

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON
JANUARY 5, 2016

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 5, 2016 at the Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Chairman Michael DelSanto called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

Paul Chaplinsky	James Sinclair
Jennifer Clock	James Morelli
Susan Locks	James Macchio
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: Kevin Clements & Joe Coviello

Ex-Officio: James A. Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer
Robert A. Phillips, Director of Planning &
Community Development
Jeremy Taylor, Assistant Town Attorney

Absent: Ted Cabata, Alternate
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Mgr/Town Attorney

A quorum was determined.

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

4. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATE

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

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting of December 1, 2015

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

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record for the public hearings.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Application of Cranberry Cove, LLC and Sterling Trust Company Custodian proposing to change the zone from I-1 to B, property located at 84 and 102 West Center Street (Map 099, Parcels 214 and 215) ZC #551.

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, CT represented the application. Joe Eddy, architect and Kathy Riccard are here as well. She is with Cranberry Cove, LLC and Sterling Trust Company.

This a petition to request a zone change for approximately 3.9 acres of land currently zoned I-1. We're proposing to change it to a Business zone.

We surrounded by I-1 and residential zones on either site. The petition is filed in conjunction with an SPU (public hearing to follow) for multiple retail buildings proposed for the site.

We believe this is a natural extension of the business zone. We think the industrial zone in this area is a little bit out of place and we think the business/retail use will be more in conformance with the abutting residential use.

The industrial zone for this site pre-dates zoning. It was done to match the uses on the site previously. Perillo Oil. And, multiple buildings on site. This site has had different types of uses in the past.

We're proposing to redevelop the site in its entirety and this is the first step in the process.

We think this would be a better fit with the surrounding properties. We think it is a natural extension. We are not spot zoning. We are continuing the zone from the north. We think once completed this site will be one of a kind in Southington and on the

entire length of the rails to trails. We think it's good for the neighbors, the applicant and the Town of Southington.

Discussion on the rationale for changing the zone was had in response to a query by Mr. Clements. It has to do with the extension of the current business zone to the north and the redevelopment of the proposed site in conjunction with the surrounding areas. The site is pretty much surrounded by residential uses and business uses. Even though it is an industrial zoned site, we think it will be more in conformance with the surrounding areas once we change it to a business zone, concluded Mr. Giudice.

Discussion of why it wasn't included in the most recent zone change.

Mr. Giudice noted the applicant has always had the idea of redeveloping this property but the thought was what would work best with the surrounding areas and with the rails to a trail that runs adjacent to the parcel. We're proposing to incorporate a family-friendly use, kind of an extension of the rails to trails into this property as opposed to an industrial use.

Ms. Clock asked if there was any feedback from surrounding residents. Mr. Giudice said they did notify all neighbors within 250' of both applications and we've had no feedback.

Mr. Chaplinsky understood the zone change from industrial to business; however the question is what are your feelings about a CB zone versus a B zone. Mr. Giudice said they'd love a CB zone. But we thought that maybe it would be spot zoning in this situation.

Mr. Phillips interjected the extension of the business zone from the north to the south over the roadway wouldn't be considered spot zoning but establishing a CB zone directly just on that property instead of the B zone, that could be considered spot zoning as it is not a natural extension of any existing zone.

Mr. Chaplinsky said removing the spot zoning aspect, would the applicant be interested in the CB zone designation. Looking at the surrounding zones, the Planner at some time in the near future has plans to look at this corridor along the trail to determine whether some of the industrial land is still appropriate or should it be considered B or C B. My perspective is we're very close in proximity

to the CB zone and future plans such as Greenway Commons would be an extension of the CB zone and I'm just wondering if the B zone that is there today, including this parcel, might be better off zoned CB versus B.

Discussion.

Where does the commission feel in the future we're going to go with potentially rezoning this area? If they feel that expanding the B zone is something we're interested in seeing, then this makes sense. If the commission feels as though expanding the CB zone in the future, including the existing B zone, maybe we don't want to make this change right away and maybe we want to accelerate a CB change instead. I'm interested in feedback on CB versus B.

Discussion.

Mr. Giudice stated from a site plan perspective the change from B to CB doesn't really change the plan we're presenting tonight.

