



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**

MAY 9, 2005

GRISWOLD TOWN HALL

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

1. Call to order:

Clyde Seaman, Chair called the first public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Philip Anthony, Roland Harris and Paul Wolinski

C. Seaman appointed Martin McKinney to sit for Roland Harris and Anne Hatfield to sit for Philip Anthony.

3. Determination of Quorum:

There is a quorum for this meeting.

4. Matter Presented for Consideration:

SUB 09-05 Quite Cove, LLC, 6 Weber Farm Road, Norwich, CT, Property Location: 55 Osga Lane, Griswold, CT. Applicant requests 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.

C. Seaman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant.

John Faulise, Boundaries. LLC was present to represent the applicants, members of Quiet Cove, LLC who were also present. J. Faulise stated that this was a continuation of a public hearing that began last month. He explained the proposed plan for the 11-lot subdivision on Bethel Road. He read the Board of Selectmen's letter of endorsement into the record and submitted it to the Commission. **Exhibit 1** J. Faulise stated that the fire marshal had reviewed the plans and that the letter was in file. D. Sorrentino stated that the letter was in the file.

J. Faulise explained the fire marshal's recommendations and review. He stated that alternatives were looked at for a water source for fire apparatus. The fire marshal recommended installing a dry hydrant north of lot five on sheet. J. Faulise explained the dry hydrant specifications on sheet

2 to the Commission. D. DeGuire asked who would maintain the hydrant. J. F. explained that the Homeowners Association would maintain the driveway access to the hydrant. M. McKinney asked about the groundwater. J. Faulise explained the groundwater depths of the water table. C. Seaman asked how the fall pond draw down would affect the groundwater depths of the hydrant. J. Faulise stated that there would be 3-4 feet of water in the hydrant. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked about the report from the town engineer. J. Faulise explained that the items of the letter from the town engineer. He submitted the engineer's letter and his comments into the record. **Exhibit 2** J. Faulise read the reviewing engineer's comments and explained his comments into the record regarding 1) zoning table indicating minimum lot size and set back lines, 2) Survey Note 4 easement for CL&P, inclusion of reference of property locations of the A flood zone noted on plans, and proposed grading, 2) proposed contours 3) finished floors, 4) footing drain locations, 5) well locations, 6) building set backs, 7) test holes 8) septic systems, 9) Bethel Road site lines, 10) silt fencing and regarding 11) signature of registered engineer, 12) Sheet 3 note for underground utilities.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino if he had any questions. D. Sorrentino stated that he is seeing these plans for the first time as well.

J. Faulise explained sheet 3 to the Commission regarding the elimination of the proposed retaining walls in favor of grading, shoulder slopes and shifting the road. There was discussion of this matter.

J. Faulise explained sheet 5 regarding test holes denoting ground water or ledge. J. Faulise stated that the test holes were witnessed by Al Gosselin, sanitarian and have his approval. He stated that sheet 5 was revised to show a 2" binder course. There was discussion of this matter including the detail sheet for road paving.

J. Faulise stated that the storm drainage calculations were signed and stamped by the design engineer. He submitted a signed and stamped set of storm drainage calculations into the record. **Exhibit 3**

J. Faulise stated that the bond estimate was signed and sealed and was submitted to the file. There was discussion of this matter including the engineer's comments of the topsoil allowance and J. Faulise read his response into the record. There was further discussion of this matter including topsoil stockpiles located on the property. J. Faulise read a letter into the record for 4 roadway construction quotes. He requested that the bond estimate be based on the average amount of the costs proposed of \$203,131 rather than the bond estimate of \$262,902 as prepared by the 2005 Book Of Means. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked if the Commission had any questions. D. DeGuire asked if Mrs. Walmsley's request was taken care of. J. Faulise stated that landscaping plans were discussed with the property owner. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked from comments from the audience.

Sarah Walmsley, 398 Bethel Road. She explained again to the Commission that she was trying to work out a landscaping agreement. She explained that she wanted to conserve as much of the trees as a buffer. She showed the location on the plans and asked for a no cut zone to maintain the privacy for her property and that of their neighbor's lot. There was discussion of this matter including the amount of trees to be cut, a proposed berm and the grove of mature spruce trees.

