



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

MONDAY – NOVEMBER 15, 2021

**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

MINUTES

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.

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chair, Keith Thurlow, called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Virge Lorents, John Sarantopoulos and Keith Thurlow (all were present in person).
Brian Card arrived at 7:11 p.m. via Webex.
Matthew Wendorf was absent with notice.

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

Also Present (in person) – Attorney Joseph Hammer, Day Pitney; David Kode, Design Director and Architect with Haskell Company (Project Consultant); Scott Lyons, Haskell; Roger Geisek, Frito-Lay (Senior Project Engineer); Brian Dotolo, Haskell (Project Director); Greg Smith, Electrical Engineer; Kevin Krump, Haskell (Civil Engineer); Scott Hesketh (Traffic Engineer).

(via Webex) - Steven Cole, Haskell (Civil Engineer); Sil Quenga, Frito-Lay (Director of Engineering and Maintenance); Yovannia Gamez; Joshua Hough, Haskell (Engineer); Attorney Timothy D. Bleasdale, Waller, Smith & Palmer, P.C.; Patti Larrow, Town Council Liaison; J.S. Perreault, Recording Secretary.

Citizens Comments Participants (present in person): Ed Grandelski; Danny Rovero; Michelle Murphy; Jason Anderson; Lois Latraverse; Nancy Grandelski; Karen Johnson; Jamie Raynsford; Earl McWilliams; Dave Jarvis; Jill St. Clair (via Webex); Mary Miller, Attorney representing the Alexanders Lake Homeowners Association; Sandra Bove.

II. SEATING OF ALTERNATES – None.

III. AGENDA ADDENDUM – None.

At this time, Town Attorney, Ken Slater explained that the Applicant for **Special Permit Application #21-1273** and **Site Plan Application #21-1275** plans to present the project as a whole (which makes sense) and he recommended that public comment regarding the site plan application be allowed during the public hearing for the special permit. There were no objections from the Commission.

Attorney Slater explained that a Notice of Intervention regarding **Special Permit Application #21-1273** had been filed by an Attorney for the Alexander's Lake Homeowners Association. Attorney Slater had not had an opportunity to review it. It had been received by Staff earlier in the day. He explained that it is part of the Environmental Protection Act and that he expects that he will need to give guidance to the Commission. He feels confident that, after hearing the testimony tonight, he will be advising the Commission to keep the public hearing open.

Ann-Marie Aubrey noted that Brian Card had signed-in via Webex at 7:11 p.m.

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.killingct.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 2630-464-6455 when prompted.

Ed Grandelski, 877 and 1827 Upper Maple Street, Town Council Member – District 2, was going to comment regarding **Site Plan Application #21-1275**, but decided to save his comments until during the public hearing for **Special Permit Application #21-1273** as he wanted to comment on both.

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 2630-464-6455 when prompted

Ms. Aubrey read aloud the above call-in information.

1) **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1274;** Weld, LLC (CGCT Killingly LLC/Landowner); 543 Wauregan Road: GIS MAP 262, LOT 20; General Commercial Zone; application seeks to change the zone of the subject real estate from General Commercial Zone to Light Industrial Zone. (**Applicant requests to withdraw application without prejudice.**) (**A new revised application submitted 11/9/2021.**)

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to allow to withdraw without prejudice, **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1274;** Weld, LLC (CGCT Killingly LLC/Landowner); 543 Wauregan Road: GIS MAP 262, LOT 20: General Commercial Zone; application seeks to change the zone of the subject real estate from General Commercial Zone to Light Industrial Zone. (**Applicant requests to withdraw application without prejudice.**) (**A new revised application submitted 11/9/2021.**)

Second by John Sarantopoulos. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (4-0-0).

2) **Special Permit Ap #21-1273;** David Kode (Frito-Lay/Landowner); 1886 Upper Maple St; GIS MAP 62, LOT 53; 94 acres; Ind Zone; for portion of proposed building addition that will exceed the maximum height of 50 ft for said zone, with a proposed height of 86 ft, 8.5 inches.

Attorney Joseph Hammer, Day Pitney, represented the Applicant. Attorney Hammer submitted, to Ms. Aubrey, resumes of professionals who may speak tonight, two IWWC letters, and a summary of the remarks he will be making. Ms. Aubrey

stated that these documents will be on the website tomorrow morning. He asked for a copy of the Notice of Intervention. Attorney Hammer introduced the following, present either in person or via Webex, who may speak: David Kode, Design Director and Architect with Haskell Company (Project Consultant); Roger Geisek, Frito-Lay (Senior Project Engineer); Sil Quenga, Frito-Lay (Director of Engineering and Maintenance); Brian Dotolo, Haskell (Project Director); Greg Smith (Electrical Engineer); Steven Cole (Civil Engineer); Kevin Krump; Scott Hesketh (Traffic Engineer).

Attorney Hammer stated that copies of the relevant Site Plan and Special Permit Regulations, with statements for each Section showing why they feel the Application complies, have previously been submitted. Attorney Hammer gave an overview (maps/plans/photos were displayed as discussed):

- The existing Facility incorporates a number of sustainability measures in its operations including the following: recycling; zero-emission forklifts; the use of an on-site electrical co-generational plant; energy-efficient roofing system; water conservation; and LED lighting.
- They feel this Project will be a benefit to the Town bringing revenue and a significant number of jobs.
- The Commission previously approved earlier Phases of this expansion: Site Plan Application for the Expansion of the South Trailer Parking Lot (Referred to as the South Lot – approved April 19, 2021); and Site Plan Application for the Trash Recycling and Receiving Dock, for a small building in the Electrical Yard and Improvements to the Storm Water Management System and other Site Improvements (Referred to as Phase One – approved June 2021).
- This Application is referred to as Phase Two proposing construction of an additional 278,000 s.f. of building area consisting of 190,000 s.f. of manufacturing space and 88,000 s.f. of storage and warehousing space. Included in that number is 11,000 s.f. of building area that is associated with an extension of the manufacturing building addition 40 feet further to the south than shown on the plans that were originally submitted in August. Since the initial submission, it was determined that, as a result of operational needs, they need the additional 40 feet further to the south.
- 172 automobile spaces to be added.
- Two new manufacturing lines to be installed in the new space with a room for a potential third line.
- On an overall basis, upon final completion of the Project, 119 trailer spaces will have been added to the site.
- In August, the Wetlands Agent issued an approval for construction activities within the 200 foot upland review area associated with Phase Two. On November 4, 2021, the Wetlands Agent issued a letter and determined that the 40 feet extra to the south is outside of the upland review area and constitutes a minor modification that requires no further application. These two letters were submitted to Staff tonight.
- **Site Plan Application #21-1275** includes: additions to manufacturing, warehouse storage, site improvements and other work on the site associated with the Phase Two expansion.
- Attorney Hammer explained that part two tonight is **Special Permit Application #21-1273** (Section 450.3.1 of the Regulations) to allow a portion of the addition to the existing warehouse and storage building to exceed 50 feet in height which is the general standard in the Industrial Zone. The proposed height for that portion of the warehouse is 86 feet 8.5 inches. Attorney Hammer noted that the PZC had previously allowed this height exceedance for the existing warehouse and storage building. Of the 88,000 s.f. being added, only about 23,500 s.f. would exceed the 50-foot standard. The Automated Storage and Retrieval System (ASRS) will have a multi-level storage rack system which will connect to a portion of the existing warehouse which is approximately 77-feet tall. Allowing the additional height will serve to reduce the amount of new building footprint on the site and will allow for more efficient and sustainable operations. They do not feel that it will interfere at all with the use of other property and they believe that it is in keeping with what is at the site today and what has previously been approved by the PZC.
- The manufacturing building addition will be behind and to the east of the current manufacturing building.
- The proposed building setbacks from all of these additions are substantially greater than what is required by the Zoning Regulations. On the west toward the Lake, the minimum setback will be about 650 feet, on the north 400 feet, on the east 233 feet, and on the south 850 feet.
- Regarding Storm Water Management, the Application will comply with all applicable Connecticut standards.
- Soil erosion measures during construction comply with Connecticut DEEP standards.
- They are proposing to extend the western portion of the site (the existing automobile parking lot) further west. The western edge of the lot will be over 150 feet from the eastern edge of Upper Maple Street. That lot is approximately 11 feet higher than Upper Maple Street which will reduce its visibility. New plantings are being proposed for the western edge of the expanded lot that will blend in with the existing trees and vegetation that will remain in that area. They believe this will provide proper screening from Upper Maple Street.

- Lighting is designed to prevent any light spill beyond the property line through full, cut-off fixtures. Fixture heights have been minimized to the extent feasible while still meeting lighting needs and safety needs. There will be zero foot candles of light at the western property line along the railroad company property.
- Regarding traffic, Attorney Hammer noted that the special permit is not for the use, it is for the height aspect. He explained that Connecticut Courts have held that the review of traffic is a more limited review than it would be for a special permit use. It would be focused on internal traffic circulation on the site and the location of entrances and exits to the site. They are not proposing any changes to the existing entrances. They have submitted a copy of a comprehensive Traffic Study, prepared by Hesketh and Associates, which has also been submitted to the State. It is anticipated that there will be about 330 new employees as a result of the expansion. They will be spread over multiple shifts and will not all be at the site at the same time. The Traffic Study concludes that the local road network can readily accommodate the projected increase in traffic associated with the expansion without the need for road improvements.
- Regarding air emissions, the production lines will comply with all applicable governmental air emissions standards.
- Regarding noise, the Facility will continue to meet applicable noise standards at the property lines.
- The additional manufacturing equipment will be on the east side of the property (away from Maple Street). They do not believe that noise levels at the boundaries will be impacted.
- Regarding construction activities, they will follow all applicable Town Ordinances on hours. Trucks will access the site from Attawaugan Crossing and will not utilize Upper Maple Street. The existing gravel drive on the west side of the Frito-Lay property will be temporarily improved so that it can accommodate raw material deliveries to the manufacturing building for several months during Project construction when the regular routing through the property will not be available. The gravel drive improvements will be removed and the drive will be seeded with grass when the Project is completed.
- They believe that they meet all applicable standards of the Zoning Regulations for both the Site Plan Standards and the Special Permit Standards.
- They believe that the Project is consistent with and furthers the Town's 2020-2030 POCD in a number of ways including: maximizing the quality and diversification of Killingly's employers (both large and small); assisting in the retention of current employers and promoting their expansions to occur in the Town; planning and implementing responsible development and redevelopment; and encouraging and promoting business development within the designated commercial and industrial areas.
- Attorney Hammer referred to a letter that had been received from an Attorney representing Mr. Simpson, who owns adjacent property, in which Mr. Simpson states that he believes that he has certain access rights. Regarding that issue, Attorney Hammer explained that Connecticut Courts have consistently found that private property disputes are not within the jurisdiction of a Zoning Commission to resolve and it does not have any bearing on the PZC's analysis of a zoning application. He cited two examples of case law. Attorney Hammer stated that, before Mr. Simpson wrote his letter, a Frito-Lay representative had met with Mr. Simpson and reviewed the Project with him. Attorney Hammer stated that he is not aware of Mr. Simpson producing any documentation that would support the claims that he is making.

Keith Thurlow commented that the easement had been an issue in the past which had to be addressed. He asked for advice from Attorney Slater.

Attorney Slater stated that Attorney Hammer had accurately described the law that a Commission does not have authority to resolve private property disputes. He explained that if there were a question as to whether an Applicant is qualified to apply, there would need to be some demonstration on the part of the Applicant that they have a legal interest in the property that they are applying for. He explained that the Commission should act on the Application as it is presented and if the Applicant is doing something that infringes on the private property rights of another with respect to a deed or easement that would have to be resolved in the Superior Court. There was discussion. Attorney Slater read from the letter from Attorney Truppa dated November 10, 2021, which states that the Phase Two expansion will infringe on the easement.

Ms. Aubrey clarified that the PZC wants to be sure that it is appropriate to move forward with Mr. Simpson's assertion being made. Attorney Slater explained that he does not see this as challenging the ownership of the land and he does not see a reason why we wouldn't proceed.
- Attorney Hammer stated that Frito-Lay had discussions with the Lake Association in August. Attorney Hammer had spoken with their Attorney on numerous occasions and attempted to understand what concerns they might have and to see if they could try to resolve those concerns or make them feel more comfortable. He said that they are unfortunately not in a position where they would be able to say that they have, but they did try. He said they have been provided with information along the way.

David Kode, Design Director and Architect with Haskell Company, gave a three-part PowerPoint presentation (Civil/Electrical/Architectural):

- Civil/Site:

Steven Cole, Civil Engineer with Haskell:

- Displayed an aerial photo of existing conditions to date and he orientated the site and area.
- Displayed the Overall Site Plan:
He indicated the 40-foot building expansion further south on the manufacturing building (approved as a minor modification on November 4, 2021, by the IWWC #21-1529).
Warehouse Expansion – He indicated the area where the special permit is being requested.
He indicated the Building Connection Expansion.
He indicated the Auto Parking Lot Expansion – They are proposing an additional 172 auto parking spaces. They are also adding an additional four ADA spaces to meet State ADA requirements.
He indicated the Trailer Parking Expansion – They are proposing thirty, 65-foot long trailer stalls.
- Displayed the Post Development Drainage Map:
He indicated and explained the Master Planned Basin (Yellin Lot Basin) that was designed and permitted as part of the South Lot Project (included all impervious area, drainage features, conveyance). Within this basin, storm water run-off was master planned, designed to be fully treated, contained and infiltrated with zero discharge to the Five-Mile River. Storm water quality meets and exceeds the State requirements and the Town of Killingly Storm Water Management Criteria.
He indicated the South Basin which discharges to Five-Mile River. They are proposing a new underground detention facility with storm water treatment for water quality prior to entrance into the underground system. Storm water discharge rate, velocity and water quality meet and exceed the State requirements and the Town of Killingly Storm Water Management Criteria.
He indicated the North Basin and stated that it similarly discharges to Five-Mile River but at a different location. This basin is routed through a series of interconnected existing ponds and were analyzed in their routing calculations. Storm water discharge rate, velocity and water quality meet and exceed the State requirements and the Town of Killingly Storm Water Management Criteria.
- Displayed the Overall Geometry Plan and he reviewed the Site Data Table which shows setback requirements and what is proposed. Mr. Cole also reviewed the following: Lot Coverage (64.5 percent impervious); Building Height Requirement (ASRS shown as 86' 8.5" and the Manufacturing Building Height shown as 40' 5"); Parking Calculations Table (402 required, they are providing 633 (campus wide) and 13 ADA spaces as required); and Post-Construction Trailer Counts (including South Lot/Phase One/Phase Two) – Increasing by 119 for a total of 716 trailer spaces.
- Displayed the Overall Utility Plan – For the ASRS Expansion, they are proposing to re-route the existing 12-inch fire main around the building for building coverage hydrants as well as new building lead in for fire suppression systems.
Also at this location is a sanitary sewer connection that will connect with a private manhole on the northwest corner of the property. Included with this is a new domestic water supply for the Manufacturing Expansion, oily waste lines, process waste lines, and fire suppression and two new fire hydrants for building coverage.
- Displayed the Grading & Drainage Plan at New Manufacturing (south end) – Matches the rest of the existing Facility, finished floor elevation is 283 feet (base flood elevation in this location is 254 feet).
They are proposing one new section of storm sewer and everything else will remain the same (routed down to the south lot)
- Displayed the Grading & Drainage Plan at New Warehouse (ASRS) – ASRS Expansion and Connector Expansion have finished floor elevation of 283 with varying grades along the building. Sheet flowing away from the Facility and capturing in underground storm sewers (routed to the three interconnected ponds).
- Displayed the Grading & Drainage Plan at Expanded Auto Parking – New Underground Storm Water Detention Area (ADS chambers, all below-grade vaults for storm water detention, controlled by an outlet structure to mitigate discharges). Prior to entrance into the underground system, there is a hydrodynamic separator to capture 80 percent of total suspended solids (oils/greases/contaminants) which is designed for first flush. Grading and elevations changes between the auto parking lot and Upper Maple Street: edge of Upper Maple Street is about 268 feet; and the edge of the auto parking lot is about 281.5 feet with berms on the west side. He explained that they are trying to not impact the existing buffer as much as possible, but there is 11+ feet of grade differential.

- Displayed the Proposed Landscape Tree Plan at Expanded Auto Parking. They performed a full tree survey at this area and want to maintain the existing tree buffer as much as possible in this area. He indicated where either white spruce or red cedars will be planted (6-8 feet in height and spaced appropriately in between the existing vegetated buffer to help screen/block the line of sight from the west looking into the parking lot. There are just over 150 feet from the Upper Maple Street right-of-way, through the rail line right-of-way, and to the curb line. They are improving/enhancing this 150-foot buffer space to really limit that line of sight.

Keith Thurlow commented that the 150-feet of landscaping described is only adjacent to the parking lot and he commented that the plan should be to scale (140). Mr. Cole explained that it is not all buffered and that the rail line is 66 feet of the 150 feet. He explained that their intent is to enhance what is naturally there to fill in any gaps that may be present and maintain the existing buffer.

Virge Lorents asked about water quality. Mr. Cole explained about the Connecticut water quality standard regarding first flush for capturing 80 percent of total suspended solids and he explained about the detention system.

Mr. Thurlow asked about a forest management plan along this border (in a prior approval). Mr. Cole stated that he cannot speak to previously approved forestry plans. Ms. Aubrey stated that it is recorded Map #6425, sheet 6 of 9 sheets, and she read aloud from the Map regarding a long-term forest management plan in conjunction with a licensed forester to enhance and preserve the visual and sound buffering characteristics of the undeveloped land east of the Providence & Worcester Railroad property and west of the 25-foot wide easement (dated September 27, 2010). Attorney Hammer stated that he does not have information regarding this. Mr. Thurlow asked that it be addressed at the next meeting. Ms. Aubrey offered to provide copies of Minutes of the PZC Meetings of March 15, 2010 and April 19, 2010 to the Applicant. Kevin Krump, Haskell, clarified regarding the 2010 forest management plan stating that they have no knowledge of specific requirements for new landscaping with the Site Plan Application, therefore, what is being planted is being done in good faith. Attorney Hammer stated that they will respond to this at the next meeting. Ms. Aubrey stated that information is available on the website regarding public comment and recording sheets.

At this time (8:12 p.m.) there was a brief recess to allow time to set-up for the next speaker.
Mr. Thurlow called the meeting back to order at 8:18 p.m.

- Electrical:

Greg Smith, Electrical Engineer with Haskell:

- Displayed Lighting Plan – At New Manufacturing
Goal is to minimize impact while still providing safety and security for the Facility. He indicated existing lights (on buildings/poles).
No pole lights are proposed for the Manufacturing Expansion (they are removing 16 lights, seven of which are poles, in this area and adding 14). Lights to be removed are not shown on the Plan. They are just proposing new building-mounted lights (mounted at 25 feet above grade). Dark-sky compliant, full cut-off. Foot candle levels are highlighted, in some select areas, on the Plan.

Virge Lorents asked that they come up with a lighting system below 25 feet which would still provide adequate lighting. Mr. Smith explained that there are existing poles of varying heights and they selected the current lowest (25 foot) so they wouldn't go up higher. He explained that if they put them lower it gets dark in some areas and that they would need to add more poles to meet the Frito-Lay lighting standards for security and safety. Some poles that are being removed are flood lights.

- Displayed Site Lighting - At New Warehouse (ASRS) Plan
They are matching the same lighting that is currently there (same quantity, same heights). He indicated the lights on walls and existing poles that are to be demolished and explained that the proposed building-mounted lights will be spaced 25 feet apart and that they will be at the same height or lower than existing. He indicated four existing poles that are 34 feet high and that there will be four new poles at the same height in new areas. Some foot candle levels along the perimeter are shown on the Plan which approach nowhere near the property line, so they are not trespassing off of the site. He said that these levels are in-line with what you would do at a facility like this for safety and security.

Brian Card asked if it was the western property boundary. Mr. Smith stated that it is on the northwest side of the building. Mr. Card asked if the boundary lighting had been compared to the previous lighting at the site boundary (the developed property line showing the extent of the foot candle) and if there was any difference. Mr. Smith stated that it does not even approach the property line. He indicated existing lights that run along the driveway and stated that they are not contributing anywhere near what is already there. Mr. Card asked if there was any consideration given to going from inside out rather than outside in. Mr. Smith explained that they are trying to get the most light at the perimeter of the building considering that it is a food facility.

- Displayed Site Lighting – At Expanded Auto Parking Plan
There are 12 existing light poles and propose to add 8 additional poles. When they ran the calculations for foot candle levels they did it without taking any of the vegetation into account. They are at zero foot candles at the railroad spur and at zero all along the property line. Lights to be mounted at 24 feet above grade which is a little bit shorter than what is currently there (about 30 feet). Average of 1.7 foot candles for this area.
- Displayed Site Lighting – 900 Lot (truck trailer expansion)
He indicated lights which are at 24 feet and have the house-side shields (detail shown on the Plan). He indicated where the existing lighting in this area do not have the shields. There will be zero foot candles at the property line.
- Architectural:
David Kode, Design Director and Architect with Haskell Company,
 - Displayed the Overall Perspective (Existing vs. New Proposed)
 - Displayed Zoning Regulations – Special Permit Application – Dimensional Requirements
 - Displayed Aerial Site Plan of the six views that will be further described: View 1 – Upper Maple at Attawaugan; View 2 – Upper Maple; View 3 – Across the Lake; View 4 – Near the Entrance; View 5 – Across the Lake; View 6 – Lake Tavern Parking Lot.
 - Displayed Street Section “View 4 ” Section A - Existing & Proposed
Berm to remain. New ASRS is shielded from the berm as well as through the trees.
 - Displayed Photo of Intersection at Upper Maple Street and Attawaugan – View 1:
Heights of the new proposed not visible from View 1.
 - Displayed Photo of Front Entrance at Upper Maple Street – View 2:
Not visible.
 - Displayed Photo of North Shore Road – View 3:
Not visible.
 - Displayed Photo of Upper Maple Street – View 4:
Not visible.
 - Displayed Photo of Island Road – View 5:
Indicated part of the existing ASRS that is visible from two residences. Ninety-eight percent of the Facility is shielded by the trees.
 - Displayed Photo of Upper Maple Street – View 6:
From the Lake Tavern not visible through the tree line or above.
 - Displayed Zoning – Dimensional Requirements Elevations Plan:
He indicated where there will be some silos (58 feet and 77 feet) which he said are exempt from the special use height reference. New proposed elevation is 86 feet 8.5 inches which is the new ASRS roof height.
 - Displayed Building Elevations & Sections:
Color and/or panels to be matched like and kind to the existing structure.

Virge Lorents asked what would be happening in the proposed additional height. Sil Quenga, Frito-Lay Site Engineer, explained that it would be automated storage for pallets and product. Ms. Lorents asked if they could create storage another way. It was explained that it would be less efficient (automated) and there would need to be more site footprint to achieve the same amount of space.

Keith Thurlow asked about future/existing cornmeal silos (page 26). He asked for clarification that this is not part of this Application.

It was explained that they are not part of the Application because silos are not subject to the 50-foot requirement. It is just on the Plan for informational purposes. Reference was made to Section 450.3 and it was stated that there are already multiples there of that type and height. New silos are to be adjacent to existing silos.

Brian Card asked if it were kept to the existing ASRS height of approximately 76 feet, how much additional impact would it have been to the site development (now at 64 percent coverage).

It was stated that it would have implications regarding the function of the warehouse and storage.

Sil Quenga explained that currently, the ASRS loads from the south side of the Plant and the new ASRS will be discharging out the north side of the Facility and will have additional input doors on the south side of the Facility. He explained that they are limited in how far they can go to the north because it would put them over the berm into the other parking lot and they can't go further south because that pushes the building into the courtyard. This forced them to go up to meet their storage pallet requirement for their new production lines.

Mr. Card asked if going west was an option.

It was explained that going west would require an additional train which is very costly and would also result in pushing the employee entrance over which would require them to removal some of the hill. They prefer to keep the hill because it provides visual buffer for the site.

Mr. Thurlow asked about mechanicals on the roof being exempt from the height requirement.
Ann-Marie Aubrey referenced and read from Section 450.3 – Under Dimensionals.

Mr. Card asked about interior traffic patterns with the new parking lots.

Mr. Kode stated that the existing conditions are met and that there are no adverse impacts. This is not shown on the Plans.

Mr. Card commented that if there are no changes to emergency access/ingress/egress/anything changing, it would be nice to see the existing traffic patterns on the Site Plans. He requested that this be provided for the record.

Mr. Quenga commented that no traffic flow patterns have changed inside or outside of the site. He explained that back in 2010, information had been provided because there were traffic changes.

Mr. Card asked again that the traffic pattern be shown on the Plans, even if there are no changes.

There was discussion regarding Site Plans submitted should be 1 inch to 40 feet (scale reference).

Steven Cole explained that the Plans submitted for the Site Plan Application included overall and enlarged views (included 1 inch to 40 feet).

Ms. Aubrey asked that this be verified all the way through the Plans.

Mr. Thurlow asked that the presentation be more readable.

Ms. Aubrey stated that she had received a number of comments from the public, some of which were present in person, in the audience. She commented that they may prefer to read their own comments.

Jonathan Blake stated that a comment was received regarding HVAC equipment on the roof. The person wanted to know if any thought had been given to sound such as a parapet shield around the equipment.

Mr. Kode stated that the latest technology has been studied and incorporated as part of the Project. He said that they would probably need to cover the mechanical units as part of the full building submission. Mr. Kode said that he would have to get back to Mr. Blake regarding sound only.

Mr. Thurlow asked if they have projected decibel levels and he asked that they bring that information to the next meeting.

Mr. Kode said that he would.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ed Grandelski, 877 and 1827 Upper Maple Street, Town Council Member District 2, commented about previous presentations by the Applicant regarding the expansion. He voiced concern regarding the tree density and height, after construction of the parking which goes to the west, which will not be the same as shown in the photographs. He also commented about the proposed extended building height and said that he feels that the photos presented are deceiving. He suggested an artist's rendition to more accurately depict

what it would look like. He said that he is not in favor of the height increase unless they put in 80 or 90-foot trees.

Danny Rovero, 181 Laurel Point Road, spoke in opposition. He said that he does not believe a word that Frito-Lay says because he, and others, had met with them several times regarding problems with odor and noise and Frito-Lay said they would take care of the problems, but they never did. He is happy about job creation, but feels that at least half would go to people from out of Town. He said that other towns have Frito-Lay facilities, but they don't have the smell problem because the towns tell Frito-Lay to clean up their act or get out of town. He feels that the Town of Killingly does not make them clean up their act.

Michelle Murphy, Breakneck Hill Road, voiced concern on behalf of the people she spoke with during her campaign for Town Council regarding sight and sound issues coming from surrounding businesses, including the constant hum that emits from Frito-Lay. She stated that she would like to see the mitigation controls that were promised be enacted before any expansion.

Jason Anderson, 125 Lake Road, provided information (copies of a portion of the Traffic Impact Report that had been submitted to the CT Citing Council) to the Commission Members and the Applicant. Although he appreciates the benefits that Frito-Lay brings to Town, he has heard many complaints from many people about Frito-Lay regarding noise, smell and traffic problems. He, as a Town Council Member, has brought this issue to the current and previous Town Managers, but he feels that the issues have not really been resolved. Mr. Anderson referenced the Traffic Study (prepared by FAH) and commented and asked the following questions:

- Introduction: Do you intend to use the full access driveway to Maple Street for truck traffic?
- Page 3: Speed limit is posted as 35 mph on Lake Road, but no reference is made regarding the change to 25 mph west of Forbes Road on Lake Road.
- Page 3: Reference is made to a recently approved power plant, on Page 4 reference is made to a proposed NTE Connecticut power plant, and on Page 5 reference is made to a KTE energy plant. Are these three referenced one and the same?
- Page 4: Reference is made to Lake Street. Is it supposed to be Lake Road or another road?
- Page 5: Reference is made to the KTE energy plant having a very minor trip generation. Is this supposed to be NTE energy plant? If so, the statement goes against what FAH states in the traffic impact report they prepared for NTE that was submitted to the CT Citing Council.

Mr. Anderson spoke of his concerns about traffic as presented in the Report. He explained that the Traffic Impact Reports for NTE and for this Project contain conflicting information as the NTE Report showed that there would be significant impact. He feels that there would be a traffic nightmare during construction of the two Projects (which would coincide) if NTE traffic is not taken into consideration when looking at this Project. He noted that the Reports for both NTE and Frito-Lay were prepared by the same company, so they have the information available to them.

Mr. Anderson stated that the Town needs to do something about Lake Road west of Forbes Road which the NTE Study shows is only 22 feet wide which he feels does not meet the guidelines for tractor trailer traffic. He included with the information he had provided, a photo from a week ago of two tractor trailers heading westbound on Lake Road through the "S" turns. Mr. Anderson explained how he had to back up to allow room for the truck to pass. He said that it has never been designated as a thru truck road with the State of CT. He explained what thru truck means.

Mr. Anderson asked, What can Frito-Lay do to prevent truck traffic from going west from their Facility on Lake Road? He asked if it would be possible to change the address for the Facility to reflect the Frito-Lay drive rather than the Upper Maple Street, so GPS systems won't show Upper Maple Street.

Mr. Anderson suggested that the Traffic Impact Report needs to be looked at again as well as the NTE Traffic Study.

Lois Latraverse, 64 Island Road, read a statement from Keith Suchy (40 Sawmill Road) into the record. Mr. Suchy wrote of noise issues and how he had met with Frito-Lay consultants to test and identify the issues, but nothing has been done to resolve it. Mr. Suchy asks that the PZC carefully consider noise emanating from the existing Facility as well as the new expansion areas and its impact on the surrounding residents.

Ms. Latraverse also read into the record her own statement in which she speaks of noise, traffic and air quality over the years and her concern regarding additional noise, odor and traffic with the expansion. She feels these issues can be mitigated and urged the PZC to send the documents out for peer review.

Nancy Grandelski, 1827 and 877 Upper Maple Street, explained that how the sound affects you depends on where you live on the Lake, and that when you're out on the Lake the sound increases. She said that there is a big difference from one side of the Lake to the other and that no site at the Lake escapes the odor. She commented that it looks quite different in the winter, when the leaves have fallen from the trees.

Karen Johnson, 1819 Upper Maple Street, said that this is one of the sloppiest traffic studies she has ever seen and she is reviewing the plans. Ms. Johnson reference her multi-page letter which she submitted for the record and had also previously submitted to Staff via e-mail. Ms. Aubrey stated that it is on the website. She said that there is a presumption, by Frito-Lay, that this is going to get approved and that this process is an inconvenience for them. She said that just about everything they have said over the last ten years has either been a lie or they don't follow through. She explained that in 2010, a special permit was granted and in 2011 and 2012 the conditions on the 2010 Plan were carried over as other reasons for granting height exemption special permits. She said that, at this point, they either need to comply with those special permits and maintain that forested buffer or withdraw this Plan. She does not see any alternative. She said that the 25-foot, right-of-way that has been shown on their Plans for 40 years won't just disappear just because they don't want to comply with it. She explained that it was a requirement of at least four special permits that she has researched and she referenced Minutes from 2010. Ms. Johnson asked why they need an 87-foot warehouse. They got the one in 2010 with conditions. She asked why they need 730 trailers on this property and what is in the trailers – food storage? The Traffic Study shows 25 trucks per hour. She said that she had gone over there in the spring and looked at the trailers which she said looked like they don't appear to be roadworthy, so they are being used for storage. She asked if they are doing this in lieu of building an actual warehouse facility so they won't have to pay taxes on it.

Ms. Johnson explained that she has many issues with zoning compliance of their current Plan:

- Abutters not shown, just states adjacent from the railroad;
- Information submitted last week and tonight;
- Sloppy Traffic Study – She asked that the PZC approve peer review consultants to be hired;
- Plans are incomplete (need to show generalized floor plans);
- Environmental concerns;
- She does not understand why they need to expand the parking lot. Why do they need to exceed the parking requirements by 231 spaces? She referenced, read from and explained Section 530 of the Zoning Regulations regarding off-street parking). She said that they have the information needed to provide a parking demand analysis and then they could do an accurate trip generation table and parking study. If you can't prove demand, why do you need another 230 spaces (she referenced their Transformation Appendix)? Maybe they have the information, but haven't shared it. She said it is a requirement.
- Visibility Analysis is terrible. Didn't even describe their methodology. She will have other comments.
- Corn Silos – She referenced Section 450.3 regarding height and she stated that this is not an agricultural use. She explained that they should come in for a special permit for their existing corn silos that are not exempt from the height regulations. At a minimum, they need to amend this Special Permit Application to incorporate corn silos which are not farm silos when it is an industrial property.
- Under the Existing Conditions Survey (Site Plan) they are supposed to identify all existing trees over a certain diameter. She asked, when they submit an updated Site Plan that accurately shows existing conditions, how many trees are being removed in exchange for what they are proposing (eighteen 6-to-8-foot white pines and red cedars). She asked, besides visibility, what is it going to do to sound mitigation.
- Light Plan – She asked why they put 40-foot poles in the trailer lot, but now can put 25-foot poles on this lot.
- Park Lot Standards Section 530.4.1 – Either get a variance or put the landscaping in. She also asked why there is no internal landscaping on the trailer lot that was just constructed.

Jamie Raynsford, 182 Sandy Point Lane, spoke in opposition. He commented about a lawsuit during the 1990's involving an agreement between Frito-Lay and their employees. They would have to hose off

employees' cars when a certain smoke stack was used because it was eating the paint off of the cars. He asked that the Commission make note of that. He spoke of the large schools of fish in the Lake in the 1960's and how clear it was. He spoke of how, in the 1990's, he noticed a decline in the fish and the clarity of the Lake. He feels that this is due to Frito-Lay being there. He asked why the lawsuit had been kept secret. He spoke of noise when pollutants were released. He asked why nobody is keeping up with this (liaison). He spoke of sound going across the Lake (like a jet engine) that lasts for two or three hours in the morning and at the end of the day. He said that Frito-Lay disturbs his peace.

Earl McWilliams, 215 North Shore Road, commented about his understanding regarding the HVAC system noise abatement. His understanding is that the best available technological mitigation efforts have been or will be used around the HVAC systems to prevent the noise.

Dave Jarvis, Brooklyn, CT, local union representative, spoke in opposition. He is disturbed by the lack of care by Frito-Lay and Haskell, and disappointed in their neighborly conduct. He said the he is concerned about moving forward without having a document in place verifying all of the empty promises that have been made thus far. He feels that there is a road forward, but both sides need to work together (Community and end user). He said that consideration should be given to hiring locally. He said, "We are very much opposed to moving forward without some real considerations from Pepsi Co, Frito-Lay and Haskell."

Jill St. Clair, Director of Economic Development, referred to and read from Policy 2 of the Economic Development Plan in the POCD (implemented in October 2020), "Maximize the quality and diversification of Killingly's employers, both large and small." Under the first Action, "To assist in the retention of current employers and promote their expansion to occur within Killingly. Regular interaction with current employers to learn of their ever changing needs are then apt to provide those needs whenever possible to maintain the employer's presence within Killingly." She said that the Economic Development Commission is in full support of this expansion. Average salary is over \$50,000 with benefits and are creating careers and economic mobility for their employees and, as a result, Frito-Lay has raised the standard of living for all of its employees. Thus, setting the standard for other Industrial Park Stakeholders to follow by this example. Ms. St. Clair went on describing the economic impact that Frito-Lay has had on the Community over the past 40 years. She stated that not supporting this Project equates to a \$42 million deficit within the Community. She explained that the manufacturing sector in the northeast, particularly in Connecticut, face greater cost headwinds relative to other states in the region. Our assistance and support in this sector is well-placed and is a financially prudent investment for our Community to support their long-term growth plans, which directly support both large and small businesses within our Community.

Mary Miller, Attorney representing the Alexanders Lake Homeowners Association, filed the Petition spoken of earlier. She explained the following:

- 1) They will be requesting to intervene in #21—1275 as well as #21-1273.
Attorney Slater advised her to file separately for #21-1275.
- 2) She was hired regarding concern for environmental issues: Section 470.9.4 – Noise Abatement; Section 40.9.5 – Other Pollution or Related Problems; Section 470.9.6 – Landscaping and Screening.

Attorney Miller stated that their biggest concern is that the parking not be expanded and odor. She said that there currently restrictions in place, so you can't just ignore past special permits that would have to be addressed. She explained that the forested buffer not only provide a buffer from more of a noise and light impact to the residents of the Lake, but also the wildlife. She said that only a strip of six-to-eight foot trees will remain where there is currently a wide buffer of mature trees which will make a significant difference. Based on the required number of parking spaces, the parking lot with additional lighting is not necessary. She said that they also have light pollution concerns. She obtained a limited noise study that Frito-Lay had done in March of this year (it did not include the additional manufacturing). She said that when they have both starch recovery blowers on, the noise level comes in at 52.7 dba in their measurements. The limit at night is 51 dba. She explained that there are much better studies that can be done and she recommended that either they be given the time to have it done or the PZC have it done making sure it is done with the equipment is on and off. Attorney Miller said that they are not currently in compliance and taking out the forested buffer will be worse.

Regarding air pollution, the last report Attorney Miller was able to find was prepared in 2009 in response to a DEEP Notice of Violation regarding odor. She recommended that the PZC require a current study. She is concerned about what might be causing the odor (oil in the air could have an impact on the water quality).

Sandra Bove, 206 North Shore Road, spoke of how Frito-Lay had promised when they came to this Town 40 years ago that there would be no noise, no smell and you won't see it. She said there is smell, there is a lot of noise that can wake you up at night. She said there is a credibility issue. She asked that the PZC keep in mind that we want the information to be credible. She said that the equipment on top of the buildings make a lot of horrendous noise and she asked if they can use state of the art noise barriers for the new addition, why can't they do it for the existing?

There was discussion regarding hiring a third-party engineer. Ms. Aubrey has spoken about this with the Town Manager and will report back on it.

Ann-Marie Aubrey reviewed/summarized the information that had been received which is on the website:

- 1) Letter from Attorney Truppa representing Anthony Simpson regarding the right-of-way issue.
- 2) Letter from Attorney Mary Miller including exhibits.
- 3) Letter from Karen Johnson.
- 4) Letter from Janice Martin who has concerns regarding smell and noise.
- 5) Letter from Lenore Gudmundson in opposition.
- 6) Letter from Debra Gaudreau in opposition.
- 7) Letter from David Scott who feels that several things need to be understood before granting the special permit.
- 8) Letter from Mark Velloux in opposition.

Ms. Aubrey noted items needed for the next meeting:

- 1) Plans should be 1 inch representing 40 feet.
- 2) Traffic Study needs to be looked at.
- 3) Updated noise levels.
- 4) Forest Management.
- 5) Attorney Slater commented about whether there is a dispute about property rights. He referenced the Letter from Attorney Truppa (Anthony Simpson) and will follow-up with Attorney Hammer regarding whether the known easement is shown on the Plans. He will, then, be in a better position to advise the Commission regarding the question raised in that letter.

There was discussion regarding a third-party engineer.

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to move forward with a peer review for both **Special Permit Ap #21-1273**; David Kode (Frito-Lay/Landowner); 1886 Upper Maple St; GIS MAP 62, LOT 53; 94 acres; Ind Zone; for portion of proposed building addition that will exceed the maximum height of 50 ft for said zone, with a proposed height of 86 ft, 8.5 inches and **Site Plan Application #21-1275**; David Kode (Frito-Lay/Landowner); 1886 Upper Maple St; GIS MAP 62, LOT 53; 94 acres; Ind Zone; for the proposed building additions that will be under the allowed height.

Second by John Sarantopoulos. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (4-0-0).

There was discussion regarding coming to an understanding of what the Commission needs to move forward: Attorney Slater advised that the ultimately, the role of the Commission is framed by the specific standards of the Site Plan Regulations with respect to the Site Plan component and, with respect to the Special Permit component, the Regulations. With the Special Permit there are some more discretionary standards that get applied. Site Plan has less discretion, but they do include considerations regarding traffic. A professional peer review would understand that framework.

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to continue the public hearing for **Special Permit Ap #21-1273**; David Kode (Frito-Lay/Landowner); 1886 Upper Maple St; GIS MAP 62, LOT 53; 94 acres; Ind Zone; for portion of proposed building addition that will exceed the maximum height of 50 ft for said zone, with a proposed height of 86 ft, 8.5 inches, to Monday, December 20, 2021, 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 (4-0-0).

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

1) **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1274**; Weld, LLC (CGCT Killingly LLC/Landowner); 543 Wauregan Road: GIS MAP 262, LOT 20: General Commercial Zone; application seeks to change the zone of the subject real estate from General Commercial Zone to Light Industrial Zone. (**Applicant requests to withdraw application without prejudice.**) (**A new revised application submitted 11/9/2021.**) – See above.

2) **Special Permit Ap #21-1273**; David Kode (Frito-Lay/Landowner); 1886 Upper Maple St; GIS MAP 62, LOT 53; 94 acres; Ind Zone; for portion of proposed building addition that will exceed the maximum height of 50 ft for said zone, with a proposed height of 86 ft, 8.5 inches. **Continued – see above.**

3) **Site Plan Application #21-1275**; David Kode (Frito-Lay/Landowner); 1886 Upper Maple St; GIS MAP 62, LOT 53; 94 acres; Ind Zone; for the proposed building additions that will be under the allowed height.

There was discussion regarding this Application being continued. Attorney Slater explained that the public hearing for **#21-1273** was continued and the Applicant has acknowledge that comment on both the Site Plan **#21-1275** and the Special Permit, therefore, a separate motion is not needed to continue the Site Plan Application.

4) **Special Permit Application #05-868**; Request for Release of Bond; Ernest Joly & Son, Inc.; for 605 Providence Pike, Killingly, GIS MAP 224; Lot 14; ~170 acres; Rural Development Zone; all phases of work completed.
Review/discussion/action.

Jonathan Blake explained that Town Staff has inspected the site and has some concerns regarding some of the equipment that is still on site. Staff would like to reach out to the Applicant to see what their plans are for full correction of that item before moving forward with any kind of bond release.

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

1) **Special Permit / Site Plan Application #16-1145**; Request renewal of the site plan for an additional five (5) years; Briarwood Falls, LLC; 142-unit active adult community; Cook Hill Road & Deerwood Drive; GIS MAP 138; LOT 012; ~91.5 acres; Low Density Zone; Planned Residential Development. **See attached correspondence for written request.**

Ms. Aubrey stated that the written request and a report were included in packets to Commission Members. They are just looking to continue the Site Plan. She said that this would be the first renewal for this particular Site Plan. Bonds are in place.

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to renew **Special Permit / Site Plan Application #16-1145**; Request renewal of the site plan for an additional five (5) years; Briarwood Falls, LLC; 142-unit active adult community; Cook Hill Road & Deerwood Drive; GIS MAP 138; LOT 012; ~91.5 acres; Low Density Zone; Planned Residential Development.

Second by John Sarantopoulos.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (4-0-0).

Discussion: Virge Lorents asked if the Commission will get a report showing what they originally got permission for and where they are now. She also asked if they ever did the final layer of paving. Ms. Aubrey explained that they came in with a special permit and then came in with two more additional sections. It is those two sections that they are asking the renewal for, everything else has been built. Ms. Aubrey thinks that they did the final paving, but will check with Town Engineer, David Capacchione.

2) **Request for Pre-Application Workshop Meeting with PZC**; Douglas Construction, LLC; re: 605 Providence Pike, Killingly, CT; GIS 224, LOT 14; Rural Development. **See attached correspondence for written request.**

There was discussion and it was decided to hold all three workshops at a Special Meeting on December 13, 2021, at 6:00 p.m.

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to schedule a special meeting on Monday, December 13, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. (location to be determined) for the following:

- **Request for Pre-Application Workshop Meeting with PZC**; Douglas Construction, LLC; re: 605 Providence Pike, Killingly, CT; GIS 224, LOT 14; Rural Development;
- **WORKSHOP – Discussion** – should the zoning regulations allow for an accessory structure to be constructed on a vacant parcel of real estate without the primary structure being in place?
- **WORKSHOP – Discussion** – Five Mile River Overlay District.

Second by John Sarantopoulos. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (4-0-0).

3) **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1276**; Weld, LLC (CGCT Killingly LLC/Landowner); 543 Wauregan Road; GIS MAP 262, LOT 20; And 19 Lucienne Avenue; Killingly; GIS MAP 262, LOT 22; both General Commercial District; application seeks to change the zone of the subject real estate (properties) from General Commercial Zone to Light Industrial Zone. **Receive, and if application is complete, schedule for public hearing on Monday, December 20, 2021.**

Ms. Aubrey explained that, at the last meeting, it was brought up that only a small portion of a corner abuts the Light Industrial, so they brought forth another address on Lucienne Avenue and another address across the street. Attorney Bleasdale had reached out to the Deary's who said that they would like to become part of the Application which made it a new Application because it increased the area of notification and also adds acreage to the Zone Change. They reached out to the Lehto's, but got no response (it is a complicated matter). There is correspondence (Agenda Item XI.1) regarding the Commission moving forward with its own application for 4 Lucienne Avenue if it so chooses. The Lehto property borders residential property and could go for Light Industrial or residential. Ms. Aubrey stated that it is legal, non-conforming.

There was discussion and Mr. Thurlow prefers that the Commission consider the Zone Change without the Lehto property and let it go through. There were no objections voiced.

Motion was made by John Sarantopoulos to receive and schedule a public hearing for **Zone MAP Change Ap #21-1276**; Weld, LLC (CGCT Killingly LLC/Landowner); 543 Wauregan Road; GIS MAP 262, LOT 20; And 19 Lucienne Avenue; Killingly; GIS MAP 262, LOT 22; both General Commercial District; application seeks to change the zone of the subject real estate (properties) from General Commercial Zone to Light Industrial Zone, for Monday, December 20, 2021, Town Meeting Room, 2nd Floor, 172 Main Street, at 7:00 p.m.

Second by Virge Lorents. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (4-0-0).

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

1) Regular Meeting Minutes – OCTOBER 18, 2021

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to accept the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of OCTOBER 18, 2021.

Second by John Sarantopoulos. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (4-0-0).

2) Regular Meeting Minutes – AUGUST 16, 2021 (not enough members to vote on approval at prior meetings)

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to adopt the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of AUGUST 16, 2021.

Second by John Sarantopoulos. No discussion.

Motion carried by voice vote (3-0-1). Brian Card abstained.

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

1) **WORKSHOP – Discussion** – should the zoning regulations allow for an accessory structure to be constructed on a vacant parcel of real estate without the primary structure being in place?

A special meeting was scheduled for Monday, December 13, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. (location to be determined). See above Agenda Item VII.2).

2) **WORKSHOP – Discussion** – Five Mile River Overlay District. Discussion continued to DEC.20, 2021.

A special meeting was scheduled for Monday, December 13, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. (location to be determined). See above Agenda Item VII.2).

XI. CORRESPONDENCE

1) Letter received from Attorney Timothy D. Bleasdale (Waller, Smith & Palmer, P.C.); discussion regarding “the event that the Commission decides to proceed on its own application to change the zone designation of 4 Lucienne Avenue”.

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

A. Zoning Enforcement Officer’s & Zoning Board of Appeal’s Report(s) – No Report.

Ms. Lorents asked about getting hard copies of the reports as in the past. Mr. Blake will be at meetings to give verbal reports and is available to answer questions.

B. Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agent’s Report – No Report.

C. Building Office Report – No Report.

XIII. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Jill St. Clair reported:

- Second Small Business Boot Camp scheduled for March and April 2022. Last Session they had 11 candidates.
- Deb’s Restaurant will be closing on December 24, 2021. Another restaurant, with a different menu, will be moving into that space.

XIV. TOWN COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

Patti Larrow reported on the recent actions/discussions of the Town Council.

- Westfield Avenue Referendum, November 6, 2021, from 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. All Districts vote at the Library.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to adjourn @ 10:34 p.m.

Second by John Sarantopoulos. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (4-0-0).

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault
Recording Clerk