

SHELTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION SEPTEMBER 11, 2012

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, September 11, 2012 at Shelton City Hall, Room 303, 7:00 p.m., 54 Hill Street, Shelton, CT 06484. The Chairperson reserved the right to take items out of sequence.

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Ruth Parkins
 Commissioner Anthony Pogoda
 Commissioner Virginia Harger
 Commissioner Thomas McGorty
 Commissioner Joan Flannery
 Commissioner Elaine Matto
 Commissioner Nancy Dickal (alternate)

Staff Present: Richard Schultz, Administrator
 Anthony Panico, Consultant
 Patricia Gargiulo, Court Stenographer
 Karin Tuke, Recording Secretary

Tapes (2), correspondence and attachments on file in the City/Town Clerk's Office and the Shelton Planning and Zoning Office and on the City of Shelton Website www.cityofshelton.org

CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE / ROLL CALL

Chairperson Parkins called the Regular Planning & Zoning meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and a roll call of the members present. Chair Parkins commented on the importance of the Pledge of Allegiance on this day, September 11th which is such a significant day in U.S. history.

She indicated that the first item on the agenda would be a public hearing for Application #12-18 and she reviewed the public hearing procedures for all those present.

PUBLIC HEARING

APPLICATION #12-18 – MCP 6 ARMSTRONG, LLC FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION/SITE PLAN APPROVAL (PHASE II: PARKING EXPANSION), 6 ARMSTRONG ROAD (MAP 18, LOT 22).

P&Z Secretary Virginia Harger read the Call of the Hearing for Application #12-18 and two pieces of correspondence.

***See attached correspondence to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from City Engineer, Robert Kulacz, PE dated August 29, 2012.**

***See attached correspondence to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from Fire Marshal, James M. Tortora dated September 9, 2012.**

Atty. Dominick Thomas, Cohen & Thomas, 315 Main Street, Derby, CT addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. Atty. Thomas introduced the photographs of the postings of the property at 6 Armstrong Road and the notification letters per requirements into the record. He indicated that this is Phase II. The initial proposal added approximately 49 parking spaces. In order to facilitate the renovations, the first Phase was 29 spaces which did not require a Special Exception. He added that it was the understanding that when they came in for the remaining spaces, however many that would be, it would exceed 49 parking spaces, and be a Special Exception. He turned the presentation over to Mr. White from Tighe & Bond.

Andrew White, Tighe & Bond, 1000 Bridgeport Avenue, Shelton, CT addressed the Commission. Mr. White stated that they are proposing 10 parking spots south of 6 Armstrong Road, 4 parking spaces on the south side toward the pond, 6 spaces on the north side including a van/handicapped space. He pointed out the current existing condition on a site map by showing the drive coming into the turnaround. Mr. White

explained that they are moving the south curb 11 feet providing 9' x 18' parking spaces. They are reducing the impervious cover within the wetland buffer and providing access to the roundabout for the drop-off spot. He explained that the grading for the proposed parking spots will remain and drain into the west, existing catch basin, and into the existing pond. The drop-off area drains to the east to an existing catch basin that also drains into the pond.

Mr. White indicated that there is a six foot concrete sidewalk using granite curbs to clean up the property on that section of the site. He concluded his presentation commenting that it was a small parking proposal.

Atty. Thomas stated that Wetlands has approved this swamp through the wetlands as an administrative action, an upland review action by Mr. Cooke.

Chair Parkins asked if he was referring to plans dated August 8, 2012.

Mr. Bill Fenn, MPC 6 Armstrong, 6 Armstrong Road, Shelton CT addressed the Commission. Mr. Fenn responded yes.

Comm. Harger asked if the reason for this proposal was because that entry way would be used more.

Mr. Bill Fenn responded that they will use it for visitors. He commented that they've already added 39 spaces at the front of the building and that project is presently under construction. It should be completed within the next few weeks and this is the second phase of the parking expansion.

Chair Parkins asked whether it would be designated as Visitor Parking.

Mr. Fenn responded yes, probably, although they aren't quite sure but their intention is to have it for visitor parking.

Chair Parkins commented that if it is not marked - it may not be used for visitors. Sometimes employees won't park there if it is designated for visitors. She added that since it is so few spaces, they will want to keep it for visitors.

Comm. Harger asked if that particular building was fully occupied now.

Mr. Fenn responded that it was about 50% occupied.

Comm. Harger asked what the approximate number of total tenants would be in there right now.

Mr. Fenn responded that it is about 7 tenants today but the lease is out for additional tenants bringing them up to about 65%.

Comm. Harger asked what the approximate number of employees in there would be.

Mr. Fenn responded that it was approx. 200.

Chair Parkins asked if this would satisfy what they are looking for in regard to their quantity of parking.

Mr. Fenn responded yes.

With no further questions from the Commissioners, Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to speak for or against this proposal. There were no audience comments and the Chair requested a motion to close the public hearing.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to close the public hearing for Application #12-18.

AGENDA ADD-ON

APPLICATION #12-17: REQUEST TO WITHDRAW 2 LOT SUBDIVISION APPLICATION, COUNTRY CLUB OF CT, LLC.

Chair Parkins requested a motion to add an item to the agenda under Old Business for Application #12-17 for Country Club of CT, LLC to request a withdrawal. She explained that it was a component of the 550 River Road application that they will hear next week. It was a request to withdraw a two-lot subdivision application which they've decided not to apply for.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to add Application #12-17 to the 9/11/12 Agenda under Old Business.

OLD BUSINESS

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE

SEPARATE #6360 – MARCUS YANCASKIE, DC, 161 CORAM AVENUE, BUSINESS & SIGN

Mr. Schultz stated that the Commission is aware that this application was tabled with the directive for Staff to go out to see if that one or two parking spaces could be provided. The consensus of the Commission on the use was fine but that would be taken up at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Schultz stated that both he and Tony Panico went to the site and they determined that the possibility of perpendicular parking is out of the question. Mr. Schultz indicated that it just doesn't work. He explained that once a vehicle is parked, no part of that vehicle can overhang into the City right-of-way, especially when there is a sidewalk, which is the case here.

He added that they all know that parking is needed in the Downtown and the areas adjacent to Downtown – such as here. Mr. Schultz stated that Staff has given this a lot of thought and essentially if one parking space could be designed, it would have to be something like a half moon driveway providing a space. They could drop off the patient and walk up the stairs and when the car exits, the nose would be going out onto Coram Road. Mr. Schultz commented that it is a pretty steep grade there.

Chair Parkins asked if there would still be another curb cut.

Mr. Panico responded yes, parallel to Coram and, if need be, they could create a very low retaining wall of about 12 – 18 inches. They could use the existing driveway that serves the back as the curb cut to the entrance of that space but they would need to create a curb cut for (inaudible). He commented that it should work but to try to get two parking spaces in that area would be...

Chair Parkins asked if it wasn't going to really be a permanent parking space – it's going to be more of a

Mr. Schultz responded that it would serve their needs.

Mr. Panico stated that they would think that if it is someone who is going to be there for a few minutes, then they would probably park there – but, yes, sometimes it would be empty.

Dr. Marcus Yancaskie, DC addressed the Commission. He commented that each patient would be there for about 15 minutes but there are others who are there for up to an hour.

Mr. Panico commented that he and Rick looked at the point of view of trying to get two parking spaces backing into the existing driveway. It doesn't work because the driveway

goes down and there is a bit of a drop-off. He added that if there wasn't enough room to pull directly into the building and to do it properly, then they are still going to have to back out into the traffic coming down Coram Road. Mr. Panico stated that it is better to have just the one space that will work, and have it work safely. Also, when that car leaves, it can leave in a front forward position and see the traffic that is coming. It shouldn't result in any additional loss of curb parking. Depending upon how the space is laid out, it might eliminate one curb space or not. The street is not striped so you really can't tell if there is a utility pole there. You should be able to exit out without having to move a utility pole. Mr. Panico stated that it was the only reasonable solution that he and Rick could come to out in the field.

Chair Parkins commented that if it still requires a curb cut, then it would still be under the purview of the City Engineer.

Mr. Schultz responded that leads to his comment that the Commission can authorize it but the Engineering Department has to issue the permit and currently, they are skeptical. He indicated that the applicant was made aware of that today. So there is no guarantee. If it is not based on sound engineering principles – and they have their criteria – they will not issue it.

Mr. Schultz indicated that in speaking with the applicant, hopefully, they can go through a phase to occupy the building, see what the needs are and take it from there. He commented that it is a good use for the building and the neighborhood and, obviously, it is ideal to have that one space for a patient that really needs it.

Mr. Panico asked Rick if there was any way the City could earmark the space in front at the curb for that purpose.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, he discussed this with the applicant today and that can be had.

Mr. Panico commented that if the City allows that to happen, then maybe they don't need to chew into the actual front yard of the site.

Mr. Schultz responded that they discussed all of the scenarios and the applicant is aware of that. If the Commission does act favorably on this, the Applicant is not going to jump into it right away. They will work with the City on this.

Comm. Harger commented that it would be an option that the City would recognize a space for their needs.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, recognizing that it would be curbside parking for their own needs.

Mr. Panico stated that actually it would not even be considered parking. They would earmark it as a drop off space so that no one could park there.

Comm. Matto asked if the vehicle wouldn't be staying there for the whole appointment.

Mr. Panico responded that if someone wanted the opportunity to drop off a person that couldn't move very well or is handicapped – they could drop them off and then find a regular parking space.

Comm. Matto commented that she didn't understand because there are stairs to the front door – so it's not really handicapped accessible...

Mr. Panico stated that he didn't know how that was going to be addressed.

Comm. Pogoda added that they aren't going to get anyone handicapped in there.

Dr. Yancaskie's Assistant (name not provided) responded that they will be installing a ramp for those with walkers, wheelchairs, etc.

Chair Parkins commented OK, they are installing a ramp.

Mr. Schultz concluded that at the very best, one parking space and a half-moon type of design, subject to the Engineering Department issuing a permit. He is prepared to recommend approval for the occupancy and the sign which they've already gone over and the one parking space.

Chair Parkins agreed but it must be subject to the review and approval by Engineering.

Mr. Panico commented that it should also include the request to the Applicant for the possibility of earmarking a public parking space on the street.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, he's talked to him about it.

Chair Parkins added – in addition to the half-moon design.

Mr. Panico responded no – in lieu of it.

Mr. Schultz reiterated that all of those issues were discussed with the applicant. The applicant realizes that this is a difficult situation.

Chair Parkins commented that it seems like the better option.

Mr. Panico added that with the curb cuts you need to ask what you are really gaining by doing all of that work. They are going to have a car parked on the same grade as the one that is parked on the curb.

Dr. Yancaskie's Assistant (name not provided) commented that it is tough to say which is better. She had her ceramics business there for over 10 years and they had issues with people parking on the street. Even if they checked carefully, they would open their doors and a car flying down the hill would bang their car door backwards.

Dr. Yancaskie added yes, that is the biggest issue.

Mr. Panico responded that if that is a big issue than maybe it would be worth it for them to go to the expense of creating a space off of the street so that wouldn't happen.

Dr. Yancaskie commented that he has personally opened his car door into this fast oncoming traffic.

Chair Parkins agreed that it was a dangerous road. There was a bad accident there recently.

Comm. Pogoda added that they come down that hill pretty fast and especially, if that light is green, they just keep on going.

Dr. Yancaskie commented that it would be very advantageous if it is possible.

Mr. Panico stated that if they did the space on the front lawn and parallel to the street then they wouldn't have to worry about anyone coming down and hitting the car.

Mr. Schultz informed the applicant that the Commission is approving the business use but they can't control curb cuts. It is out of their hands but they are going to work on it with them.

Dr. Yancaskie responded yes, he realizes that it is what it is.

Mr. Schultz reiterated that they are going to work with him and if he feels it is needed, they'll give him support beyond that.

Dr. Yancaskie thanked the Commission.

Chair Parkins stated OK that would be the first option, otherwise, they will try to get them some designation on the street to park.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6360.

SEPARATE #6398 – SHERRY AND GARY NASH, 319 HUNTINGTON STREET, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz stated that the applicant requests that the Commission table this until the October meeting. This is the old florist shop on Huntington Street going to Trap Falls and the mortgage lender. There is a lot of interest and there's another applicant coming in after this, if they choose not to go. He asked the Commissioners to check out it out the next time they're in that area. It is a pre-existing, non-conforming, single-family house that used to be Huntington Florists many years ago in the 1960's, 70's and 80's. Parking is not an issue there.

Chair Parkins requested a motion to table this until October.

Mr. Schultz added that this is for cupcake business – a bakery. They plan to live there and bake there.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to table Separate #6398 until the October 9th P&Z Meeting.

SEPARATE #6409 – DAVID GRANT, 419 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, MOBILE FOOD TRAILER

Mr. Schultz stated that Blanchette's Sporting Goods owns the adjacent parking lot. The Applicant, David Grant, who is present, developed an agreement with Blanchette's to put a mobile food trailer there. They have received approval from the Naugatuck Valley Health Department. There will be one employee with hours of operation Monday through Friday, 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

Mr. Schultz added that because this falls on private property, it is under the purview of the P&Z Commission. The Police Department allowed a vendor in the City right-of-way near Crabtree but it is no longer there. This is a better arrangement. He asked the applicant if this would be seasonal.

Mr. David Grant, 419 Bridgeport Avenue, Shelton, CT addressed the Commission.
Mr. Grant stated that it would be right through winter.

Mr. Schultz asked if it was set up for that.

Mr. Grant responded yes.

Mr. Schultz stated that Staff recommends approval.

Comm. Harger commented about the tables and chairs that have been out there and if they would be out during bad weather.

Mr. Grant responded that his sons had put out two picnic tables with umbrellas but the umbrellas keep breaking and falling over. Everything is out until they close up and then it goes into the truck. It's all self-contained. When it gets cold or snows, they won't have the tables out.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6409.

SEPARATE #242 – YANKEE GAS, CORNELL STREET, SPOIL BINS

Chair Parkins indicated that all of the Commissioners took a visit down there.

Mr. Schultz stated that the applicant has requested that this be tabled. There was a change in management and that person is no longer overseeing this. The Applicant has requested that this be tabled until the October meeting.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to table Separate #242 until the October 9th P&Z Meeting.

SEPARATE #6423 – ARNCO SIGN, 500 SHELTON AVENUE, SIGN

Mr. Schultz stated that this is the People's United Bank that the Commission recently approved. He distributed renderings of the proposed signage, and a location map showing the placement of the proposed signage on the building.

Mr. Schultz stated that they will be looking at one ground sign, one wall sign with channel letters and one ATM sign.

There was a discussion and some confusion about the labeling used to identify the proposed signs and about location of the signs around the building. It was noted that the "clearance height" sign by the ATM was a requirement.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he had been asked at the last meeting about when the zone change for this location was established. He stated the zone change occurred on January 15, 1961 by the BOA. It was rural RU-1 and it went to Commercial.

Chair Parkins asked how many signs they had in total.

Comm. Harger counted two for the drive through.

Chair Parkins asked for clarification if they were proposing a sign for the back of the building too.

Comm. McGorty commented that they have D-1, D-2, and IW-2.

Mr. Schultz responded that there is a ground sign, interior wall, ATM and two (inaudible)

Chair Parkins asked what one of the squares on the building rendering referred to.

Mr. Schultz responded that it was for the drive-through.

There was confusion and discussion (inaudible) among the Commissioners about the labeling of the signs and drawings provided. Mr. Schultz asked if the Applicant was present; however, there was no one present to provide clarification.

Mr. Panico indicated he had a question about where one fascia stops and another fascia stops and a panel that is in there. He asked what would be going in there.

Chair Parkins asked if that was another sign and if they were proposing a sign for the back of the building.

Mr. Schultz asked the Commissioners to take a look at the measurement for the height of the monument sign.

Comm. McGorty commented that the monument sign is 7 feet high.

The Commissioners continued to review all of the sign renderings provided to determine how many signs were being proposed. The sign renderings provided by the applicant had to be cross-referenced with the building rendering to determine the location of each sign which led to confusion about how many signs were being proposed.

Comm. Harger identified D-1 and D-2 as signs for the drive-through and M-1 is for the entrance (monument sign).

Comm. McGorty indicated that IW-1 and IW-2 were for the interior wall signage. Mr. Panico asked Rick Schultz if he had gotten a drawing for the right side elevation showing IW-1 and IW-2.

Comm. McGorty asked if the IW-1 and IW-2 was referring to an interior wall sign.

Mr. Panico commented that it wasn't clear to him either and that's the confusion.

Mr. Schultz asked the Commissioners if they wanted to send the plans back because it looks as though the ground sign...

Comm. McGorty commented that he thinks the IW-1 and IW-2 are for the interior.

Chair Parkins indicated that would mean that the interior signs would be as large as the signs for the exterior.

Comm. Pogoda pointed out the W-1 and W-2 for wall signs.

Chair Parkins commented that it was difficult to determine and asked for a motion to table.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to table Separate #6423 for clarification regarding signage.

SEPARATE #6424 – ANTHONY CAPECE, 503 – 505 – 507 HOWE AVENUE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz stated that the Applicant is present and this is for Luther's Garage across from the old Webster Bank on White Street. The overall square footage is 2500 square feet. This will be a continuation of the Luther's Garage with hours of operation 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. with three employees. Parking is a combination of on street and an alley way in the back.

Mr. Schultz stated that many years ago there used to be a lot of unregistered vehicles in that back alley but it has all been cleaned out.

Comm. Harger commented that there is a driveway in the back if you take a left at that building.

Mr. Capece indicated that there were no unregistered cars there at all.

Mr. Panico asked if the name was going to change.

Mr. Schultz responded no, this is a family situation. Tony Delmonico is the owner and Tony Capece is his cousin. Mr. Delmonico wants to keep this business in the family and he grew up in Shelton. It is a great mix.

Chair Parkins asked if it would be just auto mechanics for car repairs and not sales. She asked if there would be any cars out front.

Mr. Capece responded yes, just auto repair and no cars out in the front.

Mr. Schultz clarified that there would be no storage of vehicles.

Mr. Capece responded yes, correct.

Mr. Panico stated that it is a century continuing on the same operation, the same name and everything.

Comm. McGorty asked if this would be more mechanical stuff - operations like tune ups and repairs as opposed to body work.

Mr. Capece responded yes, that there was no body work just general repairs, general maintenance.

Comm. Harger asked if they would be changing the name at all.

Mr. Capece responded that eventually it will be changed to Family Garage. That will be a separate issue and he'll come in with a sign and everything.

Chair Parkins commented that there is a Family Garage in Bridgeport that has been there forever.

Mr. Capece stated that this one is a real family and they've been in Shelton for hundreds of years.

Comm. Harger commented that he might want to consider Cousin's Garage.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6424.

SEPARATE #6433 LAS VEGAS PAWN, 469 HOWE AVENUE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz indicated that the applicants are not present but Jim and Rick Toth have opened a pawn shop. They have been located in Seymour in the Seybridge Plaza so this is an expansion. They are located on Howe Avenue near the package store; 1100 square feet, hours of operation Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. – 6 p.m. with curbside parking. They deal with pawned jewelry and other items sold at retail. He added that a sign went up and they've seen a photograph of it.

Chair Parkins asked if now it would be coming down.

Comm. Harger stated that there's no sign on the application.

Mr. Schultz responded correct, there's no sign on the application. There is a phone number on it too, which is obviously an issue.

Chair Parkins commented that the sign was non-conforming – and the windows are 100 percent covered.

Comm. McGorty asked if they can have him come in and...

Mr. Schultz suggested tabling this - considering what is going on.

Comm. Harger suggested just denying it.

Mr. Schultz commented that the use is permitted. He indicated that the Commission could table it, direct Staff to inform the occupant to take down the sign and come in with a new sign application. He added that he would be told to control the signage on the walls too.

Chair Parkins indicated that he should be given a copy of the Sign Regulations.

Mr. Schultz commented yes, when he went down there with Mr. Dingle.

Comm. Pogoda stated that Rick said that he has this by right so they can't control this use.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he recommended that this be tabled. Chair Parkins asked for a motion to table and contact the applicant.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to table Separate #6433.

Chair Parkins commented that she wished Rick Schultz good luck dealing with this one.

Mr. Schultz indicated that they have gotten some cooperation such as with Cleto's.

Chair Parkins indicated that they just need to tone it down a little and let them know that they are in the middle of trying to revitalize Downtown. She reiterated that they just need to tone it down because it is not Las Vegas.

SEPARATE #6400 – TOM SALOOMEY, 5 RESEARCH DRIVE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is R.D. Scinto's building at 5 Research Drive for a corporate dining business. It is a deli name change to "Nacho Mama's Place" (or Not Yo' Mama's Place?)."

Comm. Harger asked what the name of it was previously.

Mr. Schultz responded that he did not know – probably "The Corporate Deli."

Comm. McGorty commented that was a silly name.

Mr. Schultz indicated that the deli was 2800 square feet with five employees; hours of operation 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. Staff recommended approval.

Comm. Pogoda asked if there was a sign or anything.

Mr. Schultz responded no.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6400.

APPLICATION #12-11 – COUNTRYSIDE VETERINARY HOSPITAL, LLC FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL (ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS), 374 LEAVENWORTH ROAD (MAP 150, LOT 45), R-1A DISTRICT).

Mr. Schultz stated that they have now received all favorable reports from the City Engineer and the Fire Marshal. He indicated that he would read the Staff Report and then the Commission can act.

***See attached correspondence to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from City Engineering, Robert Kulacz dated September 6, 2012.**

***See attached correspondence to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from Fire Marshal (Original Report from 2006 with no changes).**

***See attached P&Z Staff report dated 9/11/12 for Application #12-11.**

Mr. Panico commented about the landscaping being removed to accommodate the minor expansion and the new addition. He asked if they would need to replace some of the landscaping that is being removed or whether the front of the building would require more landscaping.

Carl Kregling, Architect addressed the Commission. Mr. Kregling indicated that they are very conscious of how their building looks and very concerned as to how their bushes are taken care of. They've already contacted a landscape architect to remove everything before they begin digging and then bring it back in.

Mr. Panico indicated that the typical note that they put on most site plans is about the Commission having the right to request additional landscaping if deemed necessary.

Mr. Schultz responded that he would be including that.

Mr. Kregling indicated that they would have no problem with that. He thinks that the Commission will be very pleased with what they have planned.

Chair Parkins commented that it has always been a nice looking facility.

Mr. Kregling indicated that all this is really being done to beautify it. A lot of what they are doing with this building is just to make this a nicer place.

Mr. Schultz commented that they are widening the entrance which is good too. There will be nice approach, paved and lined parking with sidewalks. It is a good upgrade – you can't really see this facility because you're driving pretty fast on that part of Rt. #110.

Mr. Panico stated that he agreed it was a nice addition that will work well there.

Mr. Schultz stated that the Commission approved this in 2007 and this is a smaller version. He read the draft motion for Application #12-11.

End of Tape 1A 7:45 p.m.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Anthony Pogoda, it was unanimously roll call voted (6-0) to approve Application #12-11.

Mr. Schultz asked Mr. Kregling asked if his client planned to go ahead ASAP.

Mr. Kregling responded yes, that they are securing all of the permits (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz stated OK, he'll be working with him on the permits.

Chair Parkins indicated that she would like to take some agenda items out of sequence to accommodate those people waiting in the audience. She stated that she would like to go to Applications #12-15 and #12-16 and do those two together.

APPLICATION #12-15, SOUNDVIEW CROSSING, LLC FOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL (SOUNDVIEW CROSSING PARCEL A: 3 LOTS), SOUNDVIEW AVENUE (MAP 126, LOT 8), R-1 DISTRICT

APPLICATION #12-16, SOUNDVIEW CROSSING, LLC FOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL (SOUNDVIEW CROSSING PARCEL B: 7 LOTS), 245 SOUNDVIEW AVENUE (MAP 126, LOT 9), R-1 DISTRICT

Mr. Schultz stated that the Commission has been asked not to act on this by the City Engineer insofar as the final detailed plans came in on Friday so the report is not ready. He added that the Applicant had been made aware of that. There are a couple of issues that should be addressed by the Commission and hopefully, they can put those to rest tonight.

Mr. Schultz commented that their next meeting is 9/26/12 for a public hearing for 550 River Road and the Applicant has asked to be assigned to that meeting.

Chair Parkins responded that she didn't see any reason what it couldn't be held on 9/26/12.

Mr. Panico asked if they had a discussion about tentatively having a public hearing on the zoning extension Downtown to include that last parcel in the waterfront district.

Mr. Schultz responded that he was recommending October for that.

Chair Parkins commented that she hates to make these folks wait because she is sure that they want to get going on construction.

Mr. Schultz asked about getting the vote in before the public hearing. They will be having the discussion tonight so they will know all the issues.

Chair Parkins agreed that it could be done that way just based upon the decision of the City Engineer.

Mr. Panico asked if there would be any other issues besides the City Engineer.

Mr. Schultz responded that it would just be the easement in the back.

Chair Parkins commented that they should wait on the decision about it and listen to tonight's presentation so that they can get a better idea.

Jim Rotondo, P.E. and Principal of Rotondo Engineering, LLC, 25 Brook Street, Shelton, CT addressed the Commission. Mr. Rotondo commented that they may recall from the last meeting that this is two applications. Using a site plan of the subdivision project, he explained that Soundview Crossing Parcel A was on the north side of Soundview Avenue consisting of three lots single-family residential and Parcel B on the southerly side of Soundview consisted of seven single-family residential which includes the existing house which will remain.

Mr. Rotondo commented that at the last meeting there were essentially two issues that were left open. The first was the increase the width of the common driveway through the access way to Lots #5 and #6 to 20 feet, just beyond the driveway because they would also be serving Lots #1 and #2. Mr. Rotondo stated that is reflected on the revised drawings that were submitted.

Mr. Rotondo indicated that the second issue was in regard to putting a conservation easement along the property line which borders the Summerfield Gardens. He stated that he discussed this with the Applicant and the Applicant would rather not be required to do that. His reasoning is that they do need the regulations here and he has provided and exceeded the Open Space requirements per the regulations. Mr. Rotondo indicated that on Parcel A, there is approximately 1.6 acres of Open Space that will be deeded to the City which is almost 31%. On Parcel B the Open Space along the westerly property line is about 13.5% or 2.2 acres.

Mr. Rotondo indicated that the Applicant has no problem with the Conservation Easement on the wetland area which equals almost an acre (42,633 square feet). He added that the Applicant would like these properties not to be encumbered. Mr. Rotondo indicated that he heard some of the concerns from Mr. Panico at the last meeting, but that is essentially the opinion of the Applicant.

Mr. Schultz asked Mr. Rotondo to show where the fire hydrant would go.

Mr. Rotondo commented and showed that, as discussed, the water main will be extended along the frontage and there will be a fire hydrant installed at the end of that main. They met with Aquarion out on site and discussed what they would be doing. Aquarion is on board with it. He added that it was difficult to get a letter from them or a hydrant flow test though. Mr. Rotondo commented that they did test the existing hydrant up in this area. Based upon their discussion, it is not low pressure – it's not a lot of pressure – they said it is kind of in between. They indicated that there is plenty of flow in the line but the pressure is– in each of the individual houses... He knows that the conversation came up with Rick about whether some booster pumps may be necessary in some of the houses. They indicated that would be determined on a case by case basis.

Mr. Rotondo stated that he has requested the standard service letter from Aquarion and the hydrant test several times but he hasn't received anything yet.

Chair Parkins asked whose responsibility is the booster.

Mr. Rotondo responded it would be the developer's.

Mr. Schultz stated that it is important for the Commission to realize that they were caught off guard by Red Fern. People buying these expensive homes asked what was going on and whether the Commission had been aware of the water pressure. They were misadvised by the Project Engineer that water was available and it was a non-issue. He stated that it became an issue.

Mr. Panico commented that the bottom line is that is an issue with the developer and the homeowner and the Aquarion Water Company.

Mr. Schultz agreed but indicated that it was important for the Commission to be aware.

Chair Parkins agreed and commented that water is available but whether they have high water pressure or not is not their purview of this Commission.

Mr. Rotondo indicated that was right, they didn't seem to have any concerns about (inaudible)...

Mr. Panico commented about the Open Space aspect. He thinks that the Commission appreciates that Open Space corridor that was provided in the way that it accommodates the potential future extension of Constitutional Boulevard. However, it does not really penalize the developer. It hasn't taken developable lots away from him in that the majority of that easement which is set aside is encumbered by the Algonquin Gas Easement. There is some extra width so that they could get a roadway located off of it. They haven't really cost the Applicant a lot.

Mr. Panico commented that as far as the Conservation Easement goes, it is on wetland which is of no value to the Applicant anyway. He doesn't think that the Commission is asking for a lot in requesting to consider the creation of a guaranteed buffer between a quality single-family development and multi-family condominium development on the other side of the line. They just want to make sure that they can maintain an interface between the two that doesn't get encumbered by indiscriminate activity on behalf of one of their future property owners. Someone could just not realize it, go out into his backyard and clear cut the property all the way to the stone wall. Mr. Panico stated that all they are looking for is to just to protect that last 20 feet or so. They aren't looking for a Conservation Easement that is going to allow public access or introduce people walking through or anything else – that is all that they are asking his client to consider.

Mr. Panico indicated that the other thing is about the interior lots, and he added that it may just be his own pet peeve, but that they are adaptable to having horses. He stated that they were nice large lots and area, there is a lot of opportunity to develop horse trails and they thought that perhaps the edge of the wetland area should be protected so that they don't get conflict between the activity of the horses and the quality of the wetlands. Mr. Panico stated that he thought that they were fairly reasonable requests and they weren't asking his client to give up the use of the land. He commented that he wished they would think a little bit more about it.

Mr. Rotondo responded that he certainly would relay that message to him.

Mr. Panico stated that they don't want to do anything that is negatively going to impact this future development.

Mr. Rotondo responded yes, he understands that.

Mr. Panico stated that they feel as though they have some planning responsibilities to protect and preserve both integrities. They don't want to have short circuit suddenly occur because one of these homeowners indiscriminately clear cuts down to the property line.

Mr. Rotondo responded that is understood and he thinks that this will be tabled until the next meeting so they think that they could talk.

Mr. Panico asked that they please give it some consideration. He added that other than that they've had great cooperation with him and his client and all the major issues have been worked out.

Mr. Schultz stated that he wanted to remind the Commissioners that if they make a condition that the applicant provide Open Space to the City and the Conservation

Easements - both of those are subject to BOA approval. They don't have the final say and they've rejected it in the past. In such case, it would come back to the Commission and if they want to make another change or provide another alternative, they can do that. He added that they should remember it requires BOA approval.

Chair Parkins commented that in all likelihood they'll accept the Open Space (inaudible)...

Mr. Panico stated that he thinks that there are other alternatives available to them to preserve or protect that corridor. He asked if there was anything that they should be concerned about with respect to the City Engineer.

Mr. Schultz responded no, not at all, he just (inaudible)... This is a very nice piece of property. It is very level by Shelton's standards for the remaining developable areas. They are going to retain the stone walls - it is a lovely area.

Mr. Panico indicated OK, then it is just a matter of them not having completed their reviews.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Chair Parkins commented that the only sticking point is going to be that Conservation Easement which they are strongly recommending that the Applicant reconsider. She concurred that the property was encumbered by that pipeline prior to the consideration of this development so it really couldn't have been built upon anyway. She indicated that they would put it on the beginning of the agenda for 9/26/12.

Mr. Schultz stated that they have an extension that takes this review process to Sept. 27th.

Chair Parkins indicated that they will have to read the City Engineer's letter and receive a yes or no from the applicant on 9/26.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to table Application #12-15 and Application #12-16 until the September 26th P&Z Special Meeting and to accept the Applicant's request for an Extension for #12-15 and #12-16 until 9/27/12.

APPLICATION #12-18, MCP 6 ARMSTRONG, LLC FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION/SITE PLAN APPROVAL (PHASE II: PARKING EXPANSION), 6 ARMSTRONG ROAD (MAP 18, LOT 22)

Chair Parkins indicated that the public hearing on this Application just closed. Mr. Schultz provided a copies to all the Commissioners and Mr. Panico read the Draft Resolution.

***See attached P&Z Draft Resolution for Application #12-18, MCP 6 Armstrong LLC for Special Exception/Site Plan Approval (Phase II: Parking Expansion) dated 9/11/12.**

Mr. Panico indicated that this is a fairly straightforward decision. He stated that he and Rick Schultz met a couple of times with the engineers for the applicant. They resolved their differences the best that they could and got to something that should, presumably, be OK.

Mr. Panico stated that it is minor addition with just 10 additional spaces. As Rick mentioned, they had to have a public hearing because it pushed them over the 40 space limit expansion that you can have as of right to be a Special Exception. He read the draft resolution for Phase II parking at 6 Armstrong Road.

A motion was made by Anthony Pogoda and seconded by Thomas McGorty to accept the draft resolution for Application #12-18 for review.

With no questions or comments regarding the resolution, Chair Parkins took a roll call vote to approve the resolution.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously roll call voted (6-0) to approve Application #12-18.

APPLICATION #12-14, SHELTON PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT FOR COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT SITE PLAN APPROVAL (FLOATING DOCK AT SUNNYSIDE BOAT RAMP), 418 RIVER ROAD (MAP 66, LOT 135)

Mr. Schultz indicated that this was tabled from the August meeting because they were awaiting a Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) approval letter which they have received. He read two pieces of correspondence and the draft resolution.

***See attached correspondence dated August 16, 2012 to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from Krystal Kallenburg-Dorismond, Environmental Analyst, DEP Office of Long Island Sound.**

***See attached correspondence dated September 5, 2012 to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from City Engineer, Robert Kulacz, PE.**

Mr. Schultz indicated that there were no comments from the Fire Marshal. He reminded the Commission that this application had been for a floating dock to be removed in the winter.

Chair Parkins asked if it would be mostly used for fishing.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, and public access – kayaks and that type of thing. He added that there was grant money and they wanted to go for it this time. He commented that the activity down there is increasing, especially over the summer. There is a nice, sandy beach area and boating.

Mr. Panico asked if the Parks Department would be responsible for taking it in and out.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, it is.

Chair Parkins asked if this was an aluminum or metal type of floating dock.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, but it is a special, non-maintenance type of material.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve Application #12-14.

APPLICATION #12-17 REQUEST TO WITHDRAW 2 LOT SUBDIVISION APPLICATION, COUNTRY CLUB OF CT, LLC.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to accept the withdrawal of Application #12-17.

APPLICATION #12-19 WINTER BROTHERS FOR MODIFICATION OF THE SITE PLAN APPROVAL (ELEVATION OF ROOF), 90 OLIVER TERRACE (MAP 63, LOT 13), 1A-2 DISTRICT

Mr. Schultz provided a site /building map of the Oliver Terrace location and indicated that the new owners were the Winter Brothers – Joe and Sean Winters. They purchased the facilities on Oliver Terrace and this application is for 90 Oliver Terrace, the larger building all the way at the end.

Mr. Schultz stated that the proposal before the Commission is only to raise the portion of the building that is shaded to match the roof of the upper portion of the building to accommodate state-of-the-art processing equipment. He explained that the building – B&D Molding was not built for this type of operation and especially the type of equipment that they will use.

Mr. Panico asked if this is where they did the manual sorting with the conveyor.

Chair Parkins commented that the conveyor was up high on the second floor.

Comm. Pogoda responded yes, there was something higher but the new system that was explained to them is going to need more height to the building. He added that the roof is deteriorating right now.

Mr. Panico stated that they need to take the roof off, raise the walls and build a new roof.

Mr. Schultz commented that it will match with the other roof. He mentioned that besides state-of-the-art equipment, it is a flat roof. He reminded everyone about the winter they had two January's ago, and they don't want that to happen.

Mr. Panico asked if this process covers a different kind of roof.

Mr. Schultz responded yes. It is a metal building and it will all be matched and be consistent. He read a report from the Fire Marshal and the City Engineer.

***See attached report to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from Fire Marshal, James Tortora dated September 6, 2012.**

***See attached report to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from City Engineer, Robert Kulacz, PE dated September 5, 2012.**

Mr. Schultz stated that this is the first phase of the new owner and it is needed for two major reasons. It is a flat roof and they don't want to deal with leaks, especially if it is a hard winter again. Secondly, it will accommodate their state-of-the-art equipment.

Chair Parkins questioned why the Fire Marshal indicated that traffic issue in his report. It is boilerplate but she asked why it would be needed in this issue and why it was in there.

Mr. Schultz responded that it has to be clear because, obviously, there are more trucks up there. The 26 feet is not remotely an issue - they are talking 75 feet surrounding the building.

Chair Parkins commented that they had previously discussed with the previous owner to the extent possible, to have trucks take a right on Bridgeport Avenue to access Route 8 rather than clogging up Bridgeport Avenue by going the other way. She indicated that she would like to reiterate that to the current owners.

Mr. Panico asked if the elevation of the roof and the replacement of the interior equipment was going to increase the activity at the location or not.

Mr. Schultz responded no but they plan on it in the next phase – new construction.

Chair Parkins commented that it may increase – but they are only permitted for a certain tonnage. It may increase what they are currently doing there right now but it can't increase past what their current allowable tonnage is.

Mr. Schultz stated that believe it or not, things are still sorted by hand.

Chair Parkins noted that she sees a lot of Winter Brothers trucks.

Mr. Schultz responded that they are all over and just purchased a large facility in Danbury. They are from Long Island and they're in Connecticut now. The amount of hand work is unbelievable. Staff recommends approval.

Comm. Harger commented that everything is mixed in together.

Chair Parkins commented that they have to follow OSHA regulations to keep their workers safe too.

Comm. Harger asked for clarification about the comment about trucks not using Bridgeport Avenue.

Chair Parkins commented that it would be preferable if the trucks took a right turn off of Platt Road onto Bridgeport Avenue. Some of the trucks may have a hard time getting onto Route #8 southbound because of that corner and they may have to take a left turn. She just wants to keep those trucks out of the mainstream of Bridgeport Avenue to the extent possible.

Comm. Harger wanted to clarify that they would not be directed onto Long Hill Avenue.

Chair Parkins responded no, that would be a right turn out of Oliver Terrace – no, she meant a right turn onto Bridgeport Avenue.

Comm. Harger mentioned a report she received from a resident on Long Hill Avenue going towards Constitution Boulevard and that there is increased truck traffic on that road. She wasn't certain if it was from Oliver Terrace but it might be something that they need to look into.

Mr. Schultz indicated that they need to keep an eye on it.

Chair Parkins commented that the trucks could be coming off of River Road and up Constitution Boulevard.

Comm. Harger indicated that this was traffic coming down Long Hill Avenue.

Mr. Schultz commented that Sikorsky employs a lot of people and they go up Platt Road and take a left onto Long Hill Avenue. They can't control that type of traffic. There are No Thru Trucks signs on the road.

Chair Parkins indicated that maybe they need another sign for vehicles taking a right out of Oliver Terrace onto Platt Road - that trucks are prohibited on Long Hill Avenue.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he would send an e-mail to the Chief regarding the trucks on Long Hill Avenue.

Chair Parkins asked for a motion on Application #12-19 for the roof elevation.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve Application #12-19.

Comm. Harger asked about the Applications for Certificate of Zoning Compliance Separates in regard to temporary signs for Connecticut Burns Foundation.

Mr. Schultz indicated that was for a fundraiser and as they know, the Commission gave Staff the ability to issue temporary signs. They are designating five locations that are working for the time being which include the Huntington Green which is regulated by Parks & Rec; Bridgeport Avenue Exit 13 where the overpass is located; Shelton Avenue and Meadow Street and the White Hills, Leavenworth and Maple area. He added that they are telling people to put them there and more importantly, these sign applications provide a contact person. In the past, they would not pick them up after the two week time period.

Chair Parkins commented that it was good that people are coming before them to get sign applications.

Mr. Schultz agreed that he was pleased to report that because signs have been scattered willy nilly and then other people complain...

Chair Parkins commented that the fund raiser wouldn't be until October 20th and she asked how long they give people to keep the signs up.

Mr. Schultz responded two weeks before the event and one week after; otherwise they sic their famous sign enforcement person on them.

NEW BUSINESS

APPLICATION #12-20, BLAKEMAN CONSTRUCTION, LLC FOR SEPCIAL EXCEPTION/SITE PLAN APPROVAL (CONVERSION OF MIX USE BUILDING TO 14 UNIT APARTMENT COMPLEX), 11 LEAVENWORTH ROAD (MAP 146, LOT 17 AND 18), CA-3 DISTRICT: ACCEPT AND SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Schultz recommended a public hearing date of October 24th. He indicated that this was the old Indian Well Country Store mixed use. They used to have the retail and the apartments. This is a complete conversion to 14 units (9 one-bedroom and 5 two-bedroom). He added that the parking is tight in the back and the front and it slopes down very quickly. They will have to put in a retaining wall which will be discussed at the public hearing. Mr. Schultz reported that they can extend the sewers to it as opposed to using the existing septic.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #12-20 and schedule a public hearing for October 24, 2012.

PZC PROPOSAL: AMENDMENT TO THE BUILDING ZONE MAP BY CHANGING EXISTING IA-2 DISTRICT TO RFD (RIVER FRONT DISTRICT) FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6 BRIDGE STREET (SPONGEX BUILDING), (MAP 129, LOT 21): SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Schultz reminded everyone that at the last meeting, Staff reported that it was recommended to use that new zone, the River Front District (RFD) , as opposed to the PDD. The DSC agreed and the potential applicant agreed. It will compliment the property next door that the City currently controls which is the River Front District. This new zone was established several years ago in anticipation of the complete renovation of this area of Canal Street. It has been quite useful to the SEDC in securing grants for cleaning up that area. They believe appropriate standards are in place because they did a comparative analysis and the standards are there. The PDD, as they know, gives them a lot of strength on architectural and that is the one piece that they've had success with but the RFD contains all the other type of languages.

Chari Parkins indicated that the only question would be about the slight possibility of a tear down.

Mr. Schultz responded that he hasn't heard anything on it.

Chair Parkins commented that if there was new construction on it, they would lose control of the architectural component.

Mr. Panico responded that they don't lose complete control but you may have to do a little bit more arm twisting. Basically, they are all going to be Special Exception uses .

Chair Parkins commented that as long as Mr. Panico is confident that they can still...

Mr. Panico commented that he thinks that they have enough. He indicated that he's been conversing with the people that are probably going to end up doing the developing so...they've always had a good relationship in the past.

Mr. Schultz added that there is a public hearing for the project. This will be brand new regulation – that is how the zoners felt with the PDD back in ...

Chair Parkins commented that with an existing building they know what they've got and they can only make it look better. But when it is a tear down and you're starting from scratch then (inaudible)...

Mr. Panico stated that on the other hand there are three more parcels that the zone applies to so they felt confident enough to put it on the other parcels.

Chair Parkins responded OK and asked for a motion to accept and schedule a hearing for 10/24/12.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to accept the PZC Proposal to amend the Building Zone Map by changing existing IA-2 District to RFD (River Front District) for property located at 6 Bridge Street (Spongex Building) and to schedule a public hearing for October 24, 2012.

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 were no comments.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: AUGUST 14TH

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes of 8/14/12.

CRESCENT VILLAGE CONDOMINIUMS: REQUEST FOR ONE (1) YEAR EXTENSION TO COMPLETE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Schultz read a letter dated August 14, 2012 addressed to himself from RGR Shelton, LLC requesting a one year extension for the development. It explained that of the 135 units originally planned, they have 115 occupied and have several more units with offers at this time. They have started construction on the final building which will complete the project. The remaining 20 units will only require work to be completed in the interior prior to occupancy.

Mr. Schultz indicated that this was the last one-year request that this particular development will be asking for. Staff wants to bring it to the Commission's attention the work that needs to be done next to the Pine Rock Fire House. It has to be cleaned up and landscaped. He has been in contact with the Captain and he'll be coordinating that.

Mr. Schultz added that this would be a condition of approval and not something above and beyond.

Chair Parkins added that it is long overdue and she would like to put a time frame on them to get it done.

Comm. Pogoda commented that Justin has been complaining about that for a very long time.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he has contacted the applicant and the response is always "when they get an extension." The applicant always says "yes" to Staff and then another year goes by.

Comm. Pogoda stated that he wanted to make the one year extension contingent upon this or table it.

Chair Parkins commented that she wanted it to be contingent upon the completion of it.

Comm. McGorty added that they have to be given a time line.

Chair Parkins stated that she wanted it to be 30 days and added that 30 days should be sufficient time for them to finish the landscaping there. It is all overgrown there.

Mr. Schultz suggested that they get a letter from Pinerock Park Fire House indicating that they are satisfied. He commented that he thinks that they should go to that extent.

Comm. Pogoda agreed and added that he would like to do that and table this until (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz suggested that they table this until the October meeting, they can get the work done and he'll read them a letter from the Pine Rock Park Fire Department that they are satisfied.

Chair Parkins asked for the location of the 20 units that would be going in for this project.

Mr. Schultz responded that it is where Zuckerman did his four units. He added that because of this market, Zuckerman didn't sell those four units but he is renting them for over \$2000/month and he's very happy. The apartment market couldn't be stronger in that location.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to table the request for a one-year extension to complete development of Crescent Village Condominiums.

PAYMENT OF BILLS

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve the Payment of Bills, if funds are available.

STAFF REPORT

***See attached P&Z Staff Report dated September 11, 2012**

Mr. Schultz discussed upcoming ZBA applications including one for home the addition of an accessory dwelling unit in a house that is less than five years old. There was a discussion about the hardship for this application being a bona fide hardship and directing Staff to express those concerns to ZBA.

There was a discussion about the public safety and public access issues regarding the UI Substation which is regulated by the CT Citing Council.

Mr. Schultz provided updates regarding the DSC, Zoning Subcommittee, Zoning Enforcement, Sign Enforcement and Filling/Grading.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Joan Flannery seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karin Tuke, P&Z Recording Secretary