Town of Trumbull
CONNECTICUT

Planning and Zoning Department
Telephone (203) 452-5044
Fax (203) 452-5169

Town Hall
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2026, MINUTES

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, October 21, 2026, at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Trumbull Town Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Fred Garrity, Chairman
Anthony Silber, Vice-Chairman
Rich Deecken, Secretary
Rich Croll
Karen DelVecchio
Dean Fabrizio, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT: Rob Librandi, Land Use Planner
James Cordone, Town Attorney
Gia Mentillo, Clerk (Via Conference Call)

ABSENT: Alissa Hall, Alternate

A quorum being present, the Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN/ZONE CHANGE/OTHER

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to continue Application File #26-29 to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the PZC.
Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

1. **98 Evelyn St:** Applicant, Katherine Palmieri, Owner Robyn Puglia is requesting a Special Permit to construct an addition to establish a 722 sq. ft. Accessory Apartment in the Residence A Zone pursuant to Article II, Section 1.1.2.7 of the Town of Trumbull Zoning Regulations. **File #26-35**

   Katherine Palmieri, 47 Koger Road, spoke on behalf of the property owner, Robyn Puglia.

   Town Planner Rob Librandi provided an overview of the application, noting that (1) the proposed ADU complies with all Town regulations for ADUs; (2) the unit would be situated above a two-car garage that sits below grade resulting in the ADU aligning with the existing first floor of the dwelling, (3) the unit would be connected to the main dwelling unity via a hallway/laundry area; and (4) the proposed would not result in an additional entrance to the front of the home.

   Public Comment: No public comment was made.

   Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to close public hearing for Application File #26-35.
   Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

   Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to approve Application File #26-35 with an effective date of November 8, 2026:
   Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

2. **Text Amendment:** Applicant, Sherry Boyd, Sarah Beck and Richard W. White, is requesting to Establish a Definition for Data Center as a direct principal use under Article I section 3 definitions and establish a one-year moratorium on Data Centers. Copies of the proposed regulations are on file with Trumbull P&Z Office and Trumbull Town Clerk. **File #26-34**

Chairman Garrity informed that the text amendment being proposed for the Trumbull Zoning Regulations would be applicable to the Town as a whole and is not in regard to any one particular scenario.

Mr. Librandi stated the application was reviewed by the regional planning agency and there is no regional impact.

Richard White, 169 Church Hill Road, spoke on behalf of the application (see full written comments attached as Exhibit 1).

Public Comment:

Jeff Thomas, 75 Suzanne Circle, spoke in support of the application, noting it would allow for a proper due diligence period to assess the potential impacts data centers may have on the Town, i.e. environmental, fiscal, benefits and risks to residents, energy consumption, etc. He noted he is not necessarily against data centers but would like the Town to take time to research impacts further.

Sena Wazer, 253 Maple Road, Mansfield, of CT Chapter of Sierra Club, spoke in support of the application, sharing concerns for the environmental and energy impacts data centers have, i.e. increased electric prices for residents, noise pollution, significant emissions, air pollution and the impact that has on individuals with increased health risks, etc. She stated the proposed would allow time for the Town to assess the impacts of data centers on the community, and she encouraged enforceable limits on various issues ultimately be set.

Alexandru Antihi, 56 Crocus Lane, spoke in support of the application for reasons already noted by others, adding that, from the vantage point of the technology industry, it is clear that the demand for data centers is not temporary and will only increase in the future.

Karen Baker, 15 East Lake Road, noted her support for the application and shared comments on behalf of Jeff Strouse, 80 Ironwood Road, also in support of the application (full comments attached as Exhibit 2).

Cynthia Cummiskey, 111 Strobel Road, stated her support for the application and read a statement from Karen Gould, 40 Saxony Drive, stated her support for the application.

Kendra Norman, 8 Turkey Meadow Road, stated her support for the application for reasons already stated by others and noted the statement she had from Wilson & Deborah Zweig, 11 Glen Spring Drive, was also in support of the application for aforementioned reasons.

Erin Pullman, 57 Jerome Avenue, stated support for the application for reasons aforementioned.