C. Seaman asked for other comments.

P. Zvingilas asked about the bond reduction stating that it was not done before and that the Commission has accepted the bond from the engineer. There was discussion of this matter. M. McKinney asked D. Sorrentino if the proposed bond change should be checked again. D. Sorrentino stated that the submission by J. Faulise could be reviewed again. There was further discussion of this matter.

D. Sorrentino asked if P. Lafayette had seen the revised plans and comments. J. Faulise stated no. C. Seaman asked for other comments from the board.

P. Zvingilas asked about the floor elevation being 3 to 4 feet above grade. J. Faulise explained the floor elevations to the board. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino what his feeling is about the engineer's review. D. Sorrentino stated that he was satisfied with the comments presented by J. Faulise. There was discussion of this matter included the A flood zone and the C flood zone.

C. Seaman asked for any further comments. Hearing none, he closed the hearing at 7:50 p.m.

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

1. Call to order:

Clyde Seaman, Chair called the next public hearing to order at 7:50 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Philip Anthony, Roland Harris and Paul Wolinski

C. Seaman appointed Martin McKinney to sit for Roland Harris and Anne Hatfield to sit for Philip Anthony.

3. Determination of Quorum:

There is a quorum for this meeting.

4. Matter Presented for Consideration:

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

C. Seaman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant

Mark Sullivan, Surveyor was present with Reepu Singh, engineer, and Nelson Rodriguez, applicant to present the application. M. Sullivan reviewed the concerns for the landscaping from last month. He explained the site lines running east and west for the driveway to the driving range.

D. DeGuire asked about the drainage for the site. Reepu Singh explained that there will be topsoil replacing the runway so there will be less run off. He explained that they are before the Commission because the regulations do not address driving ranges. He also explained that the driving range was a low intensity recreational use and that it would remain essentially green. He stated that the CDOT letter had not been received for the site line review; he stated that the landscaping plans had been revised and asked that the Commission approve the application.

M. McKinney asked about the lighting. R. Singh stated that the lighting would blend in with the neighborhood. There was discussion of this matter including hooded lights. R. Singh stated that lighting must to be designed by a lighting engineer.

C. Seaman asked about how the golf balls are kept out of people's lawns and Route 138. R. Singh stated that he had reviewed other driving ranges and the manufacturing of the netting. He stated that he could not guarantee that no golf balls would go out of the diving range. G. Rooke-Norman stated their concerns were for Route 138. There was discussion of this matter including height of netting and golf ball trajectory, errant golf ball engineers. M. Sullivan stated that the tee boxes were moved closer to Latham Road. N. Rodriguez stated that a ball would have to be hit deliberately over the net. There was further discussion of this matter.

M. McKinney asked about the arborvitae buffer being used. R. Singh stated that it is a buffer for the commercial use. There was discussion of this matter including the netting. P. Zvingilas stated that the netting couldn't be called a fence because fences can only be 6 feet high.

C. Seaman asked what was the highest point of the trajectory of a golf ball. N. Rodriguez explained how the golf balls would fly. There was discussion of this matter including the netting support structure height using timber poles or hollow steel structures.

C. Seaman asked what the hours of operation and the lighting. N. Rodriguez stated that it would be 7 to 9 on weekdays and 7 to 10 on the weekend and the lighting would shine about 150 feet. There was discussion of this matter including wattage and number of fixtures.

D. DeGuire asked about the parking lot using pavement or oiled stone. R. Singh stated that it could be at the discretion of the Commission to use stone rather than black top. There was discussion of this matter including the landscaping and trees to be cut down. M. McKinney asked which trees would be cut down on Rte 138. R. Nelson explained which trees would be moved or cut down. There was further discussion.

D. DeGuire stated that there needs to be a landscaping schedule that would show what kinds of trees will be planted in the parking lot area. There was discussion of this matter and D. Sorrentino read Section 11.8.2.10 into the record. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Commission's regulations must be followed to present the application to the Commission. There was further discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked about the visual screen. N. Rodriguez stated that there would be a wooden fence with trees to block the lights from entering cars. There was discussion of this matter. A. Hatfield asked how high the visual screen would be. R. Singh stated that the fence would be 6 feet high.

