

EL Zoning March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2026,  
Public Hearing & Regular Minutes

FILED IN EAST LYME  
CONNECTICUT  
Mar 31, 2026 AT 7:01 AM/PM  
*Bramley*  
EAST LYME TOWN CLERK

# Minutes of East Lyme Zoning Commission - 03/19/26

---

**Date and time:** 03/19/26 07:30 pm to: 03/19/26 10:00 pm

**Present:** Brooke Stevens, Recording Secretary , Members Present:, Debbie Jett-Harris, Anne Thurlow, Denise Markovitz, Norman Peck, Nancy Kalal, Cathy Yuhas, Alternates: Kerry Edwards, Absent:, Sarah Susco

**CC:** Absent:, William Mulholland, Zoning Official, Jim Liska, Alternate, Also Present: , Rose Ann Hardy, Ex-Officio, Jerry Lokken, Parks & Recreation Director, Alex Klose, Deputy Director of Public Works

**Location:** East Lyme Town Hall Upper Conference Room, 108 Pennsylvania Avenue, Niantic, CT, 06357

---

## Topics

### 1. Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance

**Note** Chairman Thurlow called the March 19th, 2026, Zoning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., and led the Pledge. Ms. Thurlow did rollcall; a quorum was present.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow noted that several members as well Mr. Mulholland are absent due to health issues or other commitments. Ms. Stevens, the Recording Secretary, will be taking the Minutes from video.

### 2. Public Hearing- Application of Jerry Lokken, for East Lyme Parks & Recreation, for a Special Permit under Section 20.1.2(F) of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations, to construct an ADA accessible trail, and improve the existing parking area for Darrow Pond, at property located at 16 Mostowy Road, East Lyme, Assessor Map #40.0, Lot #5. (Continued from 2/4/2025)

**Note** see attachment.

 [Ex-1-Special-Permit-16-Mostowy.pdf](#)

**Note** Ms. Thurlow noted for the record that legal ad was run.

**Note** Ms. Jett-Harris read Mr. Mulholland's memorandum dated February 5th, 2026, into the record.

**Note** Mr. Lokken opened the presentation by thanking everyone involved, including Deputy Public Works Director Alex Klose and members of the Darrow Pond Subcommittee (Chuck Mebus and Bruce Dassinger). He discussed some of the following with the Commission:

#### 2-1. Background, Trail use & History

**Note** \*The town is bringing the Darrow Pond trail project to Zoning because the trails, although long used by the public, were never formally approved.

\*This step ensures the town is “crossing all the T’s and dotting all the I’s.”

\*The Town bought Darrow Pond 15 years ago and has been improving it gradually.

\*Parks & Rec manages 100 acres; the remaining 200 acres are under a conservation easement.

\*A Master Plan was completed in 2023.

\*The Town received a trail planning grant and has applied for a construction grant.

\*Zoning approval is required before construction can begin.

**Note** \*The site is also the start of the Goodwin Trail, an 8-mile regional trail.

**Note** \*The property once had a JC Penney building and a large, paved lot.  
\*The building was demolished; only a small portion of the old lot remains.  
\*The proposed new lot is smaller than the original paved area.

## 2-2. Parking Lot Plan and Trail & Boardwalk

**Note** \*The Town's Engineering Department revised the consultant's plan to-  
Add more ADA spaces (increased from 2 to 6).  
Improve layout, grading, and circulation.  
\*Traffic impacts are expected to be similar to when JC Penney operated.

**Note** \*A new elevated boardwalk will run near the water, supported by helical piles to minimize disturbance.  
\*Wildlife can pass underneath; no major grading near the water.  
\*Trail work includes widening where needed, erosion control, and small structures for wet areas.  
\*The Wetlands Commission has approved the environmental aspects.  
\*Dog waste stations and pet regulations will be considered but not finalized, following town precedents.

