

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing and Regular Meeting
June 3, 2014

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, June 3, 2014. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

Paul Chaplinsky	Jennifer Clock
James Macchio	Steve Kalkowski
Kevin Conroy	Susan Locks
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: Joe Coviello

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz?

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development
Keith Hayden, Town Engineer
Mark Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/ Town Attorney

Absent: Ryan Rogers, Alternate Member
Anthony Cervoni, Alternate Member
James E. Morelli, Jr, Alternate Member

A quorum was determined.

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

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:

Approval of Minutes

A. Regular Meeting of May 20, 2014

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

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Mark H. Sekorski, applicant, special permit use application for more than 3 garage spaces (32' x 36' barn), property of Brian W. Whitford, 118 Mountain Pond Road (SPU #538)

Attorney William Tracy, 43 Belleview Avenue, Bristol representing the applicant, presented.

The application is for an accessory private garage - a detached structure - to be located on the property at 118 Mountain Pond Road owned by the applicant.

The purpose of the structure will be to house vehicle storage.

He showed the GIS information orienting the commission to the property.

The property is about 1.32 acres in size. (Showed an overhead view.) He specifically noted the rows of white pines that outline each lot along the property lines.

The plan was prepared by Robert Greene and it shows a 32 x 36 footprint located at the end of the existing driveway set back behind the existing house. It complies with all setbacks. It is 156' from the street, 29.1' from the nearest sideyard line and 149'+ from the rear. Well within the building envelope.

He showed a representative view of the structure itself. This is a mirror image situated on the property. The porch would be on the opposite side facing the interior of the yard. It will provide two spaces, 28 x 36 of interior space --- two of the 14 x 26 garage spaces with some additional space for storage. It will have a 4' porch with the overhang along the side.

The area was once an excavated sand/gravel pit. The border trees were put in as the development occurred but the rest of the trees have not grown an awful lot to provide a lot of shade. If the homeowner, as he plans, to have a pool or patio in the backyard, the overhang will provide a nice feature to go along with that. It's 4 x 36 so it doesn't count as interior space in terms of your garage space count.

Section 2.07 - private garage - requires that the materials of exterior construction match the house and that will be the intent here. The intent is to have architectural features so that it is architecturally pleasing to the eye from the view. Has some character to it. The color, the siding, the roofing materials will match the existing house. The overhang and the porch actually mimics what is on the front of the house.

The regulation talks about a garage space as 14 x 26. There will be two such spaces in this structure. Interestingly, the garage that is attached to the house is 21 x 21, approximately, and it doesn't

house any of the 14 x 26 spaces. That's an indication that you recognized the inadequacy of that as a garage space.

The applicant has a collector car that he would like to be able to store in an area where it is not as susceptible to being scratched with bicycles and lawnmower, et cetera. The detached structure will give him that opportunity.

The detached structure will have two of the 14 x 26 spaces. And, with the two car garage attached to the house we are looking at total parking for four cars. Under your regulations, it is arguably less than that. Explained the calculation comes up to slightly over 4. It is 1.3 in the attached garage and 2.7 in the proposed structure.

He showed some views of the existing landscaping and explained the view. He added the garage will be put at the end of the driveway, behind the trees, and none of the trees would need to be disturbed.

The site plan shows a minimal amount of grading. At most a 6" cut. The properties there are fairly level.

Trees were pointed out that are going to block some of the street view of the proposed garage. The house itself serves as a screen from the street view. To the south you can see rows of trees and additional plantings which will block the view of the structure.

I did read the Minutes of the last session. A lot was made of the concern by the neighbors that there would be an affect on their property values if this structure were to be constructed. We had an appraiser do a report and it is included in your file. (On file in the town planner's office.) Matthew Carrano of Plainville gave an opinion after review that there would be no decrease in value generally as a result of this and more likely than not an increase in value of Mr. Whitford's property.

The other neighborhood concern was about whether a business would be moving into this structure. It is prohibited by your regulations. Mr. Whitford intends to honor that. The standard stipulation you attach when you have approved additional garage spaces we would welcome. His business owns property in Bristol where they have adequate space for the business and he has no intention of moving it from that location.

Are there any questions at this point?

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about an elevation. Attorney Tracy explained they wanted to get this approval before going on. The construction would be limited to 1.5 Stories. The idea is to provide architectural interest. Explained the steeper pitched roof.

There is no external access to the second floor is planned. Just internal.

Mr. Kalkowski verified the current garage spaces attached to the home are 21 x 21. Mr. Tracey confirmed that. A floor plan of the home was shown and discussed.

The size of the proposed new building, if you are asking for two garage spaces, why do you have a 36' length. Why not 14 x 26 times two? Attorney Tracey explained the applicant wanted more storage space with the idea of having a pool down the road that would provide some interior room for the pool equipment, et cetera. His idea was to do it now and not expand it in the future.

The use of the existing garage spaces was discussed. They will continue to put the vehicles in there. A his/her car, collector car, a child driving and still at home you're at 4 cars. This would provide sufficient space to get them all inside.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up the covenants in the neighborhood. Attorney Tracey commented the covenants are a private matter and sometimes different from zoning regulations. They don't speak to whether the garage has to be attached or detached. This fits that. They do have a limit of three spaces and he might have to make some adjustment on the house garages. Maybe have that as one space if the covenants are an issue and he is prepared to do that.

Discussion.

The zoning regulations, which are different, are what you folks have to deal with concluded Attorney Tracey.

Mr. Conroy asked the limit for outbuilding size in this zone. Mr. Phillip said this is under garage spaces which isn't subject to an actual maximum outbuilding size. The only other restriction is that a private garage not exceed the height of 1.5 stories.

Mr. Conroy discussed the interior space and asked if the application would be amended. Mr. Trancey explained the dimensions.

The second floor space was discussed. It would be enclosed with a floor.

The size of the building lends credence to the fact that it could be used for something other than parking garages and normal uses under the code. It is a well oversized garage for the two spaces claiming and the full 1.5 story with enclosed floor. Also, your rendering shows a window. I'm looking for something more concrete than assurances that we won't be using it for this and that. I understand the zoning regulations apply but we're not in the business of giving future enforcement actions to its staff. We want to make sure everything is tightened up when we approve a plan like this. Attorney Tracey made assurances the applicant has no intention of putting a business in here or using it for living space. You could attach that to the approval. No intention of violating the zoning

regulations.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said the commission and the neighbors would be more comfortable if the height of the building were reduced or indications in the garage that would affectively make it unusable for the purpose of a business or in-law apartment.

Discussion.

Mr. Tracey again stated the idea behind the design was to give the building architectural interest and make it look more in the carriage house kind of style so it would be more pleasing. It's still screened by the adjacent trees and screened from view at the street. It is a question of taste.

Mr. Conroy said it is also a question of our ability to determine your intent. When talking about SPUs that's what we're trying to do. The fact of the matter is I have a plan in front of me that shows 36 x 32. I have testimony indicating it is an enclosed second story and that there is going to be a porch. I have a lot of concerned neighbors and a lot of concerns folks who reviewed this application that tell me this doesn't quite smell right.

There are ways that you can present this application in a manner that would allay some of those fears, but to date you seem resistant to do that.

Discussion about what Mr. Conroy was looking for in his comments. Mr. Conroy suggested revising the plan to show the interior space is what you claim it to be. Secondly, adjust the architectural features of it to suggest it as a garage and nothing more. (Removal of the porch, removal of the window). Also the stipulation the second floor would have an opening to the garage floor. It could be open in general or more of a loft than enclosed. You could reduce the height of the building altogether. These could be done and still serve the function that the applicant claims to present but it wouldn't allow him to do all the things his neighbors think he might do.

Attorney Tracy responded he would be open to making the interior a loft. We still feel strongly about the architectural design and that it serves the neighborhood much better than a rectangle with a low pitched roof that looks like a prefab garage stuck in the backyard. That is not what he intends to put in the neighborhood.

Mr. Conroy said ultimately it is your decision as it is your application.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

John Decesare, 103 Mountain Pond Road. I would like to support my neighbor, directly across the street, but I just can't. This building is a commercial style. A lot of questions and assurances it won't be used for commercial. How about the next person that comes in?

We all have single residences with two garages. This is 36' deep and you can stop two trucks in this bay.

Discussion of a pool. A 12 x14 foot shed and I'm fine. Lawnmower, tool stuff, lawn mower and outdoor furniture are in there.

This structure, I don't think, goes with the neighborhood at all.

As to the pictures shown, I live across the street and I don't recognize that property. That set that property back a couple of hundred feet and that is not how it really looks. Check the maps.

I vote no.

Steve Fournier, 70 Mountain Pond. I've been here for 16 years. I understood Mr. Putnam's vision and it did not include anything like this. It is not within the character of this neighborhood which is supposed to be spacious and provide lots of privacy.

That picture doesn't do justice. The driveway is much closer to the road.

I'm not in favor of this as it doesn't fit the character of our neighborhood.

Steve Sninsky. I spoke last week. 132 Mountain Pond Road. The size of the building is humungous. We have concerns about the second floor in the building. Questioned the height of the building. It could be used for other purposes besides storage.

Discussion.

It is not a viable garage. The pictures he took --- the house is not that far from the street.

The garage will be seen from the street. Discussed the location of the tree and not being able to block the view of the garage.

As to the porch, there is a good sized patio and deck already behind that house.

Discussion.

I'm concerned as are my neighbors about the what the space is going to be used for on the second floor. Assurances it won't be used for anything else doesn't cut it.

Jonathan Lee, 102 Mountain Pond Road. The fish eye view of the property tends to extend things so it looks a lot farther away than it actually is. It is a lot closer.

Discussed the white pines on the side of the property.

He submitted a copy of the covenants. He noted several items: no buildings larger than a three car garage, occupancy by a single family, et cetera.

Discussed the timeline and information received from April 14th to the present.

As to the architectural aspects to fit in with the neighborhood, he is saying because of the location it is not visible. Which is it? Look nice for everyone to see it but then you're saying no one can see it.

It is a large structure. Most of the neighbors have a 14 x 10 for a shed for storage that serves the purpose. It fits in with the character of the neighborhood.

Kevin Weir, 23 Mountain Pond Road. Spoke about having a lot of bikes, two drivers, this thing doesn't fit. It is way too big.

It just doesn't smell right as said earlier.

Beverly Kucharski, 167 Mountain Pond Road. Last time he said he had two acres of land that's not true. He has 1.3 acres.

Drawings from the town hall were circulated thru the neighborhood that showed this barn having it's own septic system. It doesn't need it's own septic system.

Discussion.

(Future septic area is the reserve system.)

They've been unwilling to consider some of the changes Mr. Conroy has brought up. If they don't want to change today, they won't change tomorrow. Once it's built, they'll come and do what they want. Who

will police it? The neighborhood will call the police for nuisance stuff which costs all of us money. It's not worth it as it is definitely against the neighborhood.

Thank you.

(Rebuttal)

Attorney Tracy made clear, showing the plan, in the front nearest the street is the reserve system for the septic system. Explained it shows that structure is not going to interfere with the reserve as required by the health code.

No plumbing intended for this building. No reason for hooking to the septic system and certainly no additional system.

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

B. Turning Earth Central Connecticut, LLC, Special Permit Application for the construction of multiple buildings on one lot to facilitate the development and operation of a source separated organics recycling facility, known as a volume reduction plan, using anaerobic digestion and aerobic composting to produce compost, renewable energy and heat for use in greenhouses that will grow premium quality vegetables, 111 Spring Street (SPU #537).

Jeff Fitzgerald, professional engineer with BL Companies, 355 Research Parkway in Meriden presented. This is the Turning Earth application at 111 Spring Street.

We'll answer a few of the questions we heard last week. We had good meetings with staff since the last hearing. You will hear a presentation on the odor control practice that we have in place from Mike Lanan, Tech Environmental. Our full team is here: Amy Kessler and Frank Franciosi, to answer questions you may have.

Mr. Fitzgerald answered questions on traffic to begin. We're sharing the same access point with BJ's. They accept deliveries around the clock. Turning Earth will be receiving organics from their vendors from 6:00 am to 3:00 pm Monday thru Friday and 7:00 am to 11:00 am on Saturday.

