



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**

APRIL 11, 2005

GRISWOLD TOWN HALL

I. PUBLIC HEARING (6:50 P.M.)

1. Call to Order:

Daniel DeGuire, Secretary, called this public hearing to order at 7:08 pm. in the absence of Chair, Clyde Seaman.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Daniel DeGuire, Roland Harris, Alternate, Martin McKinney, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, and Recording Secretary Donna Szall.

Absent: Clyde Seaman, Gail Rooke-Norman, Philip Anthony, Anne Hatfield and Paul Wolinski

3. Determination of Quorum:

D. DeGuire appointed M. McKinney to sit for Gale Rooke-Norman. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matter Presented for Consideration:

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.

D. DeGuire asked if anyone was present to represent the application for this public hearing. Richard DeChamps, Advanced Surveys, was present to represent the applicant. He explained that he had prepared the plans and explained the application to the Commission. He explained that the proposed subdivision was 700 feet from Route 138 and crosses over to Edmond Road with a 300-foot cul-de-sac to the north about 300 feet from the intersection. He stated that there would be 1000 feet of new roadway and that this subdivision was for seven commercial lots and was entirely within the commercial district.

R. DeChamps stated that the State of Connecticut DOT has approved the entrance of the road on to Rte138. There will be some minor deeding up against the gas station to the east of the road. He stated the applicant would convey a strip of the road and the property.

R. Harris asked D. Sorrentino if the letter was in the file from CDOT. D. Sorrentino stated no. DeChamps stated that CDOT letter was sent out on Friday; but he got verbal approval on Friday. R. Harris asked if there were any changes. R. DeChamps stated that the only changes were that sheet six was added to the set and CDOT wanted a site line profile. He stated that the other change was to the catch basins closest to Rte 138 are to be double top catch basis.

R. DeChamps explained the proposed drainage system. He stated that the proposed bond estimates as well as the drainage calculations are in the file. He explained that the drainage would outlet to the east side about fifty feet from the gravel bank and the riprap pad should be shown.

D. DeGuire stated to let the record show that Anne Hatfield and Gail Rooke-Norman arrived at 7:10 p.m. D. DeGuire handed the meeting to G. Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair.

R. Harris asked R. DeChamps if the engineer was present to discuss the drainage. R. DeChamps stated no. The engineer was not present. R. Harris had questions to the statements made in the engineering report. He questioned the statement that 1) existing conditions are moderate to low runoff; so obviously the runoff must be minimal. R. DeChamps stated that they would be correcting some of the drainage problems along Edmond Road. R. Harris stated that he has questions about the drainage calculations. There was discussion of this matter that included an increased in runoff for the area, preconditions and post conditions.

R. Harris read Section 5.4 of the subdivision regulations into the record. He stated that they are required to look at the drainage calculations. D. Sorrentino stated that with the existing runoffs on Edmond and not having any retention basins at the outlet of the proposed drainage system that collects most of the runoff from the roadways, it puts a lot of water on the Geer property. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino if it was possible to have the town engineer at the next continued hearing to address the drainage issue and that it could be a major issue regarding an adjacent property owner's property to avoid approving something that the Commission may look at with regret. R. DeChamps said that he would look at the drainage with his engineer to put a detention area there.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were any other questions from Commission members. R. Harris asked if the Board of Selectmen had approved the site line on Edmond Road. R. Harris stated he had looked at it and felt that it would be problematic too. R. DeChamps stated that the stone wall would be removed. R. Harris explained that was installed by the State at the resident's requirement. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked to have the engineer determine if the stone wall was a barrier to runoff. There was further discussion of this matter. D. Sorrentino stated that the town engineer was Patrick Lafayette. He explained that he had

called the engineer last week to find that he was on vacation. G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were any other questions from Commission members.

D. DeGuire asked to have the base of the road put in and done before any permits would be pulled. R. Harris stated that it would have to be approved by the Town Road system. R. DeChamps stated that the road would be as built before any one of the sites are developed. G. Rooke-Norman asked P. Zvingilas if a building permit would not be issued until the road was approved. P. Zvingilas stated that the bond should be in place before construction. R. DeChamps stated that each lot would come before the Commission as an individual site for approval. R. Harris asked if any of the neighbors had been contacted regarding the drainage. R. DeChamps stated that he had not contacted neighbors. He stated letters were sent out as required by the regulations.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino what the requirements were for this type of subdivision. D. Sorrentino stated that it was for abutting property owners as a re-subdivision and those directly across from the re-subdivision.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if the Commission has the green cards as part of the application. D. Sorrentino stated that we do not have the green cards. R. DeChamps stated that as far as he knows, Gail Whitney has the green cards. G. Rooke-Norman stated that we really did need the green cards and that we require that every document and every submission be provided before we set public hearings from now on so we are not going through multiple public hearings as we have been. D. Sorrentino asked if Gail Whitney submitted them to us. D. Szall stated no. D. Sorrentino stated that since there are no green cards, we should not even have this public hearing. R. Harris asked if the letter from the State is forthcoming. R. DeChamps stated correct, it is 100 percent approved. He spoke to Kelli and they are happy with everything that we have done.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino so are you saying since we don't have those green cards, we should not be proceeding with this public hearing right now. D. Sorrentino answered yes. There was discussion of this matter. D. Sorrentino stated the notice to abutting property owners is in our regulations; it is not a statutory requirement. R. DeChamps stated that he would not be here in May, the engineer will be here and so he would like to answer any questions they might have. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino to get an opinion from our Town Attorney on that issue and more specifically, can we take into consideration the comments or submissions that came in to us prior to the submission of those green cards. I would like the applicant to give us in writing waiving any objection they might have to the Board considering anything submitted today before the green cards are submitted today because it is the applicant's responsibility to have done that. So I don't want to have a decision go one way or the other and find out that that applicant is saying that we shouldn't have considered what John Smith said on April 11, because we didn't have the green cards yet. I need the waiver in before the next continued hearing or else we will have to restart everything.

G. Rooke-Norman asked R. DeChamps if that was okay. R. DeChamps stated that it was fine with him. R. Harris asked if the applicant was here. R. DeChamps stated no that he thought that she would be here. He stated he was representing her. G. Rooke-Norman asked if he was the agent for the applicant. R. DeChamps stated that he knows exactly what the applicant wants. D. DeGuire asked if he had a letter representing her. R. Harris stated that the application was signed by her.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that she would like to here from anyone. She apologized stating she had meetings in her office. We have already had a presentation by the applicant. Do we have anybody else who would like to speak in favor of this application? Hearing none, she asked to here from anyone who wishes to speak in opposition of the application or who has a neutral comment. She commented that because there are so many people here and limited time, We will be taking one comment per person and we won't go to a second comment until we have heard from everyone who wants to speak. She explained that the microphone is a recording device and that you will come up to the microphone and identify yourself please.

Gail Stalinski, 31 Edmond Road. She stated that she lives on the borderline and that she did not think the line was correct. She explained that she had just put an on addition and will be looking at the back of a parking lot and buildings. She voiced her concerns for her well that was very close to the borderline and would it be a problem when they started digging. She showed where the well was located on the property. M. McKinney asked if that was her shed too. She answered yes, that is my shed across the boundary. G. Stalinski stated that her mailbox was across the road and that she was concerned with the increased traffic on Edmond Road. She stated she is against the project.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if anyone else wished to comment.

John Fitzgerald, attorney, was there on behalf of David Geer and the family. He stated that the Geers own the property that abuts upon lot six. He explained that the lot would be draining to his property. J. Fitzgerald stated that he was not speaking in opposition to the use since area is zoned C-2 and if it is to be developed commercially, it will only improve the value of other properties. He stated that they were only concerned about the water problems, the potential flow and the runoff. J. Fitzgerald stated that they were concerned with inheriting a swamp because of serious water problems. He stated that Mr. Harris and the other members of the Commission brought that up and that is why we are speaking in opposition to it. He stated that the Town Engineer, Mr. Lafayette, will look at it and give his professional opinion; and if there is a water problem, it will become the developer's problem to solve it. J. Fitzgerald stated that the Geers trademarked the name Pachaug Village fifteen years ago. R. DeChamps stated that a woman from the day called it Pachaug Village in her article. D. Sorrentino stated that he had referenced the area as Pachaug village and had no idea what properties had done there. J. Fitzgerald stated that if there is a water problem, the Commission has a right to be told about it by its engineer and what his/her recommendation would be. He stated that those were their concerns.

G. Rooke-Norman asked is there anyone else who wishes to speak in opposition to the project or who has a neutral comment.

Bruce Laney, 816 Voluntown Road. He had fourteen things to ask about but because of the late start, he will bring up those at the next public hearing. He stated that when the state did to their work, immediately following that which was probably five years ago, we had problems with our well and it took quite a bit to straighten out. He stated that the runoff that is going to be there is not a Town problem; was created by the State when it modified the entrance to Route 138. He was concerned with the added traffic, the noise and the water concerns. He stated that he would save his other comments for the next meeting.

G. Rooke-Norman suggested that anyone who wishes to speak that they probably should attend the next meeting as well. She asked if there was anyone else.

Tony Langlois, 81 Edmond Road. He stated that he lived 4/10's of a mile down the road. He was concerned with the traffic flow because the road is a small, narrow road; the speed limit is 25 mph and there is access from the Hopeville and Rte 138. He was concerned about the traffic flow. G. Rooke-Norman asked T. Langlois to show where on the map was his property. He explained where it was located. He was concerned because the road is not in good shape and with the increased commercial traffic, he wanted to know what the Town was going to do about it. T. Langlois also stated that in front of Mr. Jacaruso's house they have all that water there.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there was anyone else wishing to make a comment.

Judith Merrill, 194 Edmond Road. She stated that she was neutral to the concept and that the town does need commercial development and the only way we will get assistance with our taxes is with commercial development. She did ask where specifically the development will get its water supply; whether it was from wells and how it will impact the water table in the whole general area. She stated that when the development went in on Edmond Road, they have a public water supply that had a lot of problems and had to be taken over by Jewett City Water Company. She also noted that it impacted the swamps at the bottom of Hemlock Drive. R. DeChamps stated that all sites would be handled by on-site sewage and on-site wells; it will be all wells, no public water. He stated that there is no public water pipe close enough to it to use public water.

Don Eccleston, 35 Edmond Road. He asked if anything has been done to tell us what residential values are going to do after these properties are built. R. DeChamps stated that he created a subdivision plan that meets the zoning requirements. He stated that he doesn't look into whether someone's property values fall. D. Eccleston asked if there would be any barriers put up. R. DeChamps stated that these sites will be individually developed and sent to the town; this is just a subdivision plan to make it into seven lots. He explained that these lots are maximized and the buildings cannot get any bigger. He stated that each site must have buffer for a commercial zone. He stated that in a residential district; it is a 25-foot buffer and there has to be screening with arborvitae or something like that. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman stated that it is a subdivision application only. D. Eccleston asked if this would take away from his well. He stated that with Stalinski's well on the line, he asked if well tests had been done. G. Rooke-Norman stated that it would be difficult to determine if the well would be affected. D. Eccleston stated that he didn't see any proposed drainage. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a subdivision plan, is there a requirement for a perc. test and a department of health letter. R. Harris stated yes. D. Sorrentino stated that the Department of Health letter is in the file and there were test holes. She stated that because we are talking about different issues, those required for a subdivision and another that is required for a site review plan that would have to be approved before any one could put a building there; that is part of where the confusion might lie.

G. Rooke-Norman stated to D. Sorrentino that he had regulations there of what the buffers are for this zone. D. Sorrentino stated yes, buffers for commercial and residential must have a 25-foot landscaped buffer. D. Eccleston asked if a buffer was lawn. G. Rooke-Norman stated no. D. Sorrentino stated that there are five pages of regulations explaining the buffers for a commercial subdivision. G. Rooke-Norman suggested that D. Eccleston see D. Sorrentino to get copies of those pages and he will be happy to give those to you. She stated that the Commission spent a lot of time to make sure that not only was there a sound buffer but also a visual buffer. There was discussion of this matter.

D. Sorrentino stated that A. Gosselin, the sanitarian has reviewed it for perc tests for septic disposal in the approval letter. He stated that he did not think that the wells could be analyzed not knowing what the uses are or the water demand. R. DeChamps stated that there is a note on the plan that refers to A. Gosselin's comments that states that each site will be looked at individually to assess the needs of the use. G. Rooke-Norman read A. Gosselin's statement into the record. She stated that there are minimal numbers in for sewage disposal. R. DeChamps stated that each lot is approved to handle on-site sewage. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for any other comments.

Tom Cartwright, 55 Edmond Road. He stated that Edmond Road was a racetrack. He stated that you take your life into your hands just getting your mail. He voiced his concerns for the safety of the children and the school buses. He explained how fast the cars come from the direction of Rte 138. He stated that Edmond Road is just a short cut from Rte 201 to Route 138. His biggest concern is the traffic. He stated that it is just a short time before someone will get hit on that road.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for any other comments.

Pat Jacaruso, 22 Edmond Road. He stated that his is the second farmhouse in. He stated that any water problem comes from his land and the next land up and the next land up; the Geers might have a problem because he has been living with the problems. He stated that he has had many people hit his walls. He stated that he could see potential problems with this road. He stated that the water problem is definitely a problem there and there will be a serious problem once they put this big development in.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were any other comments. R. Harris asked if the sidewalk issue should be addressed now since they asked for a waiver of the sidewalk requirements. He stated that the planning department suggested that we explicitly not allow the waiver of the sidewalk requirement. G. Rooke-Norman stated that she didn't think that we can make any kind of

determination within the hearing or any kind of decision. She stated that it would come along with the vote after the hearing is closed. R. Harris stated that if they were to be constructed then the whole design of the road would change. G. Rooke-Norman stated that is the risk that the applicant taking to design it without sidewalks knowing that it is required. R. Champs stated that he does not see this as a high pedestrian area. There was discussion of this matter. D. Sorrentino stated his argument for that is that if you don't provide them, it will never be a pedestrian center.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if an extension of time in writing was required from the applicant. D. Sorrentino stated that the hearing was opened tonight and we have 35 days from now which puts it at the May 9th meeting within the time limit.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were any other comments from the public here. A question was asked from the audience if there would be a formal notice for the next public hearing. G. Rooke-Norman stated that no formal notice is required for the continuation. D. Sorrentino stated that it is not required. G. Rooke-Norman stated that you all do need to be vigilant about checking the postings here in the Town Hall when the next hearing is going to be.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a continuance of this public hearing. D. DeGuire so moved. She asked for a date and time. D. DeGuire suggested May 9 at 7:30 p.m. G. Rooke-Norman stated that there is a motion that this public hearing be continued to May 9, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. at this location and asked for a second. R. Harris seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

D. Sorrentino stated to G. Rooke-Norman that he spoke to Attorney Ochsner in the hall and he stated that as long as the slips are handed in sometime during the public hearing, it is o.k. D. Sorrentino suggested asking for the slips before you open the public hearing. G. Rooke-Norman agreed and asked to be reminded that it is required before we start talking. M. McKinney stated that the applications be complete because we keep continuing the hearings. D. Sorrentino stated that this application was complete and those were new plans based on the comments by me and A. Gosselin.

II. PUBLIC HEARING (7:20 P.M.)

1. Call to Order:

Gail Rooke-Norman called this public hearing to order at 7:55 pm.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Gail Rooke-Norman, Roland Harris, Daniel DeGuire, Alternates Anne Hatfield, Martin McKinney, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, and recording secretary Donna Szall.

Absent: Clyde Seaman, Philip Anthony and Paul Wolinski

3. Determination of Quorum:

G. Rooke-Norman appointed Anne Hatfield to sit for P. Anthony and M. McKinney was appointed to sit for C. Seaman. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matters Presented for Consideration:

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 asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. Mark Sullivan, Surveyor, was present to represent the applicant. He presented the green cards to the Commission. He presented revised site plans to the Commission. He stated that Nelson Rodriguez and Engineer Reepu Singh were present.

M. Sullivan explained the proposed plan to the Commission. He stated that the proposed golf driving range is on the eastern end of the Lake Shore Airport. He stated that it would have twenty tees and a residence that the applicant, Nelson Rodriguez would be living on the property.

M. Sullivan stated that Sanitarian A. Gosselin had reviewed the property and stated that his letter is in the file. He explained that there would be netting and proposed lighting that would not impact on the neighboring houses. N. Rodriguez submitted literature regarding the lighting. He explained how it would contain shielding to minimize the impact on the area. He showed where the lighting would be located on the site to the Commission and the audience.

M. Sullivan explained that the pines on both sides of the site were well established and they will leave as many as possible. N. Rodriguez explained where the proposed plantings for the site would be located.

A. Hatfield asked if there would be a store. N. Rodriguez stated yes. M. McKinney asked if there would be one or two levels. N. Rodriguez explained that there would be only one level, though he would love to have three as they do in Japan.

G. Rooke-Norman asked how the people in the area would be protected from the golf balls going over the net. N. Rodriguez explained that the average person wouldn't be able to hit the golf balls over the net. M. McKinney asked about the netting. N. Rodriguez explained that it would be black poly netting with 375 bursts per square inch. G. Rooke-Norman asked about using green netting. There was discussion of this matter that black netting is less visible than green netting.

G. Rooke-Norman asked about his residence in the building. M. Sullivan stated that it would be upstairs from the store. M. McKinney asked about the minimum square footage in the regulations for a residence. D. Sorrentino stated that it was a minimum of 500 square feet.

R. Harris read the section for height requirements as it related to the poles. He stated that there were height requirements for fences. P. Zvingilas explained that this is screening and not a fence. There was discussion of this matter.

M. McKinney asked about the telephone poles. N. Rodriguez explained that the netting would be attached to sixty-foot poles. He also explained that the poles would be new telephone poles. A. Hatfield asked how far apart the poles would be. M. Sullivan explained that the new poles would be about fifty feet apart. He also explained that the netting would come to within four feet of the ground.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there would be trees screening the netting from the houses. D. DeGuire asked how could you cover netting sixty feet high. M. Sullivan explained how the trees presently there are well established and would hide much of the netting and stated that additional plantings would be added. N. Rodriguez explained that some of the branches would have to be cut so as not to touch the netting so as not to tear it.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino if everything has been reviewed by the engineer. D. Sorrentino stated that the engineer was on vacation and would have to review the plan. M. McKinney asked if the landscaping met the regulations. D. Sorrentino stated that the buffer had to be doubled and plans for the parking lot submitted per the regulations. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were other items. D. Sorrentino had a question about the sign in the center island. N. Rodriguez stated that he would put the sign where it would comply with the regulations for site lines. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked what the lighting would be for the sign. N. Rodriguez explained that it would be exterior illumination using low wattage lighting.

A. Hatfield asked what the hours of operation would be. N. Rodriguez explained that it would be 7 am to 10 pm on the weekend and 8 am to 10 pm during the week. He also explained that during the summer, the lights would be on about one hour and in the winter, it would be three to four hours. There was discussion of this matter.

M. Sullivan stated that there would be a visual barrier made of wood that will block the headlights from the homes. He said it would be similar to those seen on the highway. N. Rodriguez stated that there would be trees planted as well.

M. McKinney asked if the plan had received approval from the State. M. Sullivan stated that the state was sending a letter and it should be received shortly.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for questions for the Commission. D. DeGuire stated that the landscaping had to be address. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the application was not complete. She would have the Commission vote on a complete plan. There was discussion of this matter that included the bond estimate for next month.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of this application. Reepu Singh, engineer stated that the landscaping should not be an impediment to the approval of the application. He also stated that the drainage is kept on the property. He stated that the proposed driving range had minimum impact on the area.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of or who was neutral to this application.

Richard Blecka, Rte 138. He explained that he had bought the John Walsh property. He voiced his concerns that the netting would not stop the golf balls from hitting Rte 138 and bouncing on to his house and his car.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if the engineer could calculate the trajectory of the golf balls and if there was some data on this subject. She asked the applicant to provide some data if he had it at the next meeting. R. Blecka stated that he was concerned that teenagers would hit the golf balls in other directions outside of the driving range. He also was concerned with the hours and the lights for the golf range.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino regarding the hours of operation. He stated that there were regulations for gravel extractions; and the regulations did not address hours of operations for driving ranges. P. Zvingilas stated that it could be a condition of approval. G. Rooke-Norman stated that it should be on the application stating the hours of operation. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for others who would speak in opposition.

Sharon Pendleton, 32 Alvina. She had concerns for the site line as it was difficult to see when the school bus was coming and had concerns for the safety of the children waiting for the bus. She explained that it was difficult to see what was coming off of Latham on to Rte 138.

Clarence Merrill, 194 Edmond Road. He stated that he had a concern if a residence in the C-2 zone was by special exception. D. Sorrentino explained that it is a special exception. C. Merrill asked if the range could be narrower in order to create a larger buffer. G. Rooke-Norman asked how close the nearest golf tee would be to the property line. M. Sullivan explained that it would be fifty feet from the property line. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for others who would speak in opposition.

Randy Jones, 1116 Voluntown Road, stated that he would be seeing netting at his driveway. He felt that the netting would detract from the look of the road.

Judith Merrill, 194 Edmond Road, stated that she was concerned for the residents. She stated that she was neutral on the matter. She stated that the property would have a residence and that if the property was sold, it would become a private residence. D. Sorrentino read Section 7.3.12 for special exceptions for accessory uses for the residence of the owner into the record. G. Rooke-

Norman explained that there were many buildings in the town where the owner wanted to provide security for their property. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were any other questions.

R. Blecka asked if the netting went all the way to the ground. He was concerned for the deer. N. Rodriguez explained that the netting went to four feet from the ground, but he too was concerned for the deer.

G. Rooke Norman asked for a motion on this application. There was discussion of the date and time. R. Harris made a motion to continue this public hearing to May 9, 2005 at 7:15 p.m. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for discussion, hearing none, she asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

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

1. Call to Order:

Gail Rooke-Norman called this public hearing to order at 8.28 pm.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Gail Rooke-Norman, Roland Harris, Daniel DeGuire, Alternates Anne Hatfield, Martin McKinney, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, and recording secretary Donna Szall.

Absent: Clyde Seaman, Philip Anthony and Paul Wolinski

3. Determination of Quorum:

G. Rooke-Norman appointed M. McKinney was appointed to sit for C. Seaman and Anne Hatfield to sit for P. Anthony. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matter Presented for Consideration

SUB 09-05 Quiet Cove, LLC, 6 Weber Farm Road, Norwich, CT Property Location: 55 Osga Lane, Griswold, CT. Applicant request approval of an 11-lot subdivision with a proposed new street located at 55 Osga Lane, Griswold. The subject property is located in the R-60 zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if anyone was present to represent the application.

John, Faulise, Boundaries, LLC was present to represent the application. He stated that Bob Schuch, the engineer, was present. He presented the green cards to the Commission. He explained the proposed subdivision to the Commission describing the property's location on

Bethel Road. He explained that this was an eleven-lot subdivision with a proposed new street as a cul-de-sac. J. Faulise stated that there was a letter in the file from the Inland Wetlands Commission for a permit for construction of a new town road. He explained that there are ten proposed homes; the existing house is accessed from Osga Lane and is labeled lot number six.

J. Faulise explained sheet two that shows the driveways, septic systems and well. He explained the proposed grading to create yards for the proposed lots. He explained that this location was used as a gravel extraction in the past. The land will be terraced to the grade of the bulk of the property. He explained that all the storm water will be treated with the Stormceptor system and in will pass over 75 feet overland before reached the pond. He explained the conservation easements A and B. to the Commission. M. McKinney asked which easement was A and which was B. J. Faulise explained which easement was A and B.

J. Faulise explained the proposed open space to the Commission. He stated that there would be no dock for the area so that it would be accessed by kayaks and canoes. All of the lots will have access to the open space from the new road. He explained that there would be no access from Osga Lane to the open space.

J. Faulise explained sheet three that showed the drainage for the subdivision. G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino if the engineer had seen the plans. D. Sorrentino stated no and explained that the wetlands permit stipulated that their approval was that the drainage calculations met with the approval of the town engineer. J. Faulise explained sheet 4 for the plunge pool and the 75 feet of overland flow as well and the erosion and sediment controls.

J. Faulise stated that the sanitarian, A. Gosselin has approved the lots for septic and wells. He explained the pavement details for the proposed road.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for questions from the Commission.

M. McKinney asked a question about the terracing. J. Faulise explained that it had been a previous gravel extraction and the terracing will allow for the lots to have gently sloping yards. R. Harris stated that these plans had to go to the engineer. He asked if it was the old gravel bank. J. Faulise stated that it was.

R. Harris asked if there were claims for Popple Bridge Road. J. Faulise stated that the adjacent lots were conveyed to the road and some to the center of the road. He stated that there was a claim to Osga Lane but that it would not affect the property lines.

R. Harris asked if it met the statutory regulations. D. Sorrentino stated that lot five needed to meet the frontage requirements. J. Faulise stated that the house had to be moved back five feet so the building line would be put back five feet.