C. Seaman asked for other comments from the board. He asked for comments from the audience.

Tim Beyer, Glasgo Road. He stated that at Great Brook, it is hitting away from the road. He asked about the impact netting. N. Rodriguez stated that it is 230-burst netting strong enough to stop a golf ball. T. Beyer stated that the last booth would be 50 feet from Rte 138. N. Rodriguez explained there was a 12-20 buffer to the borderline and another 10 foot where the first tee out is and addition 75 ft to the last tee box. There was discussion of this matter. T. Beyer asked about insurance coverage. N. Rodriguez explained the insurance coverage. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked for other comments from the audience.

Dorothy Scott, Latham Drive. She stated that she thought that this was the best idea for the spot than anybody else has come up with. She hoped that all the safety issues can be resolved. She would personally like to see it happen.

Harry Blocker, Griswold, stated that at last month's meeting, the netting would be 3-4 feet above the ground. N. Rodriguez stated that it would be 1 to 1-1/2 feet off the ground explaining that wood would be put down to block the ball. H. Blocker asked about the trees. N. Rodriguez stated that they would be evergreens. H. Blocker stated that there should be a double line of arborvitae 5-6 feet high should be used on Rte 138 and Latham Road. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked if there was anyone else. He asked for any comments from the board.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the poles are 60 feet high and that the poles will go into the ground 5 to 6 high and the netting would be 55 feet. N. Rodriguez stated yes that the poles would be twice as high as a telephone pole. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked Demian if he had any comments or concerns for the plan as presented. D. Sorrentino stated that he agreed with D. DeGuire that there should be a landscaping plan and planting schedule and the types of lighting planned by an electrical engineer. There was discussion of this matter including pole extensions. A. Hatfield asked that the extensions should be done from the beginning. N. Rodriguez stated he didn't see the need to put extensions in the beginning but they could be added if a problem arises. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the netting would be 40 ft at the tee boxes, 60 feet at the center and 40 feet at the far end. N. Rodriguez stated that it would drop off gradually. He stated yes. M. McKinney stated that towards the building would be 60 and taper to the end. N. Rodriguez stated that it would be 40 feet at the building to about 100 feet then go up to 60 feet. There was discussion of this matter including not being able to hit the ball sideways from the tee boxes.

C. Seaman, hearing no comments or questions, closed the public hearing at 8:45 p.m.

III. PUBLIC HEARING (7:30 P.M.)

1. Call to order:

Clyde Seaman, Chair called the next public hearing to order at 8.45 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Philip Anthony, Roland Harris and Paul Wolinski

C. Seaman appointed Martin McKinney to sit for Roland Harris and Anne Hatfield to sit for Philip Anthony.

3. Determination of Quorum:

There is a quorum for this meeting.

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.

C. Seaman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. M. Reynolds, Project Engineer, was present to represent the applicant. He stated that the plans were submitted to the town's engineer for review. He submitted the revised bond estimate to the Commission. **Exhibit 1.** M. Reynolds submitted the drainage report. **Exhibit 2.** D. Sorrentino stated that the two letters are in the file. M. Reynolds submitted the revised plans to the Commission. **Exhibit 3**

M. Reynolds explained the drainage changes for the subdivision to the Commission. He explained that curbing was added on Edmond Road to collect the water and direct it to two additional hooded catch basins. He stated that all the off-site drainage goes to the proposed drainage system. M. Reynolds stated that the pipe sizes were increased. He explained at the rear of lot 7 a retention area would be created for the runoff that could store 140,000 gallons of water. He stated that all changes met with the town engineer's review.

M. Reynolds stated the site lines are demonstrated more clearly and explained them to the Commission. He stated that the site lines were reviewed by CDOT and meet with their approval for the entrance locations. M. Reynolds stated that individual lots would need individual approval and this is noted on sheet 2.

D. DeGuire asked about the roadway radius for the traffic. M. Reynolds stated that the radius met the regulations and is approximately 30 feet. D. DeGuire asked if there would be a problems with tractor-trailers accessing the subdivision. M. Reynolds stated that they have two choices of access from Edmond Road and Rte. 138.

C. Seaman asked about lot 6 concerning the paved area and the run off increasing the concentration on to someone else's property. M. Reynolds explained the topography of the area and that the runoff goes in that direction and the proposed runoff goes in that direction. That area is a depressed area to collect the water and there would be no erosion and is well drained. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that she did not want a strip mall effect. She asked if this application can reserve enough of a strip where the easement is to allow for a road access to keep off the main road. M. Reynolds stated the rights-of-way covered by an easement here would be a problem with the grade of the roadway. He stated that it would be adequate for a driveway but not for design standards for a road. There was discussion of this matter.

