

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting  
July 21, 2015

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, July 21, 2015. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

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

Alternates: Joe Coviello & James Morelli, Jr.

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development  
James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer  
Mark Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/ Town Attorney

Absent: Steve Kalkowski, Commissioner  
Tony D'Angelo & Steve Leggett, Alternate  
Commissioners

The Chair seated Mr. Morelli for Mr. Kalkowski. A quorum was determined.

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

**MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:**

4. Approval of Minutes
  - A. Regular meeting of June 16, 2015

Mr. Macchio made the motion for approval which was seconded by Ms. Clock. Motion passed on a majority voice vote.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Beecher Street Associates, LLC, Special Permit application to construct a 22 unit multifamily development, 49 Beecher Street, in an R-12 zone (SPU #553) extended from June 16

Mr. Phillips explained the applicant requested a 30-day extension at the last meeting. Doing the math, this is the 35<sup>th</sup> day. The public hearing would have to be closed today. They are also requesting an extension along with the SPR. I would just apply the requested extension before to now.

They are not going to make a presentation tonight.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

None.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

The Chair left the public hearing open to the next meeting.

B. Bill's Auto Body Clinic, Inc., Special Permit Application for an expansion of a non-conforming use to allow the sale of automobiles pursuant to Zoning Board of Appeals, approvals and stipulations, 446 West Street, primarily in an R-12 zone (R-20/25 in the rear) SPU #554.

Attorney Andrew Denorfia, 133 Main Street, represented the applicant Bill's Auto Body Clinic, Inc, owner of the property at 446 West Street.

We come before you tonight for a special permit for an expansion of a nonconforming use to allow the sale of automobiles pursuant to the ZBA approval and stipulations under Section 11-10 of the zoning regulations.

As background, 446 West Street consists of approximately 5.5 acres and has been used for auto repair since the 1950's. It has been run by the current owner since 1982.

In 1999, the applicant was approved by this commission for an expansion of a nonconforming use for the purposes of a 780 sf addition. As part of that approval, the commission stipulated that the onsite parking was not to exceed 23 vehicles. The applicant is now asking for an approval to sell motor vehicles on site which would

enable it to obtain a dealer's license from the state. The main reason for this request for the dealer's license is that with that, the applicant is able to access car auctions around the state.

As discussed with the ZBA, most of the auto sales will be done on line via the internet.

The applicant received approvals from the ZBA on June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2015 for variances to allow auto sales in a residential zone and a 6,029 sf variance to permit auto sales on a 23,971 sf lot where 30,000 sf is required.

The applicant also received from the ZBA a special exception approval to allow the sale of automobiles. As part of those approvals the ZBA did not want to exceed the 23 vehicles on site that this commission approved back in 1999. And, they limited the amount of vehicles that could be kept on site at anytime for sale to three.

The ZBA also stated that one spot on the south side of the building had to be reserved for customers. They felt that by allowing no more than 23 vehicles on site which includes the one space for the customers and the three vehicles for sale, that they would not be materially increasing the intensity of the business for the surrounding properties.

We believe this is a minor variance and a minor expansion to a nonconforming use and therefore would request your approval tonight.

The applicant is with me and Steve Giudice. We're more than happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Conroy asked about outstanding stipulations from the original 1999 approval that haven't been fulfilled. Mr. Phillips stated that the 1999 approval had shown that there should be some plantings on the north and south boundary lines and also a 6' stockade fence on the north, west and south which along the perimeter. I could not verify those were in place. I did receive a call from a concerned abutter who stated the fencing may not be where it was supposed to be or was no longer there. We can address that.

Attorney Denorfia said the applicant lives to the north of the property and actually during the construction, part of the fence was taken down. The fence will be put back up on the northerly portion. As for the southerly portion, I believe there are white birches that were part of that site plan.

Mr. Conroy suggested that as a stipulation that they fulfill those requirements.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

None.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

C. Proposed Zoning Text Amendment for revisions to Sections 4,5,9,11 and 13 of the Town of Southington Zoning Regulations (ZA #586)

Mr. Phillips summarized the sections for revision tonight. Section 4-00.9 there's language in it for commercial structures that shall not be attached to or located on the same lot as a residential wood frame structure. In discussions with Mark, we felt that it should be applying to new structures. It the term "new" isn't there, it could cause a problem for redevelopment of the downtown area where we have some existing wood frame structures.

