Present: Chair Barry Berson, Secretary: Commissioner Byron Lester, Commission Kevin Hussain, Commissioner Dwight Bolton, Sr., Commissioner Daniel Mara, Commissioner Michelle Adams and Commissioner Stephen Millette were all present at this meeting.

Alternates: Commissioner Michael Oliver, and Commissioner Katie Blint (voted)

Absent: None

Also Present: Ms. Jennifer Rodriguez, Director of Planning & Economic Development, and Mr. Jonathan Thiesse, Town Engineer were present at this meeting.

1) Call to Order: Commissioner Berson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A quorum was established with 7 members, and 2 alternates.

2) Approval of the Minutes for March 24, 2022:

Commissioner Bolton made a motion to approve the March 24, 2022 minutes as amended, and Commissioner Blint seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the minutes for March 24, 2022, as amended.

(The Commission decided to hear Sections 7a, 7b, 7d first, thereafter Section 7c was tabled until the May 26, 2022, TPZ Commission meeting).

Commissioner Mara made a motion to open the public hearing, and Commissioner Bolton seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion.

3) Public Hearings (Continued):

(Sections 3a, and 3b were heard together).

a. Application by Andy Morrison for 2 lot re-subdivision of 4.7 acres and 15.389 acres; property located at 1236 Blue Hills Ave in an R-15 & 1-2 zone, Marie Dunn, owner.

Mr. T. J. Barresi, P.E., L.S., President of Barresi Associates, located at 570 Hayden Station Road, Suite D, Windsor, CT was here representing this application. Mr. Barresi presented a PowerPoint presentation which included the proposal for a two (2) lot re-subdivision of 4.7 acres and 15.389 acres; property located at 1236 Blue Hills Avenue, in a R-15 & 1-2 zone. He indicated on the PowerPoint slides the drainage system, grading, basins, utilities, lighting, vegetation, landscaping, and outdoor storage. Old Iron Ore Road was a concern of the Commission, after careful research Mr. Barresi stated there were no documents or records in the Town of Bloomfield indication Old Iron Ore Road was abandoned or continues as a private access road by the Town. He’s still confused about Old Iron Ore Road.

Ms. Rodriguez provided memorandums both dated April 28, 2022, and both contained information concerning this application. The memo provided a description of the property, the proposed use, possible motion, and suggested special permit conditions to be met prior to outdoor storage use. Also conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits, conditions which must be met prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance, and general conditions.

Mr. Rodriguez also expressed her concerns with parking, the application submittal does not include building elevations, and the applicant hasn’t provided lighting details, landscaping, and sign details. Mr. Thiesse, the Town Engineer also provided comments.

Public Questions: None

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Mara and the other Commissioners were interested in the status of Old Iron Ore Road. The TPZ Commission requested the status of Old Iron Ore Road be researched by either the client’s attorney or the town’s attorney, and the information concerning the status of that road be provided at the May 26, 2022, TPZ Commission meeting.

Commissioner Mara made a motion to continue the Application by Andy Morrison for 2 lot re-subdivision of 4.7 acres and 15.389 acres; property located at 1236 Blue Hills Ave in an R-15 & 1-2 zone, Marie Dunn, owner. Also continue the Special Permit application of Andy Morrison to allow a proposed building with outside storage of material and equipment associated with a contractor’s yard at 1242 Blue Hills Ave in an R-15 & 1-2 zone, Marie Dunn, owner. Both applications were continued to the May 26, 2022, TPZ Commission meeting. The Commission requested the status of Old Iron Ore Road be provided at the May meeting. Commissioner Blint seconded the motion and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion.
c. Special permit application of Mansfield Street LLC for a new mixed use/multi-family development consisting of 7 dwelling units and 2 commercial spaces, property located at 747 Blue Hills Ave in a GWD district, owner Mansfield Street LLC.

(Section 3c) application was withdrawn.

The Legal Notice was published in the Hartford Courant, and notice was hereby given that the Town Planning and Zoning Commission will conduct public hearing via the zoom online platform on April 28, 2022, commencing at 7 p.m., to consider the following; (a) Petition by Aaron J. Romano for a proposed Zoning Regulation text amendment to allow for the expansion of farm activities to include agritourism, (b) Special permit application of Krown Point Capital, LLC/ CRT, LLC for approval of a revised master plan for a Planned Luxury Residential development consisting of 90 units of single-family rental residences, property located at 21 & 30 Ryefield Hollow Dr. in an R-30 zone, owner Mauucci Brothers, LLC., (c) Special permit application of Douglas Street Ventures, LLC for approval to construct a 74,520 sq. ft. warehouse/distribution center with associated loading docks and parking. Property located at 59 & 69 Douglas St in an I-2 zone, owner Douglas Street Ventures, LLC.

Commissioner Bolton made a motion to open the public hearing, and Commissioner Mara seconded the motion. The Commission voted to approve the motion.

4. Public Hearings (New):

a. Petition by Aaron J. Romano for a proposed Zoning Regulation text amendment to allow for the expansion of farm activities to include agritourism.

Mr. Mr. Romanon located at 55 Woodland Avenue, Bloomfield was at this meeting representing himself. Mr. Romanon proposed a zoning regulation text amendment to allow a expansion of farm activities to include agritourism. Agritourism are activities carried out on the farm that allows members of the general public, recreational, entertainment, or education purposes. Also to view or enjoy rural activities including farming, dancing, historic, cultural, harvest-your-own activities, or natural activities, and attractions. Mr. Romanon stated he’s interested in agritourism because the events would help keep the farm up and running.

Ms. Rodriguez submitted a memorandum dated April 28, 2022, to the Commission with her comments. She stated, while there are farm related definitions, agriculture and agritourism largely are not currently supported in the Bloomfield Zoning Regulations. Many farms, in particular small farms, remain viable through their ability to carry out activities that invite the general public to participate in addition to the normal farming operations. Agritourism can be a boost to the local economy and provide additional recreational, educational and entertainment activities for residents and tourists.

The applicant met with staff to review the current definitions as well as model regulations from towns such as Simsbury and Granby. Much of the language in the applicant’s proposal reflects the language in those towns’ regulations and some of the proposed language is modified. Decision Considerations Section 9.6.C of your regulations provides the Commission with specific decision considerations for their review and decision making of regulatory changes.

Some questions the commission might ask:

1. How does the amendment aid or contribute to the community?
2. How might the amendment impact the community?
3. How many properties and local farms would benefit from this regulation?
4. Does the amendment align with the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD)?
5. Does the regulation protect public health, safety, welfare, property values?
6. Does the regulation help to attain the purpose of the regulations and the POCD?

Plan of Conservation and Development On page 32 of the POCD the plan provides a number of goals such as to preserve farmland, agricultural heritage and specifically recognizes the importance of agritourism.

“Agricultural tourism, or agri-tourism, is one alternative for improving the incomes and potential economic viability of small farms and rural communities.” Page 34 Strategies and New Approaches 3.11 states “Evaluating land use regulations for agriculture and agri-tourism” as a strategy to achieving farm viability and preservation.

Procedural notes: when the Commission acts on a regulatory change it must: 1) state the decision on the record, 2) state findings on consistency with the POCD, 3) establish an effective date.

Public Questions: (For the record, questions were sent via email to Ms. Rodriguez)

Mr. Garrett Phelan located at 37 High Hill Road, Bloomfield CT 06002

Written Testimony on Public Hearings Agenda item 4a. 4/26/2022, Petition by Aaron J. Romano for a proposed Zoning Regulation text amendment to allow for the expansion of farm activities to include agritourism. It is important for the town to see how best the farms and residential zones coexist in Bloomfield. That said, the town must not only deal with the present but have a vision that enhances the quality of living in the future as well. I ask and argue that the Town Planning and Zoning Commission deny the Petition by Aaron J. Romano for a proposed Zoning Regulation text amendment to allow for the expansion of farm activities to include agritourism.
The petition impacts many people on many levels. It also could limit the vision of the town for not only the present, but for the future. It is a broad petition that would support and worked hard to create such a vision for this gem of Bloomfield to the farm. Now, that's a huge petition.

Aerufarm would continue to be an educational farm offering education especially to children. There are ecological and environmental concerns. Impact on wildlife, farm life and quality of human life in nearby residences, noise levels, lighting levels, hours of operation and amount of human and vehicle traffic. These concerns need further study and input from nearby residents and others.

The town must find a safe, efficient, and sensible way to preserve the farm and most suitable sight on farm to hold outdoor events that create noise. Example on AuerFarm events location abutted residential property on one side and markedly further 1000 yds (?) from property line on other side of the farm. Is a Farm large enough or remote enough so that any event be 500-1000 yds from residential property line and sound is directed into the farm and not at residential properties? There are ecological and environmental concerns. Impact on wildlife, farm life and quality of human life in nearby residences, noise levels, lighting levels, hours of operation and amount of human and vehicle traffic. These concerns need further study and input from nearby residents and others.

The town could collaborate and work with to create this incredible preserve in busy Bloomfield.

The town could collaborate and work with to create this incredible preserve in busy Bloomfield.

When does a farm and its activities become an events venue rather than a practicing farm? Based Recreational Activities only that do not include music and live entertainment, especially any amplified sound element of the event must be limited to one 4 hour period. (one block of time.

There are ecological and environmental concerns. Impact on wildlife, farm life and quality of human life in nearby residences, noise levels, lighting levels, hours of operation and amount of human and vehicle traffic. These concerns need further study and input from nearby residents and others. It is an incredible preserve in busy Bloomfield.

The town could collaborate and work with to create this incredible preserve in busy Bloomfield.

The town could collaborate and work with to create this incredible preserve in busy Bloomfield.

The town could collaborate and work with to create this incredible preserve in busy Bloomfield.
As drafted the proposal does not seem to meet the needs of a clear set of requirements to be able to serve for now and into the future. To further the preceding comment, it seems odd that there can be no “non-agricultural events” that have less than 200 people. We were concerned that if intended it would be too restrictive and not enough. 2) AuerFarm’s Noise Ordinance scrapping the residential zone decibel limit for a vague and unenforceable criterion of being able to “tough on a conversation without raising voices.” Anyone with a smartphone can have a decibel meter app. By contrast, who can measure the proposed conversation criterion? This part of the proposal is an indefensible regime. But first and foremost the Town Noise Ordinance should not be subject to change by a zone text amendment. The issue for this transaction is simply the maintenance of the current Town Noise Ordinance for residential neighborhoods since the rest of the proposal is difficult to decipher in detail. In the case of AuerFarm it exists in a residential zone and needs to operate under those boundary conditions, namely the limits on noise already established for that zone. There is an implied contract between the Town of Bloomfield and those of us who bought homes here.

Linda Goodman and Eric Grossman located at 39 High Hill Road, Bloomfield, email their comments to Ms. Rodriguez on April 26, 2022. They stated as neighbors adjacent to one of the properties that would fit the definition of “farming” in these proposed zoning regulations, they have great concerns about some provisions that would take some time to study but immediately raise serious questions: Section 2.9 of the YPZ for take its definitions and the fact that such changes would affect all Bloomfield farms that currently are covered by residential zoning. Their primary issues are: 1) Although the definitions Article 2. Section 2.2 defines “agriculture” and “farming,” the list does not define a “farm.” Since there is no specified minimum acreage for a “farm,” a Bloomfield home with a background that maintains a beehive or two would be engaged in “farming” under these definitions and could then engage in agritourism, farm-based recreational activities, and non-agricultural events on their property. These regulations need to be much more specific as to what constitutes a “farm.” 2b) Included in examples of a “farm store” in Article 2. Section 2.2 are wineries, breweries, and distilleries as well as a restaurant. “The farm store” may sell products that are produced on or off site. By that definition, a “package store” could become part of a farm store, selling products produced off-site. Would that circumvent the need for a license to sell liquor from the store? 2c) “Farm Raised” in product to industries “not directly related to agriculture with an expected attendance of over 200 persons.” Are these actually appropriate events for a farm to conduct? Would a non-agricultural event with an expected attendance of under 200 people be allowed? 2d) Agricultural events are very unclear on that point. Farms would be allowed to hold up to 15 agricultural events per year. 4) Putting the actual types of events together, a farm would be allowed to hold 15 agricultural events and 15 outdoor non-agricultural events per calendar year. Since most of these events are likely to occur in the seven months (approximately 28 weeks) between April and October, a farm could hold 70 events of every type over that period. Their need for some regulatory control in that arena is obvious. It appears that the proposed regulations would allow a single Special Permit to cover all non-agricultural events. This is far more permissive than the individual permits required. These regulations limit the types of events the same and other camps, as well as the number of events allowed per year, to 15 events. Any event for fewer than 200 people should also require a permit. 3) There are no specific, measurable sound level limits in these proposed regulations. The proposed definition of “where people can conduct a conversation without raising their voices” is neither measurable nor enforceable. There is no reference to existing town sound ordinances. “Farming circle” as referenced in these regulations would violate existing town sound level limits if held outdoors.

In summary, these regulations require much more careful consideration and Bloomfield TPZ, in consultation with the Bloomfield town attorney, should re-draft major sections of these regulations for clarity, enforceability, and reasonableness for their impact on those living in adjacent properties.

to: Town Planning and Zoning Commission, Town of Bloomfield

From: Seth and Melanie Klein, 39 High Hill Road, Bloomfield CT

Re: April 2022, Meeting: Testimony on the proposed Bloomfield Zoning Regulation Text Amendment:

We write with regard to Aaron Romano’s “agritourism” text amendment to Bloomfield’s Zoning Regulations. As set forth below, the proposed regulations are unclear and, to the extent that they do not resolve the issues, could cause significant confusion and adverse affect the solvency and further study and revision. We appreciate the need of this community to allow for reasonable and carefully considered agritourism events to occur. But the proposed amendments need significant revision and should be rejected as written. (Footnote 1) BACKGROUND:

The proposed amendments will affect not only Mr. Roman’s farm properties but all farms covered farm properties in Bloomfield. In that regard, we live at the upper end of High Hill Road, a few hundred feet from AuerFarm, which has raised much of our home properties (that is very close to our and our neighbors’ properties and homes, located less than 300 feet from the home that is closest to the farm, according to the legend on Google Maps). In the last several years, we have noticed a marked increase in the frequency, scope, and volume levels of the outdoor, amplified events held on the farm. These events have been limited by the decibel limits set out in the Town’s noise ordinance; but such specific provisions for farm events, such as “agricultural events” that have less than 200 attendees are completely banned, all Non-Agricultural events (such as weddings and banquets) have been significantly more disruptive to neighboring properties. Howeve...
are excessively permissive. It appears from 7.4.C.1 that a farm may provide an unlimited number of occasions of music or entertainment “in conjunction with a farm store,” potentially up to 365 days per year. Any music and entertainment that a farm store may provide that is not fully indoors should fall within the regular allotment for Agricultural or Non-Agricultural Events as appropriate. Ninth, a much more thorough review and analysis of the potential impact of the significant alcohol sales contemplated by the provisions related to Farm Wineries, Breweries, and Distilleries is necessary to understand the potential impact of these allowances. On their face, and without further information, they are concerning. If these are allowed at all, much more specific regulations are necessary. Seventh, given the inherently disruptive nature of the potential “special events” contemplated by 7.4.D., an application process should be put in place to ensure the public’s ability to review and comment on any such proposed special events. Eighth, to avoid any confusion or dispute, the draft regulations should specify that for the purpose of these regulations, “indoors” means fully enclosed (including four walls, roof, and closeable doors), and that any structure that does not fully meet this definition qualifies as “outdoors.” Ninth, the proposed provision on sanctions (7.4.G) should be amended to ensure that the proposed regulations do not impinge on farming activities to include the following:

1. “Agricultural events.” Although we have no personal experience with drum circles, we have attended many arts and crafts fairs over the years in settings ranging from city streets to town greens to indoors at convention centers. We find no reason to classify these types of events as agricultural; these are wholly separate, non-agricultural, and potentially disruptive activities and should be designated as Non-Agricultural Events.
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Public Questions:

Mr. Keith Anderson asked did it exist off Brown Street, and Ms. Megan King asked why rent and not buy the units? Mr. King also inquired about the units? Mr. Todd Cooper was concern with open space (easements), and Ms. Gwen Turner was concerned with the morning traffic. Ms. D. Winther’s stated she did not receive notification concerning this matter. Mr. Ziaks and Mr. Kronstadt answered all questions satisfactorily.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Bolton asked why a single family unit? Commissioner Oliver asked the rent amount for the units? Commissioner Hussain asked about the mailings, easement, building owner operator? Mr. Ziaks and Mr. Kronstadt answered all questions satisfactorily.

Public Comments:

Mr. Roger Bennet live in the area and he was not opposed to the project.

Mr. Robert Dickinson is located at 400 Seabury Dr., Apartment 4160, in Bloomfield. He encouraged multi-use paths or sidewalks be included on both sides of the street in this development in order to fulfill the goals of the Bloomfield Complete Streets Policy. He stated it would
Commission Comments:

Commissioner Bolton and Commissioner Blint were concerned with the traffic flow.

Commissioner Bolton made a motion to close the public hearing, and Commissioner Millette seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Commissioner Millette made a motion to approve the Special permit application of Krown Point Capital, LLC/ CRT, LLC for approval of a revised master plan for a Planned Luxury Residential development consisting of 90 units of single-family rental residences, property located at 21 & 30 Ryefield Hollow Dr, in an R-30 zone, owner Maulucci Brothers, LLC. This approval was subject to the conformance with the referenced plans, and the conditions outlined in Ms. Rodriguez memo dated April 28, 2022. Commissioner Mara seconded the motion. Commissioner Millette voted yay, Commissioner Oliver voted yay, Commissioner Adams voted yay, Commissioner Mara voted yay, Commissioner Bolton voted nay, and Chair Berson voted yay. The application passed and was approved.

c. Special permit application of Douglas Street Ventures, LLC for approval to construct a 74,520 sq. ft. warehouse/distribution center with associated loading docks and parking. Property located at 59 & 69 Douglas St in an I-2 zone, owner Douglas Street Ventures, LLC.

Commissioner Bolton made a motion to move the application to the May 26, 2022, TPPZ Commission meeting. Commissioner Hussain seconded the motion, and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion.

5. Site Plan:

a. Site Plan application of Douglas Street Ventures, LLC for approval to construct a 74,520 sq. ft. warehouse/distribution center with associated loading docks and parking. Property located at 59 & 69 Douglas St in an I-2 zone, owner Douglas Street Ventures, LLC.

Commissioner Bolton made a motion to move the application to the May 26, 2022, TPPZ Commission meeting. Commissioner Hussain seconded the motion, and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion.

b. Site Plan application of Permasteelisa North America for approval to construct a small outdoor display for building glass & siding panels. Property located at 1300 Hall Boulevard in a DDZ-1 zone, owner The Atrium CT LLC.

Mr. David S. Ziaks, President, F.A., Hesketh & Associates, Inc., was at this meeting representing the applicants. Mr. Ziaks gave a brief presentation, and he stated it was moved from Windsor, and it is a permitted use on the property.

Ms. Rodriguez submitted a memorandum dated April 28, 2022, for the Commission. She informed them concerning the following: (a) Zoning: The Land Use Table included in the plan set is for the entire site, 600 plus acres. The nature of this small accessory use building is insignificant relative to the overall site and does not seem to pose any conformance issues with overall site coverage or setbacks, (b) Proposed Use: The structure is used to showcase various kinds of glass from various perspectives, accessory to the company’s main use, (c) Parking: Parking needs or requirements are not impacted by this proposal. Landscaping: This application has minimal impact to landscaping, lawn and trees. The Commission may want to see the trees that are to be removed replaced in another location, (d) Possible Motion: Should the Commission find that this application meets the criteria for the approval of the site plan the following is a suggested Motion: TO APPROVE the Site plan application of Permasteelisa North America for approval to construct a small outdoor display for building glass & siding panels. Property located at 1300 Hall Boulevard in a DDZ-1 zone, owner The Atrium CT LLC, site plan application of Permasteelisa North America for approval to construct a small outdoor display for building glass & siding panels. Property located at 1300 Hall Boulevard in a DDZ-1 zone, owner The Atrium CT LLC.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Hussain asked about the maintenance of the facility, and Mr. Ziaks explained in-depth.

Commissioner Mara made a motion to approve the Site Plan application of Permasteelisa North America for approval to construct a small outdoor display for building glass & siding panels. Property located at 1300 Hall Boulevard in a DDZ-1 zone, owner The Atrium CT LLC. Site Plan application of Permasteelisa North America for approval to construct a small outdoor display for building glass & siding panels. Property located at 1300 Hall Boulevard in a DDZ-1 zone, owner The Atrium CT LLC. This approval was subject to the conformance with the referenced plans, and the conditions outlined in Ms. Rodriguez memo dated April 28, 2022. Commissioner Hussain seconded the motion, and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion.
6. Old Business:


The Plan of Conservation and Development discussion was moved to the May 26, 2022, TPZ Commission meeting.

7. New Business:

(7a and 7b was heard together)

a. Discontinuance of a portion of Cadwell Rd from 195 feet east of the easterly line of Longview Dr to the westerly line of Filley St.

b. Proposed property line adjustment/land transfer between Town & 110 Wintonbury Ave. in association with discontinuance of portion of Cadwell Rd.

Mr. Jonathan Thiesse gave a brief presentation, the Commission asked questions that were answered satisfactorily by Mr. Thiesse.

Commissioner Bolton made a motion to approve the Discontinuance of a portion of Cadwell Rd from 195 feet east of the easterly line of Longview Dr to the westerly line of Filley St., and approve the Proposed property line adjustment/land transfer between Town & 110 Wintonbury Ave. in association with discontinuance of portion of Cadwell Rd. Commissioner Hussain seconded the motion and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion.

c. Informal discussion regarding proposed cannabis regulations.

This discussion was moved to the May 26, 2022, TPZ meeting.

d. Community Investment Plan review, comment and recommendation to the Town Council as per CGS 8-24.

Ms. Nancy Haynes gave a PowerPoint presentation on the five year budget plan for the Board of Education, Infrastructure, stormwater improvements, traffic calming program, speed bumps, electronic signs, Alexander Road drainage, 2 Maple Avenue/Mallard Drive improvements, Florence Street sidewalks and under drainage, PartridgeLandFlooring mitigation, Juniper Road drainage improvements, hazardous tree removal, roadway improvements, sidewalk repairs and replacements, stormwater drainage repairs, urban forestry assessment, property revaluation consultants. Facilities: Town Hall piping replacements, salt brine, human resource building, flooring replacements, town hall masonry repairs. She also included the Parks and Leisure, equipment and vehicles.

Commissioner Bolton made a motion to approve to the Community Investment Plan review, comment and recommendation to the Town Council as per CGS 8-24. Commissioner Mara seconded the motion and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion.

8. Other Business:

a. Request from Tom Donahue of William Raveis on behalf of the Estate of Peter Stitch, for an extension of the Special Permit and Site Plan approval for the proposed residential development at 17 Watkins Rd and Overbrook Farms Rd.

This request was moved to the May 26, 2022, TPZ meeting.

9. Staff Updates:

This topic was also moved to the May 26, 2022, TPZ meeting.

10. Adjournment:

Commissioner Bolton made a motion to adjourn, and Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously to adjourn at 11:32 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: May 26, 2022