

**BOLTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**7:30 PM, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2024**  
**BOLTON TOWN HALL, 222 BOLTON CENTER ROAD**  
**In-Person and Via Zoom**  
**MINUTES**

**PZC Members Present In-Person:** Chairman Tom Manning, Arlene Fiano, Marilee Manning, Thomas Robbins, Alternates Tom Crockett and Diane DeNunzio

**PZC Members Present Via Zoom:** Vice-Chair James Cropley, Alternate Tom Crockett

**PZC Members Absent:** Jeremy Flick, Steven Clark

**Staff Present Via Zoom:** Patrice Carson, AICP, Consulting Director of Community Development, Michael D’Amato, Zoning Enforcement Officer, Recording Secretary Kacie Cannon

**Others Present In-Person:** Andrew Ladyga

**Others Present Via Zoom:** Tyler Clark

**1. Call to Order:** T. Manning called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. D. Denunzio was seated for S. Clark. T. Crockett was seated for J. Flick.

T. Manning MOVED to ADD *DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE DECISION*: Schedule of 2025 Regular Meeting Dates under **New Business**. D. Denunzio SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0.

**2. Approval of Minutes: September 11, 2024**

The following amendments (in bold) were made to the meeting minutes of September 11, 2024:

At the end of Call to Order: **D. Denunzio was seated for J. Cropley, T. Crockett was seated for J. Flick, and K. Gordon was seated for S. Clark.**

T. Crockett MOVED to APPROVE the regular meeting minutes of September 11, 2024 as amended. D. DeNunzio SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 6:0:1 (Cropley).

**3. Residents’ Forum:** No member of the public wished to speak.

**4. Staff Reports:**

P. Carson reported that approximately 80 percent of businesses have been added to the Connecticut’s Countryside website and many of the businesses have added upcoming events. She stated that she is considering holding an appreciation event for the businesses to thank them for their participation and contributions to the website. P. Carson added that she has also been meeting with property owners and interested parties on properties for sale and working on modifications to the Regulations.

M. D’Amato reported that he has been working on a couple of ongoing zoning violations as well as handling general inquiries and meetings. He stated that some items went through ZBA that staff is currently finishing. M. D’Amato stated that he is also looking into restarting an ongoing zoning matter that the Town has been dealing with for several years and will let the Commission know if it comes to fruition.

**5. Old Business**

**a. Other:** There was no other old business.

**6. New Business**

**a. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE DECISION: Schedule of 2025 Regular Meeting Dates**

T. Manning stated that Rod Parlee, Chairman of the Bolton Conservation Commission, has requested a list of the 2025 Regular Meeting Dates to include in their annual calendar, which is published in November. P. Carson provided the following proposed meeting dates for approval and noted that they do not appear to fall on any holidays:

- January 8, 2025
- February 12, 2025
- March 12, 2025
- April 9, 2025
- May 14, 2025
- June 11, 2025
- July 9, 2025
- August 13, 2025
- September 10, 2025
- October 8, 2025
- November 12, 2025
- December 10, 2025

T. Manning MOVED to APPROVE the 2025 Regular Meeting Dates as presented. J. Cropley SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0.

**b. Other:** There was no other new business.

#### **7. Ongoing Discussion: Bolton Subdivision and Zoning Regulations**

P. Carson provided a draft outlining corrections that had been discussed at the previous meeting. She noted that no changes were made to the 5% increase in building and parking areas or in the landscape requirements outlined in Items B(1-3) of the Minor modifications. P. Carson asked if the 5% increase should be kept in, modified, or removed. M. D'Amato stated that the issue with the small percentage is that it impacts sites differently depending on use and building size. He explained that the biggest building is 44,000 square feet and there are three others between 15,000 and 22,000 square feet that could be negatively impacted by the small percentage. M. D'Amato stated previous towns he has worked with provide a 10-15% increase that addresses parking issues such as changes to configurations of drive aisles, location adjustments, or turning movements for truck loading and emergency services.

J. Cropley suggested increasing the percentage. T. Crockett proposed changing the percentage to 10% with a cap of 1,500 sq. ft. He added that some of the larger businesses do not have room to add more buildings. M. D'Amato clarified that the regulation pertains to existing buildings only, and P. Carson stated that adding a building would require Commission approval. T. Manning shared his concern that Item B(1) reads as an addition to either a current building or a new building. M. D'Amato suggested modifying the language to read "Any increase of principal area". J. Cropley proposed increasing the percentage to 15%. T. Manning agreed and recommended changing the language to "15% or 1,500 sq. ft."

P. Carson asked if Item B(2) should be modified to increase the parking from 5% to 10% or if it should be removed or remain unchanged. M. D'Amato shared various nuances that can occur with parking expansions including whether a site plan or zoning permit would be required. A. Fiano stated that she believed the goal is to simplify the regulations to make them clearer for staff and the community. T. Manning agreed and asked Staff to draft a simpler version of Items B(1-5). T. Crockett asked how a modification would be handled if a manufacturing business wanted to open a retail space and expand the parking area. M. D'Amato stated that any change in use would require approval.

P. Carson stated that the RMUZ and GMUIZ currently have multi-family and commercial uses on the same site and shared her proposed corrections. M. D'Amato noted that the mixed uses would cover Items (v) and (s) and recommended striking those items. T. Manning agreed and requested that the items be removed.

P. Carson shared previous and proposed house/lot diagrams to provide a clearer example of yard setbacks and noted that the building line is the yard/setback line. She stated that she added a definition for corner lots to the section on yards that provides clarification on how the setback is determined. She stated that the section also defines front, rear and side yards. T. Manning stated that the section should not be about yards, but should be about required yards, which is the setback. M. D'Amato replied that the yard definitions are provided to address various allowances and restrictions such as allowing sheds in a reduced setback in the backyard and prohibiting accessory buildings in the front yard. P. Carson shared yard diagrams for regular, corner, pie-shaped, and irregular lots. Since most of the regulations discuss traditional or corner lots, she suggested defining how irregular yards are treated or providing diagrams. The Commission agreed that all of the diagrams should be included.

T. Manning asked whether streets include both public and private roads. P. Carson stated that the zoning regulations must be met for either type of road and shared frontage requirements for public roads and corner lots. T. Manning shared concerns about a property owner who had wanted to install a pool on a lot that had three sides, one public road, and one private road, leaving no options to install a pool other than in the front yard. He stated that he will review the front yard requirements to see how front yards can be used.

P. Carson asked how the Commission would like to proceed. T. Manning suggested leaving the definitions as they are and adding the diagrams to the section and the other members agreed. M. D'Amato suggested including language that states that anything not covered in the definitions will be determined by a zoning official or PCZ to provide flexibility for irregular, corner, or thru-lots. P. Carson informed the Commission that yards and setbacks are set when properties are subdivided and do not change when regulations change.

P. Carson stated that no corrections have been made to the Multiple Dwelling Complex section. T. Manning recommended removing the R-2 zone from Item (2) and listing it as a permitted use within the zone instead. T. Manning also noted that he would like to set the setbacks, parking requirements, and well and septic requirements according to lot size and public health requirements rather than set specific areas as outlined in (2)(a) and (b). He requested the removal of Item 6 since it has been removed from statute. He added that storage availability is a market issue and it is up to the developer to provide adequate storage. T. Manning also confirmed that Item 4 should be removed. He asked if snow removal would be provided for multiple dwelling complexes, and P. Carson replied that snow removal is the responsibility of the property owner.

In reviewing landscaping and buffering requirements, A. Fiano recommended removing the specific list of plants outlined in the section and replacing it with "native plants and trees". M. D'Amato shared concerns about the "fully landscaped" language in item (10)(a) as it suggests that all areas other than parking must be covered by landscaping. He is concerned that if a resident complains and it is listed as fully landscaped, the Town could be held to that standard. T. Manning suggested striking the word "fully". The PCZ members discussed landscaping definitions and requirements and determined that the language should be changed to "shall be fully established with a lawn or landscape and shall be so indicated on the landscaping plan."

P. Carson asked for further clarification on Item (2) and asked if the three zones should be listed to make it easier. J. Cropley agreed that listing the zones would be easier. P. Carson changed the language to add "only within the R-2, RMUZ, and GMUIZ" and remove "only where one of the following two circumstances exists". P. Carson clarified the dimensional requirements in Item (5). T. Manning requested that (5)(f) and 5(g) dealing with drainage and impervious coverage be removed since they are covered under septic systems. P. Carson urged the Commission to consider including pavement requirements. J. Cropley shared a concern about Item

(10)(b) and how a large tree would be replaced if it had to be removed during construction. T. Manning replied that there is language covering the concern.

**8. Correspondence:** There was no correspondence.

**9. Adjournment:** T. Manning MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 8:56 p.m. A. Fiano SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0.

Respectfully submitted by Kacie Cannon

*Kacie Cannon*

*Please see the minutes of subsequent meetings for the approval of these minutes and any corrections hereto.*