingilas stated that it had not been issued yet. There was discussion of this matter.

Gary Helminski explained that he and his family were devastated by Hurricane Katrina in Slidell. He also explained that he had no income and that it would take six months or possibly a year. G. Helminski stated that things are trying to be worked out with his insurance companies. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked D. Sorrentino if this was allowed according to his interpretation of the regulations. D. Sorrentino stated that he and the zoning enforcement officer discussed this situation for Section 11.9.6 of the regulations. He read this into the record. P. Anthony stated that it addresses a hardship and is not specific. There was discussion of this matter.

M. McKinney stated that he would like to put a motion on the table to give G. Helminski a six-month zoning permit to put a mobile home on the property. P. Anthony stated that if the applicant has paid a fee, he added to the motion to reimburse the fee to the applicant. P. Anthony seconded the motion. P. Zvingilas stated that it isn't a mobile home but a camper trailer that will be winterized by professionals. P. Zvingilas stated that Sanitarian A. Gosselin reviewed it and did not have a problem with it.

C. Seaman stated that the motion has been made and seconded. He asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

7. Additional Business:

Normand Sylvestre has asked to be placed on the agenda to discuss unregistered motor vehicles.

C. Seaman stated that Mr. Sylvestre has asked to be placed on the agenda. G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to put Mr. Sylvestre on the agenda. P. Anthony seconded the motion. C. Seaman stated that a motion has been made and seconded. He asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

Normand Sylvestre stated that he has an issue with the interpretation of Section 11.17 Unregistered Motor Vehicles. He stated that the vehicles must be in a garage and if they are on the lot, they must not be visible from the road. N. Sylvestre stated that he took exception to the Town regulation of having two unregistered motor vehicles. He stated if there are two unregistered vehicles on the property by State statutes, they are operating a junk yard and must be licensed by the State.

P. Zvingilas explained the process for addressing the junk car issue working within the Town's regulations. There was lengthy discussion of this matter including enforcing the regulation, taxation of the vehicles as personal property, concerns for pollution by the vehicles, and changing Section 11.17.1 of the regulations.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino to look at what other towns' regulations are for enforcement of junk cars that the Town of Griswold can utilize. There was discussion of this matter including the number of vehicles being two.

8. Old Business

A. Berman Associates Site Plan Amendment for Pleasant View Condominiums.

D. Sorrentino stated that he met with Berman Associates and Mario Tristany. He explained to them that he required a new set of plans to review all of the proposed changes including landscaping that the Berman Associates were making to the Albemarle Pleasant View site. He stated that the plans should be ready for the November regular meeting. There was discussion of this matter.

B. Workshop for Plan of Conservation and Development.

D. Sorrentino stated that he had the land use analysis. He gave copies to the Commission. He asked that the Commission set a public hearing for the Plan of Conservation and Development. D. Sorrentino suggested a separate hearing for the plan which is 100 pages plus maps. G. Rooke-Norman stated that a large portion of the November regular meeting should be set aside to go through the document by the Commission before the public hearing for any final changes or amendments section by section. There was discussion of this matter.

There was discussion to set a date and the location for the first public hearing for the Plan of Conservation and Development for the end of November. G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to set the first public hearing for the Plan of Conservation and development for 7:00 pm on November 30, 2005. P. Anthony seconded the motion. C. Seaman stated that a motion has been made and seconded for the public hearing of the Plan of Conservation and Development on November 30, 2005.

D. Sorrentino stated that between the first public hearing and the second public hearing, the Council of Governments must review the document for consistency with the regional and State plans. There was discussion of this matter.

9. New Business:

There was no new business.

10. Reports from the Enforcement Officer:

P. Zvingilas stated that there was a problem with the driving range located on Rte 138. He stated that the CT DOT has not issued a permit for the driveway. P. Zvingilas stated that a cease and desist order was issued. P. Zvingilas stated that there also was a problem with the poles for the netting. There was lengthy discussion of this matter including having a CT DOT approval letter in the application file prior to coming before the Commission.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to change the policy to include the CT DOT permit letter to the check list. M. McKinney seconded the motion. C. Seaman stated that a motion was made and seconded. He asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

- A. Drager, Tina, 2 Pleasantview, Jewett City. – Violation of Section 10.5 Junk Yard Prohibited in all Zones.
- B. Jordan, Virginia L, c/o David Jordan, 39 Monroe Avenue, Griswold. – Violation of Section 11.17 Unregistered Motor Vehicles.
- C. Furr, James C, III, 498 Voluntown Road, Griswold. – Violation of Section 11.17 Unregistered Motor Vehicles and Section 2.2.6.1.4 Junk Yards Prohibited in All Zones.
- D. Brown, Eugene 16 Soule Street, Jewett City. – Violation of Section 10.5 Junk Yard Prohibited in all Zones.
- E. Tong, Ady Sai-Kuen, 24 Wedgewood Drive, Jewett City. – Violation of Section 10.5 Junk Yard Prohibited in all Zones.
- F. Smith, Fabiola M., 243 Taylor Hill Road, Griswold. – Violation of Section 11.17 Unregistered Motor Vehicles.

G. Drager, Leilani, 178 Ashland Street, Jewett City. – Violation of Section 10.5 Junk Yards Prohibited in All Zones.

H. Smirl, James, Trustee, 258 Taylor Hill Road, Griswold. – Violation of Section 11.17 Unregistered Motor Vehicles and Section 2.2.6.1.4 Junk Yards Prohibited in All Zones.

I. Batat, Inc. 659 Voluntown Road, Griswold. – Violation Section 15.3 Signs in Commercial and Industrial Districts.

M. McKinney asked about this matter. P. Zvingilas explained that the excessive signs have been removed and they are now in compliance. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman stated that all gas station and convenience stores were to be in compliance with the signage regulations and suggested sending a letter that the signage is in excess, that they be removed or the business would be cited. There was discussion of this matter.

J. Reilly, Jerry, 28 Alice Road, Griswold. – Violation of Section 11.11 Animals.

D. DeGuire asked about the Polinsky matter. There was discussion of this matter.

11. Adjournment:

C. Seaman asked for a motion to adjourn. P. Anthony made a motion to adjourn. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary