

**BRISTOL PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF MONDAY SEPTEMBER 22, 2025**

By: Chairman Veits

Time: 6:00 P.M.

Place: City Hall
Council Chambers
111 North Main Street
First Floor

ROLL CALL:

MEMBERS	NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS:	Chairman William Veits (Chairman)	X	
	John Soares (Vice Chairman)	X	
	Jon Pose (Acting Secretary)	X	
	Tracey Bacchus	X	
	Christopher Nardi	X	
ALTERNATE MEMBERS:	Kenneth Rasmussen-Tuller	X	
	Kiana Small	X	
	Greg Klimek	X	
STAFF:	Robert M. Flanagan, AICP, City Planner	X	
	William Stango, P.E., City Engineer	X	
	Andrew Armstrong, Assistant City Planner	X	

1. Call to Order

Per the order of Chairman Veits, the meeting was called to order at 6:00 P.M.

Chairman Veits reminded the Commission the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is Monday, October 27, 2025.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Participation

There was no public participation.

4. Approval of Minutes

a. Regular Meeting - August 25, 2025

Chairman Veits designated himself, regular Commissioners Nardi, Pose and Soares with alternate Commissioner Klimek to vote on the August 25, 2025, regular meeting minutes.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of the August 25, 2025, regular meeting.

By: Pose

Seconded: Klimek.

For: Nardi, Klimek, Pose, Soares and Veits.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

5. Receipt of New Applications

There were no new applications.

6. Public Hearings

- a. Application #440 - Site Plan for Multi-Family Residential Dwellings (30 Units) at Wolcott Street and Old Wolcott Road; Assessor's Map 7, Lot 45; A (Multi-Family Residential) zone; Crown Estates, LLC, applicant.

Chairman Veits designated himself, regular Commissioners Nardi, Bacchus, Pose and Soares as voting members this evening.

Staff stated the Department of Public Works has assigned the address of 525 Wolcott St. to the property. The City Planner noted comments were sent to the applicant, but the applicant did not have the responses ready for this evening.

Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave., representing the applicant, gave a presentation for a Multi-Family Residential dwelling facility for a 30-unit complex located on Wolcott St. Attorney Furey requested to continue the application to the October meeting but gave a presentation this evening.

The attorney reviewed comments. Attorney Furey said one of the main comments was because of the revised Zoning Regulations not as much parking was required. Therefore, additional green space would be preserved. Attorney Furey noted the parking on the east side of the property would be removed from the plans and shown as future parking.

The attorney indicated a small swale was placed in the front yard for stormwater runoff. Attorney Furey indicated the landscaping was amended on the north side of site for a neighbor buffer. The attorney verified the building coverage would be 6% and the impervious surface would be 9.4%. Attorney Furey noted the lighting plan was being worked on by the applicants engineer. The attorney commented there was a significant buffer for the neighbors. Attorney Furey said the landscaping plan was not integrated into the City's plan yet.

Commission inquiries: Attorney Furey thought this was the best engineered plan for the property.

The following persons did not speak in favor or against the application but had inquiries: Kimberly Doucette, 47 Old Wolcott Rd.; Matthew Small, 15 Old Wolcott Rd. and Dawn Lloyd, 25 Old Wolcott Rd.

Ms. Doucette inquired of the location of the entrance to the property. Mr. Small questioned if there was a revised traffic study prepared during the last school year. Ms. Lloyd inquired because the traffic study was done at spring break, would it affect the neighbors negatively.

Attorney Furey responses: The attorney said the entrance to the site would be on Wolcott St. Attorney Furey reported a revised traffic study was submitted when the zone change application was approved and the State subsequently prepared a traffic study for Wolcott St. that was part of the packet. Attorney Furey indicated the site line was in question for the traffic study. The attorney verified the traffic study by the State had reduced counts versus the applicants traffic study that were prepared at different times.

No one else spoke in favor of the application.
No one spoke against the application.

MOTION: Move to continue the Public Hearing on Application #440 to the October 27, 2025, Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission.

By: Pose

Seconded: Soares.

For: Nardi, Bacchus, Pose, Soares and Veits.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

Staff explained because of the early voting in October, the October 27, 2025, Regular Meeting would start in Meeting Room 3-1 but if there is a large amount of public audience then alternative meeting rooms would be made available at 6:00 P.M.

7. New Business
There was no new business.

8. Old Business
There was no old business.

9. Zoning Commission Referrals

- a. Zoning Commission Referral of Application AZR 25-07 — Review and discussion of recommendations associated with the comprehensive rewrite of the Bristol Zoning Regulations:

Chairman Veits designated himself, regular Commissioners Nardi, Bacchus, Pose and Soares to vote on Application #AZR 25-07.

1. Recommendation #27 – Cannabis Cultivation
2. Recommendation #37 – A Zone Bulk Requirements
3. Recommendation #38 – Amend Mixed Use/Street Wall Requirements: (BD) Zone
4. Recommendation #39 – Update Sign Regulations
5. Recommendation #40 – Expand Outdoor Lighting Requirements
6. Recommendation #41 – Overhaul Access Management Regulations
7. Recommendation #42 – Update Landscaping Standards
8. Recommendation #43 – Update Fence Requirements
9. Recommendation #44 – Amend Definition of Average Finished Grade
10. Recommendation #45 – Add Animal Grooming as a Permitted Use
11. Recommendation #46 – Add Data Centers as a Permitted Use
12. Recommendation #47 – Amend Requirements for Posting of Properties
13. Recommendation #48 – Minor Text and Formatting Amendments

Initiated by: Bristol Zoning Commission

Staff indicated this was an additional Zoning Regulation amendment from the Zoning Commission that would be referred back to the Zoning Commission for their October 20, 2025, Regular Meeting. The City Planner said the Zoning Commission and Staff worked on the Rewrite of the Zoning Regulations for 2 years and it is getting to the end. Staff mentioned there were three Regulations placed on pause from the last iteration of this process because of Commissioner Pose's suggestions. Those items would be reviewed by the Commission in the springtime after Staff reviewed any recommendations.

Mr. Gomes reviewed the amendments and would receive comments. The consultant said the Regulations do not allow for the cultivation of cannabis so the amendment would allow for the cultivation in the I-Zone and I-P zones.

Mr. Gomes noted a concern of this use would be the odor control.

The following person commented on Amendment #27: Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave., said the State was restrictive on security of these facilities. Attorney Furey indicated that Staff should review the proposed requirement for provisional approvals.

Regarding the A-Zone amendment, the consultant said many existing properties were in compliance with the existing A-Zone Regulations, so some of the yards were reduced and impervious surfaces were increased. The consultant noted densities were increased near State highways.

Staff indicated the A-Zone amendments were because a developer expressed interest in constructing a high-density development in Forestville.

Mr. Gomes reviewed the BD-Zone amendments and some of the restrictions. The consultant thought the Regulations were very limited for the street facing commercial spaces. The consultant said there was little demand for office or retail space, but a large demand for housing. Mr. Gomes said this minor amendment was to allow for more residential units on the street fronts with conditions and on certain streets.

The City Planner mentioned there is a tentative applicant that wanted to construct residential units in the downtown area. Staff stated that this change to the Regulations would encourage more housing and protect the existing and future developments in the area.

Commissioner Pose disagreed and this was a major change to have street facing dwelling units in the downtown area. The Commissioner wanted to discuss Recommendation #38 for the positive and negative aspects of the amendment.

Staff explained that street facing units were not part of this proposal; all ground-level residential will load from the back of the building. Additionally, Commissioner Pose stated he needed more information and would be unable to support Recommendation #38 in its current form.

Staff responses to Commission: The City Planner said Recommendation #38 was a response to a developer's request, but the Commission would either vote positive or negative to this amendment. Staff was in favor of the Amendment.

The City Planner verified North Main St. was not part of the amendment and there were only certain streets for the amendment.

The following person commented on Recommendation #38: Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave., reviewed the reason some applicants were unsuccessful with properties in the BD-Zone with combined commercial and residential units in their proposals. The attorney noted his client bought a lot and needed the proper mix of uses to make it feasible or the lot would remain vacant.

The consultant went over the Sign Recommendation noting the Commission was bound to do so because of a Supreme Court ruling. Mr. Gomes added there were no window sign Regulations in the current Regulations and that they were needed because of clutter and safety concerns. The consultant indicated the Regulations would make it easier for Staff and the enforcement easier for the ZEO.

The following person spoke in favor of Recommendation #39: Attorney Timothy Furey 43, Bellevue Ave.; was in favor of cleaning up the clutter of stores because some of them looked terrible. The attorney suggested the Commission review billboards to be able to be reconstructed to prevent non-conformities.

Mr. Gomes went over Recommendation #40 with many recommendations to correct the lighting standards, reduce light pollution and reduce light nuisance. The consultant indicated there was a new residential lighting nuisance Regulation that allowed enforcement by the ZEO.

The following person had comments on Recommendation #40: Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave., thought the definition would improve the administration for Staff but the ZEO would be very busy. Attorney Furey requested "Athletic Field or Activity Area Lighting" be reviewed because of the lighting and noises nuisances on Morrison Ave. that had no permits. The attorney requested there be Special Permits for these uses with limits for the lighting and property uses including schools and entity properties.

Mr. Gomes stated Recommendation #41 would be a renovation of the Access Management Regulations that would be applied to the entire City for all driveways with Special Permits or Site Plans. The consultant said the Regulation would be in accordance with the City Ordinances and the Engineering Dept. Regulations. Mr. Gomes pointed out this would be a voluntary and incentive-based Regulation.

Regarding Recommendation #42 for Landscaping, the consultant said the landscaping buffers would have more detailed specifics. Mr. Gomes indicated invasive species would not be allowed on Site Plans or Special Permit plans.

On Recommendation #43 concerning fencing, the consultant commented the Regulations language would be made clearer.

Mr. Gomes said the Recommendation #44 Average Finished Grade was important for determining the height of a building. The consultant said there were no existing Regulations on how to determine the measurement, so this would be a guideline.

Concerning Recommendation #45, Mr. Gomes indicated Animal Grooming was not allowed in the Regulations because of the intensities associated with the use. The consultant reported Animal Grooming Establishment was a new use for the Regulations with a Special Permit and Site Plan.

Staff explained the Zoning Enforcement Officer had phone calls for interest with the Animal Grooming use. The City Planner stated Staff supported the use.

Regarding Recommendation #46, Mr. Gomes described the new use of data centers. The consultant advised the Commission that noise would be a concern that may be controlled with a distance from residential areas. Mr. Gomes reviewed the conditions for the data centers that would include a vibration control study.

Staff specified there was a small data center proposal for Riverside Ave. so Mr. Gomes and he felt the larger data centers should be added to the Regulations. The City Planner noted the data center would have a fuel cell for power.

Staff reviewed esthetic concerns about the previous New Britain Water Company applications that had to post many public hearing signs. The City Planner explained the revised Regulation would make the process easier for applicants.

Mr. Gomes reviewed Recommendation #48 that had a list of many Minor Text and Formatting Amendments for the Regulations. The consultant concluded there was a new incentive for sustainability of energy. Mr. Gomes noted the Zoning Commission would now be in charge of waiving requests for Site Plans versus the City Planner.

No one else spoke in favor of the application.
No one spoke against the application.

MOTION: Move to send a **positive referral** to the Zoning Commission for Application #AZR 25-07, containing Recommendations 27, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, & 48.

The Planning Commission finds that the Zoning Commission referral, as presented, **is generally consistent** with the goals and policies of the 2015 Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), amended to April 1, 2018.

By: Pose

Seconded: Soares.

For: Nardi, Bacchus, Pose, Soares and Veits.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

The CT General Statute 8-24 Referral is recommended for approval.

MOTION: Move to send a **negative referral** to the Zoning Commission for Application #AZR 25-07, containing Recommendation 38.

The Planning Commission finds that the Zoning Commission referral, as presented, **is generally not consistent** with the goals and policies of the 2015 Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), amended to April 1, 2018.

By: Pose

Seconded: Nardi.

For: Soares and Veits.
Against: Nardi, Bacchus and Pose,
Abstain: None.

The motion is denied.

MOTION: Move to send a **positive referral** to the Zoning Commission for Application #AZR 25-07, containing Recommendation 38.

The Planning Commission finds that the Zoning Commission referral, as presented, **is generally consistent** with the goals and policies of the 2015 Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), amended to April 1, 2018.

By: Pose

Seconded: Nardi.

For: Nardi, Bacchus, Soares and Veits.
Against: Pose.
Abstain: None.
Vote: 4-1

The Zoning Commission Referral is recommended for approval.

10. City Council and Other Referrals

There were no City Council and Other Referrals.

11. Staff Reports

a. Subdivision Status Report — September 2025

The City Planner indicated there was no update for the Subdivision Status report. Staff mentioned there is a potential for an 85-lot subdivision that would be filed next year.

b. Proposed Meeting Dates — 2026

The City Planner noted the proposed meeting date schedule for 2026 was in the packet and would be filed with the City Clerk's Office in November, if the Commission agreed with the schedule.

12. Communications

There were no communications.

13. Adjournment

Motion was made by Commissioner Veits to adjourn.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Nardi.

Motion carried 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 P.M.

These minutes represent the proceedings of the meeting.

This meeting was recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy King

William Veits
Chairman
City Planning Commission