

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

ATTENDANCE

A	Gina Block
X	Scott Brookes, Chairman
X	Michael Farina, Secretary
X	Mike Karam
X	Wayne LePard
X	Tim Teran
A	Edward Wallor, Vice Chairman
X	Alan Chadwick, Alternate - Seated
X	Dorothy Gillespie, Alternate - Seated
A	Larry Maggi, Alternate
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 as well as alternate members, Mr. Chadwick and Ms. Gillespie, were seated.

4. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

The agenda stood as submitted.

5. Public Comments

Section 15A – Historic Preservation by Special Permit – Lisa Malloy, speaking as a private citizen, commended the Town of Haddam for having this section within their regulations; however, under “Modifications”, although she has no objection to an applicant requesting or receiving a modification to avoid a demolition, felt the wording needed to be tightened up. Copy of letter, Exhibit A – 2 pages on file with the minutes in the Town Clerk’s Office and the Land Use Office.

Mrs. Malloy asked the following questions: What “preserve” means with respect to the regulation? Are there guidelines that are being used to determine appropriate preservation work? Are the Secretary of the Interior Standards being used? Noted that the Standards have four different levels and believes the “Preservation” section would be the best fit; however, it would be a decision for P&Z to make.

Mrs. Malloy stated the Secretary of Interior Standards have a very detailed guideline book that addresses each of the standards outlining the dos and don'ts and believes it would be very beneficial to whoever will be overseeing the work.

Mrs. Malloy asked the following: 1) who would be overseeing these types of projects and making sure the Standards are being followed (the building official, a qualified professional from SHPO, important to have someone with some preservation background overseeing these projects)? 2) Who would be making sure the protected easement has been filed with the Town? 3) Who oversees the work on the building? 4) Who follows up to see the easement is enforced. 5) Does the easement transfer with the title to the property. Mrs. Malloy again stated she believes the regulation is good and would like to see it continue, but would like to see it a little bit more fleshed out. Mrs. Malloy encouraged the Commission to look at the Secretary of Interior Standards particularly with respect to the Preservation guidelines.

Mr. Brookes stated he felt Mrs. Malloy made some very good points. Mrs. Malloy stated she believes the Commission should go for the more modified standard that says, "Yes, people live in these buildings like its 2024", but they have to respect architectural elements of the building.

Mr. Chadwick asked Mrs. Malloy in her experience of historic buildings, if there were towns in the area that Haddam could benchmark. Mrs. Malloy stated the closest benchmark would be a local historic district. Mr. Chadwick clarified with Mrs. Malloy stating not with a regulation such as this, but has with local historic districts which this is not.

Mr. Brookes asked Mrs. Malloy if she would consider Haddam's regulation stricter even though it needs to be tightened up. Mrs. Malloy stated she couldn't answer the question because she hadn't researched what other towns have done. Mrs. Malloy stated the regulation isn't clear for her, but also the applicant.

Mr. Teran stated based on what Mrs. Malloy comments there are a few ways to define preservation. Mrs. Malloy stated they have four ways. Mr. Teran asked Mrs. Malloy if in her notes she suggested to the Commission which guideline should be considered. Mrs. Malloy stated yes, the preservation guideline vs. rehabilitation vs. reconstruction vs. restoration.

Mr. Warner stated he wrote both sections within Section 15A – Adaptive Historic Re-Use section which references the Town will defer to the Secretary of the Interior Standards guidelines and demolition delay that has a list of modifications. Mr. Warner stated he personally believes it is a case by case basis; and spoke in regard to Farmington's historic districts.

Mr. Farina stated he grew up in Old Wethersfield; and although they sometimes can be too invasive into some people's lives, Old Wethersfield has kind of retained its character. Mr. Farina also stated sometimes it comes down to financial considerations of the homeowner; therefore, it would need to be looked at on a case by case basis. Mr. Warner stated a lot of the discussion at local historic districts is material – whether it is vinyl or PVC, what type of fencing, etc. Mr. Farina stated in Coventry the residents voted down an historic district, but fortunately, there were enough homeowners who wanted to preserve the character of the village and followed the guidelines that were available at that time. Mr. Warner asked Mrs. Malloy if Haddam had tried to create a local historic district. Mrs. Malloy stated a long time ago and it did not pass, but that is not what she's proposing. Mrs. Malloy stated she is merely suggesting that additional guidance be given to people who are using the Adaptive Re-Use section.

Mr. Karam stated there had been discussion regarding the oversight (making it clear; what the process looks like; do they need to bring in a professional). Mr. Warner stated if it was a significant project, the applicant would have architectural plans. Mr. Warner explained the enforcement process – P&Z approval for an Adaptive Historic Re-Use, architects would come up with detailed plans (would include windows, materials, etc.), Mr. Mularski would review/sign off on the plans, and Mr. Ruzzo would make sure the structure is built according to the plans (noted that Mr. Mularski and Mr. Ruzzo are both architects). Mr. Karam asked Mrs. Malloy if she were introducing a new addition to the process that might introduce

someone with a specific expertise in preservation to also weigh in to the process. Mrs. Malloy stated it is unclear who will be reviewing the work once the work begins on the Thomas Clark House.

Mr. Warner stated the Commission approved a Special Permit for two additional apartments on the interior. The applicant did not propose anything on the exterior. Mr. Warner explained the building inspector signs off on the building permit first (would check for appropriate windows, materials, etc.). Discussion followed at length regarding the 21 February 2024 public hearing/meeting - returning the façade to the look and feel of what it should be, not necessarily the materials, therefore, windows, siding, etc.; ramifications of not doing the work accordingly.

Mr. Warner stated the Commission did not require the applicant to do anything with the Adaptive Historic Re-Use. The Commission could have put conditions on the Special Permit requiring certain elements, but the applicant probably would have stepped back. Mr. Teran was not pleased with the discussion noting that it is on the record that the applicant agreed to fix the windows and siding. Mr. Warner noted he was not in attendance at the 21 February 2024 meeting. Mr. Teran stated the Commission needs to review the regulation to make it more specific and must tighten the language. Mr. Teran stated it is not about use, it is about form and architecture. Mr. Warner stated the Adaptive Re-Use language is a carrot to encourage people to preserve an historic structure. Discussion followed at length with it being noted that property rights need to be considered.

MOTION: Tim Teran motioned for the Commission to review the existing language on Adaptive Re-Use of Historic Structures to insure that there is sufficient specificity to provide the appropriate guidelines given the fact that it is an historic re-use. Wayne LePard second. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Public Hearing / Public Meeting

A Request for a Modification to a Previously Approved Special Permit for a Daycare Center and Request for a One (1) Lot Re-Subdivision at 6 Brookes Court, Map 49/Lot 68-3. Applicant: DBP LLC

Lisa Wadge, DBP LLC, owner/member and applicant, Paul Pizzo, President, Landmark Architects P.C., and Paul Morin, Architectural Designer, Landmark Architects, P.C., and Jake Nemergut, P.E., Nemergut Consulting, were present.

Hearing: Mr. Brookes opened the hearing at 7:25 p.m.

Mr. Farina, Secretary, read the Legal Notice into the record.

Ms. Wadge thanked the Commissioners for their time; and introduced Mr. Pizzo, Mr. Morin, and Mr. Nemergut as well as herself. Ms. Wadge gave a brief history of the parcel noting that there was a Phase 2 of the DBP Retail Development which is the subject of tonight's discussion. Using a map, Ms. Wadge pointed out the subject parcel. The applicant is before the Commission for two permit approvals: 1) A one lot re-subdivision that will meet the Commission's requirements. One lot will be 20,000 square feet running along Saybrook Road and the subject lot which will be accessed from Brookes Court. 2) Modification to a previously approved Special Permit for a daycare center.

