



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

AUGUST 6, 2009

GRISWOLD TOWN HALL

I. PUBLIC HEARING (6:30 P.M.)

1. Call to order:

Chairperson Gail Rooke-Norman called this public hearing of Griswold Planning & Zoning Commission to order at 7:40 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Chairperson Gail Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair Martin McKinney, Secretary Courtland Kinnie, Members Daniel DeGuire, Alternate Barbara Lukens, Town Planner Carl Fontneau, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Member John Taylor, Alternate Andrew Drobiak, ZEO Peter Zvingilas

3. Determination of Quorum:

G. Rooke-Norman appointed B. Lukens to sit for J. Taylor and will be a voting member. There was a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matter Presented for Public Comment:

A. SRC 01-10 Draft changes to the Town of Griswold Zoning Map to replace the current 2001 amended paper map with a digital map based on full tax parcels. Zoning district changes to eliminate the R-20 zone, to convert R-40 parcels to R-60 parcels based on the presence of one water and/or sewer, to create new C-1 parcels along the Routes 164, 138, and 201, and to create a Business Park District and an Open Space/Passive Recreation District. **Draft changes to the Town of Griswold Zoning Regulations** to multiple sections throughout and are mixed in content from administrative updates, clarification of wording, and to policy or bulk geometric requirement changes and age restricted housing. **Draft changes to the Town of Griswold Subdivision Regulations** to multiple sections throughout and are mixed in content from administrative updates, clarification of wording, and to regulation changes in the areas of common driveway configuration, conservation subdivision design, and stormwater management. **Draft change to Section 17.2 of the Borough of Jewett City Zoning Regulations** to clarify notice requirements for variance applications to Zoning Board of Appeals.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this is to continue the public comments of the subdivision regulations, the town zoning map, town zoning regulations and the change to section 17.2 of the Borough Zoning regulations.

D. DeGuire arrived at 6:42 pm.

We will review the subdivision regulations for the town of Griswold and asked for a consensus to deal with the remaining Town regulations then go through the subdivision regulations. The final document will be posted with the town clerk and can be voted on by everyone. There was consensus to deal the subdivision regulations.

C. Fontneau explained the changes to the zoning map from the last public hearing on Pleasant View. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman read a letter from Walter Held for the record offering his help for the landing strip regulation to have experts and consultants address this issue.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a review of the Subdivision regulations. C. Fontneau explained section 2.2 Optional Sketch Plan Review; Section 2.5 Review of free split documentation for new language that defines the town clerk asking the owner to meet with the planner or ZEO regarding the legality of the free split. G. Rooke-Norman stated that we cannot require surveyors, land agents to certify by letter of the free split designation. She stated that a state and town conveyance tax form is filled out and we can require a town conveyance tax form; and the town has a right to not recognize the free split as a legal lot and to put the burden on the land owner. There was discussion of this matter. C. Fontneau stated that this regulation needs not be enacted.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from the public on the sections reviewed so far.

Mario Tristany, 23 Harry Hill Drive stated that because it is on the land records doesn't mean it correct or is up to code or regulation. M. Tristany stated that this process would be cumbersome to insure everything filed on the land records is up to the regulations G. Rooke-Norman added some changes to Section to 2.5 for free splits and deletion of other language and read them for the record. There was discussion of this matter and addition wording included.

C. Fontneau explained Section 3.2 for Land Use Fee Ordinance as appendix A.; Section 3.2 regarding a free lot; Section 3.4 changes from 30 days to 35 days to be consistent with statutory requirements.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from the public. M. Tristany stated that

C. Fontneau reviewed section 3.5.1, change shall to may; Section 3.6 deletion of wording; C. Fontneau explained the new wording for Section 3.6.2 Final Approval. There was discussed regarding final and conditional approval. M. McKinney suggested removing Section 3.6.3.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for public comment. M. Tristany stated that in Section .6.2 there may not be a need for a bond. And that it is the regulation not the commission. He stated that the condition approval is text that doesn't really do anything. He cited an example using the City of Norwich procedures. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman read new language for the record.

