



Town of Griswold



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

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

MARCH 14, 2005

GRISWOLD TOWN HALL

I. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Call to Order

Gail Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair, called the public hearing to order at 6:31 pm

2. Roll Call

Present: Gail Rooke-Norman, Roland Harris, Phillip Anthony, Alternates Anne Hatfield, Martin McKinney, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, Town Planner, Demian Sorrentino, Recording Secretary, Donna Szall

Absent: Paul Wolinski, Clyde Seaman, and Daniel DeGuire

3. Determination of Quorum

G. Rooke-Norman appointed Anne Hatfield to sit for Clyde Seaman and Martin McKinney to sit for Daniel DeGuire. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matters Presented for Consideration

ZC 02-05 Griswold Industrial Development Commission, 28 Main St., Jewett City, CT
– Applicants request approval of a text amendment to the Griswold Zoning Regulations which creates a BP – Business Park zoning classification and other associated bulk regulation amendments regarding said zoning classification.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. Michael Zizka was present to represent the IDC. He stated that this was an amended application.

M. Zizka outlined the changes to the application: 1) Section 8.1 he stated that the phrase “environmentally friendly” had been removed. He explained that the term “environmentally friendly” was vague and difficult to enforce but that that phrase was put back into the text. 2) He stated that government offices were moved from special exception to permitted uses to give more **flexibility**. 3) He stated that warehouses was moved from permitted uses to special exception. 4) He explained the changes to Section 8.5.1 regarding the creation of new lots after the effective date of the Business Park district requires frontage on, or a recorded easement for access to a state highway or an internal roadway that is constructed after the establishment of the

Business Park district. He read this section into the record for internal roadways according to the Griswold Road Ordinance. M. Zizka explained the term new lots and 5) M. Zizka explained 8.5.2 regarding previously existing lots and new lots that are created which addressed 20 vehicular trips per day, as determined by a certified traffic engineer.

M. Zizka stated that the items chosen were those that the Commission was comfortable and wanted changed to establish a business park. Thomas Giard, Chair of the IDC stated that the IDC took the Commission's ideas, advice and directions to address the changes that would benefit the community.

A. Hatfield stated that research and development was still a permitted use in Section 8.3.3. M. Zizka explained that one individual spoke to the issue and it was not clear that it was a consensus of Commission; and as a business park district, it is important to be able to attract business to the district. A. Hatfield asked about the language that would be "environmentally friendly". M. Zizka stated that better language that is less vague and speaks specifically to an issue. There was discussion of this matter as a purpose statement rather than a standard.

R. Harris questioned the 20 vehicular trips per day in the Access Section. M. Zizka explained that more than 20 trips a day would require the town road would need to be upgraded. There was discussion of this matter as it related to existing lots and new lots.

G. Rooke-Norman asked about the road dimensions that was brought up at the last hearing and whether the current Town Road Ordinance addressed the road widths for trailer truck turnaround and internal roads. D. Sorrentino stated that the Griswold Road Ordinance has a 20-foot wide travel and a 50-foot wide right of way that are minimum standards. There is nothing that would keep a developer from making a wider road. There was discussion of this matter. M. Zizka read 8.5.2 to the Commission regarding the 20 vehicular trips per day. There was further discussion of this matter.

M. Zizka stated that regardless of the zoning, if an individual feels the regulation is too restrictive, a variance can be obtained. There was discussion of the existing lots and property owners and reasonable use. M. Zizka 8.2.4 the town could close a road to excessive for high traffic from the business park. G. Rooke-Norman asked if there was only one access from a lot, how could the town close the road. M. Zizka stated that the road could not be closed. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman questioned that businesses could be flourishing on back roads that would create excessive vehicular traffic. M. Zizka stated that the properties in a business park district should be used for business. P. Anthony asked that a predominately residential road with a landowner with 200 acres becomes part of the business park and cannot restrict full use of this property where does it go from there. M. Zizka stated that there was no precedents set on the matter except that for existing town roads are zoned residential and the uses proposed would require an upgraded town road. There was discussion of this matter.

R. Harris asked if a road is built by a business that exceeds the 20 vehicular trips and upgrades the road, then everyone else would benefit with the new road. M. Zizka stated that there is state

law that includes provisions for towns to require that residents along the road to pay a fair percentage of the cost for upgrading the road. There was discussion of this matter.

R. Harris asked if these regulations were designed for this specific site. M. Zizka stated no, the regulations if adopted determines whether any particular piece of land would be suitable in town. R. Harris asked what if there was another piece of land being less cumbersome. M. Zizka stated that there would be the same problems no matter where the land was located. There was discussion of this matter.

A. Hatfield was concerned about 8.5.2 stating that any lot proposed use with the possibility of 20 one-acre lots with 20 trips per day. M. Zizka agreed that this could be so and addressed the existing lots with reasonable use of property. There was discussion of this matter.

A. Hatfield questioned the expense of the commercial use. M. Zizka stated that with state law when a town improves utilities they have the ability to use the assessment power to have those who benefit from that improvement rather than the whole town. A. Hatfield was concerned that the residents would be forced to pay for the commercial upgrade. M. Zizka stated that it would be the developer that would pay the expense of upgrading the road. He stated that this was a mechanism the town could use. There was discussion of this matter.

A. Hatfield asked for Atty. Ochsner's opinion of the regulations. Atty. Ronald Ochsner of Branse & Willis stated that the regulations appeared to be good business park regulations. He stated that limiting traffic usage to 20 trips per day that don't front on a state highway is a reasonable regulation. Atty. Ochsner stated that it is the Commission's decision as to what would be proper.

G. Rooke Norman asked about the issue that the applicant is trying make lots that don't front on a state highway, what is the frequency of your experience of seeing this type of effort to allow property that does not front on as state road to use internal town roads. She asked if he had any suggestions. Atty. Ochsner stated that he has had experience with industrial operations located in residential areas that had an excess of large trucks. The restriction of 20 vehicles per day of usage by that owner when it is spread out over an 8-hour workday is not that excessive. There was discussion of this matter that including efforts to enforce or police the 20 trips per day.

D. Sorrentino stated that the IDC would consider the placement of the lots in the business park zone that would require a minimum lot of 60,000 square feet that would include impervious surfaces, parking and landscaping.

G. Rooke-Norman had a question on Section 8.5.2 about needing definitions of lots. M. Zizka stated that it would be the Commission's definition. G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino the definition of a lot. D. Sorrentino read the definition of a lot to the commission. There was further discussion of definitions.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for further comments from the Commission. She stated that she would ask for comments from the public. She addressed the ground rules that 1) everyone would have an opportunity to speak once before taking a second comment from anyone, 2) She stated that she would like to here comments from people who are in favor of the change and then from people who would not be in favor of it.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this was for the text amendment only and asked for anyone wanting to speak in favor of this application.

Atty. Tim Bates of Robinson & Cole handed information (Exhibit 1) to the Commission and was there to testify on behalf of his client Harvey Polinsky and speak in favor of the text change. He addressed the Commission stating that he felt the Commission should adopt the text change regardless of who owned the property. He addressed the issues of warehousing as a specially permitted use. He addressed the local roads issue to allow provision for smaller developments. He stated that large-scale development should not be channeled on residential streets. He suggested that a traffic report be obtained for the zone for traffic safety and flow in residential neighborhoods. He cited examples of uses for isolated parcels. Tim Bates addressed road access and enforcement of vehicular trips and suggested a vehicular log and special permits to the Commission. There was discussion of this matter.

T. Bates assured the Commission that his client does not see this text change as an end to his personal problems. He also stated that this is not a get rich quick scheme as a commercial property and that there are fewer people who want to develop commercial property.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for other comments in favor of this change. She asked for comments against the change.

Joseph Foy, 203 Geer Road, gave his concerns against this change. He read that on 8.2 to add that no land be obtained by eminent domain to be transferred to any individual or company. He added 8.3.5 that senior housing and/or condos be added. He stated that 8.4.1.2 for warehousing and distribution center to be deleted.

Phil Perreault, 157 Geer Road, he asked what criteria T. Giard used to acquire this location rather than another location. He was concerned that this will affect 100 or more people. He asked if this would become an I district. T. Giard addressed what the proposal was based upon and where the zone would be. He explained the floating zone concept to the public. He explained that the town planner in conjunction with the IDC developed the text with the town attorney. The text was developed for any location in the community that would meet the criteria. T. Giard explained how the IDC worked to bring business to the community. P. Perreault voiced his concerns that this text change would not decrease property taxes since taxes never go down and that it would adversely impact the people living there.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for anyone who wanted to address the text change only.

Frank Rogers, 587 Hopeville Road stated that Section 8.5.1 about the roads exiting on to a state highway or an internal roadway, and internal roadways that intersect an internal road or state highway. He cited Bishop's Crossing road as an internal road to the business park. M. Zizka explained that no business could use that road with more than 20 vehicular trips per day. M. Zizka read Section 8.5.3 into the record about emergency vehicle access only. There was discussion of this matter.

Ed Burdick, Town of Griswold, stated he was concerned with the definition of trips and whether it included employees. He stated that environmentally friendly as a statement of purpose and it

should be fleshed out to have more substance. E. Burdick stated that he is for a business park in Griswold and applauds the efforts of the IDC and Tom Giard.

Sheila Osko, 149 Geer Road, she had concerns with the enforcement of the 20 vehicular trips per day. She asked who would enforce any fines. She stated that when the state police are called, they state that it is not their matter. S. Osko stated that Geer Road is not a safe road now and was concerned for the safety of the children and the residents of the area. She asked the Commission to consider the residents safety as part of the regulations.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for any other comments.

Robert Osko, 149 Geer Road, stated that the statement made for access to a state highway troubled him. He posed the question of which state highway would be used for access; was it for Route 395 only, or Route 12, or Route 201. R. Osko also was concerned for the noise and the pollution and water and sewer. He also stated that Geer Road was a dangerous road; and stated that if he had know that before, he would not have moved there. He asked if there was another location that would have less impact.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for any other comments.

Pamela Reinholtz, 180 Pleasant View, she submitted a letter to the Commission (Exhibit 2). She stated that the intersections of Route 138 and 164 are potentially impacted by these regulations. She read her primary concerns for the safety of the schools from hazardous waste, medical waste and explosive substances. She stated that the definition of warehouse was vague. P. Reinholtz read the Town of Salem regulations into the record concerning trucking terminals. She stated that it needed to be identified and the number of vehicles should be limited for usage. P. Reinholtz read the Town of East Lyme regulations into the record concerning uses that are not dangerous or noxious or objectionable feature as measured at the nearest property line added to the regulations to protect residents who want to stay on their property.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for further comments from the public. She asked for any comments from the Commission. A. Hatfield asked what were Atty. Ochsner's views on the recommended changes to the regulations. R. Ochsner stated that he felt that the definitions were an important aspect of regulations. R. Ochsner stated that he would write his recommendations to the Commission. He gave his opinion regarding eminent domain stating that eminent domain is currently before the Federal courts and should not show up in a zoning regulation.

A. Hatfield asked that Atty. Ochsner's memo address the environmental issues that were raised. P. Anthony stated that he would like to see more specifics in the definitions. M. McKinney stated that he had concerns for warehouses that could house chemicals. D. Sorrentino stated that the regulations do speak specifically to prohibited uses in Section 2.2.6. He read the prohibited uses into the record. D. Sorrentino stated that he had referenced state and federal statutes that prohibit specific chemicals.

Joseph Foy explained that he is not against eminent domain and reiterated his suggestion regarding eminent domain. He also stated that there should be a p.a. system in the room so that

people in the back of the room or who are hard of hearing can hear what is going on. G. Rooke-Norman suggested that he speak to the First Selectman, Mr. Brycki.

T. Giard asked if the Commission would give some directions to go further to make changes to the text proposal. G. Rooke-Norman stated that we could discuss this during the regular meeting and not at the public hearing. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Commission has received a lot of information. She closed this public hearing at 8:17 pm.

G. Rooke-Norman called for a three-minute recess.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Call to Order

Gail Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair, called the public hearing to order at 8:24 pm

2. Roll Call

Present: Gail Rooke-Norman, Roland Harris, Phillip Anthony, Alternates Anne Hatfield, Martin McKinney, Paul Wolinski, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, Town Planner, Demian Sorrentino, Recording Secretary, Donna Szall

Absent: Clyde Seaman, and Daniel DeGuire

3. Determination of Quorum

G. Rooke-Norman stated that before we go forward, she would recuse herself from the discussion of this property. P. Anthony also recused himself from this application.

G. Rooke-Norman appointed Roland Harris as acting chair for this application. R. Harris appointed Paul Wolinski to sit for Daniel DeGuire, Anne Hatfield to sit for Clyde Seaman and Martin McKinney to sit for G. Rooke-Norman. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matters Presented for Consideration

ZC 03-05 Griswold Industrial Development Commission, 28 Main St., Jewett City, CT – Applicants request approval of a map amendment to the Town of Griswold Zoning Map which would change the zoning classification of 20 properties in the vicinity of Exit 86 from R40, R60 and R80 to BP – Business Park.

Atty. M. Zizka stated to the Commission that the applicant must withdraw this application for the map amendment. He explained that because the Commission is considering substantial changes to the text amendment from the way it was originally drafted, it creates a notice problem to the public. There was discussion of this matter. R. Harris asked for advice from counsel. R. Harris

made a motion to close the public hearing. M. McKinney seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Call to Order

G. Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair, called this public hearing to order at 8:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: Gail Rooke-Norman, Roland Harris, Phillip Anthony, Alternates Anne Hatfield, Martin McKinney, Paul Wolinski, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Clyde Seaman, and Daniel DeGuire

3. Determination of Quorum

G. Rooke-Norman appointed Anne Hatfield to sit for Daniel DeGuire and Martin McKinney to sit for Clyde Seaman. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matters Presented for Consideration

SE 03-05 Baron, Elias, 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold, CT – Property Location: 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold, CT - Applicant requests approval of a Special Exception for gravel extraction operations associated with the removal of a hill at the rear of the property for future use as an agricultural field. The subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. John Casey, Robinson & Cole, represented the applicant.

J. Casey stated that the applicant is going to withdraw this application at this time. G. Rooke-Norman thanked J. Casey and asked if something will be submitted for the record. J. Casey stated that he will submit something in writing for the record.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion to close this public hearing. P. Anthony so moved. R. Harris seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Call to Order

G. Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair, called this public hearing to order at 8:31 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: Gail Rooke-Norman, Roland Harris, Phillip Anthony, Alternates Anne Hatfield, Martin McKinney, Paul Wolinski, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, Town Planner, Demian Sorrentino, Recording Secretary, Donna Szall

Absent: Clyde Seaman, and Daniel DeGuire

3. Determination of Quorum

G. Rooke-Norman appointed Anne Hatfield to sit for Daniel DeGuire and Martin McKinney to sit for Clyde Seaman. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matters Presented for Consideration

SE 02-05 Baron, Elias, 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold, CT – 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-60/R-80 zoning districts.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. John Casey, Robinson & Cole was present to represent the applicant Elias Baron. He stated that because of the use of Mr. Baron's personal driveway, the Commission asked that the applicant provide personal notice to people who were not notified. He submitted the green cards for the record. (Exhibit 1)

J. Casey explained that the application is for a 2.7-acre farm pond on 91 acres. He stated that there is 7.5 acres around the pond. J. Casey stated that they are waiting for the Eastern Connecticut Conservation District report that had only minor changes to the erosion and sedimentation control measures and that the application compiles with the regulations. He asked the Commission to hold this hearing open pending the filing of this endorsement. J. Casey introduced Charles Camp, the land surveyor, to speak to the Commission.

Charles Camp, Cooperative Land Surveyors of Greenville, RI, addressed the Commission to explain the site plan. He submitted a narrative to the Commission. (Exhibit 2). He submitted plans to the Commission (Exhibit 3) and he explained sheet two which showed an intercept swale as an erosion control measure that would be in place for the two years of this project along with other changes including silt fence and a water tank for the farm animals. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Camp explained the area map on sheet 3 and the proposed lease area. He stated that he did an A-2 perimeter survey around the lease area. He stated that it would satisfy the A-2 requirement for the activity. He stated that if it does not, the applicant would still seek a waiver. He explained how the materials would be removed from the site via E. Baron's driveway and stated that there are two letters in the file from E. Baron and Connecticut Department of Transportation that address this matter. C. Camp stated that it would take two years. There was discussion of this matter that included the 2-year limit for a gravel extraction permit.

J. Casey explained the lease area qualifies for A-2 standards and stated that there is a request for a waiver for the A-2 survey for the entire parcel that was submitted at the 1/24/05 public hearing.

He stated that the regulations were ambiguous in their description. D. Sorrentino read the regulation into the record regarding site plans conforming to an A-2 survey. There was lengthy discussion of this matter regarding A-2 surveys for the property and the driveway access.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino when this application was submitted. D. Sorrentino explained the time-line of two postponements and a public hearing in January in reference to this application. She asked J. Casey that the applicant is asking to continue this hearing. J. Casey stated that he is asking for a continuance and explained the reasons for the continuance. There was lengthy discussion of this matter

P. Anthony raised the question about CDOT approval. C. Camp stated that CDOT did not have a problem with the entrance onto Rte 201 of truck traffic. There was lengthy discussion of truck traffic and use of the driveway as access.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Commission as been waiting for a completed application and asked when the approval request from Eastern Connecticut Conservation District was made. C. Camp stated that it was requested two weeks ago. R. Harris stated that the CDOT letter was not a permit. Elias Baron addressed the Commission stating that Mr. Bernier from CDOT stated to him that he did not see a problem using his driveway. There was discussion of this matter including the CDOT letters addressing signage and the work schedule.

M. Martin had concerns for the agricultural use and that the animals cannot get to the pond. C. Camp explained that the review agency suggested putting remote wells to water the animals so they do not create turbidity in the pond. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked how many yards of material would be removed. C. Camp stated that there would be 140,000 to 175,000 yards of material being removed. There was lengthy discussion of the number of trips for material removal.

G. Rooke-Norman asked where the water was coming from. C. Camp stated that the pond would be ground-fed and that test holes were done and that there may be seepage as well. R. Harris asked how the project would be dewatered. C. Camp stated that dirt bags would be used and building temporary measures to divert the water. There was discussion of this matter including sloping and excavation areas

R. Harris asked about the bond estimate. D. Sorrentino stated that there is a bond letter in the file. C. Camp stated that there was a bond estimated submitted. There was discussion of the restoration bond estimate as well and discussion of DEP involvement and review by the Army Corps of Engineers and recommendations by the Eastern Connecticut Conservation District.

E. Baron explained that the pond would be used for agricultural use as a hobby farm and gave a lengthy description of how it would be used by his family. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked about the bond estimate's rate for square footage. C. Camp stated that the estimate was for 35 cents per square foot. There was discussion of this matter and the actual cost of the bond.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were further questions from the Commission. He asked for comments in favor of the proposed pond.

Mary Bentley, 2216 Glasgo Road, stated that she and her family were in favor of keeping the area as rural as possible. She did voice her concerns for the truck traffic that this pond would create. She was concerned that the notification she received was different from what her neighbors received. She stated that she did not receive an amended narrative and map with the new entrance site. She was concerned with the length of time that this project would take. She was concerned with the size of the trucks and the number of trucks that will be used and who would be responsible for policing the operation. She stated that what she has seen on paper is very different from what she has heard tonight.

