

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION/  
TOWN OF EAST HADDAM  
LAND USE OFFICE  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
June 8, 2010  
(Not yet approved by the Commission)**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** John Matthew called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m. at the Town Grange.

**2. ATTENDANCE:**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Bernard Gillis (regular member), John Matthew (regular member), Harvey Thomas (regular member), Louis Salicrup (Alternate)

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Crary Brownell-Chairman (regular member), James Curtin (regular member), Elizabeth Lunt (alternate member), Kevin Matthews (regular member), Anthony Saraco (regular member),

Mr. Matthew appointed Mr. Salicrup to vote for Mr. Brownell this evening.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** James Ventres

**3. MINUTES:**

The minutes of the May 25, 2010 meeting were filed with the following amendments:

- Page 1 Attendance: Change from being absent to being present: Louis Salicrup, Anthony Saraco, and John Matthew.

**4. BILLS**

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Invoice</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Hartford Courant	2658	\$250.66
Branse, Willis, and Knapp (Morgan Estates)	1175-09075	29.00
(General zoning)	117585263	377.00
Suburban	3529057-0	32.99

**Motion by Mr. Thomas to pay the bills as presented, seconded by Mr. Salicrup, and carried by unanimous vote.**

**5. LOT LINE REVISION**

**A)Matthews Industrial, LLC, Matthews Drive, proposed lot line revision involving land owned by Matthews Drive, LLC, Parr Industrial, LLC, and DIV-ACQ, Inc. Assessor's Map 27, Lots 53, 54, and 55.**

**First date: June 8, 2010**

**Last date: August 11, 2010**

No one representing the applicant was present at this meeting. Mr. Ventres presented the plan to the Commission for review. The application is for a proposed lot line revision, based on a land swap between Matthews Industrial, Parr Industrial, and DIV-ACQ, Inc.

Mr. Thomas asked if there would be any non-conformity or any violation with this land swap, to which Mr. Ventres stated there would not be.

Mr. Gillis asked if the adjoining property owners had been notified. Mr. Ventres stated they had been, but the adjoining property owners were the participants.

**Motion by Mr. Thomas to approve the application for Matthews Industrial, LLC, Matthews Drive, proposed lot line revision involving land owned by Matthews Drive, LLC, Parr Industrial, LLC, and DIV-ACQ, Inc., seconded by Mr. Gillis, and carried by unanimous vote.**

## **6. DISCUSSION**

### **A) Discussion of existing subdivision regulations – interior lots**

Mr. Thomas asked the status of these regulations. Mr. Ventres stated the Commission asked him to streamline the comments that the Commission and Attorney Branse had made. Mr. Ventres distributed this revised draft to the Commission. Mr. Ventres stated he saw nothing in the comments that could not be accomplished through the special exception review.

Mr. Thomas asked about new applications. Mr. Ventres explained that most applications will be reviewed by the Commission, with a couple of exceptions. It would be a rare case when there would be a “free split” that would not require review. Mr. Matthew believed it could be argued that this is a better control over free splits than what the Commission currently has. Mr. Matthew suggested the Commission discuss this at the next meeting, when more members were present.

Mr. Gillis asked if a public hearing had been scheduled. Mr. Ventres stated it had not.

### **B) Additional regulations under consideration**

Mr. Thomas stated when they schedule a public hearing; there would be other regulations for that meeting as well. Mr. Ventres distributed a copy of the draft soil test pit requirements, which the Commission briefly reviewed. This would be added to the list of regulation changes when the public hearing is scheduled.

Mr. Ventres distributed copies of the seasonal use discussion topic. He stated that part of this recommended change would be to change the seasonal use period to run from April 15 through October 31. This would coincide with people who came to use cottages for fishing season, etc.

Mr. Matthew asked about the seasonal use. Mr. Ventres explained that if many people used these cottages year-round, they could have many septic issues. He explained various scenarios for identifying seasonal violations.

Mr. Gillis asked if the deeds indicated that properties were deemed seasonal. Mr. Ventres stated most of the deeds did not indicate seasonal use, but rather only described the properties themselves.

Mr. Gillis asked how the pump out schedule affects seasonal cottages. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Ventres stated they are on the same requirements as everyone else. Mr. Gillis asked about the water at Lake Hayward, to which Mr. Ventres stated it was already turned on by April 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Ventres distributed a draft proposal for Section 15 – Campgrounds. He reviewed the minor changes to this regulation. The changes included referencing sections 14A and 14B on page 1, and changing dates on page 2 to coincide with the draft changes for seasonal use. Mr. Gillis asked about the buffer strip on page 2. He asked about recreational area and screening, which allowed parking on the buffer strip. Mr. Ventres stated that it would be special exception review, and it was discretionary. Mr. Matthew noted there were a couple of typographical errors in the Campground regulation. Mr. Ventres will check into this.

Mr. Ventres stated the Commission did not yet discuss the voluntary merger of lots separated by a street or other roadway. This was in the original packet of regulations for review. Mr. Matthew asked what the merger of two lots accomplished. Mr. Ventres explained that two very small lots could be merged into one lot, which could allow a year-round conversion of a seasonal structure. It could also be used for additional structures, septic area, etc.

Mr. Thomas believed this regulation would give the Commission a lot of latitude for review.

Mr. Ventres discussed accessory units and multi-family units. He stated he would look at the State's criteria for bedroom counts, and lot size per bedroom.

Mr. Gillis asked if the Commission should make a distinction for adding additional living space within a dwelling, separate from a unit over a garage, etc. Mr. Ventres stated that technically, if there is a bedroom, bathroom, and kitchen within the same space, it is considered a dwelling unit. A discussion ensued regarding units.

Mr. Thomas stated that Ms. Laurie Alt, a former commissioner, several times voiced concern about the "mcmansions", and as economic times become difficult, that they might possibly rent out part of their houses.

Mr. Matthew voiced concern about making a distinction about the number of families in one structure. Mr. Ventres explained that it is not really about what one person is using a dwelling unit as, but it is more about what the unit is capable of being. Mr. Thomas summarized that a dwelling unit is anything that has a bedroom, bathroom, and kitchen.

Mr. Gillis believed a clear distinction would be within the house, versus something over a garage, barn, etc. Mr. Ventres has seen several signs for rooms for rent recently in other towns.

Mr. Thomas stated the draft regulations for interior lots, campground, test pit requirements, seasonal use near a road all seem to be ready for public hearing. The date of August 24 was suggested as a possible public hearing date.

Mr. Matthew was concerned about interior lots furthering more development. He stated if we increase buffering amounts to interior lots, it would not encourage or discourage more development than what we have now. He believed interior lots would have an increased development. He did not feel that a public hearing without discussion of buffers would be beneficial. He believed if there was up to 200-foot buffering requirement all the way around a subdivision, except where it meets a road, where it may be a minimum of one lot width. Mr. Ventres referred to page 36 of the current subdivision regulations. He stated currently, we have rural buffer areas, with a statement of "when required". He suggested "when required" could be deleted. He discussed rural, residential, and agricultural requirements. He stated a waiver of the subdivision requirements

was possible on an application, with a super majority vote (which would require 5 of 7 votes). Mr. Thomas suggested the Commission add numbers. Mr. Matthew suggested 200-feet be added. Mr. Ventres stated that some lots may be narrow, and would not allow anything if the Commission requires 200-feet on both sides. A lengthy discussion ensued. The consensus of the Commission was that the requirement might read 150-feet, which could be reduced by the Commission, but in no event would it be less than 50-feet.

For residential, the current regulation is 25 to 100 feet, and there was a suggestion that it could be reversed. For agricultural, the Commission discussed reversing the 50 and 150 feet requirements.

Mr. Ventres suggested when new roads are created, if the development style does not meet the pattern of housing on the street front, the first lot should not start within X number of feet. Mr. Thomas suggested 100-feet, but the Commission could reduce it. Mr. Matthew suggested if there was a one lot depth, it should provide buffer. The Commission discussed the subdivisions on Route 149 on the way to Colchester. Mr. Ventres will put something together, and submit it to Attorney Branse for review. Mr. Matthew suggested the Commission could also discuss this with the larger group at the next meeting. Mr. Gillis asked if Mr. Matthew was satisfied with the interior lots, with increased buffering. Mr. Matthew believed this would help.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the Commission wait for the revised buffering language at the next meeting before scheduling a public hearing.

#### **B) Outdoor wood burning furnaces (OWF's)**

None

#### **7. ZEO REPORT**

None

#### **8. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Mr. Thomas to adjourn at 9:10 p.m., seconded by Mr. Gillis, and carried by unanimous vote.**

Respectfully submitted,

Holly Pattavina