Discussion.

If you go forward with this request and at a later date you went to a CB zone, it would only help the applicant as far as occupation of the structures we're proposing. We have a theme for the site. CB allows a little more flexibility than B with that, but right now, the site plan itself, our proposal, wouldn't really change that drastically. If you go to B and then in the future go to CB, it would still work with what we're proposing.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. Spoke in favor of the zone change. After review, my first problem was we are losing industrial land which in town there is a shortage of but we also have to look at what are the chances of any business coming in and buying this property and putting in an industrial project. I think the chances of that are minimal.

Examples given of industrial areas in the past.

I believe this is a natural projection to change to a B zone. This property goes all the way to the river. We have a wonderful river that everybody is starting to try to clean up. This would open up the river. Very few places in this town can you get access or even look at a natural resource that we have.

We are trying to become a destination location. I do believe this would enhance Southington as a downtown destination location.

We have a housing complex coming in off of Eden Avenue, Greenway Commons, another section of housing on Center Street and all of these need additional retail places to go.

This is a golden opportunity. I believe it would be the best use to switch this from industrial to business.

Right now the property is kind of ugly. This project has to be an absolute improvement --- but we need to change the zone in order to do that.

For all those reasons, I am in support of this zone change.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing.

B. Special Permit Application of Cranberry Cove, LLC for multiple buildings on one site, property located at 84 and 102 West Center Street (Map 099, Parcels 214 and 215), owned by Cranberry Cove, LLC and Sterling Trust Company Custodian. SPU #558.

Stephen Giudice with Harry Cole & Son represented the application. Our proposed SPU is for multiple buildings on one site. Section 1-09 requires a special permit to have multiple primary buildings on one parcel. This site plan consists of 3.76 acres of land. Two parcels: 84 and 102 West Center.

We are proposing 7 retail and restaurant type use buildings with 80 parking spaces. This site is laid out to work in conjunction with the rails to trails. We have interior walks throughout the site. We'll make some modifications to the layout based on staff conversations. We're proposing a courtyard and incorporate benches, bike racks, Renaissance themed lamp posts and so on.

We have a floodway that runs through the area and we had to push the buildings to the south to keep the structures out of the floodway.

We have an area where we curbed the parking to make it aesthetically pleasing. A little turnaround at the back of the parking.

This is really going to be one of a kind along the rails to trails all the way down. Nothing like this in any other town along the trail and we think this is going to be a gem in town.

We have a lot of green spaces on site. We're looking at passive use of the grassed area with possible access to the river. Opportunities are limitless.

In your consideration for the zone change, you have to take certain things into consideration. We think that the use would be consistent with the development in the area as far as residential use. We think the buildings and structures are in harmony with the surrounding areas, especially with the smaller buildings the scale works better with the residential houses.

We have adequate emergency access from West Center Street. The streets that provide access to this property are sufficient. We think that the operation would not be detrimental to the surrounding areas and adjacent properties. We are proposing a considerable amount of landscaping and green areas to have a park like feel. Very compatible with the surrounding areas.

We are excited about this.

Joe Eddy, AE Design Group, principal architect. Explained renderings.

- Look from the West Center Street. Concept is relatively small buildings. Reasonable in scale so we can get medium sized upscale retailers and restaurant chains but in small packages.

We think that fits the area very well. The site is tough and you don't want a restaurant with 200 tables --- that won't work. The cars and effect would be horrible especially when you are keeping to a walking traffic concept. Smaller service venues really do feel the needs of the walking traffic. That's what we want to see happen here.

- Small time village effect. Still talking about colors. Single story buildings. Fair amount of detail. Residential materials of durable quality. All buildings match the theme. No second floor, it just looks like a second floor.

Fine dining, outside dining and parking requirements were discussed.

Sidewalk connection to the rails to trails permission is required.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about Renaissance themed stipulations for this project. Mr. Phillips said none are proposed by staff, but if you want to do so, now is the time to put a condition on.

Kathy Riccard, 1317 Mt. Vernon Road. To address the question earlier, my husband and I looked for land along the bike path years ago as I had this idea for a development capitalizing on the bike path and have a Cape Cod village feel or Main Street USA at Disney World type of feel where you can access it from both sides.

