



**TOWN OF KILLINGLY, CT
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK, KILLINGLY, CT
2022 MAR 29 AM 11:20

MONDAY – MARCH 21, 2022
Regular Meeting – HYBRID MEETING

7:00 PM

TOWN MEETING ROOM – 2ND FLOOR

Killingly Town Hall

172 Main Street

Killingly, CT

THE PUBLIC IS ALLOWED TO ATTEND THE MEETING IN PERSON
OR THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW THIS MEETING AS DESCRIBED BELOW

THE PUBLIC CAN VIEW THIS MEETING ON FACEBOOK LIVE.

GO TO www.killinglyct.gov AND CLICK ON FACEBOOK LIVE AT THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE.

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chair, Keith Thurlow, called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Brian Card, Virge Lorents, John Sarantopoulos, Michael Hewko, Keith Thurlow (all were present in person).

Matthew Wendorf was absent with notice.

Staff Present – Ann-Marie Aubrey, Director of Planning & Development; Ken Slater, Town Attorney, Halloran & Sage; Jonathan Blake, Planner I/ZEO, Jill St. Clair, Director of Economic Development; David Capacchione, Town Engineer (all were present in person).

Also, Present (in person) – Attorney Michael Carey, Law Firm of Suisman Shapiro and Associates; Nicholas Durgarian, Douglas Construction; Jim Rossman, Project Engineer with Stadia Engineering; Steven MacCormack; Jason Andersen, Town Council Liaison; J.S. Perreault, Recording Secretary.

II. SEATING OF ALTERNATES

Chair, Keith Thurlow stated that Michael Hewko would be seated as a voting Member for this meeting (in the absence of Matthew Wendorf).

III. AGENDA ADDENDUM – None.

IV. CITIZENS' COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING (Individual presentations not to exceed 3 minutes; limited to an aggregate of 21 minutes unless otherwise indicated by a majority vote of the Commission)
NOTE: Public comments can be emailed to publiccomment@killinglyct.gov or mailed to the Town of Killingly, 172 Main Street, Killingly, CT 06239 on or before the meeting. All public comment must be received prior to 2:00 PM the day of the meeting. Public comment received will be posted on the Town's website www.killinglyct.gov.
NOTE: To participate in the CITIZENS' COMMENTS– the public may join the meeting via telephone while viewing the meeting on Facebook live.
To join by phone please dial 1-415-655-0001; and use the access code 2633 752 3248 when prompted.

Keith Thurlow read aloud the information regarding citizens' comments. There were no comments from citizens.

V. COMMISSION/STAFF RESPONSES TO CITIZENS' COMMENTS – None.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS – (review / discussion / action)

NOTE: To participate in THE PUBLIC HEARINGS – the public may join the meeting via telephone while viewing the meeting on Facebook live.

To join by phone please dial 1-415-655-0001; and use the access code 2633 752 3248 when prompted

1) **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1278;** Douglas Construction (Jim Vance/Landowner) & Laurel A. Horne (Applicant & Landowner); 605 Providence Pike; GIS MAP 224, LOT 14; ~177 acres, RD **AND** 613 Providence Pike; GIS MAP 224, LOT 13, ~4.6 acres, RD; request to change zoning from Rural Development to General Commercial. **(CONT. FROM 01/18/2022)**

Attorney Michael Carey, Law Firm of Suisman Shapiro and Associates; Nicholas Durgarian, Douglas Construction; and Jim Rossman, Project Engineer for Douglas Construction, were present to represent the Applicant and gave an overview. Plans/maps were displayed as discussed.

Attorney Carey referred to his Application Narrative dated January 14, 2022 (which was intended to cover all of the issues and was included in packets to Commission Members) that he had submitted in January, and he stated that he feels it still stands. While he said that he would read it, he would point out some of the highlights. He said that it had been expressed, the first time before the PZC, that no concept plan had been presented.

- Two parcels (referred to as Parcel A and Parcel B in the narrative) of approximately 200 acres in total. Parcel A = 187 acres. Parcel B =
- Parcel A has been the site of a legal, non-conforming, gravel mining business for about 20 years (a commercial, if not industrial, activity).
- The change to GC will not introduce alien use concepts to the property or to the neighborhood. It will allow the site to be used for non-residential purposes as it has been. But, non-residential uses more consistent with any nearby residential use. He said that the change to GC would bring an underutilized property to its higher potential, benefiting the Town as a whole. He said that the PZC Members should be mindful that they are charged with acting in the best interest of the Town, not with any particular group of people including residents of nearby properties.
- The Applicant took great care to address the concerns that had been expressed by the public and the PZC during the public hearing on the earlier application.
- They will demonstrate the suitability of this property to be zoned GC.
- Attorney Carey spoke of the Applicant's experience in developing sites and high-quality work.
- He spoke of how, due to the topography, even a large-scale building would not be visible from outside the property.
- He introduced Nicholas Durgarian to present the conceptual plan.

Nicholas Durgarian explained that the conceptual plan identifies four uses allowable in the GC Zone: professional offices; contractor flexible space units; self-storage units; warehouse and distribution. He gave an overview:

- One of the major concerns was that neighbors did not want to lose the natural habitat adjacent to their backyards.
They looked at the Regulations for General Commercial and buffering requirements, met with the Conservation Commission, and Staff for Economic Development. They considered the Town's needs as well as the concerns of the neighbors. They expanded the buffer from 25 feet to 75 feet in the concept plan. The concept plan also shows approximately 100 acres consisting of combined buffer and what they would propose to deed into permanent conservation land. They are proposing that, although the trees would be in the GC Zone, they would be permanently placed into conservation land. The goal is to insulate a well-developed, mixed commercial-use property from the neighborhood and to be able to have a development that respects the neighbors and expands conservation land which is a goal of the POCD. Town-owned land (deeded as conservation) was indicated on the map and Mr. Durgarian noted that this would make it contiguous conservation space.
- This is not spot zoning.