**Note** \*Surveys show the #1 use of Darrow Pond is trail activity.  
\*Accessible trails in natural areas are rare, and the project has strong support from-  
Pollinator Pathways  
Friends of Oswegatchie Hills  
CT Audubon Society  
Access Independence  
Board of Education  
as well as other community groups.

**Note** Mr. Lokken answered Commission questions and some of the following was highlighted:  
\*ATVs currently use the property and cause damage.  
\*The project includes barriers to limit ATV access.  
\*ATVs enter from multiple directions, including nearby neighborhoods.  
\*More regular trail users will naturally reduce ATV and other misuse.  
\*The Darrow Pond Subcommittee has discussed strategies to limit unauthorized activity.

**Note** \*Most trails will be 5 feet wide, enough for two people to pass.  
\*Some existing woods roads are already 10 feet wide.  
\*Elevated boardwalk sections will be 6–8 feet wide.

**Note** \*Six ADA spaces are included.  
\*ADA parking slopes will be less than 2%, meeting accessibility standards.

**Note** \*The original consultant (FHI Studios) proposed 37 spaces because that layout fit the site.  
\*The Town kept the same number but improved the design.  
\*The grant is expected to cover the entire project, pending award.

**Note** \*The parking lot size is about twice the current lot but smaller than the previous commercial development.

**Note** \*The Commission expressed concerns about the environmental footprint and potential overbuilding, suggesting the possibility of reducing parking spaces in the future or phasing expansion as demand grows.

**Note** \*Old PVC pipes and test pits from past development proposals were found on site.  
\*Parks staff have removed the pipes; remaining test pits are off-trail and not part of the project.

**Note** \*The Master Plan includes education, conservation, and passive recreation.  
\*Possible future elements (not part of this application) include nature-based playground, outdoor classroom, aquatic sampling station, disc golf.  
\*No buildings are proposed.

**Note** \*Parks & Rec will maintain the 100 acres they manage.  
\*Tasks include trash removal, mowing, and general upkeep.  
\*No additional staff are needed; volunteers help maintain trails.

**Note** Ms. Kalal resident raised concerns about rattlesnakes displaced by nearby housing and Mr. Lokken asked for more information so the Town can evaluate any risks.

**Note** Alex Klose, Public Works Deputy Director, and Mr. Lokken reviewed and discussed the following items with the Commission:

### **2-3. Site Engineering- Parking Lot Design**

**Note** \*Original consultant (FHI Studios) proposed 37 spaces in a square layout.  
\*Mr. Klose redesigned it as a rectangular lot for better circulation, safety, and grading.  
\*Added four more ADA spaces (total of six).  
\*Parking lot is 500 ft from the pond and 200 ft from nearest property line.  
\*Runoff mitigation includes pervious pavers along the downhill edge & large areas of grass and forest between the lot and the pond.

**Note** \*It was asked why the full lot must be built now, Mr. Lokken said the town is open to reducing the number of spaces, and Mr. Klose explained that building the full lot now is more cost-effective because the contractor is already mobilized, the grant covers 80% of the work, and future expansion would cost significantly more.

### **2-4. Boardwalk Construction**

**Note** \*Boards will have small gaps (about ¼ inch) so water can drain.  
\*The boardwalk height changes depending on the ground underneath.  
\*Boardwalk walking width is 6 feet; the trail is 5 feet wide.  
\*The 10-foot number refers only to vegetation trimming, not the walking surface.  
\*2×6 pressure-treated lumber.  
\*Height varies to maintain a level walking surface.

**Note** \*About twelve legacy trees are on the property.  
\*All will be preserved.  
\*None of the construction affects them.

### **2-5. Grant Funding & Parking Lot Timing**

**Note** \*Project funded through a CT Recreational Trails grant.

\*Estimated project cost: slightly over \$1 million.

\*The grant may cover about 80% of the project; the Town pays 20%.

\*Building the full lot now is cheaper because the contractor is already on site.