M. Reynolds asked D. Sorrentino about other comments to address to the Commission. D. Sorrentino stated that R. DeChamps had asked for a sidewalk waiver. M. Reynolds stated the sidewalks are included in the bond estimate and it is shown on the plan. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked D. Sorrentino if any comments were made of the driveway to the other property for the grading and retention basins for the drainage on lot 6. There was further discussion of the drainage of runoff on to lot 6 including grading of a flat contour to sheet flow of the runoff.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino about the retention area satisfying the questions of the adjacent property owners concerns for drainage. D. Sorrentino stated that he would defer to the engineer's judgment. There was discussion of this matter including safety issues.

M. McKinney asked about the tractor-trailer radius and if the proposed road would become a cut-off for the light. M. Reynolds stated that there may be a possibility of its use as a cut off and he addressed the radius issue. There was discussion of this matter.

M. Reynolds stated that the drainage is the natural pathway for the sheet flow to the retention basin. There was discussion of this matter of providing municipal improvement for Edmond Road. C. Seaman asked about the other questions. D. Sorrentino stated that the fire marshal reviewed the plan and it met with his approval; and A. Gosselin had not approved lot 3 because of the drainage problem. There was discussion of this matter.

M. McKinney asked how much gravel would be moved or removed. M. Reynolds explained that there would be some material to be removed but most of it would be reused and used as fill. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked for comments from the audience.

Bill Stetson gave a history about the drainage on Edmond Road and that it was a continual problem. He stated that this proposed drainage would address the some of the problems

Dianna Jacaruso, Edmond Road. She was concerned with the drainage issue and with all the water that runs off especially in the spring She explained how the water runs off the hillside to the road creating a wet area. G. Rooke-Norman asked if it was a swampy area with plants. D. Jacaruso stated that the plants were vines and such. M. McKinney asked if the water sheet flows down her driveway across the road and into the field. She explained the runoff flow. M. McKinney asked M. Reynolds about the catch basins. M. Reynolds stated that the drainage problems would be addressed by the curbing directing the water to the catch basins. D. DeGuire asked if will still go across the road. M Reynolds stated that he couldn't stay the water across the road.

Pat Jacaruso voiced his concerns for the proposed drainage. Mr. Reynolds stated that he couldn't change the grade of Edmond Road that was a town issue. There was discussion of this matter including drainage.

G. Rooke-Norman asked B. Stetson if he was satisfied with the proposed drainage. B. Stetson asked about the catch basins. M. Reynolds stated that a manhole would be in the road to a catch basin. B. Stetson stated the water crosses the road to the project side. G. Rooke-Norman asked if the design is optimal to deal with the water. B. Stetson stated yes.

Pat Jacaruso stated that the curbing would make the problem worse. B. Stetson stated that the town would put curbing on the other side of the road. There was discussion of this matter. D. Sorrentino asked M. Reynolds if the added water affected the drainage calculations. R. Reynolds

stated that the pipes are increased from 15 inches to 18 inches and 24 inches to take the additional flow.

John Taylor, 45 Edmond Road. He asked about the tractor-trailers and that it was a tight cut. He stated that the project would cause the traffic to back up at the light. M. Reynolds stated that the truck traffic can use the other entrance on Rte 138. J. Taylor voiced his concerns for traffic and accidents at that intersection. M. Reynolds stated that CDOT has reviewed the plans and concur with his designs.

C. Seaman asked for other comments.

Gail Stalinski, Edmond Road, stated that her property touches lots 6, 5, and 4. She was concerned that her view from her new addition will be looking at a building and she was concerned that her well would be affected. She also stated that she has entered a letter into the file voicing her concerns.

Valerie Grills, 6 Edmond Road asked if there needed to be two entrances. She asked if a commercial road had to go into a residential road. There was discussion of this matter. She was concerned for the traffic congestion. She had concerns for the traffic site line. M. Reynolds explained that there was 500-foot site line in one direction and 300-foot site line in the other direction. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked if the proposed roads would be turned over to the town. M. Reynolds stated yes and they will be built to town specification and were reviewed in that light.

