



# Town of Watertown, Connecticut

Land Use Administration  
Watertown Municipal Center  
61 Echo Lake Road  
Watertown, CT 06795  
office: (860) 945-5266 fax: (860) 945-4706  
web: watertownct.org

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### Minutes

February 2, 2022

6:30PM

### WEB BASED MEETING ONLY

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Richard Antonetti called the meeting to order at 6:34pm

#### ROLL CALL

Members Present: Richard Antonetti, Chairman  
Ray Antonacci, Vice-Chairman  
Ken Demirs  
Robert Marinaro  
Dan Divito  
Joseph D'Uva

Members Absent: Lou Cavallo, Secretary  
Dan Gillotti  
Lou Esposito  
Dave Pope

Others Present: Mark Massoud, Land Use/Building Services  
Paul Bunevich, Town Engineer  
Roseann D'Amelio, Secretary

Robert Marinaro was seated for Lou Esposito  
Joseph D'Uva was seated for Dave Pope

Election of Officers:

Chairman

Motion made by: Ken Demirs nominated Richard Antonetti as Chairman  
Second by: Dan Divito  
All in Favor

Vice-Chairman

Motion made by: Richard Antonetti nominated Ray Antonacci as Vice-Chairman  
Second by: Dan Divito  
All in Favor

Secretary

Motion made by: Ray Antonacci nominated Lou Cavallo as Secretary  
Second by: Dan Divito  
All in Favor

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

**LIMITED TO COMMENTS REGARDING ITEMS NOT SPECIFICALLY LISTED ON THE AGENDA.**

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:

1. Regular Meeting December 1, 2021
2. Regular Meeting January 5, 2022

Text of Motion: Approve Regular Meeting Minutes of December 1, 2021  
Motion made by: Joe D'Uva  
Second by: Dan Divito  
All in Favor

Text of Motion: Approve Regular Meeting Minutes of January 5, 2022  
Motion Made by: Joe D'Uva  
Seconded by: Ray Antonacci  
All in Favor

STAFF REPORT

Mark Massoud reported:

1. In the process of preparing the budget for the Land Use Agency with the budget remaining approximately the same as last year. There is a request for funds for a consultant to continue the revisions of the regulations as well as an intern to assist the department as well.
2. The capital budget is in the process of being developed and will have it on the agenda for the next meeting.
3. The regulation subcommittee has met 3 times and has a good sense of reviewing with revisions proposed to date.
4. There is some interest on Main Street with a couple of new restaurants that are opening, one called Local 63 in the former Rock Garden space and the other is Jamesons in the former Red Door space.
5. There is activity on Echo Lake Road and I will report to the commission as it comes to fruition.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT – none.

#### NEW BUSINESS

1. Site Plan/Special Permit #2022-01 of Bela Sztanko for a car sales at 11 Falls Avenue, Oakville, CT in a B-C zoning district.

Mark Massoud, Land Buse/Building Services: This is an existing high end auto repair facility that would like to add a car dealership to their business. I understand it would be for internal sales with no outside storage of cars. It is a special permit in that zone and we would request that you set a public hearing for the March regular meeting.

Text of Motion: Schedule a public hearing for Wednesday, March 2, 2022  
Motion made by: Dan Divito  
Second by: Joe D'Uva  
All in Favor

#### CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

1. Proposed text amendment to the Watertown Zoning Regulations from Attorney Michael McVerry to allow professional office uses by site plan/special permit within the R-20 zoning district limited to properties fronting on CT Route 6 (Woodbury Road).

Attorney Michael McVerry, 35 Porter Street, Naugatuck: We have been before the commission since October and discussed what we wanted to do and filed an application. What we are seeking to do is to amend Section 11.4 Residential Districts

to allow professional offices in the areas in the R20 zone fronting on Route 6 also amending Section 12.4 Table of Permitted Uses which would allow professional offices by special permit/site plan in the R20 zone limited to property on Route 6 and add a new Section 12.6.18 which would allow in the R20 district professional offices by special permit and site plan located on Route 6. After the December public hearing there was a great deal of comment that was held and we amended our proposal prior to your January meeting to add a provision that these parcels would have to have a minimum area of two acres which reduces it down to 7 addresses, 3 of which are owned by Taft, another which is owned by the Watertown Fire District. We have reduced the potential numbers from 26 down to 7. If you look at the table of permitted uses, the initial use would be 19 uses by special permit we are seeking to add one more to this making it 20. A lot of what is allowed already is more intensive than what is being proposed. My client is a law firm and their interest is to move their office to the subject property. Mr. McVerry talked about the compliance with the Plan of Conservation and Development. We would have to come back with 4 special permits and site plan approval which would address the development of this particular piece of property giving the commission additional input as far as what we are planning on doing and what could be done.

Hearing no questions at this time from the commission Chairman Antonetti moved to the public for questions.

Tom Riley, Partner in the Law Firm of Grady & Riley, 193 Euclid Avenue, Waterbury: I wanted to address two items, the first was questions raised at the initial hearing, as to whether or not we would be good neighbors and I want to say yes. Mr. Riley talked about the historic building he works in and the historic home he lives in answering the question whether we would respect the historic building. The second thing has to do with the list of uses and we have heard some of the uses that are currently permitted, having a much greater impact on the neighborhood than our very low impact use. The question here is how do you manage the impact of uses, uses such as Daycare, Tennis Facility or a public swimming pool, a club house & restaurant all of which can be constructed at this property and the impact on the neighborhood would be tremendous. We are a day time impact only, there would be no outside activities from our business we do all our work indoors. I think from the point of view from how this commission and how the town manages this area of town and manages the uses would give a favorable impact on the neighborhood. It will allow people to sell their property to professional offices instead of having to rely upon on some of these greater impacts on the uses. I would encourage the commission to vote in the positive and approve this request, thank you very much.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: Your office is open 9 to 5, I would assume.

Tom Riley: Some of us come to work a little earlier than 9 A.M. It generally opens from 8:00 A.M. in the morning till about 5:30 in the evening.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: Weekends there is no operation at all.

Tom Riley: There is operation sometimes on the weekend I go in and do my research, I go in to prepare for the files. Generally, we don't have open office hours on the weekend, the lawyers may go in to do work.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: There minimal traffic going in and out? I believe you have the driveway on the side for entry and you get off of Route 6 and that is it.

Tom Riley: People come to work and they will park and go to work and at the end of the day they will leave, there is very little in and out. We do have clients who come but now adays that is less and less we are doing a lot of what we are doing tonight with our clients.

Jean King, 126 North Street: As we talked before this area and property is part of the Watertown Historic District. I want to reiterate what I said before that this proposal is still simply an attempt to do what is called spot zoning. To take a property for a use that is not used now approved in the R20 residential zone. It is our believe and with many people that this will not have a positive effect on the residential area of the historic district there. There are other areas in the historic district where there is business and commercial. This is an area of residential and the people who live there feel that their property valued by continuing to be in a residential zone as opposed to being in a mixed zone. In terms of this promoting economic development no matter what we are not building a new property here. This property is already on the tax rolls and will continue to be on the tax rolls. I believe there are a number of places in town where the business could be and it would be great to have this law firm in town. There is no evidence pro or con that this will have an impact on economic development of the town because the properties paying taxes are going to continue to pay taxes. None of this zone change was requested of the residents in town. Most of these properties are not the right size to do it. I would urge you not to approve this, let the property stay and save residential along that beautiful area of town. Encourage people to have business and professional development in areas of town that are more appropriate for that, thank you.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: Mark could you answer their question about spot zoning and what we are doing here.

Mark Massoud, Land Use/Building Services: Spot zoning typically involves the changing of a property to a different zone. In this case we are talking about uses so I am not clear if it fits in the definition of spot zoning. If you take the overall point of allowing uses for a particular property that would be the traditional definition. We noted that there are 7 properties, the majority of properties would not be in a practical sense

has Ms. King stated eligible for a change, they are either owned by the Fire District and Taft, there are in essence 2 properties that would benefit from this change of use.

Robert Marinaro: They were talking about parking and hours, for attorneys, secretaries, customers, they go down Hamilton Lane and they take a left to this property to park. Is it part of the plan to buffer that whole back area so that people that do have properties adjacent to this will have some decent sized hedges, just a thought to kind of alleviate the issues back there, thank you?

Jean King: This property no matter what is moving forward Mr. Marinaro in the historic district and anything that will be done to the property that can be seen from the street any which way they would have to come to our commission and discuss with us and receive a certificate of appropriateness. As I look at this one of the things that concerns me the most is the thought of a large parking lot there which would not be appropriate for residential. I have heard a figure of more than 20 people working there and that is a major issue in terms of the appearance in this residential neighborhood, thank you.

Mr. Thorton, 46 Litchfield Road: I would like to address the list of currently permitted uses and establish what the themes are. Just to counter the fact that Attorney Mr. McVerry said seems to suggest that office space was not significant just another name to the list of uses. I think the current list of uses small things like nonprofit institutions, things that have to do with educating the young and taking care of the old are sort of community services. The things that are on that list other than the infrastructure thing just utilities and electricity, putting in railroad lines and things like that, those things that are community orientated. They exist for the mutual benefit and the good of everyone in the community. If you are a family in a residential neighborhood you might want to have your aging parents in a home in the neighborhood so those serve the residential area, they are in. On that list there was one exception, for a bed and breakfast. A bed and breakfast are a commercial enterprise much in the way a professional office is a current enterprise. The thing about a bed and breakfast is they try to make the house look like the rest of the neighborhood; they try to make it feel like a home. What I am suggesting here is the inclusion of professional office on this list is not in keeping with the theme of the list and the precedence that is on that list. You are bringing in a very highly competitive, law, a profit raising business and you are trying to change what is a historically valuable neighborhood into a commercial district. Let's leave professional offices to Main Street and leave the residential areas to themselves. I just wanted to address the current list and to say that adding office space was not part of that list thank you

Kristina Atwood, 241 Woodbury Road: I have lived here for 14 years I specifically moved here to be in a historic district having lived in a historic home for 30 years in Newtown. I don't see how making a commercial properties part of the historic district is in the best interest of the economic development of Watertown. I agree with Jean King and I have talked to other people who live on the street. I am happy that Tom Riley has

lived in a historic property if he lived in my house would he want a law firm from somebody else down the street. I don't think so we already have to put up with zoning for adult day care 2 doors down from me and now 3 doors down I am going to have a law office which is going to have a paved over parking lot not like it is currently. We currently have another law firm in the center of town with a large office parking lot with at least twenty cars every day, this is just not appropriate for the historic district in Watertown. I am totally against it as our many of my neighbors who were prevented from joining this meeting because it has turned into a zoom fairly recently. I went around to several of my neighbors and provided agendas to let them know of the zoom change to the zoning meeting in hopes that they would also join but again this is not appropriate, thank you.

Gayle Carusillo, 51 Hamilton Lane: I have talked at one of the meetings I want to ask the board if they would like an office building in their backyard. I also want to address the traffic I would like every one of you to sit in my driveway and look at the traffic and the buses. The buses come in through Route 6 they park almost in front of that driveway. The driveway that is going to be the office is on Hamilton Lane. That home is a beautiful historic home it was on the tours, let's leave it like that. Let's not be like the rest of the country and change our history, thank you for hearing me.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: Ms. Carusillo you said there are school buses that line up on your street there.

Gayle Carusillo: Absolutely, all of the school buses cannot get into the school parking lot at one time, so they will line up.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: That whole street.

Gayle Carusillo: At different parts of the street and so will the cars to get into the school when they are picking up.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: What school is there?

Gayle Carusillo: Judson is at the other end. Not all the buses can fit in to pick up kids so they park and wait until there is room for the buses to go and so do the parents. The street is a very busy street and the buses cannot make the turn into the street. You would have to get out of Hamilton Lane onto Route 6 and you would have to back up for the buses to make that corner, it is a traffic problem, we don't need one more car.

Katherine Camara, 31 Cottage Place: I have a lot of interest in watching what happens with this application. I have been watching and reading about your comments from the residences. I will be very interested when I hear spot zoning come up that has come up

on many other applications. Talking about putting businesses in the middle of residential, we have got the winery right now in the middle of residential with major issues about noise that keeps coming up for those people. I am very interested to see how it is that this commission votes or decides on these changes because I have seen very little attention being paid to residences at the Shaker property which is now being turned into what the residences wanted to begin with. At the Sealey property which I am now involved with a lawsuit with you. I am very interested to see how it plays out that you listen to some residences and you are acting like are listening to these residences and how this will play out, thank you.

Patricia Norman, 271 Woodbury Road: My information is from the Land Use Law and Practice Volume 9. What it states that spot zoning is clearly an illegal profit. It must be determined that the proposed change is for the good of the community as a whole not exclusively for the benefit of an individual or a select group and consistent with the existing comprehensive plan and not to the detriment to the existing owner, no anticipated public benefit. A zoning map amendment is considered a spot zoning change of zone affecting only a small area change which is out of harmony with the comprehensive plan. There is only one explanation as far as spot zoning under Connecticut Law, Connecticut courts define spot zoning as the reclassification of a small area of land in such a manner as to disturb the tenants of the surrounding neighborhood. Spot zoning is in current municipalities in Connecticut where it has no public benefits. Spot zoning is still illegal in Connecticut there is no gray area in what these people are asking for. As a taxpayer in this area is that we have to go hire legal counsel to protect our properties against something that the Planning & Zoning does not have the legal right to do. You do not have the legal right to do spot zoning when it is of no benefit to the community and the only benefit is to one person. It is a detriment to other properties surrounding it. We hate to go further with this and as taxpayer's it costs money. That property pays approximately \$16,000.00 a year for taxes that is enough you do not need more. We live next door to a beautiful home with a beautiful pond, I don't want to live next to a law office with a big ugly paved parking lot. We have our investments in our properties up there. We are not in the business district and this is spot zoning at its very worst thank you very much.

Robert Lubus, 569 Winding Brook Farm Road: One of the comments was from the public indicating that none of the residents has requested the change and I live a mile away. I am one of the partners of Grady & Riley, I have lived here for more than 20 years, both of my children have gone to the public school system. One of things just to respond with regard to taxes and obligations this property has a number of bedrooms that can be filled with children that would attend the public schools at cost. What we are suggesting is a relatively stable law office. We have been in existence since the early 70's and the opportunity that we would not require any of the services of the town other than perhaps police or fire. One of the things that I think that is useful to the commission is the building we are in at the present is a historic building. We have preserved that building for more than 45 years it has been the same on the outside. The



only differences that we propose other than a parking lot which exists to a large extent already on this property though it is not paved, the only changes we propose are interior. I would point out and this has already been said this property can include the following: a group daycare, a private hospital, a sanitarium, a nonprofit institution, a summer camp and a private recreational facility, a bed and breakfast. The one I wanted to focus in on is the nonprofit institution which in effect would be doing the very same thing we would. They would have offices in the location typically and try to operate offices out of a location we are doing no different. We are an office we operate within the building we don't provide any noise to the area and in fact I actually would believe this would enhance rather than detract from the general area. The changes that would occur would actually be a less intensive use than many of the other things that this commission already has the power to permit. There would be less outdoor use, less outdoor disturbance, and that disturbance would be typically limited to typical business hours which is when we operate typically between 8 and 5:30 rather than a bed and breakfast may have a wedding at 8 to 10 at night. We are not looking for any significant change in anything other than the ability to use this property in a way that will continue on with what we are hoping for now. Having said that I understand I have just said some specific things but this use in the end is appropriate for this area. There are almost 10,000 cars passing every day on this road. I understand the concerns in regards to busing, the buses are going to exist regardless of whether this is a law office or a residence in comparison to what Judson School has. Now to answer one of the other commissioner's questions in regards to the ability to have buffers, there is substantial buffers in the back of the property and along the side which would continue to exist. There would not be any significant visibility for the property having said that if the commission has any questions, I appreciate the opportunity.

Daniel Divito: Can we confirm how many parking spots they believe they will need? How many employees, plus daily clients?

Robert Lubus: I can answer part of the question, we are moving 18 employees to the location. Typically, we would have a number of clients but with COVID we typically have less than 10 a day appearing at our office over the course of the day. I do not know the number for sure for parking.

Daniel Divito: Mark what kind of ball park size of driveway would this property would need for this type of use?

Mark Massoud, Land Use/Building Services: That would take some figuring with the Town Engineer and part of a special permit to make that determination.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: Is there anyone from the public with new information?

George Norman, 271 Woodbury Road: Yes, we are the abutting property owners to the property in question. To answer the question for Mark Massoud you mentioned the amount of parking required, usually it is 9 by 20 for the parking space. There are 20

spaces you are looking at 180 times 20, a pretty large parking area. We have been residing at this property for over 50 years and have done extensive improvements to the property and feel the addition of putting professional offices in a residential district will definitely diminish the value of our property and cause a lot of issues for us. That is a lot more than some family with children imposing on our school systems. When I look at the rest of the issues that we have gone through in the past looking under Section 11-4 the definition of a residential district which is R20 states that provides suitable areas for medium density residential development consistent with the server suburban environment. This is not a residential development this is an office complex with extensive number of things. We believe the other issue was the home occupancy which is by the regulations, says is it shall not impair the residential character and this is what is happening here. We are taking a beautiful property and diminishing the value of the neighborhood at our expense. This is predicated on limiting the properties along Route 6 a minimum of two acres. You have been cherry picking the best situations to find two acres out there and I don't know how many properties that encompasses, from 24 to 4 it doesn't make a difference to us since we are the abutters. I am an ex-veteran did service for our country and came out of the service. I have never once felt threatened when I moved to Watertown 50 years ago. I have lived there comfortably in a residential district and have raised my family there; my kids have gone to school there locally and I feel with the growth the way it is going I don't feel comfortable. I have never pulled a permit for a weapon; I have never felt I needed a weapon. You are going to have 20 people there, the people that come in there represent 62 different types uses of law. How many people are going to be there at any given time. It is going to be a large amount of people wandering in there and these are all types of people. It is very unpleasant for us and it puts us at risk financially and otherwise thank you for your time.

Attorney Michael McVerry: Initially as far as Mr. Norman I am not sure why he would feel threatened by clients coming to my office. The type of work that Grady & Riley does not present any kind of threat to the general public in any way shape or form. If Mr. Norman feels that way, I deeply apologize to him for that. His wife talked about spot zoning, we can define spot zoning and she read the definition out of the Connecticut Practice but if we look at what we have here is 15 acres that our proposal would apply to. HI don't think spot zoning becomes an issue in this whole matter. Ms. King talks about the fact that this has to go to the Historic District she claims she is the chair of. If it comes to the Historic Commission, she would have to recuse herself from public participation in that. She should be listening as the Chairman of the district with an open mind. It appears she has her mind already made up this, it should not happen. One gentleman spoke about the uses already and they are mostly a service type of thing. Mr. Lupus mentioned the private hospital, the day center certainly none those would be so much more intrusive than what is being proposed here. Mr. Divito asked a question about the number of parking we are not here to address the 325 Woodbury property that will come to this commission to see fit to grant a text change after that. This is not a site-specific application this is an application for the R20 zone for the properties that

meet the criteria that we have presented. If the commission grants this application, we do have to return with a site plan special permit application that would address specifics you are requesting. To make the determination based on the parking that would be allowed on this property is not what we are here for tonight. We are here to address whether the text should be changed to allow the use to allow a subsequent application back to you folks to address it and to deal with the parking and to deal with everything else on site. What we are tonight is to get to that next step to be able to come back with an application.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: I have one question; you believe that this application is in conformity with the Plan of Conservation and Development therefore it is meeting the criteria that is said in that plan that was required by the State of Connecticut according general statute. So, you are saying this is in conformity with the Plan of Conservation and Development is that correct?

Attorney Michael McVerry: If you look at the initial application that was submitted, we cited several sections of the Plan of Conservation and Development that we feel this conforms to and I believe we comply with your requirements.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: One question to a member of the commission. Commissioner Demirs, the property I think currently is valued at somewhere in the nature of 1.2 million dollars which means that it brings in \$16,000 a year in tax revenue. If an agency like what happened with the senior housing, where it could not be stopped under federal and state law, they had to put that house in there. We tried as a commission we voted against it. If this property is sold at 1.2 million dollars, does it devalue or does it increase property values in the area. Because property values are very important to the residents, could you answer that question sir.

Ken Demirs: I will share a few things with you that the commission members need to know. I did a little research and there is in the last five years along Woodbury Road there have been 14 sales and all my information are strictly coming from the MLS. If you took the 14 sales and you wanted to figure the average sales price for a house along that corridor through Route 63 and 6 through to where this subject property is you are looking at an average of under \$298,000. The subject property 325 Woodbury Road has been on the market for 895 days. Clearly there is not a family out there that is interested in buying it and swimming in the pool. In Watertown the past 3 years the average days on market have been for 30 days this has been on for almost 900 days. In my opinion there is 92% of any buyer who goes to the internet before they call a real estate agent. The most popular site is Zillow and what they do what is called an estimate so they have an estimate of what properties are worth. The more expensive homes that sell in your neighborhood your estimate goes up the less expensive the house sells your property values go down. In Watertown we have not had in the MLS a property sells for over a million dollars as far back as I can go in the MLS. We did get close we had 2 in the past 10 years; 22 properties sell in the \$600,000. Two of them around \$939,000 and

\$925,000 the bulk of them sold in the 6's and the 7's. So, when this property gets sold if it gets sold, I have no idea what it is selling for but if it gets recorded anywhere over a million dollars everybody's values in that neighborhood values to the public buyer who goes to Zillow 92% of buyers, that estimate is going to go up. Everybody's estimate is going up and, in my opinion, it does not hurt the property values.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: Mark Massoud, I want to make it very clear in your opinion is this spot zoning?

Mark Massoud, Lane Use/Building Services: The definition of spot zoning to take into consideration the changing of a zone for a use that was pointed out to the contrary to the goodwill of the neighborhood. This is a change of use that applies to several properties so I would say no.

Daniel Divito: Just 2 points, one is as the applicant pointed out as we are looking at this the thought process shouldn't be will the applicant be a good fit. When we change the zone, we don't change it for them we change it for eternity essentially. We need to be thoughtful in the mindset that it doesn't just affect this one property it effects several properties. Although these applicants seem like great people it doesn't necessarily mean these people will buy the property or that these will be the only ones that want to move in and do something different, we have to think long term. The other point I want to make is in my head I am questioning why do we want to do this we have a thriving neighborhood it is very stately, its historic, it's one of the most beautiful neighborhoods in town and it is what Watertown is known for. Yes, we have one home that is not selling and that could be a price adjustment and yeah that is not favorable to one homeowner but we have to think about what is best for town. So does it make sense to go and change a zone on one homeowner while we hurt others or do we leave things as is. If this was a neighborhood that needed help and needed to change to make it thrive, I would be all for it. We have a neighborhood that is a standing neighborhood and we are going to make change that potentially could really impact it in what I would say is a negative way.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: I did cite to you the Plan of Conservation & Development which again is a long-term plan and it is something we should be guided by not just by hearsay or other issues out there. I think it is very important that we look at things as they are. I agree with you on some points but I think we are looking at one simple point.

Raymond Antonacci: I am in agreement with Commissioner Divito on this matter I already expressed my concern. I feel Mr. Chairman in this instance it is not personal but I don't feel it is the duty of the Chairman to be running any promoting on any particular application.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: I am not promoting it.

Raymond Antonacci: I think the neighbors ought to be heard on this matter. In all fairness I believe the neighbors do have a concern. The elephant in the room in large part of the parking lot and more people the use changes here. I know Attorney McVerry said we are only considering a zone change here and a site plan will come later. But the fact is we are going to be dealing with that and the neighbors who have lived here for many years are going to have deal with the commercial building in their midst. I think we have to give consideration to neighbors. Most of the time I am in favor of things but this neighborhood is unique. I think we owe it to the neighborhood and I apologize if I offended you Mr. Chairman but that is the way I view it.

Ken Demirs: I have a couple of comments too. I am driving up and down Route 6 and thinking to myself there is a parking lot at the corner of Middlebury Road and Route 6, I believe it is a sizeable daycare that probably fits somewhere in the ballpark of 60, 70 cars I would guess it has been there for 20 something years since my daughter went there. My point is that parking lot is not bothering anybody and I believe it is in the historic district. I believe there is a lot more traffic going in and out of their everyday than there will be for this law office. A lot of parking at Taft too and a lot of commercial vehicles pulling in for their delivering food and supplies and what not I don't hear anyone complaining about that.

Joe Sheehan, 259 Woodbury Road: I have been here for 47 years. One of things for the whole time I have been here is I wanted the house to look the way it was when I moved in 47 years ago and when I move out. I wanted the historic neighborhood because it was good for the town. There hasn't been a commercial property here in over 160 years. The people take great pride here and leave their homes in better condition than when they moved in. I can see that some of you are ignoring what I am saying but there is an emotional impact here we don't want a commercial property in our midst. What you are going to do is take an area of town and you are going to diminish it because this will open the door for other changes, thank you.

Karen Rogobulous, 47 Woodbury Road: I live right by the corner of Woodbury Road and Route 6 that parking lot use to be the Taft Annex it is owned by Taft it did cause a commotion when it was put in. They had to adjust their lighting, they had to plant greenery because the use was being disruptive to the neighborhood. However, it is a daycare for Taft teachers and their children and there is also a residential apartment in that building. The Bed & Breakfast I was led to believe years ago when someone tried to come in do the old Merriman Mansion into a B & B you had to have an owner live there. That is a total change from you assuming that it is vacant all the time when there are people staying and you can have wedding. Well, you can't just have weddings at a B & B you would have to have special permits when you are filing to have the B & B. There would not be wild parties and weddings every weekend and someone would have to be living there that is an owner keeping it residential. On the other hand, and I respect Ken extremely quite a bit, however I would have to disagree because as we know from being in the same business CMA's or marketing analysis are very subjective. You can

go around in the past several months and there have been large home sales recently young couples buying homes in this neighborhood area and we are all happy to see it. Yes, it would diminish the values of commercial property in the middle of residential and we know that. The fact that they would still be paying the price of a million dollars for this business it's going to come up as a commercial building in a residential neighborhood. I said people don't mind if it is something that contributes to the neighborhood. This is a neighborhood that takes pride in being a historic neighborhood and the bottom line for all of you should be is this what's best for the people that live there and is this what they want. I understand that the Attorney from Grady & Riley lives in Watertown and loves Watertown but having a few kids living in that house is it going to affect anyone taxes any more than it already does. People who pay taxes in the town and don't have children to the public schools or were sent to private schools by their parents and still pay their taxes so that is really a non-comment. I hope you take into consideration the wants of the people who already live here and understand we have a business district along Main Street and there are other buildings available. I just think to affect an historic neighborhood where the people have taken great pride and in many cases a lot of us work more than one job to keep our homes and this would be a negative impact. I respect the firm of Grady & Riley what they do and they do not belong in our neighborhood. Let them go to Main Street or let them go to the Munson House or let them go somewhere else where business is conducted. But the current Attorney on Main Street what he did to his historic home is appalling and yes that is parking. The fact that it was allowed really does change the character of that corner of town. I think you need to take the people who are already living here and who already paying taxes their opinions into consideration and I don't think the neighbors are thinking of anything out of line. You cannot be doing that changing neighbors because it is not just right. It is really an emotional situation what you are doing to our neighborhood, thank you.

Text of Motion: Close the public hearing

Motion made by: R. Marinaro

Second by: Ray Antonacci

All in Favor

1. Site Plan/Special Permit#2021-06 application from Sasaki Associates, Inc on behalf of Taft School, 110 Woodbury Road, Watertown, CT, to install four (4) 70 foot sports lighting poles and lights on Snyder Field. Parcel ID Map 99, Block 58, Lot 7

Chairman Richard Antonetti: We will have to do a table on this matter because ZBA wants to a site walk pending the weather.

(Tabled until action from ZBA)

Text of Motion: Table – waiting for action from ZBA  
Motion Made by: Ken Demirs  
Seconded by: Joe D’Uva  
All in Favor

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

#### OLD BUSINESS

1. Subdivision application from Michael Jedd for a proposed two lot subdivision of lot 8 Sand Bank Road, Map 163, Block 21, Lot 8.

Paul Bunevich, Town Engineer: The applicant has satisfied the wetlands issue and the only thing left is the use of that previous proposed right of way for the future road of Concord Drive with a common driveway which requires a  $\frac{3}{4}$  quarter vote or 6-member vote by your commission. There is some wording legal that has to be filed also and the Town Attorney is going to review that along with our office that still has to be done and I don’t see an issue with that. The commission needs to vote to override the prohibition of a common driveway in a residential subdivision.

Mark Massoud, Lane Use/Building Services: Mr. Chairman I have provided you with a resolution the Town Engineer and I have reviewed the application with the exception of Paul’s comment it meets all applicable subdivision regulations. We have provided some conditions of approval if you are inclined to approve, we have the request for 6 members present. Two votes, one to approve the quest for subdivision and second to vote on the waiver for to allow for more than one driveway on common driveway.

Chairman Richard Antonetti: I am going to act on the two lots subdivision. The first vote is to approve of this project.

Text of Motion: Approve subdivision as proposed according to the resolution  
Provided.

Motion made by: Ken Demirs  
Second by: Dan Divito  
All in Favor

2 votes

2. Echo Asset, LLC, “O” Echo Lake Road, site plan application for development of an industrial building comprised of 4,800 s.f. of office space, 8,000 s.f. of

shop area with associated parking for employees and vehicles. Map 104 Block 90 L23A

Mark Massoud, Land Use/Building Services: This was a site that was formerly approved for an alternative power plant that was never built. A new company Connecticut Steel Coat has purchased the property and wishes to relocate to that property with a building that will serve as their headquarters and serve as their base of operations. It is currently under review by the Inlands/Wetlands Agency and therefore the commission cannot make any decisions until they have made theirs.

Table until action from CCIWA

Text of Motion: Table – waiting action from CCIWA

Motion made by: Dan Divito

Second by: Joe D’Uva

All in Favor

#### ARTICLES ON AGENDA (READY FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

1. Proposed text amendment to the Watertown Zoning Regulations from Attorney Michael McVerry to allow professional office uses by site plan/special permit within the R-20 zoning district limited to properties fronting on CT Route 6 (Woodbury Road).

Text of Motion: Approve

Motion made by: R. Marinaro

Second by: Ken Demirs

All in Favor:

Approve

Opposed

Abstain

Richard Antonetti

Raymond Antonacci

Ken Demirs

Dan Divito

R. Marinaro

Joe D’Uva

The motion failed to approve the application

2. Subdivision application from Michael Jedd for a proposed two lot subdivision of lot 8 Sand Bank Road, Map 163, Block 21, Lot 8.

Text of Motion: Approve with waiver for one common driveway

Motion made by: Ken Demirs

Second by: Dan Divito

All in favor:

Richard Antonetti

Raymond Antonacci



Ken Demirs  
Joe D'Uva

Dan Divito  
R. Marinaro

3. Echo Asset, LLC, "O" Echo Lake Road site plan application for development of an industrial building comprised of 4,800 s.f. of office space, 8,000 s.f. of shop area with associated parking for employees and vehicles. Map 104 Block 90 L23A

Text of Motion: Waiting on action from CCIWA

Motion made by: Dan Divito

Second by: Joe D'Uva

All in Favor

4. Site Plan/Special Permit#2021-06 application from Sasaki Associates, Inc on behalf of Taft School, 110 Woodbury Road, Watertown, CT, to install four (4) 70 foot sports lighting poles and lights on Snyder Field. Parcel ID Map 99, Block 58, Lot 7

Must await action from ZBA.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION – none.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting will be March 2, 2022.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn at: Adjournment at 8:15pm

Motion made by: Ken Demirs

Second by: Dan Divito

All in Favor

Lou Cavallo \_\_\_\_\_

Secretary