



**TOWN OF KILLINGLY, CT  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**MONDAY – APRIL 15, 2024**

**WORKSHOP MEETING - IN PERSON**

**6:00 PM**

**TOWN MEETING ROOM – 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR**

**Killingly Town Hall**

**172 Main Street**

**Killingly, CT**

**MINUTES**

RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK, KILLINGLY, CT  
2024 APR 22 AM 11:41  
Elizabeth M. Wilson

**I. CALL TO ORDER** – Chair, Keith Thurlow, called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

**ROLL CALL** – Michael Hewko, John Sarantopoulos, Matthew Wendorf, Keith Thurlow.

Virge Lorents arrived at 6:07 p.m.

Brian Card was absent with notice.

**Staff Present** – Ann-Marie Aubrey, Director of Planning & Development; Jonathan Blake, Planner I/ZEO; Jill St. Clair, Economic Development Director.

**Also Present** – Ulla Tiik-Barclay, Town Council Liaison; J.S. Perreault, Recording Secretary.  
There were five additional people present in the audience.

**Present via Online** – None.

**II. WORKSHOP DISCUSSION**

\* Review / Discussion / Action

\* Planned Residential Development – Section 570

\* Site Plan Review – Section 470

\* Special Permit – Section 700

Ann-Marie Aubrey explained that the Staff's first Draft was included in packets to Commission Members and that changes/edits are expected and then it will go to Legal Counsel for review/revisions before going to a public hearing. Copies of an email to Staff from Brian Card (dated April 15, 2024), containing his comments, had been provided to Commission Members as well as copies of the current Section 570 language. Ms. Aubrey explained that Staff had also received an email from Ulla Tiik-Barclay and Michelle Murphy suggesting that the Draft be red-lined to show proposed changes vs. current language.

Motion was made by John Sarantopoulos to open the floor to discussion with the public.

Second by Matthew Wendorf. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (4-0-0). Virge Lorents was not present for this vote.

There was discussion with Ulla Tiik-Barclay and Michelle Murphy regarding red-lining the Draft for clarity and to make it easier to follow. Ms. Tiik-Barclay said that the changes are drastic. Mr. Sarantopoulos expressed agreement with red-lining. Mr. Blake explained that it would all be red because it is looked at as a repeal-and-

replace type of regulation as it is the entire section. He explained that they will point out the changes during the review. Mr. Thurlow asked if a red-lined Draft could be provided for the next meeting. Mr. Blake stated that they can produce it, but it would probably be focusing on direct changes, otherwise, it is all in different locations. Mr. Thurlow stated satisfaction with that.

Ms. Aubrey explained that Staff tried to make the Draft in a more logical format and she reviewed the suggested changes to Section 570 – Planned Residential Development:

- 570.1 - The definition was changed adding “minimum of one (1) acre” and “not less than ten (10) dwelling units” was changed to “not less than five (5) dwelling units.” Ms. Aubrey explained that ten units may not always fit with the neighborhood.
- 570.2 – Interchangeable Terms
- 570.3 – Intent
- 570.4 – Application Submittal Requirements and Procedural Timelines. Ms. Aubrey noted that the procedural timelines are also governed by the State General Statute 8-7d. She explained about repetition so, depending on the type of application, you would also need to go to the Site Plan Review Section 470 or the Special Permit Section 700.
- 570.5 – Required Findings  
Regarding 570.5.c, Mr. Blake commented that he agrees with Mr. Card about increasing “three or more” to “five or more.”
- 570.6 – Classifications:
  - Independent Residential Living (IRL)
  - Residential Life Care Communities (RLCC)
- 570.7 – Independent Residential Living (Densities, Dimensional Requirements and Parking Space Requirements).  
Mr. Blake explained about 570.b.2.c, Medium Density currently 35, increased to 40 percent (e.g. when sidewalks are required).
- 570.8 – Residential Life Care Communities (Densities, Dimensional Requirements and Parking Space Requirements).
- 570.9 – Common Amenities  
Mr. Blake explained about common amenities vs. traditional open space. He explained that “Conservation Easement May Be Required” was added.
- 570.10 – Additional Requirements of Planned Residential Developments

There was discussion/debate with Ulla Tiik-Barclay, Michelle Murphy and Ed Grandelski regarding whether Rural Development should be included and whether city water and sewer should be a requirement. In answer to a question from Mr. Grandelski regarding how it is known which Regulations were in effect for past approvals, Mr. Blake explained that past approvals are all kept on file (either paper or digital).

Jo-Ann Perreault, Borough Resident, asked if these proposed changes would affect the Borough.

Mr. Blake explained that the Draft for the PRD has nothing in the Borough and that Multi-Family has a Borough Zone (Residential High). Mr. Blake explained that for special permit changes and site plan changes, the thought would be, long term, to replace both because we are merging to have it under one set of rules for special permit and site plan review for both the Town and the Borough. If there were changes proposed that would affect the Borough, Mr. Blake explained that they would reach out to the Borough Council and that any text change would require a public hearing.

John LaBelle, 57 Island Road, displayed a copy of the Zoning Map and asked if Rural Development would be changed to Low Density. Mr. Thurlow explained that it would not. The discussion is about whether PRD should be included in Rural Development or not. Mr. Thurlow stated that, typically, sewer lines are in Low Density which is where PRD is currently allowed/encouraged. He asked Staff if he is correct in thinking that it is not



currently allowed in Rural Development. Mr. Blake explained that the current definition references Rural Development and that there is nothing that states that it has to be on city water and sewer (Multi-Family does). Mr. Blake explained that Staff's thought was to make it definitive: if you are proposing a private system, then propose a private system. He noted that the Sewer Authority is currently looking at a, potentially, overtaxed system. Mr. Blake suggested that the PZC could do a change updating the definition and striking out all of the references to Rural Development if that is the goal. Or, he suggested that it could be added that it has to be on public water and sewer. Mr. Blake noted that there are differences to where the sewer is and public water is – there are gaps. Discussion continued regarding dimensional requirements.

Mr. Thurlow stated that his opinion is to keep PRD just in Low Density and Medium Density, not Rural Development. Mr. Blake stated that under the current Regulations, someone could submit an application for a PRD in Rural Development if it meets all of the other criteria. Discussion continued. Mr. Thurlow stated that he doesn't feel that it is practical to change the acreage size as it has worked for all of these years. Mr. Blake explained that we can't restrict unit size. There was discussion regarding taking out Rural Development. Mr. Hewko and Mr. Sarantopoulos expressed agreement. Mr. Wendorf feels that all of the restrictions would be almost impossible to meet, but he doesn't see a large impact from a density standpoint. Mr. Thurlow spoke about restricting the size of the units. Mr. Blake and Ms. Aubrey stated agreement with taking the minimum acreage out. Mr. Blake asked if the Commission would want to leave PRD in Rural Development as written currently or under different rationale (other requirements or with less units lowering the density).

Ms. Aubrey asked that Commission Members to bring their packets to the next meeting and she stated that Staff will prepare a red-lined version of the Draft for the next meeting.

- \* Continue this Workshop / Discussion (if needed, and if time allows) during tonight's Regularly Scheduled Meeting of **APRIL 15, 2023**

Consensus was to continue to another Workshop Meeting.

- \* Schedule Next Workshop Meeting on Zoning Regulation changes for **Monday, May 20, 2024.**

Next Workshop Meeting to be Monday, May 20, 2024.

### III. MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to adjourn at 7:04 p.m.

Second by Matthew Wendorf. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault  
Recording Secretary