J. Faulise explained that the open space would be deeded to a homeowner's association. He stated that there would be direct access to the open space from the road. D. DeGuire asked if the bonding for the road was in place. J. Faulise stated that a copy of the bond was in the file.

R. Wisniewski asked to explain the drainage issue. He stated that there were two issues to get a letter of approval from the Inland Wetlands Commission and have the drainage system needed to meet with the engineer's approval. D. Sorrentino explained that he was to forward the information to the engineer and that he was away.

R. Wisniewski stated that we had met in February. J. Faulise explained that we met in February to discuss the application and the hearing was set for tonight. He stated that we skipped over the April meeting due to the fact that we needed a letter from Inland Wetlands and we needed a review from the town engineer and the Commission's agenda already had several public hearing scheduled for the March meeting. So the Commission elected to have this public hearing at this meeting.

J. Faulise stated that everything on the plans is in tact and asked the Commission that this public hearing could be closed and to get action predicated on the comments from the town engineer. He stated that he didn't anticipate any problems with this application. J. Faulise stated that his design engineer is here to answer any questions. J. Faulise asked if the town engineer reviewed this from Wetlands Commission. R. Harris stated that that would have been his question. D. Sorrentino stated no. The wetlands approval is conditional upon the town engineer's approval of the drainage calculations.

J. Faulise explained that this was a very straightforward site, and straightforward drainage and we have also provided a pretreatment for the storm water that was approved by the Inland Wetlands Commission. He stated that he did not anticipate any negative comments from the Town engineer.

R. Harris stated that if we close the hearing then we cannot take any more information. There was discussion of this matter that included development of a policy as to when an application can go to public hearing. R. Harris stated that that is something that would be discussed outside of this public hearing.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that with Spring and Summer upon us, she could appreciate that everyone wants to move forward and it appears that this application has been substantially complete for a month or more. D. Sorrentino stated yes except for the end of last week when the bond estimate was submitted.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that in the later part of our meeting, she would be recommending that we have a couple of special meetings. She stated that she didn't know if the board would entertain that possibility now and so that we can continue the public hearing but have a meeting sometime in the midpoint now and May. She asked D. Sorrentino if that was possible or were there issues or errors if we were to do that. D. Sorrentino stated that if the public hearing would be continued to the middle between now and the next scheduled meeting, it would not need to be noticed again. G. Rooke-Norman asked if we noticed not only a hearing but also a meeting, we could vote on it at that time. D. Sorrentino stated that you would have to post an agenda. R. Harris asked if we would have to notice a continuance. D. Sorrentino stated no but he was

concerned if the Town engineer could review it in time would be the question. There was discussion of this matter.

R. Wisniewski had a question regarding the drainage; he asked that if there was a process where the town was using Boundaries to assist in calculating drainage on other projects. Isn't Bob doing that? J. Faulise explained that Bob has functioned as a review engineer for other projects. D. Sorrentino stated that both gentlemen function as town engineers. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that during the regular meeting we could change the continuance date if we wanted to. D. Sorrentino stated that if you change the date from which you state at the adjournment, you would have to re-notice it. There was discussion of this matter.

R. Harris asked if the selectman have reviewed this plan. D. Sorrentino state no, nor has the fire marshal. There was discussion that there was not enough information on this application. G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino to get an answer from the Town engineer quickly to address any issues so the applicant can respond before the next meeting. She also asked to get something from the selectmen in determining the road. J. Faulise stated that the designed of road was consulted with the selectman regarding that section of Bethel Road so it will match with the reconstruction.

R. Harris asked J. Faulise if the Walmsley house created a set back problem. J. Faulise stated that the house is in the center of the lot and there is a detached garage structure. R. Harris stated that he did not see it on the plans. J. Faulise stated that that could be added to the plans. G. Rooke-Norman asked how far up Bethel Road was the reconstruction. J. Faulise stated that the reconstruction would come up through the corner and ends in the vicinity of a two-lot subdivision that the Commission previously approved.

Ed Wisniewski stated that he was the other partner in the LLC. He asked for clarification that the public hearing was deemed to have officially opened tonight. G. Rooke-Norman answered yes. He stated that the meeting in February did not constitute an opening. G. Rooke-Norman explained that the Commission by statute is required to set a public hearing 65 days from the date of receipt. D. Sorrentino stated he spoke with Atty. Ochsner as to what constituted the opening of it. D. Sorrentino stated that it was his determination that this application was on in January and set a public hearing in February; the applicant had not provided notice to the abutters for that hearing. It was noticed in the newspaper, the applicant was here, the application was called and the applicant requested a continuance. It could not be moved to March so we moved it to April.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that tonight was the official opening. There was discussion of the time requirements. She stated that by statute we could continue it by one month. Then it would be closed unless the applicant gave another continuance. There was further discussion of the time requirements. G. Rooke-Norman stated that had the hearing been open in February, the application would have been denied and you would have to start over again. G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were any other comments from the applicants.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from anyone who is in favor of the application. She asked for comments from anyone who is opposed to the application or who has a neutral comment.

Sara Walmsley, Bethel Road, stated that they were not notified and explained that their address had been changed in the assessor's office to an address in Preston when her husband was there. They have lived in Griswold for twelve years. D. Sorrentino stated that the property card was attached to the notification letter that had been returned as undeliverable. G. Rooke-Norman asked if S. Walsmley was waiving notice because she is here at the public hearing. S. Walsmley stated yes.

S. Walmsley voiced her concerns for the back of her property that had a wooded area that comes within 20 feet of the back of their property. She stated that there is a hill in the corner on the property line. She stated that there were large spruce trees there. She explained there is a walkway through the woods. She asked that a 30-foot no cut zone be maintained to preserve her privacy when the new houses would be built so new property owners would not cut down the trees. She was concerned to maintain the privacy at the back of her lot.

G. Rooke-Norman explained that if the applicant wishes to place something that would deal with this issue on the maps of this application, it is the applicant's prerogative and stated that it would be a contractual matter between them. G. Rooke-Norman suggested that she consult with an attorney.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for other comments.

Sandy and Dennis McPherson, Bethel Road. D. McPherson stated that he had been notified but that he had not received a plan of the subdivision with his notification. D. Sorrentino stated that he should have received an 11" x 17" copy of the plans with his notification. D. McPherson stated that he had received just the letter. J. Faulise stated that he had sent a narrative description with the letter and a copy of the legal notice that stated the plans were on file for review at the town hall. D. Sorrentino read the Section 2.15 describing the notification requirements into the record.

