

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON
NOVEMBER 17, 2020

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and regular meeting on Tuesday, November 17, 2020 via WebEx teleconference. Robert Hammersley, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

The following participated:

Robert Salka, Jeff Gworek, Susan Locks, Christina Volpe & Peter Santago

Alternates: Caleb Cowles

Absent: Alternates Theresa Albanese, Joe Coviello & Stuart Savelkoul

Staff:

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development

James Grappone, Ass't Town Engineer

The Chair seated Alternate Caleb Cowles in place of James Macchio for this evening's meeting. A quorum was determined.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance being led by Kayleigh Phillips.

A Moment of Silence was observed by everyone.

ROBERT HAMMERSLEY, Chair, presiding:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Special Meeting of November 4, 2020

Mr. Salka made a motion for approve the Minutes from the Special Meeting of November 4, 2020. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Gworek abstaining.

B. Regular Meeting of November 4, 2020

Mr. Cowles made a motion to approve. Ms. Volpe seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

MINUTES ARE PREPARED SUMMARY STYLE. YOU MAY REFER TO THE ONLINE POSTING TO HEAR THE FULL COMMENTARY.

A. Michael Treviso, Special Permit application to construct a garage in excess of 3 spaces, property located at 212 Valley View Court, in an R-40 zone (SPU #642)

Michael Treviso, applicant presented. He noted he has three vehicles. I love my lawncare and to take care of my property. I have tons of equipment. I would like to get the space for three vehicles and another bay just for my lawn equipment.

A rendering has been provided in the packet.

Commissioner Questions:

Mr. Santago clarified he would do the two car one and not the one that shows three. Mr. Treviso said that was correct. He explained that was a design from a magazine he liked. But it is the two-bay garage.

He confirmed there would be no business run out of the garage.

Mr. Santago confirmed the garage will match the style of the home as to siding, et cetera. It will not detract from what is already in the neighborhood. Mr. Treviso said he would like to match it exactly the way they did house from the siding, shutters, color, et cetera.

Ms. Locks had no further questions.

Mr. Gworek noted that it looks like part of the property slopes down towards the north. Do you plan on bringing in fill to make it level? How'll you address the slope there? Mr. Treviso said he would like to level it out to be the same plane as the driveway. I will take the suggestions from who I hire to do it. I know when they develop, there are concerns as to water, pitch, et cetera.

There is going to be no loft space or a second floor in this garage. Just one story maybe with a little bit higher ceiling so I can put my truck in there.

Mr. Cowles asked about the foliage surrounding the property. Are you going to have to remove some of the trees? Would they be in the way of the structure? They are used as a screening for your neighbors. The applicant said the tree line is far enough way so we wouldn't have to touch any of the trees. The one tree on the side of my house, where I've laid it out, it wouldn't come close enough where it would be in the way.

And, the structure, is it a similar height to the main structure? Mr. Treviso answered the home is two stories and it has a higher pitched of a roof. This is just going to be one story. Mr. Cowles wanted to be sure the rest of the neighborhood wouldn't be heavily impacted by the construction of the new structure.

Ms. Volpe complimented the applicant on providing everything he did for us tonight. It's refreshing and impressive. Thank you.

Mr. Salka had no questions.

(Those wishing to speak in favor of this application.)

Rob Phillips noted a letter of support received from Mark Halladay, 29 Metacomet View. (Included in the packet and on line for review.)

Mike Linehan, 184 Valley View Court, noted the structure would be close to the proximity of my home and the area. I got a better idea of the size tonight. I hear this will not be used for a commercial perspective.

He brought up Restrictive Covenants on the deeds for the lots in this development. (Submitted to the commission for consideration.)

Discussion.

He specifically referred to Number 8. It concerns any building not attached to the primary residence. It says . . . to be placed to not be visible from any public street. Most of us have adhered to this in the development. I assume this is going to be visible from the street. Thus, an exception to the covenants.

Mr. Phillips explained homeowner associations, covenants, things of those nature are of a private nature between the property owners and the homeowner association or covenants they are subject to. Having this on the record will be helpful if you want to pursue this further. But the commission really doesn't have any authority to enforce any kind of covenants or anything of that nature.

Valley View Court is a public street owned and maintained by the town confirmed Mr. Phillips and Mr. Grappone.

Discussion of the covenants being enforceable in this situation by Mr. Linehan. Mr. Phillips said not by the PZC. It would be pursued through the superior court to enforce the covenants. Mr. Phillips pointed out sometimes covenants do sunset.

Discussion.

Mr. Treviso, applicant, said he was not aware of this. And, he sees everyone's cabanas from the street featuring detached sheds, cabanas for pools.

Discussion.

Mr. Treviso explained this is going to be beautiful for the neighborhood.

The Chair explained it is not unusual for us to put stipulations on an application like this such as you can't have a business running out of there, the exterior has to match the main building structure. Don't be surprised if you hear that during the business meeting.

Discussion.

Hearing no further speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing.

MINUTES ARE PREPARED SUMMARY STYLE. YOU MAY REFER TO THE ONLINE POSTING TO HEAR THE FULL COMMENTARY.

B. Severino V. Bovino, V.P. (KJA) agent for Michael Riccio and David J. Carabetta, application to change zone boundary from R-20/25 to B, property located at 307 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, owned by Compagnos, LLC, parcel size .83 acres (ZC #568)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented on behalf of the applicants. Also participating were Michael Riccio, David Carabetta, Michael Fasulo and Colin Carabetta.

Mr. Bovino stated the property is located at 307 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike just west of the intersection with Meriden Avenue. It is served by public water and sewer. Land area is 0.83 acres with 120.67' of frontage. There are two nonconforming buildings on the property built in 1948. One is 3,064 sf and the other 1,040 sf. These buildings are used for manufacturing and a small engine repair shop. The use of manufacturing has been at this property for many years.

The zone is R 20/25 with a residential zone to the north, west and a portion of the northeast. Two parcels to the east, the Old Ace Appliance site which is now removed and is zoned Business at the intersection. Land to the south and southeast is also zoned Business.

There is a gas station to the east, a Dunkin Donuts and another retail to the southeast and one multifamily building to the south across the street.

The two parcels to the east are owned by the applicants and they were used by Ace Appliance and it used to be a gas station. The buildings were removed and an environmental cleanup was done to the property.

The proposal before you is to rezone #307 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike to a B zone. This request is an expansion of the existing zone and is not spot zoning. It will allow for more appropriate development. The intent is to combine the two properties at the corner with #307 and this will allow it to meet current standards for development like proper drainage, landscaping, parking, buildings, set backs from the roadway, et cetera.

Also, it will meet the current demand in the market place.

The applicant has provided a traffic study for a possible use and the report concludes the level of service will not be diminished. It'll operate at a level C or better. It will be well managed within the site. The public roadway system can handle the additional trips.

Together with the application and appropriate fees, we've provided the area map showing properties and owners within 500' radius. Owners were notified and the proof of that was provided to the planning department.

We submit that the zone change request meets the goals of the POCD, it balances the tax base between residential and business, provides for the best use of the property, the local roadways can handle the additional traffic, property has the appropriate frontage and utilities and that the request will not have a detrimental affect to the public health, safety and welfare of the area.

I'll answer questions.

Michael Riccio, 124 Andrews Street, added we have looked at the uses for this property numerous uses and no matter what use comes there, it is appropriate for an expansion of the zone because we're looking at over 18,000 cars/day passing by this property. It is an existing nonconforming use that is long past it's time. We're very excited to be cleaning up the entire corner and putting a use there that'll be beneficial to the neighborhood. We strongly believe and have since we purchased this that a zone change for that third parcel is more than appropriate.

David Carabetta, 601 Winding Ridge, reiterated what Mike stated. We've owned the property for a good number of years and it's obviously, as we all know it is the gateway entrance to Southington and we are excited to make some revisions, bring it up to code and I think the town will like what we have proposed long term.

Commissioners questions:

Mr. Santago discussed the area map that was provided in the packet noting the area for the zone change and previous zoning for the area outlined. He further stated this corner has been an eyesore for a while. To do anything on it, I think, is okay.

Mr. Bovino explained in response to a query by Mr. Santago that the intended use is a carwash with a driveway entrance from Meriden Waterbury Road (see the plan) on the south side of the property. The circulation goes through the bays and out to Meriden Avenue. It's all one-way circulation. Discussion.

More discussion about the business will come at site plan time. Tonight, it is just should we change the zone to expand the existing business zone into that other parcel. We don't want to talk about site plan tonight when it is not the time to talk about site plan.

Discussion.

We want something that looks good on that particular parcel because right now it doesn't look good. Mr. Santago said he would have more site plan related questions if this goes forward.

Mr. Bovino advised the buildings were built in 1948, prior to the 1957 zoning regulations. It's possible they were built in the residential zone and they used them for industrial purposes. Some kind of repair facility and commercial uses.

Ms. Locks asked about the cleanup. Was it just the gas station area or the older buildings, also? Soil tests were done? Mr. Bovino said the corner property. Mr. Riccio interjected there was a house and the old Ace Appliance building that was removed. We've spent well over half a million dollars cleaning up the site, remediating the soils and remediating the groundwater. The site is now clean and we've been preparing for this for several years.

Ms. Locks asked if the same thing was done on the land for the little machine shop. Mr. Riccio said there is no need right now to do any environmental there other than remove the structure. If there are, at the time of the removal we'll do with that when the building comes down. Ms. Locks advised usually there are a lot of oils involved in those types of little shops. I'd like to see that happen.

Mr. Riccio responded that is without question. One of the partners has an entire career of environmental cleanup (Dave Carabetta). Ms. Locks said it would be nice to see that area shaped up.

Mr. Gworek had a lot of site plan questions. For this application, my question would be, as far as along the borders of the machine shop, are those trees going to be removed? I'm nervous about the cover for the residents at 321 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike and 1644 Meriden Avenue. That's basically my main concern. Mr. Bovino said there will be walls and fences and landscaping, a combination, to provide buffers to the neighbors. I don't believe there are trees to the north looking at Meriden Avenue, a substantial amount. There are trees on the west side and we will do the best we can to preserve some of those. It's our intention to have fences and landscaping and walls to create the buffer.

Mr. Gworek noted the two letters in opposition from the neighbors. A buffer would be welcome.

Mr. Cowles's question regarding hours of operation and how it will impact the neighborhood. Mr. Phillips said that would be at the site level review. You are looking now at is the zone change appropriate for the area as far as expanding the business zone outward from that corner. You want to look at the POCD, as well. Mr. Phillips concluded that having a slight expansion of this area, in his opinion, is consistent with the POCD.

Discussion.

The Chair reiterated we are looking at do we want to change the zone from residential to business and hours of operation are a site plan issue.

Discussion.

David Carabetta did respond that the hours of operation are 24 hours/day/7 days/week. Very similar to the gas station across the street and the Dunkin Donuts. Our usage is basically during the day with minimal usage at night and very little use overnight. We are a self-service facility so we want to be open 24 hours to service the community.

Explained.

Mr. Riccio added on that they will address the lighting, et cetera, at site plan time. I think you'll be pleased. The carwash use is very quiet. Not a very loud noise and should not be any disturbance to the neighborhood, at all.

Ms. Volpe referred to the POCD, Page 64, where it talks about the expanding. I agree it is probably a good idea with that corner lot and the other businesses. I echo my fellow commissioners that I am concerned with the site plan and traffic. My only other question for Rob is: Was there ever a corridor study done on 322 as recommended in the POCD at Page 62? Mr. Phillips said there was discussion during the process to look at West Street, Queen Street and the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. We're focusing on West Street right now and it is about to get underway.

Ms. Volpe added the two vital areas along that corridor connect our community and bring in visitors from outside of it. As far as the zone change, I am inclined to agree with it but I do have some apprehensions about overall size. Explained this was a residential zone at conception and any change to business might be uncomfortable to some.

Mr. Salka clarified: If we decide to go ahead and rezone this to business and they present a site plan to us, I'm hearing this is going to run 24/7 based on preliminary input. It's my understanding that if that is the case, as a commission we can stipulate perhaps that the 24/7 may not be acceptable to us.

Can we do that within a business zone? Mr. Phillips said if this is a special permit and a site plan you can certainly do that. He confirmed this fact later in the meeting.

(Anyone wishing to speak in favor of this application)

The Chair noted a couple of letters in file: two in opposition.

- Doris A. Fillion, 1644 Meriden Avenue (posted on line for review).
- Brian DellaVentura, no address, (Posted on line for review).

Mike Fasulo, 77 Southshire Drive in Southington. I am a member of the LLC that owns the property in question. I was excited to be a part of it because it was an opportunity to clean up what was there and make good use of the property.

I do want to say the property had an abandoned gas station that was becoming an eyesore. It was removed and cleaned up. Now when you look at the property, it is vacant land with a couple of old buildings. I see this as an opportunity to add to the commercial corner there and put the property to good use.

I am familiar with the plans and the other location the applicant has and it's a beautiful site and I think it would enhance that corner and finish it off in a nice way.

I am definitely in favor of the zone change to let that move forward.

(Those wishing to testify in opposition to the application)

David Conable, 335 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike advised his neighbor at 321 lives in Texas and I see his driveway and where the traffic is going to come in, I guarantee people will be pulling into his driveway.

Discussion.

I'm concerned with the traffic coming down there. To me, the road is too narrow. Explained that to me, it is a safety factor. Speed limit was discussed.

Route 322 is stated owned and governed mostly by the STC. Discussion about what could be done to make the driveway a little bit clearer.

The runoff from the site is a big concern. During heavy rains right now, the backyard can become a river.

Discussion.

The Chair advised that town staff does a pretty good job of making sure there is appropriate drainage included in this type of thing once it moves forward. Your points are well taken.

Discussion.

The Chair explained the procedure to be followed by the applicant going forward and the timeline per regulations and notice requirements.

Before closing this item, the Chair stated that under the regulations there are specific details on lighting and that type of stuff. I'm sure if this was to be approved, at the next step, the site plan, it would

have to be conformed with our regulations in term so lighting and buffers. Carwash is a special thing that talks about water usage and they'd have to demonstrate water usage if that was to go forward.

The Chair, hearing no further comments from the commission, closed this public hearing item.

C. Proposed zoning regulation text amendment to repeal Section 18- Redevelopment Overlay District (ROD) (ZA 606), opening pf public hearing was tabled to November 17th

Mr. Phillips wasn't sure if we opened the public hearing last time. We'll talk about it tonight. I did forward a comment from the economic development director to the commission for its review and it's posted on line for everyone to review.

To summarize this, the ROD is really what is called an overlay zone. If you think about an onion, one layer would be the underlying zoning map and then the outer layer would be an overlay zone that's designed to be in certain areas based upon the initiative you are trying to further.

In this case, the POCD back in 2006, this ROD concept was approved through the POCD and it outlined four or five distinct areas of multiple properties that in some cases the properties were impacted environmentally and the objective was to try and incentivize the development of those properties by including properties adjacent to it and requiring a ten acre minimum assemblage of properties in order to put together mixed uses. It could be residential, commercial, what have you.

It was a good idea at the time. The 2016 POCD did say that we should consider enhancing it or changing or doing modifications that are necessary to make it effective and a proper incentive. And, to date, we have had no development in those areas. We're looking at 14 years now this has been in place and we've had a number of different types of development proposals but they've never been compliant with an ROD overlay, except for: The Greenway Commons in the downtown area that was approved shortly after the 2006 POCD approval.

Nothing has happened there except for the demolition of the buildings and most of the environmental work. Again, that approval in 2007, that was subject to the beneficial change through the great recession that allowed a 9-year original approval instead of 5 with a 5-year extension with site plans. We have the 14 years to complete it and that expires next fall in 2021. No real reason to believe that anything is going to have any traction there to be developed from now until then.

Speaking with the economic development director and other town staff, we feel as though the evidence is there that it is not necessarily conducive to development to have this framework but actually might be an impediment to development because it hasn't produced anything of any substantial improvement. Economic development feels as though the hands would be untied a little bit if we could remove this kind of restriction over these areas. To that end, that is what is before you. Actually, repeal the actual language in the zoning regulations for ROD and if the PZC supports that the next step would be to remove the ROD reference in the POCD which requires a referral to the town council for their review. Then it would come back to you for a decision.

That's where we're at. Maybe you want to think about it. We shouldn't at this time be in the business of keeping regulations on the books that aren't necessarily leading to a means to an end to the outcome we were all anticipating. Fourteen years is a pretty good example of something that hasn't worked to date. That's in a nutshell an executive summary. I'll take questions.

The Chair asked by doing this is that anticipated this will assist in the ability of our town or economic development director to market and find a suitor for the Greenway Commons property in downtown? Mr. Phillips responded the way it is set up now, that overlay is there and associated with that specific approval back in 2007. Assuming that doesn't come to fruition, you are really back at square one. I think the options start to open to you in that area and you still retain the control about what you would like to see happen there.

In the document produced by Lou Perillo, he believes he would have the ability to affect change a lot quicker than what this was set up originally to do.

Mr. Gworek had no further questions.

Mr. Cowles said just keeping something on the books for the sake of keeping something on the books is necessarily a huge benefit to the town.

Discussion.

Four or five different areas of town were identified as RODs. The associated framework was then entered into the zoning regulations subsequent to the POCD in 2006. Greenway happened to be something approved right away. Right now, we see no progress.

Mr. Santago said by taking this off the books, the contention is we're helping the situation, to try to market it and are we hurting anything else by doing it? Mr. Phillips did not see a detrimental impact and the incentive did not come to fruition on the application. Mr. Santago said taking things off the books because I didn't get my way, yet, am I hurting anything by having it stay there? Mr. Phillips noted the layer of complexity that may in fact be a problem in redeveloping the area.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips further added that there are people with certain interests in certain properties and even if they are impacted, there is still interest. Some of the more economic type questions, if you want to delve into that, Lou Perillo could answer that. If you feel you more economically based answers to some questions, there is no time limit on this, we can get Lou at a future meeting to answer questions.

Mr. Santago said if this would help Lou to market this area, I get that, but I don't want unintended consequences elsewhere. If you are telling me that won't happen, then I'm cool with that. I don't want to do something with one thing in mind and then cause something detrimental somewhere else. That's the basis of my question.

Mr. Phillips responded this like an outer layer of the onion, just removing it reverts everything back to the underlying zone. Explained.

Ms. Locks said she'd like to hear from Lou at a future meeting before I make a decision to repeal this just to see where he stands and where we want to go with this. I agree that you want to have it more marketable and make that area a nice area --- Greenway Commons is the center of town.

We can reach out to Lou and ask him to attend the next meeting on December 1st.

Ms. Volpe wanted to hear from Lou because she wants to understand better what is restrictive about this. Is it the square footage or the ten acres? I would want to consider our most recent POCD did discuss some of the adaptive reuse policies out there that I am a big advocate for in historic overlay zones that could help in tax credits to rehabilitate buildings. Those are economic development incentives used by surrounding towns and we have no provisions for it in our regulations. Maybe that is something that could assist. I agree that we shouldn't just get rid of it when we still have qualifying buildings. I need more answers.

Mr. Phillips noted regulations for buildings that redate 1957 that do allow for adaptive reuse. The old Clark Bolt Building is an example. Factory Square. A number of areas where there are pre-existing factory buildings and they are going thru adaptive reuse. Factory Square is interesting. But that only applies to pre-1957 buildings.

Discussion.

Mr. Salka sees an upside but no downside to this is removing it from the regulations. I'd like to hear from Lou on the financial ramifications, as well.

The Chair agreed it would be good to hear from Lou. Maybe he can answer questions for us.

(Those who would like testify in favor of this application.)

Michael Riccio, 124 Andrews Street, putting on his economic development committee hat here for a second, I think bringing Lou in would shed a lot of light on this. And, help you to understand his thinking process. Having residential on the Ideal Forging property is crucial to the future success of downtown. The number of units is debatable by the PZC. Having some density there is definitely crucial to the success of downtown. Look at West Hartford.

Discussion.

Having some type of multi-use there is much better than a drop forge. Having this change will give the PZC and the Economic Development Commission an opportunity to make some changes people didn't think about 15 years ago. It was a great idea at the time.

The special overlay tax district was described as helping to redevelop and clean up the property.

Lou definitely has some insight.

The Chair left the public hearing open at this time.

BUSINESS MEETING

A. Michael Treviso, Special Permit application to construct a garage in excess of 3 spaces, property located at 212 Valley View Court, in an R-40 zone (SPU #642)

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve SPU #642 with the following stipulations:

- The exterior of the building will match the exterior of the existing home.

- No business will be run out of this garage.
- Per the applicant, no trees will be removed from the property as part of the construction of this garage.

Mr. Cowles seconded.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Severino V. Bovino, V.P. (KJA) agent for Michael Riccio and David J. Carabetta, application to change zone boundary from R-20/25 to B, property located at 307 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, owned by Compagnos, LLC, parcel size .83 acres (ZC #568)

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve ZC #568. Ms. Locks seconded.

Discussion:

Mr. Santago had no issue with the zoning change for business, but certainly because I am just happy that area is being something concrete versus what it has been and is now. I'm sure the applicants will take some of our discussion and come back site plan wise and special permit wise with answers to drainage, access from Meriden Waterbury Road, environmental things, buffers to the neighbors. This commission has been very consistent in asking those questions from everybody. I'm sure we would do that for this one, as well. Hopefully, we'll develop a nice relationship moving forward.

Mr. Salka echoed those comments. There are already industrial buildings there. If this was going to be strictly residential and homes were there, that'd be a different story. We've had some grandfathered industrial buildings there already, so I am in support of this zone change.

Discussion about the requirement for sidewalks and inclusion of that into the site plan when they come back. They need to show it and can request a waiver.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Effective date: December 2, 2020 (15 days after today).

C. Eleni Real Estate, LLC, site plan modification application for a two-story office/retail building, property located at 1615 West Street, in the WSB zone, parcel size 2.13 acres (SPR #1802), Tabled from November 4

Sev Bovino, representing the applicant, requested this matter be continued. There was no objection by the commission to that request.

D. Proposed zoning regulation text amendment to repeal Section 18- Redevelopment Overlay District (ROD) (ZA606), opening of public hearing was tabled to November 17th

Mr. Santago made a motion to table. Mr. Salka seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

* Regulations Review Committee Update and Discussion

Mr. Santago had nothing new to offer this evening. We will schedule our next meeting. We wanted feedback on revamping the presentation of the regulations.

Discussion.

If a commission member has a special request for a certain regulation, give it to Rob, Sue, Joe or myself and when we get to that section, we'll take it under advisement.

A meeting of the committee will be set up.

* Authorization for Administrative Approval: David Mase, site plan application for new driveway entrance, property located at 75 Aircraft Road, owned by Southington Business Park II, LLC, in an I-2 zone, parcel size 40 acres (SPR#1807)

Mr. Phillips explained this is a proposal for an additional curb cut on to Aircraft which kind of is towards the western side. There is an existing curb cut and they want to have one on the eastern side of the western curb cut and that's for circulation of tractor trailer non-box truck circulation. There is an Amazon distribution facility over there and there's two different distribution facilities there.

That 75 Aircraft is pretty much entirely filled out with adaptive reuses and it is doing very well.

The multi-use trail is going to run by the eastern property line and it would cross over this proposed curb cut. We are already looking at safety improvements and things like that that would be necessary for that.

Mr. Grappone continued. We had a meeting today with DOT about the trail project. A main crossing area is Yarde Metals. Safety is a big concern in that area. I would continue the same reasoning for this area. There is warning signs being put up ahead of each side of the driveway crossing at Yarde Metals. There are pedestrian crosswalk stop signs, stop bars. Those are proposed amenities for trail safety.

We'll look for these types of comments and the applicant to address these for 75 Aircraft.

The Chair explained running into the convoy of white vans coming out of there. Amazing! I am glad to hear the property is fully utilized right now.

Does anybody have a problem with town staff doing an administrative approval of this site plan application?

Mr. Phillips said the uses in there are not only bulletproof to this virus situation, but they are thriving. Those are your packages being delivered.

The Chair noted nobody had a problem with staff doing an administrative approval on this.

ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Nothing.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Mr. Phillips advised we just received an application for a site plan modification for one of the pad site approved at 99 Executive out in front of Home Goods. It's proposed to be a 110 Grille.

Discussion.

Mr. Salka asked if there were an update on the truck wash by the bowling alley. Mr. Phillips said he hasn't heard anything on that.

Mr. Gworek asked about Fiber Optic Internet Provider, Go Net Speed. Any insight when it is going to go live? They're running wires. Mr. Grappone answered he had not heard anything about the start up. They are working on the lines.

The Chair wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving and I hope everyone has an opportunity to enjoy their family and friends with a lot of good food.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Salka made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Cowles seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:39 o'clock, p.m.)