

**TOWN OF HADDAM  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC MEETING  
TOWN HALL  
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT  
THURSDAY, 17 MAY 2018  
UNAPPROVED MINUTES  
*Subject to Approval by the Commission***

**ATTENDANCE**

X	Gina Block
X	Steven Bull, Vice Chairman
X	Michael Farina
A	Arthur Kohs
X	Jamin Laurenza, Chairman
X	Wayne LePard
X	Edward Wallor, Secretary
A	Robert Braren, Alternate
X	Frank (Chip) Frey, Alternate – Seated
A	Diane Waddle Stock, Alternate
X	Liz West Glidden, Town Planner
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Laurenza, chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

The pledge was recited.

**3. Attendance/Seating of the Alternates**

Attendance was taken and all regular and alternate members were seated.

**4. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda**

None.

**5. Public Comments**

None.

**6. Discussion of Tylerville Village District Regulations**

Mrs. Glidden reported she reached out to a couple of town planners in adjacent towns for some peer review to talk about how they deal with situations similar to this and the Town of Hebron just went through the same process and recently adopted regulations. Mrs. Glidden stated she felt there were a lot of similarities between Bridge Road the area in Hebron where the Main Street regulations were adopted. In this area they have a village district (an historic district) and the Main Street district (Route 66 from Route

85 out passed Ted's Grocery Store going towards Lebanon) which has a high volume of traffic. In the last five years Hebron installed sidewalks, which people complained about, but now enjoy and use; and there's an additional project to install benches. The area is similar too in that the buildings are not densely put together – there are some historic buildings in the mix, but in many ways Tylerville is more dense than this area of Hebron. Mrs. Glidden stated Hebron commissioners had expressed interest in having the convenience of drive-thrus in their Main Street District, but not in the village/historic district. Hebron wanted to minimize the visual negative impact of drive-thrus and developed standards for their design guidelines (emailed to the Commission for review).

Mrs. Glidden reviewed Section 7B - Tylerville Village District noting under Section 7B.3.2 - Specific Standards the addition of subsection B 1-8. Discussion followed in regard to the use of "shall" and/or "should" and whether or not drive-thrus, pump islands and canopies should be located only to the rear of a structure in subsections #4 and #8. Mrs. Glidden stated her reasoning for adding this, which would be in addition to the general standards and the design guidelines, still allows drive-thrus, pump islands and canopies, but adds more guidance on how they should be sited.

Under the Use Table, Mrs. Glidden add two stars (\*\*) for vehicle oriented uses and reviewed these with the Commission. Mrs. Glidden noted this is not an exhausted list.

In regard to B roads, Mrs. Glidden stated she heard discussion about having incentives to motivate their creation. Mrs. Glidden reviewed language (in italics) under Section 7B.9 Modification Procedure for Uses Permitted in Village District. Mr. Bull asked if this will include location of the drive-thru and parking. Mrs. Glidden stated no, and read the list of items that can receive a modification and it can only be obtained if you go on a B road or use an historic structure. Mrs. Glidden briefly discussed the difference between the Higganum Village District Regulations and those being proposed for Tylerville.

Mrs. Glidden discussed the language that is proposed to be deleted (a portion of Section 7B.9 – third paragraph after list of modification items and A through D) as this is covered under Section 7B.3 – Minimum Standards and 7B.3.2 - Specific Standards.

Discussed returned to Vehicle Oriented Establishments (Section 7B.3.2.B) with Mr. Laurenza asking what will become of #4 – "all drive thrus, pump islands and canopies shall be located in the rear, or side" and #8 – "The drive-thru shall be visually subordinate to the design of the main building and located to the rear." Mrs. Glidden suggest changing "shall" to "should" which would require the applicant to demonstrate why those items cannot be to the rear. Mr. Bull talked about the village character that the town is trying to create through the POCD being disrupted when they're visible from the road; and believes if the opening is left, applicants will push the issue. Mr. Laurenza stated he would prefer giving the option of rear or side. Mr. Bull stated applicants need to be given incentives to push drive-thrus off of Bridge Road. Mrs. Glidden suggested the following for #4 "To reduce the impact of the vehicular focus, the building structure shall/should be sited to face the street and have a front door that is parallel and accessible from the main road and all drive thrus, pump islands and canopies shall be located in the rear or side, with the rear being preferred." Discussion followed at length in regard to this matter with Ms. Block, Mr. Farina, and Mr. Wallor offering input. Mr. Wallor stated that any application relating to the Tylerville Village District would go before the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and at that time ARC should be informing the applicant that placement to the rear of the structure is preferred. Mrs. Glidden noted this will also be outlined within the design guidelines and hopefully, there will be a preliminary meeting in which she can explain the process to the applicant. Mr. Bull suggested for #2 the deletion of "Where possible" and for #4 changing "shall" to "should" and delete "or side". Mr. Wallor stated in #8 "shall" would need to be changed to "should". Mrs. Glidden disagreed and explained why.

Mr. LePard stated that all of the convenience stores in town have gas pumps to the front; and asked if the Commission will now be asking, at least within the village district, that the pumps go to the back. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, and that the existing ones within a village district would be non-conforming. Further discussion followed in regard to incentives to create B roads, the goal to create a second village district, and the Commission using the Special Permit.

The Commission backtracked and reviewed item by item Section 7B.3.2.B with the following amendments: #2 – delete “Where possible”. #4 – After “street” add “and have a front door that is parallel and accessible from the main road;”, change “shall” to “should”, and delete “or side”. Sentence will now read: “To reduce the impact of the vehicular focus, the building structure shall be sited to face the street and have a front door that is parallel and accessible from the main road; and all drive-thrus, pump islands and canopies should be located in the rear.” #5 – Mrs. Glidden talked about canopies with bands of bold color and backlighting noting that existing canopies would be considered non-conforming if the regulations pass. Mr. Bull asked if a canopy needed to be replaced would it fall under the new regulations. Mrs. Glidden stated if the same vendor came in wanting to do the same thing, it would be “a replacement in kind”; but if it’s a new vendor, it would be considered different. Mr. Wallor asked if this would happen if the property changes hands. Mrs. Glidden stated if the signage is not exactly as the existing sign, then it would fall under the proposed new regulations. #6 and #7 – No changes. #8 – delete “of the main building and located to the rear.”

Mr. Frey asked why the Commission would want to have a modification for signage (7B.9.5). Mrs. Glidden stated it’s a rollover from the Higganum Village District Regulations. Mrs. Glidden provided an example of a mural on the side of a building being used as a sign.

Mr. Bull asked if placement of drive-thrus, parking, and canopies could be a modification if located on a B road. Mrs. Glidden stated it’s already a part of it and read the language; and that she didn’t believe it should be a modification, but an additional item number under Section 7B.3.2.B could be added. #9 – “Where vehicle oriented establishments are located on B roads this criteria may be modified.” Mr. Laurenza asked if this wasn’t already covered under density. Ms. Block asked to what degree it can be modified. Mr. Wallor and Mrs. Glidden stated it would be up to the Commission. Discussion followed in regard to allowing them in some manner (compromise).

Karin Blaschik stated she was under the impression that the Commission wanted the B roads to be more village like and in this way the buildings could be built more closely together and have more walkability. Mr. Frey stated no, it’s to encourage drive-thrus and that type of business on the B roads noting success in other towns that have done this. Mrs. Blaschik stated Bridge Road will be the village and walking area. Discussion followed in regard to how Madison and Old Saybrook are set up.

Mrs. Blaschik asked for clarification regard Item #4 under Section 7B.3.2.B. Mrs. Glidden reread the proposed language noting that “should” is not mandatory; whereas, “shall” is mandatory.

Mrs. Blaschik asked if someone wanted to sell their property and a B road hasn’t been constructed, can the new owner get a drive-thru. Mrs. Glidden stated a Special Permit applicant can be made and it does not require an existing B road.

Larry Maggi stated the reason for having drive-thrus placed on the side is to get the traffic away from the area where orders are placed which is typically to the back of a structure. Mr. Maggi also stated now that the wording has been changed to “should” he’s o.k. with it.

Ms. Block asked if the Commission should allow for screening of drive-thrus if they are placed on the side. Mrs. Glidden asked if they would be screened through landscaping. Ms. Block stated yes. Discussion followed as to what is already within the regulations (reviewed) and being limited to some extent by the sightline.

Jon Sibley stated he keeps hearing “what we want” noting that business people have to look at “what works” and if it doesn’t work, it has to go away. In regard to incentives, Mr. Sibley stated if someone goes 100 percent with a plan he’d provide them with a 25 percent tax abatement (that’s an incentive). Mr. Sibley also stated Mrs. Glidden has put a lot of work into the proposed regulations and he respects that, but the language is subjective pointing out the following: “harmoniously related to their surroundings” and “visual relationship” (Section 7B.3.B.1; asked who determines what’s harmony and the visual relationship); “evaluated for compatibility” (Section 7B.3.B.3); “sightlines of vistas from within the district” (Section

7B.3.C.3; stated he doesn't know what do you do with that); and "uniform architectural theme" (Section 7B.3.C.6; stated he would love everyone to have a structure similar to his, but it's not realistic).

In regard to B roads, Mr. Sibley stated he's aware of the players involved with that; and unless the town does something with imminent domain or the State of Connecticut does something drastic with Bridge Road, this won't happen or if it does, it will be way down the road. Mr. Sibley also stated any discussion of B roads is nice in theory, but he doesn't see it happening.

In terms of architectural theme, Mr. Sibley stated Bridge Road is a hodge podge of structure types and that he was particularly concerned about who the aesthetic arbiter will be. Mr. Sibley also stated he's all for upscaling Tylerville. Mrs. Glidden stated the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) would be the arbiter and they would make a recommendation to P&Z.

Mr. Sibley asked if the town wants tax ratable businesses; and stated P&Z needs to be careful that they do not create a bureaucratic nightmare for an investor to come in. Mr. Sibley also stated an investor wants to know what is wanted so they can come in, get an approval, and start a project.

Mr. Maggi thanked the Commission for listening to everyone and coming to a compromise. Mr. Sibley and Mr. and Mrs. Blaschik also thanked the Commission.

Mrs. Glidden reviewed with the Commission the following: 1) proposed zoning map; 2) Section 3 – Definitions - adult uses (language provided by Attorney Mark Branse), interior lots (only for creating new lots and will only apply to the way the Commission looks at subdivisions), and directly illuminated sign; 3) Section 5 – Zones (adding Tylerville Village District, CT River District, and the Conservation District; noted that Housing Opportunity Zone had not been added so that will be a correction); 4) Section 6A – Conservation Zone (this is for the two parcels – one owned by the State and the other by the Land Trust; however, it will be a district that is all over Haddam); 5) Section 7B – Tylerville Village District; 6) Section 7C – Connecticut River District (parcels right along the Connecticut River mostly owned by the State, but includes Goodspeed Station, Eagle Landing State Park, and two residential properties); 7) Design Guidelines (there are no changes except for the graphic under Intersections and Gateways – now B roads are encouraged; infill buildings; merely a concept).

In regard to the zoning map, Mr. Bull asked what would happen if one of the two residential lots to the left of the River House wanted to become commercially zoned. Mrs. Glidden stated she would recommend to the applicant that they consider rezoning it to village district.

Mrs. Glidden stated the soonest a hearing can be scheduled would be Thursday, 21 June 2018, as the Gateway Commission needs 30 days to review the documents. Mrs. Glidden will send out letters to the property owners affected by the proposal as well as the referral letters to the Gateway Commission and the Town of East Haddam.

## **7. Public Comment**

Comments were taken during the discussion. See above.

## **8. Approval/Correction of the Minutes**

Corrections to the 3 May 2018 minutes: page 2, fourth paragraph, first sentence – change "up" to "setback"; page 2, sixth paragraph, last sentence – change "within a 500 foot radius" to "not within a 100 foot radius"; page 3, last paragraph, second line – change "encourages" to "encouraged"; page 4, fourth paragraph, first line – delete "had" and insert a comma after "concerns"; page 4, fourth paragraph, second line – change "proposed regulations is not a way she can see in guiding" to "the proposed regulations as presented the proposed regulations do not guide"; and page 5, first paragraph, first sentence – insert "that" after "stated".

**MOTION:** Steve Bull moved to approve the 3 May 2018 Public Hearing and Meeting minutes as amended. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

## **9. Chairman's Report**

None.

## **10. Scheduling of Hearings**

**Francis Albis, Applicant and Emily and Jeff Merriam, Owners, Request for a Special Permit to Construct a Two Car Garage with Living Space Above Resulting in a Structure in Excess of 4,000 Square Feet, 180 Camp Bethel Road** – Thursday, 7 June 2018. Application, letter from Gateway Commission, and plans distributed to Commissioners.

**Proposed Tylerville Village Regulations** – Thursday, 21 June 2018.

## **11. Town Planner's Report**

**Gateway Cruise on the Connecticut River** – Thursday, 7 June 2018 – Mrs. Glidden briefly talked about the cruise. Commissioners attending: Mr. Farina and Mr. Bull. Mrs. Glidden may attend.

**7 June 2018 Hearing/Meeting** – As there will be Commissioners attending the Gateway Cruise, Mrs. Glidden will check to see if Ms. Stock and Mr. Braren will be attending the hearing/meeting to see if there will be a quorum. Ms. Block stated she would not be in attendance.

**Scovil Hoe Follow Up Workshop** – Thursday, 31 May 2018, Community Center, 7 Candlewood Hill Road, Higganum - Mrs. Glidden reported the Conway School will be presenting their findings. In regard to the workshop held on Thursday, 10 May 2018, Mr. Farina stated although there were not a lot of people in attendance, there was a lot of energy. A brief discussion followed.

**Sidewalk Grant – Joint Venture with East Haddam** – Mrs. Glidden reported that she and Jim Ventres, Town Planner, East Haddam, are working together on a Build Grant, federal grant, for a sidewalk across the Swing Bridge. In 2020, the State of Connecticut will be conducting a \$38 million rehabilitation project on the bridge and the State decided not to add a sidewalk. Mrs. Glidden stated she and Mr. Ventres will be asking for \$17 or \$18 million dollars; and that this year the federal government is recognizing rural projects. Mrs. Glidden also stated DOT, RiverCOG, and the selectmen from both towns are partnering with her and Mr. Ventres on this endeavor.

**5 July 2018 – MOTION:** Jamin Laurenza moved to cancel the 5 July 2018 meeting. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

## **12. Adjournment**

**MOTION:** Steve Bull moved to adjourn. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
*Bunny Hall Batzner*  
Bunny Hall Batzner  
Recording Clerk

**The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 7 June 2018.**