

Montville Planning & Zoning Commission
REGULAR MEETING
January 27, 2026 - 6:00 p.m.
Town Council Chambers – Town Hall
310 Norwich-New London Turnpike, Uncasville, CT 06382
MINUTES

1. **Call to Order.** Chairman Pieniadz called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance.** All rose for the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. **Roll Call and seating of Alternates: Present:** Chairman William Pieniadz, Vice Chair Wills Pike, Secretary John Desjardins, Commissioners Mickey Gillette, and Joseph Summers. **Absent:** Commissioner Lisa Terry, Sara Lundy, Chuck Longton, and Joshua Kobyluck. Alternate Commissioner Mark Meyers was seated. **Also Present:** Land Use Director Dennis Goderre, Assistant Planner Meredith Badalucca, Zoning and Wetlands Officer Stacy Radford, and Administrative Assistant Julie Boyle.
4. **Additions or Changes to the Agenda.** None.
5. **Minutes:**
 - a.) Approval of the December 9, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes
 - b.) Approval of the January 14, 2026 Special Meeting Minutes.

MOTION (M. Gillette/Wills Pike) to APPROVE the minutes of the December 9, 2025 Regular Meeting and January 14, 2026 Special Meeting. Vote: (6-0-0). Motion CARRIED

6. **Remarks from the public not relating to items on the agenda.** None.
7. **Public Hearing:**
 - a. **25 ZC 2 - Adaptive Reuse Regulation Application. Amendment to Add New Sections as follows: 1.3 New Definition: Adaptive Reuse Development; 8.3.4; 9.3.4; 9B.2.7; 10.3.2; 11.3.2; 12.3.1; 13.3.1; 16.13 Adaptive Reuse Development -Applicant: Town of Montville (Submitted 12/01/2025, Date of Receipt 12/09/2025, DRD N/A, Public Hearing set for 1/27/2026, Public Hearing must close within 35 days of opening)**

MOTION (J. Desjardins/M. Gillette) to OPEN the Public Hearing @ 6:04 p.m. All in favor. (6-0-0). Motion APPROVED

Assistant Planner Meredith Badalucca advised of the Legal Requirements of this application and that those requirements have been met as shown on the Control Sheet.

Director D. Goderre gave Opening Testimony dated January 27, 2026, attached and provided context of the importance of the Adaptive Reuse Regulations and summarized the proposed changes/additions to the regulations. D. Goderre provided the unique use of the definitions to this section and defined the Adaptive Reuse criteria and eligibility criteria. D. Goderre spoke of the application requirements for the Special Permit as it relates to the Adaptive Reuse and

the design control of the Commission. D. Goderre spoke about the possibility of a preliminary review requirement by the Commission.

Assistant Planner Meredith Badalucca describe potential properties along the Route 163 and 32 that may fit under the Adaptive Reuse Regulation.

Chairman Pieniadz questioned regarding the Special Permit Uses.

D. Goderre explained that the reason for specifically listing uses permitted and prohibited. This included acknowledgment of the broad 'for profit' uses in the C-1 and C-2 districts. Listed prohibited uses will help limited the unintentional uses that otherwise would not be compatible on an adaptive reuse site and where such flexibility is allowed.

Vice Chairman Pike questioned the 16.13.5 ii 300 feet location requirement.

D. Goderre explained it was in relation to the distance to Routes 163 and 32 and noted the distance is slightly arbitrary and also intended to ensure the Bridge Street town owned parcel would be eligible.

Vice Chairman Pike questioned the sale of Bridge Street and if it was predetermined as residential.

D. Goderre acknowledged the purchase and sale agreement in place between the Town and Developer. He noted the agreement was clear on the need for permits. D. Goderre also noted that the town publicly advertised the sale of the property and the developer was the only response, bringing forth a proposal for residential.

Vice Chairman Pike voiced concern over the appearance of a focus on housing and not bringing business to the town.

D. Goderre acknowledged the interest in housing, noting housing development is a focus of the regional and the development community brings forth uses allowed in the applicable zoning districts.

Chairman Pieniadz asked for comments from the Public, three times, for or against the Application and there was one resident who spoke in favor.

Leonard Bunnell, 5 Little John, Mayor Town of Montville, spoke in favor.

MOTION (J. Summers/ J. Desjardins) to CLOSE the Public Hearing @ 7:03 p.m. All in favor. (6-0-0). Motion APPROVED

b. Discussion & Decision 25 ZC 2 Adaptive Reuse Regulation Application. Amendment to Add New Sections as follows: 1.3 New Definition: Adaptive Reuse Development; 8.3.4; 9.3.4; 9B.2.7; 10.3.2; 11.3.2; 12.3.1; 13.3.1; 16.13 Adaptive Reuse Development - Applicant: Town of Montville (*Decision required within 65 days of the close of PH*)

The Commission had a brief discussion.

MOTION (W. Pike /J. Desjardins) to APPROVE application 25 ZC 2 to Amend Zoning Regulation to add new sections as follows: 1.3 New Definition: Adaptive Reuse Development; 8.3.4; 9.3.4; 9B.2.7; 10.3.2; 11.3.2; 12.3.1; 13.3.1; 16.13 Adaptive Reuse Development. The effective date of this amendment is February 17, 2026. The proposal is consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development and the Comprehensive Plan.

Roll Call Vote. All in favor. (6-0-0). Motion APPROVED.

8. **Old Business: None**

9. **New Business:**

a. **26 ZC 1 – 50 Cook Drive (099-009-001) Zone Change from R-20 to Government Owner -Town of Montville, Applicant – Barry Parfitt, PE – Wright-Pierce (Submitted 1/12/2026, Date of Receipt 1/27/2026,.PH must be scheduled within 65 days of receipt on 2/24/2026)**

Assistant Planner Meredith Badalucca advised that this was to be received and set for a Public Hearing.

MOTION (J. Desjardins/J. Summers) to RECEIVE AND SET PUBLIC HEARING for February 24, 2026. All in favor (6-0-0) MOTION APPROVED.

10. **Zoning Matters:** ZEO Report was read into the record by Zoning and Wetlands Officer Stacy Radford.

11. **Land Use Director Report:**

a. **Zoning Regulation Amendments**

Commissioner Feedback on Proposed changes;

Building Height Discussion (C1 Sec.10.7, C2 Sec 11.7);

Multifamily building orientation change, (Sec. 4.11.5.2)

D. Goderre asked the Commission if they had time to review the information provided them at the 1/14/2026 Special Meeting. They had requested additional time to review.

b. **POCD**

Advisory Committee Members

D. Goderre suggested the primary members as Mayor L. Bunnell and a member from the following Committees, Boards and Commissions: Town Council, Board of Education, Conservation Commission, Economic Development Commission, Housing Authority, IWWC, Parks and Recreation, Planning and Zoning Commission, Public Safety Commission, Utility Advisory Committee and WPCA.

Consultant Selection

Consultant qualification review

D. Goderre gave a brief overview of the qualification previously requested by the Commission and asked if the Commission was comfortable making the recommendation for Goman and York for a sole source versus open bid.

MOTION (B. Pieniadz/M. Meyers) to RECOMMEND Goman and York, Property Advisors as the consultants. All in favor (6-0-0) MOTION APPROVED.

- c. Housing Grant Update / feedback from State
D. Goderre provided an update on the status of the Grant and the feedback he received from State of Connecticut.
 - d. Revive and Renew Route's 163/32; Comments from Commission
D. Goderre tabled this matter for the 2/24/2026 scheduled Regular Meeting
 - e. Council of Government Safety Action Plan Update
D. Goderre provided an overview of the SECCOG Safety Action Plan and asked that they review it and provide feedback.
 - f. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Districts
D. Goderre provided an overview of the benefits of the TIF program and explained that it does not create a new tax or increase the mill rate. It is intended to support development that might otherwise not occur.
 - g. February 11 Workshop
The Commission had a brief discussion and the 2/11/2026 workshop was set for 6:00 p.m.
12. **Other Business:** None.
13. **Correspondence:**
a. TOWN OF NORWICH – Notification and referral regarding proposals to comprehensively amend the zoning map and zoning regulations of the City of Norwich
- Assistant Planner Meredith Badalucca noted the Statutory Requirement, and that a Public Hearing was opened on January 20, 2026.
14. **Executive Session:** Chairman Pieniadz invited Land Use Director Dennis Goderre, Assistant Planner Meredith Badalucca and Zoning and Wetlands Officer Stacy Radford. The Commission exited Council Chambers to Conference Room 102 at 7:34 p.m., returning at 7:37 p.m. No votes were taken and no decisions were made.
15. **Adjournment.**
MOTION (J. Summers/M. Gillette) to ADJOURN the meeting at 7:37 p.m. All in favor (6-0-0).

Respectfully Submitted by:
Julie A. Boyle
PZC - Administrative Assistant



Town of Montville, Connecticut

Department of Land Use & Development

Planning & Zoning
Inland Wetlands & Watercourses
Economic & Community Development

Opening Testimony by Dennis Goderre

January 27, 2026

Good Evening Chairman Pieniadz and Members of the Commission,

My name is Dennis Goderre, I am the Director of Land Use and Development for the Town of Montville. I am a certified planner holding the credential of AICP and a state of CT licensed Landscape Architect. I have been practicing for over 30 years and have served in various capacities as a consultant and planner for towns and cities in the State. During my career, I have had the opportunity to work with regulations from numerous municipalities. It is safe to say I have experienced and used a diverse number of zoning types of varying purpose and quality.

At the heart of zoning is to control land uses within a community; how buildings are situated, proximity of improvements to property lines, and at the basis of Euclidean zoning, to clearly separate incompatible uses. Providing consistent and predictable regulations is at the heart of zoning administration – it helps ensure equality between applications and protecting health, safety and welfare.

However, as designs that were once considered ‘cutting edge’ or ‘productive’ age, and changes in building code, zoning and use specific requirements evolve, the use of properties under current zoning can face hurdles if flexible controls are not offered. This difficulty in reuse can also be a result of environmental contamination, the cost to renovate older buildings and dynamics of local economic or market factors. At this point, a building’s life cycle has generally reached its limits of functionality and physical viability with zoning becoming a hinderance, rather than a public benefit. This can lead to building abandonment, decay, or blight.

To overcome this challenge Adaptive Reuse regulations has become a land use tool common throughout the US and CT. Adaptive reuse facilitates the repurposing of properties which are ‘challenged’ into contributing community assets. Meaning adaptive reuse can:

- Reduce or eliminate blight,
- Contribute to the community and neighborhood fabric,
- Preserve historic resources, and
- Contribute to the tax base.

I would like to read a quote from the article *How Adaptive Reuse Can Help Solve the Housing Crisis*, *Planning Magazine*, 2021 and provided as an Exhibit. The quote is from Attorney Sara Bronin, an architect and professor at Cornell school of Architecture, Art and Planning and former chair of Hartford's Planning and Zoning Commission.

"Zoning is one of those things that I think will be reexamined in the post-COVID era to see whether it has unintentional consequences in terms of making it very difficult for us to adapt flexibly as society changes, as demographics change, and as things like pandemics come our way," Bronin says.

The article continues:

"Rather than relying on one property owner to go to court for a variance, she suggests that municipalities create more flexible zoning in the first place." (i.e. adaptive reuse.)

The article continues by highlighting several adaptive reuse projects which converted mills, schools and courthouses in Worcester, Detroit and San Francisco into viable housing. This flexibility is crucial in today's housing market where updated, attainable, modern and efficient housing is difficult to come by throughout our region, state and in the Town of Montville.