Trip generation was discussed as being a very low traffic generating facility. We anticipate the finished compost will be hauled off using walking floor trucks (55 yards of compost). About 22 tons.

As to whether or not our anticipated trips of produce leaving the greenhouses could potentially increase if we added more greenhouses than proposed. The total acreage of the greenhouses is .85 acres and there is no desire or opportunity for Turning Earth to

build more greenhouse acreage for two reasons: the land doesn't allow for that because of the wetlands and the purpose of the greenhouses is to use some of the excess heat created by the heat and power units that process the methane generated through the digestion process, so there won't be that much heat generated from this facility to heat more greenhouses than shown here.

We had questions from residents who lived on Spring Street who were concerned about truck traffic on Spring Street and how that'll impact their quality of life. A good question. Turning Earth has agreed to request that all vendors delivering to the site should travel the I-84 to the Queen Street exit. Explained routes.

One of the biggest issues we talked about last time is how the odor control is being managed at this facility. We submitted a detailed report to town staff. I'd like Mike from Tech Environmental to come up and present on that.

Mike Lannan from Tech Environmental gave a very lengthy, detailed, technical explanation of the odor control method proposed after which he answered questions from the commissioners. He made reference to the report which he had submitted to staff for the record.

Discussion of the California quote submitted on a slide during the presentation.

Ms. Kessler explained further expertise her team in managing composting and biofilters.

Further discussion regarding the process and measurements along the way.

Mr. Conroy appreciated the presentation but had a couple of questions. When the feedstock comes in, is it prescreened?

Frank Franciosi with Turning Earth explained the screening process beginning at the source and then the process on the reception floor as far as the screening process.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy's second question was what is preconsumer content and what is post consumer content. Mr. Franciosi said preconsumer would be from grocery stores, et cetera. Post consumer would be from the amusement park up the road, school systems. That takes more education. It's hard to put a number on it until we start operating.

Further discussion regarding the feedstock.

A professional pest control company will be hired with a perimeter barrier around the reception area.

Discussion.

The daily routine at the facility was discussed with tasks being assigned to different people.

Ms. Kessler added to the record that the Connecticut Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority has authorized the board of that organization to loan Turning Earth a significant amount of money in the amount of \$4 million for this project.

Discussion.

We will go through another level of diligence with our permitting. It's quite extensive and a very extensive operations maintenance plan that is submitted as part of that.

(Entered into the record.)

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Beth Miller of 23 Berkley Avenue along with her daughter, Jillian, spoke about their composting activities in their family for the past four years and how excited she is about this facility. She showed photos of their family's four year composting pile.

It is a fantastic opportunity for Southington as a town to make a positive impact on the entire world.

Extensive discussion regarding the benefits of composting.

Discussion of the benefits of reducing garbage this is dumped into landfills.

Peter Egan, 789 East Street. I would like to make a statement in support of this initiative and offer a recommendation.

This is very healthy for the tax base. And, it is going to provide some relief to the residential property tax payers. I understand this is about a \$20 million capital project. That's good tax revenue for the town.

The facility is one of the first in Connecticut using this technology. That's good for the state and the town to invite the facility to site itself here in town.

My recommendation regarding the traffic is --- gave his professional credentials --- the DEEP would welcome and take very seriously any requested by the town to insert provisions into the solid waste permit regarding any activity, in particular regarding traffic patterns, if it was considered appropriate to restrict traffic from traveling from West Street to the facility on a cross street, the DEEP would I'm certain be willing to insert that as a provision in the solid waste operating permit.

Discussion.

I do support this initiative.

Grant Sewes, 21 Cedar Springs Circle in Southington. Slightly in back and to the west of this proposed facility. I've been doing a lot of research and I am very in favor of the plant. I have no problems with the type of system they're using. This is something needed badly. I also have a big pile of compost in my backyard. I can say you can stand on top of it and not smell anything. Some of the cleanest, best soil I've ever used.

I'm very in favor of it. I don't believe there'll be any problems with odor.

I'm very environmentally minded and if we don't do something about our waste, we'll drown in it and Southington would be leading the way if we let this thing go ahead.

(Those speaking against this application)

John Decesar, 103 Mountain Pond. Spoke about the traffic on Spring Street.

