

**COVENTRY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING OF MONDAY, JUNE 9, 2025**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

By: Pollansky

Time: 7:08 p.m.

Place: Annex & Zoom

		<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>	<b>EXCUSED</b>
<b>REGULAR MEMBERS:</b>	Bill Jobbagy, Vice Chairperson		X	X
	Brian Murray	X		
	Darby Pollansky, Chairperson	X		
	Carol Polsky, Secretary	X		
	Eric Thomas	X		
<b>ALTERNATE MEMBERS:</b>	Steve Reviczky	X		
	Mindy Gosselin	X		
	VACANT			
<b>STAFF:</b>	Jana Roberson, AICP, Director of Planning & Development	X		
	Heidi Leech, Planning Technician / Zoning Enforcement Officer		X	X
	Natalia Yeschick, Recording Secretary	X		

**2. ROLL CALL/SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

Alternate member Steve Reviczky is sat for Bill Jobbagy.

**3. AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS - None**

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

5. OLD BUSINESS

a. Extension for filing of record subdivision plans for PZC-24-12 Kings Rd. Subdivision

**MOTION:** Move to approve an extension to grant an additional 90 days to file record subdivision plans for PZC-24-12 to meet the deadline to record the mylars will be September 24, 2025.

**Motion by:** Murray

**Seconded by:** Thomas

Discussion: Polsky asked how it affects the animals. Roberson responded the developer is aware they missed their window and Roberson has asked for their permission to extend the mylars which the developers agreed to. The developer is aware it will not be able to start until next year. Roberson will send a certified letter with a reminder of the clearing window so the animals are not affected.

**Voting:**

For: Pollansky, Polsky, Murray, Thomas, Reviczky

Against: None

Abstain: None

**Motion unanimously approved.**

6. NEW BUSINESS

a. PZC-25-5 – Special Permit application for a Veterinary Hospital (Eterna Veterinary Wellness and Urgent Care) at 2208 Boston Turnpike in the Commercial Zone;  
Applicant: Stephen Fleshman, Architect; Owner: Memory Lane Partners, LLC.  
(public hearing scheduled for 6/23/25)

Roberson stated the public hearing has already been scheduled so it should not be discussed until the hearing opens.

Roberson pointed out the request for a waiver of the site plan is available for review. She also

mentioned comments were received from the Town Engineer regarding the request and noted he does not have concerns.

***MOTION: Move to approve the request for waiver of the site plan requirement under section 7.0304 of the zoning regulations for the following reasons:***

- ***The proposed project will not require any site work to be performed.***
- ***The site has sufficient parking, septic, and water services for the proposed use.***
- ***And a site plan exists for the property.***

**Motion by: Polsky**

**Seconded by: Murray**

Discussion: None

**Voting:**

For: Pollansky, Polsky, Murray, Thomas, Reviczky

Against: None

Abstain: None

**Motion unanimously approved.**

**b. Preliminary Discussion with Charles Brown re: Map 22, Lot 108 – south side, Boston Turnpike, 19.37 acres, GR-40 Zone, proposed development.**

In attendance is Dory Reiser from KKC Law. Reiser explained they are proposing a three-lot subdivision. There is a plan showing existing conditions. The three-lot subdivision will leave about 15 acres of remaining land. Reiser explained that in the future there will be an unrelated owner-occupied condominium project that will be three- and four-unit buildings for sale, not for rent, that would create housing diversity in the Town. The property is divided so the westerly side is the condo project, and the easterly side is the three lot subdivision. In between the two proposed developments there are steep slopes. The topography does not lend itself to combine the two developments and we would not have a through road so there would be two access points.

Reiser explained they have designed the three-lot subdivisions plan to comply with the GR40 regulations. There are some wetlands along the frontage and it lends itself best to a common driveway.