- Lot coverage is far less than the allowable maximum of 65 percent in GC.
- Well above the 25-foot minimum buffers.
- They are proposing approximately 7 percent building coverage. Critical as it relates to concerns raised in the past.
- Regarding the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) he explained that the Rural Development Zone is a development zone, not a residential zone. Many of the identified allowable uses don't rely on public utilities. Mr. Durgarian noted that the uses identified in their concept plan would not require the use of public utilities such as public water, public sewer or natural gas.
- Economic Benefits: Mill Rate/Assessment (the four uses identified in the concept plan = a total of 550,000 s.f. at \$1.04/s.f. (based on GC assessments in Town), would generate \$572,000 of positive revenue to the Town). There would be personal property tax as well.
Some other benefits to the Town: While commercial uses on private land require only a small number of municipal services such as: EMS; Fire; and Police. However, there would be no plowing and no children enrolling into the school system. This would be a significant positive from a fiscal/economic perspective. The Town and local businesses would benefit from jobs (construction as well as permanent) and substantial investment into the Town. There would be indirect growth (other businesses will benefit as well).
- Mr. Durgarian explained that the Town should consider commercial development beyond Killingly as employees from commercial developments in other towns may look for housing in other nearby towns, so Killingly could appreciate increased residential development. It is good to have a balanced development plan (1/3 Residential, 1/3 Commercial and Industrial, 1/3 Green Space).
- The Applicant looked for other GC Zoned properties as it had been previously stated that there are many. Mr. Durgarian explained that there are other GC Zoned properties, however, some are land-locked, are not suitable for redevelopment, are fully occupied, or just not available at this type of scale. This parcel is unique regarding its size, access to I-395 and Route 6, and it would allow for this type of development.
- Mr. Durgarian said that they have already addressed conservation and wetlands. The POCD addresses preserving wetlands especially in Rural Development areas. This concept plan shows (inside the red buffer zone) zero impact to any wetland or protected area. This is based on their walking the site and an initial review done by a wetland scientist.
- General Engineering
 - **Water** - They have domestic water sourced via wells on site. They do not anticipate any issue with domestic water supply for the site.
 - **Fire Service** - They have experience with building where there is no public water available (in these situations, underground cisterns and fire pumps have been utilized). Water would either be delivered to the site or brought in via the wells over time and once the cisterns are full and fire service needs are accommodated for, per State Statute in Code, they would be able to accommodate any kind of fire suppression system needed for these buildings.
 - **Sanitary Systems** – They would be very, very low impact and would be akin to any of the neighbors along Snake Meadow Road or Route 6 - underground leech fields and septic tanks (e.g., storage facility or contractor units would be one bathroom per unit).
 - **Storm Water Management** - Would all be handled on-site. They work with the CT DEEP a lot. Mr. Durgarian said that any storm water improvement and management on this site would be a positive for the surrounding areas.
 - **Heating** on-site would most likely be on-site propane which is not uncommon.
 - **Electrical** would come in on-site. They have looked into rooftop solar. In the past, Mr. Vance had the site evaluated for solar and there was not enough conveyance availability on Route 6 to take what the 80+ acres of array could produce. Mr. Durgarian explained that a private development can install rooftop solar, and he explained about net metering where you supply power to yourself and you don't have to convey power back onto the lines, which ultimately reduces your overall power consumption on-site. He said that this is something that could be looked into.
 - **Traffic Impacts** – CT DOT would evaluate Primary traffic. Mr. Durgarian stated that they had a traffic engineer look at this concept plan and the engineer's opinion was that an initial review would absolutely show that the infrastructure of Route 6 would be able to handle a commercial development of this

nature. However, Mr. Durgarian stated that there is a level of engineering that would have to go into it, and it would have to come before the PZC at that time.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS ON THE CONCEPT PLAN:

- **Michael Hewko** asked about cisterns and sprinklers and storm water run-off and where the storage areas are.
Mr. Durgarian explained that, where sprinklers are required by Code, each building would be handled separately and the water source for the sprinklers would be the cisterns. He explained about determining size and location. He explained that pumps are part of the building mechanicals. EMS services would come after the water is already running. Domestic water would be from the well
- **Virge Lorents** asked about electricity for the fire-suppression system during a power outage.
Mr. Durgarian explained that it would be either a generator or diesel backed-up pumps.
- **John Sarantopoulos** asked how much of the 100 acres is wetlands, about the agreement with the present owner of the gravel operation regarding intent because this is a similar activity that is going to be taking place there.
Mr. Durgarian was not sure, but he stated that they had reviewed the IWWC maps and are planning on putting more into conservation than there is wetland. The majority of the wetlands is on the west and Norton Brook is on the opposite side (the areas were indicated on the map).
Ms. Aubrey explained that the agreement for the gravel operation is no longer in effect because they have pulled out and have gone away. Ms. Aubrey stated that she believes that, regarding the extent of the similarity, it was meant that it was a commercial enterprise, and they are planning on continuing a commercial enterprise.
Attorney Carey stated that Ms. Aubrey's above statement regarding the gravel operation is correct. There was discussion: Ms. Aubrey explained that the last renewal was a year or two ago. She added that they also had requested their bond because they ended their operation, and the bond was returned to them. The existing permit is null and void. If the Applicant purchased the property and wanted to continue the gravel operation, they would have to apply for a whole new permit underneath the new Regulations.

Mr. Durgarian Continued His Presentation:

- Mr. Durgarian explained about and indicated the locations of proposed storage units, warehouse, contractor units (1,500 s.f. units, office space in front with a roll-up door) and a layout for single-story offices. He explained that there is a demand for office space adjacent to parent companies that they do business with.
Mr. Hewko asked about retail. Mr. Durgarian stated no retail. Mr. Thurlow gave a reminder that this is a concept plan.
- Mr. Durgarian explained that he feels Rural Development is really Remote Development because it doesn't require the public services of the Town as it relates to public utilities. It is development that can be appreciated without the need of the public services, with the exception of EMS and those type of things. Rural Development is not sprawling meadows/untouched land/green space/open space. He said that everything in this area is zoned Rural Development. He feels that the four uses on the concept plan could work here. He explained that they could have submitted applications for four text amendments to allow the four uses in the current zone. However, because these four uses are already allowable in the GC Zone, and because this parcel and the re-zone fall so well within the POCD, and because there is GC just to the north, they felt the most efficient route was to go for a re-zone.
- Mr. Durgarian explained the topography (maps showing approximate current condition of the site were displayed). Almost half of the developable area has already been disturbed. They are hundreds of feet away from Norton Brook. He explained that, due to the topography, the development would be set down significantly from the adjacent areas and, with the building height limitations in GC, there is no way that this development would visually impact Route 6 or Snake Meadow Road (regardless of the vegetated buffers or conservation land being proposed).
- Mr. Durgarian explained the elevations (map showing elevations was displayed). He noted that even if they were to raise the average, existing grades inside what has presently been disturbed as much

as 20-50 feet and then put a 50-foot building on top of it, you would still be well below the crest at elevation 585 looking west from Snake Meadow Road.

