

SHELTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

March 11, 2014

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, March 11, 2014, 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 Nancy Dickal
 Commissioner Virginia Harger
 Commissioner Thomas McGorty
 Comm. Frank Osak (alternate for A. Pogoda)
 Comm. Anthony Pogoda (via Conf. Phone)
 Commissioner Jim Tickey

Staff Present: Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator
 Anthony Panico, P&Z Consultant (via Conf. Phone)
 Karin Tuke, Recording Secretary

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

CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & ROLL CALL

Chair Parkins called the March 11th P&Z Regular Meeting to order at 7 p.m. in Room 303 with the Pledge of Allegiance and a roll call of members present. She stated that Comm. Pogoda (referred to as "Tony" and P&Z Consultant Tony Panico (referred to as "AJ") are in attendance via conference phone.

OLD BUSINESS

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE

SEPARATE #435: CENTERPLAN CONSTRUCTION, 465 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, ROOF-MOUNTED SOLAR PANELS

Mr. Schultz stated that this was tabled at the last meeting pending a letter from the Fire Marshal which he would read. The Applicant, who was not at the previous meeting, is here tonight to make a presentation about the solar panels.

***See attached correspondence from March 10, 2014 addressed to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator.**

Mr. Schultz read the letter of approval from the Office of the Fire Marshal regarding review of the site plan and a meeting with Wal-Mart representatives to discuss the installation of roof-mounted solar panels at the 465 Bridgeport Avenue location.

Mr. Schultz added that Staff had the opportunity to go out to the site and to view the area overlooking it on Buddington Road with the Applicant's representatives who are here tonight.

Mike Crisci, Centerplan Construction Company, LLC addressed the Commission and introduced Steve DeNino, Greenskies Renewable Energy, LLC and William Herchel, Greenskies Renewable Energy, LLC.

Mr. DeNino distributed literature and drawings regarding the proposed Wal-Mart solar panel project to the Commissioners.

Comm. Harger commented that her understanding is that this is a nationwide project.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, a nationwide event with everyone going "green."

Mr. DeNino indicated that Greenskies Renewable Energy is a Connecticut-based solar development company that works with Wal-Mart on this special use project to install solar panels on their facilities. He stated that the Shelton store has been selected and they have been contracted to install at that site.

Comm. Harger asked for clarification as to his comment that the Shelton store was “selected,” and if he meant that Shelton was selected out of all the Wal-Mart stores in the area. She asked if that was just where they were starting.

Mr. DeNino clarified that no, they have installed throughout New England – New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts.

Comm. Harger commented OK, Shelton is just the next one on their list.

Mr. DeNino responded yes, it is one of stores that they are currently working on. He commented that they walked this site the other day and he believes the concern has been about the houses on the backside of the store on the abutting property. He brought photos of the view, some aerial photos as to what the installation looks like from above.

Comm. McGorty asked if he had a model for the design layout of the one that is being proposed.

Mr. DeNino responded yes, he does and pointed it out in the set of drawings provided. He commented that it would be similar to the first rendering with the skylight roof so they don't have to break up the modules. The panels will be installed in a very symmetrical pattern on the roof. They will be snow aisled which is a design criteria from Wal-Mart in which there would be 10 foot aisles in the mid-spans of all of their joints (?). He added that is why it is not fully covered with panels.

Mr. Schultz commented that the orientation is facing the south.

Mr. DeNino responded yes, the orientation is facing the south, due south. It is a 10° build (inaudible) module so the racking stands about 15” off of the roof on a 10° due south so that the panels will sit in a certain way (he demonstrated the angle of the panels) He indicated that they would be a low glare glass and actually designed to absorb as much light as possible. They are in the process of installing them on a couple of landfills and one, in particular, is next to the Meriden Airport, and they haven't had any push back from that.

Comm. Harger asked if he brought samples.

Mr. DeNino responded that they brought a sample of the panel but they weren't sure where the meeting would be exactly and it is a rather large 6 ½ feet x 3 ½ feet. He added that it is presently outside.

Mr. Crisci, Centerplan Construction Company representative stated that he could try to bring it in up the three flights of stairs.

Chair Parkins responded that wouldn't be necessary; they don't want to torture their Applicants.

Comm. Dickal asked if these were basically on the roof and if you would see them as you walk into the entrance.

Mr. DeNino responded yes, they are on the roof but they are not going to see them at all. He added that from parking lot or from the road around it, the only location where they would be seen is from the elevated road behind the store.

Mr. Schultz added that it could be seen from the Buddington Road elevation.

Mr. Crisci, Centerplan Construction Co. commented that the highest part of that panel sits about 14” off of the deck, so realistically the parapet wall is 2 feet so you would never see it beyond the parapet wall.

Comm. Dickal asked if they have ever had any problem whatsoever with any type of reflective condition.

Mr. DeNino responded no, they are designed to absorb all of the light and they are low glare. They are a bluish-black color.

Chair Parkins commented about the drawing set and indicated that she didn't understand their key plans with PV01, PV02, and PV03...

Mr. William Herchel, Greenskies Renewable Energy rep. commented that PV is a reference to the breakup of the four sections of the roof. He added that the first page of the packet is the rendering of the overall roof, PV01 would be the first quadrant, PV02 would be the second quadrant, etc. It just breaks it up...

Comm. McGorty commented OK, the first one is the overall.

Chair Parkins stated that it is basically going to cover the roof but not as it is shown in this aerial photograph. It will really cover the roof.

Mr. Herchel responded correct.

Mr. DeNino added that PV01 shows a rendering of the entire roof and if they look at the bottom of the page, it shows the main entrance side of the building. He referenced the aisles that he talked about and explained that it is not completely covering it because they had to leave the snow aisles, but it does take up the useable portion of the roof.

Mr. Herchel, Greenskies Renewable Energy commented that they have setbacks from the parapet walls and from the skylights for shading purposes.

Chair Parkins asked if, from a visual point, it is not really like the first photograph then. It is more like photograph #2. She asked if that was correct.

Comm. McGorty commented that it is pretty dense.

Mr. DeNino responded that it is more like photograph #1 because of the skylights.

Chair Parkins commented OK, but not in terms of the density of the panels...

Mr. DeNino responded yes it is a little bit denser.

Comm. McGorty asked about the storage, battery storage...

Mr. DeNino responded that there is no battery storage. These are string level inverters so there isn't even a central (inaudible)...they are 100 lb. inverters that are mounted locally on the roof and work their way down through a distribution panel, a CP cabinet and main disk and then a utility disk connected on the back of the building. There is no equipment that needs to be dug into the ground or (inaudible)...

Comm. Harger asked how they would be monitored.

Mr. DeNino responded that they are monitored by ...they use a web-based monitoring system so that they get real time data every 15 minutes; it pushes the generation data and the alarm data to them. They get e-mail alerts if there is an issue on site and they have a full time crew of evaluators that maintain the sites. They do a bi-annual operation and maintenance visit to the site for inspection purposes. They inspect the physical array in its entirety and they inspect every string for performance mixture...He added that they have had no issues.

Mr. Herchel commented that in addition to that they have a utility grade meter that is there to measure all of the NU credits and the production of the system that is required for its protection.

Chair Parkins asked if they would be selling to the Grid.

Mr. DeNino responded that the power gets directly tied into Wal-Mart's power source. They would really be using it; any excess generation would go to the Grid. They aren't selling it; there is a net meter there. He added that this system is not big enough to offset their annual demand.

Comm. McGorty asked if he means that it doesn't have the capacity to run 24/7, 365 days a year.

Mr. DeNino responded no, it just offsets it.

Chair Parkins asked how much, approximately, it does generate for them.

Mr. DeNino responded that this is 329 kw systems so it is 329 mw hours. It is about 400-420 megawatts over the year.

Mr. Herchel added that it is 343 (inaudible)...about 400,000 kilowatt hours a year. It is probably about 35% to 40% of their usage.

Comm. Harger commented that there may be some falling prices at Wal-Mart.

Mr. DeNino responded yes, maybe.

Comm. Harger asked how they were secured to the roof.

Mr. DeNino responded that this system is a ballasted in, mechanically attached system, so it has a ballast block. He referenced one of the drawings provided to show the ballast block in between the trays. He explained how the panel would sit and the racking and indicated that the tray bridges the two panels together so there is low attachment point and a high attachment in the back. In between there is a ballast tray which is fully engineered for the wind and snow loads. They come up with a ballasting plan – a little bit heavier ballasting in the back of the tray because it tends to re-tilt the wind and the uploads are a little bit higher in the back. It is all calculated out and they are given a ballasting plan and they ballast it accordingly and it is also mechanically fastened on this particular install so there is a mechanical attachment to the roof.

Comm. Tickey asked how the panels hold up with the snow – how have they held up this winter in some of the projects that they have already done.

Mr. DeNino responded that they have had no issues on any of their projects with snow. He asked if he was referring to structural damage.

Comm. Tickey responded yes.

Mr. DeNino commented that the panels are designed to take the weight. A structural analysis is done with a 30 or 35 psf (pounds per square foot) depending upon the area they are in. It is only one panel in the landscape so there is not a lot of weight on that one particular panel.

Comm. Dickal asked for clarification as to what constituted a panel and asked about how much a panel weighs – she referenced how they are after a really bad storm like a hurricane.

Mr. DeNino responded that they are about 50 lbs a piece. On the drawing he clarified what constitutes a single panel and explained that they are 6 ½ feet long and 3 ½ feet wide.

Comm. Dickal asked if any have been done where they've had some major storms.

Mr. DeNino responded that they've done about a dozen stores in New Jersey that were in various different stages during Hurricane Sandy. They had stores that were fully commissioned and operating. They had stores which were partially installed with panels, no ballasting and no attachments and they had systems with only the racking in place. He added that they didn't have a single panel move off the roof.

Comm. McGorty asked if he said it was 50 lbs with the ballasting.

Mr. DeNino responded no, it is roughly 50 lbs. a panel.

Comm. McGorty asked if they didn't have to meet some sort of code, a structural code to bear certain loads. It is obviously built pretty robustly to accommodate this; otherwise, they wouldn't be able to...

Mr. DeNino responded yes, absolutely.

Mr. Crisci added that there was an end of year assessment that was turned in with the application.

Chair Parkins asked Mr. Schultz if a Building Permit had to be pulled on this as well.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Comm. Pogoda asked for clarification about the comments made regarding the glare coming off of them.

Comm. McGorty stated that it was low glare material.

Mr. DeNino reiterated that low glare glass is used in the panels – very minimal.

Comm. Pogoda responded OK.

Comm. Harger added that she thinks the angle and the direction in which they are installed wouldn't be a concern for Heritage Point.

Comm. McGorty stated that it faces south.

Mr. DeNino commented that with the angle of the sun and the 10° tilt, most of the glare, if they did get any glare, it would actually glare backwards and not anywhere near the neighborhood in question.

Comm. McGorty stated that he would think that the glass would be optimized because glare is lost in that... (inaudible)

Mr. DeNino stated yes, it takes it all in so... (inaudible)

Chair Parkins asked if this qualifies for the Connecticut Energy Fund.

Mr. Herchel responded no.

Chair Parkins asked if it was subsidized.

Mr. Herchel responded that they are qualified for the Zero Emission Renewable Energy credits. They have a bilateral contract with Northeast Utilities which (inaudible) to purchase renewable energy credits from the system.

Chair Parkins asked if anyone was here representing Wal-Mart.

Mr. Crisci responded that he is representing the installation and these guys are the (inaudible)...

Mr. Herschel stated that he and Mr. DeNino are the developers.

Chair Parkins stated OK, and asked again to clarify that there was no one here representing Wal-Mart.

Mr. Crisci responded no there isn't, that's correct.

Chair Parkins commented that there was some understanding about some sort of tree or trees being planted.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, Staff was asked by two of the property owners located in the northeasterly corner of Heritage Point if any supplemental evergreens can be installed. The Applicant indicated that would be doable. He asked the Applicants if they could state that.

Mr. Herchel, representing Greenskies Renewable Energy, commented that basically, obviously, it is their preference, and they believe that aesthetically the roof site might actually be improved with these solar panels as opposed to being detrimental to the aesthetics of it. He commented that they don't own the property at the site where they are building this project and they don't own the abutters property. They aren't sure how they are going to structure, on a practical matter, the installation of evergreens. He stated that they think that the cost might unreasonable in terms of how it will improve the look of the rooftop in the end but, if that is the position of the Committee at the end of the day, than they will try to work something out.

Chair Parkins asked why they would expect that the installers to plant evergreens. It really should be Wal-Mart that should be planting the evergreens.

Mr. Schultz left the meeting briefly to take a cell phone call from Mayor Lauretti.

Mr. Herchel stated that their other preference would be to cover this issue for Wal-Mart if it were the case – to not get Wal-Mart involved and to just take care of it for them, if they Commission finds that (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins joked that if they wanted to step up to the plate then they will take their offer.

Mr. Herchel reiterated that it was their preference that they don't believe they should have to do that.

Mr. Schultz returned to the meeting and indicated that they Mayor would arrive between 8 p.m. and 8:10 p.m.

Mr. Herchel indicated that if that is the decision they would like to understand, on a practical matter, on a contractual matter, how they would go about doing that.

Chair Parkins asked where they were asking for the trees to be planted.

Mr. Schultz stated in the northeasterly corner of Heritage Point that overlooks the Wal-Mart facility.

Mr. DeNino asked if it was Wal-Mart's property or personal property.

Mr. Schultz responded that it was on Heritage Point.

Mr. DeNino asked if it was on a particular owner's properties.

Mr. Herchel stated that there is an adequate buffer currently for the P&Z for Wal-Mart to be where they are and have their rooftop. He asked if the problem was that they are putting solar panels on the roof.

Mr. Schultz responded that there was not an adequate evergreen buffer. There is vegetation there but it is deciduous.

Mr. Herchel asked if he was saying that without the solar panels there is not an adequate evergreen buffer or is the solar panels the reason why the additional buffer is required.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Comm. Harger stated more screening at the top of the cliff.

Comm. McGorty asked Rick Schultz if he had been out there.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Mr. Herchel stated that as a result of the solar panels there is an additional screening that is necessary.

Comm. Harger responded yes, for aesthetics and also to make sure that there aren't any issues with glare or property values from looking down on it.

Mr. DeNino asked if there was any thought or discussion as to the extent, how many trees they were asking for. He asked if they were talking about arborvitaes and planting on the backside of their properties.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he thinks that there is white pine out there right now and that is the least expensive type of evergreen. They are talking about a couple, two or three trees.

Mr. Herchel commented that the only other thing that he thinks they would say is that they want to make sure that this is the lone condition because obviously, because he's sure that there are other abutters around. He wants to make sure that this is the only condition.

Chair Parkins stated that this is an Association and these people can't just going marching on this Association and start planting trees so they have to get approval for the request from the Association not the P&Z Commission.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, that's right.

Comm. Harger added subject to P&Z approval.

Mr. Panico stated that those lots are owned as fee simple.

Chair Parkins asked if there were.

Mr. Panico clarified that yes, those are fee simple, not land in common.

Chair Parkins stated OK, and then whoever's property that is going to be on is the one that has to give the approval for this.

Mr. Panico responded yes, that's correct.

Comm. Pogoda stated that they have his approval.

Chair Parkins asked Comm. Pogoda if it was his property.

Comm. Pogoda responded yes, it is.

Comm. Harger asked if there wasn't someone else too.

Mr. Herchel asked if Tony was a Commissioner.

Mr. Schultz responded yes and he cannot vote on this.

Mr. Herchel asked if he would be recusing himself.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Comm. Harger asked if there wasn't someone else up there too.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, his neighbor, it is for two homes.

Chair Parkins asked if there were two houses.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Chair Parkins asked if they wanted two or three trees...she commented that they need to give them a little more direction than "just go up there and plant some trees." She thinks that they have to be pretty specific about what they are being asked to do.

Mr. Schultz responded OK, installation of three evergreens.

Chair Parkins asked if it was three evergreens total.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, total in appropriate location supplementing the evergreens that are up there because the developer planted evergreens up there.

Comm. McGorty asked if this was just filling in some gaps.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, it is just filling gaps.

Chair Parkins stated OK, three trees to fill gaps that currently exist with the landowners' approval.

Mr. Herchel asked if that was 3 trees on each property or three in total.

Mr. Schultz responded three total.

Mr. Herchel asked if they would be able to proceed time-wise with the construction of the facility.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, absolutely, they aren't going to hold them up. When the Commission acts on this, if they do tonight, they can pick up their permit tomorrow.

Chair Parkins asked Comm. Osak to sit in on the vote for this because Comm. Pogoda is recusing himself. She asked if there were any other questions for the Applicants. With no further questions or comments, she asked for a motion.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was voted (6-0) to approve Separate #435. Comm. Pogoda recused himself from voting and Comm. Osak voted as alternate.

SEPARATE #425: SAI COMMUNICATIONS, 4 RESEARCH DRIVE, WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

Chair Parkins asked if Comm. Pogoda had the information regarding this application.

Mr. Schultz responded no, he does not.

Chair Parkins stated that since there are drawings to look at, she informed Comm. Pogoda that she would ask him to recuse himself from this and ask Comm. Osak to vote as alternate.

John Lawrence, representing Centerline Communications, addressed the Commission. Mr. Lawrence indicated that Centerline Communications is the site acquisition consultant to the Applicant who is New Cingular Wireless PCS, more commonly known as AT&T.

Mr. Lawrence commented that he is sure that they know AT&T is a federally licensed wireless carrier to provide wireless services in Connecticut and specifically Shelton. Using a site rendering, he indicated that the property he will be discussing is at 4 Research Drive. Right now, AT&T, in order to fill a hole in their coverage map for their coverage of the town of Shelton are proposing 12 antennas along with associated equipment as well as an equipment shelter on the roof of the building at 4 Research Drive.

Mr. Lawrence asked if the Commissioners had the photos that were submitted as a part of the application.

Chair Parkins stated that they are just getting this tonight. She asked if they had it previously.

Mr. Lawrence indicated that he had some additional copies and distributed them.

Chair Parkins asked Mr. Schultz what the difference was between this application and Application #14-5 on the agenda under New Business that they are accepting tonight and scheduling a public hearing for.

Mr. Schultz responded that one was for the hotel, for roof-mounted telecommunications.

Chair Parkins commented that is what this gentleman is proposing, the same thing, and asked what the difference was.

Mr. Schultz stated that this one is for AT&T and that one is for Verizon and it is going on top of the hotel.

Chair Parkins responded OK, on top of an office building or on top of a hotel - and asked why one requires a public hearing and one does not.

Mr. Schultz stated that it is a PDD and it's an earlier PDD that did not provide for roof-mounted telecommunications facilities. This one is for a newer PDD that does allow for it because they provided more language because the Commission wanted to encourage roof-mounted. It is a newer PDD that allows it.

Chair Parkins responded OK, thank you.

Mr. Lawrence stated that in order to get coverage and in looking at different sites, if there is an existing tower they could go on that or an existing rooftop then they will try to go on that. They evaluated with AT&T's rate of frequency at many different buildings within this complex. Out of the ones that they evaluated, this one suited AT&T's the best and that is why they ended up at this particular building.

Mr. Lawrence commented about the existing design and explained that there is an existing penthouse on the roof. He believes there is an elevator and the elevator goes up to roof. AT&T is looking to increase the height of it, matching the existing façade that is there so basically it will look like what it looks like now.

Chair Parkins stated – just higher...

Mr. Lawrence added that within that AT&T is going to put another 12 antennas.

Chair Parkins asked why they couldn't just put another one on the side of it so it is not so high.

Mr. Lawrence responded that in order to get the radio frequency propagation that AT&T is looking for they approved the site at that height.

Chair Parkins commented OK, they get the propagation and we get the visual.

Mr. Lawrence responded that he thinks that overall, given the area, it is an industrial area more so than residential.

Chair Parkins stated that she just feels like you guys are in competition - AT&T and Verizon. They put one up and then you put one up...it is spreading all over town...how much is needed... She asked if they were trying to reach Mars.

Mr. Schultz stated that they are going to be seeing a lot of applications for this.

Comm. McGorty commented that he thought the co-location thing was the objective.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, right.

Mr. Lawrence commented that AT&T and Verizon have put (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins stated that they have them on top of Scinto's buildings - Corporate Towers. She asked if that wasn't correct. She asked if they had one on top of Corporate Tower #2 on 2 Corporate Drive.

Mr. Schultz stated that there are multiple tenants up there.

Mr. Lawrence stated that he was not sure specifically about that but he is here for the proposal of this one tonight. This is what works for AT&T and they have worked to comply with the bylaws.

Chair Parkins stated that she was not really in favor of the tallness. She added that she would prefer that it stay side-by-side to be honest with him.

Comm. Harger commented that she thinks that they have to make sure that they aren't getting into this visual pollution. It is getting so commonplace that it is like "oh, yeah, there's another one" but asked if there really has to be another one. She asked the Applicant to bring the entire display board closer to the Commissioners.

Comm. Dickal stated that she agrees with the two previous Commissioner's comments.

Chair Parkins referenced the photo at the top right hand corner and commented that is acceptable but the photo at the bottom is...

Comm. Harger stated that is the before and the after.

Mr. Schultz stated that the proposed is super-imposed onto the photo. He asked if the Commissioners are feeling that the aesthetics are less than desirable.

The Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Schultz stated OK, and then Staff is going to recommend that it be tabled. They can work with Staff and possibly the Zoning Subcommittee.

Chair Parkins commented that it is starting to look like NYC with all the water towers up on top of the buildings.

Mr. Schultz asked the Applicant if he was here for Dave Ford.

Mr. Lawrence responded that he was filling in for Dave tonight.

Mr. Schultz informed the Applicant that the Commission is going to table this tonight and he will be communicating with him.

Chair Parkins asked if this was the one for Codespoti.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, it is the same site.

Chair Parkins stated that was her opinion and asked the Commissioners to feel free to speak about it.

Mr. Schultz stated that it seems to be the consensus. The other Commissioners agreed.

Comm. McGorty commented that yes, it is pretty significant ...

Comm. Dickal and Comm. Tickey agreed.

Chair Parkins stated that pretty soon they are going to be asking to put towers on top of buildings - 220 foot towers.

Comm. Harger agreed.

Comm. Tickey made a motion to table Separate #425 and Comm. Dickal seconded.

Mr. Schultz stated as a side note that he thinks Staff needs to put together, of all the pending applications, because they have Highland, another one on Waterview, and they are setting another public hearing tonight for another one...

Chair Parkins commented that is what she was saying – they just keep springing up all over the place.

Comm. Tickey stated that it was a slippery slope.

Chair Parkins added that they get a request from Verizon and then another from AT&T and then another one from Verizon and another from AT&T...

Mr. Schultz stated that he has an inventory of all of them throughout the community.

Comm. Osak asked what the alternative was if the Commission says no.

Mr. Schultz responded that they would look for another location. He added that their Zoning allows roof-mounted controlled by this Board. The Citing Council controls towers and collocating on towers. The P&Z controls roof-mounted, steeples in churches, water tanks...

Comm. Osak commented that those are less visible to the naked eye.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, that is right.

Comm. Osak asked if that wouldn't be more desirable than this.

Chair Parkins responded that is why they encourage collocation and on water tanks and that sort of thing.

Comm. Osak asked if they refuse to do this than it would force them to go and negotiate with another location.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, that's right.

Comm. Osak asked why he was sitting in for Comm. Pogoda.

Chair Parkins responded because of the visual photos and drawings – Tony can't see them and didn't have the information there.

Mr. Schultz stated that Staff would put together the inventory and the applications pending so that they can get a handle on it.

Comm. Tickey responded that he thinks that would be a good thing to see and review.

Comm. Dickal asked if there was any way that they could get a list to see how many there are.

Chair Parkins responded yes, that is what Rick is planning to get.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey and seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was voted (6-0) to table Separate #425. Comm. Pogoda recused himself from voting and Comm. Osak voted as alternate.

SEPARATE #6687: NATIONAL SIGN, 329 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, SIGNS

Tracy Becker, 42 Marriot Circle, Wallingford, CT addressed the Commission.

Ms. Becker indicated that she was representing National Sign. She presented a sign rendering proposed for the D'Addario GMC Buick Cadillac monument signage. It is the same rendering that was on the application but she doesn't know if they have copies of that. She indicated that

they are changing the pylon sign, refacing it with the only change being made to the Cadillac logo. The Cadillac logo will no longer have the circular wreath around the outside and it is made slightly elongated.

Comm. McGorty asked if they were getting rid of that – is Cadillac getting rid of the wreath.

Ms. Becker responded yes, Cadillac just rebranded it. She added that on the wall mounted sign they were requesting the same change with the Cadillac logo; otherwise, it is the same as what is there. She provided before and after renderings of the signs.

Ms. Becker stated that there is a wall-mounted Cadillac and logo on the building itself which they are proposing to change in the spring when the weather is better. It is not a part of this request. This application is for the refacing of the wall sign and pylon signs.

Comm. McGorty commented that Rick Schultz could consult with them in regard to the sign regulations for size and design.

Ms. Becker responded OK.

Comm. Harger asked if the proposed sign without the vines resulted in the Cadillac portion being more spread out.

Ms. Becker responded yes, that is the new Cadillac logo and it is slightly wider now.

Chair Parkins informed Comm. Pogoda that this proposed sign has a visual component so she would like Comm. Osak to sit in for this vote.

Comm. Pogoda responded that he has the drawings for this application.

Chair Parkins stated OK, she didn't realize that.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6687 for signage.

SEPARATE #426: BLDG. BLOCKS EARLY LEARNING CENTER, LLC, 1079 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, FENCE

Atty. Burt Hoffman, Hoffman & Hoffman, 1234 Summer Street, Stamford, CT addressed the Commission on behalf of the Building Blocks Early Learning Center, LLC. Atty.

Hoffman stated that he was representing the Bldg. Blocks Early Learning Ctr. He introduced Mitch Hoffman who is the President of Building Blocks Early Learning Ctr. and Scott Lawrence who is representing the owner of the property. Atty. Hoffman indicated that they were all present to discuss this licensed daycare facility that has been approved by this town. Photo renderings of the facility and a site map were displayed. He explained that it had gone out of business and it was approved for 60 children.

Atty. Hoffman stated that they were not here to expand it beyond 60 children but to request fencing for an expanded playground, to show the Commission what it would look like and provide samples of the proposed fencing material.

Chair Parkins asked if this was at the corner point.

Comm. Harger responded yes, the house on the corner.

The Applicant provided a photo rendering of the front of the facility without the fencing and with a rendering of the same facility with the proposed fencing superimposed onto the photo.

Comm. Harger asked how long ago the previous daycare closed.

Mr. Scott Lawrence, representing the owner of the property at 1079 Bpt. Avenue addressed the Commission. He responded that it had closed last August (2013).

Comm. Harger commented OK, just within the year.

Atty. Hoffman explained the setback off of that corner point and a the rendering with the proposed finished fencing and how it would come around.

Mr. Lawrence showed the Commission a sample panel of the proposed wooden fencing with lattice work at the top portion of it.

Comm. Harger asked how high this fence would be.

Atty. Hoffman responded 6 feet.

Comm. Harger stated that her initial reaction to it is that she does not care for it at all. She added that this location is a major gateway to the City, and she thinks it blocks the view of the house which is a very nicely situated home and it is very architecturally nice house as well.

Comm. Tickey asked to see the fence sample again.

Mr. Lawrence held up the wooden fence panel again.

Comm. Harger asked if it would be that color (natural brown).

Atty. Hoffman responded not necessarily. It could be any color; that is the raw material.

Mr. Schultz asked the Commission if they wanted to see landscaping.

Comm. Harger responded ...something... but to have that there when people get off of Route 8 at that major intersection on the Trumbull/Shelton line...and to have them look at that... She added that they take such pains to landscape that little island in front.

Comm. Dickal commented yes, it does look nice when you come in there.

Comm. Harger reiterated that it is a beautiful home.

Chair Parkins asked what they currently have there for outdoor play.

Mr. Lawrence responded that they have an existing fenced area to the side actually to the north.

Atty. Hoffman added that it was not substantial enough.

Mr. Lawrence commented that the area is pretty small, particularly for 60 kids and for all of them to be outside.

Mr. Mitch Hoffman, President of Bldg. Blocks Early Learning Ctr. addressed the Commission. Mr. Hoffman added that it was a small play area based upon State regulations. He commented that for the amount of outdoor play that they would like to have for these children, they need to expand the playground.

Chair Parkins commented that it was already licensed like that though for 60 children. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. Mitch Hoffman responded that it was already licensed for 60 children but those children probably didn't have enough outdoor play. He stated that they were probably allowed to go outside only one classroom at a time as opposed to bringing two sets of classrooms out at a particular time and getting the children the amount of outdoor play that they deem to be required.

Comm. Harger asked what the age groups of the children would be.

Mr. Mitch Hoffman responded that they would be 6 weeks to 5 years.

Comm. Harger asked, technically, at what age they would be letting the children outside. She added that they certainly aren't going to let the babies outside or have cribs out there.

Mr. Mitch Hoffman responded that they actually do take the babies outside in the strollers and there are ratios that must be adhered to in certain play areas. They prefer to have them in their areas as opposed to going in the parking lot, so actually all 60 children will be within the play areas. He commented that for children outside of a stroller, let's say 1 ½ years old up to 5 years old will all be outside in the play area.

Atty. Hoffman asked Mr. Hoffman a question because he felt an interesting point has been raised here. As far as the children, he asked what height, in his experience with his other facilities; he feels the fence should be as opposed to 6 feet.

Mr. Hoffman responded that there is a State regulation and it also depends upon the location area so it has to be anywhere from 4 to 6 feet.

Atty. Hoffman commented that he believes that the Commission has the discretion in that zone in regard to the height. He stated maybe that is where they could have that compromise as long as they meet the State requirement.

Comm. Harger asked if right now the playground is on the other side of the building.

Atty. Hoffman responded that it was on the Huntington Street side.

Comm. Harger stated that her concern is about that being a major road there. She added that in her opinion, the area where it is right now is protected area and vehicular traffic... she commented about the possibility if one car side swept another vehicle and it went veering off, went up on that lawn and into that fence.

Chair Parkins asked if it was possible for the side area to be expanded at all. She asked if they had any room on the side.

Mr. Hoffman commented that based upon the setbacks...

Mr. Lawrence pointed out an area on the site plan and asked if she was referring to that side.

Chair Parkins responded yes, the area where the playground is right now – she asked if there is room to expand it.

Mr. Lawrence responded not really and explained that basically right there, it is a slight slope and there's a bunch of trees along the area before hitting the parking lot. He said that there really is not much area between this side of the fence and Huntington Avenue. They would be decreasing that and there are also some trees in between the fence and Huntington Avenue. The road there is also narrow as it is, so if they put the fence even closer, it would increase the risk previously discussed.

Mr. Lawrence stated that the logical expansion area is in the front for increased area and for security purposes. He added that as the property owner, they are very well versed on how much traffic goes by and they do recognize that it is a very visible building seen on one of the most well trafficked areas in town. Mr. Lawrence added that for a daycare, because it so well trafficked and it is so exposed, for security and aesthetics, if you are going to have an outdoor play area this is one of the most tasteful kind of fences that could be used while still providing security and while still expanding the play area to accommodate as many as 60 kids.

Chair Parkins commented yes but it is just the visual impact of that corner that is being compromised.

Comm. Dickal asked if they were trying to say that it was going to be a play area for the children.

Comm. Harger stated yes, behind the fence.

Atty. Hoffman responded yes, correct.

Chair Parkins stated that it was like the entire front (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty commented yes, you lose a lot because it has a nice look.

Comm. Dickal stated that she is a little concerned about the traffic and the cars there...what if a car ever went through and (inaudible)...

Mr. Hoffman responded that there is a very large setback, a very significant setback.

Comm. Dickal commented that she hears about cars going into houses and (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty asked Rick Schultz if he could go over there and walk around, take a look at it and see what he could come up with.

Mr. Schultz suggested tabling it. He added that the Commission has control because this is a PDD.

Mr. Hoffman indicated that they have two other facilities. One of them is located on 59 Danbury Road in Wilton and has a similar playground. The other facility is on Camp Avenue in Stamford and that is a very high traffic area. They are very secure and cars are there. He stated that you actually look for childcare in high traffic areas because people want them to be in areas where the parents are coming and going from work, where they can drop their kids off and feel safe...

Chair Parkins stated that they aren't going to argue that safety is paramount with regard to children but they also have a visual issue with the placement of this fence at that location. She indicated that they were going to table this and have Staff do a site visit and see what that might be able to recommend to the Commission.

Comm. Harger asked about the current play area and the lower parking area.

Mr. Lawrence explained the site plan and the location of the beginning of the office building ...

Comm. Harger responded oh, right, that is the building behind it, OK...

Mr. Lawrence stated yes, they are over it, but it is separate.

Comm. Dickal asked if this was the same type of fence that they have at the other facility.

Mr. Hoffman responded that they actually have a similar fence but this one is much nicer. He added that this is a nicer fence that the landlord is providing.

Comm. McGorty commented yes, it is a very nice fence.

Mr. Hoffman stated that he is very much invested to this property.

Comm. Harger agreed but commented that it is just the location of it.

Comm. McGorty commented that the curb appeal presently is very nice but with that fence, it takes away from it. It is a gateway into Shelton.

Mr. Schultz indicated that Staff knows what they have to do.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to table Separate #426.

SEPARATE #6678: LAURETON SIGN GROUP, 200 LEAVENWORTH ROAD, SIGN

Mr. Schultz provided a sign rendering for the Adam's Super Food Market in White Hills.

Comm. Harger commented that she thought they already approved this.

Mr. Schultz responded no, at the time, they didn't have the final sign rendering. He asked if they liked the concept of it.

Comm. McGorty responded yes, the other one was so dated.

Chair Parkins asked Comm. Pogoda if he had a copy of this sign rendering.

Comm. Pogoda responded yes, he does.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve signage for Separate #6678.

SEPARATE #6585: R.D. SCINTO, 1 CORPORATE DRIVE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz indicated that they have new occupants and the first one is for William Leavitt, Senior Financial Advisors. They are a financial advisor group occupying 2,000 square feet with 4 employees with hours of operation 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Staff recommends approval. They are replacing space previously occupied by Prudential.

Chair Parkins asked what floor they would be on. Mr. Schultz responded is located on the first floor at 1 Corporate Drive.

Comm. Harger stated that is a small area.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6585.

SEPARATE #6389: R.D. SCINTO, 3 CORPORATE DRIVE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz indicated that this new occupant would be on the 4th and 5th floors at 3 Corporate Drive. Unilever will be replacing General Electric and Fletcher Thompson who moved to Bridgeport. Unilever will be occupying 56,000 square feet with 400 employees.

Chair Parkins commented about the 400 employees all being in that location.

Comm. Tickey stated that they were in Trumbull.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, this one is big.

Comm. McGorty stated that was nice and asked Rick Schultz if everything was in order.

Chair Parkins asked if there was going to be enough parking there.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, thankfully, there is a structured garage there. He commented that he would take them up there if they haven't been to the garage in a while.

Chair Parkins responded that she is there every day and she parks in that lot – that is why she is asking. She added that she has a reserved parking spot.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #6389.

Chair Parkins indicated that the next item is for Application #13-17 and asked Rick what time the Mayor would be arriving.

Mr. Schultz responded in about 15 more minutes.

Chair Parkins decided to take items out of sequence and move onto Application #12-17 for the Shelton Cove Development because it should probably only take about 15 minutes.

Comm. Pogoda asked the Chair to have Comm. Osak sit it on this for him because he can't see the construction material and he respects Frank's opinion on it.

Chair Parkins responded OK

APPLICATION #12-17: SHELTON COVE DEVELOPMENT: PRESENTATION OF CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL SAMPLES, 560 RIVER ROAD

Jeffrey Meinke, Project Manager for the Shelton Cove addressed the Commission representing Toll Brothers. Mr. Meinke indicated that Rick Schultz asked him to come forward with some of the finishes that they will be using at the Shelton Cove and provide samples for the Commissioners to make sure that they are all in keeping with their view of how the development was supposed to be.

Mr. Meinke provided a display board of architectural renderings for the building clusters (front elevations) which would include five different building designs including the Bradbury, Lehman, Lenox, Portman and Sinclair. The rendering showed the five different building designs and explained that it depicts the general concept of the stone, the carriage doors, the architectural roofing. He provided photographs from some different Toll Brothers developments to show the weathered wood type of roofing, the garage doors and the type of stone to be used at Shelton Cove.

Chair Parkins asked if he means real wood when he says "weathered wood."

Mr. Meinke responded no, weathered wood Timberline® architectural shingles.

Chair Parkins stated that she had a neighbor who actually had wooden shingles that he did his roof with.

Mr. Meinke responded that would be nice, but no...He provided a black and white rendering of the street light style that they anticipate using called the "Cape Cod."

Chair Parkins asked if these photographs of other developments were showing the roof that they plan.

Mr. Meinke responded no, that is not the roof. He showed a sample that is a relatively good representation of the roof color. He provided some samples of the two different siding colors which would alternate between the buildings. One cluster of buildings would be a Sterling Gray and he showed the actual material to be used up in the gable ends. He commented that the same building would have a clapboard material on the lower areas. He provided a sample of the clapboard material. He passed the materials around for the Commissioners to review.

Mr. Meinke showed a sample of a lighter color to be used on the upper shingles and the lower would be the same kind of clapboard in a different color.

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

Comm. Osak asked what the life expectancy would be for a material like that.

Mr. Meinke responded at least 30 years but probably longer.

Comm. Osak asked if it was paintable.

Mr. Meinke responded no, he did not think so.

Comm. Osak asked if it would stay like that.

Mr. Meinke responded yes, it would stay like that.

Comm. Osak asked if there was any possibility for staining or weather staining.

Mr. Meinke responded no, not that he was aware of, he has never seen it.

Chair Parkins commented about the quality construction on the bottom one.

Comm. McGorty added that it was probably low maintenance.

Mr. Meinke added that he's been using this type of siding for the last 10 or 15 years and he's never seen that type of issue. He commented that it would get a little bit of fading.

Comm. Osak asked who makes the siding.

Mr. Meinke responded that it was made by Certain Teed.

Comm. Harger asked about the photograph of the existing development and the vertical structures on the roof.

Mr. Meinke responded yes, those are the corner boards.

Comm. Harger asked if that would be on this roof.

Mr. Meinke responded no.

Comm. McGorty stated no, it would be like the drawings.

Mr. Meinke pointed out the elements on the architectural drawings that would be used on the sides. He added that those roofs would be that copper raised seam; the other units have some of that kind of detail but not shown on this elevation.

Comm. Harger asked about the color.

Mr. Meinke responded that it would be copper and weathered to be a dark bronze.

Chair Parkins asked for clarification about the stone on the designs shown on the bottom drawings.

Mr. Meinke responded that it is thin stone, brand name, which is actually really stone. He added that it was kind of like the cultured stone, thin, and the color is New England Ledge; but it is actually not a cultured stone, it is technically stone that has been cut thin.

Chair Parkins asked if it was real stone and not vinyl stone.

Mr. Meinke responded that it was real stone but it is applied in a stick-on kind of fashion.

Comm. Osak asked if it was applied with an adhesive.

Mr. Meinke responded a mortar adhesive, yes.

Chair Parkins asked again if it was real stone and not vinyl stone.

Mr. Meinke responded yes, it was real stone.

Comm. McGorty stated that it was thin-sliced stone.

Mr. Meinke responded yes, correct, it is thin sliced stone.

Comm. Osak asked for clarification of the Shelton Cove development location.

Mr. Schultz responded that the site was located off of River Road past the Pop Fastener Company and Latex Foam. He added that it was located right on the River.

Mr. Meinke stated that was about it for the exterior material samples he had to show them.

Chair Parkins asked if it was typical for them to use vinyl like that.

Mr. Meinke responded yes, that has become the material of choice for siding for developments such as this.

Comm. Osak asked if that vinyl was UV resistant.

Mr. Meinke responded yes.

Comm. Osak asked if the occupancy of the buildings would be condominium ownership.

Chair Parkins responded yes. There will be 36 units.

Mr. Meinke added yes, 36 units, 14 buildings, townhouse style with a mixture of groups of two and groups of three.

Comm. Osak commented that he was just wondering about who gets stuck for the repairs in 30 years or so.

Mr. Meinke responded that there would be a Condominium Association and there will be a public offering statement so any kind of long range repairs to the outside of the buildings will be factored into their budget.

Comm. McGorty commented that it is a lower maintenance solution versus going with the clapboard which would be higher maintenance with painting and all of that other stuff.

Chair Parkins stated yes, you would have to paint it every 10 or 15 years.

Comm. McGorty stated that is lower cost of ownership and for the Association. It is easier for installation and...

Chair Parkins commented yes, but if you power wash it- but if the life expectancy is only 30 years, and in 30 years you are tearing off the siding and putting new siding on...

Mr. Meinke responded that he didn't honestly know if 30 years was correct, but at a minimum it would be 30 years.

Comm. Dickal stated that it is 20 years. She knows that for a fact.

Comm. McGorty commented no...it is a very (inaudible)...

Comm. Dickal responded that she knows because she had it on her home so she knows.

Comm. McGorty asked if it was that manufacturer.

Comm. Dickal responded yes.

Comm. Osak asked if Tony Panico had a letter on this.

Mr. Schultz responded no, there is no action needed for this. It is just a visual tonight.

Comm. Osak asked if it was just informational.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, information.

Chair Parkins stated that this project was already approved under a different developer. Toll Brothers bought it from them so they are just coming in with the materials that they are proposing.

Mr. Schultz added that they always go through this process.

Mr. Meinke stated that the only other thing that he has, which he was going to give to Rick is the Landscape Plan, which the Commissioners can review as well. He commented that the project was approved with a landscape plan and their landscape professionals at Toll Brothers reviewed that plan and they felt that some of the species were not exactly well-suited for the area and some of the sizes of plants relative to the buildings might not be the best. He added that they've come up with a modification plan, which in terms of overall appearance is probably going to be very similar. He stated that the intent was the same but they were hoping to make things a little bit more appropriate with less maintenance.

Chair Parkins stated that she has an issue with that because Elaine Matto, who was on the Commission at that time, was very knowledgeable regarding plants. Elaine was very instrumental in helping to put that plan together. She commented that she is taking a little bit of a ...

Mr. Meinke responded OK that is perfectly fine. He commented that he wasn't a plant person at all.

Chair Parkins stated that she recalled the conversation about the plants being appropriate and native to that area. She added that she is not a plant expert either.

Mr. Meinke responded that perhaps it would make sense to give this to Rick and maybe it could be reviewed with Elaine.

Chair Parkins indicated that she was no longer a Commission member.

Comm. McGorty asked if they have provided a rationale there for why they want to change it.

Mr. Meinke responded yes, they do. They have a cover page saying what they thought about (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz commented that he could process it internally.

Chair Parkins stated that (inaudible) somehow making it easier for them to make changes.

Mr. Panico commented that they may want to run it by Inland/Wetlands if they want to make significant landscape changes.

Chair Parkins responded that was a good point so they will run it by Inland/Wetlands as well.

Mr. Meinke stated that was fine. He indicated that they weren't looking for an easy out or anything, but they are obviously trying to limit their customer service warranty type of issues so things that they think will hold up better or last better, be better there, that is what they are trying to do.

Comm. Harger asked how extensive the changes were – is it only 10%, 60%...

Mr. Meinke responded that to be honest, he really had no idea.

Mr. Schultz responded that he looked at it quickly and it is substantial.

Chair Parkins stated OK, it is substantial. She reiterated that she has an issue with that because there was a lot of thought put into that by Comm. Matto, and the Commission relied upon her expertise so she does not think it is appropriate to just disregard that.

Comm. Harger commented that they really have to justify it.

Comm. Dickal agreed.

Mr. Meinke responded OK and added that they weren't trying to ram anything down their throat. He stated that their experts thought this plan was better but it is certainly not something that is necessary if there is a problem with it.

Chair Parkins stated OK.

Mr. Meinke stated that the only landscaping that they will be doing in the short term is around the model and that was probably not included as a part of the original proposal anyway because it is sort of exceptional because it is a model.

Comm. Harger asked about his comments regarding the two and three units in the different buildings. She referenced that he is showing a three unit building below and it is a different design than the two unit building.

Mr. Meinke responded that there are 5 different designs. He showed the two units that were the same (Lehman and Sinclair), pointed out the third (Portman) and fourth design (Bradbury). He explained that the middle unit was different also. He explained that these are a little unusual; in all of the houses the grade generally slopes down from behind them so there are walk-outs. He showed the units that have garages on the main floor level with basements that walk out to grade. There are two buildings, 6 units that back up to the cemetery and in those the grade is low in the front and high in the back so they put the garages underneath and walk up to the first floor.

Chair Parkins asked if the original proposal didn't have balconies on the front of those because there was nothing in the back.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, there is an evolution on those.

Chair Parkins stated that the design seems to have really deviated from what was proposed by the original developer.

Mr. Meinke indicated that the major concern was the zoning footprint and that type of thing. They tried to stay in keeping with appearance but he does not know if something like a front balcony was something that they were necessarily concerned with. With that being said...

Chair Parkins responded that she doesn't know that she would agree with that.

Mr. Meinke stated that to sort of put this whole thing into a frame of reference, he began working with this company on the 1st of the year.

Chair Parkins commented that it appears to her as though they may just be trying to cut costs on this project and that is the last thing that they want see down at that site. She stated that when they approved this site, there was a lot of discussion regarding this, and there are some things that they expect Toll Brothers to stick to - and design is one of them and landscaping is another.

Mr. Meinke responded that is a valid point.

Comm. McGorty asked Rick Schultz what the checks and balances were on that. He asked if there would be any notification on any changes.

Chair Parkins indicated that the Commission noticed that this was going to be highly scrutinized down there.

Mr. Schultz responded that he has heard the Commission's comments so he will be checking this out. He indicated that was basically the presentation. He added that this was a work in progress and he knows what Staff needs to do.

Chair Parkins commented in regard to the materials and stated that she didn't have a big issue with that.

Mr. Meinke stated that it sounds like it is the design of these units in terms of the possible elimination of balconies and the (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins stated that this is down on the water there in a beautiful spot and they don't want to see them start cutting corners to come up with a product that...

Comm. McGorty added deviating drastically from the original plan which they thought was pretty good.

Mr. Meinke responded that they don't disagree because, obviously, they are selling these based upon the location and if they "cheap out" it isn't going to work. It wasn't really about that; it was about using some of their existing architecture and trying to tailor it to the approval.

Comm. McGorty stated that is lower cost to use an existing product without changing the design – economies of scale come into play.

Mr. Meinke responded well, he supposes that is true but the number of designs that these guys have is staggering.

Chair Parkins commented that the design is starting to go into an area where she doesn't think – that she would expect of a development that they approved.

Comm. McGorty stated that the same concern is about what was approved - and when it is done they don't know what it is and ask where the original plan went.

Mr. Meinke indicated that he understood completely and reiterated that having not been in it from the very beginning; he can't speak directly to it.

Chair Parkins asked if they didn't approve the Detailed Development Plans.

Mr. Schultz responded yes and they have everything. This just came out tonight so obviously Staff will have to address it.

Chair Parkins stated that they have to go back to the Detailed Development Plan that they approved.

Mr. Schultz responded yes. He commented that the Commission was comfortable with the materials but the broader issue now is the architectural and the landscaping.

Mr. Meinke asked if someone had the actual building plans in their file because all that they have is the approved subdivision plan. They don't have anything really that speaks directly to architecture other than the footprint. He added that was all he was aware of.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he could provide him with that and meet with him to go over it.

He stated no action was needed on this tonight; it was informational only.

Mr. Meinke thanked the Commission.

Since the Mayor had not arrived, Chair Parkins asked Mr. Panico if he thought the Codespoti approval would take about 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. Panico responded that he didn't think any longer than that because he thinks that everyone was pretty much in agreement with the concept; they were just writing it up. He suggested that they read him memo and let him know what they think.

Chair Parkins indicated that they would move on to Application #14-01 and #14-02 and do them together. She asked Comm. Harger to read Mr. Panico's memorandum. She asked Comm. Pogoda if he would like to have Comm. Osak sit in on this.

Comm. Pogoda responded that he had drawings on this but he can do that if he was present at the other meeting.

Chair Parkins stated yes, he was at the previous meeting so Comm. Osak will act for this discussion and vote as alternate for Tony Pogoda.

APPLICATION #14-01: CODESPOTI AND ASSOCIATES, P.C. FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION/SITE PLAN APPROVAL (PARKING EXPANSION), 7 PROGRESS DRIVE (MAP 28, LOT 26), LIP DISTRICT (PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED 2/26/14)

APPLICATION #14-02: PETITION OF CODESPOTI AND ASSOCIATES, P.C. FOR MODIFICATION OF STATEMENT OF USES AND STANDARDS FOR PDD #32 AND DETAILED DEVELOPMENT PLANS (PARKING EXPANSION), 4 RESEARCH DRIVE (MAP 28, LOT 3) (PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED 2/26/14)

Comm. Harger read the applicable memorandum regarding Applications #14-01 and #14-02.

***See attached correspondence dated March 11, 2014 for P&Z Applications #14-01 and #14-0 for Codespoti & Associates P.C. for Special Exception Site Plan Approval for Parking Expansion at 7 Progress Drive and Modification to Statement of Uses and Standards for PDD #32 and Detailed Development Plans for 4 Research Drive.**

Chair Parkins interrupted to ask for clarification on the map/drawing date. She indicated that the drawings that she has are dated February 25th. She asked which one was correct - February 4th or February 25th.

Mr. Panico responded that he was referencing the date on the cover sheet.

Comm. Harger indicated that her copy says Feb. 6th.

Mr. Panico stated that Feb. 6th is on the cover sheet and asked what Chair Parkins were dated.

Chair Parkins responded Feb. 25th.

Mr. Panico indicated that all of his say Feb. 6th.

Comm. Dickal indicated that hers was dated Feb. 6th too. Comm. Tickey indicated his copy was Feb. 6th also.

Chair Parkins commented that she must have gotten this one at the last meeting. She recalled that he handed out updated maps.

The representative from Codespoti & Associates (unidentified) indicated that the originals were dated Feb. 6th but Feb. 25th was presented at the public hearing.

Chair Parkins asked if there were any major changes made in them.

The Codespoti Rep. responded that there were a couple of edges here and there on the parking and Staff requested landscaping plans. He commented that is what was added to the drawings he has brought tonight.

Chair Parkins commented that his drawings were dated March 6th.

The Codespoti Rep. commented that he was asked to do some landscaping.

Chair Parkins asked Rick Schultz if he wasn't able to get them to Tony Panico.

Mr. Schultz responded that they discussed it via Skype.

Mr. Panico commented that they discussed some of those items that he is referring to. He stated that his report is based on the plans as submitted. He makes no comments relative to

landscaping, etc. so he may have already jumped the gun and addressed some of those concerns. He indicated that he would stick with the date which he has referenced which is the drawings that were presented at the public hearing and the drawings that he completed his review on (Feb. 6th).

Mr. Schultz indicated that those would be the ones which would be signed off by her.

Chair Parkins responded OK, she'll have to get them out of her trash. She really just wanted to clarify the discrepancy there. She thanked him for the clarification.

Comm. Harger continued reading the correspondence regarding the said applications.

Chair Parkins requested a motion and a second for discussion of the report.

Comm. McGorty made the motion and Comm. Harger seconded.

Chair Parkins indicated that she had a few questions. After looking at the minutes from the public hearing, she asked about who would be taking responsibility for the maintaining the fence.

Rob Ades, 4 Research Properties LLC, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. Ades responded that once the fence is installed then Steve Brennan would take care of that portion of the fence that surrounds his secured vehicles.

Chair Parkins asked if Steve was the owner of the California Closet property.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, 7 Progress Drive.

Chair Parkins responded OK. She asked if he got an answer regarding his ability to expand.

Mr. Steve Brennan, owner 7 Progress Drive, addressed the Commission. Mr. Brennan responded that they are working that out with Staff.

Chair Parkins responded OK, it has nothing to do with this approval. She asked Mr. Panico if he received the drawing cross-section that he requested.

Mr. Panico responded that he discussed it with the Applicant's engineer and he pointed out and explained to him the reason why it does not work so he is satisfied.

Chair Parkins asked about the Statement of Uses and indicated that her only question was regarding the liquor.

Mr. Panico responded that they modified that particular one so that it only applies to the occupants of that building essentially.

Chair Parkins responded OK and commented that they have addressed the parking, California Closets and asked if anyone else had any questions or comments.

Mr. Panico stated that a modified PDD requires a roll call vote.

With a motion on the table and no further comments, she requested a roll call vote.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously roll call voted to approve Application #14-01 and Application #14-02. Comm. Pogoda recused himself from voting and Comm. Osak voted as alternate.

Comm. Osak asked a question about a situation such as this one where an applicant is adding more parking to create more office space – because that is what this is really.

Chair Parkins responded that they weren't creating more office space.

Mr. Panico commented that they are accommodating a more employer/employee intensive occupancy.

Comm. Osak asked if they could dare ask them, instead of putting more surface parking, to put in structured parking.

Mr. Panico responded that financially that just does not work.

Mr. Schultz added that Staff asked them that and this Application would have gone away – but yes, absolutely.

Mr. Panico stated that they would pay \$20,000 per parking space in a structured parking situation and it just doesn't work out. He's sure that tenant would have simply gone to another location.

Comm. Osak responded OK, thanks.

Mayor Lauretti arrived at 8:16 p.m.

Chair Parkins welcomed Mayor Lauretti to the meeting and indicated that they would move on to a discussion of Application #13-17.

APPLICATION #13-17: PETITION OF HAWKS RIDGE OF SHELTON, LLC FOR PDD ZONE CHANGE, INITIAL DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN AND AMENDMENT OF FUTURE LAND USE PLAN APPROVALS, (54 SINGLE FAMILY DEVELOPMENT, 57 UNIT MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT, AND ASSISTED LIVING FACILITY CONTAINING 196 UNITS), LONG HILL CROSS ROAD AND BEARD SAWMILL ROAD (MAP 39, LOTS 14 AND 17 AND MAP 51, LOT 7 LIP DISTRICT (PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED 2/26/14)

Chair Parkins stated that when they closed the public hearing for this on 2/26/14. She indicated that Mayor Lauretti said that he wanted to present some additional information to the Commission and the Applicant had no objection.

Comm. Osak asked if he would be permitted to speak because Comm. Pogoda is sitting for this portion of the meeting. He wanted to clarify that he would not be allowed to participate.

Chair Parkins responded that unfortunately, that was correct.

Mayor Lauretti requested two easels to display site maps. He stated that he wanted the Commission members to be able to see it and added that it would be available to the public at a later time, if anyone wants to see it.

Chair Parkins clarified to the audience members present that the discussion this evening would be for the Commission only.

Mayor Lauretti stated that, as most of them can probably imagine, he has been through a number of these applications, discussions privately and publicly, about development in the City and the evolution of what is going on in different parts of the City in terms of economic development over the years.

He commented that at the last public hearing there were some things that were said that he would respectfully disagree with and when things get said they get taken literally, not only from a decision-making standpoint but for future would-be investors in the City and that is what concerns him. Particularly, it pertains to the LIP zone and how it was portrayed. Some of the comments were about the Long Hill Cross Road area, the LIP zone that was established about 35-40 years has had no new construction in the area and LIP was dead, a thing of the past and there are higher and better uses for the land in their community. The Mayor stated that was OK and everybody is entitled to their opinion but when you sit in the seat that he sits at you have to look at things through the big picture and not just a snapshot in time and not something focused around the economy at that particular point in time.

Mayor Lauretti stated that when they approve projects of this magnitude, they stay with them for an eternity and it impacts the community for an eternity and not just what is going on at that moment in time. One of the things that he has said during his tenure is that the powers to be in their community 40 years ago, he thought were very astute, and did this City a service well because the things that they carved out for economic development – that is what they are doing now and that is what they've been doing, at least since he's been around.

He stated that the two areas were the Bridgeport Avenue Corridor and the Downtown area; unfortunately, the Downtown area has taken some time but he thinks that they can all agree that their Downtown has arrived. Development continues and will continue to die its cast when major investors come into an area and they are allowed to implement projects such as the Birmingham, Avalon, and a couple of other projects that John Guedes has now on the Rolfite property and the Spongex property. Those things are just what the doctor ordered.

Mayor Lauretti indicated that up on Bridgeport Avenue many years ago they envisioned a mixed use plan that included LIP, whether it was on Forest Parkway or Long Hill Crossroads, whether it was on Trap Falls Road or Commerce. He added that the project that was just before them for the parking expansion at the office building, he believes that was an LIP zone. He commented that the point is that over time when market conditions change and business adjusts to market conditions, these zones have a tendency to reinvent themselves such as the project they just looked at on 4 Research Drive. He added that “here we go again...” – it reinvents itself.

Mayor Lauretti addressed the Long Hill Cross Road and that it was said that there was no new development up there and why should property owners have to sit around and wait for markets to change in order for them to develop their land. He referenced the area map and pointed out the location of Long Hill Avenue, Long Hill Cross Road, Forest Parkway, etc. He indicated that all of the areas colored in green represent the LIP use buildings that exist there. It also includes the dates that they were built and approved.

Mayor Lauretti stated that some of them you may not recall, and added that Frank Osak may because he's been around awhile and he himself hasn't been around as long. He commented that some of these buildings have gotten makeovers, some of these buildings have gotten new tenants and some of them have even been expanded. He added that one of these buildings, as they sit here today, is in the process of being expanded and/or rehabbed.

Mayor Lauretti stated that on Controls Drive – there is nowhere else to build on this land; maybe that is why there has been no new construction. He referenced Long Hill Cross Road and commented that with the exception of the Wells Property (he pointed out the location of the Wells property) and asked where else you could build on it. There are some residential pieces that are scattered in between here but they are ¾ acre, one acre and the only other residential, if people decided to move, what else would they do? He stated that they could sell to the adjoining LIP zone for a possible future expansion; that is certainly a possibility. The Mayor commented that these things take years and years to occur.

He referenced Long Hill Avenue and commented that there is some residential land there but they are all one acre homes that exist and have existed for a number of years and this creates the transition from the LIP to the residential. He pointed out the Long Hill Avenue location and they would see that good planning allowed transition to occur from the residential area there into the LIP to Route 8, the Bridgeport Avenue Corridor and then the residential.

Mayor Lauretti referenced the second area map and pointed out the locations of Constitution Boulevard, Waterview, Ivy Brook, all the LIP properties up there. He added that a few years back, the P&Z Commission did allow residential uses to encroach into these areas – he showed the location of Four Winds and Rivendell. He added that they can see how these back into residential areas. He showed how Rivendell backs into a residential area and commented that some of these applications do work and some of them do make sense. He indicated that people know when they come into Four Winds, as they drive through an LIP zone and they see those buildings there that there is a different use there and if they choose to buy a residential property here, they know that they will be driving through there. There are no surprises.

Mayor Lauretti stated that his point is this – when you are in his shoes, and for whoever is in his shoes into the future, whoever is in this Office into the future, they have to deal with the potential conflicts that could arise when you have a transition from residential to something other than residential. He added that you need to understand that and be able to appreciate it. The Mayor indicated that in the 23 years that Rick Schultz, Tony Panico and he have certainly grown an appreciation of how these conflicts can take place. He recalled one that came to mind loud and clear regarding Buddington Park as it backs into Wal-Mart.

Mayor Lauretti commented that Rick Schultz doesn't have to respond to this but he would use him as a reference because there were many times that Rick was sitting in his office with him, along with the P&Z Chairman, and Tony Panico discussing how they would do a conflict mediation between the Wal-Mart and the residential property owners. While they have resolved some of those things, they exist and they need to understand that.

He stated that it was also said that there were no new office building activity in Shelton since '89 which couldn't be further from the truth. He stated that the Board needs to be aware of that and when people make statements like that, they need to be corrected because it creates an impression amongst the realtors and the would-be developers that maybe this is not a viable opportunity for them in Shelton. He added that he spends a lot of time promoting their growth. He spends a lot of time, even in his different role right now in his run for Governor, telling people in different parts of the State how they have had good planning, how they have grown the Grand List, how they have balance in this community. He reiterated the word "balanced." He indicated that they have opportunities for people to work, jobs that are there for 30 years and maybe longer just because these areas have been designated for that and they create opportunities. He commented that he views that as a good thing.

Mayor Lauretti stated that he was in Stamford on Thursday last week to visit a company called Comet Technologies who have been in Stamford for a number of years. They are a company that does X-Ray for airports and for uses such as examining steel and structures for stress fractures. He indicated that Comet Technologies has been in Stamford for 10 years and they happen to be moving to Shelton. The move is going to occur next week and they are bringing 40 people and all of their equipment that they pay taxes on (personal property stuff that goes under the radar but does have meaning). He added that they will take nothing out in the way of services. The Mayor stated that the point is that they are going up on Trap Falls Road in the Bassett Building which may have been alluded to at one of their meetings. The moral to this point is that Shelton is alive and well when it comes to these types of developments. It shouldn't be second guessed or underestimated. He reiterated that for the big picture for him, it is about balance in a community.

Mayor Lauretti stated that in his 23 years, the population in Shelton has grown by maybe 4,000; it was 36,000 and change when he got elected and today it is just under 39,000. He thinks that is a good thing – he added that his point is that when you bring people in, it costs money to do it and it costs money for a very long time. He added that you are never going to get around that. It is not a bad thing, their borders aren't closed and their doors aren't shut and they welcome people to this community but for him it is about balance.

Mayor Lauretti returned to the discussion of the project and reiterated that there was nowhere else to build. He commented that if you can find another place to build on Forest Parkway, he wants to see it. He referenced all of the gray shaded areas on the site maps and explained that they represented wetlands that won't and can't be built on. He stated that the point of all this is that this was decided upon years ago and it has served this community well and that shouldn't be downplayed – all of the LIP shown in here.

Mayor Lauretti referenced the comment made that companies have downsized and they are doing things differently and that is the truth. He agreed with that but if that is the case, as was stated, then some of these smaller properties would lend itself to that downsizing effort instead of the big boxes that they used to see. He thinks that technology has really played a role in businesses in this country and their downsizing and a lot of these jobs may not come back just because of that. He reiterated that this area lends itself even more so to that concept of the downsize because what they see is that a lot of these buildings that are – such as the Bassett Building which is about 80,000 square feet – this company coming up from Stamford is taking

20,000 of it. There will be a couple – two or three other tenants in that building and that will serve a niche. He stated that they should not discount this LIP zone and that is the point that he makes.

Mayor Lauretti commented that in regard to Hawk's Ridge and showed a carved out piece shaded in gray and indicated that back in 2006, this Commission approved an LIP use there. He indicated that he brought the site plans and P&Z approval paperwork with him. He commented that it did not go forward and he won't tell the story behind it but they can blame him for it not going forward. He makes the point so that those who haven't been on the Commission for some period of time understand planning, the big picture, and the history of where they are going with all this.

End of Tape 1B, 8:32 p.m.

Mayor Lauretti stated that Hawk's Ridge is a big project and it is as big a project as they have seen in a number of years and it is not all bad. They have demonstrated that they can put some residential applications in and around these LIP areas and it does work. He wanted the Commission to understand the areas across the street are also LIP and there could be, and he is not saying that there will be, but there could be potential conflicts in the future with uses that go in there such as light, noise, truck traffic, etc.

He commented that as most of them know he lives off Long Hill and he spends a lot of time going up and down Long Hill Cross Road. He understands the traffic patterns and he also knows that most of this traffic is five days a week, very early in the morning (6 a.m. – 7 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the latest). Traffic studies don't always give you a full picture of what goes on in an area. He would suggest to them, here or anywhere else that residential traffic that comes into an area is with you 7 days a week, 365 days a year. It is just the way that it is when people live in an area - that is what they do, they live there and that is the way it is.

Mayor Lauretti commented that when you have businesses that work in an area, there are people that live here that appreciate the down time. Most people go to work at the same time that everybody else does and when they get out of work, they want their quality of life. There are an awful lot of people that walk in through this area and they do that on the weekends when there is no traffic and there is no truck traffic. He commented that if this is all pretty much built up, he asked how much more traffic be inundated in this area. He asked if you have a business development here, aren't you going to use Bridgeport Avenue, for the most part. He stated that he would think that this is the path of the least resistance. He is making these points because he isn't going to sit around and let the LIP that a lot of them have bought into over the years, to be thrown under the bus for something else because if they do that here, there will be other applications that come in and say the same thing. This is a planning decision, not a jobs decision – a planning decision, and yes, economics does play a role but let's look at all of the economics and not just a snapshot of the economics.

Mayor Lauretti stated that is what he has done over the years. He likes to think that he has become a student of some of this by looking at the different presentations, analyzing the different presentations, listening to different traffic experts and engineers. He stated that these engineers that always guarantee them with their P.E. stamp that it is "engineering sound" and two or three years later, he and Rick Schultz are up in some area trying to solve a problem that failed because it was not engineered properly or wasn't installed properly. He clarified that it was not to suggest that that is the case here but when you make these decisions, you have to understand that these things do happen.

Mayor Lauretti stated that these are some of the points that he felt were important for this Commission to hear from the bird's eye view of what he sees. As he said, Hawk's Ridge as it is proposed, he can't say that he is fully supportive of it but it is not all bad.

He concluded that with respect to that thru road or thru traffic put on that plan, he can't say that he would subscribe to that road or would support that if it came to the Board of Aldermen, if this project is approved. In regard to the Assisted Living Facility, if it is there or if it is not there is really of no consequence for him because he views that as a commercial operation because it falls in a different category for a lot of reasons. Even though people are living there, it is almost

like a nursing home; he has several nursing homes up by his residence and they are of no intrusion to a neighborhood so the Assisted Living really could go anywhere. He says that because they will get other people that may want to put these facilities in different parts of the town so he wanted them to hear another point of view. He puts it in that category because they don't have the residential component where people are living in single family houses that have family members, generate traffic at different times, every hour of every day.

Mayor Lauretti showed the location of Route 8 and commented that there were no conflicts there. There are some things across the street. He's tried to put a lot of thought into this thing and if there is a better way to approach this. He is concerned about what goes on across the street. This property has been on the market, as far as he knows, for maybe two years in a down market. He makes that point because it was said "how long are they supposed to sit around and wait for this property to sell in the LIP..." He commented OK, maybe if it had been on the market for 20, 25 or 30 years, he might agree with that. He added that the same thing could apply with the 100 acres across the street. He asked if they were going to have to deal with the same thing across the street. He doesn't want to see them have to be in the position where they are being pressed into a situation just because of an economy.

Mayor Lauretti stated that they are in a different position in this economy; unlike the rest of the State, Shelton is in a different position. He pointed out that in this City, residential is a no-brainer, you can put residential on any piece of property in this town and economically it can work and people will love it. He added that, for him, is not how he would base a planning decision. He concluded and commented that he thinks he covered a lot of points. He indicated he would leave the LIP identified area maps for their future reference because as planners and decision-makers, they need to see and understand this information. He also thinks that they need to understand the thought process that went into the zoning of these areas many, many years ago, even before he showed up on the scene.

Comm. McGorty asked if he knew what the occupancy rate was up on top there – on Forest Parkway and up in that area.

Mayor Lauretti responded that he started looking into that but he doesn't think that there is anything that is totally vacant. This Commission approved, not too long ago, on Test America property (he showed the location), a new occupant coming in from Stratford. He thinks that they are looking for 15,000 square feet.

Chair Parkins commented that she believes that they bought the building.

Mayor Lauretti responded oh, they did than that is even better. He commented that is the point that they need to understand about the LIP zone. He doesn't know what it is like anywhere else, he doesn't follow it anywhere else, but he follows it here. That is exactly the point, these things remake themselves and it shouldn't be discounted. He has been through a lot of public hearings and presentations and the presentations are designed to make the case for the applicant. He understands that and he is not being overly critical of that but he is just saying that there are other things that they need to consider other than just what people are saying to them.

Comm. McGorty agreed.

Mayor Lauretti referenced the discussion about the traffic lane over here. He stated that from his standpoint, this intersection works pretty well and besides, at the end of the day, the State is going to tell them what has to be done there. He added that for him, this issue is not a trade-off and for this double lane to go past this traffic light, he commented that this Brook kicks out pretty quick close to the road. He stated that he didn't know how that was going to work.

Comm. Dickal agreed.

Mayor Lauretti stated that it is not all bad and there are a lot of pluses to this and good economics with this. He can't say that he is crazy about this portion of this property with residential development.

Comm. McGorty stated that his concern would be – and he has been going by Long Hill Cross Road a lot lately, is the stacking of the cars at Rush Hour. He added that he used to work up there at Barnes and it is worse than ever and there is a lot of vacancy up there. It is a fraction of what it used to be because there are a lot of companies that people have left. Comm. McGorty stated that if everything was full up top, and there is already stacking up past the house and almost to 88 between 4:15 p.m. and 4:45 p.m., there is no way that it could support a large LIP project with hundreds of employees. It is not feasible; it is a cow road.

Mayor Lauretti responded that he wouldn't call it a cow road. He knows that it was referenced as being a substandard road but when stacking occurs, he asked how long it lasts and who it affects. It affects the people that come to work.

Comm. McGorty commented that it affects the people coming from Long Hill Avenue coming down to Bridgeport Avenue.

Mayor Lauretti responded that there is nothing perfect about it because they have the same situation at the intersection of Constitution Blvd. and Long Hill Avenue. When things go awry on Route 8, sometimes these things are what they are, so (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty commented that is the exception more than the rule though. He goes by there a lot, probably twice a day and he's been going by at Rush Hour just to see what it looks like right now. Having worked up there for many years, it is worse and it is not as heavily occupied up there as it was.

Mayor Lauretti stated that he wouldn't suggest that it is worse. He asked if they had traffic counts from years gone by because they could easily ascertain that information.

Comm. McGorty stated that his comments have nothing to do with the economy or anything; it has to do with what will actually work there and be less intense for that area. Also, he mentioned that companies are looking – it is not the final frontier in town and the scope of the work that would have to be performed on that property to accommodate an LIP project makes it cost prohibitive for a company to come in and have a huge project. A company would take the path of least resistance and go up to where Hubbell is.

Mayor Lauretti responded that he was glad he brought that up because he would disagree with him on that. He referenced the topo up in there, the topos are much worse than the backside of this property. He commented that when you are up here, that is pretty nice property – it is as nice as it get. He suggested that they look at the topos and to look at what occurred up there where Hubbell is, almost off of a cliff where Bob Scinto got an approval for one of these lots that is even steeper. He reiterated that he can't agree with that assessment. He stated that they should look at the topos and decide for themselves. He concluded his presentation.

Mr. Schultz commented that he would provide 11 x 17 copies of these maps for the Commissioners to review. They were prepared in house, the Engineering Dept.

Mayor Lauretti provided the packet from the 2006 approval given for property that backs into a location on Long Hill Cross Roads. It is 40,000 square foot building, 2 floors, office and light manufacturing.

Comm. Dickal commented that she read in the Connecticut Post that people coming into this area now are looking for bigger housing, not smaller.

Mayor Lauretti departed the meeting at 8:59 p.m.

Chair Parkins responded that she read the same thing and commented that it is all so cyclical. She commented that they still have a full agenda and it is going on 9 p.m. She suggested that she would like to propose, because now they have even more information to digest than they already had, to schedule a special meeting for the 25th which is a Tuesday. Normally, special meetings are held the last Wednesday of the month; however, she will be out of town. She asked for the availability of the other commissioners and stated that Hawk's Ridge would be the only thing on the agenda.

Comm. Tickey was the only Commissioner that might not be available due to previous work related commitments that evening.

Chair Parkins asked if he would be comfortable having Comm. Osak act for him.

Comm. Tickey responded yes, if he is unable to make it.

Chair Parkins reiterated that Hawk's Ridge would be the only agenda item for that meeting so they could devote considerable time to it. She added that it is already late right now with more things on the agenda.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to schedule a Special P&Z meeting for Tuesday, March 25th at 7 p.m. to discuss Application #13-17.

NEW BUSINESS

APPLICATION #14-4: JOSEPH GIAMEI FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION/SITE PLAN APPROVAL (SIT-DOWN RESTAURANT WITH TAKE OUT), 23-25 LONG HILL AVENUE (MAP 117B, LOT 128), CB-2 DISTRICT: ACCEPT AND SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #14-4 and schedule a public hearing for Wednesday, April 23, 2014.

Comm. McGorty indicated that he would be out of town but Comm. Pogoda would be there as long as there is no snow.

APPLICATION #14-5: PETITION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS TO MODIFY STATEMENT OF USES AND STANDARDS FOR PDD #27 AND DETAILED DEVELOPMENT PLANS (ROOF-MOUNTED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY), 695 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE (MAP 29, LOT 1): ACCEPT AND SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #14-5 and schedule a public hearing for Wednesday, April 23, 2014.

PUBLIC PORTION

Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any item not on the Agenda. With no comments, she requested a motion to close the public portion.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 1/22/14 and 2/11/14

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes of 1/22/14 and 2/11/14.

PAYMENT OF BILLS

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve the payment of the bills, if funds are available.

STAFF REPORT

Mr. Schultz reviewed the P&Z Staff Report dated 3/11/14 including upcoming ZBA Applications, Citing Council, Zoning Subcommittee (update on Medical Marijuana Moratorium and Draft Zoning Regulations), Downtown Subcommittee (Canal Street parking issues) and Zoning Enforcement issues.

***See attached Planning & Zoning Staff Report from Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator dated March 11, 2014.**

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karin C. Tuke
P&Z Recording Secretary