Reiser mentioned they would like some feedback from the commission on Chapter 13 of the Subdivision Regulations (Open Space Subdivisions). The size of the subdivision is 3.5 acres and being small they have the need to accommodate on-site septic and wells which makes the open space subdivision impractical. We do not have enough space to create three lots with the room we would need for septic, well, and give 40% open space as an open space subdivision would require. That is why based on the size a three-lot conventional would be more practical. They feel they can also satisfy the purpose of Chapter 13 by proposing a conservation easement along the wetlands area on the frontage. Adding up that area would be 16% of the land being subdivided which is more than the 10% the regulations require.

Thomas asked if they are looking to carry the conservation easement across 2 of the 3 lots. Reiser responded the conservation easement is shown on lots 2 and 3. Reiser mentioned the easement is the wetlands area and Brown clarified it is also about 25 feet around the perimeter which would be 50 feet of buffer that would be subject to Inland Wetlands regulations.

Reiser added this is a multi-step process. Step one being the informal meeting where they would like to discuss the waiver. Step two would be wetlands review as there is activity in the upland review area. Step three is a formal subdivision plan. Step four is going back to the concept plan to work with the PZC and Wetlands Commission on the condo project. Step five is working with DEEP for a general permit for stormwater discharge. Reiser mentioned that a field survey is required by the regulations to determine if there are rare or endangered plants or animals they feel the survey is not necessary. They have reviewed the 2024 maps from the Natural Diversity Database and showed the commission a map of where the subdivision is and noted there is no bubble for State or Federally listed species or critical habitat. Reiser mentioned they will be working with DEEP to make sure there are no changes. We would ask for a waiver of the field survey. Reiser also brought up the archeological review that is required.

Pollansky asked for clarification regarding the free cut. She goes on to ask if the free cut is for the 19 acres and then they are going to come through with submission for the three-lot subdivision off of the free cut. Reiser confirmed it is off the free cut.

Pollansky asked if there is anything that precludes us from allowing DEEP to review and request the information from the Natural Diversity Database as opposed to requiring it as part of the formal submission to the PZC. Roberson responded it is discretionary, and a decision can be made either way. Polsky asked if there is any reason we should waive it and only have them review with DEEP and not our own regulation. Roberson responded we would not be breaking regulations if we waived it though it may be worthwhile to get another opinion. Roberson also mentioned that just because it is not on the database does not mean there isn't something out there; it just may not be documented.

Thomas asked if there is any sense of the functions and values of the wetlands in that area.

Brown responded they do not. There was a survey done in 2022 or 2023. They have been delineated. The flags are still there. They have been surveyed by Andrew Bushnell. We do not have an evaluation at this time and do not have a direct impact.

Thomas asked if DOT has any drainage easement agreement into this wetland. Brown has not seen any of the surveys saying they do. Reiser mentioned there is nothing in the title search about a recorded easement to DOT. Brown mentioned DOT does drain into it as they have a culvert coming under 44 from the other side of the road but it is further down towards Sam Green. Thomas mentioned this might be a good opportunity to look for a fee in lieu of an easement and keep the wetlands in single ownership unless there is a high functioning value that can be documented.

Reiser mentioned the condo development although it is not before the commission at this time. She mentions the regulations do not require open space set aside in the condo development however there is a large chunk of land where the steep slopes are that Brown is proposing to be open space. There would be a total of 48% of the condominium site that would be encumbered with some sort of open space conservation easement, most of which is outside of wetlands. There will be a good amount of land set aside for protection.

There was some discussion regarding the open space regulations. Thomas suggested the commission have further conversations.

Thomas mentioned the adjacent UConn property and would like to know if Brown intends to reach out to Farm Services Agency at UConn as they are the ones that manage the Lee Farm. There is a tower at the back of the Lee Farm and there are impact studies going on. Brown has had contact with UConn's Forester Tom Worthley. Brown sent Worthley a copy of the survey as he noticed tags on the trees surrounding the area. The Forester is aware of what is going to be done. The tags are just for demonstration purposes.

Thomas feels the potential proposal for offering the steep slope would be supportive of keeping some of the unfragmented forest intact. Brown responded they have septic and well and need a place to put the septic system. Brown pointed out where the septic system will go and this includes the condo proposal. Brown mentioned the regulations do allow a conservation easement and being able to put a septic in it.

Roberson showed the mapping. Thomas explained UConn has been in the area and has not reported any reasonable observations that have not been reported into the NDDB. The large unfragmented forest block is one of our diminishing natural resources of statewide concern. Brown responded that in his conversations with environmental consultants, they do not do all-encompassing surveys writing off that there is nothing out there. They need something to look

for.

Gosselin mentioned there is some value to having conservation easement open space over wetland areas because the Inland Wetlands Protections Act does not prohibit everything.

Roberson pointed out the section of our Subdivision Regulations that does allow off site dedication open space is in Chapter 8 Section 2. Pollansky responded for the sake of showing intent and allowing some protection with the conservation easement as proposed and in the future the dedication of the open space could be suitable for Thomas' concerns.

Pollansky believes if there is another agency that is overseeing certain actions of any application that we do not need to be redundant in requiring it if it is going to follow a step elsewhere.

**c. Preliminary Discussion with Andrew Ladyga re: 2812 Boston Turnpike, 8 acres, Commercial Zone, proposed special permit modification (10-02S).**

Roberson gave an overview to the commission of what the applicant is looking for.

Ladyga explained he is looking to transfer his license to the location at 2812 Boston Turnpike for the vehicle repair side of things. When Ladyga originally went for approval in 2010, his intentions were to open up a small dealership at his house. At that time, the Commission explained they were looking to remove the auto sales portion of that use out of the regulations and were going to withdraw it and if he ever wanted to expand the lot he would need to incorporate a plan upon his approval at that time for the expansion. Instead of submitting his plan he wanted to do for an auto dealership approval, he had to hire a civil engineer. Ladyga designed a vehicle display lot for an approved special permit since that use was going to go away. All was approved before the regulation expired. In the coming years, he had asked for an extension for the special permit to keep it active. At the time you had to ask for an extension every two years. Ladyga was informed there were policy changes. The changes were valid for 19 years and he no longer needed to come back to the Town for renewal every 2 years. When he approached the Town he wanted to transfer the license based on the original plan without having to do any modifications so he can have his license there without having the vehicle displays. He is asking for a waiver of the entire site plan modification and to refer back to the actual smaller plan that he originally wanted to do. Currently the site does comply with all rules/regulations for the dmv to be able to be a licensed used car repair facility. He just needs to somehow be able to get the modification or waiver to be able to not do the rest of the parking lot design as part of the initial plan right now but with the potential to do it in the next 4 years.

Roberson mentioned special permits have an expiration date and if the plan is not implemented by that date, it will go away. Roberson stated that Ladyga asked her to prepare a memo to help with marketing and financing stating the permit was still good. She has to be able to document that and connect the dots. It is a complicated history. Roberson explained Ladyga got the special permit and requested several extensions. The question is how does that fit into the statute that was tweaked several times. What Ladyga shared with Roberson is a memo from Eric Trott stating he had consulted with one of the land use attorneys. The memo states he advises the owner has a full 19 years to act on the project and the PZC does not need to act on this. If that is enough for the commission for Roberson to write the letter for Ladyga to show to banks and potential buyers that his permit is still active then she will feel more comfortable writing it. Because he did receive several extensions it was in Attorney Roberts opinion he would qualify for the 19 years even though we do not have a specific extension stating it.

Roberson asked Ladyga if the four parking spaces are what he would like to do on the existing paved area. Ladyga confirmed yes.

Polsky and Pollansky asked for clarification if Ladyga is here for two reasons or one. One is for us to feel comfortable having Roberson write the letter. Roberson responded that up until today she thought it was a special permit modification. The commission has to make a finding if this is a major or minor modification.

Pollansky likes the phased application because in the future it allows for expansion into the already approved area that can be another phase. Ladyga is proposing zero alterations to the property and let the phasing take place with him or the other phase is good for another 4 years and you do not have to go back to the commission for approvals or permits in place to be able to get this done. It has a hard deadline in four years.

Thomas mentioned we are at 15 years now with the original approval and he has four more years to make the 19 years.

Roberson mentioned Ladyga was interested in parking lots across the street. The problem is the original special permit is location specific and cannot be moved. It would be a practical solution, but not one we can pursue.

Murphy asked Roberson if she looked at the section of the regulations talking about expiration of permits if the work is not complete. Roberson responded she will talk to Rich Roberts about it.

Ladyga is only looking for a postponement of his plan for him or the next party and is looking to move forward with exactly the way his site is regulated and approved right now without any alterations, construction, design differences. There is no modification being proposed. Ladyga is only looking to delay the actual site plans that are approved and potentially get them phased in at some point down the road.

Pollansky asked the commission if they are comfortable with Roberson writing a letter coinciding with Ladyga's request in the memo dated May 26. Reviczky responded yes based on what was heard.

Pollansky asked the commission if the drawing is considered a minor modification. There were further questions.

Thomas clarified we are talking about the 4 spots, not the plan with 8 spots. Roberson showed an aerial view where cars are parked on the pavement. The regulations do not always require paving but they say something about a non-erodible surface. Thomas asked if this is shared parking with the residents. Ladyga responded sometimes. Thomas responded from the Town's perspective how do we address what we see, how do we separate residential cars from business cars? Roberson asked Ladyga if he plans to expand. Ladyga responded there is a possibility. Polsky asked if he would be parking cars at Rays Plaza. Ladyga responded no. Polsky mentioned there are times a lot of cars are parked on the lot and asked if that will still be happening. Ladyga responded no. Roberson asked if Ladyga is using a car trailer to drop off cars and pick them up. Ladyga responded the only time he needs to use a car trailer is if a car does not run. Roberson mentioned two parking spaces are needed for the house itself based on the regulations. Roberson feels the use could use more space and let Ladyga know that converting the house to an office would need a zoning permit.

Pollansky confirmed with the commission this is going to be considered a minor modification.

Roberson addressed the parking. If it is both a house and an office for home and auto repair it needs to meet all of the needs and have designated spaces for both the home and office as well as storage area for cars. Pollansky mentioned Ladyga can come in for another modification if necessary. For the sake of this request there will be four spaces. If it is determined later that more spaces are needed Ladyga can come back for another modification. Pollansky expressed that the phasing is important in this request.

#### **d. Handbook for Elected and Appointed Officials and Volunteers 2025**

Roberson confirmed everyone filled out the form.

## **7. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

### **a. Minutes of 4/28/25, 5/12/25**

***MOTION: Motion to approve 4/28/25 Minutes***

**Motion by: Thomas**

**Seconded by: Polsky**

Discussion: None

#### **Voting:**

For: Pollansky, Polsky, Murray, Thomas

Against: None

Abstain: Reviczky

**Motion unanimously approved.**

**Minutes for 5/12/25 will be continued to the next meeting.**

## **8. COMMUNICATIONS**

### **a. Zoning referrals from Andover and Tolland**

Roberson mentioned we have two zoning referrals. They are adding a regulation for agritourism.

### **b. Summons re: A1Z7, LLC v. Coventry Planning and Zoning Commission**

## **9. MEMBER AND STAFF REPORTS - Report on recent legislation regarding housing and zoning**

## **10. ENFORCEMENT**

## **11. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by Pollansky at 10:06 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

**Natalia Yeschick**

Natalia Yeschick, Recording Secretary

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not official until approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission at the next Commission meeting. Please see the next Commission meeting minutes for approval or changes.