D. McPherson was concerned about maintaining the privacy of their property. He was concerned with the bar way and whether it would be used for access to Bethel Road. J. Faulise explained that that area was kept as access to a potential flag lot when the McPherson and Walmsley lots were subdivided. He stated that the area would be part of lot eleven and it would be up to the selectmen to issue a permit for a driveway through the bar way. J. Faulise stated that in a new development people want their driveways onto a new road.

D. McPherson asked if there were changes to the grading for the new house. J. Faulise stated that there would be grading to so the lots will have a fairly flat back yard. Sandy McPherson stated that there will be a large development. J. Faulise stated that the grading is to fix the steep slopes that were left from the gravel excavation. He stated that the site is open enough and want to save

the trees that can be saved and see new tree growth. There was discussion of trees providing noise control and privacy. She stated that the trees provide a buffer.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino about the notice issue that it did not include a site plan. D. Sorrentino stated that they were aware of the time and place of the public hearing and where they could see the plans. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked about the excavation, how much is going out, are we bonding the loam and how many acres of excavation exceeds the ten acres in our regulations. J. Faulise stated that it does not exceed the ten acres of the regulations; the materials that are on site will be used on site. There is loam stockpiled and will be used on site and no material will be leaving the site. J. Faulise stated that this is not a gravel excavation hidden behind a subdivision if that is the Commission's concern.

D. McPherson asked what would the homes are going up and is there a minimum square footage. J. Faulise stated that the town does have a minimum square footage. G. Rooke-Norman stated that this would be difficult to determine. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion concerning closing or continuing this application. R. Harris made a motion to continue this public hearing. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a time. There was discussion of the time and date. G. Rooke-Norman stated a motion was made and seconded to continue this public hearing to 7:00 p.m. on May 9, 2005. She asked for those in favor. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

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

1. Call to Order:

Gail Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair called the regular meeting to order at 9:20 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Clyde Seaman, Philip Anthony and Paul Wolinski

3. Determination of Quorum:

G. Rooke-Norman appointed M. McKinney was appointed to sit for C. Seaman and Anne Hatfield to sit for P. Anthony. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Approval of Minutes:

A. Hatfield stated that there were no minutes in the packet she received. She stated that she will not vote for approval of the minutes of the public hearing or approval of the minutes of the regular meeting. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion to continue the minutes to the next meeting. A. Hatfield made a motion to continue the minutes to the next regular scheduled meeting. R. Harris seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman stated that a motion has been made and seconded to continue the action on approval of the minutes of March 14, 2005 regular meeting and public hearings to the May 2005 next regular scheduled meeting. She asked for those in favor. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

5. Correspondence and Attachments:

G. Rooke-Norman read the list of correspondence.

A. Membership dues for the Connecticut Federation of Planning & Zoning Agencies

B. Memorandum from Branse & Willis, LLC, dated 3/21/05 regarding general legal matters.

D. Sorrentino stated that the Commission gets their packets a week or so ahead of time, and if you notice something is missing let us know and we will get it out to you right away. There was discussion of this matter. D. Sorrentino commented on the letter dated 3/21/05 and read it for the record. R. Harris asked if the decision had been appealed. D. Sorrentino stated that it had not been appealed. G. Rooke-Norman asked if the appeal period had gone by. D. Sorrentino stated yes.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if we ever received a breakdown for the legal fees attached to a project that comes out of a P & Z or Selectmen's budget. D. Sorrentino stated that he receives a statement from the finance department when he gets a bill for the town engineer. G. Rooke-Norman stated that it has been discussed at some of the board of finance meetings and budgeting hearings. She asked D. Sorrentino to put something together for us that tells us what the legal fees are that have to do with us so we have it.

A. Hatfield stated that she would also like a breakdown as to what offices we are using, there is the town attorney, the land use attorney. D. Sorrentino stated that the attorneys are through the Selectmen's office. There was discussion of this matter. P. Zvingilas stated that all legal matters are through the Selectmen's office. He said it would be requested from the selectmen. G. Rooke-Norman asked if a motion was needed.

A. Hatfield made a motion for a breakdown for the legal fees for the Planning & Zoning Commission and the Land Use Commission or the IDC or whatever, the Industrial Development Commission. P. Zvingilas asked what time frame. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke Norman stated that A. Hatfield has made a motion to request from the board of selectmen the fiscal year 03 to 04 and 04 to 05 breakdown of the legal expenses that have anything to do with land use matters. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

C. The Green Valley Institute 2004 Annual Report

G. Rooke-Norman stated that it was an interesting piece. She stated that she spoke to people who do attend these meetings. She asked D. Sorrentino if he saw that these people as becoming more active and having more input and influence on the regional planning in the next five years. There was discussion of this matter. She asked if there were handouts to order and review them on their own. D. Sorrentino stated that handouts were passed out at the workshops held here. There was further discussion of this matter.

6. Matter Presented for Consideration:

A. 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 was the subject of a public hearing that has been continued. She asked for a motion on this matter. R. Harris made a motion to table this application. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman stated that a motion has been made and seconded to table this matter to the next meeting. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

B. 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 was the subject of a prior public hearing, which has been continued. She asked for a motion. R. Harris made a motion to table. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman stated that a motion has been made and seconded to table to the next regular scheduled meeting. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

C. SUB 09-05 Quiet Cove, LLC, 6 Weber Farm Road, Norwich, CT Property Location: 55 Osga Lane, Griswold, CT. – Applicant request approval of an 11-lot subdivision with a proposed new street located at 55 Osga Lane, Griswold. The subject property is located in the R-60 zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this is the subject of an earlier public hearing, which has been continued. She asked for a motion. R. Harris made a motion to table. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman stated that a motion has been made, and seconded to table this matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

D. 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 some prior hearings. She asked if anyone wishing to make some comments concerning this matter. D. DeGuire stated that he has some problems with the internal roadways.