C. Fontneau read Section 3.7 added language for adequately-capitalized banking institution licensed to do business in the state of Connecticut; Section 3.8 was a clarification. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman stated that this creates more rules that can be the basis of an appeal.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for public comment on 3.7 & 3.8.

M. Tristany stated that it should include the engineer on the plan. And that the bond is posted prior to the file of the plan on the land records. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman read the changes for the record.

C. Fontneau explained section 3.9 Filing of the plan. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman read the changes for the record. C. Fontneau explained section 3.9.1 regarding the digital formatting for the final plans for maps. G. Rooke-Norman stated that this section looks like a procedures manual rather than a regulation so 3.9, 3.9.1 3.9.2, 3.9.3. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman stated that she was not comfortable that that.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from the public. M. Tristany stated that he agreed with the need for digital plans and that the file should be endorsed by the commission chairman. He suggested PDF format for maps that cannot be manipulated where some other formats can be manipulated; and that the technical jargon can be an appendix for technical specifications for subdivisions.

C. Fontneau explained the minor changes to section 3.2; Section 3.11, Section 3.12, Section 3.13. G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from the public. There were not comments. C. Fontneau explained Section 4; 4.1.3, Section 4.16; Section 4.3.1; Section 4.3.4.; Section 4.3.11 changes were discussed; Section 4.3.14 changes were explained; Section 4.3.16 new language was read;

G. Rooke-Norman asked for public comment. M. Tristany stated that the parcel history map for certification 4.1.6 it certifies the degree of accuracy. There was discussion of this matter.

Section 4.4, Section 4.4.2 Drainage new language, 4.4.3, stone wall language added, Section 4.5, C. Fontneau explained item c in Section 4.5.1 regarding a change bond for erosion and sedimentation control measures and Section 4.5.4 addressing failure of the applicant to complete the project.

C. Fontneau explained the changes to Section 4.6 for trees in excess of 2 feet in diameter. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman read the changes for the record to eliminate the reference to trees in excess of 2 feet.

C. Fontneau explained Section 4.7.5 of the State Archeologist and the changes were read for the record. M. Tristany asked about State endangered species. C. Kinnie asked if the fee would be paid by the applicant. C. Fontneau stated that the consulting archeologist fee would be paid by the applicant. There was discussion of this matter including that the applicant submit a certificate of mailing and a copy of the letter with the mail receipt and return receipt request.

C. Fontneau explained section 5.2.1, Section 5.2.5, Section 5.2.6 being compatible with the zoning regulations. M. McKinney asked if the driveway s too long. G. Rooke-Norman stated that 600 feet was too short. There was discussion of this matter. The language was change to 1000 feet driveway length. Section 5.2.7 was reviewed.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from staff, members and the public. C. Fontneau stated that because of the State Supreme Court ruling so rear lots with common driveways are encouraged to lessen the need for new town roads. C. Fontneau explained Sections 5.3; Section 5.3.2, Section 5.3.7; Section 5.4 and Section 5.5 changed to 10 percent for open space; Section 5.5.3.1 changed to 10 % and added language; Section 5.5.3.3 b

G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from the public staff and members.

C. Fontneau explained the changes to Section 5.6 regarding sidewalk easements; Section 5.7; G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from the public

C. Fontneau explained changes to Section 6.1 special design standards. G. Rooke-Norman read the section for the record.

C. Fontneau explained changes to 6.1.1, Section 6.2.2 Bonus lots. G. Rooke-Norman read the changes for the record for the conservation subdivision of 1 additional lot.

C. Fontneau explained section 6.3.1; Section 6.3.3 there was discussion of the requirements for residential lots, Section 6.3.6. There was discussion of the contiguous open space and not traversing a lot to access the open space; Section 6.3.18 Over 55 housing C. Fontneau explained changes Section 6.4.4 and Section 6.5 Drainage.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for public comment on sections 6.1 through 6.5. M. Tristany stated that in 6.2.2 what the 34 percent was. C. Fontneau stated that it was for the cluster subdivision and bonus lots. There was discussion of this matter. M. Tristany stated that the utilities were not under ground on the first lot and had overhead power and cited examples in town. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman stated that underground utilities were required for a subdivision.