Don Eccleston, 35 Edmond Road. He asked if there were floor elevations on any of the buildings and asked if there were regulations that stated they had to be set. M. Reynolds stated that the buildings are conceptual only. D. Eccleston asked if there was a height requirement. D. Sorrentino stated that it was 35 feet. There was discussion of this matter. D. Eccleston asked about the retention pond depth. M. Reynolds stated that the depth is 5 feet and the majority of the depth is at 2 feet and the side slopes are nearly flat. There was discussion of this matter. D. Eccleston asked about the limited clearing on lot 5 that borders the Stalinski property and asked about the stone wall. M. Reynolds stated that the majority of the stone wall is on the site and explained the limits of the clearing. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked about the rear yard set back for a commercial use. D. Sorrentino explained that the commercial site requires a 20-foot, planted buffer that included types of buffers as vegetation, a wall a berm. There was discussion of this matter.

Debbie Eccleston, 35 Edmond Road. She asked about keeping the stone wall. M. Reynolds stated that the stone wall is on lot 5. There was discussion of this matter.

Joyce Gootkin, 67 Edmond Road. She stated that she has lived on Edmond Road for 25 years. She stated that it would not be country anymore. She stated that it is country not the city. She voiced her concerns for the increased traffic and child safety. She was concerned with the icing in the winter.

C. Seaman asked for any one else. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 9:50 pm.

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

1. Call to order:

Clyde Seaman, Chair called the first public hearing to order at 9:50 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Philip Anthony, Roland Harris and Paul Wolinski

C. Seaman appointed Anne Hatfield to sit for Philip Anthony and Martin McKinney to sit for Roland Harris.

3. Determination of Quorum:

There is a quorum for this meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes:

C. Seaman asked for approval of the 3/14/05 minutes. G. Rooke-Norman stated that she had only received her packet and did not have time to read the minutes. She stated that it was due to the post office. G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to table all the minutes A through E to the next meeting. A. Hatfield seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried. D. Sorrentino stated that minutes in draft form are available for review in his office and through the Freedom of Information Act until the Commission approves them.

5. Correspondence and Attachments:

A. Notice from Eastern CT Resource Conservation and Development Area, Inc. dated March 30, 2005 announcing the latest brochure for the Environmental Review Team (ERT) program, a free environmental review service provided to municipalities in Eastern CT.

B. Notice from CT DEP, dated April 1, 2005 RE: DEP state Parks and Field Services Drainage Maintenance Plan.

C. Letter from Frank Chiamonte, 3rd Selectman of Harwinton, et al., dated April 4, 2005 expressing concern about CDOT's mismanagement of state traffic projects that have impact on local municipal character and land use policy. This letter asks for action in the form of correspondence with Gov. Rell's office.

There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked Chair, C. Seaman if it was appropriate to make a motion to ask D. Sorrentino to send correspondence in support of the Harwinton selectman to send to Gov. Rell's office. G. Rooke-Norman so moved. M. McKinney seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

- D. Notice of Regional Workshop "Perspectives on the Pawcatuck Borderlands: A Regional Clinic facilitated by the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy" May 19, 2005. 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Tamarack Lodge, Voluntown, CT.
- E. Letter from Mark K. Branse to Paul Brycki, dated April 18, 2005, confirming Atty. Branse's withdrawal from enforcement actions for Griswold v. Harvey Polinsky (docket numbers CV 02-056295 S and CV 02 0565685 S).
- F. Letter from Mark K. Branse to Chairman Seaman dated April 18, 2005, constituting Atty. Branse's resignation as the Planning & Zoning Commission's legal counsel.
- G. "Connecticut Wildlife" March/April 2005. CTDEPT Wildlife Division
- H. "Avalonia Trails" Spring 2005 Newsletter. Avalonia Land Conservancy, Inc.

