

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
 Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
 January 3, 2012

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, January 3, 2012. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

Paul Chaplinsky	Kevin Conroy
Stephen Kalkowski	James Maccio
Paul Champagne	James Sinclair
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: Randall Gage
 Susan Locks

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Mary Savage-Dunham, Town Planner
 Anthony J. Tranquillo, Director of Public Works / Town Engineer
 Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney

Absent: Ryan Rogers, Alternate

A quorum was determined.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance.

The Minutes are being prepared summary style and the video and audio tapes are available for further detail.

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chairman, presiding:

Approval of Minutes - Regular Meeting of December 6, 2011

Mr. Kalkowski noted a typographical error regarding Item SPR 1592.1 Loveley Development. The vote result should read: 6 to 1 with Mr. Conroy opposed.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Kalkowski. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Ms. Savage Dunham read the legal notice into the record.

A. Richard Barry, one lot resubdivision application, 389 Marion Avenue S #1285.

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, represented the applicant. At the last meeting this application was presented. We're seeking to subdivide property on the old Fan Steel Industrial site and a residential piece of property located as part of that property even though the property is zoned industrial.

We have received staff comments and have been working on them. We met with staff to discuss the issue of the need to obtain a variance for the rear lot access way. We're working on that and we're going before the ZBA on Tuesday.

I'll answer any questions you have on this application.

As for the public hearing, if there are no other outstanding issues, I request it be closed and continue it until we get through the ZBA and then you can act on the resubdivision.

In response to a query by Mr. Chaplinsky, Mr. Giudice explained the existing industrial building has additional land that's part of that site; however this portion of that property is zoned residential. We're looking for a one lot subdivision cutting this property off of the industrial site. We need a variance because we're proposing a rear lot and we will have two accesses adjacent to each other where your regulations require a 250' to 500' separation. Explained.

Those speaking in favor of the application:

No response.

Those speaking against the application:

No response.

The Chair closed this public hearing.

B. Galaxy Development, LLC, special permit use application for multiple buildings on one property, 365 Queen Street SPU #500.

Patrick Doherty, professional engineer with Twin Point Engineering and Consultants in Woburn, MA presented on behalf of the applicant. Passed around handouts of the map on the board.

He explained the application by saying we are looking for the redevelopment of 365 Queen Street. The property is approximately 3.65 acres and it is zoned entirely B.

This is the SPU application because there would be more than one principle building on the lot. He used the map to explain the existing conditions on site. The land is zoned to the south, north and west. The easterly property line is actually the zone line between the business and residential zone.

Uses of the property abutting is: east is residential as well as the south. To the west across Queen Street is commercial and to the north across Loper Street is commercial.

There are 6 existing buildings on the site. There is one residential building in the northeast corner. There is a restaurant that has been closed for some time on the northwest portion of the site. And, two buildings in the middle and towards the back are for automotive services. Along Queen Street, the middle building is a liquor store and the southerly building is Webster Bank.

The proposal would be to remove 5 of the buildings --- all of the buildings with the exclusion of the Webster Bank which would be removed and have relocated drive thru facilities. And, we would be adding a third drive thru lane.

After removal of the 5 other buildings, we would construct one restaurant in its place. So we would have 2 principle buildings on the site where there are now 6. We'd be reducing the square footage of the restaurant but the amount of impervious surface for the overall site would remain about the site as there is a requirement for more parking for the restaurant.

Right now there are 5 curb cuts: 3 on Queen Street and 3 on Loper Street. All are full access with the exception of the southerly curb cut on Queen Street which is in only and services the bank. That curb cut would remain and we would remove the other 5 and replace them with a restricted access curb cut on to Queen Street, right turns in, right turns out and the full service driveway would be on to Loper Street.

We've reviewed the circulation and curb cuts and with our traffic engineer. Explained he could not be here.

We have received a letter from the town's traffic consultant concurring with our trip generation findings. Explained the proposed development will generate a slight increase in traffic --- nothing significant. (Report on file in the Town Planner's office.)