I'm in favor of green processing. It does smell and it sounds like they have a plan to control it. But I'm concerned about that.

What is Southington becoming?

Do we really want this here?

Bruce Day from 411 Spring Street. I think we have to be very concerned about the long term implications of this facility in that particular location for Southington's residential future.

Have we gone to the two sites they are citing as the operational model to see what it's like, the reality of it? Smells?

Odor was discussed.

I do have a problem with composting 800 feet from my property. There are no guarantees. This is business modeling 101. We'll fix it, we'll do it, we'll design it, we'll do it.

I hope you see an operation in effect that meets all the requirements and satisfies all of the people in town.

(Responses)

Ms. Kessler spoke about the mother and her daughter composting. I really appreciate their speaking in favor of the project.

It's our hope that our facility will be recycling food waste from Southington schools very shortly.

I did want to mention the site we're going into is zoned industrial and it's surrounded by other industrial sites. I feel that we've made a very strong presentation as to why or use fits into the industrial zone. I think that we've presented a very thorough presentation and answered lots of questions as to why we would fit within the special permit parameters.

This is not business. This is a really thoughtful process that started a number of years ago that has gone through an incredible level of diligence. We've assembled an expert team of world class thinkers who are on this project to insure that we are going to be great neighbors. We've thought about every risk to impacting the neighborhood we would go into.

I really hope what you've heard over the last two public hearing sessions enables you to feel comfortable enough with our presentation that we might be able to close the public hearing and any additional technical issues can be worked out with our site plan application as we move through the process.

We're looking forward to continuing to work with staff on any technical issues they have with us.

Thank you.

The Chair closed the public hearing at this time.

6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Mark H. Sekorski, applicant, special permit use application for more than 3 garage spaces (32' x 36' barn), property of Brian W. Whitford, 118 Mountain Pond Road (SPU #538)

Mr. Chaplinsky said he is generally in favor of allowing a little bit more on a residential parcel and giving some latitude to folks in residential zones to do a little bit more. But from my perspective, this one is a little bit more than what I was looking for.

I am going to make a motion to deny the application based on Sections 8.02.2 with the application not being in harmony or character with the surrounding properties in the area, 8.02.3 the size not being appropriate and discouraging appropriate use of adjacent parcels and 8.02.9 the design elements of the design not attractive and suitable in relation to style of other buildings in the immediate area.

Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Conroy said some of the features we talked about during the public hearing apply. I have no problem with approving a 2 car garage or a 2+ car garage. I think the overall footprint and impact to the

neighborhood needs to be a little bit smaller. I look forward to a resubmission.

The Chair felt it was over-reaching. A little too big for the neighborhood. A little too big for the surrounding property. The regulations are put in place for that.

Mr. Chaplinsky added if another application comes forward, maybe some advanced dialogue with the neighbors would seem appropriate and the right thing to do.

Motion to deny passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Turning Earth Central Connecticut, LLC, Special Permit Application for the construction of multiple buildings on one lot to facilitate the development and operation of a source separated organics recycling facility, known as a volume reduction plan, using anaerobic digestion and aerobic composting to produce compost, renewable energy and heat for use in greenhouses that will grow premium quality vegetables, 111 Spring Street (SPU #537).

This application is ready for action. Suggested stipulations are that the applicant establish some sort of contact party number for any kind of an issue that may come forward to the town or the facility so they can provide that number of an expedited process if the need were to arise. Also, to continue to work with the engineering department through the development process for the odor controls and to encourage the trucks coming to the site to use access from Queen Street.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted for the record the June 3, 2014 memo from the town engineer. According to town staff, they feel comfortable the odor can be controlled and maintained below the threshold limits to be set by the DEEP. From their professional experience, they don't see that as an issue.

Mr. Chaplinsky thanked the applicant for their presentation. This is new information but we spent a lot of time with the previous issue and this issue. Thank you for your patience in answering the questions. It helps us understand the process.