- Traffic and Commercial Activity Impact on the Area – The only real access the former gravel operation had was from Snake Meadow Road (which is a State Highway) or the road just to the left. The Applicant is proposing main, primary access from State Highway Route 6. There are other existing commercial operations off of side roads.

Mr. Sarantopoulos read from Section 560.1.c and d of the Regulations regarding excavation operations being restored and protection of property values and quality of life for neighbors. Jonathan Blake explained that the operation was legal, non-conforming and about goals of excavation work and that some restoration work had been done which was okay under the previous regulations. There was no significant grade change in that area since 2019 (photos displayed were taken in 2019). Mr. Blake explained that the newer Regulations are stricter.

There was discussion regarding allowable uses in the RD Zone such as State Recycling Facility and Planned Residential Development.

Jim Rossman, Project Engineer with Stadia Engineering, stated that medium residential development does not require public sewer and water.

Mr. Thurlow clarified, for the record, that more land is required in medium density (40,000 s.f.).

Attorney Carey read aloud from a list of permitted uses as of right with site plan from Section 410.1.1 of the Regulations under Residential Rural Development. He noted that all of which would be significantly more intense than the concept plan.

Mr. Durgarian stated that they look at the Regulations and the POCD and try to create alignment for the Town. He gave a reminder that this is a hearing for a zone change which doesn't allow them to do anything. It gives them an opportunity to come back before the Commission and present something to go on this lot. He explained that the goal of the concept plan is compromise and collaboration taking the previous comments from the public into consideration and to work with the PZC.

Attorney Carey referred to his Application Narrative (dated January 14, 2022).

- Page 5, Item 3 – Regarding a need for more GC Zoned properties in Town.
Mr. Durgarian indicated the surrounding zones.
- Page 5, Regarding Conservation and Wetlands – The conservation land proposed would encompass the majority of the property. This development would benefit all the abutters in terms of leaving land in its natural condition. The hillside which forms the natural buffer would remain treed. Large portions of the property already lack trees. Removal of trees won't happen to any large extent. Vistas would remain as they are.
- Technical/Legal Matter – If Route 6 is considered to be satisfactory or adequate to deal with the traffic generated by the current RD Zone, then it has to be deemed to be adequate to deal with any traffic that could come from the GC Zone given the various uses that are allowed in each of those zones.
- General Zoning Procedural Matters - He read aloud from Page 7 of his Application Narrative (dated January 14, 2022).
- Regarding the POCD (Page 9 of his Narrative), Attorney Carey explained that it is a planning document, but the PZC is not bound to follow it, however, he saw nothing that suggests that this property should not be zoned GC. He said that he did find ways that it strongly supports the Application. This property is much more suitable in the GC Zone. The uses discussed would not be large traffic generators and Route 6 would be able to handle any use permitted in the GC Zone. He stated that GC allows for it to be near residences and he referred to Section 410.2 regarding buffers. Attorney Carey stated that the Applicant would almost certainly be required to plant additional trees and shrubbery at the perimeter of whatever projects are built.
- Attorney Carey referred to Section 902 Criteria for Zoning Map Amendments (Page 10 of his Application Narrative). By contrast to the potential of the GC Zone, the RD Zone is less appropriate for this property. He said that conditions have changed since the POCD was enacted and that there

were no supply chain disruptions, at that time, which leads to things like creation of more warehouse space.

- Effect on the Surrounding Area (Page 10 of his Application Narrative) – They feel that this concept plan would have less of an impact, if anything, on the neighboring properties than would most of the uses allowed in the GC Zone.
- Neighborhood Acceptance Weighed Against Community Needs – (Page 11 of his Application Narrative).
- Attorney Carey referred to Page 6/78 of the POCD which speaks about Killingly being a “crossroads community” due to its location near Route 395. They suggest that Route 6 has the same capacity. This is not only a benefit to Killingly, but to the entire region.
- Attorney Carey referred to Section 3.2 of the POCD – Economics (Page 12 of his Application Narrative).
- Attorney Carey referred to Section 3.2 of the POCD regarding Goals and Policies (Pages 12 & 13 of his Application Narrative) and he described how this proposal would be consistent with the policies and actions of the POCD.

Attorney Carey stated that, from a legal standpoint, the Applicant has demonstrated that the Application ought to be granted, would be of great benefit to the Town of Killingly as a whole and would not be a detriment to anybody in the Town of Killingly. He feels that they have addressed all the concerns that they have anticipated that neighbors and other people from Town could have. He asked that the Application be granted and offered to answer questions.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

- **Keith Thurlow** asked about the additional property and how this application is different from the previous application.
Mr. Durgarian indicated the location of the property and explained that with the previous application, they did not have the concept plan and they have come with substantial more information and a complete application. Additionally, the abutter to the east has agreed to be part of the Application to also be rezoned to GC. He explained that the abutter’s property is not on the concept plan because it had already been created. But that does not change the ability to present the plan tonight.
- **John Sarantopoulos** referred to Section 560.d – regarding excavation operations and protecting property values and quality of life. He read from Section 420.2 regarding intent – adjacent to. Rural development all around which is the concern of the neighbors. Village concept did not create a mixed uses area. Minimum of ten acres.
Mr. Durgarian, again, explained about Rural Development being detached from public services and spoke about some allowed uses. He explained that anything that they would do would be done to today’s standards. They would be improving what is there. He said that it is a concept plan, and they are open to suggestions and comments. They are not opposed to working with the neighbors and the Town. He explained that Douglas Construction is now a stakeholder in Killingly and they are looking to spend money in Killingly and that should be viewed as a good thing.
- **John Sarantopoulos** referred to and read aloud from Sections of the Regulations regarding Intent and he spoke about the Village District. He commented that you need 10 acres, and he made a distinction between the two properties because of the need to have access to the property.
- **Brian Card** stated, for the record, that he appreciates the site plan, but the uses presented, although they are what the Applicant feels are appropriate, are not the only uses allowed. He commented that everything in GC and Village Commercial would be allowed and some of the uses in GC might have a higher traffic count than what Rural Development does. They have not evaluated every single use. He asked if they could provide data to support the facts collected in their report regarding interest in GC, existing GC land - developed land vs. undeveloped land vs. what is available to be redeveloped. Attorney Carey explained that information regarding interest in GC land came from Staff.
Mr. Durgarian explained that he does not have hard data, but that they had looked for GC land and did not find anything suitable or that could accommodate what they are looking to do. He said that if

there are GC zoned properties that could accommodate what they are looking to do, they would be happy to look at them. He stated that they have been looking at properties for quite some time and that they had just closed on a 54-acre property on Route 101 (behind Aldi's) and are under contract for another 50-acre property on Route 12 (90 Putnam Pike).