Consideration also was to add that same language with the revision to industrial zones because it could apply to situations in the industrial zone, as well. Building Code really has some stringent rules as far as separation between residential and commercial type structures which should take care of any of the concerns that would be raised with such a conversion.

- Next is to remove from the CB, I-1 and I-2 language that basically requires a special permit for any development of a site 4 acres in size or larger or with 60 or more parking spaces.

I don't see that that language has been followed consistently on every application and maybe we had a situation with special permit for multiple buildings that technically should also have had a special permit for this and it wasn't called out.

My feeling is that I think that that is a potential barrier to development. I don't know if this was created for any specific reason. It's a little bit stringent in my opinion. There are mechanisms in place when you have sites that size that require a

special permit and in some cases multiple buildings and things of that nature, certain uses.

Attorney Sciota stated this makes development quite difficult. We are bringing in industrial and commercial people and they want to know that the site plan regulations are the site plan regulations. When somebody brings in a 4 acre industrial site, we should be thrilled. Or a 4 acre commercial site. And, not to be able to tell them when we meet with them what the special rules are --- because with SPU, sometimes things get thrown into the pot. We felt it was difficult from a marketing standpoint and it's very difficult when we meet initially.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips noted it is broad and can introduce a lot of unknowns.

Mr. Conroy commented he would assume that was intentional. A development of that size is going to have a certain impact to the surroundings. The nature of the SPU is to make sure that development fits with the surroundings. I think the commission should have some latitude in scrutinizing larger developments. The site plan regulations are fairly unrestrictive. While that's good for marketing, it may not be a good thing for the long term community.

I'm not sure that just getting rid of it is the right thing to do. I'm open to changing it to something that is a little more practical that kind of balances the needs to market our developable parcels but also to protect the interest of the town.

Discussion.

The SPU is not a huge hurdle to cross if it is a quality development, added Mr. Conroy. Maybe we want to consider that a little bit more. That's my opinion. I am reluctant for the commission to give up its discretion and SPU is where we have the most discretion.

Discussion of development size parcels.

Mr. Phillips said his main concern was that he didn't know if it had been followed consistently. If it is we might have a lot more special permits.

Discussion.

Attorney Sciota added the "magic number" is very difficult.  
Discussion.

Attorney Sciota stated it was opinion that if it is a business use in a business zone if it is 4.2 acres or 3.8 acres, it shouldn't make a difference.

Mr. Phillips brought up an industrial development that was approved with 40 to 45 parking spaces. They do an addition and now they're over 60, do we have to bring them in for a special permit? We get this quite often. Think about that, too.

Section 9-09.1 site plan review. Just some minor language tweaks here. The original language is the access easement shall at a minimum be provided. I suggest removing that. It should say "shall be provided to neighboring properties." And, also such easement shall be provided on each side of the parcel and shall be 20' by 60' deep. I'm saying 20' wide and 60' deep as necessary. It just cleans it up a little bit and reflects the intention the commission was trying to go for.

Discussion.

Remove the following section from 11, special regulations and this has to do with the intent to abandon a nonconforming use. Language is basically any nonconforming building or premises which is not used for such nonconforming use for a period of one year must thereafter conform. You can't set time limits on these things.

You have to establish intent to abandon. It's case law for years now.

This should not be in the regulations. I can't enforce this regulation so I think it should be removed.

Section 13-07, illumination. This is basically what we discussed establishing that backlit halo lighting is not going to be considered interior illumination because of the lighting on the back side and the outside. Therefore it could be illumination allowed in the CB zone.

(Those speaking in favor of these regulation changes)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones. I speak in favor. In regard to the 4 acre minimum and the 60 parking spaces, 60 parking is a low threshold. Explained.

Steve Giudice agreed with the changes. Specifically the 4 plus acres and 60 plus parking spaces. It's easy to create regulations but unfortunately it is hard to get rid of them when they're not that great. This one has been a hard one to deal with.

