

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
TOWN OF SOUTHTON  
MARCH 7, 2017

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, March 7, 2017 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
Susan Locks	Jennifer Clock
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: Bob Hammersley, Ross Hart & Ted Cabata

Ex-Officio: Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community  
Development  
James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer

Absent: James Morelli, Regular Member  
Joe Coviello, Alternate

Mark Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney

The Chair seated Mr. Hammersley for the vacancy and Mr. Cabata for Mr. Morelli.

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

**4. Appointment of Commissioner**

Passed.

**5. Approval of Minutes**

**Regular Meeting of February 7, 2017**

Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion for approval. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Chaplinsky abstaining.

**6. Public Hearings**

Mr. Phillips read the legal ad into the record.

A. Lovley Development Inc., Modification of Special Permit approval to add additional building, 1085 West Street, (Map 131, Parcel 43) in a B zone (SPU #573)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the applicant.

The applicant is requesting modification of a previously approved special permit use #573. We have multiple building on the site: hotel, medical buildings, UCONN, retail center and bank and a drive thru restaurant.

The restaurant was on the north side of the property and now it has been moved to the south side or center of the property.

And, this building (indicating) now is a bank.

We have an additional building from when the original SPU was granted and we had always had a mixed-use permit here to have different uses on the property which we have accomplished.

The property is located in a B zone. It has a traffic light at Corporate Drive. It is served by public water and sewer. Notifications were sent to the property owners within 500' of the property.

We believe the proposal is in harmony with the orderly development of the area and in our opinion the uses are not detrimental to the area.

Mr. Bovino showed the building elevations. Explained awnings, canopies and shutters a balcony and a stone veneer along the bottom of the building on all sides. The rear elevation and front elevation were shown.

The retail building was shown. That matches the rest of the buildings on the site. It was reduced from 18,000 sf to 14,000 sf. It has a lower roof area on the ends and it has more jogs in it and it looks better than the other one. Basically, the same architecture.

The bank will look similar in architecture to the main building.

Traffic flow stays the same.

Circulation pattern stays the same.

As to parking, the total number is 180 spots which meets the regulations. Access to the medical building was discussed as being only to be used if and when needed. Overflow parking with a porous surface.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing.

B. Dale and Eva Humphries, Special Permit Application for parent/grandparent apartment, 157 Aspen Way, property owned by AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC in an R-20/25 zone, (SPU #574)

Anthony Denorfia, 133 Main Street represented the applicant. We're seeking permission to have an in-law apartment built for the Humphries family. Ms. Humphries is here if you have questions.

The location of the property is 159 Aspen Way in Southington which is the new development we're putting in off of Loper Street.

The home consists of approximately 2450 sf and we're seeking permission to put in a 459-sf in-law apartment located in the walk out basement area.

Access to the home would be through a stairway through the garage, through the main entrance thru the home and also through a slider out back of the home.

The in-law apartment is modest. It consists of a living room, small kitchen area, bedroom and a bathroom.

More than sufficient parking on site with a three-car garage and additional parking within the driveway.

We have filed the necessary affidavit and I think we are all in order.

Mr. Phillips said it is ready for action.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing.

C. Gary Salvatore, Special Permit Application for parent/grandparent apartment, 183 Hobart Street, property owned by Sean & Chelsea Salvatore, in an R-20/25 zone (SPU #575)

Gary Salvatore, 81 DeSorbo Drive. I am looking to put on a mother in law apartment on my son's house at 183 Hobart Street. The apartment is going to be about a thousand square feet.

We are going to have an access from the house coming in and one from the garage and we'll have a slider going out the back. Full basement. One floor.

Mr. Phillips stated for the record the submission is for a 438 sf. Where did the one thousand square feet come from? And, 472 is allowed by regulation. We have the affidavit on file.

Mr. Salvatore we are also putting on the addition for a combination access for them to have living room space, space for the children, a study/playroom and then the additional space is for myself.

Mr. Phillips stated staff calculated it at 438 with no issues with it for the in-law apartment specifically. The other space may be shared space.