6. Matters Presented for Consideration:

- A. **SUB 09-05 Quite Cove, LLC, 6 Weber Farm Road, Norwich, CT, Property Location: 55 Osga Lane, Griswold, CT.** Applicant requests 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

C. Seaman asked the Commission for discussion. G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino about the application. D. Sorrentino stated that in his opinion that the lots meet the subdivision regulations and the comment were addressed appropriately. D. DeGuire asked about protecting the people adjacent to the project. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to approve the subdivision as presented with a couple of conditions. Condition 1) for screening, erosion, and other consideration that the row of mature spruce along the boundary line between the Walmsley property and lot 11 that it not be cut within 25 feet of the boundary and where the trees extend beyond the 25 feet. Also conditional on a \$262,903 bond estimate for roadwork and that the bond be posted before the mylars. There was discussion of this matter. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for any other comments. Hearing none, he asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

- B. **SE 04-05 Rodriquez, Nelson, 91 Dawley Road, Griswold, CT. Property location: 1071 Voluntown Road, Griswold, CT** – Applicant requests 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 had a question regarding the uses for special exceptions for commercial recreation. There was discussion of this matter for outdoor commercial recreation in the C1 & C2

districts. M. McKinney stated that he had no problem with the concept but he had concerns for the paving, the lighting, and the landscaping. D. DeGuire had concerns for the safety on Rte 138. C. Seaman asked if this is something we could act upon with stipulations. There was discussion of this matter including addressing when an application has met the minimum requirements,

C. Seaman asked for some action on the matter. There was discussion of the paving, 11.8 landscaping plan, lighting 11.8.2.10a, height of the netting. G. Rooke-Norman stated that if the Commission is leaning to approve this, she had some conditions written out and read them into the record as follows.

1. Screening to be a minimum of 40 feet high at the tee boxes, a minimum of 60 feet for the stretch of the center and drop back to a minimum of 40 feet high at the far end. To be noted and dimensions to be added to the plans to be submitted no later than 20 days of May 9, 2005.
2. Submission of a Landscaping Plan in compliance with 11.8 within 20 days of May 9, 2005 which is satisfactory to the Town Planner, Zoning Enforcement Officer and/or Town Engineer and they find it to be in compliance with the zoning regulations.
3. Submission of a new revised plan signed and sealed by the engineer within 20 days of May 9, 2005 which includes all required specifications for the screening, netting types, location and heights of all plantings, lights, fences and to be found satisfactory and in compliance with the zoning regulations by the Town Planner, and the Zoning Enforcement Officer.
4. Within 20 days of May 9, 2005 the submission of a lighting plan with all specifications satisfactory to the Town Planner, Zoning Enforcement Officer and/or Town Engineer and found to be in compliance with 11.8.21a.
5. The parking and driveway area is to be paved in compliance with Griswold zoning regulations.

M. McKinney stated that he had a problem with the 20 days; that it was unrealistic to have an engineer to do the work in that short time. There was discussion of this matter. There was discussion of having all the applications to be in compliances with the regulation requirements before coming to the Commission.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to make all of those conditions as part of her motion to approve the application. M. McKinney seconded the motion

D. Sorrentino stated there should be a note of the submission of the site bond.

G. Rooke Norman amended her motion to include another condition to include 6) submission of the site bond for \$104,664 and must be posted prior to the endorsement of the mylars. M. McKinney seconded the amended motion. C. Seaman stated that the motion has been made and seconded. He asked for a vote. There were 3 votes in favor, 1 vote opposed by D. DeGuire. The motion was passed.

P. Zvingilas asked when the applicant would be able to do any site work. G. Rooke-Norman stated that he must meet the conditions. P. Zvingilas stated that he has been removing the runway

asphalt. There was discussion of this matter that the applicant can continue to remove the asphalt.

C. 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.

C. Seaman stated that the drainage issues were addressed and CDOT approved the access road. D. DeGuire asked if the selectmen have approved the cuts. D. Sorrentino stated that we don't have a letter from the selectmen. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino what the time frame was for voting on this application. D. Sorrentino stated that there are 65 days. C. Seaman stated that there was no letter from the selectmen in the file. There was discussion of the need for a letter from the selectmen including truck traffic. . Seaman asked for a motion.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to table the application to the next meeting on June 13, 2005 pending the Board of Selectmen's approval of the curb cuts, the Board of Selectmen's comments and recommendations and approval concerning the traffic control and drainage. A. Hatfield seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for discussion. There was discussion of the selectman's approval letter. C. Seaman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

M. Reynolds questioned the Commission regarding the Board of Selectmen's approval. There was discussion of this matter.

D. ZP 10-05 Stockton, David B., 871 Hopeville Road, Griswold, CT. Applicant requests approval of a Zoning Permit for Home Occupation to design, construct, and package custom unicycles and unicycle wheels. The property is located in the R-40 zoning district.

