

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
 Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
 August 7, 2012

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

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

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

Alternates: Susan Locks
 Jennifer Clock
 Randall Gage

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Mary Savage-Dunham, Town Planner
 James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer
 Gregg Klimaszewski, Assistant Town Attorney

Absent: Paul Chaplinsky, Commissioner
 Ryan Rogers, Alternate
 Mark Sciota, Deputy Town Mgr/Town Attorney

The Chair seated Randall Gage for Paul Chaplinsky for this evening's meeting. 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 is available for review.

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chairman, presiding:

Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of July 17, 2012

Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion for approval which was seconded by Mr. Champagne.

Mr. Gage stated for the record he was not here, but he did read the Minutes and review the video. I just want to point out one change to the review Minutes. On Page 16, Item 5, in the

back there was a comment that said: We do not want to be the developer. I don't think that was stated by Ms. Savage Dunham nor Mr. Sciota. So the thought would be for clarification, I think we were discussing that typically the developers do not want the town to be the developer of the finished roadway rather than the statement that the town made that comment. I would like to have that changed for clarification.

Ms. Savage Dunham said we probably did say that.

Mr. Gage said he didn't hear that.

Ms. Savage Dunham said that is an accurate statement. We don't want to be the developer, but if we have to step in we would. I think we were talking about calling the bonds.

Mr. Gage said we were talking about calling it and I think the context was that the developers wouldn't want us to do it because it was a third more of a cost. Ms. Savage Dunham said that is true, as well.

It was decided to table the item and have that portion of the minutes transcribed verbatim.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table. Mr. Macchio seconded.

Mr. Sinclair removed his table. Mr. Macchio commented that he did read the minutes and also saw the video. I wasn't astute and did not pick it up.

Mr. Sinclair dittoed what was the said. Motion to table. Mr. Gage seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Verbatim transcription provided.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

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

A. Petition to change zone boundary, 49 DePaolo Drive (Map 178, Parcels 15,16,17 and Map 190, the southerly 500' of Parcel 003) from I-1 and R-40 to I-2 (ZC #539.)

Attorney William Tracy, 43 Belleview Avenue, Bristol, CT representing the applicant. With me tonight is Jim Jones who was the map of the area that we are proposing for a zone change.

It is three properties and a portion of a fourth located north of DePaolo Drive and west of West Street. The total is about 63 acres in size amongst the four.

Most of it is currently zoned I-1. There is a small sliver still in R-40. The western part of the property is the former Southington landfill and these are adjacent to that proposed for the change in zone.

The boundaries were explained.

The applicant is looking at a mulch production facility and a composting production facility eventually. He was attracted to the I-2 zone as there are larger lot size requirements in the I-2 zones more consistent with the configurations of these existing parcels and the types of uses permitted of right in the I-2 zone are much more conducive. Particularly we are looking at the sales and storage of building and construction materials that is allowed in the I-2 zone that is not included in the I-1 zone permitted uses.

Discussion.

The traffic patterns and the differences between the kinds of uses in the I-1 zone and the uses in the I-2 were discussed. For this section of the property, the ideal would be to use the access from DePaolo Drive through an existing industrial area, come out to the intersection at West Queen/West Street where there is already signalization. It is an intersection working well currently. No traffic would be routed in/out of any residential area and the traffic would not be coming in/out of that business zone but would be using existing traffic patterns.

A traffic study was done to look at that and with me tonight is Mr. Hesketh who prepared that study and he could come up and talk about whether there is a difference in level of service at that intersection or in the types of trip generation we would expect if there is a zone change.

Scott Hesketh, licensed engineer with the firm of F A Hesketh & Associates. Our office is in East Granby, CT. He then reviewed the traffic study dated August 2, 2012 which is on file in the Town Planner's Office.

It is our opinion that under a zone change we could either have the same trip generation potential or a decreased trip generation potential based on the most intensive uses.

Discussion.

I'll answer any questions you may have.

Attorney Tracy mentioned a communication which came to the applicant rather than to the commission. That is a letter from one of the property owners in the area, Mr. & Mrs. Guerette,

voicing their support. (Read the letter into the record. Letter on file in the Town Planner's Office.)

Attorney Tracy would entertain questions at this point.

Mr. Gage asked the property referred to in the correspondence. Mr. Tracy said that was Lot 3, the proposal is for the southerly 500' of the Guerette property.