Discussion.

If we're concerned about the zone, we have what is allowed in the business and industrial zones. The fact that it is 4 acres or less than 4 acres, it seems like a silly threshold. I don't think the number of parking spaces should have a huge effect on requiring an SPU for a permitted use in an industrial or commercial zone.

This regulation doesn't work. We have other checks and balances that protect residential zones such as buffer requirements for industrial and business zones, as well.

Anthony Denorfia, 133 Main Street, Southington. I wholeheartedly agree with the provision about the SPUs. SPUs are not intended to legislate site plan issues. They are designed to determine whether particular uses are compatible. It wasn't intended to govern site plan issues.

Discussion.

If it is a permitted use, it is a permitted use, no matter the size of the site. If it is not a permitted use it should be in the SPU category.

Discussion.

The intent to abandon law was discussed.

I hope that you will adopt these regulation changes to mirror what the law is.

(Those speaking against the changes)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing items for this evening.

## 6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Beecher Street Associates, LLC, Special Permit application to construct a 22 unit multifamily development, 49 Beecher Street, in an R-12 zone (SPU #553) extended from June 16

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

B. Beecher Street Associates, LLC, Site Plan application for a 22 unit multifamily development, 49 Beecher Street, in an R-12 zone (SPR #1698), tabled from June 16

Mr. Macchio made a motion to table and Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

C. Bill's Auto Body Clinic, Inc., Special Permit Application for an expansion of a non-conforming use to allow the sale of automobiles pursuant to Zoning Board of Appeals, approvals and stipulations, 446 West Street, primarily in an R-12 zone (R-20/25 in the rear) SPU #554.

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action this evening. Just a reminder you need a super majority vote in the affirmative.

Mr. Conroy asked about stipulations for this item. Mr. Phillips said we have the original approval and we have this modification and they have stated on the record they are going to comply and make sure the fence is up and the plantings. I'm comfortable with it.

Mr. Conroy felt it should be a stipulation. Mr. Phillips said it is on the plans.

The engineering comments could be made part of the zoning permit requirements.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Locks seconded. Mr. Chaplinsky said it sounds like staff has it covered without stipulations, so I don't think there is a need for stipulations. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Proposed Zoning Text Amendment for revisions to Sections 4,5,9,11 and 13 of the Town of Southington Zoning Regulations (ZA #586)

Ms. Clock made a motion to approve. After a brief discussion, Ms. Clock rescinded her motion.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up the 4 acres or larger and parking spaces. We've heard feedback from folks. We are going through the POCD, if we go through and modify the regulations --- if we specific regulations and they call out in detail the intent --- and having a bite at the apple again and looking at areas, the intensity and the safety ---

Attorney Sciota stated if you look at a business zone, there are site plan uses and sections that say certain types of uses require an SPU which is how staff feels how we are supposed to use SPU. It's the use itself. If you have an area you want SPU on, it's the use in the zone. That makes sense to us.

What doesn't make sense to us is a blanket because it's over the 4 acres, not matter what the use is, we need to do an SPU. All three staff members are on board on doing it the way you're talking about. If you have a use in a zone that needs the extra review, let's handle it with a text change where that certain use becomes an SPU, not the parcel size.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated he was supportive of this.

Discussion of this provision being a catch-all so the commission can almost anything. Maybe we should look to see if the development is defined enough. We should look at the uses and the changes that have occurred and put more definitions around what is permitted and what is not before we remove the "suspenders".

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if we should have first a review of the zones, make them neater and then remove that provision.

Discussion.

Any other use similar in nature to another use language usage was discussed as a catch all being used a lot. Mr. Conroy said the size of a development should be considered on the site plan.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky further stated he didn't see a need to rush this particular change.

Discussion.

The POCD and how it fits in was discussed.

SPU is just a public hearing and a meeting. It requires you have a quality project noted Mr. Conroy.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said we want to make sure the development fits in the community and this commission has the opportunity to review those plans.

Discussion in general about the change and this protection being removed before the POCD changes come into place.

