

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

JUNE 18, 2019

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and a regular meeting on Tuesday, June 18, 2019 at the John Weichsel Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Michael DelSanto, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

Dagmara Scalise	Paul Chaplinsky
James Morelli	Jennifer Clock
Robert Hammersley	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Peter Santago & Val Guarino

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

Absent: Susan Locks, Commissioner
Joe Coviello & Stuart Savelkoul, Alternates

The Chair seated Mr. Guarino for Ms. Locks for this evenings meeting.

A quorum was determined.

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

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:

MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting of June 4, 2019

Ms. Clock made a motion to approve. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice with Mr. Hammersley & Ms. Scalise abstaining. (5 to 0 to 2)

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Petition of Stephen M. Giudice dba Harry E. Cole & Son to enact a zoning regulation amendment of text to Section 3-04.2 o the Zoning Regulations (ZA #600)

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, CT presented. This is a request for a small modification to Section 3-04.2. This section currently permits the distance between buildings for multifamily and duplexes to be 30'. We are proposing to change that to 25'.

This would mostly affect your condominiums, single and duplex type units, as your regulations for bigger buildings is larger, 45'. But for the small buildings, you have a smaller separation.

This is proposed to allow a little bit more flexibility. This regulation was originally 20'. About 15 to 20 years ago they bumped it up to 30'. And, since that time, as we design these projects, 25 seems like a realistic distance.

In similar communities it can range any where from 20' to 25' to 30'. But generally, 20' is typically the minimum requirement because that's what the requirement is in the building code, the fire separation is 20'.

We think 25' is a reasonable request.

Housing trends change and this would allow for different types of shapes of houses to fit in a development. Giving more flexibility.

Taking a look at the POCD, they didn't really cover this specific issue but there is a line there that takes about housing diversity and I guess I would suggest we fall on this a little bit because it gives us a little more flexibility in the types of houses we would propose on a site.

I brought this forward because your new regulation, 3-09.7 proposes a 25' separation. I felt this regulation should be consistent with the other regulation on the books.

This is does not increase unit numbers. It just gives us more flexibility when laying out units in a development.

Ms. Scalise asked if we knew the background of why we moved from 20 to 30? What was the rational that got us to that point several years ago? Mr. Phillips said he didn't research that. It predated his tenure.

Mr. Giudice offered there was a development that was constructed --- new for this commission to see single family units on one parcel of land. Some people didn't like it. It was very successful and still is a good development. That's how the ball got rolling. If you looked at that development you wouldn't be able to tell the difference compared to others. I think it looks good.

Ms. Scalise asked the typical lot size you develop on if this isn't going to affect the capacity. Mr. Giudice said it doesn't affect the lot size. It affects the dimensions of the house. Explained sometimes you want the units smaller or wider. That's really the difference. Maybe have a two-car garage instead of a one car garage. It gives us flexibility to make it more home like with the different types of homes that you can build and flexibility with the garages.

Mr. Phillips said we have density, units per acre, and that's the guidance overall. There may be situations where you could get a little bit of effective density increase due to specific site topography or geometry, but you'll still be capped at the overall units per density.

Discussion.

Mr. Giudice disagreed stating his position that all multifamily housing is based on square footage of the land, not the dimensions between units. It will not change the density.

Originally, I believe you permitted one unit for every 7,000 or 8,000 sf. That was bounced to 10,000 sf when this was bumped up. Reduce the number of units and spread them out further. But they may have spread them out a little bit too far and I'd like to bring it back.

Ms. Scalise asked if it would give flexibility for open space. Mr. Giudice responded there is no open space requirements for multifamily housing.

Discussion.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates. I support Steve's proposal. It makes sense. Gives us more flexibility.

(Those speaking in opposition to the application)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

B. Special Permit Application of Lovley Development to construct an age restricted housing development on property located at 792 South End Road in an ARCHZ zone (SPU #622)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates, represented the applicant. The property is zoned for age restricted housing. It is served by public water and sewer. The land area is 5.88 acres. Currently it is zoned ARCHZ and that required a two-step process and this is the second step for SPU and later in the agenda we have a site plan application for the same property.

One purpose for ARCHZ is to increase the available housing options for the senior population. This proposal is for 15 units, age restricted housing, ranging in size from 1444 sf to 1610 sf. All on one floor, ranch style homes.

This zone allows 5 units per acre and we propose 2.7 units per acre.

The maximum impervious coverage for the area could be 50% and we propose 24%.

Required minimum frontage is 75' and we provide 145' on South End Road and 145' plus the 322 frontages.

We do not propose access from Rte. 322. That will be a conservation area.

The units have the 25' minimum set back which allowed us to have a good layout and flexibility. We'll be able to offset these units per staff recommendations to give an interesting look. In terms of the number of units, we are not getting more than we started with.

This project is bounded on the north by a veterinarian office. There is a gas station and we have a church and we have open space. A couple of residences on South End Road.

Per Section 8 of the regulations, notification is required to property owners within 500'. We did that. The area map with names & addresses is included in your packet.

Per the IT Manual, traffic manual, this project will produce 1.01 additional trips per unit at the peak hour. I have a statement from the IT Manual for the record (handed in).

We have copies of the architectural and floor layout of three different type units (A, B & C), they're similar in nature but a different layout on the inside. (Handed in)

We have not received engineering department comments. I am not going to continue with this presentation until we get more information to address the comments properly and for the public to know what is going on. I'll ask for question and then ask to continue the public hearing and table the application.

The Chair advised this will remain open until our next meeting which July 16, 2019.

Mr. Hammersley asked about the IT Manual information. Mr. Bovino clarified it states this type of development will produce one additional trip per unit at the peak. Fifteen additional trips per peak hour.

Ms. Clock asked about the historical area. Mr. Bovino pointed to an area which abuts the open space. People will be able to access per the current access to the open space.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

(Minutes are prepared summary style and you may refer to the video on line to hear the full commentary.)

Brad Lawrence, 54 Crestview Drive. When this was first brought up, we submitted a letter. Does that continue or do you want another copy that states our concerns? Concerns are positive. Mr. Phillips explained as this is a new application, it is based on its own evidence, so we have to have it resubmitted. It is dated February 5th.

The resident stated that the one thing that seems to be missing in Southington is single family living in a condominium. There is plenty of condos and they have plenty of stairs. The older you get, stairs . . .

I am in favor and hope this goes forward.

Pam LaPenta, 9 Silo Drive, Plantsville. I consider myself one of the lucky ones to be on the list for one of Mark's condos. I echo what Brad said. There is a scarcity of free-standing condos on one floor. For anybody older with trouble with their knees, there is a real need for it.

I am totally in favor of it.

Tom Curtis, 821 South End Road. He stated he was in favor of the concept. He saw the need. My comments are: this is way too dense. The other issue is: what is the difference between a conservation area and open space. I presented the possibility of moving lots 6,7 & 8 further north or closer to Meriden Waterbury Road because that area is not conducive to any public use. There is no access and the entrance to the current open space is behind the property where the church is and their parking lot. The other issue with this design is the water runoff from the swale. These areas over the years tend to get over grown with weeds, mats down, and the water does not percolate back into the ground. They just breed insects. The other issue is the sloping in the center open space which makes it unusable as open space for the complex. If 6,7 & 8 are moved further north that area could be made smaller and increase the usable open space to the town. I think there are too many units. Units 11, 12 & 13 are marginal as far as sloping. If they were eliminated, you could increase the space between the condos giving more elbow room.

I commend them for working with me on preserving the historical area which has been in the papers. I appreciate that.

Really it comes down to the density. Just because you are seniors doesn't mean you want to be crowded in.

(Anyone here speaking against this application)

None.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Bovino stated the difference between conservation area and open space, both green areas, the one we call open space is going to be deeded to the town. The other is not deeded to the town, the association will be responsible to maintain the area. We were requested to do that. Town is not interested in taking over this area (indicating) so the association will take care of that. There will be a maintenance program to take care of that. Both are green area with shrubbery growing in there. Be kept natural.

As far as moving units 6, 7 & 8 north, we already moved them north and the distance between the back of the units and the Meriden Waterbury Road, we don't want to be too close. We want to give them back yard, open area and provide a buffer of wooded area.

In regard to the drainage, we now look at open areas with no piping. We try to use swales and grass swales and the like. That's what we're doing here. Explained the drainage system.

A maintenance program between the buyers and sellers will be that this area is going to be maintained. I do not expect it to be overgrown.

In regard to the slopes, they are 6:1 which are very easy. A 3:1 is very mobile. A couple of the units are walkout so you will have a walkout basement.

As to the density, the allowed number of units is 5 per acre. We are proposing 2.7 units per acre. We have the appropriate separation distance between buildings.

Mark Lovley of 710 Main Street, Plantsville, CT. We did move this development 25' to 30' to the north from the original proposal. Any further north, we have to cut the trees along Meriden Waterbury

Turnpike which blocks in the development. That's why we didn't want to take it out any further.
Discussed.

The Chair advised the public hearing would be left open and continued to the next meeting which is July 16th.

BUSINESS MEETING

A. Petition of Stephen M. Giudice dba Harry E. Cole & Son to enact a zoning regulation amendment of text to Section 3-04.2 o the Zoning Regulations (ZA #600)

Mr. Morelli made a motion to approve. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Mr. Morelli commented thru his tenure on the board we have always talked about flexibility and working with the applicants. I think the town is lucky we have engineering firms to work with us and make modifications based on our input. I don't think to go from 30' to 25' is a huge difference. If it makes their life better, it is better for all of us.

Mr. Chaplinsky liked the idea of flexibility and being able to expand the garage size. Make these wider versus deeper. It does add flexibility in the options we are providing for these types of units.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Effective date: July 4th, 2019.

B. Special Permit Application of Lovley Development to construct an age restricted housing development on property located at 792South End Road in an ARCHZ zone (SPU #622)

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

C. Site plan application of Lovley Development Inc. to construct 15 units of age-restricted homes, property located at 792 South End Road in an ARCHZ zone (SPR #1780)

Motion to table by Mr. Chaplinsky. Second by Mr. Hammersley. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

D. Lazy Lane Industrial Associates, site plan application for a proposed 8,100 sf industrial building, 182 Lazy Lane in an 1-2 zone (SPR #1777) tabled from June 4th.

Mr. Bovino, representing the applicant, stated the proposal is for 8100 sf of industrial facility which is a combination of office, manufacturing and possibly storage. The proposed parking is

associated with the needs of the tenant. A tenant is taking these three units and he has nine employees plus management. We propose 21 space.

We expect a similar situation here. He might take the entire building as he grows.

We have received additional staff comments from engineering. We have addressed planning and engineering comments.

Last time we discussed the planted buffer to be provided next to the residential area. We were to preserve the existing growth in this area (indicating) and add to that as needed when construction takes place.

The project to the south was approved in 2009 with a 35' planted buffer versus a 50'. We want to continue that here. There are no structures within the 50' buffer, so we'd like you to consider approving the same approach to this based on Section 5-00.3B where if you find that the foliage in this area is appropriate, the buffer can be 35' versus 50.

I have a picture (handed in). Mr. Bovino pointed out they plan on keeping the mature trees. The grade is going to be cut down 4.5' to create the berm and the landscaping will be above that. This growth extends from Lazy Lane south.

Mr. Phillips reminded the commission that would require a supermajority vote (two-thirds) of the commission.

Any questions?

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action with a separate vote for the buffer.

Discussion of the foliage in the buffer area now. Discussion of removal of all invasive.
Discussion.

The plan detail shows the plantings, of mix of evergreen and deciduous trees.

Mr. Hammersley asked how many jobs are being considered. Mr. Bovino said nine employees and two management so eleven people will be here.

Mr. Hammersley made a motion to approve the application. We're fortunate to be able to add jobs in an economy that is struggling right now and increase our tax base. A good thing.

Mr. Phillips reminded everyone before this vote to approve, you have to have a supermajority vote on reducing the landscaping. He wanted to make sure it's on the record that because the parking spaces is dictated by the needs of an industrial use and there is no really hard and fast number, I want to make sure these aren't going to turn into storage of material spaces. Mr. Bovino said that is not the case here. It's not the heavy use in the back properties.

Mr. Hammersley removed his motion for a question of by Mr. Morelli. Mr. Morelli wanted clarification on what we disused as far as the invasive species, removing or not removing, and the planting plan. If we decide to leave it the way it is, then that's the way it is. If they plant in there, how're they going to get in there to plant? Mr. Bovino said we are going to maintain what is there. We are not going to cut the mature trees. If we see a gap in the growth, we'll go in there, clear a little bit, and plant trees versus what is there.

Mr. Morelli asked: What is a buffer for a buffer? Mr. Bovino said it can be an existing buffer. Mr. Morelli asked what has been decided here? You can't plant deciduous trees in there without removing the underbrush and if you remove the underbrush, we'll make him remove all the invasive or just what he needs to remove to plant the trees? What happens when the invasive grows back?

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips suggested keeping it consistent with what was approved previously.

Discussion.

Motion to waive the 50' buffer to reduce it to 35' with the expectation that plantings be made unless there is no need per town staff was made by Mr. Hammersley. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

Mr. Bovino clarified that we will put the tree in if there is a gap.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

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

E. Inspired by Opportunity, LLC, site plan application for fast-food restaurant with sit-down dining and drive through service, property owned by Southington Development Partners, LLC, located at 1799 Meriden Waterbury Road, in a B zone (SPR #1779), tabled from June 4th

David Sacco, civil engineer, with TPA Design Group in New Haven, presented on behalf of the applicant and the owner.

We received comments from the engineering department and provided a response. We followed up with the Planner regarding planting requirements and we provided a revised site plan that addressed the issue of the parking spaces and the require front yard. The parking spaces have been moved out of the front yard. We stretched the parking lot to the north and added them in that area rather than provide the berm in the front because of grading considerations on the site. Beyond that there were some technical considerations identified by the Town Engineer that we addressed.

Happy to answer any further questions at this point.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if he had a chance to look at the site layout as far as proximity close to the road or pushing it back further? Mr. Sacco indicated they had a discussion with the client and they were very strongly in favor of leaving the site plan as it was in terms of the proximity of the building to the front yard. They are very interested in maximizing the visibility given that it is on a fairly high-speed roadway and masked from the east by an existing building.

There is a 40' setback and then the building itself is about 16-17' beyond that so about 57' total from the property line. From the actual street line, it's more about 72' clarified Mr. Sacco.

Discussion of the new Dunkin location.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated he was struggling with what the hang up is being so close to the road.
Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said for him, he'd like to see the aesthetics of the area consistent. This is really one parcel with the movie theater in the back, this parcel on one side of the entrance, the parcel to the west is another piece approved for yours. Harmony in the area would be nice. I don't like the idea of having the buildings not aligned. Especially with all the open space behind there. You have plenty of room to move it back. I don't see a big advantage for traffic flow or to the town having it so far forward moved. I think we're destroying the look of the area and I don't think anybody is not going to go to Wendy's because the building is another 20' or 30' back.

Mr. Sacco reiterated he was speaking on behalf of his client and this is the layout they asked us to prepare and submit. We've tried to make it compliant with the regulations. This site is going to be extensively landscaped to be as attractive as possible. This is the approach they asked us to take.

Mr. Hammersley asked if the topography limited where you can place the building or the parking? Or is it flat? Mr. Sacco said it slopes from the rear to the front. The site does neck down as you move towards the back. There is a limit to how far back it could be slid before it would start to impair available parking. This is the limited required parking for the site.

Mr. Hammersley asked if the topography was a limiting factor in moving the building back and Mr. Sacco said it was not.

Mr. Phillips said the client wants visibility. No question about that. Every business does. The building is located within the setbacks. That's per the regulations. We don't have any additional comments on it.

Mr. Chaplinsky confirmed with Mr. Phillips, within the regulations, we have the leeway to request this site be moved forward, backward, am I correct? Mr. Phillips said you absolutely have the ability to question those things from an aesthetic standpoint but the building is in the envelope.

Mr. Chaplinsky commented he'd like to see this thing go forward. He doesn't like the inconsistency in the area because of the established site plans and buildings there today. I'd really like to see us work more closely together and collaboratively on it. I don't want to see a denial tonight.

Mr. Sacco restated he was presenting what he was asked to present by his client. They're taking the position they are being consistent with the neighbor to the east. That building is an impediment to visibility to the westbound traffic moving along Rte. 322 and I think that is what has really driven their position. They're trying to relate to the building to the east rather than to the Dunkin' to their west.

Signage was discussed.

Commissioner Chaplinsky stated that he wouldn't mind pushing this out one more time to allow the applicant a chance to push it back farther from the setback line rather than making a motion to deny it. He stated that he didn't know how anyone else felt about that.

Chairman Del Santo stated that we wouldn't know what the feeling of the commission is until someone makes a motion.

Mr. Phillips interjected before any motion was made that professionally speaking he wouldn't recommend a denial based upon asking the developer to push the building back farther from the setback line than it currently was proposed.

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

F. Borghesi Building and Engineering Co., Inc., site plan application for an 18 x 30 addition property located at 86 Queen Street (SPR #1781)

Gary Capitanio, Borghesi Building and Engineering, represented the applicant, Valvoline.

We are here for an existing building in a Business zone. It is located at 86 Queen Street. What we are presenting for consideration is a small addition, 18 x 26. It is listed as 18 x 30 but got smaller due to the fire marshal's comments. The distance from the dumpster had to be no less than 10'. We made it 11' and made the proposed addition a little bit smaller from the original submission.

At the end of this Valvoline, there used to be a carwash bay, which has been since abandoned and not functioning. They need this space for storage of filters, etc., and storage space for other businesses in the general area.

We have received staff comments. Those from the fire marshal we addressed. We have written responses to Rob's. Jim had some comments this afternoon and we have written responses to.

Mr. Phillips brought up the comment about the accessibility connection especially to the southern property line. Mr. Capitanio responded their professional belief is it is not beneficial in this particular case. We've done them in other places. The owner is not willing to do that. He feels it would be an unnecessary encumbrance upon his property for future flexibility. You are not going to reduce curb cuts or accessibility coming/going and that little bit --- I truly don't see any benefit to the area and the development. That's our personal and professional opinion.

Mr. Chaplinsky pointed out it is a B zone and cross easements are required in a B zone. Mr. Phillips said that is what the regulation states and he feels as though we have to modify this soon because there have been instances before where the topography, the slope hasn't made it feasible. It is not an issue here pointed out Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Phillips responded the regulation does not allow you to vary that, either.

Mr. Chaplinsky restated it is required in a B zone. I know the applicant might not want it, but I categorically disagree with you about the benefit. That's a very difficult area. When traffic is high there may be an advantage to going out one driveway versus the other depending on the direction you are turning. It could make the difference between a sight line and traffic moving in a certain direction. There is a benefit and if it helps one person get out more safely, it's worth doing.

The other thing is we don't know what this is going to be 30 years from now. Putting a cross easement on the land records for the future ensures there is interconnectivity between the two parcels.
Discussion.

Mr. Capitanio asked for clarity: Is it definitive black and white to have the access easement? Mr. Phillips said it is the easement, at least. There is an existing 20' sanitary encumbrance right about where you would want to make that connection. Mr. Capitanio said he couldn't argue the black and white requirement.

Discussion as to when the connection needs to be made.

An access easement needs to be filed on the land records for potential future cross connection, clarified Mr. Capitanio.

Discussion.

(Item passed for client consultation.)

Mr. Capitanio reported after discussion they are in agreement and will move forward in that regard.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulation staff will work with the applicant on proper placement of the easements per 9-09.1. Mr. Hammersley seconded.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Centrica Business Solutions, Inc., site plan application for the installation of 39.8' wide x 182.7' long solar canopy array over existing parking area and installation of solar panels on roof, property located at 261 Summit Street (The Summit of Plantsville) in an R-12 zone (SPR #1782)

(Ms. Scalise recused herself from this item and left the dais. Mr. Santago was seated in her stead for this item.)

Brian Baker with Civil-1, licensed engineer in Connecticut presented on behalf of the applicant at 261 Summit Street, Centrica Business Solutions.

He noted the existing conditions survey. A little over five acres. A senior care facility. It slopes up from south to north, higher in the back. The parking lot is in the rear.

What we are proposing is to put a solar array over top of the existing parking lot in the back over a portion of the parking lot. Refer to the sheet set.

The solar modules are shown in blue. It's approximately 60' from the rear property line. There is a 20' setback there and we're well beyond the setback for structures. The array slopes facing to the south so the lower and southern end of the top of the array is 12.5' off of the parking area. In the back and rear section is 17.5'. It covers approximately 40 parking spaces. (Pictures of what they look like on the last sheet of the plan set.)

Discussion.

As far as staff comments, the fire department had no comment initially. Neither did water. Town Engineering had a few comments. No regrading of the site. No change of impervious coverage. It's going over existing parking.

The solar panels are meant to provide power to the facility. That gives funding assist with the facility. Questions about the agreement, Ron Lewis from Centrica Solutions is here, also.

Snow melt was discussed.

Rain runoff was discussed.

No plan for charging stations.

This is ready for action.

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

The Chair reseated Ms. Scalise thanking Mr. Santago.

(Please refer to Item F again.)

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Open Space and Land Acquisition Report

Mr. Chaplinsky reported there was not a meeting. (Photos on the screen.) Mr. Guarino explained this is the pollinator garden in process over at Novick's Orchard. There is a stone path going in that Dave Lavallee did some work on. And, the Ag-Sci people planted all the bushes (blueberry, viburnums and winterberries). It's all shrubbery as opposed to flowers. We'll plant seed mix to make this low maintenance.

There is going to be a bench there. (Indicated)

Rain barrel pictures were shown.

The Chair thanked them for their hard work. On their own time, own dime.

Mr. Chaplinsky said open space is great to have but you have to maintain it as well. We have a lot of volunteer opportunities for people. Just call Dave. This property is in a sad state right now. The eastern half by the road, it's so overgrown right now it is almost to the point where we don't want to make an investment to do it. Each and every one of us should be working hard to try to talk to the other boards to get some funding to get this recut and get the field back to a condition where it can be mowed regularly. We have to pay attention. This is a gem in our town. It's a really nice parcel.

The Chair said next time you're doing work, send an e-mail. People can go and help.

B. RPC Liaison Report

No meeting to report on.

C. Heritage Committee Update

Ms. Clock reported on the June 5th meeting. We voted and approved our mission statement.

"The mission of the Heritage Identity Study Committee is to identify and safeguard Southington's historical spaces, places and structures by educating and assisting our community."

We're still in the beginning stages of everything. We'll be discussing goals and objectives and the criteria that we want to use. We're pulling data of the historical inventory report.

Our next meeting is July 3rd.

D. Administrative Review Authorization: Site plan application of John Salerno for proposed reconstruction of grocery store, 887 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike in a B zone (SPR # 1784)

There is a consensus this can be done administratively.

E. Administrative Review Authorization: Southington Country Club for proposed 374 sf addition, 150 Savage Street, in an R-20/25 zone (SPR #1783)

This is an addition to the kitchen. There is a consensus this can be done administratively.

ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

The two discussed tonight and also a floodplain filling for a truck wash on 1300 South Main Street and a floodplain application for various bridge locations in town. Two text amendments, zoning regulation and subdivision regulation, removal of a second that has to do with lot size with no sewer or water.

The next regularly scheduled meeting is July 16, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 o'clock.)