J. Casey asked if the Commission would like responses one a time or wait to hear the responses at the end. G. Rooke-Norman stated that she would hear all the comments from the public and then hear the responses as the end.

D. Sorrentino stated that he had a letter from Lisa and Scott Marsie, 2280 Glasgo Road, (Exhibit 4); he submitted letter into the record. G. Rooke-Norman stated that there were other letters in the file and asked if each should be read. D. Sorrentino stated that you could incorporate them by reference. G. Rooke-Norman stated that they would be incorporated by reference. (Exhibit 5)

Lisa Marsie, Glasgo Road, stated that she had voiced her concerns for the truck traffic that would be created. She felt that the road is too narrow to accommodate the trucks making turns onto the road. She was also concerned that the pond would affect area wells. R. Harris stated that DEP would issue a permit. P. Anthony asked if the Inland Wetlands reviewed it. D. Sorrentino stated that a declaratory ruling was issued that no work was in a regulated. There was discussion of the hydraulic movement in the area and permit requirements.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were other comments.

Ann Norwalk, President of Avalonia Land Conservancy. She was concerned for the turbidity of the water is held within so that it will not go into Billings Brook. She voiced her concerns for silt fences and hay bales for erosion and sedimentation controls that will be used for the whole sloped area that the runoff channel in the southwest corner of the area. She stated that she was concerned with the truck traffic for the residents. She also stated that she did not receive an amended map or amended narrative A. Norwalk voiced her concerns for the time frame of the project. She stated that in creating one habitat, another habitat is being destroyed.

Vickie Connor, Voluntown and Avalonia Land Conservancy, stated that she works next to the proposed project. She handed out a brochure for Avalonia Land Conservancy. She stated that the area is a flooded plain for wildlife habitat. It acts as a sponge to hold water in times of drought and that this area provides water in times of drought to fill wells. She asked the Commission to look at how the pond will affect the homes on top of the hill.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were other comments.

Johanna Patucki, Glasgo Road, She was concerned about the trucking and her concerns about the hours of the trucks. She was concerned for the safety of the children. D. Sorrentino read the zoning regulations for hours of operation into the record. E. Baron stated that the hours would be from 7 am to 5 pm. in consideration of his neighbors.

G. Rooke-Norman asked that the revised plan be given to the Commission. She asked if the declaratory ruling was for the old plan or the revised plan. J. Casey stated that based on creating a 2.7-acre farm pond. The plans were slightly different but the use remains the same. G. Rooke-Norman asked if the configuration of the boundary remains the same. C. Camp stated that the configuration remains the same and the proximity to the wetlands remains the same. She stated that if the plan has change, that it should go before the Conservation Commission. There was further discussion of this matter.

Tim Bates of Robinson & Cole, stated that M. Schaefer, Soil Scientist, made the statement in his report because Billings Brooks has a year-round, constant flow and that the brook feeds the water table in the area so the creation of the pond would not affect the wells.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that there was a question asked why the silt fences were not included in the rear portion. C. Camp explained to the Commission where the additional silt fences would be added according to the Conservation districts recommendations. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for any other comments or questions from the Commission members. J. Casey stated that the Bentleys received their personal notice for the January hearing. J. Casey stated that they crossed noticed everyone for this hearing that the field application had been withdrawn so the Bentleys received no mention of the waiver request.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Commission has conducted this hearing over many months. She asked for a motion to either continue this hearing or to close it. The applicant has asked for it to be continued. D. Sorrentino stated the hearing could be continued with the consent of the applicant, the Commission would make the decision and the applicant would consent to it There was discussion of the time limits.