We believe internal signalization will be vastly improved as well as circulation into and out of the site. Explained the layout shows it working as all one site.

Mr. Sinclair asked for an elevation of the finished building. The Engineer did not have that at this point. If we did submit the elevation, it would be very obvious as to what the restaurant would be.

Those speaking in favor of the application:

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. I speak in favor of this proposal. I believe this proposal would be an asset to our town. It would taken one of our high visibility corners and be a major improvement. We'll get more tax revenue with this proposal as opposed to a diner that is almost always closed over the last 10 years.

While I'm in favor of this, as to traffic, is there really enough queuing space on Loper Street for traffic coming out of the bank and the restaurant to take left. Do we need to eliminate all 6 curb cuts?

I ask you to look at possibly leaving one of the other curb cuts open on Queen Street. Other than that, I think it would be a great asset to this town.

Those speaking against the application:

Kinga A. Kostaniak, Attorney, 31 High Street, New Britain, CT, representing the residents at 46 Loper Street, made a presentation citing the following concerns for this property that would be basically touching this development if proposed:

- Nuisance Claim: There is going to be a huge amount of traffic increase. It does very come very close to Queen Street where there is a lot of businesses. However, most of the business traffic enters from Queen Street on to the property and this will cause a change in that with the property being pushed back all the way to Loper Street. You're zoning from where a residential house now resides and borders 46 Loper Street and pushing back commercial property towards 46 Loper Street.

It'll also increase the noise levels. Explained delivery noise and patron noise.

- Reliance Claim & Devaluation of Property: When they bought in 2007, they relied on the property and zoning that there was a break in the residential zoning between them and Queen Street. Now that's going to change and cause their property to be devalued greatly.

Visual aspects from the property will be changed, as well, impacting what is considered their front yard. Explained.

Maybe they could possibly consider another location for the development of such a large restaurant.

Katarzyna Olechowska, 46 Loper Street, represented concerns of her parents who own the home. I fully agree with what my attorney said. I encourage you to take a ride on Queen Street and take a ride up Loper Street. Explained her location.

This redevelopment will affect us the most because the house is going to be knocked down and moved up further. I'm assuming a tall building in the front with the parking lot in the back. And, a retaining wall because it's on a hill.

We'll be looking down on a parking lot. And, box truck tops that are making deliveries. This is not how the property was when my parents purchased. They paid a fair price and they pay a full amount of taxes yearly. This will seriously devalue the property.

My parents want to retire here. They enjoy the close access to the businesses nearby. It is convenient but not in their front yard.

I do agree it would be nice to see a small business open where the restaurant was to generate tax revenue. But not knocking the house down and pushing the property to our driveway. I don't think that's fair.

The Town Planner clarified the property is all business zoned. It is a residential use in a business property zone.

This is not a zone change application. It is an application to put multiple buildings on one lot.

Mike Magson, 52 Loper Street totally objected to this proposal. His concerns were noise and traffic on Loper Street. Explained.

As far as getting rid of the curb cuts on Queen Street and making Loper the main access that is totally absurd.

The owner is not here tonight and the traffic consultant is not here tonight. They did the numbers on it and it wasn't good.

The Chair advised the report from the traffic engineer is on file and you are more than welcome to come into the Town Hall during business hours to read that report.

Attorney Sciota handed the speaker a copy of the town's traffic report.

What're we going to do for a sound barrier? Are we going to have a fence? Explained.

Mr. Chaplinsky pointed out the traffic consultant's comments regarding consolidating to two building on one site.

Discussion.

Mr. Magson noted wildlife disruption and privacy disruption. Traffic and noise are concerns. Would like a fence or a buffer or a barrier.

Staff Comments:

Ms. Savage Dunham read a letter into the record from Jensen's Communities. (Letter on file in the Town Planner's Office.)

The Town's peer review on the traffic information was provided tonight as part of the public hearing.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Doherty addressed the letter from Jensen's. The applicant is committed to putting screening or fencing, whatever is needed to shield the headlights and separate the project from the residential community to the south.

As to the concerns of the abutters to the east, our site plan is presented so that all the commercial areas of the property are located as close to Queen Street as possible. We've left well over 120' in its existing vegetated tree condition which is more than what is normally left between commercial and residential uses. Maybe we can work something out with some additional screening.

Mr. Gage asked if there was any consideration given to splitting this lot. Mr. Doherty said no, it's all one property. Explained.

The Planner reminded the commission this is adjacent to a residential zone and Section 8-02.11 of your regulations states you have to make findings with regard to the location. The focus of this is on whether you feel the site is appropriate for more than one principle building.

Hearing no further comments, the Chair closed this public hearing.

BUSINESS MEETING:

A. Richard Barry, one lot resubdivision application, 389 Marion Avenue S #1285.

The Town Planner advised the applicant requested a table. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to table. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

B. Galaxy Development, LLC, special permit use application for multiple buildings on one property, 365 Queen Street SPU #500.

The SPU is ready for action. I redirect you to Section 8.02.11 with the regard to the appropriateness of this proposal being adjacent to a residential zone. You have to make a finding in regard to the design presented to you.

Mr. Sinclair felt that taking 5 building unused right now and turning it into 1 building which would look a lot nicer for the community. I think this is in finding with Section 8-02.11. I'll make a motion to approve the 2 buildings on one lot. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Conroy cited his professional experience as a licensed civil engineer with a background in traffic engineering. He commented on concerns the residents had with respect to the multiple use on this lot and traffic expectations is a valid concern. In my opinion this is actually a positive effect for traffic in this area.

Discussion.

He also stated the curb cut elimination on Queen Street is a huge positive for this project. We are able to get rid of a hazard in this area.

Discussion.

Having fewer access points along Loper Street and moving that up is also a positive he explained. Easier access getting in and out.

This particular multi use permit I feel comfortable supporting he added.

Mr. Gage felt the uses of the buildings were deemed compatible. Explained the use already exists at the property. With the residential property buffering there shouldn't be an issue with this being compatible.

The Chair pointed out this is Queen Street, it's always been business. Things change. People have the right to do what they want on their property as long as it conforms to the regulations.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Galaxy Development, LLC, site plan application for plaza redevelopment, 365 Queen Street SPR #1605.

Patrick Doherty presented the application. The property is approximately 3.5 acres with 6 buildings on the property and it is current zoned B business entirely.

The zone line between business and residential is our easterly property line. To the north, south and west is all zoned Business.

The uses to the south is a residential community, to the west is commercial properties and to the north across Loper Street are commercial properties and abutting our property to the east are residential properties, single family homes.

The project is a complete redevelopment. One building, Webster Bank, will remain. We would remove the existing drive thru and reconstruct a new drive thru with canopy and lanes to the east of where the existing drive thru is located. The interior would be renovated to accommodate that change.

There are currently 6 curb cuts providing access to the site: 3 on Queen Street and 3 on Loper Street. One of the three on Loper Street is for the single family house and gets very little traffic. The remainder of the 5 curb cuts feed into existing parking areas for the development.

There are two full access curb cuts on to Queen Street and one that allows bank customers to enter, only. There are two full service curb cuts on to Loper Street existing.

The proposal would be to remove the 5 buildings on the north portion of the site. To rework the grades so the parking lot would be relatively flat. We would construct a restaurant that is approximately 6200 sf. It's a quick serve, sit down restaurant. No drive thru. (Like Long Horn Steakhouse or Wood 'n Tap)

There would be 101 parking spaces for the proposed restaurant and 29 parking spaces for the bank.

Site is served by public water and sewer.

The grades along the site were discussed as going higher in elevation as you go east about 40'. A retaining wall of about 12' in height was discussed.

Drainage improvements on the site was discussed. A storm water collection system to be installed was explained as providing ZIRO and treatment of the water.

The site will be constructed consistent with other development in the area. Explained.

The site plan would be in accordance with all zoning regulations, including perimeter landscape regulations, street trees and internal landscape regulations.

The amount of parking is appropriate for the development. We have 10 more than required by the town.

We have located the proposed uses as far away from the residential properties as possible. Over 140' of green space will be in its existing condition against the easterly property line.

Along the southerly property line we haven't exceeded where the existing pavement is. Additional screening was discussed along the southerly property line in response to a letter regarding headlights and glare. We'll work with staff to provide the proper screening.

We do need to respond back to comments from staff. And, we'll work on providing some additional screening.

The site lighting system has been designed and needs to be provided to staff. Explained.

We are prepared to provide additional information in regards to the staff comments.

This restaurant would be open for lunch and dinner hours. Discussed delivery times.

Two dumpsters are located in the service area and will be completely screened. Discussion. We will work with staff on dumpster pick up times.

Mr. Kalkowski said his concern is with the second curb entrance in between the restaurant and the bank. Explained his sight concern. He didn't feel comfortable with it and felt it was a safety issue. I ask you to think about reworking it.

Discussion.

Mr. Sinclair brought up screening for the neighbors. Mr. Doherty said he would take photos and let everyone know what is going to stay and what would be supplemented.

The Town Planner added for the record, Section 4-00.3 of the regulations requires a 20' landscaped buffer for businesses development adjacent to residential zones.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy echoed the previous comments regarding the internal intersection between the bank and the restaurant. Too much going on there for safety sake. I prefer to see the crossover happen farther to the rear of the lot - even eliminating the crossover location altogether. It might be better if the divider parking was adjacent to the building and that'll allow more room to maneuver through there. Entrances and exit accesses for the two buildings were discussed.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy continued he liked the access management and it is a very good thing to reduce the curb cuts we have there. A big safety improvement.

The sight distance was discussed at Loper Street, right turn only. Check the vegetation through there and make sure the sight triangles are clear.

As to screening, I agree with the previous comments. On the south it is critical for the new paved area, east of the bank, to have heavy screening.

Discussion.

The height of the proposed retaining wall be 12' along the center tapering down to 0.

To provide guidance to the applicant, the trend is for them to be open, commented Mr. Conroy. It may work better operationally if we say okay, there's two buildings on this lot but let's not pretend they're two different lots. I would think if we're looking for full access, we would want to keep it closer to the bank exit. Its work exploring concluded Mr. Conroy.

Mr. Conroy spoke about the parking requirements. He didn't have a problem with combined parking for the two buildings.

Mr. Chaplinsky addressed the bank parking lot pattern. Signage may be needed.

Mr. Doherty requested a 65 day extension. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to grant the 65-day extension. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table this item to the first meeting in February, 2012. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

D. Queen Street pump station upgrades, 1049 Queen Street (FF #231 & SPR #1606.

Dave Prickett, Tighe & Bond Consulting Engineers, Westfield, MA representing the applicant. As a follow up to the last meeting when we presented the upgrade to the existing Queen Street Pump Station.

At our last meeting one significant comment raised by the commission was relative to floodway conveyance. Since then, we've developed a couple of cross sectional areas through both the existing and proposed buildings. These plans were resubmitted in mid-December. They showed although the existing building which was in close proximity to the stream was being eliminated and constructed

approximately 20' further and were under those plans still decreasing the cross sectional area through the floodway.

We had an opportunity to sit down with the Town Engineer and John Degioia of the WPCA and we looked at what concessions with might be able to make to the proposed building to maintain a non-net increase in sectional area. The plans were revised and overnighed last week.

He described the proposed revisions. The building location has not changed nor has the size or configuration. What has changed is we pulled the proposed contours up closer to the driveway such that there is no grading toward the river --- a major stipulation of the Conservation Commission. On the west side of the proposed building, we decreased the proposed turnaround shown in pavement. Staff was willing to make that concession to maintain the floodway conveyance. What we're left with is a proposed upgrade. The pump station has to go adjacent to the existing well. We decreased the impervious surface. We increased the conveyance through the floodway for the cross section through the existing building. That's important because the existing building was 20' closer to the river in a higher velocity area. Explained.

So by moving the building to a lower velocity area, during a storm event, the water is still in the floodplain, but it's moving around at a lower velocity.

Another benefit by pulling the contours back is we've increased the floodplain storage on the site by 60%.

We believe we've addressed any of the concerns associated with the floodplain and floodway while still achieving the design intent which is to give the town a pump station that is going to maintain operation during a flood event and not release an electrical failure and raw sewage to the stream.

Mr. Conroy asked about the funding. Mr. Tranquillo didn't believe there was going to be any state or federal funding for this. Discussion of funding requirements if state and federal funding is involved. Mr. Conroy said he would require the hydraulic analysis of a private developer and had problem letting the town go forward without it. He discussed why the modifications to the floodway are important. He did indicate he was comfortable it would not have a significant impact to the flood conditions.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve FF 231. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve SPR #1606. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. Nelcon Service Center, site plan application for construction of 9,775 sf industrial building for proposed towing and repair facility 51 Triano Drive SPR #1608.

Stephen Giudice, presented representing the applicant. The proposal is construct a 9,775 sf industrial building at 61 Triano Drive. This is lot #7 of the South Farms Subdivision.

Discussion.

We are proposing to construct a building with a paved parking area in the front of the building and a gravel area around the rear of the building.

The site is served by public water and sewer.

The extensive landscaped buffer next to the residential property was discussed. It's required by the regulations. We are also proposing the site be completed fenced around the perimeter.

The storm water collection system was explained.

ZIRO has been addressed by way a flood storage area constructed as part of the subdivision. Explained.

This site will primarily be for their towing operation. They own an ambulance service business and a chair service. They do a lot of mobility.

We are before the wetland commission now and we are going before the ZBA for special exception as this is considered a public garage licensed by the DMV.

We've received staff comments and we've addressed them. We are waiting to go before wetlands, so we are requesting a table at the end of the presentation.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table which Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

F. North Main 157, LLC, site plan application to convert 1,100 sf of retail space into a proposed restaurant, 1- 57 North Main Street SPR #1609.

Stephen Giudice, on behalf of the applicant presented. We are proposing to convert about 1200 sf of this first floor space to a Subway Restaurant. This technically is a change of use we're going from retail to a food service.

We are requesting a waiver of the A-2 survey due to the fact that the property lines are very well defined on this property and our only outside improvement is a fenced dumpster area.

We did require a waiver where the change of use required increased the parking requirements for that area by 13 parking spaces. We did petition the Parking Authority for a waiver of the 13 parking spaces and that was granted last week.

The parking was discussed by Mr. Chaplinsky and Mr. Giudice.

Mr. Conroy commented this is a positive thing. I think it's a good thing. I have no problem with the parking.

The Town Planner said the comments were very minor and responded to. Mr. Giudice did submit at this time the new revised plans.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with the waiver of the A-2 survey. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

G. Request for rear lot determination, 211 Meriden Avenue.

This item has been withdrawn.

H. Request for rear lot determination, 347 Marion Avenue

Stephen Giudice presented on behalf of the applicant. This is property at 347 Marion Avenue. The previous application was just to the east of this property. The original house on this lot was located here (indicating). The applicant wants to move the house to the back. We are taking the 20' out of this (indicating) in order to make this property (indicating) have access. Right now this property (indicating) is landlocked from an access perspective from residential. You'd have to go through an industrial zone to get to this residential property.

The other application was deeded 20' from here so this property would have access through the residential zone. By doing that, this lot becomes a rear lot.

What we are proposing is a paved driveway.

The property is serviced by public water and sewer.

The house is set further away from the abutting property owners. Explained the setback.

We think this is the highest and best use of this property.

Discussion of the house placement on the lot and in front of it along with access points.

Attorney Sciota pointed out these are lots that exist and we have to work as best we can within our regulations.

It's R-20/25 and the parcel is 2.13 acres.
Discussion.

A variance is required for the separation distance on the newly proposed lot which is being split off of the industrial property.
Explained the Town Planner.

Screening was discussed by Mr. Conroy and Mr. Giudice.

Mr. Chaplinsky referred to Section 11-14.9 of the regulations and extensive discussion followed.

Mr. Conroy said it is clear it is better to have the house further back on the lot.

The Town Planner confirmed this is ready for action. Staff just asked the applicant when they come in for the plot plan to rebuild the house could they show the screening as required as they will have to get a zoning permit.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Chaplinsky opposed on a roll call vote.

I. Whispering Pines Estates Rear, request for release of \$14,300 E & S bond S 1252.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

J. Whispering Pines Estates, request for release of \$23,000 E & S Bond S #1248.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Champagne seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

K. Whispering Pines Estates, request for reduction of subdivision bond to a new amount of \$50,000 S#1248.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Chaplinski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

L. Whispering Pines Estates, request for release of \$10,900 public improvement bond S #1248.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

M. Whispering Pines Rear, Section II, release of \$44,000 subdivision bond S #1252.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

N. Keith Keegan, request for release of \$19,000 public improvement bond, 1198 West Street SPR #1444.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

O. St. Armand Estates, request for release of \$2,750 E & S bond SPR #1353.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

None.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

SPR 1609 - Subway on North Main Street

SPR 1610 - Home Depot Concession trailer. The Town Planner explained this is a structure that will be permanent and plumbed into utilities. It will sit right in front of the building. Therefore, it requires a site plan. This is the Home Depot on Meriden Waterbury Turnpike.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION SUBCOMMITTEES

Turf Committee Meeting

Mr. Macchio reported they had two meetings in December, the 5th & 19th. The first was essentially why was the committee brought together and topics of discussion were why do we need a turf field, what is a turf field. Looking at current conditions at the high school. Benefits of a turf field or keeping a natural field. A number of things discussed.

We were all in concurrence that really utilize the fields to its benefits at this point we are looking at installing a turf field and recommending that.

The second meeting we discussed: if we do with a turf field, how're we going to raise the funds? How're things going to be scheduled? It's not usage for the high school, only. It is a town field so it can be used for high school functions as necessary and other functions. We probably have 7,000 kids playing in sports throughout the parks and other fields throughout the town. If we put in a turf field now you go from just being to use it for a limited time to be able to use it for all sorts of multiple events.

The other thing is to use it for even non-athletic events because of its durability and usability.

Maintenance of the field was discussed.

A lot of information has come from the BOE and the Athletic Director. Maintenance costs were discussed.

It is moving forward. Three more meetings in January. At our meeting tomorrow, we will have three representatives from three vendors present options.

Blue Ribbon Parks Committee

Mr. Gage reported there was one meeting. A questionnaire to the league commissioners will be sent out to ascertain the usage and strengths of the park system as it is right now.

In the next couple of months everyone will be in front of this committee to give their opinion.

Open Space

Mr. Champagne reported no meetings have taken place.

Continuous Improvement for Zoning Regulations

Mr. Kalkowski said as of next we'll start working in a couple of areas. One is to resurrect the Paul started on the signs. And, secondly, working on the paved parking lots which we talked about at the December meeting.

West Street Subcommittee

Mr. Chaplinsky reported he sent out a notification requesting the first two meeting dates for January and February. Over the holidays I spoke with a resident in the West Street area who has been added to the subcommittee as well as a business owner on West Street. We're looking to add one more business owner in the area, as well.

Planning Process Committee

Mr. Conroy reported they are having their first meeting next week.

Adjournment Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:51 o'clock, p.m.)