Furthermore, the article lists eight benefits of adaptive reuse:

1. PRESERVE THE PAST

Extending the life of old buildings can provide a link between your community's past and future, all while accommodating its present needs.

2. GROW SMARTER AND MORE SUSTAINABLY

Many properties ripe for reuse are in established growth areas with significant population densities. Giving them new life supports growth where there's infrastructure to support it.

3. ENCOURAGE INVESTMENT

Adaptive reuse can yield potential tax generation, employment opportunities, and housing. One project might even inspire more investment, development, and revitalization in the surrounding areas, including through other adaptive reuse projects.

4. TAKE ADVANTAGE OF INCENTIVES

Building owners may be eligible for federal tax credits for rehabilitation investments in older or historic buildings and other incentives.

5. SAVE TIME

When the building and infrastructure is already in place, municipal approval and permitting can often occur more quickly and less expensively than new construction.

6. (SAVES) AND MONEY, TOO

Reuse saves on demolition costs, promotes recycling, and preserves unique architectural details and features that would otherwise be costly to recreate. The materials and quality of construction of existing buildings are often not economically possible to reproduce today.

7. BOOST MARKET VALUES

Preserving the integrity of the materials and design characteristic of older buildings can increase the new project's property value.

8. IMPROVE PUBLIC HEALTH

Remediation of contaminants associated with some older building materials and uses can provide both environmental and health benefits.

An example of a property in Montville which can benefit from an adaptive reuse regulation is the town owned Bridge Street parcel. This older mill, while not listed on the historic register, is likely eligible. It has clearly reached its age limit and is challenged with environmental issues and structural needs. However, the building is an integral part of the Palmertown fabric. Its demolition would have an impact on the texture and sense of place that defines Palmertown and the mill history of the Oxoboxo corridor.

The adaptive reuse regulation before you this evening began as a means to make the Bridge Street a viable and successful development parcel. The regulation is also intended to facilitate other parcels along the RT 163 and 32 corridors. While this regulatory tool can be applied to a limited number of parcels at the moment, additional parcels can become eligible within the matter of 2-3 years, which we will discuss in a moment.

However, before I provide a detailed review of the proposed new Section 16.13 Adaptive Reuse Regulation, I believe it is important to call your attention of Connecticut municipalities which have adopted adaptive reuse regulations.

They include:

Waterford (Model for Montville)

- Its genesis was an abandoned nursing home
- Is a type of Use in a zoning district;
- Based upon eligibility criteria, similar to proposed
- Must meet specific design standards

City of Groton

- Genesis redevelopment of Groton Heights School and former state police building on Thames Street
- Specific reuse criteria, must be municipal, state or institutional
- Must meet specific design criteria

Old Saybrook

- Is a new zoning district (as a Planned Development District)
- Minimum lot size 8 acres
- Has 'appropriateness' clause

Milford

- Adopted 2024
- Large underperforming commercial office properties only
- Located in a specific zone.

Beacon Falls

- "Considerable size"
- Creates a new district
- Must meet location eligibility criteria

I would like to state for the record that we issued referrals to CT DEEP, SECOG and neighboring towns. No replays from adjacent towns has been received. We received a reply from SECOG, whom has found no likely intermunicipal conflict.

CT DEEP stated the amendment is consistent with stated policies. DEEP did suggest to “*disallow high density residential uses from FEMA-designated flood hazard areas and/or that such sites be serviced by dry egress for evacuation of residents and access by first responders*”. Under Section 15.2 Special Flood Hazard Area Requirements require “all new construction and substantial improvements of residential structures shall have the lowest floor (including basement) elevated to or above the base flood level.”

Staff recommends CT DEEP’s suggested revision be applied to future zoning amendments and not apply solely to the Adaptive Reuse amendment. It may be better served to be incorporated into section 15.2 and apply to all residential uses. But, to that end, the Adaptive Reuse is structured as a Special Permit and such requirement can be mandated during the review process.