



RECEIVED FOR RECORD
WATERFORD, CT

2026 MAR 17 1A 9:12

ATTEST: *Doris J. Crum*
TOWN CLERK

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

March 10, 2026
6:30 PM

Members Present: Chairman Greg Massad, Karen Barnett, Timothy Conderino, and Tim Bleasdale
Members Absent: Victor Ebersole, Jr.
Alternates Present: Michael Elbaum
Alternates Absent: Joseph DiBuono and Doris Crum
Staff Present: Mark Wujtewicz, Planning Director, Lisa Stearns, Recording Secretary and Katrina Kotfer, Office Coordinator
Also Present: Atty Matt Willis

1. CALL TO ORDER AND APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

G. Massad called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM. M. Elbaum was seated for V. Ebersole, Jr

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Motion made by K. Barnett, seconded by T. Conderino, to approve the February 10, 2026 meeting minutes.

VOTE: 5-0

3. APPLICATION RECEIPT

#PL-26-6 Request of JGW Holding, LLC, Applicant and Barth-Colburn Realty Company, Owner for a modified site plan review and approval for a Roadside Assistance Contractor as a Business Office on property located at 17 Industrial Drive, I-G Zone in accordance with Sections 11.1.3, 11.1.10 and 22 of the Zoning Regulations and as shown on plans entitled "Site Plan/Design Review Prepared for Elite Auto Services, 17 Industrial Drive, Map 50 Lot 3559, Waterford, Connecticut, last revision 2/20/2026"

APPLICATION WAS RECEIVED

2/24/2026

M. Wujtewicz stated that the application will be scheduled for review at a future meeting.

G. Massad moved PL-26-2 to be the first application for review.

4. APPLICATION REVIEW

#PL-26-2 Request of George Secchiaroli, Applicant and Maryse Callard, Trustee, Owner for a Coastal Site Plan review and approval for a new single family home on property located at 4 Ridgewood Avenue VR-7.5 Zone in accordance with Sections 6A.4.1 and 25.4 of the Zoning Regulations and as shown on plans entitled "Zoning Compliance Survey, Property of Maryse

Callard, Trustee For Property located at, 4 Ridgewood Avenue Town of Waterford – County of New London – Connecticut, April 21, 2023”

ACTION REQUIRED BY:

4/2/2026

James Bernardo LS Gave a presentation of the proposed project.

He stated that the use of the property for a single family residential structure is consistent with the Town Zoning Regulations and the 2012 Plan of Preservation, Conservation and Development. There are two FEMA designated flood hazard zones on the parcel; Zones VE (EL13) and AE (EL10). The proposed house will be constructed within the FEMA designated SFHA AE (Elev10). The Zoning Regulations require that the elevation of the first floor to be no less than 1 foot above the designated Base Flood Elevation. The applicant proposes to construct the house utilizing a pier support system and provide for a first floor elevation no less than 2 feet above the AE base flood elevation (BFE) of 10. He also stated that the setbacks established on the plan were the result a court ordered stipulated judgement from an appeal to the action of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

T. Conderino asked about the note on the plans that there will not be dry access to the structure during a 100 year flood event.

James Bernardo stated that because the entire property is located within the FEMA designated flood zone AE (EL-10), if there was to be a flood event, the entire parcel would be inundated with flood waters. He also stated that the house will be constructed above the base flood elevation.

M. Wujtewicz stated that the note placed on a site plan identifying that there will be no dry access during a flood event is a zoning and FEMA requirement.

The Commission discussed the following conditions contained in the Staff Report:

1. The site plan as approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be the plan submitted for Zoning Compliance/Building Permit review. Any deviation from the approved site plan shall be reviewed by the Zoning Official. The Zoning Official reserves the right to determine whether any proposed modifications will need to be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a modified site plan approval.
2. The parcel is located within the FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard District AE (EL-10) and VE (EL-13). The house will be constructed within the SFHA AE (EL-10). The proposed structure is to meet all requirements of Section 25.3 of the Zoning Regulations, Development in Flood Hazard Areas including plans prepared by a licensed Architect and/or PE.
3. No work of any kind to take place below the Coastal Jurisdiction Line without additional permits from the Town of Waterford and the Connecticut DEEP.
4. The plans note that in the case of a 100-year storm event there will not be dry access to or from the property.

5. Erosion control measures during construction shall be provided on site for the duration of the project and until the establishment of vegetative cover on disturbed areas. A detail of the erosion control measures (silt fence w/haybale) shall be provided on the site plan prior to filing on the land records.
6. No work covered by this permit including the stockpiling of materials shall be conducted outside of the silt fence and limit of disturbance.
7. An as-built survey shall be submitted and approved by the Zoning Official prior to issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance.

MOTION: Motion made by T. Bleasdale, seconded by M. Elbaum to approve with conditions Site Plan CAM Application PL-26-2 located at 4 Ridgewood Avenue with conditions 1 thru 7 and to find that the project as approved with conditions is consistent with all applicable coastal policies and includes all reasonable measures to mitigate adverse impacts as shown in the written findings and conditions dated March 10, 2026.

VOTE: 5-0

The Chair moved PL-26-3 Restaurant Depot to the next item of the meeting.

#PL-26-3 Request of Larry Cohen, Applicant and WS Asset Management owner for site plan approval for Restaurant Depot for property located at 161 Waterford Parkway North, C-R Zone, in accordance with sections 9.1.2 and 22 of the Zoning Regulations and as shown on plans Entitled "Site Development Plans for Proposed Restaurant Depot, 161 Waterford Pkwy North, New London County, Waterford, CT Map & Lot: 105-8981 Last revised December 10, 2025".

ACTION REQUIRED BY:

4/2/2026

Chas Evans presented the application to the Commission

Chas Evans of Bohler Engineering, spoke of the size of the previously proposed building and that this proposed building footprint is less than the previous square footage. They are also adding two more loading docks, four new fire hydrants and went over the update of the outside of the building with plantings and a fresh new light grey paint on the outside of the building

G. Massad asked if there was going to be electric charging stations

Chas Evans replied it is not proposed at this time.

G. Massad inquired as to whether they would be required to install electric charging stations as this is a new building being constructed.

M. Wujtewicz responded that this site plan was approved in 1997 and that all improvements except for the building being constructed had been completed prior to the requirement for installing EV charging stations. This proposal does not modify the existing parking lot or infrastructure to the extent that the installation of EV charging stations would be required.

Atty Matt Willis stated that the approved 1997 site plan remains in effect.

T. Bleasdale asked what color the building is going to be.

Chas Evans responded that it is going to be a light grey.

K. Barnett said it was a great use of space.

The Commission discussed the following findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report:

Findings:

1. The application is for a use subject to a modified Site Plan approval, pursuant to Section 9.1.2 of the Waterford Zoning Regulations.
2. The application meets the criteria for site plan approval, pursuant to Section 22 of the Waterford Zoning Regulations, subject to modifications and conditions listed
3. This application has been reviewed by the Town of Waterford Design Review Board in accordance with Section 22b of the Waterford Zoning Regulations and which Board submits a positive report to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Conditions:

1. Provide detail for the proposed cart corral located in the front of the building. Its design should be integrated and representative of the building design/materials. The site plan shall be updated to reflect the new cart corral prior to filing the plans on the land records.
2. The existing clothes donation box is an ongoing issue regarding the accumulation of trash and debris. It doesn't appear to be actively managed. It shall be removed from the property prior to the issuance of a Zoning Compliance Permit.
3. Any outstanding comments relative to the public water service shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the City of New London Water Department prior to filing the plans on the land records.

MOTION: Motion made by M. Elbaum and seconded by T. Conderino to approve with modifications and conditions, Site Plan application #PL-26-3 for Restaurant Depot located at 161 Waterford Parkway North, with modifications and conditions 1 through 3 and to adopt the findings 1 thru 3 of the staff report dated March 10, 2026.

VOTE: 5-0

The Chair moved PL-26-5 to the next item of the meeting.

#PL-26-5 Request of Mathon Fund I, Liquidating Trust, owner and applicant to change the Zone for a 188 acre parcel, property located at 140 Waterford Parkway South. From 1P-1 (General Industrial Park) to I-MF (Industrial – Multi Family) in accordance with Section 28 of the Zoning Regulations and shown on plans entitled “Request for Zone change Industrial Multi-

Family District (I-MF) prepared for Mathon Fund I, Liquidating Trustee, owner/applicant,
Proposed Zone change plan”

APPLICATION WAS RECEIVED
PUBLIC HEARING MUST OPEN BY:

2/10/2026
4/16/2026

The public hearing opened at 6:58pm.

M. Wujtewicz read the list of exhibits 1 thru 8 into the record.

- EXHIBIT 1 - Application
 - 1a. Application (9 pages)
 - 1b. Statement of Use
 - 1c. Traffic Statement
 - 1d. Abutters list
 - 1e. NDDDB Map
- EXHIBIT 2 - Request for Zone Change, Industrial Multi-Family District (I-MF) Prepared for Mathon Fund I, Liquidating Trustee, Owner/Applicant Proposed Zone Change Plan. December 15, 2025 (2 Sheets)
- EXHIBIT 3 - Notice of Public Hearing to Applicant dated February 17, 2026
- EXHIBIT 4 - Public Hearing Notice run in The Day newspaper February 24, 2026 and March 03, 2026
- EXHIBIT 5 - Certificates of Mailing dated February 26, 2026
- EXHIBIT 6 - Staff Report dated March 10, 2026
- EXHIBIT 7 - Community Structure Map
- EXHIBIT 8 - Application notice in the Town Clerk

Brandon Handfield, PE, principal of Yantic River Consultants representing the owner, presented the application to the Commission

He reviewed with the Commission a brief history of the property and its uses starting in 1934. He went thru the sections of the application as listed below. He presented to the Commission the reasons for the zone change request from IP-1 (General Industrial Park) to I-MF (Industrial Multi-Family). He outlined the various goals of the current Plan of Conservation and Development and how this proposal is consistent with those goals.

He stated that the proposed plan identifies a conceptual layout of areas on the property that would be used for multifamily and single family housing. The layout and building types contemplated are conceptual only at this point. If the zone change was approved, a more detailed site plan, including building locations and specific building designs would be presented to the Commission at a future date.

G. Massad asked B. Handfield what the maximum density could be if the project was constructed in accordance with the density calculations defined in the zoning regulations. B. Handfield stated that up to 1,504 units could be constructed utilizing the density calculation in the Zoning Regulations. The applicant is not proposing that many units. Given the environmental constraints on the property as well as designating a portion of the frontage of the parcel to commercial use, the applicant would consider approximately 750 units.

Atty Matt Willis asked if environmental testing had been conducted on the property.

B. Handfield stated that there had been some testing on the site for the proposed Concrete Manufacturing facility previously by the Commission. He stated that he has been in contact with DEEP and is working with them.

T. Conderino asked how many acres are buildable if 42% of the property are wetlands.

B. Handfield stated that approximately 100 acres are buildable

T. Conderino asked how many acres will be needed for an apartment complex.

B. Handfield replied that approximately 3 to 5 acres would be needed for an apartment complex, 4 to 6 acres for a town house complex and 4 to 8 acres for single family homes area.

K. Barnett asked if any of the housing will be affordable housing

Brandon Handfield stated that there are no plans at this time.

At this time the Chair opened the hearing to the public.

Kathleen E. Swope of Beechwood Drive voiced concerns on traffic safety and the condition of the existing road

B. Handfield referred to the traffic report submitted into the record as exhibit 1c.

Daniel O'Brien of Yorkshire Drive asked if there is going to be an area of the project dedicated to a 55 and older community

B. Handfield stated there are no plans at this time.

Jordan Janice of Lancashire Court raised concerns on the wildlife disturbance that a project may cause.

B. Handfield stated that he is in contact with the DEEP and that if a site plan is submitted they will be required to work with DEEP to address wildlife concerns. The Chair asked three times if there was any one who wanted to speak for or against this application. No one else came forward.

Motion made by T. Bleasdale, seconded by T. Conderino to close the public hearing at 7:40.
Vote: 5-0

The Commission discussed the application.

G. Massad raised concerns that if the zone change were approved, any developer may propose up to 1504 units and he felt that many units was not appropriate for the location.

K. Barnett raised concerns with the amount of traffic that a large residential development may create and that she had concerns with the condition of Waterford Parkway South and whether the State or the Town were responsible for its maintenance.

T. Conderino agreed with G. Massad. He also would like to see more detail in a conceptual plan. While not opposed to residential use it would be a loss of valuable industrial land.

T. Bleasdale stated that while he understands and appreciates his fellow members concerns, he felt that adding multifamily use to this property's zoning was appropriate.

MOTION: Motion made by T. Bleasdale and seconded by G. Massad to approve Application PL-26-5 to change the Zone Designation for property located at 140 Waterford Parkway South from IP-1 (General Industrial Park) to I-MF (Industrial Multi-Family) and adopt the findings 1 thru 6 of the Staff Report dated March 10, 2026.

VOTE: 1-4 (K. Barnett, T. Conderino, M. Elbaum and G. Massad)

#PL-26-4 Request of James Waldron, Applicant and John P. Casey, Esq, Agent for site plan approval for Crystal Mall Adaptive Reuse for property located at 850 Hartford Turnpike, C-R Zone, in accordance with sections 9.1.3, 9.1.13 and 22 of the Zoning Regulations and as shown on plans entitled "General Dynamics, Electric Boat, Crystal Mall Adaptive Reuse Plans for Proposed, 850 Hartford Turnpike, Waterford, CT 06385 Last revised January 26, 2026

APPLICATION WAS RECEIVED

1/27/2026

PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED BY:

4/2/2026

The Chair opened the public hearing at 7:52pm

M. Wujtewicz read the list of exhibits 1-15 into the record.

EXHIBIT 1- Application (23pages)

EXHIBIT 2 - Storm Water Management Report Narrative (14 pages)

EXHIBIT 3 - Statement of Use (2 pages)

EXHIBIT 4 - Traffic Impact Study Executive Summary (3 pages)

EXHIBIT 5 - Site Plans

EXHIBIT 6 – Compliance Statement Re-Section 23.5 of the zoning regulations

EXHIBIT 7 - Traffic Impact Study (542 pages)

EXHIBIT 8 - Memo from Traffic Officer Devine to Chief Balestracci Review of Proposed Roadway Feature Changes Proposed by Electric Boat

EXHIBIT 9 Staff Report

EXHIBIT 10 - Notice of Public Hearing to Applicant dated February 17, 2026

EXHIBIT 11 - Public Hearing Notice run in The Day newspaper February 24, 2026 and March 3, 2026

EXHIBIT 12 - Certificates of Mailing dated February 26, 2026

EXHIBIT 13 - Storm Water Management Report Manual

EXHIBIT 14 - Utility Commission Review Comments

EXHIBIT 15 - Parkway North Connector proposed in 2008

Atty John P Casey of Robinson & Cole presented the application to the Commission. The existing Crystal Mall building will be repurposed into office space, research and development

and education spaces. The food court area will become food service area for the employees. At this time the Longhorn Steak House and Olive Garden will remain and stay open on the site.

Kyle Haubert, P.E of CLA Engineers reviewed the proposed changes to the parking layouts and traffic circulation within the site, along with landscaping changes. The onsite utilities, storm water management and sewer pump station will remain in place. Minor modifications and upgrades are proposed to the existing infrastructure.

Stephan Zaets of Vanasse & Associates presented an overview of the Traffic Impact Study (Exhibit 4). He also reviewed proposed changes to Rte. 85 and the I-95 on and off ramps.

Chris Bockstael, AIA, of FCArchitects reviewed with the Commission the proposed changes both interior and exterior to the building. They are proposing more natural light in the food court area and the fitness center. More bathrooms will be installed throughout the building. The entrances will be reconfigured in such a way as to add to the security measures required for this type of use.

Chad Frost, PLA, ASLA of Kent+Frost presented the proposed landscaping. He presented renderings from various viewpoints within the property and along Rte. 85. A double wall of trees along the Hartford Turnpike and multiple areas on the property will be planted with evergreen trees that are designed to grow to 8 to 10ft in height. There will be approximately 1,000 trees planted around the site. Sidewalks will also be installed to provide a mile walking loop around the property.

T. Bleasdale asked if the public can still use the entrance way to Home Depot and the drive between Home Depot and Target.

Stephan Zaets replied that the access to Home Depot and Target will remain. The driveway that is along the rear of the building and parking area will be designed in a way that will make it distinct from the drive area around the front of the building. This is to discourage public use and access around the rear of the building.

T. Bleasdale asked about the traffic using Cross Road to access Route 1. That area is currently prone to long traffic delays on Cross Road to the Rte. 1 intersection. Will it become a traffic issue?

Stephan Zaets stated that they are going to have to retime the traffic lights so it doesn't create an issue.

T. Conderino asked if there will be more lanes added to the south entrance in the vicinity of Home Depot.

Stephan Zaets stated that an additional right turn only lane will be added exiting south into Rte. 85. There will be two right lanes and one left with a straight thru lane.

G. Massad commented that he is in support of the changes to the landscaping and is pleased with the effort that Electric Boat and their team took in listening to the concerns of the Commission.

T. Conderino asked what types of trees are going to be used.

Chad Frost responded that the evergreens will be 8ft to 10ft in height when fully grown

M. Elbaum and T. Conderino asked about snow removal.

Bryan Donovan said it will only be an issue if we get the snow like we did this year. If so, they will get a permit to have it melted on site or trucked and disposed offsite.

G. Massad discussed the potential for a Parkway North Connector Road that was previously proposed in 2008. The design was entered into the record as Exhibit 15. If it is determined at some time in the future that the connector road needs to be constructed, that Electric Boat assist in providing the area needed for that portion of the road on its property. Atty. Casey stated that they are familiar with the proposed project and that they have no objections.

M. Wujtewicz requested that a condition be added to the motion that the applicant address all outstanding concerns raised by the Utility Commission in its review memo to the Commission dated March 5, 2026 and placed into the record as Exhibit 14. Atty. Casey stated that the applicant is familiar with the comments and that they have no objection to the condition as proposed.

The Chair asked three times if there was any one who wanted to speak for or against this application. No one came forward.

Motion made by T. Bleasdale, seconded by K. Barnett to close the public hearing at 9:01.
Vote: 5-0

The Commission discussed the application.

T. Bleasdale stated that this is a great proposal and that it appears that the traffic concerns are being addressed. He also stated that he likes the reduction in impervious area with the increase in landscaping.

K. Barnett appreciated the effort that the applicant had put in in addressing the Commissions concerns and is pleased with the proposal.

T. Conderino is pleased with the increase in the landscaping and the attention to the traffic concerns.

M. Wujtewicz reviewed the following findings and conditions with the Commission:

1. The property is located within the Regional Commercial (C-R) and General Commercial (C-G) Zone Districts.
2. The property is subject to an existing Special Permit #79-02 that was granted by the Commission on November 26, 1979.

3. The change in use of the property and buildings require a new special permit in accordance with Section 23.9.1 of the Zoning Regulations.
4. The uses that are proposed by the applicant are permitted in accordance with Sections 9.1.3 and 9.1.13 of the Zoning Regulations.
5. The "Statement Regarding Compliance with Section 23.5 of the Zoning Regulations" (Exhibit 6) provided by the applicant in accordance with Section 23.5 of the Zoning Regulations identify that the findings and the proposed uses are consistent with sections 23.5.1 through 23.5.9.
6. The property is subject to the original Site Plan #79-13 and a subsequent modification approval #PZ-2008-015 granted by the Commission on September 8, 2008
7. The application meets the criteria for a modified site plan approval, pursuant to Section 22 of the Waterford Zoning Regulations, subject to condition 1.
8. This application has been reviewed by the Town of Waterford Design Review Board in accordance with Section 22b of the Waterford Zoning Regulations and which Board submits a positive report to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

With conditions:

1. An annual Maintenance and Inspection Report for the Stormwater management system shall be provided to the Town of Waterford Planning and Development Department. This report shall be required to be submitted in order to verify that the stormwater management system is maintained and continues to operate as originally designed.
2. All outside storage of materials used in conjunction with the workforce training programs shall be shielded from public view through the use of screening. These areas shall be identified on the plan prior to filing on the site plan on the land records.

MOTION: Motion made by T. Conderino, seconded by M. Elbaum to approve with conditions the Site Plan and Special Permit for the Crystal Mall Adaptive Reuse by Electric Boat Corporation application #PL-26-4 located at 850 Hartford Turnpike with conditions 1 and 2 in the staff report and to add the additional conditions that Electric Boat assist in providing the area needed on its property for the portion of the proposed connector road to Waterford Parkway North if the need for the road is determined sometime in the future and that the applicant address all outstanding concerns raised by the Utility Commission in its review memo to the Commission dated March 5, 2026 and placed into the record as Exhibit 14 and to adopt the findings 1 through 8 of the staff report dated March 10, 2026.

VOTE: 5-0

5. **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW**
No discussion occurred.

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**
Ethics Commission Advisory Opinion Notice dated January 7, 2026

7. COMMISSION BUSINESS
No discussion occurred.

8. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Motion made by T. Bleasdale, seconded by K. Barnett to adjourn at 9:12 pm.

VOTE: 5-0

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Stearns
Recording Secretary