Discussion.

Make it a destination with front porches and benches down by the water.

Discussion.

Now is my time to do what I intended when we bought the property. Thank you for your consideration.

I can guarantee you it is going to be a theme with a neighborhood feel. It will be beautiful. Renaissance themed items such as lamp posts, benches and brick were noted.

Discussion.

Internal sidewalks are being proposed all the way to the intersection and up West Center Street.

Mr. Giudice said he didn't have a problem with the Renaissance them but would like to have flexibility. Is Cape Cod theme the same? Both great, maybe just a little different. The idea is to have a consistent theme throughout the site. Very architecturally pleasing.

The larger building square footage is about 4700 sf and the smaller ones are between 2200 and 2400 sf. Uses are speculative. So much square feet on site is going to be assigned to restaurant use and so much for retail. That's how we came up with the parking calculation. Use will determine the breakdown.

We are ready to submit a full site plan and wetland application with these approvals.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. Spoke in favor of the application. I was stunned and thrilled because this is something uniquely different than what you normally see. Very pleasing to the eye. Compared to what we have now, this is like night and day. Based on this rendering and pictures the applicant has presented, I am in full support of this application.

Mike Riccio, 124 Andrews Street. This is an out of the park homerun! This is what we dreamed about 20 years ago when talking about the downtown Renaissance. Unbelievable! This is incredible! I support it.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

Mr. Giudice concluded by saying they are very excited and can't wait to move forward. Hopefully you'll see our vision. Thank you for your time.

The Chair closed this public hearing section of the Agenda.

7. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Application of Cranberry Dove, LLC and Sterling Trust Company Custodian proposing to change the zone from I-1 to B, property located at 84 and 102 West Center Street (Map 099, Parcels 214 and 215) ZC #551.

Ready for action. Mr. Phillips noted Mr. Chaplinsky's comments have merit. The area where this is located very likely could

benefit from a focus study of the downtown/linear trail/Plantsville and back up through Main Street. It's something the commission should consider but it will take a little bit of time. You have to look at the application before you right now. It is a piece of industrial property in a flood zone, right along the trail, very visible with an active intersection. You have to look at it and I don't see any reason why you shouldn't consider changing this to a B zone. Economic development does support this application even though we are losing industrial land. Changing to CB zone at a future date wouldn't have any impact. The concept would be consistent with the vision. I don't see any reason why you shouldn't support the zone change.

It's not inconsistent with the current POCD. Or the draft plan.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with a couple of comments. We have to look at the application in front of us, not the one we'd like to have in front of us. I understand the CB zone for this as opposed to B. With the variances and the SPU, we are moving in that direction. To echo Mr. Riccio's comments, it is an out of the park homerun! We are losing industrial but do we want industrial downtown or do we want this next to the linear trail.

Ms. Locks seconded.

Mr. Phillips noted an effective date is needed.

Mr. Sinclair added to his motion with an effective date of January 19, 2016. Ms. Locks seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky spoke in support of this application. The Chair spoke in support of this application noting the municipal parking in the area.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Special Permit Application of Cranberry Cove, LLC for multiple buildings on one site, property located at 84 and 102 West Center Street (Map 099, Parcels 214 and 215), owned by Cranberry Cove, LLC and Sterling Trust Company Custodian. SPU #558.

Ready for action. There are no suggested staff stipulations but if the commission is interested, it would make sense to attach anything that is in general concept to the SPU. It could be simply that the layout be similar to what was presented tonight or it could be that the lighting fixtures and walkway treatments are similar to what we see in the Renaissance area. The renderings look good.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. One stipulation is the village feel they've created with the renderings and something that meets staff's approval consistent with the presentation. And, mixed materials for the facades. We'd like to see that included that meets staff's requirements understanding what the Renaissance theme is all about and consistent with the Renaissance theme with lighting fixtures, walkways, similar in nature. Leave it to staff to come up with something consistent in the area. I do think it is important we have front and back treatments to the buildings. From the parking lot to the walking trail, similar facades. A front façade on both sides of the building. Lastly, this is a B zone; I'd like to stipulate there is no drive thru restaurants on this approval.

Mr. Sinclair seconded.