There was discussion of Section 6.6 Open Space. C. Fontneau explained Section 6.6.6 additional language for right to farm in Connecticut; Section 6.7 changes for pedestrian easement, Section 6.8; G. Rooke-Norman asked for public comment on section 6.

Section 7 was discussed of the changes to Section 7.2 drainage, Section 7.4.1, Section 7.6.5 additional language for boundary lines and a question of specimen trees and trees was removed and be on durable posts instead; Section 7.10 bond release. G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments on Section 7.

Changes were discussed in section 8 waivers; G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments on section 8. Changes were discussed in Section 10 Definitions. G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments from the public and the commission. C. Fontneau explained Appendix A Land Use Fees Town Ordinances as information

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the subdivision public comments are done and we'll go on with the Zoning regulations. G. Rooke-Norman explained the reasonable possibilities to have approvals of the zoning regulations and subdivision regulations. G. Rooke-Norman asked for any changes up to page 5. There was discussion of this matter. Changes to page 6 were discussed regarding special exception document. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked for changes for Section 3; Section 4;

G. Rooke-Norman stated that Section 6.3.18 had the potential for creating a NIMBY in the C-1 zone for over 55 housing. There was discussion of this matter. G. Rooke-Norman asked for public comment.

M. Tristany stated that with 55 older housing the density is high and that city water and sewer is needed and in the residential areas those utilities are not available. He explained that the State OPM is enforcing their POCD for utilities; and if you are not in their growth area of their POCD, you can't extend sewer without a locational map guide change through the State OPM. He suggested that many rooftops to make the area riper for developers for population density. C. Fontneau stated that the commercial development would be along the state road with residential development in the back. He recommended keeping this in C-1 zone. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a consensus. C. Kinnie stated that it fits mixed use and village commercial.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for comments through section 7. There was discussion of the changes to Section 8.6 lot coverage and that those changes will not be enacted. C. Kinnie stated that the low impact development techniques reduces the need for more stringent lot coverage and they developer will have to meet the guidelines. M. McKinney and D. DeGuire agreed.

Greg Mackin had a question regarding a gated community as it applied to roads. G. Rooke-Norman stated that it would be something similar to the Over 55 housing and the road would be made to town standards; and that it would be considered a private road. She asked him to put his question in a letter for a later time.

There were no comments on section 8 and section 9.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the language was rearranged without changing the meaning of the language. G. Rooke-Norman read the 10.1.1 regulation for the record. She asked for comments and consensus. There was consensus with 10.1.1.

G. Rooke-Norman read section 10.2.1 changes based on comments received during the prior public hearings. There was lengthy discussion of the changes to 10.2.2. She read the changes to section 10.2.2 for the record. There was consensus of the changes to 10.2.2. G. Rooke-Norman read section 10.2.3 for the record of the new language for rear lot ownership. There was consensus on this section.

G. Rooke-Norman explained the two Section 10.7 that had the original language and the proposed changes. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the proposed language addresses special exceptions through the Zoning Board of Appeals and that some of the language is ambiguous and counters case law for the term "same ownership".. G. Rooke-Norman asked from comments from the public. M. Tristany stated that it is not the same ownership and he stated that the cleaner you can make it the better if it means putting the word "identical". There was discussion of this matter. There was consensus to leave the original language for 10.7.

C. Fontneau explained section 10.8 Driveway Access changes. G. Rooke-Norman stated that on page 36, there are minor changes. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the figures are not accurate and those will be discussed at a later time. G. Rooke-Norman had a question on page 59 for section 12.2 for the strikeout. There was discussion of this matter. The strikeout will remain and 17.2 will be removed. Section 12.16 was changed based on public comments. Section 12.12.2 for private aircraft landing facilities was discussed and removed the language regarding glide slope. Section 12.16 was discussed for changes.

There was discussion of Section 12.1 addition of colon after intent; Section 21.2 was changed to reference 2, 12, and 13. Section 12.21.5.1 changes should read for C-1 with C-2 and industrial removed as a typo; Section 12.21.4 changes based on public comment and observations. Section 12.21.5.10 omitted text for parking requirements has been restored. There was discussion of this matter that streets are to be to town standards. Section 13.3.7 was a typo.

