



Town of Griswold



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

GRISWOLD PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 22, 2008

GRISWOLD TOWN HALL

I. 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 7:09 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Member John Taylor, Alternates Andrew Drobiak, Barbara Lukens, ZEO Peter Zvingilas

3. Determination of Quorum:

There was a quorum for this special meeting.

4. Zoning Regulation & Subdivision Regulation Workshop

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this is a review of an ongoing draft of the town and borough zoning regulations and the subdivision regulations.

C. Fontneau stated that there is a draft wording of the moratorium extension. He stated that the public hearing was scheduled for October 14, 2008. M. McKinney asked if there would be some items approved as well as the extension. C. Fontneau stated that the public hearing is for the extension of the moratorium. M. McKinney asked if the four months for the extension would be enough time to complete the regulations. C. Fontneau stated yes. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that she would like to review the moratorium wording. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the February 1, 2008 start date will remain. D. DeGuire suggested that the ending date be March 31, 2008. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman let the record show that C. Kinnie arrived at 7:20 p.m.

G. Rooke-Norman suggested the wording for the moratorium "this temporary moratorium will be effective on February 1, 2008 and remain in effect and extended for a term ending March 31, 2009." G. Rooke-Norman stated that the public hearing can be held in March in a special meeting to set an effective date. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked that the commissioners to prioritize items to discuss. She would like to discuss the conservation subdivision. M. McKinney stated that the R-40 zone should be replaced and to consider R-60 as a minimum lot requirement. C. Kinnie asked that for the conservation subdivision, what the discount would be to go from R-80 to R-60. G. Rooke-Norman stated that maybe we don't want conservation subdivisions. C. Kinnie stated that he thinks that they are valuable. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Fontneau stated that the R-20 will be eliminated and the R-40 will have increased dimensional requirements. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the dimensional requirements can be varied. M. McKinney asked for examples of conservation subdivisions from other towns that actually worked. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Fontneau state that the commission should decide on the frontage/rear lot ratio for use with common driveways that encouraged rear lots. He asked the commission to decide whether there would be two tiers or one tier of rear lots. He stated that he did some work on the driveway regulations. G. Rooke-Norman stated that she wanted the numbers plugged into regulations and wanted to see a cohesive regulations so they can be reviewed. M. McKinney asked if there is a community that uses this type of lot ratio. C. Fontneau stated that he will get conservation subdivision regulations and plans with common driveways and rear lots. There was discussion of this matter.

M. McKinney asked about the buildable rectangle and what does that mean. C. Fontneau explained that there is some language about buildable square that has a certain percentage or minimum amount of square footage that is usable land and excludes wetlands, outcroppings and less that 15% slope. There was discussion of this matter including that there should be a definition of "lot size".

G. Rooke-Norman stated that in regard to the open space subdivision regulations and the R-40 zone, she asked C. Fontneau if he has all the conservation subdivision regulations put together with all the changes from past workshops in writing. C. Fontneau stated that most of the changes are in the zoning regulations and the subdivision regulations build on the zoning regulations. He stated that those changes are still in note form. She asked C. Fontneau to nail down the sections and the language agreed to and all the changes that are in other sections that mirror that change. G. Rooke-Norman stated that we would like to have a buildable area and we need to see it to make the necessary changes. G. Rooke-Norman stated that a draft will be needed of all the changes thus far so it can be reviewed. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that Killingly recently did their regulations that deal will the buildable area. She read some of those regulations for the record such as preserving natural features, proposed open space areas being entirely within the undivided parcel to be one contiguous piece except where the commission finds it more effective to have separated parcels. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the buildable area must be in a rectangular form in some portion of the lot. C. Kinnie asked about language in tiers for common driveways and that an area that is less than 100 feet does not count for the square footage of the lot. G. Rooke-Norman stated that any of the R-40 zones should be changed and that any R-40's that remain will be closest to the population centers and not out in the country. There was discussion of this matter including increasing the front yard set backs to 50 ft in the R-40 zone such as the net buildable area could be 20,000 s.f. and other dimensional requirement changes.

She stated that in the conservation subdivision regulations to have a ratio of rear lots to frontage lots so that 95 percent of the lots are not frontage lots. M. McKinney stated that the square footage should exclude ledge, wetlands and rocks because a large percentage that was given was unusable land. C. Kinnie stated that the ratio should be the same for open space and the buildable area. G. Rooke-Norman asked if the commission was good with a 50/50 ratio. G. Rooke-Norman stated that 2 tiers require that the rear lots need twice the square footage and that all of the access strip or driveway square footage is not included in the lot acreage. C.

Fontneau asked if he should write it as a two tier rear lot option. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the absolute minimum number of acres in two tiers would be about 24-25 acres in an R-80 zone. There was discussion of this matter including that the zoning map would change all R-40 zones to R-60 zones even in areas that had access to public water.

C. Fontneau asked about using two tiers with minimum total parcels for two tiers in the three remaining residential districts. G. Rooke-Norman stated that two tiers are available only in R-60 and R-80 and in parcel sizes 18 acres or more. G. Rooke-Norman stated that this is different than lot dimensions; and this would be conventional subdivision design elements in the subdivision regulations. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Kinnie stated that he has said many times that there should be town wide R-80 zone. G. Rooke-Norman stated that she could see a town-wide R-60. M. McKinney stated people are probably expecting that since we're working on the regulations. C. Kinnie asked if R-40 would be come R-60 but you would keep R-80. G. Rooke-Norman stated that some R-40 can be kept that are closest to town. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Fontneau stated that his notes for the next meeting for language for net buildable area, R-20 zone eliminated and R-40 dimensional changes; a definition of rear lots and the ratio for lots in the subdivision regulations is 2 tier rear lots for a minimum of 18 acres. C. Fontneau asked the number of lots for common driveways. G. Rooke-Norman stated 4 lots for common driveways by special exception and that all the legal documents must be submitted at the beginning of the application or the application is not complete and reviewed by the town attorney.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Killingly subdivision regulation addresses subdivision design elements. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that there is the C-1 Village Commercial and C-2 Highway Commercial and would like to create another commercial zone that is appropriate for pockets of neighborhood commercial activities such as Button Farm. She stated that C-1 Village and C-2 would be called just C-1 and C-2 and that the third commercial zone can be Rural Commercial or Village Commercial and would be a more restrictive zone with strict architectural standards. G. Rooke-Norman identified the following items in Section 6.3.1 not to be allowed in Rural/Village Commercial such as hospitals, clinics and other medical buildings out, hotels, conference centers, motels, and amusement game arcades. C. Fontneau stated that this zoning designation would be under Section 8-2j of the State Statutes. There was discussion of this matter including that the Plan of Conservation and Development would need to be modified.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that the two tier systems in the R-60 & R-80 zones in a conventional subdivision will be rear lots and no more than 40 percent shall be frontage lots. This will not be available in the conservation subdivision regulations. She stated that the conservation subdivision in the R-80 zone to a minimum lot size for a conservation subdivision is equal to the percentage of open space of the same quality and this will be part of the subdivision regulations. There was discussion of this matter including that all the conditions must be in the site plan to show contours, wetlands and outcrops.

5. Adjournment:

D. DeGuire made a motion to adjourn. M. McKinney seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary