

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHLINGTON

JUNE 19, 2018

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a regular meeting on Tuesday, June 19, 2018 at the John Weichsel Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Michael DeSanto, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

Paul Chaplinsky	James Morelli
Susan Locks	Robert Hammersley
Dagmara Scalise	Michael DeSanto, Chair

Alternates: Ted Cabata & Peter Santago

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

Absent: Jennifer Clock, Commissioner
Joe Coviello & Ross Hart, Alternates

The Chair seated Peter Santago for Jennifer Clock and a quorum was determined.

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

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting of June 5, 2018

Mr. Hammersley made a motion to approve as submitted and Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to add letter F to the regular business agenda: SPR 1759 for 1671 West Street, which is a site plan update for temporary parking conditions. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Brian Whitford, special permit application for garage in excess of 3 spaces, 118 Mountain Pond Road, in an R-40 zone. (SPU #601)

Brian Whitford, 118 Mountain Pond Road, Southington, CT., applicant presented.

There used to be an attached garage on my house. Nothing is to be constructed. I want that clear. No construction, no concrete, no nothing. As a matter of fact, the door is already there and it has been there since the house was built. Just opening up the siding. Taking down the plywood covering up, putting up the molding and it's done. Absolutely no construction whatsoever.

The Chair recapped. It is an existing house, there was a two-car garage there. That was covered up and now you are asking to have it now uncovered and go back to a two-car garage.

The applicant added his wife would like to park her car there. It's easier than walking through the snow and stuff like that. She has a professional job. She's looking to park her car in there. It's a little warmer in there, too.

Mr. Phillips added, as reported to the commission in the agenda review memo, there was a proposal for an 1152 sf detached garage before the commission back in 2014. June. It was actually denied by the commission based upon public input and the commission finding it was out of character with the neighborhood. After that, the applicant came in with a proposal just under the threshold requiring a special permit and also enclosing the attached garage was able to get a zoning permit process and we approved that permit for the reduced size detached garage with the attachment closed off. That is what is application is for: a special permit for increase in garage space by reopening the attached portion of the garage.

The applicant said the increase is actually --- the house, they called it back then a two-car garage, but it is one and one quarter. So, it's really, I think, if you drove by my house today, you'd love the garage that is there and it looks very good. It actually increased everybody's values. It's not an eyesore whatsoever.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted some of the things objected to at the last meeting in the Minutes. The size, footprint of the building contributed to it not being in harmony with the neighborhood, the height was discussed and it was talked about only being 1.5 stories, concerns about the porch planned and business activities in the area. He asked the applicant to comment on those items.

Mr. Whitford said it is only a half story on the top to meet the requirements which is why I didn't have to come back again. It's been up for four years and there is no business run out of the house. I run a heating & cooling business out of Bristol, CT. I do have a van that I drive home, but that's all. The garage is for classic cars, no klunkers. Explained

I have solar panels on the garage because when I built it I pitched it in such a way that the sun --- we have no energy usage at our house. We have a negative bill. We're helping our neighbors out with that, as well. It's not an eyesore.

Mr. Chaplinsky said the optics is that you closed your garage to circumvent the denial and now you are going back. Can you comment on why your chose the route you chose after he denial and why you want to now undo the garage?

Mr. Whitford said he wasn't married at the time. It was a hobby garage for my classic cars hobby. Since then, I've gotten married. I want to give my wife a nice garage space that is attached to the house. I notice the commission has approved much bigger garages than anything I ever proposed

through my research. He pointed out a nine-car garage approved. Mr. Chaplinsky was the one who made comments about it. (Submitted the Minutes for review.)

Mr. Chaplinsky asked the dimensions of the additions. Mr. Phillips said the special permit threshold is essentially based upon a 14 by 26 garage space, so it equates to anything over 3 garage spaces requires a special permit and that totals 1,092 sf. This proposal, with the reopening of the attached garage, you are looking at a total size of 1,554 sf. Equates to about 4.26 spaces.

Mr. Morelli asked the applicant to comment on the commercial activity. We had a letter submitted saying there are a lot of commercial vehicles parked there. I did drive by a couple of times and I did not see any commercial vehicles there. Mr. Whitford explained his step son is in the HVAC trade and works for Johnson Controls. He has a company truck to bring home. He has nothing to do with my business. He's in the union. If the neighbors want it parked somewhere, I need to know that. We are not disturbing anybody. We are quiet neighbors. We don't party.

The Chair asked if his wife's car could be parked in the detached garage. The applicant said that's been tried, but in the wintertime with the black ice and stuff --- it doesn't stay as warm as the one attached to the house. And, we have five kids and they're all driving. We'd like to keep more cars in the garages than in the driveway which would be better for the neighborhood, as well, I think.

Mr. Hammersley said he drove by and noticed a trailer outside the detached garage on the side. Mr. Whitford said it was for his classic cars. Mr. Hammersley asked why that wasn't parked in one of the garages. Mr. Whitford said he wished it would fit. I would've loved to have done that. It was especially designed to fit my GTO. Explained.

The trailer stays there year-round behind the fence. You maybe see the top of it a little bit. Mr. Hammersley stated it is a big fence and big trailer. You can see it.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

(1) (Inaudible) McClun, resident at 175 Mountain Pond Road. I wasn't part of the first petition but I did hear about the controversy at the time. Mr. Whitford allowed me to look at his garage once it was constructed. He did a great job. It has beautified the neighborhood.

I don't believe it is out of character. His lot is over 1.7 acres, I believe. The structure is a very small part of the acreage. I speak in favor of it.

(2) Joanne Whitford, 118 Mountain Pond Road, Southington. She asked about a letter being submitted from the neighbor to the left. The Chair acknowledged correspondences sent to the commission. Those are all part of the record. You can come and read them any time.

(3) John DeCesare, 103 Mountain Pond Road. Right across the street. The big concern with the neighborhood is he could run a business. We don't mind an office, but not equipment and product stored there. That's why we fought the garage the first time.

The garage went up. It looks good. Opening these two doors, the old garage, I don't see that that eliminates our concern either way. In that case, I don't have a problem with it.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked him to comment on the business activity he sees. Mr. DeCeasere said he didn't know. There's some trucks. I don't think it is a problem. I don't go looking. I'm the wrong one to ask on that. My concern is I don't want to see trucks there and that hasn't happened, yet.

(Those speaking against the application)

(1) Steve Fournier, 70 Mountain Pond Road. I came the first time in 2014. I was against it and I remain against it for a couple of reasons: nobody in our neighborhood should have that many garages. This will be the only residence with a 5,6-car garage. It goes against the other 31 homes in the neighborhood. It will not fit.

As far as to the traffic and cars, I don't want this to be a commercial site. It looks like a commercial site and the rest of the homes are residential. I'd like it to stay that way.

It brings that neighborhood down, not up.

There is more garage space than living space on that property. I struggle with that. That is more of a commercial type application, to me.

As to noticing commercial activity on the property, I leave early. My wife has commented there are a lot of cars in the road and people on the sidewalks. I'm not there and can't comment.

(2) Margaret Weir, 23 Mountain Pond Road. I wasn't here for the original structure in 2014. I have four children all driving. I understand they have a large family. My concern has been that there is a lot of vehicles there. Lately it has scaled down.

It does appear that the originally structure should not have been approved. It doesn't fit, doesn't match the neighborhood. Last night there were eight cars in the driveway, the trailer and a car parked behind there. I don't think it is a good analysis of our neighborhood.

The solar panels, there is a door, it's more than just a large garage for antique cars.

I think approving this will encourage other people in the neighborhood to feel they have the right to do the same thing. I object.

Upon a question by Mr. Chaplinsky, the speak explained what she meant by cars behind. There is a black trailer and a car parked behind the fence, as well.

I think we need to stand together. Wonderful neighborhood. Nothing against the family, but I don't think closing it off and building this huge structure and now wanting to open it up again fits with what you approved in 2014. I ask you oppose this permit.

Mr. Chaplinsky commented for the record: The application came to us in 2014 and it was denied. I believe because of the denial and the desire to build an external garage, the agreement was that the owner of this property close those two garage, build the multi car detached garage as part of a standard procedure that allows any homeowner to do that by right.

The reason they're coming back now is because they now have an existing 2.25 car garage. Anything more than 3 requires them to file and ask for a special permit to do that from this board.

(3) Lisa Marshall, 77 Mountain Pond Road. I was here at the original meeting and I was against for the mere fact I was kind of worried about work trucks coming in and out and trucks in the driveway. I am a stay at home mom. I know exactly what goes on in our neighborhood.

There are trucks and vans there. People coming and going. I counted 6,7 trucks or work vans in the driveway.

She commented about the exiting/entering from the driveway.

There is activity which has slowed down over the past month or so.

My thought is if there are rules and regulations in the town for a residential area, I would hope we would stick with them. If we all applied for 5,6 car garages and had different cars going in and out, our road would be a mess.

I hope you consider just keeping it as it is.

She asked about the 462-sf additional. Mr. Phillips explained it is the attached space he wants to open up. It represents the amount of square footage over what the regulation allows which is why he is here for a special permit.

(4) Johnathan Lee, 102 Mountain Pond Road. I'm conflicted. I understand what he is trying to do. He has beautified the house to some degree. I voted against the large structure because of the height and empty space. The design is okay.

My main concern is really just you went about the whole thing. You determined that in order for me to utilize this space, I will shut this attached garage and not use it. That's fine. Now 4 years later coming back and saying I think I'll open it up now. It kind of speaks to a sort of disingenuous thought. They kept the garage door in there so it is ready to be removed. It seems the original was just to mask it and do what you had to do to meet the letter of the law so he could build the garage larger and now it is in place I want to get a special permit. My concern is the intent behind this.

It opens the possibility and we want to be aware of that.

Mr. Hammersley asked if stipulations are put on the approval, how does enforcement work to make sure they're being adhered to. Mr. Phillips said the only thing we have control over is to be sure there is not a business operating out of there with a HO approval. We can't control the number of cars. No business use is typical stipulation on these. It is typically by complaint we hear about it.

Mr. Phillips noted 2 letters in support sent to the commission previously: 175 Mountain Pond Road and 87 Mountain Pond Road. We have 2 letters in opposition: 53 Mountain Pond Road and 206 Mountain Pond Road.

(Rebuttal)

The Chair said he paramount concern is there is a lot of activity in the driveway and there is some business activity going on. And, it was mentioned the perception that you circumvented the system.

Joanne Whitford, 118 Mountain Pond Road. I need to make it very clear that we are not running a business out of that structure. You are more than welcome to come and see. We have

children that drive. No parties at my house. She explained about the vehicles in the driveway and who they belonged to.

Discussion.

I don't know about cars going in and out or having to go around cars. I don't allow them to park on the road.

We are not running a business out of that structure, garage. We are not.

I am asking for a space for me to park my car so I don't have to slip on black ice. I don't think that is a lot to ask for.

Thank you.

The applicant emphasized there is no business run out of this house. My business is in Bristol, CT. The garage has car stuff in it for antique classic cars.

You're more than welcome to come over.

No partying going on. We're good people if you get to know us. If anybody in my neighborhood wanted to build a garage, I'd let them. It's their business and they should be able to. I've increased everybody's property values. I'm making the house a better place.

Discussion.

Three cars are stored in the detached garage.

Discussion of work out of Bristol, CT. No employees. Supplies are dropped off at the job.

Discussion of cars in the driveway overnight – six. None on the street.

From the street you will only see three garage doors. You'll see the two on the garage that are there right now and the other one only has one door. Nothing different than what most neighborhoods in Southington have.

Mr. Santago asked the applicant to talk about the perceived circumvention. The applicant said he got married between 2014 and now there is a different family situation. I'm okay with the detached if I didn't get married. I need it because my family expanded.

The Chair hearing no further comments closed the public hearing.

B. Nicola Dimeo, special permit application for parent/grandparent apartment, 256 Harness Drive in an R-40 zone (SPU #602)

Mr. Santago advised he is an abutting property owner and he would recuse himself from the discussion. Mr. Santago left the dais.

The Chair appointed Mr. Cabata for Mr. Santago.

Nicola Dimeo, 256 Harness Drive, the applicant presented. He is to get an approval to put an in-law apartment in for my Dad.

I plan on putting another garage on next to my two-bay garage so my Dad can drive in and put the in-law apartment on the back side so he can just drive right in and walk into his living space. A kitchen, small living room, bedroom and bathroom.

Mr. Phillips said there are no comments on the file on this application. The applicant's filed the required affidavit. No issues.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Brian Whitford, 118 Mountain Pond Road. Whatever he is doing seems similar to what I want to do and I think he should be able to do it. I support him.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

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

6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Brian Whitford, special permit application for garage in excess of 3 spaces, 118 Mountain Pond Road, in an R-40 zone. (SPU #601)

The Chair reseated Mr. Santago and thanked Mr. Cabata for his service tonight.

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action if you so choose. I recommend as a condition of approval that no space on the property be used for business purposes.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated he was torn with this. We've tried to create regulations to allow some things but we also take into consideration the neighbors' feedback. I think overall, we've been fairly good about approving these.

It's difficult for me because of the appearance of what occurred really works on me a little bit. We determined some years ago about the fit for the neighborhood because of strong feedback from the neighbors. I agree that the design of the house and architecture is appealing, I'm torn with the decision we made before.

Given decision made on the design standards and how alleviating some of those may have alleviated some of the concern, I'm torn and am interested to hear others.

Mr. Morelli said on the way here he was also torn. There's a lot of things to consider. They did a nice job and the property looks great. They did a good job explained the situation change. It doesn't seem like it was an intent to bypass the system.

We've been liberal in the past with exterior garages with bigger parcels and 1.75 acres is a pretty good-sized piece of property. I am inclined to approve this because I think he did meet the

burden of proof that there is no business there. He has a business somewhere else and he has no employees coming to the home. I get the number of vehicles.

If the garage was never used for living space and he's going to open it up to put a car in there, I don't think we should stop him from that. My opinion.

Ms. Locks concurred. Opening that one space is not going to create havoc or chaos in the neighborhood.

Ms. Scalise is conflicted in that we always grapple with applicant's coming back for changes particularly when we have commercial applicants. I realize this is residential.

Discussion.

I feel that if you open up the garage does that not mean there will be one less car as an impediment to the people on the street. The Chair agreed in that if the complaint is there is too many cars in the driveway, instead of a wall, this will get one or two cars off the driveway.

Discussion of possible stipulations.

Mr. Santiago agreed with Ms. Scalise. We are not here to approve the structure already built. A moot point. In terms of character of the neighborhood, he took care of that. It looks great. In hearing the business aspect, I am satisfied with that. Getting a car out of the driveway and in the garage would alleviate some of that. That's a solution which does fly in the face of regs. I'm hung on the fact we have a reg, it was approved/denied. It's there for a reason. Now you come back to say, how about now? I think in this situation it alleviates a concern of multiple cars in the driveway. It is a solution to a problem in the area even though it does fly with the reg. It's probably the right thing to do but it does fly against what is written in the reg.

Ms. Scalise brought up precedent.

Mr. Morelli said he came for a special permit and is at the mercy of the board for a 426-sf deviation. Bottom line. If he's not running a business, are we going to hold him from adding that.

Mr. Hammersley added approvals go with the property. If he moves, the next person can come in and do what he wants to do with it. We all park in the driveway. I don't know if it will alleviate much of a problem. Just one vehicle.

I, too, have a bad taste in my mouth about the way this has come about.

Discussion.

Enforcement of whether he's running a business or not out of the structure is an issue. If we stipulate that, I don't know that it means much which is kind of frustrating.

This a three-car garage now, we'll add two cars and that's five-car garage. Someone comes in with a six-car garage, where does it stop. Arbitrary or not arbitrary.

Discussion.

I'm torn on what to do here.

Mr. Phillips gave background on the regulation as it has been modified.

Mr. Morelli made a motion to approve with the stipulation there is no commercial business being run out of the garage or the addition. Ms. Locks seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated listening to this, what resonates with me is the previous application that came in. The commission made a determination. The design is the same. Hearing the residents concerns me. I am going to vote against this one and stay consistent with the previous decision.

The Chair explained the perceived circumvention. Tonight, we hear from the neighbors saying I see cars in the driveway. Nothing in our regs say you can't park cars in the driveway. You can even park on the road April 15 to October 15. Nothing against the law in parking on the street.

He has a business in a different town. He's in HVAC. Not like he's cutting logs, chainsaws going ten hours a day in the yard. We would know that. It's very difficult to monitor and regulate a business.

I don't think having multiple cars in the driveway is enough to deny this application.

It's a wall and instead of a wall it is now going to be a garage door. It'll help the neighbors concerns as one or two of the cars will be inside the garage.

Character? I don't think this will disrupt the character. All beautiful houses in the neighborhood.

He came for the special process added Mr. Morelli and now he has a special circumstance. No complaints about him grinding or welding. Model citizen except for the fact they think he's running a business because there's a couple of commercial vans on the property. Some in the neighborhood were in favor. Take it all into consideration. It doesn't appear to be underhanded. The situation changed. That's why I voted that way he concluded.

Mr. Chaplinsky said this has to be monitored to be sure it doesn't become a precedent setting type of activity. Given circumstances, I am reconsidering.

Mr. Hammersley noted it is a valid point.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Nicola Dimeo, special permit application for parent/grandparent apartment, 256 Harness Drive in an R-40 zone (SPU #602)

Mr. Santago left the dais and Mr. Cabata was seated.

This is ready for action advised Mr. Phillips. He read the four stipulations required to be on the plan.

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

Mr. Santago resumed his seat at the dais.

C. Volpe & Sons Mobil, Inc., site plan application for a 4,480-sf building to house tow tucks in lower level and office space on main level, property located at 796 South Main Street, property of GMV Realty, LLC, in a CB zone (SPR #1754), tabled from June 5

Sev Bovino, Planner, with Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the applicant. He reviewed the proposal which has previously been presented.

We received wetlands approval for this. We addressed all comments and I believe it's ready for action.

The wetlands stipulation was discussed.

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

D. Request for five (5) year extension of site plan approval, 72 Center Street, in a CB zone (SPR #1530.1)

This item is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Hammersley seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

E. Release of \$25,000 Maintenance bond, Wolf Hill subdivision, 230/250 West Center Street (S#1299)

Ready for action. Mr. Hammersley made a motion to approve. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

**F SPR 1759 for 1671 West Street, site plan update for temporary parking conditions.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented the application on behalf of the applicant. This property is immediately north of Cava Restaurant on West Street. It is a proposal for temporary, overflow parking. It is right now processed stone, crushed stone parking area. There are four light posts. It's 1.8 acres of property. There is an existing house with a garage. And, the parking area is up front with a curb cut. The applicant was told he could do this and then was told to come in officially to show what it looks like and what he's doing over there.

(Minutes are prepared summary style. Please refer to the video on line for the full 30-minute discussion.)

The crushed stone was put down to create more of a stable surface. They were parking on the grass and it wasn't working. They were sinking into the mud and tow trucks had to be called advised Mr. Bovino. Plus, it has more of an orderly arrangement.

Explained.

The solar lights are bright enough to provide some safety there at nighttime when the employees go home from work. That was the intent of the lights. The Chair asked if there was a way to get some electricity from the house and get brighter lights. Mr. Bovino said the house is vacant and the applicant doesn't know what to do at this point with that structure. I could talk to the client. The Chair asked if he wanted to sell the front of his property for a parking lot. How temporary is this going to be?

Mr. Bovino said this is all owned by the Cava Entity. They're using it for temporary parking. The restaurant owner owns that entire property including the house and the driveway. Mr. Bovino pointed out it is within 400' of the existing business which is allowed.

Discussion.

The Chair said the lighting is his concern. Could we get Eversource out there. My concern is people are walking on West Street and somebody will get hit. Mr. Bovino suggested the client come up.

Mr. Phillips interjected the parking of vehicles on this property started when they expanded the rooftop dining. They don't have enough spaces on their property and regulation allows you to have parking within 400' to resolve that. Maybe that was a mistake on our part as now we are moving closer to a permanent parking area. From that standpoint, putting the stone down, solar lights up, it is looking more permanent and that's a problem with our regulations because it is in the West Street Business Zone and they specifically don't allow parking this close to the roadway, among other things.

We're in a pickle because if this is going to be a permanent lot, they need variances.

Discussion on when this would become permanent. Down the road, temporary has to become permanent. They'll have to get variances like every business in town has to do, noted the Chair. We want to try to help every business in town but we have to have the answer to some of these important questions.

Mr. Phillips stated it was his opinion you can't approve this unless it is a temporary arrangement. We need something from the applicant that says I am going to resolve this parking problem long term by such and such a date. Otherwise, you are approving a site plan with violations on it.

Discussion

Mr. Chaplinsky stated when they came for the rooftop approval, we were asked to approve that area as overflow parking as part of the expansion of the rooftop. Cars have been parking there now for years. That space has been used as a parking lot for that business and the town had agreed to allow that as part of the expansion. What is before us today is making it safer, the solar lights and we want to address the issue of whether this is temporary. We don't want to set a precedent that locks it in

forever.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips said he could not advise to approve something on a permanent basis that has potential variances necessary.

Temporary versus permanent was discussed in response to a query by Mr. Hammersley.

Mr. Bovino talked to the applicant and he is willing to do that --- temporary. He has been looking for property surrounded by large acres and we're trying to make a deal with that property owner to swap this or swap some of it and pay for some of it and create additional area around the existing restaurant. He's worked on that and will continue to do so.

A site plan is five years and he's willing to take somewhere in between --- three years maybe?
Discussion.

Mr. Papachristo, applicant. He explained how this has evolved for employee parking, mostly.

I'm trying to work on it and I don't know how it will work out. The neighbor next door has been asked to sell me some part of the property, Mr. Fragola.

Discussion.

The solar lights go on for 2 minutes and 30 seconds. No way to get power in that house.
Explained.

I did what I did for the safety of my employees. And, I asked if I could put a sidewalk and I will pay and secure and maintain. I'm trying to do everything I can.

Discussion.

The Chair asked about options. He shudders at 3 years. He's thinking a year to come back with an update. Mr. Phillips said you are tied to a 5-year approval, state statutes says. When you get to an extension, you can say a one-year extension. That's the problem here. It would be good for the applicant to agree to something.

Discussion of the timing for one year for an update. Mr. Bovino explained why two years would be more reasonable versus one year.

Everyone offered their opinion on the timing. Two years sounds good. A long-term solution needs to be found by the applicant.

Does the approval of this carry with this site or the restaurant site asked Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Phillips said for it to go with the home, they'd have to get the appropriate variances. It needs to go with the restaurant and that should be clear in the record.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said if this approval goes with the property with the house on it, I would also want to ask about easements.

Discussion.

The walkway between the two parcels was discussed. That's a concern. The applicant clears it in the winter and mows it in the summer. It is the shoulder.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the applicant's agreement for a two-year review. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

7. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

The marijuana subcommittee meeting is on June 26th in the Planning Office at 5:15 pm. The meeting is open to the public, but no public comment.

8. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None.

9. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Cava site plan we discussed this evening.

The next meeting is the 3rd Tuesday in July. We do not have a meeting on July 2nd.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Morelli made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Chaplinsky opposed.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:33 o'clock, p.m.)