

Wallingford Planning & Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
Monday, August 10, 2026
7:00 p.m.
Robert F. Parisi Council Chambers – Town Hall
Town Hall – 45 South Main Street
MINUTES

Chairman Fitzsimmons called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

Roll Call: Present: James Fitzsimmons, Chair; Jeffrey Kohan, Vice Chair; David Leonardo, Secretary; James Seichter, Regular Member; J.P. Venoit, Regular Member; Joseph Sanders, Alternate; Richard Benham, Alternate; Casey Camire, Alternate; and Kevin Pagini, Town Planner.

Chairman Fitzsimmons noted that the following agenda items will not be heard tonight.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING – # 504-26 Text Amendment request for Quinnipiac Valley Growth Partners to add cannabis retailer as an allowed use by Special Permit in the RF-40 (Route 5) Zoning District. Text Amendment will alter Sections §1.4, §6.34, and §4.16.C.**
(Continued to September meeting.)
5. **PUBLIC HEARING - #407-26 Special Permit request for Atlantis Management Group to demolish an existing building and construct a gas station with a 4,500+/- sq. ft. drive-through retail and convenience store at 124 Church St. located in the I-40 (Industrial) District.** (Continued to September meeting.)
7. **SITE PLAN APPROVALS - #213-26 Site Plan/SCG, LLC/368-372 Church Street.** (Withdrawn)
8. **SITE PLAN APPROVALS - #218-26 Site Plan/McInvale/1183 & 1185 Old Colony Rd.**
(Continued to September meeting.)
9. **SITE PLAN APPROVALS - #219-26 – Site Plan/A. Secondino & Son, Inc./ 1 Dudley Ave.**
(Continued to September meeting.)

Consideration of Minutes – June 8, 2026, Regular Meeting

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday, June 8, 2026, Meeting of the Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission as submitted.

Commissioner Leonardo: Second

Vote: Kohan – yes; Leonardo – yes; Seichter – yes; Sanders – yes; Chairman Fitzsimmons – yes.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Text Amendment request for F&M Bank, LLC to expand the allowable uses within the Town Center district. The amendment is specifically seeking to alter Section 4.26.B.2.6 to allow law offices and General/Business offices, clinics, and outpatient medical treatment**

facilities that are currently not allowed on the ground-level street-facing portion of a building. – TC (Town Center) District #414-26

Commissioner Leonardo read the legal notice and noted the correspondence. Application #503-26 – Text Amendment request for F&M Bank, LLC to expand the allowable uses within the Town Center district. The amendment is specifically seeking to alter Section 4.26.B.2.6 to allow law offices and General/Business offices, clinics, and outpatient medical treatment facilities that are currently not allowed on the ground-level street-facing portion of a building. – TC (Town Center) District.

Correspondence included an email from Alison Kapushinski, Town Engineer to Kevin Pagini Town Planner, dated June 4, 2026; letter from Don Crouch, Economic Development Commission to the Planning & Zoning, dated June 5, 2026; letter from Liz Davis, Wallingford Center, Inc., to Planning & Zoning Commission, dated June 4, 2026; email from Nanette Pastore, Pearce Real Estate to Isabelle Demers dated June 8, 2026; letter from Atty. Jim Loughlin, to Kevin Pagini, Town Planner dated July 9, 2026; email from Don Crouch, Economic Development Commission to Kevin Pagini, Town Planner, dated July 9, 2026; Inspection Report from Brian Schock, Fire Marshal dated July 21, 2026; letter from Kevin Pagini, Town Planner to F&M Bank, LLC, dated July 22, 2026, and a change to the proposal, now only allowing general business offices and deletion of clinics and outpatient medical treatment facilities provided they are not located on the ground floor of any building.

Chris McGuire, member of F&M Bank, LLC, 2 North Main Street, and John McGuire, member of F&M Bank, LLC, presented.

Mr. Chris McGuire explained that they propose to allow more permissible uses on the first floor in the special uptown business district. There has been a lot of correspondence, and the proposed change is agreeable to them. They have no objections. They appreciate the collaboration with the Town.

Chairman Fitzsimmons clarified that the last proposal is the one dated August 7, 2026. Chris McGuire confirmed. Chairman Fitzsimmons thanked the applicant for working with the Town and the EDC.

Commissioner Seichter stated that he appreciated their working with the Town. He noted that there are only 5 buildings that have the potential for a business on the first floor. He believes this will help some of those properties.

Commissioner Sanders referred to the August 5th note from Atty. Laughlin and asked if this latest proposal supersedes that. Chairman Fitzsimmons confirmed we are using the one dated Friday.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Craig Fishbein, Grieb Road, asked for verification that the change is now only to have general business offices and the rest of the language in number 6 has been struck. Chairman Fitzsimmons confirmed. Mr. Fishbein stated that he supports this proposal. He stated concern with blocked windows. He noted that there is a regulation against blocking the windows. He asked the Commission to enforce the regulation.

Wesley Krombel, Ward Street, stated that the Town made an intentional decision in 2018 when it updated the Town Center regulations. Their vision was to provide a pedestrian-friendly destination and prioritized restaurants, cafes, retail and other businesses that encouraged people to walk downtown. He stated concern about the precedent and the character of downtown gradually changing. General businesses don't generate the same pedestrian activity as retail and restaurants. He asked the Commission to preserve the long-term vision for Main Street. He reported that he conducted a survey of residents to see what they wanted to see in the Downtown area, and no one mentioned office space or any kind of office.

Liz Davis, Wallingford Center Inc., stated that she believes that downtown needs to be a thriving area for small businesses. She has seen a lot of downtown businesses increase their business due to the restaurants, salons, and other businesses. She stated that she appreciates what the McGuire's are doing, but the front entrance should be some sort of retail. Not necessarily the entire first floor. She warned that this could open a Pandora's Box. We need more different activity downtown. She agreed with the problem of blocked windows. She encouraged collaboration and considering different alternatives.

Chairman Fitzsimmons stated that the Commission has been discussing this for several months. He noted the change made in 2020 to accommodate a wellness center on Center Street. Old banks are being repurposed. The Commission supports a walkable downtown. These regulations are for more than one building. He noted that he will refer the blocked window issue to the Zoning Enforcement Officer when a new Officer has been hired.

Commissioner Seichter stated that the Commission is discussing the ability to fine for violations, giving teeth to the regulations.

Mr. Pagini agreed with the comments made and stated that this is a compromise.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Fitzsimmons called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to close the public hearing for application #503-26 Text Amendment – Town Center Zone.

Commissioner Leonardo: Second

Vote: Kohan – yes; Leonardo – yes; Seichter – yes; Venoit – yes; Chairman Fitzsimmons – yes.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to approve application #503-26, a Text Amendment request for Town Center Zone. Text Amendment request from F&M Bank, LLC to change the allowable uses in the Town Center zone on language with the proposal from the Planning & Zoning Office dated August 7, 2026, referring to §4.26.B.2.6, which states general business offices

with the strikeout of clinics and outpatient medical treatment facilities provided they are not located on the ground level, street-facing side of any building. Approve this for the improvement to the vitality of the Downtown Zone.

Commissioner Leonardo: second

Vote: Kohan – yes; Leonardo – yes; Seichter – yes; Venoit – yes; Chairman Fitzsimmons – yes.

The application is approved.

2. Text Amendment request for Justin Frytz to amend Section §6.34.A.1 to remove “transporter” from the prohibited uses under the definition of “Cannabis Establishments”. #506-26

Commissioner Leonardo read the legal notice and noted the correspondence. Application #506-26 – Text Amendment request for Justin Frytz to amend Section §6.34.A.1 to remove “transporter” from the prohibited uses under the definition of “Cannabis Establishments”. Correspondence included Inspection Report from Brian Schock, Fire Marshal, dated July 21, 2026; email from Thomas Flannery, Senior Engineer, Water & Sewer, to Planning and Zoning Commission, dated July 27, 2026; letter from Justin Frytz to the Planning and Zoning Commission dated August 10, 2026; Staff Referral Report from Emely Ricci, Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments to the Planning & Zoning Commission dated July 29, 2026; memorandum from Janis Small, Corporation Counsel, to the Planning & Zoning Commission, dated August 3, 2026, draft proposed amendment to §6.34 dated August 5, 2026; and letter from Susan Beckman, Lower CT River Valley Council of Governments to the Planning & Zoning Commission, dated August 5, 2026.

Justin Frytz, North Haven, explained that he is a licensed cannabis transport operator in Connecticut. The best comparison is to Amazon. They receive, hold, consolidate, and move product that belongs to someone else. He has been in operation since 2024 and holds one of four licenses. He is not a producer or retailer and delivers only to licensed dispensaries. Everyone on both ends is licensed. This is a closed sale network within the monitored State network. There is no public access, no retail, and no signage. From the street, it will look like a warehouse. There will be security and oversight tracked by the State. All facilities and vehicles are licensed and background checked. This will bring transport jobs to town. He operates under an approved social equity plan, and he and his employees volunteer at FoodShare. He is just asking to remove the word ‘transporter’ from the regulation. This business is like any other distribution company, just with more State oversight.

Commissioner Seichter stated that he has no opinion on whether cannabis should be legalized. He noted that Section 1.4 of the regulations states “these regulations do not allow any use, structure, development, or activity which is illegal under local, State or Federal law”. Section 3.4 for Cannabis Establishments, it gives a definition that indicates ‘transporter’. It also says “Cannabis establishments are prohibited in all zones within Wallingford”. This is a request for an exemption. If this were approved, the use would be above Federal law, so he can’t support it. He stated that if we are going to approve something that modifies Section 1.4 and 6.34, he suggests just eliminating 1.4 and 6.3.4B that

prohibits cannabis and making cannabis an acceptable use. He stated that it is not appropriate to approve some cannabis business activities while excluding others. If the Commission has changed its position on cannabis, make it clear.

Mr. Frytz noted that medical cannabis has been moved from Schedule 1 to Schedule 3. States have the right to have their own laws on cannabis and the federal government won't interfere. He understands that Section 1.4 is in conflict. His proposal uses the Town's attorney's wording. Town employees looked at the business like any other distributor in Town.

Commissioner Sanders asked where his business currently operates. Mr. Frytz replied that the business is virtual and there is no warehouse currently. They pick up and deliver the same day. Commissioner Sanders asked why he wants to be in Wallingford. Mr. Frytz replied that there are available properties here, geographic location and electricity costs make it attractive. He added that he has worked with other towns to change their zoning codes, but couldn't find appropriate properties. He wants to expand his business, and Wallingford gives him that opportunity. Commissioner Sanders noted that the regulations were thoughtfully put together, but if we make an exception for one, we will have to make an exception for everyone. Mr. Frytz replied that there is only one other licensed business doing this in the State. The nuclear option with Section 1.4 is a bigger issue that the Commission needs to discuss.

Commissioner Kohan stated that the debate over State vs. Federal cannabis laws has been going on for decades. This is a complicated issue. He added that the 10th Amendment to the Constitution protects State cannabis laws and gives states the ability to allow the use. This is a legitimate business that is highly regulated by the State. He has no problem with this type of facility.

Commissioner Leonardo stated that he is against dispensaries in town but agrees that this business is much different. He asked about security and storage. Mr. Frytz replied that currently the cargo vans pick up and deliver the same day. A warehouse would allow him to hold product for up to 6 months, though his goal is to move it within three weeks. The State has high standards for security; each item is on a manifest, there are cameras, and employees must swipe ID cards. The product is very strictly controlled. Commissioner Leonardo stated that he is in favor of this change.

Chairman Fitzsimmons clarified that the request is to remove a single word from the language prohibiting cannabis. Mr. Frytz agreed and added that there is also language to be added that was provided by the Corporation Counsel. Chairman Fitzsimmons quoted from the memo from the Corporation Counsel, "With respect to State vs. Federal law conflict, cannabis possession, production, etc. remain illegal under federal law, Controlled Substances Act (CSA). However, the Federal Government has the authority to enforce Federal law. However, the courts have found that the enactment of State laws permitting cannabis is not an obstacle to the Federal Government enforcing the CSA. In other words, cannabis is illegal under Federal law, but states may permit it under State law. The Controlled Substances Act expressly states that it does not preempt state law unless there is a positive conflict between a provision of the subchapter and that state law so that the two cannot consistently stand together. The courts have found that there is no such conflict, as state laws do not require anyone

to violate the CSA and the states are simply removing the penalties for certain activities and establishing a regulatory process for doing so in their states. This position is held by Federal courts throughout the country.” Wallingford has had warehouses and fulfillment centers for years. A fulfillment center is an appropriate use. He is in favor of removing the single word from the text amendment.

Mr. Pagini stated that he supports the change as the business will be no different from any other general warehouse with no signage or indication of what he’s transporting.

Commissioner Seichter stated that Federal courts in recent years have reversed rulings.

Commissioner Kohan stated that we are not taking the risk. The applicant and his business are taking the risk. We are just allowing a legitimate business.

Chairman Fitzsimmons clarified that the proposal is to remove one word from the regulation prohibiting cannabis activities in Wallingford.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Crouch, Economic Development Commission, stated that they look at it as a general warehouse distribution model that functions only in the state. This business is highly regulated.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Fitzsimmons called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to close the public hearing for application #506-26 – Cannabis Transporter.

Commissioner Leonardo: Second

Vote: Unanimous

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to approve application #506-26 – Cannabis Transporter for a Zoning Text Amendment to Sections §1.4, 6.34 to remove “Transporter” as a prohibited use in Section 6.34 on language dated July 20, 2026 and revised to August 5, 2026 because of the increase in business climate for Wallingford.

Commissioner Leonardo: Second

Vote: Kohan – yes; Leonardo – yes; Seichter – no; Venoit – no; Chairman Fitzsimmons – yes.

The application is approved.

3. Text Amendment request for KSCGH Partners, LLC to add a new section §4.27 entitled “Mixed Use (MU) District” floating zone to the Town of Wallingford Zoning Regulations. #505-26

Commissioner Leonardo read the legal notice and noted the correspondence. Application #505-26 – Text Amendment request for KSCGH Partners, LLC to add a new section §4.27 entitled “Mixed Use (MU)

District” floating zone to the Town of Wallingford Zoning Regulations. The full amendment can be viewed in the Planning and Zoning Office. Correspondence included Inspection Report from Brian Schock, Fire Marshal dated July 21, 2026; Staff Referral Report from Emely Ricci, Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments, to the Planning & Zoning Commission, dated July 29, 2026; memo from Allison Kapushinski, Town Engineer, to Kevin Pagini, Town Planner dated July 30, 2026; letter from Kevin Pagini, Town Planner to KSCGH Partners, LLC dated July 22, 2026; proposed amendment from Fairlawn Farms Association, Phases 1, 2 & 3 to the Planning and Zoning Commission dated August 4, 2026; email from Celine L’Heureux to the Planning & Zoning Commission dated August 5, 2026; letter from Susan Beckman, Lower CT River Valley Council of Governments to the Planning & Zoning Commission, dated August 5, 2026; email from Scott Fritz to the Planning and Zoning Commission dated August 6, 2026, email from Alexander Penczynzyn to the Planning & Zoning Commission dated August 6, 2026; memo from Bernie Daigle to Planning & Zoning Commission dated August 6, 2026; letter from David Bouvier to the Planning & Zoning Commission dated August 6, 2026; email from Sally Fazzina to the Planning & Zoning Commission dated August 6, 2026, and letter from Lisa Marks dated August 6, 2026.

Atty. Dennis Ceneviva, Ceneviva Law Firm, 721 Broad Street, Meriden, and William Fry, Project Manager, BL Companies, presented.

Atty. Ceneviva explained that they are requesting a Floating Zone. There are 102 Floating Zones in the State. He stated that given the nature of the comments from staff and the public, they will ask that the public hearing be continued to next month when they can present a more complete application. He explained that his client is looking at potential uses for the Campus at Green Hill. It is in the Watershed Interchange District. The allowed uses in that district may not be best for the Town. This is an opportunity to see if something similar to Stonebridge Crossing in Cheshire, a mixture of commercial and market residential. He explained that a Floating Zone is a legislative action. The zone floats until the property owner applies to use it. It must meet a number of requirements. The zone defines what uses are allowed. That’s the first step. Then an application is made that must include an overall conceptual Site Plan and Site Plan approval. The Commission must make certain that the language includes the appropriate requirements, so there is significant discretion for the Commission. Step one is to create the floating zone. This is a first draft.

Commissioner Camire noted that one topic of the POCD was to find more creative uses of parcels. Will the Floating Zone conflict with the existing zone? Which regulation will rule? Atty. Ceneviva replied that the Floating Zone will change the underlying zone. Commissioner Camire clarified that the permitted uses will come from the Floating Zone. He noted that he is an advocate for housing development. He asked what led to the proposal for only studios and one- and two-bedroom units. Atty. Ceneviva said they could look at that again. He noted that one of the lots in the Campus on Green Hill is under contract and would not be part of the Floating Zone. Commissioner Camire suggested including 3-bedroom units and townhomes. He stated that Section E.3, Site Plan Application, seems comprehensive. He asked if there had been a review of other properties in town that might work for a Floating Zone. This is a very creative use of zoning for mixed-use, walkable development. We need to make sure we are comfortable with Section 7, Site Plan requirements. He asked how the traffic analysis

in E. 2 is different from the analysis in the Site Plan. Atty. Ceneviva replied that he will look at it, as the Engineer also wanted more robust information.

Commissioner Kohan stated that this is a novel concept, but it has potential. He asked why the minimum size is 40 acres. Atty. Ceneviva replied, the plan is to make it impactful and to have different uses on the parcel. This allows developing something special. Commissioner Kohan stated that the POCD had maps of developable space. He noted that this would replace watershed district regulations. Could those restrictions be included in the text or part of site approval? Atty. Ceneviva replied that language can be added. Mr. Pagini stated that Water & Sewer doesn't want the Watershed Protection District overlay affected. Maybe something stricter is needed for the Watershed Interchange District. This allows flexibility with the same standards. Commissioner Kohan stated that this is a good idea. He asked if there will be clarification of the phrase strong pedestrian orientation. Atty. Ceneviva replied that it depends on what is important. Do you put it in the text of the zone amendment or wait for a Site Plan? The 40 acres is important. This is designed for a comprehensive location, without negatively impacting the quality of life for the neighbors.

Commissioner Camire noted that Section C of the WI District has stricter Special Permit requirements, but he doesn't see those in the proposal. Maybe it can specify that WI Section C still applies.

Commissioner Sanders stated that the stated objective sounds like a request for an exemption from significant portions of existing zoning regulations. Atty. Ceneviva replied it means a more detailed application and more authority to the Commission. Commissioner Sanders asked if the Floating Zone would adhere to the zone it's already in or would it be autonomous. Atty. Ceneviva replied, the underlying zone would not apply. The Floating Zone would have uses that are the only ones permitted. Clarification of the bulk standards would be needed, and protection of the watershed would need to be added. Commissioner Sanders stated that this is a new idea. We need to identify what problems this will solve. We are supposed to be simplifying regulations. Does this add more complexity?

Commissioner Seichter stated that this is going to be a complicated issue. He supports the concept. He suggested a workshop on this. Some very good comments have already been received. He asked if the applicant would consider withdrawing and presenting at a workshop. Atty. Ceneviva replied that he will keep it in mind. He is optimistic that all the questions can be addressed at the next meeting. He will get the requested changes to the Commission as early as possible.

Chairman Fitzsimmons asked if this is conceptually like the Stonebridge development in Cheshire and Somerset Square in Glastonbury. Atty. Ceneviva confirmed and stated that his client is happy to put in language that the Commission and the public want. This would allow the site to be used for something like Stonebridge.

Mr. Pagini stated that this is a draft. He agreed that a workshop might be helpful. There is a lot of intricacy involved. We want to make sure this does not impact the neighborhood.

Chairman Fitzsimmons stated that they have received substantial comments already and asked speakers to provide new comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Michele Dellipoali, 10 Trailside Drive, quoted from the May 11th minutes that “the Watershed must be protected. There is a requirement for at least 50% open space on each parcel for development going forward which significantly restricts development.” She asked for confirmation that each of the four parcels will maintain at least 50% open space. According to the May 11th minutes, “lots A, B, C and D would have access to city water and sewer, which is an issue we’re wrestling with on future applications.” She noted that the IWWC has an application for 83 units in seven buildings. She asked how this would affect the Town’s water supply on the four lots. The regulations are there for a reason. Daily traffic will be a concern. She stated that this is a major safety concern. Stricter guidelines need to be established by the Town. She stated that protection of watershed and open space percentage should be documented per parcel. The Height of commercial buildings should be capped. There are also noise and lighting concerns.

David Bouvier, President, Fairlawn Farms Neighborhood Association 4, 5 & 6, stated that he had submitted comments. He highlighted some points. The association represents 68 properties and owns 15 acres of open space. This targets the property adjacent to our neighborhood. He stated that they are not opposed to responsible development. He acknowledged the Planning Department and Engineering Department for their careful review. Staff notes state that the Commission must identify which zones would allow this floating zone and what setbacks, bulk requirements, and watershed protections would apply. Questions remain, such as there is no maximum residential density, required commercial components, etc. He asked the Commission not to vote tonight. He stated that they should require plans and allow public review.

Joe Celotto, 21 Promontory Drive, stated that this application benefits the property owner. Why not just come with a Special Permit application? They must show us what they want to do. It seems like this is a long way to go to get what they want. This would allow anyone to change the zoning for what they want and then subdivide. Should they notify everyone near a 40-acre property? Why undermine the zoning regulations with this single ambiguous amendment? He quoted from Article 1.2 that “the regulations are authorized by Chapter 124 including but not limited to 8-2 of CT General Statutes.” In Chapter 124 8-23, it ends with “subject to standards outlined in the regulations to conditions necessary to protect the public health, safety, convenience, and property values.” Article 1.2 specifically states “to conserve the value of buildings and encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout said town.” The regulations state, more than 10 times, to protect property values. He asked the Commission to make them tell us what they are going to do there.

Bonnie Daigle, 231 Grieb Road, stated that she hopes someone addresses the points in her letter. The WI District is designed to balance development with strict environmental protection of drinking water. This area has poorly drained soil. What effect will buildings and asphalt have? Does DEEP get involved?

She quoted General Statute 8.25: "Planning and municipalities must ensure safe public health, safety, as well as water, sewer, drainage, flood protection and current and future traffic needs. How can she be sure that her basement won't be flooded? Rt. 68 is one of the most dangerous roads in Town. There was a recent study by the Police Department and the DOT that she would like to see. Noise pollution and air quality are not addressed. She quoted from Mr. Pagini's July letter to KSCGH, item 10, "There should be more specific requirements that allow a change to a floating zone. Other towns allow a change if defined parcels in Watershed Interchange Areas require a minimum of acreage and access to water and sewer systems along those major thoroughfares." We need to come up with better solutions. She stated that she understands the benefits of development, but it can't come at residents' expense.

Craig Fishbein, Grieb Road, stated that this seems like spot zoning. He asked why 40 acres is the minimum when 100 acres might result in something special. Watershed and wells are a concern. He looked up the applicant, and the company was just formed in January in New York City. Developers develop and then leave. The Commission's job is to care about us. Is residential necessary for a Floating Zone? Subdivision is a concern because it could happen after the approval. In C12, or other similar uses as determined by the Commission, which is a nullity for a public process. He quoted item 13, "uses accessory to principal uses as determined by the Commission including drive-thru facilities and certain primary uses." What does it mean? He quoted "it must include a complete pedestrian and vehicular circulation system." That is the intent. Regarding building design, he appreciates the intent to make something nice. Parking is always a problem. It says "potential for shared parking". What does that mean? This is a shared use facility. You need parking for people that don't do a lot of driving. The Phasing is a problem. He quoted "must be completed no later than 5 years from the application. Or what? Do we require a bond? Is there a maximum for commercial? What are the proposed pedestrian scaled lighting fixtures? Regarding traffic impact, the intention seems to be that it can be independently analyzed. There is a word missing in the next-to-last line. In the last paragraph, he quoted "if no work has commenced within two years of the approval of the Site Plan as evidenced by the issuance of a building permit for at least one of the principal structures..." This means the pulling of the building permit, not actual activity, would toll any adverse reaction. He stated that he didn't think it's enough to protect the residents. He believes the amendment needs a lot of work.

Lynne Landry, 5 Trailside Drive, stated that she appreciates that tax implications aren't considered. She shared the size and number of stores at Somerset Square in Glastonbury. She appreciates that the Commission wants to workshop this since we don't understand what is being proposed. She is worried about home values.

Chairman Fitzsimmons thanked everyone for their comments. He stated that Planning and Zoning is about the land use, not the user. This is step one. We are not at the stage where we have comments from Town Departments. They will have a say.

Atty. Ceneviva stated that he took some notes. This is a challenging process. It's not really the applicant that wanted a mixed-use project; it was a cooperative effort. This is an opportunity to do something

unique. The client is willing to do this. He appreciates the comments and is happy to work on the proposal.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Fitzsimmons called for a motion to continue the public hearing.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to continue application #505-26 Text Amendment request for KSCGH Partners, LLC to add new Section §4.27 entitled “Mixed Use (MU) District” floating zone to the Town of Wallingford regulations to the September 14, 2026 meeting.

Commissioner Leonardo: Second

Vote: Unanimous

The application is continued.

OTHER BUSINESS

6. Special Permit – Fieldstone Farms Association Inc. – Fieldstone Farms – minor modification – driveway expansion #406-26

Commissioner Leonardo read the correspondence into the record. Including Inspection Report from Brian Schock, Fire Marshal, dated July 21, 2026; letter from Kevin Pagini, Town Planner to Fieldstone Farm Association, Inc. dated July 22, 2026; Interoffice Memorandum from Thomas Flannery, Senior Engineer, Water & Sewer, to Kevin Pagini, Town Planner, dated July 27, 2026, and some drawings and photos.

Chairman Fitzsimmons explained that this proposal was discussed at a Workshop and since then the Commission has received updates from Town Departments.

Matt Bushey, member of the Fieldstone Farm Association Homeowners Board, stated that they are in agreement with the updated proposed language.

Chairman Fitzsimmons stated that this is a minor modification to a Special Permit.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Alan Barbarino, 194 North Plains Industrial Road, asked if there is a limitation on materials. Mr. Bushey replied that either asphalt or pavers can be used. Mr. Barbarino stated that some property owners won't have enough room to turn and asked if there were any objections to going straight out to the road. It would still be a 6x4 area.

Mr. Pagini replied that Engineering was not aware of that and it would probably not be allowed because it would involve a curb cut. That might need a wetlands permit and engineering review.

Chairman Fitzsimmons noted that this was not part of the proposal. Mr. Barbarino asked about the allowed square footage. Mr. Pagini replied 240 or 250 sq. ft. per driveway. Mr. Barbarino stated that no one would go over that. He asked how this change would be requested. Chairman Fitzsimmons stated that it would have to go through the Association to do the application.

Commissioner Sanders stated that during the workshop, the Commission did not have the latest notes from the Town Engineer. The application specifically states the intent to avoid rainwater impact and maintain existing permeability. The comments from the Town Engineer allow asphalt reshaping of the application. This has changed from what was discussed. Chairman Fitzsimmons referred to the memo from the engineer that says anything over 40 would need an update to the drainage system. Commissioner Sanders noted that the intent was to avoid rainwater impact in the application. He asked if that should be removed or changed.

Chairman Fitzsimmons suggested tabling the discussion and sending it back to Engineering for clarification.

Commissioner Camire clarified that the question is the change to asphalt and why it is now okay.

Commissioner Sanders asked if that impacts the permeability, which affects the original permit.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Fitzsimmons called for a motion to continue the public hearing.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to continue application #406-26 Special Permit Fieldstone Farm Association – Minor Modification to the September 14, 2026 meeting.

Commissioner Leonardo: Second

Vote: Unanimous

The application is continued.

BOND RELEASES

10. Connecticut Proton Therapy Center/932 Northrop Road

Commissioner Leonardo noted the bond release request from DPR Construction in the amount of \$30,000.

Mr. Pagini reported that this is not ready to be released, as it has not been inspected yet.

11. Iron Horse Equipment/71 South Turnpike Road

Mr. Pagini reported that the bond for the storage area in the back can be released. This has nothing to do with the issues up front.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to approve the release of the bond for Iron Horse Equipment at 71 South Turnpike Road.

Commissioner Leonardo: Second

Vote: Unanimous

12. Choate Rosemary Hall/333 Christian Street/Carr Hall

13. Choate Rosemary Hall/333 Christian Street/Pedestrian Bridge

Mr. Pagini reported that these bonds can be released. He noted that the correspondence received today is not related to the bond release.

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to approve release of the bond for Choate Rosemary Hall, 333 Christian Street, for Carr Hall and the Pedestrian Bridge.

Commissioner Leonardo: Second

Vote: Unanimous

REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND STAFF

14. Discussion on updates/remarks

Mr. Pagini reported that the POCD was posted in the Town Clerk's office on Friday and it is now on the Town website. He reported that the SCROCG Yale Avenue Rt. 5 Intersection Study public meeting is scheduled for August 27th and he encouraged everyone to attend. The new Environmental Planner, Sebastian Velez, started this week. He reported that the Town Engineer has recommended that sidewalks be installed at Executive Kia.

15. Administrative Approvals – noted as approved

- a. **201 Church St/Quinnipiac Valley/Gas Works #211-26**
- b. **5 Northfield Rd. (Extension)/Jeffery James #408-08**
- c. **600 North Colony Rd/Keystone Novelties #214-26**
- d. **1164 North Colony Rd/Executive Kia #702-26**
- e. **1194 North Colony Rd/Executive Honda #703-26**
- f. **412 Main St Rear/DeAntonio #215-26**
- g. **665 North Colony Rd/Shaiikh #216-26**
- h. **228/230 Clifton St/Pillacia #217-26**
- i. **12 Wooding Rd/Tierney #220-26**
- j. **61 Maple Ave/Allen #313-26**
- k. **230 Main St Lot 69/Garden Homes Management #805-26**
- l. **230 Main St Lot 8/Garden Homes Management #806-26**
- m. **230 Main St Lot 4/Garden Homes Management #807-26**
- n. **1191 North Colony Rd/JACT II, LLC #704-26**

12. ZBA July Decisions – no comment

13. ZBA Notice of August Meeting

NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Kohan noted that the Quarterly Newsletter has an interesting article on expert opinion.

Commissioner Seichter noted that next month's agenda seems pretty packed and includes the POCD report. He suggested having two meetings.

Commissioner Leonardo agreed, but some applicants might not be ready.

Chairman Fitzsimmons agreed that it would be okay to notify applicants that we may be splitting the agenda into two meetings.

Commissioner Sanders asked if we can hold off on new applications. Chairman Fitzsimmons replied that new applications would have been received by today to be discussed next month. He stated that some applicants might not be ready to present and suggested just proceeding with caution.

Commissioner Kohan stated that he would be willing to start early.

Mr. Pagini noted that the legal notice for public hearings has to be done. He suggested moving the POCD to a separate meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Kohan: Motion to adjourn the Wallingford Planning and Zoning Commission for Monday, August 10, 2026, at 10:00 pm.

**Commissioner Leonardo: Second
Vote: Unanimous**

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl-Ann Tubby
Recording Secretary