I suggest we consider tabling this portion of it, added Mr. Chaplinsky, and give it another meeting so we can look at it and feel comfortable with it. Mr. Phillips recommended that this item be continued. There is no timeframe.

Discussion.

Section 4: 4-00.9 - addition of the term "new".

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Section 5: 5-00.14

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Section 9: 9-09.1

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Section 11: 11-09.5 - removal of the one year wordage.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Section 13. 13-07

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to on a roll call vote.

Attorney Sciota advised these become effective 15 days after publication.

Mr. Conroy made a motion to table Section 4 from the CB zone, Section 5 from the I-1 zone and Section 5 from the I-2 zone. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. AA Denorfia Building & Development, site plan modification application for proposed 34 unit multi housing family development 42-82 Liberty Street in a CB zone (SPR #1674.1) tabled from June 16

The Chair recused himself from this application and left the dais.

PAUL CHAPLINSKY, Assuming the Chair:

The Acting Chair seated Mr. Coviello in for Michael DelSanto for Item E.

E. AA Denorfia Building & Development, site plan modification application for proposed 34 unit multi housing family development 42-82 Liberty Street in a CB zone (SPR #1674.1) tabled from June 16

Stephen Giudice, with Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville. This application as presented at the last meeting. This is a site plan modification to a previously approved site. We did some modifications to the existing building, to the building to the north and units at the southerly building. We've modified the parking configuration.

We have done some slight modifications to the locations of drainage structures. Overall, the same concept as what was previously approved.

We did receive staff comments and supplied revised plans in response to the comments.

If you have questions, we'll be happy to answer them for you.

Mr. Phillips said it is essentially ready for action with one outstanding item and it has to deal with the disposition for a sewer connection. Charges.

Attorney Sciota advised that that wouldn't be this board. Engineering and the applicant will work that out.

No stipulations requested.

Attorney Sciota, on behalf of the town, thanked the applicant for working closely with us for the municipal parking lot. Thank you.

Ms. Locks made a motion to approve. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

MICHAEL DELSANTO, resumed the Chair.

F. FRAL, LLC, site plan modification for proposed addition to existing facility, 865 West Queen Street in an I-1 zone (SPR #1699) tabled from June 16

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones represented the application. We revised the plans and submitted them to staff after the last meeting.

All questions by staff have been resolved and I believe this is ready for action by the commission.

It is an addition to an existing industrial building. One section is two story with the second story to be used for offices.

Mr. Phillips confirmed it is ready for action.

Mr. Macchio made a motion to approve and Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Fragola, site plan review for a bank with a drive thru, 1829 West Street, in a WSB zone (SPR #1650.1)

Mr. Phillips advised the applicant has requested a 65-day extension. It is before ZBA for a number of variances as the property is in a WSB zone now.

Mr. Macchio made a motion to approve the 65-day extension. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Conroy made a motion to table. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

H. Discussion - Referral from ZBA requesting regulation interpretation as it applies to a "Caretaker" residence as part of a Public Garage at 135 Lazy Lane in an I-1 zone.

Mr. Phillips provided information ahead of time for the commission to consider. Essentially, we have what was a single family home as part of a residential subdivision that was converted to an industrial zone. Then there was a structure approved for --- well, the actual single family home was approved for vehicle repairs in the garage portion and offices, storage upstairs in the balance of the square footage.

There was a second modification that came in for approval and that was for construction of a metal building that would basically expand that use towards the west.

Basically, as I understand it, the two buildings are supposed to be combined and they were not combined. That was the original issue.

I believe the applicant is going to combine them but now asked for the ZEO to make a decision which in this case was me, about caretaker facility. We have a regulation that says in the industrial zone, that living quarters for caretakers are allowed within the principle structure as an accessory use.

My take on that regulation, fairly broad, obviously, is that auto repair facilities wouldn't necessarily have a need for a caretaker as part of a customarily accessory use. I don't believe that regulation applies in this case. But again, it is fairly broad.

They went to the ZBA to challenge the decision and the ZBA has requested the PZC to provide them with an interpretation of that regulation --- living quarters for caretakers within the principle structure. Again, key is principle structure. Right now they are not attached.

That's where we are at at this point in time. The ZBA would like an interpretation of what that regulation means. The regulation itself was created I think around 1985 and it was in response to a third party submittal and it was the storage facility on Spring Street near BJs requesting this regulation change so that they could have a caretaker associated with the storage facility. I have no reason to believe that this has been applied since.

Attorney Sciota said procedurally, the ZBA is the final authority on this. What they're looking for is more input so they can make their final decision. Mr. Phillips said they were looking for guidance as to what the intention of the regulation was because they feel that the PZC created the regulation for a purpose. They want that input before they make a decision.

The Chair asked about the site. Is it being used right now? Mr. Phillips said he didn't see that it was being used. I don't think it has a final CO. Attorney Sciota interjected that the attorney is here and he can give us his presentation. Let's get everything on the table.

James Ziogas, 271 Farmington Avenue, Bristol for the applicant, Adam Pio.

I think the statements just made are a fair assessment of what is going on. The site is not in use, yet. They're still working on it. A CO still has not been issued. The buildings have to be combined.

We have meetings and are in agreement on how that is going to be accomplished. That work will take place shortly.

The reason we are here is that this is a very simple regulation that you have which basically states in industrial zones the following uses shall be considered as accessory uses and if you go down the list of six uses provided in the regulation it says: #5 - living quarters for caretakers within the principle structure.

The language is that simple. We've made an application for a caretakers quarters in this building because it is in an I-2 zone. We don't understand why it should not be granted. There are no qualifications for it. No bullet requirements for it.

We are not supposed to leave the public unaware of what the regulations mean. They're supposed to be straight forward, plain language should apply. Quite frankly this is very simple and it should be interpreted and applied as it is written. That's why we went to ZBA and challenged the decision of the ZEO. We think we are correct. The court would look at the plain language of the regulation and they would apply it as such. We think that is a correct statement of law, as well. We think the commission should recommend to the ZBA that it be applied in a similar fashion.

Our architect is here and he has a little more input.

John Torello, Architect and Planner. I've been in the business for 50 years now. Gave professional background.

I've never seen anything as clear as in this particular case. From the standpoint of trying to evaluate what type of use would allow this, it seems kind of incredulous that it would be only for a large operation to have a caretaker apartment and that is what we were told, as a matter of fact.

It seems that just the opposite would be true. For the kind of closely held business for a small operator, that would be more in line for this kind of treatment.

Discussion.

In this case, the building being used and was properly used for an industrial use in the first instance when they had their approval, it is actually a residential building that was being used as an industrial facility. The addition accommodates the need for the applicant to conduct his business on an expanded basis and produce the proper kind of structure for the site.

That leaves the existing building which can only be used for the industrial purposes on a ground floor garage in a limited capacity with a building that has value. This particular structure would be much more attractive than a similar industrial building, a box. It makes the transition between other uses on Lazy Lane more appropriate.

The problem is what can you use it for? The regulation doesn't qualify who would be such an operator. It doesn't say it has to be a member of the family or someone who is employed by that person. We see it that way as that is how a small operation like this would run it.

Discussion.

I think this situation is clear and is probably the most appropriate of the kind of interpretation for your regulation.

A discussion followed regarding the definition of the term: caretaker, with several commissioners offering their dictionary opinions.

Discussion followed regarding which is the primary building. The nonconforming residential use or the physically larger extension of the public garage, basically.

Discussion.

Attorney Sciota clarified it is going to be one building with the accessory use of an area where a caretaker is supposed to live. That's what we're talking about. It is going to be an industrial use with an accessory area of whatever size where a caretaker is going to live.

Mr. Torello said his point was the regulation says the residence has to be in the primary building.

Attorney Sciota again clarified it is going to be one building.  
Discussion.

Mr. Torello said you can't say we are using a residential building any longer because the use was established with the approval.

The nonconforming use was abandoned when you got your industrial subdivision noted Attorney Sciota and Mr. Torello agreed.

Discussion of residential single family homes not being allowed in an industrial zone.

Mr. Phillip stated that they did intend to extinguish the residential use on the record when they were getting approvals for the conversion of the public garage but now they're coming back around and using this accessory use caveat to re-establish the residential use.

Mr. Conroy stated his opinion: We have a residential building which still is used as all that physically and then we have the industrial part which is actually now the primary use. We also have the idea of we do not want to promote residential uses in the industrial zone. I would say that things like owner, operator living in that would not conform to my idea of what a caretaker is. Renting that portion of the building for income would not conform to my idea of what a caretaker would be.

To me a caretaker would be some variant on employee of the primary operation who's primary or secondary would be for a night watchman, general caretaker of the building. That would be in conformance with what was written. I don't see the other uses doing that.

Discussion.

Attorney Ziogas interjected that is consistent with the way we interpret that regulation. That's what we are looking for.

Mr. Phillips again explained to the commissioners why he originally denied this triggering the trip to the ZBA for the

applicant. In this case, my interpretation that this was a disingenuous end around to re-establish a residential use they went on the record and said was not going to continue as they would use it for storage and office. This caretaker provision is an accessory use and is not customary to this primary use, in my opinion, what public garage needs a caretaker?

The regulation is very broad. I researched the record and figured out it was based on a third party proposal for storage facility. That's the decision I made at the time and that is the appeal process they're allowed to have.

Discussion.

Poll:

Mr. Chaplinsky felt the definition staff read for caretaker is appropriate and accurately reflects the intent of the regulations. But I also agree with staff's interpretation of the regulation, as well. I'm supportive of that decision.

Ms. Locks felt the same way.

Mr. Macchio noted the interesting comments. I agree with the Planner's interpretation.

Ms. Clock agreed with Kevin.

Mr. Morelli agreed with Kevin.

Mr. Coviello said he was there as well. He referred to the definition in the Oxford Dictionary: a person employed to look after a public building or house in the owner's absence. It's not the owner living there and renting.

The Chair agreed with Kevin.

Attorney Sciota summarized that the commission is stating that they understand that the definition does not have any restrictions in it. There is no size restrictions of area or building. But their definition of caretaker is something they want to have the ZBA heed.

I. Yarde Metals, release of \$1,500 E & S bond, 45 Newell Street (SPR #1524.6)

This is ready for action. Mr. Macchio so moved the motion. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

J. Liberty Bank, release of \$1,000 E & S bond, 60 North Main Street (SPR #1625)

This is ready for action. Ms. Clock so moved the motion. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

K. Liberty Bank, reduction of Public Improvement bond from \$17,000 to a new amount of \$7,000, 60 North Main Street (SPR #1625)

This is ready for action. Mr. Grappone explained the \$7,000 is the town's estimate for the Renaissance theme at the corner of High Street and North Main Street to just continue it around the corner. We are working with the DOT on a preliminary design to get that approved. Liberty Bank is contributing for that project.

Ms. Clock made a motion to approve. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

#### 7. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Clock advised Thursday night we concluded our discussion on all packets. We drafted a plan. There is no August meeting. We are planning on having public hearings in November or December.

I can't say enough that the process has been extremely interesting and I've been honored to be a part of it.

Mr. Phillips said thus far it has been a fantastic working group. Everybody listens and values everybody's input.

The Chair said a constituent told him the process has been phenomenal and he has been impressed with everyone's work.

Keep up the good work!

The draft will be on the website when it is available.

#### 8. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

1. Administrative approval. It's SPR 1700 Veterans Memorial Pool, for a pool house addition to remove the kiddie pool and replace it with a splash pad and associated renovations around the area.

2. The new cell tower at 1011 West Center Street has been shelved for the foreseeable future.

10. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

- Administrative approval we just talked about.
- Site plan application to renovate an existing building and construct an addition at 39 DePaolo Drive.
- You saw Bill's Autobody that was on tonight.

The Chair reminded everyone the next meeting will be August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2015. I hope you all have a wonderful rest of the summer.

Attorney Sciota announced we have assigned Jim Grappone as your engineering staff member on a permanent basis. Welcome, Jim. We are happy to have you.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Clock made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:28 o'clock, p.m.)