P. Anthony made a motion to continue the hearing at the applicant's request and he cautioned the applicant to get all his duck in line because the board is getting impatient. G. Rooke-Norman stated that there is a motion to continue the public hearing and asked for a date and time. There was discussion of this matter and questioned J. Casey regarding the request for a waiver of the A-2 survey. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a second on the motion. A. Hatfield stated that a date and time is needed. G. Rooke-Norman stated that we have a motion continue the application to April 11, 2005 at 7:20 pm. She asked for a second on the motion. Hearing no second on the motion, R. Harris made a motion to close the public hearing. M. McKinney seconded the motion. There were 4 ayes and 1 nay by P. Anthony. G. Rooke-Norman closed the public hearing at 9:45 pm.

V. REGULAR MEETING

1. Call to Order

Gail Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 9:47 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: Gail Rooke-Norman, Roland Harris, Phillip Anthony, Alternates Anne Hatfield, Martin McKinney, Paul Wolinski, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, Town Planner, Demian Sorrentino, Recording Secretary, Donna Szall

Absent: Clyde Seaman, and Daniel DeGuire

3. Determination of Quorum:

G. Rooke-Norman appointed A. Hatfield to sit for D. DeGuire and appointed M. McKinney to sit for C. Seaman. There is a quorum for this regular meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes:

G. Rooke-Norman asked for approval of the minutes of the regular meeting. R. Harris made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 14, 2005 meeting. P. Anthony seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for approval of the public hearings held on February 14, 2005. P. Anthony made a motion to approve the minutes of the public hearings held on February 14, 2005. M. McKinney seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

5. Correspondence and Attachments:

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino to read the correspondence and attachments into the record. D. Sorrentino stated that he had attended the appeal of Reinholtz v. P & Z et. al. He stated that the Judge will be rendering a decision on that appeal.

6. Matters Presented for Consideration:

A. SE 04-05 Rodriguez, Nelson, 91 Dawley Road, Griswold, CT – Property location: 1071 Voluntown Road, Griswold, CT – Applicant request approval of a Special Exception for creation of a golf driving range. Subject property is located in the C-2 zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this requires a public hearing. D. Sorrentino stated it does require a public hearing as a special exception application. R. Harris made a motion to schedule the public hearing for April 11, 2005 at 7:20 pm. M. McKinney seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

B. B. ZC 02-05 Griswold Industrial Development Commission, 28 Main St., Jewett City, CT – Applicants request approval of a text amendment to the Griswold Zoning Regulations

which creates a BP – Business Park zoning classification and other associated bulk regulation amendments regarding said zoning classification.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this was the subject of an earlier public hearing that was closed. She stated that the Commission received additional materials and would like time to review the changes. R. Harris made a motion to table the application to the next regularly scheduled meeting on April 11, 2005. M. McKinney seconded the motion. D. Sorrentino stated that there was 65 days from this evening to render a decision. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

C. ZC 03-05 Griswold Industrial Development Commission, 28 Main St., Jewett City, CT – Applicants request approval of a map amendment to the Town of Griswold Zoning Map which would change the zoning classification of 20 properties in the vicinity of Exit 86 from R40, R60 and R80 to BP – Business Park.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this is the application that was withdrawn. The Commission acknowledges the withdrawal and no further action is necessary on this matter.

D. SE 03-05 Baron, Elias, 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold, CT – Property Location: 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold, CT - Applicant requests approval of a Special Exception for gravel extraction operations associated with the removal of a hill at the rear of the property for future use as an agricultural field. The subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this was the subject of a withdrawal. The Commission acknowledges the withdrawal and no further action is necessary on this matter.

E. SE 02-05 Baron, E. Family Trust, 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold, CT – 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-60/R-80 zoning districts.

R. Harris stated that he would like to make a motion to deny. D. Sorrentino stated that the applicant has just noted that they would like to withdraw. There was discussion of this matter. R. Harris withdrew his motion. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the applicant has indicated that they would like to withdraw this application at this time, therefore the Commission acknowledges the withdrawn without prejudice and no further action is necessary on this matter.