\*Waiting to expand later would cost more due to a separate bid.

\*Reduced parking is possible while keeping the improved layout.

\*If the grant is not awarded, the project does not proceed.

## 2-6. After-Hours Use & Security

**Note** \*A swing-arm gate is planned at the entrance.

\*Town staff can lock and unlock it daily if the Commission chooses.

\*Gate management would follow Parks & Rec Commission policy.

## 2-7. Environmental Impact

**Note** \*The project adds more pavement than what exists today.

\*Still less pavement than when the JC Penney building was there.

\*Stormwater will be managed with permeable pavers and other drainage features.

## 2-8. ADA Trail Compliance

**Note** \*The trail meets modern accessibility standards-5-foot width, gentle slopes, resting areas included.

\*It exceeds the older 36-inch minimum requirement.

## 2-9. Materials

**Note** \*The trail surface is comprised of compacted stone dust.

\*For small stream crossings, simple 4x8 wooden planks will be utilized.

\*The Boardwalk will be comprised of 2x6 pressure-treated lumber.

**Note** Concerns were expressed about using pressure-treated wood so close to the water.

## 2-10. Construction Access

**Note** \*The 10-foot width is only for construction equipment.

\*The finished trail remains 5 feet wide.

\*Extra trimming prevents branches from blocking the path.

\*Some existing woods' roads are already wider than 10 feet.

## 2-11. Public Comment

**Note** Ms. Thurlow opened the public comment period and read a supportive email from a Sandy Gignac of 46 South Edgewood Road, highlighting the benefits of ADA-accessible nature trails, particularly for seniors, individuals with disabilities, and families with strollers.

**Note** Joshua Caskey of 1 Grooms Way spoke in support of the project and highlighted the following items:

\*Regional lack of accessible trails.

\*Believes visitors may support local businesses.

\*Suggests reducing parking, adding bike parking, using permeable pavers to reduce runoff.

**Note** No one spoke against the project.

**Decision** MOTION (1)

Ms. Markovitz moved to close the Public Hearing.

Ms. Jett-Harris seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

### **3. Public Hearing- Application of Jilian Lepore-Oyler for a Special Permit under Section 5.2.4, roadside stand, of East Lyme Zoning Regulations for property located 73 Scott Rd, East Lyme, Assessor's Map #34.0 #16**

**Note** Ms. Thurlow noted for the record that the legal ad had been run.

**Note** see attachment.

 [Farm-Stand-Special-Permit-73-Scott-Rd-2.pdf](#)

**Note** Ms. Markovitz read the memorandum from Mr. Mulholland dated March 17th, 2026, into the record.

 [Farm\\_stand.pdf](#)

**Note** Ms. Lepore-Oyler explained that the application is to have a farm stand selling produce grown on site which will continue the property's historic farm-stand use.

**Note** The Stand will meet:

\*20-ft setback.

\*Seasonal use

\*Parking requirements (four spaces).

**Note** She will be growing vegetables and cut flowers (which are more profitable). She will be building her own stand structure and not reusing the old trailer. Signage will be reviewed by Mr. Mulholland.

**Note** The Commission Members indicated they had no further questions and noted the application is simple and straightforward.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow asked for Public Comment for, against, or neutral on the farm stand application and no speakers came forward.

**Decision** MOTION (2)

Ms. Markovitz moved to close the Public Hearing.

Ms. Jett-Harris seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

### **4. Public Hearing- Application of Nathaniel Bodnar for a proposed Text Amendment to Section 1.90 of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations, to update the definition of a Brew Pub to include all alcoholic beverages.**

**Note** Ms. Thurlow noted for the record that the legal ad had been run.

**Note** Ms. Markovitz read Mr. Mulholland's memorandum dated March 17th, 2026, into the record.

 [Brewpub.pdf](#)

**Note** Mr. Bodnar introduced himself as owner of Fox Glove Cider LLC, a new business producing cider and apple wine and explained some of the following:

\*His goal is to open a manufacturing facility with a small tasting area.

\*The current definition of “brew pub” is beer-specific, which excludes cider and other beverages he intends to produce.

\*He requested that the definition be updated to reflect modern craft-beverage manufacturing, which often includes multiple beverage types under a single permit.

\*His proposed language mirrors the categories authorized under Connecticut’s manufacturing permit statute.

\*Cider and apple wine are legally defined under CGS §30-16, separate from beer.

\*He has identified potential space at 11 Freedom Way, located in the Light Industrial zone, where brew pubs are already permitted by special permit.

**Note** \*Tonight’s request is only for a town-wide text amendment, not site approval.

\*The current definition of “brew pub” is beer-specific, which excludes cider, wine, mead, and spirits even though they are manufactured in similar ways.

\*His proposed amendment would update the definition to include all alcoholic beverages authorized under CGS and align zoning language with modern craft-beverage manufacturing practices.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow reminded the Commission that a text amendment applies town-wide, not to a specific site.

**Note** It was asked why the amendment includes spirits, given the Applicant’s focus on cider. Mr. Bodnar explained that including spirits avoids future applicants needing additional text amendments, and ensures the definition is comprehensive and future-proof.

**Note** He personally does not plan to manufacture spirits but wants the regulation to be consistent with all categories allowed under CGS. His federal and state manufacturing permits (TTB and CT Liquor Control) will be for cider and apple wine only. His intent was to create a comprehensive, future-proof definition, not to introduce bars into town.

**Note** Ms. Jett-Harris expressed concern that including spirits could effectively allow a bar, which is not permitted in any East Lyme zoning district.

**Note** Commission Members noted that beer, cider, and mead are “beer-adjacent,” but spirits introduce a different level of service. Mr. Bodnar stated he is not opposed to removing spirits from the amendment if that is the Commission’s preference.

**Note** Mr. Bodnar explained he does not plan to serve prepared meals. He may offer packaged snacks, depending on state regulations. He believes breweries cannot operate full kitchens under certain permit types.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow asked for Public Comment for, against, or neutral on the proposed text amendment and no members of the public came forward.

**Decision** MOTION (3)

Ms. Markovitz moved to close the Public Hearing.

Ms. Jett-Harris seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

## 5. Application of Jeffrey A McNamara for a proposed Text Amendment to Section 5 by adding Section 5.2.10 to permit Educational or Philanthropic use by a nonprofit corporation on 50 acres or more in the RU-40 Zone subject to Special Permit with additional controls in Section 25.5, of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow noted that Attorney McNamara, who represents the applicant, could not attend this evening.

**Decision** MOTION (4)

Ms. Jett-Harris moved to continue the Public Hearing.

Ms. Markovitz seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

## 6. Regular Meeting

### 6-1. Application of Jerry Lokken, for East Lyme Parks & Recreation, for a Special Permit under Section 20.1.2 (F) of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations, to construct an ADA accessible trail, and improve the existing parking area for Darrow Pond, at property located at I6 Mostowj Road, East Lyme, Assessor Map #40.0, Lot #5. (Continued from 2/4/2025)

**Note** Ms. Jett-Harris said she's not comfortable with the number of parking spaces and is concerned about the type of lumber proposed for the boardwalk.

**Note** Ms. Markovitz expressed strong support for the ADA-accessible trail, noting it would be a valuable resource for residents with disabilities and mobility challenges. She observed that the trail system connects into East Haddam, so visitors from outside town will come regardless of parking size and stated a preference for a smaller parking lot.

**Note** Mr. Peck noted that construction costs rise over time and reducing a few parking spaces now wouldn't significantly lower the town's 20% share. If more parking is needed later, it would incur higher costs and require another permitting process. He prefers to avoid requiring the Applicant to return for additional approvals.

