PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
July 13 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes

These minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting.

Commission Members Present: Peggy Sayers, Tamie Quagliaroli, Ricardo Rachele, Michael Christianson

Commission Member Absent: Alan Gannuscio, David Weigert (Alternate), Roger Susaya (Alternate)

Town Staff In Attendance: Justin LaFountain (Town Planner), Mark Doody (Building Official, Housing Code Enforcement Officer, and ADA Compliance Officer)

I. Call to Order

Chairwoman Sayers called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm.

II. Roll Call

It was confirmed Mr. Gannuscio, Mr. Weigert and Mr. Susaya were absent as well as Mr. Steele.

III. Approval of Minutes

a. June 8 2026 Regular Meeting

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (4-0) to APPROVE the June 8 2026 Regular Meeting minutes.

IV. Receive New Application (s)

Chairwoman Sayers shared there was an application for 6 National Drive, Firestone for site plan review only.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (4-0) to ADD 6 National Drive, Firestone for site plan review only to the August 10 2026 meeting agenda.

Chairwoman Sayers noted the application for 229 Ella Grasso Turnpike – Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review – Chick-fil-A Food Truck was withdrawn.

Chairwoman Sayers shared the public hearing for the 55 King Spring Road, 35 King Spring Road and Lot 009-002-299-0B King Spring Road application would be moved to the August meeting.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (4-0) to MOVE the public hearing for 55 King Spring Road, 35 King Spring Road and Lot 009-002-299-0B King Spring Road -- Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review, Section 402 Special Use for Equipment and Vehicle Auction Business, Special Use for Section 707 Offsite Parking to the August 10 2026 meeting.

Mr. LaFountain shared there were 2 additional applications to receive for 3 Northgate Drive and 17-19 Northgate Drive.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Quagliaroli) and PASSED (4-0) to SCHEDULE the public hearing for 3 Northgate Drive -- Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review for change of use for Bay 4 to be manufacturing, no employees for the August 10 2026 meeting.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Quagliaroli) and PASSED (4-0) to SCHEDULE the public hearing for 17-19 Northgate Drive -- Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review for construction of 6 unit steel building, parking lot, and utilities for the August 10 2026 meeting.

V. Public Hearings

a. 41 Oak Street -- Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review to convert the former Senior Center into a Childcare Center

Chairwoman Sayers shared the legal notice was previously read. Mr. Rachele read the rules for conducting a public hearing.

Chairwoman Sayers noted the applicant had presented their information already and she read Polic Chief's comments to Mr. LaFountain into the record. She highlighted their comment would allow the applicant to proceed with using a crossing guard.

Mr. LaFountain briefly reviewed his report. He noted that the former Senior Center was well suited for reuse, expressing support for bringing the building back into active use. He acknowledged that parking on the site was limited but observed that additional parking was available across the street and noted the existing crosswalk. He briefly reviewed the recommended condition outlined in his report, including restriping the front parking area to provide standard sized parking spaces instead of the existing oversized spaces. Mr. LaFountain also noted that access along the side of the property should be addressed, adding that the applicant was already working with the neighboring property owner and that no concerns were anticipated.

Chairwoman Sayers noted the Housing Authority owns the driveway and noted Darlene West, Director of Housing was in attendance. Chairwoman Sayers shared Ms. West confirmed they own the driveway although it was long thought 43/45 Oak Street did. She shared this is an item in need of total clarification. She also expressed the need to ensure an easement was in place. Mr. LaFountain noted the best way would be a condition of approval for staff review. Ms. West confirmed their attorney would set the language.

There was a brief discussion around a gate and access to Grove Street, Mr. Doody suggested Angelo D'aleo may be able to confirm if the gate exists and provide information.

Ms. Fleeting confirmed they do need to complete monthly Fire drills for Chairwoman Sayers. She confirmed if her application was approved they would proceed with utilizing a crossing guard during drop off and pick up.

Chairwoman Sayers asked the commission for questions. None were made.

Chairwoman Sayers asked for comments in favor from the public twice.

Angelo D'aleo of 24 Grove Street addressed the commission to share he is in support of the proposed daycare, stating that additional childcare facilities were needed in the community. He expressed concerns regarding the existing rear access area behind the building, explaining that it had a long history of safety issues. He described the area as narrow, poorly maintained, lacking lighting, and containing broken curbs and deteriorated pavement. He shared previous access had been closed after several seniors fell on the steep walkway and stated that repeated requests to the Town to improve the area had never been addressed.

Continuing on he raised concerns about emergency access and evacuation, explaining that the adjacent 6 family residence resulted in a full parking area, leaving little room for children or daycare staff to safely gather during an emergency. He stated that simply installing a gate would not adequately address the safety concerns. He also questioned responsibility for future maintenance, including snow removal, and emphasized that ownership and maintenance responsibilities between the Housing Authority and the Town should be clarified.

Chairwoman Sayers acknowledged that the Town did not own the property and that any access agreement would need to be resolved between the Housing Authority and the neighboring

property owner. Mr. LaFountain suggested that any agreement be reviewed by Town staff and the Fire Marshal to ensure that safe emergency access was provided before the access was utilized.

Chairwoman Sayers asked for comments in favor from the public once more. No additional comments were made.

Chairwoman Sayers asked for comments in opposition 3 times. No public comments were made.

Chairwoman Sayers asked the commission for questions or concerns.

Mr. Rachele briefly discussed the special permit application and noted that site related concerns raised during the public hearing could be addressed through conditions of approval.

Mr. LaFountain explained renovations would require building permits and the applicant would also need to obtain a certificate of occupancy before the daycare could begin operating, providing an opportunity to verify that all required improvements and safety issues had been addressed.

Chairwoman Sayers shared the Public Works Director indicated the elevator had been repaired, certified, and was fully operational. She noted other building maintenance items, including roof and exterior conditions, were noted to be addressed by the Housing Authority as the property owner through normal maintenance.

Mr. Christianson had a number of questions regarding the backup diesel generator located on the property. Mr. Doody explained that the generator was originally installed to provide emergency power and is only exercised periodically unless there is a power outage. He suggested that the weekly testing schedule could be adjusted to occur outside of daycare operating hours to minimize disruption. He noted during an actual power outage, children would remain inside the building while the generator supplied emergency power.

Mr. Rachele began a brief discussion around the property line configuration. Mr. LaFountain shared any future transfer of ownership should require a lot line revision so the building would be located entirely on a single parcel. They agreed a condition could be included as part of the approval if the property were ever sold or transferred.

Chairwoman Sayers acknowledged there were no more questions from the commission.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (4-0) to CLOSE the public hearing for 41 Oak Street -- Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review to convert the former Senior Center into a Childcare Center.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) to APPROVE and FAILED (2-2) 41 Oak Street -- Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review to convert the former Senior Center into a Childcare Center with conditions.

The conditions are outlined below:

1. Clarification for the easement on the West side of the building
2. Clarification for the easement on the North and rear of the building
3. Site plan improvements
4. Property line on the Southeast corner, 2 parking spaces
5. Any future sale will include a lot line adjustment

Before his second, Mr. Christianson reiterated his concerns around the generator. It was concluded it would not be a condition. He also noted the need to include a condition regarding the crossing guard.

Mr. Rachele amended the motion to include the crossing guard be mandatory for any operations during operating hours of the facility. Ms. Quagliaroli seconded the amendment.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Quagliaroli) to APPROVE and FAILED (2-2) 41 Oak Street -- Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review to convert the former Senior Center into a Childcare Center with conditions.

The conditions are outlined below:

1. Clarification for the easement on the West side of the building
2. Clarification for the easement on the North and rear of the building
3. Site plan improvements
4. Property line on the Southeast corner, 2 parking spaces
5. Any future sale will include a lot line adjustment
6. Crossing guard be mandatory for any operations during operating hours of the facility

Mr. Rachele voted nay. He shared his reasons as it being too intense with the number of children, 70, attending the site. He noted his fear around the 1^{t} sign of inclement weather that people are not going to use the parking lot but rather the driveway causing traffic and parking issues. He noted the natural tendency of people is to avoid any inconvenience and referenced rain and snow weather events.

Mr. Christianson voted nay. He echoed the safety issues outlined by Mr. Rachele.

Chairwoman Sayers noted the vote was 2/2. It was confirmed the application was not approved.

Mr. Rachele noted the application was denied without prejudice so the applicant could come back with adjustments in a 6 month period.

Ms. Fleeting thanked the commission.

b. **55 King Spring Road, 35 King Spring Road and Lot 009-002-299-0B King Spring Road -- Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review, Section 402 Special Use for Equipment and Vehicle Auction Business, Special Use for Section 707 Offsite Parking**

This application was previously moved to the August 10 2026 meeting.

c. Amendment to the zoning regulations to add waiver language, section 409J

Ed Lally, licensed PE and land surveyor addressed the commission addressed the commission on his application.

The recording secretary ready the legal advertisement.

Mr. Lally presented a proposed text amendment to add Section 409J to the zoning regulations. He explained that the existing regulations limit private roads serving multifamily developments to 1,200 feet in length but do not include a provision allowing the Commission to grant waivers. He noted the Commission had previously approved developments in the MFSD zone with private roads exceeding the 1,200 foot limit, highlighting an approval in 2004 for a road approximately 1,500 feet long. He shared the road was never constructed. He continued on to explain a similar proposal was presented in 2014. He noted at that time the Town Planner had indicated that a waiver would likely be supported. He shared the application was ultimately withdrawn because of wetlands concerns. He noted the Inland Wetlands Commission had

recently approved another development in MFSD zone featuring a private road of approximately 1,500 feet, with an application expected to come before the Commission.

Mr. Lally stated that rather than relying on exceptions to the regulations, it would be preferable to clearly establish a waiver process within the zoning regulations. He explained that the proposed amendment would mirror the existing waiver provisions contained in Section 417 by adding the same language as new Section 409J. He shared the amendment would allow applicants to submit written requests for specific waivers, establish criteria for the Commission's consideration, and require a ¾ vote of the Commission for approval. He concluded that the proposal would provide a consistent and defined process for considering waiver requests.

Mr. LaFountain apologized for not preparing a written report due to a recent death in the family. He explained that the proposed amendment would add the same waiver provisions already found in the Flexible Residential Development regulations to the multifamily development regulations, giving the Commission the same authority to consider waiver requests in both sections. He then asked whether the amendment was intended only to address road length.

Mr. Lally shared the issue is that fair is fair. He continued on and explained that the proposed amendment was not intended solely to address road length but to ensure consistency between the Town's multifamily and flexible residential development regulations. He stated that both zoning districts permit similar types of development, yet only the Flexible Residential Development regulations include a formal waiver process. He noted the proposed amendment would allow the Commission to consider waivers under limited circumstances where unique site conditions exist, strict compliance would create an undue hardship, or the regulation would not provide a public benefit. He emphasized that any waiver would remain at the Commission's discretion and would require approval by a ¾ vote.

Continuing on, Mr. Lally noted the Commission had previously granted road length waivers for multifamily developments. He explained that adding the waiver language would provide a clear legal basis for future decisions and reduce the risk of a successful appeal. He stated that the amendment would benefit the Commission by clearly defining its authority. Mr. Lally shared waivers would only apply to properties with unique conditions and would not be granted routinely. He added that applicants could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals, but believed it was more appropriate for the Planning and Zoning Commission to retain authority over waivers within its own regulations.

Chairwoman Sayers asked the commission for questions.

Mr. Rachele began a brief discussion by asking Mr. LaFountain for feedback. Mr. LaFountain expressed concern that waivers are similar to variances, which are under the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

There was a brief discussion around what properties an amendment could impact in Town.

It was suggested the Commission could instead amend only the section addressing the 1,200 foot maximum road length to allow exceptions when supported by the Town Engineer and Fire Marshal.

Mr. Lally noted his intent was to keep decision making authority with the Planning and Zoning Commission. He reiterated his goal was to establish a clear amendment and to reduce the potential for legal challenges.

Chairwoman Sayers asked for comments in favor 3 times, none were made. She then asked for comments in opposition.

Joe Calsetta, 121 Orchard Hill Drive addressed the commission. He expressed support for new development in Town, but he opposed the proposed text amendment. He shared he did not know when the Commission would stop changing the regulations. He noted that many applicants in the past had been required to install sidewalks and comply with all of the requirements in the regulations, even when they did not want to, and stated that he did not believe the Commission should begin changing those requirements now.

Angelo D'aleo of 4 D'aleo Drive, a local builder addressed the commission in opposition. He stated that when he sought approval for a 3 lot family subdivision in 2014, the Commission required him to install sidewalks at a cost of approximately $67,000, despite the development consisting of only three private homes. He recalled that the Commission had justified the requirement by stating that sidewalks were important for public safety and the Town's future development. He expressed concern that the Commission had not been consistent in granting waivers over the years, stating that similar requests had received different outcomes depending on the applicant. He urged the Commission to apply the regulations uniformly, stating that if sidewalks and other requirements are required, they should be required for everyone. He concluded that consistency was needed.

Chairwoman Sayers asked for comments in opposition. No additional comments were made.

Mr. Rachele and Chairwoman Sayers began a brief discussion with Mr. Lally. He noted that much of the discussion had focused on sidewalks, but noted the waiver the Commission had historically granted involved the road length limitation. He stated that if road length was the Commission's only concern, he would be willing to eliminate the other proposed waiver provisions and limit the amendment.

Mr. Lally confirmed he had delivered letter requests for comments to the appropriate departments, but no responses had been received for the text amendment. He confirmed wetlands did approve the site application in June for Lucas Pond, 77 Old County Road, by Fox Hollow.

He explained that the proposed development had previously appeared before the Commission in 2004 and again in 2014. He noted an earlier application had been withdrawn after environmental concerns led to a costly bridge requirement. He explained that the current proposal provides 44% of the property as protected open space under a conservation easement.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (4-0) to CLOSE the public hearing for Amendment to the zoning regulations to add waiver language, section 409J.

Chairwoman Sayers shared the Commission was in the process of reviewing and updating its zoning regulations and preferred to consider any changes to the waiver provisions as part of that effort rather than through the proposed amendment.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and FAILED (0-4) to APPROVE the public hearing for Amendment to the zoning regulations to add waiver language, section 409J.

Chairwoman Sayers shared she did not vote in favor. Mr. Rachele noted the denial was without prejudice.

Mr. Lally thanked the commission.

VI. New Business

a. 6 National Drive – Site Plan Review Only for Firestone

This application was previously moved to the August 10 2026 meeting.

b. 229 Ella Grasso Turnpike – Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review – Chick-fil-A Food Truck -- Withdrawn

This application was previously withdrawn.

c. Sewer Capacity Grant Discussion

Mr. LaFountain provided an update regarding a potential Housing Growth Zone designation and related grant opportunities. He explained that the Town is pursuing eligibility for funding programs that could support infrastructure improvements and redevelopment efforts, particularly in areas near the train station and downtown. He noted that the Housing Growth Zone designation would require certain areas to be identified and approved by the State, then allowing the Town to pursue funding opportunities for projects such as sewer improvements, roadway upgrades, and other infrastructure needs.

It was explained the Town was considering adding several properties, including properties at 41 through 45 Chestnut Street, to the Housing Growth Zone area. The goal was to encourage redevelopment of underutilized properties, return them to the tax rolls, and potentially combine them with other nearby properties. It was noted that the Chestnut Street properties would likely be developed as residential.

There was a brief discussion regarding infrastructure limitations, particularly the capacity of the sewer system and stormwater issues. It was noted that additional development would require improvements to the existing sewer and stormwater infrastructure. It was highlighted that grant funding could help address these issues.

It was noted much of the information discussed covered agenda items VI c and VI d.

It was clarified the Housing Growth Zone designation does not impose additional development requirements but allows municipalities to access certain grants and low interest financing opportunities.

Mr. LaFountain shared he would return to the Commission with more detailed information regarding the proposed Housing Growth Zone boundaries, potential properties involved, and the next steps.

d. Housing Growth Zone Discussion

VII. Old Business

a. HB 8002 – Discussion

Chairwoman Sayers and Mr. LaFountain confirmed there was no new information for HB 8002.

Mr. LaFountain noted he would bring text amendments to the commission in the next couple weeks.

He shared he and Mr. Doody have been reviewing the regulations and identified sections that are unclear, inconsistent, outdated, or difficult to administer for example.

Mr. LaFountain also noted that FEMA has required updates to the Town's floodplain regulations in order to maintain insurance, with changes required by November.

He shared regulation updates would be brought in August, to be scheduled for September for public hearings.

Moving on, Mr. LaFountain discussed accessory dwelling units, explaining a request had been received from a property owner.

The Commission discussed whether it would be open to allowing accessory dwelling units under certain conditions. Members expressed interest in exploring the concept, particularly for larger properties or situations where the unit could provide housing options for seniors, family members, or children returning from college. Concerns were raised regarding the ADUs to gradually convert single family properties into multifamily uses, especially if ownership changes or if additional units are added over time.

There was a brief discussion of regulations used by other towns for ADUs, including requiring the property owner to occupy one of the units, limiting to family members use, or requiring agreements to ensure the intended use.

Mr. Doody explained the challenge is enforcement, as unauthorized kitchens or additional dwelling units are often discovered only when properties are sold or inspected. He noted examples of properties that had developed additional kitchens without permits.

The commission expressed support for exploring accessory dwelling unit regulations.

Mr. LaFountain shared a balanced approach could be prepared for Commission review.

VIII. Public Input

Mr. Rachele shared information regarding an upcoming UCONN clear webinar.

No additional members of the public approached the commission with input.

IX. Communications and Bills

Chairwoman Sayers shared there were no communications or bills to discuss.

Mr. Christianson began a brief discussion around the submission of application materials noting often the agenda and packet are finalized and distributed only for more information to be submitted to the commissioners. It was concluded that materials submitted after the agenda deadline would be placed on the following month's agenda rather than being added late, allowing sufficient time for review. A more organized submission process, such as a shared document system, to avoid receiving multiple separate emails and attachments that are difficult to track was briefly discussed.

Mr. Doody noted application fees may not fully cover the Town's costs, highlighting the legal advertising expenses. He explained that advertisements for hearings often exceed the fees collected from applicants, resulting in taxpayers covering the difference.

The Commission discussed reviewing and updating application fees, including possibly adjusting fees based on the type or size of application.

Mr. Christianson suggested setting a deadline before each meeting so staff and Commissioners have adequate time to review applications. Mr. Doody confirmed he would discuss with Staff not present at the meeting and would add calendar reminders for them beginning in January.

X. Adjournment

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (4-0) to adjourn meeting at 8:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Malec, Recording Secretary
Windsor Locks Planning & Zoning Commission