There was discussion regarding how the Applicant could come back with something different than what is on the concept plan. Mr. Durgarian explained that he wouldn't want to ruin his reputation as an investor in Killingly and that these are the uses that they are contemplating for the site. They were trying to accommodate the request for a concept plan from the PZC when the previous application was denied.

Attorney Carey added that existing conditions on the site would militate against the most uses that would be allowed in the zone that the Commission might find less attractive than the ones presented. The topography offers protection to the neighbors. You can't condition the approval on representations made during the process.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC (all attended the public hearing in person):

Bruce Aiken, 785 South Frontage Road, stated that one of his concerns is the lack of concern by the Applicant toward the neighbors. Theoretical statements were made regarding a concept and tax revenue. Effort was made for protection of Snake Meadow Road residents, but not for South Frontage Road residents. His backyard is 430-450 feet above sea level, and he can see the entire site from his back deck. He is concerned about traffic safety due to a lot of accidents on Route 6 and he said that it is all back roads to get to I-395. He feels that a warehouse would increase traffic significantly. He is also concerned about downward lighting which he would see from his backyard. The northwest corner, where the road turns, is under water when it rains. Another of his concerns is impact to his well if there are multiple wells drilled.

Edith Cote, 583 Providence Pike, her basement has flooded during a hundred-year storm because of what had been done years ago due to putting the road in. She feels that additional changes could make things even worse for her property. She is also spoke about current traffic on Route 6 which makes her house shake when trucks go by, and she is concerned about a distribution center causing more traffic coming through.

Ms. Cote also voiced concern for a neighbor – He asks where the water for fire suppression would come from and if a pump is put in to supply the storage tank, could it drain the neighbors' wells?

Kevin Allsworth, 85 Snake Meadow Road (abutter to the property), stated that nobody is against the Applicant developing his property, but Mr. Allsworth feels that he is being disingenuous that there are no definitive plans. He is concerned about traffic and lights. He feels that they don't need to change the zone if he doesn't have a plan. This is a rural residential area, and they live there for a reason. He feels that that need to come in with an actual plan.

Gill Simmons, 129 Snake Meadow Road, submitted (to Staff) a petition, against changing the zone, which he said was signed by over 50 percent of the abutters. He said that abutters do matter.

Melissa Phillips, 635 Providence Pike, (abutter to 613 Providence Pike) is concerned about noise, lights and traffic. She feels that a warehouse is not a lesser, traffic-producing use. She feels the plan goes against the POCD regarding preserving the rural character of the Town. She is concerned about home values in the area. She feels that not disclosing the intent is bothersome (a red flag). She asked about four uses on the same parcel.

Ms. Aubrey explained that they were showing uses that are allowed under GC. The Applicant constructs certain types of GC buildings/structures. It is a conceptual plan showing what could go on the campus (there can be more than one use on the lot).

Ms. Phillips continued - Another red flag for her is, if they know that Route 6 is suitable, they must know what they want to put there. She is concerned about Route 6 traffic. She feels that, due to things that were said during the presentation (suitable to help with supply chain disruptions), it will be a warehouse and she is

concerned about trucks, lights and noise on Route 6. She feels that there is no comparison of Route 6 to I-395.

Chair, Keith Thurlow, called a five-minute break at 9:01 p.m. to allow time for the signatures on the petition to be verified.

Mr. Thurlow called the meeting back to order at 9:21 p.m.

CONTINUATION OF QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC (all attended the meeting in person):

Steve Severino, 88 Snake Meadow Road, feels that this is no small zone change, this will be a whole business park. He is concerned about traffic on Route 6. He said there is other land already zoned commercially on Westcott Road and Rock Avenue. He read aloud from Section 3.5 of the current POCD regarding Land Use. He feels that this property does not fit with the POCD that this is all rural.

Steven MacCormack, 8 Wolf Den Road, Brooklyn, CT, owns property in Killingly and feels that re-zoning would be dangerous for Killingly and would open a Pandora's Box in the neighborhood. He stated that the GC Zone is the broadest commercial zone and mentioned things that could come into Town, such as a 2 million s.f. distribution center, hotels, amusement parks, water parks, football/recreation stadiums, He is concerned about traffic and the impact that a large development would have on the aquifer.

Carol Cooper-Riley, Cook Hill Road, is very familiar with Route 6 and traffic is her biggest concern. She has seen many accidents on Route 6 and stated that we should be very careful about what is allowed because Route 6 can only support so much traffic.

Jason Anderson, 125 Lake Road, feels that the Applicant discredited the neighbors' concerns. He is concerned about impacts, from traffic/safety, noise and lighting. All the people living along Route 6 will be impacted by the traffic and noise caused by it. Douglas Construction never came before the Town Council for an opinion. There is an important balance between growth in the community and maintaining the rural nature of the community. He explained that the Town Council wants to develop a Vision Commission to get an idea of the long-term direction that Killingly would want to go in. He commended the PZC for all the work that they do as volunteers. He asked if Douglas Construction would consider offering property owners, surrounding the facility, a property-value guarantee as NTE did. He stated concern about the refresh rate of the aquifer and how it could impact neighbors. He feels that something should be put into place (similar to what NTE did) so that there is money available to help homeowners if their wells run dry. He wants to see growth, but we need to look at areas to have industrial development because there isn't much room left in the Industrial Park. He has concerns regarding changing the zoning on a parcel like this, where it is rural residential, without a concrete plan in place for what is going to go there.

Randall Simmons, 107 Snake Meadow Road, is concerned about his 5-foot dug well and is concerned about traffic on Route 6. He said you don't know what it is like if you don't live on that road. South Killingly has always been rural, why change it? He noted that the Industrial Park is 166 acres, and this parcel is 187 acres.

Debra Saritelli, across the street from the property, is concerned about lighting, noise and traffic. She spoke of many accidents that have happened near her home.

James Saritelli, 560 Providence Pike, stated that this is just a conceptual plan and, if this gets approved, there is no going backwards. He is concerned about the traffic and spoke of the many accidents near his home and about difficulty getting out of his driveway due to traffic. He voiced concern about erosion and spills to Snake Meadow Brook because there has been no mention of it. He said that the Westcott Road property is no comparison to this type of project and that area is more suited to this type of commercial use. He said that the gravel pit had a very, very low impact to the residents. The South Killingly Fire Department is a very small volunteer Department, and this project may be a big burden to them.

There were no public comments via Zoom call-in.

Ms. Aubrey gave a summary of comments that had been received via mail or e-mail (all were posted on the website and had been provided to Commission Members):

- Kristie Wallis, 71 Halls Hill Road, letter in opposition, dated January 10, 2022.
- Laurie T. Crafts and Glenn R. Crafts, 105 Halls Hill Road, e-mail in opposition, dated January 16, 2022.
- Donna Bronwell, 699 Bailey Hill Road, e-mail giving her personal opinion in opposition, dated January 18, 2022.
 - Mike Montville, 30 Griffiths Road, email in opposition. He suggested that a stop light at the intersection be installed, his major concern was traffic, email was dated March 18, 2022.

Jim Rossman, Project Engineer with Stadia Engineering, gave an overview of the following topics:

- **Traffic.** He explained that, currently, Route 6 in this area is classified as Class "B" highway by the State of CT. The Traffic Engineer has looked at the number of accidents, where they took place, and the root causes, and still assessed the impact of this development, given the uses shown in the concept plan, saying that the carrying capacity of Route 6 is still adequate to maintain the volume which would be generated by this development.
A site plan with full engineering design, including traffic engineering, would have to come before the PZC for approval. If approved, it would then go to the DOT to the Office of State Traffic Authority for their review (he explained what this review would entail). If a traffic were deemed necessary, Douglas Construction would be responsible for the cost.
- **Storm Water Management** – Under the current Regulations it would come before both the IWWC and the PZC. They would have to submit a full water quality management design, including E&S control measures that would support and show that they are maintaining the current run-off rates given the change in material permeability on the site. They would have to deal with how to mitigate that run-off and how to ensure that the water that left the developed site would be maintained in a clean and uniform fashion so that all of the downstream recipients would get the same water quality, or better, coming off of our site, as it currently receives.
- **Fire Use of Water** – It would be private supply wells which would serve by building. He said that regarding recharge rates of the aquifer, we are talking about minimalistic demands for the uses that are shown on the concept plan. The re-charge rate of the aquifer, although difficult to quantify, is not unquantifiable. A hydrologist could address those questions. He said that well supply would be small, domestic demands for sanitary washing/septic systems. He said that as we move forward with development potential, each one of the categories would receive scrutiny by NDDH for public health code compliance. So, they would have to demonstrate the water use and water demands. They would also have to show how the extraction of water wouldn't be detrimental to the areas that are served.
Wells would not be utilized directly for fire suppression. The well would be used to supplement the cistern so that the cistern would always be full in the event of an emergency (they are designed to cover the first hour of an emergency). Every fire department has tanker trucks which deliver water to the site. It would be part of the building process for the mechanical and plumbing engineers to determine the water demands based on building code. The sizing would be shown on the site plan and would be reviewed by the Fire Marshal who would ensure that compliance was met for each of those demands.
- Regarding comments made about traffic/speeds/operational areas, Mr. Rossman explained that no developer has the authority to control the operation of motor vehicles/trucks on a given road. Mr. Rossman stated that he travels on both Snake Meadow Road and Route 6, and he gave his opinion that with keeping the development traffic off Snake Meadow Road and utilizing the connection with the Route 6 corridor, you're using the highest category road to maintain the lowest amount of traffic that could be generated by this site. There is no proposed activity where the traffic would move from inside the site out onto Snake Meadow and then up to the intersection of Snake Meadow and Route 6, nor would it travel south through the site to other connections either via Ross Road or down to Route 14 or across, over to Foster. He said that, in a Traffic Engineer's Study, each of those intersections and routings would be reviewed and discussed in the Report. Those concerns would be addressed at a site plan level, not a zone change level.

- Drainage & Hydrology Design Under Site Plan Analysis – Engineers would look at the topography and the availability of watercourse routing. He said that they would look to maintain the current routing pre-development and post-development. In an effort to manage the higher-volume storms, newer rainfall categorization has been coming from the DEEP, and he explained that they have looked at several management methods to slow or mitigate water that is generated by the site: how do we hold it; how long does it take us to release that water; and then, whether or not that poses any detrimental use for the downstream, adjacent property owners.
- Regarding the larger storms, he explained that no site design in Connecticut will handle a hundred or 500-year storm.
- Regarding on-site and off-site flooding, he explained that they would look at the historical values that have come down the pike over the areas so that they could see where water is collecting, how quickly it is being distributed into those locations and then, try to devise methods that would attenuate those flows. He gave examples of different methods; one being creating lined ponds that would be part of the fire-suppression system (which would come under site design and would be designed and developed under advisement with the Fire Marshal). He stated that all these things are at the site plan level, not the zone change level, so while they can address general concerns, they cannot talk about specifics.

Mr. Durgarian addressed some of the other comments that had been made:

- Rural District – He explained that it is a rural development district and the characterization of it as a residential district is not 100 percent with what the ordinance actually states. He said that there is development potential in the current RD Zone.
- GC Zones popping up all along Route 6 – He explained that, unless the GIS mapping is not up to date, there are not.
- Accident Data – He explained that they have found that a lot of the accidents have occurred late at night and there have been deaths under the influence. He stated that he is not trying to discredit the traffic concerns along Route 6, he does not live there or deal with it on a daily basis, but all they can do, as developers, is trying to review the impacts from the development and try to improve the safety on the Route 6 corridor. He said that they have considered this. He explained that there are pros and cons regarding intersections and traffic lights.
- Building Size – The concept plan represents 550,000 s.f. He stated that this is not a big number in this type of development, and he explained how they calculated the revenue that could be generated by this development.
- Soils Contamination – He explained that he doesn't think that there is a use in all of the GC that allows for any kind of hazardous use that would create some sort of contamination to wetlands. He explained that there are a number of development opportunities in the RD Zone that would disrupt the land in the same way that GC development would disrupt the land and you must look at the uses to see whether they generate any kind of hazardous or waste material that could contaminate the aquifer or the wetlands. He said that those uses don't exist in the GC Regulations or the RD Regulations. He explained that whether they develop the site under GC (zone change) or RD, they are moving the earth, doing Civil Engineering and putting buildings up.
- Comparing Douglas Construction to Other Developers/Stakeholders in Town – He stated that Douglas Construction has not done anything to demonstrate that they are not people of their word. They were asked for specific things and have provided those things. He doesn't think it is fair to consider not working with Douglas Construction on this zone change because they may not be being transparent. They have been trying to supply all the information that they can, and he said that they haven't been around for 62 years because they are bad or not people of their word. He said that they would be open to a way for the Commission to keep them to their word on paper. They take their reputation as developers and individuals seriously.
- Property Value Guarantees – They have never considered it before and have never had a development where property values have been damaged. He said that he isn't opposed to considering it and would like to review the language.

Attorney Carey:

- He commented that, in terms of being able to bind the Applicant to the concept plan or representations made tonight, the Regulations, to a large extent, allow the Commission to do that. Not by imposing conditions on a zone change, but he referred to, and read aloud from, Sections 720.4 and 740 regarding Special Permit.
- Regarding a comment made about discrediting the neighbors, Attorney Carey stated that they certainly did not mean to do that, and he stated that they took great pains to convey that they respect the neighbors and their right to express their concerns.
- Attorney Carey stated that he has never heard a suggestion that, preparatory to going before the PZC, an Applicant should go to the Town Council, Boar of Selectman, or any other politically based authority in a Town. He feels it would be wrong to do that.
- Regarding the letter from the person who does farming – He explained that agriculture is a permitted use in current RD Zone and agriculture tends to produce a good deal of run-off that may be damaging to other properties (golf courses also which are permitted in the RD Zone).
- Regarding Traffic Volume – The only expert evidence regarding the capacity of Route 6 was the testimony by Mr. Rossman who referenced the Traffic Engineers who were engaged to work on this project. Everything else is anecdotal, although nobody is questioning the sincerity.
- Attorney Carey commented that, if the Commission considers things discussed like aquifers, pollution, animals and habitats, it might make any decision, one way or the other, problematic. The Commission would have the ability to deal with those things through special permit.
- In closing, Attorney Carey stated that they have presented an application that has tremendous merit and he asked that it be granted.

Mr. Durgarian commented about Brian Card's comments from when the previous application was denied, requesting a conceptual plan regardless of what the Commission is entitled to for information. Mr. Durgarian explained about the work that they did since then to prepare this Application as it relates to, and beyond, the matter at hand. He feels that they have demonstrated that the good will is there. He stated that they sent a letter to the abutters when they decided to continue with another application.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM STAFF:

Jill St. Clair reported that after reviewing the Application at its March 2, 2022, meeting, there was a unanimous consensus by the EDC in favor of the zone change (Memo dated March 15, 2022, was included in packets to PZC Members). She gave background on how the EDC reached its decision to recommend the zone change.

Ms. St. Clair spoke about quality of life (personal economics) and the quality of place (the overall community economics and fiscal health) in the POCD. Census information was displayed. She explained Key Performance Indicators:

- Median age of population in Killingly
- Economy (manufacturing/transportation/warehousing)
- Wages
- Stakeholders are looking for light warehousing
- Tax Base/Grand List
- Business retention and expansion within our community
- Attracting new business to our community is the hardest thing to do in Connecticut
- Killingly is a Sustainable Community

Ms. St. Clair explained why she supports this Application. She explained about community service ratio. The EDC believes that this proposed, Rezone Application can provide sustainable growth and have a positive societal impact and would be an appropriate reuse of a gravel excavation site.

Ann-Marie Aubrey explained that Staff has worked with the Applicant and has repeatedly asked him to look through the Regulations and show us how you have met our Regulations. She stated that the way that they submitted the Application shows that they followed the directions.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

John Sarantopoulos commented about Attorney Carey's earlier reference to the special permit section of the Regulations. Mr. Sarantopoulos commented about how the voters determine quality of life when approving the budget. He commented that wanting to keep this area "The Quiet Corner" is detrimental. He explained that people don't like change. He expressed agreement with Mr. Anderson regarding the property value guarantee that he had suggested.

Attorney Carey explained that he was pointing out that if the PZC grants this Application, it would have the ability, later, to take into account the kinds of conditions and concerns that were expressed tonight.

There were no further questions or comments from Commission Members, Staff or the Public.

Attorney Carey asked about the petition and stated that he would like the opportunity to review it to ensure that it meets the Statute.

Attorney Ken Slater explained to the Chair that it does not need to be done during the public hearing. He offered to give a preview and he explained that if it were a valid petition, it would require four of the five voters to be able to pass it. He explained that the Town Ordinance is different than the State Statute. The State Statute requires that the persons that file the petition take up 20 percent of the area within 500 feet. Attorney Slater explained that the validity of the petition is not something that the Commission has to decide, and it is not something that the Applicant has to be heard on. If it is not interpreted correctly, it is subject to legal challenge. The Town Ordinance provides for 20 percent of the lot owners. He is not seeing an Ordinance that is inconsistent with the State Statute. He said, in this case, the Town Ordinance may govern as it is more restrictive, in some instances, than the State Statute. He said that he would allow Attorney Carey to review it and provide feedback before Staff publishes it. Attorney Slater explained about how the vote of the Commission would determine how it would pass or be denied due to the petition and whether the Town Ordinance would override the State Statute.

Attorney Carey asked if the Commission intends to act tonight. He feels it is important to know whether the petition is valid before the Commission votes as he feels that it could have a potential effect on the vote.

Attorney Slater advised the Commission that they should not hold off on voting because of the petition because the names of the persons who filed the petition have been submitted into the record and are available. Whether or not the petition is legally valid should not come into play.

Attorney Carey stated that he is not asking to have the hearing held open because of this. He said that it seems that the hearing is over.

Motion was made by Brian Card to close the public hearing for **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1278**; Douglas Construction (Jim Vance/Landowner) & Laurel A. Horne (Applicant & Landowner); 605 Providence Pike; GIS MAP 224, LOT 14; ~177 acres, RD **AND** 613 Providence Pike; GIS MAP 224, LOT 13, ~4.6 acres, RD; request to change zoning from Rural Development to General Commercial.

Second by Virge Lorents. No discussion.

Roll Call Vote: Brian Card – yes; Virge Lorents – yes; John Sarantopoulos – yes; Michael Hewko – yes; Keith Thurlow – yes.

Motion carried unanimously (5-0-0).

Attorney Slater explained to Chair, Keith Thurlow that the Commission does not need to wait for the results on the petition to vote.

2) **Special Permit Ap #22-1283**; Steven E. MacCormack (Applicant/Owner); 42 Mechanic St; GIS MAP 181; LOT 104; ~0.13 acres; **AND** 26 Oak St; GIS MAP 181; LOT 105; ~0.25 acres; both Borough General Commercial Zone; self-service

storage facility in two pre-existing buildings; under Section 430, et seq (General Commercial) and Section 700 et seq (Special Permit) of the Borough of Danielson Zoning Regulations.