A. Hatfield stated that she was concerned that at each of the public hearings, it was used more as an informational session other than a hearing. It was a guess as to what we wanted to change and there were a number of changes throughout the hearing. She stated her concerns for one change in particular regarding “environmentally friendly”. There was discussion of this matter, which included permitted uses and special exception that are regulated in section 12 and reference to a transcript of the matter of the 1/24/05 public hearing.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a three-minute break for D. Sorrentino to get a verbatim transcript of a conversation from the 1/24/05 public hearing. G. Rooke-Norman reconvened the meeting of the transcript of part of the hearing. She asked for a copy.

She asked for other comments from other members for the proposed text change. R. Harris stated that he still had concerns for the traffic and the assess people for the upgrading of roads which he felt had not been addressed to his satisfaction. D. DeGuire stated that he was looking why do we keep changing the regulations when the Plan of Development isn't done. A. Hatfield stated that technically we are supposed to refer to our plan of development. M. McKinney stated that he agreed with R. Harris regarding the traffic and how it will be enforced. There was discussion of this matter.

A. Hatfield stated that she had concerns about lot coverage. D. Sorrentino explained that lot coverage referred to the building only. He stated that he wrote in all impervious surfaces including parking lots. There was discussion of this matter.

A. Hatfield stated that when you write regulations you come before the Planning & Zoning Commission. She stated that we had a hearing with a land use attorney, why weren't there hearing with the public to discuss this as a draft prior to the actual hearing to approve. D. Sorrentino stated that this was brought to him as a mission of the IDC and he met with the IDC in public forum with landowners who were within the property boundary. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that she felt that there was something missing with this matter and the reference to internal roads and the text change could create a rural strip mall with no road services. She stated that we want to encourage but we don't want to have a negative impact and can lose the rural setting. There was discussion of this floating zone regarding R-40 and R-80 zones, sewer and water and adequate roads and improvement of the grand list.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to deny the application without prejudice. R. Harris seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman stated that a motion has been made and seconded to deny the application without prejudice. She asked for discussion on the motion. Hearing none, she asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried, the application has been denied.

G. Rooke-Norman presented a revised BP Business Park text amendment and asked that it be put on the agenda. R. Harris so moved. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. There was discussion on this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked the Atty. Ochsner if the commission can make text amendments on its own and does it have to go to public hearing like any other application. Atty. Ochsner stated yes according the regulation of the agency. He stated that for it to be valid you must have a public hearing

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino if it was appropriate to look at the structure before setting the public hearing. D. Sorrentino stated that the explanation should be done during the public hearing. Atty. Ochsner asked if you could look at the application. A. Hatfield stated that she felt as D. DeGuire that we should have our plan of development in place prior to our regulations because, technically, we are to be referring to the plan of development. There was discussion of this matter that included discussion of moratoriums, and funding for the plan of development and working together for the plan with other commissions, the selectmen and the public and having a public hearing as a workshop.

G. Rooke Norman asked Atty. Ochsner that if a public hearing set for a June meeting at this location 1) can we have a workshop to review it with the IDC between now and then with the purpose of seeing if there is anything that needs to be changed from their perspective and then modifying what goes to public hearing or does what goes to public hearing need to be this and then take every other comment in during the hearing process. Atty. Ochsner stated that it would be the latter, set a public hearing now. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Normans stated that a motion has been made and seconded to hold a public hearing for the April 11, 2005 Business Park application. G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino if he signed the application. He stated that the Secretary has signed the application. There was discussion of the date and time. R. Harris stated June 13, 2005 at 7:30 pm. There was further discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

E. 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 the application. M. McKinney recused himself from this application and has left the room. J. Faulise, Boundaries, LLC, presented the application to the Commission describing the existing bulk storage plant on Route 201. He stated that the plan is to combine the parcels together to create a single parcel, demolish the existing house on the site and to enlarge the facility for the future. J. Faulise stated that the first sheet demonstrates the existing conditions.

J. Faulise stated that sheet 2 is the proposed site, which will be in two phases. Phase one is for the demolition of the old building and the construction of a new office and storage building associated with a shop or garage area. The garage facility is the rear portion of the building and is for storage of fuel oil delivery trucks only. He stated that service will take place at an authorized service dealer off premises. R. Harris asked if the building was all enclosed. J. Faulise stated yes, it is all enclosed. J. Faulise explained there would be construction of six parking spaces across the front of the site in front of the building and an additional four parking on the left side of the driveway, eight delivery vehicle parking spaces are located in the rear of the proposed building. He stated that the main access is a 34-foot wide curb cut area and explained the proposed new curb cuts to allow delivery trucks to make safer turns in and out of the facility. J. Faulise explained the drainage that included two catch basins and Baysaver for storm water collection for the proposed site. He stated that Phase 2 would be construction of further tank storage that will be required at some point so the applicant will have all his storage at one facility. He explained that there will be a 10 x 10 dumpster enclosure.

J. Faulise explained the site grading on sheet three to accommodate the new building. He explained sheet four that is the landscape plan based on the regulations that included a staggered row of trees and landscape to enhance the esthetics of the site and a proposed landscaped island in the front of the storage tanks to provide screening.

J. Faulise explained the constructions on sheet five for the concrete sidewalks to tie into the existing sidewalks towards Jewett City on Route 201. He explained sheet six that described the Baysaver structure for storm water pretreatment. B. Schuch will explain that later. He explained how the proposed building would look and showed pictures of the proposed changes to the site and the proposed building to the Commission. G. Rooke-Norman asked where the building would be located. Steve Lombardi stated that the building is located in South Windsor. There was discussion of this matter. J. Faulise explained the fencing and the plantings for landscaping near adjacent properties.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if D. Sorrentino has reviewed these with the engineer. D. Sorrentino stated no. R. Harris asked if the fire marshal has seen the plans. There was discussion of this matter. R. Harris asked if the storage area would be increased. J. Faulise stated that was phase two of the project and it will not be increased at this time, but will be sometime in the future. S. Lombardi has met with the fire marshal and he stated that he like the idea that the gate is kept close. S. Lombardi stated that any fuel storage must pass the scrutiny of the DEP for safety and reviewed by an environmental engineer. There was discussion of this matter including when phase two would be implemented.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino is the application, except for the fire marshal and the engineer, complete. D. Sorrentino stated yes it is. There was discussion of this matter.

R. Harris made a motion to approve this application. G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino that in his review of this does everything seem to be in order and does he have any questions or concerns or issues with anything on the plans. D. Sorrentino stated that he discussed with S. Lombardi the new regulations requiring containment for outside storage of the vehicles. He asked S. Lombardi if the parking area needed to be modified for containment of oil spillage. S. Lombardi stated that any regulations that the government has affects him and he must comply with regulations for fuel dealers and the area can be easily tied into the containment system. There was discussion of this matter.