There was discussion of 13.7 for performance guarantee language was corrected. 13.8 had typos, 13.9 had minor changes to Minor Site Plan Amendments additional language; Section 15.1.4 changes for additional from one week to 30 days for a temporary sign as well as new language for time/temperature, message boards, community and school activity signs containing moving message. There was consensus.

G. Mackin asked in Section 15.3.4 for total sign area. G. Mackin stated for Section 15.3.6 that his tenants for 200 s.f. on the pole, 100 ft. in height would not be adequate to be seen from the highway; and that their sign would need 800 s.f. There was discussion of this matter including the sign is for the product. M. Tristany stated that there can be a scale drawing and elevation at the time of the application for the size of the sign. There was consensus to consider the change to the sign square footage from 200 s.f. to 500 s.f. for 100 feet in height. She read the regulation for the record with the additional language for size and

There was discussion of Section 16.6 abandonment, Section 17.3 changes to the last paragraph, Section 20.1 for effective date; Section 21 additional language citing section 12.21.3 and other additions to the definitions. G. Rooke-Norman asked for public comment, hearing none, she asked for a motion to close the public hearing on the zoning regulations, zoning map and subdivision regulations and borough of Jewett City Section 17.

M. McKinney made a motion to close the public hearing. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. The ayes carried. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a five minute recess.

II. **SPECIAL MEETING (7:00 P.M.)**

1. **Call to order:**

Chairperson Gail Rooke-Norman called this special meeting of Griswold Planning & Zoning Commission to order at 10:50 p.m.

2. **Roll Call:**

Present: Chairperson Gail Rooke-Norman, Vice Chair Martin McKinney, Secretary Courtland Kinnie, Members Daniel DeGuire, Alternate Barbara Lukens, Town Planner Carl Fontneau, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Member John Taylor, Alternate Andrew Drobiak, ZEO Peter Zvingilas

3. **Determination of Quorum:**

G. Rooke-Norman appointed B. Lukens to sit for J. Taylor and will be a voting member.. There was a quorum for this public hearing.

4. **Matter Presented for Consideration:**

A. SRC 01–10 Draft changes to the Town of Griswold Zoning Map to replace the current 2001 amended paper map with a digital map based on full tax parcels. Zoning district changes to eliminate the R-20 zone, to convert R-40 parcels to R-60 parcels based on the presence of one water and/or sewer, to create new C-1 parcels along the Routes 164, 138, and 201, and to create a Business Park District and an Open Space/Passive Recreation District. **Draft changes to the Town of Griswold Zoning Regulations** to multiple sections throughout and are mixed in content from administrative updates, clarification of wording, and to policy or bulk geometric requirement changes and age restricted housing. **Draft changes to the Town of Griswold Subdivision Regulations** to multiple sections throughout and are mixed in content from administrative updates, clarification of wording, and to regulation changes in the areas of common driveway configuration, conservation subdivision design, and stormwater management. **Draft change to Section 17.2 of the Borough of Jewett City Zoning Regulations** to clarify notice requirements for variance applications to Zoning Board of Appeals.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that Section 17.2 of the Borough Regulations was heard at three public hearings and public comment taken and concluded today 8/6/09; she asked for a motion. C. Kinnie made a motion to approve the proposed changes fro Section 17.2 of the borough regulations. M. McKinney seconded the motion. The approval carries. Let the record show that there are five members voting and the vote was 5 to 0.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the draft proposed changes to the Griswold zoning map that have been noticed and the subject of 3 public hearings, and comments taken from the public and

concluded today 8/6/09; and that there have been minor amendments to the map from prior zoning approvals; and she entertained a motion to approve and adopt the changes to the town of Griswold zoning map as amended through 8/6/09 subject to any zone changes granted by this commission and inadvertently omitted.

M. McKinney made a motion to substitute 9-2000 official zoning map as amended with the Griswold zoning map based on tax parcels zoning map as amended, and as amended to delete R-20 district parcels, modify R-40, R-60 and R-80 districts, add an open space passive recreation district and a business park district and add more C-1 parcels in several state highway corridors areas as suggested in the 6/2007 Plan Of Conservation and Development. M. McKinney so moved. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. The approval carries. Let the record show that there are five members voting and the vote was 5 to 0.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that a super majority is needed for approvals. There was discussion of the effective date. She asked for a motion for an effective date for the Jewett City zoning regulations.