Ms. Wadge gave a brief synopsis on the previous approval (subject to ARC review). Ms. Wadge stated Joe Palaris, owner of Town and Country Early Learning Centers, runs four other daycare centers and will own the property. Ms. Wadge stated the plans were presented to ARC and their comments/recommendations will be reviewed. Ms. Wadge stated the building will probably not be visible from Saybrook Road depending on what takes place on the 20,000 square foot parcel. Ms. Wadge noted that there is a drainage system along one boundary as well as trees; nothing is changing in regard to this; the setback will be met; and a sidewalk is shown on the plans. Because of the tight schedule, Ms. Wadge stated they have all of the architecture completed, but there are a few engineering items that are not located on the plan due to illness, but are sketched out.

Ms. Wadge stated 1,100 kids being dropped off/picked up twice a day will lift up Tylerville businesses. Ms. Wadge noted that the structure is tucked in to the site for safety and security reasons. This is a destination location and there will be nothing happening at night. The proposed structure is a one story building designed to fit into the community and meets all of the daycare regulations.

Mr. Teran asked what would go on the 20,000 square foot lot. Ms. Wadge stated it is unclear, but there are three people who are interested in the lot. Ms. Wadge stated as an engineer she has to wait until she has a customer, vet the customer, and then review the regulations to make sure what the customer is proposing will go on the property. Ms. Wadge stated she has had people who would like to have a vape shop, tattoo parlor, and a marijuana store and they've been told no as it is not allowed by the regulations.

Mr. Teran asked why the subdivision. Ms. Wadge stated the regulations have changed and Mr. Palaris does not need as much land. The original lot is 1.3 acres and it does not need to be. The Tyler House sits on a one acre lot and it will accommodate the existing house, a new building and all of the parking. After review of the proposal, it was determined that it would be a waste of area; and a drive-thru bank or a car wash could potentially go on the smaller lot.

Mr. LePard asked if construction on the Tyler House lot would be taking place at the same time as the daycare construction. Ms. Wadge stated she is not building anything more until what she has is full.

Mr. Karam asked if access to the daycare would be through Blueway Commons. Ms. Wadge stated no, access would be from Brookes Court, a road that she constructed, and is now town owned and maintained. Ms. Wadge stated the daycare folks like the slower, quieter access. Ms. Wadge stated there is a sidewalk that will be continued by the DOT rotary project.

Using the site plan, Mr. Nemergut pointed out Brookes Court, access to the proposed site, parking area, the proposed building, and the playground located within the L-shaped area. Mr. Nemergut stated a buffer along the southern property line will remain. Mr. Chadwick asked if it would be fenced in. Mr. Nemergut stated yes. Ms. Wadge stated there will be a fence around the playground as well as one around the perimeter. Mr. Warner stated the facility will have public water, but asked the location of the septic system. Mr. Nemergut stated the septic system can go just about anywhere (under the playground or the parking; there is really deep sand on site).

Mr. Chadwick asked if there would be a sprinkler system in the building. Mr. Nemergut stated no. Ms. Wadge stated the size of the proposed structure does not require a sprinkler system. Mr. Warner noted that he had included in the motion a condition – final approval by the town engineer.

Mr. Pizzo reported this is the second project they have worked on with Mr. Palaris with the first being in Colchester. Mr. Palaris has a business model and the proposed structure size is what he likes to build as it allows him control over the project, staffing levels. The site is approximately 1 acre and once finished with this particular project he's looking to go to Portland. Because of an easement, they are able to confine the building on the 1 acre site. The proposal calls for a double loaded corridor, front entrance that comes in off of the cul-de-sac, parking area, and enter the building securely. Once inside the building, everything is secure, there are separate exits from each classroom (required).

Mr. Brookes asked how many square feet. Mr. Pizzo stated 9,000 +/- square feet. Mr. Morin stated he thought the structure was 9,100 + square feet. Mr. Pizzo pointed out the various age bracket classrooms that will all come out onto a secure playground that is sized appropriately for the number of students that will be out there.

Mr. Pizzo stated they just came from appearing before ARC who recommended a couple of improvements that they can accommodate. Mr. Pizzo stated the elevation facing Saybrook Road is the back of the building, but they tried to make it look like the front. The cupola is on this side of the building so it could be seen. ARC asked that additional fenestration be added to the wall and will be adding a smaller

style dormer similar to the one at the entrance on the back of the building. Mr. Pizzo stated these conditions are ones that were agreed to and will submit revised plans for review.

Mr. Pizzo stated when driving from the cul-de-sac to the front entrance, a portion of the building will be recessed where you'll see the playground. This will create a bit more space where there will be some lawn area.

Mr. Brookes asked when parents are dropping off their children, will they leave them at the door and drive away or will they park and bring their child into the building. Mr. Pizzo stated there is a spot where they can park, drop their child off, and back out to leave the site, but it is not meant to be a circular drop off. Mr. Nemergut stated there is a standard parking area which Mr. Pizzo pointed out on the plan. The idea is to get as many people as close to the building as possible. Mr. Teran asked if the drop off spaces will be specifically marked as such. Mr. Pizzo stated parents will typically park their vehicles, get out, and bring their child into the building. Mr. Chadwick asked if some of these children will be getting on/off of a school bus. Mr. Pizzo stated no, as these children are younger (under 5 years of age).

Mrs. Gillespie stated the parking seems tight and asked about traffic flow. Mr. Pizzo stated people will not be entering the site all at the same time. Mr. Pizzo pointed out where staff should be parking and the more transient people will park.

Mr. Chadwick asked what was in the notch at the top of the plan. Mr. Pizzo stated it is a detention pond from the other project and is fenced off.

Mr. Karam asked if there were any landscape plans. Mr. Pizzo stated that would be coming with the engineering. Mr. Warner stated there is almost no land to landscape, but there is a substantial white pine buffer on the site; otherwise, perhaps some foundation plantings. Mr. Karam asked if there were landscaped areas in the parking. Mr. Pizzo pointed out some areas where plantings could be added as the plans finalize. Mrs. Gillespie asked about shade trees within the playground. Mr. Pizzo stated the playground will be a treated surface and no trees are allowed (safety).

Mr. Karam asked if there were any outbuildings/structures/sheds. Mr. Pizzo stated no, only a container for trash that will be behind an enclosure.

Mr. LePard asked about the playground and the cupola. Mr. Pizzo pointed out the playground on the plan and stated that the cupola is on the Saybrook Road side so it can be seen from the road. Mr. Karam asked what happens when another structure is built and the cupola is no longer visible. Mr. Pizzo stated as a destination, people will not be looking for the cupola as they will know where the daycare is. A brief discussion followed regarding security (a non-street view is probably best).

Mrs. Gillespie asked about signage. Mr. Pizzo stated there will be a sign on the cupola and a sign on the front of the building. Mr. Teran asked about signage on Saybrook Road. Mr. Pizzo stated there is a sign on Saybrook Road, but is unclear if a sign can go there. Ms. Wadge stated perhaps not advertising is best. Mr. Warner stated this application is a separate use, ownership, and parcel; and it would not be able to advertise on the Brookes Court sign (considered off site advertising).

Mr. Warner asked Mr. Pizzo to explain what ARC had requested. Mr. Pizzo stated the comments pertain to the Saybrook Road elevation: roundel to be enlarged, about 4 feet; on the long addition clusters of windows are to be added and a dormer will be added to break up the elevation. Mr. Pizzo stated the elements will be added to the plan and submitted to Mr. Warner. Mr. Farina stated he sat through the ARC meeting and all the concerns ARC had were addressed; therefore, the proposal was approved with conditions. Mr. Warner also noted that the 20,000 square foot lot will not support a very big building and that the daycare will be visible. Discussion followed in regard to the potential of the Brookes Court side of the daycare being the most visible (it will be seen when driving on Brookes Court). Mr. Karam asked if ARC was agreeable with the color(s). Mr. Pizzo and Ms. Wadge indicated yes. Mr. Farina stated if the pro-

posal does what the Commission wants for Tylerville, it will bring in traffic (foot and vehicular) to the various shops. Mr. Warner noted an ARC member who lives in the area commented that he had noticed the increase in foot traffic.

As there were no further questions/comments from the Commission or the public, Mr. Brookes closed the hearing at 7:58 p.m.

Meeting: SEATED: Brookes, Farina, Karam, LePard, Teran, Chadwick, and Gillespie.

Mr. LePard stated he sat on the Commission when the daycare was approved prior to COVID, the only thing different is there is a large apartment complex sharing Brookes Court and voiced concern over potential traffic issues (asked if a study had been conducted). Mr. Brookes felt it was a very good point. Mr. Warner stated the apartment traffic study indicated that it is not a 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. world any longer and when you go to the site, there is not a lot of coming or going at any set times. Mr. Warner stated his only concern would be the parking on the street from the apartment complex which can be controlled that by saying "No Parking". Mr. Warner also stated the road was built to an industrial standard (30 feet wide; 50 foot right-of-way; 45 foot radius cul-de-sac). Mr. Warner stated there is plenty of parking for the apartments, but people want to park on the road in front of their apartment (if an issue, will post "No Parking").

Mr. Karam asked the location of the light industrial lot that's for sale. Ms. Wadge stated it's behind Oh, Fudge and does not have access to Brookes Court.

Mr. Warner stated if the Commission is sensing an issue, the apartments will be coming in for 32 additional units and the parking can be addressed at that time.

Mr. Brookes asked Mr. Warner if ARC's recommendations should be included. Mr. Warner stated he included ARC comments as a condition; and noted that Mrs. Batzner had listed out the conditions in ARC's minutes. Mr. Warner noted that there were two ARC members, Mrs. Malloy and Mr. Ruty, in attendance.

MOTION: Scott Brookes motioned to approve a request for a modification to a previously approved special permit for a daycare center and a request for a one (1) lot re-subdivision at 6 Brookes Court, Map 49/Lot 68-3. **Conditions:** 1) Final engineering review by Town Engineer. 2) Include ARC comments. Mike Farina second. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Approval/Correction of the Minutes

MOTION: Tim Teran motioned to approve the 7 March 2024 minutes as submitted. Dorothy Gillespie second. Motion carried unanimously.

8. New Business

There was nothing new to discuss at this time.

9. Chairman's Report

Mr. Brookes reported on the following: **Scovil** – Felt the Commission had a lot of good input regarding Scovil. Believes people envisioned something different for the site; however, he's hopeful that the wedding venue will work. If not, two historic structures will be renovated for another venture. **Rossi** – The Town did the best they could in a short amount of time when they had a deadline in front of them. Although he did not care for the parking on Saybrook Road and bringing RVs, etc., to store toward the back of the parcel, the apartment units made sense (Mr. Brookes opinion; not the Commission's). **POCD and Town Garage** - Believes the POCD has done the Commission a bit of disservice as far as the Town Garage goes. Although he would like to see the garage moved, who's going to move it and where would it be moved to. Also noted that if apartments are built on the Rossi site, who wants to pay a high rental fee

and look at the garage. Mr. Brookes suggested the Commission take off their zoning hat and put on their planning hat and try looking for a location for a Town Garage. Mr. LePard asked if commercial or residential properties would be looked at for the Town Garage. Mr. Brookes stated commercial. Mr. LePard stated there isn't any commercial and the only alternative is to spot zone in a residential area that isn't heavily populated. Mr. Karam stated the town garage is light industrial. Mr. Chadwick suggested a committee be set up to put these ideas/details down, draw up a concept plan (even if a consultant needs to be hired), and allow people to make a rationale decision. Discussion followed at length regarding garages being made to look nice; the costliness of blasting; and money being better used down town. Mr. Chadwick stated in the 1800s the current Town Garage site was a park; and perhaps people would be inclined to accept the garage being relocated on the Rossi site, if its current site was returned to a park, but these ideas need to be sold to the town's residents. Mrs. Gillespie asked if a committee would be citizens, Commissioners, or a mix. Mr. Chadwick stated he wasn't sure, but it would need to be individuals that could pull it together (make a plan that will work). Mr. Chadwick stated he spoke to Chris Corsa, Assistant Director of Public Works, and he indicated he could put the enter operation on the Rossi site and that's the first time anyone has said that. Discussion followed regarding the need to have a combination of people, those that have engineering, sales, and tact; a lot of comments on social media with a number of good ideas; the need for citizens to step up and volunteer; and the unsightliness of both the Rossi property and the Town Garage. Mr. Farina suggested Mr. Warner resurrect his plan from a few years ago regarding the placement of the garage on the Rossi site. Mr. Warner stated half of the residents want it out of the Center and the other half want it to stay. Mr. Warner stated he spoke to Mr. Corsa, but at the hearing there were town garage employees who were opposed to it being at the Rossi site. Mr. Karam stated the Commission/Town is at a point where a subcommittee or group in addition to Mr. Warner needs to work on finding a new location for the Town Garage. Mr. Brookes agreed. Mr. Warner recommended that if a committee is unable to find a new site, then they need to amend the POCD to address the issue first (public hearing). Mr. Warner noted that public utility buildings (municipal) are allowed in a residential zone by Special Permit. Mr. Brookes stated he will speak to First Selectman Bob McGarry to initiate a committee to search for a new town garage location and inform the public on a regular basis. Mr. Mularski stated the Rossi site would be limited by putting the Town Garage on it. **Grant Extension** – Mr. Warner reported a 6 month extension was grant, but the requirement for a developer has not been dropped. It was asked that the RFP be readvertised. Discussion followed at length. **ARC Member** – The town attorney has indicated that Mr. Brookes, Mr. Wallor, and Mr. Farina can interview the candidates and make their recommendation to the Board of Selectmen (BOS) to select a new member.

10. Scheduling of Hearings

Request for a One (1) Lot Re-Subdivision at 195 Injun Hollow Road, Map 12/Lot 15-A. Applicant: Chris Newman – Thursday, 4 April 2024, Town Hall, 21 Field Park Drive, Haddam, 7:00 p.m.

11. Town Planner's Report

Public Information Meeting, Wednesday, 27 Mar 2024, 6:30 p.m. Haddam Elementary School (HES), Multi-Purpose Room, 273 Saybrook Road, Higganum – Mr. Warner reported there will be a presentation on the findings of the Town Assessment Report including potential use of HES for Town offices and uses. Mr. LePard asked if this was a total inventory of all town buildings. Mr. Warner stated yes.

HES Roof - Mrs. Gillespie asked if a new roof would be installed. Mr. Warner stated the old saw tooth section of the building has a new roof. Mrs. Gillespie spoke in regard to solar roofing. Mr. Warner stated solar companies need to see the usage of the building and given that there is no usage, they are unable to size the solar panels. Perhaps when the building is fully used, this matter can be looked at again.

HES Proposal Presentation, Wednesday, 3 April 2024, Haddam-Killingworth High School Auditorium, 95 Little City Road, Higganum, 6:30 p.m.. – Mr. Warner stated the town has a \$4.5 million state grant. A RFP for a developer was put out, state requires the town to obtain a private developer, and three proposals were received. The interviewing committee consisted of Bob McGarry, First Selectman, Leon

Mularski, Zoning Enforcement Officer, Bill Warner, Town Planner, Kate Anderson, Selectwoman, and Peter Baird, Selectman. The developer chosen will make their presentation as to what they would like to do with the building. Made it very clear in the grant that the town would like a combination of public and private space and the grounds should always be public.

Illegal Trailer behind Village Market – Mr. Brookes asked Mr. Mularski for an update. Mr. Mularski reported that the fire marshal was to have had a meeting with the owner today, he (Mularski) will speak to the fire marshal, and afterwards will probably speak to the owners attorney tomorrow to see if he is going to appear before the Commission or ZBA. What has been seen/heard is that there is an individual living in the trailer which is against the zoning code. Also the way it was constructed does not meet any building codes. A Cease and Desist has been issued and the owner has been told to remove the trailer from the property. Will follow up tomorrow. Would like some action on the matter sometime next week.

Illegal Living Quarters above Village Market - Mr. Brookes reported the fire department had been called to the Village Market and upon searching the building, fire fighters found on the upstairs level a lot of bedding. The second floor appears to have illegal living quarters. Mr. Mularski stated these two matters seem to be relatively recent and done rather quickly. Mr. Chadwick asked if the trailer was separate from this incident. Mr. Brookes stated the trailer is separate from the upstairs issues. In regard to the living space and the fire code, Mr. Warner stated the fire marshal can have the individual(s) arrested and enforce this matter very quickly and efficiently as it is life safety matter; whereas, zoning is a long draw out process.

Scovil Hoe – Mr. LePard asked if this is being held up. Mr. Warner stated the applicant went into the structure over enthusiastically without proper lead controls. Mr. Warner stated there was no asbestos except in the roof and the window glazing. Mr. Warner stated Parker Benjamin will need to obtain an abatement company to clean up the mess. Mr. LePard asked what would be abated. Mr. Warner responded lead (paint).

HES Multi-Generational Playscape – Mr. Karam asked for an update. Mr. Warner it is moving along.

12. Adjournment

MOTION: Dorothy Gillespie motioned to adjourn. Mike Farina second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bunny Hall Batzner

Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 4 April 2024.

Section 15 A

Historic Preservation by Special Permit

I fully commend the Town of Haddam Zoning Regulations for having a section that seeks to protect and preserve the town's significant architectural and cultural buildings particularly when it comes to the proposed demolition of a designated building.

Under the section titled "Modification" I have no objection to an applicant requesting or receiving a modification of certain zoning requirements to avoid demolition but feel the wording of the regulation needs to be tightened up.

The regulation states that for properties that **preserve, re-use historic structures and provide permanent protective easements** may be granted a modification.

What does "preserve" mean with respect to the regulation. What are the guidelines that are being used to determine appropriate preservation work? Are the Secretary of the Interior Standards being used? The Standards have four different levels:

Preservation: Maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a properties form as it has evolved over time.

Restoration: Depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods.

Rehabilitation: Acknowledges the need to alter or add to the historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the properties character.

Reconstruction: Recreates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes.

My recommendation would be to use the "Preservation" standard. Below is a synopsis of the Guidelines.

Standards for Preservation

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection and properly documented for future research.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color and texture.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

The National Park Service has a 162 page manual that covers all four levels and gives clear guidance and details on do's and don'ts from windows to roofs. I would encourage the board to use this as the requirement for "preserve".

I am also concerned on who will be reviewing the work and seeing that it meets current PRESERVATION standards. A qualified professional recommended by the State Historic Preservation Office? A consultant from Preservation Connecticut? I think it is extremely important to have someone with a historic preservation background overseeing the projects.

The other question I have is regarding the permanent protective easement. Who is this filed with. Who oversees the work on the building? Who follows up to make sure the easement is enforce? Does the easement transfer with title to the property?

Again, I have no objection to the section and believe it can work to the benefit of the town and preservation of our historic buildings.

Best,

Elizabeth Malloy
Haddam Neck

PRZ-21 MAR 2021
PUBLIC COMMENT
SECTION 15A
EXHIBIT A - 2 PAGES