**Note** Ms. Kalal raised concerns about land disturbance due to trails being widened to 8–10 feet and the use of heavy machinery. She suggested using oxen for trail construction, like in local preserves, to minimize disturbance. She stated the project is overkill and expensive as currently proposed and her intention to vote no from an environmental standpoint.

**Note** Ms. Yuhas said she wanted to see the entire Master Plan before voting on a single phase and is also concerned about the number of parking spaces.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow said she too is concerned about the number of parking spaces and questions the cost of the project.

**Note** Ms. Jett-Harris noted the packet included a list of supporters but lacked actual letters or statements, and she would have preferred to see the content of support instead of just names.

**Decision** MOTION (5)

Mr. Peck moved to approve the application of Jerry Lokken for the East Lyme Parks and Recreation Department for a special permit under Section 20.1.2 of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations to construct an ADA-accessible trail and improve the existing parking area at Darrow Pond, located at 16 Mostowy Road, East Lyme, subject to a revisitation of the method of pathway construction.

Ms. Markovitz seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 4-0-2.

Nay- Ms. Jett-Harris and Ms. Kalal.

**Note** After the vote, Ms. Yuhas stated that she believed the motion included the parking component and that she did not intend to vote in favor. Ms. Thurlow also noted that although she had voted yes, she subsequently changed her mind.

**Decision** MOTION (6)

Ms. Thurlow moved to approve the application of Jerry Lokken for the East Lyme Parks and Recreation Department for a special permit under Section 20.1.2 of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations to construct an ADA-accessible trail and improve the existing parking area at Darrow Pond, located at 16 Mostowy Road, East Lyme subject to the following conditions:

1. Revisitation of the method of pathway construction.
2. Reduction in the number of proposed parking spaces; and
3. Submission of written verification from listed supporters for inclusion in the official record.

Ms. Jett-Harris seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 5-0-1.

Nay- Ms. Kalal.

**6-2. Application of Jilian Lepore-Oyler for a Special Permit under Section 5.2.4, roadside stand, of East Lyme Zoning Regulations for property located 73 Scott Rd, East Lyme, Assessor's Map #34.0 #16.**

**Decision** MOTION (7)

Ms. Markovitz moved to approve the Application of Jilian Lepore-Oyler for a Special Permit under Section 5.2.4, roadside stand, of East Lyme Zoning Regulations for property located 73 Scott Rd, East Lyme, Assessor's Map #34.0 #16.

Ms. Jett-Harris seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

**6-3. Application of Nathaniel Bodnar for a proposed Text Amendment to Section 1.90 of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations, to update the definition of a Brew Pub to include all alcoholic beverages.**

**Note** Commissioners agreed they were comfortable with the amendment if "spirits" was removed. There were no objections to including beer, cider, wine, or mead. Concern remained that allowing spirits would effectively permit bars, which are not allowed in any zoning district.

**Decision** MOTION (8)

Ms. Markovitz moved to approve the application of Nathaniel Bodnar for a proposed text amendment to Section 1.90 of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations to update the definition of a brew pub to include alcoholic beverages except spirits.

Ms. Yuhas seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 5-1-0.

Nay- Ms. Kalal.

**6-4. Application of Jeffrey A McNamara for a proposed Text Amendment to Section 5 by adding Section 5.2.10 to permit Educational or Philanthropic use by a nonprofit corporation on 50 acres or more in the RU-40 Zone subject to Special Permit with additional controls in Section 25.5, of the East Lyme Zoning Regulations.**

**Note** Ms. Thurlow noted that Attorney McNamara could not attend and that the Hearing will be continued to a future date when he is available.

**6-5. Continuation of the Application of Parkers Place, LLC, pursuant to General Statutes 8-309 for a zone change, site plan, and Coastal Area Management Review for a multifamily affordable residential housing development on property located on the Westerly side of Park Place, East Lyme, Connecticut, more specifically designated as Assessor's Map #11.1, Lot #11. (Continued from 1/22/2026.)**

**Note** Ms. Thurlow reminded Commissioners that because this is an 8-30g application, the Commission cannot base a denial on:

\*Aesthetics.

\*Town character.

\*Density.

\*Impact on schools.

\*Taxes.

\*Comparisons to other affordable housing projects.

A denial must be based solely on health or safety concerns, supported by substantial evidence.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow noted that Ms. Susco has been sitting in Mr. Peck's stead since he recused himself from this Application. Ms. Susco is not in attendance this evening, but Ms. Edwards has attended all prior Hearings, reviewed all materials, and is fully prepared to participate in deliberations.

**Note** Mr. Peck joined the audience and Ms. Edwards sat as a Regular Member.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow invited Commissioners to share their thoughts before any motion is made.

**Note** Ms. Jett-Harris praised the residents for their participation in the Public Hearing, noting a full room with attendees lining the walls and lobby. She commended the residents for being respectful, patient, and well-prepared.

**Note** Ms. Jett-Harris highlighted that residents expressed significant safety concerns related to:

\*Traffic flow.

\*Sight lines.

\*Crash history.

She noted that residents provided diagrams, photos, and firsthand accounts, including mention of a serious accident in the area, and pointed out an unusual circumstance where two separate traffic engineering reports were submitted without communication between the firms.

**Note** Ms. Jett-Harris emphasized that residents repeatedly testified that walking conditions are unsafe, especially for children, and she recalled testimony from a parent who could not safely walk his children to school due to traffic conditions.

**Note** Ms. Markovitz agreed with the prior comments and said that while not a traffic engineer, common sense indicates a clear safety issue.

**Note** Ms. Kalal also agreed with the prior comments. She added a concern about stormwater overflow from the proposed detention basins:

\*The adjacent property sits at a lower elevation.

\*No clear provisions were shown for what happens if the detention system fails or overtops.

\*Viewed this as an additional health and safety concern.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow praised Attorney Heller for a strong presentation on behalf of the Applicant, but expressed several concerns:

\*The Applicant's traffic engineer suggested a more in-depth study would have been conducted if the adjacent business were a high-traffic establishment like Dunkin' Donuts.

\*The Book Barn generates traffic volumes comparable to or exceeding those of a Dunkin' Donuts during summer, which the traffic study failed to capture.

\*The Applicant's initial traffic submission overlooked several accidents.

\*Despite the claim that parking is restricted to one side of Park Place, there are no "No Parking" signs, and cars park on both sides.

\*The area is a cluster with cars, children, strollers, multiple driveways, and heavy pedestrian activity.

\*Questioned the relevance of a Boston study cited by the Applicant regarding property values, as Boston is an urban environment, unlike East Lyme.

\*The volume and consistency of resident testimony highlighted a significant safety issue at the intersection.

**Note** Ms. Yuhas reiterated concerns regarding:

\*Discrepancies in crash data.

\*Traffic counts conducted on a Tuesday, not during peak weekend or summer periods.

\*The project's reliance on a left turn exit, which increases conflict points.

\*The record is incomplete and lacks necessary data, making it impossible to assess whether traffic safety, emergency access, pedestrian safety, and Route 156 congestion are adequately addressed.

**Note** Ms. Edwards acknowledged the town's need for affordable housing but noted that location matters, and this particular site presents grave safety hazards.

She noted personal observations:

\*Cars parked on both sides of Park Place.

\*Poorly marked parking areas.

\*Difficulty making a left turn out of Park Place.

\*She visited the site earlier that day and felt genuine concern attempting the left turn.

**Note** MOTION (9)

Ms. Markovitz moved to deny the Application of Parker's Place, LLC, pursuant to General Statutes 8-30G for a zone change, site plan, and Coastal Area Management Review for a multi-family affordable residential housing development on property located on the Westerly side of Park Place, East Lyme, Connecticut, more specifically designated as Assessor's Map #11.1, Lot #11, for the following reasons:

A. Proposed Zone Changes to the Applicant's Property.

**Note** Whereas, the Applicant is applying for a zone change for the entirety of the property that is the subject of this application, and it is evident by the development plan submitted that high-density development is contemplated throughout the property and such approval of a zone change for the property would allow for the dense development of the entire property far in excess of what is currently allowed in an RU-40 zone; and

**Note** Whereas, the Commission has determined, Park Place is a 24-foot-wide Town Road with parking presently permitted on both sides of the street. Park Place currently services 18 existing single-family residences and an approved 66-unit Affordable Housing Development nearing completion.

**Note** Whereas, the road provides the only means of ingress and egress for all the residential units, which is to and from Connecticut Route 156 (West Main Street,) Park Place currently has vehicular and pedestrian traffic problems due to its' limited width, limited ingress and egress to and from West Main Street and lack of sidewalks. The intersection of Park Place and West Main Street currently presents dangerous sight lines. West Main Street currently has pedestrian safety problems due to the lack of sidewalks and narrow width of the shoulder.

**Note** Whereas, the Commission has determined that the sole ingress and egress to the proposed development will be a private road that will connect with Park Place. The proposed development will increase the number of residencies accessed by Park Place from 18 existing single-family residences, plus 66 approved multi-family units at Village Crossing, and the 60 units of the Parker's Place application for a total of 144 dwelling units. The proposed development will increase the vehicular and pedestrian traffic on Park Place to unsafe and dangerous levels and result in dangerous and unsafe conditions at the intersection of Park Place and West Main Street.

**Note** Whereas, the Commission has determined that re-zoning the property for the proposed density would result in dangerous pedestrian and vehicular traffic conditions on Park Place, at the intersection of Park Place and West Main Street and on West Main Street. Re-zoning the property for the density proposed would have adverse consequences to the public health and safety of the residents of Park Place, the future residents of the affordable housing development and the users of the town and state roads.

**Note** Whereas, the Commission recognizes the need for and benefit of an increased amount of affordable housing in the Town, and has weighed and balanced that need against the public's interest in the health and safety and other above-described public interests; and

**Note** Be it therefore resolved, the Commission hereby denies the application of Parker's Place LLC to re-zone the Applicant's property to an Affordable Housing District.

**Note** Be it further resolved, the Commission finds that no reasonable changes can be made to the application that would adequately protect the above enumerated public interests.

**Note** B. The request for approval of a Coastal Site Plan.

**Note** Whereas, the Commission finds, pursuant to General Statutes 22a-106, that the proposed development at the site, which is fully or partially within coastal boundary, will have potentially adverse impacts on coastal resources and future water dependent activities. The Commission find the proposed coast site plan review application inconsistent with the policies and standards of the Connecticut Coastal Management Act, the Municipal Coast Program and the potential adverse impacts on coastal resources and water quality. Additionally, the Commission finds that the proposed development would not adequately provide for future water-dependent uses and access for the public to future water dependent uses.

**Note** Be it therefore resolved, for the reasons stated above, that the Commission hereby denies the Coastal Site Plan application of Parker's Place LLC and finds that no reasonable changes can be made.

**Note** C. The request for approval of a site plan and 60-unit multi-family affordable residential housing (60 units) development.

**Note** Whereas, the Commission has resolved to deny the application for a zone change and Coastal Area Management review, See sections A and B above; and

**Note** Whereas, the Commission recognizes that an affordable housing application needs to be in strict compliance with existing zoning regulations (see *Wisniowski v. Berlin Planning Commission*, 37 Conn. App. 303 (1995)); and

**Note** Whereas, the Commission concludes that for all of the reasons enumerated in A and B above that weighed against the approval of the zone change application and the Coastal Area Management (CAM) site plan including but not limited to safe pedestrian and vehicular access and density.

