

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON
NOVEMBER 15, 2016

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, November 15, 2016 at the John Weichsel 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:

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

Alternates: Bob Hammersley & Ted Cabata

Ex-Officio: Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community
Development
James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Mgr./Town Attorney

Absent: Joe Coviello & Ross Hart, Alternates

A quorum was determined.

The Chair recognized students from Mr. Hart's Civics Class and invited them to the microphone to give their name and address. (Chris Taylor, Steven Stachvich, Matthew (Inaudible), Chris Chaplinsky, Don McDonald, Taylor Cox)

Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance being led by all the students.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Regular meeting of October 18, 2016

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

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

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Christopher R. Campbell, Special Permit Application to construct a 35 x 24 garage which will bring the total number of garage spaces to more than three, 76 Clearwood Place, in an R-80 zone (SPU #568)

Christopher Campbell, 76 Clearwood Place, Southington, CT. The proposal is to build a detached garage. The house currently has a three-car attached garage. This would be a detached two additional and it exceeds the square footage allowed by 576 sf as stated on the application dated September 15th.

Mr. Phillips advised this is in compliance. He received his ZBA approval on 10/25/16 with some stipulations. If you do decide on this application, they would be: non-commercial purposes and no living space.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Arthur Cyr, 105 Berlin Avenue. I speak in favor of this application. This town and ZBA has seen more and more applicants come forward looking to construct additional garage space. I am generally opposed to that unless it is in an R-80 zone, like this is.

More and more town residents and taxpayers have a wife and kids and two, three or four cars and antique vehicles or boats or off road vehicles, jet skis, et cetera. They simply need more garage space.

As long as it is in an R-80 zone and I've spoken at ZBA in favor, I believe this board should also approve this application.

(Those speaking against this application)

No response.

The Chair closed the public hearing for this item.

B. V Squared, LLC, eight lot resubdivision application, properties located at 460 Marion Avenue (Map 62, Parcel 181), Marion Avenue rear (Map 62, Parcel 180), Marion Ave (Map 62, Parcel 182) Marion Ave rear (Map 51, Parcel 54) and Marion Avenue (Map 51, Parcel 55) owned by Baccus, LLC (S#1315)

No application was in attendance tonight.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

(No response)

(Those speaking against the application)

(No response)

The Chair advised Mr. Phillips to reach out to the applicant and tell him to be here. Mr. Phillips, felt they made the assumption they didn't need to be here. I thought they were going to be here.

Attorney Sciota advised it is a public hearing and they need to be here.

The Chair continued the public hearing.

C. Leone Realty and Development, Special Permit Application for change of use to allow a daycare business on the main level of building (5,200 sf) property located at 805 West Queen Street, in a WSB zone (SPU #570)

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, CT. This is a proposal for a day care business. This parcel is at the corner of West Queen Street and West Street. The existing building, upper level, has been vacant for quite some time. The lower level contains a chiropractor's office.

The upper area is a 502-sf space, vacant for quite some time. The proposal is to have a day care facility with up to 80 children.

Mr. Leone and Chris and Carla Russo are here, too. They own My Little Rascals II-day care. They do own two daycare centers in Southington, already.

They are proposing to renovate the existing space and use the parking lot. We are proposing an outdoor play area (grassed area).

We have received town staff comments and we've supplied responses. We think this application is in harmony with the area and will have no negative or adverse effects to the surrounding properties or traffic patterns. The property has a traffic light at this location (indicating). We think that this will work very well with this site.

Hours of operation are 6:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday thru Friday. The applicants are anxious to get in.

Not much else to our application other than that. I'll answer any questions.

Mr. Sinclair asked if there had been any thought as to the internal traffic patterns, pick-ups, drop offs? Mr. Giudice responded the way this site is situated; the front of the building is at the upper level which where we will be utilizing this site. The lower

level is on the back side. The only way to access the day care center would be through the front parking lot and that would be used exclusively for the daycare facility. The back would be used for employee parking for the daycare and then the chiropractor office on the lower level. Our traffic will come in through the entrance and use the spaces out front and then leave through the exit.

