

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
February 5, 2013

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, February 5, 2013. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:02 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

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

Alternates: Jennifer Clock
 Randall Gage
 Susan Locks
 Ryan Rogers

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Robert Librandi, Acting Town Planner
Annette S. Turnquist, Assistant Town Engineer
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney

A quorum was determined.

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

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chairman, presiding:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Regular Meeting of January 15, 2013

Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion for approval which Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

The Acting Town Planner, Robert Librandi, read the legal notice into the record.

A. Betty J. Cole, request for proposed zoning district boundary change, 28 Werking Street from B to R-12 (ZC #542).

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, represented the applicants. This is property the Coles own at 28 Werking Street. This is where our office used to be before I moved it to South Main Street in 2005. Since that time, the Coles have been struggling with what to do with the building. It is in a residential zone but it is zoned business. They tried to lease it as a business use unsuccessfully.

They're here requesting to change this property back to a residential zone. The business zone came up to Parcel 2 on this map and Mr. Cole requested back in the 70's this commission change that business zone 50' further so he could move his business into that house.

We'd like to change it back to house. We think it fits in very well with the neighborhood. We assume the neighbors would much rather have a neighbor than our office trucks coming in and out.

We think it is a good fit with the neighborhood and we don't see any adverse impacts from the zone change. I don't believe there were any staff comments or neighbor issues.

It's pretty small but that's the gist of it. I'll answer questions.

Mr. Sinclair asked about Lot 2. That is still a residential use. Mr. Giudice said Parcels 2,3,4 & 5 are residential homes. Parcel 20 is a residential home and so is 21. Everything basically on Werking Street is residential. Parcel 13 is vacant. It's a field.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Evelyn McKay, 73 Werking Street. I am in favor because when it was commercial there were a lot of trucks on the street. There were no sidewalks and my daughter walks to school. I much prefer it to be residential. It's a very small street. I am in favor.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

B. Gugliotti, earth excavation application for removal of approximately 32,500 cy, 117 Crescent Avenue, Map 64, Parcel 106, EE #140.

Mr. Gage recused himself and left the meeting room.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones represented the applicant. He showed and explained an overall map for the area. To the east is Nunzio Drive, Barbara Lane to the south, Glennwood Park Road is here and to the west is Buckland Street. He passed around color copies to the commission so they can see close up the area.

The property is 3.42 acres. It's zoned R-20/25. Located at the end of Glennwood Park Road. The family homestead is on this property. The grading plan shows the different structures that were built in the previous phase of development.

The property for the homestead is accessed from Crescent Avenue and Buckland Street. The entire land was once owned by the Gugliotti

family and it was mined before it was developed for single family residences.

We are asking for an earth excavation approval to prepare the site for a 3-lot subdivision. The amount of material proposed to be removed is approximately 32,500 cy. If it was to be removed over a six month period, this would generate 15 trips per day for 120 working days. It is 1800 trips over a six month period.

It is expected that after the approval we'll be looking for someone interested in taking the material out and then we'll start the activity.

It is for a 2-year approval requested, but we expect the activity probably will take six months.

The hours of operation listed on the plan are Monday thru Friday, 9:00 am to 3:00 pm. No Saturdays or holidays. We expect on site one dozer, one scraper, one loader, two trucks and a watering wagon.

The maximum proposed slope is 3:1 as required.

In 2004 the applicant received approval for an earth excavation which created two lots labeled Phase I in the beginning of this subdivision. (Showed map)

The grading with that first phase is indicated on this map. You can see the north portion of that property is what we are here tonight for.

This is proposed to be in two additional phases: Phase II and III to keep the disturbance at less than two acres at a time as noted in the regulations.

Because this is for the preparation of a subdivision, we are requesting a waiver of the 100' buffer so we can grade it to create relatively good home sites.

The truck route is south to Old Turnpike and then 691 or Mulberry Street to 84. Explained they will come out of the site and go west and then south heading to 84 or 691.

Appropriate notification was mailed out to owners within 500' of the subject property.

We received staff comments and had a meeting to discuss the items and revise the maps accordingly. Written responses to comments were provided. All E & S notes are on the plan and all appropriate notes for earth excavation are on the plan. Explained.

The slopes will be stabilized with hydro seed. The maximum cut proposed is about 8 feet. It creates a bowl effect where the center of the property will be lower than the edges of the property so we have a berm around the properties. Explained.

Evergreens are proposed along the easterly boundary. The westerly boundary, the homes are far on Buckland Street and on the north side we have the condo project which is 20 to 30 feet below our grade. There will not be any visible impact to the condos to the north.

I'll answer any questions.

Mr. Sinclair asked about access to the property and where the dirt was going. Mr. Bovino said access is from the south, Barbara Lane into Glennwood Park Road and the material is meant to go south to Mulberry Street to 84 or 691 via Old Turnpike.

Mr. Sinclair asked if the hours of operation should be 9:00 am to 2:00 pm as there is a middle school in the area.

Discussion.

Clarification on the trips per day. Mr. Bovino explained the figures.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

Don (Inaudible), 36 Buckland Street, Unit 6. Our property is to the north. We live in Highland Hills.

Just in general terms, the fact that the 100' buffer would be waived would in fact clear most of the trees in that area and that right now allows for a pretty good screening. It looks like they're getting about 20' from the property line. There would be a row of trees of left and once you undercut them on the south side, you'll lose those trees, anyways. In our mind, the 100' buffer waiver on that side of the property would be inappropriate.

(Rebuttal)

Sev Bovino responded to the north there would be 25' approximately of undisturbed area. Whatever is there will not be touched and the grade starts from there and goes down at a 3:1 slope, an 8' cut. Explained it would be like a bowl. The condos are at the bottom of the slope. (Explained the map)

The first condo unit is approximately 100' away and it is at the bottom of a slope. The trees there we'll leave untouched for a 25' zone. It's residential to residential. The uses are the same.

Elevations were discussed. The condos are about 30' below our elevation explained Mr. Bovino.

(Correspondence)

Mr. Kalkowski read an email into the record from Brian Goralski at 80 Buckland Street which is on file in the town planner's office.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Bovino answered the email comments by saying 80 Buckland Street is here (indicated on the map). We don't plan to use Crescent Avenue for access at all. There is an easy access from Glenwood Park Road. Explained.

There are trees around the area already and we don't intend to remove those trees. It's more of a buffer around this area to the property line. (Explained using the map.)

We will agree if plantings need to be added in, we can agree to add them. There is already 25' after the excavation.

Discussion.

Sightlines were discussed. There is a sightline easement in effect on the site plan added Mr. Librandi. There is a clearance there.

(Resident)

Don (Inaudible) 36 Buckland, Unit 6. So we can understand it, the 100' buffer that is being waived, it would seem to us that it would be reasonable to keep as large a buffer as possible from the property line. There is a drop off down to the condo area. The activities would be going up to the property line, 25', and would be relatively close to the area and stockpiling as shown on the plan is up in the back area. We're viewing it as by infringing on the 100' setback, it just moves the whole activity up the hill resulting in everything else going up the hill. With that limited 25' buffer we're left with, stockpiling in that area for a portion of the property for a portion of the time would be a fair amount activity of heavy equipment. Explained personal experience with living in an area where there has been excavation in the past and it can be quite disruptive. Although we may be a distance away, the noise you can't get away from. That's really the reason for our request for making that buffer as large as the law allows.

Thank you.

(Response)

Sev Bovino reminded the commission the 100' buffer is for large gravel excavation areas. Then when you do the subdivision, you do the grading up to the property line to make things work. The intent here is to prepare the land for a subdivision so the use of the land is appropriate. We can locate the houses with a reasonable backyard. And, it has been the policy to allow a reduction in the buffer for this purpose.

Discussion.

This is a small excavation permit actually. Explained.

The Chair closed this portion of the public hearings.

C. Southington-Cheshire Community YMCA, earth excavation application for the removal of approximately 125,912 cy of material, 1000 East Street (EE#141).

Stephen Giudice, represented the applicant. Mark Pooler the Camp Sloper Director is here, as well.

We're here for the public hearing to remove 125,000 cy of material from the pond itself.

He gave a history of the camp which started in 1949 and the formation of the pond.

The pond is the focal point for the camp. Unfortunately, years of sedimentation has taken place in the pond due to the fact there are no low level outlets in the pond. Everything is controlled by the spillway at this location (indicating). Shallow depths and algae blooms have been created. We have weed over population in quite a few areas of the pond. The Y has decided now is the time to take action and preserve this environment. They are going to use it as an educational tool as well.

This was started in 2010. We did the field map and a bathometric survey in 2011. We did some pond borings and surveyed the depths. Of the pond. We flagged wetlands to prepare a good base.

We had numerous meetings with the YMCA Pond Committee. We have had preliminary meetings with the DEEP, the Army Corp of Engineers, town staff and we've been working with Welter Associates, Test America and Donald Ballou, hydrologic engineer.

We did receive conservation commission approval in the fall of 2012. This is the next step. Next we go to the DEEP and Army Corp for permitting.

Camp Sloper is approximately 141 acres in size and the pond is approximately 18 acres. Maximum depth currently is 10 to 11 feet. The watershed area is .527 square miles.

He indicated the five tributary streams that run into the pond.

The concrete spillway controls the flows. Explained.

We estimate approximately 150,000 cy of sediment in the pond based on the borings and surveys done.

There are wetlands and vernal pools located around the pond which areas we've tried to stay away from for our application.

We think removing 125,000 cy gives us the depths we need to create a good, healthy pond and something that will last in the future.

Our main activities are removing the sediment. Explained procedure. A low flow outlet control structure proposed was indicated on the map and explained it will allow the Y to lower the level of the

water during the winter months to help with weed control which they do not have the ability to do right now.

Discussion.

We're proposing an underwater berm as suggested by the DEEP that will provide sediment control to the pond's life moving forward. When the pond is lowered, it will provide an area where we can go in and do sediment removal without having to drain the whole pond. This is to provide maintenance for the future.

There is tree growth on the dam and we are proposing some tree removal. The DEEP feels it isn't safe for the dam to have trees growing on it.

Improvements to the site we are proposing:

- ADA accessible boardwalks for fishing.
- A rope swing to be constructed in the pond.
- A tow rope going from one end of the pond to the other.
- Proposing a glass bottom boat they can pull across the water and look at the bottom of the lake and see what's going on.
- Proposing a lot of stone and tree habitat around the perimeter of the pond for fish.
- Proposing to install floating logs that would be anchored to the ground to provide areas for turtles to come up and sun themselves.
- Improvements to the beach areas, replacing the sand and installing fabric to prevent vegetation growth in the beach area.

Improvements proposed will be fun and educational, as well.

We are also proposing some replacement culverts. Explained on the map their location. They are either undersized or not installed correctly.

The plan has a pretty detailed sequence of construction. A full set of E & S Control plans have to be implemented. We have access points here and here (indicating). The intent is to lower the pond via pumps and siphons. At that point the DEEP recommended we have a fishing derby to help us relocate as much wildlife as we possibly can. Explained catch and release into other ponds in the area.

We will continue then with the removal of the water from the pond and prep a temporary dewatering area. We have to let the material dry out before we remove it offsite.

Discussion.

Dewatering inside the pond area was described.

A diversion berm to be constructed along the northerly edge of the lack will allow the water that still comes in under current flows to travel around the excavated area and get to the outlet control.

Discussion.

He explained safety mechanisms in place to protect downstream properties from any water damage.

Grading around the pond was discussed.

Discussion that the pond will take a decent amount of time to fill back up when ready.

We don't have right now a definite home for this material. We have spoken to many contractors. But we do have a tentative site on West Street where this material could be used.

Discussion.

This is mostly sediment material. Very clean.

We did receive staff comments and have not had a chance to address them so we'll request you keep this hearing open.

Mark Pooler, 1000 East Street. I'm the outdoor center director at Camp Sloper. I'm here in favor of the application.

This is acres of land which provided endless opportunities and positive outcomes for thousands and thousands of children.

The challenge is keep this pond from encroaching into a swamp so we can continue to serve thousands and thousands of children in the future.

This is where they've learned to swim, caught their first fish, boating and other recreational activities. Our job is to make sure this pond is healthy for generations to come.

Happy to answer any questions. This is probably about a \$2.6 million project and we have to date \$1,000 raised. It's a long term project we're not doing anytime soon. Permitting and fundraising will take a few years. This would be a capital campaign coming down the road so best case scenario would be three years out to start.

Discussion.

Thank you.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. It's a great proposal. I would like some more information about the water control downstream. This is one of the big water storage areas in that area. He asked about ZIRO for this property as it relates to subdivisions south and west of Camp Sloper. What if we get a prediction of hurricane or a week of solid rain with 6 to 8 inches of rain?

Peter Holmquist, 1096 East Street. One question that I have is right now the intent is to totally remove from the property the sediment and put it in the drainage area and then it is to remove all the material from the camp to another location? The camp is not planning on spreading it around or doing something else with the material. In removing the material, the size of the truck is considered.

The other thing is the area tends to flood and has actually overflowed East Street as it backs up through the wetland area towards Kensington Road. I'd like somebody to address that.

Lowering the pond 8' is an incredible amount of water and we need to be sure it doesn't flood the rest of the area.

But, I am generally in favor of the project.

Discussion of excess water flow in the area.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

(Rebuttal)

Stephen Giudice said the intent is to remove the material from the site. We are proposing stockpiling and dewatering on site. We don't have the room on site for the material.

When it comes to drainage, it is a complicated process and it was a complicated set of calculations we went through. Explained.

We had two issues to deal with: storm drainage and storm water flows during construction to make sure we didn't cause problems. Explained we didn't want more water going downstream than what currently happens now. That was the point of the spillway in this berm over here (indicating).

Discussion.

Part of our design includes control points in this control structure that we are installing that will help with storm events and help the meter out of the pond without letting it flood over the spillway. We don't want to reduce the everyday flows choking the river conditions.

Discussion.

The town engineer hasn't had a chance to review all the drainage computations as of yet.

Stockpiling of the material was discussed.

The Chair left this portion of the public hearing open.

6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Betty J. Cole, request for proposed zoning district boundary change, 28 Werking Street from B to R-12 (ZC #542).

Mr. Librandi advised staff has reviewed responses to comments and received revised plans. This is ready for action.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve this application. It makes total sense. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Gugliotti, earth excavation application for removal of approximately 32,500 cy, 117 Crescent Avenue, Map 64, Parcel 106, EE #140.

Mr. Librandi advised staff has received responses to comments and revised plans. It is ready for action.

(Mr. Gage recused himself)

Mr. Chaplinsky had a concern with the school. If we are going south, working until 3:00 with the school letting out at 2:30, that could be an issue. I think it's appropriate to look at the hours or ask the applicant to provide a crossing guard or flag person at the school crossing to the rear of the JFK School when school is being released.

Another concern was if you felt additional buffering on the north side would be needed once excavation was done.

Mr. Librandi said from the property line to Unit 7 is around 120' from there. It is in a bowl shape. At the property line it looks like there is some buffering. With the landscaping and the buffering there, I would assume that the noise would be kept to a minimum in terms of excavation.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to waive the 100' buffer with the exception of only waiving it up to 25 feet total of the property line on the northern section. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

Mr. Sinclair acknowledged he made the motion and usually he doesn't vote in favor of waivers but this parcel, we are not waiting it so they can build a hundred condos. They won't be able to use this property for anything without this waiver. We have to.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote for the waiver of the buffers.

Discussion of the hours of operation. Attorney Sciota suggested the hours of 9:00 am to 2:00 pm.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with the stipulation that operations are from 9:00 am to 2:00 pm Monday thru Friday. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

Mr. Conroy clarified the haul route. South on Buckland to Mulberry and then to 84 or 691.

Mr. Sinclair amended his motion to include the stipulation of the haul route. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded the amended motion.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Southington-Cheshire Community YMCA, earth excavation application for the removal of approximately 125,912 cy of material, 1000 East Street (EE#141).

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

D. Southington-Cheshire Community YMCA, site plan application to remove sediment from Sloper Pond, install outlet pipe, replace culverts, clear trees/shrubs from dam, install educational/recreational amenities such as handicap aces boardwalks, rope swing and viewing platform, 1000 East Street (SPR #1630).

Stephen Giudice, representing the applicant presented. The site plan issues I addressed during the public hearing. All amenities I talked about are the items that are on the site plan approval. If you would consider that testimony towards this item. And, then we would request a table at this point.

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

E. S. Carpenter Construction Company, 2 lot resubdivision application, 176 Townline Road, Lot #3, Strawberry Fields (S#1259.3).

Stephen Giudice represented the applicant. We have not finished revising the plans based on staff's comments. We request a table.

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

F. Joseph Albrycht, 5 lot subdivision application (Albrycht Meadow), 40 Old Mill road and Marion Avenue (S#1294).

Stephen Giudice, represented the application. This was presented to you at the last public hearing. It's a 5 lot subdivision located at the corner of Marion Avenue and Old Pond Road. Our subdivision proposes to retain the existing home (indicating) and existing driveway. We are proposing four additional lots. We are proposing a small extension of the sewer main for sewer service to lots 4 & 5. All houses would be serviced by public water and public sewers. Minimal improvements to the roadway. Just curb cuts. Grading is rather minimal.

We did receive staff comments and provided responses and revised plans. I believe this application is ready for action.

Discussion of the "spite" strip. We did agree we would not propose any driveways in that location. I think letting it overgrow and be natural would be the best thing for it noted Mr. Giudice. It would provide a little buffer from Knox Drive to these homes.

Mr. Librandi noted #7 on the checklist, showing the volume and page of the slope easement on the plan is outstanding.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with that stipulation noted by the town planner. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

Mr. Conroy suggested a stipulation that any access to the property would be from Marion Avenue or Old Mill Road and not from Knox Drive.

Mr. Sinclair amended his motion. Mr. Chaplinsky amended his second. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Wal-Mart, request for release of \$3,000 trailer bond, 235 Queen Street (SPR#1210.10)

Mr. Sinclair recused himself from this item. The Chair seated Mr. Rogers for Mr. Sinclair.

Mr. Rogers made a motion to approve. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. M

Mr. CHaplinsky stated for the record that although this isn't always a popular item for the commission, I've got to say for the last few years Wal-Mart has requested this and we've asked them to put up a bond, which they did without arguing. They've done what they need to do and every year they're out on time. They do a good job. I'm in favor and supportive of this now, in the past and in the future.

Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

The Chair reseated Mr. Sinclair.

H. Ace Building & Design, request for release of \$5,000 E & S bond, Fox Hollow Section II (S #986.3)

Mr. Librandi advised this is ready for action.

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

I. Cocomo Brothers Builders, LLC, request for 2nd 90-day extension to file mylar, Curtiss Farms, 806 South End Road (S#1290)

Mr. Conroy advised when they were on the process review committee; one of the goals of the planning department was to try to avoid these never ending extensions for filing mylars. I support this one, but I think we should impress upon the applicant that these are not going to go on forever. I have no problem approving this but, don't come back for a third one is what I'm subtlety stating.

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

J. The ARC of Southington, request for 2nd 90-day extension to file mylar, 314 Summer Street (S #1291.)

Mr. Conroy offered the same friendly reminder.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve and Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

K. AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC request for 90-day extension to file mylar, Walkers Crossing, 59 & 77 Summit Street (S #1292).

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

7. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- Pack Tracks, Special Permit application to extend hours to allow for 24 hour service for dogs in an existing kennel, 1177 West Street (SPU #511.1), February 19.

Scheduled.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

- West Street Subcommittee

Mr. Chaplinsky passed around a punch list staff put together. It is three pages of outline of what the regulations will entail. I ask each of you to review that and I'll give you one week to come back and offer an email response or phone call with any additional suggestions you'd like before this gets referred out. I'll probably schedule a meeting with staff to go through this document and take any additional comments and then staff can begin to put the final one together and begin the referral process so we can schedule a public hearing and get final approval on this.

Pay special attention to:

- we've modified the parking requirements in Section 1.
- Location of the parking in Section 2.
- Number 4 says drive thru operations are allowed. I think we specified we are looking to have banks only have drive thrus in this area. We'll ask staff to modify that.
- We need to create design standards we will reference in Section 6.
- There is a modification to the number of stories. Closer to West Street, 3 stories.
- Permitted uses, Number 9, I ask for everybody to give their feedback. We are proposing a mix of the CB and B zones. And, also sprinkling in some light industrial type stuff like medical office buildings. Provide things you'd like included or excluded.

- Easements are under A. So that is the town can have right of ways and cross easements on lots so we can have interconnectivity of the parcels.

- Section 11, we've been working with staff to determine what is appropriate to allow for potential expansion of West Street in the future and also allow for larger landscape buffers between the road and buildings and also allow for parking between the road and the building.

The low impact development standard I will be email to you. They're talking about creating an LID that is similar to the Evergreen Walk in South Windsor so we can manage the parking areas and entranceways to these areas.

I thank Dave and Rob for putting this framework together. A great job.

Stop one is to get the regulation written and have it referred out. We will then schedule public hearings for comments and make changes if necessary and then we'll decide on the new regulation. Once that's adopted we'll then start talking about revising our zoning maps. We'll refer that out as well and have public hearings to revise the maps as to where the West Street zone best fits on the corridor.

Mr. Conroy noted it is a little bit different than what we've been talking about; however, he does like the general direction of it.

- Administrative fee for temporary A-frame signs.

Mr. Librandi introduced the breakdown of the costs. The planning & zoning commission would decide the fee. We did a breakdown for the costs and it is \$25. That's an annual fee for the six 14-day periods.
Discussion.

Mr. Conroy felt the fee should be just for the enforcement of the regulation. We're going from a ban to requiring a certain amount of tracking on who is current on their permit and who is not and have they used up their times. It is a lot more labor intensive with a lot of data entry. I want to make sure whatever we're charging is not taxing the town staff. Extensive discussion.

Mr. Kalkowski explained the breakdown he provided:

Application process	-	05 minutes
Entry into tracking	-	10 minutes
Town Staff investigation	-	<u>15</u> minutes
		30 minutes x \$50 per hour or \$25.

Extensive discussion on the figures compared to the staff work required.

Many commissioners expressed they would like to see the number higher.

The application process time, tracking process and enforcement process times should be tracked and after the six month pilot program, come back with data for the activities explained Mr. Kalkowski.

Consensus for the \$25 fee:

Ms. Clock: I think it is okay at \$25.
 Mr. Gage: I'll go with the \$25.
 Mr. Macchio: I think it should be higher.
 Mr. Champagne: I'm fine with the \$25.
 Mr. Kalkowski: Okay with the 25.
 The Chair: At \$25.
 Mr. Chaplinsky: I don't know the figure now. Unknown.
 Mr. Conroy: I'm against a nominal fee right now.
 Mr. Sinclair: I think it should be higher.
 Mr. Rogers: \$25 as opposed to nothing now.
 Ms. Locks: \$25 to be business friendly.

Mr. Kalkowski then made a motion to approve the \$25 fee with also asking our ZEO to track the details of the time around the three categories mentioned for the six month pilot program and come back with the results. Then we can make adjustments, if necessary. Mr. Champagne seconded. Motion passed 4 to 3 with Messrs. Macchio, Conroy & Sinclair opposed.

9. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

New applications:

Pack Tracks

Administrative approval for the clothing bin at the church site.
 Hawk's Landing coming in for an addition to the kitchen.
 B & R Corporation is going to be storing mulch on their site.

Mr. Librandi advised Art Rich and the pictures should be ready soon.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 o'clock, p.m.)