Mr. Hammersley noted the property is tight. Where is, the addition going on? Mr. Salvatore said straight back in back of the garage. Exactly parallel with the garage.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

D. ARC of Southington, special permit application for modification to existing municipal building and parking lot, 201 West Main Street, property owned by the Town of Southington in an R-12 zone (SPU #576)

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, represented the applicant.

We're proposing an addition and parking improvements. This property is technically owned by the Town of Southington. It's .88 acres originally part of the Plantsville School. We've cut it out. It used to be part of the school parcel and now it is a separate piece to make the public hearing process a little easier.

It is serviced by public water and sewers.

The ARC is suffering space wise and parking wise. They are parking wherever they can possibly park. They are accomplishing a lot of good things and need more space to do so.

The existing building is 2600 sf. And, a 540-sf existing garage on the parcel with 18 parking spots currently.

We're proposing an 1800 sf addition located at the back of the building. We're proposing to eliminate the existing garage and we propose a storage shed at this location. Then we will redevelop the parking area. We have a sidewalk that connects to the school property and this parking lot will be used for overflow purposes during school activities. A good cross use of the property.

He discussed the storm drainage for storm water management.

We think it will be a nice addition for the ARC and the Town.

We have met with staff and received comments. I think we've addressed most of their comments with one final comment from Mr. Grappone we need to do research on. Everything else, I believe, is in order with this application.

We believe it is in harmony with the surrounding areas and not negatively impact any property values of the area or traffic.

Happy to answer questions.

Mr. Cabata asked if they had communication with the BOE or Plantsville School. Mr. Giudice said he has not. We worked with Attorney Sciota and the staff here.

The ARC operates separately from the BOE and we did not think that was necessary.

Mr. Phillips noted they are currently located on one site but they will be cut out into their own lot. There is a municipal exemption where you can make that lot split. Mr. Giudice explained this was a separate parcel at one time and the town acquired it and combined it with the school. Now we are re-establishing it and cutting it into a separate piece to make it easier for the ARC to get their funding, et cetera.

Mr. Sinclair asked if this should be an 8-24 item. A call was put into Attorney Sciota about an 8-24.

Discussion.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking in against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

## **7. Business Meeting**

A. Lovley Development Inc., Modification of Special Permit approval to add additional building, 1085 West Street, (Map 131, Parcel 43) in a B zone (SPU #573)

Ready for action.

This is ready for action. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Lovley Development, Inc., site plan modification to show additional building, 1095 West Street (Map 131, Parcel 43), in a B zone (SPR #1513.3)

Mr. Bovino represented the applicant. This property is located on West Street across from the Corporate Drive intersection. The site plan was revised to accommodate this new building. Otherwise, the rest of the site plan is exactly like the one you approved not long ago.

Drainage and circulation pattern is the same.

We received staff comments and addressed them from the planning and engineering department.

Mr. Phillips said this building may in the future be cut on its own separate fee simple lot. That's kind of the impetus to the text change tabled on the agenda previously. The SPU/SPR portion is here nor there with respect to that.

The other comment is they're not proposing a loading area. Per your regulations, you have to be comfortable with that.

And, we have six stipulations.

Discussion about having or need a loading area for the bank. And, the back building will have small deliveries. No need for an official loading dock with a concrete pad, et cetera. The tenants have said they don't need the loading dock. Same thing with the medical building.

This is ready for action with stipulations.

Stipulations:

1. Subject to the design of the Force Main and Pump to be reviewed by Engineering prior to issuance of the Building Permit.

2. Subject to any and all cross easements for utilities, storm water and access management between individual parcels, if split in the future.

3. Subject to an additional accessible space located adjacent to the mountable curbing due to the total number of parking spaces (less deferred) exceeding 50. Also, must provide current accessible van sign on detail sheet.

4. A separate building permit is required for the retaining wall Building #1109. Wall design shall be submitted by a CT PE.

5. Provide detail for pervious overflow parking. Final revised plans should show curbing closure and clear hatching over the deferred parking as well.

6. Application to be submitted to CT DOT OSTA for review under the current traffic certification.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with the six stipulations noted which seem very minor. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Dale and Eva Humphries, Special Permit Application for parent/grandparent apartment, 157 Aspen Way, property owned by AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC in an R-20/25 zone, (SPU #574)

This is ready for action.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Sinclair.

The requisite notes are on the plan as noted in the regulations.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Gary Salvatore, Special Permit Application for parent/grandparent apartment, 183 Hobart Street, property owned by Sean & Chelsea Salvatore, in an R-20/25 zone (SPU #575)

This is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve which Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. ARC of Southington, special permit application for modification to existing municipal building and parking lot, 201 West Main Street, property owned by the Town of Southington in an R-12 zone (SPU #576)

Mr. Phillips noted Attorney Sciota responded advising that the 8-24 is not necessary.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Cabata seconded.

The ARC has done fantastic things in this town for years and years and years. I'm sure they'll continue to do so and we wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. ARC of Southington, site plan application for proposed building addition and parking lot expansion, 201 West Main Street, property owned by the Town of Southington, in an R-12 zone (SPR #1728)

Mr. Phillips mentioned the municipal exemption. There was some question about the parking and how it complied with the regulations. They have a demonstrated demand there. It is shared parking between the school and ARC as necessary. Even though not technically called municipal parking which is exempt from the overflow parking stipulations and regulations, it is functioning like that and from a staff point of view we don't have any issues with it being used as municipal parking.

All staff is satisfied and it is ready for action.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve and Mr. Cabata seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Zoning Text Amendment of Lovley Development for proposed revision to Sections 11-14.2, 11-14.3 and 11-14.4 of the Town of Southington Zoning Regulations (ZA #590) tabled from February 7

Mr. Phillips advised they are still looking for a table.

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

H. Briarwood Real Estate Limited Partnership, 4 lot subdivision application, 2278 Mount Vernon Road, I an R-40 and R-80 zone (S#1316).

Mr. Bovino represented the applicant. This is directly across from Welch Road. The land area is 8.14 acres. Open field and wooded area. Zone is R-40 and R-80. It is R-40 along Mount Vernon Road and R-80 in the back of the property. It will be a short cul de sac, less than 300' of road.

We have received staff comments. The maps reflect those changes.

The groundwater recharge concept was explained.

The sheet runoff design was explained.

Proposed deep sumps were discussed.

Connection to one of the catch basins on Mt. Vernon Road was discussed.

ZIRO is provided.

Street trees are shown on the maps as staff requested.

All appropriate notes are on the plan.

Sidewalks are not required according to the regulations.

I'll be glad to answer any questions.

All curb cuts are off the new road with only the main entrance being off of Mt. Vernon Road.

The connection to Mt. Vernon Road is going to be directly across from Welch Road with no offset.

Sight distances were measured as 450' north and 600+' south.

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action.

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

I. 405 Queen, LLC 3 lot subdivision application, 405 Queen Street, in a B and R-20/25 zone (S#1314.1)

This is a previously approved subdivision that you had last year. Statutes dictate that they have to file the record subdivision plan on the land records and you have 90 days to do that and then two 90-day extension. If you don't do it, you have to come back for reapproval. Sev is here to answer any questions.

They're about ready to settle with the sale/mortgage and they just ran out of time. They came in for the reapproval. Nothing has changed here.

Staff did have another bite at the apple but nothing came up.

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

## **8. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

The following are notes on the highlighted items. Please refer to the video on line for the full presentation.

### **Discussion of possible rezoning of Upson, Chaffee and Stoughton Lane**

Mr. Phillips introduced the topic. There was a little sliver rezoned on those three streets that was allowed to change to B to accommodate some business development along Queen Street. That same applicant came in to take another little piece, sliver essentially. A few lots. It was clearly becoming a piecemeal nature and eating away at the existing R-12 zone.

Last meeting you had the application for the second sliver and you denied it to protect the interests of the current residents in the neighborhood.

I'll mention again the POCD for that area, the future land use plan shows it as R-12 as it is now. There are competing policies in the POCD. One being revitalize and enhance your existing business areas and zones and there is also protect existing residential neighborhoods.

The question becomes: Do you want to take a stand and protect the rest of that neighborhood and keep it R-12, what's left of it. You kind of did that with the last denial. Or do you want to look at the whole entire site and look down the road and say well, this is going to be business, it should be business. Should we just change the whole area to business that way if there is a developer that comes along and wants to buy up a few properties to conglomerate or buy them all out, that's more possible.

1. What happens to the existing residents there? If it converts to business they can live there as long as they want to. The only issue comes if they want to do additions or pools or any other way of expanding the residential footprint. That would be looking at a variance issue. You can inform the ZBA to be lenient on those variances but it is still a situation where they have to pay for the application and go through the process which is a little cumbersome.

2. Does their property stay the same or increase if it is looked at from a business standpoint. That's possibly something our town assessor can comment on if you go that direction.

It's really a judgment call. Personally, I think it is clear someday this is not going to be a residential zone. Those houses were built in the 50's, 60's. Down the road, I don't see it happening. It is an area that is completely surrounded by business or multifamily in the rear, which is sandwiched behind Home Depot. It is a tough area for a residential development.

Do you want to entertain a commission-sponsored --- which means you are being proactive rather than reactive to a developer's proposal.

Or would you rather stand pat and see what happens over time? Maybe at the next POCD we look at it again. In the meantime, you could open up the POCD to focus on the change there.

The Chair explained after the denial last meeting, he spoke with the Town Attorney and asked what we could do to protect these neighbors. There are two ways to go and with some education Mark thought the best way to do it --- Mark and I both in our discussions -- if the town were to make an application to change the neighborhood over to business. Have lots of education. Brian Lastra would have to come and speak with regards to property values and what hindrances, what benefits there would be for changing it from residential to business.

Lou Perillo would have to be involved with the economic development impact.

Also, we thought we would reserve the conversation for tonight to have you have a discussion. To see how everyone feels about going forward. We're not making any decisions tonight. We can have discussions with Rob and Mark offline. If we decide to change the entire neighborhood over to business, we would follow our own rules. A public hearing and invite staff to speak.

Mr. Chaplinsky spoke about the West Street area. If you feel rezoning is the way to go, we'd have to put something in writing to the ZBA that said we feel they should be compelled to accept any future expansions in this area. This PZC felt the intent of any type of regulation change was to protect their interests.

If we felt a business opportunity presented on any one of these multiple of them, they could engage in discussions. There's options to go either way.

I'd like more information and opinions from the economic development coordinator and the town assessor to dig in and understand the impact.

Mr. Hart said by rezoning it, there could still be "death by a thousand cuts". I feel like it is not really going to solve the

problem of just the encroachment on the neighborhood. I feel personally we should leave it as a residential zone and wait for a developer to come in that's interested in the whole neighborhood. That way they can do it all at once. I feel it would still leave the door open for the slow chipping away of the neighborhood. Mr. Phillips said it could. There is a fundamental difference: development risk.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips suggested another option: Overlay zone. Explained they are triggered by something and many times by a lot consolidation of some sort.

Discussion of the overlay zone concept.

Mr. Sinclair said he could probably get behind the overlay zone, but taking this to a business zone, I don't think I could support that. Spoke about the "death by a thousand cuts" issue. That neighborhood has been here a lot in the last year.

I have a problem with writing a letter to the ZBA, also. That's a letter that gets ignored. This board changes and that board changes. It is the will of the people that're sitting there and not what we're thinking right now.

Finally, speaking of protecting the residents of that neighborhood's interests, they kind of spoke of their interests and where their hearts lay in this matter. Without them telling us they want this change, I can't really see myself supporting it.

Mr. Cabata asked what happens to the condos referenced if we change everything around them to business? You're an island of condos surrounded by businesses. Do you change them? If you do, does that open the door? Mr. Phillips said from a land use transitional standpoint, multi family is always a good transition from business to single family.

If this all becomes business and I agree at some point it will be, now you'll have the condos surrounded by Queen Street, Home Depot and the new developments. Do you rezone them? The Chair said it wouldn't be part of this application. They're zoned business --- not residential.

Ms. Locks said she supported the residents, leaving it as residential. They're leaving their homes to their children and I think it is going to go on. I hate to hurt that situation.

Ms. Clock reiterated her opinion stated at the last meeting. I would not be supportive of this unless with more education, the residents learned more and did find it would benefit them. I don't think it would. I think it would put them into various issues with

the ZBA. We cannot guarantee them anything. I feel it is making it more difficult on a specific group that came here and were not in support of it. I would not feel comfortable with it.

Mr. Hammersley saw no harm in getting an education on it. I like that idea of having staff do research on similar situations in our town and other towns, as well. Use that education to make an informed decision about what we want to do. I can see both sides of the argument. It would benefit all of us to look at the facts and reality and make a decision.

The Chair said the biggest thing he struggles with is if this zone changes, I want these residents to feel comfortable they can do what they want and it bothers me they'd have to go to the ZBA. If there is a way around that, I'm all in it.

Mr. Phillips added at the ZBA all are public hearings with notification and that what is sometimes brings out the ill-will between neighbors and that influences decisions.

We'll have another discussion when Attorney Sciota returns.

#### **Discussion on Food Trucks**

Mr. Chaplinsky introduced the item. The goal is look at the food truck regulations. In my opinion our current regulation is lacking. There is no definition of what a food truck is. We have to look at that definition and make sure we clearly define what that is.

What do we do with food trucks? Should we put in the regulations where they should be allowed? Where they should not be allowed?

The Chamber of Commerce Committee and the Economic Strike Committee, some council members gave feedback.

Discussion points:

- Do you allow food trucks for special events?
- Special events, only?
- Allow food trucks all over town?
- Should there be restrictions on the period of use?
- Should they have to remove it at the end of the day or can it stay there for a longer period of time?
- Are there specific locations?
- Would there be any exemptions?

- Any area of town we would want to allow food trucks or not allow food trucks?
- What about community sponsored events?
- New businesses, i.e.: breweries?
- Whether we should have a complimentary ordinance that discusses food trucks and how that ordinance might be enforced.

Everyone felt we should consider adding additional language and guidance for food trucks.

- Restrictions in certain areas to protect the brick and mortar businesses.
- All food trucks with brick and mortar businesses, only.

Mr. Phillips advised in the zoning regulations right now, we have no definition. The only regulation we have is under special exception in business zones. It says: temporary location of vending cart on private property requires consent of property owner and all other applicable permits, i.e.: health and requires annual approvals.

Mr. Phillips advised of a definition he put together: Food trucks/cart, a vehicle that has been designed to be self-propelled or otherwise portable for the purpose of food preparation, sales or service.

Mr. Sinclair felt this hasn't been an issue in town.

Ms. Clock said it is an issue because we're starting to see more of them. It does take away from the brick and mortar businesses that decided to come to town and pay taxes and thrive their business in Southington. It drives the customers away. What is the end goal? Do we want to keep businesses in Southington? Do we want to grow the tax base?

I tend to lean on allowing them at special events, only. What about enforcement? But I am open to other ideas.

Mr. Sinclair pointed out food trucks are businesses and we could tax them. But that's a Council issue.

Mr. Chaplinsky agreed the brick and mortar businesses in town have to be protected. I've heard that food trucks on private property help the brick and mortar stay in business. Two sides of the coin.

Mr. Sinclair said they're serving people who are not going to go to a brick and mortar and sit down and eat. It's fast food.

Discussion.

Mr. Hart felt this is a solution to a problem that's not there. Explained going to a food truck as opposed to a sit-down restaurant.

Ms. Clock felt this is hurting the small businesses in town.

Mr. Sinclair agreed this is creating a regulation to solve a problem that doesn't exist.

Discussion on whether the food trucks are businesses in Southington when they're in Southington. They don't pay taxes while the brick and mortar business does pay taxes.

Mr. Sinclair said have the town council create an ordinance so we can tax them but that is not a planning & zoning issue.

Mr. Hammersley agreed we should get out in front of this issue. Food trucks are an option and they do take away from the brick and mortar businesses. Explained his experience in Hartford and New Haven. Let's do something proactive instead of reactive. That's a good strategy to take.

Mr. Cabata felt it was important to control where and when they can be. I do think we need to protect our local businesses. But there are places in town that don't have the time to go downtown for lunch and to let a food truck be in that area, I don't think you are taking away from the businesses in Southington. You're giving the people working an option.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips brought up:

- Create a definition.
- Taking the approval authority out of the special exception and putting it into the special permit. It gives it to the PZC.
- Ideas for stipulations in the regulations that normally some are attached to the special exception approval by the ZBA.
  - Temporary location of food cart/truck, requires consent of property owner and all other applicable permits. Requires annual approval and all applicable permit application fees.

For requirements:

- At no time shall more than one food truck/cart be located within 500 feet of another such food truck/cart or within 500 feet of an established building housing a restaurant.
- Allowable hours of operation and location on site shall not exceed those of an 8-hour standard work day for a period of time and number of days as deemed appropriate by the commission upon approval in accordance with Section 8, Special Permit Use.

- Placement of any tables or chairs outside of the food truck car is prohibited.
- The use of loudspeakers for projecting voice or music is prohibited.
- No temporary signage included but not limited to balloons, streamers, flags, festoons or banners.
- All truck cars shall have adequate trash receptacles that are removed with the vehicle.
- All truck cars shall operate from a generator or power pedestal and at no times will direct connect to existing electrical services.
- Approved community and special events by the Town of Southington whether or not on municipally owned land shall be exempt from Sub Section G in its entirety and otherwise compliant with any other requirements as set forth in the zoning regulations.

Discussion of a fee for a license.

Mr. Hart felt he needed more information on this from the standpoint of what other towns the same size as us are doing. Maybe review a study on food trucks and if they have economic impacts on brick and mortar businesses would be extremely useful instead of trying to regulate a problem that doesn't exist.

Mr. Phillips asked Chief Daly for a copy of the information form for a peddler to see what they are requiring.

Ms. Locks brought up food trucks at the new breweries that don't want to have food but will allow two or three food trucks in their parking lot. It's not taking away from somebody that's downtown. I think there is a place where these food truck should be. Example: Industrial area.

Maybe in a temporary sense, added the Chair, we allow food trucks in an area such as up on Executive Boulevard.

Discussion.

If it is a food truck attached to a brick and mortar in town, the commission had no issue with that.

Mr. Sinclair said some of the points are valid but they are not planning & zoning issues and it would be better handled at the council level. If it is done by ordinance, now it is an issue to enforced by the police department and not our one ZEO. If we do this here, we have to have the ZEO check on those hours as opposed to the PD if it is done by ordinance.

If it goes to the council, you increase fees and taxes and get some revenue on it.

Mr. Phillips said many towns have these that are policed by the police. That's one way to look at it. Maybe by going to the council, that's the way to go. In that case, you can actually dictate how many and where they're allowed.

Mr. Chaplinsky felt a complimentary ordinance would be required for enforcement.

A lot of towns have complete bans. Some are very open and some are in the middle.

This is an enforcement heavy issue.

The best place for this is with the council reiterated Mr. Sinclair.

Possible resolutions to go to the council were discussed.

The Chair ended discussion on this item by saying we have to do something.

#### **Discussion on Open Space/Cluster Subdivisions**

Mr. Chaplinsky said they're meeting Thursday. Hopefully, at the next meeting we'll talk about some ideas.

#### **Discussion on Continuous Improvement Subcommittee - Filling vacancies**

The Chair asked for volunteers. If you are interested on serving on this subcommittee, let me know.

#### **9. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING**

**Zone Text Amendment, revisions to Section 6 - Floodplain Zoning (ZA #591), April 4**

Okay for April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **10. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS**

None.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn which Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with two abstentions.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:36 o'clock, p.m.)