

**TOWN OF COLUMBIA**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
Adella G. Urban Administrative Offices Conference Room  
323 Route 87, Columbia, CT  
Monday, April 9, 2018 7:00 pm  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**

**Members Present:** Chairman Rick Nassiff, Vice Chair Vera Englert, Don Schofield, Thomas Currier, Richard Napolitano, Robert Powell, E.J. Starkel, Walt Tabor (Alternate)

**Members Excused:** Larry Preston (Alternate)

**Staff Present:** Town Planner Paula Stahl, Board Clerk Terri Lasota

**Others Present:** Ann Dunnack, Mary Roickle

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** R. Nassiff called the meeting to order at 7:04pm

2. **ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES:** None

3. **ADDITIONS/CHANGES TO AGENDA:**

R. Nassiff **MOVED** to **MODIFY** agenda items 6 & 7 and postpone the public hearing and unfinished business until 04/23/2018. EJ Starkel **SECONDED**. **MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0**

4. **APPROVAL OF PZC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF March 12, 2018:**

R. Nassiff **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the 03/12/2018 meeting minutes as written. T. Currier **SECONDED**. **MOTION CARRIED 4:0:3**; B. Powell, EJ Starkel, and R. Napolitano **ABSTAINED**

5. **AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS:**

Mary Roickle of 34 Erdoni Road said the Columbia Lake Association (CLA) wants to focus on partnerships with the PZC, LMAC, IWWC, etc., and have created a liaison position, but the liaison (Dan O'Neil) could not be present at this meeting. M. Roickle said they wanted to share their preliminary discussions. The CLA also wanted to recognize the PZC board for the clarity now seen in the proposed draft regulation changes regarding Section 10 Nonconformity.

M. Roickle noted the three main areas of preliminary discussion were regarding the double whammy that would be applied to non conforming properties, especially the first two on the matrix with the smallest frontage. She added that the public health regulations already dictate a footprint (for septic and wells, etc.) and additional setback restrictions would decrease the ability to build something on those small properties; there was concern especially for the cottages on RT 87. P. Stahl commented that M. Roickle was referring to the proposed 5 ft reductions overall for side setbacks.

M. Roickle's second discussion point was the Public Hearing concept, and she noted that the CLA understood and liked the new streamlined matrix. However, the assumption was that communications with 500 ft abutters was going to zero. R. Nassiff said that all of these properties were within the 200ft upland review area, and property changes of any substantial consequence would more than likely require an IWWC public hearing, and may be sufficient to appease any concerns people have.

The third point that M. Roickle discussed was regarding having a PZC board member attend a CLA meeting to answer these or any other questions there may be and have communications before the public hearing.

R. Nassiff, B. Powell, and the other board members talked about the regulation changes and noted that the intent was to make the process easier and less of a burden financially.

6. **OPEN PUBLIC HEARING – POSTPONED until 04/23/2018**

**PZC-1718-08:** Fairview Farms LLC application for seven lot subdivision at 301 Route 66, Map 28 Lot 21

**7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (Discussion/Possible Action) – POSTPONED until 04/23/2018**

**7.1. PZC-1718-08:** Fairview Farms LLC application for seven lot subdivision at 301 Route 66, Map 28 Lot 21

**8. NEW BUSINESS:** None

**9. REGULATION REVISIONS**

**9.1. Section 10 – Nonconformity**

R. Nassiff **MOVED** to set the public hearing date for 06/11/2018

V. Englert **SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0**

**9.2. Section 21.4 – Columbia Lake Watershed Protection Overlay Zones**

P. Stahl said she had provided copies to CLA and LMAC for comments but had not yet heard back from them.

**TABLED**

**10. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS:**

P. Stahl and the board members discussed various issues, including a property on Route 66, noting that all residents needed to be treated equally and the zoning regulations needed to be enforced.

P. Stahl asked for clarification on the regulations. Is there a need for change of use when going from a retail business to another retail business on the same property? For example, an approved auto, gas, repair shop changing over to retail such as antiques. P. Stahl added that it is different if a public hearing is required for the approval, but we don't break down the retail as to what type of retail. The members also discussed parking, P. Stahl noted that parking was based on the footprint of the building. The consensus was that retail to retail business was not a change in use.

R. Napolitano questioned, if the Michaud building is used as retail, if he moved sign shop there, would a zoning permit be needed for change of use? P. Stahl and R. Nassiff replied yes because you must comply with what the zoning regulations stipulate. A zoning permit would be needed for the change of use from retail to manufacturing.

P. Stahl talked about at what point to people need to come to PZC for approval verses a zoning agent or staff approval, and what are the triggers; a 25% growth in the footprint/activity level is currently penciled in the draft for CM regulations.

**11. COMMISSION OPEN DISCUSSION:**

**12. AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS:**

**13. ADJOURNMENT:**

R. Nassiff **MOVED** to **ADJOURN**; EJ Starkel **SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0**

The meeting adjourned at 7:53pm

Respectfully submitted by Terri Lasota, Board Clerk

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