PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
September 14 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes

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

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

Commission Member Absent: 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 6:00 pm.

II. Roll Call

It was confirmed Mr. Weigert and Mr. Susaya were absent.

III. Approval of Minutes

a. August 10 2026 Regular Meeting

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (5-0) to APPROVE the August 10 2026 Regular Meeting minutes with an update to page 5 to update the typo of the word swerve.

IV. Receive New Application (s)

It was confirmed there were no new applications. It was shared 17-19 Northgate would be heard at the October meeting.

V. Public Hearings

a. 73 Old County Road, STE A1 – Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review for Liquor Permit

The applicant was not present. Mr. Doody asked the commission to review other applications to allow time for the applicant to arrive if they had mixed up the start time of the meeting.

b. Amendment to Zoning Regulations to add Section 409 J, Waivers

Ed Lally, licensed PE addressed the commission. The recording secretary read the legal advertisement and Mr. Rachele reads the rules for conducting a public hearing.

Mr. Lally presented the proposed text amendment to add Section 409 J to the Zoning Regulations. He submitted correspondence he sent and received from the Inland Wetlands, Police Department, and the Fire Marshal for the record.

He shared Inland Wetlands had reviewed the proposed text amendment and determined that it had no comments because the amendment did not necessarily impact inland wetlands or watercourses. The Fire Marshal responded that it had no objection to the proposed regulation change, and would review and comment on each individual waiver application. The Police Department also responded that it had no concerns.

Continuing on he explained that Section 409 establishes standards for multifamily use and driveways greater than 100 feet in length to be equipped with a cul de sac or other adequate and provides that such roads shall not exceed 1,200 feet in length. He shared Section 409 does not currently provide a specific procedure for requesting a waiver of the road length. He noted that the Commission had previously approved a development that included a private road constructed to Town standards except that the road exceeded 1,200 feet in length. He shared Inland Wetlands had recently approved development within the same zone involving a road exceeding 1,200 feet in length.

Mr. Lally referenced Section 417 sharing it provides a procedure for applicants to request specific waivers. He shared waiver requests must be submitted in writing, reviewed by the Fire Marshal and Town Engineer, and approved by a ¾ vote of the Commission. He shared the proposed Section 409 J incorporates a limited portion of the waiver procedure contained in Section 417 and applies it specifically to the road length requirement under Section 409. He shared the proposed language would allow an applicant to submit a written request for a waiver of the road length requirement under specified conditions, following recommendations from the Fire Marshal and Town Engineer. Mr. Lally emphasized that no other waivers would be authorized under the proposal and the Commission would retain the authority to approve or deny each request. He further explained that each waiver request would be considered separately.

The proposal addressed cul de sac length and turnaround design, allowing the street length to exceed 1,200 feet or the turnaround design to be modified upon consideration of recommendations from the Fire Marshal and Town Engineer, provided adequate access is available for emergency vehicles. The proposal also addresses streets exceeding 1,200 feet that have only 1 means of ingress or egress.

He explained that the current proposal had been significantly revised from an earlier version presented to the Commission. The applicant concluded by offering to answer questions.

Mr. LaFountain reviewed the application for the Commission. He shared the proposed amendment was similar to the previous version but had been significantly reduced. He explained that the previous application essentially copied the waiver provisions from the flexible residential development regulations, whereas the current proposal was limited to waivers concerning cul de sac length.

He noted he was more comfortable with the revised proposal because fewer waivers were being requested and noted that the provision allowing a waiver based on recommendations from the Town Engineer and Fire Marshal provided appropriate criteria for consideration. He shared from a zoning perspective, he believed the amendment could be approved if the Commission wished to do so.

Continuing on, Mr. LaFountain briefly discussed a concern raised during the prior presentation regarding whether waiver requests should be considered by PZC or be referred to ZBA as the appropriate mechanism for granting waivers. He noted the revised proposal was more focused on safety considerations and provided clearer criteria for the Commission's consideration.

To conclude he noted the Commission could determine that waiver requests should instead be referred to ZBA, but he shared he was comfortable with the revised proposal.

Mr. Lally responded to the concern regarding whether waiver requests should be handled by PZC or the ZBA. He shared based on his 51 years of experience presenting applications before commissions throughout New England, he shared many commissions prefer to retain control over the regulations they have adopted rather than have applicants seek changes through the ZBA. He reiterated the proposed amendment would require a ¾ vote of the Commission and favorable recommendations from the Fire Marshal and Town Engineer. He briefly discussed the review of a recent development, noting that detailed plans were provided to the Fire Marshal addressing emergency vehicle access, turning radii, cul de sac dimensions, and the use of Cape

Cod curbing. To conclude Mr. Lally shared proceeding through ZBA would be an option, but he believed the Commission may prefer to retain control over the waiver process. He shared he was willing to proceed through either process and that the decision was ultimately the Commission's.

Chairwoman Sayers noted that the Commission was currently reviewing and updating the Zoning Regulations to address inconsistencies and make updates where needed or required. She noted she did not want the matter referred to ZBA and invited the other Commissioners to provide their input.

Mr. Gannuscio agreed, no to ZBA route. Mr. Rachele noted the proposed text amendment was more narrowly drafted than the previous version, included limitations and review by the Fire Marshal and Town Engineer. He expressed a preference for having waiver requests remain under PZC.

The Commissioners agreed that the narrower criteria provided a more focused basis for considering the requested waiver.

Chairwoman Sayers asked for comments in favor and opposition from the public 3 times each. No public comments were made.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Gannuscio) and PASSED (5-0) to CLOSE the public hearing for Amendment to Zoning Regulations to add Section 409 J, Waivers.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Gannuscio) and PASSED (5-0) to APPROVE the Amendment to Zoning Regulations to add Section 409 J, Waivers, effective October 5 2026.

c. 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 Permit for Equipment and Vehicle Auction Business, Section 707 for Special Use Permit for Offsite Parking

Attorney Paul Smith addressed the commission as representative for the applicant, Sales Auction Company and S&S Sales Realty LLC to present an application concerning properties at 55 King Spring Road and 35 King Spring Road, along with an additional parcel across King Spring Road. He explained that the properties are located in the industrial zone and have historically been used for contractor, automotive, and related industrial purposes. He shared the applicant has operated an auction business at 55 King Spring Road since receiving approval in 2009 and is seeking approval to continue and expand the auction use across the properties.

He shared the applicant had acquired additional property since the original approval, allowing all auction parking and staging to be accommodated on site. He explained that the auction business has changed significantly with online bidding, approximately ½ of the bidding now occurring online and some auctions being conducted entirely online. He shared fewer customers are physically present at the property during auctions. He stated that the site is generally inactive between auctions and that equipment and vehicles are removed shortly after each auction.

Continuing on Attorney Smith reviewed revisions made to the site plan in response to Wetlands Commission comments concerning drainage and water quality. The revised plan includes designated areas for stormwater treatment and improvements to an existing drainage. He shared the applicant had no objection to incorporating the Wetlands Commission's conditions of approval into PZC's approval or referencing those conditions directly.

Also addressed was parking and accessibility. It was noted the designated auction parking areas are located on the property, with the parcel across the street available for overflow parking if

necessary. It was shared parking staff are present during on site auctions to manage parking. It was highlighted that ADA parking is available near the building.

The applicant requested removal of the limitation imposed with the original 2009 approval restricting the property to 4 auctions per year and prohibiting auctions during the Winter months. Attorney Smith explained that the original limitations were primarily related to concerns about parking and potential impacts on neighboring properties. He shared the applicant now has sufficient property to accommodate auction parking and has operated for approximately 17 years without parking or traffic issues, or neighbor complaints.

Sam Sales, owner of the property and auction business, confirmed the 4 auction limitation was imposed in 2009 when the business was new and the parking demand was uncertain. He shared that online bidding has significantly reduced the number of people attending auctions in person and that the business has not experienced parking or neighborhood issues. He also noted that some auctions are now conducted entirely online with no customers present on site.

It was highlighted that the King Spring Road area is predominantly industrial and that the auction business has operated successfully without traffic or neighbor concerns. The applicant requested flexibility to conduct additional auctions as needed.

Mr. Rachele briefly discussed his concern of a typo on the dimension for the parcel across the street, which the applicant agreed to correct. Additionally, the applicant confirmed that the parking and staging areas would remain gravel and would not be paved or surfaced with millings.

The Commission discussed the number of auctions permitted under the original approval. The applicant agreed to a maximum of 12 auctions per year, without a seasonal restriction. The applicant explained that the limitation would provide flexibility while remaining consistent with the scale of the business and that online auctions could be conducted during the winter months if necessary.

The Commission reviewed staff recommendations and the conditions from the Wetlands Commission. The applicant agreed to incorporate the Wetlands Commission conditions into the approval. The discussion also addressed maintaining clean equipment and materials on site, spill prevention, designated parking areas, ADA parking, on site personnel to direct parking during auctions, and compliance with applicable building, fire safety, signage, and other permitting requirements.

It was noted that the property has operated as an auction facility for approximately 17 years without reported traffic, parking, or neighborhood complaints. It also noted that the site is well maintained and appropriate for the surrounding industrial area.

Chairwoman Sayers asked the commission for questions. No additional comments were made.

Chairwoman Sayers asked for comments in favor and opposition from the public 3 times each. No public comments were made.

Mr. Doody shared he had attended several auctions and had observed the operation to be well managed.

It was MOVED (Gannuscio) and SECONDED (Rachele) and PASSED (5-0) to CLOSE 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 Permit for Equipment and Vehicle Auction Business, Section 707 for Special Use Permit for Offsite Parking.

Mr. Rachele reviewed the findings as outlines in Mr. LaFountain's memo and found all appropriate.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Gannuscio) and PASSED (5-0) to APPROVE 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 Permit for Equipment and Vehicle Auction Business, Section 707 for Special Use Permit for Offsite Parking with conditions.

The Conditions are outlined below:

1. The applicant shall provide adequate off-street parking with appropriate surface treatments for all auction customers. ADA parking spaces shall be provided after review by Town staff.
2. Parking areas shall be in areas noted on the provided plans, and shall be clearly marked on auction days. The applicant shall have personnel on-site controlling parking on all auction days.
3. Auction hours shall be limited from 8:00am to 8:00pm.
4. Portlets and trash receptacles shall be provided on auction days, and promptly removed following the completion of auctions. The site shall be returned to a clean state the day following the auction.
5. Only minor repair and refurbishing of equipment and vehicles shall be allowed on-site. All such repair and refurbishing shall occur inside buildings.
6. If signage is proposed, a separate sign permit will be required to be filed with the Zoning Enforcement Official.
7. All comments from the Town Engineer shall be addressed to his satisfaction.
8. All building code and fire safety requirements must be met.
9. Any additional required federal, state, or local permits must be obtained in advance of occupation.
10. Label the 3 stormwater basins (1-3) on the plans to match the Engineering Report.
11. The Engineer shall provide calculations confirming the stormwater basin volumes for my review and if necessary, increase the basins to provide the intended storage volume.
12. Provide a detail of the stormwater basins confirming that the downstream interior side of the Jersey barriers will be backfilled with earthen slopes and vegetation rather than riprap to discourage leaking between the structure joints. The upstream slopes, particularly where swales discharge into the basin, can be riprap.
13. The stormwater basins are designed with a concrete weir that is set above the existing grade (up to 24" at basin #1, 12" at basin #2, and 6"-12" at basin #3). The basins shall be pulled back as needed to provide a riprap apron around the weir to dissipate this flow into the receiving wetlands and protect against erosion. If the existing edge is already riprapped, this condition will be considered met.
14. The plans shall include a post-construction stormwater management plan including inspection schedules for the site and stormwater basin, spill cleanup procedure and repair measures, and mowing of the watercourse banks.
15. The engineer will continue to work with the applicant during the construction project and to maintain engineering oversight and shall provide a final report confirming proper installation.
16. Final plans shall confirm the intention to riprap the inlet slopes and vegetate all remaining slope of the stormwater basin (see item #4 above).
17. The plant locations shall be determined in the field by George Logan of REMA Ecological Services.
18. The applicant shall continue mowing the channel slopes to maximize stormwater conveyance capacity.

19. As an impact mitigation, the applicant shall remove the downstream 30" RCP and restore the channel to open flow. Final restoration of the channel is subject to staff approval during construction.
20. Limited to 12 auctions per year
21. E & S Bond

Attorney Smith and the applicant thanked the commission.

Chairwoman Sayers invited the applicant from 63 South Main Street to present.

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Mr. Gannuscio) and PASSED (5-0) to MOVE item # VI a to before item # V e on the agenda.

d. 17-19 Northgate – Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review, Construct 6 Unit Steel Building, Parking Lot + Utilities. 3 Units for Storage and 3 Units for Auto Repair

This application will be heard at the October meeting.

VI. New Business

a. 63 South Main Street -- Site Plan Modification

Jessica presented the application for 63 South Main Street and clarified that no work was proposed at 65 South Main Street. She explained that the business is a USDA regulated food manufacturer producing raw and smoked pork products and operates Monday through Friday from 6:30 am to 3:00 pm. She described the existing outdoor smoking operation, consisting of 5 custom welded smokers located on a concrete slab beneath a steel awning at the rear of the building. She reviewed the construction of the awning and the operation of the smokers, including the collection of grease in pans beneath the products.

Continuing on Jessica explained the grease collection process and cleaning procedures. She shared grease is transferred to a barrel, while the smokers are wiped down before being cleaned with degreaser and hot water. She shared a wet vacuum is used to collect the cleaning water so that it does not enter the sewer drains. The collected water is discharged through a 3 compartment sink equipped with a grease trap. The grease trap is professionally cleaned approximately every 3 months, with separate containers maintained for grease trap waste and smoker grease.

Jessica highlighted that the business maintains USDA food protection procedures, daily equipment inspections, and documented cleaning procedures. She explained that any issue affecting food safety requires production to stop until the issue is corrected. She also noted that the smokers face the garage doors so that smoke and other materials are directed into the building rather than toward the rear of the property.

To conclude, Jessica shared that required records are maintained for 5 years and employees receive food safety, HACCP, and ServSafe training. She concluded the presentation and invited questions from the Commission.

Chairwoman Sayers asked the commission for questions. In response to questions, Jessica explained that HACCP refers to Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points and includes monitoring factors such as product temperature and the length of time food remains outside refrigeration. She stated that the business typically has 3 to 5 employees working at a time.

Parking was briefly discussed and it was shared parking is available in the front of the building for employees, with additional shared parking in the rear for 63 and 65 South Main Street.

Mr. Christianson began a brief discussion around the concrete slab and drainage at the rear of the building. Jessica confirmed there is no drain in the slab and that the surface is graded

toward the building. She shared during cleaning, employees hose the area while another employee uses a wet vacuum to collect the water. She acknowledged that portions of the concrete have some uneven areas where water can collect but stated that the area is routinely cleaned and maintained. Silt sacks were suggested as a water containment mechanism.

Mr. LaFountain shared Staff met with Jessica to review concerns regarding the proposed operation, primarily related to drainage. He noted the existing storm drain at the front of the property and stated that Staff wanted to ensure runoff was directed appropriately to the storm drain. Based on the system presented by the applicant, Staff was satisfied that the drainage concerns had been addressed. Continuing on he shared the Fire Marshal had reviewed the proposal and had no concerns. He also noted that the Wetlands Agent had no concerns. It was clarified that the local health district does not regulate the outdoor operation because the business is a wholesale food manufacturer regulated by the USDA, with no retail sales.

To conclude, Mr. LaFountain shared the recommended conditions requiring appropriate containment and protective measures whenever grease is transferred from the smokers to disposal containers to prevent discharge to the stormwater system.

It was MOVED (Christianson) and SECONDED (Rachele) and PASSED (5-0) to APPROVE 63 South Main Street -- Site Plan Modification with conditions.

The Conditions are outlined below:

1. Any time grease is transferred from the smokers to the disposal container, adequate protection methods must be employed to ensure that no grease is allowed into the stormwater system.
2. The business shall not be open to the public, and all sales of products must be wholesale.
3. Permits and inspections for interior coolers must occur on the premises.
4. All building code and fire safety requirements must be met.
5. Any additional required federal, state, or local permits must be obtained in advance of occupation.
6. Use of silt sacks for water containment during the washing process.

V. Public Hearings

e. Zoning Regulation Text Amendments -- Floodplain Regulations-Subdivision Regulations, Floodplain Regulations-Zoning Regulations, Public Act 25-1 (HB 8002), Minimum Dwelling Square Footage Requirements (PA 21-29), Accessory Building Clarifications-Sections 213 and 405, Lot Coverage Definitions, Front Yards on Corner Lots, Accessory Dwelling Units, Fees, and Zoning Map-Main Street Overlay Zone Expansion-Chestnut Street

Mr. LaFountain acknowledged that some of the public were in attendance for the discussion on accessory dwelling units. The owner of 98 Paul Dr addressed the commission noting they have owned the home for 47 years. They spoke in favor of the proposed accessory dwelling unit regulations, explaining that he had approximately 75 feet of land and would like to construct an ADU to allow his son and his family to live nearby while maintaining the existing family home. He stated that the arrangement would allow his family to remain together and support continued use of the property by future generations. Another family member in the audience expressed agreement with the comments. It was confirmed that the comments were being received as public comment.

Mr. LaFountain reviewed the proposed addition of Section 226 concerning accessory dwelling units. He explained that the regulations would permit ADUs under specified conditions, noting they can provide an accessible and more affordable housing option for extended family members and others. The proposed regulations would require a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet and a minimum 20 foot setback from property lines for a detached ADU. Only 1

ADU would be permitted per single family dwelling, and the property owner would be required to occupy either the principal dwelling or the ADU. The ADU would also be limited to 1,000 square feet or 30% of the floor area of the principal dwelling, whichever is less, unless approved through a special permit.

The Commission discussed how the owner occupancy requirement. It was noted that existing accessory dwelling units that do not conform to the proposed regulations would be considered pre existing nonconforming uses and would not be affected by the new regulations. It was confirmed if an existing nonconforming unit was discontinued or abandoned, a future request to establish an ADU would be subject to the new regulations.

There was a brief discussion around the absence of a family relationship requirement for occupants. Mr. LaFountain explained that the draft would allow a nonfamily member to occupy the ADU as long as the property owner continued to reside in either dwelling. There was a brief discussion around concerns of properties being converted into rental units. The potential housing benefits of allowing ADUs without restricting occupancy to family members was also discussed. Mr. LaFountain explained the intent was to maintain the accessory nature of the unit and prevent ADUs from effectively becoming duplexes or creating structures too close to neighboring properties.

There was a brief discussion regarding the construction requirements. Mr. Doody explained that the structure would be required to comply with the applicable state building code. Also discussed was the importance of building code compliance and concerns regarding sheds, trailers, or other structures being converted into dwelling units without the required permits.

Chairwoman Sayers asked for a sense from the commissioners. It was concluded more time to consume and take a closer look at the draft would be needed.

Next, Mr. LaFountain reviewed the proposed floodplain regulation amendments, explaining that FEMA DEEP had reviewed the Town's regulations and identified several required updates. He shared the amendments applied to both the subdivision and zoning regulations and were necessary for continued compliance with floodplain requirements and to avoid significant increases in flood insurance rates.

For the subdivision regulations, Justin reviewed Section 8.2.14D. Based on FEMA's review, the language would be amended by removing the acreage and Flood Zone A limitation so that the requirement applies to all subdivision proposals and other proposed developments.

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

It was MOVED (Rachele) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (5-0) to APPROVE the proposed amendment to Section 8.2.14.D effective October 5 2026.

Continuing on Mr. LaFountain reviewed the 2nd set of required floodplain amendments to the zoning regulations. He explained that the changes were identified through FEMA and DEEP's review and included revisions to the definition of "substantial improvement," updates to Appendix A regarding flood insurance rate map numbers and effective dates, and revisions to requirements for electrical, heating, plumbing, ventilation, HVAC equipment and other building components in special flood hazard areas.

It was MOVED (Christianson) and SECONDED (Rachele) and PASSED (5-0) to APPROVE the proposed amendments for Appendix A, Section 223.C Definition, Appendix A, Section 223.D.2, Appendix A, Section 223.F.1.d, Appendix A, Section 223.F.1.i effective October 5 2026.

Moving on to item #3 in Mr. LaFountain's memo dated August 4 2026, he reviewed additional zoning regulation amendments required by Public Act 25 1, including provisions concerning transit community middle housing. He explained that the legislation requires commercial and mixed use zones to allow residential developments containing between 2 and 9 dwelling units

through site plan review rather than special permit approval. The requirement does not apply to residential or industrial zones. The proposed amendment would add the use to the applicable Business and Main Street Overlay zones.

Mr. LaFountain also discussed the State's Housing Growth Management Plan requirements and explained CRCOG will be developing housing targets for municipalities. There was a brief discussion around the Town's limited developable land and existing affordable housing.

It was confirmed by Mr. LaFountain the Commission could review the matter once the regional housing targets are provided.

Chairwoman Sayers shared Patsy would share the recent CRCOG presentation regarding middle housing with the commissioners.

The Commission then discussed a change eliminating minimum parking requirements for residential developments containing 16 units or fewer. Mr. LaFountain explained that although the Commission would not be required to amend the regulations immediately, any application subject to the statute would have to comply with the new requirement. The discussion also referenced existing statutory limits on the number of parking spaces that may be required for certain residential units.

The Commission agreed to continue reviewing these statutory changes at a future meeting.

Mr. LaFountain next introduced item #4 from his memo, another statutory amendment from Public Act 21 29. Zoning regulations may not require a minimum residential unit size greater than the minimum size required by the State Building Code. The Commission agreed to continue reviewing these statutory changes at a future meeting.

Item # 5 began the staff recommended updates.

Mr. LaFountain reviewed the proposed revisions to the accessory building regulations, explaining that the current requirements are divided between Sections 213 and 405 and can be difficult to interpret. The proposal would remove the accessory building provisions from Section 213 and consolidate them under Section 405. He noted that the existing standards for setbacks, height, and required variances would remain unchanged.

He also reviewed a minor wording change concerning the use of no more than 20% of the rear yard, explaining that removing the word "required" would clarify that the calculation is based on the existing rear yard.

Next, Mr. LaFountain spoke on the proposed definitions for lot coverage and impervious coverage, explaining that the amendments would formalize the Commission's existing interpretation. Lot coverage would include structures with roofs and in ground or above ground pools, while uncovered patios would not count. He noted that the changes were intended to clarify existing practice rather than change the current standards.

Continuing on Mr. LaFountain reviewed proposed regulations for front yards on corner lots, item # 5c of his memo. The amendment would establish a primary front yard along the street associated with the property address and a secondary front yard along the adjoining street, with the secondary front yard setback reduced by 50%.

There was a brief discussion around properties where the driveway or entrance does not correspond with the assigned address, highlighting parks in Town, such as Reed Park.

Next item # 5e of Mr. LaFountain's memo was discussed, fees. He reviewed proposed increases to Planning and Zoning fees, explaining that the primary purpose was to better offset the costs of required legal notices and application processing. Proposed changes included revised site

plan, special permit, zoning amendment, zoning permit, certificate of occupancy, and printed zoning regulation fees, with larger applications subject to additional fees based on size.

There was a brief discussion concerning the costs of legal advertising, staff review, and providing printed copies of the zoning regulations. The Commission also discussed establishing a fee for special meetings to account for the additional administrative and advertising costs. Commissioners supported updating the fees. It was shared by Mr. LaFountain and Mr. Doody a new online application portal process will be forthcoming. Mr. LaFountain confirmed for the commission with the updates to fees they would be in line with other Towns/Commissions.

It was MOVED (Sayers) and SECONDED (Gannuscio) and PASSED (5-0) to APPROVE the proposed fees as outlined on Town Planner's memo dated August 4 2026 and a $750 fee for special meeting, effective October 5 2026.

It was confirmed for the Commission Mr. LaFountain and Mr. Doody handle making the approved updates.

Finally, Mr. LaFountain reviewed item # 5f of his memo, Zoning Map-Main Street Overlay Zone Expansion-Chestnut Street.

He reviewed a proposed zoning map amendment to place 39, 41, 43, and 45 Chestnut Street within the Main Street Overlay Zone. He explained that the Town owns the 4 properties and intends to sell them together with adjacent properties on Main Street to facilitate residential development. The properties were acquired with State funding that requires residential use, and placing them within the MSOZ would also make them eligible for applicable development funding.

Mr. Christianson began a brief discussion around prior proposals for using the properties for parking. Also discussed was the potential for combining the properties to support a larger residential development.

It was MOVED (Gannuscio) and SECONDED (Rachele) and PASSED (4-1) to APPROVE moving parcels 39- 45 Chestnut Street into the MSOZ zone.

VI. New Business

b. 63 South Main Street -- Site Plan Modification

This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

c. Discussion -- Revisions to Fee Schedule

This item was discussed earlier under agenda item # V e.

VII. Old Business

a. HB 8002 – Discussion

None.

VIII. Public Input

No public was present.

IX. Communications and Bills

a. Email testimony 7/29/26

Mr. LaFountain read correspondence concerning a proposed demolition at 177 Old County Road. The correspondence raised concerns regarding the potential historical significance of an existing single family dwelling and the proposed development of the property. It was noted that the Commission does not have authority over demolition matters.

X. Adjournment

It was MOVED (Gannuscio) and SECONDED (Christianson) and PASSED (5-0) to adjourn meeting at 9:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Malec, Recording Secretary
Windsor Locks Planning & Zoning Commission