

**MINUTES
TOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JUNE 13, 2023
7:00 P.M. HYBRID MEETING
275 BROAD STREET, WINDSOR, CT**

Present: Commissioners Mips, Levine, Jaggon, Jepsen and Kuintzle and Alternate Commissioners Hallowell and Rivas Plata

Absent: Alternate Commissioner Meg Harvey

Also Present: Town Planner Barz, Assistant Town Planner Sealy and Secretary Andrea D. Marcavitch

I. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Mips opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

- A. Public Communications and Petitions (five-minute time limit per person) – None**
- B. Communications and Petitions from the Town Planning and Zoning Commission**
Commissioner Mips welcomed new Commissioner Donald Jepsen who was appointed to finish former Commissioner Alex Correia’s term.
- C. Zoning Enforcement Officer’s Report – None**
- D. C.G.S. §8-24 Referral Requests – None**
- E. Pre-Application Scrutiny – None**
- F. Re-Approvals/Revisions/Extensions**
 - 1. 3.9 Site Plan – 1985 Blue Hills Avenue Ext.**, Parking revisions, I Zone, CT Light & Power Co. (Eversource)
 - 2. 3.9 Site Plan – 1001 Day Hill Road**, Outdoor dining patio areas, Dudleytown Brewing
 - 3. 3.9 Site Plan – 875 (777) Day Hill Road**, Adding soccer field and modifying entry way, I Zone, Alford Assoc., Inc.
 - 4. 3.9 Site Plan – 1215 Kennedy Road** (formerly Joseph Lane & 1201 Kennedy), Landscaping and EV equipment, I Zone, Amazon
 - 5. 3.9 Site Plan – 1190 Kennedy Road**, Site lighting, I Zone, 501,500 sq. ft., ARCO National Construction

Assistant Town Planner Todd Sealy reviewed the approved applications.

G. Site Plans

- 1. Site Plan – 205 Baker Hollow Road**, Manufacturing & distribution warehouse, I Zone, 185,600 sq. ft., 20.6 acres, Alford Assoc., Inc.

This agenda item was heard during the public hearing portion of the meeting with the corresponding special use application.

H. Minutes

1. May 16, 2023

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved to approve the draft minutes of May 16, 2023 meeting as presented.

Commissioner Jaggon seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

II. MISCELLANEOUS – None

III. PLANNER’S REPORT

1. Update on recent development

Town Planner Eric Barz briefly reported on the status of Dudleytown Brewing, Amazon and the Bradley Logistics Center.

IV. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Application Acceptance

1. **Site Plan – 29 Windsor Avenue**, Mixed commercial development, 13.8 acres, B2 Zone, Dijon, LLC
2. **Special Use – 29 Windsor Avenue**, Section 5.2.6H, Parking within a front yard, 13.8 acres, B2 Zone, Dijon, LLC
3. **Special Use – 29 Windsor Avenue**, Sections 15.2.1A & D, Fuel filling station with self-service carwashes, 13.8 acres, B2 Zone, Dijon, LLC
4. **Special Use – 29 Windsor Avenue**, Section 5.2.6C, Establishments with drive-through windows, 13.8 acres, B2 Zone, Dijon, LLC
5. **Special Use – 777, 903 and 1001 Day Hill Road**, Section 15.2.13, Top Soil, Gravel, Sand, Clay, or Stone Removal, I Zone, Alford Associates, Inc.
6. **Site Plan – 458 Windsor Avenue**, Public park, 5.68 acres, NZ Zone, TOW
7. **Text Amendment – Sections 13.2.9C(3)(d)(iv), (v) & (vii) and add new section 13.2.9C(3)(m)**, Poquonock Village Design Development (PVDD), Poquonock Commons LLC

The above items will be scheduled for public hearing at the next regular Town Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on July 11, 2023.

B. Old Business – None

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Commissioner Levine read the legal notice into the record.

- A. **Text Amendment – Sections 13.2.9(C)(3)(d)(IV), (V) & (VII) and add new section 13.2.9(C)(3)(m)**, Poquonock Village Design Development, A.R. Building Company, Inc.

Application was withdrawn.

B. Text Amendment – Great Pond Form-Based Code, Freestanding signs and clarifying amendments in various sections, Lewis/Winstanley Enterprises, LLC

Commissioner Jepsen recused himself, as he serves on the Great Pond Improvement District. Alternate Commissioner Hallowell was seated.

Valerie Ferro from Good Earth Advisers and Great Pond Design Manager Craig Lewis from Arcadis were present to represent the applicant. Ms. Ferro discussed the site, signage needed, visibility, safety, uniqueness, challenges and wayfinding. Mr. Lewis discussed the activity on the site, challenges to provide signage to a 600+ acre site, visibility and reviewed proposed changes to the form-based code.

Commissioner Hallowell asked to look at the signage on the two-story building and said that she understood the argument but not the practicality of it. She wanted to know why they were proposing that. Mr. Lewis said that they wanted to give a visual which showed the worst visual case scenario. He said the way the standards are written, wall signs get 5% of the façade and there is any combination of signs that can be used and he described the different combinations for wall signage.

Commissioner Mips stated that she liked the stone base structures.

Commissioner Levine asked if they had looked at the comments from the town staff. Mr. Lewis said yes.

Commissioner Levine said that the staff comments included some questions regarding gutters. Mr. Lewis said that they had addressed them.

Public Comment: None

Mr. Barz said that he was a bit puzzled by Mr. Lewis' presentation and that he thought they were at an impasse on the sign regulations but perhaps it was not as big of an impasse as he had thought. He reviewed the current standards for business signs on Day Hill Road in the I Zone. Mr. Barz said that he believed he heard Mr. Lewis propose 25 square feet per face. Mr. Lewis replied that the standard Business (B-2) Zone size is 25 square feet per face. He explained that he used the B-2 Zone regulation for Noble Fuels and the other retail oriented tenants and used the Industrial (I) Zone sign regulation for the campus base.

Mr. Barz said that he was okay with that part of the proposed regulation and that he and Mr. Sealy thought they were proposing 200 square feet – 100 square feet per face and was glad to hear that was not the case. He asked to back up and reviewed the town's history with the applicant. He explained that he had concerns that their proposal was going too far but was glad to hear that they were proposing to use the B-2 Zone as the standard and not the I Zone. Mr. Barz said the only impasse that remains is the campus/remote sign. He stated that the Town has an anti-billboard regulation written in our standard zoning regulations, which prohibits off-site signage. He said Mr. Lewis showed two examples in town during his presentation. He said one example contains a zoning violation and he explained the reasoning behind the regulation on the other sign, which was to consolidate signage on shared industrial driveways. He said other than the old non-conforming gas station, pylon signs that are high in the sky, which are meant to be seen from a distance, he could not think of any recent signs sitting on top of a pole anymore. He said they have all been monument signs in the time he has worked for the Town.

Commissioner Mips said they looked much better and that she liked the ones they are planning to use compared to others.

Mr. Barz said that he appreciated that the height of the sign will come down.

Commissioner Levine stated that the sign on Day Hill Road that was referenced was very difficult to see who is in that particular area from the road.

Mr. Barz said there are books and studies written about signage and they look at speed, how many lanes there are and factor in visual clutter. He said the human eye and brain can only process so many pieces of information and no one can process phone numbers and email addresses on those signs. He said a directory sign is better placed in the site when you get to a fork in the driveway and need to know where a dentist is located. He said no one will be able to read that information when you are going 40 mph on Day Hill Road.

Commissioner Levine said the signs that were shown tonight were far more attractive.

Commissioner Mips agreed.

Mr. Barz said the last sticking point was that the staff Development Team is unanimous in the belief that the tenants in the back of Groton Road do not need a sign in this electronic age. The examples of trucks making wrong turns are predominantly two businesses in town – Dollar Tree and Amazon on Day Hill Road – and the reason is because the property address is the front entrance of the building and not the truck entrances. He said there is not that problem on Groton Road. They will have a Groton Road address and it will take you to the front door and to the loading docks. He did not think there would be confusion there.

Commissioner Levine asked if the staff thought they needed a sign.

Mr. Barz said that they do not believe it is necessary. The truck drivers work there and know where they are going and the employees will know where they are going once they find the facility. He noted that the Trader Joes behind Amazon does not have a sign out on Goodwin Drive telling their drivers to turn there.

Commissioner Levine asked if there was any possibility that there will be more in there besides Target.

Mr. Barz said that there could be one more tenant in there, unless they further subdivide.

Commissioner Levine asked the applicant representatives if that is why they felt they needed a sign there.

Ms. Ferro said that it had nothing to do with trucks and thought that was the staff interpretation. She said across the board every tenant that they had been speaking with are moving past e-commerce and want a presence in the community. She said they want a brand and love it when you can see their sign on street view on a Google search. She said depending on the market, there could be further subdividing. They feel that the intersection at Day Hill Road and Groton Road is really an arrival point. They expect as they grow that there will be internal wayfinding signage. She shared they thought having the brands there at the corner signifies the campus.

Commissioner Levine commented that internal signs would be helpful if someone turned in there by accident.

Ms. Ferro said that having arrival points and nodes brings the campus together and that the tenants are becoming more aware of community and understanding impacts. She said the Winstanleys are very discerning and want quality and a presence, as this campus means a lot to them. She said the signage is about more than just directions for trucks.

Mr. Lewis said they would like to avoid another flag lot. He said we can do that and create little corridors to get out to the street but that it seemed ridiculous to have to do something like that. If they did that, they would be permitted to have a sign by the Town's regulations.

Commissioner Levine said she thought they would want uniformity.

Mr. Lewis said they would and that they would not want to chop up the open space to do it.

Commissioner Hallowell asked if they were talking about five signs going across the front. Commissioner Levine said no.

Commissioner Hallowell said we are talking about a single, larger sign at the intersection of Groton and Day Hill Road. Mr. Lewis said yes and that would be one of five signs.

Commissioner Hallowell asked if there would be five signs sitting on Day Hill Road. Mr. Lewis said there would be five signs across the entire frontage in a span of 1,500 feet or more. He explained that one of those signs would be located at the far edge and would advertise for the two parcels that are in the back.

Commissioner Hallowell said the applicant gave some examples, which we appreciated but that there are equally other examples of it not happening. She said the question becomes which behavior do we want to perpetuate and what precedent are you setting. She said the rest of the signage that they are proposing is very tasteful, it makes sense and it feels like a campus. She wasn't sure that same feel would be accomplished with a single, larger sign. She explained that she was on the fence with this sign. She did not think she wanted a Target sign out on the street only because it is not real Target, it is a warehouse, and there is a lot of traffic on that road. She said she could understand where they are coming from but on the flip side she could understand why the regulations are written the way they are.

Ms. Ferro said that Target still wants to be a part of this community whether it is distribution or retail. She said the folks they are employing and the number of people they are putting through college, she would say they are part and parcel of this community and are bringing their brand to Windsor and they would like a sign. The Winstanleys would like to brand those tenants and for them to have a presence along Day Hill Road.

Mr. Barz closed out his statements and re-emphasized that we are not talking about just a Target sign or a Target plus another tenant to be named later, but there are four others and they could be advertising every restaurant or business back in the mixed residential/retail areas and it is a collection of off-site signage and sign clutter. He stated that the Town has had a long history of being proud of the lack of visual clutter you see in other towns. He said it is too much signage in our minds. He said he would welcome all the other changes

that were outlined tonight. He reiterated that he was speaking on behalf of the entire staff Development Team and shared that they all thought it was too much signage relative to what we have on Day Hill Road and could create a precedent for other developers.

Commissioner Hallowell asked if we could split the proposal. Mr. Barz said yes.

Commissioner Hallowell asked if they could potentially move forward with the stuff that they are all in agreement on and go back to the drawing board, understanding that it is a difficult issue.

Ms. Ferro asked the Commission to clarify if it was the number of signs or the size of the signs that was problematic and asked if it would help to make the signs smaller. Mr. Barz responded that it was the principle. It is the off-site advertising of things that are not physically present there.

Commissioner Hallowell asked if it was possible to do an east campus, west campus sort of thing rather than individual signs.

Mr. Lewis said maybe. He said the only challenge that they have with that is that there are Supreme Court rulings that have said signage content cannot be regulated. The Town does currently and other communities do too. He said they are trying to be responsive to what will be in the future and they have inserted content neutrality to this code as the Town might be changing their regulations in the future. He said the signage could say different things but from their perspective it could be smaller so it looked more consistent with others.

Ms. Ferro said they are trying to figure it out because the Commission and staff are counting five signs but there is only the one sign with two tenants on the sign that will be in the rear. She said everyone else will have frontage so they are entitled to a sign regardless. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. Barz said that it would depend on if someone is back on Great Pond, they are not going to be able to use that if they are on Lexington.

Mr. Lewis clarified that they are proposing one other multi-tenant sign reserved for potential tenants that are in the back of Great Pond, like a shopping center would have. He summarized they are proposing two multi-tenant signs and three single-tenant signs.

Ms. Ferro said that two signs are for tenants that do not have frontage along Day Hill Road.

Commissioner Levine wondered if someone would see the Target sign and mistake it for the retail store and get back there with all of the tractor trailers. She said they would not want all of the extra traffic back there.

Mr. Lewis said that you can exit out before you get to the warehouse and that it is not a single connection.

Commissioner Levine replied that if you do not know that it is a warehouse, you will keep going to find the Target store.

Mr. Lewis replied that they would explore a new place.

Ms. Ferro added that folks will potentially be going back there at some point for the connection to the trail head and access the trails.

Commissioner Levine was thinking of someone who might be out for a Sunday drive and would want to go to Target.

Mr. Barz asked if they would like to recess the hearing so that they can go have a conversation.

Ms. Ferro asked if they could do that for just a few minutes.

Mr. Barz said yes, and that they would move on to other items on the agenda and come back. He asked for a motion.

Commissioner Mips said that there was a CRCOG (Capitol Region Council of Governments) letter to be read into the record.

Commissioner Levine read the May 31, 2023 CRCOG letter into the record.

**Motion: Commissioner Levine moved to recess the meeting pertaining to the Form-Based Code for Great Pond until later this evening.
Commissioner Jaggon seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.**

C. Text Amendment – Sections 3.1.2C(3) and 3.4.2C, Parking lot landscaping requirements and tractor trailer storage spaces, TOW

Commissioner Jepsen resumed his seat.

Town Planner Mr. Eric Barz reviewed the application and proposed edits to the regulations, adding additional edits suggested by Civil Engineer Wilson Alford, Jr., who represents a lot of applicants before the Commission.

Public Comment:

Wilson Alford, Jr. of Alford Associates located at 200 Pigeon Hill Road spoke in favor of the text amendment. He said it will provide further clarification and will make a better design.

Commissioner Levine read the May 15, 2023 CRCOG letter into the record.

There were no questions from the Commission.

**Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval of the text amendment for Sections 3.1.2C(3) and 3.4.2C as amended in the discussion this evening.
Commissioner Jaggon seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.**

B. Continued Text Amendment – Great Pond Form-Based Code, Freestanding signs and clarifying amendments in various sections, Lewis/Winstanley Enterprises, LLC

Alternate Commissioner Hallowell was seated for Commissioner Jepsen.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved to re-open the public hearing concerning Great Pond, Form-Based Code.

Commissioner Jaggon seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

Mr. Lewis said that they were sensitive to the multiple signs along the frontage and the most important one to them is the sign along Groton Road because the tenants in those buildings are not visible. He proposed the placement of one multi-tenant sign at Groton Road, 50 square feet in size, so that it would not be larger than any of the other signs that are out there and they would remove any reference to the use of similar multi-tenant signs at the other major street entrances. He said they had another one planned for what will ultimately be their main street at Concord as you go back to the Great Pond area where there are multiple shops and retail. He recognized that it is still viewed as an off-site sign in principle but again they go back to the only thing that is different about this is that it is a private driveway and they just happen to have a public street.

Commissioner Levine asked if they would still have the gas station sign. Mr. Lewis said yes. The gas station sign is the only one that is being proposed to be larger than the others. He clarified that the multi-tenant sign would be smaller than the gas station sign.

Ms. Ferro said their challenge is that they have significant frontage and they had users that located along that frontage first, so they have been challenged by that. She said they thought it would be a good compromise.

Mr. Barz summarized the Supreme Court ruling on content neutral signage to the Commission.

Ms. Ferro said where they feel that they have some standing is that this is part of a form-based code, different than anything else in town and it is in an arrival area that is within that campus. She acknowledged that what complicates it is ownership.

Mr. Lewis said that they could not advertise a business somewhere else on those signs and that they are limited by the Supreme Court Decision to what is called time, manner and place – how long the sign is there, construction of it or size of it and the physical location of it on the site. He said there is also regulation on off-premises advertising and that still holds true. They thought by having a smaller sign would lessen the possibility of having an issue.

Mr. Lewis offered another option where they limit the multi-tenant sign to two tenants but mentioned that it could be an issue at some point in the future.

Commissioner Mips stated that she understood that they have got to advertise.

Mr. Barz said that their compromise does not move him and that he could not speak for the Commission. He said the situation is not unique, citing the Ford parts warehouse at the distant end of Tradeport Drive without any signage on Rainbow Road.

Commissioner Levine asked if they would be opening Pandora's box by approving this.

Commissioner Hallowell said that her worry was the precedent that it would set.

Commissioner Mips said that she does not like setting a precedent.

Commissioner Levine said especially now when Day Hill road is in a transitional state with lots of these office buildings empty and transitioning over to other manufacturing business. She said the worst thing that could happen is going down Day Hill Road and seeing one sign after another like Ella Grasso Turnpike.

Commissioner Mips said that she liked the style of the signs that they presented and Commissioner Levine agreed.

Commissioner Levine said that she understood the Noble gas station sign.

Commissioner Mips said that it made sense but did not want to set a precedent.

Commissioner Hallowell asked what it does for everyone else in town if the form-based code is amended to allow for it. Mr. Barz said it would do nothing.

Commissioner Hallowell said we would have two different set of rules – one for Great Pond and one for everybody else.

Commissioner Levine said that is true and that we would not have to worry about setting a precedent for everybody else on Day Hill Road because this only applies to Great Pond.

Commissioner Mips said that might be a way to get through this.

Commissioner Hallowell said she is still not overly thrilled but she wanted to make sure this did not open Pandora's box where someone could say that we let someone else do it.

Mr. Barz said that they could certainly ask and say that if it is good for them, then it is good for us.

Commissioner Mips said that Great Pond has been different from our zoning regulations from the start. She asked if there was any way to do this without the sign they wanted on Groton Road. Mr. Barz said that it would be up to the applicant and that they can remove it and bring it forward another day.

Commissioner Mips said that was the sticking point and that the rest of the amendments were fine.

Mr. Lewis said that if they had to carve that out, they could do that. He said there were two choices – come back and provide another proposal separately or bring that single individual sign to the Commission for approval.

Mr. Barz asked if they were looking at passing the sign in the regulation tonight and then coming back to have the Commission approve a multi-tenant sign. Mr. Lewis said the regulation could say a multi-tenant sign at Groton Road and Day Hill Road could be permitted subject to the approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Commissioner Mips asked the Commission if that was making sense to everyone.

Commissioner Kuintzle said that it would still mean that they could put a blank sign up.

Commissioner Hallowell said the fundamental issue would remain the same.

Commissioner Kuintzle agreed and that it would give them approval to build the sign just not what goes on it.

Mr. Lewis said they still would not have approval for the sign until the Commission gave their approval.

Commissioner Levine said she thought the Supreme Court ruling said that the Commission could not dictate what is on the sign. Mr. Lewis said that is correct.

Commissioner Levine clarified that it is just the sign itself that we would approve. Mr. Lewis said yes.

Mr. Barz recommended going with the first option and remove it for now and then have discussions at the staff level before coming back to the Commission. He said he did not want to hold up all of the other changes.

Mr. Barz asked Mr. Lewis what sections were being struck. Mr. Lewis said it would be 10.2.3G and that there was a line in table 10.1 regarding site and neighborhood identification signs.

Mr. Lewis said that there were stone walls under construction today and they were under construction for the 24 square feet of content that was out there. He would like to ask the Commission to allow them to drop down to the 24 square feet that is permitted today. He asked to eliminate the 100 square feet and allow them to continue to do those walls.

Mr. Barz asked what would be going on the stone walls. Mr. Lewis said the one that was done today says the "Preserve at Great Pond" and other one says "Great Pond Village." He wasn't sure what the other one was going to say.

Mr. Barz asked what they are calling those. Mr. Lewis said that it was a neighborhood identification sign. Mr. Lewis apologized for muddying it as they thought they were simplifying it when they put it together originally.

Mr. Barz asked how to spell that out separately in the motion. He asked if it made it into the change. Mr. Lewis said they would reduce the amount of square footage in T4 district.

Mr. Barz said he was in section 10.2.3 and asked where it was in there. Mr. Lewis said 10.2.3G, Site Identification Signs Along Day Hill Road. He said they would delete that section.

Mr. Barz said okay, but how do we leave 24 square foot identification signs. Mr. Lewis said they could still permit it if we still permit 24 square feet for a neighborhood identification sign in all three zones and that would allow them to continue with the stone walls that are out there. He asked that they amend it by changing it from 100 square feet to 24 square feet in Table 10.1.

Mr. Barz said he would agree to that if the Commission was fine with that. He said he fully expected there to be an identification signs there.

Commissioner Hallowell asked if they were amending section G and not striking it. Mr. Barz said no, they are striking 10.2.3G and amending Table 10.1.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval of the application concerning the Form-Based Code for Great Pond as amended tonight, eliminating Section 10.2.3G and amending Table 10.1 to limit identifications signs to 24 square feet.

Commissioner Hallowell seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

Commissioner Jepsen resumed his seat.

D. Zone Change – 458 Windsor Avenue, B2, A and R8 Zones to NZ Zone, 5.68 acres, TOW

Assistant Town Planner Todd Sealy reviewed the application and provided details.

Commissioner Levine asked about the white area shown on the map. Mr. Sealy said that was a part of a state right-of-way.

The Commissioner did not have any questions.

Public Comment: None

Commissioner Levine read the May 15, 2023 CRCOG letter into the record.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval of the zone change for 458 Windsor Avenue from the B2, A and R8 Zones to the NZ Zone, 5.68 acres.

Commissioner Jaggon seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

E. Special Use & Site Plan – 205 Baker Hollow Road, Section 8.6Y, Addition of loading docks and trailer storage spaces, Manufacturing & distribution warehouse, I Zone, 20.6 acres, Alford Associates, Inc.

Civil Engineer and Land Surveyor Wilson Alford, Jr. and Jeff O'Neil of Condyne were present. Mr. Alford reviewed the applications, surrounding properties and wetlands approval.

Commissioner Mips asked if they had a chance to respond to the staff comments from May 23. Mr. Alford said the comments were dated June 7.

Mr. Sealy explained that the Engineering comments were dated June 7 and there were a few staff comments dated May 23.

Mr. Alford said that all of the comments have been reviewed. He said the Engineering comments have been complied with and he did not think the Engineering Department had time to review their responses. He said they have discussed them and they are in agreement that all comments can be complied with.

Mr. Sealy stated that staff received responses from the applicant on the Planning and Fire Marshal's comments and that they did not have a chance to review them internally yet.

Commissioner Mips said that if the application was approved, it would have to be subject to final staff approval.

The Commission did not have any questions.

Public Comment:

Debra Mechachonis, the property owner to the south in Bloomfield, CT, was concerned about access to her property, which uses the dirt road bordering the properties. She also asked how much acreage they would be keeping and how they would be entering and exiting the site.

Mr. Sealy said that there were some outstanding comments but that they felt that there is nothing in the comments that cannot be addressed at a staff level. He asked that if they were inclined to approve it that the Commission would condition it to address the two memos mentioned earlier. He asked the applicant if the truck parking at the rear of the project could be held in reserve until we know the particular needs of a tenant. He said they could give the tenant the option of building it out without having to come back to the Commission and if they do not need the parking area, they would not waste pavement.

Mr. Barz asked if their intent was to build all of the loading docks or have punch-outs that could be adjusted in the future depending on the needs of the tenant. Mr. O'Neil said their intention is to build them all as loading docks, just as they did at 105 Baker Hollow Road.

Mr. O'Neil addressed Ms. Mechachonis' concerns and said the Hebebrand family owns the 20.6 acres of the site, which was outlined in red on the displayed visual. He said they believed the further second parcel is not owned by them and when they went through their title search they found it to be owned by the State of Connecticut, which surrounds all of the brook going further down. He spoke to Ms. Mechachonis and said that is the land which abuts your parcel.

Mr. O'Neil stated that there will be no change in access to Ms. Mechachonis' property. He said that there is a deeded right-of-way between the two properties. He continued that it will have no effect on the rear trailer storage lot either.

Mr. Alford said there is also a note on the drawing stating that access to Ms. Mechachonis' property is to be maintained at all times during construction. He said that their driveway will be separate from her driveway.

Commissioner Mips asked if all that information is on the drawing. Mr. Alford said yes.

Commissioner Mips asked Ms. Mechachonis if they satisfied all of her questions. Ms. Mechachonis said yes, and she thanked them.

Commissioner Mips asked Mr. Sealy if he had anything else. Mr. Sealy said he just wanted a response to the possibility of holding the rear parking lot in reserve.

Mr. O'Neil said that they are amenable to that and that they do have to go back there and remove some abandoned machinery and equipment and things like that.

Mr. Barz suggested they could clear and grub it and to be sure to lock in their wetlands permit as well. He said that they could save money on the pavement if they do not end up needing it.

Commissioner Jepsen asked how Ms. Mechachonis would guarantee her access to the dirt road in the future. Mr. O'Neil said that she has a deeded right-of-way on her title.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval for the special use at 205 Baker Hollow Road. Commissioner Jaggon seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval of the site plan for 205 Baker Hollow Road to increase the ratio of dock to floor area from 12 to 37 and to reserve future construction of the tractor trailer storage area, all subject to staff approval to resolve any outstanding issues as outlined in the memorandums attached to the application.

Commissioner Jaggon seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

VI. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Commissioner Jaggon seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

Respectfully submitted, _____, Andrea D. Marcavitch, Recording Secretary on June 13, 2023.

Jill Levine, Secretary