With that, he made a motion to approve with the two stipulations and also encouraging the requirement the applicant work with DEEP to make a request for permit provisions for the traffic patterns keeping access to the Queen Street side to minimize traffic on the west side of Spring Street. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Conroy said he was the lone vote against the other facility. I will say you have a better site and process than the other application. But really it comes to do I want not necessarily the end

product, I am more concerned about the process and the input. For that reason I'll vote against this one as I did the last one. Thank you for your information. One benefit is we'll be able to compare it to the other one and we have any issues with the other, we'll know, with odor. I do believe this is a better facility than the other one previously proposed.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted for an additional stipulation that the greenhouses will have no retail and that we would not be growing marijuana in the greenhouses. I'll amend my motion.

Mr. Kalkowski amended his second.

The Chair said he was in favor of this. Welcome! I'm happy this is coming to town. This is good stuff. It puts Southington on the map. We're open for business and this is the business that we want.

Motion passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Conroy opposed.

C. Strollo Brothers & Sons, Inc., site plan application for proposed 8,800 sf building with associated parking to be used for Boss Snowplow sales and storage, and request for sidewalk waiver, 1520 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike (SPR #1670).

This application has to be tabled. The wetlands commission hasn't provided a report.

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

D. Walmart, application for the temporary storage of two trailers in back of building from June 4, 2014 to August 1, 2014, 235 Queen Street (SPR #1210.12)

The Chair asked if there were anyone here for this application.

(No response)

Attorney Sciota advised a table. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to table.

Mr. Macchio made a motion to approve with a stipulation for some bonding.

Mr. Phillips said a \$3,000 bond has been requested for a while now until the trailers are removed. In some cases a certain time period. Not sure what you want to do with this.

The Chair said without information and the applicant here, I strongly advise a motion to table.

Mr. Chaplinsky said his motion to table is still on the table. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

E. 8-24 Referral for the bond ordinance regarding the ordinance authorizing the issue of bonds and notes not to exceed \$2,640,000 to finance the design, construction and installation of sanitary sewer improvements on Welch Road, and authorizing the issue of bonds, notes and obligations not to exceed \$2,640,000 to finance the appropriation (MS #486).

Mr. Hayden, town engineer, explained the bond ordinance. He explained the original plan for providing sewer for the northwest corridor, and this is a solution that stays within Welch Road and puts a pump station on donated land. Easements were granted from an adjacent property owner. Welch Road will be gravity feeds from both sides down to the pump station ultimately providing sewer for Lincoln College and Lake Compounce. We're designing it in house.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve a favorable 8-24 back. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

F. 8-24 Referral for the bond ordinance regarding the ordinance authorizing the issue of bonds and notes not to exceed \$11,000,000 to finance the design and construction of various road and bridge improvements and appropriating grants received for such project for an aggregate appropriation of \$12,500,000 (ME #487)

Mr. Hayden explained this is a continuation of our road project. There are two bridges with decks rated as poor by the DOT. We'd like to address those, if we can.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to send back a favorable 8-24. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

G. 8-24 Referral for the bond ordinance regarding the ordinance authorizing the issue of bonds and notes not to exceed \$5,200,000 to finance the planning, acquisition and construction for sludge thickening and odor control in the Southington Water Pollution

Control Facility, and authorizing the issue of bonds, notes and obligations not to exceed \$5,200,000 to finance the appropriation (MR #488).

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to send back a favorable 8-24. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

H. Baldwin Estates, request for reduction of subdivision bond from \$100,000 to the maintenance bond figure of \$15,000 (S#1224.1)

Ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski so moved a motion for approval. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

I. Baldwin Estates, acceptance of Cortalnd Way, subject to the acceptance of a maintenance bond in the amount of \$15,000 (S#1224.1)

Ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion for approval. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Phillips advised the subcommittee checked references for consultants. The results came back for one unanimous. They tipped the scales. We've engaged them and let them know they've been awarded the contract. The company is Planemetrics, LLC based out of Avon. They've done a lot of this work with other towns. And, they've been rehired by the same entity.

Ms. Clock thanked Mr. Phillips for all his hard work. Glad we have a contract.

8. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Nothing at this time.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Nothing to report.

10. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

1. Atlas Stamping & Manufacturing. Proposed 12,800 sf facility for manufacturing at 143-157 Industrial Drive.

2. Turning Earth SPR

11. ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 o'clock, p.m)