Mr. Sinclair said his concern was with the peak drop off and pickup times and the volume of cars. Mr. Giudice didn't think there would be 80 cars in the parking lot at one time. There will be an influx at certain times (peak times).

Discussion.

Mr. Sinclair reiterated his concern was back up in the parking lot, traffic patterns, cars stacked. Mr. Giudice said it would be congested at times, but the parking standards in the town as to aisle ways, distances between parked cars, I think it will function properly.

Mr. Sinclair asked him if he felt there would be minor congestion and no gridlock. Mr. Giudice agreed.

Mr. Chaplinsky discussed for clarification, on the northern side of the building, there is something there --- stairs? Mr. Giudice said this is where the grade changes and there is a stairway that goes down to the lower level.

Mr. Leone, 360 Captain Lewis Drive, Southington, Leone Realty & Development. That's going to be an emergency exit, so it does come out on to that side of the building. There is a landing there for egress in case of emergency.

Mr. Morelli discussed the outside play area. Can it be pushed back from West Street? Mr. Giudice said it is possible to back slide it, but the grade starts to drop off and we are trying to keep it in a flat area. Mr. Morelli pointed out there is a lot of traffic on that road. He would be nervous.

Mr. Leone added from the front edge of the playground where the fence is, it is approximately 50 feet to the sidewalk facing towards the building and then you have the woods to the sidewalk and another seven or eight feet to the road. We tried keeping it as far back as possible.

Mr. Morelli discussed trucks coming down the other way, if they didn't make the turn. Mr. Leone said on the south side of the property there is the bordering property and it is sloped way up. If a car was coming down, there is the slope.

Mr. Chaplinsky discussed transportation pillars and parking pillars and maybe we could discuss that at site plan.

Mr. Phillips said he didn't think that 19 spaces up front is a critical shortage, but there may be occasionally an Event Day. On those days if the people have to park down low, is there access to the facility anywhere except for the front, and if not, is there adequate safety provided for getting around to the back parking lot? Based on this discussion, that is my question.

Mr. Leone clarified there currently is no set of stairs going down to the lower parking lot. There is space on the north side of the building where we could put some where the north side exit is. The other thing to keep in mind is that the lower level is only occupied by 2500 sf. The other 2500 sf I'm using for my office. The chiropractor has at most four to five cars at one time in the parking lot. I don't plan on leasing out the other half. Employees could use that parking down there. I'm okay with that.

Discussion of the total parking spaces.

(Those speaking in favor of this application)

No response.

(Those speaking against this application)

No response.

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

BUSINESS MEETING:

A. Christopher R. Campbell, Special Permit Application to construct a 35 x 24 garage which will bring the total number of garage spaces to more than three,76 Clearwood Place, in an R-80 zone (SPU #568)

This is ready for action. Mr. Phillips added he would recommend you carry forward the stipulations that the ZBA which is this is not for business use or for contained living purposes.

Mr. Chaplinsky said this was a great win for a homeowner in town to be able to use their property to the fullest extent. I'm in favor of it.

The Chair commented the markups look very nice.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the town planner's stipulations. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. V Squared, LLC, eight lot resubdivision application, properties located at 460 Marion Avenue (Map 62, Parcel 181), Marion Avenue rear (Map 62, Parcel 180), Marion Ave (Map 62, Parcel 182) Marion Ave rear (Map 51, Parcel 54) and Marion Avenue (Map 51, Parcel 55) owned by Baccus, LLC (S#1315)

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

C. Leone Realty and Development, Special Permit Application for change of use to allow a daycare business on the main level of building (5,200 sf) property located at 805 West Queen Street, in a WSB zone (SPU #570)

Ready for action. Your zoning regulations allow for a waiver of anything more than 25 children in a day care facility by a vote of two thirds.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to grant the waiver for more than 25 children. My concern was with traffic and the applicant has relieved my fears. I think this will be good.

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

We've had a couple of discussions about daycare facilities in town commented Mr. Chaplinsky. He discussed the YMCA facility and a lot of discussion about traffic in that congested area and they've done fine. Here there are twice as many parking spaces.

I do share the concern about the play area. There is a steep grade there and there is a hill on the south side. We might want to consider stipulations about enhanced containment around the play area.
Discussion.