**Note** Whereas, the Commission recognizes the need for and benefit of an increased amount of affordable housing in the Town, and has weighed and balanced that need against the public's interest in the health and safety and other above-described public interests; and

**Note** Be it therefore resolved, that the Commission hereby denies the application of Parker's Place LLC for an affordable housing development Site Plan, and

**Note** Be it further resolved, the Commission finds that no reasonable changes can be made to the application that would adequately protect the above enumerated public interests.

**Decision** Ms. Jett-Harris seconded the motion.  
Motion carried, 6-0-0.

**Note** Ms. Edwards rejoined the audience and Mr. Peck rejoined the Commission.

## 7. Disposition of Minutes

### 7-1. March 5th, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes

**Note** see attachment.

 [Minutes of East Lyme Zoning Commission 03\\_05\\_26.pdf](#)

**Decision** MOTION (10)

Ms. Markovitz moved to approve the Meeting Minutes of March 5th, 2026, as presented.

Ms. Kalal seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

## 8. Old Business

**Note** There was none.

## 9. Subcommittee Reports

### 9-1. Short-Term Rental Subcommittee

**Note** After some discussion with the Commission, Ms. Jett-Harris said that she and Ms. Yugas had worked on the proposal and put significant thought and effort into it. She explained that the next step would be to return to the drawing board to draft the formal text amendment in collaboration with Mr. Mulholland. Once completed, the commission would ideally vote to schedule a final public hearing, which would bring the short-term rental discussion to a close.

## 10. New Business

### 10-1. Application of Michael and Mary Manning for a Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review to demolish and rebuild a single-family dwelling at 30 West Lane.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow said she will ask Mr. Mulholland to schedule this item.

### 10-2. Any business on the floor, if any, by the majority vote of the Commission.

**Note** There was none.

### 10-3. Correspondence

**Note** Ms. Thurlow said they did receive additional correspondence on Park Place, but since the hearing was closed, they legally cannot enter it into the record.

## 11. Public Delegations

**Note** Time set aside for the public to address the Commission on Land Use items not on the agenda.

**Note** There was none.

## 12. Zoning Official

**Note** Mr. Mulholland was not in attendance.

## 13. Comments from Ex-Officio

**Note** Ms. Hardy reported on the previous night's Board of Selectmen meeting:

\*A previously submitted resignation was withdrawn, creating an unexpected procedural issue.

\*Several applicants attended hoping to fill the vacancy, but the application deadline had passed.

\*The Board will make a decision at its next meeting.

**Note** She noted additional updates but deferred them to the next meeting due to the late hour.

## 14. Zoning Board Liaison to Planning Commission

**Note** Ms. Kalal described the last Planning Commission meeting as difficult to follow and at times confusing. She reported that Mr. Goeschel has secured a \$15,000 grant to study affordable housing, though the specifics were not clearly explained.

**Note** She raised concerns about a proposal on Upper Walnut Hill where a property owner is attempting to reconfigure acreage to meet the five-acre minimum, suggesting this could be an effort to manipulate parcel requirements. Ms. Kalal also emphasized that the Planning Commission may not fully appreciate the role five-acre zoning plays in protecting groundwater, particularly in lower-lying areas of town.

**Note** Discussion of the Hathaway parcel and potential open-space connections took place, but the details were unclear. She also noted surprise that an architectural review reportedly found a 400-year-old parcel to have no architectural value.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow added that Mr. Mulholland will be involved in reviewing the parcel issue. Ms. Kalal further clarified that remote attendance counts toward fulfilling liaison responsibilities.

**Note** Ms. Thurlow said that Mr. Liska is scheduled to attend the April 14th, 2026, Planning Commission meeting.

## 15. Adjournment

**Decision** MOTION (11)

Ms. Jett-Harris moved to adjourn the March 19th, 2026, Zoning Commission meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Ms. Kalal seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

**Note** Respectfully Submitted,  
Brooke Stevens, Recording Secretary