C. Kinnie made a motion for the effective date for Section 17.2 of the Borough zoning regulations for August 10, 2009. M. McKinney made a motion to set the effective date of the changes to the Town of Griswold Zoning map for August 10, 2009. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. The ayes carried.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Griswold zoning regulations. There was discussion the sections not to be enacted that included section 8.6 lot coverage percentage changes not being enacted; and adopting the text changes to Section 8.6, and the maximum lot coverage changes not being enacted; not adopting the revised Section 10.7 and keeping the existing Section 10.7 Area and Frontage Exception; not adopting the changes to Section 12.12.2 relating to language referring to the glide slope until such time as a better description for the context of private aircraft landing facilities is established.

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the town of Griswold regulation with the changes proposed including strikeouts, bold, italicized bold, notes added to the working copy based on public comments on the master copy of the draft changes and comments through 8/6/09 and all the changes we are implementing and the amendments to the changes we are implementing are based on public comments, clarifications, and existing and proposed language making amendments less restrictive than that which had been recommend; and to include the exclusions of Section 8.6 will be adopted in their entirety in the 8/05/09 draft except that the proposed change from 60% to 50% will not be adopted; and will remain at 60% which was lot coverage prior to the proposal; and where the commission can vary by special exception, we are leaving intact the 80% but all the other changes in that section are adopted. We are not adopting any changes to Section 10.7 and keeping Section 10.7 intact and not adopting any of the strikeouts, or any of the additions for 10.7; to adopting the strikeout in 10.2 and not adopting the language in 12.12.2 to be made effective August 10, 2009. B. Lukens so moved. M. McKinney seconded the motion. All were in favor. The ayes carried. Let the record show that there are five members voting and the vote was 5 to 0.

G. Rooke-Norman went through the Subdivision regulations for changes and notated on the Master Copy. There was discussion of the changes to Section 2.5. G. Rooke-Norman read the Section 2.5 for "free split" parcels as it will be adopted by the commission. There was discussion of Section 3.2. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 3.6 as it will be adopted by the commission. There was discussion of 3.3 (b) correction of a typo log to long. There was discussion of Section 3.6.2 and Section 3.6.3. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 3.6.2 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 3.7 Performance Guarantee. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 3.7 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 3.8 Endorsement of the Plan. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 3.8 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 3.9 Filing of the Plan. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 3.9 as it will be adopted. There was

discussion of Section 3.12 E & S Control Plan. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 3.12 as it will be adopted based on public input. There was discussion of Section 4.1.6. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 4.1.6 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 4.3.6. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 4.3.6 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 4.5.4. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 4.5.4 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 4.7.5 Review letter from State Archeologist. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 4.7.5 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 5.2.6 Access strip to road frontage. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 5.2.6 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 5.3; Section 5.4; Section 5.5 as presented. There was discussion of Section 5.5.3.1. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 5.5.3.1 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 5.5.3.3. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 5.5.3.3 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 5.6; 5.7; 5.8; 5.9 will be adopted as presented. There was discussion of Section 6.1. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 6.1 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 6.2.2 G. Rooke-Norman read Section 6.2.2 Bonus lot as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 6.3.8 Rear lots. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 6.3.8 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 7.6.5 Boundary lines. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 7.6.5 as it will be adopted. There was discussion of Section 7.10 bond release. G. Rooke-Norman read Section 7.10 as it will be adopted.

G. Rooke-Norman entertained a motion relating to the master copy of the Subdivision Regulations. B. Lukens made a motion to approve the changes to the Town of Griswold Subdivision Regulations as shown on the master copy with strikeouts, additions in bold and other edits and amendments that implemented public comments, clarification of existing and proposed language and making the amendments less restrictive than that was proposed and for those changes to be effective August 10 2009.. D. DeGuire seconded the motion. All were in favor. The ayes carried. There were five voting members and the vote was 5-0.

5. **Adjournment:**

D. DeGuire made a motion to adjourn. C. Kinnie seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary