

approval. They have received approval from Wetlands. There was a small piece of wetlands that the previous subdivision was approved to fill; however, that was at a time when they required a septic system. Therefore, now that they are located farther up, they don't have to fill it. They spoke to Wetlands and they are satisfied just leaving it like that.

Mr. D'Amico indicated that it was very straightforward and he'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Parkins asked if the existing house had access from Isinglass.

Mr. D'Amico responded that the existing house fronts on Isinglass Road. He showed the direction of Isinglass in relation to Crystal Lane coming off it. The existing lots for Crystal Lane are around the cul-de-sac.

Comm. Flannery asked if there were any other houses on those existing lots.

Mr. D'Amico responded yes, they have been built for a while.

Comm. Flannery asked if the zoning was for one acre.

Mr. D'Amico responded yes, the zoning is one acre and they meet all of the zoning regulations.

Mr. Schultz stated that Staff has a report when they get to it under Other Business, but for the record, when this subdivision was approved they paid \$24K to the City of Shelton Open Space Fund, so open space does not have to be considered in this application.

Comm. Spinelli commented for the record in regard to full disclosure, that he shares the same last name as this Applicant; however, he has no relation to him in any way and there is no conflict of interest. He wanted to clarify that for the record.

Chair Parkins asked if there were any other questions from the Commissioners or anyone in the audience wishing to speak for or against this proposal.

James Knapp, 249 Isinglass Road, Shelton, addressed the Commission.

Mr. Knapp indicated that his property directly abuts this property and he was concerned if it made a conforming sized lot by combining these two pieces of property or is it a non-conforming lot where variances are needed.

Chair Parkins responded that there are no variances needed for this project. It makes a conforming lot.

Mr. Knapp asked about the setback lines – the 40 foot setbacks, and if it was within the norm for an acceptable lot.

Mr. Schultz responded that all of the standards are in compliance, and as indicated, Staff would be giving a report under Old Business. It completely complies with all the regulations. This Lot 1 was just awaiting the conveyance of that land to make it a conforming lot.

Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone else in the audience wishing to speak for or against this proposal. There were no other comments from the public. She asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Comm. Harger commented that it seems to be cut and dry.

Comm. Flannery asked for clarification about the \$24K for Open Space.

Mr. Knapp asked who paid that.

Mr. Schultz responded that the developer paid that.

Comm. McGorty asked if that was for the whole thing.

Chair Parkins responded yes, for all of Crystal Lane development.

Mr. Schultz clarified for the new members that when a subdivision comes in, the Commission can either take 10% or a minimum of one acre for payment in lieu of. The Commission determined that for this 5 lot subdivision to take the payment in lieu of or 10% of the raw value of the land which equaled \$24K. On the recommendation from the Conservation Commission, this Commission decided to take the payment in lieu of because there is no other adjacent open space to add to.

Chair Parkins asked when that subdivision was put in there.

Mr. Schultz responded that it was approximately 12 or 13 years.

Mr. D'Amico added that he believes that it was about 1999.

Mr. Schultz commented that the surveying took place in 1996.

Chair Parkins asked if there were any further questions or comments. There were none.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to close the public hearing for Application #11-17.

OLD BUSINESS

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE

Chair Parkins asked if there were any questions on Staff Approved Standards 1-17 or Staff Approved Separates 1-5.

Comm. Flannery asked for more information about all of the home office separates.

Mr. Schultz clarified that Separate #6037 on 33 Ledgewood Road is for a building contractor home office with the standard restrictions for no materials or equipment on site. Separate #6048 on 30 Basking Ridge Road for a 50 square foot home office for a home improvement contractor with the same restrictions. Separate #6026, 41 Martinka Drive is for a fully licensed home improvement contractor (75 square feet) home office and Separate #6027, 269 Buddington Road is for a landscaping business office. Both home offices have the same restrictions for no equipment storage on site or commercial vehicles.

Comm. Flannery commented that her only concern was about commercial trucks or vans being parked.

Mr. Schultz responded that there are not allowed and it is strictly enforced. He added that if there is a repeat violation, they can issue a Cease & Desist, and the Commission has the ability to revoke it and then they have to go through the State of Connecticut.

Comm. Harger asked about the basement renovation for Separate #6033 on 390 River Road.

Mr. Schultz responded that was for Riverview Funeral Home basement renovation work.

Mr. Schultz commented that the new format for the Applications for Certificate of Zoning Compliance will have Staff Approved Standards for anything unique like additions, pools; Staff Approved Separates for home offices or something unique (like a conversion for 3-family back to a 2-family); and Previously Approved by the PZC through Site Plan – three different scenarios.

Comm. Flannery asked if the detached garage for Separate #6042 on 42 Dogwood Drive was within the size limits

Mr. Schultz responded yes, it complies with the Shelton Zoning Regulations. He added that they are starting to see the homes on Richard Boulevard and he suggested that the Commissioners take a ride up there because it is getting stabilized with grass.

SEPARATE #5983 ABC SIGN CORP., 515 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, BUSINESS & SIGN

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is for “M Spa & Skincare” taking over the “Simply Body.” This is for both the occupancy and for the sign. It is 2,050 square feet with the same type of ownership

Chair Parkins commented that she thinks the sign is already there because the “Spa” caught her eye while driving, but she is not certain (inaudible).

Comm. McGorty added that it may have gone up today.

Mr. Schultz responded that he didn't think so. ABC Sign was so helpful in preparing their regulations. Staff recommends approval.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #5983.

SEPARATE #6035 CHARTER FIREARMS, 18 BREWSTER LANE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz stated that a couple of meetings ago, they approved the boxing school that was going to occupy the old Russell Linen building and now this is the owner coming in to occupy the balance of the building.

Comm. McGorty asked when they are moving.

Mr. Schultz responded that he did not know the particulars about that.

Comm. McGorty commented that he was concerned about the parking.

Chair Parkins asked how many parking spaces were there.

Mr. Schultz responded that they have 22 spaces.

Chair Parkins asked how much this would require.

Mr. Schultz responded that he has two company vehicles and 29 employees, both full and part time and salespeople. As the Commission indicated, obviously the site has to accommodate both the occupants. This is the principle occupant, he is the owner of the property, so they have to continue to monitor this.

Comm. McGorty asked about the Boxing School hours because he recalls that they were later in the day with school-aged kids in the late afternoon and evenings.

Mr. Schultz responded that this application is for 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, leaving the weekends free. This is a standard manufacturer. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that sufficient on-site parking be provided at all times.

Chair Parkins asked if he was moving out of Canal Street.

Comm. McGorty responded yes.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6035.

SEPARATE #6055, SIGNSLITE INC. 1 FAR MILL CROSSING, SIGN

Mr. Schultz indicated that Sikorsky is moving into the old Health Net. He showed a rendering of their existing winged "S" logo for the proposed signage.

Chair Parkins asked if they are taking that whole building.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, the one in the back previously occupied by Health Net.

Comm. Spinelli commented that he read a report in the Fairfield County Business Journal that it was only going to be a temporary move, and that there won't be a lot of new jobs. They are re-doing the factory and it is a lease so they will eventually be going back.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6055.

SEPARATE #178, PRIMROSE COMPANIES, 223 CANAL STREET EAST, ENCLOSURE OF LOADING DOCK

John Guedes, Primrose Companies addressed the Commission.

Mr. Guedes indicated that (inaudible) in reference to 223 Canal Street, for the past year or so they have been dealing with environmental litigation on this property. Until they finish litigating, they really can't focus on anything else on the property because of the fact that when they took it over there was a dry cleaner there. This triggered into the (inaudible) and everything else that goes with it. In the past few months, there has been some clean-up taking place with soils and so forth.

Mr. Guedes indicated that what they discovered is that some of the soils contained some lead in the loading dock area. Some of the soil has been cleaned up but some of it wound up being just underneath the loading dock and next to the building. He stated that there are two ways they can handle this. They could continue to try to dig it, remove it and determine how to dispose of it or secondly, they could basically encapsulate it or enclose it. The State recommends that they do the later because they have tenants that require the

use. Also, with Avalon Bay proceeding next door they have limited space as well. They have decided to propose to enclose it. It will provide a better system for Avalon and some of the other tenants because it will provide an enclosed dock to take in supplies and deliveries during the winter weather.

Mr. Guedes provided a site plan and explained that they would be putting in two roll-up doors and one window and the rest is brick and (inaudible). It is within the loading dock area and it is pretty self-explanatory.

Chair Parkins asked if taking the Option B to cap it would limit their future use of it.

Mr. Guedes responded no and added that basically, somewhere along the line, somebody may have spilt something that got between the building wall and the asphalt, and now they have these standards. In other words, if the dry cleaners had not been there, he would not be here about this. It is strictly because of the dry cleaners that borings had to be done all over the place. On all of these sites, they have the dark belt that dates back to when they created the Canal and for some of it they used pot ash or whatever they had from the factories at the time; so nothing down there meets any kind of standards. This creates no hazard for anybody.

Chair Parkins asked if this was DEP approved.

Mr. Guedes responded yes, everything has to go within the regulations. The unfortunate thing is that until they get through some of these issues, although the financial crisis has hampered this, the idea is to follow through with the original plan with Avalon, 223 and so forth. It is going to take much longer than anyone anticipated, but until they finalize these issues they can't continue.

Comm. Harger commented that the loading dock was exposed and she understands that they want to box it in. She is familiar with the building and asked about the condition of the driveway.

Mr. Guedes responded that eventually everything has to be re-paved. Right now it is like the back. They've dug it up and there are piles there. It is best that they wait for the results to go up to the State and to receive their approval. They haven't figured out where to dispose of it and then the State has to approve of that too. This thing which is something simple, just goes on forever.

Comm. Harger indicated that she didn't understand what the dock enclosure project has to do with the borings that he did around here (inaudible).

Mr. Guedes responded that different locations have different issues.

Comm. Harger asked if this was just boxing in the loading dock up here, then why (inaudible)...

Mr. Guedes added that they are also extending it a little bit.

Comm. McGorty asked if it was an addition to it.

Comm. Harger commented OK, then it is an addition and that is where the footings are going.

Mr. Guedes responded that they are extending it about nine feet forward. He showed the three areas that have been cleaned up and signed off on. He explained that this is one of the areas that they dug out to the bottom of the footings of the building. They can't go any further or it will collapse so some of

these decisions have to be made. The decision was that this was the simplest way to meet the requirements and at the same time benefit the building. He offered to answer any other questions.

Comm. Flannery asked if the edge met the required setbacks.

Mr. Schultz responded that it was not an issue.

Mr. Guedes added that it stays within the existing line. He added that it is going to look better than just having a canopy there.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #178.

APPLICATION #11-17 ROGER SPINELLI FOR RE-SUBDIVISION APPROVAL (2 LOTS: CRYSTAL LANE ESTATES), CRYSTAL LANE, R-1 DISTRICT (MAP 25, Lots 38 and 81).

Chair Parkins indicated that the public hearing on this was just closed.

Mr. Schultz read that the Staff Report is dated November 1, 2011.

***See attached P&Z Staff Report dated 11/1/11.**

Mr. Schultz read that based on this review, the application is seeking re-subdivision approval for the creation of a conforming lot known as Lot 1 containing an area of 1.04 acres. This will be the last conforming lot created within the Crystal Lane Estates development using excess land from Parcel A and merging it with Lot 1, currently an undersized parcel which was established within the original subdivision. Said lot will be served by municipal sanitary sewers and public water. Property is located within Resident's R-1 District and, as indicated, the lot conforms to all lot area requirements.

Mr. Schultz stated that the Application was referred to the City Engineer, Fire Marshal and the Conservation Commission. The City Engineer had no comments and the Fire Marshal did not respond. The Fire Marshal is filling in for the Fire Chief because the Fire Chief normally reviews subdivision applications but he didn't have any comments. The Inland Wetlands Coordinator determined that there were no regulated activities associated with this application. They noted that the wetlands pockets will be preserved now and it will be noted on the Record Map. Property is not located within the Aquarian water company watershed area, flood hazard area or coastal area management area.

Mr. Schultz stated that the Applicant provided an acceptable Sediment and Erosion Control Plan. A certificate of Sediment and Erosion Control Permit will be issued prior to the commencement of site work. Mr. Schultz added that this is a fairly level lot on that portion of Isinglass Road.

He added that the Applicant has provided an acceptable Site Development Plan and Staff has examined the existing topography and the traffic needs of the existing neighborhood. There are no existing or planned sidewalks. Presently, Crystal Lane is an accepted City street.

Mr. Schultz stated that there is no open space set aside requirement for this application as the original subdivision paid \$24K into the City's Open Space Trust Fund.

The following are recommendations from Staff to add all standard notes to the Record Map, notes to be provided by Staff. Lot 1 shall require an Engineer Site

Plan to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and the P&Z Administrator prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Mr. Schultz added that this is very straightforward and everything is in compliance. He stated that if there are no questions, he has prepared a Draft Motion for the Commission to consider.

Comm. Flannery asked if the reason that this did not go forward years ago was because they did not have City water or sewers.

Mr. Schultz responded no, it was because Lot 1 was an undersized parcel and did not comply with the one acre requirement. So the owner of Parcel A, the next door neighbor, is now going to sell that land which can be added to Lot 1 to make it a conforming lot.

Comm. Flannery asked why they did not do that years ago.

Mr. Schultz responded that was not their choice at the time. So they had a five lot subdivision with a half acre parcel sitting there waiting to be added to and it just happened in 2011. He read the Draft Motion for Application #11-17 with recommendations and conditions for approval.

***See attached Draft Motion for Application #11-17 dated 11/1/11.**

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve Application #11-17.

PUBLIC PORTION

Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any item not on the agenda. There was no one.

Comm. Flannery thanked the Commission for moving this Public Portion to an earlier time on the agenda.

Chair Parkins commented that they will continue to see how it works and if everything is fine, it will continue.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to close the Public Portion of the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

APPLICATION #11-18 PINE ROCK AUTO SALES, INC. FOR MODIFICATION OF USED CAR DEALER LICENSE (INCREASE FROM 8 TO 12 VEHICLES), 1 SENECA TRAIL (MAP 5A, LOT 39), CA-2 DISTRICT – TABLED AT 10/11/11 MEETING

Mr. Schultz stated that as directed by the Commission, Staff sought a legal opinion on whether or not this application had to be accepted in light of the fact that a Cease & Desist order had been issued.

Mr. Schultz reviewed the status of Application #11-18 for the Commissioners. He explained that a Cease & Desist Order had been issued for One Seneca Trail because of failure to comply with both the State License for a Used Car Dealership License and for the conditions of approval by the ZBA, who handled automotive licenses at the time of approval. The condition was for no more than 8 vehicles on the premises, both inside the structure or outside, could be parked there at any time.

Mr. Schultz indicated that there were over 20 vehicles. The adjacent property owner made a formal complaint and subsequent to his office issuing a Cease & Desist Order, they filed a lawsuit. He will be attending the initial hearing on March 7th.

Mr. Schultz stated that the Commission's question to Corporation Counsel is whether or not the Commission has to accept this application in light of all these circumstances. Atty. Welch responded yes, they do and he will be providing a formal letter. Mr. Schultz stated that the clock has to start when this was taken up at the October 11th meeting because that was a Regular Meeting. If the October 11th meeting had been a Special P&Z Meeting, it would have started tonight. He indicated that the Commission would need to accept this and begin the review period as of 10/11/11. Later he will recommend that the Commission hold a Special Meeting on November 29th or November 30th to take this matter up for review. He will report on the Cease & Desist Order because that was issued first.

Chair Parkins indicated that they'll accept it tonight retroactive to Oct. 11th. She asked about starting the clock and if that would be 60 days.

Mr. Schultz responded no, 65 days – it concludes on December 5th. Staff would like to take this up but he has to do a detailed report as recommended by Corporation Counsel. They will do their normal referrals and he will be doing a detailed report.

Mr. Schultz stated as a side note, he has not gone down to the site but he has heard that there has been some removal of vehicles. He'll be providing a detailed report and added that the owner was going to cooperate.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #11-18 for review retroactive to October 11, 2011.

APPLICATION #11-21 F&R REALTY LLC FOR MODIFICATION OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL (DEMOLITION OF BUILDING – FORMER CAPTAIN'S PIZZA), FOR THE STORAGE OF MOTOR VEHICLES – ACCEPT, REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION

Mr. Schultz stated that Captain's Pizza has officially left this location and Curtiss-Ryan would like to have more room for their vehicles. He stated that when Curtiss-Ryan came in for a demolition permit, he was prepared to issue it on the spot; however, he asked if any vehicles would be parked there. Curtiss Ryan does plan to park vehicles there. This Commission regulates that so this will be a simple modification of the Site Plan. They will use the older site plan and request that the Commission waive that requirement.

Chair Parkins asked if they will be leaving the foundation and the (inaudible)

Mr. Schultz responded yes, the concrete slab. He indicated that the contractor was present.

Joe Jalowiec, Crista Building Contractors, 90 Sodom Lane, Derby, CT addressed the Commission. Mr. Jalowiec indicated that he built this building 27 years ago and he never dreamed that he would be taking it down. He stated that he built both of them there. He stated that the original building that has Honda in it now, and it was shared between Lincoln Mercury and Honda. He continued that Honda wanted to have its own facility and Curtiss-Ryan bought the Lincoln Mercury distributor. They set it up for Lincoln Mercury who had it

for about five years before selling it to Healy in Ansonia then they leased out the space to Captain's Pizza which is about 3500 square feet.

Mr. Jalowiec stated that they kept the original service area for Lincoln Mercury (inaudible)...

Comm. Harger commented that originally this whole thing was a car dealership.

Mr. Jalowiec responded yes, the whole thing was a car dealership originally and he believes the center piece was a dry cleaners at one time. He stated that they are going to leave the service area which is about 8000 square feet and demo about 3400 square feet because it just doesn't work out for a whole new showroom at this point in time.

He showed the area for the demolition which consists of the original showroom and the office space. He indicated that there are columns in there so they can't move cars around and so forth. He stated that there was a retaining wall on the side and in the back which will remain and the slab will remain. Mr. Jalowiec showed where they would like to put some cars inside for storage. The slab would also remain. He added that they are going to have less cars on the site because Captain's Pizza won't be there and they'll have less customers.

Mr. Jalowiec stated that was basically the whole plan at this point in time. They aren't going to change the appearance, pavement or anything. There is no site work.

Comm. Pogoda asked if there were any drainage issues.

Mr. Jalowiec responded no drainage issues. All the catch basins are in and it is the same as it was before.

Mr. Schultz commented that he had two reports when the Commission was ready for him to read them.

Chair Parkins asked about the dry cleaners, because they just spoke with John Guedes regarding a dry cleaner automatically triggering the need for site borings.

Mr. Jalowiec responded that they did a report on the building for asbestos and that was clean. He showed the location of the Service Area which has the oil separator and other things. He stated that it meets the Connecticut Standards. The other area was just for car sales.

Chair Parkins commented that he had mentioned earlier that there had been a dry cleaner there.

Mr. Jalowiec responded that there had been a dry cleaner but that area will remain in place in a building that is going to be preserved.

Mr. Schultz added that the portion of the building that is being demolished is clean. He read reports from the City Engineer and the Fire Marshal regarding this application.

***See attached correspondence to the P&Z Administrator, Richard Schultz from Robert Kulacz dated October 28, 2011.**

***See attached correspondence to the P&Z Administrator, Richard Schultz from James Tortora dated November 1, 2011.**

Chair Parkins commented that she trusts it is going to look nice because it is a prime location there.

Mr. Jalowiec stated that Curtiss Ryan would do it right.

Mr. Schultz read the draft motion requesting a waiver of the full site plan submission and to approve the modification of the site plan for Application #11-21 for demolition of the former Captain's Pizza portion of the building for the storage of motor vehicles for the Curtiss Ryan dealership with the noted conditions.

With no further questions or comments, Chair Parkins asked for a motion.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #11-21.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve Application #11-21.

OTHER MATTERS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 10/11/11

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes of 10/11/11. Comm. Spinelli abstained from voting.

HUNTINGTON WOOD SUBDIVISION: REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF PERFORMANCE BOND AND MODIFICATION OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (ELIMINATION OF BUDDINGTON ROAD/HUNTINGTON STREET INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS)

Mr. Schultz indicated that there are two parts to this. The Commission required the upgrade of Buddington at the intersection of Huntington Street through the elimination of that island. This Commission has repeatedly recommended the denial of that and that is going to hold true. They will need to eliminate the previous Commission's conditions for that subdivision.

Mr. Schultz stated that secondly, he had a report from the Director of Public Works recommending that the Performance Bond be released so that it can go to the Full Board of Aldermen.

***See attached correspondence to the P&Z Commission from Paul DiMauro, Director of Public Works, dated November 1, 2011.**

End of Tape 1A 7:46 p.m.

Mr. Schultz recommended that this be handled with two separate motions.

Chair Parkins read the Condition 6A of the Huntington Woods Subdivision dated March 9, 1999:

"the modification of the intersection between Buddington Road/Huntington Street including the elimination of the raised island and installing pavement, adjustment of curb line geometry for better traffic control, striping of pavement to provide an exclusive turn lane for each direction exiting Buddington Road with stacking space for at least 3 or 4 vehicles, and installation of appropriate traffic control signs."

Comm. Flannery asked if that means that the island would remain.

Chair Parkins responded yes, it will remain and there will be no improvements made to that intersection.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to eliminate Condition 6A of the Commission Approval dated March 9, 1999 for the intersection improvements for Huntington Woods Subdivision.

Chair Parkins indicated that the second motion would be for the release of the bond subject to BOA approval. She stated that they are going on the recommendation of the Public Works Director that all the items on the punch list that had been previously indicated by the City Engineer either have been addressed or will be addressed before the BOA votes to accept the City streets or release of the bond.

Comm. McGorty asked if everything had been met and fulfilled.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, the matter is out of their hands now. The guard rail is still an issue with some of the residents but that is going to be taken up by the BOA. It sounds like they are going to be adding wood.

Comm. McGorty asked if it was an issue of appearance.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, aesthetics.

Comm. McGorty commented OK, it's not an issue of scope – they have met the requirements of scope.

Mr. Schultz responded that the Commission required metal guard rails. They softened that approach but that was done years ago. The residents want wood and it sounds like the developer is willing to work with them.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve the request for release of Performance Bond for Huntington Woods Subdivision subject to BOA approval.

ZONING ENFORCEMENT:

1) 215 MILL STREET: INITIATE LEGAL ACTION (ABANDONED CAMPER)

Mr. Schultz stated that he was disappointed that Comm. Sedlock was not present because he wanted him to make this motion. This is a sensitive issue because the parents are elderly and have no control over their son who lives in Oxford. They have repeatedly requested that he get a flatbed and move it to Oxford. This camper is not even street-worthy. The owner is the parents but, hopefully, the Legal in the paper will get the son's attention. The son has been working with Staff all along.

Chair Parkins commented that he has certainly been given enough time.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to initiate legal action for zoning enforcement at 215 Mill Street.

2) 71 LONGFELLOW ROAD: INITIATE LEGAL ACTION (UNREGISTERED MOTOR VEHICLES)

Mr. Schultz stated that this was an uncooperative property owner. There is one vehicle but this is a high profile neighborhood complaint and it has been on this list for a while.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to initiate legal action for zoning enforcement at 71 Longfellow Road.

PAYMENT OF BILLS

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to pay the bills, if funds are available.

STAFF REPORT

Mr. Schultz provided the P&Z Staff Report including ZBA applications, Downtown Subcommittee Report, Zoning Subcommittee Report, Zoning Enforcement updates.

United Illuminating

He indicated that UI is going to be using the property that it bought off of Exit 12 for the parking of their tree cutters contracted by UI. The state statutes give them a lot of control over their property but he has a call into management.

Comm. Flannery indicated that they clear cut it.

Mr. Schultz added that they are also parking very haphazardly. This is the gateway to corporate Shelton.

Chair Parkins commented that she thought it was temporary.

Mr. Schultz responded that he thinks so but aesthetically it looks like a war zone. It needs to be more organized and Staff is working on it.

In regard to upcoming meetings, Mr. Schultz recommended Tuesday, November 29th for the public hearing and December 13th for the last Regular P&Z Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to adjourn at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karin Tuke
Recording Secretary, Planning & Zoning Commission