C. Seaman asked if any was present to speak on this application. David Stockton presented his application to the Commission. He explained that this application was to create unicycles. He stated he was using 145 square feet of the house for his workshop. He stated that he uses dremmel type tools and spray pants. He integrates the unicycle to the customer. D. Stockton showed his portfolio and a sample of his unicycle to the Commission.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the area is 10 ft x 14 ft. D. Stockton stated that there is storage for parts. M. McKinney asked if there will be customers and traffic to the house. D. Stockton stated that there isn't traffic for customers.

M. McKinney made a motion to approve the unicycle shop on 871 Hopeville Road, Jewett City. A. Hatfield seconded the motion. D. Sorrentino asked if there would be signage. D. Stockton stated no. C. Seaman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

E. SUB 12-05 Bonchuk, James & Elizabeth, 67 Patrick Road, Jewett City, CT. Property Location: 56 Bitgood Road. Requesting approval of a one-lot subdivision to create an additional building lot, in order to construct a single-family residence on the resultant parcel. The subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district.

C. Seaman asked if anyone was present to represent the applicant. Mark Sullivan, Surveyor, was present to represent the applicants who were also present. He explained where the property was located along the Pachaug River. He stated that it meets all the set back requirements. He explained that the ZBA approved a side yard set back reduction. M. Sullivan stated that the IWW&CC approved activity in the buffer in the regulated area. He stated that there is a letter of approval of the septic system from the sanitarian in the file.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if the parcel wrapped around the Cutler property that was a free split. M. Sullivan stated correct.

C. Seaman asked for any questions from the Board.

D. Sorrentino stated that the ZBA approval of the variance application was in appeal to the New London Superior Court by the Cutlers. He stated that the IWW&CC approval was also in appeal to the New London Superior Court by the Cutlers. He stated that these appeals did not stay the proceedings in land use matters. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked for a motion on this application. D. DeGuire made a motion to approve. M. McKinney seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

7. Additional Business:

A. Discussion of amendment to all Land Use Applications (application checklist)

D. Sorrentino passed out the checklist to the Commission. D. Sorrentino stated that it is for special exceptions, subdivisions, zoning permits to have a certificate of completeness. There was discussion of this matter.

B. Discussion of the hours of operation at American Industries, Route 12, Griswold.

D. DeGuire stated that there were complaints for hours going over the suggested hours. G. Rooke-Norman asked how it was monitored. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Discussion of potential zoning violation(s) at Browning & Crary Roads.

D. DeGuire asked if someone is living in the barn. P. Zvingilas stated that there is a furniture refinishing business in the barn prior to regulations. He gave a history of the business. M. McKinney stated that he was concerned for the chemicals being used. There was discussion of this matter including space in the barn and the well and septic system and living space. D. DeGuire asked if P. Zvingilas could take pictures for the Commission. P. Zvingilas stated that he

could ask the owner. There was further discussion of this matter.

8. Old Business

A. Plan of Conservation and Development progress report from Town Planner.

D. Sorrentino stated that there is a need for a location for this meeting. After discussion, it was rescheduled for May 25, 2005 at 7 pm.

D. Sorrentino stated that P & Z is scheduled on the IWW & CC agenda for May 19th. He stated that he would put natural resource maps together for the Commission. There was discussion of this matter.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Reports from the Enforcement Officer:

P. Zvingilas stated that Mr. Tracy has started moving the vehicles off the property. There was discussion of this matter. P. Zvingilas stated he would keep on Mr. Tracy until he is in compliance.

11. Adjournment:

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to adjourn. D. DeGuire had a question and M. McKinney had a question regarding Atty. Mark Branse. G. Rooke-Norman withdrew her motion to adjourn.

D. Sorrentino stated that Atty. Branse is willing to meet with this Commission in executive session to discuss any issues. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to request the Board of Selectmen provide the Planning & Zoning Commission in executive session with an update of the negotiations concerning the enforcement actions. There was lengthy discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to go into executive session to discuss the litigation. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. C. Seaman asked for a vote. There was further lengthy discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman withdrew her motion to go into executive session.

G. Rooke-Norman made a motion to adjourn. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 11:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary