

SHELTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

May 28, 2014

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission held a Special Meeting on Wednesday, May 28, 2014 Shelton City Hall, Auditorium, 7:00 p.m., 54 Hill Street, Shelton, CT 06484. The Chairperson reserved the right to take agenda items out of sequence.

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Ruth Parkins (arrived 7:05 p.m.)
Vice Chairman/Comm. Anthony Pogoda
Commissioner Virginia Harger
Commissioner Thomas McGorty
Commissioner Jim Tickey
Commissioner Frank Osak (alternate)
Commissioner Ned Miller (alternate)

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

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

CALL TO ORDER/ PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & ROLL CALL

Vice Chairman Anthony Pogoda called the P&Z Special Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He began the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance, a roll call of members present; he indicated that alternate Commissioner Ned Miller would sit in for Chair Parkins who would be arriving a few minutes late this evening. He indicated that there would be two public hearings this evening, he reviewed the procedures for a public hearing and requested that there be no cell phone usage in the auditorium.

Vice Chairman Pogoda indicated that he would be taking agenda items out of sequence and beginning with the public hearing for Application #14-9. He asked the P&Z Secretary to read the Call of the Hearing for Application #14-8 and any applicable correspondence.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

APPLICATION #14-9: WONDER YEARS LEARNING CENTER FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION/SITE PLAN APPROVAL (CHILD DAYCARE CENTER), 60 TODD ROAD (MAP 63, LOT 19), 1A-3 DISTRICT

P&Z Secretary Virginia Harger read the Call and one piece of correspondence.

***See attached correspondence dated 5/21/14 addressed to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from Shelton Fire Marshal, James Tortora.**

Chair Parkins arrived at 7:05 p.m.

Laura Lipinsky, 7 Chucta Road, Seymour, CT addressed the Commission. Ms. Lipinsky indicated that she was the owner of Wonder Years Learning Center currently located at 188 Rocky Rest Road in the First United Methodist Church. She stated that she proposes to move the location of her daycare center and has signed an Intent to Lease pending Zoning Approval for 60 Todd Road. This location would allow her daycare center to be in the business district versus the residential neighborhood and allow her to increase her enrollment and capacity for children that she can currently have.

Ms. Lipinsky stated that this is an existing building and they don't plan on changing any of the outside structure aside from cosmetic repairs. She indicated that they would be renovating the inside of the building in reference to the Fire Marshal's recommendations. She stated that they do have a building contractor that will be working on it and they will be submitting specific building plans for an architect.

In regard to traffic she indicated that there would be two entrances to the property because it is off of Bridgeport Avenue onto Todd Road. There is an entrance on the side on Platt Road which has a traffic light and another access on the other side directly onto Bridgeport Avenue.

In regard to parking for the Center, she plans to be licensed for approximately 100 children which would give them a staff of approximately 15 and 35 parking spaces. The building currently has 33 planned, striped parking spaces and an area for additional parking that was not paved but cleared. It was an existing overflow parking area for approx. 10 other cars. There is more than enough parking available for staff and clients.

Ms. Lipinsky indicated that the outdoor activity area would be behind the building. It is very secure building for a daycare center and it is one of the reasons that they were attracted to it. The playground area is not accessible from the street at all and there is no visibility at all. It is covered by trees, surrounding by ledge in the back because the building is built against it. It will be fenced in for safety because they will be fencing in an area in there with 4 foot PVC fencing but none of it would be visible from the street. It provides some additional area outside of that fenced area to have some natural foliage for the children too. It is quite private and they feel very safe.

Ms. Lipinsky explained that it is a 2 story building and they will occupy the entire building. She provided a floor plan of the building. Their plan is to move in immediately to move their center to the upstairs and the downstairs. The upstairs has egress directly out to the playground. The downstairs area would be for infants and toddlers and upstairs would be used for the preschool program and for their before/after school program with access through the back or from the main stairway for the older children.

Ms. Lipinsky stated that the plan to occupy the entire space would be within two years but within the first year they would occupy the rest of the space. Upstairs there will be an all purpose room with offices for the staff and downstairs they plan to expand the following year for a before/ after school program that would house more children than they currently take right now, giving them an additional 30 children. She clarified that those 30 children would be a part of the total 100 children – with 70 here and the additional 30 for the before/ after school program in the other location. She offered to answer any questions.

Chair Parkins asked how many Staff members she would have.

Ms. Lipinsky responded that 15 would cover the ratio for the entire Center.

Comm. Harger asked if she could provide a breakdown of the age groups of the children there.

Ms. Lipinsky responded that the age range would be 6 weeks to 12 years old. They would have four rooms with an infant room (6 weeks to 9 months); a toddler room (9 months - 18 months) and two other toddler rooms with one room for 1- year olds and another for 2-year olds. She stated that upstairs there would be two preschool classrooms with 20 children each. There would be 3 and 4 year old children. She pointed out the location of the before and after school program with 30 school-aged children. She stated that they hope to offer a full day kindergarten as well. The hours are 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Comm. Harger asked if her license covered offering a full day kindergarten program.

Ms. Lipinsky responded that it does not at her current location.

Comm. Harger asked if she would be certified to teach a kindergarten classroom.

Chair Parkins commented that the State regulates that.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes.

Comm. Tickey asked if she said it could accommodate 200 children.

Ms. Lipinsky responded no, 100 children.

Comm. Tickey asked how many children she had at the current location.

Ms. Lipinsky responded 50.

Comm. Pogoda asked if school buses would be dropping off and picking up the kids for school.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes, it is in the Long Hill School District so it would just be the buses from Long Hill School that would be dropping off kids.

Comm. Pogoda asked if they would drive up to the building or to the end of the street.

Ms. Lipinsky responded that they wouldn't come right to the building but at the end of the street.

Comm. Pogoda asked if they would have a staff member there to pick up the children.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes, absolutely, just like they do right now. The buses come to the edge of the church property presently.

Chair Parkins asked if she had summer programs as well.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes.

Chair Parkins asked if they were full day programs.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes and added that they are open 51 weeks a year and closed for one week for maintenance at the current building and they would continue to do that.

Chair Parkins asked if the summer program would displace the before and after school program.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes.

Comm. Pogoda asked the hours of operation.

Ms. Lipinsky responded 6:30 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Comm. Dickal asked if those would be the same hours during the summer.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes.

Comm. Harger asked if they had provisions for a kitchen or for the kids to eat.

Ms. Lipinsky responded that presently the children bring their own lunches. They don't do any cooking. They offer a hot lunch program that is catered through a restaurant. The center has an employee room in the corner with a dishwasher, sink, and no stove currently but that would be the kitchen facility they would use for a cooking project or educational project.

Chair Parkins asked if there were refrigerators for the children's lunches.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes, they have refrigerators in every classroom.

Chair Parkins commented that she thinks this is a great location for this.

Comm. Harger asked about handicapped accessibility.

Ms. Lipinsky responded that there is a handicapped ramp in the back.

Comm. Harger asked if there were only stairs inside.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes but the downstairs is handicapped accessible and the handicapped bathrooms are on the first level as well.

Comm. Harger asked if she had foreseen a need to put something like a stair lift in.

Ms. Lipinsky responded not necessarily, they have will speak with the building inspector once they get the final plans to make sure that this back entrance is appropriate and convenient for handicapped access. She added that there may be a need to redo it but they've discussed it with the building owner but they are waiting for the building inspector to come and tell them if anything needs to be changed.

Chair Parkins asked if that would be a State requirement for handicapped accessibility.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes, and it is handicapped accessible. There is a ramp in the back. They will have the architect look at and make sure that it is in compliance once they receive their plans for the building inspector.

Comm. Harger commented that they will need to take into consideration the grade outside.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes and she added that she's discussed it with the building owner so he is aware of it and they've got a written agreement to repair anything outside required by the State or required by the Building Inspector.

Chair Parkins asked how close the stone ledge is to the back where she is proposing to put the fence.

Ms. Lipinsky responded that she wasn't really sure but about 6 feet from the proposed fence line.

Chair Parkins asked if there were any signs back there about rocks falling.

Ms. Lipinsky responded that there really isn't, there is a row of trees in there that they were going to try and close in – close in the tree line to keep vegetation because even though that is not going to be the play area, it is beautiful back there so they want to keep it clean. They are going to put additional fencing back there so if there were any rocks coming down that might catch it.

Chair Parkins commented about the additional fencing and asked if she had their fenced in yard and then about 6 feet (inaudible)...

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes and then 6 feet going uphill a bit and then there is vegetation so they thought about fencing along that vegetation would keep that up. It is a low grade of stones.

Chair Parkins stated OK, so it's a double fence.

Ms. Lipinsky responded yes, more like a safety fence in the back.

Chair Parkins asked if there were any other questions from the Commission.

Comm. McGorty commented that it looks like a good location.

Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak regarding this proposal. There was no one wishing to speak. She asked for a motion to close this public hearing.

On a motion made by Anthony Pogoda seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to close the public hearing for Application #14-9.

APPLICATION #14-8: WATER'S EDGE OF SHELTON, LLC FOR PDD ZONE CHANGE, FINAL SITE DEVELOPMENT PLANS (14 UNIT CONDOMINIUM COMPLEX), CAM SITE PLAN AND REVISION TO FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORY

FOR THE 2006 POCD, 500 RIVER ROAD AND 41 FANNY STREET (MAP 54, LOTS 33 & 42), IA-3/R-3 DISTRICTS

Chair Parkins indicated that they would go back to the first public hearing on the agenda for Application #14-8 for Water's Edge of Shelton, LLC. She asked the Secretary to read the Call of the Hearing.

P&Z Secretary, Virginia Harger read the Call for Application #14-8 and three pieces of applicable correspondence.

***See attached correspondence dated 5/22/14 to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from City Engineer, Robert Kulacz, P.E.**

***See attached correspondence dated 5/21/14 to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from Fire Marshal, James Tortora**

***See attached e-mail correspondence to Richard Schultz from Kristen Kallenberg, Environmental Analyst, Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP), Office of Long Island Sound Programs**

Chair Parkins clarified an error on the agenda – *River's* Edge of Shelton, LLC should be *Water's* Edge of Shelton.

Peter Hughes, for the Applicant, submitted an additional piece of correspondence from the Department of Transportation to be read into the record.

Secretary Virginia Harger read the letter from the Department of Transportation regarding Water's Edge and the requirements necessary to obtain an encroachment permit for the Dept. of Transportation's right-of-way.

***See attached correspondence to Mr. Philip DeLippo, ATA Realty, Torrington, CT from Department of Transportation Michael Cannous[sp?], Transportation Supervising Service Agent, Bureau of Highway Operations.**

Mr. Peter Hughes, Planner for the Applicant, Water's View of Shelton, LLC addressed the Commission. Mr. Hughes submitted certified mailing receipts from nearby property owners. He stated that they were here tonight for the 3.1 acre parcel that had been described by the legal notice at 500 River Road which houses a factory/commercial use today and 41 Fanny Street, the owner of the property's current residence. They are proposing to develop 14 units, 12 new units and 5 buildings taking the existing house on 41 Fanny Street and making that into 2 unit building.

He explained the access on a site drawing, coming down River Road to the circular driveway system in front of the units and out on Fanny Street with a two way access. On Fanny Street they are proposing one way off of River Road. This is what they were proposing.

Mr. Hughes indicated that they sent out the letters and before they sent out the letters, Mr. Matto went out to speak to his neighbors. The certified letters were sent to people within 200 feet of the proposed project; Mr. Matto told them that the neighbors expressed concern about opening up Fanny Street.

An audience member (unidentified) interrupted and Chair Parkins asked the audience members to wait until the Public portion to make any comments. She reiterated that she would give them an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Hughes continued that there is a concern of opening up Fanny Street to traffic. Mr. Hughes indicated that they are offering to the Commission to make Fanny Street an emergency access only. They can open the River Road access to a 2-way so before beginning his presentation he wanted to let everyone know that they have been examining this for the last few days and they believe that they can make it a two-way River Road access with an emergency access only off of Fanny Street.

Mr. Hughes stated that they would move the gate back, a locked gate for Firemen's access for emergency only and for recycling. He pointed out the location and explained that they could widen it to a 20 foot lane. The Traffic Engineer indicated that it is suitable for low volume traffic. They could possibly get it to a 22 foot lane.

Mr. Hughes reiterated that on the 3.1 acres they are proposing 14 units. He showed a dock location on the site plan and indicated that the permit in the CAM letter is for that dock. This was originally for Sacred Heart University but that deal fell through because of the length of the DEEP permitting. The current owner got a permit for a commercial marina so part of this application is for maintaining the dock. He explained that three of the six slips have to go public per the State's Regulations. They are providing three parking spaces for those three slips. It is a seasonal use and they will restrict the hours. There is no guest parking just one parking spot per slip.

Mr. Hughes indicated that the State also required them to provide an office and a bathroom for the marina so they put that on the house at 41 Fanny Street. If they are familiar with that house today, that is where the deck is located. They are going to put a building under the deck to house an office and a bathroom.

Mr. Hughes clarified that these slips are not full width boat slips. This was permitted for folks who follow the skulls, the crews and the slip is not the full width. He indicated that he was not a boating expert but he thinks it is 4 to 6 feet narrower than a normal boat slip. He stated that would be the commercial marina aspect – three slips and they would have to come through the gated parking and use a code to open the gate. He added that people with the code would be the only people accessing that gate and using the three parking spaces on the end.

Mr. Hughes explained that the units would be 27' x 54' and they are approximately 2500 square feet without the finished basement. He indicated that they would be three-bedroom units, five units that front the River and he pointed out the others with River views. As part of the Wetland approval, they were asked to try to retain as much buffer from the River's edge; he pointed out the three units which they have moved back. He showed one unit that they could not move back because when they moved it back they got into a series of stairs. They have pushed back very close to the footprint of the existing building and all of their building and parking is within the existing paving that is out there today. They are not infringing into the grass with any of the (inaudible)...

He explained the entranceway and the circular drive - and to address the City Engineer's comment - they had widened this out to the width he required. He indicated that from the garage at Unit #12 to the curb is 22 feet. On the plans that they are going to submit right now reflecting those, they also took the main access drive that is 18 feet wide with two 24' x 50' bump outs. They interpreted his letter to say that if they made this 22' then 16' was fine with the bump outs. It is hard to read what the City Engineering is saying in that third paragraph but regardless, they can make it 20 – 22 all the way out.

Mr. Hughes indicated that the units have decks and grass areas in the back. He pointed out the units that have decks on the front. There are two-car garages, two parking spaces in front of the units and they have 19 additional parking spaces. In regard to the City Engineer's comments about widening the circle out two feet, they moved the buildings up to accommodate the Wetland's Commission, so they can't make that 26 because they moved the buildings up. The Fire Marshal finds this fine in his correspondence. As far as the grade, there is only 90 feet of 14% grade not a 150 feet. The rest is 12%; the existing driveway today is between 13% and 15%.

Mr. Hughes read a letter from Berkshire Engineering, Dennis McMorrow P.E. who could not attend tonight.

Based on the review from City Engineer dated May 22, 2014, they have revised the plans as follows:

- *The emergency access was widened to 22 feet from Unit #12 to the corner.*

- *The remainder of the drive straight portion was widened 18 feet with two 15' x 24' pull-offs.*
- *The 14% grade matches the existing grade of the driveway which services the site.*
- *The 14% section is only 90 feet long and not 150 feet long and the grade is reduced to 12%.*
- *The existing drive has a section which is 14% or greater and a length of 220 feet. This includes a 60 feet long section of 15.3% grade. The driveway width in this area is only 14 feet wide in places.*

He submitted Mr. McMorrow's letter for the record.

Mr. Hughes stated that the units are set back and they aren't crowding the neighboring properties. He showed the area above the units, along the edge and along the Housatonic River where they are proposing Conservation Easements. He provided the draft Conservation Easement document. He explained that these can be easements or restrictions to the City or private, however they want to work it, they will do the same thing for them. If they are private restrictions then the City has enforcement powers, and if the City wants to grant them then they will grant them to the City.

Mr. Hughes explained some of the changes with the 18 feet with the bump-outs and explained that they could make 20 - 22 feet with two way traffic. He showed the gate location, the location of their signage and a flagpole up at the street.

Mr. Hughes indicated that in regard to the site utilities and the City Engineer's comments about the sewers, they appeared before the WPCA at their May meeting and they will be back for their June meeting. They ran an analysis that the WPCA asked them to run of their flow into the existing pipe on Petremont Street, the 2 inch low pressure line. Their engineers have done that and there is enough capacity for them to flow through that pipe so they expect their approval at the June meeting. He added that it is a public sewer on Petremont Street.

Mr. Hughes stated that they would be running a low pressure line up the main street and each unit will have a gravity system that comes to an individual pump station so there are five pump stations that will go up and out. They are providing a sewer connection for the neighbor on the right, the auto storage facility because they asked them to so will put out a connection for their sewer connection.

Mr. Hughes explained that for the water they will bring in a loop connecting Anna Street to Fanny Street. They will provide a fire hydrant at the end of their drive in front of the gate which will provide fire protection for Fanny Street which does not have a fire hydrant there today.

Mr. Hughes showed a landscaping plan and stated that it was prepared by Kim Barbieri of Pony Lake Studios. He showed the location where they would be adding buffering by Anna Street, along the side with Latex and around the units along the River.

Mr. Hughes discussed storm water management and explained that they were infiltrating all of the storm water and they have a zero post development increase from what is there today. He indicated that all of the storm water will collect and discharge into an underground gallery system. He showed the location of the underground gallery system at two different points on the site plan. He stated that there would be no additional run-off into the Housatonic River; however, he showed where, today, there are point discharges off this property to the River. All of their roofs and all their pavements go into the infiltration systems, go into the ground with a zero post development run-off so they will not be contributing in any erosion to the River by adding any storm water to the River.

Mr. Hughes indicated that the flood plane – he showed the portion of the road that the City Engineer pointed out correctly - that the 100 year storm would be under 1 – 3 feet of water. He showed where they have made a compensation area for flood storage in front of the units so there is no increase in the flood discharge off of the property. They submitted all of those calculations to the City Engineer as well as the storm water. They comply with the City Storm Water Ordinance as well, 854 or 856, he wasn't sure what it was.

Mr. Hughes indicated that they tried to use the site in a sensitive context. This is a transitional area as they know, they have a CA-2 zone, an R-3 zone, IA-3, Constitution Boulevard. They feel that this is a transition between the big use and the neighborhood use and with straightening the access out here they have addressed, hopefully, some of the comments from the neighbors. He added that they want to hear all of the neighbor's comments and they will do what they can accommodate them.

Mr. Hughes stated that as far as the tax impact, they are looking at units between \$575K and \$750K. They are projecting that they will see \$100,000/year in tax revenue versus the \$7,000/year that they see today. He added that these types of developments have a very small school aged population potential. They have seen that here in Shelton and it just doesn't happen.

Mr. Hughes indicated that they are trying to maintain the buffers, preserve the Riverfront, utilize the existing permits for the docks. He stated that one question asked was what would happen if they got rid of one of these and they got rid of the commercial marina. He indicated that if they got rid of the commercial marina, they would have to get rid of all of the slips, pull the dock in and have to eliminate one. They are allowed one residential point of access on a river per property. The State has told them that is what would happen. Also for public access, the DEEP wanted it at the end of Fanny Street. They had originally proposed it inside and they told them to pull it out because they feel that neighbors on Fanny Street and Anna Street deserve to have a River access on the street. They are widening the cul-de-sac five feet to provide a place to park.

Chair Parkins asked Mr. Hughes to go back to the colored drawing that he had because it was a little bit clearer.

Mr. Hughes pointed out the walkway into Fanny Street. He referenced a meeting that they had and commented that the walkway reflects, there are steps, a landing, steps, a landing and he showed where they will widen the existing pavement.

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

Chair Parkins asked if that was outside of the gate.

Mr. Hughes showed where the gate would be located in the back.

Chair Parkins asked if the only people that would be allowed to access the two slips would have access to the gate.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, off of River Road, seasonally, limited hours.

Chair Parkins asked if they would be able to condition that to be seasonal.

Mr. Hughes responded that they were limiting the hours to 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. for the public slips.

Comm. Dickal asked if that was Monday through Sunday or Monday through Friday.

Mr. Hughes responded that it would be seven days a week.

Comm. Harger asked what they considered to be the season.

Mr. Hughes responded that for the boating – he would say May 1st to October 31st. The river is full of stuff in the spring.

Chair Parkins asked who would police that.

Mr. Hughes responded the Association – the marina would be run as a part of the Association, as their community.

Chair Parkins asked if that dock exists there today.

Mr. Hughes responded that the dock was partially built today. He showed the dock that exists today.

Comm. Harger asked if he could indicate the depth of that easement behind Building #7 through Building #12 and toward Fanny Street and Anna Street. She asked how deep it was.

Mr. Hughes responded that it would range between 40 to 60 feet – he showed a part that would be 15 to 20 feet, and added that it would be 10 feet on the River.

Comm. Harger asked what the depth of it was though – not the width of it.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, it was the depth - 40 to 60 feet.

Chair Parkins asked about the area in the flood zone – the one to three feet underwater – she asked if that would impact any of the residences or just the road itself.

Mr. Hughes responded just the road itself – actually the driveway, there is a (inaudible) drive here today, a dip in the road (inaudible)... He added that the elevation 16 would be out of the flood, and showed where the elevation 14 would be in the water. He showed again the area that would be high and dry, an area in front of the four parking spaces.

Comm. Dickal asked if that would be enough clearance for people to get out in case of an emergency.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, he stated that they have checked with some people in the City and no one, maybe they know, but no one has told them that Fanny Street has ever been underwater. He doesn't know if it has or hasn't but they were told that it hasn't been.

Comm. Tickey asked about the Fanny Street entrance and asked if that was a driveway into the current, existing building right there.

Mr. Hughes responded that there are two driveways – one to the side and one to the front.

Comm. Tickey asked if someone was in that building would they be able to enter through Fanny Street.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, they have moved the gate back there so that it would remain as it today. He added that they come out on Fanny Street today. He explained that they would take all of the new units and bring them up to River Road.

Comm. Harger asked if he meant that only that one, two-building unit would be ...

Mr. Hughes responded yes, the existing house at 41 Fanny Street.

Comm. Tickey asked about the other driveway with the island in between and if that was the one for emergency use only.

Mr. Hughes responded that in their original proposal it was two-way but what they have said is that they would bring the gate back here and taper this driveway back.

Comm. Tickey asked if it would be used for emergencies only.

Mr. Hughes responded yes. He added that it was 22 – 24 feet wide and they will make that 20 – 22 feet wide.

Comm. Tickey asked if he had said that he would be widening the cul-de-sac around Fanny Street because he knows that there will be more traffic there.

Mr. Hughes responded that the State wanted parking available on Fanny Street. He wanted people from the neighborhood – the State felt that people there shouldn't have to walk to Sunnyside and that they should be able to walk or drive down here to access the River.

Comm. Tickey asked if that reflected the additional widening around the cul-de-sac for parking.

Mr. Hughes responded yes.

Chair Parkins asked where the parking would be located for the public slips.

Mr. Hughes showed the location for the parking for the public slips on the site drawing.

Chair Parkins commented that they would actually come into the complex from River Road to access the slips.

Mr. Hughes responded yes from River Road.

Chair Parkins asked how they would get out to use the facilities.

Mr. Hughes responded within the gate.

Chair Parkins asked where, when they are within the gate.

Mr. Hughes pointed out where they would park, where the boats would be located and that they would walk over and leave back out where they came in.

Chair Parkins asked how they would use the facilities, the rest rooms.

Mr. Hughes responded that they would have a key.

Chair Parkins stated that she thought the building was going to be located outside of the fence.

Mr. Hughes responded that they will have a walkway and he showed where they would put a gate past the driveway there so they would still have access to the front door.

Chair Parkins commented OK and asked if it was worth having those slips in consideration from the demands from the State.

Mr. Hughes responded that is something for the Applicant to think about.

Comm. Harger asked about the area on the river side past the gate and if it was grass.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, it is all grass today. He showed the location of the existing pavement, the house, the driveway so they converting some of that into grass and some of it into the driveway.

Mr. Panico asked about the public slips and asked if the boats would have to be put in somewhere else. He is assuming they would because you can't launch a boat there.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, that is absolutely correct.

Chair Parkins added that no one can.

Mr. Panico stated that all this does is provide them with a place to get to and from their boat once the boat has been put into the water.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, that is correct. He added that there is no fueling and no maintenance; they put that in the Statement of Uses that there would be no fueling and no boat repair. It is strictly to park the boat like it would be in a parking spot.

Mr. Hughes provided drawings of the elevations of the buildings. He showed the upper units and indicated which seven of the units they would be on the site map. He added that they would be garage under, first and second floor and made so that there is a shaft for a suction elevator. He stated that if people want to put an elevator in then they have the room for that. He explained the

glass out the front and the living area to the river. He added that the garage doors may go to a shade of gray from this white but this is the relief of the building, the circular (inaudible) soffice versus square.

Mr. Hughes showed renderings of the Riverfront units and explained that they would have a shade of gray for the garage doors, the entryways would release back (inaudible) as they've required. Treatment (inaudible) they've staggered all of the buildings...

Chair Parkins asked if they were facing away from the water.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, right, that is in the front. They staggered all of the buildings and maintained the 20 feet, in some cases more than 20 feet separation distance. He showed the location of the mailbox pick-up, they've brought it a long way out to the River. They aren't proposing any community building or any sort of amenities beyond the dock.

Comm. Pogoda asked about the gate at River Road and how they would provide for garbage pick-up. He asked if they were going to have to have a code.

Mr. Hughes responded that yes, they will give them the code just like the Fire Dept. or EMT. They are planning on using the City system. He indicated that they have contacted all of the utility companies – sewer, water, electric and gas.

Comm. Pogoda asked if it was going to be gas.

Mr. Hughes responded that they would like a gas line but it may be propane. There is an exuberant price to bring a gas line down and they are negotiating right now.

Comm. Pogoda asked if it would be some form of gas though.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, it will be propane or the gas line.

Comm. Dickal asked if all of the housing units would be the same as that drawing.

Mr. Hughes responded yes, these are the designs of three with the only changes to the interiors. There is a master bedroom first floor option but the facades are the same. They have added a note, per their discussions with Staff, there will be a fence along the retaining wall in the back. It will be part of the structural design of (inaudible)...it will most likely be an aluminum.

Comm. Pogoda asked if it would be a page fence or solid.

Mr. Hughes responded a page fence – bars.

Comm. Pogoda stated OK, open bars.

Chair Parkins asked about the building there now, the factory that is there now, and what has been their ingress and egress. She asked if they have used Fanny Street.

Mr. Hughes responded that Fanny Street was utilized until 2004 or 2006 – in that timeframe. When the current owner came in to get the zone change, he put the house here and abandoned the non-conforming use of access out onto Fanny Street. It was formally abandoned on a map that they approved – there is a note on it.

Chair Parkins stated OK, so up until 2004, Fanny Street was an exit.

Mr. Hughes commented that it was somewhere between 2004 and 2006; the map is dated 2004 but he doesn't know when it was actually implemented. He stated that they can provide safe two-way access out to River Road, provide the emergency access only on Fanny Street, meet everyone's safety requirements and address the concerns that they've heard so far from the neighbors about opening up that street.

Mr. Hughes indicated that their traffic count shows that it is very negligible traffic and the level of service at Jordan, Wakelee and River Road are excellent and won't be impacted by the development. He added that they understand that the people there are used to not having traffic come out there so they are willing to accommodate that.

Chair Parkins asked if there were any environmental concerns with that building that is currently there.

Mr. Hughes responded no.

Chair Parkins stated that there have been a lot of uses proposed for that.

Mr. Hughes commented that the canopy had asbestos shingles but that was it.

Chair Parkins responded OK and asked if there were any other questions from the Commissioners. With no further comments from the Commission, Chair Parkins opened the public hearing for public comments. She asked anyone wishing to speak to please sign in with their name and address.

Barbara Parrelli, 35 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Parrelli indicated that she is a resident living at 35 Fanny Street and she is responding as an abutting landowner to the application to change the future land use category of her street and the surrounding area from moderate density residential, office, light industrial to multi-family residential group quarters. Ms. Parrelli indicated that she and her husband have paid taxes in this City and raised their children here for 37+ years and they are adamantly opposed to this change because of the affect it will have on their neighborhood and their house, in particular.

Ms. Parrelli stated that they understand from what they had learned previous to tonight, that Fanny Street would become a direct access route for the planned development as they were leaving the site; however, she learned tonight that will be changed.

Ms. Parrelli added that Fanny Street is still a cul-de-sac and there is a reason people choose to live in a cul-de-sac. There is minimal traffic traveling through, children are safe to play on or near the street and crime is less prevalent because cars are noticed. A home on a dedicated cul-de-sac may garner up to 20% in a resale value. As it stands now, the street can't sustain an increase in traffic with its narrow dimensions and an obscure bend in the road at the intersection of Jordan Avenue. They feel that there will be an increase in street parking as public access is given for five canoes and kayaks as part of the development. Shelton does offer people access to the Riverfront just a few feet away at the boat launch behind Sunnyside School. In conclusion, she and her husband urge the Commission to deny this application from Water's Edge of Shelton, LLC because they feel it will diminish their home's value as well as the surrounding homes and diminish the quality of life that they enjoy and have endeavored to build in this City for last 37 years. She thanked the Commission.

Heather Campofiore, 31 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Campofiore agreed with everything that the previous speaker stated. She indicated that she grew up on Fanny Street and has lived there the majority of her life, moved away and has now moved back. She had a couple of questions. It was stated that Fanny Street would now be a proposed emergency exit only. She asked what that meant exactly.

Chair Parkins responded that it would be gated and you can only get out in the event of an emergency.

Ms. Campofiore asked if it meant that there would be no traffic whatsoever from the condos coming in or out.

Chair Parkins responded under normal circumstances, yes that is correct.

Ms. Campofiore asked about the public access. It was stated that they would want to widen the cul-de-sac for parking and they felt that the residents on Fanny Street shouldn't have to go to

Sunnyside. She asked, if that is the case, why would they be providing parking for residents on the street – it wouldn't be for them, it would be for the public to come.

Chair Parkins responded that these are State requirements, not City requirements. These are required by the State, the DEEP.

Ms. Campofiore responded OK. She asked about the gas or propane line and where it would come through.

Chair Parkins responded that if it is put in, it would come down into the property as any gas distribution line would be.

Ms. Campofiore commented that as far as she knew they didn't have that.

Chair Parkins responded that's correct.

Ms. Campofiore asked if construction would be on their street for this.

Chair Parkins responded no, more than likely, it would come off on Route #110 but it would certainly be a benefit to the neighborhood if they could tie into it.

Ms. Campofiore responded OK and concluded her comments.

Ann DeFilippo, 36 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. DeFilippo stated that she is a property owner on the Housatonic River and has owned the property for over 50 years. This came to her attention yesterday. She did not get a notice that they said was given out. It came to her attention just yesterday afternoon that there would be a public hearing about a proposed condominium and mixed use marina development at 500 River Road and 41 Fanny Street. Although she is not an adjacent property owner, her property is located a few houses down from this proposed development site. Ms. DeFilippo stated that she, along with most of her neighbors had not been notified about this project and haven't had access to or ample time to review any detailed plans. Given the limited information shared with her by a neighbor based upon an article in the Huntington Herald, she has the following significant questions and concerns about this project.

Ms. DeFilippo asked what the overall plan was for the development of the Housatonic Riverfront and how the P&Z Commission is going to protect it. This is a precious resource and it seems that all that is happening is that one condo project after another is approved. She asked if that is what they want – condos from one end of the river to the other. As soon as a major developer submits plans, the zoning changes to accommodate them. She asked if that was really protecting their valuable resources. She asked what would stop the next proposed project. This project, if approved, would be make the fourth marina in the River within a very short distance of each other. She asked if they really needed that.

Ms. DeFilippo stated that this project is inconsistent with the look and feel of the current residential neighborhood consisting of primarily modest single family homes. There is a vague description given in the article from the Huntington Herald dated May 14, 2014 stating that the plan provides a public access easement to the Housatonic River. She asked what that means exactly. She asked if this quiet neighborhood now has to deal with constant intrusion by the public with no remedy to stop the flow of traffic to the River and through their neighborhood. Public access including a boat ramp and park are already available behind Sunnyside School. She asked why they needed more.

Ms. DeFilippo stated that waterfront property owners have been denied permits for private docks in front of their homes and some have even had to tear them down. She asked how it was fair that developers are allowed to install docks and marinas in the very same neighborhood. She asked what the traffic impact would be on the neighborhood and on the river. She asked how large the housing units be and would they be considered luxury units or basic units. She asked if there would be any dredging, erosion control or other alteration of the river and how might this impact her property. She added that she has a lot of erosion now and she has erosion concerns and asked how it will impact her property in the future. She asked if this had been thoroughly

analyzed. She is already dealing with erosion problems along her property due to the current flow of the river and boating traffic which has been atrocious lately.

Ms. DeFilippo requested that this project be denied. She reiterated that she never received a notice. Someone said that everyone got notices but there are other neighbors that didn't get them either.

Chair Parkins stated that the requirement is within 200 feet of the project.

Ms. DeFilippo asked if this was going to be a gated community or for the public because it was said that it was gated but it was public. She asked how they were getting into this if it is public. She personally feels that she has not had the opportunity to understand what this is until tonight.

Chair Parkins stated that is the purpose of the public hearing; it is for the Applicant to explain exactly what it is and then to listen to the concerns.

Ms. DeFilippo commented that she was never notified and she was really upset. She lives on the River and she knows what goes on, on the River.

Chair Parkins responded that they will have the Applicant address some of the concerns that she has raised.

Thomas Klepacky, 36 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. Klepacky stated that he and his family have lived abutting this property for over 50 years. It has always been a nice single family neighborhood with very little traffic and the children could play in the road and it wasn't a concern unless the factory workers were coming in a 8 a.m. or leaving at 4:30 p.m.

Mr. Klepacky stated that 36 Fanny Street is his father's property, he's in Florida right now so he is speaking on his behalf as well as his sister's behalf, who will receive this property in the future. He commented that they don't want a multi-family housing project at the end of their cul-de-sac where they've lived for over 50 years. He doesn't want any additional boat traffic. It is horrendous as it is now and they also have the erosion problems.

Mr. Klepacky used the Applicant's site drawing to explain the location of his father's property in relation to where the public access has been proposed. He commented that they were planning to widen it, and take his father's property to make parking spots for public.

Chair Parkins commented no, they can't take your property.

Mr. Klepacky stated that he didn't know but it upsets him. He doesn't want to hear 40 extra people at the end of his street. It will be like a block party every night – maybe or maybe not – but he likes the neighborhood the way that it has been his whole life and he wants to keep it that way. He commented that he hopes the Commission considers that and he wants to propose not to accept at least the commercial part with boat ramp – marina. He added that he didn't think that was a good idea at all and the multi-family wasn't right for the neighborhood either. He thanked the Commission.

Dawn Shuby, 72 Victory Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Shuby stated that she was present on behalf of her mother, Carol Polifka, who owns the property at 72 Victory Street. She commented that as Mrs. DeFilippo stated, the boat traffic is really bad and the (inaudible) out and the traffic that just keeps going by. She added that they can't control it. There is so much erosion and there is nothing that they can do unless they get involved with the DEEP and then you have to go by their stipulations. Ms. Shuby stated that she is one of the people who the DEEP made take their dock out because they couldn't prove that it had been there since 1980. She asked how they couldn't even a simple dock and the applicant can have all this going in on the river. She stated that she didn't know if there were pilings going in or anything like that but it doesn't seem fair to the average resident. She commented about the traffic and growing up in the neighborhood and having her kids growing up in this neighborhood. She hopes her kids will grow up without all the extra traffic and chaos.

Sandra Fee, 19 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Fee indicated that she agrees with everything that has been said. Everyone who has spoken is a neighbor and they all know each other very well on Fanny Street. Ms. Fee commented that she didn't think the slips are necessary. She doesn't really object to the condos going in but if the State is going to ask for public access at the end of Fanny Street that will mean that people are going to drive down, park their car and it is a somewhat private road. She reiterated that she objects mostly to the slips and the marina that they are proposing. If they keep the condo traffic in and out from River Road...by the way, she asked if Petremont Lane was coming down to or if it was a private road, or 500 River Road.

Mr. Panico responded that it was private.

Chair Parkins questioned that Petremont was private.

Mr. Schultz responded no, this one was documented years ago as the extension of Petremont.

Anna Molitoris, 17 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Molitoris stated that she agrees with everything that has been said by previous speakers.

Frank Baranowsky, 14 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. Baranowsky indicated that he was first resident to build a house on Fanny Street when he came out of the service. He stated that it was a nice neighborhood and he wants to keep it the way it is. As far as them having Fanny Street as an entrance and exit, they could use Petremont Lane to get to his house right on the water. If they can't use Petremont Lane then right next to the cemetery, the contractor owns the land all the way to the cemetery, they could build another road alongside the cemetery with a entrance and exit to the condos that they want to build. He thanked the Commission.

Mrs. John Kosturko, 47 Victory Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mrs. Kosturko indicated that she has lived on Victory Street for 52 years and when they moved in it was a beautiful neighborhood including Fanny Street. She stated that they had a family with nine children, no traffic but now it is becoming a big issue. Mrs. Kosturko stated that she was opposed to the marina. She lives right in front of another marina and in the summer she has cars parked on both sides of the street and sometimes she has a hard time backing out of her own driveway. She stated that she doesn't want to see the zone changed and she doesn't like the plan proposed. She indicated that she is concerned about the neighborhood; it was beautiful many years ago and now it is out of control.

Chair Parkins asked Mrs. Kosturko about cars being parked on both sides of her street and if it was because people were accessing the river or because they are ...

Mrs. Kosturko responded that it was because the marina is in front of her house and there are times that they don't go down to use the marina because of repairs or some kind of problem down there. A couple of weeks ago they were putting in a water line and cars were blocking her mailbox. She had to ask them to move their cars and she doesn't think that is fair because she is a taxpayer and she doesn't think it should be like that.

Chair Parkins stated that it wasn't the residents and their company then, it was people that are accessing the river.

Mrs. Kosturko responded yes it is people with their boats at the boatyard. She thanked the Commission.

Debra Beauchemin, 20 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Beauchemin stated that most of her questions have been answered but the only concern she has is about the additional traffic. She commented that having two way traffic with children around, she is afraid it will cause some issues in the neighborhood.

Joseph Kralic, 66 Jordan Avenue, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. Kralic stated that he lives on Jordan Avenue right on top of Fanny Street. Mr. Kralic stated that he thinks it is ridiculous that six spots are going to be called a marina. It can't even fit a boat; it is for a skull

and for that they want to take a five foot piece out of everyone's adjoining property because of this State mandate. He commented that this was like the tail wagging the dog; stupidity on top of stupidity and if they can't see that...it is ridiculous. He asked why they don't just get rid of this marina that only has only three skull slips available to the public and because of that, there needs to be all of this other parking. Mr. Kralic asked what would stop the people that are in the condos from exiting out Fanny Street.

Chair Parkins responded that it was going to be a locked gate.

Mr. Kralic asked if they had the key to it though.

Chair Parkins responded that they residents don't.

Mr. Panico added that it was for emergency people only.

Mr. Kralic asked how that would work if there was a fire there. Someone has to call the Fire Department and asked if they have a key to get in.

Chair Parkins responded yes and added that she would assume the condo association president would have a key as well – or someone within the condo complex.

Mr. Kralic stated that he objects to the increase in traffic. He has lived there 37 years and has never seen that sort of thing and now there is the potential for it to be a lot more than it is. He indicated that was all he had to say.

Ann Miroz, 11 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Miroz stated that she has lived at 11 Fanny Street for about 20 years and her husband's family lived there for almost 60 years. Ms. Miroz agreed with what everyone else has been saying. Any kind of extra traffic – it's OK for the condos if they go in and out from River Road but they don't want any parking in that cul-de-sac area or extra people coming in because there aren't any sidewalks. She added that the children play in the street sometimes and ride their bikes and she likes the way that it is right now. Ms. Miroz indicated that they can hear the noise from the River already from the other marinas and they live up on top of the hill. She asked a question about something she heard about connecting Anna Street and Fanny Street and if that was correct.

Chair Parkins responded no, that's not right.

Mr. Panico responded that maybe she was referring to the connecting the water lines.

Ms. Miroz responded OK and added that she hopes that this isn't approved. She thanked the Commission.

Judson Crawford, 8 Jordan Avenue, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. Crawford stated that all of the people that have spoken to the Board this evening except for one gentleman are residents of Fanny Street. If this was ever allowed by this Board, the number of cars and trucks that would be increased on Jordan Avenue would be unbearable too. They have too many children that live on Jordan Avenue. Their safety is more important.

Mr. Crawford stated that before anyone came this evening a lot of questions were asked about what would be taking place this evening. He referenced Section 3.2 and asked if they had an application for a Certificate of Zoning. He commented that a copy of it should be passed out to all the people here this evening so that they would have an idea of what was going on.

Mr. Crawford referenced Section 32.2 and asked about a plot plan drawn to scale and if the people proposing this have contacted the Board of Education and requested a conference with the Superintendent of Schools to find out what their thoughts are as to the number of children that would be increased by this proposal. As far as he knows the answer to that question is no.

Chair Parkins responded that it was not the purview of the BOE to make that determination.

Mr. Crawford commented that he still thinks that they should have contacted the Board of Ed because he would have like to hear their response to this application.

Chair Parkins responded no, they don't make that determination.

Mr. Crawford asked what is going to happen to the entrance on 500 River Road. He stated that he has driven down that road and asked where a bus would pick up future students because when he drove down 500 River Road, it is downhill and turns in sharply. He asked if a school bus would be able to go down to that area.

Chair Parkins responded that school buses don't go on to private property. They would pick up children on River Road.

Mr. Crawford stated that he has been living on River Road for the last 30 years and they are a very quiet community but if they put in slips for the public...He commented that if something goes on now at Danny O's, the parking in front of his house and other people's homes on Jordan Avenue, is bumper to bumper cars. It is just going to increase the traffic on their roads.

Mr. Crawford asked about the traffic counts which were mentioned. He stated that there is a counter out in front of his house that he watches daily, he can't see the figures, but commented about the number of cars that are going down Jordan Avenue and the number of cars going down River Road. He asked if that information should be available to citizens of this community. He indicated that it was just a question. When he sees the counter in front of his house, and the gentleman who spoke this evening said that the traffic has not increased that much, he would just like to have the facts and figures before something is done. Mr. Crawford stated that all in all, he is against this application. He thanked the Chair for her time.

Marie Cataldo, 43 Anna Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Cataldo indicated that she has lived at this address for 39 years. She commented that they already have the access from 500 River Road and she is the second house from the end of River Road. She asked how much that road would be extended, the width of it, to make that, instead of going through Fanny Street, and have it go down. She asked if it is going to be the main thoroughfare to get on and off River Road then they need some bushes or a fence because she is very close to the end of the cul-de-sac. She reiterated that they would need a fence or something, not like a stockade fence but something nicer so that people, children, animals don't go further down – if that is going to be made into the main access road.

Ms. Cataldo commented that she heard that the condos are going to be lovely, high-end condos, \$600K or whatever. She stated that she doesn't see how they are going to sell them with the bad smell from the Latex factory there. She reiterated that the smell is terrible and she has complained and complained and no one does anything about it. She stated that they have called the factory, called City Hall and nothing is done; now they want to put beautiful condos there. Once the condos are there and people come to see them on the weekends and smell that smell, they won't be able to sell those condos. She thanked the Commission.

Joy Klepacky Jarvais, 36 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Jarvais stated that she is speaking on behalf of her father who is presently in Florida. She wrote a letter and hadn't planned to speak but she does agree with everyone. She stated that having heard about this proposed development just a few days ago, it has greatly upset her family. Their home on 32 Fanny Street is the first house on the street and her parents chose their home on Fanny Street largely because it was a dead end. She grew up playing on this quiet street and enjoying the fact that she knew everyone who lived on the street and every car that came down the road. Over the past 40 years the houses have gotten larger and some neighbors have changed but as a whole they have remained a very tight knit, happy community.

Ms. Jarvais indicated that Salvatore A. Matto has only lived on Fanny Street for a handful of years and has now taken it upon himself to rearrange the face of their neighborhood and move out leaving the mess he has developed. The potential impact on the neighborhood would be devastating.

End of Tape 1B 8:50 p.m.

Ms. Jarvis commented that not only would they have cars from the 14 condos, which means at least 28 cars, but also additional traffic from - what is at this time - six boat slips and visitor parking to public access to the river. Every community has additional traffic for deliveries, and visitors but this amount of traffic would be a shame on their small street and neighborhood. They have already added traffic from the River's End Marina that is on the next street. As far as public access to the waterfront, they already have the Sunnyside boat launch just two blocks away. There is also another public access park within one mile on River Road. She asked if they really needed another place within a few hundred feet of each other.

Also, the undeveloped land of the proposed area is home to much wildlife. She stated that she has personally watched countless animals come to the waterfront to drink, graze and swim. She can see deer swim across the river daily from their home at 36 Fanny Street. Their view down the river is more beautiful than she can express. With the additional 36 townhouses currently being built only 100 yards away from this proposed development, many animals and wildlife will be losing their homes.

Ms. Jarvis stated that their property is directly connected to property proposed to be developed. Her family has not been contacted in any way about the proposal. They are only aware from what they have read in the newspaper. She asked if this was an oversight. As she understands, they are supposed to receive a certified letter. They are well within the 200 foot range that was mentioned. She added that their property abuts the proposed property.

She asked how many oversights there will be and asked if there is a reason to be hiding the information from the people being directly impacted by this proposed development. Ms. Jarvis commented that while she is for the development of Shelton, you cannot take away the reason that people love this town, and for them those reasons are peace and quiet. While the River continues every day to take away part of their land on the waterfront, they would like to keep what little they have to remain the same.

Her main concern in all of this is that all is not being disclosed. She does not believe that it will be only one way traffic coming out of Fanny Street. She also does not believe it will remain six docks but become a large scale marina for many visitors.

Ms. Jarvis mentioned again that their property abuts the proposed development; she spoke to her father in Florida at 6 p.m. this evening and he still had not received any certified letter or any mail about this. She checked his mailbox on Fanny Street. She and her brother live within one mile of their father's Shelton property and many of the neighbors know how to reach them. She submitted her letter for the record.

Vincent Ferrante, 16 Fanny Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. Ferrante indicated that he's lived on Fanny Street for 10 years – he's the newbie to the neighborhood. He stated that his main concern is the public access that they are planning to put in at the end of Fanny Street. He added that with public access, they are going to add an area for fishermen, kayakers, and everybody to come and park at the end. As they may know, fish bite at night and they'll have people parking down there late at night. He stated that they already have that problem on Route #110 across from the other condominiums that have been built.

Mr. Ferrante indicated that people park at that park and police are chasing people out at all hours. He commented that they don't need that at the end of their street. They don't need extra cars at the end of the street at midnight. Everyone there has families, kids and they don't want that.

Mr. Ferrante commented that there is no room – there are going to add two parking spaces then they might as well say that they are going to add ten because people are going to double park. People will park wherever they need to park – if they want to use the river then they are going to use it whether there is parking or not. The only people that will be affected are the people that live on that street and the people at the end of that street. Mr. Ferrante stated that they are punishing those people if they are allowed to do that.

Mr. Ferrante discussed the marina aspect and commented that, as another speaker mentioned, it was originally designed for skulls. Skulls are not boats; they are narrow and long. They are

talking about putting in small slips, 4 to 6 feet wide. He commented that he fishes and he knows that a boat 4 to 6 feet wide is a small boat. It was mentioned that no fuel was allowed. He asked where they would get fuel because the nearest fueling point is Beacon Point Marina. Those boats are not going to be able to make it there. He added that people are going to have to bring fuel down to the dock. Mr. Ferrante mentioned that it was stated that there would be no repairs but people are still going to do it. He asked what was going to contain a spill, an issue, a boat breaking, a motor blowing or if something happens. There is no containment there. It is not set up to have a marina there. There will be an office but no staff.

Mr. Ferrante asked if there was a spill, who would put the booms out and who would put the stuff out to contain that spill. He commented that was an issue that he has besides the parking at the end of the street. He stated that he just didn't see how three public slips and three private slips and access to the River, which is already available at Sunnyside School and the park up the road, why it needs to be there.

Mr. Ferrante asked what else they were going to do on the bottom besides the access – would they be putting in a docking area, a walking area or a pad. It is going to attract people down there even if they just walk down there such as kids, etc. – stuff that they don't need. He commented again that it doesn't need to be there.

Mr. Ferrante stated that if the condos are done the right way then he has no problem with the condos. He expressed concerns about construction traffic and asked if construction traffic would be coming through Fanny Street. He commented that he knows it was said that it would only be used for emergency access but wanted to know if it would be a main access point during the construction phase. If that it is the case, he didn't want to see tri-axels on his road and added that he has two children. He doesn't want to see that and worry about his 8-year old or 3-year old running out into the road to chase a ball when there are tri-axel vehicles in the road. He added that the street is very narrow. He commented that he hopes that the Board doesn't approve it. He thanked the Commission.

Jacqueline Rivera, 44 Anna Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Rivera stated that she is currently residing in her parents' home. She received notification of this a ½ hour before she left work and she didn't prepare anything. Because she doesn't live on Fanny Street, she doesn't want to underscore some of the concerns that the residents there have. Ms. Rivera indicated that she lives at the end of Anna Street so her concerns are a little bit different – about the driveway.

Ms. Rivera referenced the comment made about bumping out the driveway and she wanted to know if they would be bumping it out toward Anna Street or toward the Latex Company. She asked how much closer they were coming to Anna Street. Her present view is the top of the existing factory and (inaudible). She stated that when they looked at that home 8 years ago, part of the reason they decided to purchase the home was because of the beautiful view. They have untapped forest with trees everywhere and that is really unattractive. If they are going to do any developing, she asked if they would be cleaning that area up so that the value of the homes don't go down. She stated that right now she doesn't have a view of the river because these trees obstruct it – trees that the current owner has grown. She doesn't want to look at the factory and likes the idea of the condos but wants them to do it right.

Ms. Rivera asked approx. how long the construction would last.

Chair Parkins responded that they haven't gotten into that kind of detail yet.

Ms. Rivera responded OK and stated that she would be concerned about the noise and the trucks during construction. She commented that, as other people had mentioned, they need more time to look at this and review the plans and the proposal. She thanked the Commission.

Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone else in the audience who would like to speak. There were no other speakers from the audience. She addressed Ms. Joy Jarvis and stated that in regard to the mailing notice, there was a letter sent to Charles Klepacky at 32 Fanny Street.

Ms. Joy Klepacki- Jarvais responded that her father doesn't live there. Her brother, Thomas Klepacky added that he hadn't lived there for about 30 years.

Chair Parkins indicated that this is the certified mail receipt from that letter but this particular one is not signed.

The Applicant, Mr. Hughes stated that they never picked it up then. If they aren't there to sign it than they keep it.

Comm. Harger indicated that they made three attempts.

Ms. Klepacki stated that he doesn't live there. One of the neighbors stated that he owns the house but lives in Florida. Ms. Klepacki indicated that he also owns the house next to it and the lot next to that.

Chair Parkins stated that they have to go by the address on record on the Assessor's Field Cards.

Mr. Hughes stated that he owns three pieces of property and they sent the notice to one person who owns three pieces of property.

Chair Parkins clarified that the letter had been sent. She commented that she is going to let the Applicant address some of the issues that were raised tonight. She indicated that she wanted to reiterate that the public access is really a function of the Connecticut DEEP. She added that she wasn't go to say that she agrees with what they mandate for things along the River but it is very important for a natural resource such as that to have some sort of public access according the State.

She added that regardless of what type of development is going on – for example, when they built the Sports Center farther down on River Road, they had to provide public access to get to the River too. It is something that the State feels is important and they require Applicants to do this; therefore, it is not the Commission or the Applicant but at the hands of the DEEP who is mandating this. She indicated that they can address the dock and those sort of things further but she wants it to be understood that is a function of the CT DEEP in trying to ensure that resources such as river maintain access to the public. They aren't going to go out and advertise that there is new public access to the River but the State does list it as access. She wanted to make that point; she doesn't necessarily agree with it but it is a fact of CT Regulations. She asked Mr. Hughes to address some of the concerns.

Mr. Peter Hughes, representing the Applicant addressed the Commission. Mr. Hughes indicated that they do have their traffic engineer here and he will be coming up to provide his report.

Scott Hesketh, Licensed Engineer F. A. Hesketh & Associates, 6 Creamery Brook, East Granby, CT addressed the Commission. Mr. Hesketh stated that he was the author of the May 13, 2014 Traffic Report that has been submitted as a part of the record for this application. He provided additional copies of the report for the Commission.

Mr. Hesketh stated that the Applicant has represented that the plans which have been drawn up and submitted and which are soon to be modified, disallow access to Fanny Street with only an emergency access. He commented that the report being handed out right now is pretty much moot – outdated. He indicated that he would prepare an updated report and submit it back to the town within the next day or so for the next meeting.

Mr. Hesketh stated that he would highlight some of the things that he believes the next report will indicate. They are proposing a total of 14 residential units on this property. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), 14 residential units have a potential trip generation of about 208 trips on a daily basis. Twenty trips during the morning peak hour with 5 entering and 15 exiting movements and 25 trips during the afternoon peak hours with 16 entering and 9 exiting movements.

In their basis for estimating that, they look at the Institute of Transportation (ITE) Trip Generation Report, it is a standard engineering reference which presents traffic volume data

collected at existing facilities. The ITE publishes that data so that engineers and land planners can estimate traffic at different facilities that are proposed.

Mr. Hesketh indicated that included in the residential land use are single family residences, apartments and condominiums. They ran the trip generator estimates for all three uses and presented to you in the table and in the report the land use for both morning and afternoon peaks which presented the highest trip generation potential. Typically, that is a single family residential development, they are larger and tend to have more married couples, have children and tend to make a lot more trips than people living in condominiums or apartment units.

Mr. Hesketh stated that the presented data is based on the highest trip generation there and that was during the morning peak hour for the single family units. In the afternoon because of the small number of units, the apartments generate the highest trip generation and the condominiums are the lowest generator of all three during both peak hours. Since they are presenting to them the higher trip generation for each of those uses, they believe that the traffic volumes that they have presented will include the three public docks at the marina and whatever public access would be allowed as result of the path down to the water.

Mr. Hesketh stated that in their report they had assumed the 75% of the entering traffic would enter the entering driveway from River Road and 25% would use the residential neighborhood and enter the facility through Fanny Street. Of course, the existing plan was one way entering from River Road then they had 100% of their traffic exiting to Fanny Street and going out to Jordan Avenue to access Route #110. The capacity calculations based on that distribution indicated that the intersection and River Road operated at acceptable levels of service, Level of Service for the southbound left turn movement were Level of Service A during peak hours and during the morning peak hours, the Jordan Avenue approach was Level of Service C and afternoon approach Level of Service D. With the addition of the site generated traffic, the levels of service remained the same and the increase in delay was approximately one second per vehicle on the side street approach. He indicated that very minor impacts resulted from a very minor increase in traffic as a result of this proposal.

Mr. Hesketh indicated that with the new site plan, 100% of the traffic minus the existing housing unit on Fanny Street with all of the traffic going out to River Road, there will be no impact on Fanny Street and Jordan Avenue and that intersection will operate at the same levels of service.

Mr. Hesketh stated that they did do an alternate analysis for their client for a two-way approach to River Road from the site driveway and although they hadn't presented that to them it will be in the next report. They believe that the levels of service at that location will be an acceptable level of service for that location as well.

Mr. Hesketh summarized that they don't see any impacts from the proposed development and in fact peak hour volumes of this proposal are very similar to the existing peak hour volumes of the existing use on that site, which he believes is a gym down on that development. They did the traffic counts out in the area; there is no need to present that this evening but will have it in the updated report.

Mr. Hesketh indicated that they measured traffic volumes on Jordan Avenue, Wakelee Street and Fanny Street and at the existing site driveway out to River Road. All of that data will be presented in the next report and he will summarize it for them at the next public hearing. If there are any questions related to the traffic, he believes that the revised site plan the traffic impacts on the site are negligible and revised site plan will present acceptable levels of service from the site driveway out onto River Road. If the Commission has any questions, he'll be happy to answer them.

Chair Parkins asked if the State views the impact coming in and out any differently than just coming in.

Mr. Hughes responded that it was an existing curb cut.

Mr. Hesketh added that he didn't believe that they will because this is an existing curb cut and very low volume generator and the traffic volumes that they are talking about are less than one

trip every other minute on average during the peak hours and non-peak hours significantly less than that. He added that there is an existing industrial use on the property which is generating about the same volume of traffic, maybe slightly less during some hours and slightly more during others but he doesn't think that the State will have a significant issue with this development either as a one way or as a two way access out to River Road.

Chair Parkins if there were any traffic questions from the Commission. There were no questions from the Commission at this time. She asked Mr. Hughes to address some of the public concerns.

Mr. Hughes stated that to address the Anna Street question about the driveway location, he showed the site map and pointed out the location of Anna Street as well as the existing driveway coming down. He indicated that they are planning to shift the driveway over to the side toward the Latex factory; he showed how the current driveway presently comes down through the buildings. He restated that they will be shifting it 40 feet away from the end of Anna Street. The widening through the corner will hold the existing edge of pavement and the widening goes to Latex. He showed where they will be building a small retaining wall. He reiterated that they would be shifting the driveway away from Anna Street.

Additionally, the landscape plan shows plantings for a buffer. As far as height, their units are below the crest of the hill so they won't interfere with anybody's sight line to the River or across the River; they will be below everybody. He stated that they will make themselves available to anyone here and meet with them between now and the next meeting. The letter sent out to people had his phone number on it and they can call him. He'll meet with people and see what they can do to address concerns.

Mr. Hughes discussed the marina and showed another site drawing and commented that the marina permit exists today. He stated that they didn't apply for the marina permit; the marina permit has already been granted. There is no dredging.

Chair Parkins asked Mr. Hughes if he could explain why because she thinks that people are asking a commercial (inaudible)...She asked him to give a little bit of history on that.

Mr. Hughes responded that the property owner went to apply for a dock and marina to house Sacred Heart University's Rowing Team but it is still a commercial marina. The six slips were for the boats that follow the skull boats; they are narrower – he thinks that they are 8 to 20 feet wide versus 24 to 26 wide so the bigger boats cannot get in there. The State had already approved this 2 or 3 years ago. It is pilings. The first two sets of pilings are in and the deck is in. He met with Susan Jacobsen and Krystal Kallenburg (DEEP) back in the February/March timeframe with the engineer who got the permitting done for the current property owner and that is when they sat down and asked them what they can do with this. They told him that he cannot have 100% private slips on a river. They don't allow that in the State of Connecticut anymore. So they have their rules down in writing that 50% are public so they are proposing that. In their Statement of Use, there are no events from the boat renters. The only people that can have events or parties are the residents so whoever leases a slip cannot have parties on the boat in the slip – it is not allowed.

He showed where they would have residential people living 60 feet away from this slip. They are there to take the boat in and take the boat out. As far as safety and the boom, they assume the permit from the State so whatever is in that permit and requires them to have on hand, they will have it on hand, whatever that is.

Comm. Harger asked about the boats and whatever types of boats these slips are made to accommodate would not normally be launched off of the back of a trailer or down a ramp.

Mr. Hughes responded no, they have to come in from a boat launch of either Sunnyside or Beacon Point. If they have to get fuel, they have to get it from wherever they sell fuel on the river.

Comm. Harger asked why they would stop there then – just to take a break or look around.

Mr. Hughes responded that they have a requirement by the State to have three of them – they don't see (inaudible)...

Comm. Harger asked if these things are going to be leased so that there are (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins stated that they rent the space.

Mr. Hughes indicated that they are leased and it will be a premium lease, rest assured it will be a premium lease.

Mr. Hughes commented about the traffic – Mr. Matto told them before the hearing, with the one way circulation, he thinks that addresses a lot of the increased traffic issues. He indicated that the construction entrance is River Road and there is no way out of Fanny Street today. There is a grass strip between the parking lot and Mr. Matto's driveway so all construction vehicles will be on River Road. In regard to the construction timeline, he stated that it would probably be 3 to 9 months of real construction activity maybe a little bit longer, during the construction seasons.

Mr. Hughes commented that he thinks that was everything and added that they would revise the site plan and the traffic report and submit it early next week. He reiterated that when they sat down with the State on the public access, he said everything that was said by the people in this room. He indicated that there was already Sunnyside School. He was told that the neighborhood needs to get to the River and he told them that there was access on the other side of the cemetery in the 36 condo unit proposal that was just put in and then there is the next one down with the park. As the Chair stated, the State wants it wherever they have riverfront and they want riverfront access.

In regard to the parking, and now that they are going to narrow this down, they will see if they can just put it inside and not widen the existing city right-of-way. He added that they aren't taking anyone's private property. This widening is fully within the City's right-of-way and he wants to make that perfectly clear. He indicated that they would look at that and see if they could adjust that location. He asked if they had any other questions or see any information that hasn't been presented.

Comm. Harger asked for clarification that three of the leased spaces are for residents of the proposed units or for the public.

Mr. Hughes responded that three spaces go to three unit owners and three are leased to the public at large.

Comm. Harger asked how are the spaces are handled for the people living on site.

Mr. Hughes responded that is for them to figure out as they go...he doesn't know if it will be by lottery or what...he added that they haven't gotten that far yet.

Mr. Panico stated that it is just not worth it.

Chair Parkins commented that she would recommend taking them out.

Ms. Donna Bauerman, Seymour CT (daughter of Victory Street resident) addressed the Commission. She asked if there would be any blasting involved.

Mr. Hughes responded that there would be no blasting.

Mr. Frank Baranowsky addressed the Commission and asked why they couldn't use the Petremont Lane or build an exit and entrance right alongside the cemetery to eliminate Fanny Street, Jordan Avenue and Victory Street.

Mr. Panico stated that is exactly what they are proposing to do. They are changing

Mr. Baranowsky added that property goes all the way to the cemetery – from the cemetery they could make a road right through.

Mr. Panico reiterated that they are proposing to change the plan and have no access from Fanny Street. It will only be through what he just referred to as Petremont Lane – that is exactly what they are going to do.

Mr. Baranowsky asked if that means that they aren't going to exit or enter from Fanny Street.

Chair Parkins responded yes, correct.

Mr. Baranowsky asked where they were going to go through then.

Mr. Panico responded Petremont Lane.

Chair Parkins added exactly where he just suggested. They took his suggestion.

Mr. Baranowsky responded that it liked that.

Chair Parkins clarified that Fanny Street would only be used for emergency access.

Mr. Baranowsky commented that there are neighbors there will small kids. He added that he has lived there for 70 years. He is the first neighbor that ever built on Fanny Street right after he came out the service in World War II – 46 years – 1946 and he has been there ever since. He raised his family there and he enjoys it there and it is a nice neighborhood, a quiet neighborhood and they want to keep it that way. He thanked the Commission.

Chair Parkins stated that in lieu of the traffic report which needs to be updated and perhaps some modifications to the plans, and also to give residents some more time to digest the information – they will continue the public hearing.

She indicated that anyone wishing to see these plans, they are available at City Hall, in the Planning and Zoning Office, Room 304 during business hours.

She indicated that the Commission is beginning their summer hours and their June 10th meeting is almost completely booked up and they will probably be there until 11 p.m. July 7th would be the next regular P&Z Commission meeting.

Mr. Hughes stated that their Traffic Engineer cannot do July 7th.

Chair Parkins scheduled the continuation for the public hearing on June 10th in the auditorium.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to continue the public hearing for Application #14-8 until Tuesday, June 10th in the City Hall Auditorium, 7 p.m.

Chair Parkins called a brief recess at 9:08 p.m.

Recess 9:08 p.m. – 9:16 p.m.

OLD BUSINESS

APPLICATION #13-7: PETITION OF HAWK'S 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 & 17 AND MAP 51, LOT 7), LIP DISTRICT (PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED 2/26/14)

Chair Parkins resumed the meeting with Old Business and Application #13-7. She indicated that the public hearing for this project closed on 2/26/14 and the Commission reached a consensus to move ahead with a favorable resolution. The P&Z Consultant, Tony Panico has prepared a draft

resolution. This is the first time that the Commission is seeing this draft so it will be up to the Commissioners to decide if they need more time to digest it. After it is read, they can accept it for discussion purposes and act on it if all the commissioners are comfortable.

Mr. Panico apologized to the Commissioners and to the Applicant for taking so long to complete this resolution for a variety of reasons, personal and otherwise, it just did not get done. He added that he did not want to rush through it for fear of missing something important or not giving it the proper consideration.

Mr. Panico read the Draft Resolution for Application #13-7.

***See attached P&Z Report Resolution for Application #13-7 for the Petition of Hawk's Ridge of Shelton, LLC for PDD Zone Change, Initial Development Concept Plan and Amendment of Future Land Use Plan Approvals, Long Hill Cross Road and Beard Sawmill Road.**

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to accept the Draft Report Resolution for Application #13-7 for discussion purposes.

Comm. Miller asked for clarification between a Final Detailed Site Plan and what has been submitted so far.

Mr. Panico clarified that every detailed question that you could ask about the project has to be answered on the Detailed Plans. This is just to give them the sense for the overall development, how intense it is going to be, how it will generally layout but the roads have not been designed, the drainage is not in there and they don't exactly know the nature of the road improvements that will be on the abutting ends. There is a lot of engineering (inaudible)...it is a two stage approach. You get enough zoning information to be comfortable with adopting the PDD which makes the zone change. Once that is in place, the Applicant has a window of time to come back with their Detailed Plans to show the Commission precisely how they are going to do it.

Chair Parkins asked if there were any questions or comments on the draft.

Comm. Tickey stated that he thinks it is thorough and he thinks that it is a reflection of all the discussions that they have had about it.

Chair Parkins indicated that she had a few comments which were mostly language related. She stated that as she was reading through; she is doing research on another PDD that they have in place, that the gas line traverses. The language was a little bit more succinct, in that they stipulate the 50 feet easement so she would ask that they consider under Comments and Findings where it says, on Page #3, under #1, the second to last sentence. It states that the sanitary sewer main traverses the site from north to south...she asked to strike out "gas pipeline and easement of Iroquois Gas and replace it with "while a 50 foot easement held by the Iroquois Gas Transmission System that contains a high pressure natural gas transmission line..." She indicated that she doesn't want it to be thought that this is just a distribution line rather than a transmission line because there is a big difference.

Mr. Panico revised the language on Page 3.

Chair Parkins referenced another clarification on Page 4 under #2, and commented that this is almost the same situation because the transmission line does dissect this other property. They requested that an approval of the blasting plan by the Gas Company shall be submitted to the Fire Marshal before a Blasting Permit will be issued.

Mr. Panico responded that he kind of treated that generally because it is a little more specific but they can certainly put it in.

Chair Parkins asked if it should be more specific in the Detailed Development Plans.

Mr. Panico responded that the specifics of any blasting program will be further addressed. He reiterated that they could incorporate it...

Chair Parkins indicated that it just says “it should be sensitive to the existing Iroquois Pipeline...”

Mr. Panico asked what suggested language she would like to use.

Chair Parkins stated approval of the blasting plan.

Comm. Harger commented that it was more than just more control but an awareness to safety and security of the pipeline.

Chair Parkins responded right, because it doesn't even mention it in here that they even contacted the pipeline company.

Mr. Panico stated that it was the word “approved” that bothered him a little bit.

Comm. Harger suggested “reviewed.”

Mr. Panico commented that it definitely ought to be reviewed and their comments ought to be obtained and when the Fire Marshal is getting ready to issue a permit he should be aware of their feelings.

Chair Parkins responded that it wasn't just their “feelings,” it was their requirement.

Mr. Panico clarified that they could go much further than they really had to. They could make it almost impossible to do an effective blasting program.

Comm. Harger asked who could make it impossible.

Mr. Panico responded that Iroquois Gas could conceivably do that.

Chair Parkins stated that it is written requirements that they need to do. Rick has the booklet upstairs.

Mr. Panico stated that he didn't mind putting it in there saying that it should conform to the requirements of...something to that effect...but he didn't like the wording “approved by them...”

Chair Parkins commented that was OK, she was just going by what was done in the last one. “Review of the blasting plan...” or “requirements” is fine.

Mr. Panico stated that he would make the revision to that language.

Chair Parkins stated OK, as long as there is something in there.

Mr. Panico stated that there was something that he just learned at the 11th hour that there is an understanding or an agreement with the Applicant and the Honey Cell people that they would respect regarding a 50 foot setback. He had written 40 feet in the Draft but he doesn't want it to appear that they are trying to compromise that agreement and asked if he should change it to 50 feet and be in concert with their agreement. He stated that he would be more comfortable with that.

Comm. Pogoda asked if that came from the Applicant himself about the 50 feet.

Mr. Panico stated that the phone message from the Applicant's attorney informed him about it because he knew that he was working on this document. He already wrote 40 feet but before going ahead and changing it, he wanted to discuss it with the Commission. They can say 40 feet, if the Applicant has to provide 50 feet that is a private thing but he suggested that they be consistent.

The Commission consensus agreed to be consistent with 50 feet.

Mr. Panico commented about a 200 foot setback (page number/location not identified) in regard to the Assisted Living Facility and he explained his reasons for putting that setback amount.

Chair Parkins indicated that she had planned to ask about that before he explained it.

Comm. Tickey commented pointed out a misspelling on Page 2.

Mr. Panico asked if there were any further suggestions.

Comm. Harger commented that the only thing she was concerned about was that they discussed eliminating this particular entrance and making it into an Emergency Exit but asked if that would create any issues with people having to get to the far side of the development. There is a lot of buildings planned there.

Mr. Panico stated that this can be designed as a very nice development and it will have limited houses on it; maybe three at the most and it might only be two from the way that corner is confined. There is a pretty clean stretch of road to the point so you either continue straight into the condos or turn left and go into the single family home area.

Comm. Harger asked if it would be advantageous to add something there.

Mr. Panico stated that he doesn't mind this plan provided that they have the emergency connection over there. If there is a problem they can always (inaudible)...

Comm. Harger asked if they were going to provide speed bumps.

Comm. Pogoda responded that would be up to the development. It is private road.

Mr. Panico agreed that would probably be a product of the Homeowner's Association. They can't tell them that they can't do it. He stated that once they clear this than they can meet again with the Applicant and exactly how they plan to work things out.

Comm. Harger asked about the exiting, especially in the morning, what kind of queuing they will need to have.

Mr. Panico responded that is what they have to see for the next stage – what kind of improvements are they talking about here and how does it interface with what the traffic engineer says that they need, what the Commission's experiences and what the STC has to say. A lot of things have to happen.

There were further (inaudible) comments about the difficulties from traffic that may result on Long Hill Cross Road.

With no further questions or comments from the Commission regarding the Draft Resolution, Chair Parkins conducted a roll call vote.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was roll call voted (5-1) to approve Application #13-7. Chair Parkins voted in opposition.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karin C. Tuke
P&Z Recording Secretary