Ms. Clock complimented the applicant for this application. At our POCD meeting this is exactly what we talked about and I hope there's others to come forward. This town will make our town great. A start of a great community improvement.

Mr. Morelli asked about the connection approval to the rails to trails property. Mr. Grappone said we have a license agreement currently with the DOT. We'll have to converse with them.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. O'Reilly Automotive Stores, site plan application for construction of 7.735 s.f. new building for proposed retail sale of auto parts, 944 Queen Street, in a B zone (SPR #1708)

Josh Sperling, professional engineer with (Inaudible) Engineering, presented on behalf of the applicant. This is a proposal to redevelop the existing formerly developed 944 Queen Street location.

This is a roughly three quarter acre parcel. The building is proposed to be right around 7700 sf. Thirty-eight parking spaces which based on operations of other site is ample to meet their needs.

Customer entrance and parking was discussed. To the rear is where they have their loading facilities and dealer door. Explained.

We are proposing eight trees or close to 70 plants in total.

We have a storm water management system to mitigate the increase in the impervious proposed here. Sizable underground infiltration system. Water quality that meets CT DEP standards.

We have responded to staff comments. The engineering department has reviewed the drainage with a few minor comments that could be included in the approval as conditions if you were so inclined.

We have updated elevations based on suggestions to break up the façade. Explained.

Mr. Phillips had no concerns. The applicant made some modifications to the renderings at our request. I appreciate that.

Three comments from engineering remain that could be stipulations.

Just to confirm with the applicant, Mr. Phillips asked regarding the renderings, that the screening at the top? The engineer said the response from the architect was that all the mechanicals would be screened.

Parking requirements were discussed.

Mr. Chaplinsky discussed cross easements to the north and the south to adjacent parcels. The engineer said that was a staff comment as well. This is a leased property and going to the underlying property owner, they have a verbal that they would be okay in theory. A private agreement would need to be reached between the property owners. They would be willing to consent to a future easement for cross access.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips added the final plan should include that and you should consider it as a stipulation.

Signage was discussed. They understand that signage will be handled separately.

Stipulations:

1. Engineering comment #7 of the 12/10/2015 checklist has a discrepancy between the responses to comments and plan sheet C-1 for the size of the outlet pipe exiting the underground storage system. Please confirm 6 or 8 inch pipe size. All would be on the final plan submitted.

2. Engineering comment #11 of the 12/10/2015 checklist provide a cleanout manhole detail for each of the underground system rows adequate for maintenance of the units.

3. Engineering comment #14 of the 12/10/2015 checklist, minimum sidewalk width shall b 5' based on DOT requirements.

4. To assure that the easement access to the north and south are on the final plan, as well.

The engineer clarified we are only repairing about 20' of sidewalk out front. The existing sidewalk that appears to be in pretty good condition is only 4.7 feet. We'll make our new section the 5' wide.

Mr. Grappone explained you have to go before District 1, DOT for their determination. My guess is he'll go with 5'.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with Planner's stipulations and clarifying the easement to the north and the south ideally would be to the east of the building in line with the flow of traffic on the parcel and the adjacent parcels, if possible.

Stipulations:

1. Engineering comment #7 of the 12/10/2015 checklist has a discrepancy between the responses to comments and plan sheet C-1 for the size of the outlet pipe exiting the underground storage system. Please confirm 6 or 8 inch pipe size. All would be on the final plan submitted.

2. Engineering comment #11 of the 12/10/2015 checklist provide a cleanout manhole detail for each of the underground system rows adequate for maintenance of the units.

3. Engineering comment #14 of the 12/10/2015 checklist, minimum sidewalk width shall be 5' based on DOT requirements.

4. To assure that the easement access to the north and south are on the final plan, as well.

Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Beacon Electric, Inc., site plan application to construct 7,500 s.f. industrial building, property located at 306 Clark Street owned by D & B at Clark, LLC in an I-1 zone (SPR #1709).

Sev Bovino, Kratzert, Jones & Associates, represented the applicant. The property is located 306 Clark Street, south of Manor Inn. It is zoned I-1. Served by public water and sewer.

Proposed building is going to be a two story building with a mix of office and manufacturing. The total story will be totally dedicated to office space. It will be slab on grade. It will require 34 parking spaces and we've proposed 35. The property is owned by the property owner next door, Beacon Electric. There is a connection proposed between the two properties that will allow traffic between the two without going on to Clark Street.

The connection to the south property is not possible as there is a ditch in the way. The frontage is 131.09 feet and the requirement is 100 feet. The lot area is 28,979 sf and the minimum requirement is 30,000 sf.

Because of the obstruction to the south and also because there is no sidewalk in the area, south or north of the intersection including both sides of the road, and because we have two CL&P poles and two telephone poles located in front of the property with transformers falling right in the way of the sidewalk, and the last site plan we did we received a waiver of the walk, based on those issues and the section of the regulations that talks about existing development of 75 per cent of the area being developed and obstructions beyond our control to move, we request you consider waiving the sidewalk along the frontage.

We received staff comments and have not been able to work on changing the plans to reflect those comments. I request a table at this time.

Mr. Bovino asked if the sidewalk issue could be voted on so we will know what to do on the plan. It is Section 9-03.9C.2, 3 & 5. Explained.

Mr. Phillips noted that sidewalks are not required in the industrial zone.

After discussion, it was decided the commission would not vote on the waiver this evening but would wait as several commissioners wanted to go out to the site to review it.

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

E. Request for 5 year extension of site plan approval, 1198 West Street (SPR #1444)

Ready for action. This had an original approval of 2007 and is in the window where site plan approvals were extended 9 years so they're in for the 5 year statutory extension which would give it 14 years. All issues at the outside, I believe are corrected. Discussion.

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

F. 8-24 referral for the purchase of development rights for Hawk's Landing Golf Course, 201 Pattonwood Drive (MR #503).

Mr. Phillips presented. He explained the 8-24 process including the history of Section 8-24 of municipal improvements in the state statutes.

Essentially it was done to create a check and balance where items under consideration for municipal improvements couldn't just be done based upon one board's whim but they had to actually pass it through the planning & zoning commission which is charged with the act of planning of the city itself. It allows the PZC to weigh in on what may be occurring at the Town Council level.

He read verbatim the 8-24 state statute as it exists today.

We do a lot of these through planning & zoning. Not only is it those things that would come before planning & zoning, but also if something is going to be bonded, the bond counsel will recommend the 8-24 is done so they can legally sell the bonds.

Discussion.

The 8-24 referral is totally separate from any local zoning authority. Anything that would require a site plan, a special use permit, a special exception or anything that you would have locally as a regulation still stands whether you need an 8-24, or not.

In summary, if the municipality exempted itself from zoning, then everything that went before 8-24 could be controversial because that's the time you get to look at it. We do have things in place.

Discussion.

As to accusations on some matters we did an end around, that's not the case. We did apply the regulations, whether or not, they were interpreted correctly, according to the commission or staff, is a question that can be answered by somebody else. The reality is they're two separate processes. A check and balance and should not be confused.

Looking at the current 8-24 referral for Hawks Landing, this is development rights. In this case you have a piece of property that has an existing golf course, existing banquet facility and we would be paying some money for what's called one of their bundle of rights which is basically the development of the property in the future.

In order to exchange an easement restriction on that property, you have to pay a sum of money that would be equal to the value of those rights. In this case, Jim will go on talking about the layout and how he did determine the number of lots for this piece of property if it were to be subdivided, its highest and best use in the sense of single family homes on the remaining land, we'll get into that. Brian will discuss the numbers behind it.

It's pretty straight forward. I can answer any questions. It looks like I think a good deal for the town.

James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer. The engineer's role in this was to look at the number of lots. The subject site is known as 201 Pattonwood Drive. The parcel is roughly 88 acres. It's located in an R-80. For the most part, based on the location, it is served with public water and onsite sewage disposal.

Our role was to look at and work with the developer and his engineer for the number of lots for the remaining portion. Several iterations came before engineering but basically the agreed number of parcels for single family home sites totals 25.

The lot layout meets the current subdivision regulations and it is based on two major factors for the parcel: there is a wetland and floodplain corridor and the other natural resource protection is steep slopes exceeding 25 percent. Those are laid out on the plan toward the rear of the property. Explained that needs to be reduced from the 2-acre requirement.

We are in agreement that 25 parcels could be contained in the remaining usable area outside of the designated use for a golf course and a banquet facility.

Brian Lastra, Director of Assessment & Revenue. A copy of his presentation in the form of a handout was passed around with a copy on file in the Town Planning Department for review.

He went through the calculations per his handout and concluded by saying in his opinion; the market value of just the 18 holes of golf is 1.32 million. Now I cut that in half for the valuation of 9 holes. It's his opinion that the value of this golf course for 9 holes is \$660,000.

(This is if they were to operate a 9-hole golf course and propose 25 building lots.)

Mr. Phillips reminded everyone that with the development rights easement, you are getting the entire property. Explained.

Mr. Lastra ended by saying that \$990,000 is the actual value of the development rights for this land where the 9 holes would be taken out and the 25 lots would be developed.

Mr. Clements stated that he was very strongly against creating any lots on the Hawks property. First and foremost the citizens state they want open space. They gave \$2 million to do that. Very clear on that.

Economic development and tax for this property should be irrelevant for any commissioner voting on this because we are here to look at the regulations and make sure they abide by what's on paper and not how much we can get for this land or the house down the road.

I think people would be very pleased to have pristine land as the golf course being used by the community.

I don't think the golf course is an appropriate place to cut in half and build 25 housing units. A builder can look elsewhere to develop property.

Ms. Clock stated as Chair of the POCD, I feel like the POCD Gods have come to this meeting. This is a great opportunity for a solution to what the voters have told us they want. This is preserving not only land but the character of our town. It's controlling population.

This is completely in line with the POCD. I'm glad it's come before us.

Mr. Chaplinsky said as discussion that the financials are being based on the development of 25 homes and an operation of 9 holes. However, the proposal before us is to preserve the entire 18 hole golf course in its entirety. It is my understanding we are voting on an 8-24 for the preservation of this entire parcel whereby if this is voted and passed today and passed at the future council meeting, this golf course in its entirety will be preserved from any future residential building, 100%. Not one home will be built on this.

Mr. Phillips pointed out that acquisition of this would establish a good corridor or conglomerate of open space. Explained you should consider any way of making managed open space to dedicated open space. Here is an opportunity to do that.

The rights are in perpetuity.

Mr. Sinclair stated he thought it sounded like a win, win, win. This does fall within our purview of an 8-24. Our POCD guru loves it. The financials don't really come to us. It's all come together. I make a motion to send back a favorable 8-24 referral.

The Chair thanked staff for their excellent presentations. I am in full support of this.

Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

8. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Clock advised the POCD Gods are with us tonight, but also we are entering the final stages of putting the plan into motion. All that's left is for all of us to review the plan, if you have not, and we will share it at the next meeting.

The Chair confirmed it is on the Agenda for the 19th of Agenda.

Mr. Phillips stated it is a great plan to focus on that night.

Please review the draft and come with great questions to discuss.

Reach out to constituents for any questions they may have or want answered.

9. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

There is an application but it won't be scheduled until February.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Mr. Phillips noted an administrative approval for Lake Compounce. They want to put in a 44 by 20 foot pavilion addition adjacent to a campground store. It's part of the approvals. We have no concerns and it is very minor.

The commission agreed to the administrative approval.

Mr. Phillips talked about a potential modification to the subdivision regulations in front of the commissioners. It's a hot topic. It's Section 6 and has to do with the open space subdivision. He noted several modifications suggested.

The main tenence (sp) is that our open space regulations as they are right now aren't utilized very well. The fee in lieu of isn't utilized at all. At least recently.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips discussed several concepts in the document put together and noted requirements suggested.

The big nut is increasing open space to 20%. It's applicable on any size subdivision. On smaller subdivisions a fee in lieu would be

utilized with the money going into the open space fund.
Discussion.

The Chair asked Mr. Phillips to finish the language and send it out for referral. If commissioners in the next couple of days after looking at this have questions or concerns, if they could get them to Rob by Thursday. If you don't hear from the commission by Friday, send it out to referral.

11. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

List circulated to the commissioners.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to adjourn which Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:54 o'clock, p.m.)