

SHELTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MARCH 10, 2105

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, March 10, 2015 at Shelton City Hall, Room 303, 7:00 p.m., 54 Hill Street, Shelton, CT 06484.

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Ruth Parkins
 Commissioner Nancy Dickal
 Commissioner Virginia Harger
 Commissioner Thomas McGorty
 Commissioner Ned Miller (alt. for Comm. Pogoda)
 Commissioner Jim Tickey

Staff Present: Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator
 Karin Tuke, Recording Secretary

Tapes (2), correspondence and attachments are 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

Chair Parkins called the P&Z Commission regular meeting to order at 7 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and a roll call of members. She indicated that there would be no one on teleconference phone tonight but Comm. Ned Miller would be acting as alternate in for Comm. Pogoda.

AGENDA ADD-ON

Chair Parkins requested a motion for one item to be added to the agenda under Applications for Certificate of Zoning Compliance/Old Business for a manufacturing/office at 100 Trap Falls Road Ext.

On a motion made by Virginia Herger seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to add Separate #0232, 100 Trap Falls Road Ext for manufacturing/office to the agenda under Old Business.

OLD BUSINESS

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE

SEPARATE #0225: MAINLINE GRAPHICS, 185 CANAL STREET, SIGN

Mr. Schultz indicated that this was for Avalon Shelton. He provided sign renderings of the existing signage and the proposed signage. He asked the Applicant to make his presentation as the Commission reviews them.

Chair Parkins commented that she thought they already approved all of the signs for Avalon.

Mr. Schultz responded yes they did but they are changing it to "Avalon" from "Avalon Shelton."

Chair Parkins asked what happened to "Shelton."

Michael Passick, Senior Manager with Avalon Bay and Avalon Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. Passick responded that they rebranded.

Mr. Schultz commented that the Commission spent a lot of time on the initial signage.

Mr. Passick responded yes he understands.

Comm. Harger commented on the renderings and said that she didn't like it all.

Chair Parkins stated that they can't choose lettering and they can't choose color.

Comm. Miller asked if this wasn't similar to a lot of their other projects.

Mr. Passick responded yes, absolutely.

Comm. Miller stated that he thought he saw that in San Diego and a few other places.

Chair Parkins commented about the existing one and if they were thinking that this new one was a little bit classier.

Mr. Passick responded that he assumes so but he wasn't the decision maker.

Chair Parkins asked if it was no longer going to say "an apartment complex" either or are they going to...

Mr. Passick responded that it is just going to say "Avalon," that is all it is going to say.

Chair Parkins commented that there was no phone number, no address, no nothing...

Mr. Schultz stated it was nice and clean.

Comm. Harger asked if they were going to carry over the little doo-dad there.

Comm. Miller commented that he's seen that before, it has it on top.

Comm. McGorty asked if it was internally lit now.

Mr. Passick responded yes.

Chair Parkins asked why they would take off the address.

Mr. Passick responded that again it was the way that they were rebranding all of their communities – taking off all of the community names, address and phone number information. They will just say "Avalon" and be nice and clean.

Comm. Harger asked if they had Zoning Regs on that for the street address.

Comm. McGorty responded that if they put it on that side (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins added that she kind of liked the street address on it but she thinks that if people don't know that their down on Canal Street when they get there... It's not like they'll be driving up and down Canal Street.

Comm. McGorty commented that you can only go so far before you hit water.

Comm. Harger asked if they were keeping the brick and all that.

Mr. Passick responded yes, the only thing that will change is the sign in the middle.

Chair Parkins asked if it was just this sign because they have a lot of signs all over the place down there.

Mr. Passick responded that is the only sign that they were looking to change at the present time.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Jim Tickey, it was voted (5-0 with one abstention) to approve Separate #0225 for signage. Comm. Harger abstained from voting.

SEPARATE #0227: SIGN CONSULTANTS, 704 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, SUITE 103, SIGN

Mr. Schultz provided renderings for the existing and proposed signage for Pancharo's Mexican Grille.

The Applicant (Name not provided), representing Sign Consultants addressed the Commission for Pancharo's. He stated that they were updating the front and it was a new logo for the exterior sign and they are adding the side signage.

Comm. Harger asked if this front sign would be new.

The Applicant responded yes it was new.

Comm. McGorty asked if there was a fence on the side.

The Applicant responded yes.

Comm. Harger asked if it was up as of yet.

The Applicant responded no but he knows that it looks like it - the rendering is very realistic and looks like it is really on the building.

Comm. McGorty commented that he drove by there the other day and he didn't see it.

Comm. Tickey indicated that he thought it looked nice.

Chair Parkins asked if the graphics on it were spatulas.

The Applicant responded yes. Comm. Miller added that there were Mexican spatulas.

Chair Parkins asked for clarification on the size of the sign – 3' x (inaudible)...it covers almost the top so that is 3' 10". It's pretty big...

Comm. McGorty indicated that he would make a motion.

Comm. Harger asked if they are internally lit.

The Applicant responded yes, they will be lit.

Comm. Harger asked if the one on the side would be lit as well.

The Sign Consultant Rep responded yes.

Comm. Tickey seconded the motion.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0227 for signage.

SEPARATE #0228: ARCHER SIGNS, 733 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, SIGN

Mr. Schultz indicated that Brian Vassar was back for the change to the Dunkin' Donuts signs.

Brian Vassar, representing Archer Signs addressed the Commission. Mr. Vassar provided a revised rendering of the Dunkin Donuts signs because he noticed a mistake on the logo height of the information he previously provided to the Commission. He referenced the change on the last page of their packets where it says "18" and that wasn't correct.

Mr. Schultz commented that as the Commission is aware, they have four Dunkin' Donuts in town and he is assuming that all franchisees will eventually be coming before the Commission. This is the first one in town.

Mr. Vassar stated that this is all consistent with their standard new branding.

Chair Parkins asked if they had such a tall monument sign down there right now.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, that is pre-existing, non-conforming because they hold them at 12 feet now.

Mr. Vassar commented that all they are doing to the monument sign is just changing the face of it.

Mr. Schultz reiterated that it was non-conforming.

Comm. Dickal responded yes, it has been there for years.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, the ZBA gave the approval.

Chair Parkins responded that they are changing the signs so...

Mr. Vassar clarified that they were changing the face.

Chair Parkins commented again that they are changing the signage.

Mr. Vassar asked what the percentage that you would say they would need to change before they bring it up to Code (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz clarified that it was the height that... (inaudible)

Mr. Vassar responded that usually there is a percentage (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz stated that it requires a monument sign on Bridgeport Avenue so this is totally inconsistent.

Mr. Vassar responded that he didn't know when it was put up but he's assuming that...

Mr. Schultz indicated that it goes back a long time – ZBA gave a variance on that too.

Comm. Harger added that there is no monument sign for that whole plaza.

Mr. Schultz responded yes he knows – that is how old it is.

Comm. Harger commented that would be a nice upgrade if they did something like that.

Comm. McGorty asked for clarification about the monument sign.

Mr. Schultz responded that ZBA, back in the 80's was giving height increases because "bigger was better." The car dealership got them, Fascator, when they were in there, they got a big one and this shopping center got one too.

Comm. Tickey asked for clarification on the sign renderings in the packet.

Mr. Vassar explained that everything on that page is existing and coming down.

Comm. Tickey asked if the one for the side was staying.

Comm. McGorty responded that one is going away and he thinks they are going over to this other one. Mr. Vassar added yes, that's right.

Mr. Schultz indicated that it was their new prototype.

Multiple conversations (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz asked Mr. Vassar if he knew if all of the franchises would be consistent.

Mr. Vassar responded yes, they are just changing the size that's all.

Mr. Schultz indicated that they have three more locations for them in town. He commented that he would ask the owner if they are ready to do the monument.

Chair Parkins commented that she thinks that they are changing the sign. She commented that understands Mr. Vassar's argument but she doesn't agree with it.

Mr. Vassar responded that typically, and he wasn't certain of the Code in Shelton and asked to be corrected if he was wrong, but he asked if there was a time frame for everybody to come into conformity when there is a non-conforming issue. He asked if there was a time frame or a percentage requirement such as if you change the sign more than 60 percent than you have to come into conformance.

Mr. Schultz responded that the timing is now though.

Chair Parkins commented that, honestly, it looks like something that belongs along Route 8 – a tall monument sign, drive-through, Dunkin' Donuts – it isn't something that they want to see on Bridgeport Avenue. Bridgeport Avenue is little classier than that.

Comm. Dickal stated that they want to see something that is a little bit more uniform.

Mr. Vassar responded that he understands and he thinks that to go to the owner and have them do that is fine. He added that he doesn't know if Dunkin' Donuts is the right guy to penalize though. If he doesn't have the new logo up there then they literally won't let him open without the right logo. It is going to cause a whole lot of (inaudible) ...there is a flip side to this whole thing with corporate. He commented that they could go back to the owner of the property, tell him it is a tall and he has to change it.

Mr. Schultz stated that it is supposed to be 12 feet – it is about 25 feet so it is more than double...

Comm. McGorty responded yes, the plaza needs to get a monument.

Mr. Schultz recalled that there used to be an evergreen tree there, they cut that down a while ago; the tree took away from the height of the monument sign.

Comm. Dickal responded that she remembered that.

Chair Parkins commented on the renderings and indicated that they've already got the cup on their logo there so they are adding the splashy drive-thru...

Mr. Vassar responded that they already have a drive thru now but they've just moved it up to the top. It has always been an orange color.

Comm. Tickey commented that it is orange – it is below orange.

Chair Parkins commented that it was subtle now, not as flashy.

Mr. Vassar added that the cup and the letters are a little (inaudible) in color – they changed it a little bit.

Comm. Dickal commented that everyone knows the place (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins commented that the attitude that if they don't approve it he'll go out of business is a little bit unreasonable as well.

Comm. Tickey stated that (inaudible) go there every morning getting coffee.

Comm. Dickal agreed that everybody knows it's there.

Comm. Harger stated that she thinks it is a nice look – but she didn't know it's just up there so high and out of place.

Chair Parkins stated that once they approve this then they have no leverage to get that monument sign down.

Comm. Dickal commented that now would be the time to address it.

Mr. Vassar asked why they would not have leverage.

Comm. McGorty reiterated that once it is approved...it is just the (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins indicated that then the landlord wouldn't care.

Mr. Vassar responded that it is just the face that they're changing. It is not like they're changing the whole sign.

Chair Parkins asked him if he didn't think the owner or manager of Dunkin' Donuts would push to get conformance with what the Commission is looking for in return for getting his signage up.

Mr. Vassar responded that he didn't think there was time for that right now for him and that is the problem. He may but he only has thirty days to renovate. It is just not – if there is a conformity issue he would imagine that it is with the owner of the plaza in the town. He asked why it would be with the tenant.

Chair Parkins stated that once they approve this, it is a done deal. There would be no reason for him to have any stake.

Mr. Vassar asked if there was any way they could just go back to the owner and say...

Mr. Schultz indicated that he can call him.

Chair Parkins added that there is no end to this for the ...She asked the other Commissioners what they thought about this new signage.

Comm. Harger responded that she just didn't like it high on top of the monument.

Comm. Dickal stated that she agreed and if they are going to do it then they have to do it right. They have property up there that is hopefully, someday going to be bought and that is a (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz asked if in the spirit of cooperation, the Commission wanted to put it on the 25th for a resolution because that is when they meet again.

Chair Parkins responded sure and asked him to talk to the land owner.

Mr. Schultz commented that the consensus is here to approve everything so he can walk away (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins stated that she honestly, personally didn't care for the splashy drive-thru. She liked the subtleness of the other one.

Comm. McGorty indicated that wasn't a big deal to him but the height of this other sign is really terrible.

Mr. Schultz told Mr. Vassar that time has come so he told Mr. Vassar he would be talking to him and to the owner.

Comm. McGorty commented that they are set back there.

Comm. Tickey commented that he didn't mind the sign but sees what she's saying about the height but the sign is fine.

Comm. Dickal stated that bothers her too.

Mr. Vassar indicated that the meeting is in two weeks and asked what was going to happen. He asked if they would have to get a new monument out there and then start the process all over again (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz stated that he was going to work with the owner of the property and see if the change can happen.

Comm. McGorty (inaudible) ...

Mr. Vassar asked if they are going to have to make that change contingent – are they going to have to make that change and put a new monument up before they can get approval...

Mr. Schultz responded that as long as they agree to do it, the Commission will work with them. They have done that with that with phasing it in. Once they get the approval in writing, they will have the comfort level and they'll work with them. At least he'll be leaving tonight knowing that the change is fine.

Mr. Vassar commented that if he orders that face and they can't put the face in then that is a \$3000 worth of a face.

Mr. Schultz asked when he would have to order it.

Chair Parkins commented that face is not going to go on the monument sign very well either.

Comm. Harger agreed and (inaudible)...

Mr. Vassar responded tomorrow morning because it takes 4 weeks to get it. He added that he wasn't making it. It is coming from their corporate people but it takes 4 weeks to make the sign.

Mr. Schultz stated that he's going to communicate with the Commissioners starting tomorrow because they get requests like this all the time. He knows that timing is important. He reiterated that at the Staff level he'll work on it right away.

Chair Parkins indicated that she doesn't think there is anything in this town that has such tall signs.

Comm. Dickal responded no there isn't.

Comm. Harger commented that there is the car dealership.

Comm. Tickey stated that he didn't think so.

Comm. Harger stated the one that comes close is the storage place up the street – Cube Smart.

Chair Parkins asked what the consensus was.

Comm. Harger stated that she thinks it is time to move for the monument, table this and have Rick get in touch with the owner.

Chair Parkins told the Applicant that if it goes to a monument, it is not going to be as large of a sign so she wouldn't order it.

Mr. Vassar indicated that was his point about ordering it because it takes four weeks.

Mr. Schultz stated that he can work with the Commissioners. If the owner says fine about the monument, he can ask him to send him something, show it to the Commissioners and they can authorize him to sign off. He added that they can do this quickly.

Mr. Vassar responded that it won't be - if the monument is approved and he says he'll put a monument in and he produces a drawing for a monument, then it has to be permitted again and...

Mr. Schultz indicated that it wouldn't have to be – he could send it to the Commissioners.

Mr. Vassar continued that they would have to manufacture it, install it and he'll miss his opening.

Comm. McGorty asked if they could move forward with the other signs for the building and everything. He asked why they couldn't do that.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, that is the Commission's call.

Comm. McGorty added that they can discuss the other separately and come up with a plan.

Mr. Vassar stated that even if they start a monument today, he is going to be two months or more away from having it installed in the ground.

Chair Parkins asked if his franchise was really going to be taken away from him because he doesn't meet that.

Mr. Vassar responded that if they don't have the right signs in there, they are not permitted to open.

Mr. Schultz asked about phasing it in.

Mr. Vassar asked what he would be phasing in.

Mr. Schultz responded the replacement signs.

Mr. Vassar responded well, yes, if the owner decides to (inaudible)...He just thinks that this is holding Dunkin' Donuts as a tenant responsible for the owner's non-conformance.

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is one of the last old signs on Bridgeport Avenue.

Mr. Vassar responded that he's with them and isn't saying that they are wrong but he just doesn't think that Dunkin' Donuts is the guy to put on the (inaudible)...

Comm. Dickal stated that they aren't penalizing them.

Mr. Vassar responded yes, by not approving this then ... (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins indicated that it was the only leverage that they have. He has to understand that.

Mr. Vassar responded that he really didn't know if that is all the leverage that they have. He agrees with them if it is, but it seems like there has to be another way than to hold this tenant responsible.

Comm. McGorty asked Rick if he could probably, in short order get a hold of the owner.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, that it is going to be high priority.

Comm. McGorty commented that he'll know pretty quickly what can be done then.

Mr. Schultz indicated that they have had high priority issues before.

Chair Parkins stated that she wasn't sure what else he was proposing here. She asked for clarification about the packet of renderings.

Mr. Vassar pointed out the awnings with no graphics on them.

Chair Parkins commented OK, just dark brown awnings replacing these striped awnings and the new sign on top of the monument.

Mr. Vassar responded that they were proposing the wall signs replacing the existing sign there. He referenced an elevation drawing and the location of that wall sign.

Comm. McGorty commented that for all that stuff – they can go forward. There is no issue.

Comm. Dickal stated that the only issue is the height.

Chair Parkins indicated that the problem is that the sign itself is going to change because if it is a monument sign, it is not going to be that big.

Mr. Vassar indicated that the one shown is 45 square feet. He asked what the monument sign requirement would be.

Mr. Schultz indicated that it was up to 12 feet in height and 40 square feet - 8'x5' double-faced.

Mr. Vassar commented OK.

Chair Parkins stated that if it is a monument sign for that complex there may be other tenants listed on that monument sign.

Comm. Dickal agreed and mentioned that other tenants at Woodside would want to put their names on it.

Mr. Schultz added that was another incentive to do the monument sign - to do multiple tenants.

Mr. Vassar agreed and added (inaudible)...He indicated that he's not going to get anything better than that sign he's got there and they all know it. If that sign comes down, he will not have the same exposure - but it is what it is. He just doesn't personally feel that holding Dunkin Donuts feet to the fire is the right thing to do but he's not (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty commented that it wasn't necessarily holding their feet to the fire; it is going to happen really quickly that Rick is going to talk to the landlord.

Chair Parkins stated (inaudible)...

Comm. Dickal stated that they are going to try to move forward as quickly as possible. She personally doesn't see how it is going to make (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is something that they've done in the past with the Commission for Huntington Center (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty added that it is not a long drawn out process, its (inaudible)...

Mr. Vassar stated that he's fought about as hard as he can fight and has done his best.

Comm. Harger asked about the size on one of the signs.

Mr. Vassar referenced a page listing the sizes to clarify her question.

Mr. Schultz commented that it would be no ground sign but everything else.

Comm. Tickey motioned for approval on the awnings and wall signs.

Comm. Harger asked what was going to be 68 inches.

Mr. Vassar clarified that the logo would be 68 inches.

Comm. Harger commented OK and this is another 5 feet...

Mr. Vassar indicated that he listed each item's square footage and the total square feet on the right hand side.

Comm. Harger stated that it would be 52.84 square feet. She asked what the current size was.

Mr. Vassar responded 50.

Comm. Harger clarified that she wanted to know what the height was, not the square footage.

Mr. Vassar responded that the height of that particular sign – the old one is 5 feet and this one is 89 inches. They are individual pieces and not one big mass. The logo has empty space to the left and right of it. The Dunkin' and the Donuts are kind of connected but ...

Mr. Schultz asked if they were channel letters.

Mr. Vassar responded no, they are regular.

Comm. Harger asked if the brown striping on the top would be staying there.

Mr. Vassar responded no.

Comm. Harger commented that the side of the building wouldn't be able to accommodate that. It would be overpowering.

Mr. Vassar referenced the new elevation and commented that they have a little tower there and there is nothing on that tower but that logo.

Chair Parkins stated that it is also very visible from the street as far as people not knowing you are back there, she would disagree.

Mr. Vassar responded that the FedEx building blocks it.

Comm. McGorty commented that there is a little alleyway where you could see through.

Chair Parkins commented that you can see straight through there from Bridgeport Avenue.

Mr. Vassar responded only when you are right directly in front of it but you are driving at 45 mph so you don't see it.

Comm. Harger commented that she didn't have a problem with the awnings or with the other. It is just the pylon sign.

Chair Parkins asked for a second.

Comm. Dickal seconded.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0228 for wall signage and awnings only.

SEPARATE #0208: SIGNWORKS STUDIOS, 4 RESEARCH DRIVE, SIGN

Mr. Schultz indicated that this was the big surprise earlier. He provided renderings for United Healthcare's proposed signage.

The Applicant (unidentified) stated that there was nothing there right now. There is channel lettering on the upper floor of the building.

Comm. Harger asked where this was located compared to BIC and if it was around the corner.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, diagonally.

The Applicant clarified that it was across the street from BIC.

Chair Parkins asked if it was towards the front of the building with nothing on the side – just the front.

The Applicant responded that it was only going to be on the front of the building.

Mr. Schultz commented that it was pretty clean.

Chair Parkins added yes, it is nice.

Comm. Harger agreed.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0208 for signage.

SEPARATE #0224, ABC SIGN CORP., 2 MOUNTAINVIEW DRIVE, BUSINESS/SIGN

Mr. Schultz provided a rendering for the previous California Closet building going up to Four Winds Condos on the left.

Chair Parkins asked if it was Elvex or (inaudible).

Larry Borque, representing ABC Sign Corp. addressed the Commission. Mr. Borque responded that it would be Elvex Corporation.

Chair Parkins commented OK, it was formerly California Closets.

Mr. Schultz stated that this was formerly Jeffrey Brennan's California Closets. California Closets went to Research Drive.

Chair Parkins asked what type of business this was.

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is for safety products. They are occupying 22,000 square feet out of the 27,000 square feet so there will probably be a second tenant.

Mr. Borque responded maybe or maybe not. They are also thinking about taking that space (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz indicated it would be 20 employees, hours of operation 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday. The space works well for them as well as the building design.

Chair Parkins commented that it was a nice monument sign.

Comm. Dickal agreed.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0224 for business occupancy and signage.

Mr. Schultz commented that Shelton has been very lucky in getting these buildings reoccupied.

SEPARATE #0218: PAR POOL & SPA, 478 RIVER ROAD, BUSINESS/SIGN

Mr. Schultz indicated that this was at the old A&P Shopping Center on River Road. Par Pool & Spa is currently in Stratford and will lease 10,000 square feet with 3 employees and hours of operation will be seasonal Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 7 p.m.

Chair Parkins asked what they were replacing in there.

Mr. Schultz responded the Giggling Pig was the previous occupant.

Comm. Harger asked if they were leasing 10,000 square feet.

Mr. Schultz corrected the 10,000 square – it was 900 square feet but 10,000 is the total square footage.

Chair Parkins commented that she thought the Giggling Pig moved from Center Street to that shopping plaza.

Mr. Schultz responded that they must have moved out.

Comm. Harger stated OK so they were only taking 900 square feet.

Chair Parkins asked if was saying that they were on Center Street right now. She commented no, that they had been on Center Street and moved to the old A&P Plaza. She added that she was at La Scogliera's last night and they were right next door.

Comm. Dickal responded yes, they are right next door in that shopping mall.

Mr. Schultz commented OK, they are still there. They have the restaurant, the Giggling Pig, the bookstore and the office for the (inaudible)...

Comm. Harger added that the Chinese Restaurant.

Chair Parkins asked if the Church was still there.

Mr. Schultz responded that the Church is gone. The Church consolidated over here with (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins asked to see the signage.

Mr. Schultz indicated that the sign was consistent, uniform letters, 2' x 10' with red lettering on a white background. It matches other signs in the shopping plaza. They have all uniform signs up there like White Hills.

Comm. Harger asked for clarification on the Par Pool Spa location there.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he thought the Church used to be on the end and (inaudible)...He added that Tom wrote down Giggling Pig on the form so he thought it was a replacement. He said he would get clarification and email them.

Chair Parkins responded that it was not a big deal. She was curious only because she just saw it the other day.

Comm. McGorty made a motion for the sign and the business.

On a motion made Thomas McGorty seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0218 for business occupancy and sign.

SEPARATE #0220: FENG JIANG, 494 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE #104, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz indicated that this was located in the Botti shopping center with Wendy's and it is just a name change. The Fancy Angel Nails, everything is the same, 3 employees and they still have 1,100 square feet.

Chair Parkins asked about signage for this.

Mr. Schultz responded no, everything is staying the same. It is transfer of owner.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0220.

SEPARATE #0221: ELMAR DAVE & ROBERT LAPIDUS, 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SUITE 402

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is the same building that the Commission acted on for the Healthcare. This is for Women's Telemedicine Logistics providing medical services, three employees, hours of operation Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Chair Parkins asked for clarification of the "medical services" and if it referred to a doctor's office.

Mr. Schultz responded it says Women's Telemedicine Logistics.

Comm. Tickey commented that telemedicine refers to a call center type thing.

Comm. Harger stated that it could be a nurse on call or something like that where you call in to get advice.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, probably with only three employees. This is one of the newer tenants.

Comm. Harger asked Rick if he could provide further clarification of that application. Mr. Schultz responded OK.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0221.

SEPARATE #0223: FABIANA JARRIN, 90 HUNTINGTON STREET, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is the coffee shop and it has a change of owner.

Comm. Harger asked if it was behind Webster Bank.

Mr. Schultz responded no this is on Huntington Street across from Huntington Depot.

Chair Parkins added - the Huntington Café with the music (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty asked if it was supposed to go to a liquor store – a high end liquor store.

Chair Parkins responded that they approved it but it didn't go through and reverted back to a café. They came back in for a liquor license...

Comm. Harger asked if it was staying that way.

Chair Parkins asked what they wanted to do now.

Mr. Schultz indicated that everything is the same – it is just change of ownership. He added that with these change of ownerships he wants to go on record to say that everything is status quo – signage, hours of operation and the bar restrictions.

Chair Parkins reiterated that there was no bar.

Mr. Schultz added that Staff would monitor it as they have in the past.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0223.

SEPARATE #0090: R. D. SCINTO, 4 CORPORATE DRIVE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is for a new occupant, Cosmetic and Reconstructive Surgery, Mark Melendez, M.D. and owner. They will be leasing 1,542 square feet, 3 employees and this is a specialty, hours of operation Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and Saturday, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0090 for a business.

SEPARATE #0091: R. D. SCINTO, 60 PARROT DRIVE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz stated that this is for the building at the end of Parrot Drive on the left going into the Renaissance. This includes a new business and they also need a loading dock addition to the site plan. He provided a site map showing the location of the loading dock. He pointed out the location of the building off of the cul-de-sac in relation to the Renaissance and the proposed location of the concrete pad for the loading dock. He indicated that it meets the setbacks and it is for the new applicant's loading dock. He added that everything around it is industrial.

Comm. Harger asked if it was an addition.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, in the back. The company name is Five Star and it is an industrial chemical manufacturer. They are leasing the whole building, 27,333 square feet, 35 employees. He added that they are getting another tenant that is occupying the whole building which is good. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Comm. McGorty asked where the access to the loading dock was located.

Mr. Schultz responded that it was accessed from the parking lot. He showed the location of the entrance and explained how it goes around to the loading dock area. He commented that you won't even see it but it abuts industrial anyway - not any type of residential. He reiterated that Five Star was a new business occupying the whole building of 27, 333 square feet and they are a chemical manufacturer.

Comm. Harger asked if the entrance shown is the only one that they can use coming up Parrot Drive and that there was nothing connecting in the back.

Mr. Schultz responded yes and stated that Parrot Drive is a private drive. The City does not maintain it.

Chair Parkins asked for clarification about the chemical manufacturing.

Mr. Schultz responded that it was for industrial chemical manufacturing.

Comm. Harger asked what type of controls they had in place.

Chair Parkins agreed that was her question too.

Comm. McGorty asked if the access road going back there was wide enough for emergency vehicles and apparatus. He added that obviously they wouldn't have approved the building if it wasn't.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, right and they have to get their Certificate of Occupancy from the Building Department and the Fire Marshal as their next step. He asked if the Commission wants information on the business because he would send it to them.

Chair Parkins responded yes, more information about what they do and who regulates them.

Comm. Harger asked about the driveway being in a little more because of the location of the handicapped parking spaces. She asked how they were getting access ...

Comm. McGorty asked if they got rid of those spaces because there are a bunch of handicapped spaces.

Mr. Schultz responded that those are from the previous owner. He indicated that everything is clean and Staff has been up there. It has not been neglected and actually Mr. Scinto upgraded it.

Comm. McGorty asked Rick if he saw the access road to the back.

Mr. Schultz responded yes and said it was not problematic. It worked well (inaudible).

Chair Parkins reviewed the site map showing Parrot Drive, Ruby Tuesday's to the left, the large building on the curve with multiple tenants...

Comm. McGorty asked if it was up on the left there when you go up past EAO.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Chair Parkins asked if Parrot Drive went all the way up.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, all the way up to the cul-de-sac. It was an old industrial road that had Branson Cleaners and other old manufacturers.

Comm. Harger commented that you are able to go through the parking lot to get to the other side of the towers.

Comm. McGorty motioned to approve.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0091.

Mr. Schultz reiterated that he would email company bio information tomorrow.

Chair Parkins commented yes she wants to know what they do there and who oversees the chemical use, monitoring and regulations.

SEPARATE #0222: PREFERRED TOOL, 30 FOREST PARKWAY

Mr. Schultz indicated that this is for Preferred Tool and Die and they are having a separate dba known as Preferred Automotive Components. They are working out of the same company at 30 Forest Parkway.

Comm. McGorty asked if it was a subsidiary of the tool and die business.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, it is for automotive.

Comm. McGorty asked if they would still do both.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Chair Parkins asked if they were the ones who just expanded parking to accommodate the two shifts. She asked if this required additional parking.

Mr. Schultz responded no. He commented that what is happening is that some of the companies are diversifying because of the specialties that they do and how they organize it within.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0222 for the business.

SEPARATE #0230: THOMAS HAIGHT, 78 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, BUSINESS

Mr. Schultz presented a site drawing of the presently vacant garage at 78 Bridgeport Avenue.

Chair Parkins (inaudible) auto parts...

Comm. McGorty commented that he thought it was an Internet Flea Market site.

Inaudible comments (paper noise...)

Mr. Schultz stated that it was for Koop (sp?) Automotive Sales and Service, Automotive Repairs, Sales, Towing and Storage. They need a DMV License; the P&Z Commission deals with that now but years ago it was the ZBA. The building is 1800 square feet and the Applicant will be occupying the entire facility, 2 employees, and hours of operation 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday and 8 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Saturday.

He read some of the prior conditions of approval from the Commission to refresh their memory including the condition for up to 12 vehicles for sale and all drums were to be removed before issuance of Zoning Permit

Mr. Schultz asked the Applicant if the site had been cleaned up right now because he hadn't been out there in a couple of weeks. Mr. Haight responded yes.

Comm. McGorty asked if that existed before the previous tenant. Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Mr. Schultz continued that all motor vehicles and motor vehicles parts are to be removed. He added that had been done. No outside storage of motor vehicle parts and he asked Mr. Haight to confirm that for the record.

Mr. Haight responded yes.

Chair Parkins added that included any wrecks.

Mr. Haight asked if he couldn't store wrecks outside.

Comm. McGorty responded no.

Mr. Schultz added that there were to be no vehicles stored in front of the garage doors and no body shop repair work.

Mr. Haight responded that there was no body shop.

Mr. Schultz asked about the wrecker.

Mr. Haight indicated that he wouldn't be doing towing right away. He wanted to get on the town towing.

Chair Parkins commented that they don't want wrecks being stored there.

Mr. Haight asked even if there was a fence put up there at some point so they aren't visible.

Mr. Schultz responded that it is not something that he's requesting now so they can revisit.

Mr. Haight added that was correct.

Chair Parkins commented that she wanted to let him know up front what (inaudible)...

Mr. Haight responded that he definitely (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty stated that the situation there (inaudible),...

Mr. Schultz stated that he's inclined not to (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty commented that it would probably be (inaudible) ...type situation where they stay there for an extended period of time because of insurance reasons or whatever and they abandon it (inaudible) and then start selling parts.

Mr. Haight responded that they aren't allowed to sell parts. There is a limited amount of time they have to file for paperwork to get rid of the motor vehicle with the DMV. If they tow something in and they don't claim it...

Chair Parkins added that it could be weeks.

Mr. Haight agreed.

Comm. McGorty indicated that was one of the conditions on the last one that there were no wrecks in there.

Mr. Haight responded OK.

Mr. Schultz asked the Applicant what he wanted to put for the total number of vehicles for sale.

Mr. Haight responded probably 10.

Mr. Schultz asked Mr. Haight to show the Commission on the site plan where he would park them. He indicated that was a net decrease from the previous amount of 12.

Mr. Haight pointed out the location for vehicles for sale.

Chair Parkins commented about all the car dealerships on that road...

Mr. Haight pointed out some other locations where he could put cars for sale.

Comm. Harger commented that cars for sale would be in good condition.

Comm. McGorty indicated that the important thing is for the public flow through there with people/customers coming in was the concern.

Comm. Dickal asked if he had the space to push them to the back.

Mr. Haight responded yes and showed where he could put them more to the back.

Chair Parkins asked if he was talking about the cars for sale.

Mr. Haight responded yes, he could put them not as close to the street.

Comm. McGorty stated that in all fairness, he kind of wants people to see the cars as they drive by without people slowing down to look down there.

Chair Parkins asked if his two bays were accessible from the front.

Mr. Haight responded yes.

Mr. Schultz reiterated that the Commission does not want parking in front of those.

Chair Parkins asked about two other parking spaces in the front.

Mr. Haight responded that they would be for customer parking.

Chair Parkins asked if there would just be two in the front.

Mr. Haight pointed out one other spot where he had two more spaces for customer parking. He added that it would be for customers and not for cars staying there overnight or for a one day repair.

Chair Parkins commented that if his intention is to get on the City's tow list, the purpose of doing that is to tow wrecks from accident scenes. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. Haight responded right.

Comm. McGorty commented that they would need to be stored inside probably.

Comm. Harger stated or in the back.

Comm. McGorty indicated that he had two bays.

Comm. Harger asked what was behind that building, behind that wall and if it slopes down.

Mr. Haight responded that there was a little (inaudible) there but not really.

Mr. Schultz commented about the color that the previous owner had which was a kind of purple.

Mr. Haight responded that he would be repainting it white.

Chair Parkins asked if he proposed any signage.

Mr. Haight responded that he would come back for that.

Comm. McGorty commented that he didn't have a problem with it other than the normal stipulations that they have with the wrecks. If he is going to be towing, they are probably going to have to be stored inside.

Comm. Harger commented that they could fit them in that bay area in the back.

Mr. Haight responded that he could get two or maybe three or inside. He showed where they could be stored inside.

Comm. McGorty commented that they wouldn't be able to do repairs but the DMV would get rid of them quick.

Mr. Haight responded that he wouldn't be doing the towing right away. He said that his main concern is in the other business.

Comm. McGorty stated that he could get a half dozen cars that are wrecks pretty quick.

Comm. Harger agreed.

Mr. Schultz indicated that is what has been problematic.

Comm. McGorty agreed and added about getting them out of there quickly.

Mr. Schultz commented that is especially true with a winter like this one.

Comm. Dickal commented that stuff like that just takes time.

Chair Parkins stated that if he isn't doing body work there and the car is salvageable it would be out of there soon because no one wants their car just tied up in a storage yard. It would get towed out of there fast. If it is totaled then (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty commented that it could be a week or two weeks until an adjuster gets out there to see it. He could accumulate a half dozen pretty quick.

Mr. Haight responded that the insurance companies are a lot quicker (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz stated that the previous occupants were R&R Automotive and C&K (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty commented that he doesn't know if he actually did automotive...he only saw Christmas trees out there.

Chair Parkins indicated that for the last owners, the Commission stipulated no junks there.

Comm. McGorty stated yes, but they got rid of the junk. It was abandoned there. They had been short term.

Chair Parkins informed Mr. Haight that he has heard the sentiments of the Commission.

Mr. Schultz added that Staff has talked to him about it as well.

Comm. McGorty indicated that Staff monitors that stuff.

Chair Parkins mentioned that there were also the Commissioners that drive by there every day.

Mr. Haight responded that he understood.

On a motion made by Nancy Dickal seconded by Thomas McGorty, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0230 with the noted conditions regarding vehicle storage/parking.

SEPARATE #318: ANTONIO'S PIZZA, 14 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, ENCLOSED PORCH/ENTRANCE

Antonio Xhokola, owner of Antonio's Pizza, 14 Bridgeport Avenue, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. Xhokola commented that a lot of pizzas have been burned because he has been waiting for so long tonight. He provided a plan showing the layout right now and commented that he didn't really know exactly what he's doing but...

Chair Parkins responded that didn't sound too comforting.

Comm. Harger stated that he wants to enclose this.

Mr. Xhokola indicated that right now it isn't really serving an purpose.

Chair Parkins commented that it is too cold to eat outside right now.

Mr. Xhokola responded that even in the summer and the main entrance needs something.

Comm. Harger asked if he wanted to change the entryway.

Mr. Xhokola responded that the entryway would be the same but showed where he wanted to enclose it going across.

Comm. McGorty asked if he wanted to enclose for a season or all year (inaudible)...

Mr. Xhokola responded no, that part is going to be all year, actually he has a double door that he wants to take out that he'll use for access because it is through the kitchen. He added that part wouldn't be seen when people enter. He would dress it up like the wall, like 3 feet of wall from the bottom.

Chair Parkins asked if he is just basically bringing everything out.

Mr. Xhokola responded yes - just enclose the porch and the main entrance the way it is right now, in between those two posts he would like to do something.

Comm. McGorty asked if he was increasing the size.

Chair Parkins responded he was increasing the size of the kitchen, not patron area.

Comm. Harger asked the Applicant if this was going to be for a kitchen.

Mr. Xhokola responded that it was really more storage but it is right by his kitchen.

Comm. McGorty asked if it was off of the kitchen and he'll keep supplies there.

Mr. Xhokola responded yes, like pizza boxes or whatever.

Comm. Harger commented OK, he is taking out the doors and asked if he had windows.

Mr. Xhokola responded yes, he was thinking like three feet up with blocks and dressed up with stone so it will match with the garages he has. The posts would be taken out and there will be four probably. He is very concerned about the look of it. The entrance will look better because right now a lot of people think they are going into the kitchen.

Comm. Dickal commented that if it is more appealing then he'll get more foot traffic.

Mr. Xhokola responded yes, he hopes so.

Chair Parkins asked if he has had more business since he moved here.

Mr. Xhokola responded yes, they will see it in taxes.

Comm. Harger commented about more revenue and asked if he was keeping the original doors but moving back (inaudible)...

Mr. Xhokola responded that he has two people looking at the doors because when you open the doors that are there now, especially in winter, it is like...(inaudible)

Comm. Harger stated OK, this is going to be a little enclosed foyer.

Mr. Xhokola responded that they are looking for something that would be glass window something ...He added that he lost Tom Dingle as a customer for the winter because it was too cold in there to eat.

Comm. Harger pointed out an area and asked if the entire area would be enclosed.

Mr. Xhokola responded yes.

Comm. Harger added that all the poles would come down.

Mr. Xhokola responded yes.

Comm. Dickal commented that it was going to look really nice.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #318 for the enclosed porch/entrance.

SEPARATE #0232: MICRO PHASE CORPORATION, 100 TRAP FALLS ROAD EXTENSION, MANUFACTURING/OFFICE

Mr. Schultz indicated that this was for Micro Phase Corporation and they are leasing 1500 square feet, 48 employees, hours of operation 7:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., five company vehicles and this is in the Bassett Building. This will be the fourth occupant in the old Bassett Building and there is room for one more occupant. He indicated that they have Comet, Micro Phase, Red Bull, and Walgreen's.

Chair Parkins asked if the parking was sufficient there.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Comm. McGorty added that there is a pretty big lot over there.

Comm. Harger asked about the type of business.

Mr. Schultz responded manufacturing and office.

Comm. Harger asked what they manufactured.

The Applicant (name not provided) responded that they manufacture military electronics so they'll be going for a while.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0232 for manufacturing/office occupancy.

APPLICATION #15-1: STEVEN BELLIS ON BEHALF OF HAWKS RIDGE OF SHELTON, LLC FOR FINAL SITE DEVELOPMENT PLANS APPROVAL (PHASE 1: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT), LONG HILL CROSS ROAD (MAP 39 AND 51, LOTS 7 AND 71), PDD #77: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REVIEW PERIOD/PROJECT UPDATE BY APPLICANT.

Mr. Schultz read Atty. Bellis's letter dated 3/6/15 regarding an extension to the Detailed Development Plans until April 15, 2015

***See attached correspondence dated March 6, 2015 to Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator from Atty. Steven Bellis.**

Chair Parkins asked what the previous deadline had been.

Mr. Schultz indicated that it expires later in March before the next meeting. He indicated that a motion was in order to authorize the extension.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to authorize the request for the extension of the review period for Application #15-1.

Atty. Steven Bellis, representing Hawk's Ridge of Shelton LLC addressed the Commission. Atty. Bellis indicated that in regard to the update, A. J. Grasso is here to present some visuals for the Commission.

Mr. Schultz pulled the easel board closer to the Commission and indicated that the drawings shown are the current, Phase 1 upper area.

A.J. Grasso, Developer, Hawks Ridge of Shelton, LLC addressed the Commission. Mr. Grasso began by prefacing that Tony Panico had some concerns about the upper entrance in regard to the original driveway setup. He pointed out a small turnaround area on the site plan and showed a drive that serviced seven houses off of a driveway versus a cul-de-sac. He indicated that they extended the cul-de-sac.

He switched over to another drawing with red-lined revisions and pointed out a small island in the center of this entrance and stated that they took the island back further. He indicated that it was a 30 foot wide entrance and they extended this cul-de-sac so that it is picking up the first three houses directly off of the cul-de-sac and the driveway. He pointed out three units in one location as well as another two units that would share a driveway. He explained that the third unit has a turnaround so they can turn around and go straight out but another one would back out.

Mr. Grasso indicated where they have a mail box area which would service all of the mailboxes prior to that location and act as a mail drop on the way out. He showed the location of another

mailbox area which would handle all of the other single family homes in there. He pointed out the location of the roadway and the pull off area created to provide space for two, maybe three cars set up near the mailboxes. He reiterated that was one of Tony's areas of concern.

Comm. Harger asked if there was an adequate line of sight for someone coming around the corner when two or three cars are parked there.

Mr. Grasso responded yes, and one of the other things that is going to happen is that the roadway there is about 26 feet so it's at about 34 feet wide so there is quite a bit of (inaudible). He added that he discussed the line of sight with the Engineer and he's comfortable with it at the speed that they are going to be coming in when they make that turn. It shouldn't be an issue.

Comm. Harger commented OK and asked about the small island and if it would be lit.

Mr. Grasso responded that there would be some lighting around it and some plantings so that it acts as a focal point. He pointed out another area that would also be a focal point.

Chair Parkins asked if focal points like that are typically closer to the entrance.

Mr. Grasso responded that the problem with putting it closer to the entrance is that it begins to squeeze this area (he pointed out the area of road near the island). He added that he didn't know that it would help them.

Comm. McGorty asked if there was any directional in that area.

Mr. Grasso responded that this is similar to the entrance into Heritage Point so when coming in this way, you would go around the outside of that. There is really not enough room to drive comfortably to the left side of it. They could certainly ...

Comm. McGorty commented that in regard to direction he asked if there would be any signage on that island right there directing people to certain addresses or whatever.

Mr. Grasso responded that he hadn't really thought about that. He doesn't want it to look like the exit of a hotel elevator. He added that he didn't know if it was necessary either but if it became necessary, they could probably do it. He added that he didn't think it would need to be necessary though.

Chair Parkins asked if there was any signage proposed.

Mr. Grasso responded (inaudible)...

Comm. Harger mentioned Aspetuck Village (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty commented (inaudible)...the left comes up quickly.

Mr. Grasso responded that since their meeting with Tony and Rick, they spent a lot of time redesigning this area and areas in the back where the duplex units are which he would discuss in a minute. He indicated that they will probably have to use some type of area in here so that they'll have a true entrance. He'll make sure that is drawn on the next phase.

Comm. McGorty commented that it would be for people entering and because the left comes up quick. If you're not familiar with it and you're looking for an address that is in that cul-de-sac you would shoot to the right, go in and have to go back.

Mr. Grasso indicated that they could certainly do that and showed a location that would have a different street name as well which might help but he'll make sure (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty commented that would probably take care of it.

Atty. Bellis stated that if you put a monument, it would be done there.

Mr. Grasso indicated that the monuments would be far enough in that they aren't affecting the sight lines. He'll have those drawn in and sign other areas.

Comm. Harger commented about someone trying to exit and bearing to the left of that (inaudible)...

Mr. Grasso responded that they could probably line this. They aren't lined at Heritage Point and it doesn't seem to be an issue but if they think it is an issue they can also bring this slightly over as well. There is plenty of width.

Comm. Harger stated that she is familiar with the Aspetuck entrance and they have a boulevard entrance there where there's a monument sign in the middle. She is concerned about someone driving over that. She knows that there will be plantings and things.

Mr. Grasso responded that this is a 40 scale - but it is 160 feet in and it will have plantings and be lit. He commented that he would speak to Alan Shepard who has the flu and couldn't be here tonight. He added that they can move it slightly one way. It is a 26 foot width – that's probably pretty close to 24 – 26 feet (inaudible) which would force you to comfortably go around the outside. He reiterated that he would discuss it with Alan Shepard.

Mr. Grasso went back to the original conceptual plan as far as the multi-family housing units. He said that originally they had this designed with tri-plexes, four-plexes and six-plexes. After the approval, he was thinking about it and went up into Crescent View, and thought if he could keep from having to sell interior units it will be a lot easier to do. He indicated that they did a lot of redesign work and originally they are approved for 111 units and with the plan redesigned it is 110 units.

With another drawing of a building rendering he showed what they came up with for a duplex unit. He explained that the duplex was two units 30 feet wide each so it is a total of 60 feet. The single family units in the development are a total of 42 feet. It is not an enormous building even as a duplex. He added that he thinks it is a much nicer looking building.

Mr. Grasso referenced another rendering and explained that he'd like to keep it all as duplexes. He indicated that he would explain what the discussion was with Rick and Tony in a minute.

He pointed out the 60 foot wide duplexes and the 15 foot space between the units. He stated that most of these units, and he provided a site plan of the multi-family section in orange that are all duplexes in this footprint right now. He showed all of the units that have separation from about 18 feet, 20 feet, 26 feet, etc. with the closest units in one area being 16 feet apart.

Chair Parkins asked what he said were the closest ones.

Mr. Grasso responded yes, 16.1 feet to scale on one and 16.7 between the two. He stated that what he is looking to do and he asked the Commission – when they redesigned it and talked to Tony and Rick, they are trying to keep 20 -25 feet and they've done it on most of the units. His question becomes what looks better – these units at 15 feet apart or putting two of these units together and having no ...

Atty. Bellis commented that he is talking about the units at (inaudible)...

Mr. Grasso continued that when he redrew this to make sure that nothing was closer than 15 feet, all of them were separated keeping close to 20 feet or better. He pointed out these two were at 16.1 and two others at about 17.1 – 18 feet. He commented that he would still like to separate these units.

Atty. Bellis indicated that they wanted to ask the Commission if they thought it would be a better idea to have them all duplexes separated a little bit – he added that they were only talking about these two.

Mr. Grasso indicated that one of the other concerns was the way they had it drawn before, some of the backyards overlapped. He showed where it was 47 feet between these units right now so it is a pretty good depth from this backyard to the side of this house. He said that they had them

overlapping where they were really close to each other so if you went out to the backyard, you'd be looking straight at the side of a building. He showed the areas where he thinks that they've resolved that and explained that in looking straight out, they are angled just enough and with the exception of one unit, they are all 47 apart, there is nothing immediately behind them. He commented that is one of the things that they are weighing right now.

Atty. Bellis reiterated that they wanted to Commission's feedback.

Comm. Dickal asked if they would have to eliminate one of them.

Mr. Grasso responded no, what he would do is separate them. The separation space...the reality is that these units are all going to be 60 feet. If he puts two of them together he'll have a 120 foot building. He still has the same air space between all of these units, it is just a matter of where he utilizes it. Using the site plan, he asked if he should put more space here, more space here or have less space here and not have four units together anywhere in there which is what he was trying to do.

Comm. Harger asked if there were three instances of that.

Mr. Grasso responded no there is only two and showed the locations; they are right across from each other.

Comm. McGorty stated that he thinks they would be better separated.

Comm. Dickal agreed that separated would be better.

Chair Parkins commented that she thinks that they can demand more money for end units too.

Mr. Grasso indicated that he thinks that they'll be more (inaudible) but asked if they didn't think it looked better too.

Comm. McGorty stated that it was the aesthetics of it though.

Comm. Dickal commented that it looks like a house.

Chair Parkins indicated that she personally wouldn't want to live in that circle there. There is no privacy - decks on top of decks. She added that she would never consider condo living ever again.

Mr. Grasso stated that was his point as well and asked if he would want to live in a fourplex – probably not - but he could see himself in this one. He added that they put a lot of effort into it and he's excited about the plans. These look as good as the single families look. He told them that these were 60 feet with a master on the second and with a master on the second they become 62 feet because they become a little bit deeper but there is only one foot in width difference so the front will look virtually the same. They will be changing up the color a little bit but it will have three different colors in there and it will stay that way.

Comm. Harger asked if they had any thoughts of making the circle units single ones.

Mr. Grasso responded no, there are different looking units. There are going to be three different duplex models and they are in the process of drawing this one here. These will have garages attached on either side, basically 24' x 24'. He showed another that would be 30' x 50' deep. These are straight-in garages, off grade so this one will be a different looking unit that they are finalizing right now. The façade will look similar to this except it will have garage-wing, garage-wing. He showed the location of two units that would be garage under duplexes. Again, they have the same width; they don't need the same depth because they aren't putting a 22' deep garage on the front there. He showed the units that would have patios off the back because they are basically going into a hillside. There are going to end up being three different models that will be similar in appearance except four of these units will have garage under and the rest of them will have decks.

Mr. Grasso indicated that they were very close to grade too. There is very little – all of these units in here with the driveways - there probably won't be 18" to 24" in grade from the streets to the units.

Atty. Bellis asked if it was the consensus to split them.

Comm. Tickey commented that he thinks so.

Comm. Dickal stated that she thought it would be cleaner and nicer looking.

Mr. Grasso indicated that one other thing that he can do and he told them that there was a 2' difference in the width of these and he doesn't know how many masters on the first are going to be sold – he indicated that everyone says that they want a master on the first until sitting down to go over the price, the master bedroom isn't as nice nor is the kitchen or the family room. They'll have to see how many end up being masters on the first. He could keep the masters on the first that are a little bit wider in an area where he has more width, more separation. If there is a total of 30 duplexes, if he sells 8, 10 or 12 units as masters on the first, he'd keep them on the side where he has greater separation.

Mr. Grasso showed an area and commented that if he keeps them all at 60' then this might be 12 feet. He added that he won't go less than 10' and he's trying to stay at 12' to 15' but he won't make his units any wider in that section.

Chair Parkins commented that she just doesn't think (inaudible)...

Mr. Grasso indicated that was why he brought this and had him do it to scale at 15' which is a quarter of this building. He added that he still thinks that they look better separated than they do together.

Atty. Bellis asked him to explain what he was going to do in this other area – the Assisted Living facility.

Mr. Grasso commented that the original end user that they were hoping to sell this lower parcel to for the approval that was granted, fell through a couple months after the approval was granted. They now have a signed Letter of Intent from an actual developer who is also looking for an end user; he doesn't have a specific end user but it is both of their intentions to sell this property at some point – whether it is 2 months or 8 months or 14 months down the line – to an end user that has the ability and the wherewithal to develop what was approved. They don't have that person yet. He reiterated that they have a Letter of Intent, somebody who is searching that and that is what he does.

Comm. Harger asked if he was doing some speculation.

Mr. Grasso responded that he is in that industry and he can bring them a list of what he has developed. To carry this forward and to show that it is their intention, they want to have a general site grading plan so that they can show where the entrance is going to be, do some tree clearing and take the grade down to what it will be when it is ultimately developed. He commented that when someone drives up and looks at this, and unless they walk behind the house on the street, they are looking at what amounts to a large pimple. It is pretty steep. It is pretty high up – that elevation is 130 and this is 180 and there is another elevation of 150 - which is what the entire parcel wants to be. He indicated that they want to do some tree clearing, some soil erosion control and take it down to grade, use some of the stone for the road base over there and level off some of the low spots in between there. He indicated that then they have a grade to set an elevation that is more desirable for the end user.

Atty. Bellis indicated that this wasn't a new concept. A lot of time these guys come in and want to see the site ready so they could put their building on it and see how it sits. He added that he doesn't know how many times people have come and said they can't see it – they can't visualize it.

Mr. Grasso commented that it is some much easier if they can see it.

Mr. Schultz indicated that they did that for Split Rock.

Mr. Grasso added that right now if you go out there you have no idea what the useable space is. This parcel is about 11 acres and when that grading is done, it will show at least 6 useable acres of space for whoever the end user is. Right now, if you look at it, unless you're an engineer, you have no idea what the useable space is. He indicated that they would show the complete area of disturbance. It won't help them to show buildings and parking. It isn't going to help them because the end user isn't go to put it in that way.

Comm. McGorty agreed that they would want to configure it (inaudible)...

Mr. Grasso added that somebody may decide that they may want to put cluster housing here, etc. He indicated that rather than going through that effort he wants to show the grade they'll be at, bring in a site plan, go to Wetlands and P&Z at the same time so that the Soil and Erosion Control is done properly and that they handle the watercourse properly.

Atty. Bellis indicated that John Cooke already said that the Wetlands on this part are not even anything he wants.

Mr. Grasso showed a small portion of wetlands in one area and added that John Cooke, what was said in their original approval is that they would rather see that piece for some drainage or as Alan Shepard stated as a detention area to keep buildings away from the more valuable area farther up that they want to enhance as a wetland.

Atty. Bellis commented that they can make those trade-offs in Wetlands.

Mr. Grasso commented that is kind of what they were looking at and when Alan has something drawn they should probably have a workshop session.

Comm. McGorty commented that was a good idea and helps the marketability of that parcel. To visualize it helps potential (inaudible)...

Mr. Grasso stated that he wants the Board to understand that the greatest value for this parcel is to sell it with the approval that it has so the last thing he wants to do is sell it for anything else. Hopefully, it is marketed enough that if there is user/supplier they will find him before that well runs drive with assisted living or continued care facilities.

Comm. McGorty commented that more and more people need that.

Mr. Grasso indicated that sometimes when they do a marketing study (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty stated that different areas could get saturated.

Mr. Grasso continued that by bringing it up to the Valley it becomes less desirable but if they keep the Valley out of it and it's just Fairfield County, then it is more valuable or desirable. He reiterated that was what they were trying to do. He wanted to come to the last meeting when Steve was here but he had the flu. He wants the Commission to understand that their intention is to sell it for what it is approved for because they still owe money to the Wells family for the rest of this parcel. He indicated that (inaudible)...

Comm. McGorty asked if they were actively searching as well.

Mr. Grasso indicated that they own it and (inaudible)...

Atty. Bellis added that they actually closed which is very rare and against his advice. They actually closed and bought this property without their approval.

Comm. McGorty commented that they have a Letter of Intent but asked if they were also searching themselves for (inaudible)...

Mr. Grasso responded that they are searching a well and he's actually trying to sell it on Loop Net.com and find as many avenues to sell this as possible.

Atty. Bellis commented that he knows that it helps because they did it for Benchmark.

Comm. McGorty indicated that this is a no-brainer really – to visualize something and not just see rough land because it is tough to visualize. It looks like a big, huge project when...

Comm. Dickal agreed that it is too overwhelming.

Mr. Grasso stated that they all know that this comes back down as soon as you get to this (inaudible)...

Atty. Bellis indicated that they are actively working on it and told Rick that he gave a one month extension because their next meeting is April 14th.

Mr. Schultz commented it is April 14th but there is a lot that has to be done especially with Alan.

Mr. Grasso stated that once he goes back and tells him what they discussed tonight -

Chair Parkins asked how he was treating the other entrance.

Mr. Grasso found a map showing that entrance but indicated it was to scale and he don't know how well they would see it.

Comm. Miller asked when Connery was leaving.

Mr. Grasso responded that they'll let him stay there as long as he can. He's also his accountant so...

Comm. Miller commented OK, at least until April 15th.

Mr. Grasso showed the lower entrance on a different site map drawing. He pointed out the lower entrance and commented that not much had changed other than the fact that they have the mailboxes areas over there for that section. He explained that all of the duplex units would be taken care of by this entry and this mailbox area. No single family homes would be accessed from (inaudible) – it would be direct access off of this street. This will all be multi-family. His guess is that people that live here in the single families may use this entrance but everybody else, he would think, would come through the upper entrance so for the most part this will be handling the multi-family (inaudible)...

Mr. Grasso stated that the pool and the clubhouse haven't changed much; there is a lot of parking. Tony asked for some more parking spaces so he showed where they added some additional spaces above and more near a cul-de-sac for visitor parking. They will work out well in the winter when they get a lot of snow because they can be used for snow dumping too.

Chair Parkins asked about the two buildings shown at the bottom near the entrance.

Mr. Grasso indicated that those two units are duplex units also – that is how they arrived at the total of ...

Chair Parkins responded that was not a part of the original approval – that was (inaudible) and single family homes.

Mr. Grasso showed where they were drawn as single families toward the back.

Chair Parkins responded yes.

Mr. Grasso responded that he is actually building less units now and in regard to this, he doesn't personally think it has a negative impact on the development, that duplex there - but it is up for discussion with the Board.

Mr. Schultz indicated that was conveyed to the Applicant.

Chair Parkins stated that was a major change from the initial presentation.

Atty. Bellis asked for clarification that she was talking about having that unit there.

Chair Parkins responded that they are condos and are not a part of single family cluster housing. She understands that he is trying to get all of the units that were approved but that is a major deviation from what was originally proposed. Those two units belong in the back.

Comm. Dickal agreed.

Mr. Grasso responded OK.

Atty. Bellis indicated that there may not be any more room back there.

Chair Parkins stated that then they are losing however many units they are proposing there instead of houses.

Mr. Grasso responded that they were two duplexes so it would be two units. Originally he had them drawn on the last plan that they had seen and they were fourplexes.

Comm. Dickal recalled that because she had asked what a fourplex was.

Atty. Bellis asked if she was saying that they don't want them at all being multi-family.

Chair Parkins responded that she thinks they need that separation. Those are cluster houses and the condo complex is in the back. She asked if the pool and clubhouse would be shared.

Mr. Grasso responded that they would be shared. The only difference is that there would be a different Association fee for condominiums versus single family homes because the single families will physically be owned fee simple and the condominiums won't be.

Atty. Bellis indicated that they went over that so that it would be clear, or at least they went over it with Tony. For the single family they would be doing a subdivision so that each person would own their own lot – fee simple lots.

Chair Parkins asked who pays for all the – is there a Homeowner's Association.

Mr. Grasso responded yes, the Homeowner's Association – these units here will pay for plowing, snow removal, road repairs, clubhouse...

Chair Parkins added OK, recycling and all of that.

Mr. Grasso indicated that these other would pay for – they would be set up for common insurance, roofing, siding...

Chair Parkins asked who pays for the pool.

Mr. Grasso responded that they would both pay for the pool. It will be a little bit tricky determining the exact (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins commented that it was a pretty big pool.

Mr. Grasso indicated yes, assuming everybody uses it.

Chair Parkins commented that it was a lot of people sharing.

Mr. Grasso commented yes but asked how many units they have at Sunwood – it's probably 128.

Chair Parkins asked if they had two pools at Sunwood.

Mr. Grasso responded no, just one. This is a large area with the clubhouse and the pool. They are actually finalizing the plans for the clubhouse right now. It is going to be about 1600 square feet up and 1600 square foot down, walk out, high ceilings, and access to the pool from the back.

Atty. Bellis indicated that he thinks that those are the issues that they talked about. He stated that they'll have to redraw and get back...

Mr. Grasso stated that they'll change these back over to single family and separate the others.

Atty. Bellis asked how they want them to come back for permission to do the (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins stated that she was asking again how they were treating the entrance and if they would have a different sign there for the condo complex or is it all Hawks Ridge.

Atty. Bellis responded that would be a marketing thing.

Chair Parkins stated that it is a marketing thing but it is also aesthetics.

Mr. Grasso indicated that he would think about how they would identify it if you're coming into the multi-family.

Chair Parkins stated that the purpose of two entrances is to kind of separate the two.

Mr. Grasso responded correct and he has to figure that out – he's even trying to figure out what to call them other than duplexes because it has a negative connotation. He stated that they'll have to figure out some kind of signage that will inherently tell someone that this section is condominiums.

Atty. Bellis asked if the roads were named differently.

Mr. Grasso responded yes, the roads are named differently but if you are driving up – and he showed one road that had the same name so that would be helpful.

Chair Parkins commented that even if it was Hawk's Ridge A or Hawk's Ridge B or whatever for people that are coming up to know which road to turn onto.

Atty. Bellis told Mr. Grasso that they'll have Alan show them the board on the monument signs so that they can see what they're saying.

Mr. Grasso commented that what he'd like to do, if they can, is have the ability to draw this before redoing all the engineering and stuff and have a meeting with Rick & Tony to take a look at it.

Mr. Schultz agreed before April 14th.

Mr. Grasso responded yes, hopefully, like next week.

Comm. Harger asked about the two houses that were pointed out and if that was a dead end if you came in and took a right and took another right to go to those two homes.

Mr. Grasso responded that they were right off of the main road.

Comm. Harger asked if they would have a common driveway.

Mr. Grasso responded no, they will have individual driveways.

Comm. Harger asked if you had to go down to get to them.

Mr. Grasso responded no, they are at the same elevation.

Comm. Harger commented OK, she was looking at the wrong ones – she didn't see the red color.

Mr. Grasso stated that the driveways were directly off and at the same elevation as the road.

Comm. Harger asked what the other line shown there was for.

Mr. Grasso responded that was buffer line, the setback line – there is a stone wall there.

Comm. Harger commented OK she was just having a hard time seeing the red line because of the crease in the paper.

Mr. Grasso indicated that he would clean up a couple of the areas where there were questions and he asked Rick if they could set something up for late next week.

Atty. Bellis asked if there was anything else that the Commission wanted to address.

Chair Parkins responded no, she would just be interested to know how they were going to address those two Hawk Ridges.

Comm. Harger suggested Hawk's Ridge East and Hawk's Ridge West.

Atty. Bellis responded that he liked that was not a bad idea.

Mr. Grasso stated that it is certainly easier for somebody to explain when they want to have company over.

Comm. Dickal liked the East and West – she said “sold.”

Atty. Bellis thanked the Commission and said he'd see them in about a month.

APPLICATION #15-03: 223 CANAL GROUP, LLC FOR MODIFICATION OF PDD #70 INCLUDING INITIAL CONCEPT PLAN, STATEMENT OF USES AND STANDARDS AND FINAL SITE DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL (SITE C: 68 MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL UNITS), 223 CANAL STREET (MAP 129, LOT 18): ACCEPT AND SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING.

Mr. Schultz suggested the fourth Wednesday in April - April 22nd and asked if everyone could make it. He added that they were also going to get John Watts to resubmit shortly. This is the Brennan Building.

Chair Parkins commented that this was the one where they both withdrew their applications previously. She added that they need to keep in mind that there is already a PDD approved for this site and because it is a major modification to what was originally proposed, they have to have a public hearing. As they can see on the drawing – and the second one is a little clearer – in terms of what is going to be needed. The City Engineer came up with this plan and as they can see the 223 site is definitely impacted and the buildings need to be (inaudible)...Mr. Watts' property, 235 is not going to be ...

Mr. Schultz commented that Apex Building can be saved.

Comm. Harger responded that she thought it was right on the road.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he did too but it includes the sidewalk too. Comm. Harger responded OK, because they are shifting the road.

Chair Parkins stated that the City is proposing to demolish this building.

Mr. Schultz indicated that all of the buildings get demolished on the Brennan site.

Comm. Harger asked if they were trying to keep the back part of 223.

Chair Parkins indicated no, it is a totally new layout and they'll see that when the plan is presented. She asked for a motion to accept.

On a motion made by Nancy Dickal seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #15-03 and schedule a public hearing for Wednesday, April 22nd.

PUBLIC PORTION

Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any item not on the Agenda.

Karen Meyer, 77 Myrtle Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Meyer indicated that she has been living in Shelton for about 10 years and she loves the town, enjoys the beauty of the town. She added that she leaves near the Shelton Cove. She commenting about loving nature and all of the bird and wildlife in Shelton and she's concerned that it will all be disappearing with all the new development that is going on.

Ms. Meyer commented that she didn't know if any studies were done regarding the environmental impact of all of this building or the woods being cut down. She cringes every time she goes by the Shelton Cove because it used to be just beautiful woods along the River. The condos are beautiful but she feels like she is being surrounded by condos where she lives. She stated that she realizes that people need somewhere to live but she also noticed an incredible increase in the traffic congestion in the area along Riverdale Road.

Ms. Meyer commented about seeing the plans for things like this, the developers that just came in – she asked if anyone was thinking about the long term impact as far as traffic in the town increasing, the impact on wildlife, etc. She knows that they have a Wetlands Commission and she went to one of those meetings but nothing was really mentioned about the wildlife or birds that Shelton has. She wanted to voice her concerns about it. She added that she didn't know if other people felt the same way that she does. She commented that she sees the advantages to these type of projects with jobs created and places to live but she noticed the incredible increase in the number of condominiums going up. It seems like everywhere she goes in Shelton...

Ms. Meyer indicated that she moved to Shelton from Norwalk and she hates to see this town turn into another Norwalk. She clarified that there are things she likes about Norwalk, however, she moved up here for the beauty of the town and to get away from all that hustle and bustle.

Chair Parkins asked how long she lived here.

Ms. Meyer responded 10 years and she lives near Public Works, in the woods near there. She hopes they won't be torn down for the development of anything. When she goes on Howe Avenue now or down the Riverdale Road area, she cringes when she sees a bulldozer and she's personally saddened by it. She sat here and saw people come in with these fancy plans to build these fancy buildings – to her a building is a building, and it doesn't really matter what it looks like.

Comm. Harger asked for clarification as to where Ms. Meyer lived because she said Riverdale but that isn't near the Shelton Cove.

Ms. Meyer responded that she lives on River Road – that is what she meant – near the Riverdale Diner. She lives in a older home that already existed – no woods were torn down.

Comm. Harger commented OK, she thought she meant Riverdale Avenue.

Chair Parkins stated that they appreciated her taking the time to come out and share her sentiments with them tonight. She explained that the unfortunate part is that land that is not held in Open Space or Conservation, that it is privately owned – people do have the right to develop their land. This Commission tries to take those things into consideration. Typically when developments come in they have their Traffic Engineers, their studies and that is basically what the Commission bases their decisions on.

Comm. Harger mentioned that there were public hearings held regarding the Shelton Cove.

Chair Parkins added that there are always public hearings for the developments.

Comm. McGorty commented that Inland Wetlands is involved and the State DEEP is involved with cases like that which are right on the River. A lot of thought goes into these projects and the Commission is pretty tough with their requirements. They give a lot of consideration to the surrounding neighborhoods. He added that they are all from this community and have been for a long time so they share her passion and concerns. He commented that they are all in the same boat.

Chair Parkins added that they don't always get as much as they want – as many units. She indicated that they realize that there are a lot of people who do want to come into Shelton and while there is an inventory of older homes, people may not be looking for something as large as what was being built 20 years ago or those McMansions. Many are looking to downsize now and that seems to be the new market – to build smaller projects.

Comm. McGorty indicated that on this project tonight – when people get to a certain age they often leave town to find a smaller place but now there are new things, smaller pieces of property so when you downsize you don't have to leave the town you like.

Comm. Dickal commented that, unfortunately, they have to realize that as time goes by things change and it is a balancing act. They try to consider everything. When she first moved to Shelton, the Woodside Deli was one of the only things on that road but it has developed there tremendously. It has helped the tax base but they take in consideration conservation issues and the wildlife – they really do.

Ms. Meyer responded that was great that they do. She understands what they are saying but as far as a wildlife preserve – they set aside a Dog Park for the dogs...she asked if there was any land open for that.

Comm. McGorty responded that this town is very aggressive in regard to Open Space that has been purchased. He added that he thinks that they lead any communities in the surrounding area with regard to the amount of open space that the town acquires.

Comm. Dickal mentioned all the walking trails.

Mr. Schultz suggested to Ms. Meyer that she attend a Conservation Commission meeting because they project what they would like to see the City purchase down the road for open space. She could share her comments with them.

Ms. Meyer responded OK, she'd be happy to.

Mr. Schultz mentioned that they would be getting into the update of their Plan of Conservation and Development and there is an Open Space component so they need input from the Conservation Commission. The Conservation Commission meets the first Wednesday of each month, Room 303 at 7 p.m.

Comm. Dickal stated that it was great to have her come out and they look for people to do that. They like to have the input from residents here.

Ms. Meyer thanked the Commission for letting her speak.

Comm. Harger encouraged her to attend public hearings for future projects and make her comments there.

Comm. McGorty explained that public input was critical – hearing from people, neighbors that live there. It is good for the Commission to have that information because they may not have it because they don't live in that area.

Ms. Meyer commented that she would talk to her neighbors too. She wasn't sure if it was going to be appropriate for her to come tonight.

Comm. Dickal responded absolutely – that is how change happens.

Comm. Harger mentioned all the neighbors who came out for the Perry Hill project and Fanny Street.

Comm. McGorty indicated that for Fanny Street there was going to be a passage put right through their cul-de-sac and because of all the neighbors who came out to speak against it ruining their neighborhood, it didn't happen and the project was changed to go through another way. The public input is critical and they listen.

Comm. Harger commented that unfortunately there is nothing that can be done now with the Shelton Cove.

Ms. Meyer stated that it was great that they take the public's comments into consideration.

Chair Parkins commented that their public hearings can sometimes be very emotional but many good points are raised – such as with Water's Edge.

Comm. Harger indicated that for many projects the public hearings have been kept open for another month to give residents more time to comment.

Chair Parkins commented that it would depend but if a lot of people come out and they weren't given an opportunity to speak or if they ask questions still requiring answers than the hearing will be continued.

Comm. McGorty added that there is fact-finding that needs to take place so until all the questions are answered they will keep a public hearing open.

Chair Parkins clarified that if no one comes out to oppose or ask any questions than the Commission feels it is unopposed and they will just move it forward.

Comm. McGorty stated that they move forward but keep the surrounding areas in mind too - but it is good to hear from the local community.

Chair Parkins stated it could be for any project not just ones near where you live.

Comm. Harger indicated that public hearing notices are in the newspaper and on the City of Shelton website and they have to be posted.

Ms. Meyer responded OK.

Chair Parkins commented about her questions regarding a wildlife preserve and indicated that is really more of a State or federally funded project. A city like Shelton would not have the resources to maintain a wildlife refuge. She commented that typically they'll have like the Stewart McKinney National Wildlife Refuge in Stratford which is federally funded.

Ms. Meyer commented about there being a lot of the vacant old buildings and she thinks it is great that many have been renovated and made into apartments.

Chair Parkins responded that is their goal for Downtown – to use as many of the buildings down there as possible with private investment.

Ms. Meyer indicated that she would check the website more often and thanked the Commission.

Comm. Harger told her the regular P&Z meetings were held on the second Tuesday of the month and Special Meetings are the fourth Wednesday of the month. The Special Meetings would typically be for public hearings.

Chair Parkins commented that all agendas are on the website.

Ms. Meyer responded that the meetings was very informative.

With no further public comments, Chair Parkins asked for a motion to close the public portion of the meeting.

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to close the public portion.

OTHER BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: 2/10/15 AND 2/25/15

Comm. Dickal scoped out another Dingle/Dickal/Tickey spelling error on the second page of the 2/10/15 minutes. Chair Parkins mentioned the reference of Comm. McGorty which should have been Comm. Harger on Page 18 of 2/25/15.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Thomas McGorty it was voted 5-0 with 1 abstention to approve the minutes of 2/10/15 and 2/25/15 with the noted corrections. Comm. Harger abstained from voting.

PAYMENT OF BILLS

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

Mr. Schultz reminded the Commissioners that on the Consultant bill coming up for the Downtown would be coming before the Commission.

STAFF REPORT

***See attached Planning & Zoning Staff Report dated March 10, 2015 from Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator.**

Mr. Schultz reviewed report items including the 3/17 ZBA Agenda items, Citing Council, Zoning Subcommittee (Child Daycare Regulations), Downtown Subcommittee Agenda and Zoning Enforcement Issues.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Thomas McGorty seconded by Nancy Dickal, it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karin C. Tuke
P&Z Recording Secretary