



TOWN OF THOMPSON

Planning & Zoning Commission

815 Riverside Drive
P.O. Box 899
North Grosvenordale, CT 06255
PHONE: 860-923-9475
E-MAIL: zeo@thompsonct.org
planner@thompsonct.org
WEBSITE: www.thompsonct.org

Minutes – PZC Subcommittee Meeting-Subdivision Regulations - Appendices
Wednesday, May 4, 2022, 7:00 PM
ZOOM Meeting

p. 1 of 5

Topic: PZC Subdivision Regs Review - Appendices
Time: May 4, 2022 07:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
Zoom Meeting
Join Zoom Meeting
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81615003881?pwd=OGZvaHZyNmt5STZOCjBVT2pvcDJlOZz09>
Meeting ID: 816 1500 3881
Passcode: 657988
One tap mobile
+13126266799,,81615003881#,,,,*657988# US (Chicago)
+19292056099,,81615003881#,,,,*657988# US (New York)
Meeting ID: 816 1500 3881
Passcode: 657988
Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81615003881?pwd=OGZvaHZyNmt5STZOCjBVT2pvcDJlOZz09>

Here are the recording links:
Zoom: https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/um8F7xlov-_HAstWwli8d5za6D8tWuNQqM4O7YOKvpA7_oZQ0YrWXNyUGwJmh_Y.eIG0cEcDwerr7Oye?startTime=1651705204000
Passcode: j%on9TXF
Youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wWPRr8DHICI>

1. Call to Order, Roll Call

Ray Williams	Randy Blackmer	Jane Salce
John Lenky	Joseph Parodi-Brown	Dave Poplawski
Brian Santos		

Absent: Charlene Langlois, Michael Krogul, John Rice, Robert Werge Sr., Kies Orr, Alvan Hill
Staff Present: Tyra Penn-Gesek, Planner; Cindy Dunne, ZEO; Gloria Harvey, Recording Secretary
2. Discussion of Proposed Revisions to Subdivision Regulations-Appendices A-C

Appendices

Appendix A Planning and Zoning Fee Schedule

PLANNING AND ZONING FEE SCHEDULE

Unless otherwise specified, all fees include the required State fee per CGS, as amended.

ADULT ENTERTAINMENT ESTABLISHMENT:

Special Permit Application	\$250
Adult Entertainment Use Site Plan Review	\$500
Additional fees: Public Hearing Sign Fee, Legal Notice Fee	

Commented [P1]: The order of the Appendices will need to be adjusted to follow when they are referenced in the flow of the document.

For example: the Table of Fees is referred to first in the regs, therefore it will be added as Appendix A. The Letter to Abutters will move to Appendix B and the remainder will be re-ordered accordingly.

Planning and Zoning Subcommittee Meeting Minutes May 4, 2022

p. 2 of 5

Appeal of Zoning Enforcement Officer Decision \$210

Additional fees: Public Hearing Sign Fee, Legal Notice Fee

Amendments to the Subdivision or Zoning Regulations or Zoning Map \$250

Additional fees: Public Hearing Sign Fee, Legal Notice Fee

Excavation Permit

Base fee of \$0.09/cubic yard of materials to be removed per phase but not less than \$500

Additional fees: Public Hearing Sign Fee, Legal Notice Fee

Annual renewal fee \$250

Home Occupation/Neighborhood Limited Enterprise \$100

Additional fee for Neighborhood Limited Enterprise, Site Plan Review: \$310

Legal Notice Fee \$75

Motor Vehicle Certificate of Location \$210

Additional fees: Public Hearing Sign Fee, Legal Notice Fee

Public Hearing Sign \$50

Special Permit Application \$250

Additional fees: Public Hearing Sign Fee, Legal Notice Fee

Commented [P2]: Cindy is going to check to confirm whether these are actually the fees we are charging.

Telecommunication Site Plan Review \$500

Variance Application \$210

Additional fees: Public Hearing Sign Fee, Legal Notice Fee

Subdivision/Resubdivision

With public improvements proposed \$350/lot

Without public improvements proposed \$150/lot

Additional fees: Public Hearing Sign Fee, Legal Notice Fee, State Fees per CGS, as amended

Zoning Permit Application \$100

Zoning Permit Application with Site Plan Review by Commission \$150

Appendix B – Sample Letter to Abutters

Dear _____

Commented [P3]: As with the other forms: need feedback from ZEO to be sure this template is what we want.

You are receiving this letter because your property is within a 200 foot radius of the property known as _____ (Map/Block/Lot # or Street Address of Applicant Property).

Commented [P4]: Make sure this radius is consistent wherever possible. Janet noted some instances in which the radius is 500 ft.

The owners of Record, _____, are seeking a (Sub Division/Re-Subdivision) according to the provisions of the Thompson Subdivision Regulations.

They are proposing the following:

The Town of Thompson Planning and Zoning Commission Public Hearing on this application is on Monday, _____ (date) at 7 pm in the Merrill Seney Community Room located on the first floor of the Thompson Town Hall, 815 Riverside Drive, North Grosvenordale, CT 06255. Said application, # _____, is available for viewing in the Town of Thompson Planning and Development Office located on the first floor of the Thompson Town Hall, Call 860-923-9475 for an appointment.

All interested parties are encouraged to attend and be heard. Written communications will be received and read into the record.

Signature of applicant:

Date

APPENDIX C – Road Design & Construction

SECTION 1 – Road Design Criteria

A. ROAD CLASSIFICATION

1. Proposed roads shall be classified as defined in Article II of the Subdivision Regulations and based on the following criteria:

	Average Daily Traffic (Vehicles Per Day)	Number of Lots Served
Collector Street ¹	500 +	50 +
Sub-collector Street ²	251-500	26-50
Access Street ²	101-250	11-25
Residential Lane ²	1-100	1-10
Private Road	1-100	Any

B. PAVEMENT AND RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH

1. Road Width

The minimum pavement width of roads, as measured from face to face of curbs (or to the edge of pavement where curbs are not required) shall be as follows:

Collector Street	26 Feet
------------------	---------

¹ Criteria for Collector Streets are included as a point of reference, only. It is generally presumed that no subdivision application within the Town of Thompson will include a proposal for a Collector Street.

² Streets of these classifications are generally presumed in these Regulations to be proposed as Town accepted roads.

Commented [P5]: As per above: will become Appendix C

Commented [P6]: 1.J. Blanchette - This section, based upon our current regulations, is not concise. It could easily be half the length and still include all important standards. It goes into way too much detail for minor items. I'm not sure that Thompson needs 5 road classifications or sections on surplus materials or intersection grading plans. My suggestion would be to have this section completely re-written and re-organized.

Commented [MB7]: Why are these roads only “generally presumed” to be streets proposed as accepted roads as noted in the footnote?. If the streets in this classification are not residential sub-collector streets, then what else can they be – private roads, private ways or shared driveways? Do you really want a Residential Sub-collector Street to be a private road, private way or shared driveway?

T. Penn: The footnote is meant to provide further contrast between publicly accepted vs private roads. If, as I suspect, Marla’s comment is intended to mean that we should state that these road categories are ALWAYS publicly accepted, that may make sense. The members should discuss which language is clearest.

Also, the word RESIDENTIAL has been struck from Sub-collector and Access streets, consistent with the definitions. Should “residential lane” be changed in construction to “neighborhood lane,” to stay consistent with other changes?

Collector streets could serve a commercial subdivision, so may have application here. B. Santos refers to some standards in the Granby CT road standards.

One thing that the members seem to like about the Granby example is the clarity and the order of action. Reorganization of this appendix for proper order of action seems that it would be favorable, regardless of any changes to the specifications.

A.Santos wonders about the utility of using ADT as a measure. Who is verifying that projection? He refers again ...

Commented [MB8]: Ditto above. Do you really want a Residential Access Street to be a private road, private way or shared driveway?

T. Penn: see the response comment above.

Commented [MB9]: Ditto above. Do you really want a Residential Lane to be a private road, private way or shared driveway?

T. Penn: see the response comment above.

Commented [MB10]: If you are considering new private ways, (aka private roads or shared driveways, why wouldn't the number be limited?

T. Penn: Agree that it is worth discussing whether or not to set a limit on the # of lots that may be served by a private road. The purpose of not limiting the # of lots would be to incentivize the use of private vs public roads.

Commented [P11]: There is some feeling that it may be a good idea to set a single standard for all road widths. If so, then it would be preferable to make all town accepted roads 24 ft rather than 26 ft. Include language that allows the DPW Director to require an alternative road width on a case-by-case basis.

Planning and Zoning Subcommittee Meeting Minutes May 4, 2022

p. 4 of 5

Sub-collector Street	26 Feet
Access Street	24 Feet
Residential Lane	24 Feet
Private Road	22 Feet

Commented [MB12]: Comment [p159]: Modern traffic calming theory would say that safety might be enhanced with the narrower width in all cases...if you have 50+ lots in a project traffic calming would be more important than if you only had 10 lots. It's also less future maintenance cost. (D. Held)

Response by DPW: Minimum 24 ft should be required on any town accepted street, regardless of calming measures

Commented [MB13]: Regarding Comment p159 above - Who decided that the Town needed such an incentive for development as suggested?

T. Penn: The edition of the PoCD adopted in 2021 lays out the argument that the Town cannot afford to continue to accept new roads, unless those roads have a genuine value to the Town in terms of connectivity/shortened car trips. The members of the PZC who worked on that update, and who

Commented [P14]: Should this last sentence actually apply to private roads? Also, shouldn't we either describe standards or carve out an exception in the language for the loop roads described in the new section, later?

D Poplawski wants the 50 ft row for all road widths, based on standardization.

R Blackmer re: one-way streets may need a wider relative row

Commented [MB15]: Is increasing gradient for all road classifications from 10% to 12% in keeping with ConnDOT standards?

T. Penn: That standard was recommended by engineer Held. DPW has reviewed these standards with me and did not raise an objection to the change.

Commented [P16]: J. Blanchette - I agree with David Held that 12% is an appropriate maximum slope for most new residential roads. I suggest keeping 10% for collectors and subcollectors.

R Blackmer suggests that the gradient at intersections is more significant to have the lower gradient.

Commented [MB17]: Comment [P60]: Per DPW: currently there are no streets or roads in town that require speeds over 35-40 mph. Speeds on collector road can vary based on design and placement.

Question: given that road width is one of the factors that contributes to travel speeds, how

Commented [MB18]: Comment [P61]: I would not want a road in a 50 lot residential subdivision designed for 40 MPH. The actual speed of vehicles will be dictated by the geometric design of the road, not a speed limit sign and if it's designed for 40 MPH, they will routinely travel 45 MPH. That's excessive in a residential neighborhood setting whether there are

2. Right-of-Way

For every road, the right-of-way lines on each side of the road shall be parallel or shall be concentric arcs and all intersections of right-of-way lines shall be rounded by a curve having a radius equal to the required curb line radius, but not less than 25 feet. Minimum right-of-way widths for all classifications of roads shall be 50 feet.

C. GRADIENT

1. General

Roads shall be designed so as to avoid excessive cuts and fills and to avoid a combination of steep grades and sharp curves.

2. Minimum

The minimum gradient on any road shall be 1%, except turnarounds which shall be 1.35%.

3. Maximum

- Maximum gradients at pavement centerline for all classifications of roads shall be 10%.
- The maximum gradients at pavement centerline for turnarounds shall be 5 %
- Intersections - The maximum gradient shall be 3% for a distance of not less than 100 feet for arterial and collector streets and 50 feet for all other streets (as measured from the gutter line of the intersected road to any change in gradient).

D. STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE

1. Minimum

The horizontal and vertical alignment of all roads shall be based on the following criteria:

Classification	Design Speed (MPH)	Stopping Sight Distance (Feet)
	(MPH)	(Feet)
Collector Street	40	300
Sub-collector Street	30	200
Access Street	25	150
Residential Lane	20	125
Private Road	20	125

2. **Determination**

Stopping sight distance for motorists is measured from the driver's eyes, which are assumed to be 3 ½ feet above the pavement surface to an object 2 feet high on the road.

3. **Vertical and Horizontal Curves**

Where crest vertical curves and horizontal curves occur at the same location, sight distance shall be provided to assure that the horizontal curve is visible as drivers approach.

Tyra will check on legality of holding a Zoom meeting on Referendum night. 5/16 at 7pm

3. Adjournment

Dave Poplawski moved and Ray Williams seconded the motion to adjourn. Hearing no discussion, the motion carried unanimously and the Meeting adjourned at 9:13 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gloria Harvey,
Recording Secretary

Commented [P19]: J. Blanchette - the height of the object should be 2' (as per AASHTO /CT DOT standards) not 6" – that is obsolete