Because of no guardrail on the easterly side, we might want to consider some concrete posts or barriers there. It is a pretty steep grade from the road down. A bank kind of goes on the southerly edge.
Discussion.

Mr. Grappone added there is a sewer easement that runs parallel to West street. I thought there was some type of landscaping there.

Mr. Macchio noted at their other facility they have barriers for parking and safety. They were amenable to that. I would think they'd be amenable to doing the same here for safety reasons.

Attorney Sciota asked Mr. Grappone: If you want to protect the easterly boundary of the playground and you want to put bollards in there, what is the distance between?

Discussion.

Mr. Grappone said they would probably be 8 feet maximum between.
Discussion.

Mr. Grappone pointed out there is an existing sidewalk there, a state ROW, to put in a proper guardrail, it would have to be a metal beam rail. It'd probably be located on private property. We wouldn't mind it running parallel with the sewer easement.

Mr. Phillips suggested a wooden guardrail down the slope on the east side of the play area to adjoin the existing parking area.

The guardrail go north to south along the sidewalk and then wrap around to the play area --- is that possible, questioned Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Grappone did say it looks like the sidewalk is one foot off the property line.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked how the commission would feel about stipulating they work with staff on appropriate safety measures and what staff feels would be appropriate. Some level of safety would be good.

Everyone agreed with that.

Specifically: for safety for a vehicle leaving the roadway, so it's got to be strong enough to handle that and talking about the easterly boundary and a portion of the southerly and northerly boundary. (North of the play area and to the east side of the play area.)

Mr. Phillips advised they are removing some trees here as far as the vegetative buffer and that should be replaced in-kind. (To accommodate the play area.) If they replace in kind and work with staff, that would be fine.

Ms. Clock brought up an access way from the back parking lot to the building be it stairs or otherwise. I do see an issue happening on Event Days and guiding people to the place to park and make sure there is a safe way for them to access the building. She felt that would be a necessity.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the three stipulations discussed.

1. Ms. Clock's about the accesway.
2. Fence.

3. Replacement of the trees.

All three are with staff approval.

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

D. Leone Realty and development, Site plan application to allow daycare business on the main level of building located at 805 West Queen Street in a WSB (SPR #1723)

Everything incorporated from the SPU into this application.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the site plan with the same stipulations as the SPU. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. Cranberry Cove, LLC floodplain filling and site plan application to remove existing structures and parking areas and construct multiple retail and restaurant buildings and associated parking, 102 West Center Street, in a B zone (FF #248 / SPR #1719), tabled from October 18

Mr. Giudice presented on behalf of the applicant. This has been before you a couple of times in the past and now currently for site plan.

We did achieve a conservation commission approval and a favorable recommendation for floodplain filling at the last conservation commission meeting.

We've worked with staff to address comments. I did speak with Mr. Grappone this afternoon about a few minor issues. I believe he'll talk to you about them for stipulation.

We did add the sidewalk connection at three locations to the rails to trails. That's something the commission was concerned about.

A loading space and some modification with the dumpsters.

We added a walking trail along the perimeter of the green space (indicating). Something we thought would be nice for the husbands to do while the wives shop.

At this point I believe we are in pretty good shape.

Mr. Phillips said from a planning perspective there is nothing outstanding. However, I would note for the commission any stipulation

--- on the SPU approval you required Renaissance treatment to the walkways. The applicant responded to comments it would be either pavers or stamped concrete. If it is stamped concrete, the color used would match the paver Renaissance look. That's planning's comment. Discussion.

Discussion about stamped concrete on walkways from a safety standpoint. Anti-slip additives were discussed as it is in the applicant's best interest to not have slippery sidewalks.

Mr. Grappone had six suggested stipulations:

1. Provide watertight covers for all new sanitary manholes.
2. All openings and building entrances shall be one foot above the regulated FEMA Flood Plain elevation.
3. Provide overflow Tee at building for all roof drains.
4. Structural engineer (Certified CT PE) design for preventing hydraulic uplift for foundations as required by the CT Building Code.
5. Provide design for ejector system and force main for Building A.
6. Clearing limits for flood plain mitigation to be approved by Town Staff.

Mr. Guidice said the applicant will accept those stipulations.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with the stipulations noted. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. Lazy Lane Industrial Park, LLC, site plan modification application for a proposed 16' by 16' salt storage shed and additional employee parking, property located at 172 Lazy Lane, in an I-2 zone (SPR #1538.1)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented the application. The property is located at 172 Lazy Lane. It is served by public water and sewer. It is in an I-2 zone.

The existing building is 24,866 sf. It is a multi-unit facility. Incubator type of businesses.

The proposal is for a 16 by 16 salt storage shed shown in the southwest corner of the site. In addition, the request is also to allow employee parking on the west side of the site. It is in an existing paved area. The number of proposed parking spaces is 23.

They are necessary for the employees of the multiple businesses that are located at this facility. We did not expect this many businesses to be here. We expected more single users using more square footage. We have mini businesses located here.

A list of them was provided to the Planner, but we will provide a copy for the record. There is 18 of them --- names and type of trade is listed. (Submitted)

In discussions with the Planner, the applicant has agreed to relocate the salt storage shed to the storage area dedicated which was approved with the original site plan. That issues goes away in terms of the salt storage shed near the residential area. (Indicated areas)

The request right now for the site plan revision is to allow the additional parking in this area here (indicating). For the record, the distance between the house to the west and the beginning of this parking area is about 174 lf. It is separated by a landscaped area. The grade is lower than the grade at the house.

Additional comments by the Planner I'm sure we can address. I'll be glad to answer commission questions.

Mr. Munson and he can make additional testimony to the application if you want.

Mr. Phillips clarified the reason why they're here is essentially because there is an ongoing enforcement action for basically noncompliance with the approved site plan. Obviously, they have two options. One was to appeal that decision to the ZBA or come into the planning & zoning with a site plan modification with changes to the site plan to accommodate what they're currently doing and what they desire to do. They've chosen that route, obviously.

I'll go through some of the comments/issues on the site plan explained the Planner. These have either not been done in accordance with the original approval or are there and haven't been approved.

- The evergreen vegetative buffer on the west side abutting the residential zone and property - they don't appear to be planted according to the approved plan which was supposed to be three rows with trees 15' on center. I see only two rows. Some of the trees are not alive and they should be replaced. Some trees look 15' on center and some don't.

- The storage area is supposed to be screened by a 4' chain link fence. That's not the case. The applicant had indicated to me earlier that concrete blocks might be more beneficial. I'm fine with that if the commission is fine with that.

- There is storage of heavy equipment, storage trailers, RVs, maybe a bollard or two. Similar items are stored around the site on the western side. They should be in a storage area as designated.

- There are some roll offs at the rear of the building that should be on pads and appropriately screened like a dumpster.

- A number of dumpsters on site --- about a half dozen at my count - they should all be located in a centralized area and on pads and screened in accordance with the regulations.

- There was a vehicle up on the front lot behind the tree line on Lazy Lane and that appears to have been removed. There is some material: cement blocks, trench boxing in that area that really should be removed or approved as a storage area but it is off the site of this property.

- The salt storage structure was located within that 35' setback, as approved by the commission previously. It is supposed to be 50', but the commission allowed the 35' reduction to allow for vehicles to come around the northwest side of the building. Since the commission approved that previously, you probably don't have any wherewithal to change that at this point in time.

- There was an above ground fuel storage tank on the rear of the building and it looks like it may have been removed.

Probably the most important thing that the developed very recently is I asked the applicant to provide me with a list of tenants of the 19 individual units. There are 18 tenants, one is renting a double. I tried to verify that on site as well as what we had for zoning permits that were previously approved in the last four or five years. And, I could only verify two of them that would still be legitimate approved zoning permits for that particular tenant use. So, there has been some turnover, obviously. I can't verify at least two of them and the rest of them either never had a permit to begin with or have turned over to similar uses, but different applicants and they didn't go through the vetting process to make sure they are compliant uses in that zone. We do that with strip malls. Anybody who has an individual unit in a business zone has to go through a zoning permit.

That's where we're at right now. We would need at the very least the applicant to provide us with zoning permits for all the tenants that are in there. Then we can verify. I didn't see any issues with a dealer repairer but if there was, they would need to get location approval and go through that process. Including ZBA.

Mr. Bovino responded. He understood that the applicant is willing to fence in the storage area with concrete blocks as stated by Rob.

Discussion about the location.

Rich Munson, 990 Andrews Street, Southington. My part Dave (inaudible) and I are both here tonight.

The first issue on the list of comments was the plantings in the 35' landscaped buffer. When we got the initial approval to occupy the entire building, we had to go through site plan approval and we suggested to the then Planner, Mary Savage, that we move all of the evergreens up the slope and consolidate them to provide a better buffer for the residents that are on the western side. She agreed to that.

If you counted trees, the same number of trees that were on the original site plan are there now but they are moved up the slope and there are indeed two rows instead of three.

As far as the concrete blocks, Dave Lavalley was out one time and he and I agreed that we would line the south and westerly buffers with concrete blocks. Those were temporarily removed this summer because Eversource was in and they had to build a large pad to replace the high line towers. They were wood and they replaced them with steel.

We had forgotten that we needed to reline those. So, Dave and I over the weekend did indeed reline the south and west sides with blocks.

The roll offs on the south side of the building, what we would propose as far as the roll offs and dumpsters is to move those up into the storage area and to have a dedicated area for any dumpsters and any tenants that we have will have to go up there to use the dumpsters. Probably in the middle of the southern buffer. This is where we think would be the best area. It would provide the most landscaped protection from the neighbors. It's furthest away from any of the neighbors.

The fuel storage tank has been removed.

On the parking area, there is a note on the plan indicating that no trailers or large trucks be parked there. Just employee cars will be parked there added Mr. Bovino. And, there would be a sign indicating that if there is anything else, it will be towed at the owner's expense. Trailers, campers and that type of vehicle will not be allowed in that area.

The Chair asked if the Planner had proof of the tree situation. Mr. Phillips said there was evidence there may have been discussions with the previous Planner on site based upon the result of the reading of the Minutes from the meeting of the approval. There is no evidence I could anywhere of anything. I did look at the approved plan. I would suggest if you are interested, you could possible either one,

stipulate the approval or better yet continue the application to the next meeting so the applicant get their zoning permits in for all their tenants and also revise the plans accordingly to show everything we need to have on there that has been discussed and is compliant with the regulations so we have a final revised plan to always reference.

Ultimately, problems can accumulate when you have tenants who behave differently than others. It really falls upon the property owner to be in control of the situation.

The Chair asked Mr. Munson: You own the property. What controls do you have in place? Are you communicative with the tenants? Do you tell them they have to clean this up? Mr. Munson said he and his partner are in constant communication with them. Probably on a daily basis. I admit we weren't as diligent as we should've been. We will certainly make an effort to be more so.

Mr. Chaplinsky suggested the commission consider tabling this to the next meeting and ask the applicant as to the list of things from the planner, if we could button that up and give it to the commission. I'd also like to ask the applicant for us to be able to go out to the site and look for ourselves. We can determine effects of screening with blocks as opposed to fencing. The communication we received with respect to some of these issues, I'd like more time to go out and look at it.

Mr. Munson responded: You are certainly welcome. We're proud of the property and we think it does serve a need and it is a good thing for the Town of Southington.

The Town Attorney noted this is the first portable incubator industrial zone.

Mr. Phillips did add engineering has some comments they sent to the applicant, as well. A number of them are still outstanding and need to be addressed.

The Town Attorney said it is important to get the zoning permits in place before you vote on this. We have to make sure all tenants are there and are supposed to be there. I agree this should be tabled. Get the ZPs in place, everything on the map and then we don't have to worry about these aspects of it. This is the problem with onsite meetings when decisions are made and nothing is followed up on it. Let's get it on the map. Everything we want on there.

Mr. Chaplinsky thanked the applicant for working with the commission. We do have a letter from a neighbor adjoining and it might be good for you to reach out to the neighbor, as well. Just discuss issues and be sure you are aligned coming into the meeting next time. That often helps with the decision process. Mr. Munson said certainly.

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

G. Floodplain Application of Limitless Energy, LLC seeking to install a ground mount solar array in the floodplain, located at 178 Newell Street, in an I-1 zone (FF #249)

This application is not an approval as presented. Staff is working right now to see where we can go with it.

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

7. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

The Chair reiterated everyone has their responsibilities. You should be checking in with me. I don't want this to get away from us.

Rob, you gave us something earlier tonight?

Mr. Phillips stated this is the Miscellaneous Regulation Project. He reviewed it really quick.

Page I - Section 2: Add some language: 364 sf to make that very clear because 14 by 26, we measure by area.

Page 3 - Issue with living quarters for caretakers. Nothing but problems. Propose to remove that.

Page 8 - Number 16: Just add a word "detached" to the private garage definition. That's warranted as it doesn't make sense if it is attached and you can't have more than 1.5 story.

Page 10 - This has to do with our kennel, doggy daycare issue. It's up for discussion. I'm not sure where you want to go with this, but our main issue is dog runs outside, any kind of noise emanating from the structure and things of that nature. With that in mind, in this section for definition where the actual use is addressed to propose some changes where a definition of a kennel would change from currently: any premises on which four or more dogs, six months or older are kept, add language: day and or night, all pets spayed, neutered, dog grooming, doggy daycare, dog therapy facilities are considered to meet the same requirements. I don't know how we'll separate them.

The Chair noted the low hanging fruit is whether or not there is overnight stays at these kennels. I think the term kennel is not what it used to be. Five years ago, no one knew what a doggy daycare was. Dog therapy facilities?

Mr. Phillips stated the problem with overnight is that not everybody works first shift. We had an issue like that.
Discussion.

Section 4: That's the business regulation section and it allows for offices for the practice of veterinary medicine and/or animal hospitals or kennels. Suggesting adding some language: providing the kennel is located in a soundproof building and has any outdoor facilities more than 500' way from residential zone or use.

Section 5: That's the industrial zone. The first section allows by right animal hospitals inside soundproof buildings. And it kind of conflicts with the fact that it is also a special permit for offices for the practice of veterinary medicine and/or animal hospitals and kennel use providing said kennel use is more than 500' from a residential zone or use.

I would suggest getting rid of the double meaning and ambiguity. Remove the "as of right" and make it a special permit like it is in the other zones.

And, also add language: located in a soundproof building and has any outdoor dog facilities.

The last minor change is 5.02.1 that's Page 12. The very first as of right: any building or use that is permitted in Section 5-01.1A thru I. At one point in time I went through the regulations and when that particular letter "A" was added, there was only A thru I. It was referring to that in its entirety, but there has been more added to I after and I think we should just remove that. It's the only instance in the regulations that has that situation where it's A thru I. Everything else refers back to the whole section.

There will be a few little other tid bits I am going to send out in the next few days. Review it. We wouldn't get to it until January 3rd, anyway. If I could get a response within a week or so?

ZBA has an application on next week for a doggy daycare.
Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated these seem to be pretty straight forward changes. Can't we just begin the process? Get them referred out.
Discussion.

After comments, the Chair advised Mr. Phillips to start referring this to the pertinent agencies.

Mr. Chaplinsky suggested where appropriate strike the term "dog" and use "animal". Keep it generic. Mr. Phillips will look at it.
Discussion.

8. REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE

Mr. Cabata advised no meeting has been held since September. He will attend the next one scheduled for Thursday.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Mr. Phillips advised Faith Living Church has a site plan mod for an addition to house an elevator at 20 Grove Street. Minor.

ExecWest site plan modification to eliminate several landscape islands in accordance with recent parking regulations modifications. Staff will work with them on that.

Discussion.

10. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- Senad Ahmetovic, Home Occupation application for a home office for online sales of ammunition 58 Longo Drive, in an I-2 zone (HO #66), December 6

- Matthew Denorfia, Special Permit Application for parent/grandparent apartment, property located at 70 Hawk's Nest Drive, in an R-80 zone (SPU #571), December 6

11. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Mr. Phillips noted on the list distributed, A thru J. Some were on tonight's agenda.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Planning & Zoning Commission - November 15, 2016

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 o'clock, p.m.)