Mr. Gage asked if he heard from any property owners of R-40 that were not subject to this. Did you get any response from the notice? Mr. Tracy said Mr. & Mrs. Guerette own the balance of Lot 3. We did not receive anything from the other people.

A communication from Mrs. Dudac was referred to.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

Lou Perillo, Southington Economic Development. Our office is in favor of this application. This commission's initiative was to change a significant portion of the R-40 to I-1 and potentially I-2 for the purpose that many of the existing uses are already an I-2 use. He noted the Tilcon use and the town's leaf storage on a portion of the site. It is a former landfill so the traffic generation we feel is perfect for I-2. A significant portion of this, about 26 acres, has been mined for the quality sand and gravel. It is recessed with a buffer all around the periphery which is a natural boundary area to adjacent properties. This will allow us to attract a quality company bringing in jobs and tax revenue. We are in support.

Discussion.

(Those speaking against the application.)

No response.

(Staff comments)

Ms. Savage Dunham read into the record a letter from Ms. Dudac dated 8/1/2012 in favor of the application.

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

B. B & R Corp., special permit use application for outdoor storage and processing of mulch, 49 DePaolo Drive (SPU #515).

Attorney William Tracy represented the applicant. The proposal is accompanied by a site plan and is for the

establishment of a facility for further processing wood grindings that are brought in from off site and stored and processed there and for additional storage of that mulch product.

In terms of permitted uses, we think that the processing and storage of the material are permitted uses. It is the outside storage provision that we're looking at, Section 5-00.9, which allows this commission to authorize the outdoor storage of product for sale.

It's the nature of the business and the product that all of this happens out of doors.

Discussion.

The product then would be stored. The site plan we have would show the areas (indicating) on the east, north and west side along the perimeter of the property for the outside storage. The processing would take place in the center.

Discussion.

Because of the natural configuration of this property, it is in a bit of a depression and forms somewhat of a natural bowl with a buffer for hiding the storage of this material from the adjacent properties. The mulch piles will provide additional screening. (See existing conditions plan submitted)

Discussion.

In terms of the mechanics of how this is done and what the traffic patterns would be will be addressed at site plan.

In terms of the need for the special permit, it's the nature of the product which is driving the need for outside storage.

Discussion.

Discussion of the operation of the company through the years.

Mr. Champagne asked about the noise of the grinding equipment.

Mark Vigneault, vice president, can address those questions. He explained the type of grinder used, one of the quietest machines there are for processing. The residents to the east are quite a ways and he would be surprised if they could hear the noise over the sounds of West Street.

Mr. Champagne asked about the dust that might be generated. Mr. Vigneault explained about the wood fibers which stay in the general vicinity of the machine grinding them. Water is not used

as there is no earth type dust. Only a clean wood product is used in the forms of chips or grinding.

Discussion.

Mr. Kalkowski asked how the color is applied to the mulch. Mr. Vigneault explained Mr. Bernaby from Color Dyonics is here and he can explain the process in detail.

Ray Bernaby, Pennsylvania, explained the liquid colorant process.

Mr. Gage noted the height for the outside storage is limited to 8'. Are you looking for higher than that? Mr. Vigneault said they were looking for about 35' in height --- three stories.

Are we looking to say here processing and outdoor storage in general and then it would be limited for further defined with the site plan? Ms. Savage Dunham clarified under the special permit you are looking at making an action on the outside storage. You are limited to 8' in the regs. If you were to going to consider modifying the approval, you would want to do that under special permit. That would also be the time to look at things like hours of operation and traffic and other conditions you want to put on. There is a site plan here but not with the level of detail you are looking for. It would need a majority vote.

Discussion.

The Town Planner asked for comment from the applicant on the hours of operation and the days of the week. The submission says 5:00 am to 7:00 pm and within 500' we just received an application for a campground for the fun park next door. I'm wondering if there would be conflict with that.

Mr. Vigneault explained the hours. That is generally the outside window of our traffic. Early morning hours are devoted to the drivers arriving at the site, doing a pretrip inspection on their vehicles and possibly a few of them being loaded. Most of them, if they're arriving early, will have a preloaded truck for a 7:00 am delivery. They would like to be in their truck generally by 6:00 am and leave the site.

The mulch manufacturing operation doesn't start until 7:00 am and ends at 4:30 pm.

Discussion.

The Chair noted the noise heard when the big trucks back up. Noise travels in the morning.

Mr. Macchio asked about fire prevention and mulch gets warm during the summer and heats up. What do you do to prevent that? Mr. Vigneault explained brining in the already processed material reduces the risk of spontaneous combustion. Freshly ground piled material is your greatest point for spontaneous combustion. We monitor windrows with long probing thermometers. If the temperature gets too high, the windrow needs to be turned, aerated and cooled.

Discussion.

Mr. Tracy asked Mr. Hesketh to address the traffic related to this application.

Scott Hesketh referred to the August 2, 2012 traffic report. The maximum peak hour generation of the facility was explained. Based on the background traffic volume conditions on local roadways, it is our opinion that this minor increase in traffic will not have a substantial impact on the traffic operations in the area.

Mr. Tracy asked Mr. Jones to address the height of the pile in relation to the topography of the site.

Jim Jones, Jones Engineering, Southington, CT. Pointed out the site is depressed with very high banks to the south and east. Landfill to the west. Buffered by trees all the way around. The 35' of the piles they're requesting are not going to be noticed because most of the banks that exist out there are in the 15' high range or higher.

Discussion.

Mr. Gage further discussed the height of the piles and the 15' of depressed area.

At this facility there will be four or five people working, explained Mark Vigneault.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

(Staff Comments)

None at this time.

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

C. Don Stevens Tire company, Inc., special permit use application for approval of location, 60 Curtis Street (SPU #516).

Attorney Timothy Sullivan, on behalf of the applicant. Before you tonight for a special permit application but it's a 14-54 location permit. Don Stevens Tire has been in existence for more than 50 years at 60 Curtiss Street. Today, we're here because the DMV is requiring Don Stevens Tire to get a 14-54 location approval in order to install a computer on one of their lifts. We're trying to install a front end alignment machine on the lift. It is safety related. Explained this will augment the service provided by allowing the front end alignment of motor vehicles.

Except for the computer there is no additional equipment being added. We're adding a computer to an existing lift in an existing building. It's for safety purposes.

No changes in the hours of operation. Will remain at 8:00 am to 5:00 Monday thru Friday and 8:00 am to 2:00 pm on Saturday.

No more employees being added.

I'll answer questions.

(No questions)

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Lou Perillo, Southington Economic Development. We're in favor of this application. This has been a quality company for a great number of years. What's causing this is the DMV requirement. An alignment machine is consistent with the sale and servicing of tires. A very good corporate citizen and they're local and very charitable. We fully endorse the applicant for your approval.

(Those speaking against the application)

(No response.)

(Staff Comments)

(None at this time.)

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

**D. Thomas C. Downie & Rebecca Romajas, 3 lot
resubdivision application, 590 West Street (S #1289).**

Sev Bovino, Planner, with Kratzert, Jones & Associates representing the applicants. He showed an aerial view of the property.

This property has 1.99 acres of land served by public water and sewer. The front portion is zoned R-12. The zone line bisects the property all along West Street. Explained.

The property has the main house which is on the National Register and the barn on the far northeast corner of the property and a shed in the back. An old chicken coop has been removed.

The proposal is to subdivide the property into three parcels. One for the existing house, one for the barn which has a pool area in the back and the barn is planned to be converted to a house internally. There are four curb cuts on this property and we plan to eliminate one on the northeast corner (indicating).

The plan is to keep the stonewalls on the property and the pea stone driveway which is used throughout the property (indicating).

There are many large trees along the front and perimeter. Only two trees along West Street will have to cut to improve the sight distance. (Indicating)

Additional evergreens have been planted along the westerly boundary for concern about headlights shining towards the neighbors. Quite a bit of buffer.

Lot 1, the existing house lot, is proposed to have 20,473 sf. Lot 2, the exiting barn lot is 14,400 sf. The new lot for a new residence is 51,665 sf or 1.19 acres.

We received staff comments and have responded. We have revised maps to reflect the comments. Staff has not had a chance to look at the answers or revised plans so we request a table after your deliberation.

The property owner wants to speak. Tom Downey, 590 West Street. Thank you for the comments that did come in. We spent a considerable amount of time restoring the property since '99 when we bought it. Our goal is to maintain the look and feel of the property. We think this arrangement would give potential buyers some flexibility to change the property while still maintaining the house and barn structure and view from the road.

Appreciate the comments and any others that might come.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

The Chair continued the public hearing to September 4, 2012 at the applicant's request.

E. Cocomo Brothers, LLC, 6 lot resubdivison application, South End Road, aka Map 23, Parcel 6, property of Thomas A. Curtis (S #1290).

Mr. Gage recused himself from this application. The Chair seated Ms. Clock in for him for this public hearing.

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, Plantsville, CT, here tonight on behalf of the applicant.

This property was formerly the Curtis Farm property. It's a 12.6 acre parcel located on the west side of South End Road. Originally there was and still is a farm store at this location. The site was previously occupied by numerous greenhouses.

It's an R-40 zone. Approximately 6.5 acres of wetland. We did receive wetland approval for this application a month ago.

We are proposing a 6-lot R-40 residential subdivision. We're proposing lots from 40,000 sf to 108,000 sf. We have a 380' permanent cul de sac to be known as Curtis Farm Court.

The houses will be serviced by public sewer by extending the sewer down South End Road approximately 600' to tie in Curtis Farm Court.

Public water is proposed.

The lots are all considered frontage lots. Explained unique configuration of Lot 2.

Very flat, very open piece of property. We have a small area of clearing around Lot 4 and our storm water quality basin. Other than that, the site is open pretty much. Almost all greenhouses have been removed at this point.

We don't have a lot of grading. Lots will be relatively flat. We are not proposing any direct impact to the wetlands or watercourses.

We have infiltration units for the houses for storm water management. The plan proposes street trees along South End Road and Curtis Farm Court as required by the regulations.

We have a large area of open space proposed along the Quinnipiac River --- 4.7 acres we're proposing to deed to the town.

We have staff comments. We've just started to address the comments. I would ask you to leave the hearing open until we're able to address the issues satisfactorily.

We're here to answer any of your questions.

Mr. Champagne asked the driveway length for Lot 2. Mr. Giudice said it would be approximately 200'.

Mr. Sinclair asked how the open space would be accessed. Mr. Giudice said there is an easement for drainage and we will incorporate that into the plan, as well.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

The Chair left the public hearing open.

The Chair reseated Mr. Gage.

BUSINESS MEETING

A. Petition to change zone boundary, 49 DePaolo Drive (Map 178, Parcels 15,16,17 and Map 190, the southerly 500' of Parcel 003) from I-1 and r-40 to I-2 (ZC #539.)

This application is ready for action. We would remind you that should you approve it, it is effective 15 days after date of publication.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve the zone change effective 15 days from date of publication. Mr. Champagne seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. B & R Corp., special permit use application for outdoor storage and processing of mulch, 49 DePaolo Drive (SPU #515).

The Planner stated the commission heard a lot of information tonight. I would just draw your attention to the process laid out in your packet memo. This operation is permitted by the I-2 zone which won't be in effect until 15 days after the date of publication. Should you choose to act on this, any action would be effective 15 days after the date of publication and after the expiration of the appeal period for the zone change.

She also stated there is still no legal access to this site. The applicant is working on it but technically they do not have access to the site. That would be another stipulation that would need to be placed that the operation cannot commence until the legal access is secured and all appropriate easements and maps are filed with the Town Planner and Town Attorney's office.

She also noted the hours of operation that are stated to be 5:00 to 7:00. There wasn't any indication as to the days. You need to give some consideration to that.

Should you choose to support a 35' outside storage height as proposed on the site plan you would need to incorporate that as part of any motion.

Mr. Conroy discussed the proposed access with the Town Planner. Mr. Gage offered that the West Street Committee clearly wanted industrial to remain on West Queen Street and DePaolo Drive for access to sites like this.

Discussion.

Discussion of stipulations that could be put on the application if approved.

Mr. Conroy stated for the record he would have an issue if the access wasn't from DePaolo Drive.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table. When they come back with a site plan we can vote on one issue. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

C. B & R Corp. site plan application for proposed mulch processing and outdoor storage, 49 DePaolo Drive (SPR #1621).

Attorney Tracy, representing the applicant made a presentation.

You have before you the actual site plan for the proposed use of the processing and coloring and storage of the mulch products that the applicant is in business for.

He gave a quick overview of the site plan explaining the process. He detailed the vehicles that will be on site. The parking was explained. Sanitary facilities, a trailer.

The way in is shown as the existing paved road that was used some time ago when the site was excavated. It does connect to DePaolo Drive by hooking up with the ROW that the town has from DePaola Drive. We've looked at that easement document.

Discussion.

We have approached Tilcon, the property owners, with three variances:

- Buy enough land so that we would have direct access to DePaolo Drive as well as control of that internal road that the town uses which would give the applicant access to all points of the site.

- An offer to purchase a portion of land extending north from DePaolo Drive which would get us a corner into the property and an easement from there following the town's easement to the point where the road splits off and then there'd be a rectangular easement necessary to cross the property line.

- Rework the easement language that already exists for the town to allow the applicant to piggyback on what the town has from DePaolo Drive in and create a new easement to follow the existing access road.

Discussion of the access proposals. We don't have it in place but we do believe that this property is not landlocked.

Discussion.

The commission could say that the use should not take place until access is secured. If there isn't access, how're we going to get the material there? We have no intention of having direct access to West Street. We want to use the signalized intersection at West/West Queen.

Discussion.

Jim Jones, Jones Engineering, talked about the development and topography of the site. It is only going to consist of mowing it. It's overgrown. The only grading on the site will be over by this pond (indicating) where they would relocate the pile on to the northwest corner of the site. Along the northern property line is a proposed mulch berm to direct water towards the water quality basin, which is over designed.

They are going to widen the entrance to get a turning radius to allow trucks into the site.

He explained regarding the wetlands (indicating), the conservation commission had no problem with it. Most of the buffer falls within the actual 50' vegetated buffer they're going to keep.

The vegetated buffers were discussed and indicated on the site plan.

The existing haul road will be improved as I stated.

The Town Planner commented that the applicant did state they're working to secure the property. There is 500' to the north of this that was rezoned and that's not shown as part of the site plan because right now it's not part of this application. One of your requirements under site plan is that a 50' landscaped buffer to adjacent residential uses or zones. For the portion adjacent to the neighboring property just rezoned, there is a note on that and the applicant has stated in the future they'll install. You need to think about before these are finalized, are you comfortable with that note.

Discussion.

Attorney Tracy noted on the property immediately to the north in the area that was just voted to be rezoned, this is a location where the town maintains its leaf composting operation at present. There is a residence on that property but it is located to the far north of that property. The immediate zone to the north is an industrial zone. The use of that portion of the property is the leaf compositing by the town. The residence is 800' to the north of the property line.

I do agree if there is going to be an expansion on to the Guerette property to the north, a modification of this plan would be in order. If there is a use of that for outside storage as proposed here, we would be back in for another application addressing those issues. But that is not what is before you tonight.

Mr. Hesketh, traffic engineer, reviewed the August 2, 2012 report as it relates to this application. (On file in the Town Planner's office for review.)

It is our opinion that the low grade network in this vicinity has adequate capacity to accommodate the increased traffic as a result of this proposed site plan.

Attorney Tracy went over staff comments and written responses which he submitted to the Town Planner. (On file in the Town Planner's office.)

Mr. Sinclair commented as we have no SPU, he will make a motion to table. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

D. Don Stevens Tire company, Inc., special permit use application for approval of location, 60 Curtis Street (SPU #516).

This application is ready for action. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. Thomas C. Downie & Rebecca Romajas, 3 lot resubdivision application, 590 West Street (S #1289).

This should be tabled. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table which Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

F. Cocco Brothers, LLC, 6 lot resubdivison application, South End road, aka Map 23, Parcel 6, property of Thomas A. Curtis (S #1290).

This should be tabled. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table which Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Gage indicated he had to recuse himself. Ms. Clock was seated.

Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Gage was reseated.

G. Paw Play, LLC, site plan modification for an addition to existing kennel, 210 Queen Street (SPR #1620).

Mr. Bovino, Kratzert & Jones, represented the applicant. This is located in a B zone. This was granted an approval for a dog day care center and the site will continue to be a dog day care center with no night time service offered. Public water and sewer.

The proposal is to expand the training area which is on the southerly portion of the building by 282 sf. It will provide shelter for the dogs while they are outside exercising to the west of the building.

Explained two portable removable structures are to be installed so the dogs can go there for shelter. These structures will be placed on blocks, anchored to the ground. The reason for raising on the blocks is the floodplain area, the 100 year flood line comes through this area and that will allow free flow of the water.