Kristen Ligouri, 55 Crocus Lane, stated support for the application and read comments from Judith de Graffenried, 323 Unity Road, also in support of the application (full comments attached as Exhibit 3).

Richard White stated the proposed text amendment fits well with the existing Trumbull Zoning Regulations and he looks forward to working with the Town and Commission to develop regulations for data centers during time set forth by this moratorium and that which was approved by the Town Council.

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (DelVecchio), to close public hearing for Application File #26-34.

Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

The meeting paused for a brief recess at 8:12pm and reconvened at 8:23pm.

Chairman Garrity stated that good questions and comments where shared by the public this evening, noting that many of the concerns raised are addressed through various town mechanisms when projects move through permitting processes. He stated that most data centers already actively process AI everyday and that there are some misconceptions out there regarding what an AI data center is. He noted that the Town deliberately established industrial zones on the periphery of the town to limit impacts of those uses on residents, including noise. The Chairman stated that he does not wish to prohibit businesses from thriving, noting that businesses need to update equipment every so many years.

Commissioner Croll voiced appreciation for residents identifying potential gap in the Trumbull Zoning Regulations as they relate to data centers. He stated many of the concerns raised by the public this evening are addressed by the Town moratorium recently established by the Town Council. He shared concerns regarding the text amend language submitted, specifically Art. II, Paragraph 6 where it is stated that, "No existing data center shall be expanded or modified in a manner that materially increases its capacity or intensity of use as a data center during this time period." He stated the language to be too broad and that there would need to be a definition of what is considered capacity and intensity in order to enforce the moratorium and those definitions have not be provided.

Commissioner Deecken shared the concerns regarding language as noted by Commissioner Croll. He stated further study of data centers and their impact by the Commission would be prudent.

Commissioners Silber and DelVecchio agreed with both Commissioners Deecken and Croll.

Chairman Garrity stated that the text amendment language as presented would be impossible to enforce. He stated that when Town entities review applications and permits they do thoroughly consider the potential impacts of the proposed changes in terms of use, efficiencies, etc. He thanked the public for their comments, noted appreciation for their concerns, and asked that they not be deterred should the application be denied.

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Silber), to approve Application File #26-34.

Vote: 0-5 (Garrity, Silber, Deecken, DelVecchio, Croll) **Motion Denied**

REGULAR MEETING

PLANNER'S REPORT

Mr. Librandi informed that the P&Z Department has identified a new hire who will be clerking the PZC moving forward.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Acceptance of the Minutes from September 16, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting.

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to approve the minutes from the PZC September 16, 2026, Regular Meeting

Vote: 5 – 0 **Motion Carried**

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll) and unanimously carried to adjourn the October 21, 2026, PZC Regular Meeting at 8:36 p.m.

Dated at Trumbull, CT this 28th day of October, 2026.
By: Gia Mentillo, Clerk.

Ex 1

Planning and Zoning
Public Hearing — 10/21/2026

Richard W. White
Trumbull, CT
rww@waldengeographic.com

Opening
Our guiding principle in drafting these amendments was that the definition and moratorium should read as though they had been in our regulations for years.

We believe we've accomplished that, but we're certainly open to suggestions and revisions as we work through our amendments this evening.

Data Center Definition
Our first proposed amendment establishes data centers as a distinct **principal use** while specifically excluding ordinary server rooms and computer equipment that may be **accessory** to other businesses.

Trumbull's Zoning Regulations contain nearly 200 definitions covering different land uses, buildings, and activities. Approximately 20% of these definitions describe specific land uses.

We have four separate definitions dealing with dogs: doggie day care, dog kennels, veterinary outpatient clinics, and veterinary hospitals. We distinguish between breweries, brewpubs, and brewpub restaurants. We even distinguish between manufacturing and "boutique" manufacturing.

These distinctions each exist for a reason. Businesses that may seem similar can operate very differently, with different impacts on the surrounding community.

Our regulations have evolved as new land uses and technologies have emerged. There was a time when Trumbull had no cell towers. As wireless telecommunications developed, the Town established an entire article of regulations addressing wireless facilities, including definitions and permitted uses, as well as monitoring, certification, and evaluation.

Data centers aren't new. But today's data centers, particularly those supporting artificial intelligence and machine learning, can have very different demands for electricity, cooling, water, and other infrastructure. Defining data centers as a distinct principal use is a natural next step in the evolution of Trumbull's Zoning Regulations.

One-Year Moratorium
Our second proposed amendment establishes a one-year moratorium on data centers. The purpose is straightforward: to give our Planning and Zoning Commission the time and breathing space to study data centers and develop meaningful regulations with public input.

Without a moratorium, applications could be filed under our existing regulations while new regulations are being developed. Under Connecticut General Statutes § 8-2, applications that

conform to the regulations in effect when filed are generally protected from subsequent zoning changes.

The Commission's study could include examining electrical capacity, water consumption, wastewater discharge, plus noise, vibration, and environmental impacts. We believe the Commission should establish clear, measurable, and enforceable standards addressing these potential impacts.

One-Year Moratorium — Existing

As you know, our Town Council recently adopted a two-year moratorium on new data centers. We appreciate that action. It recognized the need for Trumbull to take a closer look at this emerging land use.

But that ordinance does not address the expansion of existing data centers, and that's particularly important because Trumbull already has one.

We believe the Planning and Zoning Commission is particularly well positioned to address the expansion of existing data centers. Our Zoning Regulations already recognize the distinction between changes to a building and changes to the intensity of its use.

A data center can substantially increase its electrical consumption, computing capacity, and cooling requirements without adding a single square foot to the building. That's why our proposed moratorium includes material increases in the capacity or intensity of use of existing data centers, not simply physical expansion.

The Town Council has taken an important first step. We believe the Planning and Zoning Commission has an opportunity to build on that work by addressing the material expansion of existing facilities.

Closing

We look forward to working with the Commission and Town staff to develop regulations that work for Trumbull. We're residents of this town, as are our many supporters and the members of this Commission. We all share an interest in getting this right.

We also have several people here tonight who plan to speak during public comment and offer additional perspectives: Sena Wazer, Outreach Coordinator from the Connecticut Chapter of the Sierra Club and Desiree Brooks from a group working on similar issues in Beacon Falls.

Our goal remains straightforward: to give Trumbull the time and tools to develop appropriate regulations for both new and existing data centers.

10/21/26
Planning + Zoning Hearing

Exhibit 2

We are not asking the Commission to oppose technology or economic development. We are instead asking it to apply ordinary land-use principles to a project whose impact will have a lasting and materially consequential effect on our community at large.

Before acting, the Commission should insist on objective answers concerning maximum power demand, cooling and water use, continuous and low-frequency noise, backup-generator emissions, fuel storage, fire safety, and effects on municipal infrastructure. Those answers should come from technical studies available to the public and reviewed by independent experts.

If the applicant believes there will be no increase in electricity draw, water use, noise or building footprint, those commitments should be converted into precise, enforceable approval conditions with monitoring, reporting and corrective-action requirements. Mere verbal assurances made to the Town by the applicant are meaningless and nowhere near equivalent to enforceable land-use protections.

At the very least, before any action is taken or any approval is granted, the public has a right to know—and indeed the Commission has an obligation to address—the following questions, which are designed to determine whether the proposal is truly a limited modernization or a materially intensified use, and whether any conditions and/or assurances imposed by the Commission will be in fact measurable, enforceable, and independently verified.

- Why should this be treated as a modernization of an existing use rather than a material intensification or expansion of that use? And importantly, what objective zoning standard governs that determination?
- What changes are proposed to the existing facility's equipment, electrical capacity, cooling systems, generators, fuel storage, operating intensity, and hours of operation. In the spirit of full transparency and clarity, I'd like to see a full side-by-side comparison that distinguishes existing conditions from proposed conditions.
- What portion of the facility will support artificial-intelligence or high-performance-computing workloads?
- Will the approval limit the type or density of computing equipment that may be installed later?
- Has the complete application, including all technical studies and revised plans, been available to the public for a meaningful review period?

- Has the Town retained independent experts in acoustics, electrical infrastructure, air emissions, water use, fire safety, and data-center engineering? And w
- Will the Commission decline to act until the record is complete?
- What is the facility's existing peak electrical demand, and what is its projected peak demand after modernization? Will the applicant be required to agree to an enforceable cap on maximum electrical draw? Has the Commission evaluated reliability during peak summer and winter demand, outages, and extreme weather?
- What are the projected average-day, peak-day, and annual water demands at initial operation and full buildout? Where is water discharged & what effect does it have on the environment?
- Does the noise analysis model take into account all equipment operating simultaneously, including fans, chillers, cooling towers, pumps, transformers, rooftop equipment, and generators?
- Does it address startup, cycling, maintenance, abnormal operating modes, and future equipment replacement?
- Will the Town require post-construction testing by an independent acoustical engineer during worst-case operations?
- Will the results be public, and what happens if the predictions are wrong?
- What pollutants and greenhouse-gas emissions are expected from everyday usage, routine testing and emergency operation?
- Which federal, state, and local permits apply, and have they been obtained?
- What enduring benefits, if any, will Trumbull receive, including permanent jobs, tax revenue, infrastructure improvements, and emergency-service funding? And how do the benefits compare to the risks/pollution/impact on the value of real estate?

One last thing. If there's time. Maybe add something like the following to the end - these are uncertain times. Dangerous times. But we, as humans, still have control. We still have good, reasonable human judgement to do what is right. In the end, it's not about money. It's not about the bottom line. It's about protecting our citizens and our community. Our environment. And our future. The commission has a hefty decision to make. We implore their human senses to act accordingly.

Thank you.

Jeff Strouse

80 Ironwood Road, Trumbull CT 06611

203-241-4365

zoning text ammendment

Ex 3
10/21/26 P+Z Hearing

Subject: Public Comment regarding the redevelopment of the data center property at 80 Merritt Boulevard— Environmental, Infrastructure, Financial Responsibility and Required Safeguards

To the Trumbull Town Council:

I am submitting these comments regarding the proposed data center expansion at **80 Merritt Boulevard**. My purpose is to raise an issue that I believe deserves careful consideration before the Town takes actions that could facilitate or approve the project: **long-term liability and accountability.**

The fundamental question is straightforward:

If this project creates environmental damage, infrastructure problems, impacts to neighboring properties, or additional municipal costs—either during construction or years afterward—who will be legally and financially responsible?

Approval of a major development should not address only whether the project satisfies requirements at the time permits are issued. The Town should also consider what happens throughout the useful life of the facility, particularly if ownership, operators, corporate entities, or financial circumstances change.

1. Environmental Liability

A project of this magnitude may involve stormwater management, groundwater, wastewater, drainage, fuel or chemical storage, and other environmental considerations.

Before approval, the Town should establish appropriate baseline conditions and determine what monitoring will be required after construction.

If environmental impacts subsequently occur, there should be no uncertainty regarding:

- who must investigate the problem;
- who must perform remediation;
- who pays for that remediation;
- how responsibility will be determined; and
- what happens if the original developer or operator no longer owns or operates the property.

These obligations should be enforceable for as long as the potential liability exists.

2. Successor Ownership and Corporate Responsibility

One of my greatest concerns is what happens when ownership changes.

Businesses reorganize. Properties are sold. Operating companies change. Corporate entities can merge, dissolve, or be replaced.

The Town therefore should not rely exclusively upon promises made by the company operating the facility today.

Where legally appropriate, significant environmental, maintenance, monitoring, infrastructure, and remediation obligations should be structured so that they remain enforceable against **successor owners and operators**.

The Town should determine which obligations should be incorporated into permits, agreements, recorded instruments, or other enforceable mechanisms so that responsibility does not disappear simply because ownership changes.

3. Financial Assurances

An obligation is only meaningful if there are resources available to satisfy it.

The Town should therefore determine whether the project warrants appropriate forms of financial protection, which could include insurance, performance bonds, letters of credit, guarantees, escrow arrangements, or other legally available financial assurances.

Those protections should be sufficient to address reasonably foreseeable obligations involving environmental remediation, infrastructure, construction damage, maintenance, restoration, or other project-related liabilities.

The Town should also determine how long such protections must remain in effect and what happens if the responsible corporate entity ceases operations.

4. Municipal Infrastructure and Taxpayer Liability

The Town should carefully evaluate the project's demands upon **sewer and wastewater infrastructure, water supply, roads, drainage, utilities, fire protection, emergency response, and other municipal services**.

If additional municipal infrastructure or services become necessary because of this expansion, the public should know:

Who pays?

The Town should identify reasonably foreseeable costs and determine whether those costs will be borne by the developer/operator or ultimately transferred to Trumbull taxpayers and ratepayers.

Any projected municipal revenue from the project should therefore be considered together with the potential long-term municipal costs attributable to it. If the project is receiving benefits under

Connecticut's Qualified Data Center Tax Incentive Program, the Town should also identify the obligations contained in any host-municipality fee agreement and determine whether those provisions adequately protect Trumbull against reasonably foreseeable long-term municipal and infrastructure costs.

5. Construction and Neighboring Property

Construction impacts can sometimes become apparent only after substantial work has occurred.

Before construction begins, consideration should therefore be given to documenting baseline conditions of potentially affected neighboring properties and infrastructure.

If residents later report problems involving foundations, wells, drainage, groundwater, retaining structures, settlement, vibration, or other property conditions, there should be a clear process for investigating those claims and determining responsibility.

Residents should not be placed in the position of trying years later to reconstruct what conditions existed before construction began. Where appropriate, baseline documentation should be completed before demolition or major construction activities that could alter those conditions.

6. Data-Center-Specific Long-Term Obligations

A data center also warrants careful consideration of the long-term obligations associated with its particular operation.

Depending upon the final design and operating characteristics of this facility, those issues may include substantial electrical demand, cooling systems, water use, backup generation and associated fuel systems, noise, fire and emergency response requirements, and eventual replacement or decommissioning of specialized equipment.

The Town should identify which of these issues actually apply to the proposed expansion at 80 Merritt Boulevard and ensure that the costs and liabilities associated with them are appropriately assigned.

7. Emergency Response and Public Safety

The Town should also determine whether existing emergency services are adequately equipped and staffed to respond to foreseeable incidents at the expanded facility.

If specialized equipment, training, staffing, fire suppression capability, hazardous-material response, or other additional resources are required because of this development, the Town should identify those requirements and associated costs **before approval rather than after an emergency occurs**.

8. End-of-Life and Decommissioning

Long-term accountability should also address what happens when the facility or major portions of its equipment eventually reach the end of their useful lives.

The Town should consider whether appropriate provisions are necessary for removal of equipment, remediation of affected areas, restoration of the property, disposal of materials, and other decommissioning obligations—and who will bear those costs if the operator at that time is financially unable to do so.

Conclusion

My concern can ultimately be summarized in three questions:

Who is responsible?
Who pays?
And will those protections still be enforceable years from now?

These questions should be answered while the Town has the ability to establish appropriate protections—not after a problem occurs.

I respectfully request that the Town Council, and all appropriate Town boards, commissions, departments, consultants, and legal counsel involved in reviewing this project, carefully examine the long-term liability structure associated with the proposed expansion at 80 Merritt Boulevard.

Where appropriate and legally permissible, the Town should consider enforceable permit conditions, recorded obligations, monitoring requirements, insurance, financial assurances, successor-owner provisions, infrastructure protections, and other mechanisms necessary to prevent project-related liabilities from ultimately becoming the responsibility of neighboring property owners, residents, ratepayers, or Trumbull taxpayers.

This is not simply a question of whether a project can be constructed.

It is a question of **who remains responsible after it is constructed.**

Respectfully submitted,

Judith de Graffenried **10/21/2026**

323 Unity Rd
Trumbull, Connecticut