Steven E. MacCormack represented himself and gave an overview (plans/maps were displayed as discussed):

- The properties have been vacant for approximately 3 years.
- He intends to re-paint, make repairs to and keep the existing buildings, improve the parking lot, add some landscaping.
- Floor plan was submitted for self-storage (average size 5'x10') which is a high need for the area.
- He feels that it would not only benefit the community, but it would be an economic asset to the Town by reusing a vacant property that was not maintained properly and increase the tax revenue.
- Mr. MacCormack explained the site plan: required handicap parking spaces; 12 regular parking spaces (calculated per warehouse requirements); loading zone; signage; 1,000 s.f. garage in back (will be repairing damage done by a tree).
- Each building to be self-contained with units inside with 4–5-foot isles. He explained that nobody can access the buildings without going to the door and punching a keypad. They are not changing the site plan to accommodate self-storage units; they are retrofitting the buildings to make a good use without impacting the neighborhood with new development.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS/STAFF:

Keith Thurlow asked what would be done if tenants abandon their belongings in their units.

Mr. MacCormack explained that the State gives you the right to hold an auction, but he said that he would try to avoid that as much as possible. He said that he may have to do it occasionally (inside) and he explained that, if they had to do it outside, it could be done in the garage building.

Mr. Thurlow read aloud from the Borough Regulations which allows for periodic auctions. He asked if there would be any of the following: outside storage; operation of power tools; any use that is noxious or offensive; animals or pets; anybody sleeping on the premises; anything hazardous.

Mr. MacCormack stated “no” to each of the above items asked by Mr. Thurlow.

Mr. Thurlow asked about outside lighting.

Mr. MacCormack stated that it is existing motion detector lighting: there is one light above the entrance door; there are a couple on the back garage building.

Mr. Thurlow asked about hours of operation.

Mr. MacCormack stated that it would be seven days per week from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. with an office manager there from 10 or 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. to meet people who want to rent and give them their storage code.

Mr. MacCormack stated that it would be a very low key, self-service facility.

Brian Card asked about exterior improvements to the buildings.

Mr. MacCormack stated that they will paint it all one color (brown or white), repoint the brick, remove graffiti, possibly some potted plants, repair broken windows, improve the broken pavement in the parking lot.

Mr. Card asked about security.

Mr. MacCormack stated that they will have security alarms and two or three security cameras. Someone will be there during the office hours.

Ann-Marie Aubrey clarified that the entrance on the same side as the parking lot will be a keyed entrance.

Mr. MacCormack confirmed that is right. He stated that the front one on Mechanic Street will be the office entrance, so they won't have a key to that. He explained that the back two doors on the garage building (main entrances) will each need a code to unlock.

Jonathan Blake asked about parking pointing toward the east which is GC. He noted that the Zone next door is GC, but the use is residential, and he asked if there was any consideration for shading or privacy fencing at the property line.

Mr. MacCormack explained that the abutter is above grade (about 3 feet above us), so the cars are parking at a higher level. He said that he had thought about headlights and thought about adding some kind of vegetation there, but he doesn't feel that a fence would make a difference.

Mr. Thurlow noted that there is future pavement on the plan and asked Mr. Blake if there is a need for that. **Mr. Blake** referred to MS-4 and Borough Regulations and stated that we want to reduce parking if it is not needed. He stated that there is at least one catch basin on the property and if the rest of the property were to be paved, the water run-off would need to be addressed.

Mr. Thurlow stated that his concern is the neighbors. He feels there should be buffers of some sort, at least for the parking spots.

Mr. Blake asked the Applicant if he had presented his case in front of the Town Council, the EDC, or the Conservation Commission.

Mr. MacCormack stated that he had not.

Jill St. Clair, Director of Economic Development, stated that we need storage.

There were no further comments from the Commission, Staff, or the Public.

Motion was made by Michael Hewko to close the public hearing for **Special Permit Ap #22-1283**; Steven E. MacCormack (Applicant/Owner); 42 Mechanic St; GIS MAP 181; LOT 104; ~0.13 acres; **AND** 26 Oak St; GIS MAP 181; LOT 105; ~0.25 acres; both Borough General Commercial Zone; self-service storage facility in two pre-existing buildings; under Section 430, et seq (General Commercial) and Section 700 et seq (Special Permit) of the Borough of Danielson Zoning Regulations.

Second by Virge Lorents. No discussion.

Roll Call Vote: Virge Lorents – yes; John Sarantopoulos – yes; Michael Hewko – yes; Brian Card – yes; Keith Thurlow – yes.

Motion carried unanimously (5-0-0).

3) **Zone MAP Change Ap #22.1284**; State of CT; Aquifer Area Program Implementation Letter for Map Delineation; 360 Lake Road; GIS MAP 61; LOT 52; ~11 acres; Industrial Zone; Level "A" Mapping Approval for the Connecticut Water Company's Killingly Industrial Park Well Field.

Ann-Marie Aubrey explained that it needs to be added to the Zoning Maps by May 14, 2022. There are three in total, the other two have already been done. They are all Level A. The Aquifer Protection Area Program Implementation Letter for Map Delineation dated January 20, 2022, as well as the Map were included in packets to Commission Members.

Jonathan Blake explained about Well Heads vs. Aquifers. At the Industrial Park, it is now a Level A.

There were no further comments from the Commission, Staff or the Public.

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to close the public hearing for **Zone MAP Change Ap #22.1284**; State of CT; Aquifer Area Program Implementation Letter for Map Delineation; 360 Lake Road; GIS MAP 61; LOT 52; ~11 acres; Industrial Zone; Level "A" Mapping Approval for the Connecticut Water Company's Killingly Industrial Park Well Field.

Seconded by John Sarantopoulos. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – (review / discussion / action)

1) **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1278**; Douglas Construction (Jim Vance/Landowner) & Laurel A. Horne (Applicant & Landowner); 605 Providence Pike; GIS MAP 224, LOT 14; ~177 acres, RD **AND** 613 Providence Pike; GIS MAP 224, LOT 13, ~4.6 acres, RD; request to change zoning from Rural Development to General Commercial. (CONT. FROM 01/18/2022)

Motion was made by Brian Card to table the decision on **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1278**; Douglas Construction (Jim Vance/Landowner) & Laurel A. Horne (Applicant & Landowner); 605 Providence Pike; GIS MAP 224, LOT 14; ~177 acres, RD **AND** 613 Providence Pike; GIS MAP 224, LOT 13, ~4.6 acres, RD; request to change zoning from Rural Development to General Commercial.

Seconded by Virge Lorents. No discussion.

Roll Call Vote: John Sarantopoulos – yes; Michael Hewko – yes; Brian Card – yes; Virge Lorents – yes; Keith Thurlow – yes.

Motion carried unanimously (5-0-0).

2) **Special Permit Ap #22-1283**; Steven E. MacCormack (Applicant/Owner); 42 Mechanic St; GIS MAP 181; LOT 104; ~0.13 acres; **AND** 26 Oak St; GIS MAP 181; LOT 105; ~0.25 acres; both Borough General Commercial Zone; self-service storage facility in two pre-existing buildings; under Section 430, et seq (General Commercial) and Section 700 et seq (Special Permit) of the Borough of Danielson Zoning Regulations.

Motion was made by Brian Card to approve **Special Permit Ap #22-1283**; Steven E. MacCormack (Applicant/Owner); 42 Mechanic St; GIS MAP 181; LOT 104; ~0.13 acres; **AND** 26 Oak St; GIS MAP 181; LOT 105; ~0.25 acres; both Borough General Commercial Zone; self-service storage facility in two pre-existing buildings; under Section 430, et seq (General Commercial) and Section 700 et seq (Special Permit) of the Borough of Danielson Zoning Regulations.

Second by Michael Hewko. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

3) **Zone MAP Change Ap #22.1284**; State of CT; Aquifer Area Program Implementation Letter for Map Delineation; 360 Lake Road; GIS MAP 61; LOT 52; ~11 acres; Industrial Zone; Level "A" Mapping Approval for the Connecticut Water Company's Killingly Industrial Park Well Field.

Motion was made by Michael Hewko to approve **Zone MAP Change Ap #22.1284**; State of CT; Aquifer Area Program Implementation Letter for Map Delineation; 360 Lake Road; GIS MAP 61; LOT 52; ~11 acres; Industrial Zone; Level "A" Mapping Approval for the Connecticut Water Company's Killingly Industrial Park Well Field.

Seconded by Brian Card. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

VIII. **NEW BUSINESS – (review/discussion/action)**

1) **C.G.S. Section 8-24 Review AP #22-1285** – Town of Killingly, Capital Improvement Budget for the July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, fiscal year. (review/discussion/action)

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to accept **C.G.S. Section 8-24 Review AP #22-1285** – Town of Killingly, Capital Improvement Budget for the July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, fiscal year.

Second by Michael Hewko.

Discussion: Ms. Aubrey asked the Commission is just passing the 8-24 Review. Mr. Thurlow stated that they are.

There was discussion regarding the bridge on Peep Toad Road.

There was discussion regarding renovating the Town Hall Building.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

Attorney Ken Slater left the meeting at this time.

2) **Special Permit Ap # 22-1286** – American Storage Centers, LLC, (American Sports Centers, Inc./Landowner); 551 Westcott Road; GIS MAP 214; LOT 5; ~3.8 acres; General Commercial; request to construct six (6) new buildings and convert one (1) existing building to establish a self-service storage facility; under TOK Zoning Regs Section 420.2.2[q]. **Receive and schedule for public hearing. Proposed date Monday, April 18, 2022.**

Ms. Aubrey stated that it is ready and that they have made the corrections that were suggested.

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to receive and schedule a public hearing for **Special Permit Ap # 22-1286** – American Storage Centers, LLC, (American Sports Centers, Inc./Landowner); 551 Westcott Road; GIS MAP 214; LOT 5; ~3.8 acres; General Commercial; request to construct six (6) new buildings and convert one (1) existing building to establish a self-service storage facility; under TOK Zoning Regs Section 420.2.2[q], for Monday, April 18, 2022, Town Meeting Room, 2nd Floor, 172 Main Street, at 7:00 p.m.

Second by John Sarantopoulos. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

3) **Zone TEXT Change Ap # 22-1287** – Town of Killingly, special permitted use under Business Park, General Commercial, Light Industrial, Mill Mixed Use and Mixed-Use Interchange Zones for the creation of cannabis establishments. **Receive and schedule for the workshop on Monday, March 28, 2022.**

Ms. Aubrey stated that it is written and is in review with legal counsel.

Motion was made by John Sarantopoulos to receive and schedule a Special Meeting Workshop for **Zone TEXT Change Ap # 22-1287** – Town of Killingly, special permitted use under Business Park, General Commercial, Light Industrial, Mill Mixed Use and Mixed-Use Interchange Zones for the creation of cannabis establishments, for Monday, March 28, 2022, Town Meeting Room, 2nd Floor, 172 Main Street, at 7:00 p.m.

Second by Michael Hewko. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

IX. ADOPTION OF MINUTES – (review/discussion/action)

1) Regular Meeting Minutes – Tuesday, February 22, 2022

Motion was made by Michael Hewko to accept the Minutes of the Regular Meeting Minutes of Tuesday, February 22, 2022, as presented.

Second by Virge Lorents.

Discussion: Virge Lorents stated, for the record, that she no longer corrects the typos.

Motion carried by voice vote (4-0-1). Brian Card abstained.

X. OTHER / MISCELLANEOUS – (review / discussion / action)

1) **TRAINING** – Scheduled for **Tuesday, March 22, 2022 @ 6:00 PM** in the Town Meeting Room.

a. FOIA, Parliamentary Procedure, Ethics

2) **WORKSHOP** – Next Workshop Scheduled for **Monday, March 28, 2022 @ 6:00 PM** in the Town Meeting Room.

a. Free standing accessory structures – to become primary use?- review, discussion, action

b. Five Mile River Overlay District – review, discussion, action

c. Cannabis Zoning Regulations – review, discussion, action

d. Proposed Updated Policy – Town of Killingly Policy for the sale of real estate

XI. CORRESPONDENCE – None.

XII. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS – (review/discussion/action)

A. Zoning Enforcement Officer's & Zoning Board of Appeal's Report(s) – None.

B. Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agent's Report – None.

C. Building Office Report – None.

XIII. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Jill St. Clair deferred until next month's meeting.

XIV. TOWN COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

Jason Anderson reported on recent actions of the Town Council.
There was discussion regarding solar at the capped landfill.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to adjourn at 11:25 p.m.
Second by Michael Hewko. No discussion.
Motion carried unanimously (5-0-0).

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault
Recording Secretary