Currently, the site is approved for a large building with wetlands and floodplain impacts approved already. The impacts were mitigated and stabilized on this property.

No additional pavement is proposed. We received staff comments and addressed them.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Macchio. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

H. 865 West Queen Street - Discussion of Notice of Violation/restoration plan

The Town Planner requested a table to the next meeting at the request of the applicant. Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to table which Mr. Gage seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to add Items M thru P per the memo from the Town Planner. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

I. LePage Homes, release of \$24,000 erosion and sedimentation bond, West Street condos (SPR #1448)

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

J. LePage Homes, reduction of \$77,280 public improvement bond to a new amount of \$5,000, 500 Mill Street (SPR #1595).

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

K. Barberino Jaguar, release of \$4,500 erosion and sedimentation bond, 480 Queen Street (SPR #1300).

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

L. DBF, LLC, request for reduction of earth excavation bond from \$144,000 to a new amount of \$50,000, West Pines Drive and Sandy Pines Drive (EE #132).

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

M. Done Construction release of a \$5,300 E & S bond, 1234 Meriden Waterbury Road, SPR 1499.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Gage indicated he had to abstain from this vote.

Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Gage abstaining.

N. Done Construction, release of a \$7,700 public improvement bond, 123 Meriden Waterbury Road, SPR 1499.

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Gage indicated he had to abstain from this vote.

Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Gage abstaining.

O. Lake Compounce, release of a \$1,800 E & S bond, Riptide Racer, SPR 1493.

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

P. Request for a release of a \$20,000 E & S bond West Pines Drive, S #1213.1.

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

7. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

A. Proposed zoning text amendment, Sections 9-01; 12-10.1, 12-10.2 and 12-10.3; and 14-02.1 (ZA #566), September 4

B. WB Staebler Properties, LLC, special permit use application for outside storage, 409 Canal Street (SPU #517), September 4

The Planner also indicated she had the special permit for a campground for Lake Compounce we think should be ready.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

The Town Planner referred to the draft text amendment which came in your packet. That will be on for public hearing for September 4th. If you have any comments on that, please let me know.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

The Town Planner listed:

- Paw Play site plan modification that was acted on tonight, SPR 1620.
- SPU application for 49 DePaolo Drive, SPU 515. Before you tonight.
- Associated site plan application, SPR 1621, 49 DePaolo Drive.
- SPU application for outdoor storage, 409 Canal Street, SPU 517, W B Staebler Properties. That will be on September 4th for public hearing.
- Associated site plan application, SPR 1622, goes with the outside storage.
- SPU modification to include map 190, parcel 6 to Lake Compounce Amusement Park property. SPU on your next public hearing September 4th.
- Site Plan application for proposed campground facility, Map 189, Parcel 4. Map 190, Parcel 6. On September 4th.
- Subdivision application for 6 lots, S 1290, South End Road, Cocomo Brothers and that was before you tonight.

PZC SUBCOMMITTEES

Mr. Kalkowski reported the four items he would like to make you aware of:

- relooking at the restaurants within a residential zone with the potential of allowing them to serve beer and wine where there is no bar associated with the restaurant. I'd love your feedback and views on that.

- temporary signs are being reviewed. We've all seen that signs are cropping all over the town and it is out of control. We do want to bring that back into control and allow our businesses and nonprofits to be able to advertise legitimately per regulations.

- medical marijuana proposal has been finalized for the October time frame with the understating the state still has to adopt more formal regulations which they're planning on doing with the January time frame. We'd like to get our initial regulations out there in the October time line and then revisit them after the state acts.

We're looking at production and dispensaries and keeping production within an I zone and dispensaries within C & CB zones, licensed pharmacy and licensed pharmacist.

- as to poultry and livestock, we took the feedback and Attorney's Sciota's recommendations into account. We are going to make the regulations based on setback requirements from front, side and rear yard with no minimum lot sizes. We do want to limit the number of animals on a lot based on the lot size.

We'll have formal text to the commission in the next several weeks.

WEST STREET SUBCOMMITTEE

Postponed as Mr. Chaplinsky is on vacation.

Attorney Tracy asked if the commission were going to take SPU 515 and SPR 1621 off the table tonight. The Chair indicated they were tabled to the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 o'clock, p.m.)