R. Harris asked if DOT has acted on this. J. Faulise stated that DOT has not been there to look at the facility. There was discussion of this matter. R. Harris asked about the bond. J. Faulise stated that the bond estimate is in the file. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were any other questions from any board members. There were no other questions from board members. D. Sorrentino stated that the landscaping doesn't meet the requirements because it is an already developed site under 11.8.28 to the greatest extent possible. There was discussion of this matter including plantings and fencing and existing landscaping.

G. Rooke Norman asked for modifications on the motion. R. Harris made a motion to approve the application contingent upon the approval from the Fire Marshal, CDOT and the Town Engineer if deemed necessary. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. J. Faulise stated that he would

make the modifications on the plan for the trees to go from 3” to 3.5” calipers. G. Rooke-Norman stated a motion has been made and seconded to approve this application with certain conditions. She asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

F. ZP 09-05 Hyland, Bernie, 6 Mathewson Street, Jewett City, CT. Property Location: 6 Mathewson Street, Jewett City – Applicant requests approval of a zoning permit for multiple signs on one or more buildings on a single lot several of which exceed thirty-two square feet in size. The subject property is located in the Industrial zoning district.

M. McKinney has returned to the meeting. G. Rooke-Norman asked if anyone was present to represent the application. Bernie Hyland, Builders Surplus, was present to represent the application to the Commission.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there was a map or drawings. B. Hyland stated that there were photographs submitted with the application. He explained that there were seven buildings on the property that all have signs on them. He stated that since it was such a well-established landmark, they wanted to increase their visibility. There was discussion of this matter regarding the number of signs and the square footage and the regulations for signage.

M. McKinney stated that the sign on the fence was a problem. G. Rooke-Normans stated that it was an infringement of the residential uses. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion concerning signs. She read the section for sign square footage into the record. M. McKinney made a motion to approve all the signs on the buildings and remove the sign from the fence. R. Harris seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman stated that a motion has been made and seconded to have a zoning permit issued to have five signs on the buildings and no sign on the fence. She asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

G. SRC 02-05 Griswold Department of Planning and Development, 28 Main Street, Griswold, CT. – Applicant requests approval of text amendments to the Griswold Subdivision Regulations to change the title of Section 5 to “Conventional Subdivision Design Standards”, implementation of a new Section 6 entitled “Conservation Subdivision Design Standards”, subsequent re-numbering of remaining sections, and alteration to existing Section 6.6 “Open Space”.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino if this was his application. D. Sorrentino stated yes and that it up to the Commission to move it to public hearing. D. Sorrentino stated that it is important that this amendment be addressed to deal with conservation subdivision design. G. Rooke-Norman stated that she did not agree with renumbering sections because it becomes confusing. There was discussion of this matter regarding subsections and text revisions.

D. DeGuire stated that he liked the idea of this but he felt that it would not work in all areas of the town. R. Harris stated that he is in favor of cluster subdivisions and explained how this would apply. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that there should be workshop on it. M McKinney asked who would own the property. D. Sorrentino explained the four options for deeding of the property. There was discussion of this matter. D. DeGuire agreed with A. Hatfield that we need to work on the

plan of development There was discussion of this matter and included business development and jobs for Griswold.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a time frame to schedule a public hearing. D. Sorrentino stated that this was their application and there was no time limit. There was discussion of this matter.

R. Harris made a motion to table this matter. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

7. Additional Business:

M. McKinney raised the point that when the vice chair asked to put the BP Business Park application on the agenda it was never voted upon. M. McKinney made a motion to put April 11, 2005 Section 5 BP Business Park District proposed text amendment on the agenda. D. DeGuire so moved. R. Harris seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion to schedule a public hearing. M. McKinney made a motion to schedule the text change for the Business Park for June 13 at 7:30 p.m. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried. M. McKinney made a motion that we go over the for the text change that Demian brought forth on the cluster housing on at 7:00 p.m. June 13. R. Harris seconded the motion. There was discussion of the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

D. Sorrentino had additional business to put Polinsky Cedar Glen Subdivision on the agenda. This is the second and final 90-day extension by statute. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion to put the Polinsky Cedar Glen Subdivision on the agenda. R. Harris made a motion to place the Polinsky Cedar Glen Subdivision on the agenda. A. Hatfield seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

D. Sorrentino explained that J. Faulise is requesting an addition 90 days to record the final mylars on the Cedar Glen Subdivision. J. Faulise explained the reasons for this extension to work out the Homeowners Association with the attorneys. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion to approve a second 90-day extension. A. Hatfield made a motion to approve a second 90-day extension at the request of the applicant. M. McKinney seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried. There was discussion of the bond and the phasing plan.

8. Old Business:

G. Rooke-Norman submitted an outline for the plan of development to the commission that included recommendations regarding public involvement and letters sent to all the agencies for their submission to the plan. There was discussion of this matter that a form letter to be sent to the various agencies requesting a letter for their submission before April 30th.

G. Rooke-Norman asked about the mapping. There was discussion of this matter for printing the maps requiring a special printer. G. Rooke-Norman stated that we create a opportunity to have the public submit photos under categories of resources, and who is selected their photo would be included in the plan of development. There was discussion of this matter for two comment hearings and do a final draft in October.

D. Sorrentino explained where he was in the process of the time line. He stated that he has been working on goals inventory and analysis and housing statistics and housing trends. He stated that he fundamentally disagreed with the approach and where only 3 members of this commission working on it will produce a document where Griswold will be in ten years. He stated that there should be public participation. There was discussion of this matter of the chairmen of each commission participating in the formulating of the plan and setting an agenda for a workshop.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a special meeting to have a workshop of the plan of development. There was discussion of this matter for time and date and set the agenda. M. McKinney made a motion for a workshop meeting for the plan of development for April 18, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. to meet at the town hall. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

9. New Business:

There was no new business.

10. Reports from the Enforcement Officer:

P. Zvingilas reported that the Dziejcz application has met the conditions of approval for their one lot subdivision. He stated that their mylars needed to be signed. There was discussion of this matter.

11. Adjournment:

G. Rooke Norman asked if there were other matters. Hearing none she asked for a motion to adjourn. R. Harris made a motion to adjourn. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 11:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary