

**TOWN OF HADDAM
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING
TOWN HALL
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT 06438
THURSDAY, 7 MARCH 2024
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
*Subject to Approval by the Commission***

ATTENDANCE

X	Gina Block
X	Scott Brookes, Chairman
X	Michael Farina, Secretary
X	Mike Karam
X	Wayne LePard
X	Tim Teran
X	Edward Wallor, Vice Chairman
X	Alan Chadwick, Alternate
A	Dorothy Gillespie, Alternate
X	Larry Maggi, Alternate
X	Bob McGarry, First Selectman, <i>Ex Officio</i>
X	Bill Warner, AICP, Town Planner
X	Leon Mularski, Zoning Enforcement Officer
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

1. Chairman Calls Meeting to Order

Mr. Brookes, 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 members were seated.

4. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

The agenda stood as submitted.

5. Public Comments

Concern over Email from Commissioner – Peter Leonardo, 531 Little City Road, voiced concern over an email sent 26 February 2024 from Mr. Teran in which Mr. Teran indicates he does not want vape shops allowed in town, but wants to allow marijuana dispensaries (recreational and medical). Mr. Teran stated the regulations prohibit marijuana dispensaries, but not vape shops. Mr. Leonardo stated he's for vape shops.

Mr. Brookes stated one commissioner put out some ideas and the Commission has not discussed them as a group; and that Mr. Teran's wish list is not necessarily the Commission's wish list. Mr. Leonardo stated he understood.

Mr. Warner advised Mr. Leonardo to focus his comments to the whole Commission, not to Mr. Teran, and then the Commission will respond. Mr. Leonardo indicated he understood.

Mr. Leonardo stated his biggest concern is Mr. Teran's prohibited use list as it ends specifically regarding his businesses – gun store and tattoo shop. Mr. Leonardo stated the wording indicates that if something were to happen to his building he would not be allowed to move/relocate his businesses. Mr. Brookes stated the Commission is not saying that, it's merely a wish list. Mr. Leonardo stated it sounds like spot zoning; and asked how many businesses would be affected. Mr. Brookes stated he thought possibly Jeremiah Johnson in Tylerville, and the tattoo parlor and gun shop in the Center. Mr. Leonardo stated there are seven Federal Firearms License holders in town that sell out of their houses, therefore, six would be affected not including his business. Mr. Leonardo stated he thought the Commission had previously discussed this matter when the tattoo shop was going through their issues and deemed it a monopoly then. Mr. Teran stated the Commission is not doing anything and that "we" is the wrong word to be using.

Mr. Leonardo stated he understands someone's hatred toward firearms or tattoos, but Mr. Teran mentions militaria specifically; and asked if it was a detriment to the town, an issue. Mr. Leonardo explained what militaria is - uniforms, antiques, historical interest, and asked if anyone in Mr. Teran's family served. Mr. Teran stated yes, aces WWI and WWII. Mr. Leonardo stated he took the comments personally and that the email specifically targeted two businesses in town that have done nothing but help this community, non-stop, monetarily, and physically noting that they have come out to assist Mr. Karma with beautification project. Mr. Teran took exception to the word "hatred".

Mr. Brookes thanked Mr. Leonardo for his comments and stated the Commission will take them under consideration if and when the Commission gets to those subjects, but are currently not there.

Storage Units - Claude Albert, Timms Hill, asked if there were storage units in the works. Mr. Brookes stated not to his knowledge. Mr. Albert asked if there were any proposals to change the rules, size, or location. Mr. Brookes stated that will be discussed at another meeting, but it is not on any agenda nor has the Commission spoken about it as a group.

Linda Shaw, 299 Hidden Lake Road, asked if the Commission would be discussing changing the zoning to allow storage units in town. Mr. Brookes stated some members are new to the Commission and a bit behind on historical decisions, but the Commission has discussed reviewing all the districts and will look at everything and to date have had zero discussions on storage units as a group. Ms. Shaw asked if the Commission was aware of how the town feels about storage units, especially the Higginum side, and that they do not want the regulations changed and are against having them in town. Mr. Brookes stated he would take that as part of the no vote (re Rossi); and yes, he believes the Commission is aware of that. Ms. Shaw asked if the matter would come up as a referendum again. Mr. Brookes stated no, not for the one issue; and if the regulations were changed, a public hearing would be held before the Commission would vote on any amendments. Ms. Shaw suggested a referendum be held.

Doug Downey, 176 Thayer Road, stated he was opposed to the anti-gun agenda.

Conflict of Interest of Commissioner – Recusing - Kenny Vallera, 21 Bamforth Road, asked what the Commission's view and position are on conflict of interest with Commissioners who are involved in present day issues that are coming up in front of the Commission.

Mr. Wallor stated it is up to the Commission member to recuse themselves. The Commission does not have any right to request that they remove themselves. If there is a conflict and the Commissioner knows there's a conflict, in good faith he/she should recuse themselves, but do not have to. Mr. Vallera asked what the exposure for the town and Commission would be if there were a member and they did not recuse themselves from the particular matter. Mr. Wallor stated the Commissioner has one vote as does every other Commissioner and it will come down to how the Commission votes. Mr. Wallor stated the Commission has no authority to make someone recuse themselves.

Mr. Teran stated he was saddened by a situation he had put the Commission in, disrespect and distrust. Mr. Teran stated there are far too many rumors and innuendo. Mr. Teran stated on 1 February 2024 the Commission spoke in regard to reviewing the regulations. At that time it was agreed that it would be far

too difficult to do so and all should take the time to put their thoughts to paper and share them in order to discuss the different points of view, develop a set of ideas to carry forth to the town, and let the town decide whether it is worthy of amendment or not. Mr. Teran stated sadly someone in the room decided to would be more fun to put it on email, out of context with no respect to the individual who wrote it or the institution that was trying to do something good for the town. Mr. Teran stated that disturbs him, and more disturbing personally was the disgusting ways in which people treated him and the Commission with lack of respect on email because of it. Mr. Teran stated those individuals were not in attendance at that meeting nor did they read the minutes. Mr. Teran apologized that his email came out of context.

Mr. Teran stated he has read all the emails and believes the good news is that some good ideas have come up regarding what might be done on the Rossi site. Mr. Teran asked those individuals to do the work and do not just talk about it. Mr. Teran also stated that he had read the bizarre thought that he may be involved with the developer noting that he had never meet the individual before and it is beyond a nutty idea. Mr. Teran asked those in attendance to put it out of their mind as it is not true. Mr. Teran stated he does not know about the Rossi deal other than what he had learned from Bill Warner, Town Planner, Bob McGarry, First Selectman, and people who are trying to work that proposal. Mr. Teran stated he has spent 60 years in the town, loves the town, and was elected by many people to try and do the right thing for the town and respects what people want and what the POCD does. Mr. Teran again apologized to the Commission for any disrespect that they may have felt or lack of trust because of something he had written and was sadly taken out of context.

POCD - Ron Borrelli, Wig Hill Road, asked when the POCD was drafted. Mr. Warner stated 2018. Mr. Brookes stated it is a ten year document. Mr. Borrelli asked if it was due for an update in five years. Mr. Brookes stated four years. Mr. Borrelli stated there is no reason to bring it up now as there's four more years before changing all the zoning. Mr. Brookes stated no, as a Commission, they can look over the regulations and change them; however, the POCD is a guideline that was compiled by a number of concerned townspeople and believes the Commission takes it very seriously, but it is not a document that has to be followed 100 percent. Mr. Borrelli stated seven or eight adjustments in less than six years seems like quite a bit.

Mr. Albert stated he hopes when the Commission discusses the proposed zoning amendments that it is done in public as it would be illegal for the Commission to get together privately. Mr. Brookes stated Mr. Albert was 100 percent correct.

Posting of Minutes - Ms. Shaw stated Mr. Teran mentioned the minutes from 1 February 2024 and the public was not able to obtain those minutes because they were not posted to the website and could not reference the minutes. Ms. Shaw stated this is an issue and asked that they be posted in a timely manner. Ms. Shaw stated that could help a lot of people not reference bad things on Facebook and put Mr. Teran or anyone else in a bad position. Mr. Brookes stated her point was well taken.

Erik Hesselberg, Walkley Hill Road, asked why the minutes are not posted. Mr. Wallor stated the minutes are not posted online until approved; the Commission had copies before them for approval tonight. Mr. Hesselberg stated he had seen unapproved minutes in the past. Mr. McGarry stated minutes should be posted even if unapproved within seven days and it will be addressed. Mr. McGarry stated the notice that was posted on the door for a cancelled meeting was for an FOI training session.

6. Public Hearing / Public Meeting

A Request for Special Permit to Construct a 6,900 Square Foot Four (4) Bedroom House within the Gateway Conservation Zone at 15 Sergeant Morgan Drive. Applicant: Chris Minerly/Doane Engineering.

Bob Doane, P.E. and L.S., Doane Engineering, representing the applicant, was present.

Hearing: Mr. Brookes opened the hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Mr. Farina, Secretary, read the Legal Notice into the record. Mr. Brookes noted a correction that the structure is for 6,900 square feet not 2,900 square feet as read.

Mr. Brookes explained the public hearing process.

Mr. Doane reported the proposed 6,900 square foot house will site on a 6.74 acre parcel in Haddam Neck noting that the Tidewater Feldspar Co. was once located on the site (a 1934 aerial with attachments was submitted; Exhibit A). The application is before the Commission due to the building being over 4,000 square feet and within the Gateway Zone - required to calculate the area of the garage, basement, and the attic as it has six feet of headroom and a public hearing is required to meet the Special Permit criteria.

Mr. Doane submitted 11 inch x17 inch copies of the map and abbreviated sets of the architectural renderings - Sheets 1-3 and 5 of a 14 sheet set (Exhibit B and C). Mr. Doane reported the Gateway Conservation Zone has a 100 foot setback from the coastal jurisdiction line (high tide line, elevation 3 on the eastern side of the Connecticut River that abuts the property). The property is in between the river and the Rock Landing Cemetery. Mr. Doane stated the property has steep slopes covered with laurel undergrowth on the river side and wooded with oaks, maples, black birch, and cherry. The property was previously disturbed, large excavation on the southeast corner of the property creating a ridge that may have been built to access navigational aids (there was a navigational aid on the top of the hill at one time) and there is a cistern that may have been a base of a navigational aid. The soil is extremely favorable (deep soil tests were conducted with the Connecticut River Area Health District (CRAHD), to demonstrate the site can support a septic system and get an idea of the soil that they would be dealing with. One of the features of the property, particularly from the river, is ledge running from the existing beacon (close to a property line) along the edge of the river for approximately 300 feet and goes up approximately 40 feet to the top. Mr. Doane stated tests were conducted in the area of the house and went down over 16 feet through sand and gravel and never hit ledge (ledge drops off fairly quickly as you go into the property). Mr. Doane stated you enter the property approximately 140 feet before the front of the house, staying out of the 100 foot setback of the Gateway Commission.

Mr. Doane reported there was a house on the property but it has been removed. The driveway will come off Sgt. Morgan Drive, town road, meandering up a hill following an old cart path. The driveway is at eight percent climbing the hill to get around the southwest corner of the cemetery and will follow the ridge to get to the house location. Mr. Doane stated the ridge is very narrow and runs in a north-south direction as you approach the house. With the favorable soils will be cutting down approximately 10 feet into the ridge to lower the west side and pushing that material into the large hole that was excavation in order to create a pad to set the house on. This has the advantage of lowering the house, the first floor will be at the existing ridge line and the lower floor will be at 10-11 feet below the ridge line and pushed back into the bank. Because of these factors, it allows the applicant to not disturb the vegetation, the healthy stand of oaks trees, and the significant stand of laurel that is the undergrowth along the ridge line from the southwest corner to the north.

Mr. Doane stated there are wetlands (not typical wetland soil) in the northwest corner of the property; flagged by a soil scientist. The Wetland Regulations require a 100 upland review area and they have stayed out of that review area with the grading, driveway, and house. The well is right on the edge of the upland review area.

Mr. Doane reviewed the nine Special Permit criteria that he placed in a narrative (copies distributed to the Commission) noting that a number of the items overlap with the Gateway Conservation Zone. #1. Due to the low profile not visible from the river. #2. Terrain previously altered. Slopes toward river and east and south sides are being maintained. #3. Structure will be pushed back from the ridge. Elevation of the hill-side behind the house near the cemetery is within six feet of the ridge of the house. Mr. Brookes asked the location of the cemetery in relation to property. Mr. Doane pointed it out on the map. The first floor of the house is 22 feet to the ridge from the main level and 29 feet from the walkout level (to the peak). Mr. Doane used one of the elevation sheets to demonstrate these points. #4 and #5. Mr. Doane stated these criteria talk about the vertical element. The slope of the roof (want it to fit into the silhouette of the hill-

side) will be similar to the natural terrain - roof pitches (multiple ridges) blend in with the hillside as requested in #6. The roof will have dark gray or black asphalt shingles. The siding will be dark gray board and batten style vertical siding. It will blend in nicely with the hillside. #7. Grading not visible from the river. Grading will be pushed back. #8 Proposed development will not disturb any sensitive areas – meet the setback from the river as well as the upland review area.

In conclusion, the property receives the house, driveway, and septic system very nicely with relatively minor amount site work. Will not be dealing with any ledge, there will be no blasting.

Mr. Brookes asked if there were any other houses on the street. Mr. Doane stated yes, further down. Mr. Doane stated a public hearing sign had been posted since 20 February 2024 and the legal notice was in the paper.

Mr. Chadwick asked if any trees will need to be cut down in the 100 foot area and if the new construction would be blocking anyone else's view of the river. Mr. Doane stated no to both questions.

For clarification on the view, Mr. Teran asked if in Higganum Cove going from Buoy 61 down towards Buoy 60 (where the red light is flashing on the cliffs and the kids jump off), if the house would be visible from above that cliff. Mr. Doane stated yes.

Mr. Warner stated of the number of trees the applicant will be preserving there is a substantial stand in front of the house that will not be cut. Mr. Teran stated due to the color being specified, the house will not be too visible; but did ask what visual pollution there might be at night. Mr. Farina stated that is an issue Gateway addressed as well as non-reflective glass. Mr. Doane stated he believes they meet the eight criteria of the Gateway regulations. In regard to where people jump off the ledges, Mr. Doane noted there is 52 feet of water there. Mr. Doane stated non-reflective glass will be used and light fixtures will either be in the soffit or dark sky friendly. Mr. Doane stated he is aware of the regulations that Gateway has been presenting to the nine towns and will adhere to them as well.

Mr. Karam asked if there will be a path to the river from the house. Mr. Doane stated there is an existing path and the applicant will maintain it. Mr. Doane also stated the path meanders from the navigational beacon on top and whoever is jumping off the cliff have maintained access to the top of the ledge. Mr. Doane stated it is not easy to walk down there because you have to walk around the ledge.

Mr. LePard stated the Commission is talking about two separate entities – Gateway and the Town of Haddam; and asked which of those two would provide the final approval or disapproval. Mr. Warner stated as it is a Special Permit, the P&Z would have the final approval. For zone changes and variances Gateway has veto power over what could happen. Mr. Warner stated the town has eight to ten pages of Gateway regulations and as long as the applicant complies with those it gets approved. Mr. LePard clarified that the applicant is not asking for a zone change. Mr. Warner stated no, Special Permit only and Gateway is aware of the matter.

Mr. Karam asked if a forester was consulted in the cutting of the trees. Mr. Doane stated no; and asked if Mr. Karam was asking about the 100 foot area. Mr. Karam responded yes. Mr. Doane stated the only trees to be removed are in the area that will be graded and outside the review area. Within the 100 foot setback area the applicant is allowed to do some maintenance cutting and for that an arborist would be consulted.

Mr. Albert asked if the property was further subdividable in any way that would produce another building lot. Mr. Doane stated the lot is large enough to be divided, but the proposal does not call for that. Mr. Doane stated he did not know if the geometry of the lot would fit into the squares, etc., needed for another lot(s). Mr. Albert asked if another big house could fit. Mr. Doane stated there is room in the area where the existing house was removed; however, it is not something that's being considered. Mr. Albert asked if Gateway gets to recommend. Mr. Warner stated by statute only zone changes and variances go to Gate-

way; and Mr. Doane has presented this matter to Gateway and they understand this proposal does not have to be referred to them formally. Mr. Warner stated the proposal has to meet P&Z's criteria that Gateway wrote.

Jack Calhoun, Higganum, stated some of the houses along the river are painted white; and asked if there is any control over color. Mr. Doane stated they are proposing dark gray for the siding and dark gray or black for the roof. Mr. Calhoun asked if there are any rules regarding color. Mr. Warner stated no. Mr. Farina stated Gateway suggests a palette to fit into the environment. Mr. Farina also stated he believes Mr. Doane understands Gateway's concerns and has developed a decent plan.

Mr. Hesselberg asked Mr. Doane the name of the feldspar company and if the quarry was on the property. Mr. Doane stated the company's name was Tidewater Feldspar Co. Mr. Hesselberg asked if there was a quarry on the property. Mr. Doane stated no, the quarry was approximately 4,000 feet north. Mr. Hesselberg stated feldspar quarries typically have pegmatite veins which have a lot of gem stones. A brief discussion followed.

As there were no further questions/comments from the Commission or the public, Mr. Brookes closed the hearing at 7:53 p.m.

Meeting: SEATED: Block, Brookes, Farina, Karam, LePard, Teran, and Wallor.

Mr. Brookes asked the Commission if they had any further comments or discussion regarding the motion. As there was none, Mr. Brookes called the vote.

MOTION: Ed Wallor motioned to approve a request for special permit to construct a 6,900 square foot four (4) bedroom house within the Gateway Conservation Zone at 15 Sergeant Morgan Drive. Scott Brookes second. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Approval/Correction of the Minutes

MOTION: Ed Wallor motioned to approve the 1 February 2024 minutes as submitted. Mike Karam second. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION: Ed Wallor motioned to approve the 15 February 2024 minutes as submitted. Mike Farina second. Motion carried unanimously.

Prior to beginning the Scovil Hoe presentation, Mr. Karam disclosed that he had made an inquiry about possibly renting space in the Scovil building. Mr. Karam stated it would not affect his judgment whatsoever and would act objectively on the business before the Commission for any application going forward.

8. New Business

Site Plan Review of Proposed Site Work to Remediate the Environmental Contamination and Authorize Renovation of Two Buildings for Event Space at Scovil Property (Former State Garage), 11 Candlewood Hill Road. Applicant: PB Projects 8 LLC

Mark Grocki, Senior Project Manager, VHB, Shannon Healy, Parker Benjamin, Brian Lyman, Parker Benjamin, Amy Vaillancourt, Director of Environmental Services, VHB, and Katie Eannotti, Senior Engineer, VHB, were present.

Ms. Healy, operating member of PB Projects 8 LLC, stated they are before the Commission for their site plan review for the Scovil Hoe property and the town had engaged VHB to handle the site plan engineering. Ms. Healy turned the presentation over to Mr. Grocki.

Mr. Grocki introduced himself as well as Ms. Vaillancourt and Ms. Eannotti and outlined their presentation. Mr. Grocki reported that the Wetlands Commission approved their application for a regulated activity

within 100 feet of a watercourse on 20 February 2024, and on 6 October 2022 received P&Z approval for a Special Permit for an historic adaptive re-use of the property which included a number of different variety of uses. So the use of that property has been approved through that Special Permit. Mr. Grocki stated via the Special Permit one of the conditions was a final site plan review and approval by the Commission. Mr. Grocki stated tonight's presentation will focus on the site plan review for the property and the site plan development.

Using an aerial map of the site, Mr. Grocki pointed out Candlewood Hill Road (northern portion of the property), two mill buildings (approximately 10,000 square feet each, located to the center of the property), and Candlewood Hill Brook (southern portion of property). The property R1 Residential.

Mr. Grocki reported that DOT purchased the property and used it as a maintenance and storage facility for a number of years. Throughout the years there has been some soil contamination (remediation and soil cleanup will be discussed). The site is currently owned by the Town of Haddam.

Mr. Grocki stated the site is a great historic site, but the buildings are not looking their best (need a little TLC), the pavement is beat up, and there is a lot of contamination in the soil. Currently there is no treatment for water runoff and stormwater runoff discharges into Candlewood Hill Brook.

Mr. Grocki stated the buildings will not be demolished - currently working with an architect for internal renovations to fit out the event space that is proposed. A number of the garage doors will be converted to window space, existing windows will be replaced, and the roof will be repaired.

A lot of the bituminous pavement on the east and west side of the site will be completely repaired (new bituminous asphalt). The western parking lot has very steep grades (14-15 percent grades) and will be regraded, and the western curb cut will remain (has a higher elevation, to decline approximately five percent down to the buildings).

On the eastern portion of the site a complete redo of the asphalt parking. The parking area will be slightly expanded into the hillside on the northern portion (retaining wall to be installed on the northeast corner of the property). The curb cut on the far northeastern corner will remain the same (shared curb cut for event center, Community Center, and Veterans' Museum). Will have appropriate pavement markings to circulate people around, counter clockwise movement. There is ample parking for the site that will satisfy the tenant's needs. In between the two buildings (a pavilion space) and a patio area off to the west behind the southern building will have stamped bituminous asphalt. Mr. Grocki noted that the asphalt is a specific requirement for a capping mechanism for CT DEEP remediation.

In terms of utilities, Mr. Grocki reported there is an existing well on the far western portion of the site and the client has spoken to the Connecticut Health Department which did provide a screen form which requires yield testing and supply and demand analysis for the well. Before the site can function, the well will be tested and either removed or replaced or repaired to make sure the well will provide adequate domestic water service for the site. There will be a water tower on the site (well to feed water tower) that is needed for health and safety reasons. Mr. Grocki stated their engineers have reviewed the calculations for the water tower and it is sized appropriately to service the two buildings for fire protection needs. Mr. Grocki noted that their client is speaking to the fire marshal to review the calculations and there is a chance that the tower can be decreased in size.

In terms of sewer/septic system disposal, due to the majority of the soils being contaminated they cannot infiltrate the sewage waste into the contaminated soil. Off the property to the north, the client worked with a secondary engineering service, Nathan L. Jacobson & Associates (NLJA), for a septic system design. Mr. Grocki stated they do have the necessary grease traps, septic tanks, and pump station located just east of the northern building. The effluent will be pumped up into the neighboring land with an agreement with the town and with necessary easements in place. The septic system will be located just north of the property.

Regarding stormwater management, Mr. Grocki stated all of the parking lots will be curbed off. Under current conditions there is no curbing, the pavement is broken up, and the stormwater runoff is untreated running into Candlewood Hill Brook. The runoff will be drained to catch basins on site – four foot deep sumps, hooded outlets will capture sediment and any floatables. As a pretreatment method on the eastern portion of the site, all of the catch basins will direct the stormwater to an underground detention system. The detention system is necessary due to the slight increase of impervious area on the site. Prior to entering this system there will be additional water treatment measures – proposing three hydro-dynamic water quality units (a manhole type unit with internal baffles that can swirl the stormwater creating a vortex effect that settles all the sediment designed with 80 percent total suspended solid removals, have a vast capacity for oils and floatable removals and very easily cleaned). All the water discharging from the site will now be considered clean pursuant to the DEEP stormwater manuals.

Mr. Brookes asked if there are any catch basins, etc., on the site now or does the water just find its way to the brook. Mr. Grocki stated there is one catch basin with a pipe that goes under the building and discharges into the brook. Some of the water from the west side of the parking lot goes right into the brook. There is no treatment of stormwater runoff on the site today.

Using the map, Mr. Grocki pointed out the proposed site lighting (indicated by black dots). Proposed fixtures will be decorative (candle box type of fixture; details provided). All dark sky compliant with no bleed over property lines (trying to be very respectful). The sight lighting can be controlled (dimmed or shutoff at night); safety measures will be in place (engineers are looking into this).

Along the southern perimeter, there is a perimeter fence and it has to do more with the remediation aspect of the property (do not want anyone making their way down to the brook).

Ms. Vaillancourt stated she is a licensed environmental professional and director of environmental services for VHB's Connecticut office and has been involved with Scovil for 12 years (was initially brought in on behalf of the town to help the with the town acquiring the property).

Ms. Vaillancourt stated DOT had owned the property since 1941, it was a maintenance facility, and on the western portion of the property there used to be the Star Mill Pond (DOT filled it over the years with street sweepings from all over CT). There are several sources of contamination on the property. There were a number of negotiations with the State and DOT for the town to acquire the property. At that time one of the biggest initiatives for the town was historic preservation of the mills. Ms. Vaillancourt stated the mills will be preserved and the buildings have been added to the National Register and the National Park Service (a great addition to the project). In addition, the buildings have been enrolled in the Liability Protection Program with the State prior to the town taking ownership and obtained a grant to cover the remediation to move forward. Ms. Vaillancourt explained the grant program requirements.

Ms. Vaillancourt distributed copies of a map titled Flood Management Certification Pre-Application Drawing, dated February 6, 2024, (copy on file with the minutes in the Town Clerk's Office and Land Use Office, Exhibit A). Ms. Vaillancourt stated one of the problems is the project is located within the 100 year flood plain. Ms. Vaillancourt stated the contamination on the property is: street sweepings in the pond, fueling station, and a tank barn. DOT removed the tanks and did some remediation, but they were allowed to leave some of the impacted soil behind.

Using the map, Ms. Vaillancourt pointed out the call outs where they will be removing impacted soil and then because all the fill material that has been placed on the property over time that will be capped in place. It was important to coordinate the remediation with the development of the site. The redevelopment of the property will essentially be the cap. Ms. Vaillancourt stated she has worked with DEEP over the past three years to come up with the plan.

Ms. Vaillancourt stated the brook has had erosion issues over the years where the fill material is eroding into the brook. The cap will prevent the rain water from leeching through and also carrying that contamination to the brook. DEEP has agreed to allow the applicant to use the existing vegetation (a kind of bar-

rier for people; they won't be able to access the contaminated soil) on the property along the brook and will be installing a low fence (another barrier) as an added precaution to the brook from this facility along the back.

Ms. Vaillancourt stated the paving, being the cap, will be imperative in being able to handle all the storm-water runoff. Working with DEEP and the Ecological Risk Group on how to minimize all those inputs to the stream or the groundwater. Essentially, that is what the remedial plan does.

Mr. Brookes asked Ms. Vaillancourt to clarify the type of barrier between the building and the brook. Ms. Vaillancourt stated after consulting with the client – a medium height wood post and beam fence.

Mr. Chadwick stated when the town sold the property, it gave away the parking lot for the old fire house and veterans' museum noting that the property line goes up to the side of the building. Mr. Chadwick also stated there used to be parking between the building and the chain link fenced in area. Mr. Chadwick asked if the applicant will be able to make any provisions for the residents to park or share a parking lot. Mr. Grocki stated there is a shared access agreement because the curb cut spans the property line.

Ms. Vaillancourt stated where DOT used to park their vehicles (chain link fenced area) that was an old feldspar mill, the original mill on the property burned down in 1938. With regard to share parking that would be something to discuss with the developer, but the town still owns the property at this time.

Mr. Farina asked about the height of the water tower, up to 24 feet. Mr. Brookes asked if there had been any consideration as to putting the tank underground for a sprinkler system. Ms. Vaillancourt stated it would be a very large excavation of the contaminated soil. Mr. Brookes stated he spoke to the fire marshal briefly, and the tank looks to be approximately 30,000 gallons. Mr. Grocki stated that is what the initial calculations show for the health and safety of the buildings; and he believes the applicant is working with the fire marshal to reduce that. Mr. Brookes stated he saw a picture of the tank; and asked if there were any thoughts to make it more aesthetic. Mr. Grocki stated thought was put into the design and they felt this was an appropriate look, a silo contributing to the historic nature of the buildings. Mr. Brookes asked about coloring and if this would be discussed later. Mr. Warner stated it should be discussed tonight. Mr. Warner stated he put in the motion's conditions screening the tower with evergreens; however, the Commission would probably want it to be a color that blends more into the background.

Brian Lyman, Management Broker, Parker Benjamin, stated the water tower as it stands now is 30,000 gallons and the calculation were determined by their sprinkler engineer as a worst case scenario to create enough water for the life safety sprinkler system of the building. Have been working closely with the fire marshal and his third party consultant and they find that we can go down to potentially 15,000 gallons – half the size – a huge reduction. Obviously, at the end of the day, they need to meet the State safety code for fire sprinkler coverage. Mr. Brookes agreed. Mr. Grocki stated this would be the largest permitted size they are applying for. Mr. Brookes stated he did not see anything that shows trees. Mr. Warner stated he updated the conditions and it should be on the motion sheet. Mr. Farina read the updated wording regarding the buffering of trees.

Mr. LePard asked about a small part of the site plan immediately south of the building next to the brook – will there be anything in that area. Mr. Grocki stated no, all the vegetation will remain in place. The vegetation needs to reflower and create a barrier where people can be vs. where the brook is. Mr. LePard asked if there would be a patio of some sort. Ms. Vaillancourt pointed out a patio area on the side of the building (not the back side of the building), but behind the building they will be leaving an open area – just lawn for egress out of the back of the building. The top of slope down to the brook will be vegetated.

Mr. Chadwick asked what the plan is regarding the Green. Ms. Vaillancourt stated it is being worked on by others, NLJA is the engineer for that, and they have included it on the site plan. Mr. Grocki stated they have been working closely with NLJA and have listened to comments from Mr. Warner. There is an investment to reconstruct the parking field – the initial design for the primary leaching field will stay

primarily in the parking field on the western side and will not impact the trees; should the secondary reserve leeching field be necessary due to some failure, some of the trees may be impacted.

Mr. Karam asked how many feet from the parking to the grass area. Using the plan, Ms. Vaillancourt pointed out the edge of the parking to the last galley. Mr. Grocki stated approximately 60-70 feet. Mr. Warner stated that's the reserve that will not be touched until a new system is needed. Mr. Grocki stated 15-20 feet of the primary. Mr. LePard asked if it could be showed in relationship to the gazebo. Mr. Grocki pointed out the gazebo on the plan and noted that it is way outside the reserve mark.

In conclusion, Mr. Grocki stated the site is very difficult due to the amount of remediation noting that the State is willing to invest a lot as well as the developer. It is really a tremendous improvement for the site and feels very confident the work can be accomplished and appropriate redevelopment. Mr. Warner stated the State's investment not touching the buildings in any way is \$1.8 million and the developer is probably up around \$2 million.

Mr. Brookes asked when this project could be opened. Mr. Lyman distributed/reviewed a time frame (Exhibit B) – 2014 former Town Planner Liz Glidden introduced Mr. Lyman to the property. Parker Benjamin specializes in historic restoration and has done projects throughout the State of Connecticut, have won many awards, and are passionate about the work. 3/4/2022 – DECD created a financial assistance grant of \$1.8 million which was approved. 5/1/2022 – Before EDC for referral to a town meeting. Unanimously approved. 5/5/2022 – P&Z – Before P&Z for referral. Unanimously approved. 5/11/2022 – BOS – Before BOS for referral to go to a town meeting to acquire the property. Unanimously approved. 5/18/2022 – Town Meeting – To sell Scovil Property. Forty-four residents showed up at the meeting and all agreed that the town should sell the property to Parker Benjamin. Unanimously approved. 6/2/2022 – Town entered into an Acquisition Agreement with Parker Benjamin. Approved. 10/6/2022 – P&Z – Came back before the Commission for Special Permit for Use (a very wide net of various uses that might fit into the property without knowing who the tenants would be or what the market would bear). Unanimously approved. 11/1/2022 – CT Attorney General Tong had a Project Review and he approved the project. 4/15/2023 – Shannon Healy, Project Manager and Operating Member, worked with the CT preservation folks and the State Historic Preservation Office to create a Scovil Industrial Historic District. Not only looking to get two mill buildings on the register, but rather looking to create a district of other historic Scovil Buildings, encompasses four buildings. At the same time, Ms. Healy nominated both mill buildings in question to the Nation Register of Historic Places. 4/24/2023 – Ms. Healy then filed with SHPO and NPS Part 1 an Historic Preservation Certification Application. 7/26/2023 – Ms. Healy filed with SHPO and NPS Part 2 a Description of Rehabilitation Application. The restoration program was approved and that's how the buildings will be rehabilitated. 8/22/2023 – The property was enrolled in the Brownfield Remediation and Revitalization Program. Approved. 8/23/2023 – SHPO and NPS Part 1 National Preservation Certification was approved. 11/1/2023 – SHPO and NPA Part 2 Description of Rehabilitation was approved. 1/23/2024 – Building Permit Application approved by the Fire Marshal and Building Inspector and work commenced shortly thereafter. Today the interiors of the buildings have been stripped and ready to go to construction. Construction has just started. 2/20/2024 – Wetlands – Site Plan Review. Unanimously approved. 3/7/2024 – P&Z – Site Plan Review – Before the Commission tonight seeking an approval. 3/22/2024 – The final entry to of the district and the Scovil Hoe Property will be made to the National Register of Historic Places. 12/31/2024 – Plan on completing the project and delivering the property to the tenant on or before 12/31/2024. Currently on schedule.

Mr. Lyman stated they are very enthusiastic about working in Haddam and on the project. Noted that they have been receiving a lot of support both locally, at the state level, as well as all of the vendors and subcontractors. Everyone is looking forward to get on site and start working.

Mr. Chadwick stated somewhere along the line there was a switch to go with the wedding facility. Mr. Lyman stated they never switched; they proposed a bunch of uses they thought the building could accommodate. They did not know who the tenant would be or the uses or what the market would bear. Little or no interest in the early stages of marketing, only a couple of inquiries and they were not credible enough to warrant spending any money on the building. This is the first project ever been involved that

prior to construction they were able to rent the entire building out. Mr. Lyman stated they have the funding, a state grant, the buildings, the building permit, and a wonderful tenant – a credible, multi-store operator in multiple states, great corporate citizens. Mr. Chadwick stated he believes the one question people have is that there is one facility in town that does this already and is there a market big enough to do this type of business. Mr. Lyman stated the tenant thinks so as well as himself. Mr. Lyman stated if you look at some of the proposed uses, they were always concerned about a brewery as there was one around the corner and that restricted their understanding of the market place and that brewery never opened up. The fact that that building is vacant and does not have any new businesses in it for the last four years was concerning to them. This is a wonderful opportunity to restore the buildings, complete the project, and have the project be successful.

Mr. Teran stated when people envisioned this being developed with the idea of multi-use for shops for artisans, restaurants, and breweries, etc., and the idea for an event space for weddings was not contemplated. Mr. Teran stated some of the concerns have to do with will these places only be open when people have weddings, will there be a real vibrancy in that space, so the general public can partake in the uses or will they merely be for a planned wedding. Mr. Teran also stated the noise issue - how do we manage noise abatement from the inside reaching the outside because if it is a very good sound system it will be heard on Maple Ave.

Mr. Lyman stated he did not know how to answer the sound question; however, they have already gone through the Special Permit for Use (approved). Mr. Lyman stated when the wedding venue was presented to them, they went to Mr. Warner to discuss the use. Mr. Lyman stated in the lease the tenant has the right to sub-let half the building for a variety of different uses that are party to the Special Permit for Use. Mr. Warner being very careful and mindful of the Special Permit for Use and went to the town's attorney for his advice and the attorney felt the proposed wedding venue use was within the Special Permit for Use and a letter was written indicating that it would be compliant. The tenant was comfortable enough to sign the lease. Mr. Teran asked if the intended use was only for weddings - stores only open to wedding clientele or the community would have access to shops, restaurants, etc. Mr. Lyman stated he could not speak to their use, but does know what they are being allowed in the lease – two commercial kitchens.

Mr. Teran stated he is very concerned about noise. Mr. Farina stated there are a couple of conditions within the motion regarding noise and read them for them for everyone's benefit. Mr. Teran suggested the Commission include the interior and that there is some decibel count that is not permissible after a certain hour at night.

Mr. Maggi stated there are no issues at the Riverhouse with noise and there are more houses over there. Mrs. Block stated that is not right in the middle of a neighborhood; this is within. Mr. Maggi stated it is, it is right across the street from residential. Mr. Teran stated the acoustics are a bit different from sitting on top of a hill and sitting in a little valley and it will make a difference.

Mr. Karam asked if the Commission is saying the event space is a restaurant based on the Special Permit language and if it fits into that definition as the regulations do not define restaurant; and if the Commission approves the use (that a restaurant qualifies as an event space) what would it mean for other restaurants in town. Can they hold events under their restaurant permits. Mr. Warner stated they always could. Mr. Wallor asked if he held a birthday party at AJ's would that be an event. Mr. Karam stated a banquet space for an event facility vs. a restaurant having a party. It's different. Mr. Karam stated he's trying to understand the Commission's comfort level in lack of definition of a restaurant in the regulations with an event space that sounds as if it is not open to the public (can't book a reservation to eat dinner). Mr. Karam stated he felt it was a banquet facility or an event space. Mr. Karam stated that is a question he would have the town's attorney address. Mr. Warner stated it has a kitchen, it has tables, people go to dine there and it acts fairly similar to a restaurant. Mrs. Block stated if she cannot call up and come in for dinner, it does not seem like a restaurant. It's an event space. Yes, they have food, but it's not the same.

Mr. McGarry asked Mr. Warner if the town attorney had reviewed the matter and what his response was. Mr. Warner stated yes, the town attorney had reviewed the matter and he agreed with what he (Warner)

had said earlier. Mr. McGarry stated he is not saying that restaurants are now event spaces, this use as an event space falls within the uses permitted as a restaurant. They are serving food, they are booking parties, private parties, association dinners are all held at restaurants. For clarification, Mr. McGarry stated the town attorney said an event space is the same use as a restaurant, but the difference is you can walk into a restaurant and get a dinner, but for the purpose of the law you (Commission) are regulating the use.

Mr. Teran stated this proposal is a little different than how people envisioned Scovil being developed. Mr. Lyman stated the tenant will be open certain days of the year for reservations for the public, he will be acting as a restaurant, and he will have hours of operation (open to the public). Mr. McGarry asked if one of the permitted uses would be for office space. Mr. Lyman stated yes. Mr. McGarry stated people conveniently forget when they say they were promised restaurants, breweries, and shops and one of the permitted uses was for office space. If the market space market was different than it is now, both of those buildings could be a mix of offices with no access to the public. You may argue that they would bring more people/employees there for longer periods of the day (unclear how accurate), but as far as this feeling that we are being deprived of what we were promise, we forget it all could have been offices.

Mr. Karam asked if an easy text amendment could be made to include event space in the Special Permit. Mr. Warner stated subsequent to the present application, yes. Mr. Karam stated that seems like an easy solution.

Mr. Brookes stated how he is hearing this is like Riverhouse north, very much the same thing. Mr. Brookes also stated the use was approved prior to the new membership, the town attorney has spoken, Mr. Warner wrote a letter and the applicant proceeded on those guidelines, and he (Brookes) did not see where the Commission had a lot of choice. Mr. Brookes stated he believes the Commission can do something better to clarify as it is ambiguous.

Mr. Karam recommended that a text amendment be made to the Special Permit to include event space for that location so there is no question as to whether it is a restaurant or an event space. Mr. Teran stated there would be an exception for this application.

Mr. Karam asked how many parking spaces are proposed and the capacity of the building. Mr. Grocki stated there are 155 spaces proposed and 370 capacity.

Mr. Brookes asked how much time, start to finish, will be needed to complete the septic project on the Green. Ms. Vaillancourt stated they do not have a time frame as the system is being designed by others; however, they would aim to do the work very quickly (minimize any activities going on there). Mr. Brookes stated less amount of time would be better all the way around for the contractor and the citizens. Ms. Vaillancourt agreed.

Mr. Chadwick asked if the former HES property is being proposed as a primary or alternate option. Mr. Warner stated no, long before he or Mr. McGarry got here, the previous grant that was not approved all had the septic on the Green. Fuss and O'Neill, the prior engineer that worked on that grant, tested the soils on the Green and it was always planned for there. Fortunately, with the new modern systems, they can create a lot of flow with 7,500 gallons, they can create a small systems (very tight). They are not even touching the memorial rock on the Green.

Mr. Karam asked if there are any improvements to Candlewood Hill Road. Mr. Warner stated the town has a grant to completely reconstruct Candlewood Hill Road, but have hit a roadblock with Frontier Communications with the utilities and where the poles should go, so they are working through that with the State and the utility. Mr. Grocki has those plans to make sure this would work.

Mr. McGarry clarified that the reconstruction of Candlewood Hill will take place in the area of the curves by Scovil. It is not the entire length of Candlewood Hill Road.

Mrs. Block stated although she is aware the proposal is not within the Village District, the Village Regulations specify that there cannot be more than 10 spaces without including either a landscape island or some sort of buffer and that she would like to see it broken up a bit more. Ms. Vaillancourt stated one of the issues they had with installing trees or other types of landscaping is the fact that they need to cap the area; however, they do plan on having landscape islands on top of the pavement.

Mrs. Block asked about potential frequent mass exodus of intoxicated guests filtering out into downtown and this proposal coinciding with the timing of the town trying to advance the infrastructure, walkability, at the same time introducing drunk driving into the mix. Mrs. Block asked if there is anything in place to address this, has there been any thought to offsite parking and shuttling guests to the site.

Ms. Vaillancourt stated she could not speak on behalf of the client, but in general common sense what would be the difference if there was a brewery there or a restaurant. Ms. Vaillancourt stated when talking about people drinking and driving it can happen in any situation; it is not caused because of a wedding. Mrs. Block acknowledged that, but continued by stating that her chief concern is by the high number of people coming and going at the same time who have been drinking.

Mr. McGarry stated he had done some quick research and there has not been a noticeable increase in drunken driving problems with the Riverhouse. Mr. McGarry stated he's aware it is a different environment, but the Riverhouse does not have a couple of bars right around the block either. Ms. Shaw stated perhaps there should be a drunk driving campaign in town periodically.

Mr. Karam asked Mr. McGarry if the town could put up signs in the parking area across from the Green and at HES to mitigate overflow parking in those areas. Mr. Grocki stated outlined the zoning regulations for required parking noting that they are slightly over parked because they are taking advantage of the capping that is required.

Mr. McGarry stated the parking on the Green is intended to support parking for things that are going on in Higganum Center and this would be something going on in Higganum Center. Overflow into HES could be another matter and that could be looked at.

Mr. Brookes stated on Memorial Day this area has always been a traditional spot for residents to park for the parade (7:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.) and wanted to let the wedding folks know that it would be appreciated if it could remain open for people who are attending the parade. Mr. Warner stated the wedding group is present and is sure they heard the request. Mr. Warner stated Tom McDowell was born and raised here. Mr. Brookes agreed.

Justin Tralli, 48 High Street, stated there is a lot of debris, trash, 55 gallon metal drums in the brook; and asked if anyone would be taking care of that. Mr. Brookes stated although Mr. Tralli's point is well taken, it does not have anything to do with the site plan review. Mr. Warner stated if it is on the town's property it can be looked into. Ms. Vaillancourt stated it sounds like illegal dumping as she did not recall seeing any metal drums during the number of times she had been on the site.

Mr. Hesselberg asked the primary source of water (drinking, washing, etc.) for this facility. Ms. Vaillancourt stated there is an existing well at the most up gradient corner of the property away from any contamination. Ms. Vaillancourt stated previous companies have tested the potability of the water for contamination and none was detected. As far as what it can produce per gallons per minute she was not sure, but it has to be tested yet.

Mr. Hesselberg asked how many test borings were done on site to test the water. Ms. Vaillancourt stated there have been over 160 test borings and she herself oversaw 22 test pits excavated to the bottom of the pond. Mr. Hesselberg asked what was the worse that was found in those test pits noting that he had looked at some of those tests and they do have high levels. Ms. Vaillancourt stated she did not have any documents in front of her; however, they did not get any levels that triggered a significant environmental hazard (requiring 90 days to clean it up or report it to the state). Ms. Vaillancourt stated there is contam-

ination that does require remediation to meet the standards that DEEP requires for a commercial/industrial facility noting that is a key point. The property had to remain commercial because to clean it up to a residential standard there would not have been sufficient funds and the state was not offering that kind of funding. Ms. Vaillancourt stated 12 years ago the goal was to clean the site up to a commercial/industrial standard. Mr. Hesselberg stated he knows that some of the wells tested at fairly high levels of some harmful stuff. Ms. Vaillancourt stated the only thing that will be leaving the site is sodium chloride (related to road salt). Mr. Hesselberg asked if the plume of contamination could be drawn into the well with the increase in water usage. Ms. Vaillancourt stated no, the use will not draw enough water to reverse the groundwater flow. Mr. Hesselberg stated up gradient of the site people are on filtered water. Ms. Vaillancourt acknowledged that. Mr. Warner stated this facility will require a State Health Department transient well permit and the applicant will not receive the permit until the well is tested.

Mr. Hesselberg asked if the town has easements for the town green for the septic. Mr. Warner stated no, there is approval from a town meeting to grant an easement; however, the town attorney will have to draft the easement. Mr. Hesselberg asked how many people were in attendance at that town meeting. Mr. McGarry asked the relevance of the question; and informed Mr. Hesselberg that he could review the minutes and that it was mentioned earlier in the presentation that there were 44 present at the town meeting. Mr. Hesselberg asked if additional permission from the town will be required. Mr. McGarry stated no. Mr. Hesselberg asked about an 8-24 review. Mr. McGarry stated the questions are not pertinent to the site plan review.

Regarding the use of the water, Mr. Vallera stated he lived in the old fire house next to the site for nine years and the water DOT used to wash the trucks after plowing was far more than what will be used by the facility. Mr. Vallera asked if this project stays on track for its time line, the town can expect the agreement with Parker Benjamin by the end of this year, they will have invested the amount of money they need to, it will become taxable property, and the town will start seeing the taxes at that point (by the end of this year). Mr. Warner stated yes; once Parker Benjamin invests \$600,000 into the property, the property transfers to them (it is already in the purchase and sales agreement) and it becomes taxable. Mr. Warner also stated this will create significant part-time jobs for people in town.

Bob Gardner, Camp Bethel Road, reviewed the developer's request for qualifications – project goals and objectives and stated it does not seem that the town is meeting those. Trying to develop the town businesses to get people to walk around town, this proposal does not seem to be contributing to that objective. This is just a rental hall, not open to the public, will not be drawing people in to walk around the community.

Mr. Albert stated this is a great opportunity for the town. Yes, there won't be people walking around the town all day long, but it makes the Center much more attractive. It will save the buildings that will otherwise fall apart. Essex has a wedding venue at Stream Boat Dock right in the middle of the most charming village in Connecticut. Issues can be worked out.

Pam Crum, Saybrook Road, stated her house looks directly onto the property and believes it will be great for the town. Mrs. Crum asked if she could see what she would be looking at in terms of the septic, leeching fields, water tower. Mr. Grocki and Ms. Vaillancourt pointed out the items Mrs. Crum asked about.

Ms. Shaw stated this proposal is wonderful and will put Haddam back on the map. Ms. Shaw stated if the town could get a developer like this for the Rossi property it would be great.

Mr. Leonardo asked if the town allowed the applicant to use the Green and gazebo at some point as a venue. Mr. Brookes and Mr. Wallor stated no. Mr. Leonardo stated they cannot go to the Green to take pictures. Mr. Brookes stated he didn't believe anyone would stop them from taking pictures on the Green. Mr. Leonardo stated he heard something that the applicant would be utilizing the Green. Mr. McGarry stated the Commission did not approve anything for the town green, but the town meeting approved using

the town green for a community septic and septic for this project. Mr. Leonardo asked would the town be indemnified if someone were to trip and fall.

Mr. Calhoun stated he thinks the proposal is a great idea. Mr. Calhoun stated there is a lot of water on the road and the two projects are going to have to coordinate well. Mr. Warner stated Mr. Grocki has the plan (NLJA) and once approval from the utilities is reached, the projects will be coordinated.

Prior to the vote, Mrs. Block asked if a note could be added in regard to screening where applicable for outside utilities. Mrs. Block asked the applicant if dish washing will happen on site after the event or will trucks be idling at 12:45 a.m. Mr. Warner stated they will have two commercial kitchens and cannot image they would not have dish washing right on site. Mr. Teran asked the Commission address noise emanating from the structure should it become a problem. Mr. Brookes stated he believes it has been addressed. Mr. Chadwick asked about sharing some parking for the old fire house and the veterans' museum. Mr. McGarry stated he can talk to the developer. Mr. Warner stated community center may end up at HES and the veterans have plenty of parking. Mr. Karam asked if the text amendment (to add event space) would be a part of the motion or made after the motion. Mr. Brookes, Mr. Wallor, and Mr. Warner stated a text amendment cannot be a part of this motion as it would have to have a public hearing.

Mr. Karam stated the team for Parker Benjamin did an excellent job. Aware it was a lot of work and the historic nature of the project is really important to the town and everyone on the Commission. Also the conceptual drawings that have been seen on the website are impressive. Mr. Karam thanked them.

MOTION: Scott Brookes motioned to approve a site plan review of proposed site work to remediate the environmental contamination and authorize renovation of two (2) buildings for event space at Scovil property (former state garage), 11 Candlewood Hill Road. Applicant: PB Projects 8 LLC. **Conditions:** 1) All lighting shall be shielded and down casting and fully dark skies compliant. 2) Lighting shall comply with the photometric plan and not leave the property. 3) Lighting on the property on days when there is no event scheduled and after events shall be limited to security lighting along the buildings. 4) All lighting shall include technology to allow the adjustment of light levels. 5) The fire storage tank shall be screened with a substantial evergreen buffer of trees at planting of six (6) feet or greater in height. 6) There shall be no activity on the outdoor patio after 10:00 PM 7) Music on the patio or anywhere on the exterior of the building shall cease at 9:00 PM and be limited to acoustic music that solely uses instruments that produce sound through acoustics, as opposed to electric or electronic means. Commission reserves the right to re-evaluate this condition upon repeated and verified complaints or violations. 8) There shall be no events or activity on site between 1:00 AM and 7:00 AM. Commission reserves the right to re-evaluate this condition upon repeated verified complaints or violations. 9) First Selectman, as Chief of Police for the Town of Haddam, shall insure that resident troopers are aware of all conditions. 10) Screening for outside exterior mechanicals. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

9. Chairman's Report

Section 15A – Adaptive Reuse - Mr. Brookes stated he has spoken to Mr. Mularski regarding what Lisa Malloy, Director, Haddam Historical Society, had spoken about in terms of Section 15A – Adaptive Reuse. Mrs. Malloy stated she is working on a memo and will send it to Mrs. Batzner – a lot of questions. Mr. Brookes stated Mr. Mularski and Bob Ruzzo, Building Inspector, are both architects and are probably handling the matter well.

Mrs. Block asked if the conversation was in relation to Section 15A. Mr. Brookes stated yes. Mrs. Block stated she was just clarifying.

Mrs. Malloy suggested the Commission consider reconfiguring the way they sit during presentations as the audience can never see what the applicant is proposing – applicant to the front, audience facing the applicant, and Commission facing each other and the applicant by using two long tables. Mrs. Malloy

stated it is ridiculous for the audience not to be able to see what is being proposed. Unless the plans were on line which they weren't for both applications, how can you comment on something that they're just seeing. Just a suggestion.

10. Scheduling of Hearings

Mr. Warner reported that there will be two (2) hearings for 21 March 2024 – Modification to a Special Permit for a Day Care Center, Brookes Court, this was approved right before COVID, and a One Lot Resubdivision, Injun Hollow Road, Haddam Neck.

11. Town Planner's Report

Mr. Warner reported that he and Mr. Mularski are dealing with a very significant violation and are working on an enforcement policy. A Cease and Desist has been issued for a trailer parked behind the Village Market. The trailer is sitting up on blocks five to six feet high with utilities in a boxed particle board going into the building and a staircase going up to the trailer in the back. Unclear what is taking place, but there are no permits have been issued. Potentially illegal housing. Cannot see the trailer from the parking lot from the bank side. Mr. Brookes stated it is camouflaged with dumpsters, drive around the back and view it. Mr. Warner stated it is a significant investment and will hurt to take it away too.

Mr. Mularski reported he has been dealing with minor zoning violations – fence along the town's property line (civil matters) but no huge issues.

12. Adjournment

MOTION: Ed Wallor motioned to adjourn. Tim Teran second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bunny Hall Batzner
Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 21 March 2024.