



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 Regular Meeting

Monday, February 27, at 7:00 PM

Merrill Seney Community Room, Thompson Town Hall, 815 Riverside Drive, North Grosvenordale, CT 06255 and via Zoom

Listen on Zoom:

https://us02web.zoom.us/jc/share/drVwyZyMAAggMGOY7XNUbGHQfPPy030VtXggQJ_SwGu_MdsHbeZvzpMTj_YChRGW.LEXjf5AJE05ataEi?startTime=1677542408000 Passcode: tT\$F4.WX

Listen on Youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p2QEG73e8el>

1. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

Chairman Statement – Under Citizens comment – state your name and address, 3 minutes speaking time unless otherwise directed by chair, please address comments to Chair in a civil and respectful manner. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call, Seating of Alternates

Members Attending: J. Parodi-Brown – Chair, R. Blackmer, D. Poplawski, A. Hill, M. Krogul, J. Lenky, Kies Orr-LaVack (not seated), J. Rice, J. Salce, B. Santos (seated for C. Langlois), R. Williams

Staff Attending: C. Dunne – ZEO, Tyra Penn-Gesek – Director of Planning & Development

3. Public Hearing

PZC 23-01 Applicant Green Valley Self-Storage LLC, Zachary LaBonte, property owner of 72 Main Street, KKB Acquisition LLC, 1919 Flowers Circle, Thomasville, GA., Map 169, Block 88, Lot 65A, 65 and 64. 4.2 acres (3 lots) to develop Storage Rental Facilities (climate controlled) and Office Building. **Article 4F, Section 2-27.**

Vote Required

The following is a summary of comments heard during the public hearing. For the full content of the public hearing, please refer to the recordings (linked above)

Applicant Zachary LaBonte summarizes his proposed project, with assistance from Paul Terwilliger (Surveyor). The former Superior Bakery is to be converted to a climate-controlled self-storage facility as a primary use. An access ramp for better pedestrian access will be added. Rental square feet will include 248 storage units of varying sizes. The lower level will be configured as offices for rent to local small businesses. There will be no changes to the footprint of the building. The existing house at 78 Main St is planned for demolition, to be replaced by green space. The house to the south of the main structure will also be repurposed as business space for rent. P. Terwilliger describes details of the drainage and other design elements.

- **R. Keefe/First Street** - asks if the only entrance will be from Main St (response: yes)
- **R. Cabelis (sp?)/Main St** – representing a group of abutting neighbors. The neighbors have had issues with unsafe overgrown trees overhanging from the bakery parcel, and are asking for the new owners to address that. There are also issues with runoff from a retaining wall on the bakery property, and they are concerned about the possible results from work in that area. The applicant confirms that no work is planned in the area of concern, but that he will take a look at those areas.
- **D. Hancock/Sunset Hill** – Wants to know why the house at 78 Main is to be taken down instead of rehabbed. He would have some interest in potentially purchasing and renovating the building. The applicant confirms that the plan is to demolish, based on the poor condition of the structure.
- **A. Hill** – Asks about the existing fire suppression system, and what the plans may be for upgrading. The applicant describes the classification required for self-storage and areas where upgrades are needed. A. Hill also asks about any plans for exterior lighting.
- **J. Rice** – Asks about the parking capacity for the house to be used as offices. The applicant believes there are 6 spaces as currently configured. The lot is not striped.

Planning and Zoning Regular Meeting Agenda February 27, 2023

- **B. Santos** – Asks about the difference between the light and dark gray areas on the demonstration plan. Light gray is existing pavement, dark gray is proposed pavement. Asks if a perc test was done to verify whether there is adequate on-site capacity for stormwater storage/infiltration. B. Santos also points out to D. Hancock that the existing teardown house would interfere with handling runoff. B. Santos asks about daily operations and anticipated traffic. The applicant believes it will be 10-15 cars per day. There are also questions about the potential impact on the day care center.
- **R. Williams** – Asks for more detail about the ramp. Is it for foot access only? The applicant replies that it is.
- **R. Cabelis/Main St** – Makes an additional comment regarding trash that was a problem when the bakery was active. Asks if some kind of fencing can be added to mitigate that.
- **B. Santos** – Asks if there will be security cameras installed (answer:yes)
- **D. Poplawski** – Directs questions to the surveyor vis a vis the catch basins shown on the plan. They do not connect to one another. Some are shown on the plan as “proposed” or “configured” and it is unclear that the detail is adequately captured. The surveyor replies that some of the presumed connecting pipe is buried and cannot be verified. The applicant also replies that he has reviewed the file copy of the bakery plans, and they do show the existing catchbasins. The surveyor and Killingly Engineering have concluded that the proposed plans will reduce runoff to the Street. D. Poplawski would like to see a more accurate rendering on the new site plan.
- **J. Salce** – Asks for clarification as to what will replace the demolished house. Will it be greenspace? (answer: yes, and that greenspace will be help with runoff).
- **R. Williams** – echoes D. Poplawski’s request for greater detail of the drainage on the plan.
- **D. Poplawski** – Asks if the facility will be gated or will it have 24-hour access (answer: no gate planned)
- **J. Salce** – Asks about hours of operation. The applicant replies that they are TBD, but likely 7 – 7.
- **B. Santos moves to close the public hearing/J. Salce seconds the motion.**
Motion Passes Unanimously

PZC 23-03 Applicant Baystate Investment Fund LLC. Property owner of 26 Main Street, St. Joseph’s Catholic Society, 18 Main Street, Thompson, CT Map 169. Block 94, Lot 3, Zone DMRD,2.4+/- acres development of structure to 40 residential units, inclusive of 1 handicap, 4 affordable housing, 60 parking spaces, 6 electric charging stations **Article 4F, Section 2-21**

- **Attorney Ian Sullivan of St. Onge & Brouillard speaks for the applicant to describe the project:** He describes the applicant’s experience as a developer of multi-family housing. His company has 250 units in Northeast CT and 75 properties in MA/CT/RI. They have extensive experience in renovations of the type proposed. The school is to be converted to 40 units of one-bedroom and studio apartments. Impact to the schools is expected to be minimal, since they are unlikely to be rented to families vs individuals. **The applicant, Ed Murphy, provides additional project details.** He points out that the property will come on the tax rolls once it is separated from the Church. Traffic impact is expected to be lower than the prior use as an active elementary school. He is still working with the Church on the final division of the lot.
- **P. Lenky/Watson Rd** – Asks if the project is an 8-30g proposal? The applicant replies that it is not an 8-30g project, but has agreed with the Town to include the 4 Affordable Housing units in the plan. Atty. Sullivan clarifies that the development will not be restricted in terms of population (all over-55 or all income restricted), it is only the 4 units that will be income restricted as Affordable Housing.
- **J. Salce** – Asks for more clarification about the affordability element, and also asks what the proposed rents might be. The applicant replies that the rents haven’t been determined yet, but estimates that market rate for the area for a one-bedroom is \$1000/month, whereas \$895/month would be more of a “low-income” rent level. Asks what average sq ft will be? Answer: around 500 sq ft.
- **J. Lenky** – Wants to know if the fire marshal has commented on the plan. Also has questions about the single “accessible” unit shown on the first floor and wants to know about some of the interior changes. The applicant replies that the entire building will need to be brought up to current codes, which will require a full design provided by relevant professionals (e.g. fire alarm /sprinkler engineers & architects, etc).
- **D. Poplawski** – Asks about the traffic patterns and wants to know more about the easement across the parking lot shared with the Church. The applicant shows the outline of the easement on the plan.
- **J. Salce** – Asks about the relationship between the project and the additional access point on Reardon Rd. Will that be a one-way flow or two-way on and off Reardon Rd. Applicant: at this point the plan is for two-way traffic to Reardon.
- **B. Santos** – Asks whether the building may need a new roof. Applicant: the roof is in good shape at this time. If they pursue solar for the building at some point, they would upgrade the roof. B. Santos asks

Planning and Zoning Regular Meeting Agenda February 27, 2023

about HVAC/Windows/repointing. Mini-splits are planned, as well as new windows. Repointing does not appear to be needed. B. Santos asks about resurfacing the parking lot. That is TBD but seems likely.

- **R. Williams** – Asks about haz mats. What kind of testing has been done? Applicant: lead test hasn't been done yet but asbestos test has been done, and asbestos has been found. In the design phase, removal vs encapsulation will be determined according to current codes and best practices.
- **J. Salce** – Ask whether there will be onsite management staff. Applicant: not on site, but they have 8 on-call staff in the region who will be accessible 24/7.
- **B. Santos** – Asks if it is to be an interior gut. Applicant: it is not. Based on the type of construction, the units will be configured within the existing walls of the classrooms.
- **J. Salce** – Asks how many units per classroom space Applicant: 2.
- **D. Poplawski** – Asks about the traffic flow into the shared church parking lot, and wonders if there can be any clear definition to avoid congestion or confusion coming on and off Main St.
- **J. Salce** – Asks what the timeline is to begin. Applicant: that is TBD based on some of the design elements such as heating systems. J. Salce asks if the apartments will be individually metered for utilities. Applicant: that is also TBD at this point.
- **R. Morin/Pompeo Rd** – Expresses general support for the project but believes that 40 units is too many. Asks the Commission to consider reducing the number of units, based on public sentiment he hears in his role as Tax Collector. He also believes that 4 Affordable Housing units are not favorable and believes that opinion is shared by members of the public.
- **S. White/East Thompson Rd** – Agrees with R. Morin's observations. She asks for more detail on what the differences are between the one-bedrooms and the studios. The Applicant describes the general differences between the two types: one has an interior room which cannot be considered a "bedroom" because of the lack of windows, and full walls cannot separate the living area from the kitchen area, only knee walls. She also asks about the retaining wall between the building and Reardon Rd: there was a religious shrine there at one point. Is it still there (answer: no). Asks about the maintenance staffing. Also asks about the 6 proposed EV charging stations. Repeats R. Morin's request that the Commission consider reducing the number of units. The Applicant clarifies that the 6 EV spots are required by CT Statutes.
- **T. Knowles/Main St** – Has concerns about traffic load/speeds, especially at the intersection of Main & Reardon. She is uncomfortable about the number of units being added in the neighborhood.
- **K. Greene/Hagstrom Rd** – Wants to know if there are limits to the # of occupants per unit. Applicant: Federal Law does not permit the limitations she suggests. As smaller units, it is expected that they would predominantly be occupied by singles with some couples. A ratio of 1.5 parking spaces per units (60 vehicles) is estimated to be adequate.
- **J. Salce** – Asks why the 4 Affordable Housing units are being included. The Applicant replies that the State has a priority for adding Affordable Housing, statewide, and the Town also has goals in that area. He replies that a mix of affordable and market-rate units generally works very well in his other developments. J. Salce asks if he had considered a smaller number of units. The Applicant replies that fewer units would actually create more bedrooms in order to make the project profitable, therefore the likelihood of more impact to the school would be higher.
- **D. Hancock/Sunset Hill** – He rents several apartments, and he clarifies that one-bedroom units have little impact on numbers of children in schools. The Applicant points out that the health departments do have limits on # of occupants by square footage, and that 3 people per unit may be the limit.
- **S. Brisette/ Lowell Davis Rd** – Raises concerns about the sight-lines on Reardon Rd and wonders if there is some way that can be improved.
- **P. Lenky/Watson Rd** – Raises concerns about changing the characteristics of the building and its structural load capacity. Also asks if there is an impact to the capacity of the public utilities. Wants to know who certifies the safety on the haz mat when the project is done. Applicant: A licensed asbestos company will complete all required removal according to State and Federal codes.
- **N. Chrzanowski/Mountain Hill Rd** – Wants to know if there are height limits, and if that affects the possibility of adding solar on the roof. The Applicant: there will be no addition of height for more units. If solar becomes a part of the project, the applicant will check the dimensional requirements of the Town.
- **S. White/East Thompson Rd** – feels that the questions being asked and answered are vague and therefore believes that the project is unsuitable. She wants to know about emergency vehicle access. The applicant replies that there is good access as currently configured, including a fire access lane behind the building.
- **B. Santos** – Comments regarding the requests to reduce units. Increased size of units seems logically likely to have more individual residents, since additional bedrooms could result in more families renting. The applicant concurs.
- **T. Knowles/Main St** – Expresses additional concerns because the Town has no police department.

Planning and Zoning Regular Meeting Agenda February 27, 2023

- **A resident from First St (name unclear)** – Asks again if there is a way to limit the # of residents per unit. The Applicant repeats that Federal Law does not allow limits of that nature.
- **A. Hill moves to close the Public Hearing. J. Salce Seconds the motion. Passes Unanimously**

4. Discuss Public Hearing and Possible Action

PZC 23-01 Applicant Green Valley Self-Storage LLC, Zachary LaBonte

- **A. Hill moves to approve the application/ B. Santos Seconds the motion**
- **B. Santos requests a condition that the new owner work with the residents at 56 Main Street to remove the hazardous trees. Also add the condition that the plans to be updated with accurate catch-basin locations.**
- **The Chair calls for a voice-vote on the conditions individually**
- **The condition regarding the trees is unanimously approved**
- **The condition regarding the updates to the plan is unanimously approved**
- **A. Hill and B. Santos amend their motion to include the conditions.**
- **The application is unanimously approved with those conditions on a roll call vote.**

PZC 23-03 Applicant Baystate Investment Fund LLC

- **B. Santos moves to approve the application/R. Blackmer Seconds the motion**
- **B. Santos comments that he is enthusiastic in his support of the project and is pleased that the building will no longer be vacant**
- **J. Rice follows up on comments by S. Brissette regarding the sight-lines on the entrance from Reardon Rd and would like a condition added that the sight-lines be addressed. He would also like a condition added that approval is conditional pending approval of the project by the WPCA.**
- **M. Krogul confirms that the facility has sufficient capacity to handle the development.**
- **J. Rice wants more clarity on the ROW across the existing Church parking lot. The easement will be included on the deed, so the condition is not needed.**
- **R. Blackmer comments that using the existing plan that utilizes existing walls is likely more supportive of the structural load than removing walls to make fewer, larger units.**
- **The Chair calls for a voice-vote on the conditions individually.**
- **The condition regarding the 100-ft sight line condition is unanimously approved**
- **The condition regarding the approval by WPCA is unanimously approved**
- **B. Santos and R. Blackmer amend their motion the include the conditions**
- **Roll call vote:**

Yes: Krogul/Salce/Williams/Santos/Rice/Poplawski/Blackmer/Lenky/Parodi-Brown

No: Hill (please note: A. Hill initially votes “yes,” but subsequently requests that his vote be amended to ‘no’)

The application is approved: 9 yes to 1 no

5. Citizens Comments

- **S. White/East Thompson Rd** – Comments that she believes the house at 78 Main St should not be torn down.
- **P. Lenky/Watson Rd** – Repeats his concerns from the public hearing regarding the physical characteristics of the existing school building, and its capacity for the proposed project
- **B. Romanek/Pasay Rd** – Also has reservations about the demolition of the house at 78 Main St and hopes that the new owner will get in touch with Mr. Hancock to discuss it.

6. Applications:

PZC 23-02 – Applicant LeRoy Gullaume, property owner of 365 Riverside Drive Moon Spinners LLC, 455 Meadow Court, Unit 8, Southheld, New York, Map 85, Block 51, Lot 7A, Zone TCDD, 4.54 Acres, request Zoning Permit with Site Plan Review by Commission to develop Storage Rental Facilities, **Article 4E, Section 2-19.**
Applicant request to withdraw.

- **C. Dunne** - comments that the application is withdrawn because no paperwork has been submitted within the appropriate time frame. She requests that the fee be waived for the applicant when he returns to re-submit the application.
- **R. Williams moves to waive the \$150 fee when the application is re-submitted/J. Salce Seconds the motion**

Planning and Zoning Regular Meeting Agenda February 27, 2023

- **Roll call Vote:**
Yes: Blackmer/Poplawski/Santos/Williams/Salce/Hill
No: Rice/Krogul/Lenky/Parodi-Brown
The application fee is waived: 6 yes 4 no

PZC Application #23-05 applicant Strategic-Commercial Realty, Inc. dba Rawson Materials Applicant, property owners Lynn Rawson Landry & Cheryl Jane Foshay, 0 Quaddick Town Farm Rd, Map 145, Block 14, Lot 14, Zone R-40 gravel operation renewal permit, Zoning Regulations 2012, **Article IX, Section 5, F-1**

- **J. Rice moves to approve the renewal/D. Poplawski Seconds the motion.**
- **J. Salce** - wants to know how many active gravel operations the applicant currently has in Thompson.
- **B. Santos** – wants to know if fees are current ZEO confirms that they are.
- **ZEO** – 54K cu. yd of sand remains to be removed. 16k cu yd were removed last year.
- **J. Rice** – wants to know how the amount of removed material is verified and documented.
- The rate per cu yd is questioned by some members of the commission. Their rate is 2-cents per because the application was approved under the prior regulations.
- **Roll-Call Vote:**
Yes: Blackmer/Poplawski/Rice/Santos/Williams/Salce/Blackmer/Lenky/Parodi-Brown
No: Hill
The renewal is approved: 9 yes 1 no

PZC 23-07 Applicant Jason Lavallee, 0 Riverside Rd (corner of Riverside Rd and Azud Rd), Map 67, Block 53 Lot 1 H and 1G, Zone TCDD, owner Lavallee Construction, LLC, Rich Rd, North Grosvenordale, Ct, Special Permit request for construction of multi-family dwellings under Zoning Regulations **Article 4E, Section 2-#30.**

- **A. Hill moves to accept the application for public hearing/M. Krogul Seconds the motion**
- **R. Williams** prefers to wait to vote on the application until after it is approved by IWC
- **ZEO** requests that the Commissioners save the paperwork in their packets for the next month's meeting to save paper
- **A roll-call vote is taken and passes unanimously**

PZC 23-08 – Town of Thompson Planning and Zoning Commission of 815 Riverside Drive, Amendment Zoning Regulations Format change, codification.

- **J. Parodi-Brown moves to accept the application for public hearing/D. Poplawski Seconds the motion**
- **A roll-call vote is taken and passes unanimously**

7. **Applications Received After Agenda Posted:**

Application 23-06 Hany Youssef, 274 Riverside Drive, Map 87, Block 95, Lot 39, Zone TCDD, Permit with Site Plan Review by the Commission to operate a recreational arcade/pool hall/bar/food establishment under Zoning Regulations **Article 4E Section 2 #8.**

- The Applicant describes his purpose: he was previously approved for a Special Permit for adult-use cannabis in this location, but he did not receive a license in the State's lottery. In order to put the building to use, he is asking for an additional permit for use as a recreational facility to include an arcade and pool hall. It is not an amendment to the existing special permit, it is a separate permit that would apply to the same location.
- **J. Salce moves to approve application 23-06/B. Santos Seconds the motion**
- **R. Williams** raises concerns about the proposed use as a bar and separation from the mini-golf business. He points out that there were conditions placed on the cannabis permit to include a fence for separation.
- **B. Santos** suggests that the new permit include the same conditions that were placed upon the cannabis special permit.
- **A. Hill** asks if the two uses can be concurrent.
- **J. Lenky** replies that it is his understanding that at this time it would be an either/or, and that the State would not permit an adult-use cannabis establishment to be co-located with a bar.
- **The Chair calls for a voice vote to add the condition that the requirement for the fence on the special permit be added to 23-06**
- **The condition is approved unanimously**
- **J. Salce and B. Santos agree to amend the motion**
- **J. Rice** requests an additional condition to strike the bar as a permitted use.

Planning and Zoning Regular Meeting Agenda February 27, 2023

- **M. Krogul** observes that the prior restaurant at the location also had a bar
- **The Applicant** comments that a pool hall without a bar wouldn't really be feasible
- **R. Williams** asks what the hours would likely be. Answer: likely closing at 2 p.m.
- **D. Poplawski** asks whether this application is being called "food and beverage." ZEO says she is calling it a general "Business" use. D. Poplawski believes that the application is being rushed, since the Commission has not had time to review it since it was received that same morning.
- **R. Blackmer** wants further clarification on whether the two uses can be co-located.
- **J. Lenky** repeats that it is currently not allowed by the State to co-locate cannabis and alcohol.
- **The applicant clarifies that, if he gets the license and the State will not allow both uses, he will eliminate the alcohol service accordingly.**
- **B. Santos** suggests an additional condition that if the use will combine cannabis and alcohol, the applicant will return for an amendment to the special permit.
- **J. Salce and B. Santos amend their motion to include the additional condition**
- **A roll-call vote is taken to approve the application with the 2 conditions. Passes unanimously.** J. Parodi-Brown and D. Poplawski each comment that they would have brought the application under a different use from the table (food & beverage or #31)

8. Old Business

- a. CBA Education & Training Seminar Planning and Zoning – discussion of Commission attendance
ZEO asks if any of the Commissioners are attending. Some of the members will follow up with the ZO during office hours.
- b. Update of attendance to comply with required educational hours
ZEO asks any Commissioners who have taken any courses on the required topics thus far connect with her to confirm her list is updated.

9. New Business

- a. Planning and Zoning Commission Approval for Board of Selectman to enter into a Lease agreement with the Historical Society - Section 8-24.
 - **A. St Onge** addresses the Commission to explain that Ordinance 10-014 requires the Town to seek approval of the PZC when entering into a lease. Thompson Historical Society is seeking to formalize a lease with the Town to manage the museum rooms and auditorium at the 1909 High School Building. The lease is required by a grant that THS is applying for to complete upgrades to the facility.
 - **R. Blackmer moves to approve the lease/A. Hill Seconds the motion**
 - **B. Santos** asks to clarify that the contents of the lease are not what they are being asked to approve.
 - **A. St Onge** confirms that the content of the lease has been reviewed and approved by counsel. PZC approval is administrative only.
 - **A roll call vote is taken to approve the lease**
 - **The lease is approved with 9 "yes" votes and one abstention by R. Rice, who is on the Board of Directors for the Historical Society.**
- b. Connecticut Federation of Planning & Zoning Agencies Annual Conference
 - **R. Blackmer** asks if this is one of the classes that will count toward the educational requirements. The ZEO believes so. Several Commissioners indicate their interest to attend. The ZEO asks for the Chair's permission for members to attend, which he provides. The Treasurer approves the expenditure of the fees.
- c. Connecticut Land Conservation Conference
 - **The Dir. Of Planning & Dev.** shares a hard-copy of the schedule for the upcoming conference on 25 March and offers to register and pay for any commissioners who would like to attend. It is unlikely that this event will provide educational credits for any of the required topics.

10. Approval of the PZC Minutes

- a. January 23, 2023 PZC Regular Meeting
 - **B. Santos moves/J. Salce Seconds to approve the minutes**
 - **J. Parodi-Brown** calls out a typo in Section 10 in his last name which he would like corrected
 - **Roll call vote passes with 9 affirmative votes and one abstention from J. Rice (not in attendance)**
- b. January 25, 2023 PZC Subcommittee Mtg. Subdivision Draft Review
 - **B. Santos moves/J. Salce Seconds to approve the minutes**
 - **Roll call vote passes unanimously**
- c. February 1, 2023 PZC Subcommittee Mtg. Subdivision Draft Review

Planning and Zoning Regular Meeting Agenda February 27, 2023

- **B. Santos moves/J. Salce Seconds to approve the minutes**
- **Roll call vote passes with 8 affirmative votes and 2 abstentions (D. Poplawski and M. Krogul were not in attendance).**

11. Reports of Officers and Staff

a. Town of Thompson Budget Report

Secretary D. Poplawski states that 64% of the PZC budget remains.

b. Planner – Review of Subdivision Regulation Meeting Schedule

- **T. Penn-Gesek** has received all of the comments from the Wetlands Agent and incorporated them into a review draft for the PZC. She believes that the PZC can complete the presentation draft with one more subcommittee meeting to review a few substantive changes suggested in the comments from M. Butts (the rest are simple language/outline edits). The members agree to **a subcommittee meeting on the evening of Weds 22nd at 7 p.m. on Zoom**. Following that, the plan is to give the draft to counsel for review, bring an application to the PZC to accept for public hearing and post for public comment at the March regular meeting, with a public hearing in April.
- **T. Penn-Gesek** also addresses the condition of the house at 78 Main St. She has been in it and agrees that it is likely unsalvageable, but suggests that Mr. Hancock should reach out to Mr. Labonte to discuss the topic.

c. ZEO Memo

- **C. Dunne** asks what the Commissioners would prefer she do when she receives an application after the agenda is posted (as per 23-06).
- **C. Dunne** also informs the Commission that she has received and approved final copies of the permits that will now be available online through Permitlink, with pdf backup on the Town website.

12. Correspondence

a. Minutes: Zoning Board of Appeals – meeting February 13, 2023

b. NECCOG – NOTICE TO ADJACENT TOWN

13. Signing of Mylar – none

14. ZBA Review:

ZBA requested a monthly update on the clean-up of Bates Auto. Report Attached.

15. Citizens Comments:

- **V. Clarke/Alm Rd** – comes online to let the Commission know that the snow hasn't started yet.
- **N. Chrzanowski/Mountain Hill Rd** – Asks the Commission to consider the applications that are brought before them strategically, rather than only looking at them individually.

16. Commissioners' Comments:

- **D. Poplawski** clarifies for the ZEO & Mr. Youssef that he was not criticizing her work or the application, he just wanted another month to consider the application more fully
- **B. Santos** asks what the status is of the paintball use on Hagstrom Rd. ZEO replies that she has not had the opportunity to do much. Brief discussion follows, with J. Rice suggesting that it may be worth asking Counsel what the Town can do. B. Santos wants to know what the actual violations are prior to asking counsel for advice.

17. Next Meeting:

PZC Regular meeting Monday, March 27, 2023 Merrill Seney Community Room, Thompson Town Hall, 815 Riverside Drive, North Grosvenordale, CT 06255 and via Zoom

18. Adjournment: 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Tyra Penn-Gesek, Director of Planning & Development