F. SUB 10-05 822 Voluntown Road, LLC, 76 Salem Turnpike, Norwich, CT. Property Location: 822 Voluntown Road (Route 138). – Applicants request approval of a 7-lot re-subdivision and construction of 1000 linear feet of new roadway. Subject property is located in the C-1 zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this application requires a public hearing. D. Sorrentino stated that it does require a public hearing. There was discussion of the time and date. P. Anthony made a motion to set a public hearing for April 11, 2005 at 6:50 p.m. R. Harris seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

G. SUB 11-05 Langlois, Brian & Brittany, 15 George Street, Apt. 25, Jewett City, CT – Property location: 176 Norman Road, Griswold, CT – Applicants request approval of a one-lot subdivision for a proposed building lot. Subject property is located in the R-60 zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if this was a re-subdivision. There was discussion of this matter of the odd-shaped lot and a free split. G. Rooke-Norman asked if anyone was present to represent the application. Eric Seitz, Land surveyor was present to represent Richard Geer and Brian and Brittany Langlois.

P. Anthony asked D. Sorrentino if there were any problems D. Sorrentino stated that it meets all the zoning regulations and it will still be considered an interior lot. P. Anthony asked if the sanitarian had been consulted. E. Seitz stated yes.

R. Harris made a motion to approve. P. Anthony seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman questioned that the lot was from the 35.3 acre parcel and looks like it was pulled from two parcels. E. Seitz stated that and he stated that he took some property from one parcel and some property from the other parcel. He explained page 3 of the site plan of how the property was divided with the rest of the property as remaining land. There was discussion of this matter including free splits, one-lot subdivisions and remaining lands.

P. Anthony stated that the motion was made and seconded. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

H. ZP 08-05 Lombardi, Steve, 392 Squaw Rock Road, Moosup, CT – Property Location: 236-244-246 East Main Street, Griswold, CT – Applicant requests site plan approval for construction of a proposed office/garage building, expansion of the existing fuel storage facility and associated site improvements. Subject property is located in the Industrial zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if anyone was present to represent Mr. Lombardi. D. Sorrentino stated that John Faulise of Boundaries, LLC was here and asked that the application be continued. D. Sorrentino state that there is 65 days to act on the application. He asked the Commission if his determination was correct that this was a trucking terminal. There was discussion of this matter.

R. Harris made a motion to table the application to the next regularly scheduled meeting. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

7. Additional Business:

A. Old Business

1. Plan of Conservation

D. Sorrentino stated that he had sent letters to all the state agencies that work is being done on the Plan of Conservation. M. McKinney asked we officially want to request money from the

Board of Finance. D. Sorrentino asked for money from the Board of Finance. There was discussion of this matter.

8. New Business

There was no new business.

A. Reports from the Enforcement Officer:

Peter Zvingilas gave his reports of the cease and desist orders for Carolyn R. Mackin for unregistered vehicles. He stated that Carolyn Mackin was in compliance.

P. Zvingilas stated that the cease and desist order for Virginia L. Jordan for unregistered vehicles. P. Zvingilas stated that all five cars were removed. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Zvingilas stated that the cease and desist order for James Andruskiewicz had fifteen unregistered vehicles. He is still in the process of getting rid of the four or five that are left. There was discussion of this matter.

M. McKinney stated that the Commission approved something with the new street regulations regarding no catch basis. D. Sorrentino stated that it met the regulations as written because the road ordinance states that if State statues allow it, the town regulations allow it. P. Zvingilas stated that it is done on a case-by-case basis. There was discussion on this matter.

P. Anthony asked about the Dzedzic property and whether they were still in violation. P. Zvingilas stated that they are working on removal of the debris. D. Sorrentino stated that there was a condition that they had 90 days to comply with the conditions of the approval and that the plans would not be signed until the conditions were met. There was discussion of this matter.

D. Sorrentino stated that after the Aspinook View plans were filed, Atty. Branse advised him that bonds for improvements should be posted before this Commission endorses the plan not before construction commences. He stated that he will have a letter forthcoming from the attorney explaining why; and that he will begin enforcing that. There was discussion of this matter.

9. Adjournment:

P. Anthony made a motion to adjourn. R. Harris seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary